

## EUROPE DOMIINANT IN WORLD BRIDGE GANES



From Left to right - the dealers who duplicate the boards: Arkadiusz Ciechomski, Marek Waglewski, Pawel Szczgiel, Franco Crosta, Paolo Vecchio, Federica Parizzi, Monica Gorreri, Carlo Vecchio and Simona Maini
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Today's Programme
Open \& Women's Teams: RR 7-9 (start 10:30)

Seniors \& Mixed Teams: RR 9-I2 (start 10:00)

As the grind continues towards Saturday - when the knockout phases of the four teams events begin - European teams are occupying most of the top spots in the competition.
There are three groups in the Open series, two in the Women's Series and one each in the Senior and Mixed Teams. Taking the top three in each group, that's 21 places. European teams occupy 16 of those spots. That is $76 \%$.
Group leaders in the Open series are Italy, Poland and Austria. In the Women's, China and France are leading their respective packs. USA has a strong lead in the Senior Teams.Australia is cruising in the Mixed Teams. In the two larger fields - the Open has 54 teams, the Women's 35 - making the cut for the final 16 teams will be more difficult.

In the Senior Teams, 24 teams will be fighting for 16 places. Two thirds of the field will make the cut. The odds are virtually the same in the Mixed Teams, with 23 entries.
The round robin concludes on Friday.


Bank Polski


GROUP AND INDIVIDUAL PICTURE SCHEDULE

Tuesday 6

SENIORS

| Japan | 11.55 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Mexico | 12.00 |
| New Zealand | 14.40 |
| Pakistan | 14.45 |
| Turkey | 16.55 |
| USA | 17.00 |

OPEN

| Chinese Taipei | 10.10 |
| :--- | ---: |

New Zealand $\quad 10.15$
Pakistan 10.20
Philippines $\quad 13.35$
Russia $\quad 13.40$
Singapore $\quad 13.45$
South Africa $\quad 16.30$
Tunisia $\quad 16.35$
Ukraine $\quad 16.40$
The meeting point is outside the front door. Thank you very much for your cooperation!


## No smoking or drinking

 policy

Please be reminded that smoking and drinking is prohibited at any time and in any place during sessions.

## No cell phones allowed

No cell phones will be allowed in the playing area, but players can leave them at the registration desk.


## Schedule

## Senior Teams

| RR 9 - 10:00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 51 | SPAIN | NEW ZEALAND | 71 | CHINA | NEW ZEALAND |
| 52 | NORWAY | BRAZIL | 72 | CHINESE TAIPEI | GERMANY |
| 53 | DENMARK | USA | 73 | JAPAN | IRELAND |
| 54 | TURKEY | ENGLAND | 74 | POLAND | BULGARIA |
| 55 | ISRAEL | JAPAN | 75 | UAE | AUSTRALIA |
| 56 | CHINA | SWEDEN | 76 | HUNGARY | TURKEY |
| 57 | GERMANY | PAKISTAN | 77 | SWEDEN | RUSSIA |
| 58 | EGYPT | ITALY | 78 | NETHERLANDS | ISRAEL |
| 59 | FRANCE | CHINESE TAIPEI | 79 | USA | FRANCE |
| 60 | CANADA | MEXICO | 80 | ENGLAND | INDIA |
| 61 | POLAND | INDIA | 81 | DENMARK | BRAZIL |
| 62 | CHINA HONG KONG | AUSTRALIA | 82 | ITALY | BYE |
| RR 10-12:15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 51 | NEW ZEALAND | MEXICO | 71 | NEW ZEALAND | ITALY |
| 52 | CHINESE TAIPEI | INDIA | 72 | FRANCE | INDIA |
| 53 | ITALY | AUSTRALIA | 73 | ISRAEL | BRAZIL |
| 54 | PAKISTAN | CHINA HONG KONG | 74 | RUSSIA | DENMARK |
| 55 | SWEDEN | POLAND | 75 | TURKEY | ENGLAND |
| 56 | JAPAN | CANADA | 76 | BULGARIA | USA |
| 57 | ENGLAND | FRANCE | 77 | IRELAND | NETHERLANDS |
| 58 | USA | EGYPT | 78 | GERMANY | SWEDEN |
| 59 | BRAZIL | GERMANY | 79 | CHINA | HUNGARY |
| 60 | SPAIN | CHINA | 80 | CHINESE TAIPEI | UAE |
| 61 | NORWAY | ISRAEL | 81 | JAPAN | POLAND |
| 62 | DENMARK | TURKEY | 82 | AUSTRALIA | BYE |


| RR \| - 15:00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 51 | NORWAY | NEW ZEALAND | 71 | CHINESE TAIPEI | NEW ZEALAND |
| 52 | DENMARK | SPAIN | 72 | JAPAN | CHINA |
| 53 | TURKEY | BRAZIL | 73 | POLAND | GERMANY |
| 54 | ISRAEL | USA | 74 | UAE | IRELAND |
| 55 | CHINA | ENGLAND | 75 | HUNGARY | BULGARIA |
| 56 | GERMANY | JAPAN | 76 | SWEDEN | AUSTRALIA |
| 57 | EGYPT | SWEDEN | 77 | NETHERLANDS | TURKEY |
| 58 | FRANCE | PAKISTAN | 78 | USA | RUSSIA |
| 59 | CANADA | ITALY | 79 | ENGLAND | FRANCE |
| 60 | POLAND | CHINESE TAIPEI | 80 | DENMARK | ITALY |
| 61 | CHINA HONG KONG | MEXICO | 81 | BRAZIL | INDIA |
| 62 | AUSTRALIA | INDIA | 82 | ISRAEL | BYE |
| RR 12-17:15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 51 | NEW ZEALAND | INDIA | 71 | NEW ZEALAND | INDIA |
| 52 | MEXICO | AUSTRALIA | 72 | ITALY | BRAZIL |
| 53 | CHINESE TAIPEI | CHINA HONG KONG | 73 | FRANCE | DENMARK |
| 54 | ITALY | POLAND | 74 | ISRAEL | ENGLAND |
| 55 | PAKISTAN | CANADA | 75 | TURKEY | USA |
| 56 | SWEDEN | FRANCE | 76 | AUSTRALIA | NETHERLANDS |
| 57 | JAPAN | EGYPT | 77 | BULGARIA | SWEDEN |
| 58 | ENGLAND | GERMANY | 78 | IRELAND | HUNGARY |
| 59 | USA | CHINA | 79 | GERMANY | UAE |
| 60 | BRAZIL | ISRAEL | 80 | CHINA | POLAND |
| 61 | SPAIN | TURKEY | 81 | CHINESE TAIPEI | JAPAN |
| 62 | NORWAY | DENMARK | 82 | RUSSIA | BYE |


| RR 7 - | O:30 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| I | SINGAPORE | UKRAINE |
| 2 | JORDAN | ISRAEL |
| 3 | ESTONIA | FRANCE |
| 4 | GERMANY | CHINESE TAIPEI |
| 5 | ITALY | GREECE |
| 6 | BRAZIL | INDIA |
| 7 | PHILIPPINES | AUSTRALIA |
| 8 | SOUTH AFRICA | RUSSIA |
| 9 | FINLAND | SWITZERLAND |

## RR 8 - 14:00 <br> Open Teams Group A

RR 9 - 16:50

| I | ISRAEL | SINGAPORE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | RRANCE | JORDAN |
| 3 | CHINESE TAIPEI | ESTONIA |
| 4 | GREECE | GERMANY |
| 5 | INDIA | ITALY |
| 6 | SWITZERLAND | BRAZIL |
| 7 | AUSTRALIA | UKRAINE |
| 8 | RUSSIA | PHILIPPINES |
| 9 | FINLAND | SOUTH AFRICA |


| I SINGAPORE | FRANCE |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | JORDAN | CHINESE TAIPEI |
| 3 | ESTONIA | GREECE |
| 4 | GERMANY | INDIA |
| 5 | ITALY | BRAZIL |
| 6 | ISRAEL | AUSTRALIA |
| 7 | UKRAINE | RUSSIA |
| 8 | PHILIPPINES | FINLAND |
| 9 | SOUTH AFRICA | SWITZERLAND |

Open Teams Group B

| 11 | PAKISTAN | LATVIA | II ENGLAND | PAKISTAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | KUWAIT | ENGLAND | 12 USA | KUWAIT |
| 13 | BOSNIA HERZ. | USA | 13 NORWAY | BOSNIA HERZEG. |
| 14 | MONACO | NORWAY | 14 ARGENTINA | MONACO |
| 15 | POLAND | ARGENTINA | 15 MEXICO | POLAND |
| 16 | LEBANON | MEXICO | 16 TURKEY 17 ICELAND | LEBANON |
| 17 | CH. HONG KONG | ICELAND | 18 JAPAN | CH. HONG |
| 18 | TUNISIA | JAPAN | KONG |  |
| 19 | BELGIUM | TURKEY | 19 BELGIUM | TUNISIA |


| II | PAKISTAN | USA |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I2 | KUWAIT | NORWAY |
| I3 | BOSNIA HERZ. | ARGENTINA |
| 14 | MONACO | MEXICO |
| I5 POLAND | LEBANON |  |
| I6 ENGLAND | ICELAND |  |
| I7 LATVIA | JAPAN |  |
| 18 | CH. HONG KONG | BELGIUM |
| I9 | TUNISIA | TURKEY |

## Open Teams Group C

| 21 | BANGLADESH | SCOTLAND |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | GUADELOUPE | SPAIN |
| 23 | NEW ZEALAND | SWEDEN |
| 24 | NETHERLANDS | DENMARK |
| 25 | CHINA | SAN MARINO |
| 26 | HUNGARY | CANADA |
| 27 | AUSTRIA | EGYPT |
| 28 | IRELAND | LITHUANIA |
| 29 | UAE | BYE |


| 21 | SPAIN | BANGLADESH |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | SWEDEN | GUADELOUPE |
| 23 | DENMARK | NEW ZEALAND |
| 24 | SAN MARINO | NETHERLANDS |
| 25 | CANADA | CHINA |
| 26 | LITHUANIA | HUNGARY |
| 27 | UAE | SCOTLAND |
| 28 | IRELAND | AUSTRIA |
| 29 | EGYPT | BYE |


| 21 | BANGLADESH | SWEDEN |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | GUADELOUPE | DENMARK |
| 23 | NEW ZEALAND | SAN MARINO |
| 24 | NETHERLANDS | CANADA |
| 25 | CHINA | HUNGARY |
| 26 | SPAIN | UAE |
| 27 | SCOTLAND | EGYPT |
| 28 | AUSTRIA | LITHUANIA |
| 29 | IRELAND | BYE |

## Women's Teams Group A

| 31 | KOREA | MEXICO |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 32 | JAPAN | SWEDEN |
| 33 | PAKISTAN | ENGLAND |
| 34 | CHINA | SPAIN |
| 35 | NETHERLANDS | BRAZIL |
| 36 | NORWAY | JORDAN |
| 37 | AUSTRALIA | SOUTH AFRICA |
| 38 | EGYPT | TURKEY |
| 39 | SAN MARINO | FINLAND |


| 31 | SWEDEN | KOREA |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 32 | ENGLAND | JAPAN |
| 33 | SPAIN | PAKISTAN |
| 34 | BRAZIL | CHINA |
| 35 | JORDAN | NETHERLANDS |
| 36 | FINLAND | NORWAY |
| 37 | SOUTH AFRICA | MEXICO |
| 38 | TURKEY | AUSTRALIA |
| 39 | SAN MARINO | EGYPT |


| 31 | KOREA | ENGLAND |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 32 | JAPAN | SPAIN |
| 33 | PAKISTAN | BRAZIL |
| 34 | CHINA | JORDAN |
| 35 | NETHERLANDS | NORWAY |
| 36 | SWEDEN | SOUTH AFRICA |
| 37 | MEXICO | TURKEY |
| 38 | AUSTRALIA | SAN MARINO |
| 39 | EGYPT | FINLAND |

## Women's Teams Group B

| 41 | CHINESE TAIPEI | CHILE | 41 ITALY <br> 42 CH. HONG KONG <br> 42 ITALY <br> 43 ICELAND | USA | CHINESE TAIPEI |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 44 | SCOTLAND | CH. HONG KONG |  |  |  |
| 44 | FRANCE | SCOTLAND | ICELAND |  |  |
| 45 | POLAND | INDIA | FRANCE |  |  |
| 46 | DENMARK | INDIA | PALESTINE | GERMANY | 45 |
| 47 | PALESTINE | POLAND |  |  |  |
| 46 | CANADA | DENMARK |  |  |  |
| 48 | IRELAND | GERMANY | NEW ZEALAND |  |  |
| 49 | NEW ZEALAND | CYE |  |  |  |
| 48 | IRELAND | TUNISIA |  |  |  |
| 49 | CHILE | BYE |  |  |  |


| 41 | CHINESE TAIPEI | USA |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 42 | CH. HONG KONG | SCOTLAND |
| 43 | ICELAND | INDIA |
| 44 | FRANCE | PALESTINE |
| 45 | POLAND | DENMARK |
| 46 | CHILE | GERMANY |
| 47 | NEW ZEALAND | IRELAND |
| 48 | TUNISIA | CANADA |
| 49 | ITALY | BYE |

## Rankings

## Seniors Teams After Round 8

## Mixed Teams After Round 8

| TEAM | VP |
| :--- | ---: |
| I USA | 123.17 |
| 2 CHINA | 121.55 |
| 3 POLAND | 108.60 |
| 4 SWEDEN | 107.39 |
| 5 EGYPT | 103.48 |
| 6 DENMARK | 102.65 |
| 7 | CHINESE TAIPEI |
| 8 | GERMANY |
| 9 | ITALY |


|  | TEAM |
| :--- | ---: |
| I AUSTRALIA | VP |
| 2 POLAND | 114.24 |
| 3 NETHERLANDS | 108.96 |
| 4 RUSSIA | 108.00 |
| 5 ISRAEL | 103.59 |
| 6 FRANCE | 99.81 |
| 7 NEW ZEALAND | 97.89 |
| 8 ITALY | 97.75 |
| 9 GERMANY | 95.50 |
| IO JAPAN | 91.57 |
| II USA | 91.53 |
| I2 CHINA | 89.57 |
| I3 BULGARIA | 86.30 |
| I4 DENMARK | 85.34 |
| I5 IRELAND | 81.93 |
| I6 INDIA | 67.52 |
| I7 BRAZIL | 67.05 |
| I8 SWEDEN | 65.04 |
| I9 TURKEY | 64.10 |
| 20 HUNGARY | 63.27 |
| 2I ENGLAND | 61.03 |
| 22 CHINESE TAIPEI | 39.41 |
| 23 UNITED ARAB EMIRATES | 37.39 |

## HOW TO REACH CENTENNIAL HALL FROM THE HOTELS THROUGH PUBLIC TRANSPORT

## Hotel Mercure BB Hotel

 Stop "GALERIA DOMINIKAŃSKA" Tram 2,4,10 direction "Biskupin", directly to stop "HALA STULECIA"
## Hotel Radisson

Stop "URZAD WOJEWÓDZKI"
Tram 2,Io direction "Biskupin",
Bus 146 direction "Bartoszowice" directly to stop "HALA STULECIA"

Hotel Monopol Stop "ŚWIDNICKA"
Tram 4, 10 direction "Biskupin"
Directly to stop "HALA STULECIA"
Hotel Novotel
Stop "PARK POŁUDNIOWY"
Tram 9 direction "Sępolno"
To stop "WZGÓRZE PARTYZANTÓW"
Switch to Tram 2 direction Biskupin
To stop "HALA STULECIA"
When going back to hotels: From "HALA STULECIA" tram 2 goes to direction KRZYKI
4 goes to direction "OPORÓW"
10 goes to direction LEŚNICA
9 goes to direction PARK POŁUDNIOWY
Bus 146 goes to direction GAJ

|  | Open Teams |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Open A aiter i 6 |  |  |
|  | TEAM | VP |
| 1 | ITALY | 89.10 |
| 2 | FRANCE | 81.23 |
| 3 | ISRAEL | 74.06 |
| 4 | RUSSIA | 73.69 |
| 5 | SWITZERLAND | 72.14 |
| 6 | GERMANY | 70.33 |
| 7 | SINGAPORE | 67.44 |
| 8 | INDIA | 64.81 |
| 9 | GREECE | 62.61 |
| 10 | AUSTRALIA | 61.18 |
| 11 | IORDAN | 54.28 |
| 12 | FINLAND | 52.09 |
| 13 | UKRAINE | 49.00 |
| 14 | PHILIPPINES | 45.51 |
| 15 | CHINESE TAIPEI | 45.30 |
| 16 | BRAZIL | 44.30 |
| 17 | ESTONIA | 34.16 |
| 18 | SOUTH AFRICA | 31.31 |

## pen B after R 6

|  | TEAM | VP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | POLAND | 87.76 |
| 2 | ICELAND | 82.81 |
| 3 | IAPAN | 81.62 |
| 4 | ENGLAND | 72.91 |
| 5 | ARGENTINA | 71.68 |
| 6 | TURKEY | 60.98 |
| 7 | BELGIUM | 60.88 |
| 8 | PAKISTAN | 60.53 |
| 9 | NORWAY | 59.87 |
| 10 | USA | 57.51 |
| 11 | LEBANON | 57.05 |
| 12 | BOSNIA HERZEGOVINA | 56.23 |
| 13 | TUNISIA | 56.02 |
| 14 | MONACO | 54.30 |
| 15 | LATVIA | 51.39 |
| 16 | MEXICO | 42.12 |
| 17 | CHINA HONG KONG | 35.14 |
| 18 | KUWAIT | 31.20 |
| Open C atter R6 |  |  |
|  | TEAM | VP |
| 1 | AUSTRIA | 93.57 |
| 2 | SPAIN | 85.57 |
| 3 | HUNGARY | 76.98 |
| 4 | IRELAND | 76.13 |
| 5 | DENMARK | 71.18 |
| 6 | SWEDEN | 70.61 |
| 7 | NETHERLANDS | 68.25 |
| 8 | LITHUANIA | 65.50 |
| 9 | CANADA | 59.86 |
| 10 | CHINA | 57.45 |
| 11 | EGYPT | 56.36 |
| 12 | NEW ZEALAND | 55.07 |
| 13 | UNITED ARAB EMIRATES | 49.78 |
| 14 | SCOTLAND | 48.58 |
| 15 | GUADELOUPE | 43.29 |
| 16 | BANGLADESH | 27.92 |
| 17 | SAN MARINO | 25.90 |


| Women's Teams |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Women's A after R 6 |  |
| TEAM | vp |
|  | ${ }_{7}^{88,16}$ |
| 3 Nornar | ${ }_{73.46}^{796}$ |
| 4 5 5 SuRKEY 5 SWEDN | ${ }^{70.50}$ |
| 5 SNEDEN 6 AUSTRALA | 70.31 |
| ${ }_{7} 7$ ANGIAND | ${ }_{6}^{68.41} 67$ |
| 8 finland | 64.71 |
| 9 g APAN | ¢92.27 |
| 10 SOUTHAFRICA | ( |
| ${ }_{\text {che }} 112$ Mexico |  |
| 13 Spaln | 51.50 |
| 14 KOREA | ${ }^{51.38}$ |
| ${ }_{\text {l }}^{15}$ Pakistan | 47.65 |
| ${ }_{1} 16$ EGYPT | 45.31 |
| 18 SAN MARINO | 37.18 |

## Women's B after R6

| TEAM | VP |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 FRANCE | 92.25 |
| 2 GERMANY | 87.88 |
| 3 USA | 80.62 |
| 4 CHINESE TAIPEI | 75.30 |
| 5 NEW ZEALAND | 74.24 |
| 6 POLAND | 73.79 |
| 7 ITALY | 68.50 |
| 8 CHINA HONG KONG | 65.30 |
| 9 IRELAND | 63.23 |
| 10 SCOTLAND | 61.39 |
| 11 DENMARK | 59.97 |
| 12 CANADA | 57.48 |
| 13 CHILE | 51.57 |
| 14 ICELAND | 39.70 |
| 15 PALESTINE | 30.85 |
| 16 TUNISIA | 29.77 |
| 17 INDIA | 19.16 |

## Tramtastic

You should have no trouble using the English option on the ticket machines now stationed at most transit stops and on all trams and buses. The machines on trams and buses only take plastic! A single fare is 3 zl - but night buses cost 3.20 zl. Tickets are not valid until you stamp them once inside the tram or bus. Plain-clothed inspectors regularly travel the lines handing out hefty fines to those without valid tickets; being a foreigner will not excuse you - it will only mean you will have to pay in cash on the spot.

## Spotting the intrafinesse <br> By Jos Jacobs

In Monday morning's Round 4 (Open and Women), this was board 22:

Board 22. Dealer East. E/WVul.

- K Q J 62
$\vee$ J 7
$\diamond$ Q 106
- J 65
- A 4

คA65
$\diamond$ J 852
\& K 1082


In the Australia v. Russia match, this was the bidding in the Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Semenor | Hans | Kholomeer | Nunn |
|  |  | 18 | 10 |
| Dble | 30 | 50 | All Pass |

South led a spade to dummy's ace, declarer shedding his diamond loser. Kholomeev then drew trumps in three rounds, ending in dummy and continued the $\$ 5$, inserting the eight from his hand. South won his ten and returned a diamond to declarer's ace. Kholomeev's next move was to advance the $\triangle Q$ which held the trick. When the jack appeared in North, he thus had managed to bring off a genuine intrafinesse for an overtrick. Not that it mattered at all as the Aussies were in $6 \%$ at the other table and went one off.
The all-important question on this deal thus had become: did anyone play for this intrafinesse in a situation in which it really mattered? The answer is YES.
For Denmark, Clemmensen-Graversen were E/W against Canada and they too ended up in 6\%.
The play went exactly the same as described above but the big difference was that in $6 \%$, the intrafinesse did really matter. So full credit to H.C. Graversen, the only declarer in the Hala Stulecia to record +1370 .
This deal also reminded me of an old truth. More often than not, and if time etc. allows, it's a good idea to try to speak to the players involved. This time, it was the easiest way to find out that in the official scoring, the E/W names had been interchanged.As Poul Clemmensen smilingly said: "It has happened to us before. Usually, the wrong player (my partner!?) then gets credited with the -800s."
So very well played, Hans-Christian!
In the Women Series, no 1370s were scored but Nan WANG from China managed to record the best overall score on this board, because she had to find, and actually did find, the same intrafinesse play in 68 for a proud +1430 . Even better ...congratulations!

## The International Bridge Press Association (IBPA)

IBPA is a club for the world's bridge media people and you may also join as Associate Member.

The main service is a monthly Bulletin edited by John Carruthers with the best of the best. Members may also enjoy the Press facilities at championships.

The annual IBPA subscription is US\$42 ( $€ 38$ ). New members joining in Wroclaw pay US\$52.50 (€48) for 2016 and 2017.You can apply, and pay, in the Press Room.

Current members paying late for this year, or early for next, can clear their dues in the Press Room.

The Annual General Meeting on Saturday (the 10th) will start at 09:00 a.m. (precisely) in the Vugraph Theatre (where the Opening Ceremony was).

Per Jannersten
Chairman
Directions to Press Room
Orbit the playing area 90 degrees counter clockwise until you reach Entrance A where you find a large stairwell to the right. The Press Room is at the top of the stairs in Sala Cesarska.

## TRANSFERS

## HOTEL PARK PLAZA

8:30 WBF Staff
9:10 players who made reservation through ZAPA
HOTELS IBIS and SCANDIC
9:00 for all who made reservation through ZAPA
HOTEL RADISSON
TRANSFERS BY WICAR TAXI
If you stay in the other hotels, you need to arrange your transfers yourselves!

## Badges !!

Players, please note that without a badge you will not be allowed into the playing area. If you lose your badge, replacing it will cost you 5 Euros.

## Open Teams Round 2



## Ireland v. New Zealand



By Jos Jacobs
One of the sometimes underestimated aspects of bridge is its entertainment value. Here in Europe, Ireland have acquired a reputation for themselves of sending teams that often enough produce a combination of both sensible and entertaining bridge. The same applies to our antipodes, if I have been properly informed, so I decided to sit down for their match in Round 2.
Surprisingly enough, the pretty cold slam on the first board was not only missed at half the tables in play but also by one of our two featured teams.

Board I7. Dealer North. None Vul.

- AKQJ74
$\bigcirc 52$
$\diamond$ Q 74
\& K 6
-1053
®K943
$\diamond K 8$
\& 5432

- 96

Q Q J 7
$\diamond 9653$
\& 1987

- 82
$\bigcirc$ A 1086
$\diamond$ AJ 102
\& AQ 10
As the heart loser disappears on the 2 Q , only a 5-0 trump break or an unlikely initial ruff beats 64.
The Irish quickly landed on their feet:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brown | Hanlon | Whibley | McGann |
|  | $1{ }^{1}$ | Pass | 2\% |
| Pass | 30 | Pass | 4\% |
| Pass | 49 | Pass | 5 |
| Pass | 6\% | Pass | 68 |

All Pass
Please note the $6{ }^{\circ}$ cuebid en passant. Had South been able to bid $6 \diamond$, they would have ended up in the grand... Ireland +980.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Carroll | Tislevoll | Garvey | Ware |
|  | $1 乌$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $2 \$$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| Pass | 4 | All Pass |  |



The Open Room
The differences between the two auctions are clear. The slow 2/l GF approach made it much more difficult for South to assess the values of his aces opposite partner's spades. In the Open Room, the Irish natural 34 rebid over the relay 20 made life easy for South as it all but solved the quality problem. New Zealand +480 and the first II IMPs to Ireland.
Two boards later, New Zealand were definitely unlucky:
Board I9. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

- 10987

৫K 975
$\diamond$ Q 105
92


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brown | Hanlon | Whibley | McGann |
|  |  |  | 24 |
| 3 | 32 | 49 | Pass |
| 50 | Pass | 6 | All Pass |

With trumps 3-0 behind you, there is no way to bring home the good slam in diamonds. Ireland +100 .
In the other room, the Irish were in trouble when West did not overcall after the Multi:


|  | Geo Tislevoll, New Zealand |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Carroll | Tislevoll | Garvey | Ware |
|  |  |  | $2 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | 4\% | Dble | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| 4NT | Pass | 5\% | All Pass |

4e asked opener to transfer to his suit, so Ware politely did so, consuming a lot of bidding space in the process. N/S had managed to bid three suits, only to find out that South actually held the fourth. E/W could not cope with the situation, apparently. Down five, New Zealand +500 and 9 IMPs back to them. They may well have felt that some justice had been done to them after all...
On the next board, 3NT by South was made more often than not. It would need a brilliant lead by West to beat it.

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.


The auction was the same in both rooms:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | Hanlon | Whibley | McGann |
| Carroll | Tislevoll | Garvey | Ware |
| Is | $2 \triangleleft$ | $3 \$$ | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

For Ireland, West led the 1 J which immediately handed over the contract to declarer. Twelve tricks were made when West did not hold on to his clubs. New Zealand +690 .
At the other table, Brown found a possibly over-brilliant lead: the 86 away from his $\vee A x$. Dummy played the queen, East won his king and what now? If partner had led from Axx, another heart would quickly settle the issue. In that case, however, declarer wold have gambled 3NT holding just a singleton heart. Another interesting question is: why did declarer call for dummy's queen?
When East returned a heart rather than the $\$ 10$, declarer could run for home. Ireland +600 and only 3 IMPs for New Zealand's rather too inspired effort.
Three boards from the end, Tom Hanlon was faced with an unusual problem.

Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul.


He opened what could be a Strong Club - forcing to INT in principle. But what to do with a passing partner (may be intended as forcing, of course) and an opponent who is suggesting he too is looking at your strong suit? Hanlon passed and collected +50 .
In the other room, the auction was more straightforward.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Carroll | Tislevoll | Garvey <br> Pass | Ware |
|  |  | Pass |  |
| Pass | 1s | Pass | INT |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

Ten easy tricks, New Zealand +430 and 9 IMPs to them, seeing them into the lead. An adverse partscore swing made the final result $30-27$ or 10.9 I - 9.09 V.P. to Ireland.

## Round 2 - Open Group A



By David Stern
Round 2 of the Open Series saw South Africa drawn against Germany. South Africa had a tough time in the first match, losing by almost the maximum to Italy, while Germany had a small win against Finland.
Board 17 saw continuing problems for South Africa when the Open Room tentatively explored a spade slam, stopping in 54 while the closed room bid to 64 after having a sniff at the possibility of the grand slam.

## Board I7. Dealer North. None Vul.

- AKQJ74
$\checkmark 52$
$\diamond$ Q 74
\& K 6
↔ 1053
『K 943
$\diamond$ K 8
2 5432

| N |  | - 96 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Q Q J 7 |
| W | E | $\checkmark 9653$ |
| S |  | - 1987 |

- 82

คA 1086
$\diamond A J 102$

* A Q 10

With 7s being marginally worse than the diamond finesse, because of 5-0 spades, it seems that GowerApteker sold the hand well short when South didn't appreciate the strength of the three aces and intermediate cards opposite the jump rebid.
In the closed room, Gromoeller-Fritsche explored the possibility of seven after what appeared to be a cue bid of 4\% by South over North's 3s rebid. Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schwerdt | Gower | Linde | Apteker |
|  | $1{ }^{1}$ | Pass | 2\% |
| Pass | 30 | Pass | 4\% |
| Pass | 49 | Pass | $5 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 59 | All Pass |  |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eber | Gromoeller | Bosenberg | Fritsche |
|  | $1{ }^{1}$ | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | 34 | Pass | 4\% |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | 5\% |
| Pass | 5NT | Pass | 64 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Although flat, board 19 could have seen Germany generate another slam swing.

Board 19. Dealer South. E/WVul.

|  | - 10987 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K 975 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 105 |  |
|  | \% 92 |  |
| - 65 | N | ¢ K Q |
| $\bigcirc$ A 3 |  | $\bigcirc$ Q 1084 |
| $\diamond$ KJ87642 |  | $\diamond$ A 93 |
| ¢ K 4 | S | * AQ 105 |
|  | - AJ432 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J 62 |  |
|  | $\checkmark-$ |  |
|  | ¢ 18763 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schwerdt | Gower | Linde | Apteker |
|  |  |  | 2s |
| 3 - | 49 | $6 \diamond$ | All Pass |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Eber | Gromoeller | Bosenberg | Fritsche |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 18 | INT |
| 2 | 24 | 3NT | All Pass |

3NT had similar chances to $6 \diamond$ and we all know which scores better. If the diamonds behave reasonably, any $2-1$ break or 3-0 with South holding Q-I0-5 declarer has 12 tricks. Alas, not on this deal, but nor were there nine tricks in 3NT.


Neville Eber, South Africa

Board 7 saw an opportunity for South Africa to pick up a vulnerable game, missed in the other room, by guessing a diamond suit of $\diamond K$-Q-IO opposite 7-5-3. When Gower misguessed, that resulted in 7 IMPs for Germany, who led 18-0.
On Board 25,South Africa finally saw daylight in a most unusual way.

Board 25. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

|  | - KJ1086 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 9652$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 82$ |  |
|  | \& 73 |  |
| - 3 | N | - A 54 |
| PJ873 |  | $\bigcirc 4$ |
| $\checkmark$ AK 963 |  | $\checkmark 10754$ |
| - AK 10 | S | - Q 8654 |
|  | - Q 972 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AKQ IO |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q J |  |
|  | - 192 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Schwerdt | Gower | Linde | Apteker |
|  | Pass | Pass | INT |
| Pass | $2 \dot{2}$ | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Eber | Gromoeller | Bosenberg | Fritsche |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \$$ |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | $2 \triangleq$ | $3 N T$ | All Pass |

In the open room, despite seeming close to making, $2 \checkmark$ drifted three down, which became academic when Bosenberg bid a very aggressive 3NT and was proved justified when the diamond suit behaved perfectly for him - South Africa II - Germany I8.

On this deal, Germany picked up 5 IMPs.

## Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.

|  | ¢ 63 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ¢KJ643 |  |
|  | $\diamond 53$ |  |
|  | \% Q 854 |  |
| - Q 87 | N | - AKJ 5 |
| $\bigcirc 9$ |  | $\bigcirc 72$ |
| $\diamond$ AK 874 | W E | $\checkmark 1062$ |
| ¢ J 1073 | S | ¢ AK 62 |
|  | ¢ 10942 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 1085 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q J 9 |  |
|  | \% 9 |  |

Open Room

| West <br> Schwerdt | North <br> Gower | East <br> Linde | South <br> Apteker <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | Pass | INT | $2 \%$ |
| $3 \varnothing$ | Double | $4 \%$ | Pass |
| 49 | Pass | $5 \%$ | All Pass |

Closed Room

| West | North <br> Eber |
| :--- | :--- |
| Gromoeller |  |


| East | South |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bosenberg | Fritsche |
|  | $2 \varnothing$ |
| Double | Pass |

Fritsche's $2 \triangleleft$ opening for Germany in the closed room showed $4+/ 4+$ in the majors. Clearly a raise by North to $4 \checkmark$, as some might consider, would have been wrong here as that may have prompted E/W to take action at a higher level than they actually did, thereby ensuring that they reached the cold game in spades or clubs or took 300 for $4 \bigcirc$ doubled.
One should have sympathy for West. He had enough values to express interest in game but, knowing that South had at least four spades, nothing looked perfect in terms of expressing his hand. South Africa II - Germany 23.
Germany furthered their lead when, on Board 29, South Africa went down by two tricks vulnerable at both tables playing at the three level in 4-3 fits.

Board 29. Dealer North. All Vul.

|  | - AJ 64 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ®K543 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 92 |  |
|  | \% K 5 |  |
| \& K Q 953 | N | -108 |
| QQJ 97 |  | $\bigcirc$ A 86 |
| $\diamond 753$ | W E | $\checkmark$ AJ 10 |
| -6 | S | * QJ 842 |
|  | $\pm 72$ |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 102$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 864 |  |
|  | \& A 10973 |  |

In the open room, Gower-Apteker played $3 \triangleleft$ N/S while in the closed room Bosenberg and Eber played $3 \wedge$ E/W.
Germany played solidly throughout the match to record a 32-II win with the only scores being the ones recorded on the five boards covered in this report.


## Throw winners, keep losers <br> By Patrick Jourdain, Cardiff, Wales (in 1991)

This is a sequel to "Keep Winners, Throw Losers," written in 1981.

By chance, I found myself in that same town where I had suffered humiliation at the local bridge club. As 18 years had passed, I felt safe in paying another visit, to see how the club had changed.
I received the same friendly welcome and was taken to the rubber-bridge room. It was a shock to see one player who greatly resembled the Maestro whose favorite phrase had been, "Keep winners, throw Losers."
Although I sat at a discreet distance from his table, I heard this player say to partner: "Keep your loser, throw your winner, and we beat their game with ease."
Unable to contain my curiosity, I told my story to the barman. He explained the puzzle: "The Maestro passed away some years ago, and his son is now our leading player. He was a rebellious boy and chose his own catchphrase merely to contradict his father's. Don't let it worry you." I went to the table, cut in, and soon found myself partnering Maestro Junior. Both sides were vulnerable and 40 on score when this deal came along:

```
& KQJ
QQ953
\diamond5432
* %
```

432
© KJ 1086
$\diamond K$ QJ
\& $A Q$

As South, I opened one heart, West bid two hearts, which was explained by East as Michaels, showing spades and a minor. I thought this unusually sophisticated for rubber bridge, but had already been warned that it was the club's favorite convention, so I kept my peace.
My partner raised to three hearts. As this was game at the score, I passed and was happy when this bought the contract and a satisfactory dummy.
West led the diamond ace, on which East played the ten. When West switched to ace and another spade, East played high-low. It was clear that a ruff was imminent, so I quickly played a trump. West won, gave his partner a spade ruff; and received a diamond ruff in return. One down.
"Unlucky! The trumps were two-two." I said, rather wittily I thought. But my partner displayed a scowl."You heard my advice to my previous partner," he said, "but did not take it."
What did he mean? As the cards were being distributed for the next deal, I recreated the layout:

- K Q J

QQ953
65432
3

| - A 10975 | N | - 86 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A 2 |  | $\bigcirc 74$ |
| $\checkmark$ A | W E | $\checkmark 10987$ |
| \& K 9754 | S | d. 10862 |
|  | - 432 |  |
|  | PKJ1086 |  |
|  | $\checkmark \mathrm{K} \mathrm{VJ}^{\text {d }}$ |  |
|  | - AQ |  |

Suddenly, I saw his point. Upon winning the second spade, I must play the ace and queen of clubs. Then, when West covers with the King, I throw dummy's winning spade. I would lose a club unnecessary, but save two tricks in return. If West continues with a spade, I can ruff high in dummy, then start on trumps. East cannot gain the lead to give West a diamond ruff, and I would lose only three aces and a club. Obvious, really! How did I miss that?
Feeling somewhat humbled, I became a defender on the next deal (so I have rotated the positions, showing myself as East):

- 185

P J 874
$\triangleleft$ Q 10873

- A


| South | West | North | East |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18 | $2 \vee$ | 38 | All Pass |

The bidding, strange to tell, was identical to that of the previous deal. Once again, three hearts was a game-going bit. "This Michaels cue-bid is everywhere," I thought.
My partnerled the king of spades and followed with the ace and queen. I played high-low, wondering why he had started with the king, as we had agreed to lead ace from ace-king. On the third round of spades, I briefly considered ruffing his winner in order to cash the diamond ace, but, thinking of the sneer I would receive, chose simply to discard a low club.
Partner duly switched to diamonds. I took the ace and led another. Declarer ruffed, felled the missing trumps in two rounds, and claimed, scoring up the rubber.
My partner looked annoyed again. "I would have expected you to get that right after the last deal." he said aggressively.

After I worked out how much I owed, I reviewed the deal:
, 185
ค J 874
$\diamond$ Q 10873
$\stackrel{4}{4}$

- AKQ 73
$\checkmark$ Q 2
$\diamond$ K 9654
- 10


I deduced that West had chosen the king of spades because he belonged to the school that leads king from ace-king when intending to switch to a singleton. After he saw the bare ace of clubs in dummy, he just continued spades. Now how could we have beaten three hearts?
Eventually, it clicked. On the third spade, I should have discarded the ace of diamonds. Partner can continue with the king and another diamond, which I ruff, promoting the setting trick in trumps.
Partner could have made things easier for me by playing a diamond at trick two. I can win and return a spade, after which it is natural for me to throw my remaining diamond on the third spade. But, humiliated by my failure to spot the winning defense, I said nothing and resolved to do better now that I was Maestro Junior's opponent.
My new partner and I began by making an easy game. On the next deal, he opened one spade and I held this massive hand:

## \& $2 \vee \mathrm{AKQ} \diamond \mathrm{AQ} 54$ A 982

To my surprise, Maestro Junior, on my right, overcalled two notrump, showing the minors. The penalty against three clubs doubled might well be too little to compensate for slam and rubber, so I tried four notrump. Taking this as an ace-asking bid, partner replied five diamonds. I felt compelled to bid six notrump. My left-hand opponent led the five of clubs, and this is what I could see:

```
& AKJIO9
& J 3 2
\diamond1032
& 4 }
@ 2
\triangleAKQ
\diamondAQJ54
& A982
```

That's not an opening bid, in my opinion, but there were two bits of good news: the lead implied that clubs were sixone, and dummy's ten of diamonds appeared to be useful in taking a repeated finesse in that suit. The snag was, if I set up the spades, how was I going to return to dummy?

Suddenly, I saw the answer to my entry problem and a chance to make Maestro Junior regret his coaching. I won the club, cashed two hearts, and then played spades from the top, throwing the blocking heart.
West won with the queen of spades but, having started with no diamonds and one club, had only major-suit cards remaining. He played a heart to dummy's jack. I continued spades, coming down to what I knew was this ending:


When I cashed the last spade, Maestro Junior paused for a moment, then sneered, "When I throw my club," he said, doing just that, "What are you going to do?"
With a sinking feeling, I saw what he meant. If I threw the low diamond, I would be stuck in the wrong hand after a finesse; if I threw a middle diamond, he could successfully cover when I led the ten. So, I jettisoned my nine of clubs and led dummy's four. When East threw a diamond, I found myself in the same one-suit squeeze. Whatever I did, the slam had to go one down.
East made little attempt to contain his glee. "Throw your high clubs early and keep the low one. Then, everything is easy." he chortled.
I checked the statement. Yes, he was right. In the ending, if South has the two of clubs instead of the nine, when East throws a club, South throws is low diamond, takes a diamond finesse, returns to dummy by leading the two of clubs to the four, and takes a second diamond finesse.
Eventually, we lost the rubber, and I have resolved to wait another 18 years before visiting that club again.


# Weighed in the balance? (RR2) <br> By Barry Rigal 

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.
63
KJ643
$\diamond 53$
\& Q 854
Q Q 87
$\diamond 9$
$\diamond A K 874$
$\& 1073$

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

- 10942
$\checkmark$ AQ 1085
$\diamond$ Q J 9
$\% 9$

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C. Terraneo | Bob Drijver | Simon | Nab |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| I $\diamond^{*}$ | 18 | Dble* | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | Pass |
| 49 | All Pass |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { I Blue } \\ & \text { Dble } 4 / 5 \mathrm{sF} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ub (II-16, no } \\ & \text { des } \end{aligned}$ | card m |  |

Christian Terraneo declared 4s on this deal where there were some interesting family line-ups. The Austrians had half-brothers Christian and Franz Terraneo, one in each room. Meanwhile, for Netherlands, Bas Drijver was out, brother Bob was in.
In the other room after the same start De Wijs passed Muller's double of $4 \bigcirc$ out to collect 300 .
Christian removed to 4s and settled in a game that had only two top losers but some handling charges. After a low diamond lead, which could easily have been a singleton, he won in hand and returned a heart, both to cut the
defenders' communications and to set up his ruff in the short hand. South won to return a diamond, and when everyone followed Christian ran the ${ }^{2}$, and repeated the club finesse. Disaster! Bart Nab ruffed and played a third diamond; Bob ruffed his partner's winner and gave his partner the second ruff to kill the game.
This was the ending after the first club finesse holds.


Declarer's winning line once the club finesse holds is to cross to the spade king, and ruff a heart, then exit with a diamond. North can ruff, but if he does, whether he plays a club - when declarer runs it - or a heart (when declarer pitches the club loser from dummy and ruffs in hand) declarer just loses one trick. Best is for South to win his $\diamond$ j. He can do no better than return a trump, and declarer wins in hand and leads a winning diamond to pitch dummy's club loser, and though South can ruff dummy is now high.
(Incidentally, at trick four if declarer leads to the club ace to ruff a heart and then exits with a diamond, the killing defence is for East to win and return a trump. The best you can do is win one or two trumps then run the club jack. East ruffs and returns a trump and you are left with a club loser.)

## World Championship Book 2016 - Wroclaw

The official book of these championships will be ready around April next year. It will consist of approximately 350 large full colour pages and will include coverage of all the championship events, with particular emphasis on the latter stages of the Open and Women's Teams. There will be a full results service and many colour photographs.

The principle analysts, as in recent years, will be John Carruthers, Barry Rigal, Brian Senior and Geo Tislevoll, probably backed up by one or two guest writers who have not yet been confirmed.

On publication, the official retail price will be US\$35 plus whatever your local bookseller charges for postage. For the duration of the championships, you can pre-order via Jan Swaan in the Press Room at the reduced price of 100 Zlotys, 25 Euros, or 30 US\$, including postage.

Alternatively, you can pay the same prices via Paypal to Brian Senior at bsenior@hotmail.com

## Open Teams Group A RR-4



## By Ram Soffer

Both Italy and Israel had a good start to their Group A matches. Their match started with a normal push at 4s down one due to a losing diamond finesse. The next deal produced the first major swing:

Board I8. Dealer East. N/S Vul.
\& A 972
8 K QJ 82
$\diamond 102$

- 75

4 K 83
ค65
$\diamond$ QJ 9763

- 19

- J 64
$\bigcirc$ A 103
$\diamond$ K 4
\& Q 8643
$\bigcirc 974$
$\diamond$ A 85
\& AK 102

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Versace | O. Herbst | Lauria | I. Herbst |
|  |  | Pass | 10 |
| $1 \diamond$ | $1 \triangleleft$ | Dble | Rdbl |
| $2 \diamond$ | $2 \triangleleft$ | All Pass |  |

Interestingly, despite having a textbook hand for a weak jump overcall, both Wests overcalled at the one-level. Did they wish to conceal their weakness and persuade their opponents to stop below game? At least Versace was successful. Lauria's double showed a maximal passed hand with some diamond help. llan Herbst's redouble showed exactly three hearts.
Ophir Herbst (North) apparently believed that the opponents did have their points and that with an eight-card fit his hand was not worth a game try. However, he had a nice 10 -count with well-placed strength. In my opinion, this hand was worth an effort toward bidding a vulnerable game.
East led $\diamond$ K against $2 \checkmark$, and declarer played well to score +170 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Barel | Di Franco | Zack | Manno |
|  |  | Pass | 1\% |
| $1 \diamond$ | Dble | Rdbl | 18 |
| $2 \diamond$ | 21 | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |

Di Franco's double showed hearts, and Manno's voluntary

18 probably showed three of them. Thus the bidding up to $2 \triangleleft$ was essentially the same as in the other room, but Di Franco assessed his side's prospects much more optimistically, driving towards game with a natural 24 bid. Barel led $\diamond Q$ against $4 \checkmark$, covered by Zack's $\diamond K$, and Manno did well to duck this trick (otherwise after winning his $\triangle A$ East would have played another diamond and received a trump promotion). He won the next trick with the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and led a heart to the king. Zack did well to duck this as well, so that declarer wasted a club entry before playing another trump. Eventually Manno did not have enough entries for a double finesse in spades, and he had to guess: lowl to the $\$ 10$ or Q ? Remembering the $\mathrm{l} \diamond$ overcall as well as the fact that East had already shown $\vee \mathbf{A}$ and $\diamond K$, it was not hard to come to the conclusion that West held the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ and play the suit successfully. Italy scored +620 , jumping to a $10-0$ lead.
The next board was an interesting push, well bid and played by both teams, but not so well defended.

Board I9. Dealer South. E/W Vul.
上 983
$\bigcirc$ K 105
$\diamond A$
2 Q 96542


| N | , Q 4 |
| :---: | :---: |
| W E | $\bigcirc$ Q J 6 |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 10982 |
| S | \% KJ 3 |
| + 52 |  |
| คA8732 |  |
| $\checkmark$ Q 65 |  |
| 2 A 108 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Versace | O. Herbst | Lauria | I. Herbst |
| Barel | Di Franco | Zack | Manno |
| Is | Pass | INT | Pass <br> 2 $\boldsymbol{~}$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Both Easts held 10 HCP with spade help, but the rest of their hand was of poor quality, especially for a suit contract. Lauria and Zack did well to resist the temptation to raise to 3s (even though there is something to be said for a 2NT bid, which may have "improved" the contract to $3 \diamond$, which cannot be beaten with perfect play but requires a guess in trumps).
At both tables North led his stiff $\diamond \mathrm{A}$. The problem was that South may well have read this as a lead from A-K, in which case he would have no particular desire to return the suit. Ophir Herbst switched to a club,Versace cleverly playing e K to create a losing option for the defence (of
course, declarer knew that the lead was a singleton). After some thought, llan returned a heart. At the other table Di Franco switched to a heart and Manno returned the suit. In both cases the defenders got only one diamond ruff, which was insufficient to beat the contract, so both EastWest pairs scored a well-deserved +110 .
In the next board, Italy was rewarded for making a bold lead with no clues from the bidding.

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.
, 10743
$\bigcirc 1085$
$\diamond 9873$
\& Q 6

| , Q 52 | N | ¢ A 986 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ AKQ 94 |  | ¢1763 |
| $\diamond 104$ | W E | $\diamond$ Q 5 |
| ¢ K 42 | S | - A 107 |
|  | ¢ K J |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 2$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AKJ 62 |  |
|  | ¢ 9853 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Versace | O. Herbst | Lauria | I. Herbst |
| 18 | Pass | 2NT | $3 \diamond$ |
| Dble | Pass | 31 | Pass |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |  |

Lauria's 2NT bid implied a fit, so llan Herbst made an effort to suggest the best led to his partner by bidding $3 \diamond$. However, diamonds were not the winning lead. Ilan took his $\diamond \mathrm{A} K$ and switched to a passive trump. Versace drew three rounds of trump ending in dummy and led a low spade. Ilan won his $\mathbf{~ K}$ and continued with s . Declarer had to guess whether spades were 3-3 or 4-2, and after cashing all of his other winners he got it right - Italy +620 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Barel | Di Franco | Zack | Manno |
| INT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass |
| $2 \triangle$ | Pass | $4 \odot$ | All Pass |

Notably, Manno didn't care to overcall $2 \triangleleft$ even though his hand seemed to be good enough. Di Franco had to pick a lead on his own and he decided that the opponents were likely to make their bid, so an active lead was the order of the day. His bold choice of 2 Q met with spectacular success, since declarer read it as a lead from a $Q$ J combination. His thoughts might have been:"Why should I bother with a spade guess when there is a safe way to dispose of my club loser?!". Michael Barel won the NA and after drawing trumps he finessed towards the K 10 , just like everyone else would have done. After that finesse lost, there was no longer any hope to make the contract, and Italy's early lead increased to 22-0.
Two deals later, Israel got 12 IMPs back, but it might easily have been a swing in the other direction:

Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

- A 4
- A 65
$\triangleleft$ J 852
\% K 1082
-KQJ62
$\bigcirc$ J 7
$\diamond$ Q 106
」 65

| N | ¢ - |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 9842 |
|  | $\diamond$ AK 7 |
| S | \& A Q 743 |
| ¢ 1098753 |  |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 103$ |  |
| $\diamond 943$ |  |
| \% 9 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Versace | O. Herbst | Lauria | I. Herbst |
|  |  | 18 | Pass |
| 29 | 24 | 30 | 49 |
| Pass | Pass | 4NT | 54 |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Versace's 2\% bid did not necessarily show clubs, so Lauria bid naturally at the three-level over North's interference of 24. His hand was good enough to continue over 44, but he accepted partner's penalty doubled when South bid at the five-level. Then he led the $\diamond A$ and switched to hearts, but Ophir Herbst guessed well, cutting his losses to -500.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Barel | Di Franco | Zack | Manno |
|  |  | 18 | Pass |
| 20 | 24 | 49 | 54 |
| Pass | Pass | 69 | Dble |
| Pass | 68 | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

2\% was a natural (and game-forcing) bid according to the Israeli system, so at this table Zack responded with 44, a void-splinter (and a strong slam invitation). When South bid 54, Barel decided that his hand was not bad enough to


Michael Barel, Israel
double, and left the decision to his partner. East's 6\% bid certainly put a lot of pressure on North-South, even though they had a system to defend against it. South's double probably showed one defensive trick. This was supposed to help North make the correct decision, but it was not easy to judge his hand. He had bits and pieces in clubs, hearts and diamonds. Would they amount to a second defensive trick? Eventually Di France decided to "take insurance" at 6s and squandered a great opportunity, as declarer must lose two heart tricks in 6\%. Sacrificing at a higher level than the other table was already costly, and then declarer guessed hearts wrong to go minus IIOO, putting Israel firmly on the scoreboard.
Italy got back most of those IMPs on the very next board
Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.

| $$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \Delta A K 10862 \\ & \& 5 \\ & \diamond 9 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | , QJ 54 |
|  |  |  | $\bigcirc 43$ |
|  |  | E | $\checkmark$ K 875 |
| - A9875 |  |  | - KJ3 |
|  | - 97 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A | 109 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A |  |  |
|  | - Q |  |  |
|  | North | East | South |
| Versace | O. Herbst | Lauria | I. Herbst |
|  |  |  | INT |
| $2 \checkmark \quad 2 \bigcirc$ | $2 \checkmark$ | $4{ }^{1}$ | All Pass |

Both East-West pairs used the $2 \triangleleft$ against a strong NT to denote a one-suited major suit hand. North bid $2 \triangleleft$ (natural and weak). Now East knew his partner's suit, and Lauria made an excellent decision to bid game directly, putting a lot of pressure on South. Fearing minus 800, Ilan Herbst refrained from a 5 save, letting Italy score an easy +620 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Barel | Di Franco | Zack | Manno |
|  |  |  | INT |
| 2 | 28 | 24 | 2NT |
| 49 | 5 | Dbl | All Pass |

After an identical start, Zack bid only 24, allowing South to make some noise at a comfortable level. 2NT must have indicated a heart fit. Barel's hand was good enough to bid 4s on his own, but North was already sacrificing with his 5-5 hand. East-West made a sensible decision to double (in order to prevent a loss they had to bid 5s and then make it by running the ${ }^{2}$ ), but the diamond finesse was working for declarer, so the penalty amounted to a mere 200. Italy's lead grew to 31-I2.
After so much drama in the first half of the match, the final nine boards served as an anti-climax. Overall the bridge was good, and there were no free gifts. Those nine
boards were tied at 4-4, so there was not much to report, except for the next deal which may be regarded as a missed opportunity for Israel:

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.
\& K 3
K Q J 2
AK Q 4
\& 54
¢ 874
$\bigcirc 873$
$\diamond$ J 832
\& K 108


A 10962
$\bigcirc 4$
$\diamond 5$
\& A Q J 763
Q Q J 5
คA10965
$\diamond 10976$
\& 9

| West <br> Versace | North <br> O. Herbst | East <br> Lauria | South <br> I. Herbst |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $3 ヵ$ | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $\mathbf{3}$ |  | Pass |

All Pass
3\% showed a black two-suiter. Somewhat surprisingly, the Italian pair didn't make another bid, allowing Ophir Herbst to play in a comfortable $4 \bigcirc$ contract and make +450 .

| West <br> Barel | North <br> Di Franco | East <br> Zack | South <br> Manno |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ | 39 | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

According to the Italian system, a $2 \triangleleft$ opening is used to show balanced I8-I9 HCP.
$3 \%$ was natural, and $3 \triangleleft$ was a transfer to hearts. North bid $4 \checkmark$, but Zack bid again. The 44 save was good for Israel, but South's forcing pass prompted North to bid again.
It seems that Di Franco should have simply bid 5 P . Having a known nine-card major suit fit, why suggest diamonds as an alternative trump suit?
The eventual $5 \triangleleft$ contract was makeable but very risky. For example, if East leads his heart singleton, declarer must draw exactly one round of trumps before leading spades. Failing to draw trump at all might result in a heart ruff, while drawing two rounds would allow a club continuation, forcing dummy to ruff with a high spot card and creating a diamond loser. However, finding the winning play was not an impossible task, given East's bidding which showed a likely 6-5 pattern.
Zack's actual lead of $\boldsymbol{x} A$ made it much easier for declarer. All he had to do was to play $\diamond A K$, enter dummy in hearts while avoiding a blockage and lead $\diamond 10$ for a finesse. Thus the inferior contract made, while Israel still gained 2 IMPs.
Italy's final margin of victory was 35-16, converted to I4.8-5.2 VP.

| $R R 5$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Match |  | IMPs |  | VPs |  | Match |  | IMPs |  | VPs |  |
| 51 DENMARK | NEW ZEALAND | 49 | 15 | 18.00 | 2.00 | 71 JAPAN | NEW ZEALAND | 25 | 11 | 14.22 | 5.78 |
| 52 TURKEY | NORWAY | 17 | 18 | 9.64 | 10.36 | 72 POLAND | CHINESE TAIPEI | 29 | 3 | 16.73 | 3.27 |
| 53 ISRAEL | SPAIN | 35 | 18 | 14.93 | 5.07 | 73 UAE | CHINA | 3 | 63 | 0.00 | 20.00 |
| 54 CHINA | BRAZIL | 44 | 2 | 19.02 | 0.98 | 74 HUNGARY | GERMANY | 22 | 13 | 12.90 | 7.10 |
| 55 GERMANY | USA | 8 | 16 | 7.39 | 12.61 | 75 SWEDEN | IRELAND | 25 | 35 | 6.82 | 12.18 |
| 56 EGYPT | ENGLAND | 24 | 18 | 12.01 | 7.99 | 76 NETHERLANDS | BULGARIA | 27 | 15 | 13.71 | 6.29 |
| 57 FRANCE | JAPAN | 31 |  | 16.91 | 3.09 | 77 USA | AUSTRALIA | 19 | 15 | 11.38 | 8.62 |
| 58 CANADA | SWEDEN | 20 | 15 | 11.70 | 8.30 | 78 ENGLAND | RUSSIA | 9 | 28 | 4.63 | 15.37 |
| 59 POLAND | PAKISTAN | 29 | 4 | 16.55 | 3.45 | 79 DENMARK | ISRAEL | 10 | 40 | 2.60 | 17.40 |
| 60 CHINA HK | ITALY | 15 | 22 | 7.69 | 12.31 | 80 BRAZIL | FRANCE | 10 | 27 | 5.07 | 14.93 |
| 61 AUSTRALIA | CHINESE TAIPEI | 13 | 17 | 8.62 | 11.38 | 81 INDIA | ITALY | 6 | 25 | 4.63 | 15.37 |
| 62 INDIA | MEXICO | 15 | 24 | 7.10 | 12.90 | 82 TURKEY | BYE | 0 | 0 | 12.00 | 0.00 |


| RR 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Match |  | IMPs |  | VPs |  | Match |  | IMPs |  | VPs |  |
| 51 NEW ZEALAND | ENGLAND | 15 | 20 | 8.30 | 11.70 | 71 NEW ZEALAND | BULGARIA | 22 | 19 | 11.05 | 8.95 |
| 52 USA | JAPAN | 45 | 22 | 16.18 | 3.82 | 72 IRELAND | AUSTRALIA | 15 | 15 | 10.00 | 10.00 |
| 53 BRAZIL | SWEDEN | 0 | 63 | 0.00 | 20.00 | 73 GERMANY | TURKEY | 32 | 2 | 17.40 | 2.60 |
| 54 SPAIN | PAKISTAN | 32 | 6 | 16.73 | 3.27 | 74 CHINA | RUSSIA | 14 | 35 | 4.21 | 15.79 |
| 55 NORWAY | ITALY |  | 50 | 0.46 | 19.54 | 75 CHINESE TAIPEI | ISRAEL | 25 | 55 | 2.60 | 17.40 |
| 56 DENMARK | CHINESE TAIPEI | 27 | 8 | 15.37 | 4.63 | 76 JAPAN | FRANCE | 33 | 27 | 12.01 | 7.99 |
| 57 TURKEY | MEXICO | 52 | 9 | 19.13 | 0.87 | 77 POLAND | ITALY | 27 | 33 | 7.99 | 12.01 |
| 58 ISRAEL | INDIA | 10 | 17 | 7.69 | 12.31 | 78 UAE | INDIA | 24 | 67 | 0.87 | 19.13 |
| 59 CHINA | AUSTRALIA | 31 | 4 | 16.91 | 3.09 | 79 HUNGARY | BRAZIL | 39 | 21 | 15.15 | 4.85 |
| 60 GERMANY | CHINA HK | 31 | 30 | 10.36 | 9.64 | 80 SWEDEN | DENMARK | 40 | 14 | 16.73 | 3.27 |
| 61 EGYPT | POLAND | 20 | 27 | 7.69 | 12.31 | 81 NETHERLANDS | ENGLAND | 21 | 14 | 12.31 | 7.69 |
| 62 FRANCE | CANADA |  | 29 | 3.09 | 16.91 | 82 USA | BYE | 0 | 0 | 12.00 | 0.00 |
| RR 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Match |  | IMPs |  | VPs |  | Match |  | IMPs |  | VPs |  |
| 51 TURKEY | NEW ZEALAND | 19 | 9 | 13.18 | 6.82 | 71 POLAND | NEW ZEALAND | I | 15 | 5.78 | 14.22 |
| 52 ISRAEL | DENMARK | 24 | 29 | 8.30 | 11.70 | 72 UAE | JAPAN | 4 | 34 | 2.60 | 17.40 |
| 53 CHINA | NORWAY | 20 | 9 | 13.45 | 6.55 | 73 HUNGARY | CHINESE TAIPEI | 9 | 9 | 10.00 | 10.00 |
| 54 GERMANY | SPAIN | 37 | 9 | 17.08 | 2.92 | 74 SWEDEN | CHINA | 16 | 16 | 10.00 | 10.00 |
| 55 EGYPT | BRAZIL | 32 | 16 | 14.70 | 5.30 | 75 NETHERLANDS | GERMANY | 14 | 16 | 9.29 | 10.71 |
| 56 FRANCE | USA | 4 | 34 | 2.60 | 17.40 | 76 USA | IRELAND | 23 | 12 | 13.45 | 6.55 |
| 57 CANADA | ENGLAND | 7 | 17 | 6.82 | 13.18 | 77 ENGLAND | AUSTRALIA | 20 | 33 | 6.03 | 13.97 |
| 58 POLAND | JAPAN | 20 | 27 | 7.69 | 12.31 | 78 DENMARK | TURKEY | 20 | 25 | 8.30 | 11.70 |
| 59 CHINA HK | SWEDEN | 27 | 11 | 14.70 | 5.30 | 79 BRAZIL | RUSSIA | 11 |  | 2.60 | 17.40 |
| 60 AUSTRALIA | PAKISTAN | 21 | 14 | 12.31 | 7.69 | 80 INDIA | ISRAEL | 9 | 25 | 5.30 | 14.70 |
| 61 INDIA | ITALY | 31 | I | 17.40 | 2.60 | 81 ITALY | FRANCE | 11 |  | 6.03 | 13.97 |
| 62 MEXICO | CHINESE TAIPEI | 14 | 38 | 3.63 | 16.37 | 82 BULGARIA | BYE | 0 | 0 | 12.00 | 0.00 |



| $R R 4$ |  |  |  | $R R 5$ |  |  |  | $R R 6$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Open Teams Group A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Match VPs |  |  |  | Match VPs |  |  |  | Match |  | VPs |  |
| 1 FINLAND | SINGAPORE | 5.00 | 15.00 | I SINGAPORE | SOUTH AFRICA | 13.18 | 4.82 | 1 PHILIPPINES | SINGAPORE | 3.76 | 15.24 |
| 2 SOUTH AFRICA | Jordan | 6.25 | 13.75 | 2 JORDAN | PHILIPPINES | 11.48 | 8.52 | 2 UKRAINE | JORDAN | 15.59 | 3.41 |
| 3 PHILIPPINES | ESTONIA | 11.20 | 8.80 | 3 ESTONIA | UKRAINE | 2.15 | 17.85 | 3 ISRAEL | ESTONIA | 19.07 | 0.93 |
| 4 UKRAINE | GERMANY | 7.45 | 12.55 | 4 GERMANY | ISRAEL | 6.25 | 13.75 | 4 FRANCE | GERMANY | 15.19 | 4.81 |
| 5 ISRAEL | ITALY | 5.20 | 14.80 | 5 ITALY | FRANCE | 14.60 | 5.40 | 5 CHINESE TAIPEI | ITALY | 6.96 | 13.04 |
| 6 FRANCE | BRAZIL | 13.04 | 6.96 | 6 BRAZIL | CHINESE TAIPEI | 2.69 | 17.31 | 6 GREECE | BRAZIL | 11.20 | 8.80 |
| 7 CHINESE TAIPEI | INDIA | 2.28 | 17.72 | 7 INDIA | GREECE | 5.00 | 15.00 | 7 SWITZERLAND | INDIA | 14.80 | 5.20 |
| 8 SWITZERLAND | GREECE | 5.00 | 15.00 | 8 FINLAND | AUSTRALIA | 6.03 | 13.97 | 8 AUSTRALIA | SOUTH AFRICA | 11.20 | 8.80 |
| 9 AUSTRALIA | RUSSIA | 3.74 | 16.26 | 9 RUSSIA | SWITZERLAND | 7.97 | 12.03 | 9 RUSSIA | FINLAND | 18.66 | 1.34 |
| Open Teams Group B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Match |  |  |  | Match |  |  |  | Match |  |  |
| II BELGIUM | PAKISTAN | 9.09 | 10.91 | II PAKISTAN | TUNISIA | 7.45 | 12.55 | 11. CHINA HK | PAKISTAN | 0.00 | 20.00 |
| 12 TUNISIA | KUWAIT | 20.00 | 0.00 | 12 KUWAIT | CHINA HK | 8.52 | 11.48 | 12 LATVIA | KUWAIT | 6.48 | 13.52 |
| 13 CHINA HK | BOSNIA HERZ. | 12.55 | 7.45 | 13 BOSNIA HERZ. | LATVIA | 11.76 | 8.24 | 13 ENGLAND | BOSNIA HERZ. | 10.61 | 9.39 |
| 14 LATVIA | MONACO | 18.55 | 1.45 | 14 MONACO | ENGLAND | 8.52 | 11.48 | 14 USA | MONACO | 9.39 | 10.61 |
| 15 ENGLAND | POLAND | 10.00 | 10.00 | 15 POLAND | USA | 12.55 | 7.45 | 15 NORWAY | POLAND | 4.08 | 15.92 |
| 16 USA | LEBANON | 18.44 | 1.56 | 16 LEBANON | NORWAY | 9.39 | 10.61 | 16 ARGENTINA | LEBANON | 7.45 | 12.55 |
| 17 NORWAY | MEXICO | 12.03 | 7.97 | 17 MEXICO | ARGENTINA | 4.26 | 15.74 | 17 TURKEY | MEXICO | 16.58 | 3.42 |
| 18 TURKEY | ARGENTINA | 8.24 | 11.76 | 18 BELGIUM | ICELAND | 5.61 | 14.39 | 18 ICELAND | TUNISIA | 15.19 | 4.81 |
| 19 ICELAND | JAPAN | 14.18 | 5.82 | 19 JAPAN | TURKEY | 14.39 | 5.61 | 19 JAPAN | BELGIUM | 15.92 | 4.08 |

## Open Teams Group C

|  | Match | VPs |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 21 | IRELAND | BANGLADESH | 17.72 | 2.28


|  | Match | VPs |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 21 | BANGLADESH | AUSTRIA | 3.74 |
| 16.26 |  |  |  |
| 22 NEW ZEALAND | SCOTLAND | 15.38 | 4.62 |
| 23 NETHERLANDS | SPAIN | 13.28 | 6.72 |
| 24 CHINA | SWEDEN | 13.52 | 6.48 |
| 25 HUNGARY | DENMARK | 13.75 | 6.25 |
| 26 CANADA | SAN MARINO | 15.92 | 4.08 |
| 27 IRELAND | UAE | 20.00 | 0.00 |
| 28 EGYPT | LITHUANIA | 7.71 | 12.29 |
| 29 GUADELOUPE | BYE | 12.00 | 0.00 |


|  | Match | VPs |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 21 | SCOTLAND | GUADELOUPE | 14.60 |
| 22 SPAIN | NEW ZEALAND | 18.55 | 1.45 |
| 23 SWEDEN | NETHERLANDS | 12.03 | 7.97 |
| 24 DENMARK | CHINA | 15.56 | 4.44 |
| 25 SAN MARINO | HUNGARY | 6.72 | 13.28 |
| 26 LITHUANIA | CANADA | 1.79 | 18.21 |
| 27 UAE | AUSTRIA | 1.91 | 18.09 |
| 28 EGYPT | IRELAND | 8.24 | 11.76 |
| 29 BANGLADESH | BYE | 12.00 | 0.00 |


|  | Match | VPs |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 3 I SAN MARINO | KOREA | 10.31 | 9.69 |
| 32 EGYPT | JAPAN | 1.56 | 18.44 |
| 33 AUSTRALIA | PAKISTAN | 20.00 | 0.00 |
| 34 MEXICO | CHINA | 4.26 | 15.74 |
| 35 SWEDEN | NETHERLANDS | 6.48 | 13.52 |
| 36 ENGLAND | NORWAY | 9.39 | 10.61 |
| 37 SPAIN | JORDAN | 5.82 | 14.18 |
| 38 FINLAND | BRAZIL | 16.58 | 3.42 |
| 39 SOUTH AFRICA | TURKEY | 6.96 | 13.04 |

## Women's Teams Group A

| Match |  | VPs |  | Match |  | VPs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31 KOREA | EGYPT | 15.92 | 4.08 | 31 AUSTRALIA | KOREA | 16.26 | 3.74 |
| 32 JAPAN | AUSTRALIA | 6.22 | 12.78 | 32 MEXICO | JAPAN | 13.28 | 6.72 |
| 33 PAKISTAN | MEXICO | 1.56 | 18.44 | 33 SWEDEN | PAKISTAN | 15.92 | 4.08 |
| 34 CHINA | SWEDEN | 12.80 | 7.20 | 34 ENGLAND | CHINA | 3.91 | 16.09 |
| 35 NETHERLANDS | ENGLAND | 9.69 | 10.31 | 35 SPAIN | NETHERLANDS | 11.20 | 8.80 |
| 36 NORWAY | SPAIN | 14.39 | 5.61 | 36 BRAZIL | NORWAY | 13.52 | 6.48 |
| 37 JORDAN | BRAZIL | 4.62 | 15.38 | 37 FINLAND | JORDAN | 10.91 | 9.09 |
| 38 SAN MARINO | SOUTH AFRICA | 2.05 | 16.95 | 38 SOUTH AFRICA | EGYPT | 3.58 | 16.42 |
| 39 TURKEY | FINLAND | 12.03 | 7.97 | 39 TURKEY | SAN MARINO | 6.96 | 13.04 |

## Women's Teams Group B

|  | Match | VPs |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 4I IRELAND | CHINESE TAIPEI | 8.80 | 11.20 |
| 42 TUNISIA | CHINA HK | 0.31 | 19.69 |
| 43 NEW ZEALAND | ICELAND | 18.33 | 1.67 |
| 44 CHILE | FRANCE | 2.15 | 17.85 |
| 45 ITALY | POLAND | 2.97 | 17.03 |
| 46 USA | DENMARK | 12.55 | 7.45 |
| 47 SCOTLAND | PALESTINE | 13.75 | 6.25 |
| 48 CANADA | INDIA | 17.31 | 2.69 |
| 49 GERMANY | BYE | 12.00 | 0.00 |


|  | Match | VPs |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 4I CHINESE TAIPEI | TUNISIA | 17.59 | 2.41 |
| 42 CHINA HK | NEW ZEALAND | 8.24 | 11.76 |
| 43 ICELAND | CHILE | 4.81 | 15.19 |
| 44 FRANCE | ITALY | 14.18 | 5.82 |
| 45 POLAND | USA | 13.52 | 6.48 |
| 46 DENMARK | SCOTLAND | 8.80 | 11.20 |
| 47 PALESTINE | INDIA | 15.76 | 3.24 |
| 48 GERMANY | CANADA | 20.00 | 0.00 |
| 49 IRELAND | BYE | 12.00 | 0.00 |


|  | Match | VPs |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 4I NEW ZEALAND | CHINESE TAIPEI | 5.82 | 14.18 |
| 42 CHILE | CHINA HK | 4.44 | 15.56 |
| 43 ITALY | ICELAND | 18.77 | 1.23 |
| 44 USA | FRANCE | 6.03 | 13.97 |
| 45 SCOTLAND | POLAND | 6.03 | 13.97 |
| 46 INDIA | DENMARK | 2.69 | 17.31 |
| 47 CANADA | PALESTINE | 15.74 | 4.26 |
| 48 GERMANY | IRELAND | 7.45 | 12.55 |
| 49 TUNISIA | BYE | 12.00 | 0.00 |

## The Polish Corner

## SPLINTER - PODEJŚCIE PRAKTYCZNE

Podczas poniedziałkowego meczu seniorów Polska - Meksyk Julian Klukowski dostał całkiem interesująca kartę:
¢AKD86 ©DI06 $\$ A \$10852
Jego partner, Wiktor Markowicz otworzył I i i po odpowiedzi 1s powtórzył kolor otwarcia - 2§. Co należy licytować?
Odpowiedź jest oczywista - Splinter! Zaczynamy rozważać może $z$ singlowym asem nie jest za estetyczny?
Ale Julek poszedł w innym kierunku - praktycznym. Jak zniechęcić obrońców do wistu w trefle? Stara zasada walki wręcz mówi: „ukrywaj swoje słabości" - zalicytował więc 4๕, po cue bidzie partnera $4 \diamond$ zapytał ○ asy i po odpowiedzi dwoma zalicytował szlemika.
Postawmy się teraz w pozycji reprezentanta Meksyku, który po tej licytacji był na wiście z kartą: 1752 872 $\vee$ D954 \&AW74. Wybrał narzucający się atak karowy... Z jakim skutkiem? Oto całość rozdania:

Rozd. 23. Obie po, rozd. S.

- AKD 86

คD 106
$\checkmark A$

- 10852

| ¢ 752 | N | - W9 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 72$ |  | $\bigcirc$ W 4 |
| $\diamond$ D 954 | W E | $\diamond$ W 8763 |
| \& AW 74 | S | \& K 93 |
|  | ¢ 103 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AK 985 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 102 |  |
|  | \& D 6 |  |

Bez ataku w trefle rozgrywający łatwo wzią komplet lew, zarabiając 13 imp , gdyż na drugim stole sprawdzono, że szlemik ma poważny feler i licytacja wygasła w 4 §.

## ZAUFANIE

Brydż jest graz par. W parze kluczowym elementem jest spójność stylu i zaufanie. Oto przykład z meczu kobiet Polska Włochy:
Popatrzmy na rozdanie z meczu Polska - Włochy:

Rozd. 24. Obie przed, rozd.W.
© 864
$\bigcirc$ W 7
$\diamond 9642$

- 10962

$$
\pm 32
$$

-A106432
$\diamond D$
\& K D 5


- A 95
$\checkmark$ KD 8
A 753
- A 87

Justyna Żmuda z ręką N otworzyła $\mathrm{I} \vee \ldots$ Karta za ładna na blok, a pasując się nie wygrywa. Włoszka z ręką E miała regularne, można nawet powiedzieć „pancerne", wejście IBA. Kasia Dufrat skontrowała. Teraz z kolei $W$, widząc, że na IBA z kontrą grozi dramat, postanowiła szukać szczęścia w grze w kolor - miała w końcu dwie czwórki. Dała rekontrę SOS. Justyna z pełną dyscypliną i zaufaniem spasowała (jak potem mówiła, w każdym kolorze, który Kasia by skontrowała, „miałam podpórkę"), E zalicytowała $2 \diamond$-WE znalazły kolor do gry. Z kartą $S$ kontra była prawdziwą przyjemnością... I wszyscy się zgodzili:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Paoluzi | Żmuda | Saccavini | Dufrat |
|  | I $\triangleright$ | IBA | ktr. |
| rktr. | pas | $2 \diamond$ | ktr. |

pas...
Wist był prosty - po ataku królem pika obrona musiała dostać 8 lew; rozgrwająca nieco pobłądziła w efekcie czego wpadła bez czterech, za 800.
Na drugim stole, po podobnym początku, Włoszka z ręką N odeszła z kontry:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bałdysz | Manara | Busse | Ferlazzo |
|  | I $\varangle$ | IBA | ktr. |
| rktr. | pas | $2 \dot{2}$ | ktr. |
| pas | $2 \varangle$ | pas... |  |

the meeting place

