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Today's Programme
Teams:
Semi-finals
Segment I- 10:30
Segment 2 - 14:00
Segment 3 - 17:00
Pairs:
10:00
| 1:50
14:30
16:20
18:10

The tireless team of BBO operators who allow the world to watch these championships in real time. From left to right: Janusz Drwecki, Urszula Kedzierska, Pawet Szymaszczyk, Marta Wojcik, Zofia Baldysz, Dawid Barzyk, Alexsandra Byra, Lukasz Plader, Witold Petryszyn, Maja Mrozek, Blazej Krawczyk, Adam Waszkiewicz, Dawid Permus, Kamil Zabierek, Mateusz Strzelczyk, Lukasz Trendak, Arkadiusz Poziemski, Ryszard Wiacek and Lukasz Mazurkiewicz

There were some close calls in the final sessions of the four teams events, but there was nothing like the dramatic comeback by Bulgaria in the Mixed Teams.
Playing against Germany, Bulgaria trailed by 14 IMPs with one board to play. In the open room, East played in $3 \vee$, making, for plus 140. At the other table, Diana Damianova for Bulgaria was doubled in $2 \vee$, but that was not the end of the bidding. The contract was redoubled and Damianova scored it up with an overtrick for plus 1240. The resulting 15 IMPs to Bulgaria made the final score I88-187 in their favor. There was similar action in the Netherlands-China match, where East for China was one down in $4 \checkmark$ in the open room and the Dutch East played $2 \checkmark$ redoubled, making three, for the same 1240, good for 16 IMPs. That only increased the margin for the Dutch, however.
In the Women's series, the closest match was won by France, 165-I52 over Poland. In the Seniors, USA had all they could handle from Australia but had a strong final session to win by 30 IMPs. In the Open series, Poland found themselves tied with Sweden at the halfway point of their match but pulled away with an $88-65$ second half.

Prize Giving and Closing Ceremony
The ceremony will take place on Saturday 17th in the auditorium, beginning at 20:00. It will be followed by a reception at the "La Pergola" restaurant. Players who wish to attend the dinner must collect their invitation card at the Hospitality Desk. If you do NOT bring your invitation you will not be admitted.

## Open Teams Quarter-finals

|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NEW ZEALAND SPAIN |  | 20 41 | 34 | 6 <br> 43 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 9 \\ 13 \end{array}$ | 44 <br> 35 | 35 <br> 49 | $\begin{aligned} & 148 \\ & 201 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | SPAIN | HT |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot |  |  |
| CANADA |  | 25 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 26 | 0 | 77 | MONACO | VT |
| MONACO | 2 | 34 | 54 | 38 | 34 | 82 | 0 | 244 |  |  |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot |  |  |
| NETHERLANDS |  | 41 | 31 | 3 | 24 | 60 | 48 | 207 |  |  |
| ENGLAND |  | 15 | 15 | 19 | 42 | 2 | 19 | 112 | NETHERLANDS | VT |
|  | c/o 1 |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot | POLAND | HT |
| POLAND |  | 21 | 27 | 31 | 35 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 24 \\ 29 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 29 \\ 21 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 167 \\ & 144 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| SWEDEN | 4 | 39 | 20 | 16 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |


| CANADA | KOKISH Eric O. (coach), POLLACK Frederic, GARTAGANIS Nicholas, GARTAGANIS Judith, L'ECUYER Nicolas, FOURCAUDOT Marc-Andre (captain), FERGANI Kamel, MARCINSKI Zygmunt |
| :---: | :---: |
| ENGLAND | ROBSON Andrew, DIXON Christopher (captain), BAKHSHI David, GOLD David, FORRESTER Tony, HINDEN Frances, OSBORNE Graham, JONES David (coach) |
| MONACO | HELNESS Tor, HELGEMO Geir, MARTENS Krzysztof, MARTENS Krzysztof (captain), MULTON Franck, ZIMMERMANN Pierre, ALLAVENA Jean Charles, FILIPOWICZ Dominik (coach) |
| NETHERLANDS | MAAS Anton (captain), BRINK Sjoert, NAB Bart, MULLER Bauke, DRIJVER Bob, BAKKERENTon (coach), DRIJVER Bas, DEWIJS Simon |
| NEW ZEAL | TISLEVOLL Geir-Olav, CORNELL Michael, BACH Ashley, WARE Michael, WHIBLEY Michael, EVENNETT Derek (captain), BROWN Matthew |
| POLAND | GAWRYS Piotr, JASSEM Krzysztof, KALITA Jacek, GOLEBIOWSKI Stanislaw (coach), WALCZAK Piotr (captain), NOWOSADZKI Michal, KLUKOWSKI Michal, MAZURKIEWICZ Marcin |
| SPAIN | LANTARON Luis, GODED Federico, KNAP Andrzej, WASIK Arturo, SABATE Jordi, GODED MERINO Gonzalo, JIMENEZ Ignacio (captain) |
| SWEDEN | NYSTROM Fredrik, UPMARK Johan, LAGERMAN Jan (captain), SYLVAN Johan,WRANG Frederic, BERGDAHL Tommy,WARNE Niklas |

## Women's Teams Quarter-finals

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CHINA <br> ENGLAND | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & 32 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 39 \\ 13 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 21 \\ 19 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \\ & 35 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 33 \\ 30 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45 \\ & 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 180 \\ & 154 \end{aligned}$ | CHINA HT |  |
|  | 1 |  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot |  |  |
| USA SWEDEN | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 39 \\ 11 \end{array}$ | 15 27 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 38 \\ 12 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 42 30 | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \\ & \mathbf{3 1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \\ & 50 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 196 \\ & 161 \end{aligned}$ | USA | VT |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot |  |  |
| SCOTLAND NORWAY | $\begin{aligned} & 41 \\ & \hline \mathbf{4 2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56 \\ & 33 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \\ & 39 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|} 28 \\ 35 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 49 \\ 24 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53 \\ & 33 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 267 \\ & 206 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | SCOTLAND | VT |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot |  |  |
| FRANCE POLAND | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 28 \\ 38 \end{array}$ | 53 32 | 21 5 | 13 33 | 26 <br> 13 | 24 31 | $\begin{aligned} & 165 \\ & 152 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | FRANCE | HT |


| CHINA | WANG Wen Fei, LU Yan,WANG Xiaojing (coach), LIU Yan, HUANG Yan, SHEN (I) Qi,WANG Nan,WANG jianxin (captain) |
| :---: | :---: |
| ENGLAND | BURN David (coach), BROCK Sally, SMITH Nicola, DHONDY Heather, SENIOR Nevena, PATTERSON Derek (captain), DRAPER Catherine, BROWN Fiona |
| FRANCE | FREY Nathalie, ZOCHOWSKA Joanna, D'OVIDIO Catherine, CRONIER Benedicte, WILLARD Sylvie, REESS Vanessa, THUILLEZ Laurent (captain) |
| NORWAY | LANGELAND Aase, ROREN Tormod (captain),WENNEVOLD Ida, HELNESS Gunn, EIDE Lars (coach),VIST Gunn Tove, GRUDE Liv Marit, OIGARDEN Bodil Nyheim |
| POLAND | SARNIAK Anna, CICHOCKI Miroslaw (captain),WOJCICKI Marek (coach), BREWIAK Grazyna, BALDYSZ Cathy, ZMUDA Justyna, BUSSE Grazyna, DUFRAT Katarzyna |
| SCOTLAND | McGOWAN Elizabeth (Liz), LESLIE Paula, McQUAKER Fiona, SYMONS Anne, PUNCH Sam, KANE Helen |
| SWEDEN | ANDERSSON Pia,AHLESVED Catharina, GRONKVIST Maria, OVELIUS Emma, BERTHEAU Kathrine, KONYVES Andreas (captain), GRONKVIST Ida,WADEMARK Carina (coach) |
| USA | SOKOLOW Tobi, SEAMON-MOLSON Janice, DEAS Lynn, PALMER Beth, SANBORN Kerri, SOKOLOW David (captain), SHI Sylvia |

## Mixed Teams Quarter-finals



BULGARIA NANEV Ivan, ARONOV Victor, ARONOV Victor (captain), KARAKOLEV Georgi, MITOVSKA Miriana, DAMIANOVA Diana, NIKOLOVA MARTA
CHINA
DENMARK
FRANCE
GERMANY WODNIANSKY Beatrix, FELMY Matthias, KONDOCH Hartmut,VECHIATTO Claudia, EGGELING Marie, GOTARD Thomas, ELLERBECK Max (captain)
NETHERLANDS JANSMA Jan, JANSMA Jan (captain), RITMEIJER Richard, JANSMA Aida, TICHA Magdalena
RUSSIA GROMOVA Victoria, PONOMAREVA Tatiana, GROMOV Andrey, DUBININ Alexander, MATUSHKO Georgi, GULEVICH Anna USA WANG Hongli, ZHANG Yu, FU Zhong, LI Jie (coach), HOU Xu, FENG Xuefeng, CHEN Ji, ZHOU Qing Jia (captain) FARHOLT Stense, CASPERSEN Henrik, HENNEBERG Marlene, HENNEBERG Jens Ove
DELMAS-SIRVEN Thibault, OURSEL Christophe (captain), PIGEAUD Fabienne, HARARI David, POIZAT Rokia, POIZAT Philippe, RIMBAUD Laurence ALDER Phillip (captain),WINESTOCK Sheri, PICUS Sue, SEAMON Michael, MOSS Brad, MOSS Sylvia, ORNSTEIN Alexander

## Senior Teams Quarter-finals



AUSTRALIA HAUGHIE William, KLINGER Ron, LORENTZ Gabi, BURGESS Stephen, STERN David (captain), LAVINGS Paul, KROCHMALIK Robert
CHINA SUN Ming, JU Chuancheng (coach), ZHOU Jia Hong, TAO Jian Hua, LIN Rongqiang, LIN Rongqiang (captain), SHEN Mingkun, SHEN Xiaonong
CHINESE TAIPEI YEH Chen, YEH Chen (captain), CHEN Chuan-Cheng, SHIH Juei-Yu, LIN Chii-Mou, YEH TONG Shu-Ping (coach), CHI JenLee, CHENG Kuo-Paw
DENMARK SCHALTZ Dorthe, SCHALTZ Peter, BOESGAARD Knud-Aage, NIELSEN Hans Christian, SCHOU Steen, HANSEN Jorgen, MAGNUSSEN Peter (captain), IBSEN Jytte (coach)
FRANCE TOFFIER Philippe, GAUTRET Eric (captain), PALAU Jean-Jacques, GUILLAUMIN Pierre-Yves, DECHELETTE Nicholas, IONTZEFF Georges, SCHMIDT Pierre
ITALY GIUBILO Valerio (captain), FAILLA Giuseppe, BURATTI Andrea, SABBATINI Stefano, COMELLA Amedeo,VECCHI Lanfranco, MANCINI Berardino
TURKEY KARADENIZ Mesut, INCE Mehmet Ali, KOKTEN Namik, YILDIZ Veysel, AKSOY Ibrahim, SIRIKLIOGLU Mehmet, COPUR Mehmet Emin (captain)
USA MAHMOOD Zia, MARTEL Chip, PSZCZOLA Jacek (coach), HAMMAN Bob, MECKSTROTH Jeff, HAMMAN Petra (captain), LALL Hemant, MILNER Reese

## BBO and OURGAME SCHEDULE

BBO I = VuGraph, BBO 8 is also OURGAME

| 10:30 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W | China v USA | BBO I |
| O | Spain v Monaco | BBO 2 |
| S | France v Chinese Taipei | BBO 3 |
| W | France v Scotland | BBO 4 |
| M | Netherlands v Bulgaria | BBO 5 |
| M | USA v Russia | BBO 6 |
| S | USA v Denmark | BBO 7 |
| $\bigcirc$ | Poland v Netherlands | BBO 8 |
| $\bigcirc$ | $14: 00$ <br> Spain v Monaco | BBO I |
| $\bigcirc$ | Poland v Netherlands | BBO 2 |
| S | Chinese Taipei v France | BBO 3 |
| W | France v Scotland | BBO 4 |
| M | Netherlands v Bulgaria | BBO 5 |
| M | USA v Russia | BBO 6 |
| S | USA v Denmark | BBO 7 |
| W | China v USA | BBO 8 |
| $\bigcirc$ | 17:00 <br> Poland v Netherlands | BBO I |
| $\bigcirc$ | Spain v Monaco | BBO 2 |
| S | France v Chinese Taipei | BBO 3 |
| W | France v Scotland | BBO 4 |
| M | Netherlands v Bulgaria | BBO 5 |
| M | USA v Russia | BBO 6 |
| S | USA v Denmark | BBO 7 |
| W | China v USA | BBO 8 |

## Team <br> Photos

Those teams qualifying for the semifinals will have their team photos taken as per the following schedule:

## Open:

Wednesday 13.35

## Women:

Wednesday 16.35

## Senior:

Thursday 13.35
Mixed:
Thursday 16.35
The Assembly Point will be outside the main entrance.

## High Level Players Committee Communication

The HLPC Express Line has been established to enable concerns of potential unethical behaviour to be reported. Any WBF registered member may report suspicious occurrences or activities, related to unethical behaviour, which may materially infringe the Laws, Rules and Regulations of Bridge and the WBF Disciplinary Code. The Report will be in the form of an Unethical Behaviour Report, easy to find on the WBF website, and where reporters can remain anonymous.
Here is the link if needed:
http://worldbridge.org/repository/hlpc/ wbfhlpcreportform.asp

## Dealing machines and cards

The Duplimates used for the duplication during the championship are sold for 2280EUR. You are strongly advised to order as soon as possible, because they will probably be sold out very quickly. Contact Jannerstens at the bridge stall in the Reception area, or drop a line to per@jannersten.com.

The (new) Wroclaw cards that you are playing with will be sold after usage for I63EUR per 240 decks. Other quantities on request in the book stall.

## Championship cards



The championship cards that you play here are for sale for $€ 0.68$ (bulk rate) in the book stall so long as supply lasts.

## No cell phones

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

## 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 Pairs after 13 |  |  |  | Women's Pairs after 13 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | KUBAC N - ZORLU N | TUR-TUR | 60.54 |  | MOSZCZYNSKA Z - PIESIEWICZ D | POL-POL | 58.39 |
| 2 | JAGNIEWSKI R - GAWELW | POL-POL | 60.49 |  | PILIPOVIC M - SVER N | CRO-CRO | 57.35 |
| 3 | EIDE P - GRAESLI B | NOR-NOR | 57.07 |  | SZCZEPANSKA K - MAJ-RUDNICKA M | POL-POL | 55.92 |
| A | ANKLESARIA K - CHOKSHI S | IND-IND | 56.79 |  | 4 YANGJ-LIY | CHN-CHN | 55.48 |
| 5 | GIERULSKI B - SKRZYPCZAK J | LTU-LTU | 56.76 |  | GU L- ZHOUT | CHN-CHN | 55.01 |
| 6 | FLACASSIER F - GROSSET C | FRA-FRA | 56.54 |  | 6 PAVLUSHKO O-RUDAKOVA E | RUS-RUS | 54.39 |
| 7 | THOMPSON B - JACOBSW | AUS-AUS | 56.54 |  | SANDSTROM K - MYLLAERI M | FIN-FIN | 53.61 |
| 8 | JANISZEWSKI P - NOWAK K | POL-POL | 56.50 |  | HARDING M - FUGLESTAD A | NOR-NOR | 53.11 |
| 9 | AUKEN S -WELLAND R | GER-GER | 55.64 |  | NILSEN L - GRUDE M | NOR-NOR | 52.52 |
| 10 | SZULEJEWSKI B - DARKIEWICZ-MONIUSZKO G | POL-POL | 55.61 |  | XIA M - LIU S | CHN-CHN | 51.99 |
| 11 | NARKIEWICZ G - INGIELEWICZ Z | POL-POL | 55.59 |  | JOYCE E - FITZGERALD J | IRL-IRL | 51.63 |
| 12 | GILL P - PEAKE A | AUS-AUS | 55.58 |  | NORDGREN M - BERGLUND A | FIN-FIN | 51.60 |
| 13 | STARKOWSKIW - GOLEBIOWSKI S | POL-POL | 55.43 |  | LEVI H-ASULIN A | ISR-ISR | 51.48 |
| 14 | LINDE J - SCHWERDT C | GER-GER | 55.31 |  | ZORANOVIC J - PEPIC S | SER-SER | 50.50 |
| 15 | KING P - McINTOSH A | ENG-ENG | 55.29 |  | GARATEGUY M - IACAPRARO M | ARG-ARG | 50.21 |
| 16 | GRAVERSEN H - CLEMMENSEN P | DEN-DEN | 54.82 |  | LIPSHITZ C - KENNY R | RSA-RSA | 50.03 |
| 17 | WOJCIESZEK J - BOCHENSKIA | POL-POL | 54.57 |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | MATKOWSKI P - SLIWON K | POL-POL | 54.38 | Senior Pairs after 13 |  |  |  |
| 19 | TEWARI R - SHIVDASANI J | IND-IND | 54.32 |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | VOLHEJNV - MACURA M | CZE-CZE | 54.26 |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | KRUPOWICZ M - SAKOWICZ R | POL-POL | 54.25 |  | VOGT W - FRESEN L | GER-GER | 55.88 |
| 22 | BARYLEWSKI M - KRZEMINSKI C | POL-POL | 54.06 |  | HACKETT P - HOLLAND J | ENG-ENG | 55.17 |
| 23 | BLACHNIO A - WUJKOW A | POL-POL | 54.02 |  | KIERZNOWSKI R - KACZANOWSKIT | POL-POL | 55.06 |
| 24 | TOMASZEK W - GARDYNIK G | POL-POL | 54.01 |  | MARSTRANDER P - ANDERSSEN R | NOR-NOR | 54.94 |
| 25 | WILDAVSKY A -WEINSTEIN H | USA-USA | 54.00 |  | 5 WAKSMAN S - USZINSKIW | FRA-FRA | 54.87 |
| 26 | VAINIKONIS E-ARLOVICH A | LTU-LTU | 53.88 |  | HOEGER W - MALCHUS P | GER-GER | 54.67 |
| 27 | SKALSKIA - KOLUDA P | POL-POL | 53.83 |  | MICHALOWSKI J - DOLNY W | POL-POL | 54.43 |
| 28 | STAMATOV J - DANAILOV D | BUL-BUL | 53.71 |  | FRONCZAK - KONOPKA R | POL-POL | 54.32 |
| 29 | LEWACIAK G - ZUBIEL P | POL-POL | 53.69 |  | JELENIEWSKI A - WACHNOWSKI J | POL-POL | 54.14 |
| 30 | LIJ-ZHANG B | CHN-CHN | 53.68 |  | KOWALCZYK S - SUCHARKIEWICZ J | POL-POL | 52.13 |
| 31 | NAWROCKI P -WIANKOWSKI P | POL-POL | 53.68 |  | OHNO K - YAMADA A | JPN-JPN | 51.97 |
| 32 | HOYLAND S - HOYLAND S | NOR-NOR | 53.64 |  | BAKKET - HANTVEIT H | NOR-NOR | 51.76 |
| 33 | SCHILHART N - BUCHLEV N | GER-GER | 53.62 |  | HIRATA M - OHASHI M | JPN-JPN | 51.72 |
| 34 | PAWLOWSKI A - GRZELCZAK J | POL-POL | 53.47 |  | DANYLYUK ${ }^{\text {- DANYLYUKV }}$ | UKR-UKR | 50.98 |
| 35 | KWIECIEN M - ZATORSKI P | POL-POL | 53.43 |  | HUSSAIN M - MAZHAR M | PAK-PAK | 50.73 |
| 36 | YANG L-DAI J | CHN-CHN | 53.39 |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | CHUMAKY - ROVYSHYN O | UKR-UKR | 53.27 | Mixed Pairs after 13 |  |  |  |
| 38 | WANGW - CHENY | CHN-CHN | 53.20 |  |  |  |  |
| 39 | VANDERVORST M - BAHBOUT S | BEL-BEL | 53.19 |  |  |  |  |
| 40 | CARROLLJ-GARVEYT | IRL-IRL | 53.15 |  | HUBERSCHWILLER M - HUBERSCHWILLER A | FRA-FRA | 58.18 |
| 41 | SHEK D - RASMUSSEN J | MAS-MAS | 53.00 |  | FISCHER D - SAURER B | AUT-AUT | 58.09 |
| 42 | MARINOVSKI K - SIPUS M | CRO-CRO | 53.00 |  | KHAZANOV I - LEBEDEVA M | RUS-RUS | 56.45 |
| 43 | SIELICKIT - TUCZYNSKI P | POL-POL | 52.97 |  | SAPORTA P - SAPORTA-TWORZYDLO R | FRA-FRA | 55.98 |
| 44 | OZDIL M - OZBALCI E | TUR-TUR | 52.94 |  | 5 JIN K - ZHU P | CHN-CHN | 55.98 |
| 45 | BENDIKS J - BETHERS J | LAT-LAT | 52.87 |  | ROZENBLYUM M - VOROBEYCHIKOVA O | RUS-RUS | 55.58 |
| 46 | SZELKA W - WOLCZAK C | POL-POL | 52.82 |  | WROBEL M - PIETRZYK A | POL-POL | 55.49 |
| 47 | KUCHARSKI P - KLIS M | POL-POL | 52.81 |  | SHI B - TIANW | CHN-CHN | 54.76 |
| 48 | KRISHNAN R - KIRUBAKARAMOORTHY N | IND-IND | 52.79 |  | WINCIOREK T - STACHOWIAK-KLUZ J | POL-POL | 54.65 |
| 49 | BERG T - JORGENSEN G | DEN-DEN | 52.64 | 10 | SCHROEDER M - SCHROEDER M | GER-GER | 54.32 |
| 50 | WIELOWIEYSKI A - KLIMACKI P | POL-POL | 52.64 |  | SAUTAUX M - SZCZEPANSKI R | POL-POL | 54.28 |
| 51 | CIESLAK J - MAKARUK J | POL-POL | 52.57 | 12 | HANLONT - BARTON G | IRL-IRL | 54.18 |
| 52 | WRECZYCKI M - BAJEK G | POL-POL | 52.48 |  | KHANDELWAL R - KHANDELWAL H | IND-IND | 53.70 |
| 53 | TAMMINEN J - LESKELAV | FIN-FIN | 52.43 |  | GUMBY P - LAZER W | AUS-AUS | 53.46 |
| 54 | BURAKOWSKIW - PAWELEC J | POL-POL | 52.41 |  | EFRAIMSSON B - ZACK E | SWE-SWE | 53.34 |
| 55 | KOWALCZYK I-WISNIEWSKIT | POL-POL | 52.39 |  | JANECZEK M - BUNIKOWSKIA | POL-POL | 53.27 |
| 56 | GOWER C - VANV | RSA-RSA | 52.33 |  | KARMARKAR M - KARMARKAR S | IND-IND | 52.93 |
| 57 | RIMSTEDT M - RIMSTEDT O | SWE-SWE | 52.32 |  | STEPHENS R - ROSSLEE D | RSA-RSA | 52.76 |
| 58 | SHUKHMEYSTER B - RYBNIKOV G | UKR-UKR | 52.30 | 19 | HUNGY - HSIEH H | TPE-TPE | 52.64 |
| 59 | KRASNICKI M - WITKOWSKI L | POL-POL | 52.30 |  | SHARKANAS G - JANKUNAITE G | LTU-LTU | 52.17 |
| 60 | SCHOLLAARDT M - NETTL O | NED-NED | 52.29 |  | CLAIR P - PAGNINI-ARSLAN C | ITA-ITA | 51.97 |
| 61 | SZTYRAK L-JASZCZAK A | POL-POL | 52.16 |  | HOFFMAN D - BOURKE M | AUS-AUS | 51.86 |
| 62 | BALASOVS J-BETHERS U | LAT-LAT | 52.14 |  | KACZMAREK E - PYCLIK-CHOJENKA A | POL-POL | 51.66 |
| 63 | MISZEWSKA E - ILCZUK P | POL-POL | 52.02 |  | SOLOMONW - CAPALT | ENG-ENG | 51.63 |
| 64 | CIECHOMSKI J - GLASEK G | POL-POL | 52.01 |  | SIKORA M - WALCZYNSKIA | POL-POL | 51.51 |
| 65 | RODZIEWICZ-BIELEWICZ O-PIECHOCKI S | POL-POL | 52.01 |  | HANNA N - EATON J | CAN-CAN | 51.48 |
| 66 | GROMOELLER M - FRITSCHE J | GER-GER | 52.00 |  | NIKITINA A - GUSEVV | RUS-RUS | 51.48 |
| 67 | DROZDOWSKI J - KULESZA P | POL-POL | 51.96 |  | SOBOLEWSKA E - KUSION A | POL-POL | 51.42 |
| 68 | WITEK M - BYZDRA A | POL-POL | 51.78 |  | OLIVIERI G - ZALESKI R | ITA-ITA | 51.35 |
| 69 | VAINIKONIS - OLANSKIW | LTU-LTU | 51.76 |  | HETZ C - PACHTMAN R | ISR-ISR | 51.02 |
| 70 | CUMMINS P - ROTCHELL D | BAR-BAR | 51.76 |  | KOWALSKA A - TYRAN M | POL-POL | 50.99 |
| 71 | DALECKI M - MODRZEJEWSKI M | POL-POL | 51.72 |  | SUWIK A - OSTROWSKA L | POL-POL | 50.98 |
| 72 | COUTTS J - MOSKOVSKY E | NZL-NZL | 51.49 |  | NG K - LIAN S | SIN-SIN | 50.76 |
| 73 | CARACCI M - CUEVAS L | $\mathrm{CHI}-\mathrm{CHI}$ | 51.47 |  | MECKSTROTH S -TUNCOK C | USA-USA | 50.73 |
| 74 | OPALINSKI R - ZAWADA J | POL-POL | 51.46 |  | LILLIS H-McGLOUGHLIN M | IRL-IRL | 50.58 |
| 75 | LESNICZAK J - JANIK S | POL-POL | 51.43 |  | DOBROWOLSKI M - MADUZIA A | POL-POL | 50.58 |
| 76 | PIETRASZEK M - ZNAMIROWSKI J | POL-POL | 51.37 |  | RUDAKOV E - DIKHNOVA T | RUS-RUS | 50.07 |
| 77 | BERTHEAU P - HULT S | SWE-SWE | 51.36 |  | RETEK G - RETEK M | CAN-CAN | 50.06 |
| 78 | SZYMCZYK T - KOPERNOK H | POL-POL | 51.31 |  | YUEN M - FENTON A | CAN-CAN | 50.01 |
|  | EIDE E - EIDE H | NOR-NOR | 51.31 |  | HOOYKAAS P - RANKIN P | AUS-AUS | 49.98 |
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COME TO LYON AND PLAY!


## By Ram Soffer

## Senior Teams QF - S2 and S3

USA v Australia


The USA team, Senior world champions for 2015, started the event as clear favourites. They finished first in the round robin by a big margin, and then easily won their round of 16 match. Their first real test came in the quarterfinal against a tough Australian team that managed to overcome a huge deficit and eliminate Poland in the previous stage. After the first set, USA trailed I5-30, but they started the second session very strongly.


All Pass
My article in yesterday's bulletin featured a board on which an Italian player helped his opponents to reach the best contract by supporting his partner's preempt after their opponent overcalled. This was more of the same. Burgess had potential defence against any game contract

and partner's preempt was in third seat, where the range is wider. If so, then why not let the opponents find their way and, perhaps, stumble?
After bidding 5\%, his partnership was booked for a substantial minus score.
Meckstroth led $\Phi$ A and Zia signalled with \$10 encouraging according to their methods. This was the correct signal, as North was unlikely to hold more than four spades, so Zia knew there would be no discard on the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$. However, his partner decided to switch, and failed to guess which red suit switch was safe. A heart was led at trick two and a potential +500 became +300 . This is one aspect the USA needs to address in this tournament. Both partnerships Meckstroth-Zia and Hamman-Martel have little experience playing together.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Milner | Klinger | H. Lall | Haughie |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 3e | Dble | Pass | 3NT |

## All Pass

Lall passed North's takeout double - he didn't even bid $4 \%$ - and was rewarded when South (naturally) elected to play 3NT, which was defeated by three tricks as West had a side entry to his clubs. +300 at both tables meant a swing of 12 IMPs, and by the next board the Australian lead was gone.

Board 19. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

- QJ 2
-AJ94
$\diamond A 10$
- QJ 107

| , AK 10975 | N | - 843 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 75$ |  | $\bigcirc$ K Q 106 |
| $\checkmark 3$ | W E | $\checkmark 872$ |
| \& 9532 | S | \& AK 8 |

© 832
$\diamond$ KQJ9654

- 64

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lorentz | Meckstroth | Burgess | Zia <br> B |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

According to their convention card, Lorentz-Burgess signal standard count and nothing else. East led \& and switched to 8 K . His partner gave him even count by the 87, but this information was pretty useless. As a result, Meckstroth's Bath Coup worked - Burgess continued hearts and gave away the 9th trick.

| West <br> Milner | North <br> Klinger | East <br> H. Lall | South <br> Haughie <br> 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

Next door, the bidding was the same, as well as the first trick and the $\triangle K$ switch, but Milner signalled with the $\nabla 5$ - discouraging. Lall got the message - his partner discouraged both clubs and hearts, so he tried spades. Shortly afterwards the defenders gathered five tricks and the USA took the lead 37-30.
The following board was Australia's best of the session, thanks to a heavy four-level opening that worked, though they missed a defensive trick which would have improved their score.

Board 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.


## All Pass

Zia was fixed. He had an automatic 5 e bid over 49, but three aces were missing, while his opponents' contract was hopeless. At least he managed to park his heart losers on the diamond suit and reduce the damage to -I00.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Milner | Klinger | H. Lall | Haughie |
| Is | Pass | INT | $2 \dot{2}$ |
| 3 | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

Milner chose the normal is opening, but now South could show his suit at the a comfortable level. There was no necessity to compete to $5 \stackrel{1}{2}$ at adverse vulnerability, as his hand contained significant defensive potential.
Klinger led $\triangleleft K$. Declarer won this and drew two rounds of trump, South discarding $\odot 5$ (odd=encouraging while discarding). Then he played a diamond and South discarded \& 2 , also encouraging. North cashed his diamonds and switched to... clubs, blowing a trick. As a rule, the first signal is the primary one, so North should have trusted his partner and played a heart. South was also partly to blame: declarer was unlikely to hold more than one club, so he should have dropped a discouraging $\$ 4$ on the second diamond trick. Australia collected +100 at both tables for a medium swing of 5 IMPs.

However, towards the end of this session the Australians missed three non-vulnerable games bid and made at the other table. In two of those cases, they had a combined total of 25-26 HCP plus a major-suit fit, and I could hardly find a valid reason for their underbidding. Those three boards cost them unnecessary 19 IMPs, giving the USA a lead of 63-42 after two sessions.
However, the third session was brighter for Australia. On board 2 they were handed 6 IMPs when Bob Hamman (the dealer) decided to open the following hand with one heart:

```
4.
&AKQ4
A A 107
& 10 832
```

Well, Hamman had played four-card majors for most of his bridge career, but his current convention card states "five-card majors" and doesn't mention any exceptions. Despite the excellent quality of his suit, the $I \triangleleft$ opening worked out poorly as his partner held:

- A Q 109
$\bigcirc 1093$
$\diamond 653$
\% K J 4
Chip Martel bid $2 \triangleleft$, which ended the auction. This contract was unmakeable, while at the other table Australia reached the proper contract of INT and made it with an overtrick.
In the following board, another of Hamman's $1 \triangleleft$ opening fared better. This time he held seven hearts.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

|  | - A Q |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 975$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 753 |  |  |
|  | \& K Q 93 |  |  |
| 49876 | N |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 2 |  | $\bigcirc$ | J 108643 |
| $\diamond$ Q 96 |  | $\checkmark$ | J 2 |
| \& A 864 |  | 9 |  |
|  | ¢ K 10432 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K}$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 1084$ |  |  |
|  | 9.1072 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Martel | Klinger | Hamman | Haughie |
|  |  | 18 | 14 |
| Dble | Rdbl | 2 | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | 38 | All Pass |

South led a spade. North's first three played cards were $\Delta \mathrm{A}, \mathrm{Q}$ and $\stackrel{\mathrm{K}}{\mathrm{K}}$. Hamman came to the right conclusion that South needed to have some high cards as well for his

Is overcall, and he dropped South's stiff $Q \mathrm{~K}$ for the overtrick.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lavings | Meckstroth | Krochmalik | Zia |
|  |  | 18 | 19 |
| Pass | $2 \varnothing$ | Pass | $2 \Phi$ |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \varnothing$ | Pass |
| $4 \varnothing$ | Dble | All Pass |  |

Krochmalik bid to 38 while facing a silent partner, so Lavings decided his hand was worth a shot at game. Meckstroth showed his disagreement by doubling.
Zia led a club rather than a spade, so declarer did not have any significant information about the location of the high cards. Krochmalik tried the normal heart finesse - one down. Plus 200 and 9 IMPs for the USA.
After 9 boards the USA led 78-49, but then Australia rallied.


Without any clues from the bidding, Haughie selected the normal $\diamond 2$ lead, after which the defence was not very hard. Klinger won with $\diamond K$ and returned the suit. Upon winning his $\vee \mathbf{A}$ he accurately switched to a spade and got his ruff.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lavings | Meckstroth | Krochmalik | Zia |
|  |  | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 38 | Pass |
| $4 \varnothing$ | All Pass |  |  |

The Australian East-West pair used the multi $2 \diamond$, reaching the same contract from the other side of the table. The same defence described above could set this contract as well, but the only successful start would be $\diamond$ K from North. Understandably, Meckstroth did not find this lead. He started with a spade. Next Zia switched to diamonds, but his spade entry was gone so no ruff was coming. Australia +620 and a swing of 12 IMPs.
Australia added 13 more in the final three deals of the day. In the following board, Ron Klinger and Meckstroth
played 2NT on identical auctions. One made it, the other didn't.

Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul.

4 J 864
$\checkmark$ A 9
$\diamond A 3$
\& A 10865

| - Q 7 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| ¢J876 |  |
| $\diamond$ K 1072 |  |
| \% K Q J |  |
| N | ¢ 53 |
| W E | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 10432$ |
| W E | $\diamond$ J 84 |
| S | ¢973 |
| - AK 1092 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 5 |  |
| $\checkmark$ Q 965 |  |
| * 42 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Martel | Klinger | Hamman | Haughie |
| Lavings | Meckstroth | Krochmalik | Zia |
|  |  | Pass | $1 乌$ |
| 2@ | Dble | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 2NT | All Pass |  |

Both Easts led a club. West won his A and continued the suit.
Meckstroth attacked diamonds immediately, playing the overcaller for the $\diamond$ J. It was not to be, and after playing a low diamond to the queen, no recovery was possible, as West cleared the clubs. Soon declarer had to concede two down.
Klinger delayed the critical decision and played three rounds of top spades, noticing that West started with four spades. At this point he knew that East held eight red cards, and West only four. Furthermore, two of those four red cards had to be an ace or a king, in order to justify West's overcall.
East was the clear favourite to hold the $\diamond$ J. Accordingly, Klinger played low to the $K$ and ran the $\diamond I 0$. When this succeeded he had three diamond tricks, as well as three spade and two club tricks.
At the halfway stage the USA had a rather fragile 84-74 lead.


Zia Mahmood, USA and Paul Lavings, Australia


At the beginning of the third segment, Spain were enjoying a 6-IMP lead. Though New Zealand had done well early in the second segment, Spain had rallied near the end of it and managed to get back into the lead. Below, we will see that they continued their rally for the best part of the third segment as well.
New Zealand had scored just I IMP over the first five quiet boards. Then, things started to liven up a little, as this was board 6:

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

|  | - A Q |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 975$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 75 |  |
|  | - KQ93 |  |
| - 9876 | N | - J 5 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 2 |  | Q AJ 108643 |
| $\checkmark$ Q9 6 | W E | $\checkmark$ AJ2 |
| +A864 | S | - 5 |
|  | - K 10432 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K}$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 1084$ |  |
|  | * 1072 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lantaron | Tislevoll | F Goded | Ware |
|  |  | $1 \varnothing$ | 19 |
| Dble | Redbl | $4 \Omega$ | All Pass |

Federico Goded followed an inspired line of play in his contract. South led a spade, North winning his $\stackrel{\mathrm{A}}{\mathrm{A}}$ and $\stackrel{\mathrm{Q}}{\mathrm{Q}}$


Gonzalo Goded Merino, Spain
before exiting with the $\triangle 5$. Up went the $\triangle A$ and down came the $9 K$. When South discarded a diamond on a later trump from declarer, Goded even made an overtrick as the eA was still there for a diamond finesse. Spain +650 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | Sabate | Whibley | G Goded |
|  |  | $1 \varangle$ | Pass |
| Is | Dble | $2 \varnothing$ | 30 |
| Pass | Pass | 38 | All Pass |

As N/S had not bid, there was nothing to guide Whibley in the play. South led the to dummy's ace and declarer immediately took a losing heart finesse. Later on, he lost a diamond as well and thus just made his contract, New Zealand +l40 but II IMPs to Spain.
Three more flat boards came next but then, once again it was all about $4 \checkmark$ :

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.
\& Q 763
-A932
$\diamond$ K 9
\& 1065


- A9852
$\bigcirc 6$
$\diamond$ Q 7652
ค 18

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lantaron | Tislevoll | F Goded | Ware |
|  |  | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | $3 \&$ | Pass |
| 4 | All Pass |  |  |

All Pass
The Multi and the "weak hearts" response from East made West the declarer. Had North found the lead of the $\diamond K$, he would have been able to reach his partner in time for a diamond ruff to add to the defence's two aces and natural diamond trick. When he led a more natural low spade instead, South could win his ace and return a diamond but with South's entry gone, there was no longer any danger of a ruff. So Lantaron could come to ten tricks in relative peace. Spain +620 .
In the other room, New Zealand were playing a natural weak two:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | Sabate | Whibley | G Goded |
|  |  | $2 \boxtimes$ | Pass |

$4 \bigcirc \quad$ All Pass
With East the declarer, South led a natural diamond. Declarer had to duck this but now, North won the king and returned the $\diamond 9$. With the still there, the subsequent diamond ruff put the contract one down. Spain another +100 and 12 more IMPs to them. It's all about luck, boards of this type. Two boards later, Spain again troubled the scorers.

Board 12. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \& A Q 93 \\ & \& A J 1052 \\ & \diamond 54 \\ & \& 109 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -107 | N | - K 6 |
| $\bigcirc 93$ |  | $\bigcirc 84$ |
| $\checkmark$ A Q J 1086 | W E | $\diamond 973$ |
| - AJ3 | S | - KQ 7652 |
|  | - J 8542 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ KQ 76 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K2 |  |
|  | - 84 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lantaron | Tislevoll | F Goded | Ware |
| $1 \diamond$ | $1 \otimes$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \varnothing$ |
| 2NT | $3 \otimes$ | All Pass |  |

When East simply led his partner's suit, the defence collected two tricks in each minor and the $\Phi \mathrm{K}$. Spain +100 , a sort of par result, one would think.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | Sabate | Whibley | $G$ Goded |
| $1 \diamond$ | $1 \otimes$ | $2 \Leftrightarrow$ | 2 |
| 3 | 3 | All Pass |  |

Goded showed a fair heart raise with his $2 \diamond$. East led the $\%$ and upon seeing partner's shifted to the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$. Suddenly, declarer had ten tricks. Spain another +170 and a surprise 7IMPs more.
So much for the normal contracts. In the Mixed Teams, a variety of different approaches to beating par were on display. This is what happened in the Netherlands v. China match.
As you may or may not remember, Netherlands took the lead early in the Mixed Teams round robin, never to lose it. One of their strong points certainly is putting pressure on the opponents.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $F u$ | Ritmeijer | Y Zhang | Ticha |
| $1 \diamond$ | $1 \diamond$ | INT | $2 \diamond$ |
| $3 \diamond$ | $4 \diamond$ | $4 N T$ | Pass |
| $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

West's $1 \diamond$ was either II-I3 balanced or II-I5 unbalanced. $2 \triangleleft$ from South showed a fair heart raise and when West showed his suit, North went straight to game, giving East a nasty problem. When she solved it by showing interest in either minor, the Chinese had found a cheap phantom sacrifice. Netherlands +50 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| J Jansma | Hou | A Jansma | H Wang |
| INT | 2 | 2NT | 4 |

## All Pass

Jan Jansma opened a well-timed 15-I7 NT (!). Hou showed his majors and Aida Jansma showed her club suit in Lebensohl style. With her two good major-suit fits, Hong Li Wang jumped to game but at this table, E/W judged the situation reasonably well by passing and collecting two down undoubled for a score of +200 and 6 more IMPs to the Netherlands.
On the next board, New Zealand again might consider themselves unlucky but this time, not that much:

Board I3. Dealer North. All Vul.

|  | ¢ 5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 10963$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 96432$ |  |
|  | * A 4 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10864 \\ & >87 \end{aligned}$ | N | ¢ J 72 |
|  | W E | $\bigcirc$ AJ 2 |
| $\checkmark$ A Q J |  | $\checkmark 875$ |
| ¢K952 | S | \& 10876 |
|  | \& AKQ 93 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 54 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 10 |  |
|  | \& Q J 3 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lantaron | Tislevoll | F Goded | Ware |
|  | Pass | Pass | INT |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

Once South expressed some interest in a heart contract over partner's transfer, the Antipodes (from the European point of view) were quickly in game. This looks a reasonable proposition, vulnerable. Declarer has to find the $\diamond$ A onside or to locate the $\oslash \mathrm{J}$ and hope that spades or diamonds are not breaking too badly. When declarer did not meet with the first two requirements, he had to go two down. Spain +200.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | Sabate | Whibley | G Goded |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \$$ |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | $2 \vee$ | All Pass |  |

Playing a strong le, the Spaniards were able to assess the
situation a little better.As Sabate had shown a maximum of 7 HCP with his $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ response, Goded called it a day over $2 \diamond$. Nine tricks in comfort, Spain another +140 and 8 more IMPs.
The segment thus had gone mainly Spain's way: 43-5 was the segment score in their favour. So at halftime, Spain were 44 IMPs up, but as we had seen in the second segment, even a lead of this size can easily evaporate within one segment.

## Segment 4

For the Tuesday morning session, the boards were even more quiet than on Monday morning. So no big surprise that the score over the segment was just 13-9 to Spain, giving Spain an overall lead of 48 with 32 boards to go.
As our featured match did not produce very much spectacular bridge, I turned my attention to some of the other matches as well. An interesting defensive problem arose on board 23:

Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.

|  | , Q 72 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 9$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 10854$ |  |
|  | \& AKQ 54 |  |
| - AJ 3 | N | ¢ K 84 |
| PK 62 | $W^{\text {N }}$ | $\bigcirc$ A 1053 |
| $\diamond$ A Q 3 |  | $\diamond$ KJ |
| ¢ J 732 | S | \% 10986 |
|  | ¢ 10965 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q J 874 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 9762$ |  |
|  | \& - |  |

Against West's normal contract of 3NT, North is on lead. The first question is, of course, which club to lead. If you lead a low club, declarer will win and return a club every time he gets the lead. Eventually, South might appear to be squeezed out of his part of the spade guard on the fifth


Michael Wibley, New Zealand
club. The combined holding of the $\$ 8$ will enable you to lead the through North, scooping South's $\$ 109$ in the process.
At one of the tables in the Mixed Teams, North led a top club on which South discarded the 10 to signal hearts. Declarer, Jan Jansma of the Netherlands, won the diamond continuation and returned a club to North. Another diamond came back, Jansma winning and again returning a club to North who exited in diamonds, dummy throwing a heart from dummy. As South had been squeezed without the count, she had come down to $\Phi_{9 x x}$ and $\vee Q J x$, so Jansma simply played three rounds of hearts and ran the forced spade return to dummy's $\$ 8$. Nicely done.
Needless to say, against correct defence 3NT cannot be made, as was shown, for example, in our featured match. Dummy has to play a major-suit card ahead of South so there is no genuine squeeze.
In our featured match, the two boards below were the only two more or less substantial swings.

Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.

$$
17432
$$

$\bigcirc$ A 10
$\diamond$ AJ

- KQ1095
$\quad$ KQJ5
$\vee Q 92$
$\diamond K 4$
$>8432$

| N | - 86 |
| :---: | :---: |
| W E | $\bigcirc{ }^{\text {J }} 3$ |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 109873 |
| S | - A 6 |
| - A 109 |  |

©K8764
$\diamond 652$

- 17

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| G Goded | Tislevoll | Sabate | Ware |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| In | 20 | All Pass |  |

New Zealand ended up in a very good contract this way, for +90 to them.
Even 2NT was already too high, as was shown at the other table.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bach | F Goded | Cornell <br> Lantaron |  |
| Pass | INT | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

On the lead of the $\diamond I O$ to the king, no matter what declarer (North) does, the defence will collect five diamond tricks and the M . That's what happened at this table; New Zealand another +100 and 5 IMPs to them in this very low-scoring set.
At many tables, North had become declarer in 3NT, which usually went two off. In the Mixed Teams, once again I spotted an exception:

| West <br> Chen | North <br> Ritmeijer | East <br> Feng | South <br> Tichá |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I $\diamond$ |  | Pass | Pass |
| Pass | INT | $3 \diamond$ | Dble |
| A | $3 仓$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass

West's I $\diamond$ was nebulous, Precision style and North's INT overcall was plainly shaded. East led the normal $\diamond I 0$ but when West played the king, declarer ducked, playing the jack. Not counting his partner for an ace, West shifted to the $\mathbf{~ K}$. This was all declarer needed. He won the ace, drove out the eA and had his nine tricks when East returned the precious $\$ 8$ after winning her ace - the $\$ 7$ eventually becoming a winner. As E/W cannot profitably attack hearts, declarer would have been able to establish a second spade trick himself, if necessary.
On the next board, Spain registered their "big swing" of the segment.

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.



GeO Tislevoll, New Zealand

Double showed strength but there was no obvious route to game for N/S after West's light opening bid, showing II13 HCP. Ten tricks, New Zealand +170.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bach | F Goded | Cornell | Lantaron <br> Pass |
| Pass | INT | Pass | $\mathbf{2} \diamond$ |
| Pass | $3 \vee$ | Dble | $4 \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

In the other room, it was North who was allowed to open INT, after which game was easily reached once North super-accepted the transfer. Spain +420 and a big swing, the biggest of the set: 6 IMPs!
On the last five boards of the set, Spain added 5 more IMPs in "peanut style," to win the segment 13-9 and increase their lead to 48.

## Playing the pairs game <br> By Brent Manley

Duplicate bridge is supposed to eliminate the luck factor in bridge, and it does to an extent. If you have a set in which the opponents have most of the high-card points, at least you know that all the other pairs sitting your way will have the same experience. You can still score well by doing better with limited assets.
Luck comes into play when you find yourself in the right place at the right time (declarer bungles an easy contract against you and goes down) or vice versa (the opponents bash into a slam that few will bid and they make it somehow).
In the fifth qualifying session of the Open Pairs, Michal Kwiecien, winner of the Open Pairs with Jacek Pszczola in Lille I8 years ago, is playing in Wroclaw with Piotr Zatorski.
They got off to a good start, scoring $75.26 \%$ on the first board they played.

Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \qquad 10765 \\ & \otimes A Q 76 \\ & \diamond K J 105 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - 84 | N | Q QJ 32 |
| Q J 105 |  | ¢K93 |
| $\checkmark$ Q 742 | W E | $\checkmark$ A |
| - 1753 | S | * A Q 1096 |
|  | - AK 9 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 82$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 9863$ |  |
|  | 9K842 |  |

Zatorski landed in $3 \triangleleft$ on a competitive auction that included a 2 overcall by East and a raise by West.
East started with the 9 . Zatorski went up with the king,
pitching a spade from hand. He played a low heart from dummy, playing low when West inserted the 10 . On the diamond return, Zatorski played low and East won with the singleton ace. East played the A , ruffed by Zatorski to cash the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and ruff a heart, felling the king. He played a diamond to his 10 and continued with the $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$, ruffed by West, how down to the singleton $\diamond Q$. Exiting with the diamond would allow Zatorski to run the hearts and take two spades on the end, so West played another club. That forced declarer to ruff with the $\diamond K$, but he could play good hearts from there. There was only one more trick coming for the defense. That was plus IIO for North-South.
This board was painful for Kwiecien and Zatorski.

|  | rd I4. D | East. N | None Vul. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\pm$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
|  |  | 0762 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\pm 7$ |  |  | \& AKJ 85 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 86 |  |  | $\bigcirc$ AK 107542 |
| $\checkmark$ AJ 854 |  | E | $\diamond 3$ |
| * Q 1092 |  |  | 2- |
|  |  | 32 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | Zatorski |  | Kwiecien |
|  |  | 10* | 14 |
| Db** | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| 4 $\bigcirc$ | Pass | 68 | Pass |
| Pass | Dbl | All Pa |  |

10 Strong, articial and forcing
Dbl 5+ HCP
Zatorski obviously was not envisioning a hand such as East's. East could actually have made seven, but it's a bit double dummy (North's doubleton 1109 are important). As it was, North-South weren't getting a great score for
minus 980 (about $25 \%$ ). The double made it minus 1210 , good for only $13.31 \%$.
The two were having a below-average game but were saved by the final round.
On the penultimate board, an opponent in 3NT had 10 easy tricks by taking a finesse, but he failed to do so and ended up with just nine tricks. That was good for a 91.57\% score for Zatorski and Kwiecient. The final board of the session was a near top.

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.

$$
\text { \& K } 65
$$

४ 9875
$\diamond$ Q 10
\& A 1063
$\searrow 982$
$\diamond 642$
$\diamond 1863$
$>972$

| N | ¢ AJ 103 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 103$ |
| W E | $\diamond$ A 72 |
| S | 2 J 85 |
| , Q 74 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ A Q J |  |
| $\checkmark$ K 954 |  |
| \& K Q 4 |  |

West
Pass
$2 \diamond *$
$2 \oslash$
All Pass
North
Zatorski
Pass
Dbl
Dbl

INT 12-14
$2 \diamond$ Diamonds or the majors
Kwiecien led a low spade to his partner's king and declarer's ace. With a near Yarborough for a dummy, declarer could manage only four tricks for minus IIOO, good for $98.93 \%$. That boosted the Zatorski-Kwiecien score to $5 \mathrm{I} .01 \%$ for the session. By day's end, however, they were up to $56 \%$ and on their way to qualifying for the next stage of the event.

## 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

## Houdini at work

By Jan van Cleeff

In Sunday's round of 16, the Netherlands defeated Hungary in the Mixed Teams to advance to the quarterfinal round. The Dutchies (Aida and Jan Jansma and Magie and Richard Ritmeijer) were ahead by so much that Hungary withdrew after the fifth session.
In his home country, Jan Jansma is nicknamed 'Houdini' because he is quite often able to escape the odds against him and land seemingly impossible contracts. Check out these two deals from the round robin.
First a slam from the Netherlands v. Israel, Round 9
Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

- J 9864
-K986
$\diamond$ K 96
K


West - Jan Jansma - having shown a club suit of six cards or longer and shortness in hearts, had become declarer in 6\%. North kicked off with a tricky 99 . Declarer took his time. He then won the ace, finessed in clubs, losing to the eK, won the spade return, cashed a top club, returned to dummy by overtaking the 5 with the 6, pitched a diamond on the K K , ruffed a low heart in hand, played a diamond to the Jack and advanced the $\vee Q$.


Jan Jansma, Netherlands

It was decision time. Should declarer pitch another diamond? Jan Jansma decided to ruff and run his long clubs. Eventually North was squeezed in the red suits and Houdini duly took +1370. The second slam was against Hungary:

Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- 109872
$\triangleright$ K Q J 9
$\diamond \mathrm{Q}$
\% 75
- K 6
$\bigcirc 8$
$\diamond$ A 10987
\& AJ 1082


Q6532
$\diamond$ J 542
\& Q 943

| West <br> J. Jansma | t North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | sma | A. Jansma |  |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| 2\% | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| 3\% | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | 4\% | Pass |
| 49 | Pass | 4NT | Pass |
| 5 | Dble | $6\rangle$ | All Pass |
| $184+$ spades |  |  |  |
| $2 \checkmark$ 4th suit |  |  |  |
| 34 doubleton spade |  |  |  |
| 4\% club control |  |  |  |
| 4, \&K |  |  |  |
| 4NT RKC |  |  |  |
| Dble An | Anticipating no-tr | played by East |  |

It was the last board of the match and dummy, somewhat impatiently, asked her partner if it would take long. 'Might be,' was the answer. Mrs. Jansma knew enough. She left the playing area to score a refreshment. On the way, she ran into Zia Mahmood, who asked what contract Jan was playing. 'Some diamond contract,' said Aida.
'Hopefully not in slam as trumps are 4-I divided and spades 5-I.' All of a sudden, Aida regretted bypassing 3NT.
Meanwhile, Jansma won the lead of the $\vee K$ and cashed the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ and the s A . He noticed the drop of the Q , but still played another spade. South ruffed and switched to a trump: 9, queen, king. Jan ruffed a heart, cashed the A, ruffed a club, ruffed a heart and ruffed the fourth club.
At this point, declarer was left with the $\forall A I O$ and a high club. When Jan advanced the from dummy, South was helpless. Whatever card he played, the slam was home. Great minds may think alike, great magicians may not.


# 8th European Open Championships 

## Palazzo dei Congressi \& Teatro Verdi

# Montecatini Terme, Italy 10th to 24th June 2017 

## MIXED/OPEN/WOMEN/SENIORS Pairs and Teams

## PROGRAMME

| From | To | Championship | Event |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Saturday $10^{\text {th }}$ June | Tuesday $13{ }^{\text {th }}$ June | Mixed Teams |  |
| Monday $12^{\text {th }}$ June |  |  | Open BAM |
| Tuesday $13{ }^{\text {th }}$ June | Friday $16^{\text {th }}$ June | Mixed Pairs |  |
| Thursday $15^{\text {th }}$ June | Friday $16^{\text {th }}$ June |  | EBL Cup |
| Saturday $17^{\text {th }}$ June | Wednesday $21{ }^{\text {st }}$ June | Open Teams |  |
| Saturday $17^{\text {th }}$ June | Tuesday $20^{\text {th }}$ June | Women/Seniors Teams |  |
| Monday $19^{\text {th }}$ June |  |  | Open BAM |
| Tuesday $20^{\text {th }}$ June | Saturday $24^{\text {th }}$ June | Open Pairs |  |
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| Friday $23{ }^{\text {rd }}$ June | Saturday $24^{\text {th }}$ June |  | Open Pairs Event |
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At the start of the second half of their Women＇s series quarter－final match with Sweden，USA had a 42－IMP lead． The Swedes，looking to make up ground，sent Pia Andersson and Kathrine Bertheau to play against Sylvia Shi and Beth Palmer in the open room．At the other table，it was Tobi Sokolow and Janice Seamon－Molson for USA against Maria Gronkvist and Catharina Ahlesved．
After three push boards，USA scored first．
Board 20．Dealer West．All Vul．
－K 106
$\bigcirc$ KQ 6
$\diamond K$ Q
お」10763
4 A98
คJ42
$\diamond 97543$
\＆ A 5

． 73
$\bigcirc$ A 10987
$\diamond$ J 106
¢982
ค 53
$\diamond$ A 82
\＆K Q 4

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Shi | Andersson | Palmer | Bertheau |
| Pass | 19 | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | INT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{e n}^{*}$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $4 \varrho$ | All Pass |  |

Shi started with the A，Palmer playing the 9．A second spade went to South＇s king，Palmer following with the 8 ， clearly indicating a preference for hearts．Shi won the


Pia Andersson，Sweden
second round of spades，Palmer following first with her 7 and then the 3 ，and played a heart to the king and Palmer＇s ace．The club return allowed Shi to ruff for the setting trick．

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ahlesved | Sokolow | Gronkvist | Seamon－Molson |
| Pass | INT | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| Pass | 4 | All Pass |  |

As is evident from a view of all four hands，the defenders must lead a club to defeat 41．It is equally evident that Gronkvist had no reason to lead a club on this occasion． On the lead of the $\diamond$ J，Sokolow had no difficulty with the contract and in fact ended up with II tricks when Ahlesved won the A and cashed the followed by a club， allowing declarer to discard dummy＇s losing hearts．That was 13 IMPs to USA．
On the next deal，Sweden struck back：
Board 21．Dealer North．N／S Vul．
－ 1962
－A 107
$\diamond A Q 9$
\＆Q 53

－ 76

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Shi | Andersson | Palmer | Bertheau |
|  | $1 ヵ$ | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | INT | Pass | $2\rangle^{*}$ |
| Pass | $2 \triangleq$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |

All Pass
Palmer started with the 84 ：queen，2，7．Andersson played a diamond to the ace and a spade to the queen，followed by the $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$ ．Declarer entered her hand with the $\diamond Q$ and played the $\uparrow$ to East＇s king．Another heart went to declarer＇s 10 ．Andersson still had to lose two clubs but she had plus 620．In the closed room：

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ahlesved | Sokolow | Gronkvist | Seamon－Molson |
|  | 19 | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | INT | Pass | $3 N T$ |

All Pass
had plus 620．In the closed room：

Gronkvist led a heart to the 9 and declarer's 10 . Sokolow played a spade to the queen, 4 A and a third spade to East. Gronkvist played the $\& 10$ to her partner's king. When a club came back, Sokolow put up the 2 Q but Gronkvist won and cashed two more club tricks for one down and a I2-IMP swing to Sweden.
On board 22, Bertheau made the mistake of doubling a contract she was likely to defeat, only to have the opponents run to a making contract.

Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
\& K 10873
$\bigcirc 9843$
$\diamond 4$
\& 1062
© AJ 4
Q Q 65
$\triangleleft A J I 086$

- 19

- AK 7
$\diamond K$ Q 952
\& 84
462
- J 102
$\diamond 73$
\& AKQ 753


Sylvia Shi, USA

| West | North <br> Shi | Andersson |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | East |
| :--- |
| Palmer |
| INT |$\quad$| South |
| :--- |
| Bertheau |

Over Palmer's 14-I6 INT, Shi's 3e was checking for majors. When Palmer denied holding a major, Shi put her partner in 3 NT.Warned by the double, Shi ran to $4 \diamond$, which has only three losers: two clubs and a spade. Plus 130. At the other table, Seamon-Molson stayed quiet as the bidding went INT by East, 3NT by West. Seamon-Molson took the first six tricks for plus 200 and an 8 -IMP swing.
On the final board of the set, an II-IMP swing went to Sweden when Andersson and Bertheau played 3NT making five for plus 460 while Sokolow and Seamon-Molson bid up to 6NT, down one, with no legitimate way to get to 12 tricks.
USA won the set 42-30. With two sessions left to play, the Americans were ahead I34-80.


Kathrine Bertheau, Sweden

## SIMPLY WORLD CLASS

The Best Bridgefestival in the World
ÖREBRO | SWEDEN | JULY 28 - AUGUST 6, 2017
www.svenskbridge.se/festival-2017

## Never say never <br> By Mark Horton

As the Mixed Teams match between the USA and Japan drew to a close, things were looking bad for the North Americans as they trailed by 9 IMPs with only four deals to play. Cometh the hour, cometh the man:

Board 29. Dealer North. All Vul.

|  | ¢ 7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K 1065 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 1032 |  |
|  | ¢ 7432 |  |
| - 642 | N | ¢ J 1085 |
| $\bigcirc 432$ |  | $\bigcirc$ A J 7 |
| $\diamond$ A 9754 |  | $\checkmark$ K 86 |
| 2 Q 5 | S | * KJ 8 |
|  | 4 AKQ 93 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 98 |  |
|  | $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ |  |
|  | - A 1096 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Moss | Teramoto | Winestock | Shimamura |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond *$ | Dble |
| $2 \diamond!^{*}$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | $3 ڭ$ |

$1 \diamond \quad 11-15,2+\diamond$
$2 \diamond$ Psychic, in theory strong, forcing
East had to do something over $2 \diamond$. That meant South was forced to take a decision at an uncomfortable level. Had she started with an overcall of is she could have doubled, but here she felt it was essential to show her five-card suit. Had she doubled for a second time we can speculate about what action North would have taken - it looks normal to bid $3 \checkmark$ but, as you can see, converting the double would be a big winner.
West led the four of diamonds and East won with the king and decided to switch to the jack of spades (as the cards lie, a low club is best). Declarer won with the ace, cashed the king and continued with the queen, pitching a heart from dummy (it would have been better to start developing the clubs). The ace of clubs and a club saw East overtake West's queen, cash the ten of spades and the jack of clubs and exit with a diamond. Declarer pitched a heart and West won with the ace and played a heart to East's ace, two down, -200.
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Narita | Ornstein | Sato | Picus |
|  | Pass | 19 | 19 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West led the queen of clubs and when it held continued with the five, declarer winning with the ace, cashing three
top spades and exiting with a club. She was assured of seven tricks and when East exited with a low diamond rather than the king she was in overtrick territory, as West took the ace and exited with a heart, +ll0 and 7 IMPs, reducing the deficit to 4 IMPs.

Board 3I. Dealer South. All Vul.

- KQ 7632
$\bigcirc 1053$
$\diamond$ K 7
- 83

$$
104
$$

$\vee K Q 2$
$\diamond$ A 986
$\& K Q J 4$

| N | $\pm 1$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J 7 |
| W E | $\diamond$ QJ 10543 |
| S | \& A 1062 |
| 4 A 985 |  |
| - A 9864 |  |
| $\diamond 2$ |  |
| 9 975 |  |

Open Room

| West <br> Moss | North <br> Teramoto | East <br> Winestock | South <br> Shimamura <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| INT | Pass | 2 NT* $^{*}$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond *$ | All Pass |  |  |

2NT Transfer to diamonds
$3 \diamond$ Fit
Declarer lost three tricks, + I 30 .
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Narita | Ornstein | Sato | Picus |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| INT | Pass | 2** | Pass |
| 30* | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | $3{ }^{1}$ | Pass |
| 420 | Pass | 5 | All Pass |

The East-West auction apparently disclosed that East held both minors.
After $3 \diamond$, West then showed a heart feature. 3s appears to suggest the lack of a spade stopper.
Give West the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ instead of the $\vee \mathrm{K} \mathrm{Q}$ and $5 \diamond$ is on the trump finesse. South cashed her aces and one down gave the USA 5 IMPs and a I-IMP lead going into the last deal.
It was a part-score, USA taking eight tricks in INT for +120 , Japan nine tricks in clubs for +IIO-and it was Japan who had to say sayonara.

## Open Teams QF - S4 <br> Poland v Sweden

By Micke Melander
Don't give your little finger away

As reported in my article yesterday, it was highly expected that Poland vs Sweden would be a very tight game. But who could foresee that the standing halfway through the match would be 79-79? The drama is certainly on again and the slightest error might make the other team the winner.
Both teams clearly stepped on the gas pedals from the start when they decided to bid all the way up to Six Spades on the first board of segment four.

Board I7. Dealer North. None Vul.

- KQ 10942
$\bigcirc 8$
$\triangleleft K 93$
- A 104

- 8
down all his aces and kings in the minors to exit with his last club. If the player who got in didn't have had any diamonds left, Gawrys would have made it... but as we know, that wasn't the case. So no swing.
The Poles actually got to be leaders of the pack after the second board when they managed to steal the part score contract in both rooms and eventually scored 2 IMPs.
The third board didn't present any problem for either declarer when they opted to play a cold Four Spades being vulnerable. The defence could have sacrificed to pay out 500, but to find that out you need to be more than a rocket scientist. So another push.The first real swing was soon to be seen, though.

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.

|  | - K 106 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8 KQ 6 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ KQ |  |
|  | 2 J 10763 |  |
| - A98 | N | - 73 |
| ¢J42 |  | - A 10987 |
| $\checkmark 97543$ |  | $\checkmark$ J 106 |
| - A 5 | S | +982 |
|  | - QJ542 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 53$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 82 |  |
|  | - KQ4 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sylvan | Gawrys | Wrang | Klukowski |
| Pass | 1\% | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | INT | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 24 | Pass | 49 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| Closed Room: |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jassem | Warne | Mazurkiewicz | Bergdahl |
| Pass | I $\diamond$ | Pass | 14 |
| Pass | INT | Pass | 3NT | All Pass

When Sylvan led the three of diamonds in the open room, Klukowski simply won with the queen, drew trumps and it was too late for Sylvan to try to get a club ruff when partner didn't have the king of clubs. The ace of clubs and a club in the lead would have brought Four Spades down if he could find partner's heart entry. That was 620 to Poland. In the closed room, One Spade promised only three, when North rebid INT Bergdahl decided not to reveal anything more about his hand and simply jumped to game.


Frederic Wrang, Sweden
When East kicked off with the ten of hearts and West had the well-needed entry to get in to play hearts through declarer, it was quickly two off. 13 IMPs to Poland.
Board 21 gave the Swedes their first IMP of the segment when they managed to score one overtrick in another cold Four Spades game, where you basically needed one out of two finesses to work (both did).
On the next board, the Swedes bid INT-3NT and South had no problem cashing out the first six tricks when he held ace-king-queen six times. At the other table, the Poles tried Five Diamonds when they realized that they had no club stopper. However, with two club losers and a spade finesse that didn't work. They also went down (but just one) for 3 IMPs to Sweden.
The next real blood was coming up in one of the more interesting boards of the segment, when Jassem made a really great play to take advantage of an error by a defender.

Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.
. Q 72
$\bigcirc 9$
$\diamond 10854$
\& AKQ 54


The two rooms:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sylvan | Gawrys | Wrang | Klukowski |
| Jassem | Warne | Mazurkiewicz | Bergdahl |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| INT | Pass | 29 | Pass |
| $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

Let's start examining the Open Room. Gawrys led the king of clubs and South pitched the four of hearts, which made Gawrys change his mind and play on diamonds. A ping-pong battle started where declarer played clubs and the defense diamonds. Klukowski eventually discarded a low spade. But that was it, and when declarer took his finesse in spades, North could cash his established diamond for one down.
Jassem in the Closed Room also got the king of clubs lead. Here Bergdahl discarded the fatal ten of spades, which was like giving your little finger away. If declarer now would read the situation right he could take advantage of it - and he did! Warne continued with the ace and queen of clubs to play a fourth round, setting up his last club. Declarer won with the jack and now cashed out the king and ace of hearts, and ace-king-queen of diamonds leaving the following four-card ending:


Jassem cashed the ace of spades and put the jack on the table. When North didn't cover, Jassem ran the jack, and when the nine appeared from South he had nine tricks. 12 IMPs for Poland after not-so-careful discarding and good card reading by declarer.
The next board didn't present any swing when both tables went to play in 3NT and when both tables again led clubs the contract was set twice.


On board 25, Mazurkiewicz managed to score one trick too many when the Swedes tried to bring declarer down. Another IMP to Poland. The standing was then 3I-I in the set, and Poland suddenly were in a comfortable lead. It should have been even bigger after the next board, but it wasn't.

West

Sylvan $\quad$\begin{tabular}{l}
North <br>
Gawrys

$\quad$

East <br>
Wrang

$\quad$

South <br>
Klukowski
\end{tabular}

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jassem | Warne | Mazurkiewicz | Bergdahl |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| $1{ }^{1}$ | 20 | 2 - | Dble |
| Pass | 24 | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Dble | 31 | Pass | 4\% | All Pass

In the open room, Gawrys got the ten of diamonds in the opening lead. West went up with the king and declarer allowed it to hold. Another diamond came back. Declarer won with the ace and played a spade to the ten and West's jack. The defense then decided it was time to play trumps, so a club to the ace and another round followed. When the hearts proved to be 3-3, declarer could simply pull trumps ruff a heart and claim for ten tricks. Three clubs could have been set on a spade lead because it gives the defenders a chance to remove declarer's entry for the later established hearts. If declarer follows low from dummy, West wins and returns a heart or a club. East when getting in again returns a second spade through dummy.
With that analysis in the bag, one might think that Warne should have no chance making Four Clubs in the closed room. Mazurkiewicz led the ace of clubs. The defence was still fine if East just shifted to spades. In fact, he did just that! Declarer called for the nine and West won with the jack. The king or queen of spades would now have been enough to bring declarer down, but Jassem shifted to a low
diamond! That was all declarer needed to pull the trumps, cash ace and king of hearts to ruff the suit good and claim his contract. Jassem is probably still thinking about what to do at home with his spade honours.

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \& \text { QJ } 94 \\ & \diamond A Q 52 \\ & \diamond K 7 \\ & \& A 107 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - A65 | N | - K 10732 |
| ¢ K 108 |  | $\bigcirc 6$ |
| $\checkmark 543$ | W | $\checkmark$ AJ |
| +KJ62 | S | - Q 9843 |
|  | - 8 |  |

QJ9743
$\triangleleft$ Q 109862

- 5

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sylvan | Gawrys | Wrang | Klukowski |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 1\% | Dble | 18 | Pass |
| 19 | Pass | 3\% | $3 \diamond$ |
| 49 | Dble | All Pass |  |
| Closed Room: |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jassem | Warne | Mazurkiewicz | Bergdahl |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 1\% | 14 | Pass |
| 20 | Pass | 24 | Dble |
| Pass | 38 | 34 | $4 \bigcirc$ |

When Sylvan decided to open the bidding in the closed room, the Poles were more or less outbid. Gawrys didn't


Michal Klukowski, Poland


Johan Sylvan, Sweden
believe for a second that Four Spades could be made doubled - and right he was. The king of diamonds was led. Declarer won and called for the queen of clubs, a dangerous line. Gawrys, who didn't understand what had happened, ducked. When declarer played a second round of clubs, South pitched a diamond. Gawrys took the king of clubs with the ace and gave his partner a club ruff. South cashed the queen of diamonds and continued the suit. Declarer ruffed in dummy and played a spade to his ace and a low one towards dummy. Gawrys went up with the queen of spades and was end-played for two down. Dummy's clubs were good, so Gawrys had to cash his ace of hearts.
In the Closed Room, West passed and N-S struggled but finally reached their game in hearts. When West also doubled they got some extra IMPs because declaring didn't present any big problems for North after the defense started with a spade to the ace and a club shift. Declarer won the ace, put the king of diamonds on the table. East won with the ace and returned a club, which declarer ruffed. A heart to the queen and the ace of hearts followed. When East discarded and declarer played a diamond to dummy, declarer could note the jack appearing from East and claim for ten tricks and a 7-IMP swing to Sweden.
Board 28 gave the Polish team another 2 IMPs when they came to play in INT and the Swedes played in $\mathbf{I} \diamond$. In fact, 3NT was making thanks to the placement of the major-suit aces and the lucky lie of the defenders' clubs.
In 29 we were back to a cold Four Spades. The Polish defenders cashed out ace and king of clubs in the closed room to hold declarer to 10 tricks. In the other room the defence didn't start with clubs and declarer eventually managed to get rid of his club losers for two extra tricks. Another 2 IMPs to Poland.
More part-scores on board 30. The Poles again played in no-trump while the Swedish practiced playing minors. Bergdahl made no mistakes in his play in Three Clubs to score I30 and I IMP to Sweden when the Polish opponents were held to plus 90 . This was board 31 .

Board 3I. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

- 762

คA986
$\diamond 4$
\& KJIO 42
-K 943
○KJ543
$\diamond 75$
2 Q 3

Open Room:


| West <br> Sylvan | North <br> Gawrys | East <br> Wrang | South <br> Klukowski <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 18 | Pass | $1 乌$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | All Pass |  |  |

Closed Room:

| West <br> Jassem | North <br> Warne | East <br> Mazurkiewicz | South <br> Bergdahl <br> INT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | $2 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $3 \&$ | All Pass |  |

The circle could very well have been closed on the last board of the segment when $N / S$, pretty much as on the first board, more or less could have bid slam to find out that they were a trick short. Apparently both tables had learned the lesson and settled in 3NT, making two overtricks for no push.
With two segments left to play, Poland led II4-94.


Marcin Mazurkiewicz, Poland

## The Polish Corner

$\square$

## MAKSY I ZERA

W turniejach par kobiet i open na półmetku eliminacji prowadziły pary polskie - wśród pań aktualne mistrzynie Europy juniorek, Zuzanna Moszczyńska i Dominika Piesiewicz, a w open Wojciech Gaweł i Rafał Jagniewski. Jak to bywa w parach, do dobrego wyniku potrzeba dobrej gry i trochę fartu. Popatrzmy, jak to wyglądało:

Rozd. I8/V. NS po partii, rozd. E.

- AW 1076432
$\bigcirc 7$
$\diamond$ -
\& W 942

| Q - | N | Q D 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ AK 5 |  | $\bigcirc$ DW 432 |
| $\diamond$ KW 97643 |  | $\checkmark 102$ |
| 2 1063 | S | \& AKD 7 |
|  | ¢ K 85 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 10986$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AD 85 |  |
|  | \% 85 |  |

Liderki doszły do naciągniętego kontraktu 6*:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Moszczyńska | Garateguy | Piesiewicz | lacapraro |
| $2 \diamond$ | $3 s$ | 18 | pas |
| $6 \diamond$ | pas... | pas | pas |
| $2 \diamond$ |  |  |  |

O licytacji nie ma co dyskutować... N wyszła asem pik. Rozgrywająca przebiła, przeszła do stołu asem trefl i zagrał dziesiątkę karo. Małe, małe, pik. Na drugie karo S wskoczyła asem i nieco machinalnie zastosowała zasadę „krótszy pokorniejszy", grając w pika. Gdyby zagrała trefla, kontrakt byłby nie do wygrania. A tak? Król pik przebity i trzy razy kiery, po czym czwarty kier przebity w ręce. Teraz treflem do stołu i forta kier. W ten sposób dama karo została wyłapana na paradzie. Dało to liderkom 99.78\%.
W open liderom nie przeszkodziły także momenty pecha:
Rozd. 4/IV. Obie po partii, rozd.W.

|  | ¢ K DW 52 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 843$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 2 |  |
|  | 2 AK 6 |  |
| -108643 | N | - 9 |
| ๑K 976 |  | $\bigcirc$ AW 1052 |
| $\diamond$ W 7 | W E | $\checkmark 853$ |
| \& 5 | S | 98742 |
|  | - A 7 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ D |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K D 10964 |  |
|  | 2 DW 109 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Jagniewski |  | Gaweł |
| pas | 14 | pas | $2 \diamond$ |
| pas | 2 | pas | 3\% |
| pas | 3 | pas | 34 |
| pas | 4\% | pas | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| ktr. | pas | pas | 49 |
| pas | 4BA | pas | 5\% |
| pas | 6 | pas... |  |

$2 \diamond$ naturalne, forsujące do dogranej, zwykle ręka niezrównoważona, gdyż alternatywą jest rozpoczęcie licytacji jednokierunkowej relayem 2e
3s zwykle druga figura, z pełnym fitem E rozpocząłby od relayu bądź uzgodniłby piki okrążenie wcześniej
Licytacja doskonała, kontrakt maksowy, ale... E ściagnął asa kier, po czym odszedł w trefla. Rozgrywający zaczął ściagać piki, ale przysłowiowa zupa się wylała. Teraz trzy razy karo i bez dwóch, za $15.43 \%$, gdyż nawet ci, którzy grzężli w 3BA wpadali tylko bez jednej...
Za chwilę jednak nastąpił przydział bonusa za pracę włożoną w system licytacyjny:

Rozd. 30/VI. Obie przed, rozd. E.

- 1075
-K 1052
$\checkmark 9843$
- 85

| - DW |  | - AK862 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A 74 | N | $\bigcirc 98$ |
| $\checkmark 52$ | W E | $\checkmark$ AK 106 |
| - AKD642 | S | - W 3 |
|  | - 943 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ DW 63 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ DW 7 |  |
|  | - 1097 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jagniewski |  | Gawet |  |
|  |  | $1{ }_{1}$ | pas |
| pas | 20 | pas | 3BA |
| pas | $4{ }^{2}$ | pas | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| pas | 7BA | pas... |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20-\text { relay } \\ & 3 B A-5242 \text {, nie minimum } \\ & 4 \&-\text { pytanie o } 5 \text { wartości na pikach } \\ & 48-0 \text { lub } 3 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |

Tu wszystko dzieliło się „po bożemu" i zabonowano 94.73\%


## Pol-Motors

## Autoryzowany Dealer Suzuki

ul. Kamienna 145
tel. (71) 3697698
www.suzuki.pol-motors.pl

## Autoryzowany Dealer Forda

 ul. Bardzka 1tel. (71) 3697550
www.ford.pol-motors.pl

Autoryzowany Dealer Hyundaia
ul. Kamienna 145
tel. (71) 3697683
www.pol-motors.hyundai.pl
www.pol-motors.pl f/GrupaPolMotors
in /pol-motors

Nowosadzkim podeszli do rozdania bardziej optymistycznie:

| West <br> Kalita | North <br> Wrang | East <br> Nowosadzki Sylvan |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 8 |  |  | pas |

20- Gazzili - naturalne trefle, albo wszystkie ręce w sile 16+
$2 \diamond$ - forsujące do dogranej w przypadku silnej ręki partnera
3\% - naturalne, od 16-I7 PC
3 - tolerancja kierowa
4BA - inwit
Gdy licytacja zgasła po 6e, w brydżramie zapadła martwa cisza. Wydawało się że Szwedzi zanotują spory zysk, bo kontrakt przy podziale kierów 6-0 i trefli 5-I wyglądał beznadziejnie. Ale... Nz tej licytacji bezbłędnie wydedukował, że partner ma renons kier i postanowił dać mu przebitkę. Najwyraźniej nie był zdecydowany, czy wyżej ocenić swoje walory pikowe, czy karowe (zwykle wychodząc do przebitki daje się Lavinthala) i zdecydował się na średniego pika - szóstkę. I to było to! Na szóstkę Jacek dał ze stołu ósemkę, a S przebił.W ten sposób lewa kierowa obrony i lewa atutowa z długości skompresowały się w jedną. Po odwrocie damą pik zagranie trefli we właściwą stronę było już tylko kwestią chwili - po asie pik na stole pojawiła się blotka trefl, ze stołu król i walet trefl puszczony w ręce zwieńczył dzieło... Impas karo był już jednostronny!

## MANEWR ZŁODZIEJSKI

Manewr złodziejski to dobrze znany motyw rozgrywkowy. Rozgrywający dzięki właściwej kolejności zagrań doprowadza do tego, że dwie lewy obrońców, atutowa i w bocznym kolorze zbijają się w jedną. Taka rozgrywka nie zdarza się często, ale w ćwierćfinale Polska - Szwecja ten manewr udał się szwedzkiemu obrońcy już w pierwszej lewie!

Rozd. I5. NS po partii, rozd. S.

- W 102
-1096532
$\diamond 1065$
\& 7
- A
$\bigcirc$ AKW 74
$\triangleleft A W 3$
\& A 1084

$\nabla$ -
$\diamond$ D 942
2 D 6532
Karta na WE jest duża, ale bez fitu. Wydaje się, że najlepszym kontraktem jest 6『, które przy podziale atutów 3-3 bądź 4-2 jest na jednym z dwóch impasów. Jednak podział atu 6-0 jest zabójczy. Szwedzi po silnym treflu wyhamowali w 3BA. Kalita z
the meetine place


Staropolanka.
SoTrefi

