

## IT'S ONE ON ONE FOR TTTLE HOPEFULS



Young bridge players work with some of the 22,000 playing cards strung together in Plac Solny on Thursday. Story on page 4
Eight teams will begin battle today for four championships, and three countries have chances to emerge with two world titles. France (Seniors and Women's), the Netherlands (Open and Mixed) and USA (Seniors and Women's) each have two chances for gold. The match between USA and France in the Women's will be a rematch from last year in Chennai, where the French prevailed.
The most dramatic of the victories on Thursday was staged by Monaco, who trailed by 46 IMPs at one point against Spain but rallied in the second half to emerge with a 6-IMP win.
Poland, one of the favorites in the Open, fell behind against a surging Dutch team and never recovered, losing by 78.
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## 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.

## Press Conference on Friday

There will be a press conference today at $\mathbf{I 0} \mathbf{a . m}$. in the Pergola Terrace.

| Today's Programme | Today's Programme |
| :---: | :---: |
| Pairs: | Teams: |
| Finals | Finals \& Play-Off |
| F I - 0:00 | Seeament I- 10:30 |
| F2-14:30 | Segment 2-14:00 |
|  | Segment 3-17:00 |

Today's Programme

## Teams:

Finals \& Play-Off
Segment I- 10:30
Segment 3 - 17:00

## Open Teams Semi-finals

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 45 |  | 6 | Tot |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SPAIN | 13 18 | 29 | 45 | 23 | 33 | 13 | $176$ | MONAC |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot |  |
| POLAND <br> NETHERLANDS | 18 44 | 15 | 20 7 | 9 45 | 32 | 29 44 | 123 | NETHERLANDS |


| 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, BAKKEREN Ton (coach), DRIJVER Bas, DEWIJS Simon |
| 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) |

## Women's Teams Semi-finals

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CHINA | 12 | 40 | 5 | 43 | 12 | 42 | 154 |  |
| USA | 33 | 31 | 38 | 27 | 49 | 5 | 183 | USA |


|  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 56 |  | Tot | FRANCE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FRANCE | 63 | 33 | 6 | 42 | 38 | 42 | 224 |  |  |
| SCOTLAND | 36 | 34 | 46 | 31 | 24 | 34 | 205 |  |  |
| CHINA | WANG Wen Fei, LU Yan, WANG Xiaojing (coach), LIU Yan, HUANG Yan, SHEN (I) Qi,WANG Nan,WANG Jianxin (captain) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FRANCE | FREY Nathalie, ZOCHOWSKA Joanna, D'OVIDIO Catherine, CRONIER Benedicte, WILLARD Sylvie, REESS Vanessa, THUILLEZLaurent (captain) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SCOTLAND | McGOWAN Elizabeth (Liz), LESLIE Paula, McQUAKER Fiona, SYMONS Anne, PUNCH Sam, KANE Helen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| USA | SOKOLOW Tobi, SEAMON-MOLSON Janice, DEAS Lynn, PALMER Beth, SANBORN Kerri, SOKOLOW David (captain), SHI Sylvia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Senior Teams Semi-finals

| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| CHINESE TAIPE | 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 |
| USA | MAHMOOD Zia, MARTEL Chip, PSZCZOLA Jacek (coach), HAMMAN Bob, MECKSTROTH Jeff, HAMMAN Petra (captain), LALL Hemant, MILNER Reese |

## Mixed Teams Semi-finals



| Open Pairs SF $A$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | GRAVERSEN H - CLEMMENSEN P | DEN-DEN | 58.49 |
| 2 | KING P - McINTOSH A | ENG-ENG | 56.73 |
| 3 | THOMPSON B - JACOBS W | AUS-AUS | 56.63 |
| 4 | STAMATOV J - DANAILOV D | BUL-BUL | 56.60 |
| 5 | BERTHEAU P - HULT S | SWE-SWE | 56.31 |
| 6 | VOLHEJNV - MACURA M | CZE-CZE | 55.74 |
| 7 | FERGANI K - POLLACK F | CAN-CAN | 55.41 |
| 8 | RIMSTEDT M - RIMSTEDT O | SWE-SWE | 55.35 |
| 9 | KRISHNAN R - KIRUBAKARAMOORTHY N | IND-IND | 54.85 |
| 10 | KRUPOWICZ M - SAKOWICZ R | POL-POL | 54.41 |
| 11 | LIJ - ZHANG B | $\mathrm{CHN}-\mathrm{CHN}$ | 54.20 |
| 12 | WIELOWIEYSKI A - KLIMACKI P | POL-POL | 53.88 |
| 13 | HOYLAND S - HOYLAND S | NOR-NOR | 53.83 |
| 14 | NAWROCKI P - WIANKOWSKI P | POL-POL | 53.80 |
| 15 | SZTYRAK L - JASZCZAK A | POL-POL | 53.59 |
| 16 | AUKEN S -WELLAND R | GER-GER | 53.02 |
| 17 | GIERULSKI B - SKRZYPCZAK J | LTU-LTU | 53.00 |
| 18 | NADAJ J OGLOBLIN A | POL-POL | 52.99 |
| 19 | VANDERVORST M - BAHBOUT S | BEL-BEL | 52.93 |
| 20 | PIETRASZEK M - ZNAMIROWSKI J | POL-POL | 52.90 |
| 21 | BROWN M - WHIBLEY M | NZL-NZL | 52.87 |
| 22 | SZULEJEWSKI B - DARKIEWICZ-MONIUSZKO G | POL-POL | 52.72 |
| 23 | WITEK M - BYZDRA A | POL-POL | 52.71 |
|  | BENDIKS J - BETHERS J | LAT-LAT | 52.55 |
| 25 | WILDAVSKY A - WEINSTEIN H | USA-USA | 52.43 |
| 26 | KWIECIEN M - ZATORSKI P | POL-POL | 52.27 |
| 27 | BACH A - CORNELL M | NZL-NZL | 52.13 |
| 28 | GILL P - PEAKE A | AUS-AUS | 51.99 |
| 29 | KOWALCZYK I - WISNIEWSKIT | POL-POL | 51.91 |
| 30 | SLIVAV -VOROBEI P | RUS-RUS | 51.80 |
| 31 | TOMASZEK W - GARDYNIK G | POL-POL | 51.71 |
| 32 | JANISZEWSKI P - NOWAK K | POL-POL | 51.71 |
| 33 | MISZEWSKA E - ILCZUK P | POL-POL | 51.70 |
| 34 | VAINIKONIS E - ARLOVICH A | LTU-LTU | 51.44 |
| 35 | STARKOWSKIW - GOLEBIOWSKI S | POL-POL | 51.36 |
| 36 | CHUMAKY - ROVYSHYN O | UKR-UKR | 51.33 |
| 37 | SCHILHART N - BUCHLEV N | GER-GER | 51.29 |
| 38 | JAGNIEWSKI R - GAWELW | POL-POL | 51.20 |
| 39 | YANG L - DAI J | CHN-CHN | 51.16 |
| 40 | MARINOVSKI K - SIPUS M | CRO-CRO | 51.15 |
| 41 | ANKLESARIA K - CHOKSHI S | IND-IND | 51.08 |
| 42 | OPALINSKI R - ZAWADA J | POL-POL | 50.96 |
| 43 | GROMOELLER M - FRITSCHE J | GER-GER | 50.86 |
| 44 | SCHOLLAARDT M - NETTL O | NED-NED | 50.85 |
| 45 | BLACHNIO A -WUJKOW A | POL-POL | 50.79 |
| 46 | BERGDAHLT - SYLVAN I | SWE-SWE | 50.79 |
| 47 | LEWACIAK G - ZUBIEL P | POL-POL | 50.73 |
| 48 | DI FRANCO - MANNO A | ITA-ITA | 50.62 |
|  | BERG T - JORGENSEN G | DEN-DEN | 50.59 |
|  | DIAMOND J - HAMPSON G | USA-USA | 50.54 |
| 51 | LINDE J-SCHWERDT C | GER-GER | 50.24 |
| 52 | HINDEN F - OSBORNE G | ENG-ENG | 50.21 |
|  | COUTTS J - MOSKOVSKY E | NZL-NZL | 50.03 |
|  | TEWARI R - SHIVDASANI J | IND-IND | 49.96 |
|  | KUBAC N - ZORLU N | TUR-TUR | 49.86 |


| Open Pairs SF B |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | STRZEMECKIW - ZAWADA P | POL-POL | 57.54 |
| 2 | SZWENKEL K - OSINSKIT | POL-POL | 57.41 |
| 3 | SERPOI G - STIRBU C | ROM-ROM | 57.41 |
| 4 | BARTOSZEWSKI M - MAKATREWICZ M | POL-POL | 57.08 |
|  | WASZYNSKI A - HINTERTAN A | POL-POL | 56.63 |
| 6 | 6 RUBINS K - LORENCS M | LAT-LAT | 55.88 |
|  | HUTYRA M - WOJNAROWICZ J | POL-POL | 55.86 |
| 8 | 8 MARCINOWSKI P - SOBCZAK M | POL-POL | 55.52 |
| 9 | TERPILOWSKI M - KLUKOWSKIT | POL-POL | 55.26 |
| 10 | MAJCHER A - MAJCHER A | POL-POL | 55.15 |
| Mixed Pairs SF A |  |  |  |
| 1 | DELMAS-SIRVENT - PIGEAUD F | FRA-FRA | 56.92 |
|  | FU Z - ZHANGY | CHN-CHN | 54.73 |
| 3 | GROSS S - HYDES A | ENG-ENG | 54.64 |
| 4 | KARMARKAR M - KARMARKAR S | IND-IND | 54.23 |
|  | $5 \mathrm{KONDOCH} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{-VECHIATTO} \mathrm{C}$ | GER-GER | 53.65 |
|  | WROBEL M - PIETRZYK A | POL-POL | 53.41 |
|  | STEPHENS R - ROSSLEE D | RSA-RSA | 53.39 |
|  | SAPORTA P - SAPORTA-TWORZYDLO R | FRA-FRA | 53.32 |
| 9 | KONDAKCI S - SENT | TUR-TUR | 53.02 |
| 10 | HANLONT - BARTON G | IRL-IRL | 53.01 |
|  | KHAZANOV I - LEBEDEVA M | RUS-RUS | 52.72 |
| 12 | PRAMOTTON E-VERSACEA | ITA-ITA | 52.20 |
|  | SHIMAMURA K - TERAMOTOT | JPN-JPN | 52.15 |
|  | BUTRYN P - SAKOWSKA N | POL-POL | 52.08 |
|  | SHI B - TIANW | CHN-CHN | 51.93 |
|  | WINCIOREK T - STACHOWIAK-KLUZ J | POL-POL | 51.76 |
|  | JIN K - ZHU P | CHN-CHN | 51.54 |
|  | KAZMUCHA D - SEREK C | POL-POL | 51.46 |
|  | HUNGY - HSIEH H | TPE-TPE | 51.31 |
|  | SAKR M - PSZCZOLA J | USA-USA | 51.14 |
|  | GRZEJDZIAK I - GRZEJDZIAK S | POL-POL | 50.97 |
|  | SCHROEDER M - SCHROEDER M | GER-GER | 50.90 |
|  | HONTI L - MEZEI K | HUN-HUN | 50.74 |
|  | HUBERSCHWILLER M - HUBERSCHWILLER A | FRA-FRA | 50.55 |
|  | SIKORA M - WALCZYNSKIA | POL-POL | 50.53 |
|  | ROZENBLYUM M -VOROBEYCHIKOVA O | RUS-RUS | 50.41 |
|  | SAUTAUX M - SZCZEPANSKI R | POL-POL | 50.38 |
|  | GARTAGANIS - GARTAGANIS N | CAN-CAN | 50.35 |
|  | BODIS G - FISCHER B | HUN-HUN | 50.22 |
|  | HOU X -WANG H | CHN-CHN | 49.54 |
| Mixed Pairs SF B |  |  |  |
|  | RUDAKOV E - DIKHNOVA T | RUS-RUS | 60.58 |
|  | SCHIPPERS-BOSKLOPPER E-STIENEN R | NED-NED | 56.83 |
|  | NIKITINA A - GUSEVV | RUS-RUS | 56.53 |
|  | KOWALSKA A - TYRAN M | POL-POL | 54.43 |
|  | 5 ROSSARD M - ROMANOWSKIJ | FRA-FRA | 54.26 |
|  | SAUVAGEV - BOGACKI P | FRA-FRA | 53.70 |
| Senior Pairs SF |  |  |  |
| I | DAEHR C - ENGEL B | GER-GER | 55.32 |
| 2 | KIERZNOWSKI R - KACZANOWSKIT | POL-POL | 55.06 |
|  | MARSTRANDER P - ANDERSSEN R | NOR-NOR | 54.85 |
|  | SCHWARTZ A - ZELIGMAN S | ISR-ISR | 54.59 |
|  | 5 HACKETT P - HOLLAND J | ENG-ENG | 54.17 |
|  | JELENIEWSKI A -WACHNOWSKIJ | POL-POL | 53.71 |
|  | BARAN B - DAIGNEAULT P | CAN-CAN | 53.65 |
| 8 | MANCINI B -VECCHI L | ITA-ITA | 53.11 |
|  | OHNO K - YAMADAA | JPN-JPN | 53.03 |
|  | LING R-TSE E | HKG-HKG | 52.80 |
|  | VOGTW - FRESEN L | GER-GER | 52.74 |
|  | KOWALSKIA - ROMANSKI J | POL-POL | 52.72 |
| 13 | FRONCZAK A - KONOPKA R | POL-POL | 52.57 |
| 14 | BAKKET-HANTVEIT H | NOR-NOR | 52.53 |
|  | SELLDEN G - WeNNEBERG B | SWE-SWE | 52.44 |
|  | 6 CARRUTHERS J - SILVER J | CAN-CAN | 52.22 |
| 17 | HOEGER W - MALCHUS P | GER-GER | 52.12 |
|  | GOELA - SHAH | IND-IND | 52.04 |
| 19 | KAMINSKIA - LEVITY | ISR-ISR | 51.53 |
| 20 | WAKSMAN S - USZYNSKIW | FRA-FRA | 51.49 |
|  | HIRATA M - OHASHI M | JPN-JPN | 51.42 |
| 22 | INCE M - KOKTEN N | TUR-TUR | 51.26 |
| 23 | DAS B - SADHU A | IND-IND | 51.13 |
|  | KUSHARI P - RAY D | IND-IND | 50.91 |

## Women's Pairs SF

| I PILIPOVIC M - SVER N | CRO-CRO | 56.94 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 MOSZCZYNSKA Z - PIESIEWICZ D | POL-POL | 56.07 |
| 3 SZCZEPANSKA K - MAJ-RUDNICKA M | POL-POL | 55.85 |
| 4 GU L - ZHOU T | CHN-CHN | 55.68 |
| 5 YANG J - LIY | CHN-CHN | 55.36 |
| 6 DUFRAT K - ZMUDA J | POL-POL | 53.80 |
| 7 GLADIATOR A -WEBER E | GER-GER | 53.35 |
| 8 TEBHA A - HOWARD A | USA-USA | 53.27 |
| 9 HARDING M - FUGLESTAD A | NOR-NOR | 53.21 |
| I0 HUMPHRIES - -JACOB S | NZL-NZL | 52.77 |
| II BROWN - SENIOR N | ENG-ENG | 52.71 |
| I2 SANDSTROM K - MYLLAERI M | FIN-FIN | 52.46 |
| I3 GRUDE L - OIGARDEN B | NOR-NOR | 52.12 |
| I4 LEVI H - ASULIN A | ISR-ISR | 52.07 |
| I5 NORDGREN M - BERGLUND A | FIN-FIN | 52.02 |
| 16 BIRMAN D - POPLILOV M | ISR-ISR | 51.37 |
| 17 BREWIAK G - BUSSE G | POL-POL | 51.08 |
| I8 LUESSMANN C - SMYKALLA G | GER-GER | 51.04 |
| 19 ARNOLDS C -VERBEEK M | NED-NED | 50.99 |
| 20 PAVLUSHKO O - RUDAKOVA E | RUS-RUS | 50.69 |
| 2I BABAC M -YAVAS D | TUR-TUR | 50.40 |

# Fun with bridge in Salt Square <br> By Brent Manley 

On Thursday morning, Lena Leszczynska, venue facilities manager for the 15th World Bridge games, showed up at Plac Solny (Salt Square) in Wroclaw wearing a bright orange T-shirt with the words "Rekord Polski" in large letters on the front. The words, translated as "Polish Record" were meant to convey the objective of what Leszczynska called "the happening" in Wroclaw - the assembly of a chain of playing cards celebrating the game of bridge and what it means to the 75 young players who came from three other Polish cities to help with the project, which attracted local television coverage and lots of interested spectators.
Leszczynska's team had four hours to connect as many cards as possible and lay them on the ground in the square in concentric circles. When the time was up, the young players had connected 22,000 playing cards. Put end to end, the cards would stretch for more than 2 kilometers.
"They wanted to do this," said Leszczynska,"because it is fun for them."


Adam Olejniczak
Gabriela Gibek, I5, traveled from Krakow to participate in the card connecting. She is part of a special bridge class at a school that specializes in math and physics. She likes bridge, she said, because "it's difficult like chess. It's a smart game and you can learn a lot."
One of Gibek's classmates is Adam Olejniczak, also 15, who enjoys bridge because "it's a game where you can think." When interviewed, he was wearing a "girdle" of playing cards around his midsection. Gibek said that when she and others play competitive bridge in Krakow, players as young as 7 years old take part.
The players who came to help with the card display will enjoy a tournament today in Plac Solny.
Referring to the students she recruited to help with the project, Leszczynska said,"They are very smart people."
Leszczynska, a member of the Polish Bridge Union board, said work on Thursday's event started 10 days ago and included trips around the city placing 13 stuck-together
cards in the hands of the small statues of gnomes often seen around Wroclaw.
Preparations for the event started with Leszczynska's recruitment of the youngsters to help out and solicitation of donations of playing cards. Her final count, she said, was 40,000 decks - more than 2 million cards. One large donation came from Trefl, a Polish manufacturer of games and cards.
Among the observers on Thursday was WBF President Gianarrigo Rona. "They are doing a great job," he said.
"Bridge in Poland is very well developed, and I have to congratulate the Polish federation. They are having marvelous results. Bridge for them is not only competition. It is also fun."
Leszczynska said she had to get permission from Wroclaw authorities to stage the card event but that her idea was received warmly. In Warsaw, where she lives, she had to jump through even more hoops for a bigger idea. Leszczynska, an architect, had to contact and cajolel2 different bureaucracies to get the okay for a mural she plans for the side of a building in Warsaw. The mural - five meters high and three meters wide - will be a depiction of a playing card with a slogan:"Wroclaw - City of Bridge."

## BBO and OURGAME SCHEDULE

BBO I = VuGraph, BBO 8 is also OURGAME

| $\bigcirc$ | $\begin{gathered} 10: 30 \\ \text { Netherlands } \vee \text { Monaco } \end{gathered}$ | BBO I |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ | Poland v Spain | BBO 2 |
| W | France v USA | BBO 3 |
| W | China v Scotland | BBO 4 |
| S | Denmark v Chinese Taipei BBO 5 |  |
| M | Netherlands v Russia | BBO 6 |
| M | USA v Bulgaria | BBO 7 |
| S | USA v France | BBO 8 |
| $\bigcirc$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:00 } \\ & \text { Netherlands } \vee \mathrm{Monaco} \end{aligned}$ | BBO I |
| $\bigcirc$ | Poland v Spain | BBO 2 |
| W | France v USA | BBO 3 |
| S | Usa v France | BBO 4 |
| S | Denmark v Chinese Taipei BBO 5 |  |
| M | Netherlands v Russia | BBO 6 |
| M | USA v Bulgaria | BBO 7 |
| W | China v Scotland | BBO 8 |
| 17:00 <br> to be decided |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# A switch in time saves nine <br> By Mark Horton 

One of the more difficult aspects of defence is to appreciate when it is necessary to change tack, particularly when it appears that you have made a good start. This is from the third session of the semifinals:

| Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - K 1074 |  |
|  | ค A 1092 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 3$ |  |
|  | - Q 952 |  |
| - A 9 | N | - Q 3 |
| QJ76 |  | $\bigcirc 54$ |
| $\checkmark$ QJ 1097 |  | $\checkmark$ AK542 |
| - AJ3 | S | - K 764 |
|  | - J 8652 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K}$ Q 83 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 86$ |  |
|  | -108 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Nowosadzki | Muller <br> Kalita |  |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond *$ | Pass | $2 จ^{*}$ | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

$2 \triangleleft$ Natural, invitational plus
The auction in the closed room was virtually identical, East rebidding 24 as opposed to $2 \Omega$.
Both North's led the four of spades, handing declarer his ninth trick.
In the match between USA and Denmark the same spade lead gave the Denmark +600 but declarer had to work much harder in the Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Martel | D Schaltz | Hamman | P Schaltz |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond *$ | Pass | 28* | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |
| $2\rangle$ | game forci |  |  |

North led the ten of hearts and South won with the king and continued with the queen, North following with the two. South continued with the three of hearts and North won, cashed a fourth heart, declarer throwing two diamonds from dummy and spade from hand and switched to her diamond. Declarer won in dummy and ran the diamonds, to reach this position:


When declarer cashed the last diamond North had no answer. She pitched a club and declarer threw one of dummy's clubs and cashed the ace of spades (in case North had cunningly bared the king) and crossed to the king of clubs. From the heart lead it was almost certain that North did not start with five spades and South had passed over I $\diamond$ with 8 KQ83, so was unlikely to have five spades headed by the king. That meant it was almost a sure thing that South did not have 9 Qxx in front of the AJ . It was just about possible that North had started with $\$ \mathrm{Kxx}$ §AI092 $\diamond 3$ Qxxxx which is why it was important to cash the spade ace. Having completed his calculations declarer played a club to the ace to flatten the board.
To defeat the contract South must switch to a spade at trick two - a tough play to find.
Suppose North had started with a fourth best two of hearts (by no means impossible, as you are hoping to find partner with something useful in the suit). Now South knows you have only four tricks in the suit at best and might find the spade switch.
Notice that it is not good enough to switch to a spade at trick three as declarer can win and play five rounds of diamonds, squeezing North in three suits!
Just for the record try and find a route to nine tricks if North leads her singleton diamond - I can't!


Peter Schaltz, Denmark

## Open Pairs SF A - S7

By Jos Jacobs

For a change, I decided on Thursday morning to have a look at the pairs event. As always, the main problem is to find out which pair(s) to watch, taking into account that you cannot move freely through the room trying to follow just one specific board. After a look at the current standings, I chose the fourth-ranked pair as the ones to follow, a choice I did not regret. My chosen pair managed to score $62,25 \%$ in the ten boards and thus rose from fourth to second in the rankings.
At a World Championship, the greatest thrill, in my opinion, is to meet people from other continents, preferably from continents as far away from Europe as possible. So I had little trouble in choosing Ben Thompson and Bill Jacobs (what's in a name?) from Down Under (aka Oz ) as my pair to watch.
As an appetiser, they presented me with a beautiful defence on a simple deal played on Wednesday night..

Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.

|  | - Q 962 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 84$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 1087 |  |  |
|  | ¢ J 53 |  |  |
| ¢ 5 |  |  | 4 AJ 873 |
| $\bigcirc 9652$ | N |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{KJ}$ |
| $\triangleleft 652$ |  |  | $\diamond$ A Q J |
| 2K Q 974 | S |  | - A 106 |
| ¢ K 104 |  |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 1073 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 943$ |  |  |
|  | \% 82 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Zubiel | Jacobs | Lewaciak | Thompson |
|  |  | 19* | 18 |
| Pass | Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | pass |
| 2\% | Pass | 24 | All Pass |

East's is was Polish: often a balanced minimum opener, but it can be a strong hand of any shape.
South led the 8 , won with dummy's king. Declarer played a spade up, inserting the eight when North played low. South won the ten and exited with his last club, won by declarer with the ace. When declarer next played the , A, South unblocked his $\boldsymbol{\$}$, intending to create an entry to his partner for a heart through. The effect of the unblock was that declarer tried to cash another club, which South was able to ruff. When he exited with the $\diamond 9$, North knew he should withhold his king, so declarer won the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$. At this point, declarer had little option but to exit in trumps. North cashed the Q 9 and led a heart, enabling South to play three rounds of the suit. Declarer could ruff the third heart with his last trump but then still had to concede the
$\diamond K$ to North for down two, the matchpoint "kiss of death." This result was worth $99.98 \%$ for NS.
On the first board of the session I watched, they were playing Italians Di Franco and Manno, who bid as follows:

Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.

|  | ¢ AK 10 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 74 |  |  |
|  | \% AKJIO 92 |  |  |
| ¢ J 643 | N |  | 975 |
| ¢ K 86 |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\diamond}$ | 052 |
| $\diamond 8652$ |  |  |  |
| 9 43 | $S$ ¢ |  |  |
|  | - 82 |  |  |
|  | - Q 9743 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AK 93 |  |  |
|  | \% Q 8 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jacobs | Di Franco | Thompson | Manno |
|  |  |  | 18 |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 35 |
| Pass | 4\% | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 49 | Pass | 50 |
| Pass | 5 | Pass | 5NT |
| Pass | 79 | All Pass |  |

2 was two-way: either natural GF or start of a relay sequence. $2 \square$ asked for the specific distribution of partner's hand and 3 showed exactly 2-5-4-2. 4e then set trumps and was also RKC, $4 \diamond$ showing an odd number. When South signed off initially, 54 asked about the e Q and 5NT said "Yes!" As either red king with partner would do, Di


Frances Hinden, England

Franco then bid the grand with a lot of confidence.
As it happened, 7NT is an easy make because the $\diamond J 10$ come down quickly so the superior contract did not score the bigger number of matchpoints. The Italians thus had to be content with 76.55 only (top on a board is 98).
On the other board at this table, the Australians got their revenge, one might say.


As 31 has to go one off on a trump lead or continuation, the Italians wisely did not compete any further over 3\%. When Jacobs put up dummy's $\oslash \mathrm{K}$ on the low heart lead from North and South ruffed it, the contract was just made as there were a spade, a diamond and a further club to lose.
For E/W, + I 10 was worth 85.73 m.p.
The following board was an interesting defensive matchpoint problem.

Board I3. Dealer North. All Vul.

|  | ¢ J 7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ¢J432 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A Q 873 |  |
|  | 2 104 |  |
| ¢ A 965 | N | ¢ Q 1032 |
| Q Q 97 |  | $\bigcirc 1065$ |
| $\diamond$ K 5 |  | $\checkmark$ J 64 |
| \& K 6 5 3 | S | ¢ J 72 |
|  | , K 84 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AK 8 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 1092$ |  |
|  | \% A Q 98 |  |

At many tables, South would open INT and play there. West leads a spade to the ten and king and you play the $\diamond 10$. West covers, you win the ace, cross to your $\vee A$ and run the $\delta 9$ to East's jack.At this point, East should resist the temptation to return the Q , scooping dummy's jack. It ought to be East who, after the spades have been cashed,
has to shift to a club to break up the squeeze on West on the run of the diamonds.
If you don't defend this way, West will be on play after cashing the spade tricks. Please note that a heart is not good enough as it will only serve as a Vienna Coup for declarer. Curiously enough, exiting in diamonds also works as declarer needs this Vienna Coup before cashing his diamonds to execute the squeeze.
Alternatively, not cashing the spades but pushing a club through from the East side will make it impossible for declarer to rectify the count.
On board I6, we saw an amusing auction that, in a sense, ended well for all players involved.


The natural weak two made life difficult for N/S, but they saved themselves well out of the initial mess.
In fact, Graham Osborne did very well to retreat from a 3-3 fit into a 4-4 fit but still had to go down in his contract. Double-dummy defence beats it by two tricks but on a $\mathbf{Q}$ lead and $8 K$ continuation from West, declarer lost only five tricks for -100. Nevertheless, 84.71\% of the matchpoints went to $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$.


Stephanie Jacob, New Zealand

By Brent Manley

## Senior Teams SF - SI <br> USA v Denmark

## Going for two in a row

Coming off their tough match against Australia in the quarter-final of the Senior series, USA - winners of the d'Orsi Senior Trophy in India last year, were prepared for another challenge in Denmark, 187-I74 winners over Turkey.
For USA, Jeff Meckstroth and Zia Mahmood would face Peter and Dorthe Schaltz in the open room. In the closed room, it was Hans Christian Nielsen and Knud-Aage Boesgaard for Denmark against Chip Martel and Bob Hamman.
Not much happened in the early rounds. After 10 boards, the score was I3-5 for the Americans. Board II produced an II-IMP swing for USA.

Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.
$-10$
88643
$\diamond 84$
A QJIO6 3

## -AK 985 <br> $\bigcirc 7$ <br> $\diamond$ KJ 96 <br> \& K 84

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P. Schaltz | Meckstroth | D. Schaltz | Zia |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 10 | 39 | Pass | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

Peter Schaltz's is showed any hand with 14+ HCP. Meckstroth's jump overcall gave the Danes little room to maneuver, but they landed in a normal-looking spade game. Meckstroth started with the 86 , declarer putting in the 10 from dummy. Zia won the $\vee \mathrm{J}$ and shifted to his singleton club. Declarer played low, but Meckstroth won with the IO, cashed the m A and gave his partner a ruff. Zia still had a trump trick coming, so USA was plus 100. At the other table:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Martel | Nielsen | Hamman | Boesgaard |
| 19 | 3\% | Dbl | Pass |
| $3 \checkmark$ | Pass | 34 | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

Nielsen started with the taken by Martel with the king. He cashed the $\Phi \mathrm{A}$ and played a heart to dummy's king. Boesgaard won the 8 A and played a spade. Martel could
not risk North's having started with a doubleton 10 , so he played the king, then exited with a spade to South. A diamond went to dummy's queen and Martel soon claimed with three spades, four diamonds, a club and a heart.
The next board was a push when Zia in the open room and Boesgaard in the closed room managed nine tricks in 3NT for plus 600.
The penultimate deal was interesting for the bidding and play at both tables.

Board I5. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

|  | , AK 7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 732 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 102 |  |
|  | \% K 109 |  |
| ¢ Q 94 | N | ¢ 65 |
| ¢J985 |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 106$ |
| $\checkmark$ J 6 | W E | $\checkmark$ AK 843 |
| 98762 | S | ¢ J 54 |
|  | ¢ J 10832 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 4 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 975$ |  |
|  | 2 A Q 3 |  |

The auctions were identical, both Norths opting to play in no-trump despite the known spade fit. Both were right: North can make just nine tricks in spades after two high diamonds, a diamond ruff and an eventual heart trick.


Bob Hamman, USA

The lead at both tables was a low diamond. In the open room, Meckstroth took West's $\diamond$ J with his queen, cashed a high spade, entered dummy with a club to the queen and ran the ${ }^{\mathbf{j}}$.When that proved successful and the suit broke, he cashed winners in spades and clubs, coming down to the $\diamond 102$ and the $8 A 7$. East did not want to bare her $8 K$, so she was down to the $\triangle K I O$ and $\diamond A K$. Meckstroth exited with a diamond and took his IIth trick when Dorthe Schaltz had to play a heart from her doubleton king. The play was the same at the other table except that Nielsen took a first-round spade finesse instead of cashing a high one first.This was the final deal of the set:

Board I6. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

- A 64
$\bigcirc 9$
$\diamond 983$
\& KJ7643
\& KJ 93
คAJIO 73
$\diamond K J$
\& 105


75
Q 82
A 10754
\& A 82

- Q 1082
- K 654
$\diamond$ Q 62
\% Q 9

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P. Schaltz | Meckstroth | D. Schaltz | Zia |
| 18 | $3 \%$ | 3 |  |
| $4 \varnothing$ | All Pass |  | Pass |

Meckstroth started with the $\triangleleft 8$, taken in dummy with the ace. At trick two, Peter Schaltz led a spade from dummy and put up the king, playing Zia for the ace after Meckstroth's weak jump overcall. Meckstroth won and got out with a club, ducked by declarer to Zia's queen. Zia exited with a diamond to declarer's bare king.A club to the ace was followed by a spade from dummy. Zia won the queen and got out with a spade. Declarer played the 9, which was winning the trick, but he had to ruff it in dummy to be able to take the heart finesse. With only two trumps in dummy, however, declarer could not pick up Zia's trump king, so the contract was one down for plus 100 to USA. At the other table:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Martel | Nielsen | Hamman | Boesgaard |
| $2 \Delta^{*}$ | $3 \triangleq$ | $3 \diamond$ | All Pass |

Martel's $2 \triangleleft$ was the Flannery convention, showing four spades, five or six hearts and II-16 HCP. On the bidding, Nielsen's $3 \%$ did not sound like the weak jump overcall that it was, so Hamman had a bit of an advantage as declarer.
Boesgaard started with the Q , taken by Hamman with the ace to play a spade to dummy's jack, Nielsen playing low. Hamman next played the $\diamond K$ and followed with the $\diamond J$ to the ace, then got out of his hand with another spade: IO,
king, ace. Nielsen cashed the ${ }^{2}$ and followed with the K , ruffed in dummy.
Hamman next ruffed a spade and played the $\oslash \mathrm{Q}$. When then held, he played a heart to the jack, followed by the ace. South had the master trump, but dummy's 9 was good, so Hamman could claim for the loss of one more trick. That was plus 170 for USA and a 7-IMP gain. The set ended with the Americans ahead 34-7.

## Nice deception <br> By Jos Jacobs

In the Netherlands v. China Mixed Teams quarterfinal, Richard Ritmeijer found an amusing deceptive play on this board from the 5th segment.

Board 12. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

| - KQJIO2 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A Q 6 |  |
| $\checkmark 184$ |  |
| - J 7 |  |
| N | - 83 |
| W E | ¢KJ 85 |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 1032 |
| S | - Q 84 |
| - A 754 |  |
| $\bigcirc 1097$ |  |
| $\checkmark$ A 97 |  |
| \& K 52 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hou | Ritmeijer | Wang H.L. | Tichá |
| Pass | INT | Pass | 3NT |

All Pass
As the auction had not been very revealing, the first problem for East was to find the right lead. Yes, we can see that a diamond lead is hitting the jackpot, but East went for her strongest suit - a good principle, by the way - and led the $\vee 5$. Dummy's $\vee 7$ held the trick and now, not knowing yet where his ninth trick was coming from, declarer took a reasonable shot to develop an extra trick when he led a low club (!) from dummy. When East won declarer's jack with her e , how could she possibly know that a club continuation would set the contract out of hand?
Instead, she tried the $\diamond 2$. When declarer played low from dummy, West won the $\Delta K$. Ritmeijer won the heart continuation with his ace and finally rattled off his wellconcealed five spade tricks. East had to find three discards from $\vee K J$ and $\diamond$ Q 103 . She wanted to hold on to her $\vee K$ J, so she discarded the low diamond and both remaining clubs. Ritmeijer could then exit with his 8 Q and score his $\diamond J$ as the game-going trick from East's forced diamond return.


Monaco enjoyed a great performance in their quarterfinal match against Canada, scoring 244 IMPs in 80 boards, and their victory margin of 167 IMPs was one of the highest ever.
However, all those IMPs do not count for the next round. Monaco had to start from scratch against Spain, and after 16 boards the big favourites werel 5 IMPs behind.
Early in the second session they encountered more difficulties:

| Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ AK 84 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 984$ |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ K 62 |  |  |  |
| \& ${ }^{\text {c }} 6$ |  |  |  |
| ¢ 109 |  |  | Q Q J 3 |
| $\checkmark$ AK |  |  | $\bigcirc$ J 76 |
| $\diamond 7$ |  | E | $\checkmark$ A 953 |
| 2 K Q |  |  | - J 85 |
| 4 7652 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 1032$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ Q J IO 84 |  |  |  |
| \& 3 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Wasik | Multon | Knap | Zimmermann |
| 18 | Dbl | INT | Pass |
| 20 | Pass | Pass | 2 - |
| $2 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 30 | All Pass |

Wasik-Knap had a normal auction to stop in $2 \boldsymbol{2}$. Zimmermann's brave balancing effort allowed Wasik to introduce his hearts as well, but the Spaniards were not tempted into game. They just competed to 3e, easily made with an overtrick.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Sabate | Helness | G. Goded |
| $1 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | INT | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{6}$ | Pass |
| $3 \nabla$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

Helness decided to invite game with 9 HCP . It was quite a stretch - his hand contained far too many queens and jacks to call it a good 9. Helgemo cooperated by showing his hearts, and Helness just bid the no-trump game.
Maybe he thought that bidding thin games was the way to put pressure on Spain, but on this particular hand Gonzalo Goded had an easy $\diamond$ Q lead. Declarer didn't even bother to hold up, and the defence quickly collected seven tricks: +300 and 10 IMPs to Spain, their biggest swing of the session.
Monaco got some IMPs back on the very next board, which displays the obvious shortcomings of a common
agreement of dubious value: forcing pass when our side has bid a vulnerable game, regardless of the meaning of the auction and the likely balance of power.

Board 2I. Dealer North. N/S Vul.
© K Q J 9
$\bigcirc \mathrm{K}$
$\diamond$ JIO 754
2 764

| ¢ 876 | N | -10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ AJ742 |  | $\bigcirc$ Q 1098653 |
| $\diamond 8$ | W E | $\diamond$ A 93 |
| \& Q 1082 | S | \& A 5 |
|  | ¢ A 5432 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ - |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K Q 62 |  |
|  | 2 KJ 93 |  |

West
Wasik
$4 \bigcirc$
North
Multon
Pass
49
East
Knap
$1 \varnothing$
$5 \vee$

South
Zimmermann
14.

All Pass
After such an auction one can hardly know who owns the hand. Probably the high-card power is split and both sides are bidding to a high level because of distribution. Therefore there is no reason that forcing pass should apply just because one side is vulnerable (after all, the bidding might have been the same at any vulnerability). Zimmermann-Multon did well to pass out $5 \triangleleft$ and concede the least possible minus of 450 .


Andres Knap, Spain

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Sabate | Helness | G. Goded |
|  | Pass | 18 | 19 |
| $4 \triangleright$ | 49 | $5 \vee$ | Dble |

All Pass
Goded doubled 5 $\upharpoonright$, so Spain conceded their least minus, assuming they were committed to the forcing pass idea. That was +650 and 5 IMPs for Monaco.
By the way, Michal Klukowski bid 54 with the South cards in the other semi-final match. He was doubled and it cost him -800: diamond to the ace, diamond ruff, club to the ace, another diamond ruff and a late club trick.
Then came a series of six consecutive small swings in Spain's favour, in total: I8-0. Here are two of them:

Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
\& A Q J
$\bigcirc$ K 7
$\diamond$ A 83
2) 19652
© K 1093
คA5432
$\diamond 765$
\& 8

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \qquad 7652 \\ & \diamond \text { QJ } 1096 \\ & \diamond K 9 \\ & \& K 3 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Wasik | Multon | Knap | Zimmermann |
|  |  | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | 24 | 2NT | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

Zimmermann's $2 \triangleleft$ opening showed at least $4-4$ in the majors, and Multon was happy to play a 24 contract. When Knap intervened with 2NT (for the minors), he let the Spaniards play $3 \diamond$ undoubled and wisely led the $\diamond 3$, although it would have been even wiser to double and lead a trump. After three rounds of trumps, the contract was hopeless. Knap tried a spade to the ten, and when Multon returned a club he misguessed to play the Q so he had to go three down. Plus 300 seemed fine for Monaco, but...

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Sabate | Helness <br> G. Goded |  |
|  |  | Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ |
| Pass | 49 | Dble | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \triangleright$ | All Pass |  |

South's $2 \triangleleft$ was a mini-multi, weak in either major with 610 HCP . Sabate right-sided the contract by bidding 4\%, which asked his partner to transfer to his real suit.
Helness doubled 4\%, but didn't follow his own leaddirecting advice. That was not fatal because all the defence needs to do is win $\vee A$, play a club, get a ruff and continue with another trump so that declarer cannot rid himself of
his slow spade loser.
At the table, events took a different course: Sabate won the $\diamond$ Q lead in dummy, played two rounds of hearts, ducked, finessed spades and led a club up. Helness ducked his ace as well, so the K won. Thereby the defence lost its potential ruff and declarer got the entry he needed to repeat the spade finesse. The rest was easy, as dummy had just one loser in each of the suits except diamonds. This was a very soft defence by Helgemo-Helness standards, and Monaco conceded 3 more IMPs.

Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.

$$
\text { - A Q } 73
$$

Q Q 102
$\diamond$ J 86

- 643
- J 94
$\bigcirc$ K 8
$\diamond$ AK 1075
\& 1075
$W^{N} \quad$ E
- 108
P J 954
$\diamond Q$
\& AKQJ9 8
\& K 652
-A 763
$\diamond 9432$
92

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Sabate | Helness | G. Goded <br> Pass |
| I |  | Pass | I $\vee$ |

At last a good result for Helgemo-Helness: Sabate led \$3, won by his partner's $\$ \mathrm{~K}$. Gonzalo Goded didn't know spades were running, so he couldn't see the necessity of cashing the $\vee \mathrm{A}$. Sabate won the next three spade tricks, with Goded trying to show suit preference by playing $\$ 6$ in the third round and $\$ 5$ in the fourth. This mild signal didn't have the desired effect - his partner switched to a diamond and Helgemo claimed the rest - Monaco +600 .

| West <br> Wasik | North <br> Multon | East <br> Knap | South <br> Zimmermann <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

Monaco's supporters were hoping that in the replay, their team would defend better, but Franck Multon selected a questionable $\diamond 8$ for the lead. Result: -660 and a loss of 2 more IMPs.
By the way, in Poland-Netherlands Gawrys led the PI 0. Declarer played low from dummy and Klukowski (South) could ask himself why the 810 was not covered with the §J. The answer was simple: declarer would like South to duck this trick. So Klukowski promptly won the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and switched to spades. One down.
In board 25, Arturo Wasik held

- 108
\&KJ97642
$\triangleleft 3$
- 1042

Multon, his LHO, opened $I \oslash$. Two rounds of bidding later, Multon bid $4 \checkmark$, passed around to him.
Wasik could hardly have expected $4 \checkmark$ to make, but it was clear to him that his opponents' real fit was spades, so he refrained from doubling. The ugly contract failed by four tricks, minus 200. However, at the other table 3s also failed by two tricks due to a defensive cross-ruff. Spain won another 2 IMPs, but perhaps missed a chance for a bigger swing.
Anyway, their lead kept growing, even though Monaco struck back 15-0 in the last four boards. The following partscore deal concluded the session:


Helness responded with 4 HCP , ready for the challenge of making 31. The defence made a subtle error as early as trick I: South led $\vee 3$, dummy played low and North inserted the $\oslash \mathrm{J}$ rather than the $\vee 7$ or $\vee 8$. Helness won $\vee K$ and continued the suit. Dummy's $\vee 9$ lost to the $\vee \mathbf{A}$, and the $\bigcirc$ Q became good. Later he finessed diamonds, cashed his side tricks and embarked on a successful cross-ruff which resulted in nine tricks.

| West | North | East |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wasik | Multon | Knap |
| $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

South<br>Zimmermann

Knap didn't respond to the $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ opening, and Multon found the good lead of $\diamond I O$. He continued trumps upon winning the $\$ \mathrm{~A}$. After denying declarer any possibility of a ruff in dummy, accurate defence held him to six tricks, which meant +100 and 6 IMPs to Monaco.
At the end of the session the scoreboard showed 62-45 in Spain's favour. After three sessions, this lead grew to 10761. Monaco would have to play very well in the remaining three sessions to make a comeback against the in-form Spanish team.

## Cambriolage <br> By Marek Wojcicki

"Coup of the thief" - it is the free translation of the Polish name of the declarer play, when after appropriate manoeuvres of the declarer, in the end of the play defenders' two tricks - one in trumps and one in a side suit - are taken together at the last trick. It is not so rare, but when made on defence it is something unique.
In the quarterfinal of Poland against Sweden, the Swedish defenders managed it at trick one!

Board. I5. NS vulnerable, dealer South.

|  | ¢ J 102 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark 1096532$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 1065$ |  |
|  | ¢ 7 |  |
| , A | N | ¢ 87543 |
| $\bigcirc$ AK J 74 | W E | $\bigcirc$ Q 8 |
| $\checkmark$ AJ 3 | W E | $\diamond$ K 87 |
| \& A 1084 | S | ¢ KJ9 |
|  | ¢ K Q 96 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ - |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 942 |  |
|  | \& Q 6532 |  |

The E/W hands are powerful, but slightly misfitted. Looking for only two hands, $6 \square$ seems to be the best, with trumps 3-3 or 4-2 it depends on one of two finesses. But with trumps 6-0 it has no chances.
The Swedish pair, after a strong club sequence, stopped in 3NT. Kalita and Nowosadzki took a much more optimistic approach:

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

When the bidding was over, in the vugraph audience, all Polish supporters were silent. It looked like a big gain for Sweden. But North deduced that partner had a void in hearts and decided to give him a ruff. North could not decide whether to give suit preference for spades or diamonds, so he led a middle heart - the 6. And that was that. Declarer played the $\vee 8$ and South ruffed. This way, the natural heart trick and trump length trick were reduced to one trick, the first one. When $\Phi K$ was led at trick two, declarer played a club to the king and finessed against the queen. The diamond finesse also worked and declarer scored plus 920 for a I0-IMP swing to Poland.

## When trumps aren't good enough <br> By Micke Melander

Here is a deal from the fourth set of the match between Poland - Sweden in the Open series. The board contained one of the most surprising defenses of this tournament. The defenders - Piotr Gawrys and Michael Klukowski certainly were in a position to earn an award for defense of the year.

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

|  | - 762 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | -A986 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 4$ |  |
|  | * KJIO 42 |  |
| - K 943 | N | Q QJ 105 |
| ¢ KJ543 |  | $\bigcirc$ Q 2 |
| $\checkmark 75$ |  | $\checkmark$ A 10932 |
| * Q 3 | S | \& A 7 |
|  | - A 8 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 107$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ KQJ 86 |  |
|  | -9865 |  |
| Open Room: |  |  |


| West <br> Sylvan | North <br> Gawrys | East <br> Wrang | South <br> Klukowski <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| I $\vee$ | Pass | 10 | Pass |
| 2. | All Pass |  |  |

Closed Room:

| West <br> Jassem | North <br> Warne | East <br> Mazurkiewicz <br> Bergdahl <br> INT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 3 | All Pass |  |

It looks like Two Spades is a very safe spot and that you have one loser in each of the suits for nine tricks. However, North with a singleton diamond might take a ruff to keep declarer to eight tricks.
Our beloved game is strange at times because the contract might actually have been set, when declarer's trumps weren't good enough. But who could believe that when trumps were 3-2 and you held K943 opposite QJI05?
Klukowski led ten of hearts, which ran to declarer's queen.Wrang then played a low diamond from hand. South went up with the jack and returned the eight of clubs through dummy. Declarer tried the queen of clubs, covered by the king and ace. So far, so good for declarer, but when he next played the ace of diamonds, he should have gone down.
If Gawrys "just" would have ruffed, cashed the ace of
hearts and underled his clubs to South's nine, South would have been able to play a diamond. Declarer would have to ruff high, leaving this position:


Declarer can't play trumps because South will win and play another diamond. Declarer will no longer be able to pull trumps to be in hand to enjoy his established hearts. If declarer plays a heart and ruffs it high, South simply will overruff and play one of his diamonds to force declarer to ruff high, again preventing him from cashing hearts because he can no longer pull trumps and be in dummy.
At the table Gawrys did ruff the diamond, he did cash the ace of hearts but continued with the ten of clubs remaining on play. When a heart came back declarer ruffed high and South overruffed with the ace but when the diamond come back declarer had no problem ruffing high and be in control of the play for eight tricks.
So very close to be a perfect defense when declarer made a small error of playing that ace of diamonds (ducking a diamond was in fact fine), and any other card would have been great...
At the other table, North declared Three Clubs. INT was minors and 10-I5, Two Diamonds asked for distribution, and Two Spades showed five diamonds. Three Clubs ended the auction. A spade was led and when the queen of clubs was with West there was no way declarer could be defeated, That was 6 IMPs to Sweden.
But wouldn't it have been a really great ending to this story if Gawrys could have found the underlead of his jack-ten of clubs to defeat Two Spades!
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At the start of the third segment, Spain were leading Monaco 62-45. On the first board, their lead went up considerably.

Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.


Goded's 24 was "Muiderberg," showing five spades and 4+ of a minor. Over 2NT, Multon started by showing a strong hand so E/W ended up a little high when East stretched a bit. On a good day, you might make 6NT easily enough but last Wednesday was not such a day. One off, Spain +50 .


Krysztof Martens, Monaco


Left to their own devices, the Spaniards managed to stay on firm ground. Twelve tricks when South led a normal diamond. Spain +490 and II IMPs.

## Board 6. Dealer East. E/WVul.

- 185
$\bigcirc 8$
$\diamond$ K 1087542
\& K Q


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Multon | F Goded | Martens | Lantaron |
|  |  | INT | Pass |

3NT All Pass
With both E/W hands looking at three low clubs, E/W were more than a trifle unlucky when Lantaron had a normal club lead, and the suit broke 5-2. Spain +100 .

| West | North <br> Helness | East <br> Knap | South <br> Helgemo |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wasik |  | INT | Pass |
| 2\& | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | All Pass |

Wasik tried Stayman first, so the 4-4 heart fit was duly found. Looking at his hand again, Wasik saw a bare minimum so he decided to give up. Well judged, Spain +140 and another 6 IMPs.

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.
4. A 102

98543
A 9

- AJ 4


When Lantaron led a heart. Martens must have felt happy that he was in just 24. He won dummy's ace and played on hearts, pitching two diamonds. South ruffed the third heart, however, and returned a club to partner's ace. Declarer pitched a club on the heart continuation, South ruffing, and won South's club return in hand. A spade then went to the jack and ace but declarer had the rest: Monaco +140 .
West
Wasik
$1 \diamond$
$2 \diamond$
$4 \Phi$

## North

Helness
East
Knap
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Pass } & \text { 14 } \\ \text { Pass } & 34\end{array}$
All Pass
In the other room, South led a trump against the game contract. North won the ace but it did not occur to him to return a heart. This would have cut declarer's communication with dummy and thus have resulted in beating the contract. On the actual return of A and another club, declarer could win, draw trumps and enjoy a number of heart tricks, finishing up with even an overtrick. Spain +650 and another II IMPs.
A few boards later, Monaco hit back strongly when they reached 3 NT from the right side of the table:

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.

- K 1074

ค A 1092
$\diamond 3$
\& Q 952

- A 9
© J 76
$\diamond$ QJ 1097
\& AJ 3

$\stackrel{Q}{\wedge} 3$
- 54
$\diamond A K 542$
\& K 764
, 18652
$\triangleright$ K Q 83
$\diamond 86$
2 108

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Multon | F Goded | Martens | Lantaron |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 3 NT | All Pass |  |  |

When North led a spade and dummy's queen scored, Multon had nine top tricks. Monaco +600 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wasik | Helness | Knap | Helgemo |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 20 | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | 3s | Pass |
| $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

When the Spanish bidding revealed the absence of a heart stopper, E/W settled for $5 \diamond$, a contract that had no play at the actual layout. Down two, Monaco +200 and 13 IMPs back to them. There was a slam on the next board - or was there?


As you can see, 60 by North can be defeated if East finds the unlikely lead of the A and another spade. Two or three $N / S$ pairs reached $6 \%$ and they all made it.
The secure spot is 6NT by North, as this contract will not be affected by any ruffs at all. Over all our eight matches, only one pair reached this excellent contract and here is their bidding sequence:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shih | Schmidt | Chi | Toffier |
| Pass | 190000 | $1{ }^{1}$ | $2 \nabla$ |
| Pass | 24 | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | 5 |
| Pass | 6NT | All Pass |  |

When South bid a forcing $2 \checkmark$ over the IS overcall, North had no further problems.
Congratulations to Pierre Schmidt and Philippe Toffier (French Seniors) on their fine sequence to +1440 and 13 IMPs in their match against Chinese Taipei.
Back to Monaco-Spain.
Board I3. Dealer North. All Vul.


## All Pass

Lantaron's 2s was a serious raise, so Martens did not balance when this came round to him. He led the and, not being able to read partner's 22 , shifted to a diamond. This enabled declarer to draw trumps and establish a club trick for his contract, losing just the three hearts and the \&AK but not the club ruff. Spain +110 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wasik | Helness | Knap | Helgemo |
|  | $1 \varphi$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | Redbl |
| $2 N T$ | Dble | 39 | Dble |
| $3 \triangleleft$ | Pass | Pass | $3 \Phi$ |

## All Pass

In the replay, Knap did balance and rightly so, as E/W are cold for $3 \diamond$. South then bid one more, only to suffer a twotrick defeat (undoubled) when the defence duly found their ruff. Spain another +200 and 7 IMPs to them.
At the halfway point of the match, the score stood at I0761 to Spain.

## A gallant effort <br> By Barry Rigal

The Chinese women defeated England by what in the end was a comfortable enough margin for one deal not to matter. But Sally Brock was fighting to the end:

Board 32. Dealer West. E/WVul.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { KJIO } 82 \\ & 54 \\ & \diamond A K Q 3 \\ & 92 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Q 53 | N | - A96 |
| $\bigcirc$ A 8 |  | Q K Q J 10973 |
| $\checkmark 10982$ |  | $\diamond J$ |
| d. 1084 | S | - K Q |
|  | - 74 |  |
|  | 862 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 7654$ |  |
|  | * 4653 |  |

Brock bid $4 \checkmark$ over $1 \Phi$, and on the lead of $\Phi 7$ she played low from dummy and ducked the 10 from North. The defence now doesn't have to cash $\diamond \mathrm{A}$, but in theory should do so, because of what happened next. North shifted to a trump to remove dummy's entry. Brock won in dummy and led a club to the king and ace. Back came a heart (the last chance to cash that diamond winner) and Brock now ran her hearts, crossing to hand with Q . In the three-card ending North had a choice between baring her $\boldsymbol{~ K}$, throwing all her diamond winners to set up $\diamond$ J, or being endplayed with a diamond honour to lead into the spade tenace.

## Dealing machines and cards

The Duplimates used for the duplication during the championship are sold out. You can buy a new machine for 2480EUR including shipping to EU destinations until the closing ceremony. Drop a line to per@jannersten.com if you want to take up on this offer.

The (new) Wroclaw cards that you are playing with will be sold after usage for l63EUR per 240 decks. Other quantities on request in the book stall.

Championship cards


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


Open Teams SF - S4

## Spain v Monaco

The first half of this match did not turn out well for Monaco. In particular, Helgemo-Helness were playing below their usual standard. The team needed a big session by their leading pair, and they didn't fail to deliver, starting from the second deal of the morning:

Board I8. Dealer East. N/S Vul.


Helgemo-Helness are one of the few top pairs who do not adhere to five-card majors. They systematically open with their lowest four-card suit. In this particular deal, the results were superb. The heart fit was found immediately, and North had to show his good spades, if he wished to, at the three level, vulnerable against not. Sabate did not want to encourage a 4s bid by his partner, but there were also lead considerations. In my opinion, the spade doubleton lead should be considered anyway when the leader holds K x in trumps, but Gonzalo Goded's club lead was normal. The problem was that it didn't work. Helness played three rounds of clubs, discarding dummy's \$K. Then he allowed the diamond ruff when he could even make an overtrick by playing hearts from the top. Monaco +420 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lantaron | Multon | F. Goded | Zimmermann |
|  |  | $1 \&$ | $1 \diamond$ |
| Dble | $1 \&$ | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| $4\rangle$ | All Pass |  |  |

This bidding and play were typical of what happened almost everywhere when this deal was played. East opened his better minor, South overcalled in diamonds, West doubled (nowadays commonly played as a transfer to hearts) and North showed his spades at a comfortable level before his opponents found their fit. Following that auction, the winning defence was pretty easy: spade lead to

North's ace, diamond switch, diamond ruff, curtains. Monaco +50 and 10 IMPs - a good start, and in the next board they struck another heavy blow.
Board I9. Dealer South. E/W Vul.


Gonzalo Goded made a questionable $5 \bigcirc$ call while holding three potential defensive tricks. It would have been right only in the case of a double fit.
Tor Helness doubled and led A - not a good start. He continued with $\Phi A$ and a low spade. Next, Sabate erred by playing $\triangle \mathrm{K}$ from dummy right away.After that, there was no possibility of ruffing clubs in dummy without being overruffed, so the contract failed by two tricks - Monaco +300.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lantaron | Multon | F. Goded | Zimmermann <br> I $\diamond$ |
| Pass | $I \triangleleft$ | $4 \diamond$ | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Zimmermann found a double of 4 with the South cards (in the semi-final match between Poland and Netherlands, Klukowski and Nab passed). He led $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and followed up with a heart. North's $\triangle A$ was ruffed. Now Federico Goded was thinking of making his contract rather than minimizing damage by playing clubs early, preparing to ruff the 3 with dummy's $\boldsymbol{\Phi}$. He led $\diamond Q$ and Zimmermann allowed this to be ruffed by his partner. Multon switched to a spade and declarer could still get his club ruff by playing 9 , but he played low. Zimmermann won the $\Phi \mathrm{K}$ and continued trumps, and now even the opportunity to visit dummy for a club finesse didn't help declarer, as he was bound to lose two club tricks. That was +500 , so that 23 out of their 46IMP overnight lead had disappeared by the third board of the day.

Spain recovered some of those IMPs by virtue of good bidding in the next deal, where many pairs fell into the slam trap.

Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
© 53
$\bigcirc$ A Q 93
$\diamond$ A 1063
\& 763

```
4
& J10652
    J875
& Q94
```

| Q Q 94 | \% 10852 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ¢ AJIO 9842 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ - |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 42 |  |  |
|  | \& AKJ |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Helgemo | Sabate | Helness | G. Goded |
|  |  |  | 1\% |
| Pass | 2\% | Pass | 24 |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 31 |
| Pass | $4 \checkmark$ | Pass | 5 |
| Pass | 54 | All Pass |  |

1\% was strong, and 2\% showed a balanced 9-II hand. After some natural bids, North cue-bid $4 \diamond$ in support of spades. Gonzalo Goded realized that slam was highly likely, but how to continue? He found the perfect solution showing a heart void by jumping to $5 \triangleleft$ (at that point the five level looked pretty safe). Now his partner could reassess his hand. Of course, the news of a heart void severely downgraded North's cards.Accordingly, Sabate bid 54. His partner trusted him and passed.

In fact, 64 was makeable after any lead but a low diamond, but in order to succeed, declarer must first guess trumps and then organize a squeeze against West while ignoring the simple possibility of a finesse against Q . In short, this was not a play to be found at the table. Some declarers even failed to make II tricks, but Gonzalo won the opening lead with $\vee A$ and finessed his next, so he had no problem. This was his best moment in an otherwise forgettable session.

| West | North <br> Lantaron | East <br> Multon | South <br> F. Goded |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zimmermann |  |  |  |

Multon, having received no news of his partner's void, can hardly be blamed, facing facing a strong 20 opening, for taking control and bidding the slam. Zimmermann took wrong views in both black suits and ended up two down II IMPs to Spain.
Something strange happened on the next board - a
rather easy 64, where declarer was missing four trumps including the queen. Thanks to the 2-2 trump break, the expected result was +1460 . Multon-Zimmermann played in their secondary club fit, scoring +1390 , but Sabate-G. Goded did much worse. Goded opened an II-I5 HCP (according to system) is with a very nice 17-HCP hand (did he miscount?). His partner just signed off in 44, costing the team 12 IMPs.
Once again, however, Spain staged a mini-recovery:
Board 25. Dealer North. E/WVul.


At three out of four Open semi-final tables, North opened a weak INT with II points. In all cases, South's 3NT got doubled by West, and then all South players ran to $4 \diamond$ ! West's double, traditionally asking partner to lead his shorter major, was also triggered by the fact that at favourable vulnerability, the responder to a weak INT opening may sometimes psych a 3NT bid to conceal weakness.
Curiously, the only way for East to beat 3NT here was to ignore partner's recommendation and choose the normal club lead! G. Goded did not want to risk the loss of many spade tricks, and he bid $4 \diamond$. Nevertheless, Sabate decided to try out 4NT.
Dutifully, Helness led the $\$ 10$, and now the only way for the defence to succeed was Helgemo winning the $\Phi \mathrm{A}$ and switching to clubs. Helgemo ducked, and Sabate embarked upon a double finesse in hearts. Helgemo's club switch was too late: declarer put up his K , finessed hearts again and claimed 10 tricks.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lantaron | Multon | F. Goded | Zimmermann |
|  | INT | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| Dble | Rdbl | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |

## All Pass

At this table, Multon redoubled 3NT. One cannot be sure whether the meaning of this redouble had been discussed by the partnership. Anyway, Zimmermann ran to $4 \diamond$ and

Multon didn't look for further adventures. The contract just made, but Monaco conceded 7 IMPs.
At this point Spain's lead still looked impressive, but Helgemo-Helness cut it by 9 IMPs by virtue of some fine bidding:

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.


Helgemo made the first cue-bid, thus agreeing diamonds. A spade slam was also makeable, but $6 \diamond$ was much better because it was right-sided, guarding East's 9 K from the lead. Of course, there was the little matter of the missing $\diamond$ Q, but once it fell in the first round, declarer could claim his contract.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lantaron | Multon | F. Goded | Zimmermann |
|  |  |  | 3\% |
| 32 | 49 | 49 | All Pass |

Monaco's cause was further helped by some disruptive bidding from Zimmermann-Multon. East had too little space to show his diamonds, and a $4 \diamond$ bid risked missing 4 when that was the best contract. Therefore slam was out of the question at this table.
The remainder of the session became a nightmare for Spain. On board 28, Sabate opened a 14-I6 INT which his partner passed with 9 HCP . However, Multon's INT range was $15-17$ and his partner raised him to game, which was just made after a good guess in clubs. Then in board 29 Multon was doubled in 3\% for -500. At the other table G. Goded-Sabate failed to find the club switch against 3NT and allowed the contract to make: minus 630.
By then the Spanish North-South pair had had enough of it. In the final two boards they inexplicably stopped at $3 \diamond$ and 2e, in both cases with game-going values, while Multon-Zimmermann bid and made games.
By the way, on board 32 Zimmermann succeeded in 4e
while both declarers in the Poland-Netherlands match failed in the same contract.
When the smoke cleared and the IMPs were added up, Monaco had a mammoth session. They won by 79-23, turning the match on its head. Spain's lead by 46 became Monaco's lead by 10 with just two sessions to go.


On Thursday morning, Monaco had finally hit back strongly against Spain, turning a $46-\mathrm{IMP}$ deficit into a 10 IMP lead. In the other Open semi-final, the Dutch had extended their lead by another 36 , so they were leading by 60 with 32 boards to play.
The middle session of the day started in quiet fashion. The Dutch were trailing Poland $7-11$ in the segment, thus still 56 up, and Spain were trailing 4-I in the segment and thus I3 IMPs down, when board 7 arrived.

## Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

- A 9842
- J 2
$\diamond$ K Q 108
- J 3
- K 107
$\bigcirc 65$
$\diamond 16432$
\& 1097


When Helgemo produced a sound splinter raise, the pair was quickly in game.

| West | North <br> Lantaron | East <br> Helness | South <br> Helgemo |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | $1 \&$ |
| Pass | $1 \&$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \$$ | All Pass |  |

As you can see, 4 can be made by way of the intrafinesse in trumps, but a low trump away from the ace first does not look the standard approach, even less so as there had been no opposition bidding. Once Helness decided to lay down the A in the first round of the suit, the contract was doomed: two trump tricks and two red aces. Spain + 100
Well, had the same contract been made at the other table, Spain would have registered a major swing. When Zimmermann spoke once too often, Spain registered an even bigger swing:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zimmermann Knap | Multon | Wasik |  |
| Wass | Is | Dble | $2 \boldsymbol{1 9}$ |
| $3 \triangleleft$ | Dble | All Pass |  |

North led the to the queen and king and South returned his trump, of course: 9-2-10-ace. Club to declarer's nine, back to the 8 A and from dummy, covered all round. Now North could cash one top trump and continue his $\S \mathrm{J}$. South overtook with the queen, cashed the A and continued the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$, ruffed by declarer and overruffed by North. The $\triangleleft \mathrm{Q}$ and one more spade trick then meant down four, Spain +1100 and 15 IMPs to them to regain the lead by 2 MPs.
In the Poland-Netherlands match, there were no bidding accidents on this board so both teams ended up in 4 4 . This board thus should have been a push but when Gawrys solved the intrafinesse problem for declarer by leading the aj, De Wijs suddenly had his ten tricks and I2 more IMPs. Spain added 7 more IMPs when Monaco missed a game on the next board:

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.


18 showed spades and 14 showed three cards in the suit. Not knowing about partner's singleton heart, Zimmermann could not find any reason to go on after partner's 24 . Ten tricks, Monaco +170 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lantaron | Helness | F Goded | Helgemo |
| 19 | $1 \varnothing$ | Dble | 2 NT |
| Dble | $3 \varnothing$ | 4 | All Pass |

As West's double showed some spades as well, Goded jumped straight to the spade game in spite of South's good raise in hearts. Eleven tricks, Spain+450 and 7 IMPs more to them.
At the end of the segment, Spain's IO-IMP deficit had been turned around into a $10-\mathrm{IMP}$ lead and thus the prospect of an exciting final segment.

In the Poland-Netherlands match, the Dutch dealt their opponents another blow on board 9:

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- K 9

832
$\triangleleft$ K 10
AQJ9863
上 8543
-K 1087
$\triangleleft$ QJ 86
$\% 2$


- J 10
AJ 94
A 7542
- AQ 762
Q Q 65
$\diamond 93$
- K 54

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brink | Nowosadzki | Bas Drijver | Kalita |
|  | INT | Pass | $2 \rrbracket$ |
| Pass | $2 \mathbb{Q}$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |

All Pass

Against this normal auction, Bas Drijver found the fine lead of the 94 . Declarer called for dummy's queen but when Brink won his king and, understandably, returned the suit, Drijver could only cash his $\diamond$ A because on the third round of hearts, Brink "unblocked" the 10 , resulting in the blockage he was trying to avoid. That was one off instead of five but still +50 to the Netherlands.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Klukowski | De Wijs | Gawrys | Muller |
|  | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

In the Dutch system known as Tarzan, $2 \boxtimes$ was Precisionstyle and 24 natural and invitational. Gawrys thus had a different type of lead problem. When he selected the $\mathbf{~} \mathrm{l}$, declarer quickly ran home for +430 and 10 more IMPs to the Netherlands. At the end of the segment, it looked all over as the score stood at 157-94 to the Dutch.


Geir Helgemo, Monaco

| $\star$ : $:$ | Women's Teams SF - S4 |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | China v USA |

By Micke Melander

## The Greek gift

When you are 45 IMPs down, it is never an easy task to catch up, but it is certainly not impossible when there are three segments left to play. Would China be able to pull back to USA in the Women's semi-final?

Board I9. Dealer South. E/W Vul.
52
AJ 753
$\diamond 5$
\& K 7642

- J 6
$\checkmark$ Q 1064
$\diamond$ JIO 987
98

- K 982
$\diamond$ AK 642
\& 105
Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Shi | Lu | B Palmer | Y Liu |
|  |  |  | INT |
| Pass | $2 \Delta^{*}$ | $3 \varsigma$ | $4 \checkmark$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| W Wang | Sokolow | Q Shen | S.-Molson <br> IQ |
| Pass | $I Q$ | 49 | All Pass |

With what looks like 8.5 tricks in East hand, Beth Palmer for USA bid "only" Three Spades in the open room, leaving space for South to bid the heart game. However, with the trumps and clubs poorly located there was no way for declarer to make Four Hearts. West led the jack of spades to East's ace. A a second round of spades went to South's king.
Declarer now tried a club to the king, but East cashed her ace and collected the queen before something could happen. When a third round of clubs appeared on the table, declarer ruffed with the eight and was overruffed by the ten for one down. Declarer could now have pitched a club on the king of diamonds and ruffed the last club high to set up dummy while finessing her way back to dummy. When declarer instead cashed the king of hearts she had no way to get rid of her loser in clubs, so it was two down in the end.
Shen in the closed room jumped to what looks like the obvious contract, Four Spades, since it requires very little from partner to make. That silenced the opponents. With
the cards distributed as they were, there was no way for declarer to make the contract. The final result was two down after the smoke had cleared. 7 IMPs to USA when it was China who was in great need of them.
The Chinese immediately took them back, and could have scored even had they defended correctly.

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.


Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Shi | Lu | B Palmer | Y Liu |
| $1 \stackrel{s}{1}$ | INT | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Dble | All Pass |  |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| W Wang | Sokolow | Q Shen | S.-Molson |
| I $Q$ | Dble | Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | $3 N T$ |

## All Pass

In the closed room, Tobi Sokolow got a club lead, which ran round to her queen, whereupon she fired back another club towards dummy's ten, to set up the suit if clubs weren't $5-1$. West did what she could and discarded an encouraging low diamond to partner. That didn't work out well, however, as East returned a spade, which went to declarer's queen, West wisely refusing to put up the king. Even with all this help from the defense, there was no way for declarer to make her contract. She could not get more than three spades, one heart, one diamond and three clubs for one down.
In the open room, Sylvia Shi probably wished that she had not balanced against INT. North doubled for takeout and South, holding more diamonds than Shi, converted the double to penalty. Two Diamonds could quite easily have been two down but declarer actually managed to escape for one down even though the defense correctly kicked off with two rounds of trumps. Declarer won the second
round in hand with the king and played a club towards dummy, North rose with the ace and, for reasons unknown, South followed with the ten, which was a card she needed to keep so partner could continue clubs and still bring the contract two down, by avoiding giving any extra favours in the majors.
North returned a heart, which went to the jack and declarer's queen. Declarer then exited with the king of spades to North's ace. When South couldn't get in to play more trumps, declarer had now opened up her communications to get a spade ruff and escape for one down. Still, it was 7 IMPs back to China.

Board 22. Dealer East. E/WVul.


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shi | Lu | B Palmer | Y Liu |
|  |  | Pass | 1\% |
| Pass | INT | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 31 |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | 4\% |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | 5 | Dble | Pass |
| Pass | Rdbl | Pass | 65 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W Wang | Sokolow | Q Shen | S.-Molson |
|  |  | Pass | $1{ }_{\text {1 }}$ |
| Pass | INT | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 3\% | Pass | 32 |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | 5 | Dble | Pass |
| Pass | 5 | Pass | 64 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

After two very long bidding sequences, both N/S pairs ended up in Six Spades contract, and both declarers got the jack of hearts lead. On the of the cards, declarer had no chance to make the contract.Alas, when declarer put in the queen of hearts, East covered with the king and declarer had to ruff. The ace of trumps followed and when the suit broke as it did declarer had two trump losers. If trumps
would have been 2-2 or if an honor would have been singleton, this line would have worked fine since a single or double squeeze might well have materialized.
In the closed room Seamon-Molson got a club return when East got in with trumps, and finessed. When that lost to the queen she actually went two down. The same happened in the open room, but the Chinese declarer went up with the ace and set up her squeeze for one down.
The only killing lead for the defense was a low diamond, which would have taken away declarer's possibilities to have the necessary communication for the squeeze endplay. That was 2 IMPs to China.
Another slam was right around the corner.
Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.

- K 1083
$\bigcirc 3$
$\diamond$ A 83
Q Q 10873
- 75

ค J 10864
$\triangleleft$ J 952

- 92

| N |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| W | E |
| S |  |
| ¢ AJ962 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ A 97 |  |
| $\diamond 6$ |  |
|  |  |

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shi | Lu | B Palmer | Y Liu |
|  |  |  | 1\% |
| Pass | 2\% | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 34 | Pass | 4\% |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Dble | 4NT |
| Pass | 5\% | Pass | $5 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 54 | Pass | 7\% |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| Closed R |  |  |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W Wang | Sokolow | Q Shen | S.-Molson |
|  |  |  | $1{ }^{1}$ |
| Pass | 38 | Pass | 3s |
| Pass | $4 \checkmark$ | Dble | Rdbl |
| Pass | 49 | All Pass |  |

The Chinese Precision system actually took them all the way up to the grand slam in clubs. Maybe the Americans were affected by just having gone down in Six Spades. For whatever reason, they didn't get past game. South's redouble over Four Diamonds looks strange, there were no other bids than Four Spades for partner when she already have splintered in hearts with a limited hand (9-I2). Four Spades ended the auction and declarer had no problem getting the spades right.
In the open room, Liu again got the jack of hearts in the opening lead (and why not? It worked out fine on the
previous deal). Declarer simply won with the ace, pulled two rounds of trumps and cross-ruffed all the hearts and diamonds to see if she could extract some information about whether she needed to finesse in spades and if so which way. When everyone followed all the way down the line, she eventually just laid down the king of spades and played a low spade towards her hand. When East now followed with the queen she could claim, for 16 IMPs to China!
The American women team scored another swing to their account of 10 IMPs on the next to last board of the segment, bidding and making 3NT while the Chinese stopped in a partscore. Then came the last board when Seamon-Molson received some Greek gifts, which led her to take the wrong decision.

Board 32. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

- AQJIO

Q Q 83
$\diamond$ K Q 32

- A 3

| ¢ 9 | N | ¢ K 743 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ J 107642 | $W^{N}$ | $\bigcirc$ A |
| $\diamond 1064$ |  | $\checkmark$ AJ875 |
| \% 1082 | S | Q Q 64 |
|  | ¢ 8652 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K 95 |  |
|  | $\diamond 9$ |  |
|  | \& KJ 975 |  |

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Shi | Lu | B Palmer | Y Liu |
| Pass | 10 | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | INT | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | 24 | Pass | 4 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| W Wang | Sokolow | Q Shen | S.-Molson |
| Pass | $I \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \$$ |
| Pass | $3 \triangleq$ | Pass | $4 \Phi$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

All Pass
First let's examine the Open Room before the Greek adventure. North became declarer and East led the three of spades, which went to the two, nine and queen. Declarer then put the queen of diamonds on the table to set the suit so she could ruff diamonds in dummy. East won with the ace of diamonds, cashed the ace of hearts and played another trump. Declarer then won in dummy, noting the 4I break, but was in complete control when she just ruffed a diamond and played a heart to the queen, East could ruff but that was her trick in spades going away in the air. Declarer just finessed in clubs to pitch the last losing diamond.

In the Closed Room Seamon-Molson got the Greek gift of the lead of the the two of club, which went straight into her tenace. Instead of ruffing diamonds in hand she could now just establish the clubs for her ten needed tricks. East went up with the queen of clubs and declarer won with the king. It looks very likely that you have a heart and diamond loser and maybe a spade also.
Declarer went to check trumps by playing a low to the ten, when Shen in East smoothly followed low! Declarer, who now must have felt sure to make her contract, called for the king of diamonds, East won with the ace to return another diamonds, declarer pitching a heart and dummy winning with the queen.
Declarer now cashed the ace of spades and the curtain fell when West discarded the six of hearts. Declarer tried the ace of clubs, which held. This was the position:

|  | \& Q J |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 32$ |  |
|  | \%- |  |
| 9- | N | ¢ K 7 |
| $\bigcirc$ J10 742 | W E | $\bigcirc$ A |
| $\checkmark 10$ | W E | $\checkmark$ J 85 |
| -10 | S | 96 |
|  | ¢ 86 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K 9 |  |
|  | $\diamond-$ |  |
|  | - 97 |  |

When declarer now played a heart, East won with the ace, cashed the king of spades and simply put the jack of diamonds on the table, forcing declarer to ruff. There was no way for declarer to avoid two down.
That was another II IMPs for the Chinese, who won the fourth segment by 43-27, and closed the gap between the two teams to 29.


Janice Seamon-Molson, USA

## The Polish Corner

## SZLEMIKI W STYLU MIKST

Jedno z rozdań eliminacji mikstów było okazją do porównania temperamentów par na linii WE:

Rozd. 4/III. Obie po partii, rozd.W.

- D 1093
- 107
$\diamond 1052$
- W 872


Szlemik karowy nie jest nadzwyczajny. Główny jego plus jest taki, że wychodzi... Wylicytowanie i wygranie dawało aż $88,5 \%$. Popatrzmy, jakimi drogami dochodzono do niego.
Najlepsza, jak na razie, polska para turnieju mikstów licytowała w stylu partnerskiej kooperacji, z szacunkiem dla Blackwooda:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wróbel | Saurer | Pietrzyk | Fischer |
| $1 \diamond$ | pas | $1{ }^{1}$ | pas |
| 2\% | pas | 28 | ktr. |
| 30 | pas | 3BA | pas |
| 4 | pas | $4 \bigcirc$ | pas |
| 4BA | pas | 5\% | pas |
| $6\rangle$ | pas... |  |  |

W pojedynku dwóch par naszej reprezentacji mikstowej Kazmucha, po pokazaniu przez partnera „wielkiego układu", od razu zalicytowała szlemika.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Serek | Grzejdziak | Kazmucha | Grzejdziak |
| $1 \diamond$ | pas | $1 \uparrow$ | pas |
| $2 \diamond$ | pas | $2 \diamond$ | ktr. |
| $3 \diamond$ | pas | $3 B A$ | pas |
| $4 \diamond$ | pas | $6 \diamond$ | pas... |

Podobnie było na stole, gdzie z rękami WE licytowała par,a co prawda w barwach USA, ale z silnymi konotacjami polskimi:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pszczoła | Gartaganis | Sakr | Gartaganis |
| $1 \diamond$ | pas | 14 | pas |
| 20 | pas | 2 | pas |
| 30 | pas | 3 | pas |
| 4 | pas | $6\rangle$ | pas... |

May Sakr stwierdziła po rozdaniu: "Gramy na maksy. Jeżeli już przekroczyliśmy 3BA, to przecież nie będę grała $5 \triangleleft$. Bo to nie może dać dobrego zapisu.A szlemik na pewno będzie miał ręce i nogi".

## ALBO KIJEM, ALBO PALKA

W jednym z rozdañ turnieju par open Wojtek Olański dostał okazję do popisania się rozgrywką:

Rozd. I9.WE po partii, rozd. S.
. W 1043
-86
$\diamond 105$
\& AKW 106

- 965
-DW954
$\diamond$ W 73
-85

|  | N |
| :---: | :---: |
| W E |  |
|  | S |
|  | D 82 |
|  | A 10 |
|  | D 92 |
|  | D 9743 |

Wygląda, że na 4 grane na linii WE są do oddania 4 lewy, ale... Po licytacji

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Olański |  | Vainikonis |  |
|  |  |  | $1 \diamond$ |
| pas | 14 | ktr. | rktr. |
| 28 | 2 | $4 \bigcirc$ | pas |
| pas | ktr. | pas... |  |

I $\diamond$ Precision
rktr. - trójka pików
N ściagnął \&, po czym zagrał @W. As i atu. S nie wskoczył. Dama, przebitka trefla. Teraz król pik i piki. S wziął, odegrała asa atu i musiał zagrać w karo. Swoje!
Jeżeli S wskoczyłby asem atu, i zagrał w pika, rozgrywający musiałby uważnie śledzić damę pik. Jeżeli zostałaby u S, trzeba by go wpuścić bez zgrywania kar; jeżeli odblokowałby się należałoby odegrać topy karo i dopiero potem odejść pikiem.
staropolanka.
SoTrefl

