Scots lead Open Pairs

Malcolm Cuthbertson and John Matheson of Scotland, who are representing Great Britain, leaped into the lead in the Société Générale Open Pairs after two of the five sessions. They racked up a matchpoint total of 2292.7 to lead the 72 pairs into today’s third and fourth sessions. The fifth session will be played tomorrow.

Larry Cohen of Law of Total Tricks fame and David Berkowitz of the United States were only marginally behind with 2284.9 points. Another North American pair, George Mittelman and Allan Graves of Canada, were third with 2275 points.

South Africans ahead in Women’s Pairs
Val Bloom and Maureen Holroyd of South Africa took a small lead into today’s sessions of the Louis Vuitton Women’s Pairs. They topped the 36-pair field with a matchpoint total of 1076.8 after the first two sessions. They held a slim lead over Sylvia Moss and Gail Greenberg of the United States, who had 1068.3.

The Netherlands pairing of Bep Vriend and Carla Arnolds were next with 1058.1.

Russians score well, lead in IMP Pairs
A. Ladyzhensky and A. Pavlov of Russia scored plus 70.4 to take the top position in the Cara IMP Pairs after completing two sessions of the four-session event. The last two sessions will take place today. In second place were G. Cohner and P. Frecke of Germany with plus 63.3. Another Russian pair - A. Riskin and J. Malinovsky - were third with plus 62.4.

Schapiro-Gordon take lead in Elf Senior Pairs
Boris Shapiro, Bermuda Bowl champion in 1955, and Irving Gordon of Great Britain led the 40 finalists in the Elf Senior Pairs at the halfway mark. The Seniors will play the last two sessions today. Shapiro and Gordon tallied 1474 matchpoints, giving them a 38-point lead over G. Gigli and A. Latessa of Italy.

Cara Continuous Pairs
For the winners both N/S and E/W of the 22 rounds of the Cara Continuous Pairs, prizes are available at the Hospitality Desk today and tomorrow. The overall winners of the two series of 11 rounds will receive their prizes at the prize-giving ceremony on Friday evening.

The winners of the last two sessions on Tuesday:

| Session 21 | N/S | A. Sjoberg - K. Ahlesved | Sweden | 61.10% |
| E/W | A. Ljang - M. Melander | Sweden | 67.36% |
| Session 22 | N/S | A. El Sadi - J. El Sadi | United States | 66.34% |
| E/W | Mrs. Courigara - Mrs. Griffin | Great Britain | 62.35% |

Starting times
Today’s sessions of the Société Générale Open Pairs and the Louis Vuitton Women’s Pairs once again will begin at 10.30 and 15.45.

The Cara IMP Pairs will begin at 11.00 and 16.00.

Starting times for the Elf Senior Pairs will be 11.00 and 15.00.

Victory Banquet
All players who have not visited the Hospitality Desk to receive their invitations to the Victory Banquet are asked to do so this morning.

Cocktails will be served in “LILLE METROPOLE” (main hall, at the top of the stairs) at 18.30.

The Prize-Giving Ceremony will take place in “AMPHITHEATRE VAUBAN” (near the main hall) at 19.00. There will be two entrances: the “ENTREE BASSE” on the right, for all the medallists, - the “ENTREE CENTRALE”, on the left up the stairs, for all the participants.

The Banquet will take place in room “ZENITH”, in LILLE GRAND PALAIS (hostesses will guide you).

There will be no reserved tables. The room “ZENITH” will be opened only after the end of the Prize-Giving Ceremony.

Black tie.
### SOCIÉTÉ GÉNÉRALE OPEN PAIRS
(Standings after two sessions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUTHBERTSON M</td>
<td>COHEN L</td>
<td>MITTELMAN M</td>
<td>ODIL M</td>
<td>WEISCHEL P</td>
<td>CRONIER P</td>
<td>CRAWFORD W</td>
<td>MARTEL C</td>
<td>CHAGAS BRANCO</td>
<td>QUINN MEYERS</td>
<td>ABECASSIS M</td>
<td>BOCCHI N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATHESON J</td>
<td>BERKOWITZ D</td>
<td>GRAVES C</td>
<td>ZAREMA J</td>
<td>SONTAG A</td>
<td>SALAMA M</td>
<td>GED D</td>
<td>STANSLY B</td>
<td>CHAGAS BRANCO</td>
<td>9215.2</td>
<td>QUANTIN J</td>
<td>DUBOIN G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>POL</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>BRA</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>BRA</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>ITA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2293.1</td>
<td>2285.6</td>
<td>2274.7</td>
<td>2253.0</td>
<td>2240.9</td>
<td>2188.8</td>
<td>2165.3</td>
<td>2158.4</td>
<td>2141.8</td>
<td>1355.4</td>
<td>2118.7</td>
<td>2113.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHWEITZER M</td>
<td>HACKETT J</td>
<td>GLANSKIW</td>
<td>VLACHAKI M</td>
<td>LINDQUIST</td>
<td>SCHOU S</td>
<td>MAAS A</td>
<td>SIMSON D</td>
<td>DEPIK</td>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td>QUANTIN J</td>
<td>KOSIKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>POL</td>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>DEN</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>BRA</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>ITA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032.5</td>
<td>2031.4</td>
<td>2021.8</td>
<td>2000.2</td>
<td>1971.7</td>
<td>1965.3</td>
<td>1940.6</td>
<td>1936.1</td>
<td>1928.7</td>
<td>1926.8</td>
<td>1917.1</td>
<td>1906.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARI C</td>
<td>GAWRYS P</td>
<td>ROSS H</td>
<td>DEUTSCH U</td>
<td>BRESS S</td>
<td>LAM M</td>
<td>LAIR M</td>
<td>ROBBERT</td>
<td>KEMBLE</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>HOPKINS</td>
<td>MORTELMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>POL</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>CHN</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>GBR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908.3</td>
<td>1906.5</td>
<td>1899.8</td>
<td>1890.9</td>
<td>1898.4</td>
<td>1896.0</td>
<td>1895.0</td>
<td>1894.0</td>
<td>1893.0</td>
<td>1892.9</td>
<td>1891.8</td>
<td>1890.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LOUIS VUITTON WOMEN’S PAIRS
(Standings after two sessions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLOOMV</td>
<td>MOSS S</td>
<td>FRIEDE</td>
<td>LACROIX E</td>
<td>KVIECIONIEN</td>
<td>AKUEN J</td>
<td>LE POIDER</td>
<td>HAMMAN R</td>
<td>ZUR-ALBU M</td>
<td>KITA M</td>
<td>MIERS</td>
<td>LEPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLROYD M</td>
<td>GREENBERG G</td>
<td>ARNOLDS</td>
<td>POULAIN C</td>
<td>WESER</td>
<td>KOCH PALMUND</td>
<td>ROY</td>
<td>MAHMOOD Z</td>
<td>LEVIT -PORAT</td>
<td>KROGULSKA</td>
<td>ERIN</td>
<td>DORAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>DKK</td>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>POL</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1076.8</td>
<td>1068.5</td>
<td>1063.5</td>
<td>1047.3</td>
<td>1049.7</td>
<td>2097.2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>999.0</td>
<td>940.1</td>
<td>949.1</td>
<td>2095.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOKOLOW</td>
<td>FIASA</td>
<td>SIMPSON</td>
<td>WOLFERT</td>
<td>CZYSZOWICZ</td>
<td>NOVAK</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>987.5</td>
<td>981.0</td>
<td>979.8</td>
<td>979.8</td>
<td>954.8</td>
<td>954.8</td>
<td>954.8</td>
<td>954.8</td>
<td>954.8</td>
<td>954.8</td>
<td>954.8</td>
<td>954.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEHMERT P</td>
<td>JEANNIN-NALTE</td>
<td>GIANARDI</td>
<td>PAULI</td>
<td>JUNKER</td>
<td>MOSS</td>
<td>LEVIN</td>
<td>LEVIN</td>
<td>LEVIN</td>
<td>LEVIN</td>
<td>LEVIN</td>
<td>LEVIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922.5</td>
<td>915.6</td>
<td>910.5</td>
<td>907.0</td>
<td>907.0</td>
<td>907.0</td>
<td>907.0</td>
<td>907.1</td>
<td>907.1</td>
<td>907.1</td>
<td>907.1</td>
<td>907.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ELF SENIORS PAIRS
(Standings after two sessions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHWARZ</td>
<td>GIUGI</td>
<td>SCHWARTZ</td>
<td>GAVINO</td>
<td>CREINS</td>
<td>GROMOELLER</td>
<td>JANICKI</td>
<td>GORDON</td>
<td>ROBINSON</td>
<td>ABBER</td>
<td>REBER</td>
<td>SCHAPIRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCIBO</td>
<td>LATESSA</td>
<td>ROBINSON</td>
<td>GAVINO</td>
<td>KLESSER</td>
<td>WIECHMULLER</td>
<td>PIOR</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>VON KLEIST</td>
<td>STURM</td>
<td>FRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>CHN</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>FRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1474.0</td>
<td>1436.0</td>
<td>1436.0</td>
<td>1343.1</td>
<td>1341.5</td>
<td>1341.5</td>
<td>1340.2</td>
<td>1330.1</td>
<td>1327.5</td>
<td>1326.4</td>
<td>1326.0</td>
<td>1324.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PESONI</td>
<td>REVILL</td>
<td>BERNER</td>
<td>ROMAIN</td>
<td>MORIN</td>
<td>SCHETT</td>
<td>ROBINSON</td>
<td>GORDON</td>
<td>ROBINSON</td>
<td>MORTELMANS</td>
<td>MORTELMANS</td>
<td>HIRSHBERG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>CAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1321.7</td>
<td>1323.5</td>
<td>1323.5</td>
<td>1305.6</td>
<td>1301.6</td>
<td>1301.6</td>
<td>1301.6</td>
<td>1301.6</td>
<td>1301.6</td>
<td>1301.6</td>
<td>1301.6</td>
<td>1301.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWAD</td>
<td>ABKER</td>
<td>CASIANI</td>
<td>ABBER</td>
<td>SCHWARTZ</td>
<td>JUSS</td>
<td>HESSELBACH</td>
<td>JUSS</td>
<td>SCHWARTZ</td>
<td>SCHWARTZ</td>
<td>SCHWARTZ</td>
<td>SCHWARTZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1262.6</td>
<td>1244.7</td>
<td>1243.8</td>
<td>1243.8</td>
<td>1243.8</td>
<td>1243.8</td>
<td>1243.8</td>
<td>1243.8</td>
<td>1243.8</td>
<td>1243.8</td>
<td>1243.8</td>
<td>1243.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education is key to WBF growth

José Damiani
President of WBF

Education, growth, sponsorship, the Olympics, finances, and communication all are integral parts of a healthy World Bridge Federation. WBF President José Damiani here offers his views on these and other subjects relevant to the WBF.

Education a must

"It is clear that those who have actively promoted bridge have obtained results," said Damiani. "They will reap the benefits of their efforts, particularly in the long term, thanks to the teaching of bridge in schools. On the contrary, those who have been happy to leave things as they are and who have interested themselves only in competitions are in for a rude awakening."

"Some federations have decided to make every effort to explore new avenues of development. I assure them that they can count on my help and my experience in the field of marketing."

Damiani said he has convinced a number of governments and UNESCO of the value of bridge as an educational tool. "It is obvious that bridge teaches children how to reason. It also accustoms them to concentrating, using their visual memory, and focusing attention. This experience can be nothing but beneficial for youngsters from the ages of 9 to 14."

Moving toward the Olympics

Recent meetings with International Olympic Committee President Juan Antonio Samaranch have been very positive, according to Damiani. "I believe we are well on our way to becoming an International Sports Federation. From there we hope to join the Winter Olympic Games."

Damiani pointed out that bridge teaches children how to reason. It also accustoms them to concentrating, using their visual memory, and focusing attention. This experience can be nothing but beneficial for youngsters from the ages of 9 to 14.

3. requires equilibrium and a physical and mental resilience.

He also pointed out that many national bridge federations have been accepted into their country’s Olympic committee.

"Bridge can, at the least, be considered to be a mind sport, just like chess. Bridge and chess have nothing in common with games of chance or gambling. Mind sports contribute to the improvement, or at least the maintenance, of the mental helath of humanity."

WBF is growing

The WBF now has 110 members, with the potential of another 15 among the developing nations of Africa. Zone 1, Europe, has 390,000 members, with 100,000 in both France and the Netherlands. Great Britain has 40,000, Italy 30,000, Germany 25,000, and Scandinavia 50,000. North America, the American Contract Bridge League, has 170,000 members. South and Central America are not developing as well as hoped - the two zones have a total of only 9,000 players.

Zone 4 is an especially interesting area. This zone, which includes Asia, the Middle East and Africa, now has 20,000 members, but the potential for growth is great. "We are doing our best to find the money to start a bridge teaching program in this part of the world," Damiani said. "And today we have some hope of achieving this."

Dynamic Zone 6 (Pacific Asia) is showing great progress with nearly 50,000 members.

Communication

Clearly the promotion of bridge is important - how else can we let the world know about our great game?

Damiani believes the Worldwide Bridge Contest is enormously important. "We need to create a new format for 1999, using Internet, with scoring across the field as well as IMP scoring for one of the sessions. We are working on this and we will certainly get a new sponsor."

Internet already works well for various services, especially in America and Europe.

Finances

"Our WBF treasury is healthy, thanks to the money (approximately $2 million (U.S.) provided by our sponsors," said Damiani. "Nevertheless, we must finance our development and teaching programs. I still believe the idea of charging all bridge players $1.00 per head is the right idea. I dispute that it would be difficult to collect this amount. It is a very simple matter for the federations to add it to their normal membership dues, collect it, and send it to us."

"Under the present structure of the WBF Championships, the years in which the Bermuda Bowl and the Venice Cup take place - the odd-numbered years - run at a loss despite the addition of the transnational events. We showed a profit from the Olympiad in Rhodes two years ago, and we always are well on the plus side at our World Bridge Championships. "We need the financial support to ensure the quality of the events."

Program for coming years

The 50th anniversary of the Bermuda Bowl will be observed in Bermuda in January 2000. This tournament has received sponsorship from Orbis ($300,000). Later in the same year Olympiad 2000 will take place in Maastricht, the Netherlands.

"We had planned the 2001 Bermuda Bowl for Bali, Indonesia," said Damiani, "but this might be in question in view of the financial, economic and, indeed, the possible political crisis affecting that country. Should this be the case, we will be very happy to receive some new candidates."

In 2002 the World Bridge Championships will return to North America, this time in Montreal, Canada.
mid the confusion and chaos that enveloped the first session of the Société Générale Open Pairs Championship final some spectacular bridge was played.


West North East South
Kierznowski Hamman Lukaszewicz Mahmood
Pass Pass 1♠ 1♦
1♥ 2♥ 3♦ Pass
4♦ Pass 4♥ Pass
5♥ Dble 6♥ All Pass

On a good day you will make 7♥ and declarer won the next trick. He was clearly weighing up the amount of bidding his opponent’s had done against the possibility of Zia having played the ten from ♠10.

Eventually he crossed to hand by cashing the ace of diamonds and ruffing a diamond and ran the ♠9.

Not surprisingly Kierznowski got a lot of applause. He also collected all but 2.1 of the 70 matchpoints available.

Board 13. Game All. Dealer North.

West North East South
Versace Lindquist Sementa Fredin
2♠ 3♥ 4♠ Pass 4NT Pass
5♠ Pass 7♠ All Pass

In pairs play you tend to bid at every opportunity but perhaps overcalling the weak 2♠ opening was tempting fate. Versace was sucked into the auction and N/S had an easy alternative to trying to make 4♠, a contract that failed slightly more often than it made.

South led the ♠K and followed it with the ♦A. When North played the ♠A a knowledgeable member of the audience explained it showed interest in diamonds and moments later South had reverted to that suit, selecting the ♦2. North ruffed and played the ♦4. That was the end of the story. Two down cost -500 and the Swedes had 50.01/70.

After a few quiet hands we saw something much more exciting.


West North East South
Lazard Gawrys Bramley Lesniewski
Pass Pass 2♥ 2♦
4♥ Pass 4NT Pass
5♠ Pass 7♠ All Pass

Once Sidney Lazard had splintered in support of clubs it was inevitable that the grand slam in clubs would be reached.

After the heart lead declarer was able to ruff a couple of hearts in dummy whilst drawing trumps and he reached the following ending:

It did not take Bart Bramley long to work out which squeeze was going to operate and he cashed the ♦A.

North parted with the ♠K because it was still possible South had the ♠10 and in any case it is never a good idea to let your opponents take trick 13 with the ♦7! Making 7♠ scored 62/70.

The Polish pair earned a measure of revenge on the next deal.
**Board 20. Game All. Dealer West.**

- **West North East South**
  - **Lazard**
  - **Gawrys**
  - **Bramley**
  - **Lesniewski**

- **Pass 1**
  - **Dble**
  - **1NT**

One club was Polish and the choice for East between 1NT and double is perhaps a matter of taste. With such soft values double looks the sounder action. Eric Kokish ventured that he would not have passed on the West hand - 2NT is one possibility, asking partner to bid a major, but since that would end up costing at least -100 Lazard did well to keep quiet.

He led the 3 for the queen and king and East switched to the 5. Declarer put up the 9 and played a club to the nine. East won and not being sure of the heart distribution played back the 10. If West had won this and gone back to hearts, his side would have collected most of the matchpoints but when he played low declarer scored dummy’s J and claimed eight tricks for 61.2/70.

---

**Board 21. N/S Vul. Dealer North.**

- **West North East South**
  - **Jason**
  - **Wang**
  - **Justin**
  - **Zhuang**

- **Pass**
  - **2NT**
  - **Pass**
  - **2NT**
  - **Pass**

When Barry Rigal queried how one might convey the nature of the West hand to partner after the 2NT opening bid Bobby Wolff opined that the scientific bid of 6NT would do the job nicely! The Hackett twins probably wished they could have heard him!

Justin alerted his brother’s bids, explaining the second one as ‘1-4-4 I think’. South led the 3 and that held declarer to ten tricks. 51.4/70 for the Chinese pair.

---

**Squeeze time in the Zonal Pairs**

Guy Beresiner of London, England, played a classic double squeeze during the second session of the Elf Zonal Pairs. This was the deal:

**Board 18. N/S Vul. Dealer East.**

- **West North East South**
  - **Beresiner**
  - **Essex**

- **Pass**
  - **Dble**
  - **2NT**
  - **Pass**

Beresiner bid very aggressively, competing with 2NT when 2NT came back to him, giving Gavin Essex a very easy raise to game.

The opening lead was a low heart to the nine. Beresiner led a diamond towards dummy and the ace went up. Back came the J, which declarer won in hand. Beresiner played a second diamond and ducked it when East showed out. West won and switched to the J. Again Beresiner won in hand. Now he led a heart, covered, to the ace, and cashed two top clubs. Three rounds of diamonds followed. On the last diamond, West had to pitch a spade to keep his club guard. Away went declarer’s last club and now it was East’s turn to be squeezed, this time in the majors. The six of spades made the last trick; +660 and an excellent score for North/South.

---

**Turbo Charged**

The German pairs certainly bid the pips off when it comes to slam bidding. Here is another example, this time from the Louis Vuitton Women’s Pairs semifinal.

**Board 14. Love All. Dealer East.**

- **West North East South**
  - **Nehmert**
  - **Miroslaw**

- **Pass**
  - **4NT**
  - **Pass**
  - **6NT**

The key bid was Wiesia (we finally spelt it right!) Miroslaw’s decision to show her first round diamond control after Pony Nehmert’s splinter. Since she was looking at good spades she correctly inferred that a significant part of her partner’s values would lie outside the trump suit.

With the J in the opening bidder’s hand +980 earned 44/50 matchpoints.

---

**Gitelman Chats On-line**

Canadian Fred Gitelman, who has developed much of the software used in the Microsoft Game Zone, held an online chat session last night from here in Lille.

The session attracted a lot of interest from games enthusiasts around the world, with many people calling in with questions or to express their views.

And don’t forget that the Microsoft Games Zone is a free service so why not give it a try sometime!

The address is: www.zone.com
pairs started out in the five-session, all-play-all final of the Louis Vuitton Women’s Pairs. They played four board rounds, 28 boards per session. Leading at the end of the first session were Gail Greenberg and Sylvia Moss of USA who scored around 60%. We watched them against two of the Chinese pairs and they had much the better of the exchanges.


Round six started badly for the two Americans when they missed the excellent slam on the North/South cards.

North  South
Greenberg  Moss
2♦  2♣
3♥  3NT
4♥  Pass

2♦ was a weak two bid and 2♣ natural and forcing. Perhaps North should do more than make a simple heart raise, looking at excellent heart support and a side singleton. When Greenberg bid only 3♥, Moss completed the picture of her hand as big and balanced by bidding 3NT. Greenberg, with no aces, did not consider slam and simply went back to what she expected to be the better game.

Ling Gu led a diamond and Moss won in hand, drew trumps and ran the diamonds, taking the spade finesse at the end; 12 tricks for +680 but only 6 MPs out of 34.


West  North  East  South
Gu  Greenberg  Yalan Z  Moss
1♦  Pass  2♠  3NT

2♠ was Precision, natural 11-15. Gu led a spade to the jack and queen. Moss cashed the diamonds now, throwing a heart from hand, then played a club towards her queen. Yalan Zhang rose with the ♣K and returned a spade and Moss won, cashed her other top spade, and played the ♠Q. Zhang could have saved a trick by ducking this as declarer would have had to play a heart to the ace next and concede a heart and a club. But Zhang actually won the club and declarer had the rest; +460 and 33 MPs.

Board 23. All Vul. Dealer South.

West  North  East  South
Gu  Greenberg  Yalan Z  Moss
1♦  INT  2♠  3NT

1♦ was Precision, perhaps as short as a doubleton. Greenberg overcalled 1INT and Zhang bid 2♠, asking for a major. Moss closed proceedings with a jump to 3NT. Zhang led a heart to the king and Greenberg ducked after some thought. Gu returned her remaining heart and Greenberg won, cashed the ♦K and passed the ♦J. She ran the remaining clubs, taking the spade finesse at the end; 12 tricks for +680 but only 6 MPs out of 34.

Gail Greenberg did very well on this deal, getting her side to their top scoring contract.


West  North  East  South
Gu  Greenberg  Yalan Z  Moss
1♦  INT  2♠  3NT

1♦ was Precision, perhaps as short as a doubleton. Greenberg overcalled 1INT and Zhang bid 2♠, asking for a major. Moss closed proceedings with a jump to 3NT. Zhang led a heart to the king and Greenberg ducked after some thought. Gu returned her remaining heart and Greenberg won, cashed the ♦K and passed the ♦J. She ran the remaining clubs, taking the spade finesse at the end; 12 tricks for +680 but only 6 MPs out of 34.

It isn’t often that you hold a ten-card suit and Greenberg showed enormous restraint in bidding it only once. The Chinese did what they could against 3NT, when Gu led a spade and, after cashing the two top spades, Zhang switched to a heart at trick three. Holding 3NT to ten tricks was worth only 4 MPs to the Chinese pair. For some strange reason the bulk of the field played in clubs.


It isn’t often that you hold a ten-card suit and Greenberg showed enormous restraint in bidding it only once. The Chinese did what they could against 3NT, when Gu led a spade and, after cashing the two top spades, Zhang switched to a heart at trick three. Holding 3NT to ten tricks was worth only 4 MPs to the Chinese pair. For some strange reason the bulk of the field played in clubs.


West  North  East  South
Gu  Greenberg  Yalan Z  Moss
1♦  INT  2♠  3NT

1♦ was Precision, perhaps as short as a doubleton. Greenberg overcalled 1INT and Zhang bid 2♠, asking for a major. Moss closed proceedings with a jump to 3NT. Zhang led a heart to the king and Greenberg ducked after some thought. Gu returned her remaining heart and Greenberg won, cashed the ♦K and passed the ♦J. She ran the remaining clubs, taking the spade finesse at the end; 12 tricks for +680 but only 6 MPs out of 34.
Along came a second Chinese pair and things continued to go the way of the Americans. On this one Sun Ming opened the North hand 2NT, showing a club pre-empt. Greenberg overcalled 3♠ and Wang Hongli doubled for penalties. That might have been O.K. if she had been able to avoid leading clubs, but Wang led ace then jack of her partner’s suit. Greenberg won the ♣K and cashed a top spade, discovering the 4-0 split. Now she just needed some good fortune in the red suits, and the double strongly suggested that she might get it. She finessed the ♦Q then played a spade to hand and ruffed her last club. When the ♣A was also onside she had nine tricks for +730; 32 MPs for Greenberg/Moss.

Board 27. Nil Vul. Dealer South.

Moss/Grrenberg bid freely: 1♣ - 1♥ - INT - 3NT. The lead was a low diamond to the jack and ace. Moss led the ♦Q, ran it, then repeated the finesse and cashed the ace. Next she tried a low heart and Wang went in with the king to return the ♦3. That was run to Sun’s queen and she returned a diamond, giving Moss a third trick in the suit and eleven in all. Of course, if the defence leads spades from the beginning, it is much tougher for declarer, though she can still come to ten tricks by rising with the ace at trick one. Any other play and she will be held to nine. And after the actual diamond lead, a passive return after winning the ♦Q also holds the contract to ten tricks hence 33 MPs for the Americans.


I believe that 3♠ was forcing, Lebensol-style, making it quite normal for Sun to convert to 3NT. Alas, Greenberg led a diamond and the defence had five tricks there with the ♦A still to come; down two for 29 MPs for Greenberg/Moss. Over the four boards, they had scored 99 MPs to 37, for a second successive big round.

Elf Zonal Team correction

With one exception, the players listed for the Guadeloupe team that won Zone 5 in the Elf Zonal Teams were incorrect. The team listed in the Daily News was the one originally submitted, but Guadeloupe eventually fielded a much different team. On the team were Philippe Mathieu, Paul Benichou, Daniel Veron, Jean-Pierre Booveresse, Jean-Claude Pelletier and Janine Moers.

The Aberlour VIP Club News

Yesterday the VIP Club hosted a reception for members of the local press corps who were paying a visit to the Championships. Representatives of the WBF were on hand to explain the mechanics of the tournament and to answer their many questions.

Honor Member for 1998

Very few of our members have been to more than 50 international championships, and one might suppose that none can count more attendances than years of life. But Per Jannersten of Sweden is the exception. At the age of eight he went to the European Championships in Stockholm with his father, Eric Jannersten, who was for 30 years the Mr. Bridge of his country: international player, author, columnist and creator of bridge products.

Per went to nearly all the European and World Championships from 1956 to 1970 with his father. Then he concentrated on a business career as a printer. When his father died in 1981, he took over the family business and has appeared at all European and world events since then – always accompanied by a large supply of books and bridge equipment. He has improved the bidding boxes that his father invented, produced automatic dealing machines, and manufactured the first table screens used in Europe. Per was present when the International Bridge Press Association was founded in 1958, has made valuable contributions to the organization for the past 15 years, in many capacities. Thanks to his energy and vision, we expect soon to have an IBPA Web page which will permit us to give our members even better service.

Always accompanying Per in his travels is his sparkling wife, Brit. Nowadays they usually bring their lively children, Calle and Anna. We are confident that one of them will be the Honor Member in the year 2038, continuing the great Jannersten tradition.

France Télécom provides the telecommunication equipment
The 1998 IBPA Annual Awards

The 1998 Personality of the Year:
Paul Chemla

Since our last award ceremony in Hammamet, Paul Chemla, 54, has had a fantastically successful year as a player. It began with a win in the Bermuda Bowl. He was also on the French team that won the Olympiads in 1980, 1992 and 1996, in each case defeating the United States in the final.

This April in Aachen he took silver in the European Mixed Pairs partnering Catherine d’Ovidio (formerly Saul). He followed this with gold in the European Mixed Teams (teaming up with Michel & Véronique Bessis). A couple of weeks later he was in Corsica to become the Generali World Individual Champion.

Chemla was born in Tunis in 1944. His father, a lawyer, separated from his mother, Ginette, when Paul was quite young. His mother and he moved to Paris in 1960. She married a member of the French cabinet, Bertrand Flornoy, but is now married to the Turkish bridge player Halit Bigat.

Chemla took up bridge in 1968 after leaving university. He worked as a lecturer. He won the first European Pairs in 1976 in Cannes partnering Michel Lebel, and again in 1985 with Michel Perron.

His Olympiad win in 1980 was decided by the famous grand slam in which Hamman led the wrong ace where Chemla partnered Christian Mari. In the 1984 Olympiad in Seattle, with Chemla partnering Michel Perron, France lost in the final to Poland.

Chemla is known for his large cigars, and the ample figure formed through love of good food. His main hobby is classical music, opera in particular. He reads good literature and enjoys a really tough crossword. He also plays rummy for high stakes.

Chemla, a bridge professional, says the evening and night are for playing bridge, the morning and afternoon for sleeping. He is unmarried.

"Le Bridgeur"Award for Best Play
Jeff Meckstroth (USA)

Journalist: Jean-Paul Meyer (France)
From IBPA Hammamet Special Page 10

Jeff Meckstroth is under survey after stealing a contract. Norwegians Geir Helgemo & Tor Helness were the victims, a role they are not used to.

Game All, Dealer: East
♠ K 7 5 3
♦ K 8
♥ J 9 7 4
♣ 3 2
♠ 10 4
♦ Q 3
♥ J 10 6 5 2
♦ 5
♠ A 9 8
♥ A 10 2
♦ A J 0 9 7 6 5 4
♣ Q 6 3
✿ Q

The contract was 5♣ by West (yes, 3NT is much easier!) Helness led a low diamond and Jeff played the 10 from dummy! Of course Helgemo’s queen held the trick. Now South, a young, promising and confident player, played back a diamond. And suddenly there was no longer any efficient defence!

Meckstroth discarded a heart on the ♠A and led a heart to his queen. Helness won this and fired back a spade - too late. Meckstroth rose with the ace and played the ♦J. South had to put up the ace, which Meckstroth ruffed in hand. He cashed the ♦A and crossed to ♦K, and the ♦10 took care of his spade loser.

Other deals which made the shortlist were:
David Price (Bulletin 393, page 20); Jean-Christophe Quentin from the Paris Mixed Pairs reported by Jean-Paul Meyer (Bulletin 397 pg 7); Warren Lazer at the Australian Nationals reported by Ron Klinger (Bulletin 398, pg 4); and Marc Smith from a League match reported by David Bird (Bulletin 400 pg 13).

The Wei-Sender Award
for Best Defence
Geir Helgemo of Norway

Journalist: Patrick Jourdain (GB)
From the Generali World Masters (Bulletin 400 pg 3)

It is easy to confuse the Deschappelles and Merrimac Coups. The first is the lead of an unsupported honour to create an entry to partner’s hand; the second is the deliberate sacrifice of a high card to remove a vital entry to an opponent’s hand, usually the dummy. On this deal Geir Helgemo managed both with one card!

First, Apolinary Kowalski told of an imaginative switch by Claude Delmouly but it was Helgemo elsewhere who found the most accurate defence:

E/W Vul. Dealer East.
♠ J 6
♥ A J 10 8 3
♦ Q 6 2
♣ K 8
♠ 5 4 3 2
♥ Q 5
♦ J
♣ KQ 10 8 7
✿ 9 6 2
♦ K 9 7
♣ A 9
♥ 7 4
♦ A 10 8 5 4 3
♣ Q 6 4

West North East South
Lanten Jason Delmouly Kowalski
1♠
3♥
4♦
All Pass

West North East South
Khalv Chemla Helgemo Freeman
1♠
2♥
3♥
All Pass

Other deals which made the shortlist were:
West led a spade against Kowalski’s four diamonds. Declarer won and returned a spade to East. Delmouly found the good switch of ♦K. Declarer won this and also did well by leading ♠Q covered by the king and ace.

When the jack fell from West, Kowalski tried to get back to dummy by playing a club. Delmouly won, put his partner in with ♠Q and received a club ruff to defeat the part-score.

Note that it does not go for declarer to duck ♦K when it is led. East will cash ♠A and play a second heart. Declarer wins and plays trumps: Q, K, A, J. But now he cannot get back to dummy. However, as Kowalski spotted he did have a chance to make.

After winning the ace of trumps he must play a heart. West wins and plays a club, but now East is end-played into conceding an entry for the trump finesse.

This reveals a flaw in Delmouly’s defence. He should have cashed ♠A before making the switch to ♦K - then declarer cannot succeed. And guess what, that is exactly how Helgemo defended against Freeman after the same start.

Freeman won the heart switch, began trumps by playing ♠Q, K, A, J, but when he tried to get back to dummy with a club, Helgemo ruffed, put his partner in with ♠Q and received a second ruff. Two off!

The other defenders on the shortlist were:

Piotr Tuszynski in a Polish League match reported by Ryszard Kielczewski (Bulletin 395 page 12); Marcin Lesniewski reported by Eric Kokish (Bulletin 397 page 12); George Rosenkranz & Jamie Ebery reported by Jim Klinger (Bulletin 398 page 6); Christian Mari & Alain Levy reported by Ron Klinger (Bulletin 399 page 5); Leigh Gold & Jamie Ebery reported by Jim Klinger (Bulletin 397 page 12); Borin (Bull 397 pg 12); George Rosenkranz & Leigh Gold at the Australian Club reported by Marten Schollaardt (Bulletin 398, page 16); Leigh Gold & Jamie Ebery reported by Jim Klinger (Bulletin 397 page 12).

How did Sylvie Willard come up with the winning bid so quickly? As SNT was a grand slam try asking for the top trumps she knew her partner must have the ace of diamonds and a void in clubs. So surely he would have at least six hearts headed by the ace-king. In which case she could count 13 top tricks in notrumps.

Game All. Dealer South.

| ♠ 3 2 |
| ♣ 10 9 3 |
| ♣ K 10 9 3 |
| ♣ 10 6 3 |
| ♠ 10 8 7 4 |
| ♣ Q 10 9 6 |
| ♣ 4 2 |
| ♣ 6 3 |
| ♣ A 9 8 7 |
| ♠ 5 6 |
| ♣ J 6 5 4 |
| ♣ K Q J 5 4 2 |

The other auctions which made the shortlist were:

Leigh Gold & Jamie Ebery reported by Jim Borin (Bull 397 pg 12); George Rosenkranz & Eddie Wold (Bull 396 pg 5); Piotr Gawrys & Marcin Lesniewski reported by Eric Kokish (Bull 398 pg 6); Christian Mari & Alain Levy (Bull 395 pg 12).

The Levendaal Award for Best Play by a Junior: Igor Grzejdziak (Poland)

Journalist: Jon Sveindal (Norway)

From the European Junior Teams

(Bulletin 403 page 3)

The Vugraph match between Norway & Poland was mostly a one-way affair in favour of the Vikings, but on Board 10 the capacity crowd saw a beautiful deceptive play by Igor Grejziak (see next column):

In the Closed Room Kristoffersen for Norway opened 1♥ as South, and shortly thereafter West was on lead against 4♥. He chose ♥4 which enabled South to play the suit for no loser.

In the Open Room South opened 1♠ (Polish) and Grzejziak (North) bid 1♣. South bid 2♦ and 4♥ concluded the auction. However, this time East was on lead, and Saur chose ♦8. It is impossible, I think, for anyone to find a legitimate winning line. But Grzejziak found an excellent deceptive play that made it really difficult for East to find the right defence. At trick one the play went ♥8,4,2,3.

Cashing ♥A could have been a disaster with another layout, so Saur continued with ♥6. North took West’s jack with the ace, played three rounds of hearts, and later finessed in spades and threw a club loser on the fourth spade. A club ruff made a total of 10 tricks thanks to a very imaginative deception!

Game All. Dealer East.

| ♠ A 5 3 |
| ♦ 9 6 5 2 |
| ♣ A K 9 2 |
| ♠ 10 7 |
| ♠ J 2 |
| ♣ Q 9 8 6 |
| ♣ J 4 3 |
| ♠ Q 8 5 |
| ♣ J 10 6 |
| ♠ K J 8 6 3 2 |
| ♠ A K 10 7 4 |
| ♦ A K Q 8 |
| ♦ 7 4 3 |
| ♠ 9 5 |

The other players to make the short list were:

Bas Tammens, 14, at the Amsterdam Youth Club reported by Marten Schollaardt (Bulletin 397, page 16); Leigh Gold at the Australian Youth Teams, reported by Ron Klinger (Bulletin 398, page 5); Boye Brogeland at the European Junior Teams (see this Bulletin); Freddi Bron- dum at the European Junior Teams, reported by Morten Lund Madsen (see this Bulletin).
**Appeal No. 23**

Reported by Rich Colker

**Appeals Committee:**

Bobby Wolff (Chairman, USA), Virgil Anderson (USA), Rich Colker (USA), John Lenart (New Zealand), Dan Morse (USA)

Open Pairs, 29 August 98
Great Britain (N/S) v Israel (E/W)

N/S: M. Smith/P. Czerniewski
E/W: Stela Sagi/Lilo Popiliov

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vulnerable.

```
West North East South
```

(1) Alerted and explained on both sides as "strong"
(2) Some sort of two-suiter; undiscussed

**Facts:**

4[4] made five, +650 for E/W. The TD was called at the end of the play. N/S contended that they were damaged because they were not given the proper explanation of E/W’s methods. In the post-mortem West indicated that he had misbid when he opened 2[2], intending it as weak. When he realized his mistake (almost as soon as he began describing his bid as weak to South) he changed his explanation in mid-sentence to reflect E/W’s agreement (strong/ACOL). East also explained the 2[2] bid as strong to North. The TD noted that N/S had not corresponded with West’s hand was true, but irrelevant. West was obligated to explain the meaning in his partnership of his bid and was not obligated to disclose the contents of his hand. The TD allowed the table result to stand.

**Appellant:**

N/S appealed.

**The players:**

N/S contended that both West and East’s hands were consistent with a weak 2[2] bid, and that this was consistent with the way the front of their card was marked (“2[2] = 5[5] + 5 any, 6-10”). If North had known that 2[2] was weak he would have bid a systemic 4[4], showing clubs and hearts, and South would then have bid 5[5]. They also stated that if West had chosen this moment to psych his strong 2[2] opening, East appeared to have underbid. In response to questions from the Committee, E/W indicated that they were not a practiced partnership. They had filled out their convention card by starting with one used by West’s card through the computer." West explained that when he opened 2[2] he had done so reflexively, as he played weak two-bids with most of his other partners. He also explained his bid as weak, but then remembered his obligation to disclose the meaning of his 2[2] bid on his side of the screen, as per E/W’s agreements. The fact that this did not correspond with West’s hand was true, but irrelevant. West was obligated to explain the meaning in his partnership of his bid and was not obligated to disclose the contents of his hand. The TD allowed the table result to stand.

**The Committee’s decision:**

The TD determined that the mismarked section on the front of E/W’s convention card was a computer error which could not have affected the table result, since neither opponent looked at E/W’s convention cards. Since East and West both explained 2[2] as strong, and since the second page of the E/W cards were both consistent with this explanation (marked as ACOL), the TD ruled that N/S had been properly informed of the meaning of 2[2] as per E/W’s agreements. The fact that this did not correspond with West’s hand was true, but irrelevant. West was obligated to explain the meaning in his partnership of his bid and was not obligated to disclose the contents of his hand. The TD allowed the table result to stand.

**The players:**

N/S contended that both West and East’s hands were consistent with a weak 2[2] bid, and that this was consistent with the way the front of their card was marked (“2[2] = 5[5] + 5 any, 6-10”). If North had known that 2[2] was weak he would have bid a systemic 4[4], showing clubs and hearts, and South would then have bid 5[5]. They also stated that if West had chosen this moment to psych his strong 2[2] opening, East appeared to have underbid. In response to questions from the Committee, E/W indicated that they were not a practiced partnership. They had filled out their convention card by starting with one used by West’s card through the computer.” West explained that when he opened 2[2] he had done so reflexively, as he played weak two-bids with most of his other partners. He also explained his bid as weak, but then remembered his obligation to disclose the meaning of his 2[2] bid on his side of the screen, as per E/W’s agreements. The fact that this did not correspond with West’s hand was true, but irrelevant. West was obligated to explain the meaning in his partnership of his bid and was not obligated to disclose the contents of his hand. The TD allowed the table result to stand.

**The Committee’s decision:**

The Committee (Chairman) adjusted the score for E/W to average minus based on the following: (1) West forgot his methods; (2) West did not disclose the intended meaning of his 2[2] bid on his side of the screen, as per Active Ethics; (3) E/W’s convention card was not filled out properly; and (4) East chose a conservative 4[4] bid with a hand that warranted a slam try, while at the same time West held a weak hand consistent with East’s (conservative) action. The Chairman also adjusted N/S’s score to the better of the table result or average minus, in recognition of N/S’s responsibility in not having adequately discussed their conventional defenses to the opponents’ strong, natural opening bids.

APPEALS 23 to 24

Two Committee members (Lenart, Morse) left the hearing at the end of the testimony due to other commitments (this was the third appeal heard by this Committee during the current sitting) and did not participate in the discussion or the final decision. One indicated before he left that he favored assigning N/S Average Plus and E/W Average Minus.

The Committee noted that West correctly explained the systemic meaning of his 2[2] bid to his screenmate, as required by law, but behind screens also might have volunteered that, “My partner will explain it as strong, but I have a weak two-bid,” as suggested by Active Ethics. Players using new (for them), complex or unfamiliar (to others) methods have a special responsibility to know what they are playing, alert their bids properly, and explain them accurately and completely on both sides of the screen. In this case West failed to live up to that standard.

In addition, while it is clear that E/W systematically played ACOL two-bids in the majors and accurately informed their screenmates of this, East’s “oddly” conservative 4[4] bid was troubling to some Committee members in light of West’s “misbid.”

As for N/S, while they would have had a better chance to compete for the contract had the problems created by the opponents not occurred, they themselves had not adequately discussed the meanings of their conventional methods over what should not have been a totally unexpected ACOL 2[2] opening. Thus, they bore responsibility for their problems.

**The Committee’s decision:**

The Committee (Chairman) adjusted the score for E/W to average minus based on the following: (1) West forgot his methods; (2) West did not disclose the intended meaning of his 2[2] bid on his side of the screen, as per Active Ethics; (3) E/W’s convention card was not filled out properly; and (4) East chose a conservative 4[4] bid with a hand that warranted a slam try, while at the same time West held a weak hand consistent with East’s (conservative) action. The Chairman also adjusted N/S’s score to the better of the table result or average minus, in recognition of N/S’s responsibility in not having adequately discussed their conventional defenses to the opponents’ strong, natural opening bids.
**Dissenting Opinions (Colker, Anderson):**

We disagree with the Committee's decision. While it is disruptive and generally not good for our game when players forget their methods, these things do happen. Under the present laws, as long as the opponents are properly informed of the systemic meaning of a player's bid (not necessarily his actual hand) there has been no infraction ¾ unless the partnership is found to have an undisclosed understanding, which was clearly not the case here. We also find it likely that West's initial few words to South, his halting speech pattern and sudden change in explanation conveyed to his screenmate the idea that his hand did not match his bid. We would have preferred it had West simply and completely volunteered his error to his screenmate, but the laws do not require players to do this, and Active Ethics is not yet the law.

Similarly, we find East's conservative ♠ bid not to be an egregious action; rather, we would characterize it as a non-aggressive (perhaps less-than-expert) call, typical of the level of bridge involved here.

We believe that the problem with the E/W convention cards stemmed from the pair's failure to notice and remove a reference on the front of the card to the two-suited major-suit openings played by their spouses when modifying the computer file from the spouses' card. The methods were not part of E/W's system, nor did the presence of the error have any bearing on the present situation (except for the inquiries needed to determine this).

Finally, we believe N/S's problems stemmed solely from their failure to have adequately discussed their conventional defenses to strong opening bids.

We regret that we cannot find any basis in the laws for adjusting either side's score from that which occurred at the table. We believe that the problem with the E/W convention cards stemmed from the pair's failure to notice and remove a reference on the front of the card to the two-suited major-suit openings played by their spouses when modifying the computer file from the spouses' card. The methods were not part of E/W's system, nor did the presence of the error have any bearing on the present situation (except for the inquiries needed to determine this).

**Appeal No. 24**

**Reported by Rich Colker**

**Appeals Committee:**

Rich Colker (Chairman, USA), Naki Bruni (ITA), Joan Gerard (USA)

Open Pairs, Semifinals D
31 August 98
USA (N/S) v USA (E/W)

**N/S:** Michael Seamson/Shelha Ekeblad
E/W: Adam Wildsky/Dan Morse

**Board 19. Dealer South. E/W Vulnerable.**

| ♦ | Q | 7 | 6 | 5 | 3 |
| ♣ | Q | 7 | 6 | 2 |
| ♠ | Q | 9 | 2 |
| ♡ | A | J | 8 | 2 |
| ♢ | K | 4 |
| ♣ | 10 |
| ♠ | 9 | 4 |
| ♥ | K |
| ♥ | 3 |
| ♥ | 10 | 3 |
| ♠ | A | K | 4 |
| ♡ | 7 | 6 | 4 | 2 |

**West North East South**

**South INT (1)**

Pass 2♠ 3♥ 3♠

Dble (2) All Pass

(1) 10-12 HCP
(2) No alert by West; alerted by East

did not result in any damage to North. Therefore, the table result was allowed to stand.

**Appellant:**

N/S appealed.

**The players:**

South did not attend the hearing. North stated to the Committee that had he been told that West's double was for penalties, as East's pass suggested, he would have ruffed the third heart with dummy's ♠9. Later he might have guessed to finesse West for the ♦8, although he might still have played for spades to have been three-two originally ¾ given East's pass of the double.

E/W said they had played together a couple of times on OKbridge, but this was their first time playing together at the bridge table. This was also the first time they had filled out a WBF convention card together. Their card was marked "competitive" doubles in competition when the opponents had bid and raised a suit.

West said that he had too much to pass 3♠. He believed he had two-way values and that his double asked East to decide whether to bid or defend. He believed his spade holding was good should East decide to defend, while he had club support if East chose to bid that suit. Otherwise, he could prefer hearts. When asked, West indicated that he would have doubled with a variety of hands, including some with shorter spades but more high cards.

East indicated that he fully expected West to hold shorter spades ¾ perhaps as few as two. He said that he knew that passing 3♠ doubled was risky, but the Law of Total Tricks guided him in his decision. If N/S had a nine-card spade fit and E/W an eight-card club fit, then if his side could make 4♠ they would likely collect 300 defending 3♠ doubled, while if they would be down one in 4♠ they would be plus 100 defending.

E/W said that, beyond their agreement to play these doubles as card showing ("Cards rather than trumps" was marked on their ACBL convention card ¾, which they had never used but had filled out in anticipation of playing together) they had not discussed the requirements for the bids. East indicated that he personally would readily have doubled with as few as two trumps in West's position, while West was less convinced that he would have doubled with only two trumps without significant extra high-card strength.

East requested guidance from the Committee on how he should explain these doubles in the future, so as not to run into this sort of problem again.

**The Committee:**

The Committee agreed with the TD that East's explanation of West's double as "Cards" was inadequate. E/W had an obligation to discuss the requirements of such doubles and...
The Committee's decision:

The Committee allowed the table result to stand for both sides. The Directing staff was commended for their difficult decision in this case. The deposit was returned.

**Fascination**

by Blazencic Davor

This deal from the first session of the Zonal Pairs did not see declarer - alas, it was me - making a great play. However, had things been different it might have produced one of the stories of the championship.

**Board 1. Love All Dealer North.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>♠ K Q 9 5</th>
<th>♦ 10 7 3</th>
<th>♣ A K 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♠ 8 6 2</td>
<td>♦ Q 9 8 2</td>
<td>♣ J 9 7 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ J 6 5 4 3</td>
<td>♣ 10</td>
<td>♠ J 5 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ 8 6 5 4 3</td>
<td>♠ 9 7 6 5 4 3</td>
<td>♣ J 10 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**West** North East South

Davor Eastad

1♠ 1NT Pass 2 ♠ Pass

Dble Pass Dble All Pass

North started with the ♠A and then cashed the ♠AK. He reverted to diamonds and West ruffed with the ♦3.

From here I managed to go two down even though there is no real problem in escaping for one down. That would have been an excellent score since N/S have an easy nine tricks available in diamonds.

My partner is used to me making one trick less than the number available and later when he discovered that I had the ♦7 he literally exploded and demonstrated how it is possible to make the contract against any defence.

This is what you have to do:

Having ruffed the king of diamonds at trick five you ruff a club and ruff dummy's last diamond. Then you cash three top hearts discarding a club from hand and play another heart from the dummy. That gives rise to two possibilities:

If South discards a diamond West throws his remaining club and North is forced to ruff. When he plays the ♦K you duck and claim the last two tricks with the ♦A.

If South ruffs with the ♦10 West plays the ♦J and North has to win. His best return is the ♦K or ♦9. West wins with the ♦A and plays his last club. That ensures one further trick for declarer.

This game can be magical but only with the right conjuror on stage!
POLONAISE INVERSEE

Issue de la Rosenblum

Les enchères :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ouest</th>
<th>Nord</th>
<th>Est</th>
<th>Sud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3♦</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Passe 4♠</td>
<td>1♣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passe 4SA</td>
<td>Passe 5♥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passe 6♥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tout se joue à la première carte. C’est ce que s’est dit Bryna Kra, une américaine de Paris, lorsqu’elle joua ce coup. Vous laisserez l’entame vers le Roi de la main… et vous chuterez !

Vous ne pouvez pas décemment gagner si les atouts sont 4/1. Vous jouez donc 3 fois atout (ils sont 3/2) puis ♦ vers la Dame qui fait la levée. Vous avancez le 10 de ♦ que le Roi du mort à nouveau. Bloqué au mort, vous êtes fait comme un rat ; vous ne pouvez exploiter vos ♦ et concédez 2 levées.

Evidemment, si vous vous étiez ménagé une rentrée en main en prenant l’entame de l’As de ♦, tout aurait été plus simple et 12 levées venaient aisément.

Main d’Est :
♣ 10954 ♦ 65 ♥ D10 ♠ V10853

Main d’Ouest :
♣ 32 ♦ 93 ♥ ARD84 ♠ U74

CROCODILE INATTENDU

½ finale-4ème séance-donne 24

Il fallait faire le plein à Pierre Saporta (associé à Jean-Louis Marlier) pour se qualifier. Des enchères dynamiques (2SA - 3SA) leur permirent d’atteindre la manche en Est/Ouest.

Main d’Est :
♣ 109752 ♦ 1073 ♥ RD3 ♠ RD6

Main d’Ouest :
♣ AV4 ♥ AV74 ♠ A ♠ RD1032

Contrat : 3SA
Entame : 4 de ♦

UNE AMERICAINNE A PARIS

NIS vulnérable, Sud donneur

Contrat : 6♦
Entame : 2 de ♦

AVENTURES LILLOISES

par PHILIPPE BRUNEL

Les 4 jeux :
♣ 109752 ♥ RD3 Dow RD6 ♠ AV
♣ AV4 ♥ AV74 ♠ A ♠ RD1032
♣ – ♥ 8 ♠ 10985432 ♠ 97654

ENTAME MORTELLE

½ finale-4ème séance-donne 24

Qualifié avant la dernière donne, Henri Swarc et Hervé Pacault étaient optimistes. Mais ils devaient encore jouer la donne 24. Qu’auriez-vous entamé en Nord après la séquence suivante ?

Main de Nord :
♣ 109752 ♥ RD3 Dow RD6 ♠ AV

Contrat : 3SA
Entame : 3 de ♠

Le 10 du mort pousse au Valet pris de l’As. Ne voyant que 8 levées, Pierre Saporta joua le 2 de ♦ de la main pour le Roi de Sud. Ce dernier tira le Roi de ♦ pour « éclairer son partenaire » et rejoua ♦ pour le Roi du mort. Ouest encaissa alors très rapidement ses ♦ et mit Nord dans l’obscurité pour arriver à la position à 4 cartes suivante :

Main d’Ouest :
♣ 109752 ♥ RD3 Dow RD6 ♠ AV

Contrat : 4 de ♦

Si, comme beaucoup, vous sélectionnez le Roi de ♦, Ouest alignera sans problème 10 levées. Mais, comme vous jouez contre Hervé Pacault, auteur de l’entame mortelle, vous vous devez de trouver la carte qui tue.

Touche, coulé ! Nord, supposant son partenaire court à ♦, entama du 2 de ♦ (préférentielle ♦) coupé par Sud. Cette brillante entame prive le déclarant d’une place en finale.

CROCODILE INATTENDU

½ finale-4ème séance-donne 11

Il fallait faire le plein à Pierre Saporta (associé à Jean-Louis Marlier) pour se qualifier. Des enchères dynamiques (2SA - 3SA) leur permirent d’atteindre la manche en Est/Ouest.

Main d’Est :
♣ 109752 ♥ RD3 Dow RD6 ♠ AV
♣ AV4 ♥ AV74 ♠ A ♠ RD1032
♣ – ♥ 8 ♠ 10985432 ♠ 97654

Contrat : 3SA
Entame : 4 de ♦

Il tira maintenant le Valet de ♦ et un crocodile imprévu s’anima. Si Nord prend de la Dame de ♦, il rend 2 levées de ♦ à la fin ; si Sud « surprend » la Dame de l’As, pour rejouer à travers la fourchette ♦, il affranchit alors le Valet de ♦.
We had seen HACKETT in set four the previous night, but there they had started with a bang. Here they began with two soft results. They began by playing Boards 29 and 30, and then later they also played Board 28 out of sequence because the tempo was slow in the other room. LINDKVIST gained 6 IMPs on these three deals. The third of the set follows.

**Board 30. Love All. Dealer East.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♠ T05</td>
<td>♣ K2</td>
<td>♦ 532</td>
<td>♠ Q8742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♣ K87632</td>
<td>♠ A5</td>
<td>♦ 9</td>
<td>♦ 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♥ A10876</td>
<td>♣ A1065</td>
<td>♠ A10565</td>
<td>♠ A10656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♠ A1Q4</td>
<td>♣ Q10964</td>
<td>♠ K93</td>
<td>♠ Q52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mats Nilsland and Bjorn Fallenius bid to 4♦ for plus 130. The Hacketts were more ambitious:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2♠</td>
<td>3♠</td>
<td>4♦</td>
<td>5♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4♠</td>
<td>6♠</td>
<td>All Pass</td>
<td>All Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even 5♦ is nearly impossible to make on the lead of the ♠K, and the slam was duly set two tricks for a loss of 6 IMPs.

But HACKETT struck back at once when both tables had an ace-asking accident.

**Board 17. Love All. Dealer North.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♠ T05</td>
<td>♣ K2</td>
<td>♦ 532</td>
<td>♠ Q8742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♣ K87632</td>
<td>♠ A5</td>
<td>♦ 9</td>
<td>♦ 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♥ A10876</td>
<td>♣ A1065</td>
<td>♠ A10565</td>
<td>♠ A10656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♠ A1Q4</td>
<td>♣ Q10964</td>
<td>♠ K93</td>
<td>♠ Q52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After a 2♠ opening, Jason showed spades, Justin used Roman Keycard Blackwood, and Jason did not jump to 6♠ to show the void. So the final contract was 6NT. Not a great spot — but it’s better than 7NT doubled, the contract in the other room. (Blame has not been apportioned between Nilsland and Fallenius—one should not intrude into private grief!)

Then another hammer blow.

**Board 19. E/W Vul. Dealer South.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♠ T05</td>
<td>♣ K2</td>
<td>♦ 532</td>
<td>♠ Q8742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♣ K87632</td>
<td>♠ A5</td>
<td>♦ 9</td>
<td>♦ 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♥ A10876</td>
<td>♣ A1065</td>
<td>♠ A10565</td>
<td>♠ A10656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♠ A1Q4</td>
<td>♣ Q10964</td>
<td>♠ K93</td>
<td>♠ Q52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1♠!! Pass Pass Pass Pass!

3NT Dbl 4♠ Pass Pass

All Pass All Pass

(11-13 or 17+)

4♦ is actually tough to beat — maybe nearly impossible on the ♠10 lead. Jason actually won the jack and played the ♣K. Magnus Lindkvist won this and played another diamond. Declarer took this and drew trumps with the aid of a finesse. Plus 790 and 12 IMPs.

The Swedes reduced the margin to a manageable size when Tony Forrester made a slightly hasty decision.

**Board 23. Game All. Dealer South.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♠ T05</td>
<td>♣ K2</td>
<td>♦ 532</td>
<td>♠ Q8742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♣ K87632</td>
<td>♠ A5</td>
<td>♦ 9</td>
<td>♦ 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♥ A10876</td>
<td>♣ A1065</td>
<td>♠ A10565</td>
<td>♠ A10656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♠ A1Q4</td>
<td>♣ Q10964</td>
<td>♠ K93</td>
<td>♠ Q52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the diamond opening lead declarer played ♣9-5-king-duck – a key to the defence. Now declarer erred by playing a low trump—a second spade is essential. This went to the ♣10 and 10, and a second diamond went back to the jack. Declarer now played the ♣J, and when Jason covered it in error (ducking defeats the contract by force), declarer won, played a club to hand and ruffed a diamond. A second spade went to the ace, leading to this ending:

**Board 27. Love All. Dealer South.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♠ T05</td>
<td>♣ K2</td>
<td>♦ 532</td>
<td>♠ Q8742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♣ K87632</td>
<td>♠ A5</td>
<td>♦ 9</td>
<td>♦ 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♥ A10876</td>
<td>♣ A1065</td>
<td>♠ A10565</td>
<td>♠ A10656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♠ A1Q4</td>
<td>♣ Q10964</td>
<td>♠ K93</td>
<td>♠ Q52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After a 2♠ opening, Jason showed spades, Justin used Roman Keycard Blackwood, and Jason did not jump to 6♠ to show the void. So the final contract was 6NT. Not a great spot — but it’s better than 7NT doubled, the contract in the other room. (Blame has not been apportioned between Nilsland and Fallenius—one should not intrude into private grief!)

Then another hammer blow.
Angelini v Bramley

By Barry Rigal

As Italy and the United States entered the final 14-board segment of their semifinal match, Italy led by 10, 81-71. Both teams played in 4♠ doubled on the first board, and the Americans gained back 5 IMPs. Lorenzo Lauria suffered a three-trick set while Howard Weinstein and Steve Garner escaped for down two. Board 50 offered a reasonable heart slam, but both teams missed it - push. Both Souths played in 4♠ on the next board. The key was the play in the club suit where dummy had 8-4-3-2 and declarer K-J-9. Both declarers made the technically correct play, in the context of the whole hand, of finessing to the 10, but this didn’t work - West had the doubleton 10. Without a second entry to dummy declarer had to lose a heart, a diamond and three clubs - down two. Another push.

A grand slam in hearts was easy on the N/S cards on Board 53 - a matter of fact there are 15 top-card tricks. But both North-Souths settled for the small slam for a flat board after Lazard jumped to 2NT even though his hearts left something to be desired. Bart Bramley went on to game despite the fact that his partner was a passed hand. Lazard had no trouble with this contract - in fact he made an overtrick when he made the correct guess in clubs. This was a major gain for the Americans because Andrea Buratti and Massimo Lanzarotti stopped short of game, playing in 3♠.

Lazard jumped to 2NT even though his hearts left something to be desired. Bart Bramley went on to game despite the fact that his partner was a passed hand. Lazard had no trouble with this contract - in fact he made an overtrick when he made the correct guess in clubs. This was a major gain for the Americans because Andrea Buratti and Massimo Lanzarotti stopped short of game, playing in 3♠.

Both East-Wests reached 4♠ after vigorous auctions. The defender in the South seat had the best chance, winning the ♦K at trick one and playing a diamond. North took the ace and played a low diamond. Both Wests worked out the 4-1 split, playing low from dummy to make plus 420.

At the other table, declarer would have had to guess very well if West had led the ♣K, but the situation was different when West actually led the ♠10. Declarer crossed to the ♦A, ruffed a spade as Sidney Lazard pitched a diamond, and then ruffed a diamond. He next led a low spade and scored up his slam.

Both East-Wests reached 4♠ after vigorous auctions. The defender in the South seat had the best chance, winning the ♦K at trick one and playing a diamond. North took the ace and played a low diamond. Both Wests worked out the 4-1 split, playing low from dummy to make plus 420.

The Americans regained 14 IMPs on this board. Both East-Wests got to the heart slam and neither guessed the trump position. But the American opening lead was a spade, setting up a trick when North won his trump queen. However, it appears that declarer could have escaped a spade loser by cashing two top trumps, then running clubs. North could ruff the fourth round, but by this time declarer would have been able to sluff both spades.
from dummy.

The Italian lead was a club, which gave declarer all the necessary time to eliminate trumps.

Board 61. Game All. Dealer North.

| ♠ | Q J |
| ♦ | Q J 9 8 7 |
| ♣ | 8 3 |
| △ | K J 9 5 |
| ♠ | A 10 9 2 |
| ♦ | K 4 3 |
| ◇ | J 7 |
| ♠ | A 10 7 4 2 |
| ♠ | K 8 4 3 |
| ♦ | 10 6 |
| ◇ | A K Q 10 6 4 |
| ♣ | 6 |

Board 62. Love All. Dealer East.

| ♠ | K J |
| ♦ | 9 3 |
| ♣ | K 9 4 |
| △ | A J 10 4 3 |
| ♠ | 8 5 |
| ♦ | A K Q |
| ◇ | 8 5 3 2 |
| ♠ | K 9 8 7 |
| ♠ | Q 7 6 3 |
| ♦ | 10 |
| ◇ | Q 6 5 |

Leaving Lille Saturday poses serious problems

Leaving Lille on Saturday will pose serious problems for those attending this tournament. Lille will be host to Plan Semi-Marathon, a major festival this weekend, and more than a million people are expected.

Driving will be very difficult early in the morning and impossible after 15.00 when all automobile traffic will be banned in downtown Lille. This prohibition will continue until midnight Sunday. It is strongly suggested that you do any driving prior to 10.00. We suggest that you pick up a map called “Braderie le Plan” from the Hospitality Desk. The map shows clearly all the streets from which automobiles will be banned.

Special arrangements have been made for participants in the bridge tournament.

Anyone with a car who needs to travel out of Lille MUST have a special pass. This pass can be obtained from the Stand in the foyer at the bottom of the main stairs. To obtain the pass you must give your car registration number, your name and the hotel where you’re staying.

Those who do not have cars may use taxis to get to the airport or the railroad station until about 9.00. After that, any taxi that accepts a fare will take his passengers to their destination, but the taxi will NOT return to Lille. Therefore it is incumbent on all those who need taxi service to use a taxi as early as possible.

Rides on the Metro will be free from Friday through Sunday evening.

Driving will be very difficult early in the morning and impossible after 15.00 when all automobile traffic will be banned in downtown Lille. This prohibition will continue until midnight Sunday. It is strongly suggested that you do any driving prior to 10.00. We suggest that you pick up a map called “Braderie le Plan” from the Hospitality Desk. The map shows clearly all the streets from which automobiles will be banned.

Special arrangements have been made for participants in the bridge tournament.

Anyone with a car who needs to travel out of Lille MUST have a special pass. This pass can be obtained from the Stand in the foyer at the bottom of the main stairs. To obtain the pass you must give your car registration number, your name and the hotel where you’re staying.

Those who do not have cars may use taxis to get to the airport or the railroad station until about 9.00. After that, any taxi that accepts a fare will take his passengers to their destination, but the taxi will NOT return to Lille. Therefore it is incumbent on all those who need taxi service to use a taxi as early as possible.

Rides on the Metro will be free from Friday through Sunday evening.

Any additional notices concerning this matter will appear in the Daily News as received.

Welcome to Montreal

At the Closing Ceremony in Lille, the WBF flag will be passed on to representatives from Montreal, where the best players in the world will meet again during the last two weeks of August 2002. The tournament will be held in two adjoining great hotels where reasonable rates have been secured for our players.

Organizers from Montreal are busy taking notes in Lille. They have expressed great admiration for the work done by the Fédération Francaise de Bridge, led by Michel Marmouget, Yves Aubry, Bernard Finger, Bernard Liochon, Jean-Paul Meyer, Jean Duflot and Jean-Claude Beineix.

For lovers of art there will be an exhibition at the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts and theatre at Place des Arts. The World Cinema Festival will take place during the tournament just a few blocks away. Side excursion tours will be offered to New York and Niagara.

The World Championship program probably will be quite similar to the program here in Lille. Airline connections are excellent. Montreal is served by most major airlines, and the airport is less than 15 minutes from the hotels by taxi - a ride that costs only US$16. Once in Montreal, participants may want to stroll in the picturesque old city, sample the excellent cuisine offered by hundreds of restaurants, and take advantage of the shopping bargains available where prices are among the lowest in the world.


Weston in Lille:
34-36 rue Grande, Chaussée, Lille