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left: Boris Schapiro, Irving Gordon

On the 60th anniversary of his first world championship victory, 89-year-old Boris Schapiro of Great Britain once again stands at the top of the heap. He and Irving Gordon, with a score of 2274.8 , finished a full 100 points ahead of the field in the Elf Senior Pairs. Another world champion, Benito Garozzo of the United States and a former mainstay of the Italian Blue Team, finished second, playing with his regular partner, Lea DuPont.

At 89 Shapiro certainly is the oldest person ever to win a world championship. The 1938 championship he won was considered unofficial - the World Bridge Federation wouldn't come into being for another 20 years. But he was a member of Great Britain's Bermuda Bowl championship team in 1955 and he also won the 1962 World Mixed Teams.

## Americans out front in Open Pairs

Larry Cohen and David Berkowitz, one of America's most successful partnerships, are in front in the Société Générale Open Pairs with one session remaining today. Melih Ozdil and Jerzy Zaremba of Poland were second.

## French pair now lead Women's Pairs

Véronique Bessis and Catherine d'Ovidio of France had two good session yesterday to move into first place in the Louis Vuitton Women's Pairs. Their score of 2134.6 gave them a 45 -point lead over Shawn Quinn and Jill Meyers of the USA.

## Damle of India wins Coralia Continuous Pairs

Sanjoy Damle of India was the victor in the second II-session Coralia Continuous Pairs with a score of I72.41. He was five points ahead of runner A. Sayde of Belgium. K. Klesser of the Netherlands was next with 163.93.

Coralia provided prizes for the winning North/South and East/West pairs in each session as well as overall prizes. The overall winners of the two series of II rounds will receive their prizes at the prize-giving ceremony tonight. Winners of session awards can pick up their prizes at the Hospitality Desk today.

## Americans win IMP Pairs

Russ Ekeblad and Michael Seamon of the United States, a relatively new pair although both are among America's leading players, yesterday won the Cara IMP Pairs with a score of plus 123.20.That was 2.35 points better than runners-up Dominique Masure and Marcel Leflon of France. A Russian pair,A. Ladyzhensky and A. Pavlov, were third with 120.30 .

TODAY'S STARTING TIME - $\mathbf{1 0 . 0 0}$
For the Open and Ladies Pairs

## VICTORY BANQUET

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 "AMPHITHEATREVAUBAN" (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.

## Buses will be available for banquet attendees

Buses will be available to take you to your hotels from the Grand Palais after the Victory Banquet tonight. The buses will be running from 11.30 until the banquet is over. This means it will not be necessary for you to use your cars.

## SOCIÉTÉ GÉNÉRALE OPEN PAIRS

(Standings after four sessions)

| I COHENL | BERKOWITZ D | USA | 4404.8 | 25 HOYLANDSO | HOYLANDJ | NOR | 4032.0 | 49 BERGER H | GUTTMANN D | AUT | 3764.6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 OZDILM | ZAREMBAJ | POL | 4356.2 | 26 WOLPERT D | CZYZOWICZ」 | CAN | 4013.5 | 50 SCHWEITZER H | DECHELETTE N | FRA | 3757.3 |
| 3 LINDQUIST | FREDIN | SWE | 4321.6 | 27 LANTARON L | KNAPA | ESP | 3992.8 | 51 JIALALM | MEISS | NLD | 3751.3 |
| 4 RAMER R | PAULISSEN G | NLD | 4317.7 | 28 SCHOUS | RON J | DNK | 3974.5 | 52 KOKKO K | EBENIUSJ | SWE | 3743.0 |
| 5 DEBOERW | MULLER B | NLD | 4311.8 | 29 ALLEGRINIP | PALAU | FRA | 3973.5 | 53 GILLP | COURTNEY M | AUS | 3735.2 |
| 6 CUTHBERTSON M | MATHESON J | GBR | 4309.0 | 30 WANGW | ZHUANG Z | CHN | 3971.5 | 54 LALANNE B | SALEY C | FRA | 3733.4 |
| 6 KWIECIEN M | PSZCZOLA | POL | 4308.7 | 31 GAWRYSP | LESNIEWSKIM | POL | 3970.8 | 55 KOWALSKIA | ROMANSKIJ | POL | 3709.4 |
| 8 MITTELMAN | GRAVES | CAN | 4235.0 | 32 VLACHAKIM | MAJ | GRC | 3962.5 | 56 BRAMLEY | LAZARD | USA | 3704.6 |
| 9 HAMMAN R | MAHMOOD Z | USA | 4218.4 | 33 SIMSON D | RODWELLE | USA | 3961.4 | 57 LEVINR | MOSS B | USA | 3698.7 |
| 10 MECKSTROTH | JOHNSON P | USA | 4206.6 | 34 KIERZNOWSKIR | LUKASZEWICZ K | POL | 3955.2 | 58 GOTARDT | HOLOWSKI Z | DEU | 3684.9 |
| II WEINSTEINS | ROSENBERG M | USA | 4179.6 | 35 MILLER B | CHEEK C | USA | 3943.5 | 59 DUPRAZ P | SALLIERE G | FRA | 3683.5 |
| 12 CHAGAS | BRANCO | BRA | 4174.5 | 36 CALDERWOOD G | SHEK D | GBR | 3942.2 | 60 LE PODERJ | SOLARIJC | FRA | 3670.0 |
| 13 AUKENJ | KOCH PALMUND | DNK | 4167.1 | 37 OLANSKIW | STARKOWSKIW | POL | 3932.7 | 61 MARIC | LEENHARDT F | FRA | 3640.3 |
| 14 MARTENS K | SZYMANOWSKIM | POL | 4157.6 | 38 LAIR M | SCHWARTZ R | USA | 3911.5 | 62 HAUKSSON B | SIGURDSSONS | ISL | 3636.5 |
| 15 HACKETTJ | HACKETTJ | GBR | 4155.4 | 39 LIX | SUNS | CHN | 3899.4 | 63 BESSIS M | ROMBAUT J | FRA | 3621.8 |
| 16 MAASA | RAMONDTV | NLD | 4148.2 | 40 MORSE D | WILDAVSKYA | USA | 3892.4 | 64 PARAINY | DUBUS X | FRA | 3612.7 |
| 17 BOCCHIN | DUBOIN G | ITA | 4132.6 | 41 LAMBARDIP | CAMBEROS H | ARG | 3875.0 | 65 SHARMAV | SADHUA | IND | 3584.1 |
| 18 VERSACE | SEMENTA | ITA | 4131.8 | 42 PILOND | FAIGENBAUMA | FRA | 3863.7 | 66 PAWLIKA | GWINNER H | DEU | 3544.6 |
| 19 WEICHSEL P | SONTAG A | USA | 4123.0 | 43 JASSEM K | TUSZYNSKIP | POL | 3849.8 | 67 DE ZURICH C | STUTZ U | CHE | 3523.3 |
| 20 ABECASIS M | QUANTINJ | FRA | 4102.5 | 44 GARNER | WEINTEEN | USA | 3844.3 | 68 VAN MIDDELEM | JEUNEN F | BEL | 3509.4 |
| 21 COMPTONC | KATZ R | USA | 4083.0 | 45 SOLOWAY P | ZOLOTOW S | USA | 3833.3 | 69 FREED E | PASSELL M | USA | 3497.7 |
| 22 CRONIER P | SALAMA M | FRA | 4079.3 | 46 PULGAR | RINALDI G | ITA | 3826.3 | 70 AUBY D | NYSTROM F | SWE | 3478.7 |
| 23 CAMPOS | VILLAR BOAS | BRA | 4047.5 | 47 ROSS H | LAWRENCE M | USA | 3807.6 | 71 DECHATILLON | HELER J | FRA | 3378.2 |
| 23 MARTEL C | STANSBY L | USA | 4048.0 | 48 WOLDE | ZECKHAUSER R | USA | 3796.4 | 72 HAMAOUIS | CAPONIC | VEN | 1.2 |


| $5$ | (Standings after four sessions) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I BESSISV | D'OVIDIO C | FRA | 2134.6 | 13 SUTHERLIN P | HAMMAN P | USA | 1963.1 | 25 LOTTE M | COUSSON M | FRA | 1838.1 |
| 2 QUINN | MEYERS | USA | 2089.8 | 14 CAPODANNOL | D'ANDREA M | ITA | 1956.9 | 26 JEANNIN-NALTET | LEMAITRE E | FRA | 1825.5 |
| 3 MENIL R | PIGEAUD F | FRA | 2077.9 | 15 SOKOLOW | SPRUNG | USA | 1950.4 | 27 KEARSEA | MITCHELL J | USA | 1823.4 |
| 4 MOSS S | GREENBERG G | USA | 2055.1 | 16 DEBETS M | SPEELMAN B | NLD | 1931.4 | 28 KITAM | KROGULSKAJ | POL | 1817.3 |
| 5 AUKEN | VON ARNIM | DEU | 2046.4 | 17 LACROIX E | POULAIN C | FRA | 1921.8 | 29 CORMACKJ | HAVAS E | AUS | 1805.4 |
| 6 YA-LAN Z | LING G | CHN | 2017.0 | 18 WILLARDS | CRONIER B | FRA | 1918.3 | 30 MIDSKOG K | MELLSTROM J | SWE | 1801.5 |
| 7 VRIEND B | ARNOLDS C | NLD | 2015.0 | 19 TORNAY | LEWIS | USA | 1907.6 | 31 GIANARDIC | ROVERA L | ITA | 1791.7 |
| 8 WEI-SENDER K | CHAMBERS J | USA | 2010.3 | 20 SUNM | WANG H | CHN | 1894.1 | 31 MORSE | MICHAELS | USA | 1791.8 |
| 9 ZUR-ALBU M | LEVIT-PORAT R | ISR | 2006.9 | 21 SANDERS | TRUSCOTT | USA | 1887.5 | 33 NEHMERT P | MIROSLAWW | DEU | 1789.0 |
| 10 WEN FEIW | YU Z | CHN | 2003.0 | 22 WOOD | KIVEL | USA | 1875.8 | 34 NAKAOT | NISHIDA N | JPN | 1735.8 |
| II FISCHER | WEIGKRIET |  | 1986.2 | 23 RADINJ | EYTHORSDOTTIR | USA | 1874.8 | 35 MODLIN M | MANSELL P | ZAF | 1689.4 |
| 12 BLOOMV | HOLROYD M | ZAF | 1978.6 | 24 FAVASA | DE HEREDIA B | FRA | 1861.6 | 36 TIBI-DESBOIS C | KERLERO P | FRA | 1501.6 |


|  | ELF SENIORS PAIRS <br> (Final Standings) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I SCHAPIRO B | GORDON I | GBR | 2274.8 | 15 | WEISMANJ | SOLODARJ | USA | 2055.5 | 29 | CASIAN E | FRANCOS L | ESP | 2002.4 |
| 2 DUPONTL | GAROZZO B | USA | 2174.4 | 16 | KREINS H | KLESSER C | NLD | 2050.4 | 30 | RIMON R | HONKAVUORI R | FIN | 2001.4 |
| 3 V AVENSLEBEN B | HOGER W | DEU | 2170.1 |  | PESONENJ | STUBB S | FIN | 2050.3 | 31 | SHANNON D | BENETT H | USA | 1986.3 |
| 4 GIGLI G | LATESSAA | ITA | 2131.1 | 18 | SKOPINSKA E | WITKOWSKI P | POL | 2040.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 MARUGGIA | ROMANIN G | ITA | 2127.3 | 19 | HUMBURG H | MATTSON G | DEU | 2035.7 | 32 | FUIORESCU M | VON KLEEST G | DEU | 1977.5 |
| 6 RENOUARD J | FARAHAT J | FRA | 2122.5 | 20 | ABIKER J | LASOCKI K | FRA | 2030.8 | 33 | BARONI F | BELLIA | ITA | 1957.8 |
| 7 HAMILTON F | SUTHERLIN J | USA | 2111.3 | 20 | LEVINEM | JABBOUR Z | USA | 2030.8 | 34 | FELLOUSJ | TASSAN J | FRA | 1907.6 |
| 8 SCHWARTZ P | ROBINSON J | CAN | 2108.8 | 22 | JEZIOROA | KLUKOWSKI J | POL | 2023.2 | 35 | VERHEES J | KOKKES J | NLD | 1863.2 |
| 9 DELMOULY C | ROUDINESCO J | FRA | 2104.3 | 23 | REVILL C | HEICKLEN J | CAN | 2022.5 | 36 | MORIN J | CHAVANNAZ P | FRA | 1855.9 |
| 10 GROMOELLERW | SCHNEIDER W | DEU | 2099.7 |  | KAISER K | SINT C | NLD | 2020.2 | 37 | HIRON M | HIRONA | GBR | 1813.5 |
| II JANICKIW | POCHRON J | POL | 2093.3 |  | AWAD M | AWAD G | FRA | 2016.5 | 8 |  |  | GBR |  |
| 12 EISENBERG B | JONAS D | USA | 2077.2 |  | AVOND | MALIGNON R | FRA | 2009.8 | 8 | CLEARY E | CLEARYA | \|RL | 1795.5 |
| 13 MAGERMAN P | VD MIJNSBRUGGE | BEL | 2065.4 | 27 | BIGANZOLIG | GAVINO G | ITA | 2009.7 | 39 | MORTELMANS G | ST GEORGES L | BEL | 1793.9 |
| 14 LONGINOTTIE | RESTA G | ITA | 2059.4 |  | KATZ M | RAND N | ISR | 2008.0 | 40 | DUPUIS L | DUPUIS B | FRA | 1660.1 |
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San Gorg Corinthia \& SAS Radison, St Julians, Malta 12-26 June 1999

## The Venue

The main complex comprises 3 hotels, the Radisson SAS, the San Gorg Corinthia and the Marina Corinthia. The Open Teams and the Vugraph will probably be located at the Radisson, and the Ladies Teams and Pairs and the Senior Teams will be at the San Gorg (the EBL reserve the right to switch the playing venues).

All three hotels are very modern and comfortable with direct sea frontage. Special group rates have been obtained by the EBL for all participants and the Press.

Special reduced rates have also been obtained from several other hotels within a $10-15$ minutes walk from the playing venues.


## Reservations

The Malta Bridge Association and the EBL have appointed Bridge Malta as Championship co-ordinators. Bridge Malta are responsible for handling all hotel reservations and airport transfers (only 15 minutes) which are complimentary for those reserving through Bridge Malta.

## Information / Entries

EUROPEAN BRIDGE LEAGUE
Bill Pencharz, President
8 Bell Yard, London WC2 A2JU, Great Britain
은 +44-|7I-242300|
算 +44-171-2423002
⑩0717.272@compuserve.com

## BRIDGE MALTA

을 356-380 333 / 380444
艮 356-380 555
— mario@bridge.org.mt

## Championship Dates

Opening Ceremony 12 June<br>Ladies Pairs<br>Championship<br>13-15 June<br>Open Teams<br>13-26 June<br>Ladies Teams<br>16-26 June<br>Senior Teams<br>17-26 June<br>Victory Dinner<br>26 June

## Travel

There are direct flights from most major European cities. Special discounts are offered by AIR MALTA, the official carrier, to all the players, officials and supporters who are registered members of their Bridge Federation.

For those who wish to travel by car or coach, it is possible to do so via Sicily by either ferry or a quick catamaran (I hour 40 minutes).


## European Open \& Ladies Teams Championships

These events are open to one national team per EBL member country in each series.A round robin will be played in each series which act also as qualifiers for the Bermuda Bowl \& Venice Cup World Championships to be held in Bermuda, January 2000.

## Ladies Pairs Championship

The Ladies Pairs Championship is open to all National Ladies Pairs and also to the Lady players whose standard of bridge is well known in their own country. Those pairs wishing to participate in this International and very prestigious Tournament should apply to their Federations. We know that each country has a number of Ladies Pairs, not selected to play internationally but who, nevertheless, have the necessary expertise to participate in this event, and we want to give all of them the opportunity to compete in this great Championship.

## European Senior Teams Championships

Eligibility: players born before January I, 1945. Full round robin format. Each European NCBO can send one or two teams to participate in the Championship. In addition, some transnational teams will be approved (upon application) by the EBL Seniors Committee to assist European countries that could not otherwise compete. This approval will be given to a transnational team that includes at least two players from a country that is not otherwise represented by a national team.

| Hotel | Rating | Rooms | Twin <br> Lm | Single <br> Lm | H/B Lm <br> per person |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Walk time |  |  |  |  |  |
| to venue |  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]Session two of the Louis Vuitton Women's Pairs final saw a strong performance from the South African pairing of Val Bloom and Maureen Holroyd, leaving them in the lead overnight. As it happened, by the time we caught up with them for the last couple of rounds, they had lost a little momentum and had two below average rounds to complete the session.


The normal contract was reached and jill Meyers led a spade. Shawn Quinn won her ace and returned a spade. Val Bloom won the spade return, cashed the ace and king of trumps then played a club to the king, which held the trick. She cashed the $\triangleleft K$ and played a diamond to the jack and queen, and back came the 10 . That meant two club losers and one down for a mere 2 MPs for the South Africans. The key to making 4 is to force the defence to open up the diamonds. Suppose that declarer plays a club to the king before touching trumps. If that is ducked, as is quite likely, she now draws trumps and plays a second club up, ducking. Whoever wins this trick must either establish a club for a diamond discard or open up the diamonds to declarer's advantage. And if West wins the first club and exits with a trump, ducking a club after drawing trumps is again good enough.

It looks as though West has to win the first

## Thanks to Orbis

The Polish Bridge Union wishes to thank Orbis S.A. for the financial support they have given to the Polish teams playing in the world championships here in Lille and again next week in the IOC Bridge Grand Prix in Lausanne, Switzerland.
club and return a low club to East's ten, a tough play to find. Now there is no obvious way home.

Board 22. E/W Vul. Dealer East.
A 9

- 754
$\diamond$ Q 65
\& K Q 642
- 54
©AJ62
AJ 87
- A 108

- K 732
- Q 983
$\diamond$ K 94
-97
Meyers/Quinn bid: Pass - INT - 2『-2A 2NT. Bloom led a low club, normally enough, and this ran to declarer's ten. Quinn played a spade at trick two and Holroyd won this to return a club. Quinn won her ace and played a second spade. Bloom won and cashed the clubs but Quinn had the rest; +120 and 18 MPs for the Americans.

Declarer can be restricted to one spade trick if the first round of the suit is ducked by the defence. Now the winning line is for declarer to play on diamonds in a winning fashion, which may not be the obvious line. If she does not get the position right, playing for example a second spade and hoping to find North with the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ so that the finesse provides a second dummy entry, she will go down.

Board 23. All Vul. Dealer South.


Holroyd opened $\downarrow \diamond$ as dealer and Bloom made a preemptive raise to $3 \diamond$ over Quinn's takeout double. Jill Meyers competed with $3 \checkmark$ now and there the matter rested. Holroyd cashed the two top spades then switched to ace of diamonds followed by a club. Meyers won the club in hand and thought for a good while about how to play the trumps. Eventually she played ace and low to the queen, so was down one; 32 MPs to the South Africans.

Board 24. Nil Vul. Dealer West.


Meyers' pass of the double of the transfer denied three spades so her later preference to 3s showed precisely a doubleton. The lead was a heart in response to the double of $2 \Omega$. Meyers won the ace and played the jack of clubs to the queen and ace. Next she finessed the J , cashed the A and led a second club towards the ten. When South played low without a flicker, Meyers ducked the club to the bare king. She ruffed the heart return, cashed the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ and played out the clubs. Bloom could ruff and force dummy with another heart but the diamond position meant that declarer could take the rest; II tricks. Plus 200 was worth 32 MPs to Meyers/Quinn, cancelling out the previous board.

Board 25. E/W Vul. Dealer North.

- A972
$\triangleright 983$
$\diamond$ AK 1086
* 7

| $\begin{aligned} & \qquad K Q J \\ & \diamond 102 \\ & \diamond 953 \\ & \diamond 986 \end{aligned}$ |  | E | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 1 K 4 \\ & 2 J 7 \\ & 210532 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { J } 765 \\ & 2 \\ & \text { K J } 4 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bloom | Truscott | Holroyd | Sanders |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 18 |
| 14 | Dble | 2NT | 3\% |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | 38 |

Bloom led the king of spades to dummy's ace. Carol Sanders led the club at trick two, finessing the jack, then cashed the ace and king of clubs, throwing spades from the dummy. On the lead of the fourth club, Holroyd ruffed in with the ten and dummy disposed of its last spade. Best is for the defence to play three rounds of trumps now, preventing the spade ruff in dummy and holding the contract to nine tricks. In practice, Holroyd led a spade and now dummy could ruff and there were just two trumps to lose; +170 and 23 MPs to Truscott/Sanders.

| Board 26. All Vul. Dealer East. |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| - 53 |  |
| Q QJ 1062 |  |
| $\diamond$ J1085 |  |
|  | - 53 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { A Q J IO } \\ & \odot 943 \end{aligned}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ K 98 |
|  | W - $\quad$ AK 87 |
| $\diamond 73$ | W E $\diamond$ AKQ 92 |
| * K Q 74 | S 29 |
|  | - 7642 |
|  | $\bigcirc 5$ |
|  | $\checkmark 64$ |
|  | AJ10862 |

The South Africans bid this one: $1 \diamond$ - I 2 ence that West was strong because she used fourth suit forcing when clearly able to bid no trump over $2 \checkmark$, hence Holroyd's invitational raise to $4 N T$.Truscott led the $\oslash Q$ to dummy's ace and Bloom led dummy's club at trick two. Surprisingly, Sanders went in with the ace and continued with a club. Now Bloom could test the diamonds and, when they did not divide, cash her black winners to squeeze North in the red suits; 12 tricks for +690 and 21 MPs.

Three pairs bid and made 6NT and three more brought home 6s on the $4-3$ fit. Only one of the pairs who bid a slam went down.

Board 27. Nil Vul. Dealer South.


Sanders opened the South hand with $1 \diamond$ and rebid INT over the $1 \triangleleft$ response. She played there on the lead of a spade to the ace. A second spade was ducked to dummy's queen and the jack of diamonds led. Holroyd rose with the $\diamond A$ and played her last spade, allowing Bloom to win and cash the 13th spade. Bloom switched to a club now and Sanders won and
played a low diamond to the ten and queen. She won the club return, played a heart to dummy, and finessed the $\diamond 8$. Finally Sanders cashed the $\diamond K$ and remaining top club then led a heart and Bloom had the last trick with the $\vee A ;+90$ and 21 MPs to the Americans.

Board 28. N/S Vul. Dealer West.


3NT is the place to be for North/South but it was not possible to get there after Bloom had opened 3k and Holroyd raised to 4e over Truscott's double. Sanders bid $4 \longdiv { \square }$ and played there.

The lead was the ace of clubs. Perhaps taking Holroyd's $\$ 2$ as suit preference, Bloom switched to a diamond at trick two. Sanders won in hand and played a heart to the queen then the 810 to her ace. Next she cashed the \&K and started on the diamonds. Holroyd ruffed the third diamond and exited with the §J, an error. Sanders could now win and draw the last trump with her eight, before cashing the remaining diamonds for ten tricks; +620 and 27 MPs.

If Holroyd switches to a spade after ruffing the diamond, what is declarer to do? The heart suit is blocked so that she can take the finesse against the jack but cannot then get back to hand to cash her king. The ©J must score a trick and now declarer is down one. True, if declarer has $\$ \mathrm{Q} 10$, a winning guess will allow her to win the A , run the 810 and cross to the Q Q to draw the last trump and make an overtrick, but even if declarer has this holding she may well go wrong on the spade switch. The defence of partner ducking the $\$ 10$ on this layout also saves the overtrick, but is perhaps a little fanciful.

At another table, the top Dutch pairing of Carla Arnolds and Bep Vriend faced Judi Radin and Hjordis Eythorsdottir of the United States. Radin also opened 3e but Arnolds did not double. Eythorsdottir also passed and it was left to Vriend to balance with $3 \diamond$. Arnolds converted to 3 NT , ending the auction.

The lead was the queen of clubs, ducked to declarer's king. Arnolds proceeded to get the diamonds right then cashed the 8 A , crossed to the 8 Q and ran the 810 . Now she cashed all her red winners and Radin was squeezed down to the bare ace of clubs to keep her spade guard. Arnolds exited with a club and a spade away from the king gave the I2th trick and a complete top for Arnolds/Vriend.

## No recommendation?

by Barry Rigal

Nissan Rand of Israel, a member of the winning team in the Elf Senior Teams, is known to be such a modest player that it is almost impossible to find a hand that he has played well. However, when I pressed him for details, he finally admitted to a hand which he described as routine, but which I consider to have been exceedingly well played. See what you think.

Board 14. Love All. Dealer East.

|  | - Q J 6 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 10943$ |
|  | $\checkmark 63$ |
|  | - K Q 76 |
| - 75 | N K 842 |
| -KQJ8752 | $N-\bigcirc A$ |
| $\diamond$ K 95 | W E Q 72 |
| - 5 | S AJ 1082 |
|  | - A 1093 |
|  | $\bigcirc 6$ |
|  | $\checkmark$ AJI0 84 |
|  | -943 |

Rand as West reached $4 \checkmark$ after South had overcalled in diamonds. He received a diamond lead to the 10 and king, and he had to make a key play at trick two. He led a club and North split his honours. Next he ruffed a club, went to the 8 A and ruffed another club. Then he ran the trumps.

This was the ending:


He led his last trump and watched South's discard carefully. South pitched a diamond, so he endplayed him in that suit and collected a spade at the end to score his contract. Had South bared his A , Rand would have endplayed him with it for an overtrick.


Coralia sponsors the Continuous Pairs

## Rosenberg solves double dummy problem

Pietro Bernasconi called the double dummy problem we printed in the Daily News "the most difficult I have ever conceived." Bernasconi set up the problems that caused 34 experts so many headaches in the Jean Besse Foundation Par Contest, sponsored by Compaq Computers. As he handed us this problem, Bernasconi said, "I want Michael Rosenberg to present me with the solution." Rosenberg was the winner of the $\$ 35,000$ first prize in the Par Contest.

Rosenberg did he was asked - he was the only player to turn in a correct solution. This was the problem:
$\Delta K 8$
$\diamond K 7654$
$\diamond K J 95$

- 65


The contract was 4 §, and the opening lead was the $\$$. The problem: make $4 \bigcirc$ against the best possible defence.

Rosenberg's analysis covered three pages much too long to print in the Daily News. However, the basic idea was as follows: If East discards a spade on the first trick, declarer must win. If East discards a diamond, declarer must duck. Work it out from there - if you can!

## Sisters!

Everyone knows that the Hacketts are brothers - they can't hide it with their names.

But there are five pairs of sisters in the Women's Pairs final, and they do manage to hide it well:

Anne-Frédérique Favas and Blandine De Hérédia both have their sisters in the field, respectively Véronique Bessis (née Favas) and Sylvie Willard (née De Hérédia). Sylvie's partner Bénédicte Cronier (née Pigeaud) is the sister of Fabienne Pigeaud. Catherine Poulain and Marie-Paule Cousson are locals, and sisters, although they don't play together.

Finally the Italians Luciana Capodanno and Marisa D'Andrea do play together, and they are locally known as "Le Sorelline".

## Do you have to tell when partner psychs?

Do you have to tell your opponents that your partner probably has psyched?
As South I was dealt the following hand in the Mixed Pairs:

Q Q 108
$\bigcirc 8643$
$\diamond 10865$
$\% \mathrm{~J} 10$
I opened INT even though we play II-I3 notrumps. The rest of the bidding:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | INT ${ }^{(1)}$ |
| Dble ${ }^{(2)}$ | Rdble ${ }^{(3)}$ | Pass | 2\% ${ }^{(4)}$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | Rdble ${ }^{(5)}$ |
| 2NT | All Pass |  |  |

(1) $11-13$
(2) $13+$
${ }^{(3)}$ 8+ - our only strong bid. Partner must pass
${ }^{(4)}$ Does not exist!
${ }^{(5)}$ SOS, alerted on both sides of screen,
asked and explained only on my side

The full deal:


Declarer made nine tricks. RHO called the director and complained that psyching in first hand was not allowed. N/S play a system where, in the sequence INT-x-xx-Pass, the opener must not bid. The information both East and West received was the same. 2\% was explained as "does not exist".

In the director's opinion it was quite safe to psych, knowing it would be doubled by LHO.

He said I could make any bid at the twolevel after partner's redouble to show him the psych.As a result the director considered this a Brown Sticker convention, forbidden here, and gave 60/40 to E/W.

In my opinion I did not have insurance against the sequence INT-Pass-3NT/4 $\ / 4$ Double. What was happening at the table seemed obvious to everyone but East, who didn't trust partner even though he bid twice.

E/W had the opportunity to make an expensive double or to bid at least 3 NT , which they didn't do. I didn't agree with the
rule and decided to appeal.
At the appeal hearing, the director, both opponents and my partner took part. East again claimed she was damaged because I didn't have the right to psych first in hand. I responded that I had psyched for the first time in a six-year-old partnership. My partner would sometimes psych, but we had never had a situation like this one. He said he wouldn't be crazy enough to make such a mad psych. The committee asked him what he thought would be a reasonable psych. He said you should have at least one suit to escape to.

I claimed I thought the director's ruling was wrong because I didn't agree that we were playing a brown sticker convention. If the bidding had gone some other way, how could I stop partner from bidding a game that probably would be redoubled, or from doubling the opponents?

I explained that the score of minus 150 would have been worth 507.9 out of 526 , while minus 400 would have been worth 426 . $40 \%$ was worth only 210.4 . The committee ruling shocked both my partner and me: "E/W get $50 \%$ instead of $60 \%$; N/S get $20 \%$ instead of $40 \%$. The score of $20 \%$ might seem a bit unjust to N/S, but it is meant as a reminder not to behave this way at the table against obvious weak pairs who are playing a championship to have some fun. Their fun would be destroyed if pairs like you behave this way. You could do something like this against the best pairs in our country - or maybe other countries. However, an opponent that obviously doesn't realize what is going on has to be told, 'My partner hasn't psyched for six years, but I think she has this time.' The deposit is returned."

The appeal hearing finished at 15.50 and the last qualifying session started 10 minutes later. We went in to play in shock and weren't tough enough to play reasonably, scoring only $42.5 \%$. So we missed the final by 202 points. Without this ruling we would have been able to afford this terrible session and still reach the final.

## Birta Birr, Germany

## Bobby Wolff's comment

It became apparent that the man in the N/S partnership had psyched some number of times. Here, against weak competition, the woman psyched, which is her right. However, the bidding developed in a way that the man was reasonably sure his partner had psyched. The committee thought this should be told to the opponents as partnership information. Since it wasn't, we felt N/S should bear the brunt of a bad score for "shooting fish in a barrel."

## Americans on Vugraph

t was American time on vugraph early in Wednesday's second session. On Boards 3 and 4 Ralph Katz and Chris Compton opposed Larry Cohen and David Berkowitz. Compton found his way to nine tricks in 3NT on Board 3.

Board 3. E/W Vul. Dealer South.

- 10985
$\bigcirc 754$
$\diamond 1065$
\& 74

- A 2

QQ1092
$\diamond$ A Q 7
\& Q 852

| West | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Katz | Cohen | East <br> Compton | South <br> Berkowitz |
| $2 \Phi$ | Pass | 3NT | $1 \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Berkowitz started with the $8 I O$ to the jack. Compton played the $\Phi \mathrm{Q}$ and Berkowitz withheld his ace. Compton transferred his attention to clubs, leading low from hand. Berkowitz rose with the queen and continued the attack on hearts. Compton won with the ace and cashed his clubs. Then he crossed to the $\triangle K$ and led the $\Phi K$. Berkowitz was able to win this and cash his good heart, but then he was forced to lead diamonds, giving Compton his ninth trick with the $\forall K$.

Cohen and Berkowitz play a INT response to a major as usually forcing, but Cohen decided on Board 4 that INT might be the best place to play the hand.

Board 4. Game All. Dealer West.

- A Q 84

○KQJ86
$\diamond 82$

- Q 4

| -10973 | N | - K 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 72$ |  | ¢ A 10543 |
| $\checkmark$ QJ 543 |  | $\diamond$ K 9 |
| \& 46 | S | \& K 753 |
|  | - J 65 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 9$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 1076 |  |
|  | a) 10982 |  |


| West | North <br> Cohen | East <br> Compton | South <br> Berkowitz |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | I $\vee$ | Pass | INT |
| Pass | Pass! | Pass |  |

At times it appeared that Berkowitz was going to make his contract - at other times it looked as if he was going down. Katz led a diamond to the king and ace, and Berkowitz decided his best chance was in clubs, so he led low to the queen and king. Back came the $\diamond 9$ to the 10 and jack, and the vugraph commentators thought Katz would cash the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$ and lead another diamond to set up his fifth diamond. Now the defence would take three diamonds, two clubs, one heart and most likely a spade as well.

But Katz switched to the $\Phi 10$, ducked to the king. Compton returned a club to Katz' ace, and now Katz could see nothing to do but play a heart. Compton won this for the sixth trick for the defence, but Berkowitz had the rest for a good matchpoint result.

Now two more American pairs took their places in the vugraph room - Zia and Bob Hamman against Doug Simson and Eric Rodwell.

## Board 5. N/S Vul. Dealer North.

- Q 5
- K 109432
$\diamond$ A Q 43
2 9

| A AJ 1062 | N | - K 874 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 J 8 |  | $\bigcirc 65$ |
| $\diamond$ K 10965 | W E | $\diamond 872$ |
| - 7 | S | - QJ 42 |
|  | - 93 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 7 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J |  |
|  | * AK 10 | 653 |


| West | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hamman | East <br> Rodwell | South <br> Zia | Simson |

Simson was faced with a tough decision at his last call. Defeating 44 should be easy, but would the penalty be sufficient to make it worthwhile if his side had a vulnerable game for the taking? And that was the other question - did his side have sufficient strength to win II tricks at hearts? He finally decided his hand was primarily offensive and bid 59 . The defence started with spades, then switched to a club. Rodwell took the ace and led a low club to ruff. Soon he was claiming his contract. Doubling 4s probably would have been worth only 500 , so bidding on paid off.

On the next board N/S can make $2 \square$ and with the spades splitting, $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ can make 2 A . So it makes sense for $N / S$ to go on to $3 \bigcirc$ and for E/W not to go on. And that's exactly what happened.

Board 6. E/W Vul. Dealer East.


The defence collected three clubs, a spade and a diamond for a one-trick set. N/S did well to go to the three level, and E/W did well to stop.

## 1997 World Championship Book



The book of the Hammamet World Championships is on sale at the Le Bridgeur shop in the main hall.

Edited by Brian Senior, the 304 page book includes coverage of all three teams championships, a full results service and listing of all participants. There is also cross-imping of both round robins and many photographs.

The main analysts are Eric Kokish, Brian Senior and Barry Rigal, with sections by Alan Truscott, Kit Woolsey, Walter Walvick, Geir Helgemo and Alain Levy.

As always, the best value bridge book of the year!


The lead seemed to change hands after every round in the third session of the Louis Vuitton Women's Pairs final. At the end of the session, Americans Jill Meyers and Shawn Quinn were narrowly ahead of Sabine Auken and Daniela von Arnim of Germany. Third were the Chinese pairing of Wenfei Wang and Yu Zhang.

Board 5. N/S Vul. Dealer North.


Bep Vriend found a nice bid on this deal. Gail Greenberg opened the North hand Is, Carla Arnolds overcalled 2e and Sylvia Moss raised to 24 . Vriend jumped to 3 NT with her six-card club fit! Greenberg led a low spade against 3 NT and Vriend won, cashed the $\diamond A$ and started on the clubs. When the $\diamond Q$ fell doubleton, she had an overtrick; +430 and 26 MPs out of 34 .

Board I I. Nil Vul. Dealer South.

|  | - 985 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 98$ |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 82 |
|  | 2 107432 |
| - A Q 4 | $\mathbf{N}$ ¢ 106 |
| Q Q 74 | W E A 063 |
| $\checkmark$ J 106 | W E $\diamond$ K 53 |
| - Q 965 | S AJ8 |
|  | - K 732 |
|  | ¢KJ 52 |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 974 |
|  | \& K |

Amalya Kearse made an innocent little reopening double and found that she was swimming in shark infested waters on this deal.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wei-Sender | Mitchell | Chambers | Kearse |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| INT | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| Rdbl | 20 | Dble | $2 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | Rdbl |
| Pass | 24 | Dble | All Pass |

Once Kathie Wei-Sender had redoubled INT to show her maximum, Juanita Chambers was happy to double everything in sight. The music stopped in 24 doubled and Chambers continued the good work by leading the 4.J. Jacqui Mitchell covered with the king and Wei-Sender won the ace then continued with a low spade to her partner's ten. Back came a third spade to the queen. Wei-Sender switched to a low club and Chambers won the ace and returned the ef, ruffed in dummy. Mitchell tried a low heart off the dummy now but Wei-Sender had seen that one before and went in with her queen. She cashed the 2 Q next before switching to the $\diamond$ J. That ran to the king and Chambers cashed the ace of hearts; three down for -500 and 33 MPs for Chambers/Wei-Sender.

## Board I3. All Vul. Dealer North.



The hot pair of the session to date had been newly crowned Louis Vuitton McConnell Cup champions, Doris Fischer and Terry Weigkricht of Austria. On this one, Fischer opened $4 \diamond$, a good 4s bid, and Weigkricht used Blackwood. Fischer's response to 4NT was $6 \%$, showing one ace plus a club void. Weigkrichr bid 64 and had no trouble making it after the lead of ace and another heart; +1430 and 33 MPs.

Board I4. Nil Vul. Dealer East.

|  | - Q 96 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 63$ |
|  | $\diamond 9432$ |
|  | \& KJ9 4 |
| - AJ 74 | N 8 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 10985 | w E ¢ AKJ74 |
| $\checkmark$ K 8 | W E $\diamond$ AJ76 |
| ¢ 52 | S A 76 |
|  | 4 K 10532 |
|  | $\bigcirc 2$ |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 105 |
|  | \% Q 1083 |



## Veronique Bessis

Jan Cormack and Liz Havas of Australia gained swift revenge by bidding a slam themselves on the very next board. Havas opened I 8 as East and Cormack, formerly of New Zealand, raised to $4 \checkmark$ over Weigkricht's Is overcall. Havas just jumped to $6 \bigcirc$, ending the auction. She won the trump lead, drew the remaining trump and played king, ace and a third diamond, ruffing. When the queen came down, Havas had a discard for dummy's losing club and could take two club ruffs for +1010 and 27 MPs.

Board I8. N/S Vul. Dealer East.

- 6
$\triangleright K$ Q
$\diamond$ QJ 982
\& A Q 1064


| West | North <br> Weigkricht | Yu Zhang | East |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fischer | South |
| Wenfei W |  |  |  |

China's Zhang Yu and Wenfei Wang had suffered a bad opening session to the final but were storming through the field now. Their charge was temporarily halted by good Austrian defence on this deal.
$2 \diamond$ showed a single-suited major hand. Whether 2NT was natural or intended to show the minors is unclear. If the latter, the message did not get across to Wang who converted to her threadbare spade suit.

Weigkricht led the ace and another heart to dummy's king. Wang pitched a diamond on
the second heart then played a spade, won by the ten. Fischer switched to a diamond now and Weigkricht won the ace and returned a second diamond to declarer's king. Wang played a second trump and Fischer thought a little then worked it out and overtook her partner's queen with the ace to give her a diamond ruff. There was still the $\boldsymbol{j}$ to come for two down; minus 200 and only 8 MPs for the Chinese pair.

Board 20. All Vul. Dealer West.


Ruth Levit-Porat and Migri Tzur-Albu of Israel had a very simple auction on this one: 19-24-44, where 2 was weak. The lead was the $\vee$ Q.Tzur-Albu won in dummy, cashed the ace of trumps then played ace and ruffed a low club. She cashed the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ then played a heart to dummy and played the K . Had North ruffed this, it would have been at the expense of a spade trick, so she discarded a heart. But it did her no good at all. Declarer continued with the heart winners and again North could not ruff in without giving up her second trump trick. She discarded diamonds, as did Tzur-Albu. In the four-card ending, declarer ruffed a club, forcing North to bare her ace of diamonds. Now a diamond threw her in and she had to give up her second trump trick after all by leading them at trick twelve. That gave the Israelis eleven tricks, +650 , and a complete top.


When the pair from Israel played this deal they were occupying the East/West seats against the French pair, Fabienne Pigeaud and

Rachel Menil. Pigeaud opened $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ as dealer and when this came around to Levit-Porat she doubled.Tzur-Albu passed that so $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ doubled became the final contract. With East/West cold for game, the board was all about whether they could get a second undertrick against $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ doubled.

The start was not good for the defence. With a blind lead,Tzur-Albu guessed to lead a spade, which cost a defensive trick immediately. Levit-Porat put in the $\$ 10$, losing to the jack. Pigeaud returned a spade and Tzur-Albu went in with the king and played a third round of the suit. Levit-Porat won the A and switched to ace and another heart to her partner's king. Now it was unclear how many hearts everyone had and Tzur-Albu played a third round, allowing Pigeaud to ruff in dummy while pitching a club from hand. She continued by playing a club to the queen, cashing the 2A and playing the 13 th spade. Tzur-Albu ruffed in with the nine in front of dummy and played a diamond to the ace. Levit-Porat played a club through but Pigeaud ruffed low and Tzur-Albu had to lead into the $\forall \mathrm{KJ}$ at trick twelve; one down for -200 and 29 MPs to the French pair.

Board 27. Nil Vul. Dealer South.

- 973
-K 32
$\diamond$ K 543
\& K 65


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bessis | Tzur-Albu | D'Ovidio <br> Levit-Porat |  |
|  |  |  | $1 \$$ |
| 1s | $2 \vee$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | 24 | $3 \varnothing$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

When you had hopes of making a partscore and the opposition compete further, you often have to make tight doubles which you would not even consider at IMP scoring. That is what Catherine D'Ovidio did on this deal.Veronique Bessis led a top spade and switched to the Q to surround a hypothetical jack in declarer's hand. Levit-Porat went up with the K K and played a heart to her ace followed by the $\diamond$ Q. D'Ovidio won the $\forall A$ and played back a spade. Bessis took two spade tricks and continued with ace and ten of clubs. Declarer ruffed, drew trumps and had the rest. Down one for -I00 was worth only 7 MPs to the Israelis.

## Société GÉnérale Group : Profile

## Société Générale is a key player in the increasingly global banking market

- European Loan House of the Year (IFR)

N 1 1 bookrunner for all French franc bond issues (IFR)
N 11 bank for DEM/FRF and USD/FRF currency swaps, FRF interest rate options and CAC 40 index options (Risk Magazine)
$\mathbf{N}^{\circ} 4$ arranger of syndicated credits by number of issues (excluding US) (IFR)
$\mathrm{N}^{0} 13$ bookrunner for all international equity issues (IFR)
N 14 adviser for European cross-border mergers and acquisitions (Acquisitions)

France:
$\mathbf{N}^{\circ} 1$ lead manager for equity and convertible bond issues
$\mathbf{N}^{\circ} 1$ bookrunner for equity block trades on the secondary market
$\mathbf{N}^{01}$ mutual fund manager (based on assets under management)

7th largest bank worldwide based on total assets*
13th largest capitalization on the Paris stock exchange at December 31, 1997
350,000 shareholders
2,600 branches in France (including Crédit du Nord)
500 offices in 80 countries

Ratings at December 31, 1997
Aa3 (Moody's), AA (IBCA),
AA- (Standard \& Poor's)

* The Banker, July 1998


GROUP


Appeal No. 25
Reported by David Stevenson (Great Britain)

## Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Grattan Endicott (Great Britain), David Stevenson (Great Britain).

## Open Pairs Semifinal USA v Netherlands

North/South: Hampson/Greco
East/West: Ramer/Paulissen
Board I. Dealer North. No-one vulnerable.

(1) $14-17 \mathrm{HCP}$
${ }^{(2)}$ One-suiter
${ }^{(3)}$ Strong
${ }^{(4)}$ Asks for suit


Rendezvous with the World Bridge Championships very day at 18:40 on Radio France Frequence Nord 94.7 or in Lille 87.8

## Result at table:

3 plus two, N/S -200.

## Facts:

The Director was called by East/West at the end of the play. It was suggested that North's actions "fielded" South's strange INT opening.

## TD's decision:

Table score stands. Law 75A. There was no evidence of undisclosed partnership agreements.

## Appellant:

East/West appealed.

## The players:

East suggested that it was possible that North/South were known in their home country for agreements over psyches, in which case an alert would be required for the INT opening. He agreed that he had stronger methods of trying for game, but decided against using them because he felt with all the points shown around the table his partner must be weak.

West said the double could be made with as little as KQJ $10 \times$ with nothing outside.

North said that he could never remember South psyching an opening bid before, and that they had been playing together for four years. He did not really believe that his opponents produced overcalls that asked to go for 1100 , and believed they were merely appealing because they had got a bad board through their bidding. His methods allowed him to bid 3NT direct, and he probably would have if he had a fifth diamond.

South said that he decided to try something because they were not doing very well, and their opponents appeared to be getting all decisions right. He said that if his partner had doubled $3 \bigcirc$ he would not have passed.

## The Committee:

The Committee asked the Chief Director whether North/South were known for a history of psyching in the ACBL. He said he had no knowledge of such a history.

Law 40A says: "A player may make any call or play (including an intentionally misleading call - such as a psychic bid - or a call or play that departs from commonly accepted, or previously announced, use of a convention), without prior announcement, provided that such call or play is not based on a partnership understanding."

The Committee reminded players that psyches are perfectly legal if not protected by a partnership understanding. There was no
evidence of such an understanding here and it appeared that East/West had not bid their hands to the full. Since there was no understanding, there was no reason for any alert of the INT bid nor any case for any adjustment.

## The Committee's decision:

The Committee ruled:Director's ruling confirmed - table score stands. Deposit forfeited.

## Appeal No. 26

Reported by Herman De Wael (Belgium)

## Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Naki Bruni (Italy), David Stevenson (Great Britain), Herman De Wael (Belgium). George Retek (Canada) attended but excused himself.

## Open Pairs - Semifinal Argentina v USA

North/South: Poleschi/Alujas
East/West: Wildavsky/Morse
Board 19. Dealer North. N/S vulnerable.

> Q J 6
> \& K 10
> $\diamond$ AK 10764
> J J 10


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 18 |
| Pass | $14^{(1)}$ | Pass | 20 ${ }^{(2)}$ |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

${ }^{(1)}$ Relay (nothing about spades)
(2) N/E: 5 $+49 / \triangleleft$ OR $5>332$

S/W: 5 +4 + / / OR $5 \vee 332$.

## Result at table:

$3 N T+4, N / S+520$

## Facts:

The explanation that East received about the bid of did not conform to the true meaning of the call, which was the one explained by South to East. East claims he might have led spades in stead of clubs with the correct information.

## TD's decision:

Misinformation, No Damage, Score Stands.

## Appellant:

East/West appealed.

## The players:

North/South did not attend the Committee meeting, and neither did West, as the only problem was with East's lead. East stated that had he received the correct information, his chances of finding the more successful spade lead were greater.

## The Committee:

The Committee decided that the explanation that East received was consistent with nine possible distributions in South: 3541, 2542, I543, 35 I4, 2524, I534, 2533, 3523,3532 . In five of these, there are more clubs than spades in dummy. In two, the number of spades and clubs is equal, and in two, there are more spades than clubs. In any case four spades is impossible, while four clubs is. With the correct explanation, seven distributions remain: 5 with more clubs, I equal, and I with more spades.

Although the relative frequency of each of these distributions is not absolutely equal, the Committee felt that the spade lead stood out nevertheless.

The Committee felt the player had tried to play the board three times, once at the table, once before the Director, and a third time before the Committee. While it is perfectly normal for him to call upon the Director if he feels damaged, a higher standard is needed before the Committee.

The Director had given a well thought through ruling. By appealing, the player had proved only a lack of faith in the Director. The Appeals Committee at World Championships does not act as a safety net for incompetent Directors, especially when these Directors prove time and again their quality. For this reason the Committee felt the appeal lacked merit.

## The Committee's decision:

The Committee ruled: Decision upheld, Score stands. The deposit was forfeited.


Don't leave Lille without visiting the boutique CARA, a refined and unrivalled place for lovers of luxury.

Let yourself be charmed by my selection of gifts coming from the most prestigious companies.

With me, you will discover the pleasure of giving presents.

## Laurence Bourdon

65, rue Nationale - 59800 Lille
Tél. 205442 19-Fax 20300472

## Appeal No. 27

Reported by Rich Colker

## Appeals Committee:

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

## Tournament Director:

O. Beauvillain

## Women's Pairs, 29 August 98 Ireland (N/S) v France (E/W)

N/S: O'Neill/Meehan
E/W: D'Elbee/Roth
Board IO. Dealer East. Both Vulnerable.

- K 63

810852
$\diamond$ J 104 \& 1062

${ }^{(1)}$ Alerted by North to East; explained as a weak-two overcall
${ }^{(2)}$ Negative double
${ }^{(3)}$ Explanation in (I) corrected by North: " $2 \bigcirc$ was normal"

## Facts:

At the table 5ent down one, plus 100 for N/S. North alerted South's $2 \triangleleft$ bid and explained it as a "weak-two" because she believed at the time that East had opened l\&. She realized her mistake after West's 4NT bid and corrected her previous explanation, saying that $2 \checkmark$ was a "normal" overcall. The TD was called by East at that point because, after the original explanation, her system forced her to double to show a "good" hand (31 would have just been competitive). She said that had she been given the correct explanation she would have bid 34, which in this case is a good hand.

## TD's decision:

The TD ruled that, had East been properly alerted she would have bid 34, and West would have competed to 4\$ over South's $4 \checkmark$. It was then likely that N/S might have allowed the contract to make either by South leading
the 9 K or leading a top diamond but then not finding the low trump switch. (In point of fact, 4. making by East/West was a normal score in the event.) Thus, according to Laws 75C, 40 C and I2C2 the TD adjusted the score for both sides to 4a by East, plus 620 for E/W.

## Appellant:

$\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$ appealed.

## The players:

Only N/S attended the hearing.
South stated that she would have led a high diamond (after all, why else was she dealt the $\diamond A K$ ?) and then would have made the obvious shift to a low trump. Thus, 49 would have been defeated. North added that East should have realized from the original description of $2 \varnothing$ that something was wrong: no one plays a non-jump two-level overcall as specifically weak.

When asked by the Committee, N/S could not remember how West had gone down in $5 \&$. South led the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and shifted to the 8 K . East then played a spade to dummy's ace and a second spade as North rose with the king, felling South's queen. North thought that she then led a second heart, but somehow declarer had managed to lose another trick and neither North nor South could explain how.

## The Committee:

The Committee believed that East would have bid 34 over $3>$ had she not been misinformed and that E/W would most likely have played 44. Based in part on results which were typical of the board and in part on N/S's defense of $5 \%$, the Committee decided that it was "probable" that 44 would be made. However, the Committee was not convinced that E/W deserved full protection to making.

## The Committee's decision:

The Committee decided to adjust the score for N/S (the offending pair) to 49 making, -620 . Since it was not clear that $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ would have made 41 $100 \%$ of the time, the Committee decided to protect E/W to Average Plus or +620 , whichever was less. The deposit was returned.

## Macallen Championship

The Macallan International Bridge Pairs Championship, one of the most prestigious invitational tournaments in the world, will take place on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, 20-22 January, 1999 in London at the White House Hotel.

Paul Mendelson and Helen Schapiro, who are here in Lille, advise that shortly after the end of the various world championship events they hope to finalize invitations for all the pairs who will participate in the Macallan.

## Extraordinaire!

America's Stevie Robinson and Peter Boyd were on the wrong end of a brilliant deceptive play by France's Simon de Wijs on this board from the 4th session of the Société Générale World Open Pairs Championship.

They were so impressed they made sure the details made their way into the Daily News!

Board I. Love All. Dealer North.

- 432
- Q 62
$\checkmark 3$
\& K Q 1073

| $\begin{aligned} & \& K Q 10 \\ & \otimes 1073 \\ & \diamond \text { K } 1062 \\ & \& \text { A J } 2 \end{aligned}$ | N A 8765 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | W E $\quad$ - 9854 |
|  | W E $\diamond 17$ |
|  | S -98 |
|  | -19 |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AKJ |
|  | $\diamond$ A Q 984 |
|  | +654 |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Robinson | San Prooijen <br> Boyd <br> de Wijs |  |  |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | INT |
|  | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

With an awkward lead West went for the old standby, 'fourth best of your longest and strongest'.

The $\triangleleft 2$ went to the jack and declarer's ace! He played a club to the king and when that held he came back to hand with a heart and played another club to the queen. He then cleared the club suit.West was in with the ace and was at the crossroads.

East had followed to the clubs with the eight and then the nine. It was a Smith Peter situation but here East had been dealt poor spot cards and in any event would usually give count in case declarer could be cut off from the club suit. However in that situation many players then simply use the next suit as the one in which to tell partner how they feel about the opening lead. East had played the 84 on the first round of the suit and discarded the 89 on the third round of clubs. That would tend to suggest that East was hoping for a switch.

Whatever, West played the $\diamond K$ and followed it with a low one. Now declarer had eleven tricks.

Should West have been able to see through declarer's brilliant deception?

In our experience the image created in the mind when declarer plays the ace of diamonds is virtually impossible to overcome whatever the evidence of the subsequent cards played by partner.

## Opportunity Missed



Howard Cohen and Bob Brinig were the only pair to bid this thin slam in Monday morning's Continuous Pairs game.Alas, Brinig went down, only seeing the correct line of play after the end of the hand.

INT was strong, $2 \diamond$ a transfer, and $3 \diamond$ natural and forcing. Now Brinig decided that the hand should be played in hearts rather than no trump and, with a good hand, jumped to $4 \oslash$ on his doubleton. Cohen was interested in slam now and cuebid $5 \%$. Brinig cuebid in turn and now Cohen had to sign-off due to his lack of a spade control. Looking at the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$, Brinig went on to six.

The opening lead was a low spade to the ace. Back came a second spade and Brinig took the king. He played a club to the king, a trump back to hand, then threw dummy's remaining spade on the A. Next Brinig drew the trumps and hoped that something good would develop. He played a diamond to the ace and a diamond back to the king but North had to win the last trick with the $\diamond$ J for one down and a zero.

Brinig was unhappy with himself, realising that had he chosen a better line he could have converted that zero into a top board. After throwing the spade loser on the ace of clubs, he should have ruffed a club before drawing trumps. It was not possible to establish the long club, but he would have seen North discard on the third round. Now he would have known that North held four diamonds in the ending. The percentage play would then be to lead low to the nine of diamonds and that would have brought home the slam.

## When a Negative can be Positive

The Leighton brothers, Maurice and Cecil, from England, did not have a great time in the Seniors Pairs qualifying sessions on Monday but they did achieve one outright top against 'a famous ex-Italian'. This was the deal:

Board I8. N/S Vul. Dealer East.

- 9

คAK 64
$\diamond$ AJ 106
\& Q 852

| ¢ J 10532¢ 92 | 2 N |  | - AKQ 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Q 10873 |
| $\checkmark$ K 97 | W E |  | Q 5 |
| - 103 | S |  |  |
|  | - 764 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 5$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 843$ |  |  |
|  | \& AKJ 974 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  |  | 18 | 2s |
| Dble | 5\% | 54 | Pass |
| Pass | 68 | Pass | Pass |
| Dble Ald | All Pass |  |  |

The Leightons play a convention known in England as 'negative slam doubles'. Basically, in a possible sacrifice auction, you cannot double a slam to say it is going down, rather you tell partner how many defensive tricks you believe yourself to hold. The idea is that you judge right whether to save more often than when using traditional methods.

Here, East's pass over showed zero or one defensive trick, and West's double showed one trick (the $\triangleleft K$ ). With two defensive tricks, West would have to pass $6 \%$. Knowing that his brother was looking at a defensive trick, and believing that he too would make a trick, East passed the double. Had he held no defensive trick, he would have taken the save.
6. doubled was one down for a complete top to East/West, and a result they will both remember for a very long time. So you see, a negative (slam double) can lead to a positive (result).

## OFFICIAL ENCYCLOPEDIA OF BRIDGE

Work is beginning on the next edition of the Encyclopedia of Bridge. Some NCBOs already have the forms which are to be completed, giving information. If your NCBO has not yet got them, please apply to Alan Truscott in the Press Room. Suggestions for improving the Encyclopedia are welcome.

## AVENTURES LILLOISES

## par PHILIPPE BRUNEL

## LA VOIE ROYALE

Paires seniors - 3ème séance - finale
Voici une jolie séquence d'enchères réalisée par Jean-Marc Roudinesco associé à Claude Delmouly pour être l'une des rares paires à atteindre ce grand chelem à Sans-atout.

| \& ARD963 D <br> - RV7 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ouest CDY | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est } \\ & \text { JMR } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20 * \\ & 2! \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\mathbf{3}}{\mathbf{2} * *}$ |  |
| 3SA | 40* |  |
| 4 ${ }^{*}$ | 4SA* |  |
| 5\% | $5 \wedge^{*}$ |  |
| 54 | 60* |  |
| 7SA |  |  |

20: fort indéterminé
$2 \checkmark: 3$ contrôles ; 5 cartes à $\vee$ ou plus
4\%, 4 $\downarrow$ : cue-bid
4SA : BW atout
$5 \diamond$ : BW aux Rois extérieurs
6\% : interrogatives aux Dames des couleurs nommées $(\nabla+\Phi)$

## LE PRIX DE L'IMAGINATION

Yves Parain et Xavier Dubus sont les seuls représentants du Comité des Flandres dans cette finale du paires Open. Voici une de leurs donnes:


| Ouest | Nord | Est | Sud |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $2 \diamond^{*}$ | $2 \vee$ |
| $X^{*}$ | $4 \bigcirc$ | 49 | 5 |
| $X$ (fin) |  |  |  |

[^1]Ouest continue du Roi de $\diamond$, coupé. Yves Parain « visualise » maintenant les mains. II met le Roi de $\vee$ en Ouest et imagine la main avec laquelle Est a reparlé rouge contre vert :

## Ouest : $\Delta x x>R x \diamond A R x x$ Dxxx

Est: $\boldsymbol{4} \times$ Axxxxx $\diamond$ Dxxxx x
Cohérent avec lui-même, il tire l'As de $\vee$, joue le Valet de qui fait la levée et pour le 9 et la défausse d'Est. Pendant quelques secondes, il pense avoir touché le gros lot. Mais, quand il joue I'As de Est coupe du Roi de $\triangleright$ et tire l'As de $\boldsymbol{\Phi}$. Pauvre Yves! Une de chute ... tout seul dans son coin.

Voici les mains réelles :
Ouest : $463 \vee 8 \diamond$ AR982 D654
Est : \& Al09542 $\vee$ R7 $\diamond$ DI053 \& 2
UN LACHER DE CERVEAU

| Paires Open - finale - 3ème séance |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Est donneur. Nord/Sud vulnérables |  |  |
| -1053 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ V94 |  |  |
| $\diamond$ D86 |  |  |
| * DI096 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& AR7642 } \\ & \& \text { Al02 } \end{aligned}$ | N | - V8 |
|  | $0^{N}$ | $\bigcirc$ RD73 |
| $\checkmark$ VIO | 0 E | $\diamond$ R732 |
| \& A2 | S | \& 753 |
| - D9 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 865$ |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ A954 |  |  |
| 2 RV84 |  |  |


| Ouest | Nord | Est | Sud |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Le Poder | Odzil | Solari | Zaremba |
|  |  | Passe | Passe |
| Is | passe | ISA | passe |
| $3 \Phi$ | passe | $4 \Phi$ | passe |
| passe | passe |  |  |

Entame: 9 de
Le déclarant laissa passer le Roi de et perdit sa chance de réaliser II levées. En effet, il prit le retour et joua petit vers le Valet pour 10 levées... et un mauvais coup. Il aurait du plonger de l'As, tirer deux tours d'atout et vérifier la distribution des $\bigcirc$ pour une éventuelle défausse de son 2 de .Très vite, II se rendit compte de son erreur et la position des cartes ne fit qu'accentuer ses regrets !

VA QUE JETE POUSSE<br>par Colette Grosfils (Belgique)

## Paires Open - finale - 3ème séance

Nord donneur. Nord/Sud vulnérables

- R1095
$\bigcirc 104$
$\diamond$ RV9542
\& 5

| - 62 |  | N |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ D |  | N | V986 |
| $\diamond$ D10876 | 0 | E |  |
| \& RV874 |  | S | 9632 |
|  |  | ADV8 |  |
|  |  | R7532 |  |
|  |  | A3 |  |
|  |  | 10 |  |
| Ouest | Nord | Est | Sud |
| Berkowitz | Campos | Cohen | Villas Boas |
|  | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \bigcirc$ | contre |
| passe | passe | surcontre | passe |
| 3\% | passe | passe | $3 \checkmark$ |
| contre | 34 | 4\% | $4{ }^{1}$ |
| 5\% | passe | passe | passe |

Sur l'ouverture d'un $2 \triangleleft$ faible, Cohen enchérit à $2 \checkmark$ que Villas Boas contre punitivement.

Cohen surcontre (SOS) et c'est comme si, dès septembre, le Père Noël arrivait...avec l'annonce de 3s chez Berkowitz.
$3 \diamond$ chez Villas Boas, contre chez Cohen, 3↔ chez Campos qui révèle ainsi sa deuxième couleur, 4\&, 4e,5e chez Berkowitz.

Villas Boas va-t-il contrer ? Au vu des enchères, il se rend compte qu'un de ses deux As va être coupé et que s'il contre, il pourrait se rapprocher du zéro absolu ! Il passe. Sur l'entame \& le déclarant réalise 12 levées.

## Fair Play

Saluons le fair-play de la paire Cuthbert-son-Matheson. Michel Bessis, au contrat $\mathrm{d}^{\prime} \| \diamond$, était en principe à moins 2. L'un des flancs, pour activer, montra son jeu au déclarant pendant que son partenaire réfléchissait encore. Bien que la chance qu'il se trompe soit infime, il demandèrent d'eux-mêmes au déclarant de n'inscrire que moins un - soit un écart notable en leur défaveur sur la donne. Comme le disait Philippe Cronier, nous sommes bien loin de l'ambiance des tournois de clubs parisiens.
Frinal Session one

The third session of the Société Générale World Open Pairs Championship Final saw all the leading pairs making early appearances on vugraph. At least they were early for when our reporter arrived Jean-Paul Meyer was doing his best to give a solo commentary in French and English! First up were the overnight leaders from Great Britain.

Board 3. E/W Vul. Dealer South.


Maj is the nickname by which Thanassis Matziaris likes to be known. He is perhaps more familiar as the Internet Editor at all major championships. At least two of the Editors would like to think he has read so much of their material that it has turned him into a top class player!

As you can see there is nothing wrong with his judgement as he made the winning decision to pass his partner's 3s bid.

South not unreasonably led his partner's suit and declarer won and played a diamond.


Maria Vlachaki (Greece)

North won and switched to the 10 for the king and ace. South played his remaining club and declarer won, discarding a heart, and played dummy's remaining diamond. North won and played a top club. East ruffed high as South discarded a heart. When East played her remaining diamond South could ruff in front of dummy or discard hoping his partner could ruff. Either way the defence could only take four tricks. - 140 was a terrible score for N/S worth only 6 of 70 matchpoints.

Board 4. Game All. Dealer West.

- K 975
®93
-A974
K 42

| - 64 | $\mathbf{N}$, AQJ8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PJ6 |  | $\bigcirc 87$ |
| $\checkmark$ QJ 105 |  | $\checkmark 8632$ |
| \% QJ65 3 | S | * 108 |
|  | - 1032 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AKQ 10542 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K |  |
|  | \& 97 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maj | Cuthbertson | Vlachaki | Matheson |
| Pass | Pass | 19 | 3 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Barry Rigal can usually be relied upon to predict both the course of the bidding and the play. Whilst he is usually right about the latter he is sometimes seen to be at odds with the bidding views of his fellow experts.

Here he opined that East might well open I 4 in preference to introducing the emaciated diamond suit. Barry's point was a good one, as a spade lead would defeat $3 \bigcirc$ in double quick time.

Whereupon East promptly opened l\&!
West preferred the solid looking lead of the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ and declarer won in hand and drew two rounds of trumps before playing a spade to the nine and East's jack. East correctly returned a diamond so declarer discarded a club on the ace and then ruffed a diamond in order to start running his trumps. When East fatally parted with her remaining diamond she was squeezed in the black suits and eventually thrown in to concede a vital tenth trick. +170 collected 53 of 70 and kept the leaders in the hunt.

It was the turn of the second-place pair to appear in front of the cameras and they became involved in one of the more exciting auctions of the tournament.

Board 5. N/S Vul. Dealer North.

| $\begin{aligned} & \& K 1095 \\ & \diamond 104 \\ & \diamond K J 9542 \\ & \& 5 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{62}{ } \\ & \diamond \mathrm{Q} \\ & \diamond \mathrm{Q} 108 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \qquad A Q J 8 \\ & \vee K 7532 \\ & \diamond A 3 \\ & \& Q 10 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| West <br> Berkowitz | North Campos | East Cohen | South Vilas Boas |
|  | $2 \checkmark$ | 2 | Dble |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pass } \end{aligned}$ | Pass | Rdble | Pass |
|  | Pass | Pass | 3 |
| Dble 5\% | 34 | 4\% | $4{ }^{4}$ |
|  | All Pass |  |  |

When Larry Cohen overcalled the weak $2 \triangleleft$ opening South made a penalty double. West had nowhere to go but after due consideration East decided to look elsewhere. When 3 came round to him you can hardly blame South for not going quietly. $3 \diamond$ doubled is clearly laydown but North knew his partner had to have some spades so he removed. The rest of the bidding was sort of inevitable and South did well not to double in rage. North led his trump and West won and played the $\bigcirc$ Q to dummy's ace. When the $\wp \mathrm{J}$ pinned North's ten declarer could claim 12 tricks, playing on a crossruff and losing only to the 9Q. 38 of 70 for the Americans and good entertainment for the audience.

Board 8. Love All. Dealer West.
© AK 4
คA9 9
$\diamond$ A 7

- J 10984

- QJ9 85

ค 1053
$\diamond$ K 10
\& AK 7

| West | North | East <br> Faigenbaum | South <br> Graves |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mittelman | Pilon |  |  |
| $2 \vee$ | $2 N T$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Only two pairs bid a slam on this deal, but inasmuch as 12 tricks in notrumps scored 55.6 of 70 matchpoints, that was the main issue here. We all know no God-fearing Frenchman would dare open a weak two without a six-card suit but that information had not reached Graves even though France has a very strong connection with Canada. The opening lead was the $\oslash \mathrm{J}$. When Graves ducked, a vital trick had gone west and +460 collected only 19.6.

We returned later to see more of the leading pairs in action and we were not disappointed. One of the French players produced a sparkling piece of dummy play.

| Board 17. Love All. Dealer North. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - 54 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ A Q 54 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ K 10953 |  |  |  |
| ¢ 87 |  |  |  |
| ¢ K Q 103 |  | N |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ AJ W E $\quad$ Q 764 |  |  |  |
| - A10532 S 26 |  |  |  |
| ¢ J 9876 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc{ }^{1} 3$ |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 82$ |  |  |  |
| * QJ9 4 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Le Poder | Ozdil | Solari | Zaremba |
|  | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| 2\% | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

Faced with a difficult opening lead North selected the $\diamond 10$ which ran to declarer's jack. He ran the 98 to South's jack and won the diamond return with the ace. He played the 86 and when North played low after considerable thought he won with dummy's 9 . Now North was cut off and declarer read the hand perfectly. He played three rounds of clubs and
when South exited with a spade he won with dummy's ace, returned to hand with a spade and exited with a club. South won and played a spade. However, declarer had a complete count and finessed the 10 . Only $54 / 70$ as 15 declarers made 10 tricks but still a pleasure to watch.

There was just time to catch one more deal.

Board 20. Game All. Dealer West.
A A6542
$\triangleright$ Q
$\diamond$ J 10976

- A 9

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& J } 7 \\ & \vee \mathrm{KJI} 105 \end{aligned}$ | - | 4 K 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N |  |
|  | $w^{N}$ | - A 7432 |
| $\checkmark$ K 3 |  | $\diamond$ A 852 |
| ¢ Q 6432 | S | 9K 8 |
|  | - Q 1093 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 986$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 4 |  |
|  | * 1075 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| De Boer | Shek | Muller | Calderwood |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{L a s}$ | Dble | 49 |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

It was a good time to have a two-suited gadget available on the N/S cards - it made life very difficult for the Dutchmen. East, faced with a very awkward lead, eventually tried the ace and another diamond. West won with the $\triangleleft K$ and switched to the 810 . East won and returned the suit so declarer ruffed and cashed the A. Perhaps imagining that West had both the remaining trumps and four diamonds, declarer played on diamonds, trying to get rid of dummy's losing clubs. Now the defence could get at their club trick so the contract was two down. Minus 500 was still good, scoring 47 of 70 but minus 200 would have been a huge 64 of 70 .

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


Hervé Cassar, 'Directeur adjoint' of Elf France the World famous Oil Company, pictured here with José Damiani the President of the WBF, was the latest celebrity to visit the VIP club. Elf who know all about Kings in the field of Formula One Grand Prix are now supporting 'Aces' of a different kind!

## The singleton ace

Zeke Jabbour of the United States decided to play for a singleton ace of trumps on this deal from the Senior Pairs. When he found that his wish had come true, he took full advantage.

- K Q 105
- A 1094
$\diamond$ Q 6
2 754
- J 97432
- K 53
$\diamond$ AK 5
- 8

| West | North | East | South <br> IS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $3{ }^{(1)}$ | Pass | 4 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

${ }^{(1)}$ Limit raise in spades.
Jabbour decided to go for broke with his aggressive distribution. West led a club and Jabbour ruffed the club continuation. He then cashed three diamonds, pitching dummy's last club on the third diamond. Only then did he touch trumps, and he was pleased to see West rise with the ace, as hoped. West, holding both the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ and the $\S \mathrm{J}$, tried a deceptive $\vee \mathrm{J}$, but Jabbour wasn't fooled. He let the jack ride to his king, then took a finesse to the $\$ 9$. Making five was an excellent matchpoint result.


AIR FRANCE, official carrier


## Chagas plays every Championship board

Gabriel Chagas of Brazil has played every board in every major championship for which he was eligible. Altogether his board total is 742 , which works out to approximately 53 boards a day for the entire tournament.
Listed below are the players who have played the most boards in championship events. Secondary events such as the Zonal championships are not included.
The "Iron Man"Award
Gabriel Chagas

| Player | Country | Deals | Mixed | Ros/MC/Q | Ros/MC/KO | Pairs |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gabriel Chagas | BRA | 742 | 124 | 140 | 336 | 142 |
| Anton Maas | NLD | 734 | 124 | 140 | 224 | 246 |
| Betty Speelman | NLD | 706 | 124 | 130 | 112 | 340 |
| Bep Vriend | NLD | 706 | 124 | 130 | 112 | 340 |
| Daniela von Arnim | DEU | 674 | 124 | 130 | 280 | 140 |
| Marcelo Branco ${ }^{(7)}$ | BRA | 670 | 52 | 140 | 336 | 142 |
| Steve Robinson $^{(7)}$ | USA | 656 | 72 | 130 | 112 | 342 |
| Peter Boyd | USA | 656 | 72 | 130 | 112 | 342 |
| Terry Weigkricht | AUT | 622 | 72 | 130 | 280 | 140 |
| Miguel Vilas Boas | BRA | 618 |  | 140 | 336 | 142 |
| Joao Paulo Campos | BRA | 618 |  | 140 | 336 | 142 |
| Sabine Auken ${ }^{(4)}$ | DEU | 612 | 52 | 140 | 280 | 140 |

(1) +12 boards par contest
(m) +48 boards zonal mixed pairs

## 199,656 boards played in Lille

Believe it or not Herman de Wael has worked out how many boards will have been played by the end of this tournament. The number is staggering - 199,656. That means that the average player has played 48.5 boards per day.

The following table offers the statistics by event.

| Tournament playersboardstotal_bds |  | play_days |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mixed Pairs | 1250 | 112 | 28288 | 2314 |
| Rosenblum | 1048 | 476 | 70336 | 6096 |
| McConnell | 252 | 410 | 10752 | 920 |
| Senior Teams | 160 | 162 | 6060 | 602 |
| Junior Triathlon | 132 | 238 | 7144 | 608 |
| Senior Pairs | 200 | 150 | 5160 | 460 |
| Open Pairs | 1318 | 342 | 18364 | 1670 |
| Women's Pairs | 252 | 288 | 9740 | 888 |
| all world championships 4612 |  |  | 155844 | 13558 |
| Zonal Mixed Pairs | 552 | 48 | 6624 | 552 |
| Zonal Teams | 432 | 100 | 10800 | 864 |
| Zonal Pairs | 117 | 96 | 11232 | 224 |
| Continuous Pairs | 1290 | 528 | 7740 | 645 |
| IMP Pairs | 324 | 96 | 7416 | 618 |
| total side games | 2715 |  | 43812 | 2903 |
| Total = average per day |  |  | 199656 | 16461 |
|  |  | 14 | 48.5 | 1176 |
|  |  | days | Boards | players |

## Something Special



Margaret Parnis-England and Mario Dix

When Mario Dix took out his cards on this deal from the third session of the Cara IMP Pairs he was looking forward to a delicate auction.

Board 9. E/W Vul. Dealer North.

- A 873
© JIO 93
$\diamond$ A Q J 4
\& 3
- 102
- 7642
$\diamond 9862$
- 1072

- KQ964
- 

$\diamond$ K 10753

- 984

| West <br> Parnis-England | North | East <br> Dix | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | $68!$ | $6 \diamond$ |
| Pass | Pass | $6 \vee!$ | $6 \stackrel{6}{ }$ !! |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

As you can see things turned out rather differently!

Once North opened the bidding Mario decided to dispense with science. South was not going to risk 6eing cold when his side clearly had a cheap save in diamonds. However the man from Malta was not finished yet. He used the second string to his bow and tried for a different slam. North must have been itching to get his hands on $6>$ but South was not going to let East have any fun and he tried for a different save.

After East had doubled the spotlight went across the table to Margaret Parnis-England. She had a shrewd idea what was going on and she fished out the $\diamond 2$. Mario ruffed and realising that it takes something special to secure a spot in the Daily News he returned the $\mathbf{2} 5$ ! A surprised Margaret won and gave him another ruff.

Malta will be hosting next year's European Team \& Women's Pairs Championships.


[^0]:    Rates are quoted in Maltese Liri $(L m)$. At the time of writing, $L m \quad I=\$ 2.57$

[^1]:    $2 \diamond$ :Multi $\quad X$ : fit
    Contrat : $5 \checkmark$ contrés
    Entame : As de $\diamond$

