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## One Day Down, Two to Go



## Director Dušan Krautsak oversees two lines of tables

After the first of three days of the Pairs Championship, 32 pairs have moved into today's Semi Final A. The other 29 are in Semi Final B. Each flight is playing five 10-board sessions. Then, the top 16 pairs in A and the top 4 in B will compete in Final A tomorrow, Tuesday. This will consist of nineteen three-board rounds played over six sessions. Any pair not qualifying for Final A may play in Final B.

Yesterday, four pairs ended with at least 60 percent. First were Bob Drijver and Ernst Wackwitz from the Netherlands. Then came three American pairs: Roger Lee - Daniel Wolkowitz, Anam Tebha - Zachary Brescoll and Kevin Dwyer - Owen Lien.

## Pairs Qualifying - Results of Day One

| 1 | DRIJVER B. - WACKWITZ E. | NED | NED | 1902,6 | 66,06\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | LEE R. - WOLKOWITZ D. | USA | USA | 1866,4 | 64,81\% |
| 3 | BRESCOLL Z. - TEBHA A. | USA | USA | 1807,8 | 60,26\% |
| 4 | DWYER K. - LIEN O. | USA | USA | 1800,6 | 60,02\% |
| 5 | HEGGE K. - STANGELAND K. | NOR | NOR | 1795,2 | 59,84\% |
| 6 | GULENC B. - IMDAT E. | TUR | TUR | 1775,7 | 59,19\% |
| 7 | SEVEREIJNS L. - WESTERBEEK C. | NED | NED | 1688,8 | 58,64\% |
| 8 | HARRISON S. - HENBEST M. | AUS | AUS | 1753,4 | 58,45\% |
| 9 | GUMZEJ R. - STANKOVIC A. | CRO | CRO | 1705,6 | 56,85\% |
| 10 | LEBATTEUX A. - POULAT S. | FRA | FRA | 1685,9 | 56,20\% |
| 11 | BOS B. - LANKVELD J. | NED | NED | 1684,1 | 56,14\% |
| 12 | GULLBERG D. - KARLSSON J. | SWE | SWE | 1613,7 | 56,03\% |
| 13 | HELMICH A. - HOP G. | NED | NED | 1666,7 | 55,56\% |
| 14 | AGICA M. - NISTOR R. | USA | ROM | 1660,8 | 55,36\% |
| 15 | EDGTTON A. - EDGTTON N. | AUS | AUS | 1648,0 | 54,93\% |
| 16 | BERNARD J. - GAYDIER N. | FRA | FRA | 1647,1 | 54,90\% |
| 17 | KIDO Y. - KIYAMA T. | JPN | JPN | 1646,5 | 54,88\% |
| 18 | DELLE CAVE G. - DI FRANCO M. | ITA | ITA | 1570,6 | 54,53\% |
| 19 | BOTTA G. - COSTA M. | ITA | ITA | 1628,5 | 54,28\% |
| 20 | GROSSACK A. - KAPLAN A. | USA | USA | 1560,2 | 54,17\% |
| 21 | FERRO F. - SCANAVINO A. | ARG | ARG | 1614,9 | 53,83\% |
| 22 | MILNE L. - WHIBLEY M. | NZL | AUS | 1546,2 | 53,69\% |
| 23 | EIDE H. - ELLINGSEN K. | NOR | NOR | 1539,0 | 53,44\% |
| 24 | JAKABSIC J. - KVOCEK J. | SVK | SVK | 1591,4 | 53,05\% |
| 25 | POSTIC I. - RUSO L. | CRO | CRO | 1525,5 | 52,97\% |
| 26 | HOLLANDS P. - HOWARD J. | AUS | AUS | 1525,1 | 52,95\% |
| 27 | FOURNIER J. - TOWNER M. | USA | USA | 1516,7 | 52,66\% |
| 28 | DONATI G. - PERCARIO G. | ITA | ITA | 1557,2 | 51,91\% |
| 29 | JAROSZ A. - WEINHOLD I. | POL | POL | 1488,8 | 51,69\% |
| 30 | KOCLAR A. - UCAR A. | TUR | TUR | 1528,1 | 50,94\% |
| 31 | KITA M. - STACHNIK W. | POL | POL | 1517,2 | 50,57\% |
| 32 | KURGAN S. - USLUPEHLIVAN S. | TUR | TUR | 1516,3 | 50,54\% |
| 33 | MANCINELLI A. - PINTO G. | ITA | ITA | 1443,3 | 50,12\% |
| 34 | SUZER U. - TASKIN A. | TUR | TUR | 1490,9 | 49,70\% |
| 35 | OZGUNGORDU C. - ULUER B. | TUR | TUR | 1429,3 | 49,63\% |
| 36 | CAILLIAU I. - DU CORAIL E. | FRA | FRA | 1383,0 | 48,02\% |
| 37 | GANDOGLIA A. - ZANASI G. | ITA | ITA | 1380,9 | 47,95\% |
| 38 | GULCZYNSKI M. - KAZMIERCZAK W. | POL | POL | 1370,4 | 47,58\% |
| 39 | LAZAR K. - WADL R. | HUN | AUT | 1422,7 | 47,42\% |
| 40 | EKENBERG S. - HULT S. | SWE | SWE | 1413,9 | 47,13\% |
| 41 | KITAMURA T. - SUGIMOTO D. | JPN | JPN | 1353,6 | 47,00\% |
| 42 | DRODGE S. - EMMONS D. | USA | USA | 1379,4 | 45,98\% |
| 43 | CRUSIZIO M. - GARCIA DA ROSA R. | ARG | URU | 1376,8 | 45,89\% |
| 44 | CHAVARRIA M. - LANZUISI F. | ITA | ITA | 1370,0 | 45,67\% |
| 45 | BASA M. - RUS G. | SLO | SLO | 1365,9 | 45,53\% |
| 46 | OVERBEEKE T. - WESTERBEEK R. | NED | NED | 1362,4 | 45,41\% |
| 47 | PETERSEN M. - WAHLESTEDT C. | SWE | SWE | 1361,2 | 45,37\% |
| 48 | LEANEZ L. - ORTEGA L. | VEN | VEN | 1283,6 | 44,57\% |
| 49 | BURGIO C. - MORINA S. | ITA | ITA | 1322,3 | 44,08\% |
| 50 | BJORKSTRAND R. - PETERSEN I. | SWE | SWE | 1291,2 | 43,04\% |
| 51 | FAILLA A. - FRUSCOLONI L. | ITA | ITA | 1280,3 | 42,68\% |
| 52 | VAJDOVA M. - ZAVODSKA Z. | SVK | SVK | 1219,9 | 42,36\% |
| 53 | CIFTCIOGLU G. - OZER C. | TUR | TUR | 1207,5 | 41,93\% |
| 54 | HERMANN S. - WEINBERGER S. | AUT | AUT | 1188,1 | 41,25\% |
| 55 | MILANO E. - OJEDA C. | VEN | VEN | 1186,0 | 41,18\% |
| 56 | KESIC L. - TOTH M. | CRO | CRO | 1144,3 | 39,73\% |
| 57 | BULATOVIC L. - VUSOVIC M. | MNE | MNE | 1143,0 | 38,10\% |
| 58 | DE JESUS K. - POLEO M. | VEN | VEN | 1087,3 | 36,24\% |
| 59 | DJILOVIC J. - MIJIC A. | CRO | CRO | 1074,1 | 35,80\% |
| 60 | BLAJKOVIC I. - VUKAS I. | CRO | CRO | 1013,3 | 35,19\% |
| 61 | KUBICA A. - VODICKA M. | SVK | SVK | 1050,9 | 35,03\% |

# The Board-a-Match Final - Second Session 

by Kees Tammens

A good friend of mine once calculated that I must have played about 10,000 sessions of bridge between 1968, when I learned the game, and 2007, when I played my last match in a Dutch premier competition. About half were at rubber bridge (and those days a session of rubber bridge could easily be 70 deals or more), 23 percent imp matches (teams and Butler) and 22 percent pairs tournaments of all kinds. The other five percent must have been 45 days of Patton team tournaments (mostly played in France) and five days of Board-a-Match.

So, to be honest, I am no expert in B-a-M strategy, although I am convinced that good bridge stays good bridge and will always be the basis for scoring points.

I sat down to follow Bob Drijver and Ernst Wackwitz from the Netherlands in the second session of the B-a-M, eager to learn something. Their team-mates were the pair from Rumania, Radu Nistor and Marius Agica (now a resident of New York City), the same team that won the bronze medals in the Knockout Teams. Let us imagine that I am always in the decision seat; I will try to explain my thoughts as honestly as possible (of course I now know all of the deals).


What should South lead from:

$$
\text { ↔A83 ๑J2 厄J10762 \& } 983 ?
$$

Partner has hearts and clubs, I stop the diamonds, declarer can only make tricks by ruffing something in dummy. Anybody for a low spade in trick one? Or are you going for the heart ruff and lead $৩ \mathrm{~J}$.

On this deal, it did not matter! Minus 140 was a draw.

Then came some nice declarer play:


The four-diamond splinter showed a hand worth 15 points or more, and North thought his honours were working well. However, the five-heart contract was in danger of losing a spade, a heart and one or two clubs.

East led the jack of spades. North won with his king, played a heart to dummy's ace, unblocked the king of diamonds, and returned a heart to his king - one wrong view. Then he cashed the ace of diamonds, discarding a club from the dummy. After a spade to dummy's ace, dropping West's queen, a trump exit endplayed West. He had to lead a club away from the king or concede a ruff-anddiscard. 2-0.

On Board 13, North-South had a stone cold 630 for a draw.

(a) Enquiry
(b) Minimum

After the ace of hearts, a club to the ace, and a club, the young declarer, Adam Kaplan from the United States under-21 team, did well. He cashed a third club, then took the ace of diamonds and three top spades ending in the dummy. He discarded a diamond on the thirteenth spade and exited with a diamond to endplay East for one down.

To get the contract two down, West had to switch to a diamond at trick two, eventually giving his partner a diamond ruff - tough to find.

However, it was 2-0 because four hearts went one down at the other table.


Adam Kaplan

| Board 15 Dealer South N-S Vul | -Q9853 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - K J 109 |  |  |
|  | - A |  |  |
|  | - A98 |  |  |
| - 107 N |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| QJ105432 ${ }^{\text {W }}$ E |  |  |  |
| - 4 |  |  |  |
| - J 62 |  |  |  |
| - A 76 |  |  |  |
| -K976 |  |  |  |
| - J 73 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Drijver Wackwitz |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 14 | 24 | 24 |
| Pass | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | Pass | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

North-South did very well by doubling and passing.
It took a while before West got his sevencard suit in the bidding. To escape for two down, declarer had to duck a diamond to North's bare ace. When he did not do that, he had to lose three hearts, three diamonds and one club.

However, at the other table:

| West | North | East | South <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $3 \diamond$ | Dble | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

A club lead would have defeated this contract, but for some strange reason West did not find that! After he had started with the queen of diamonds, South developed spades and picked up the queen of hearts for plus 600 and $0-2$ on the board for Ned-Rum.


North's 13-count looked promising, so I was somewhat surprised by Drijver's pass over two notrump.

East led the queen of clubs, ducked around, and continued with the king of clubs to North's ace. Declarer had many options. In the end, though, not finessing for the queen of hearts correctly and hoping one of the diamonds honours was favourably placed resulted in two down. That was $1-1$ when at the other table three notrumps failed by two tricks.

| Board 17 | - A 1097 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dealer North | - AKJ 2 |  |  |
| None Vul | -K1083 |  |  |
| - 843 <br> - Q 8 <br> -9764 <br> *K974 |  | ¢ E 5 $*$ | 86532 |
|  | - ${ }^{\text {Q }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 97643 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Wackwitz |  | Drijver |  |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | $2 \%$ | Pass |
| $3 \%$ | Dble | 5\% | All Pass |

Drijver's impressed opponents sold out for two down undoubled. This was 2-0 when five clubs went two down doubled at the other table.


West found the best lead of his trump.
Declarer won with dummy's king, when winning in hand looks better because West is sure to have the ace of clubs.

After a club to the king and ace, West returned a low club to the nine and queen. Now South could have secured his contract by ruffing a club high, but when he trumped with dummy's five of spades (now you see why declarer should have won the first trick in his hand), East overruffed and led back his last trump to stop another club ruff.

Now declarer seemed to have only nine tricks, but a defensive accident let South score dummy's queen of hearts at the end.

That was 0-2 because at the other table four spades went one down.


Green versus red, every bridge player likes to open the bidding with a pre-empt. So two hearts seemed like the right move. However, the young Australian sitting West knew the dummy had a strong hand, so he led the devious queen of diamonds!

After declarer ducked in dummy, West cashed his ace of diamonds. The defenders also had two trump tricks, but the contract still made.

At the other table with North the declarer after a transfer sequence, the obvious ten tricks were taken: 0-2.


You would like to have some tool to get to three clubs. (Editor's note. In North America, many pairs play responder's three-club rebid is canapé to play; two clubs is a puppet to two diamonds, either to play there or to invite game; two diamonds is game-forcing.)
When South led the ten of spades it looked as though the defenders would take four spades, one heart and two clubs for one down. However, they got the spades tangled and lost a trick.

Luckily their team-mates were plus 200, so it was still a win: 2-0.

On Board 21, with only North-South vulnerable, the bidding began:

| West | North | East <br> Drijver | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wackwitz | $1 \circlearrowleft$ | Dble <br>  <br> $4 \diamond$ | $4 \diamond$ |
| ?? |  |  |  |

(a) Four-card heart support but limited highcard values

What should East do with
-AKQJ $\bigcirc$ Q $82 \diamond$ AQJ 2 \& K
He might have doubled or bid five diamonds or six diamonds.
This was the full deal:


At the table, all three of those options would have led to $0-2$. How can East find four spades with this huge hand?

This deal was interesting at another table:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crusizio | Lee | García dR Wolko'tz |  |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Dble | $3 \diamond$ (a) |
| $5 \diamond$ | Pass | ?? |  |

(a) 7-9 points with four hearts

Rodrigo Garcia da Rosa thought for ages. If the points were to be believed, his partner had bid with almost nothing. And if so, probably he had a heart void. Then maybe there was a slam. But eventually he passed.


That was a real B-a-M problem for North: Bid four clubs and perhaps make eleven tricks for plus 150 , or pass for plus 200 (or minus 730 once in a while), or jump to five clubs and risk going down? North bid his suit and did win eleven tricks, but lost the board.

The session was 13-11 for Ned-Rum.
So, have I worked out the winning strategy in $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{M}$ ?

No, that will certainly take more boards. Maybe after the afternoon's session I will get a better idea of what to do in this very special formula. Perhaps I should play some B-a-M myself. Is anyone ever too old to learn?

## She can do Everything

Ljerka Kukurin had been helping us all day. Inter alia we had learnt that apart from writing nice stories, she also speaks Japanese. During the evening rush, we still needed a picture for the front page and Ljerka offered to go and find the Norwegian winners. She was back barely two minutes later with a wonderful picture (see yesterday's Bulletin).
"Is there anything you can't do?" we enquired. "Play bridge," was the lightningly quick answer.


Originally from Uruguay, now the coach of the Norwegian Juniors. She was hoping to be here but could not make it, so the team was named in her honour.

# WBF Youth Committee Meeting 

Opatija, 27-28 August 2011

A series of meetings were held by the WBF Youth Committee in Opatija during August 27-28, with the participation of Gianarrigo Rona (WBF President), Ata Aydin (WBF YC Chairman), Paolo Clair (YC Secretary), Yves Aubry (YC Member), Radoslaw Kielbasinski (YC Member), Geert Magerman (YC Member), PO Sundelin (YC Member), Jacqueline Thompson (YC Member), Murat Molva (YC Member), Sevinc Atay (WBF Executive Council Member), Phillip Alder (Daily Bulletin Editor), Gianpaolo Rinaldi, Maurizio Di Sacco (WBF Championship Committee Member).

The following main items were on the agenda:

Participation and format of the 2nd World Youth Bridge Congress held in Opatija.

2012 World Youth Bridge Championships venue and zonal quotas: President Rona announced that the previously foreseen location of Cuba had been cancelled due to local issues encountered. President Rona will investigate the possibility of staging the Championships in another venue.

Information from Zonal Representatives: Jacqueline Thompson, the representative of Central America (Zone 5), provided information about the limited resources and bridge facilities in the area. She stressed the need for bridge teachers as a means to facilitate interest in bridge. The Youth Committee decided to recommend to the WBF Executive Council to send bridge teachers to the countries with limited budgets to assist with educating the local bridge teachers.

2013 World Youth Bridge Congress Venue: Currently no venue has been fixed for the event. The meeting participants underlined the importance of selecting a venue that is easily accessible by major airlines with reasonable air-fares.

Dress Code at the Youth Championship Prize Giving Ceremonies: All teams appearing on the podium in WBF youth events are expected to wear their team jerseys or suits.

System Restrictions in the Youth Events: WBF Youth Committee will recommend to the

WBF Executive Council that systems for especially the team events should be submitted in a reasonable period prior to the start of the championships to allow preparation by all participating teams.

Utilization of Internet: The Youth Committee recommends that the WBF introduce and activate alternative mediums of online communication such as Facebook and Twitter. While the official WBF webpage will be the main source of information for all WBFrelated issues, the WBF Miniweb that has been specifically started by the WBF for the Youth Committee activities will be updated more frequently to provide up-to-date information for all youth events around the world.
It has been discussed that a "Sponsorship File" will be prepared for negotiations with prospective sponsors for funding of youth events and projects.

The following subjects have also been discussed:

Currently, the WBF is expecting news from IMSA about the next U28 World Teams/Pairs Championships. The date of the event has been fixed as August 11-25, 2012, but the location is yet to be determined.
The Youth Committee strongly recommends that the WBF Executive Committee make every effort to include bridge as a branch in the multi-sport event of the Universiade organized by FISU (International University Sports Federation).
President Rona discussed his plans to utilize internet bridge as a means to create funds for youth events.
The world-wide simultaneous pairs tournaments held two or three times every year could also be considered as a source of funds for youth bridge, especially to assist and subsidize the NBOs that operate with limited budgets. This would facilitate their participation in international youth events.
New formats for bridge events will also be considered in order to increase the popularity of the sport and boost participation.

## Pairs Qualifying - First and Second Session

by Kees Tammens

Pairs - the real game! The battle for matchpoints is like good food for a connoisseur. And a pairs game with a junior field is always very interesting to follow.

Berend van den Bos and Joris van Lankveld sat down in the first round of the qualifying against fellow Dutch juniors Bob Drijver and Ernst Wackwitz. As I can assure everyone, competition between Dutch pairs is always severe, as witness by North's two-spade opening.


With three hearts doubled a sure disaster (minus 500), West gambled on East having a four-card minor. It was not to be today, and "the bear" (Bos' nickname) could not avoid minus 500.

It is very nice to see the pairs from Slovenia, Montenegro and Slovakia joining us in Opatija for this pairs event. And all week I have enjoyed the Croatian sports shirts: I was always impressed by Croatian footballers Prosinečki, Boban and Šuker; I once saw a match in the N.B.A. with the great Draźen Petković, the basketball player who so tragically killed; and of course tennis great Goran Ivanisević. The enthusiasm of Croatian supporters is a joy for every lover of sports.

(a) At least game-invitational with heart support
(b) Roman Key Card Blackwood
(c) Three key cards

When North kept things quiet with only a one-spade overcall, it was easy for East, knowing one key card was missing, to see that six notrumps was the top spot.

On the next deal, a Multi two diamonds caused considerable problems:


West North East South v Lankvelddelle Cave vd Bos Franco Pass

| $2 \diamond(\mathrm{a})$ | Dble | $3 \circlearrowleft(\mathrm{~b})$ | Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $3 \wedge$ | Dble | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

(a) Probably a weak two-bid in either major
(b) Pass or correct

It was strange not to see "the bear" double four hearts when he knew he could have given his partner at least two heart ruffs in five of a minor, and four notrumps would surely have failed.

Regardless, plus 400 was a good result.

## The Worst Tricktaker solution

No solver at the competition run by Richard Pavlicek did better than 54, so if you beat that, you are the new world champion. With 54 you share the title with nine others.
Dealer North
-K986
None Vul

- A K Q J 103
- 876
- A
$\bullet-$
- AK
* AK Q J 1098642

- 75432
$-4$
- 5432
- 753

South wins the lead of a low club and cashes another two clubs, North and East throwing spades. South continues with the four of hearts, West discarding his ace of spades. Five spade tricks follow as everybody discards diamonds, and finally the four diamond tricks complete what may very well turn out to be a winning board.

## Most Points but no Three Notrumps - a better solution.

Ricardo Westerbeek and Tom van Overbeke of the Netherlands Youngsters offer the following solutions to PO's problem:

North-South have 39 points between them, but South cannot make three notrumps:


And another one: North-South have 38 points, but neither of them can make three notrumps:


## Pairs Qualifying - Second Session

by Phillip Alder

For the second session of the pairs I watched Kevin Dwyer and Owen Lien from the United States, not realizing that they were doing well. They use Meckwell Light, a trimmed down version of the Precision Club system employed by Jeff Meckstroth and Eric Rodwell.

Before we get to the boards, though, try these problems.

1. Sitting West with only your side vulnerable, you pick up:

$$
\text { ๑ } 84 \diamond \text { Q } 92 \diamond 6542 \text { \& } 72 .
$$

The bidding starts:

| West | North | East | South <br> 104 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | 2 NT (a) |
| Pass | 14 |  |  |

(a) At least 5-5 in the red suits

What would you do, if anything?
2. Sitting North with only your side vulnerable, you have this nice hand:

$$
\text { ค Q } 3 \diamond \text { J } 54 \diamond \text { AK } 5 \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{AKQ} 42
$$

The auction proceeds:

| West | North | East | South <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2~ | Dble | $3 \circlearrowleft$ (a) | Dble |
| 4 | Dble | All Pass |  |

(a) Game-invitation in spades

What would you lead?
1b. Now back to the first problem. Suppose you pass. Lefty rebids three spades, partner competes with four diamonds, and righty raises to four spades. What now?
3. You are West, holding:

かJ3 ๑AQJ82 $\diamond$ Q 6 \& 765

The auction goes like this:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| What would you lead? |  |  |  |

1c. Suppose you bid five diamonds. It goes five spades -- pass -- pass back to you ... and now?
4. With only your side vulnerable, you hold:

$$
\text { ^Q } 852 \text { ৩J654 } \diamond \text { AQ } 9 \text { \& K } 8
$$

The dealer on your right opens three spades. After two passes, your partner makes a take-out double. Would you pass, bid three notrumps, advance with four hearts, or do something else?

I arrived just as the first deal was winding up:


| West <br> Dwyer | North <br> Gandolia | East <br> Lien | South <br> Zanasi |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \varnothing$ |  | 24 | 3 (a) | | Pass |
| :--- |
| Dede |

(a) Game-forcing heart raise
(b) First-round spade control
(c) Roman Key Card Blackwood
(d) Three key cards

Note that there are twelve top tricks in notrump. Plus 990 was a 65.5 percent board.

(a) Five spades, four hearts, invitational values

I first saw these two-of-a-major responses to one of a minor to show major two-suiters in the Meckwell system (and for them it is only over one diamond since one club is strong and artificial). But probably the idea was also devised elsewhere.

The play was unexciting with both club honours onside. Gabriele Zanasi lost three aces to score 170. This was just below average for the Americans: 44.8 percent.


That auction was probably duplicated many times. It would have been a real gamble by

South to pass over his partner's double, although North-South can get plus 200.

West led the six of diamonds: two, nine, ten. Declarer played a club to the ace and misguessed by returning a club to his queen. West led a second diamond, ducked to East's king.
To hold declarer to seven tricks, East had to switch to a spade; but he returned a diamond, worried that he had to get the ace of diamonds out of the dummy in case South could win the first spade trick.
Declarer threw a low spade, won with dummy's ace and, as the cards lay, should have taken the heart finesse. But he gave up a club.
Now the defense was on top. East pushed through the nine of spades. West took South's ten with his jack, cashed the seven of diamonds and ace of spades, then played another spade. East had to get the king of hearts for one down and 87.9 percent.

| Board 14 \& K 854 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dealer East 『 10 |  | 54 |  |
| None Vul |  | -932 |  |
|  |  | -942 |  |
| - 73 N |  |  | 102 |
| $\checkmark 82 \mathrm{~N}^{\text {- }}$-9763 |  |  |  |
| - A $10854{ }^{\text {W }}$ E |  |  |  |
| * AJ53 S |  |  |  |
| ^ J 96 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ A K J J |  |  |  |
| - Q J 6 |  |  |  |
| - Q 87 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Dwyer | Kitamura | Lien | Sugimoto |
|  |  | $1 \diamond(\mathrm{a})$ | 1NT |
| Dble | Pass (b) | Pass | Redble |
| Pass | 24. (c) | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Dble | 20 | Dble | All Pass |

(a) 10-15 points, two-plus diamonds
(b) Forces redouble
(c) Scrambling, not $3=3=3=4$

South had a perfectly normal one-notrump overcall, but was caught by a well-timed double by Dwyer.

The pass forcing redouble works well when one notrump is makable or the scramble locates a 4-4 fit. but when the responder has
$4-3-3-3$, it is usually best to struggle in one notrump. Here, minus 300 would have been about average.

Against two spades doubled, East led the two of spades. This is often the right start in these positions, but was not on this deal. The defenders can take three spades (North cannot get to his hand to lead towards the jack of spades), two diamonds, three clubs and a diamond ruff.

North took the first trick with his eight of spades and led a diamond. East rose with his king and played a second round of the suit, West winning and returning his second trump. East cashed two tricks there and led a low club to his partner's jack. Now came a diamond ruff and two more clubs for three down.

Plus 500 was worth "only" 79.3 percent.

| Board 15 <br> Dealer South <br> N-S Vul | - Q 3 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - J54 |  |  |
|  | - AK 5 <br> - AKQ4 2 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\text { K } 109762$ |  | - A J 5 |  |
| - Q 92 | , | $\begin{gathered} \text { E } 10 \\ * \mathrm{~J} \end{gathered}$ |  |
| - 84 |  |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K Q 87 |  |  |
|  | - J 873 |  |  |
|  | -853 |  |  |
| West N | North | East | South |
| Dwyer | Postic | Lien | Ruso |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\sim}$ | Dble | $3 \bigcirc$ (a) | Dble |
| 4ヘ D | Dble | All Pass |  |

(a) Game-invitation in spades

The Americans overbid on this deal, although all of their actions look normal. But with the bad club break, the best North-South can do is make two of a minor!

North led the ace of clubs, which was in theory fatal. (He surely should have led a trump, given that he knew his partner had heart values. There was no hurry to cash winners, only to reduce the opposition's ruffing tricks.)

North then played three rounds of diamonds. West won and could have
crossruffed home, but he played a spade to dummy's jack and ruffed a heart in his hand.

Now West had to lead the ten of clubs, ruff away North's queen, return to his hand with a heart ruff, and continue with the nine of clubs, ruffing away North's king and squashing South's eight.
It is no surprise that West did not do that. He played the ten of spades, so lost a club in the end for one down.
Minus 100 was a 15.6 percent result.


East's bluff bidding talked South into being cautious.

The play was interesting. North led the nine of clubs. South won with her king and continued with a suit-preference jack of clubs. West ruffed and led the ten of hearts, ducked to South's jack. Now she led the ten of clubs. When West ruffed, North had to discard a diamond!

Understandably, though, he overruffed and switched to the ten of diamonds: queen, king, ace.
The ping-pong match continued. A trump exit would have worked well, but declarer ruffed a diamond. South overruffed and led a high club, ruffed and overruffed.
Now North made a bad error. He should have played his high diamond to guarantee a spade trick. But he led a spade, giving declarer three tricks in the suit.

Plus 110 was a top.


This was the second opening-lead problem.
Choosing a heart is potentially suicidal. So, do you lead from the long clubs or short spades?

I agreed with Dwyer's club choice, but the jack of spades would have worked much better.

South won and played three rounds of diamonds. East pushed a heart through, West taking his three tricks and switching to the jack of spades. Declarer cashed out for one down.

Plus 50 was worth 67.2 percent to the Americans.


Owen Lien

| Board 18 | ๑ J |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dealer East | - K 1098 |  |  |
| N-S Vul | -K 843 |  |  |
|  | - Q 1095 |  |  |
| - 3 NAK 109764 |  |  |  |
| - A Q 2 | N $\uparrow$ AK 109764 |  |  |
| - J 752 | W E 10 |  |  |
| - A J 432 | - 76 |  |  |
|  | - Q 852 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 654 |  |  |
|  | - A Q 9 |  |  |
|  | - K 8 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Dwyer |  | Lien |  |
|  |  | 34 | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

I did not like South's choice of four hearts. If he was not going to pass because of the prevailing vulnerability, I thought he should have bid three notrumps.

West led his spade, East taking the trick and switching to the seven of clubs. West won with his ace and returned a club to declarer's king. Now South led the jack of hearts and surprisingly put up dummy's king. West took the next two tricks with his high trumps and had to open diamonds, selecting the seven.

South took East's ten with his ace, cashed the queen, and played a diamond to dummy's king. Declarer cashed the queen of clubs, discarding a spade, ruffed a club, and ruffed a spade, but lost the last trick to West's jack of diamonds.
That was lucky for East-West, getting 94.8 percent of the matchpoints. East was known to have started with seven spades (West led the three, remember, and South had the two), two hearts and at least two clubs. So he could not have more than two diamonds. The finesse of dummy's eight of diamonds on the third round of the suit was marked.

| Board 19 | -A J 107632 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Dealer South | - A 107 |
| E-W Vul | $\begin{aligned} & * 3 \\ & * 106 \end{aligned}$ |
| - 84 <br> - Q 92 <br> - 6542 <br> - Q J 72 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K Q } 9 \\ & \text { - } 64 \\ & 108 \\ & * \text { AK } 8543 \end{aligned}$ |


| West <br> Dwyer | North | East <br> Lien | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | $2 N T$ (a) | $3 \&$ |
| Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | $4 \diamond$ | $4 \uparrow$ |
| $5 \diamond$ | $5 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | Pass | Pass |

(a) Hearts and diamonds

I agreed with everything Dwyer did until he doubled five spades. That was far too greedy, especially since there was no guarantee that five diamonds was making.

East led the king of diamonds, West giving count. East switched to a low heart, North taking West's queen with his ace.

North could have drawn one round of trumps before switching to clubs to bring home an overtrick. But when everyone followed to the first spade, eleven tricks were guaranteed: seven spades, one heart, two clubs and a late heart ruff in the dummy. It would have been silly to risk East having $2=5=6=0$ distribution.

North played a spade to dummy's queen, cashed the ace of clubs and ... accidentally called for a low club instead of the king. And he did not realize his error in time. Now he lost a diamond, a club and a heart to go one down, giving East-West 96.5 percent of the matchpoints.

Finally:

| Board 20 |  | -8762 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dealer West |  | $\bullet$ - |  |
| All Vul |  | -A Q 75 <br> *K 10976 |  |
| - Q 3 <br> - 1098432 <br> - 843 <br> - A 8 |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& K J J } 9 \\ & \vee \text { K Q J } \\ & 62 \\ & * \text { Q } 4 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Dwyer |  | Lien |  |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | 10 |
| Pass | 24 | Dble | Pass |
| $3 \bigcirc$ | Pass | Pass | 4* |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

West led the ten of hearts. Declarer ruffed in the dummy, drew trumps, and ran the king of hearts, discarding a diamond from the dummy. East won and returned a heart, another diamond disappearing from the North hand.

Now declarer should have led his queen of clubs, and if he had guessed the position, he could have taken eleven tricks. However, South tried the diamond finesse and only made his contract.

Minus 620 gave East-West 79.3 percent, six percent higher than their session score, which moved Dwyer and Lien into first place.


Kevin Dwyer

## Appeal 1 - Sweden vs the Netherlands

## Appeals Committee:

Ata Aydin (Chairman, Turkey), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Maurizio Di Sacco (Italy), Giampaolo Rinaldi (Italy)

B-a-M Teams Final

| Board 18 Dealer East N-S Vul |  | - 52 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | - K J 52 |  |
|  |  | - Q J 8654 |  |
|  |  | *- |  |
| - K Q 1093 N |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 63 |
| -1073 |  | N |  |
| \& Q 10873 |  | S |  |
| $\text { A } 87$ |  |  |  |
| - A 984 |  |  |  |
| - A 92 |  |  |  |
| - 462 |  |  |  |
| West | North | Cast | South |
| Hop | Hult | Helmich | Ekenberg |
|  |  | Pass | 1NT |
| 24 | 3\% | 35 | 3NT |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Dble | All Pass |

Comments: 2 4 : five spades and four-plus in a minor

Contract: four hearts doubled, played by North

Result: 13 tricks, NS +1390

## The Facts:

North alerted his call of three clubs and explained it to East as showing diamonds. But when the tray went to the other side, South alerted minimally and mumbled something like "Lebensohl". During the next round, West asked again about three clubs and South apologized. His previous explanation had been wrong, as they had recently switched to Transfer Lebensohl. North had shown first diamonds, then also hearts.

After the play, West called the Director, explaining that he would have bid over three notrumps if he had received the correct explanation the first time.

## The Director:

Noted that South agreed to having misinformed West the first time round. Although the system card still contained the mention "Lebensohl", South's admission and North's bid clearly indicated that West had been misinformed.

The Director checked with several players, and a significant number would have bid with the West hand (on the second round). Therefore, North-South did not deserve the result they got. The Director decided to change their score to zero mps (out of the two available in this Board-a-Match).
However, the Director ruled that East had contributed to his bad result and he applied Law 12C1(b).

## Ruling:

Both sides receive zero mps for this board.
Relevant Laws:
Law 40B4, 12B1, 12C1(b)

## East-West appealed.

Present: All players and the Captain of East-West

## The Players:

East explained that he had doubled, thinking his partner had diamonds, because he could have bid, but not if he had held diamonds. East also wanted to discourage partner from sacrificing in spades. East admitted that he should have taken longer and thought about it some more, and then he would not have doubled. But, if partner had bid four clubs or four spades, he never would have doubled. Should not the laws punish the first infraction?

East added that Board-a-Match is a very hard type of game. Sometimes you need to double for just one down. His double was not a serious infraction, just thinking they would go down.

North stated that if they bid four spades, he would have bid once again and maybe they would have ended up in slam.

## The Committee:

Agreed completely with the first part of the Director's decision: North-South did not deserve the result they got.

The Committee then read Law 12C1(b):
If, subsequent to the irregularity, the nonoffending side has contributed to its own damage by a serious error (unrelated to the infraction) or by wild or gambling action it does not receive relief in the adjustment for such part of the damage as is self-inflicted. The offending side should be awarded the score that it would have been allotted as the consequence of its infraction only.

The Committee checked both points:
The non-offending side had indeed contributed to its own damage.

Despite East's arguments, it was not believed that the double was related to the misexplanation, which had occurred, after all, on the other side of the screen. West might have bid with clubs, but there was no guarantee that if he didn't bid, he was showing diamonds.

The double was a gambling action. The very nature of Board-a-Match means that gambling doubles are sometimes necessary, but that does not make them less gambling. In this case, the double was judged to be extremely badly judged.

East-West did not deserve rectification for the damage that was largely self-inflicted. The wording of Law 12C1(b) then means that both teams should receive zero mps .

## The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.
Deposit: Returned

# How to Win <br> a Qualifying Session 

by PO Sundelin

| Board 3 | - A Q 8 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Dealer South | - Q 1083 |
| E-W Vul | - K J <br> - K Q 54 |
| - 1064 <br> - 9754 <br> - 3 <br> - A J 1073 |  |
|  | - J 5 <br> - A 2 <br> -986542 <br> $\because 982$ |


| West <br> Wackwitz | North | East <br> Drijver | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | 3NT | Dble | $3 \diamond$ <br> Pass |
| Redble | Pass | Pass |  |
| $\mathbf{4 \&}$ | Dble | 4^ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |

For reasons that will soon become obvious we will let North-South remain anonymous.

Bob Drijver reports: South pre-empted with three diamonds, more or less normal, not vulnerable, ...

My partner sensibly passed my double of North's three notrumps, but he got cold feet when it was redoubled, and ran to clubs. My potential dummy would surely not even nearly be worth a thank you, so to save partner from going many down, I decided to take the blame myself, thus four spades.

Diamond lead to king and ace. Diamond ruff, spade to king and another spade to jack and queen. North cashed the ace of spades and played a heart to jack and ace. South returned a heart to my king. On the trumps, North was squeezed in clubs and hearts. An easy plus 790.

## Welcome Montenegro



Mustafa Šahmanović, Giannarigo Rona, Vesna Daćić, Goran Grgurić

Mustafa Šahmanović, president of the Bridge Federation of Montenegro, and Vesna Daćić, npc of Montenegrin Youth, as well as two players, arrived in Opatija yesterday.

Montenegro has been a member of EBL and WBF since 2009, but Milan Vusović and Luka Bulatovic are the first to play in an official competition.

## Time Table

Day 8 - Monday August 29th

| 10.00-11.30 | Pairs | - | Semi Final A \& B | - | 1st session |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11.45-13.15 | Pairs | - | Semi Final A \& B | - | 2nd session |
| 14.00-15.30 | Pairs | - | Semi Final A \& B |  | 3rd session |
| 15.45-17.15 | Pairs | - | Semi Final A \& B | - | 4th session |
| 17.30-19.00 | Pairs | - | Semi Final A \& B | - | 5th session |
| Day 9 - Tuesday August 30th |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10.00-13.00 | Pairs | - | Final A | - | 1st session |
| 13.45-16.15 | Pairs | - | Final A | - | 2nd session |
| 16.30-19.00 | Pairs | - | Final A | - | 3rd session |
| 10.00-11.30 | Pairs | - | Final B | - | 1st session |
| 11.45-13.15 | Pairs | - | Final B | - | 2nd session |
| 14.00-15.30 | Pairs | - | Final B | - | 3 rd session |
| 15.45-17.15 | Pairs | - | Final B | - | 4th session |
| 17.30-19.00 | Pairs | - | Final B | - | 5th session |

