

## THE MICHIY HAVE FALLEN



It was upset day in Wroclaw on Sunday as three favoured teams in the Open Series were sent to the sidelines. France, European champions this year, staged a late rally but still fell to New Zealand I67-I50. Even more impressive was Spain's performance against USA in a 182-149 win. The Spanish held the strong American team to 3 IMPs over the final 16 boards of the match. Italy, another highly regarded team, fell to Canada 214-173
In the Women's Series, the favorites - France, England, USA and China - all moved into the quarterfinal round in comfort. In the Seniors, USA continued to march ahead, winning over China Hong Kong by 172 IMPs.
As this issue went to press, China was leading Italy 203-200 in an eight-board playoff in the Mixed Teams.
${ }_{\text {Mind }}$ Snternational

## Open Teams



## Women's Teams



## Senior Teams



## Mixed Teams

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NETHERLANDS HUNGARY | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \\ & 28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ 2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 55 \\ 6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 40 \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{l\|} \hline 40 \\ 35 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 235 \\ 87 \end{gathered}$ | NETHERLANDS$?$ |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot |  |
| ITALY CHINA | $\begin{aligned} & -18 \\ & 44 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49 \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 31 \\ 26 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 28 \\ 47 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42 \\ & 27 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 20 \\ 37 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 188 \\ & 188 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot | GERMANY |
| GERMANY AUSTRALIA | $\begin{aligned} & 41 \\ & 31 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\left\|\begin{array}{l}37 \\ 29\end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline 70 \\ 6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 67 <br> 19 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 14 \\ 35 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 262 \\ & 135 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 56 |  | Tot | BULGARIA |
| BULGARIA ENGLAND | $\begin{aligned} & 31 \\ & 27 \end{aligned}$ | 41 7 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 38 \\ \mathbf{3 2} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 16 \\ 38 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 63 \\ 21 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 27 \\ \mathbf{2 2} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 216 \\ & 147 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot |  |
| RUSSIA ISRAEL | $\begin{aligned} & 48 \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | [41 8 | 62 <br> 46 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 24 \\ 32 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38 \\ & 16 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 213 \\ & 121 \end{aligned}$ | RUSSIA |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot | DENMARK |
| DENMARK POLAND | 28 32 | 35 <br> 29 | 48 <br> 31 | 44 16 | 31 <br> 40 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 21 \\ \mathbf{2 2} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 207 \\ 170 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot |  |
| JAPAN USA | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \\ & 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\|$29 <br> 41 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 29 \\ 24 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 27 \\ 24 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 23 \\ & 28 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 26 \\ 17 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 158 \\ & 159 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | USA |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot | France |
| FRANCE | 44 | 44 | \|59 | 28 | 49 | 24 | 248 |  |

## Bid for show and Play for dough <br> By Mark Horton

It was the outstanding South African golfer Bobby Locke, winner of four British Opens who coined the phrase 'You drive for show, but putt for dough'.
In the last of his victories in 1957 Locke was only four feet from the cup on the 72nd hole when he moved his ball marker one putter-head length to avoid the line of fellow competitor Bruce Crampton's putt. After Crampton holed out, Locke forgot to replace his ball in its original position and proceeded to sink his four-foot putt to finish three shots clear of the field. His error was revealed Newsreel footage provided to the R\&A after the trophy presentation. The rules at the time made no provision for the two shot penalty that would apply today and according to the rules Locke's win could have been overturned through disqualification. However, the Championship Committee did not enforce the disqualification rule, citing 'equity and spirit of the game' as overriding factors in sustaining the posted result.
On this deal from the third session Germany's Elke Weber and Anne Gladiator (isn't that a great name for a bridge player!) demonstrated perfect technique in both the bidding and the play:

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul. - -
$\triangle$ AKJ 963
$\diamond A 1032$
\& Q 73


In the other room Norway had stopped in Six Clubs.
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wennevold | Weber | Helness | Gladiator |
|  |  |  | 1980 |
| $1{ }^{1}$ | $2 \diamond *$ | Pass | 36 |
| Pass | 5 | Pass | 6 * |
| Pass | 78 | All Pass |  |

$2 \triangleleft$ Transfer
5. Exclusion Blackwood
$6\rangle 2$ key cards, no Q
West led the king of diamonds and declarer won with dummy's ace, came to hand with a club, ruffed a spade, ruffed a diamond, ruffed a spade, ruffed a diamond, drew
trumps and claimed, +2140 and 13 IMPs.
In the Open series three pairs stopped in 6\%, the remaining 13 playing in 78 - and someone went down.
In the Women's event the ratio was 6 in $6 \%$ and 8 in $7 \%$ and again one declarer was red faced. One pair reached the dizzy heights of 3NT while another stopped off to double $2 \diamond$.
In the Senior Teams 10 made $7 \%$, five were in $6 \%$ and one in 4NT.
In the Mixed 10 were in $7 \%$, four in $6 \%$ one in 6 NT and one in $6 『$ down one.


## Open Teams R/I6-SI <br> Austria v Monaco

By Ram Soffer

Despite finishing fifth in their preliminary groups, Monaco is still considered among the favourites here. The Austrians, who finished second in their group, were obliged to select either USA or Monaco as their opponents, due to the pairing restrictions (teams from the same group were not allowed to meet again at the Round of 16).
The match started well for Austria when a I0-I3 INT opening by Monaco failed to produce a positive score, while the deal was passed out at the other table.
The next board was a push, as both E/W pairs did extremely well.

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

|  | ¢ J 742 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 9$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q J 876 |  |  |
|  | \& KJ7 |  |  |
| ¢ Q 86 | N |  | ¢ AK 953 |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 1074$ |  | - $\bigcirc$ |  |
| $\checkmark$ A 42 |  | E |  |
| \% Q 98 | S |  | 10543 |
|  | -10 |  |  |
|  | ¢ Q 8653 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond \mathrm{K} 10953$ |  |  |
|  | -62 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Helgemo | Simon | Helness | C. Terraneo |
|  |  | 14 | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | 4 | Pass |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 6\% | Pass |
| 69 | All Pass |  |  |

Helgemo's 3s was a simple limit raise. Helness had a very good hand, and they quickly bid the slam. Making it depended on how declarer played the clubs. Declarer won the $\wp 3$ lead with his jack, drew trumps in four rounds by finessing against North ${ }^{\boldsymbol{J}}$ and entered dummy with a heart to lead 2 Q , which worked in the actual layout but might have failed against either \%xx or \%xx in North's hand.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F. Terraneo | Multon | Bieder | Martens |
|  |  | 1\% | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| 31 | Pass | 4\% | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | 5\% | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | 54 | Pass |
| 6 | All Pass |  |  |

The Austrian E/W pair had a much longer auction to slam, but once East opened a strong (16+) I\% and West showed
three controls (by ls) and a spade fit (by 3s), they were always likely to bid six.
Bieder found a better line of play by leading a low club toward the 9 Q right after drawing trumps, and when that failed he finessed against North ${ }^{2}$. This gave about 75\% chances of success and ensured a push in the actual layout. Out of the other 14 teams remaining in the competition, only Canada managed to bid and make this slam with the E/W cards.
On board 3, the question was which minor-suit game to bid. E/W had together nine diamonds and only eight clubs, but West's club suit was AKQJ95. Both teams reached 5\%, going down to a diamond ruff, while $5 \triangleleft$ was cold.
Board 4 was a 7-IMP swing in Austria's favour due to their choice of a better partscore, after which we had another slam hand, which was a perfect fit for the Austrian strong club methods.

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.
(KJ85
คAJ10 9
$\diamond-$ 2 A Q 863

- Q 96

88742
J 10653
9

| N | ¢ A 743 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | QQ653 |
| W E | $\diamond \mathrm{KQ}$ |
| S | ¢ 72 |
| ¢ 102 |  |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{K}$ |  |
| $\diamond$ A 98742 |  |
| \% KJ 104 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Simon | Helness | C. Terraneo |
|  | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | Pass | 49 |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 N T$ |
| Pass | $5 \$$ | Pass | 69 |

All Pass
$2 \triangleleft$ showed II-16 HCP with short diamonds. 2NT enquired and 3 NT showed a maximum 4-4-0-5. After such a start, bidding 6 was quite straightforward.
Helgemo choice of $\diamond J$ for the lead simplified declarer's task, as after the fall of East's diamond honours declarer could simply draw trumps and employ a ruffing finesse in diamonds. However, he would probably have managed to make 6\% after any lead due to the favourable layout in both major suits.
At the other table, the sequence produced by MultonMartens started $1 \boldsymbol{c}$ - (showing diamonds) - $2 \boldsymbol{2}$, after which Martens could not be sure about his partner's extra values and exact distribution, so he made only a mild slam
move, after which they landed in 5e.
At that stage Austria were up by 23-0, but their lead quickly evaporated when Franz Terraneo blasted three consecutive game bids, while Geir Helgemo who held the same cards was much more modest, stopping in a partscore in each case and being right on each occasion. In addition, Multon-Martens played flawless defence throughout the session, so that any overbid by their opponents proved costly.
Here are some examples of Monaco's defensive prowess, starting with a board where they still lost IMPs because their opponents found the best contract.

Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.


Helgemo's decision to pass on the first round didn't work out well. Helness was not sure about the strength of his partner's belated $3 \triangleleft$ call, and the bidding subsided there, declarer making two overtricks with ease.


Christian Terraneo, Austria

| West <br> F. Terraneo | North | Multon | East |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bieder | South <br> Martens |  |  |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \oslash$ | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

After the immediate $3 \triangleleft$ overcall, the only question was which game to choose. The Austrians preferred to play at the four level. Martens led his singleton $\diamond$ J, and upon winning the $\vee \mathrm{K}$ he immediately underled his \%A and got a diamond ruff. He may have been disappointed when it transpired that declarer had no more clubs and the contract was safe.

Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

|  | - AJ 72 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 3 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A 843 |  |
|  | Q J |  |
| - 1063 | N | , Q 985 |
| ¢ J 109864 |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K}$ |
| $\diamond 6$ |  | $\diamond$ K 975 |
| * K 105 | S | 99743 |
|  | , K 4 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 752$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q J 102 |  |
|  | \% A 862 |  |

Fifteen out of $16 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{S}$ pairs managed to make their 3NT contracts in the Open Teams. Krzysztof Martens, playing the contract from the South side, received a $\vee$ J lead which could have been away from the king, according to his opponents' system. He still made the right decision when he put up dummy's ace, as he could always play a heart toward his queen later, if necessary. After the fall of East's king, nine tricks were not difficult.
At the other table the declarer was North:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Simon | Helness | C. Terraneo |
| $2 \boxtimes$ | $2 N T$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |

## All Pass

Any major suit lead would have given away the contract immediately, but Helness found the excellent $\$ 4$ lead. Helgemo won the first trick with e K and returned the suit. Declarer entered his hand with $\mathbf{~ K}$ and lost a diamond finesse to the $\Delta$ K. Helness returned the $\$ 7$, making his $\$$ good. Declarer didn't see any problem - he had eight tricks, and the ninth was sure to come through a heart finesse. After all, Helgemo opened a weak two in hearts.
However, he should have invested some more time analysing what to do in case East's heart singleton was the king (both teams played fast and finished this set well ahead of schedule).
There were two ways to overcome this problem:
I. Play $\vee A$ first, return to hand in diamonds and play a heart to the queen if necessary;
2. Finish diamonds and then finesse hearts. Even in the case East wins 8 K and cashes 29, he is endplayed in
spades.
In the event though, Christian Terraneo didn't employ any precaution, finessed hearts too early and went down. Thus Monaco's I2-IMP swing was a combination of good defence and sloppy declarer play.
In the final deal of the set, Multon and Martens displayed superior defence to take advantage of a poor choice of games by their opponents, helping Monaco to register another 12 IMPs.

Board 16. Dealer West. E/WVul.

- 97

Q Q J 8
$\diamond$ Q 1075
\& K 973

| ¢ Q 52 |  |  | ( KJ 1086 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ๑K 542 |  |  | $\bigcirc$ A 6 |
| $\diamond$ AJ 92 | W | E | $\checkmark 84$ |
| \& A 8 |  |  | \% Q J 104 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Helgemo | Simon | Helness | C. Terraneo |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 19 | Pass |
| INT | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| $2 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 3NT | Pass |
| 49 | All Pass |  |  |

This was quite standard "checkback" bidding. E/W played two-way checkback, $2 \triangleleft$ being the game-forcing variety. $2 \triangleleft$ showed four hearts with 2-3 spades. East had to have five spades for his 3NT bid, otherwise using checkback was pointless and he should have immediately bid 3NT over INT. Helgemo bid 4s according to this logic. As declarer has essentially only three losers, there was no problem making this contract.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| F. Terraneo | Multon | Bieder | Martens |
| I $\$$ | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| INT | Pass | $2 \mathscr{2}$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |

Terraneo-Bieder are among the few world-class pairs still employing four-card majors in the modern game. However, their checkback methods were insufficient to locate the 53 spade fit (or perhaps they liked 3NT more despite that fit).
Multon's top-of-sequence $\triangle Q$ lead proved to be a great choice, as it took an important step towards removing dummy's heart entry. Naturally, declarer won in hand and tried spades, but Martens didn't let him off the hook, ducking twice. After winning the A on the third round, he played another heart. At this point dummy's clubs became useless, and declarer ended up one trick short.
At the end of the session, Monaco led by 5I-30 despite being 0-23 down after five boards.

## Nice endplay <br> By Micke Melander

In the second-to-last match of the round robin, Spain faced Sweden in group C. Both teams were at the top of the table, which meant that all was at stake if they wanted to put some distance between each other in front of the last match to be able to get a better spot for the knockout stages.

Board I6. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

$$
7642
$$

KJ 752
K 86
\& 3


Upmark got the four of diamonds lead from West: six, queen and the ace. Carefully eyeing the situation, Upmark set up the plan and found a beautiful elimination and endplay against West. The queen of hearts was played at trick two. When that was ducked, declarer simply played a diamond to the king, ruffed a diamond and played his last trump. West won to continue with diamonds, forcing declarer to ruff in dummy. The jack of hearts followed, pulling West's last trump.
Upmark then called for the three of clubs from dummy and simply covered what East played to throw in West, who had to lead away into one of declarer's tenaces. He would have made the contract even if West had held ace-queenten of spades.
At the other table, the Spanish declarer was at the helm in Three Hearts. Declarer there also got a diamond lead and eliminated the red suits. Declarer then just played a spade to the jack, losing two spades and a trump for 10 tricks. Still it was a game swing and an elegant elimination and endplay by Upmark.


## France v New Zealand

By David Stern

In the second of six sessions in the round of 16, France was coming off a win in round robin Group A. With the option to pick their opponents, the French selected New Zealand, who had finished a solid 5th in Group C - the group from which the best sixth emerged.
Given the recent international performances of both teams, one would guess that the form assessors would have France as a clear but by no means certain favorite for this match, an assessment certainly not supported by the I IMP lead that they held after the first 16 boards. Ninety-six boards is a marathon not a sprint, as the cliché goes, so let's see how the teams fared in the second round of this bout.
The action started on board I.
Board I7. Dealer North. None Vul.

- 5
$\bigcirc$ K Q J 8
$\diamond A$ Q 986
\& 96
\& K J 106
คA3
$\diamond 104$
K K J 742


4
10976542
$\diamond 72$
2 A 53
-A Q 98742
$\diamond-$
$\diamond K J 53$
$\&$ Q 10
Open Room

| West | North |
| :--- | :--- |
| Brown | Lorenzini |
|  | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 5 |


| East | South |
| :--- | :--- |
| Whibley | Quantin |
| Pass | 14 |
| $2 \triangle$ | $4 \triangle$ |
| All Pass |  |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Combescure | Tislevoll | Rombaut | Ware |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | $3 \triangleright$ | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

In the Open Room, Lorenzini, North for France, got a club lead.After the defense cashed two clubs and switched to a trump, declarer played $₫ \mathrm{~A}$ and ruffed a spade, crossed to dummy in trumps, ruffed a spade and again crossed to dummy in trumps to ruff a third spade, thereby establishing the suit. With trumps 2-2 that was II tricks.
In the closed room, the defence began with the singleton $\$ 3$ lead. Declarer winning the ace and ruffing a spade high followed by the ruffing finesse in hearts (and who wouldn't) losing to West's ace. That player continued with two rounds
of clubs ruffed in dummy. The $\diamond K$ cashed and a spade ruff led to this ending.


Declarer played a club but with East having shed a club on a previous spade ruff he was forced to over-ruff East's $\forall 7$ with the jack.A spade ruff established the suit, but with no high diamond in dummy West scored the $\diamond I 0$ and the third defensive trick when declarer tried to establish hearts. France led 33-22.
Both tables then reached an excellent $6 \diamond$ by North on the following deal:

Board I8. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

- A 3
$\bigcirc$ Q 10
$\diamond$ KJ 98432
\& K 3
- 1742
-K 98
$\diamond 1076$
\& 72

K 8
AJ 2
$\diamond A 5$
\& AJ 1094

## Dealing machines and cards

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

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

Seven diamonds would not be the worst contract imaginable and in fact reached by Austria against Monaco, both tables in England vs Israel and Switzerland against Poland, while surprisingly three tables failed to reach slam. New Zealand made a recovery on Board I9.


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brown | Lorenzini | Whibley | Quantin |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 1\% | 2NT | Pass | 38 |
| Pass | 4. | Dble | Pass |
| Pass | Rdbl | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | $4{ }^{1}$ | Pass | 5 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Combescure | Tislevoll | Rombaut <br> Ware |  |
| 19 | 18 | Dble | 28 |
| 24 | 48 | All Pass |  |

Who could blame Lorenzini for getting excited on the North hand? The $\triangle \mathbf{Q x x}$ and the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ would have made slam a reasonable proposition, but the actual layout meant $5 \vee$ was a shaky proposition. Remembering that South became declarer in the Open Room, West started with two rounds of spades, the second ruffed in dummy. One top trump and $\diamond K$ followed by $\diamond A$ and a diamond ruff saw West over-ruff and play another trump. That left declarer with a diamond loser for one down. Did declarer do anything wrong here? Probably not - we can, of course, all see that the ruffing diamond finesse (see closed room) would secure eleven tricks, but what makes this play superior to any 3-3 diamond break OR trumps 2-2 break?
In the closed room, declarer followed the same line as the open room but, with the luxury of needing only ten tricks, he ran the $\diamond J$ to lose just a spade and diamond ruff. The score was tied at 33.
After a flat board, more blows on board 21 .

Board 2I. Dealer North. N/S Vul.
. 10975
ค A 4
$\diamond$ AKQ 75
95
QJ43
QK953
$\diamond 863$
$\& \mathrm{AJ}$


- A 8

1076
$\diamond$ J 42
\& 87643
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brown | Lorenzini | Whibley | Quantin |
|  | I $\diamond$ | Dble | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Dble | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Combescure | Tislevoll | Rombaut | Ware |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | 18 | INT |
| $2 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| $3 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |  |

Brown and Whibley in the Open Room assessed that they held the majority of points and that N/S would be struggling for tricks. The defense's trump lead together with declarer's failure to secure a spade ruff led to him making just five diamonds and two major suit aces for -500. In the closed room, after cashing two diamonds the defense went after their spade ruff to beat the contract by one trick, so that was +50 and +500 and II IMPs for New Zealand and the score now France 33 - NZ 44.
A flat board and 2 IMPs for overtricks in INT followed. Then both tables bid 3NT, which would have made on no worse than a 4-2 spade break. Both tables failed when they turned out to be 5-I.
Although flat, Board 25 was defensively interesting.
Board 25. Dealer North. E/WVul.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \wedge \bar{\prime} Q 765 \\
& \vee K Q 65 \\
& \diamond 10532
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
985
$$

$\vee A 832$
$\diamond K 987$
$+K 4$
$W^{2} \quad \mathrm{E}$

- QJ 4
- J 9
$\checkmark$ Q 103
- AK 107632
© 104
$\diamond 42$
- A 7

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | Lorenzini | Whibley | Quantin |
|  | Pass | Pass | 49 |

All Pass
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Combescure | Tislevoll | Rombaut | Ware |
|  | 18 | Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 49 |

## All Pass

Lorenzini believed that this hand was not worthy of an opening bid and subsequently explained that playing Gazilli would create rebid complications for a hand of this type and that is why he elected to pass.
In the closed room Combescure, West for France, led a diamond, removing the diamond entry from dummy and putting an end to any chance that declarer could find a heart discard for his losing club or diamond. Losing a trick in each suit meant down one.
In the open room, however the defence had to be deadly accurate after West elected to lead a spade. Declarer won the queen with the ace and immediately played a heart towards dummy's $\triangle \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q}$, West ducking. Declarer crossed back to the A and tried a second heart, which West won. West then, cashed the 2 K and exited with a diamond. This must have excited declarer, who won the $\diamond A$ and tried the $\bigcirc Q$ to pitch his losing diamond. East had other ideas however, ruffing with the Q , on which declarer pitched the losing diamond, leading to this ending:


Whibley continued with the good work by playing the $\% \mathrm{Q}$ and promoting the $\$ 8$ for the setting trick. Well done. New Zealand took the set 32-I8 and led 54-4I with four sets to play.

## Trumps aren't everything <br> By Micke Melander

In the second segment between the Netherlands and Russia in the Open series round of 16 , five large swings were recorded. Most of them have been covered in a previous issue, but this one was saved for today's edition.

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

- A 8
$\bigcirc$ AK 8
$\triangleleft A 53$
\& 19652


Closed Room:

| West <br> Brink | North <br> Vorobei | East <br> S Drijver | South <br> Sliva |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | INT | Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ |
| Dble | Pass | Pass | $3 \triangleleft$ |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

In the closed room, N/S bid to 3NT in a quite normal fashion. In fact, all tables played in 3NT in the open series, except for the open room in this match.
3NT needed help from the defense if it was going to be allowed to make (which happened three times). The Dutch defenders did not make any mistakes. They just kept on attacking hearts when they got in and went up with a high card when they were forced to do so. Declarer stood no chance for a ninth trick and had to give in when the diamonds didn't break 3-3.
Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Khiuppenen | B Drijver | Bavchine | Nab |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | INT | Pass | $30^{*}$ |
| Dble | Rdbl | All Pass |  |

Nab , eyeing his hand in the open room had a handy convention to use, he could in fact ask and show a five-card major by jumping to Three Clubs. West with ace-queenfourth thought it was a good idea to double. When North redoubled, West probably wasn't so so happy anymore.
With eight solid winners in spades, hearts and diamonds, Nab just had to make sure not to lose more than four club tricks, and achieved his target when he played on trumps as soon as he got in. Three Clubs redoubled was 840 and a I4-IMP swing to the Netherlands.


By Ram Soffer

## England v Israel <br> Open Teams R/I6-S2 \& 3

sensibly stopped at game, so it was IO IMPs to England. The younger Israeli pair carried on its hyper-aggressive bidding style to the next board, where David Bakhshi missed a golden opportunity.

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.

- K 107
- 8542
$\diamond$ AK Q 8
75


| N |
| :---: |
| W E |
| S |
| - 986 |
| $\bigcirc 1093$ |
| $\checkmark$ J 965 |
| - 462 |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bakhshi | Birman | Gold | Padon |
| I | I $\diamond$ | $I \$$ | 3 |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | Pass |

Everything was natural except I $\oslash$ which was a transfer, but I find it very difficult to agree with North-South's bidding. Birman elected to overcall with four cards when his distribution was perfect for a takeout double. Did he think they were playing matchpoints? Padon's jump to three level with a flat hand including plenty of losers was extremely risky, to say the least. David Gold did double for


David Bakshi, England
takeout, and with four cards in the opponents' suit and some quick tricks, converting this double to penalty (and a likely plus 800) seems quite clear, at least when seeing all 52 cards. Bakhshi was of a different opinion and he made his 4 contract with an overtrick. Result: another push as Herbst-Herbst stopped in $3 \hat{\%}$ at the other room.
Two boards later, something funny happened: Ilan Herbst played extremely well to make an enterprising 3NT contract, bid with 23 HCP , while Bakhshi was unable to fulfill a modest INT contract with the same cards.

## Board 22. Dealer East. E/WVul.

|  | ¢ A 86 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 1097$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 1086 |  |
|  | ¢ K J 6 |  |
| ¢ 754 | N | - K Q 103 |
| $\bigcirc$ A Q J |  | $\bigcirc 52$ |
| $\diamond$ Al9 32 |  | $\diamond 754$ |
| \& Q 9 | S | \& A 1074 |
|  | - J 92 |  |
|  | ¢K8643 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K |  |
|  | 28532 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bakhshi | Birman | Gold <br> Pass | Padon |
| Is | Pass | IS | Pass |
| INT | All Pass |  |  |

Birman led $\vee 10$. Declarer took South's king with his ace, played a spade to the king and then took his first wrong view when he let South's $\diamond K$ hold the trick. Padon returned a heart. Birman took the next diamond trick and cleared the hearts. Next declarer tried the Q , covered, and the next trick went to North's e . Birman played a small spade, prompting declarer's worst misguess so far, as he let South win the 1 J as well as two heart tricks. England -I00, but they were booked for a big loss anyway due to the result at the other table.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I. Herbst | Hinden | O. Herbst | Osborne |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| INT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2 0}$ | Pass |
| $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

The first two tricks were essentially the same as in the other room, but then Ilan overtook South's $\forall K$ with his ace and played a spade to the queen. A diamond trick was conceded to North, and hearts were continued. Needing four more tricks, declarer envision that North led from a three card heart suit and continued brilliantly: $\odot \mathrm{J}$ and a spade, endplaying North! Hinden was forced to hand declarer his ninth trick in one of the minor suits. An excellent play and a well-deserved +600 to Israel.
Three boards later it was once again Israel in game and England in a partscore, but the outcome was different:

Board 25. Dealer North. E/W Vul.


A typical result of opening with 10 HCP and a spade void: partner bids a 44 game which is against the odds. Bakhshi led an aggressive K K and Padon tried his best: club duck, A, and a heart taken immediately by West's ace. He won the diamond switch in dummy and cashed two hearts, discarding a diamond while East ruffed high. Had he been able then to draw trumps on his own terms, the contract would have made, but a club continuation by East promoted a trump trick for his partner's $\$ 9$. Israel -50.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I. Herbst | Hinden | O. Herbst | Osborne |
|  | Pass | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | INT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

In the replay North refrained from opening. England stopped in a safe 24 and registered an uneventful +140 .
For a change, England was the overbidding team in the very next board, but Ophir Herbst missed his own golden opportunity in defence.

Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.

- Q 10752
$\bigcirc 762$
$\diamond$ Q J
\& K Q 7
(K) 986
$\bigcirc 104$
$\diamond 10983$
\& J 94

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bakhshi | Birman | Gold | Padon |
|  |  | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 3\% |
| Pass | 31 | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |

Birman-Padon "threatened" to go overboard but eventually stopped at a safe level. 24 followed by $3 \%$ was a trial bid showing club shortness. Holding eKQ, I doubt whether North should have cooperated at all. Padon scored an overtrick in 4 『.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I. Herbst | Hinden | O. Herbst | Osborne |
|  |  | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | 28 | Pass | 30 |
| Pass | 31 | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | $5 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |

A similar auction, but the English pair went past the fourlevel into the danger zone. Still it required a very alert defence; otherwise declarer gets a spade discard on one of his clubs. The only winning possibilities for the defence were a spade lead and a misguess by declarer or a trump lead with a spade switch, guaranteeing one down.
llan Herbst continued his inspired session by finding the heart lead, but his brother won the $\vee A$ and, after a long, agonizing think, put the $\triangleleft 6$ on the table. Relief for England and frustration for Israel's supporters.
The session ended with five more pushes and a I-IMP swing in the final board, but we shall move right into the next session.
In the very first board, both Israeli pairs were playing the same contract.

| Board I. Dealer North. None Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - 87652 |  |  |  |
| ¢ K 109 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ J 73 |  |  |  |
| +93 |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | - J 103 |
|  |  | $864$ | QJ8753 |
| $$ | W |  | $\checkmark$ K 65 |
|  | S |  | - ${ }^{\text {a }} 2$ |
| Q Q |  |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 2 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 1082 |  |  |
|  | \& KJ765 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bakhshi | Birman | Gold | Padon |
|  | Pass | Pass | INT |
| Pass | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass | 2 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Barel | Forrester | Zack | Robson |
|  | Pass | Pass | 19 |
| Is | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{Q}$ | All Pass |

While the only good thing I have to say about Padon's INT opening with a singleton Q Q and 14 HCP was that he was not vulnerable, Barel's four-card is overcall was exactly as per Mike Lawrence's recommendations: opening strength, good suit, length in opponent's suit. Indeed, he was the one who reached a makable contract after some normal bidding. Nothing exceptional happened in the play. Both East-West pairs took eight tricks. For Israel it was worth +110 , while England scored $+I 50$ and I more IMP.
The spectators had to wait a few more boards for some real action:

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.

- AKQ 8
$\bigcirc$ Q 108
$\diamond$ K 106
\& 1082

| ¢ J 1062 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | ¢ 975 |
| $\bigcirc 9$ |  |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 7542$ |
| $\diamond$ Q 43 |  | E | $\checkmark$ A 72 |
| \& $A Q$ | S |  | - 43 |
|  | ¢ 43 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A J 63 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 985 |  |  |
|  | ¢ K 76 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bakhshi | Birman | Gold | Padon |
| Pass | 180 | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| 18 | Dble | 19 | Dble |
| 20 | Dble | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ |

## All Pass

South's $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ response was a transfer, and West, being a passed hand, decided to intervene by bidding his opponent's suit. For a while it seemed that England was in trouble, but North-South's doubles were primarily takeout (the first one was a support double showing three hearts). Evnetually Israel settled in $2 \triangleleft$. West led his heart. Declarer misguessed by playing a diamond to the king and then fell victim to a defensive cross-ruff. England +100 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Barel | Forrester | Zack | Robson |
| Pass | 19 | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Rdbl | Is | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Barel's belated intervention was greeted by a strengthshowing redouble from Forrester, who later converted his partner's takeout double.

There was quite some drama in the play. Robson found the perfect trump lead. His partner should have cashed three top trumps for an easy +500 , but he played two rounds of hearts.After ruffing the second heart, West could make his doubled contract: $\diamond A$, club finesse, ceA, club ruff, another heart ruff and a trump, endplaying North and forcing him to lead a diamond at trick 12.
For some reason, Barel was sure that the club finesse was offside, and after his unfortunate e Q continuation, Robson won and of course returned another trump. As the defence drew trumps, the roof caved in for declarer, and he needed to engineer a diamond endplay just to prevent the indignity of a II00 penalty. The actual -800 was sufficiently severe, as Israel lost 14 IMPs and the match became tied at 5I-5I.
Over the next ten boards, each team scored 8 IMPs, and the match was finely balanced when the following deal hit the table:

Board I5. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \& 652 \\
& \& Q J 10 \\
& \diamond 10765 \\
& \& 197
\end{aligned}
$$



Apparently, Gold-Bakhshi don't subscribe to the common view that game should be bid with any two hands totalling 25 HCP or more. In a sense, they were right. The INT response wrong-sided the contract and 3NT can hardly be made after the actual $\vee Q$ lead. Israel started with three heart tricks, but they were looking for a way to defeat 2NT. At trick four Birman tried a hyper-active el, which gave away an overtrick, though the contract was always safe. England +150.

| West <br> Barel | North <br> Forrester | East <br> Zack | South <br> Robson |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | Pass | 2NT | Pass <br> Pass |
| 3上 | Pass | 3上 | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

Yaniv Zack's 2NT opening was a good move, as after a Puppet-Stayman sequence he reached a right-sided and makeable 3NT contract. However, this was the time for the most brilliant play of the session, and perhaps one of the best in the tournament.
Andrew Robson realized that leading away from his honours was probably going to assist declarer, so he put on the table the passive $\$ 8$, despite the fact that declarer had announced the possession of a five-card spade suit during the bidding.
It was not a lethal lead, and declarer could probably guess that South had honours in every other suit, but he still would have had to play very well. The winning play would start by cashing five spades (discarding hearts from dummy). Then a diamond would be played towards the queen, and eventually South would be forced to lead away either from the 8 A or the K . However, the details are not so simple to work out at the table!
At the table, Zack won the first trick in dummy and tried a small club toward his queen. Robson won his e K and continued the suit. Now North had a sure entry with $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{J}}$ and declarer could not prevent a heart being led through his king, so the contract was doomed.
This was a highly deserved +50 for England, and it meant they led by 64-60 at half-time. Later the English team had a good fourth session as well, and they opened up a handy lead of I20-86 with just two session to go.



In the round of 16 match between Italy and England in the Women's series, England had started strong, forging a 7023 lead after two sets. Italy won the third set but by only 3 IMPs, and halfway through the match England was up 94-50. In set four, the last of the day on Saturday, Italy was looking to put a bigger dent in England's edge.
In the open room, England sent Catherine Draper and Fiona Brown against Francesca Piscitelli and Margherita Chavarria. At the other table, it was Simonetta Paoluzi and Ilaria Saccavini for Italy against Nevena Senior and Heather Dhondy.
The match started well for Italy. After a push on the first board, this deal was next.

|  | Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ¢ 8632 |  |  |
|  | ¢ Q 9732 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 2$ |  |  |
|  | ¢ 107 |  |  |
| ¢ K 9 | N |  | , AQ 54 |
| $\bigcirc$ A 1054 |  |  | $\bigcirc$ J 6 |
| $\triangleleft \mathrm{K}$ Q J 3 | W E |  | $\checkmark$ A 10874 |
| \& Q 53 | S |  | \% 84 |
|  | - J 107 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 8$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 965$ |  |  |
|  | \& AK962 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Draper | Piscitelli | Brown | Chavarria |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 18 | Pass | 12 | Pass |
| 20 | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | 49 | Pass |
| 5 | All Pass |  |  |

It's hard to fault Draper for being reluctant to insist on no-trump. Clearly her partner was weak in clubs. With the top two clubs favorably placed, 3NT is in no danger, but Draper couldn't know that. Without a defensive error, there was no play for II tricks in diamonds. The result was minus 50. In the closed room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paoluzi | Senior | Saccavini | Dhondy |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 20 | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 38 | Pass |
| 31 | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

Paoluzi's 2 was an artificial game force. Senior made the normal heart lead, which went to the 6 , king and ace. Paoluzi can always take 10 tricks, but she ended up with II
when North discarded a spade on the run of the diamonds and South played low when declarer called for a club from dummy. When the scored, that was plus 460 and II IMPs to Italy.
The Italians gained an overtrick IMP on the next board to take a 12-0 lead in the set. England struck back on this deal:

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.
-AJIO 7654
$\bigcirc$ AKJ 7
$\diamond 5$
\& 9


- 2

จQ654
$\diamond$ Q 1096
\& 」 1075

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Draper | Piscitelli | Brown | Chavarria |
| Pass | $1 Q^{*}$ | Pass | INT |
| Pass | $2 e^{*}$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | 3 | All Pass |  |

According to the partnership's system card, Piscitelli's 2\% rebid was natural and limited (II-I4) or artificial indicating 15+ HCP. South's 2NT apparently was just a denial of spade support. Even so, North's conservative 3 risked what actually happened. Piscitelli won the heart opening lead in hand and cashed the A , followed by a low spade. She lost two spades and a trick in each minor for plus 140 . In the closed room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Paoluzi | Senior | Saccavini | Dhondy |
| Pass | 19 | Pass | INT |
| Pass | $4 \infty$ | All Pass |  |

Senior was sufficiently encouraged by the fact that Dhondy responded, simply launching into the vulnerable game. The opening diamond lead went to the ace and a diamond was returned. Senior ruffed, entered dummy and in hearts and played a spade to the jack and East's king. Senior won the heart return in hand and played the $\Phi \mathrm{A}$, dropping the queen for plus 620 and a I0-IMP gain.
England went ahead in the set on this board, but it should have been a 9-IMP gain for Italy.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
, KJ6
-A954
$\diamond$ J 762

- 18

| Q Q | N | ¢ 75 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 10$ |  | ¢ K 8732 |
| $\checkmark$ KQ 10543 | W E | $\checkmark$ A 9 |
| 2K 7542 | $S$ S | \& A 1096 |
|  | - A 1098432 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q J 6 |  |
|  | $\diamond 8$ |  |
|  | \& Q 3 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Draper | Piscitelli | Brown | Chavarria |
|  |  | I $\$$ | 39 |
| Pass | 49 | All Pass |  |

Chavarria could not avoid losing a diamond, and heart and two clubs for minus 50. At the other table, Chavarria's teammates did better in the auction ... up to a point.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paoluzi | Senior | Saccavini | Dhondy |
|  |  | $1{ }^{1}$ | 3s |
| $4 \checkmark$ | 49 | Pass | Pass |
| 50 | Pass | 6\% | All Pass |

Game in clubs was cold. There was no play for the slam. With the obstructive bidding by the opponents, East-West did well to get to a makeable spot ( $5 \diamond$ was also cold). Too bad for Italy, Saccavini wasn't satisfied with that. Instead of a 9-IMP gain, the Italians lost 4 IMPs. England won the set 36-I8. With 32 boards to play on Sunday, England was leading 130-68.


Catherine Draper, England

## Mark Blumenthal <br> 1942-2016

Mark Blumenthal, two-time silver medalist in the Bermuda Bowl and a former member of the Aces bridge team created by Ira Corn, died Sept. 2, in Portland OR.
Blumenthal started playing bridge as a student of the University of Pennsylvania and the bridge bug bit him bad. After college he worked in retail and played bridge with his boss. His boss decided that Mark should spend his time playing bridge rather than managing a retail store. That was the beginning of his life as a professional bridge player.
High-level success came early for the bridge prodigy. In I965, he was on the winning Reisinger Knockout team. His reputation grew and he soon was invited to join the Aces. The team finished second to Italy in the 1973 Bermuda Bowl in Guaruja, Brazil. A year later in Venice, Italy, Blumenthal was again second in the Bermuda Bowl, playing with Bobby Goldman, Bob Hamman, Bobby Wolff, Sami Kehela and Eric Murray. Blumenthal won his first Vanderbilt Trophy in 1973 and his second in 1977. He married Kathy Evans in January 1976.
About two weeks after the 1977 summer nationals, Blumenthal had open-heart surgery. Complications resulted in some form of CVA, probably a stroke, putting an end to his career as a bridge professional. He and his wife Kate subsequently raised two children, Erik and Laura, in Chicago. After almost three decades he returned to competitive bridge in 2004 and won a secondary event at the 2004 Fall NABC. A subsequent fall caused additional brain damage and he never played competitive bridge again.
In 2006, he moved to Portland OR where he enjoyed being near his children and bridge blogging. After a serious fall and additional brain damage in 2009, he could no longer use his computer and his blogging ended. Shortly before his death, according to his wife, "he had the happiness of holding his first grandchild, Hugo George Anderson-Blumenthal."
Said Kate Blumenthal:"For Mark, bridge was not a game. It was constant challenge as well as a way of life. He reveled in competition at the highest levels and his ability to focus on the game was amazing. One anecdote stands out in my mind. Mark was playing in a tournament in Milwaukee WI when two lovely young ladies in hot pants and very low-cut tops sat down at the table. When the round was over and the ladies moved on, Mark's partner remarked, 'Wow, did you get a load of that?' Mark responded, 'Yes, the way she butchered the second hand was unbelievable.'


The "Dallas Aces" in 1973. Ira Corn, Mark Blumenthal, Bobby Wolff, Michael Lawrence, Bobby Goldman, Bob Hamman. from 'L’Aristocratie du Bridge" 1973 Editions Ballard.

By Ram Soffer
Having been down 3 IMPs after two sessions, Poland scored a resounding 76-15 in the third session. Going into the final session of the day, Poland wished at least to protect its lead.
In the very first deal Poland reached a game which was not bid at the other table.

Board I7. Dealer North. None Vul.

- 72

QQ952
975
\& A 1073

| - A 3 |  | ¢ K Q 1098 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ K 10763 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ A 102 |  | $\diamond$ Q J 8643 |  |
| 2 J 94 | S |  | ¢ Q 5 |
|  | , J 654 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AJ 84 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark \mathrm{K}$ |  |  |
|  | 2K862 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Markowicz | Lavings | J. Klukowski | Krochmalik |
|  | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $5 \checkmark$ | All Pass |  |  |

24 was a weak two-suiter (spade+minor). 2NT was an enquiry, with at least invitational values. East's jump to $4 \diamond$ indicated his 6-5 pattern plus extra strength, and West sensibly bid 5 .
Making $5 \diamond$ after a club lead involves an early spade ruff with $\diamond I 0$ and then some good guessing in the trump suit. However, South led a friendly $\triangle$ A, ruffed. Declarer entered dummy in spades and threw a club loser on the 8 K . Later he could make six, but he didn't guess trumps and conceded a trick to the $\diamond 9$.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lorentz | Kowalski | Burgess | Romanski |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ Pass |
| 18 | Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | Pass |
| 28 | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

At the replay East opened at the one-level, and one would expect the Australian pair to reach game. Perhaps there was some misunderstanding regarding the $2 \boxtimes$ bid. Let me guess that it was a forcing bid according to their system. Anyway, Romanski found the good club lead, and declarer also conceded a spade trick. Australia + I30, but 7 IMPs to Poland.The next big swing came when South held
s2 (Q654 $\langle$ Q1096 2j1075
and had to respond to partner's second-seat lse opening, with both sides vulnerable.
Krochmalik allowed Is to be passed out, while Romanski bid INT, telling his partner to bid 4s with a 7-4-I-I pattern. Dummy had exactly one entry, and declarer who was missing KQ983 of trumps, had to find a doubleton honour at his right. This was indeed the situation, so Poland scored 10 IMPs. Next board, Poland once again bid 4s on thin values, but in this case they were less fortunate and Australia's +140 at the other table was worth 6 IMPs. The net gain of those two hands was 4 to Poland - that's why one is supposed to bid a lot of these thin vulnerable games at IMPs.
One board later, Poland misjudged at the four-level.
Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

- K J 6
- A 954
$\diamond$ J 762
- 18

$\triangleright$ Q J 6
$\diamond 8$
2 Q 3

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Markowicz | Lavings | J. Klukowski Krochmalik |  |
|  |  | I $\$$ | $3 \uparrow$ |
| $4 \diamond$ | $4 s$ | Dble | All Pass |

True, East had merely II HCP for his opening bid, but in the context of the auction his values were working ones. Therefore East's double, strongly discouraging any further bidding by partner, didn't seem to be justified. Perhaps Markowicz should have bid on nevertheless with his 6-5-I-Idistribution, but he decided to respect his partner and lead the SIO. Declarer knew from the bidding that making his doubled game was impossible. So he asked for dummy's ace, quietly accepting one off for -I00.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lorentz | Kowalski | Burgess | Romanski |
|  |  | $1 \otimes$ | 19 |
| $2 \diamond$ | $3 \Phi$ | Pass | 49 |

5\% All Pass
Romanski's It did little to disrupt the Australians, who reached their top spot of 5 e. When trumps broke 2-2, they scored +600 and II IMPs.
Two boards later, North-South were cold for 4s in a 6-I
fit, but Australia stopped at 24 making +170 , while Poland did even worse by bidding 3NT where their opponent could take the first seven tricks. The best lead was not found, but 3NT was still one down (6 IMPs to Australia).
Australia's surge continued in the following deal:
Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& } 7 \\ & \text { Q } 66 \\ & \diamond \text { K } 10952 \\ & \text { Q } 1053 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K Q$\bigcirc 72$ |  | N | 109832 |
|  |  | $\bigcirc 72$ W E $\bigcirc$ AK9543 |  |
| $\checkmark$ A Q J 874 |  |  |  |
| * 8 S S 4 |  |  |  |
| - AJ 64 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 108$ |  |  |  |
| 63 |  |  |  |
| 2 19762 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | Sout |
| Markowicz | Lavings | J. Klukowski | Krochmalik |
|  |  | $1{ }_{1}$ | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 28 | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 38 | Pass |
| 4\% | Pass | $4{ }^{1}$ | All Pass |

The is opening seems to be normal enough, as one would not regard the East hand worthy of a reverse bid. After such a start, the Polish pair was bound to reach 44.
This contract was a bit tricky due to the bad trump break, but there were several ways to overcome it. After the $\mathbf{\$ 2}$ lead, the simplest line was to win in dummy, ruff our hearts and then conceding two spades, when the k preserved in East's hand makes sure that declarer would not lose control.
However, Klukowski won in his hand and played a spade to the king. Next came two top hearts. Now the winning line was heart ruff, diamond ruff and cashing hearts, overruffing South if necessary.
However, declarer played another spade toward dummy, handing South an opportunity to defeat him by taking his ace and continuing spades. Instead, Krochmalik ducked. Dummy's $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$ won as well as the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$. Now declarer should have ruffed a diamond and a heart before playing $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$, but he took the ruffing finesse too early. North ducked, and now South was ready to ruff the next trick and remove dummy's last trump with his A A . Eventually declarer lost control and gave North the final two tricks with $\vee \mathrm{J}$ and $\diamond \mathrm{K}$. Overall, his play was not a very good one, starting from trick one, which should have been won in dummy.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lorentz | Kowalski | Burgess | Romanski |
|  |  | $1 \nabla$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \vee$ | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | $4 \nabla$ | All Pass |

After Burgess elected to open $1 \vee$, spades were never mention. The heart game was easier to handle, as declarer was never in danger of losing control. Eventually Burgess conceded one heart and two spade tricks for +620 , a gain of 12 IMPs.
However, the final six boards belonged to Poland. In the following one East thought he was preventing declarer from stealing a ninth trick, while in fact his "second hand high" play handed declarer no less than four tricks.

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.


North's off-shape (and light) INT overcall propelled the Polish pair to a game which seemed to be hopeless as the defenders were supposed to win the race between the two red suits. However, North won the heart lead with his 8 K and led a small diamond. Of course, his six-card diamond suit remained hidden during the bidding. Now East imagined declarer having a hand such as
$\triangle \mathrm{AQx} \vee \mathrm{Kx} \diamond$ Qxx $\stackrel{\mathrm{Axxxx}}{ }$.
In this case he must go up immediately with $\diamond A$ and continue hearts, or else declarer comes to nine tricks.
So he went up with the ace, but declarer won the next trick with $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and then his partner's $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ came down under dummy's $\diamond K$. Good news for Kowalski, who claimed II tricks.
At the other table North preferred a normal bid of $2 \diamond$ and played there for +110 , a loss of 8 IMP for Australia when it could be 5 IMPs the other way.
Further misfortunes by Australia (a bad lead allowing 3\% to make in board 3I, and then missing an excellent minor suit non-vulnerable game in board 32), helped Poland regain some lost ground. Eventually the session was tied at 40 apiece, and Poland still led by 58 with just 32 boards to play.


In the final session on Saturday night, the boards were reasonably quiet. Probably the players were grateful for that, as it definitely is not an easy task to play 64 boards in one day, even less so in the current weather conditions.
My original idea was to write a report on the proceedings in the Spain v. USA match, one of the close matches at the halfway point - USA leading by just 7 IMPs. When it transpired during the session, however, that Canada were staging a rally against Italy, I decided to include a few boards from that match as well in this report.
Here is one of the boards on which Canada outbid their opponents:

Board 22. Dealer East. E/WVul.


When Fergani eventually showed his minor two-suiter, the Canadians reached a contract that proved unbeatable with the trumps 2-2. Canada +600 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Di Bello | L'Ecuyer | Avossa <br> $1 \varnothing$ | Marcinski <br>  <br>  <br> Dble |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |  |
| $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

Over 34, it was much more difficult for West to show the two-suiter, so the club game was not bid. Italy +130 but 10 IMPs to Canada.
Two boards later, in the Spain v. USA match Sabate had a nasty problem:

Board 24. Dealer West. None Vul.

|  | -10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 97532$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AK 62 |  |
|  | - A 106 |  |
| - Q 942 | N | - A 5 |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 8$ |  | PAQJ 1064 |
| $\checkmark 83$ |  | $\diamond 954$ |
| \& Q 9874 | S | - 32 |
|  | - KJ8763 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ - |  |
|  | $\diamond$ QJ 107 |  |
|  | - KJ5 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Greco | Sabate | Hampson | G Goded |
| Pass | $1 \searrow$ | Pass | $1 乌$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 ¢$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | Pass | $5 \diamond$ |

## All Pass

The final contract is reasonable enough, but to bring it home was another story. East led a trump to declarer's ace and the 10 ran to West's queen. A heart came back, dummy ruffing with the $\diamond I 0$. Declarer cashed dummy's $\diamond$, both defenders following suit, and had to decide about his next move now. As you can see, ruffing a low spade in his hand would have brought down the ace from East - after which the rest would have been easy. When declarer decided to run the K through West, shedding a heart from hand, East won the ace perforce and returned a trump. Back in dummy, declarer cashed the $\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\mathrm{J}}$ and ruffed a spade with his last trump. All he had to do now was to guess the N Q for his contract: NK , spades, club to the ten and claim. When he played the ex first and immediately took the club finesse through East, West won the queen and the defenders suddenly had the rest of the tricks: down four, USA +200.
At the other table, the Americans were less ambitious:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wasik | Lall | Knap | Bathurst |
| Pass | $1 \triangleleft$ | Pass | INT |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |

## All Pass

East led a club to declarer's ten and went up with the ace when the 10 was played next. This way, Lall had 12 easy tricks. USA another +170 and 9 IMPs.
In the Netherlands v. Russia match, the Dutch had already
taken a big lead. On this board, they further extended it:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Semenov | S Drijver | Kholomeev | Brink |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | $1 \$$ |
| Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | $3 \Phi$ |
| Pass | $4 \Phi$ | All Pass |  |

West led the 9 , solving any problems in the suit. Brink won in hand and simply led a spade to dummy's ten. No matter what West did, he would not lose more than three trump tricks. At the table, West played low, so the ten forced East's ace. If West goes up with the queen and plays a heart, declarer has just enough time to ruff, play a high trump to East's ace, ruff the next heart and cash his other top trump. West can ruff with his master trump whenever he likes, but declarer has the rest.
On an initial heart lead, declarer can certainly prevail by guessing the clubs and playing a trump to his king and a trump back.
This deal brought the Dutch another 7 IMPs when Russia stayed in a partscore at the other table: 3$\rangle+1$ for +130 .
On board 27, you needed to stay low:
Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.


That's exactly what the Spaniards did. A sensible partscore for a well-deserved +IIO.
At the other table, South found an opening bid:

| West <br> Wasik | North <br> Lall | East <br> Knap | South <br> Bathurst |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | $1 \diamond$ |
| I $\diamond$ | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

One Diamond showed at least a doubleton but opposite partner's opening bid, North could not stay out of game. On correct defence, 3NT has no chance, as the Spaniards showed.
Heart lead to the ace, $\diamond \mathrm{J}$ to West's queen, heart back and
the defence have seven tricks when East comes in with his $\diamond$ A. Spain another +150 and 6 IMPs back.
At a few other tables, the defence against this 3NT went astray. Heart lead and a diamond but now, some Easts went up with the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ to return a heart. This cleared the hearts but also set up declarer's diamonds when the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$ appeared under dummy's king...
On the next board to be shown, Kholomeev found a fine play to land a slam in the Netherlands v. Russia match:

Board 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

|  | ¢ K 4 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 10$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q J | 74 |  |
|  | 9 97 |  |  |
| - A 10 | N | $\pm 9$ |  |
| $\bigcirc 3$ |  | $\checkmark$ A | ) 82 |
| $\diamond$ K 52 |  | E $\quad \diamond$ A | 1093 |
| \& A Q | 543 S | \% K |  |
|  | , Q J | 7532 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 6$ |  |  |
|  | * 8 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Semenov | Bas Drijver | Kholomeev | Brink |
| 20 | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 30 | 30 |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| 49 | Pass | 6\% | All Pass |

After a Precision-style auction, the Russians ended up in a slam that, at first sight, seems to have no play. However, Brink's bold 3s bid changed things for the defenders, as Kholomeer was quick to prove. He won the $\Phi \mathrm{K}$ lead and immediately led a heart to dummy's ace and ruffed a heart in hand, thus starting the elimination process. Club to the jack, heart ruff, club to the king and the last heart ruffed. By now, Kholomeev knew that South had four hearts and one club. The rest was "plain sailing." As South would hold at least six spades and probably seven, he could not hold more than two diamonds. So declarer cashed the $\diamond$ AK and exited in spades, forcing South to give a ruff and discard. Very well done, Russia +920 and 10 IMPs to them when the Dutch stayed quietly in 3NT on this auction, making two overtricks:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Khiuppenen | Muller | Barchine |
| 2@ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | $3 \Phi$ |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

The last board of the day was another slam in both the Italy-Canada and Spain-USA matches, but not a convincing one:


Once South showed a decent-looking suit opposite partner's Strong Club, Sabate decided to go all out to the diamond slam. Luck was with him when the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ came down in three rounds.
Spades were led and continued, declarer ruffing the second round. $\diamond A K, \gtrdot A K$ and a heart ruff, followed by the Q, covered by king and ace. Declarer drew the last trump and took stock. It looked as if West was 5-4-2-2 so Sabate next ran the 8 . When this won the trick, he was home for an exciting +920 on the last board.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wasik | Lall | Knap | Bathurst |
| Pass | 1980 | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| $1{ }^{1}$ | Dble | 2 | 3 |
| Pass | 31 | Dble | 4 |
| Pass | 4 | Pass | 5 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The Americans' Strong Club saw them reach 5 - more or less the par contract, as $5 \diamond$ too would have been. On a spade lead and continuation, declarer would have needed the K doubleton with West to make an overtrick but when East, only defending 5e, at trick two returned a low trump to the king and ace, declarer quickly had his 12 tricks. USA +420 but II IMPs to Spain.
After 64 boards, the score stood at II3-I02 to USA. In the Italy-Canada match, the Canadians missed a chance:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fergani | Lauria | Pollack | Versace |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Dble | 3 | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

3 NT is not the best contract for $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$, even less so when West kicked off by leading the K . Fatigue played a part in what happened next, I cannot help feeling. East overtook with his ace and returned the $£ 7$ to West's eight but now, West shifted to a heart...
When West discarded a heart and two spades on the run of the diamonds, declarer could afford to play and another to land his contract. Italy a very fortunate +400 .
The Canadian version of the Strong Club saw them reach 62. As we saw above, this slam would need the ek doubleton onside.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Di Bello | L'Ecuyer | Avossa | Marcinski |
| Pass | 1s | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| $1{ }^{1}$ | Dble | 2 | 3\% |
| Pass | 31 | Pass | 4* |
| Pass | 62 | All Pa |  |

This time, the defence led two rounds of spades, declarer ruffing the second round. 『AK and a ruff to reach dummy, $\Leftrightarrow \mathrm{Q}$ which held the trick when West did not cover. When the A next brought down the king, declarer was home after all for a lucky +920 and II IMPs to Canada.
The score in that match after 64 boards: I49-I 37 to Italy.

## Segment 5

In this segment, only ten boards were played on BBO in the Spain v. USA match. Spain also incurred a procedural penalty of 10 IMPs for refusing to play. Before the start of play on Sunday afternoon, they informed the director that they had been looking through many bidding sequences of the American pair involved and that they had found that the pair has a habit of always producing an opening bid in 3rd position non-vulnerable, irrespective of the number of HCP the hand holds. That's why they required that the American line-up for the segment should be changed in such a way that this pair would not be allowed to play.
When play was due to start at 5:30 p.m., the Chief TD informed the Spanish players that they were liable to get penalised for every minute they would be late in starting. When it turned out, shortly afterwards, that all players involved were present at $4: 45$ p.m., it was decided that a penalty for late arrival would not be appropriate but that a penalty for refusal to play would have to be imposed. This explains for the fact that the initial penalty of 32 IMPs was reduced to 10 IMPs .
Play eventually got underway just after 6 p.m. It was then decided that, for obvious security reasons, the first six boards of the segment would be replaced by six manually dealt boards, to be played immediately subsequent to the original boards 7 through 16 .
The segment started with the scores very close in both the matches. Remarkably enough, both USA and Italy were leading their respective opponents by 13 IMPs. Whose lucky day would it be today?
On the first board of the regular set, we can only inform you about what happened in the Italy-Canada match.

Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.


2e was strong and 2 showed at least three controls. East was obviously hoping for anything extra or a favourable lead. When South found the latter, the $\vee 10$, Pollack had immediately got his 12 th trick. Canada +990 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Versace | L'Écuyer | Lauria | Marcinski |
|  | Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | Pass |
| INT | Pass | 20 | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | 31 | Pass |
| 4\% | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 49 | All Pass |  |  |

In view of Versace's initial INT response and his denial of a heart control (Versace would certainly have bid $4 \checkmark$ over $4 \diamond$ to show it), Lauria called it a day when Versace correctly signed off. So the cold spade slam was missed - the $\triangle Q$ was already enough for it to succeed. Italy +480 but II IMPs to Canada.
Over now to what turned out to be the first board in the Spain v. USA match.

|  | 7. Dealer Sou | All Vul. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - A Q 94 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 63 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ - |  |
|  | * AK 862 |  |
| ¢ K 85 | N | ¢ 72 |
| $\bigcirc 10987$ |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 52$ |
| $\diamond$ AK 654 |  | $\diamond$ Q 107 |
| \& 7 | S | \% Q J 943 |
|  | , 」1063 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 14$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 9832$ |  |
|  | \& 105 |  |


| West | North <br> Sabate | East <br> Hampson | South <br> G Goded <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | 14 |
| Pass | INT | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

It looks as if the Spanish agreements about the 4th suit made it difficult for them to reach the proper denomination, as they eventually stranded in $2 \triangleleft$ and went one down with possibly even 44 making their way, at least double-dummy. USA +100.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lantaron | Lall | F Goded | Bathurst <br> Pass |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | $\mathbf{I} \diamond$ |
| Dble | $2 \dot{2}$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

In the Closed Room, the Spaniards fared little better. Lantaron's aggressive doubles both came when the opponents would never get into trouble and his side had nowhere to go. These things happen. Lall made an overtrick when West never got the chance to lead a trump through. USA +380 and 10 IMPs to start the day.
On board II, three of our featured four N/S pairs were in 3NT doubled, with three different outcomes.

Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{J} 10854 \\ & >6 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\diamond$ | K 105 |
|  | 2 AKJ 4 |  |
| - 2 | N | - A Q 96 |
| $\bigcirc$ J1075432 |  | $\checkmark$ A 8 |
| $\diamond 984$ | W E | $\diamond$ A Q 2 |
| \% 52 | S | 910987 |
|  | ¢ K 73 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K Q 9 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 763 |  |
|  | \% Q 63 |  |

In the Spain v. USA match, Greco as West did not open.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Greco | Sabate | Hampson | G Goded |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | INT | Dble |
| 3 | Pass | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

With East holding the best hand at the table, and West producing a noise, East considered it unlikely that 3NT could be a success. However, when West duly led the 2 in response to his partner's double (dummy's first bid suit, the classic idea), East's nine came under pressure. No matter which card East would play, declarer would be able to establish his spades at the loss of two tricks in the suit and
thus come to nine tricks easily enough, as East would not be able to profitably attack any suit. Spain +550 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lantaron | Lall | F Goded | Bathurst |
|  |  |  | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | INT |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | 2 | All Pass |  |

In the other room, the light opening check-back enabled N/S to stay in a modest partscore which just made. USA +110 but 10 IMPs to Spain.
Much more action in the Italy-Canada match.

| West <br> Fergani | North <br> Di Franco | East <br> Pollack | South <br> Manno <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | Dble | $2 N T$ | Dble |
| $3 \%$ | Pass | $3 \triangle$ | Pass |
| Pass | 39 | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

For Canada, West did in fact open a weak two and quite rightly showed a bad hand by responding 3\% to partner's enquiry. After that, the Italians thought they knew enough to venture a game - and so did East when he had the last word.
West led the $^{\prime} \mathrm{J}$ to partner's ace and East correctly returned a club, starting the attack on declarer's communications. When declarer won this in dummy and played the J rather than a low spade to his seven, he could no longer make the contract.. Canada +100 .


Jordi Sabate, Spain

When West passed and North showed his spades in transfer over partner's opening bid, the Canadians, too, landed in 3NT after Versace had shown his hearts. Once again, East did not believe in all this. Versace made the excellent lead of the 5 and when declarer did not play a spade from dummy to his seven, he even went two down as Lauria could simply return clubs whenever he got the lead. Eventually, declarer had to lead a diamond to dummy, enabling Lauria to score three spades, two diamonds and the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ for a fine down two, +300 and 5 IMPs to Italy.
On the next board, Spain again scored heavily.
Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- 82
$\bigcirc$ A 3
$\diamond \quad$ A8652
2 K 1098

| ¢ AKJIO 753 | N | +96 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 108$ |  | $\bigcirc 97542$ |
| $\diamond$ - | W E | $\diamond 1973$ |
| 9 7432 | S | \& 65 |
|  | , Q 4 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K Q J 6 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K Q 104 |  |
|  | \& A Q J |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Greco | Sabate | Hampson | G Goded |
| 49 | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | $5 \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Though N/S were looking at nearly all the high-card points in the pack, they both were worried about a doubleton spade with partner. Spain a fine +600 - as we shall see.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lantaron | Lall | F Goded | Bathurst |
| $4 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| Pass | $4 N T$ | Pass | $5 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $6 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

Like so many other N/S pairs in the room, N/S were hoping to find at least one of them with a singleton spade. Spain another +100 and 12 IMPs.
When the supplementary boards were played, Spain took over the lead. They would go into the final segment with the score at 147-146 (including the penalty they had incurred). It could hardly be more exciting...
With 16 boards to go, Canada were leading by 7 IMPs so another close finish was in prospect.

## The Polish Corner



## WSZYSTKO DOBRE CO SIE

 DOBRZE KOŃCZYWspólny Język, nasz niemalże ,,narodowy" system, można powiedzieć, że statystycznie się sprawdza. Ale w jednym z rozdań meczu kobiet Polska - Turcja przyszła sekwencja, która na pewno jest jego piętą achillesową.

Rozd. 7. Obie po partii, rozd. S.

|  | - AD 94 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PAD6 3 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ - |  |
|  | - AK 862 |  |
| - K 85 | N | - 72 |
| -10987 |  | ¢K52 |
| $\diamond$ AK 654 | W E | $\checkmark$ D 107 |
| -9 | S | \& DW943 |
|  | - W 1063 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ W 4 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ W9832 |  |
|  | -105 |  |

Takim systemowym felerem jest licytacja silnych rąk trójkolorowych po otwarciu l\& i negacie partnera. Popatrzmy co się stało tutaj:
Kasia Dufrat z ręką N po dwóch pasach otworzyła l\&, a po pasie E Justyna Żmuda ze swoją mizerią odpowiedziała I $\downarrow$. W także spasowała. Co teraz? Niestety, system nie pozostawiał alternatywy - IV. Z kartą $S$ trudno było cokolwiek licytować dalej i licytacja zgasła. Na pewno prościej by było, gdyby W zainterweniowała.
E wyszła damą trefl. Justyna wzięła asem i zagrał króla trefl. W przebiła, zagrała w atu, z ręki blotka. E po lewie na króla powtórzyła kiery. Teraz udany impas pik i 8 lew, IIO.

Turczynki znalazły piki, co więcej, doszły do nie najgorszej końcówki:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sarniak | Ozgur | Bałdysz | Ozbay |
|  |  |  | pas |
| pas | 1\% | pas | pas |
| ktr. | rktr. | $1 \diamond$ | pas |
| pas | 18 | pas | 14 |
| pas | 21 | pas | 4¢(!) |

Naturalny system Turczynek sprawdził się tutaj lepiej. Trudno dziwić się wznowieniu z ręką W, po czym NS znalazły piki. Być może zalicytowanie końcówki przez S było dyskusyjne, ale kontrakt wyglądał nieźle. Co prawda do czasu ... W wyszła w singla trefl. N wzięła asem i pozornie bezpiecznie zagrał damę pik. Anka Sarniak wzięła królem i doskonale odeszła blotką karo. Rozgrywająca przebiła w stole, po czym spróbowała króla trefl. Przebitka i kier. Małe ze stołu. Cathy, po lewie na króla, zagrała w damę trefl i rozgrywająca w tym momencie poddała się bez jednej. Nasze zawodniczki się nie zgodziły i szczegółowa analiza wykazała że jest bez dwóch - 8 imp dla Polski.
Można podsumować jak w tytule...
A swoja droga, to rozdanie to ciekawy problem rozgrywkowy. W świetle licytacji, biorąc pod uwagę, że rozpoczęła się od trzech pasów, a potem $W$ wznowiła kontrą, można założyć, że $W$ ma dwie figury karo, w związku z czym starsze króle są rozdzielone. Dlatego najlepsze wydaje się zagranie w drugiej lewie w kiery do waleta - odwrotne, niż w rzeczywistości położenie króli w kolorach starszych nie daje wiele rozgrywającemu, gdyż przejście do stołu atutem do impasu kier spowoduje po kolejnym połączeniu pików problemy ze skompletowaniem 10 lew.
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