

The Cavendish Invitation retains its unique position as the world's only really-big money event. The Auction that precedes the event again exceeded a million dollars, though the total raised was slightly down on last year. The winners, for once, were the favourites, the current world pairs champions from Poland. It is a sign of the times that the backers, nearly all American, are expecting a pair from Poland to win an American major held in Las Vegas.

Respect in America for the top European players has grown as a direct result of increased participation in the American Nationals of the leading players from the European Continent. There is now recognition that Italy, France and Poland all have a considerable depth of talented players, supported by pockets of excellence elsewhere. But there are indications that in both France and America itself, the players who dominated the world scene a decade ago are looking vulnerable. The era when the Nickell team started as clear favourites in any tournament they entered has gone.

From the European point of view the sad thing is that the traffic is one-way. The high-class European Invitation events have a smattering of the top Americans, but there is no Open event in Europe that has enough on offer to attract them. The attraction does not need to be prize money, for there is none of that at the American majors. But the alternative is a prestigious title. That can only be provided by the European Bridge League, as it can offer European titles.

When the EBL reviews its calendar it should give favourable attention to abandoning the March date that clashes with the American Nationals and replacing it with a June date in the years alternating with the current Zonals. This new event, of 12 days, starting on a Monday and ending on a Friday (so that competitors can travel at the weekend and avoid taking more than two weeks off work), could be the European Transnational Championships, with Pairs and Teams events for Mixed, Open, Ladies and Seniors. Then we might see Americans travelling to Europe in search of good bridge, a prestigious title and a holiday.

\* \* \* \* \*

The next Bulletin will be dedicated to the European Championships in Tenerife. The August Bulletin will be the last to have automatic consideration for the annual awards. Daily Bulletins at the World Junior Teams in Rio in August will also be included.

No telephone numbers have been received for Tenerife Press Room. Look for them either at the EBL website [www.eurobridge.org](http://www.eurobridge.org) or Anna Gudge's website [www.ecatsbridge.com](http://www.ecatsbridge.com). The telephone number of the Mare Nostrum Resort is: 0034 + 922 75 75 00

*Patrick Jourdain - Editor*

## World Pairs Champions & Favourites Take Cavendish Invitation

**Michal Kwiecien & Jacek Pszczola of Poland**, who won the World Pairs title in 1998 in Lille, won the Cavendish Invitation in a tight finish with Billy Cohen & Ron Smith of the USA.

Results compiled by Adam Wildavsky, nyc-bridge@yahoo.com from *e-bridge* website; distributed by Bridge Today.

### Leading Auction Prices:

\$46,000 Kwiecien-Pszczola;  
 \$44,000 Robert Levin-Steve Weinstein (USA);  
 \$40,000 Paul Chemla-Alain Levy (France);  
 \$38,000 Helgemo-Lev;  
 \$36,000 Howard Weinstein-Steve C. Garner US;  
 \$35,000 Greco-Hampson;  
 \$31,000 Eric Rodwell-Marty Fleisher (USA);  
 \$31,000 Moss-Gitelman;  
 \$27,000 Russ Ekeblad-Michael Seamon (USA);  
 \$27,000 Jeff Meckstroth-Perry Johnson (USA);  
 \$27,000 Zia Mahmood-Billy Eisenberg (USA);  
 \$27,000 Ferraro-Duboin;  
 \$26,000 Eddie Wold-John Mohan (USA);  
 \$26,000 Nick Nickell-Bob Hamman (USA);  
 \$24,000 Curtis Cheek-Billy Miller (USA);  
 \$24,000 Michel Abecassis - J-C Quantin (Fra);  
 \$22,000 Brogeland-Erichsen;  
 \$22,000 Smith-B. Cohen;  
 \$21,000 Steve Robinson-Peter Boyd (USA);  
 \$21,000 Christian Mari-Albert Faigenbaum (Fra);  
 \$20,000 Jon Wittes-Ross Grabel (USA);  
 \$20,000 Bramley-Lazard.

### Barry Rigal says:

The field this year included by my reckoning 63 World Championship medal winners from ten countries, and the auction for the teams was over \$150,000. Holders, Perry-Johnson, Meckstroth-Rodwell went for \$15,500, while Zia's team, including the mercurial line up for the first time of Helgemo-Lev brought in \$12,500. O'Rourke (including the 1999 winners and runners-up in the pairs, Levin-Weinstein and Miller-Cheek) cost \$11,000; Welland, Gawrys, Robinson and Meltzer all bringing in \$9,000.

How reliable an indication is the auction price? Well, students of racing form will be interested to know that of the six prizes at stake, the top seven listed above collected precisely two of them. Three of the favoured squads finished narrowly out of the money, and two finished well below average. One of the teams that did well though was Welland,

### Results:

The three \$ amounts on the right refer to: the auction price for the pair, the prize for the people who own the pair, and the players' prize, all to the nearest \$'000

Place	Score	Pair & Country	Cost	Back	Prize
1	2621	Michal Kwiecien -Jacek Pszczola (Pol)	46	228	31
2	2549	Billy Cohen - Ron Smith (USA)	22	147	20
3	2289	Bjorn Fallenius-Roy Welland (Swe-USA)	18	98	13
4	2283	Jan Jansma - Louk Verhees (Neth)	14	73	10
5	2119	Giorgio Duboin - Guido Ferraro (Italy)	27	65	9
6	2081	Geir Helgemo - Sam Lev (Norway-USA)	38	57	8
7	1992	Boye Brogeland - Espen Erichsen (Nor)	22	49	7
8	1946	Fred Gitelman - Brad Moss (Can-USA)	31	41	6
9	1945	Bart Bramley - Sidney Lazard (USA)	20	33	4
10	1587	Eric Greco - Geoff Hampson (USA)	35	24	3

Totals: Backers: \$814,050 + session awards \$100,000;  
 Prizes \$110,500; Total:\$1,024,550; Auction: \$1,008,000

For full coverage see

<http://e-bridgemaster.com/cav2001/pairs.asp>

52 pairs competed over three days in Las Vegas. The auction preceding the event raised just over a million dollars. The Poles were narrow favourites (ahead of Levin-Weinstein). Their price was \$46,000. Their backers collected \$228,000 when they won. The players received \$31,000 from the Players' Prize Pool.

*Granovetter reports:* Fred Gitelman, was part of a team that won the 2001 Cavendish Teams in Las Vegas. Fred, with partner Brad Moss and teammates Roy Welland, Bjorn Fallenius, Steve Garner and Howard Weinstein, took first place by 1 VP over a team captained by John Onstott.

many of whose team lost the finals of the Spingold tournament last summer.

Dealer: East " J 10 8 7 6 4  
 Game All ' 7  
 ♠ K 10 6 5  
 § J 10  
 " A Q " K 9 5  
 ' Q 10 8 6 4 ' J 5 2  
 ♠ A J 7 3 ♠ Q 8  
 § A 8 § K 9 7 5 2  
 " 3 2  
 ' A K 9 3  
 ♠ 9 4 2  
 § Q 6 4 3

The near-blitz that Welland inflicted on the Deutsch team came from some good play by the Welland team and some bad luck (coupled with a spot of carelessness) for Deutsch. The set started

off with a bang for Welland when both tables declared a delicate 4'. Fallenius as West won the spade lead and immediately led a heart to the jack and king. Back came a spade and Fallenius won in hand and led the ' Q, ducked all around. He crossed to the § K and tried to cash the " K, and when this was ruffed he needed to find the ♠ K on his left to make, which it was.

Chemla's line was only slightly different: He won the opening spade lead and unblocked the second spade before leading a low heart to the jack - notice in passing how much better it would have been to lead the six not the four from hand! Weinstein, with no spades to lead, tried a low club to the ten and king, then pitched a diamond on the " K. That exposed the trump position of course, so Chemla led a heart to the eight -- since he no longer owned the ' 4 he could not run the ' 5 from dummy. At this point he tried a small diamond from hand. Garner as North won, and thoughtfully led a fourth round of spades, which Chemla had to ruff in dummy as Weinstein and he threw diamonds. This was the four- card ending:

```

      " 10 8
      ' ---
      ♠ 10 6
      § ---
" ---          " ---
' Q 10 6      ' ---
♠ J           ♠ Q
§ ---        § 9 7 5
      " ---
      ' A 9
      ♠ ---
      § Q 3
  
```

Chemla could now have led the § 9, and run it if South followed small, after which he could have brought home his contract. If South covers, declarer ruffs low and leads a high trump, and South is helpless. But Chemla had lost rack of the § 8, having played it himself at trick one, and he thought South was left with the § Q8! So he played a diamond from dummy and suffered a ruff for down one. Oh well, even Homer nods.

Going into the last round of the event, there were a handful of teams that could win. Welland was 5 Victory Points behind Onstott (Compton, Robison-Bates and Grabel-Wittes), with 30VP available per match, with the field a further half a match behind, should both teams slip up. The last match was a truly wild affair, and since duplicated boards were in use, all the teams had their chances for a big victory.

Dealer: South " ---  
 Game All ' 10 9 5 3  
 ♠ A 2

```

      § K 9 8 5 4 3 2
" K Q J 8 7 5      " 3
' A J 8 2          ' K Q 7 6 4
♠ J 6             ♠ K Q 8 5 4 3
§ J               § Q
      " A 10 9 6 4 2
      ' ---
      ♠ 10 9 7
      § A 10 7 6
West  North  East  South
Wittes          Grabel
          2"
Pass  Pass  3♠  Pass
3NT  All Pass
  
```

It looks to me as if N/S have quite decent chances in 3NT - after all it only requires either East or West to lead their long suit! By contrast E/W do not have nine tricks even on a low spade lead, and there are other more efficient opening leads... However it was E/W who finished up in 3NT for the Onstott team.

East might have elected to jump to 4♠ over 2" to show diamonds and hearts; equally converting 3NT to 4' might have been a reasonable action I suppose. Anyway, how often do you gain imps for going five down in a freely-bid game, which was what happened to Wittes?

This was what took place in the other room:

```

West  North  East  South
Moss  Bates  Lindkvist  Robison
          Pass
1"     3§    3'     5§
5'     Pass  Pass    6§
Dble   All Pass
  
```

A really fine bid by Robison; on a spade lead Bates could pitch his diamond and crossruff. With trumps one-one the play was straightforward for +1540 and a 14 IMP pick-up. This helped his side to a win by 21-9; would it be enough? Well in the other match Welland had been doing well against Robison. They led by enough IMPs to win 26-4 before this deal. Both tables passed the South cards and heard West open 1", and North overcall 3§. Both Easts bid 3', and South bid 5§, over which West bid 5'. Weinstein-Garner for the Welland team were allowed to play it there and went one down. Gitelman for the Welland team found the Lightner double that Moss after much thought passed out (hoping his partner would have more in hearts and less in diamonds). +200 meant a 3IMP pick-up for Welland, and a 27-3 win that left his team the victors by a single VP.

AWARDS		\$'000	\$'000
	VPs	AUCTION	PLAYERS
		POOL	POOL
Welland	185	48.9	16.8
Onstott	184	32.6	11.2
Johnson	169	23.7	8.2
Deutsch	156	17.8	6.1
Brachman	156	14.8	5.1
Moss	152	10.4	3.6

*Pairs*

Dealer: North " A 5 3  
 N/S Game ' Q 9 8 7 6  
 ♠ 9 3  
 § Q 6 5  
 " 9 8 7 4 " Q J 10 6 2  
 ' 3 ' A J 4  
 ♠ 10 6 5 4 ♠ J 8  
 § 10 9 3 2 § K 8 7  
 " K  
 ' K 10 5 2  
 ♠ A K Q 7 2  
 § A J 4

On this deal Ferraro declared 6' on the auction:

West	North	East	South
	<i>Ferraro</i>		<i>Duboin</i>
	Pass	1"	Dble
4"	Dble	Pass	4NT
Pass	5'	Pass	6'
All Pass			

On a spade lead Guido won the king and carefully cashed the ♠ AK, then led a heart to the queen. The "dentist's coup" had extracted East's troublesome doubleton diamond. When he won the ' A he had to return a black suit to let declarer cross to hand to finesse in hearts and make his slam. Peter Weichsel and Rose Meltzer reached the same contract on the following auction:

West	North	East	South
	<i>Weichsel</i>		<i>Meltzer</i>
	Pass	1"	Dble
3"	4'	Pass	4NT
Pass	5§ (1)	Pass	5♠ (2)
Pass	5NT(3)	Pass	6'
All Pass			

(1) One keycard; (2) ' Q ask; (3) ' Q + other queen values

Peter received the " Q lead and played the hand similarly to Ferraro with one slight refinement. He won the " K, cashed the ♠ AK, and played the ' 10 (unblocking, to facilitate later communication) to his queen and East's ace. Again East had to concede a black-suit entry to the North hand

allowing him to take the heart finesse through the opening bidder.

How do you rate your defensive skills?  
 By Marc Smith of e-bridge

Here is a chance to compare them with the likes of Eric Rodwell, John Mohan and Roy Welland, only one of whom found the correct defensive play on this deal from Friday evening's session.

Dealer: South " Q 7 3 2  
 N/S Game ' A K 7 6  
 ♠ A Q 4  
 § 4 2  
 North " 6 5  
 East ' Q J 9 8 5  
 ♠ K J 8  
 § 10 8 6

This was the auction at the table where Bjorn Fallenius and Roy Welland were West and East respectively:

West	North	East	South
<i>Fallenius Lev</i>		<i>Welland Helgemo</i>	
		1"	
Pass	2NT	Pass	4"
All Pass			

2NT was a game-forcing spade raise, and South's jump to Four Spades showed a minimum without a singleton.

West led the ♠ 7 (second and fourth). Declarer played low from dummy and East won with the jack. How would you have continued?

It is reasonable to assume that declarer's shape is 5(332). You can further narrow things down by assuming that your partner would have led a singleton heart, and thus both West and South must hold doubletons in that suit. So declarer is precisely 5-2-3-3.

Then, ask yourself where you hope to find four tricks. You hope to make two diamond tricks, so partner will need to produce two tricks in the black suits. Perhaps the obvious answer is that West may have a club holding headed by the ace-queen. In that case, though, is there any rush to cash your club winners? Where do you imagine declarer might dispose of his losers in the suit?

The important layout is when declarer can dispose of dummy's losing diamond on his clubs. Imagine West holding the " A and the § K, with South holding § A-Q-J, and it is easy to see why you must switch not to a club, but to a spade. The actual layout was similar.

“ K 9  
 ' 10 4  
 ♠ 9 7 6 3  
 § A 9 7 5 3

“ 6 5  
 ' Q J 9 8 5  
 ♠ K J 8  
 § 10 8 6  
 “ A J 10 8 4  
 ' 3 2  
 ♠ 10 5 2  
 § K Q J

“ A 10 9 7  
 ' Q  
 ♠ ---  
 § Q

“ K Q 4  
 ' J 9 7  
 ♠ ---  
 § ---  
 “ J 5  
 ' ---  
 ♠ 8 6  
 § 9 8  
 “ 8  
 ' K  
 ♠ ---  
 § J 7 6 4

Most defenders switched to a club and were soon recording minus 620 on their scorecard. Roy Welland found the spade switch. Declarer made a valiant effort - he rose with the “ A and led the § K.

Bjorn Fallenius was not about to undo his partner's good efforts though – he ducked, won the second round of clubs with the ace, and played a second diamond.

Declarer went up with the ♠ A, cashed dummy's top hearts and tried to re-enter his hand with a third-round heart ruff. However, Fallenius was able to over-ruff with the “ K and play a diamond to East's king for one down. N/S minus 100, and a well-deserved swing to E/W. As Roy pointed out after the hand, the result would have been the same, much more spectacularly, if West had held the ♠ K. That, though, would just be gilding the lily!

*The Daily Bulletin adds:*

The leaders fought out a fascinating duel here.

Bd: 26 “ A 10 9 7  
 Dir: East ' Q 5 4  
 Vul: Both ♠ 5 4 3  
 § Q 10 2  
 “ K Q 4 3 2 “ J 6 5  
 ' A J 9 7 6 3 ' 10  
 ♠ 10 9 ♠ A Q J 8 6  
 § --- § 9 8 5 3  
 “ 8  
 ' K 8 2  
 ♠ K 7 2  
 § A K J 7 6 4

West	North	East	South
M. Moss	Molson	Lindkvist	S. Ekeblad
		Pass	2§
3§	Pass	4“	All Pass

On a top club lead Lindkvist ruffed and took the losing diamond finesse. Sheila Ekeblad won and returned a club and Lindkvist ruffed in dummy, then played ' A and ruffed a heart. Now he cashed two diamonds, reducing to this ending:

Needing four more tricks Lindkvist tried the ♠ 8, but when Ekeblad ruffed in with the “ 8 stood no chance. He overruffed but Molson took his “ A and played back a trump for down one. At the point declarer tried the ♠ 8 if he ruffs a club and ruffs a heart he still cannot quite do it.

When he leads a card from his hand Molson gets to over-ruff dummy and play a trump back again for down one.

The winning line after ruffing the second club is to play ' A and ruff a heart, go to the ♠ 9 and ruff a heart, cash the ♠ A, ruff a club, then ruff a heart with the “ J. At this point declarer has three club ruffs, four heart tricks and two diamond tricks in the bag, and dummy still has the “ KQ left.

Bob Blanchard also played 4“ on the defense of a top club lead. He ruffed and took the losing diamond finesse but here South shifted to a heart. Blanchard won his ' A and assumed that with South having six clubs and long hearts the right thing to do was to draw trumps. Now the four-one split took him two down.

Getting back to the Moss-Ekeblad match, how many imps did Lindkvist lose for going down in 4“ ? None. He gained "only" 11 imps. At the other table Charlton Buckley opened 1§ and when the next hand bid 2§ Ferguson doubled. Now East bid only 2“ , Buckley bid 3§ , and Ferguson bid 3NT.

He won the spade lead and led the § 10 to the ace. When he then led a low heart from dummy West took his ace and tried to cash out the spades: contract made.

Note that with the six-one heart split declarer can always make the hand as Sharon Osberg and Mark Feldman discovered to their cost against George Steiner. In 3NT on the spade lead declarer simply won the “ A and ran six club tricks. What is West to do? He can keep three spades and three hearts but now declarer comes down to “ 1097 ' Q5 and a diamond. He leads a

heart from dummy and whether West takes his ace or not, the defense can't take more than four tricks.

Del'Monte also played 3NT against Wittes and Grabel. He ducked the spade lead and the next one. Now Grabel had to shift to the ♠Q to beat him. When Grabel played a third spade declarer had his ninth trick.

Bd: 26           “ K Q 4  
 Dlr: East       ' Q 10 4 2  
 Vul: Both       ♠ A 2  
                   § K 10 7 4  
 “ A 6 2                 “ J 5 3  
 ' A K 5                 ' 9 8 3  
 ♠ J 8 4                 ♠ K Q 10 9 3  
 § A J 9 3               § Q 8  
                   “ 10 9 8 7  
                   ' J 7 6  
                   ♠ 7 6 5  
                   § 6 5 2

How far can Bruce Ferguson push the envelope? The more outrageous things he does, the more people suspect him so he has to keep trying ever more unusual tricks. But he still keeps reeling in the victims!

Consider this affair from the last match Wednesday evening, where he caught another world champion and added yet another notch to his belt.

If you play 3NT as West, as did the vast majority of the field, you find the cards lying exceptionally well. With the ♠A doubleton and spades and hearts behaving better than one has a right to expect, it looks very hard to go down.

Ferguson started the war of attrition by leading a deceptive '4, playing fourth highest leads when you have a hand this strong, that can be a good move. When West ducked the first heart Ferguson had won the first battle. Back came a heart and West won, crossed to a top diamond, and passed the §Q. Ferguson won and put the “4 on the table! West eyed this suspiciously and decided to duck we can all see that this may not be technically supportable but Bruce had given him the chance to go wrong and he took it. All credit to Ferguson, who left chortling, with another victim added to what is by now a rather long list.

Match Eight:

Bd: 10           “ ---  
 Dlr: East       ' K J 9 5 4  
 Vul: Both       ♠ A 10 3 2  
                   § Q 7 4 2  
 “ K 10 7 2                 “ A Q 8 6 3  
 ' A 6 2                 ' Q 10 7

♠ Q 5                                 ♠ K 9  
 § K 9 8 6                           § J 5 3  
                   “ J 9 5 4  
                   ' 8 3  
                   ♠ J 8 7 6 4  
                   § A 10

Fallenius and Garner (a scratch partnership, which in this context is an especially appropriate term since their partners were off playing golf!) had an impressive start to their set against Greco-Hampson. Greco opened 1“, Fallenius jumped to 3§, limit or better in spades.

Greco doubled, there being some confusion as to whether this meant clubs or spade take out, and when Garner passed, Fallenius retreated to 3NT the only game with any play.

The field played this in game except for Erichsen-Brogeland. They bid:

1“ -Pass-2NT(GF)-Dbl; 3“ -All Pass!

A good view by Brogeland. Their systemic agreement is that 3“ here is not game forcing any more. 3“ just made for +140 for an 8-imp pickup.

Of course in 3NT on a diamond lead the defense has the upper hand, but Greco led a heart and Fallenius, after some thought, put in the ten. Then he ran five spades and when Greco pitched two clubs, two diamonds, and then a heart on the last spade Fallenius could now build a club trick for his contract in safety by leading to the §K. These 12 imps were the only imps scored by Welland, but it was enough for a 21-9 VP win.

*FRANCE TAKES BONN NATIONS CUP*

Bad-Godesberg Stadthalle, Bonn 23/24<sup>th</sup> May,  
2001 By Patrick Jourdain (Wales)

18 teams from European nations, mostly composed of players who will be competing in the European Championships this month in Tenerife, took the opportunity for a high-class run-out in the two-day Bonn Nations Cup.

The event is run under the auspices of the German Bridge Federation, and organised by its vice-President, Göran Mattson, (who, in March, became European Senior Pairs champion). But much credit for its continuation after a sponsor retired, goes to the Bonn Bridge Club. The Club's premises are next door to the impressive Stadthalle, venue for the Cup, and an Open Pairs of 240 pairs running alongside. With 500 at the prize-giving banquet, there was an atmosphere close to the Europeans itself.

The teams were drawn into two Pools. After a round robin of 10-board matches, the winners of each pool play-off for the big prizes whilst the rest play a further three matches, Swiss, against teams from the other pool.

In Pool "A" the favourites were Norway (Helgemo-Helness, Grotheim-Aa) and the holders, the England team that reached the semifinals at the Olympiad in Maastricht (Burn-Callaghan, Liggins-Fawcett), but the winner was **France** (Pierre Adad-Maurice Aujaleu, Francois Duffour-Patrice Conte) ahead of Denmark (Werdelin-Cohen, Madsen-Madsen).

In Tenerife Adad-Aujaleu will be defending the European Senior Teams title they won in Malta with Roudinesco-Delmouly. Roudinesco's health has deteriorated again, but he is determined to be in Tenerife.

Pool "B" was won by the favourites **Belgium** (Alain Labaere-Valerie Carcassonne, Zvi Engel-Guy van Middeltem) who did well in Maastricht, and expected to do so in Tenerife. In the 24-board final France beat Belgium 70-45.

Round Robin results:

"A": 1. France 166; 2. Denmark 163; 3. Wales 151; 4. Norway 146; 5. Austria 144; 6. Czech Republic 142; 7. England 125; 8. Germany 2 119; 9. Luxembourg 84.

"B": 1. Belgium 159; 2. Netherlands 152; 3. Hungary 149; 4. Germany 1 146; 5. Poland 142; 6. Bulgaria 135; 7= Sweden, Estonia 123; 9. Rumania 109.

Swiss: 3. Denmark 208; 4.= Netherlands, Germany 1, Czech Rep, Hungary 197; 8. Wales 195; 9. Norway 190; 10. Austria 188; 11. Poland 187; 12. Estonia 177.

Asked for a hand from the winners, Pierre Adad at once picked a deal where both himself and the England declarer at the other table had gone wrong. It is in that frustrating category where you make an *auto-pilot* play, which still looks right when you hit bad news, but, in reality you have missed the chance for a Best Play award:

Round 6	"	K 10 9 4
Board 20	'	None
Dealer: West	♠	K 9 8 6 3
Game All	§	9 8 7 4
" 8 2	"	A Q 7 6
' Q J 9 8 3	'	A K 6
♠ Q	♠	J 10 7 2
§ K Q 5 3 2	§	J 6
	"	J 5 3
	'	10 7 5 4 2
	♠	A 5 4
	§	A 10

West	North	East	South
	<i>Aujaleu</i>		<i>Adad</i>
Pass	Pass	1NT	Pass
2♠	Pass	2'	Pass
3§	Pass	4'	All Pass

A standard auction of strong no-trump and transfer led to 4' by East. South led a spade (a surprising *jack* at this table). East won, led a low club to dummy, and a second club to South. A second spade was won by East.

Next came the *auto-pilot* card, a high trump from the East hand, the standard safety play to guard against a 5-0 break either side. Well, the trumps were 5-0 and declarer happily picked up the trump suit. Sadly, when the clubs did not break both declarers had to admit defeat. They made five trumps, two spades, and only two clubs. A push in 4' -1.

During the post-mortem light struck. Suppose declarer, at trick five, when playing a trump, instead had made the anti-natural play of a small trump from East to a high trump from West. Has this ruined the trump position?

Not at all, the contract is now cold! You ruff a couple of clubs high in East, and a couple of spades low in West, then exit with a diamond, and come to your last two trumps in the West hand without problem. You make only one club, and two spades, but *seven* trump tricks.

Note that if the trumps prove to be 4-1 either way round, the contract is still safe. After

the first round of trumps won by West, you ruff a club high, unblock the trump from East, ruff a spade, cash the remaining high trump from West, and play winning clubs, conceding only a club, diamond, and a trump to whichever defender held 10xxx.

This was the round my team sat out, and when I heard about the hand, it was too late to canvas other players. If you know of any declarer making Four Hearts by starting with a high trump from West, please e-mail me. An award may await you!

It is the sort of hand that you might expect Geir Helgemo to get right. His clarity of thought uncovers winning lines missed by other internationals. This was a typical example:

Round 3	“ A 3 2
Board 29	' 8 3 2
Dealer: North	♠ A 6 5
Game All	§ K Q 8 2
“ K Q J 5	“ 9 8 6 4
' 10	' A J 5 4
♠ Q J 8	♠ 7 2
§ J 10 6 5 4	§ 9 7 3
	“ 10 7
	' K Q 9 7 6
	♠ K 10 9 4 3
	§ A

West	North	East	South
	<i>Helness</i>		<i>Helgemo</i>
	1§	Pass	1'
Pass	1NT	Pass	2§
Pass	3NT	Pass	4'
All Pass			

The standard contract was 4' , sometimes played by North (as at my table after a weak notrump and transfer), but more often by South. At all tables the play began: spade lead taken by the ace, club to the ace, diamond to the ace, cash a top club, ditching the losing spade. Now declarer should lead a trump towards the South hand, before clearing the diamonds (East usually throwing a club). West won and played a spade reducing declarer to the ending diagrammed:

(Wales were playing England. At the other table the England declarer cleared the diamonds before touching trumps. He ruffed the next spade and played a high trump that held. So, the ending was the same.) South, on lead, must lose only two tricks:

“ 3	“ 9 8
' 8 3	' A J 5
♠ None	♠ None
§ Q 8	§
“ J 5	“ None
' None	' Q 9 7
♠ None	♠ 9 4
§ J 10 6	§ None

At all tables bar one the declarers came to the conclusion that they could not cope with trumps 4-1, and led a high trump from the South hand, hoping West's ten had been from J10 doubleton. East won, drew another trump, and forced out South's last trump. Two off.

The exception was the table where Helgemo was declarer. Without much hesitation, according to the spectators, he played a winning diamond, and threw his last spade from hand.

East ruffed, but was end-played. A trump lead makes life easy for declarer. A club, if East had one, would be run to North to allow a second trump lead. East actually led another spade. Helgemo threw his last diamond from the South hand, ruffing in North, and caught East in a trump coup at the end.

Round 1 On the first board of the championship, Lars Madsen faced an unusual problem: In response to Blackwood should he show an ace, in a suit in which he had already promised a void!?

Round 1	“ 8 2
Board 1	' K 5
Dealer: North	♠ K 7 2
Love all	§ K J 10 7 5 2
“ K Q J 6 5	“ A 10 7 3
' 10 9 8 2	' A Q 7 6 4
♠ A 9 8 3	♠ J 10
§ None	§ A Q
	“ 9 4
	' J 3
	♠ Q 6 5 4
	§ 9 8 6 4 3

Morten Madsen opened 1' on the East cards, and his brother pulled out what he thought was 4§ to show a raise to 4' with a club void. East at once launched into Keycard Blackwood. Surprising, as he has two losing diamonds? Not really, because West now spotted that the



bidding card showing on the table for his first response was actually 4♣! Should he now show an ace? When he decided to be honest, the response was 5§ (showing 1 or 4 keycards outside the void). North doubled for a club lead.

East “knew” West’s keycard was the trump king. From North’s double he inferred that the club king was well-placed. His brother’s outside values must be in spades. So he concluded the auction with a leap to 7’!

This grand slam proved to be cold when the trump suit came in. Denmark was off to a good start. Their opponents were Austria, who were fielding the Olympiad champions from the University event in Maastricht, Andreas Gloyer and Martin Schiffko. They must have felt aggrieved that their 6’+1 proved a major loss. However, there is actually some logic to being in Seven Hearts. On a diamond lead, you cannot even make Six unless the trumps behave, in which case you might as well be in Seven.

Those in Six, however, who did not receive a diamond lead, could afford a safety play in trumps (ace first). They lost a trump trick, but still made their slam.

My partner, Tim Rees, did well on this deal from our first match, v. the Czech Republic:

Round 1	“ K 10 5
Board 8	’ Q 9 7 6
Dealer: West	♣ J 3 2
Love all	§ A 6 5
“ Q 2	“ A J 8 7 6 4 3
’ K 10 8 4	’ J
♣ 10 9 5	♣ 7 6
§ K J 8 3	§ 10 7 4
	“ 9
	’ A 5 3 2
	♣ A K Q 8 4
	§ Q 9 2

  

West	North	East	South
	<i>Rees</i>		<i>Jourdain</i>
Pass	Pass	3“	Dble
Pass	4’	All Pass	

Against North’s Four Hearts, East led a diamond. Rees won and played ace and another trump, winning the nine of trumps. When the suit showed 4-1, he continued with diamonds.

West ruffed the fourth diamond with ’ 10. North over-ruffed, and led the *king* of spades, to prevent West obtaining the lead to draw North’s last trump. East won the spade, and now found the club switch: § 10, queen, king, ace. A spade ruff was followed by the fifth

diamond. West could see he was end-played if he ruffed, so he threw a club. As a small safety play against West still having a spade, Rees ruffed his own winning diamond, and ruffed his third spade.

West, of course, over-ruffed, but then had to lead up to dummy’s nine of clubs to concede the game.

At our other table against the same contract, East for Wales, Filip Kurbalija found the club lead (7, 9, jack, duck). West, Mike Pownall then carefully led a *low* spade from Q2. East won and played another club to sink declarer’s chances. 10 IMPs to Wales.

Note that if West had switched to “ Q declarer would have played low. East cannot afford to overtake without setting up “ K for a club discard, and if the queen wins, West may be endplayed later to lead away from § K.

At another table, after identical bidding, Stig Werdelin was declarer as North in Four Hearts against Austria. The first seven tricks went the same way as at our table. After North’s king of spades was won by East’s ace, East, instead of switching to a club, persisted with a second spade. Werdelin ruffed, and led his last diamond. West refused to ruff, so Werdelin came to hand with § A, and ruffed his last spade, giving the same ending as at our table. West had to over-ruff and lead up to dummy’s § Q.

There was also a freak hand in the first round which led to some exciting bidding:

Round 1	“ 9 5
Board 9	’ A K J 4 3
Dealer: North	♣ K Q 10 5 3
E/W Game	§ 10
“ 8 3	“ A K Q J 10 7
’ 9 2	’ 5
♣ A 9 8 7 6 4 2	♣ None
§ 7 2	§ A K Q 8 6 5
	“ 6 4 2
	’ Q 10 8 7 6
	♣ J
	§ J 9 4 3

The shortest auction was where North opened 1’ and East, Klaus Rees for Germany 1, overcalled Six Spades. South Passed and led ♣ J, so Klaus ditched his losing heart, and conceded a club later for his slam.

*West* was often declarer as East started with an extreme Michael’s cuebid. For example, my partner opened 1’ , East bid 2’ , and when my 4’ call came back to East, he tried 5’ ! West bid a reluctant 5“ , and was raised to Six.

A heart lead beats the slam, and North would have been on lead. But, unaware of my club trick, partner took out insurance in 7'.

This looks to cost 800, but Rees actually did not lose a spade! East led a top club against 7' doubled, and then boldly under-led his spade honours in an attempt to reach West's hand for a diamond ruff. But it was North who won the "9, drew trumps, and played a diamond. West won, and thinking East was 7-5 in the blacks rather than 6-6, tried a club. So the loss on the board (our team-mates were in 6" -1 on a heart lead) was held to 9 IMPs, small enough to leave us with a win.

The key board from Round 2 was this play problem for my team-mate, Mike Pownall: Board 13, Game All, Dealer North.

" A	" 9 7 3
' Q 5 4 2	' K J 9 8 7 3
♠ A K Q 8 3	♠ J 6
§ A Q 4	§ 10 2

Our Austrian opponents, Gloyer and Schifko, had stopped in Five Hearts by East. When I led §J declarer put on the ace, and led a trump to ensure 11 tricks.

Six Hearts by West is the safe slam, but system led to East being declarer in Six, and South also found a club lead, this time a low one. How would you play as East?

Declarer chose to refuse the finesse, and play on diamonds. The losing club went away, but South ruffed with a small trump to beat the slam. As South held:

" J 6 5 4 2 ' 6 ♠ 9 5 § K J 9 6 5  
taking the club finesse was the winning line.

"Isn't a finesse a better chance than a 3-3 break?" enquired West with a touch of criticism in his voice. But Pownall had the answer. There are two further chances if you play on diamonds. If North has the doubleton diamond he will have to ruff the third diamond low, and you can return to dummy with a spade to play a fourth diamond. So you also succeed when a doubleton diamond is with bare trump ace either side, or ' Ax with North. *A priori*, that is a better shot than a finesse. The difference between the lines was 26 IMPs but we still won the match narrowly.

In Round 3 this was the key board in the match between England and Wales:

Board 23	" A 7
Dealer: South	' K 5 4 3 2
Game All	♠ A J 10 5
	§ 6 4
" K Q 10 9 2	" 5 4
' J 9 7	' 10 8 6

♠ 4 3 2	♠ K Q 9 6
§ J 3	§ A 9 8 7
	" J 8 6 3
	' A Q
	♠ 8 7
	§ K Q 10 5 2

West	North	East	South
	<i>Kurbalija</i>	<i>Liggins</i>	<i>Pownall</i>
			<i>Fawcett</i>
			1§
1"	2'	Pass	2NT
Pass	3NT	All Pass	

West	North	East	South
	<i>Callaghan</i>	<i>Rees</i>	<i>Burn</i>
			<i>Jourdain</i>
			1§
Pass	1'	Pass	1"
Pass	3NT	All Pass	

Where Fawcett was declarer as South, West led a high spade. Declarer won, led a club to the king, unblocked hearts, and took a diamond finesse. East won and returned a spade to West's nine.

The winning defence, difficult to find, is for West to cash his high spade, squeezing dummy out of a diamond, then put East in with the ace of clubs to endplay dummy with a heart.

West actually led a club without cashing the spade. East won and exited with a heart, but declarer now has an endplay of his own. He cashed the hearts, and might now exit with a low diamond to finish East. However, playing for the remaining diamond honour to come down from West, declarer laid down ♠ A, to lose two diamonds to East at the end.

At our table, North was at the helm. East led a high diamond. When Helgemo was declarer against this lead he won at once, led a club to the king, unblocked the hearts, and played a diamond to set up his ninth trick.

Rees preferred to try for the clubs, starting with a club to the ten. When this lost, it seemed the contract was as well, but the defence continued diamonds. A second club was ducked by East and won in dummy. Rees was now able to rely on hearts for his nine tricks (two diamonds, five hearts, a spade and a club). The swing of 12 IMPS helped Wales to a win of 33-18 or 19-11 in VPs.

Wales played Norway next. This deal with psychological points proved the key:

Board 35	" A J 10 4
Dealer: South	' 7 5
	♠ A 3
	§ A K Q 9 3

“ 7 6 5 2  
 ' K Q 9 8  
 ♠ 9 6 2  
 § 7 2

“ K 9 3  
 ' A 10 4 2  
 ♠ Q 8 5  
 § 8 6 4  
 “ Q 8  
 ' J 6 3  
 ♠ K J 10 7 4  
 § J 10 5

' A 10 8 6  
 ♠ Q  
 § Q 10 8 6 3  
 ' 3  
 ♠ K 6 4 3 2  
 § J 7  
 “ Q 8 5  
 ' K Q 7  
 ♠ A 10  
 § A K 9 5 2

What game contract should North-South reach? Five Clubs may be best. After ruffing the third heart, declarer can cross to dummy to lead “ Q. As West does not cover declarer might change tack, put on the ace, and successfully rely on the diamonds for 11 tricks.

Both tables reached 3NT, Helness-Helgemo using an uninformative 1§ -1NT-3NT-Pass whilst Rees-Jourdain took a longer route, pin-pointing the heart weakness.

If the defence make a passive lead such as a club, with only eight top tricks declarer might well choose to test diamonds before taking the club finesse, for two down. In practice, however, both defences cashed four hearts, leaving West on lead, with dummy reduced to: “ AJ and ♠ A3 with five clubs.

Grotheim then led a spade. Was that a play of a man trying to put me off the spade finesse? I didn't know, so went for the simple line of rising with the ace and cashing clubs. There was no diamond guess. East, to keep three diamonds, relied on West for “ Q, and ditched “ K on the last club. Game made.

At the other table, after four rounds of hearts, West played a club. Helgemo thought West might have led a spade if he had the king, and would clearly have avoided a diamond lead if he held the queen. So after one top club from dummy and a second to hand, he backed his judgment by leading ♠ J and letting it run.

East won and led a third club, removing declarer's entry to ♠ K. He then had to take the spade finesse. Two off for 11 IMPs to Wales and a win by 32-11 or 21-9 in VPs.

The IBPA Editor would like to think the swing was deserved, but, in reality it was probably a matter of the luck of who held ♠ Q.

The next round, v. Denmark, brought Wales down with a bump. I went wrong here:

Board 8 “ J 6  
 Dealer: West ' J 9 5 4 2  
 Love all ♠ J 9 8 7 5  
 § 4  
 “ K 9 7 “ A 10 4 3 2

West	North	East	South
	<i>Cohen</i>	<i>Rees</i>	<i>Werdelin Jourdain</i>
2§	Pass	Pass	2NT
Pass	3♠	Pass	3'
Pass	Pass	Dble	All Pass

West's Precision 2§ was followed by a conservative 2NT, and a transfer by North.

West led his singleton diamond. I won, discarded a spade on the top clubs and cleared the diamonds. West threw a club, East won and played another diamond. East was known to be out of clubs, and it was too risky to discard. So I ruffed high. West threw a spade to leave this ending with South on lead:

“ J  
 ' J 9 5 4 2  
 ♠ 9 8  
 § None  
 “ K 9 “ A 10 4 3 2  
 ' A 10 8 6 ' 3  
 ♠ None ♠ 4 3  
 § Q 10 § None  
 “ Q 8 5  
 ' Q 7  
 ♠ None  
 § 9 5 2

The winning line here is a low heart to the nine. West was known to have six cards in the minors and therefore 4-3 in the majors, so that line is perhaps indicated, but I led a low heart to the jack and could not recover.

The Dutch team was their Juniors. The newest member, Jeroen Bruggeman, 22, found the answer to a complex defensive problem in their match v. Estonia:

Round 9 “ Q 7 6 4 3  
 Board 6 ' 6  
 Dealer: East ♠ K Q J 2  
 E/W Game § 10 8 7  
 “ K 8 “ A 9 2  
 ' K Q 8 4 ' 10 7 3 2  
 ♠ A 10 8 7 5 3 ♠ 9 6  
 § 2 § A J 4 3  
 “ J 10 5  
 ' A J 9 5

♠ 4  
 § K Q 9 6 5

West	North	East	South
	<i>Schollart</i>		<i>Bruggeman</i>
		Pass	1§
Dble	1“	Dble	Pass
2'	Dble	Pass	2“
3♠	Dble	3'	Dble
All Pass			

The popular result was Four Hearts doubled one off, so the Dutch defenders gave themselves a hard task. South felt he had to join in when everyone else was doubling!

North led his singleton trump: 6, 7, 9, king. (South might do better to play ace and another to cut down West's cross-ruff chances.)

West played ace and another diamond, taken by North, won the club switch, and returned to “ K. In this ending West, who had already made four tricks, ruffed a diamond with dummy's ten:

	“ Q 7 6 4	
	' None	
	♠ K Q	
	§ 10 8	
“ 8		“ A 9
' Q 8 4		' 10 3 2
♠ 10 8 7 5		♠ None
§ None		§ J 4 3
	“ J 10	
	' A J 5	
	♠ None	
	§ K Q 9	

Bruggeman over-ruffed. If he now makes the natural play of forcing declarer with a club, the contract would make. Declarer will ruff the club, and ruff another diamond. South is left with no solution. If South over-ruffs declarer is in control, with good diamonds and a trump more than South. If South instead discards, declarer ruffs another club and then crosses to “ A for a coup en passant to make his bare ' Q.

In the diagrammed ending, Bruggeman returned a *spade*. It was now declarer that was in a dilemma. He returned with a ruff to ruff the diamonds good, but South refused to over-ruff and was in control himself. He was able to make both his trumps and one outside trick.

## The 51st. Southamerican Bridge Championship By Carlos Cabanne (Arg)

The 51<sup>st</sup> . Southamerican Championship was played at the city of Cochabamba, Bolivia, with complete success. The only trouble was the "soroche" (altitude sickness) as Cochabamba is 2.400 mts. High.

In the semifinals Brazil beat Chile by 93 IMPs., and Argentina, Uruguay by 124. The final started with a carry over of 16 IMP from Brazil, but Argentina won the four rounds 16 hands, by 8, 20, 20 and 16 IMPs; who make a total of 48 IMPs. Ahead.

The Argentine team was composed by Ernesto Muzzio, 44 years old, Marcelo Villegas, 48, Cristobal Aguirre, 48, Jorge Estevarena, 42; Pablo Ravenna, 25, and Agustín Madala, 14. Cap. Alexis Pejacsevich. Only the two first named had S.A.Champ. experience. For Brazil played: Gabriel Chagas, Diego Brenner, Joao Campos, Miguel Vilas Boas and Mauricio Figueiredo. Both team classified for the Bermuda Bowl.

On the women's Championship semifinal Won Argentina and Brazil, defeating Chile and Bolivia. Brazil won the final. Their team was composed by Agota Mandelot, Leda Pain, Heloisa Nogueira, Ana Maria Assumpcao, Isabella Andrade and Sylvia F. de Mello. Cap. Damiao Paez. The Argentine team: Malena Iacapraro, Charo Garateguy, Gloria Rosenfeld, Silvia Boldt, Amanda Salamanca and Susana Vila Sanchez. Cap. Cristina Antonini. Only Brazil classified for the Venice Cup, in accordance with the self-defeating rule of the World Bridge Federation.

The big difference in the final score was due to small details and played, of several hands; most of them working in favour of the Argentine team. Let's see two hands.

Dealer: West	“ K 6 5 3		
Game All	' A 9 7		
	♠ K 10		
	§ 10 7 3 2		
“ J 4		“ Q 10 7 2	
' J 10 8 3 2		' K Q 5	
♠ A J 8 6		♠ 9 5 4	
§ K 5		§ Q 6 4	
	“ A 9 8		
	' 6 4		
	♠ Q 7 3 2		
	§ A J 9 8		

West    North    East    South

Pass	Pass	Pass	1♠
Pass	1“	Pass	2“
All Pass			

Against North's 2“ , the ' K was led and allowed to hold. East switched to ♠ 9 to the jack and king. Declarer took a club finesse which lost to the king. West's continuation of ' J was taken by the ace, and a heart was ruffed in dummy. Declarer now led a low diamond, taken by West's ace. West now made the key play of leading a fourth heart. Declarer threw a club from hand, East ditched his last diamond, and dummy ruffed. Declarer cashed “ A and then tried to ruff a diamond low. East over-ruffed, and stuck declarer back in dummy by playing § Q. Declarer could not avoid losing a club ruff to West and another trump to East.

East played well discarding the third diamond and returning CQ instead of a small club.

(For a further deal featuring the 14 year old see Postbag)

## Four hands from the European Pairs Championship, Sorrento By Geo Tislevoll (Norway)

**Hand 1** The first one is from the A-final, and is told in Daily Bulletin no 7, page 4, board no 15.

“ 6 4 3	“ J 10 7
' 5 2	' A 10 3
♣ K Q 10 9 8 5	♣ 7 6 4
§ 4 3	§ A J 9 5
	“ 5
	' K Q 8 4
	♣ A 2
	§ Q 10 8 7 6 2
	“ A K Q 9 7 2
	' J 9 7 6
	♣ J 3
	§ K

The Bulletin says, against South's 4<sup>♣</sup>, the defence started off correctly with three rounds of diamonds. After drawing two (or three) rounds of trumps declarer wins his contract by unblocking his club king and simply playing a heart to the ten which endplays East. BUT:

My partner, Christer Kristoffersen (West) found a better defence. After king of diamonds taken by my ace, another diamond to the jack and queen, he switched to a heart. Declarer had to let it run, and after getting our third trick I played a trump. It looked to me as if we would get the setting trick and I was quite pleased with what was going on. But the trump switch was not good enough. Declarer (sadly, I did not know him and failed to get the name) played six rounds of trumps. Before the last one this was the situation:

“ ---	“ ---
' A 10	' Q 8
♣ ---	♣ ---
§ A J 9	§ Q 10 8
“ ---	“ ---
' 2	' K
♣ 10 9 8	♣ J 9 5
§ 4	§ ---
	“ 2
	' ---
	♣ K 8 6
	§ ---
	“ 2
	' ---
	♣ K 8 6
	§ ---

On “ 2 he discarded ' 10 from dummy and I was caught in a perfect criss-cross squeeze.

BUT: I guess you can see how I could have avoided it? At trick four, after getting the heart trick, I should have played a club to damage declarer's communications.

A nice one, don't you think?

**Hand 2** Against young Desi Popova from Bulgaria I would expect a bad result. But on this hand the

talented player made a common type of mistake, after being frustrated because one believes partner has erred!

“ J 4	“ K 10 7
' A 9 8 5 3	' Q 10 7
♣ 7	♣ A Q 10 2
§ A 9 8 6 3	§ 10 7 4
	“ A 9 3
	' K J 4 2
	♣ J 9 5 4
	§ J 5
	♥ Q 8 6 5 2
	' 6
	♣ K 8 6 3
	§ K Q 2

Sitting South I hear partner open 1<sup>♣</sup>. After Pass from East and 1<sup>♠</sup> from me, Popova bid 2<sup>♠</sup>. North doubled (= 3 cards in spades) and East bid 3<sup>♠</sup>. Over 3<sup>♠</sup> from me, all passed.

West led her singleton diamond to dummy's queen. East played low on a small trump from dummy and the queen won. Another trump went to the jack, king and ace. West was quite frustrated by not getting her diamond ruff, but it didn't really matter since East would get a diamond trick later. East switched to § J, and it went king, ace and small, then another club to the ten. The spade ten was cashed before entering South on the club queen. Now I played my ' 6 toward dummy. West took her ace and played on hearts. And using her ace was the mistake of that hand, as it left East in control of both red suits. On the next heart it went, 10 from dummy, jack from East and ruff. This was the situation:

“ ---	“ ---
' Q	' K
♣ A 10 2	♣ J 9 5
§ ---	§ ---
“ ---	“ ---
' 9 8	' K
♣ ---	♣ J 9 5
§ 8 6	§ ---
	“ 2
	' ---
	♣ K 8 6
	§ ---

On the last spade ♣ 2 was discarded from dummy, and East put away his cards. Ten tricks, plus 170 was a cold top in the final, 52-0.

**Hand 3** This includes a nice play from Norway's Frank Svindahl. It's from the semi-final or qualifying stages.

**Dealer: South** ♥ 9 6 2  
Game All ' 8 7 6

	♠ A Q 4 2	
	§ A 10 8	
“ 10 5 4	“ A Q J 8	
' K 3	' Q 9 5 4	
♠ 10 9 6 5	♠ J 8 7	
♣ Q 9 4 3	♣ 6 5	
	♥ K 7 3	
	' A J 10 2	
	♠ K 3	
	♣ K J 7 2	

3NT was the normal contract. Most Souths opened 1NT and became the declarer. The normal result was nine tricks, but some declarers made even more after getting, for instance, a club lead from West.

I had a terrible experience on this hand since West after 1NT-3NT found the spade lead. I missed what was possible to miss and finally went one down! That was a poor score, I can tell you....

South, Frank Svindahl (partnering Eskil Hagen) got the normal diamond lead after the same bidding. A lot of work has to be done both in hearts and clubs, and declarer has bad communications and at most one spade-stop. Svindahl put up the diamond ace and played a heart to the ten and king. West switched to a small spade. East took his ace and played the spade queen. (Spade jack on the first round of the suit would have been better, of course.) Svindahl won with the spade king and played the *club jack!* West covered, and the club ace won. Then a heart to the jack was followed by the ace of hearts in this position:

	♥ 9	
	' 6	
	♠ Q 4 2	
	§ 10 8	
♥ 10		♥ J 8
' ---		' Q 9
♠ 10 9 6		♠ J 8
♣ 9 4 3	♣ 5	
	“ 7	
	' A 2	
	♠ K	
	§ K 7 2	

On the ' A West was squeezed in three suits. He cannot discard from a minor-suit, so he must get rid of “ 10, which was the entry-card for his partner's spades. Then Svindahl played as with open cards; ♠ K, club to the eight, § 10, ♠ Q. Then he gave West a diamond trick in trick twelve. He had to help declarer home to the club king in trick thirteen. Ten tricks after a kind of “stepping-stone-squeeze” gave the Norwegian a good feeling, and a good score. **Hand 4** This next hand was told in the Daily Bulletin no 4, page 17 (board 17):

Dealer: North “ ---  
 Game All ' A K 9 7 5 2  
 ♠ A 8 7 2

	§ J 9 5	
“ A 10 9 8		“ J 7 6 2
' 8		' J 6
♠ 10 9		♠ Q J 5 4 3
♣ K 10 8 7 4 3		♣ A Q
	“ K Q 5 4 3	
	' Q 10 4 3	
	♠ K 6	
	§ 6 2	

Strangely enough Lesniewski (North) missed the play in 5“, making only 11 tricks after a spade lead from East. I managed to take all the thirteen tricks, and the play was finished within ten seconds. I opened 1' and partner (Christer Kristoffersen) responded 2NT (GF with support). I bid 3♠ showing a little extra with diamonds, forgetting that 4' would have shown the void in spades and a minimum hand! The opponents didn't ask about this, but when partner bid 4' I had a small problem. Should I go on? Finally I passed and was happy when the first partner put on the table was his spades.

East led the ' 6. I put up the queen and played a *small* spade from dummy trying to look like a man who wanted to steal the trick with my singleton jack. West was a good player from Poland, (*IBPA Editor*: Aren't they all?) Look at his problem only seeing his own cards and dummy. He tried the ace - ruffed. Then trump ace, diamond to the king and another small spade ruffed. Three spade tricks now gave three club discards, and thirteen tricks in all.

The Norths who got a spade lead should play *low* from dummy in trick one (*IBPA Editor*: As per BOLS Tip). Maybe West believes the lead is a singleton (or that declarer has a singleton jack, if that's possible from the lead). At least West has a problem. Putting in the ace will give declarer all the tricks. If he doesn't it is no problem making twelve by ruffing out the spade ace, and later establishing the fifth spade by finding the spades 4-4.

## Poles' Success at the Top by Richard Laufer (USA), *e-bridge*

The resurgence of an Italian powerhouse and the sputtering of the American Nickel(1) machine have become favorite topics among bridge journalists and bar-room pundits. But we wonder if the real story from the top isn't the Poles? Fantastic numbers of them are reaching for the top rungs and attaining real heights. And by the standards of the bridge world the average age of the Poles is rather young. Consider some of the evidence:

\* The Polish team at the Olympiad fought the Italians to the bitter end, losing in one of the most exciting world championship finals in history. They fought from behind and with a handful of boards to go were in a position to win. Only an incredible performance by the Italians kept them from winning at the end.

\* The winners of the European Pairs championship in Sorrento were the Polish pair of Jaroslaw Cieslak and Jan Moszynski, both in only their late 30s, and 10 of the top 19 spots at the finish were held by Polish pairs.

\* The two finalists in the Vanderbilt Cup at the Spring North American Bridge Championships each had a Polish pair. Incredibly, the Vanderbilt was held at the same time as the European Pairs, so Poles were dominating play on both continents.

\* The Transnational Team champions at the Olympiad had one Polish player and another who grew up in Poland.

\* The team winning the NEC Cup in Japan in February was anchored by a Polish pair. Furthermore, four of the five team members were born in Poland.

\* Jacek Pszczola and Michal Kwiecien are the current World Open Pairs champions (1998, Lille) and now, the 2001 Cavendish Invitational Pairs winners.

\* Krzysztof Jassem and Piotr Tuszynski have been a force at the Cap Gemini in each of their appearances and Cezary Balicki/Adam Zmudzinski are always among the leaders at the prestigious tournament to which they are invited.

The Polish team did not distinguish itself in Bermuda, but Pszczola-Kwiecien had the third best Butler ranking, after only Meckstroth-Rodwell and Bocchi-Duboin.

Anyone interested in following all the best events the world of bridge has to offer can do so by joining *e-bridge*

[www.e-bridgemaster.com](http://www.e-bridgemaster.com)

Vugraphs, Bulletins, extensive player profiles, Deals of the Day, complete results, photos, and sometimes much more. The site offers unparalleled content and, of course, online bridge (a new version was released in mid-May). Free seven-day trials are usually available (exceptions may occur during the actual staging period of these major events). The *e-bridge* News pages, which include breaking news stories on all the major tournaments, are free to members and visitors alike. Please see:

[www.e-bridgemaster.com/news/news\\_hub.asp](http://www.e-bridgemaster.com/news/news_hub.asp)



## Is Bridge a Spectator Sport?

By Richard Laufer (USA), *e-bridge*

*Material may be used without credit except to e-bridge. The deal has already been used in the NYT.*

Is bridge a spectator sport? The International Olympic Committee seems to think so, and there will be a demonstration at the Salt Lake City Winter Olympics. But there have always been obvious problems with watching bridge. The Internet is changing that, however. There are matches online now on: [www.e-bridgemaster.com](http://www.e-bridgemaster.com)

(a subscriber site; seven-day free trial available except during major tournaments) that can bear a virtually unlimited number of kibitzers. Kibitzers choose whether they want to see only one player's hand – the way they did in the old days – or see all four hands (and can change mode at any time).

If some of the recent matches online at e-bridge had been at live tournaments, kibitzers would have had to fight to keep their place at the table. Some recent confrontations include:

*Bob Hamman-Paul Soloway v Jacek Pszczola-Michal Kwiecien*

Geir Helgemo/Sam Lev v. Alfredo Versace/Lorenzo Lauria  
Andrei Gromov-Aleksander Petrunin v Stelio Di Bello/Pinhas Romik.

Piotr Gawrys/Jacek Pszczola vs. Versace/Lauria  
Kerri Sanborn/Irina Levitina vs. Lev/Bob Blanchard  
Versace/Lauria and Pszczola/Gawrys vs.

Lev/ John Mohan and Michael Rosenberg/ Barnet Shenkin  
Marcelo Branco/ Joao Paulo Campos vs. Lev/Gawrys

Lest anyone have doubts about women in this exalted company, here is Kerri Sanborn, partnering Irina Levitina and playing against Sam Lev and Bob Blanchard, showing her skill:

*Kerri's e-bridge Debut* **By Drew Cannell**

*e-bridge* is sponsoring a Women's Team (Jill Meyers-Randi Montin, Lynn Deas-Beth Palmer and Irina Levitina-Kerri Sanborn) at the North American Bridge Championships in Toronto this summer. Irina and Kerri made their *e-bridge* debut in a set match vs Sam Lev and Bob Blanchard on April 19, 2001. The very first board of the match brought fireworks (*see next column*).

A rather dangerous double of 2§ by Blanchard. How would he have felt if it had gone redouble-pass-pass, I wonder? Encouraged by South's double of 2§, Lev ventured a penalty double of 4'. Declarer would have to play well to hold this to one down. She would need to strip the North hand, and attempt an endplay in trumps. Sanborn gave due respect to the penalty double, and

so escaped to 4NT. N/S, less convinced about defeating this, did not double.

Board 8036 " K 10 5  
Dclar: West ' K 10 9 6 2  
Game All ♠ 5 4 3  
§ 8 6  
" A Q 7 6 " J 3  
' J 8 7 3 ' A Q 5 4  
♣ K 2 ♣ A 10 9 6  
§ K Q 10 § J 9 2  
" 9 8 4 2  
' ---  
♣ Q J 8 7  
§ A 7 5 4 3

West	North	East	South
	<i>Sanborn Lev</i>		<i>Levitina Blanchard</i>
1NT	Pass	2§	Dble
2'	Pass	4'	Pass
Pass	Dble	Pass	Pass
4NT	All Pass		

The § 8 lead went to declarer's ten, and the " 6 was played towards dummy's jack. Lev took his king, and returned the § 6 to South's ace. A suit-preference § 3 cleared the club suit, and Lev pitched his ' 2. The ' J was covered by the king and ace, South pitching the ♣ 8. The " J was cashed, and the ♠ 6 went to the king. The spade ace and queen were cashed with North pitching the ♠ 4 to leave this position (it does no good pitching a heart as declarer will lose a heart to North, win the diamond exit, and cash the long heart):

" ---  
' 10 9 6  
♣ 5  
§ ---  
" --- " ---  
' 8 7 3 ' Q 5 4  
♣ 2 ♣ A  
§ --- § ---  
" ---  
' ---  
♣ J 7  
§ 7 5

Sanborn played the ♣ 2 to the ace to remove North's "flight square," (as Terence Reese would have said) and exited with dummy's ' 4 to the eight. North was endplayed in hearts, and had to yield the last two tricks to declarer! Ten tricks: 430 for E/W, and 10 IMPs. Now that's a debut!

\* *Frank Stewart* reported this deal in his *Sheinwold's bridge* column. From the Fall Nationals it features overbidding by North and accurate defence by IBPA members Mark Horton, West, and Leonard Helman, East:

Dealer: West	“ K 10 9 7 5	
N/S Game	' 9 6 5 3 2	
	♠ 8 5	
	§ 2	
“ Q 6		“ A 8
' K 10		' A 8 7 4
♠ A K J 4 2		♠ Q 7
§ Q 8 7 4		§ K 10 9 6 5
	“ J 4 3 2	
	' Q J	
	♠ 10 9 6 3	
	§ A J 3	

West	North	East	South
<i>Horton</i>		<i>Helman</i>	
1♠	2♠ (1)	Dble	3♠
Pass	Pass	Dble	All Pass

(1) A (very) light Michael's cuebid showing both majors

<b>Calendar</b>	<b>Event</b>	<b>Venue</b>	<b>IBPA Contact</b>
<b>JUN</b> 1/2	WBF Worldwide Simultaneous Pairs		www.worldbridge.org
16/30	Generali European Teams, Ladies Pairs, Tenerife		EBL
29/Jul 11	Biarritz Festival		hervepacault@wanadoo.fr
<b>JUL</b> 6/8	World Junior Pairs, Szczecinski, Poland		panos g
9/16	World Junior Camp, Insko, Poland		youthcmte@bridge.gr
19/29	ACBL Summer Nationals, Toronto		ACBL
<b>AUG</b> 6/15	World Junior Teams, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil		panos g
2/11	World University Teams, Bruges, Bruges Belgium		anna@ecats.co.uk
12/19	European University Teams, Rotterdam, Neth		EBL
<b>OCT</b> 5/11	Cyprus Festival, Girne		anna@ecats.co.uk
20/2 <sup>nd</sup> Nov	Bermuda Bowl, Venice Cup, Transnational Teams, Bali	WBF	
<b>NOV</b> 18/28	ACBL Fall Nationals, Las Vegas		ACBL
<b>2002</b>			
<b>JAN</b> 17/20	Cap Gemini Invitation, Hotel des Indes, The Hague		henk.van.dalen@capgemini.nl
<b>MAR</b> 7-17	ACBL Spring Nationals, Houston		ACBL
<b>JUL</b> 15/20	? Commonwealth Games Bridge, Manchester?		EBU
18/28	ACBL Summer Nationals, Washington		ACBL
<b>AUG</b> 9/18	England Summer Nationals, Brighton		EBU 44+ 1296 394 414
16/31	World Bridge Championships, Montreal		WBF
<b>NOV</b> 28/ 8 Dec	ACBL Fall Nationals, Phoenix		ACBL
<b>2003</b>			
<b>MAR</b> 6/16	ACBL Spring Nationals, Philadelphia		ACBL
<b>AUG</b> 8/17	England Summer Nationals, Brighton		EBU 44+ 1296 394 414

West cashed two high diamonds, and shifted to king and another heart. Helman took the ace and led a third heart. South ruffed with the jack and West over-ruffed with the queen. A third diamond was ruffed in dummy and over-ruffed, and then a fourth allowed West to make the “ 6 for a penalty of 800 and a top to East-West.

*IBPA Editor:* Six Clubs by West is on the trump guess. Six Clubs by East is, in a way, easier. South leads a spade, covered by queen, king and ace. Declarer is forced to play on diamonds. The third diamond is ruffed by North and over-ruffed. The West hand is re-entered with ' K. When North cannot ruff the fourth diamond, not only does the spade loser go away, but the trump position is exposed.

## AUSTRALIA HAS CLEAN SWEEP IN ZONE 4

By Ron Klinger (Aus)

Australia won the Open, Women's and Seniors.  
*April:*

Three teams contested the Seniors Playoff over the Easter weekend: Westwood (Bill Westwood - Bob Evans, Kaoru Anderson - Roger Januske, Wally Malaczynski - Tom Moss), Jackman (Denise Dodds - Tony Jackman, Jenny Han - Margaret Drake, Joan and Michael Kent) and Haughie (Jim Borin - Bill Haughie, John Lester - Gabi Lorentz, Tim Seres - Ron Klinger). Westwood missed the finals by losing 39-96 to Jackman and 22-97 to Haughie. In the final, Haughie defeated Jackman 197 - 122.

On the Sunday Haughie, representing Australia, played a test match against the New Zealand Seniors (Janet Woodfield - Lindsay Knight, Robyn Freeman-Greene - Tony Lenart, Jeff Green - Dougal McLean, Charlie Cahn npc). Haughie won the 64-board match by 197 - 82 and so earned the right to play for the South Pacific Zone in the 2001 Seniors World Championships in Bali in October.

On the deal below, North passes and East opens one spade. What action would you take as South?

Dealer: North	“ A 10 5				
N/S Game	' 10				
	♠ Q 10 9 5 4 2				
	§ Q 9 5				
“ 4		“ Q 9 7 6 2			
' 8 7 5 4 3		' A Q 6 2			
♠ A J 7		♠ 8 3			
§ 8 4 3 2		§ A 7			
	“ K J 8 3				
	' K J 9				
	♠ K 6				
	§ K J 10 6				

At our table, Seres opened 1“ and South passed. I responded 1NT and Seres rebid 2' . Hopeful of a stronger hand opposite, I raised to 3' , passed out. Declarer had to lose two trump tricks and a trick in each of the other suits, one down, minus 50.

At the other table Lester, South, bid 1NT over one spade. West passed and Lorentz raised to 3NT. Declarer made ten tricks for +630 and +11 Imps.

*May* In the South Pacific Championships in Christchurch, in the women's event, Australian

teams finished 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> in the qualifying rounds. Travis (Alida Clark, Jan Cormack, Marilyn Chadwick, Elizabeth Havas, Debbie Moir, Barbara Travis) topped the list. In the final Travis defeated the leading NZ team 277-178.

On this deal from the final Barbara Travis-Liz Havas outbid their NZ counterparts and Havas brought home a tricky game.

Dealer: North	“ K 9 3				
E/W Game	' 10 9 6 4				
	♠ A Q J 7 4				
	§ 3				
“ J 6 4 2		“ Q 7			
' 3 2		' K J 8 7			
♠ 8 6		♠ 10 3			
§ A Q 9 5 2		§ K 10 8 7 4			
		“ A 10 8 5			
		' A Q 5			
		♠ K 9 5 2			
		§ J 6			

The New Zealand North-South reached 5♠. Despite a strong trump fit and the heart finesse working, it has no reasonable play. Declarer has a spade, a heart and a club to lose.

Havas opened a 14-17 1NT as South and Travis, North, jumped to 3§, a splinter showing the values for game and shortage in clubs. The bidding ended in 4“ by South.

The ♠ 8 lead was won in dummy and the “ 9 led. East covered with the queen, taken by the ace. Havas returned the spade eight: four, three, seven. Picking spades to be 4-2 (why would East cover the nine with three spades to the queen?), Havas reverted to diamonds.

West ruffed the third diamond, cashed the club ace and switched to a heart. That made things easy but Havas would succeed even if West played club ace and another club: ruff in dummy, finesse the heart queen and play a trump. She has a trump left and can discard her heart loser as dummy still has an entry.

If West ruffs the fourth diamond, declarer is still all right. If West then plays club ace and another club, declarer discards a heart from dummy. She can ruff a third club in hand, play a spade to the king, drawing the last trump. The fifth diamond allows a heart discard and the heart finesse sees declarer home.

**The Open** Teams was won by Barry Noble, George Bilski, Terry Brown, Peter Fordham, Phil Gue, Michael Prescott ahead of two NZ teams.

Fordham played this deal well. After East opened 1NT, 12-14 points, South overcalled 2', showing both majors. North raised to 3' and South went on to game. The lead was § 7.

Dealer: East	“ 9 7	
Love all	' J 6 5 3	
	⌘ K J 9 2	
	§ A 10 3	
“ Q 6 5 2		“ A 10 3
' 7		' 9 8 2
⌘ Q 8 3		⌘ A 10 6
§ Q 9 8 7 2		§ K J 6 5
	“ K J 8 4	
	' A K Q 10 4	
	⌘ 7 5 4	
	§ 4	

Fordham took the club ace and played a spade. East played low and Fordham did the right thing by rising with the king. He exited with a low spade which went to East's ten.

Declarer ruffed the club return and continued with a spade, ruffed low in dummy, heart to the ace and a spade ruffed with dummy's jack. Trumps were then drawn and Fordham continued with a diamond to the jack. When this fetched the ace, the contract was home. Declarer had scored five trumps in hand, two ruffs in dummy and one trick in each side suit.

The key was to take the right view for both king-jack combinations. East had shown 12-14 points, leaving West with 4 to 6 points, so Fordham placed the missing aces with East.

At the other table Michael Hughes, also from Sydney, made four hearts in identical fashion. No swing.

On this deal from a qualifying match in this year's Grand National Open Teams, West seems to have three trump tricks against five clubs, but appearances can be deceptive.

Dealer: North	“ A 10 7 5 3	
Game All	' A J 9 3	
	⌘ 2	
	§ Q 8 4	
“ J 6 4		“ K Q 8 2
' K 5 4		' 8 7 2
⌘ K Q 6		⌘ J 9 5 4 3
§ A J 10 9		§ 5
	“ 9	
	' Q 10 6	
	⌘ A 10 8 7	
	§ K 7 6 3 2	

With East-West silent, the bidding, Acol-style, went one spade two clubs, two hearts : 2NT, three clubs : five clubs. The king of diamonds was led and declarer, Bruce Neill of Sydney, won with the ace and led the heart queen. West covered and dummy won. After spade ace and a spade ruff, declarer ruffed a diamond, crossed to the heart ten and ruffed another diamond. A heart winner in dummy stood up and declarer ruffed another spade.

West was now down to just four trumps. Neill led a diamond and West could not gain by ruffing with the ace. He ruffed low and was over-ruffed with dummy's queen. A spade from dummy was ruffed low by declarer. West over-ruffed but could score only one more trick from ace-jack in clubs to declarer's king-seven.

To defeat five clubs, West needs to lead ace and another club (hardly feasible) or decline to cover the heart queen (also very difficult).

\* The ACBL has awarded *Alan Truscott*, IBPA's Chairman, the *Blackwood Award*, given to a living member for service to bridge in all facets of the game.

\* *Carlos Cabanne reports*: The 51<sup>st</sup> South American Championship, played in the city of Cochabamba, Bolivia, ended on Saturday 12<sup>th</sup> May with the triumph of Argentina.

Only two of the members of the team had played the championship before, one being Agustín Madala, 14 years old. He must be the youngest player to win a zonal championship. The team was: Ernesto Muzio, Marcelo Lerner, Cristobal Aguirre, Jorge Estevarena, 30, Pablo Ravenna, 28 and Madala.

The big difference in the final was not due to spectacular hands but to small details in the bidding and play. Let's see this hand.

Dealer: West	“ 6 5 3		
N/S Game	' Q 7 3		
	♠ Q 9 4		
	§ A K 9 3		
“ K Q 9 8 7		“ J 10 2	
' J 4		' A 10 8 6	
♠ J 8 5		♠ 7 6 3 2	
§ J 10 4		§ 8 7	
	“ A 4		
	' K 9 5 2		
	♠ A K 10		
	§ Q 6 5 2		

At both tables the bidding was: 1 NT - 3 NT

The Argentine pair lead fourth best against NT contracts, but Aguirre, because the strength of his spades; led the King. South took the second round and played a small club to the Ace and ' 3 off the dummy. Estevarena, East, rose with the Ace, and continued spades. Finish .

At the other table, the lead was “ 8; Madala took the trick at once and played as in the other room, crossing to § A to lead a low heart, but East did not put on ' A, and Madala ran for home.

*For further details see Anna Gudge's web site.*

\* *Leandro Burgay*, silver medallist in the European Pairs in Sorrento with Carlo Mariani, sends an idea for extending the advantages of screens during the play.

He suggests that each table has a second copy of the board in play. At the end of the auction the flap is not raised. Instead, after the opening lead is made *two* dummies are faced, one each side of the screen.

As cards are played, they are relayed by a recorder through to the other side of the screen simultaneously, as with bidding. Dummy's cards, as played, are placed face downwards, both sides of the screen.

Burgay says a debate and experiment is to be carried out in Bali. Burgay's ideas are given in full in an interview in *Bridge d'Italia*. Burgay is a TV producer who invites IBPA members to comment on his idea.

*IBPA Editor*: The idea, presumably, is for a defender to be able to take time in defence without giving partner unauthorised information. The key question is the effect on speed of play.

An oddity is that the set-up is not symmetrical. The defender on the same side of the screen as declarer, has more information about speed of play than partner, who is with a dummy. Also, for each trick, three cards are selected one side of the screen, only one from the other. That may reveal the speed of play of the defender who is on his own.

\* *Mark Horton* says The Cyprus Festival, Girne, will be from 5-11 October 2001

Contact: Anna Gudge - Phone 01787 88 19 20 Fax: 01787 88 13 39 e-mail: anna@ecats.co.uk.

*Mark adds*: Enjoyed the latest issue of IBPA magazine. It occurred to me that in order to compete for example in a World Pairs Championship you have to pay an entry fee. Isn't the subscription to an Internet site the equivalent in this situation?

As to the use of the word 'World' - well in the good old US of A they play baseball every year for what they call the World Series - although only American teams take part. If you were reporting it would you change the name?

*IBPA Editor*: My Editorial made the point about an entry fee, which is why I described the *e-bridge* matter as one of presentation. I don't know enough about baseball to know whether there is an undisputed world authority. If my local bridge club set up a competition and called it the World Bridge Championships, would *you* report it as such?

\* *Elena Jeronimidis* clarifies a possible misunderstanding arising from the last Postbag: "As from March 2001, *Mr Bridge* has taken over the Bridge Plus title and all related publications. Elena Jeronimidis continues as Editor of Bridge Plus, and has in addition been appointed Associate Editor of BRIDGE, also published by *Mr Bridge*."

\* *Jean-Paul Meyer* has a new address:  
34, rue de Docteur Blanche 75016 PARIS

\* *Eric Smets* has a new address:  
Regenboogstraat 7, b.2 B-2500 Lier Belgium