

THE INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE PRESS ASSOCIATION

Editor: JOHN CARRUTHERS

This Bulletin is published monthly and circulated to around 500 members of the International Bridge Press Association comprising the world's leading journalists, authors and editors of news, books and articles about contract bridge, with an estimated readership of some 200 million people who enjoy the most widely played of all card games

BULLETIN
www.IBPA.com
mail@ibpa.com

N° 454 Year 2002 Date November 10

President:

HENRY G FRANCIS
6875 Stornaway Drive
Memphis, TN 38119 USA
(1) 901 754 3405 F: 901 398 7754
Email: hfranci1@midssouth.rr.com

Executive Vice-President:

PATRICK JOURDAIN
8 Felin Wen, Rhiwbina
Cardiff CF14 6NW Wales
(44) 29 2062 8839 F: 29 2061 5234
email: patrickjourdain@compuserve.com

Organizational Vice-President:

PER E JANNERSTEN
Villa Cicero
S-77400 Avesta, SWEDEN
Email: per@jannersten.se

Chairman:

ALANTRUSCOTT
3333 Henry Hudson Parkway
Bronx, NY 10463 USA
Email: alantruscott@aol.com

Secretary:

MAUREEN DENNISON
148 Thornbury Road, Osterley
Isleworth TW7 4QE, ENGLAND UK
(44) 20 8560 3788 F: 20 8568 3553
Email:
maureen_dennison@ibpa.freereserve.co.uk

Membership Secretary:

Dr STUART STAVELEY
Rhu-na-Bidh, Shieldaig, Strathcarron
Ross-shire IV54 8XN SCOTLAND UK
(44) 1520 755 217 F: 1520 755 355

Treasurer:

HANS CHRISTER ANDERSSON
Arstagatan 20 C
75434 Uppsala, SWEDEN
(46) 18 253584 O: 18 175764
Email: jus289n@tinet.se

Honorary General Counsel:

WILLIAM J PENCHARZ
5 Gt College St. London SW1P 3SJ UK
Email: bill.pencharz@radcliffes.co.uk

Awards Secretary:

BARRY J RIGAL
Apt 8E, 22 West 26th Street,
New York NY 10010, USA
Email: baryrigal@mindspring.com

Sponsored Members' Secretary:

IRENA CHODOROWSKA
Ul Sewastopolska 3m41
02-758 Warsaw, POLAND
Email: trans@syrena.com.pl

Production Editor:

ANNA GUDGE
The Old Railway Station
Long Melford, Suffolk CO10 9HN England
Email: anna@ecats.co.uk

EDITORIAL

The opinions expressed here are those of the Editor, and not necessarily the IBPA Executive or its members.

I can think of at least four occasions (I'm sure there are many others) when the World Bridge Federation performed magnificently in complicated situations when their backs were to the wall. The first was in 1985, when India was to host the Bermuda Bowl and Venice Cup, but, alas, had to withdraw when the Indian government would not guarantee to admit all participants regardless of their country of origin. With 11 months to go until the event was to take place, Brazil took up the challenge and staged a fantastic tournament, perfect in every regard. In 1989, hundreds of competitors were in danger of being stranded at their point-of-entry to Australia by a domestic airline pilots' strike, while trying to reach Perth, site of the Bermuda Bowl/Venice Cup. The WBF and members of the local Organizing Committee ensured that all competitors not only reached Perth in time to play, but were able to debark Australia on schedule. In an occurrence that is still fresh in everyone's memory, the WBF moved the 2001 Bermuda Bowl/Venice Cup from Bali to Paris, almost without a hitch, even diverting supplies already on their way to Bali back to France in time.

Truly, these achievements were momentous, and if we look carefully at the reasons why, we can see that one person was responsible in each case. Ernesto d'Orsi was the architect of Sao Paulo's success and is the reason all Bermuda Bowls are now measured against his. Denis Howard managed the workarounds for the pilots' strike in Australia, and Jose Damiani stage-managed the Paris-Bali Rally in 2001.

The fourth incident occurred most recently, in Montreal, when the computer containing the hand records for the fifth and last session of the Open Pairs Final, along with some other electronic gear, was stolen from a locked hotel meeting room the night before the deals were to be played on the last day of the Championship. Thirty-six sets of boards had been prepared for the next day's play. Upon discovering the theft, the WBF Operations staff redealt all 36 sets of boards for the final session (played simultaneously at every table), delaying proceedings, amazingly, by not more than fifteen minutes. Most competitors were not then, and are not to this day, even aware of the theft. Ton Kooijman, the WBF Director of Operations, was the mastermind in this case, ensuring that the Final of the Open Pairs would not be marred by the incident, or worse, by a resulting scandal. Congratulations are due to Ton and the staff.

I point out these examples to provide a little balance to the storm of criticism directed the WBF's way in the wake of the Montréal World Championships. Let us keep in mind that most of the time they do a bang-up job. That's not to say they won't be castigated in these pages for their blunders!

Address all editorial correspondence to: **JOHN CARRUTHERS**
65 Tiago Avenue, Toronto, Ontario M4B 2A2, Canada
Tel: +1 416 752 7034** Fax: +1 416 344 3493
Email: ibpaeditor@sympatico.ca

AND NOW FOR SOMETHING COMPLETELY DIFFERENT...

try your hand at P.O.'s quiz. As usual with P.O.'s deals, they sometimes require a deft touch and they are always fun!

SIMPLE SAMPLES

BY P.O. SUNDELIN, STOCKHOLM

1. Dealer West. N-S Vul.

♠ 10 7 5 3
♥ K J 2
♦ 7 4
♣ K Q J 6

♠ K
♥ A Q 10 7 5 4
♦ A J 2
♣ 7 4 2

West	North	East	South
1 ♠	Pass	2 ♠	3 ♥
Pass	4 ♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

West leads the spade two, third and fifth – East wins with the ace, ponders for a few seconds, then returns the spade four. On a high trump West throws a spade. A penny for your thoughts.

2. Dealer South. N-S Vul.

♠ 10 7 6 4
♥ —
♦ A J 8 7 4
♣ K 10 7 5

♠ A K Q
♥ A 10 7 5
♦ 9 5
♣ A 9 6 3

West	North	East	South
—	—	—	1 ♣
1 ♥	Double	2 ♥	Double
Pass	3 ♣	Pass	5 ♣
Pass	6 ♣	Pass	Pass
Pass			

North's double was negative, South's promised extra strength. We don't know if North was sure, or why he bid clubs rather than diamonds (the opening only showed three). Five clubs showed imagination, and six clubs optimism. West led the heart eight. What is your plan?

3. Dealer West. Neither Vul.

♠ J 7 5
♥ Q
♦ Q J 9 7 6 4
♣ K J 10

♠ K 6
♥ A K 10 4
♦ —
♣ A Q 9 8 6 5 4

West	North	East	South
1 NT	Pass	2 ♠	Double
Pass	3 ♦	Pass	4 ♣
Pass	5 ♣	Pass	6 ♣
Pass	Pass	Pass	

West's 1 NT showed 12-14. North's diamond bid showed constructive values, so it is somewhat understandable that South raised to slam. In six clubs, West leads the trump two and East discards the spade four. Would you like to play or defend?

4. Dealer East. N-S Vul.

♠ 5 3
♥ A 5 4 3
♦ J 7 4
♣ K Q 5 4

♠ A K 7 4
♥ K 10 9 7 2
♦ K Q 2
♣ 8

West	North	East	South
—	—	1 NT	Double
2 ♠	Double	Pass	3 ♥
Pass	4 ♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

The opening again showed 12-14. South's double was penalty-oriented, but North's was take-outish. West leads the spade jack. Declarer wins with the ace, plays a club to the king and ace. Back comes the spade queen. Could anything go wrong from this point?

5. Dealer North. Both Vul.

♠ K J 8 6 3 2
♥ Q 9 2
♦ 5
♣ A 10 4

♠ Q
♥ A K J 10 6
♦ 7 6 4 2
♣ Q 8 3

West	North	East	South
—	1 ^a	2 ♦	2 ♥
Pass	3 ♥	Pass	4 ♥
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Opening Lead: ♦ J

I defended this one as East. I overtook with the queen and returned the trump four, won by dummy's nine over West's seven. A spade to the queen was followed by a diamond ruff, then the spade king, which I covered. Declarer took another diamond ruff, and led the spade jack, discarding his last diamond. West ruffed and exited with a trump. Declarer took another trump (West's last), discarding spades from the dummy, while I discarded the

diamond ace-king. Declarer now played his last trump(!), coming down to three clubs in each hand. West discarded the club deuce and I let go the thirteenth spade.

With everyone down to three cards declarer led the club three, six, ten, jack; I exited with the club five. Finally, we have arrived at the quiz question (you were hoping it was never coming weren't you?): do you play the eight or the queen?

Solutions follow the IBPA Column Service

BEST DEAL FROM MONTRÉAL I

(ROSENBLUM SECOND QUARTER)

BY ERIC KOKISH, TORONTO
BART BRAMLEY, CHICAGO

This is our second installment of excerpts from the upcoming 2002 World Championship Book, a must have for all journalists and serious players, and continues last month's theme of the "best deal". This one is certainly a candidate. It's from the second quarter, and is analyzed by Eric Kokish (with an assist from Bart Bramley) in his thorough, entertaining manner. According to Kokish, the deal prompted a steady stream of email discussion about the 'correct' line of play and four times as much work as any other by Fred Gitelman for his Bridge Base "Deal of the Week." Because of the favourable lie of the cards, if EOK had not done the analysis, the deal might have slipped by unnoticed.

Board 30. Dealer East. Neither Vul.

<p>♠ A 10 9 5 ♥ 5 4 ♦ 9 5 4 2 ♣ Q 10 6</p> <p>♠ K 7 4 3 ♥ A Q 8 ♦ A J 8 ♣ A 8 5</p>	<p>♠ — ♥ K J 9 7 3 ♦ K 10 7 ♣ K J 7 4 2</p>
<p>♠ Q J 8 6 2 ♥ 10 6 2 ♦ Q 6 3 ♣ 9 3</p>	

POLAND VS INDONESIA

Open Room

West	North	East	South
Mariani	Manoppo	Burgay	Lasut
—	—	2♣(i)	Pass
2♦(ii)	Pass	2♥(iii)	Pass
6♥	Pass	Pass	Pass

- (i) 12-15: 6+♣ or or 4+♣/5+ in another suit
(ii) Inquiry
(iii) 4+♣/5+♥

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
Tobing	Balicki	Asbi	Zmudzinski
—	—	1♥	Pass
1♠	Pass	2♣	Pass
2♦(i)	Pass	3♣	Pass
3♥	Pass	4♥	Pass
4NT	Pass	5♣	Pass
5♥	Pass	Pass	Pass

(i) Fourth suit game forcing

ITALY VS SWEDEN

Open Room

West	North	East	South
Fredin	Lauria	Lindkvist	Versace
—	—	1♥	Pass
2♣(i)	Pass	2♦(ii)	Pass
2♥(i)	Pass	3♠(iii)	Pass
4♣(iv)	Pass	4♦(v)	Pass
6♥	Pass	Pass	Pass

(i) Game-forcing relay

(ii) 5332/5440/4+♣

(iii) 0=5=3=5

(iv) Slam Asking Bid, clubs trumps for now

(v) Minimum

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
Duboin	Bertheau	Bocchi	Nystrom
—	—	1♥	Pass
2♣(i)	Pass	2♦(ii)	Pass
2♥(i)	Pass	2♠(iii)	Pass
2NT(i)	Pass	3♥(iv)	Pass
3♠(i)	Pass	3NT(v)	Pass
4♦	Pass	4♥	Pass
4♠	Pass	5♣	Pass
5♦	Pass	5♠	Pass
6♥	Pass	Pass	Pass

(i) Relay, at least game-invitational strength

(ii) 5+♥, 11-15

(iii) Clubs

(iv) 5+♥/5+♣

(v) Minimum

Tobing/Asbi, the natural bidders, were the only pair to miss the decent slam on this one. Zmudzinski led the ♠Q, ducked in dummy. Asbi ruffed, drew trumps, played ♣A, club to the jack, and eventually guessed the ♦Q correctly for +510. In 5♥, Asbi really should have played as safely as possible in clubs (see the play in the other match, below) after drawing trumps, as he could afford one loser in the suit but not two.

Mariani had reason to believe that 6♥ would often be the right contract, his decision to get there as quickly as possible seems questionable. Burgay also got the lead of the ♠Q. He followed Asbi's line, playing clubs for five tricks. He too guessed the ♦Q correctly: +1010. 11 IMPs to Poland, back in front, 70-61.

Burgay would also have made 6♥ easily enough with clubs four-one onside as he could throw North in with the fourth club to lead from the ♠A or break diamonds.

It took Duboin four relays to determine that Bocchi was five-five and minimum. What happened next is not clear from the records, but my best guess is that 4♦ set hearts, 4♥ signed off, four cue-bids, conclusion.

The methods of Lindkvist/Fredin were best in show here, Lindkvist revealing his precise pattern and general strength below the game level. Here, Fredin could place his partner with 11-13 HCP outside spades, so slam had to be reasonable.

Both South players in this match led the ♦3, a sensible but unfortunate choice as it spared declarer the guess in diamonds. Lindkvist and Bocchi drew trumps, and here the correct line of play was clearly indicated as only four club winners were needed: ♣K, and if the ten or nine appeared in North, low towards dummy, intending to put in the eight. Had South shown out on the second club, declarer would have won and led low towards his jack. Although there was no swing at +980, both E/W pairs acquitted themselves particularly well to halve the board: Italy 58-Sweden 48.

Kokish admits to being “troubled” by Burgay’s line of play and turns the analysis over to Bart Bramley, *technicien extraordinaire*, whose exhaustive report could fill half this issue. The five main lines developed by Bart are: (1.) trumps, clubs, then diamonds, (2.) trumps, diamonds, then clubs, (3.) dummy reversal, (4.) trumps, then safety play in clubs, and (5.) multiple possibilities, including a first-round club finesse and delaying trumps. Each has variations. Bart states:

“Among the lines that draw trumps first, (4.), the safety play, is clearly the best. The comparison among it and (3.), the dummy reversal, and (5.), multiple possibilities, is closer. However, the best line is (3.). The next best line is close between the other two.”

Bart goes on to examine the effect of false-carding in trumps and/or clubs by the opponents, and the resulting ‘variations’ in the play. Taking it all into consideration, he concludes:

“The best exact sequence after ruffing at trick one is: Heart jack, switching to the safety play line if the heart ten drops (draw trumps first and safety play clubs only if trumps split; if they go four-one, revert to the four-one backup plan: if North has four trumps, start clubs now with the ace, club finesse; if South has four trumps, draw trumps, then play the club ace; if South plays the queen, ten, or nine, double finesse; if South plays a low club, finesse the jack).”

“If the heart ten does not drop, then play the club king, again switching to the safety play line if East drops the ten or nine. If he does not, club to the ace, spade ruff, club. When the heart ten drops you must assume that trumps will be four-one, but if both follow to the sec-

ond trump, then you can play clubs via the safety play, which is best among the lines where you draw trumps first. This line makes whenever both key suits split evenly, or if the club queen is doubleton, and in several other cases of bad splits. My estimate is that this line will work about 60% of the time. I believe that the best line is somewhere between 1% and 2% better than the next-best line, but it might be closer than that. Perhaps someone else can come up with the numbers.”

“This is my opinion. Yours may differ.” (*For the complete analysis, buy the book! – Ed.*)

BEST DEAL FROM MONTRÉAL II

BY JAN VAN CLEEFF, AMSTERDAM

From the Mixed Pairs came this interesting deal, described in the IBPA bulletin as possibly “the best played hand of the tournament.” The declarer, JoAnna Stansby, indeed followed a creative line of play. But was that really required?

Dealer North. E-W Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
—	Pass	1♦	1♠
2♥	2♠	Pass	3♠
4♥	4♠	Pass	Pass
Double	Pass	Pass	Pass

The defence started with two times hearts. Stansby ruffed and counted eight sure tricks and probably ten if she could ruff two diamonds in dummy. But why had West doubled? Not on trumps or top tricks. Bad distribution could be the reason. With a singleton, West would have led or switched to diamonds. Because that did not happen West was likely to have a void in diamonds. Therefore declarer continued with a low diamond. East won and continued with the diamond king, ducked again by Stansby, who rectified the count this way for a double squeeze: clubs/hearts against left and clubs/diamonds against RHO. Ruffing one diamond in dummy would be enough to obtain the squeeze. This way JoAnna Stansby found her way to ten tricks (a 95 percent score).

JoAnna Stansby’s creative play was great indeed, but still there is more to be said:

1. If the defence leads a black suit, the contract cannot be made any more. Even in some variations, after a heart

lead and a black switch, the contract is unmakeable.

2. Stansby - after the duck of the ace of diamonds - could also have made her contract by ruffing two diamonds in dummy. That way, the squeeze was not necessary. The squeeze would be required, however, if East, after winning the first diamond, had switched to a trump, with West pitching clubs. South should then indeed play another small diamond and East is to continue with another trump.

3. Stansby also makes ten tricks when in fact she does play the diamond ace on the second diamond, ruffed by west. If west continues in trumps the double squeeze is still on. If west switches to something else, three diamonds can be ruffed in dummy.

4. The double dummy analyser Deep Finesse turned out to be a great help for me in analysing this hand!

PAPAYA WITH SUGAR

BY DIEGO BRENNER, RIO DE JANEIRO

Here are some recent deals I found interesting. Gabriel Chagas and I played this first deal at the Rio de Janeiro Championship. We bid aggressively (as usual) to a fair slam. How would you play it?

<p>♠ A K 6 ♥ 10 8 7 5 4 ♦ A J 6 4 ♣ Q</p>	<p>♠ 8 ♥ A K 3 2 ♦ K 5 ♣ A K J 10 9 5</p>
---	---

West	North	East	South
<i>Brenner</i>		<i>Chagas</i>	
1 ♥	Pass	2 ♣	Pass
2 ♦	Pass	3 ♥	Pass
3 ♠	Pass	3 NT*	Pass
4 ♣	Pass	4 ♦	Pass
4 ♥	Pass	4 NT	Pass
5 ♥**	Pass	7 ♣	Pass
Pass	Pass		

* 3 NT = General Slam Try

** 5 ♥ = denies trump Q

The slam has good chances even with the spade entry removed from the dummy: a 2-2 heart break or a diamond finesse is about 70%, with the additional chance of dropping the diamond queen doubleton offside when South guards the red suits.

Chagas took the spade lead and cashed the queen of clubs and king of spades. Another spade saw his right hand opponent discard a diamond! For Chagas, it was now “papaya with sugar”, as we say in Brazil. He played trumps, both following, then the ace and king of hearts, left hand opponent discarding a spade. Now the run of the trumps squeezed his RHO in the reds. The full deal was:

<p>♠ Q 3 ♥ Q 9 6 ♦ Q 10 8 7 2 ♣ 7 6 4</p>	<p>♠ 8 ♥ A K 3 2 ♦ K 5 ♣ A K J 10 9 5</p>
<p>♠ A K 6 ♥ 10 8 7 5 4 ♦ A J 6 4 ♣ Q</p>	<p>♠ J 10 9 7 5 4 2 ♥ J ♦ 9 3 ♣ 8 3 2</p>

The great play was cashing the spades, which enabled Chagas to get a complete count on the hand. It's hard to see at the table that you must play the third spade, but “Mr. Always Awake” did, as expected. :-)

Norberto Bocchi and I played the following “Challenge the Champs” deal on OK Bridge one afternoon. The bidding was totally natural. (*Well, almost totally. – Ed.*)

<p>♠ J 9 7 4 ♥ Q 2 ♦ 8 6 5 ♣ 7 6 4 3</p>	<p>♠ A 8 3 2 ♥ A 3 ♦ K Q J 2 ♣ Q 10 5</p>
<p>♠ Q 10 6 ♥ K J 7 4 ♦ A 10 ♣ A K J 9</p>	<p>♠ K 5 ♥ 10 9 8 6 5 ♦ 9 7 4 3 ♣ 8 2</p>

West	North	East	South
<i>Brenner</i>		<i>Bocchi</i>	
—	—	1 NT	Pass
2 ♣	Pass	2 ♠	Pass
3 ♣	Pass	3 ♦	Pass
3 ♥	Pass	4 ♣	Pass
4 ♦	Pass	4 ♥	Pass
4 NT	Pass	5 ♠	Pass
5 NT	Pass	7 ♣	Pass
Pass	Pass		

The lead was a trump. My plan was to win in hand and ruff two hearts in the dummy, using diamonds as entries to my hand. If the lead had been a spade, it would be the same since the queen of hearts falls second.

Chagas and I played this next deal in Session 4 of the World Open Pairs Final in Montréal against the young Argentines, Ravenna-Madala. They want to beat us in bridge as much as they do in football.

Board 16. Dealer West. E-W Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Madala</i>	<i>Chagas</i>	<i>Ravenna</i>	<i>Brenner</i>
Pass	1♥	Pass	2♦
Pass	2♥	Pass	3♥
Pass	4♣	Pass	4♦
Pass	4♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Ravenna led a club, which Chagas won in hand to lead heart ace and a heart to the ten, Madala pitching a club. A spade to the ten and queen was followed by another club play from East. Chagas won the club ace, drew the last trump, Madala throwing another club, and cashed the spade ace. This position had been reached:

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

When Chagas cashed a heart, both he and Madala threw diamonds. But on the penultimate heart, Madala had no good discard when Chagas threw another diamond from the dummy. He actually chose a diamond, but Chagas read it correctly, playing off the ace-king of diamonds before ruffing a spade back to hand to make the good diamond. Making six!

Let me give you one more deal as a bidding problem. With both vulnerable, at pairs, you hold:

♠ K 5
♥ J 7 4
♦ A 9 6 5
♣ 8 6 4 3

The bidding goes One Spade on your right, you Pass, Three Spades on your left. Partner Gabriel Chagas says Double, and it goes Pass. What now? Does it

make any difference whether Three Spades is limit or preemptive?

In any case, Three Spades was a limit raise, but I passed anyway. They went one down vulnerable, a good result for us since no game was on our way. I found it strange, but still wondered if Pass was really the best bid. What do you think? I did not find an answer, but I know one thing, that Pass would be a terrible bid at IMPs!

THE VIEW FROM CHIH-KAN TOWER

BY TENG-YUAN LIANG, TAINAN, TAIWAN

In Bulletin No. 452 (Montréal Special), page 3, PO Sundelin reported a spectacular play by JoAnna Stansby in the Mixed Pairs. (I'd vote for it as the best-played hand in that tournament.)

JoAnna's line covers most of possible shapes the opponents can have, even if East attacks the club entries when he's in. Following her line, I found a very interesting position she may achieve if West has 2-6-1-4 shape. Suppose the hand is as follows:

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

(The auction had gone 1♦-1♠-2♥-2♠-Pass-3♠-4♥-4♠-All Pass, and West had 3-6-0-4 on the actual deal. – Ed.)

After the defence's first two rounds of hearts and following JoAnna's giving up two rounds of diamonds and East's attack on the club entries, we ruff a club back with a big trump to explore the shape, to reach the following position. (West's best defence is to throw a club on the second diamond. If he throws a heart, we can make the contract another way.)

	♠ K J 3		
	♥ 9 7		
	♦ —		
	♣ 9		
♠ 8 2		♠ 9 7 6	
♥ Q J 10 5		♥ —	
♦ —		♦ K Q J	
♣ —		♣ —	
	♠ A Q 5		
	♥ —		
	♦ A 7 6		
	♣ —		

We know West had 2-6-1-4 shape originally. A low diamond from hand will end the opponents' future. If West ruffs with the eight, we overruff with the jack and cash the spade king, extracting West's last trump. The remaining club will force East to ruff and we overruff. Now we can cash the diamond ace freely and ruff a diamond in the dummy.

Conversely, if West pitches a heart on the third diamond, we can ruff with 3. Now a heart from the dummy will force East to ruff, or we can make ten tricks by crossruffing. We overruff and the diamond ace forces West to ruff (or we can make ten easy tricks). We overruff again and the remaining heart forces East to ruff once again, and we also overruff. Now, with one trump remaining in each defender's hand, we can clear the trumps in one round and cash the club 9.

In the July issue, page 5, Brian Senior reported a brilliant queen-dropping move by a Hong Kong youth defender, L.H. Chin, against Australia. On that deal, Chinese Taipei (Taiwan) PABF Open team player Tony C.C. Duh also made the same brilliant queen-dropping move, although after a different sequence of plays.

<p>♠ 6 3 ♥ A J 8 5 2 ♦ J 2 ♣ A K 9 8</p> <p>♠ 8 5 2 ♥ Q 10 ♦ A 10 9 8 7 6 ♣ 7 5</p> <p>♠ K Q J 4 ♥ K 6 3 ♦ K Q 4 3 ♣ J 3</p>	<p>♠ A 10 9 7 ♥ 9 7 4 ♦ 5 ♣ Q 10 6 4 2</p>
--	--

In the Open Series, when Chinese Taipei faced Japan, Duh, sitting West, found the diamond ace lead against South's Four Hearts. A second diamond allowed East to ruff. East cashed the spade ace and continued a spade, Duh following high-low (encouraging) to distort the picture. Declarer then cashed the heart king (maybe a low heart to dummy would have been better), and Duh dropped his queen in tempo! Now declarer felt very annoyed and took a little time to think. Finally, persuaded that West had 2-1-6-4 shape, he decided to cash the club ace-king and ruff a club in hand. When Duh overruffed with the heart ten, declarer was stunned.

Besides that defensive gem, Duh had another playing gem in the PABF Open Series, which may (or may not) qualify to be a candidate for our annual Hand of the Year. In the 12th round of the PABF Open Series in June, Duh played this hand.

MATCH 1 OF SECOND ROUND ROBIN (12TH ROUND), 2002 PABF OPEN TEAMS, CHINESE TAIPEI VS MALAYSIA

Board 6. Dealer East. E-W Vul.

<p>♠ — ♥ J 9 7 3 2 ♦ K J 4 2 ♣ J 8 7 2</p> <p>♠ 5 4 2 ♥ A Q 6 5 ♦ A 6 5 ♣ A K 5</p> <p>♠ K Q 9 8 3 ♥ — ♦ Q 10 8 3 ♣ Q 10 4 3</p>	<p>♠ A J 10 7 6 ♥ K 10 8 4 ♦ 9 7 ♣ 9 6</p>
--	--

West	North	East	South
<i>Duh</i>		<i>Li</i>	
—	—	Pass	Pass
1 NT	Pass	2 ♣	Pass
2 ♥	Pass	4 ♥	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Tony Duh, sitting West, had to play this normal-looking Four Heart contract. The bad trump break dooms the contract against perfect defence: looking at the four hands, there is no legitimate solution to make the contract. But Duh took the advantage of a slight, blameless, defensive flaw to make his game.

North led a low club to Duh's ace. Tony made the first key play at the second trick. He reasoned that there would be no harm in playing a spade before drawing trumps, so he played a low spade immediately. When North discarded a diamond, he went up with the spade ace. Then, warned by the bad break in spades against a possible bad break in trumps, he led a club to the king, ruffed a club and led a diamond to the ace. Now he played a spade and the contract became unbreakable in the meantime.

Upon winning the spade, South cashed another, then led a fourth round, Duh ruffing high in his hand. North was reduced to his five trumps! When Duh next led a diamond, North was forced to ruff and get out a heart, won by dummy's eight. Duh could ruff dummy's last spade high, and the last two tricks were taken by dummy's ten-eight of hearts.

Had he ducked a diamond at trick three after winning the spade ace, to try to arrange two minor suit ruffs in dummy instead of two spade ruffs in his hand, South could get in at this trick and cash spade honours to allow North to pitch his last two diamonds. Then a diamond ruff would be the setting trick. On the other hand, if he fails to take a club ruff in dummy, South can cash two spades and a diamond, denying him the three entries necessary to make four trumps in dummy and two ruffs in hand.

So where's the blameless defensive flaw? On a double dummy basis, North should have trumped the spade at trick two and played a heart. Declarer could then arrange two ruffs in dummy, but would not be able to cash the spade ace, or one ruff in dummy and the spade ace. But how can you blame North for failing to ruff nothing with what looked like a sure trump trick? Nevertheless, it was a masterpiece of timing.

IBPA COLUMN SERVICE

BY BARRY RIGAL, NEW YORK CITY

(These deals may be used without attribution to the author or IBPA.)

217. One of the hardest decisions in defending a no-trump contract can be to give up on a good plan to move to a better one. On the deal that follows both East-West pairs started off on a sensible route, but only one found the critical improvement to scupper Declarer in his game.

Dealer West. East-West Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
Berkowitz	Freeman	Cohen	Nickell
Pass	1♦	Pass	1♠
Pass	2♦	Pass	2♥
Pass	3♣	Pass	3NT
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Freeman chose to rebid Two Diamonds initially, and only subsequently to introduce the clubs to show a 6 4 shape without extras. For some of us the North hand has enough values to rebid Two Clubs first and then repeat the diamonds, but a lot depends on whether you play sound opening bids.

In 3NT, Nick Nickell took the heart king with the ace and then led a diamond to the nine. The good news was that the nine held the trick; the bad news was that the 4-1 split gave him some problems. Declarer cleared the diamonds, discarding spades from his hand as East threw clubs away. Now David Berkowitz had reached the critical moment on the hand: he knew that his partner did not have five hearts from the auction, and the play to the first trick had told him that the future of the hand had to lie outside the heart suit. He therefore thoughtfully shifted to the jack of spades, and Cohen overtook

this with the queen. Had Nickell ducked this trick, the defence would have reverted to hearts with a vital gain of tempo. When Nickell won the first spade, hoping for a 3-3 split in that suit, the defence had three spade winners together with a diamond and the ace of clubs, for down one.

In the other room, the world's top pair, Meckstroth and Rodwell (*There are some Italians who might argue that point, not to mention a few Poles. — Ed.*), erred by continuing hearts when in with the queen of diamonds, allowing declarer to take nine tricks.

218. Wolff and Hamman were the first pair to defeat Meckstroth-Rodwell in the 1996 Macallan, an event the latter went on to win handily. That was despite this missed opportunity by Bobby Wolff.

Dealer North. North-South Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
Rodwell	Hamman	Meckstroth	Wolff
—	Pass	2♠	3NT
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Wolff reached Three No Trumps after East had shown a Weak Two bid in spades, and received the lead of the six of clubs. He crossed the first hurdle by playing the seven from dummy, and Meckstroth as East played the king. Which red suit is it right to play on?

All right, I admit it; that was a slightly tricky question. The key to the hand was to **duck** the first trick. The right way to look at this hand, although it is by no means obvious at first or even second glance, is that if clubs are 4-2 you will need the heart finesse whether or not you take the first trick. If clubs are 5-1, you gain a vital tempo by ducking the first trick, and unless West has all three key red suit cards (in which case you stand no chance anyway), you are safe.

219. The final of the 1996 Grand National Teams featured a squad from San Francisco against a team from Detroit. The San Franciscans were spearheaded by Chip Martel and Lew Stansby, who have been there or thereabouts at the top of the world rankings for the last two decades. This was one of the hands that generated a game swing for San Francisco.

Dealer South. North-South Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Stansby</i>		<i>Martel</i>	
—	—	—	1♣
1♥	2♦	3♥	Pass
4♥	5♣	Pass	Pass
Pass			

After Chip Martel as East jump-raised him, Lew Stansby sacrificed in four hearts, which would have been a profitable save at the vulnerability. However, his opponents pushed on to five clubs. Stansby found a defence to trouble declarer when he led the king of hearts, and instead of switching to the obvious spade, he led a second heart to reduce dummy's trumps. Declarer ruffed, and played the king of diamonds from dummy; Stansby won and played back a second diamond. At this point declarer played the king of clubs and Stansby contributed the jack!

South next played the jack of diamonds, discarding a second spade. Now he was at the crossroads. If trumps were 2-2, he could succeed by simply drawing the trumps. Alternatively he could take the spade finesse, which on the auction figured to be wrong. However the most elegant line would work if trumps were 3-1 with Martel having the length. He would simply run the diamonds from dummy; when Martel ruffed he would overruff, and cross back to dummy with the queen of clubs to draw the last trump, and cash the rest of the diamonds.

When South led the fourth diamond from dummy Martel carefully discarded (ruffing in would have exposed the position). Declarer triumphantly discarded his queen of spades - until he was brought back down to earth by Stansby producing a small trump that he was not supposed to have, to take the contract one down.

220. One success story of the 1999 San Antonio Summer NABC was Barnet Shenkin, whose team reached the semifinals of the Spingold before bowing out to Nickell. Here he is, defying the odds to bring home a game contract against unfavourable distribution.

Dealer South. Both Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
			<i>Shenkin</i>
—	—	—	1♥
Pass	2♥	3♦	4♥
Pass	Pass	Pass	

As you can see, a club lead and continuation will sink the contract, but who would even think of doing so after this auction? West led the ten of diamonds, and Shenkin read it as a doubleton, meaning that East had seven diamonds, which argued that trumps were relatively unlikely to behave. Shenkin took East's king of diamonds with the ace, cashed the ace of hearts, noting the fall of the jack, and decided to play this to be a true card. He therefore abandoned trumps, and ran three rounds of spades. When East discarded on this trick, it was safe to play the fourth spade, discarding a club loser to bring home his game. Ten tricks made!

Note that if Shenkin had crossed to dummy with a spade to take the trump finesse, the spades are blocked, and even if West fails to find the club shift, declarer can no longer obtain his discard on the spades.

SOLUTIONS TO SIMPLE SAMPLES

1. Contract: 4♥ (after West's 1♠ opening)

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

Where I watched the play, declarer, after shaking his head, decided to play for a friendly club distribution. On a good day West might take the club ace too early - or too late. Ducking a diamond to open for a ruff in dummy would allow the defenders to pump him with spades to produce a trump trick for the defense. But this was not one of those days. West ducked one club, won the next

and gave his partner a ruff.

Dutch star Luuk Verhees was one of the very few declarers in the European Championships who took ten tricks after the same opening lead and continuation. He decided that West was marked with the remaining honours for his opening, and that clubs were very unlikely to split 3-3. Just in case Verhees played a club, but then drew trumps. West must let go of another three cards. He could throw a diamond and a club, but then what?

The heart ace is played in this position:

	♠ 107	
	♥ -	
	♦ 74	
	♣ K Q 6	
♠ Q 9		♠ J
♥ —		♥ 9
♦ K Q 9		♦ 10 8 6 3
♣ A 8		♣ 10
	♠	
	♥ A 4	
	♦ A J 2	
	♣ 7 4	

Discarding a club means West must win the second club, giving declarer three club tricks.

A diamond lets declarer first take a club, then establish a diamond trick by playing ace and another. A spade must be the solution then. No, then South plays a club, ruffs out West's last spade, and exits with his last club, forcing West to give satisfactory help in diamonds.

2. Contract: 6 ♣

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

I think declarer, who expressed surprise when he saw dummy, prefers me to let him remain anonymous - he thinks I make too much noise about the hand. Not that he misplayed it, quite the opposite. It took him only a couple of seconds to decide on the winning line and execute it. Ruff a heart, spade to king, ruff a heart, spade to ace, ruff a heart, trump king, spade to queen, trump ace. Everybody followed to everything, and he could discard the losing diamond on the high spade ten, losing only a trump trick.

It is harsh to criticize West for leading a heart, but it seems that any other lead beats the contract.

3. Contract: 6 ♣ again, this time a better one

A Chinese finesse is sometimes declarer's only chance, but mostly it also requires an opponent to make a mistake by not covering when you play an unsupported queen up to the ace. Maybe this example doesn't qualify as one – certainly no mistake was made. Did you choose to play or defend?

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

South tried his chances in order: First, ruffing three diamonds might establish the suit. Consequently, winning the first trick in dummy he ruffed a diamond, played a heart to the queen, and ruffed another diamond. No honour had dropped. Second, East might hold the heart jack. That would allow declarer to play the hearts, discarding all the spades, then ruffing spades in dummy since East had no club to return. Two spades went on high hearts but sadly enough West showed up with the jack. Dummy had to ruff.

With North to play the ending was:

	♠ J	
	♥ —	
	♦ Q J 9 7	
	♣ K	
♠ A 8		♠ Q 10 9 4 3
♥ —		♥ —
♦ A K		♦ 10
♣ 4 3		♣ —
	♠ K 6	
	♥ —	
	♦ —	
	♣ A Q 9 8	

Last chance: East might have the spade queen. The ace was marked with the NT opening, but there was room for 12 without that queen. So declarer played the spade jack, and ran it. If East had covered, South would not. A spade ruff in dummy would produce the 12th trick.

No mistakes? Well, if a diamond honour had dropped on the second ruff, who knows which plan declarer would have chosen. Perhaps he would have used up a trump entry to try another diamond ruff. Then the winning line would not have been available any more.

4. 4♥ (after East's 1NT opening)

No, nothing could go wrong, or at least it shouldn't. Only a 4-0 break in trumps would test your skills, and the only one who might hold them all is East. There is also a threatening overruff in spades.

In real life South rather sloppily played a small heart, which was fatal when the whole deal was:

♠ QJT92	♠ 53
♥ —	♥ A543
♦ 953	♦ J74
♣ 97632	♣ KQ54
♠ AK74	♠ 86
♥ K10972	♥ QJ86
♦ KQ2	♦ A1086
♣ 8	♣ AJT

If, instead, he had taken the precaution of running the heart ten - ducking it if West showed out, otherwise it would have been safe to play the ace. East wins with the jack, but must then either give South a heart finesse with the seven allowing him to ruff a spade high and take another trump finesse (duly knocking out the diamond ace first). Or he must give declarer an entry to dummy in clubs or diamonds to let him take the same heart finesse before ruffing the spade high.

5. Contract: 4♥ (a silly problem?)

♠ 75	♠ KJ8632
♥ 8753	♥ Q92
♦ JT3	♦ 5
♣ K762	♣ A104
♠ Q	♠ AT94
♥ AKJT6	♥ 4
♦ 7642	♦ AKQ98
♣ Q83	♣ J95

Declarer misguessed(?), playing the queen, and had to lose the last trick to my nine. I'd had to come down to three clubs to protect against his playing ace and another. If you too misguessed then stop reading here!

Because it wasn't a guess. No, it was a terrible insult to me since I'd have to be an idiot to keep a third club if I'd had the king. "Throw losers, keep winners," that's my motto! I'm still not speaking to that declarer!

A DISAPPEARING ACT

BY JOHN WILLIAMS, OXFORD, ENGLAND

John Williams, formerly Secretary of the English Bridge Union and now a regular NPC of England teams, had an opportunity to show his playing skill on a recent deal in the EBU's National Inter-Club Knock-Out.

Dealer East. N-S Vul.

♠ —	♠ AK10
♥ AK1087643	♥ 52
♦ Q	♦ J64
♣ KJ92	♣ AQ753
♠ 98653	♠ QJ742
♥ 9	♥ QJ
♦ AK952	♦ 10873
♣ 86	♣ 104

West opened 4♥ in third seat, North doubled and South settled in 4♠. The defence started with ace and king of hearts, East following with queen then jack. Prospects seemed poor when declarer ruffed the second round and played a spade to the king, West showing out. It's never nice to hold fewer and smaller trumps than a defender. However, declarer brightened when a diamond to the ace drew the queen. Three further rounds of diamonds could now be played, with the aid of a marked finesse, followed by a club to the queen and the ace of clubs. East would be known to be down to ♠ QJ74 whilst North held ♠ A10 and two low clubs, and declarer ♠ 986 and ♦ 5. A club from dummy now would leave East without resource. He could ruff high, declarer throwing a diamond, and be left on play to lead into the trump tenace, or ruff small, in which case declarer would overruff and exit with a diamond, throwing dummy's last club and leaving East endplayed as before. Either way, declarer loses only two trumps and a heart.

Having played all this through in his mind, John remembered just in time that NPCs, by their long-established code of conduct, are not permitted to point out such lines of play to team-mates who have failed to find them at the table and, more importantly, are absolutely forbidden to themselves execute squeezes or endplays of any kind, on those rare occasions when they are allowed to pick up the cards. He therefore followed a line of play which it would be undignified to describe here, went one down and declared the contract to be unmakeable. Team-mates, remembering their own Oath of Allegiance to NPCs - *Mock Not The Afflicted* - agreed.

And if you believe any of the last paragraph, apart from the down one, you'll believe anything.

ROSENBLUM LEAD QUIZ

Board 18. Dealer East. N-S Vul.

You (West) hold: ♠ 5 4 2

♥ 10

♦ A 10 9 8 3

♣ K J 7 6

What would you lead against each of the following auctions?

POLAND VS INDONESIA

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Mariani</i>	<i>Manoppo</i>	<i>Burgay</i>	<i>Lasut</i>
—	—	Pass	1♣(i)
Pass	1♦(ii)	Pass	1♥
Pass	2♦	Pass	2♥
Pass	3♥	Pass	4♥
Pass	Pass	Pass	

(i) Strong, FI

(ii) 0-7

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Tobing</i>	<i>Balicki</i>	<i>Asbi</i>	<i>Zmudzinski</i>
—	—	Pass	1♣(i)
1♦	Pass	1♥	Double
Pass	2NT	Pass	4♥
Pass	Pass	Pass	

(i) Polish, FI

ITALY VS SWEDEN

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Fredin</i>	<i>Lauria</i>	<i>Lindkvist</i>	<i>Versace</i>
—	—	Pass	1♥
Pass	1NT	Pass	2♣(i)
Pass	2♥(ii)	Pass	4♥(iii)
Pass	Pass	Pass	

(i) Natural and limited; or artificial, strong

(ii) Natural, less than 8 points

(iii) Revealed as the artificial, strong version

These are three of the four auctions on this board from the semifinals of the 2002 Rosenblum. At the fourth table, a different contract was reached. Decide what you would lead in each of the three cases.

Solution after the CA~IB Cup results.

CA~IB EUROPEAN CHAMPIONS CUP

Eight countries were invited to send their national representative to Warsaw on the weekend of October 25-27 to compete in the European Champions Cup sponsored by CA~IB Bank and sanctioned by the European Bridge League. Top place-getters would receive EBL medals and cash prizes. The format was two groups of four to play a round robin of 20-board matches, then

32-board semifinals and finals, with a playoff for third place.

The players were:

Bulgaria Rosen GUNEV, Ivo KARAIVANOV, Vladimir MIHOV, Ivan NANEV, Jerry STAMATOV, Roumen TRENDAFILOV

England Patrick COLLINS, Denis O'DONOVAN, Derek PATTERSON, John SHORT

Israel Gilad ALTSHULER, David BIRMAN, Dani COHEN, Amir LEVIN, Salek SELIGMAN, Uriel ZWILLINGER

Italy Norberto BOCCHI, Giorgio DUBOIN, Guido FERRARO, Lorenzo LAURIA, Maria Teresa LAVAZZA, Alfredo VERSACE

Netherlands Ton BAKKEREN, Hubb BERTENS, Bart NAB, Gert-Jan PAULISSEN

Norway Terje AA, Per Erik Austberg, Jon-Egil Furunes, Glenn GROTHEIM, Geir HELGEMO

Poland Bartosz CHMURSKI, Apolinary KOWALSKI, Mariusz PUCZYNSKI, Jacek ROMANSKI, Marek SZYMANOWSKI, Piotr TUSZYNSKI, Edward KOWALEWSKI (NPC), Adam RATYNSKI (Coach)

Sweden Börje Dahlberg, Bo-Henryk EK, Peter NORDEN, Göran PETERSSON

The group tables from the round robin looked like this:

GROUP A

Team	Representing	VP
Lavazza	Italy	60
Tel Aviv Club	Israel	51
Relpol-Praterm	Poland	33.5
Örebro	Sweden	31

GROUP B

Team	Representing	VP
Heimdal	Norway	57
Bridge Plus	Bulgaria	55
Modalfa	Netherlands	45
Kent Bridge Club	England	23

The Conditions of Contest stated that the winner of Group A would face the runner-up from Group B in one semifinal, with the B leader playing against the A second-place finisher in the other. The winners would play for gold, the losers for bronze. The results:

Semifinals:	Italy 90	Bulgaria 27
	Israel 79	Norway 41
Final:	Italy 83	Israel 34
Bronze:	Norway 65	Bulgaria 23

So, to no one's surprise, the Lavazza team won in dominating fashion, adding the CA-IB European Champions Cup to their long list of recent titles, which includes the 2000 Olympiad, the 2002 Rosenblum, the past five European Championships, three Forbos, and a Spingold.

Further information can be found at www.polbridge.pl

SOLUTION TO ROSENBLUM LEAD QUIZ

Remarkably for this level of play, all three West players, Mariani (Poland), Tobing (Indonesia), and Fredin (Sweden) led a passive spade against South's four hearts. As can be seen from the full deal, this was not a huge success:

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

Did you find the aggressive club lead in all three cases? Well done! Declarer wins the ace and knocks out your diamond ace; you cash two clubs. Partner's diamond shortage and heart length prevent declarer taking two spade pitches on the diamonds and the opponents finish one down. On a spade lead it's a matter of an overtrick. At the fourth table, Nystrom-Bertheau for Sweden reached 3 NT, which was impregnable on any lead, and were disappointed to halve the board since the normally aggressive Fredin was likely to be on lead against four hearts at the other table. An opportunity lost.

GOLDILOCKS

BY BARRY RIGAL, NEW YORK CITY

This deal arose at Honors, my local NYC duplicate club.

Dealer South. E-W Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
—	—	—	1 ♥
Pass	2 ♣	Pass	3 ♣
Pass	3 ♥	Pass	4 ♥
Pass	Pass	Pass	
Opening lead: Club queen			

My partner declared four hearts and tried to make five on the Goldilocks lead of the club queen – a spade would have given her no chance, a diamond would have made things easy, giving four tricks in the suit, but the club queen kept things up in the air.

Marilyn won and drew trumps, then cashed the top diamonds to pitch her spade loser. Then she played a spade and ruffed the next one but only took ten tricks. When she surrendered a club to East, he had a spade exit, and later won a second club.

♠ J 10	♠ A K 2
♥ —	♥ —
♦ 8	♦ —
♣ A 9 5	♣ J 10 7
♠ Q 9 6 5	♠ 7
♥ —	♥ 10 6
♦ J 7	♦ —
♣ —	♣ 8 6 3

Note what happens if declarer ruffs a diamond instead of a spade. When the diamond is led East must pitch a spade, and declarer ruffs and exits with a spade. East wins and leads his last spade but declarer ruffs. North, East, and South are all down to clubs. Declarer leads a club to the nine and East is end-played into leading back a club.

I consoled my partner: "If you had played for this position East would doubtless have discarded the spade ace or king when the diamond is led. Then West would hop up with his spade queen when you lead a spade, and play the thirteenth diamond to let East pitch his low club, and the endplay is killed off." (Or, how about if clubs are 3-2 all along, and the opponents cash a side winner after these machinations, on which you are left to throw your now winning club? – Ed.)

Correspondence ...

The Editor reserves the right to shorten correspondence

Email: ibpaeditor@sympatico.ca

We have received a lengthy reply from José Damiani to the Dutch Bridge Federation in response to their letter published in last month's issue. José's response has been abbreviated here in the interest of conserving space. However, no pertinent points have been omitted.

Dear Presidents and Friends,

Let me comment on the Dutch Bridge Federation's Memorandum point by point as it is presented:

I. Introduction. Besides the wrong wording there are inaccuracies stated as facts.

- a) Before 2002 the Dutch Bridge Federation paid \$8,163 to the WBF as dues, and not \$1,500. In 2002 they did indeed pay \$46,000 as agreed, \$0.50 per member.
- b) The entry fees for the Bermuda Bowl, Venice Cup and Olympiad were increased from \$2,000 (where they had been since 1987 when the dollar was very strong) to \$2,500 in Rhodes 1996, and have remained the same since that time. This concerns **ONLY** the National Teams and is the only income other than sponsorship obtained (if any) that offsets the cost of staging the event.
- c) In our World Championships we now have the Transnational events, for which the entry fees are far less, in order that all interested players may participate.
- d) Finally, as far as 2004 onwards is concerned, I would like to repeat what I said many years ago, which is that every bridge player should pay US\$1 for World Bridge in order to enhance, develop, and promote our own sport. I have always insisted on the fact that it should be the players themselves who pay this and that it should **NOT** come from the Federations' budgets.

Unfortunately, for some reason, and despite the fact that the WBF gave the Federations a great deal of time (6 years) to implement this policy, it seemed that it was not possible, and in Maastricht we agreed to reduce this to \$0.50 per member.

I raised again the possibility of a \$1 per member subscription in my speech in Montreal. This was based on a new idea of the sale of decks of cards to the players. This was on the floor for discussion in Montreal, but not considered, nor was a decision taken or imposed on the Federations.

2. Desired Policy. Here again, the wording and the

concept are wrong.

- a) IOC – we did not fail in our ambitions to join the Olympic Movement. We succeeded in obtaining full recognition as an International Sports Federation. However, the letter I received from Jacques Rogge actually specified the Programme Committee recommendation for the summer games in 2008, for which we did not apply. In any event, we have at least obtained a great deal of publicity for bridge.
- b) As far as the rest of the desired policy is concerned, I would like to make the following points:
 - i. If you look at the small size of our balance sheet & budget you will easily understand how much we control and limit the few expenses that we face.
 - ii. In the difficult international situation we have to face these days, it is indeed probable that we need to reconsider our policy regarding the World Championships, particularly in staging them in Europe and America. However, the rest of the world does exist, and many players like the idea of having a World Championship as part of a vacation in a pleasant resort.
 - iii. Unfortunately 5-star hotels are often the only places where we are able to obtain the necessary playing space, and it is the case that the accommodation has to be used in order to obtain the playing areas at minimal/no cost. Please remember also that the players prefer to stay in the venue hotel or very close to it, so siting the Championship in an out-of-town Congress Centre is unpopular and inconvenient for them, and the WBF always likes to consider the comfort of the players. We have had to do this in the past, and may need to do so in Istanbul, but in any event we always seek to ensure that cheaper accommodation is available.
 - iv. To lead people to believe that we have “highly paid or reimbursed officials and staff” instead of dedicated sportsmen and officials is just too much.
 - v. Enough is also enough when I read the recommendation to “find external resources”. I have raised several million dollars for bridge over the years.

Stop, please, and let me do my job as I believe it should be done, and have already shown can be done with the

Laws, with the Code of Practice, with the Guide for Development, Teaching in Schools, Championships, and Bridge Promotion. Or, on the other hand, ask me to step down – as I offered to do three times in Montréal, but it seems that there is no one ready to take up the helm.

3. Procedural Request. I am prepared to state and confirm that it is not my intention to increase the dues beyond the \$0.50 per member during my current (4-year) term of office unless an acceptable way can be found to accommodate an increase without involving the NBOs' budgets.

I sincerely hope that the European Federations will show their solidarity with my actions in the past as EBL President, and in the present as WBF President.

J. Damiani, President,

World Bridge Federation

Upon receipt of M. Damiani's letter, the Dutch Federation replied as follows:

Dear Mr. Damiani,

On October 1st, we received your letter to NBOs, in which you gave your very straightforward comments to the memorandum of opposition distributed by the Dutch Bridge Federation.

We would like to stress that this memorandum aims to address the serious concerns we have regarding the development of international Bridge and the associated costs. We have no intention of discussing personalities or attacking the president of the WBF. On the contrary, the Dutch Bridge Federation fully respects both your efforts and your enthusiasm. If you have the feeling that this memorandum was a personal attack than I as president of the Dutch Bridge Federation apologize for this misunderstanding.

The Dutch Bridge Federation feels a need to discuss the issues raised openly (and not anonymously) with its colleague federations, because Bridge matters to us. This, we believe, is the way forward to future fruitful discussions and decisions at the level of EBL and WBF.

Kind regards,

Dutch Bridge Federation

A.L.F. Trippaers

Alan Truscott weighs in on a less controversial topic.

The printer perceptively deleted the last few line of the commentary on the Hackett hand on page 8 of the Montreal Special Bulletin. It should have said that West could have prevailed by shifting to a diamond after winning the second round of spades. As the printer presumably noticed, South can then win, cross to the club ace, take the diamond pitch on the spade winner and ruff a diamond. A club lead prepares for an endplay against West. The game is beaten by an opening dia-

mond lead, an opening low heart lead, and the bizarre lead of the club king, knocking out a key entry.

Alan

Anna Gudge writes:

Don't forget the European Simultaneous Pairs which is being held from 25 - 28 November. Results will all be at www.eblsims.org

SILENCE IS GOLDEN

BY VLAD RACOVICIANU, BUCHAREST

Mr. Szakacs was declarer on the following deal:

Dealer South. N-S Vul.

♠ A 10 6
♥ A K Q 3
♦ K 8 6 4
♣ 9 4

♠ K 8 2
♥ 10 6 2
♦ A Q J 10 5
♣ 3 2

♠ J 9 7 5 3
♥ 8
♦ 9 2
♣ J 10 8 7 5

♠ Q 4
♥ J 9 7 5 4
♦ 7 3
♣ A K Q 6

West	North	East	South
—	—	—	1 ♥
2 ♦	Pass	Pass	Double
Pass	3 ♦	Pass	4 ♣
Pass	4 NT	Pass	5 ♦
Pass	6 ♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

North's initial pass looks strange. 4 NT was Roman Key Card Blackwood, with the response showing one key card. West led the heart six against Six Hearts. South won in hand and led a diamond at once. West won and led a second trump.

Oddly, declarer could squeeze either defender holding the king of spades. First, suppose East has it. Then declarer plays king of diamonds, diamond ruff, trump to dummy, diamond ruff, spade to the ace, and dummy's last trump, to squeeze East in the black suits. But declarer decided that the bidding implied West was more likely to hold the missing king. So Szakacs proceeded as follows: he drew the last trump, took three rounds of clubs, ruffed a club, took king of diamonds, ruffed a diamond, and then the last two trumps squeezed West in spades and diamonds. *(It looks as though a safer line might be to draw trumps and lead a diamond, intending to ruff the club before the diamond. This does not risk a diamond ruff. – Ed.)*

WORLD BRIDGE CALENDAR

Dates	Event	Location	Contact
2002			
Nov 10-17	8 th Red Sea Festival	Eilat, Israel	birmand@inter.net.il
Nov 11-17	5 th International Madeira Open	Funchal, Madeira	www.bridge-madeira.com
Nov 25-28 E	BL Simultaneous Pairs	Clubs in Europe	anna@ecats.co.uk
Nov 27-Dec 1	Sicily Open	Cefalu, Sicily	www.infcom.it/albor
Nov 28-Dec 8	ACBL Fall NABC	Phoenix AZ	www.acbl.org
2003			
Jan 20-25	20 th Cairo International Festival	Cairo, Egypt	www.egybf.com
Feb 4-9	8 th NEC Cup	Yokohama, Japan	nakatani@jcbl.or.jp
Feb 14-17	Icelandair Open	Rejkyavik, Iceland	www.bridge.is
Mar 6-16	ACBL Spring NABC	Philadelphia PA	www.acbl.org
Mar 21-29	XXXIII International Crans-Montana Bridge Week	Sion, Switzerland	simonderivaz@bluewin.ch
Apr 19-27	ABA Spring Nationals	Minneapolis MN	ABA (Atlanta) 1-404-768-5517
May 7-11	Cavendish Teams and Pairs	Las Vegas NV	Bill Rosenbaum 1-212-725-2135
May 21-29	USBF Women's Team Trials	Orlando FL	www.acbl.org
May 24-31	CACBF Zone 5 Championships	Martinique	dabreteaujy@wanadoo.fr
Jun 1-9	USBF Open Team Trials	Memphis TN	www.acbl.org
Jun 5-15	PABF Championships	Manila, Philippines	altan@info.com.ph
Jun 6-7	WBF Worldwide Pairs	Clubs everywhere	anna@ecats.co.uk
Jun 14-28	European Open Championships	Menton, Côte d'Azur, France	EBL (Milan) 39 02 7000 0022 ebf@federbridge.it
Jul 4-6	World Junior Pairs Championship	Tata, Hungary	www.worldbridge.org
Jul 7-14	World Junior Camp	Tata, Hungary	www.worldbridge.org
Jul 17-27	ACBL Summer NABC	Long Beach CA	www.acbl.org
Jul 24-Aug 3	ABA Summer Nationals	Puerto Rico	ABA (Atlanta) 1 404 768 5517
Aug 8-17	English Summer Nationals	Brighton, England	EBU 44+ 1296 394 414
Sep 19-22	European University Championships	Wroclaw, Poland	ebf@federbridge.it
Nov 24 - 28	EBL Simultaneous Pairs	Clubs	anna@ecats.co.uk
Nov 20-30	ACBL Fall NABC	New Orleans LA	www.acbl.org

Please contact the Editor if you have dates for your major Zonal Championships that you would like included in future editions of the Calendar

IBPA WEBSITE NOTICE

To access a Bulletin on the IBPA website, enter the website address www.IBPA.com followed by a forward slash, then the Bulletin code, immediately followed by .pdf - the November Bulletin will have code 455xm so you will need to type:

www.IBPA.com/455xm.pdf

Remember - You can download a copy of the Handbook from www.ibpa.com (click the link at the bottom of the page).

When you try to open it will ask for a password: which is ihccaT (EXACTLY as typed)