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# LONG AND WINDING ROAD 



The audience in the VuGraph auditorium watches the action and listens to expert commentary

Two days of round robin play are in the books, time for competitors in the Bermuda Bowl, Venice Cup and D'Orsi Senior Bowl to take a breath and realize they still have five days of play left to try to make it to the knockout phases of their respective events.
By the time they're done, each team will have played 21 matches with the goal of making the top eight in their brackets, the requisite for playing on after Saturday.
Italy is still in the lead in the Bermuda Bowl, but with a loss and a narrow win over Iceland, their substantial lead has shrunk as the Netherlands closes in. In the Venice Cup, Sweden has a slim lead over Germany, with England in hot pursuit. France is setting the standard in the Senior Bowl, 9 VPs ahead of USA 2.
Contents
Tournament Results ..... 2-3
A smasher called Italy .....  5
Familiar foes (VC Round 2, Germany - Netherlands) ..... 6
SB Round 3, Denmark - USA 2 ..... 8
Good morning, Veldhoven ..... 11
Comeback (BB Round 2, USA I - China) ..... 12
Bermuda Bowl and Venice Cup - Round 3 ..... 14
Second hand high ..... 17
Rub of the Green (Round 4, China - France) .....  18
Meet my maker, the Mad Multi ..... 22
Chinese slam swings ..... 24


|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
| ROUND 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |  |
| I | Bulgaria | Egypt | $37-25$ | $18-12$ |  |
| 2 | China | Sweden | $35-34$ | $15-15$ |  |
| 3 | Japan | Poland | $16-49$ | $7-23$ |  |
| 4 | Iceland | USA I | $12-19$ | $14-16$ |  |
| 5 | Netherlands | New Zealand | $16-17$ | $15-15$ |  |
| 6 | Guadeloupe | Brazil | $15-72$ | $3-25$ |  |
| 7 | Canada | Australia | $43-56$ | $12-18$ |  |
| 8 | USA 2 | South Africa | $39-7$ | $23-7$ |  |
| 9 | Chile | Singapore | $55-12$ | $25-5$ |  |
| IO | Italy | Pakistan | $49-12$ | $24-6$ |  |
| II | Israel | India | $54-25$ | $22-8$ |  |


| ROUND 5 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| I | New Zealand | Brazil | $26-39$ | $12-18$ |
| 2 | India | Australia | $32-31$ | $15-15$ |
| 3 | Iceland | Guadeloupe | $28-57$ | $8-22$ |
| 4 | Sweden | Singapore | $85-23$ | $25-2$ |
| 5 | Egypt | Pakistan | $60-31$ | $22-8$ |
| 6 | Bulgaria | USA I | $19-41$ | $9.5-19.5$ |
| 7 | China | Italy | $44-43$ | $15-15$ |
| 8 | Japan | Chile | $87-7$ | $25-0$ |
| 9 | Israel | USA 2 | $30-28$ | $14-14$ |
| I0 | Netherlands | Canada | $61-0$ | $25-2$ |
| II | Poland | South Africa | $40-24$ | $19-11$ |


|  |  | ROUND 4 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| 21 | Egypt | Jordan | $27-17$ | $17-13$ |
| 22 | Netherlands | Venezuela | $54-9$ | $25-5$ |
| 23 | Trinidad \& Tobago | Italy | $3-65$ | $2-25$ |
| 24 | Australia | Germany | $36-40$ | $14-16$ |
| 25 | England | Brazil | $58-24$ | $23-7$ |
| 26 | Poland | USA 2 | $18-39$ | $10-20$ |
| 27 | USA I | India | $58-35$ | $20-10$ |
| 28 | Sweden | Japan | $55-5$ | $25-4$ |
| 29 | China | France | $25-39$ | $12-18$ |
| 30 | New Zealand | Morocco | $57-32$ | $21-9$ |
| 31 | Indonesia | Canada | $33-22$ | $17-13$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ROUND 5 |  |  |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| 21 | Brazil | USA 2 | $41-27$ | $18-12$ |
| 22 | Canada | India | $33-42$ | $13-17$ |
| 23 | Australia | Poland | $16-38$ | $10-20$ |
| 24 | Venezuela | France | $25-27$ | $15-15$ |
| 25 | Jordan | Morocco | $26-36$ | $13-17$ |
| 26 | Egypt | Germany | $25-70$ | $5-25$ |
| 27 | Netherlands | New Zealand | $24-16$ | $17-13$ |
| 28 | Trinidad \& Tobago | China | $42-42$ | $15-15$ |
| 29 | Indonesia | Sweden | $19-46$ | $9-21$ |
| 30 | England | USA I | $27-34$ | $14-16$ |
| 31 | Italy | Japan | $53-9$ | $25-5$ |

## ROUND 6

|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| I | Egypt | Sweden | $16-26$ | $13-17$ |
| 2 | Bulgaria | Poland | $30-22$ | $17-13$ |
| 3 | China | India | $35-3$ | $23-7$ |
| 4 | Japan | New Zealand | $21-23$ | $15-15$ |
| 5 | Israel | Brazil | $27-4$ | $20-10$ |
| 6 | Iceland | Italy | $7-9$ | $15-15$ |
| 7 | Guadeloupe | South Africa | $21-46$ | $9-21$ |
| 8 | Canada | Singapore | $36-7$ | $22-8$ |
| 9 | USA 2 | Pakistan | $56-9$ | $25-4$ |
| IO | Chile | USA I | $8-44$ | $7-23$ |
| II | Netherlands | Australia | $22-32$ | $13-17$ |


| ROUND 6 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| 21 | Jordan | Venezuela | $28-17$ | $17-13$ |
| 22 | Egypt | Italy | $5-49$ | $5-25$ |
| 23 | Netherlands | Canada | $24-44$ | $10-20$ |
| 24 | Trinidad \& Tobago | Brazil | $9-37$ | $8-22$ |
| 25 | Indonesia | USA 2 | $1-43$ | $5-25$ |
| 26 | Australia | New Zealand | $12-29$ | $11-19$ |
| 27 | Poland | Japan | $16-31$ | $12-18$ |
| 28 | USA I | France | $11-40$ | $8-22$ |
| 29 | Sweden | Morocco | $33-1$ | $23-7$ |
| 30 | China | Germany | $17-16$ | $15-15$ |
| 31 | England | India | $50-15$ | $23-7$ |



## d'Orsi Senior Bowl



| ROUND 4 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| 41 | Egypt | Denmark | $37-35$ | $15-15$ |
| 42 | Japan | China Hong Kong | $50-34$ | $19-11$ |
| 43 | Germany | Brazil | $53-30$ | $20-10$ |
| 44 | Reunion | New Zealand | $69-22$ | $25-4$ |
| 45 | France | Guadeloupe | $83-26$ | $25-3$ |
| 46 | India | Australia | $33-30$ | $16-14$ |
| 47 | Netherlands | USA I | $16-45$ | $8-22$ |
| 48 | Indonesia | Poland | $49-39$ | $17-13$ |
| 49 | Pakistan | Canada | $23-38$ | $12-18$ |
| 50 | USA 2 | Argentina | $67-17$ | $25-4$ |
| 51 | Italy | Bulgaria | $34-47$ | $12-18$ |

## ROUND 5

|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 41 | Guadeloupe | Australia | $16-58$ | $5-25$ |
| 42 | Bulgaria | USA I | $25-42$ | $11-19$ |
| 43 | Reunion | India | $53-50$ | $16-14$ |
| 44 | China Hong Kong | Canada | $52-14$ | $24-6$ |
| 45 | Denmark | Argentina | $24-13$ | $17-13$ |
| 46 | Egypt | New Zealand | $54-6$ | $25-4$ |
| 47 | Japan | USA 2 | $41-51$ | $13-17$ |
| 48 | Germany | Pakistan | $48-29$ | $19-11$ |
| 49 | Italy | Indonesia | $26-31$ | $14-16$ |
| 50 | France | Netherlands | $51-35$ | $19-11$ |
| 51 | Brazil | Poland | $11-22$ | $13-17$ |


| I | Sweden | 122 | 12 | Venezuela | 89 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Germany | 118 | 13 | Indonesia | 85 |
| 3 | England | 112 | 14 | Egypt | 80 |
| 4 | New Zealand | 108 | 15 | Jordan | 77 |
| 5 | Italy | 106 | 16 | China | 76 |
| 6 | France | 105 |  | Poland | 76 |
| 7 | USA 2 | 103 | 18 | India | 75 |
| 8 | USA I | 98 | 19 | Australia | 74 |
| 9 | Canada | 96 | 20 | Japan | 71 |
|  | Netherlands | 96 | 21 | Morocco | 56 |
| II | Brazil | 94 | 22 | Trinidad \& Tobago | 51 |

## ROUND 6

|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 41 | Denmark | China Hong Kong | $27-8$ | $19-10$ |
| 42 | Egypt | Brazil | $37-15$ | $20-10$ |
| 43 | Japan | Bulgaria | $22-20$ | $15-15$ |
| 44 | Germany | Guadeloupe | $70-9$ | $25-2$ |
| 45 | Italy | Australia | $15-25$ | $13-17$ |
| 46 | Reunion | USA 2 | $0-28$ | $8-22$ |
| 47 | India | Poland | $28-29$ | $15-15$ |
| 48 | Netherlands | Canada | $40-11$ | $22-8$ |
| 49 | Indonesia | Argentina | $42-12$ | $22-8$ |
| 50 | Pakistan | New Zealand | $13-35$ | $10-20$ |
| $5 I$ | France | USA I | $33-7$ | $21-9$ |

## d'Orsi Senior Bowl

| 1 | France | 127 | 12 | Indonesia | 88 |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | USA 2 | 118 |  | Italy | 88 |
| 3 | India | 106 | 14 | Egypt | 87 |
| 4 | Germany | 104 | 15 | Pakistan | 84 |
| 5 | China Hong Kong | 102 | 16 | Argentina | 83 |
| 6 | Poland | 100 |  | Reunion | 83 |
| 7 | Netherlands | 99 | 18 | Bulgaria | 80 |
| 8 | Australia | 97 | 19 | Canada | 74 |
| 9 | Japan | 95 | 20 | Guadeloupe | 60 |
| IO | Denmark | 94 | 21 | Brazil | 58 |
| 11 | USA I | 93 | 22 | New Zealand | 40 |

## Just the Facts

A new feature designed to tell you more about some of the best known players here in Eindhoven.

## Name

Ron Klinger.
Date of Birth
8 November 1941.
Place of Birth
Shanghai, China.
Place of Residence
Sydney, Australia.
What kind of food makes
you happy?
Lots of it.


And what drink?
Also, lots of it.
Who is your favourite author?
Michael Connelly (Lee Child, Harlan Coben, Vince Flynn).
Do you have a favourite actor?
Sean Penn (Robert de Niro, Paul Newman, Gene Hackman)

## Actress?

Naomi Watts (Lee Remick, Genevieve Bujold, Jacqueline Bissett).
What kind of music do you like to listen to?
Classical.
Do you have a favourite painter or artist?
Van Gogh.
What do you see as your best ever result?
Bermuda Bowl semifinals 1989.
Do you have a favourite hand?
Yes, Bols award 1976.
Is there a bridge book that had a profound influence on you?
Bridge with the Blue Team.
What is the best bridge country in the world? Italy
What are bridge players particularly good at (except for bridge)?
Cryptic Crosswords.
What is it you dislike in a person?
Blaming everyone else for mistakes.
Do you have any superstitions concerning bridge?
Losing 100+ IMPS per session is unlucky.
Who or what would you like to be if you weren't yourself?
My wife Suzie's lover.
Which three people would you invite to dinner?
Suzie, our son Ari \& his wife Lucy
Is there something you'd love to learn?
Cooking

VUGRAPH PRESENTATIONS
Round 7 (I0.30)
Match Room

| BBO I |  | Open (VG Studio) <br> Closed | China - Iceland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BBO 2 | 12 |  | South Africa - USA I |
|  |  | Closed |  |
| BBO 3 | 13 | Open | Egypt - Israel |
|  |  |  |  |
| BBO 4 |  | Open | New Zealand - USA 2 |
|  |  | Closed |  |
| BBO 5 | 17 | Open | New Zealand - China |
|  |  | Closed |  |
| BBO 6 | 18 | Open | USA I - Italy |
|  | 9 | Closed |  |
| OurGame | 19 | Open | Germany - Sweden |
|  |  | Closed |  |
| StepBridge |  | Open (studio) | Sweden - Netherland |

Series Table

## Round 8 (13.45)

| Match | Room | Teams | Series Table |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BBO I | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \text { Open } \\ & \text { (VG Studio) } \\ & 50 \text { Closed } \end{aligned}$ | USA 2 - Italy | BB/IO |
| BBO 2 | 12 Open <br> 24 Closed | Sweden - Poland | BB/I |
| BBO 3 | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \text { Open } \\ & 23 \text { Closed } \end{aligned}$ | Canada - USA I | BB/9 |
| BBO 4 | 16 Open <br> 22 Closed | England - France | VC/27 |
| BBO 5 | 17 Open <br> 21 Closed | USA I - Germany | VC/29 |
| BBO 6 | 18 Open <br> 9 Closed | Germany - USA I | SB/45 |
| OurGame | 19 Open <br> II Closed | China - Brazil | BB/4 |
| StepBridge | 14 Open (studio) <br> IO Closed | Netherlands - USA 2 | VC/24 |

## Round 9 (16.45)

| Match | Room | Teams | Series Table |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BBO I | $8 \text { (Ven }$ $50 \text { Closed }$ | Brazil - USA I | BB/3 |
| BBO 2 | 12 Open <br> 24 Closed | Poland - USA 2 | BB/6 |
| BBO 3 | 13 Open <br> 23 Closed | New Zealand - Italy | BB/4 |
| BBO 4 | 16 Open <br> 22 Closed | Sweden - Canada | BB/8 |
| BBO 5 | 17 Open <br> 21 Closed | Iceland - Japan | BB/IO |
| BBO 6 | 18 Open <br> 9 Closed | USA 2 - Germany | VC/23 |
| OurGame | 19 Open <br> 11 Closed | China - Israel | BB/II |
| StepBridge | 14 Open (studio) <br> 10 Closed | Bulgaria - Netherlands | BB/9 |

## A smasher called Italy

by Fernando Lema \& Ana Roth

Bulgaria \& Italy met in the third match of the first day. Bulgaria was first in the rankings, just IVP ahead of Italy. Bulgaria had won 25-5 to India and 23-7 to Pakistan. Italy had won $25-1$ to Chile and 22-8 to Japan. Bulgaria, during the 16 hands of the match, produced only 14 IMPs: 2 IMPs from 2 down instead of only I down in a non vulnerable contract and 12 IMPs because Duboin led an ace thinking declarer might have an immediate pitch of a loser in that suit... All the rest was Italian, and at the end of the match Italy won $25-4 \mathrm{VP}$ and finished the first day in pole position. This was the first double-digit swing for Italy:

Dealer West. All Vulnerable

- A 62

PA 7
$\triangleleft 6$
AKJIO 975

- Q 108543
© J 84
$\checkmark$ A J
- 32

| N | ¢ K 97 |
| :---: | :---: |
| W E | QQ 1032 |
|  | $\checkmark 107543$ |
| S | -8 |
| - J |  |
| -K965 |  |
| $\diamond$ KQ982 |  |
| 2 Q 64 |  |

Open Room:


Lead: $\mathrm{V}^{2}$
Declarer made 6 , losing only to the $\diamond A$.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aronov | Sementa | Stefano | Duboin |
| $2 \diamond(1)$ | Dbl | 38 | Dbl |
| 34 | 4\% (2) | Pass | 49 (3) |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ (3) | Pass | 5 (3) |
| Pass | 54 | Pass | 6\% |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

(I) Multi
(2) Suit and strong
(3) Cue-Bids old fashioned Italian style

This bidding sequence generated a lot of problems in the BBOVG. Nobody knew what was going on and all the peo-
ple thought that the Italians were heading for a disaster: Some of them ventured they were using a Turbo sequence, but Agustin Madala, one of their teammates, wrote that Turbo wasn't on their Convention Card. Every body was asking what is 4NT then? Agustín explained: "all cuebids, old fashioned Italian style", and all the Italians relaxed when Sementa passed after Duboin's 6\%.
On this deal both teams reached the same contract. The Italians scored 620, but the Bulgarian declarer had to suffer an incredible defense from Duboin who deserved a "Bravo Giorgio" from Agustín:

Dealer East. E/W Vul

- Q 96

QQJ75
$\diamond$ A 975
\& 103


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Aronov | Sementa | Stefano <br> $I \diamond$ | Duboin |
|  |  | $\mathrm{I} \varangle$ |  |
| 4s | Dbl | All Pass |  |
| Lead: $\oslash Q$ |  |  |  |

Declarer won the lead in his hand with the $\vee A$, and continued with a club to the king. Giorgio Duboin won with his $\%$ A and, after long thought, played a low diamond! Sementa won with his $\diamond A$ and returned a $\diamond$, declarer won with his $\diamond K$, and everybody saw South's $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$ hit the table. Now Aronov played a trump, South played a little one, West the $\$$ and North his $\Phi \mathrm{Q}$ to continue with a diamond generating a trump promotion when South ruffed with the king...one down.
If Giorgio instead of a diamond returns a club, declarer wins with the 2 Q and continues with the $\vee \mathrm{K}$ pitching a club. Afterwards he loses the trump finesse, but he is safe, loosing only 3 tricks: a diamond, a trump and a club. A heart return produces the same effect.


## Germany

Familiar foes
by Jos Jacobs

As early as the second round of the round robin, the old rivals Germany and Netherlands were scheduled to meet each other in the Venice Cup. After two quiet pushes, the Dutch were the first to strike as this is what happened on board I9:

Board I9. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

$$
\text { , AQ } 1086542
$$

$\bigcirc 109$
$\diamond 53$
e 8
$\Delta 9$
QJ 75
$\diamond$ J 72
K6432

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Simons | Auken | Pasman | Von Arnim |
|  |  |  | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 49 | All Pass |  |

In the Open Room, Jet Pasman saw no reason to take any action when Sabine Auken jumped to 41 straight away over her partner's opening bid. Right she was, as there is no legitimate way to beat the contract. Even a heart underlead and a trump shift is not good enough for the defence, as declarer can win the ace and play $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{Q}$, smothering the \% in the process. No matter if West covers this with her king or not, a successful diamond finesse will ensure the contract as declarer's second heart will disappear on a good club. East can ruff with one of her natural trump tricks...

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Della Monta | Arnolds | Hackett | Vriend |
|  |  |  | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 14 | 2 | 3\% |
| $3 \diamond$ | 49 | Dbl | All Pass |

## Netherlands

In the Closed Room, Barbara Hackett could overcall $2 \triangle$ when Carla Arnolds did not take away too much bidding space by bidding no more than just Is. When Della Monta produced a constructive raise, Hackett, looking at two trump tricks, ventured a double which she was soon to regret.
On the actual $\vee$ A lead and $\$ 7$ switch, Arnolds won the ace, ruffed a club, ruffed her last heart and advanced the $\% 10$, discarding a diamond when West did not cover. East could ruff this but only at the cost of one of her natural trump tricks. The $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ was the third defensive trick but Arnolds too had made her contract, winning 5 IMPs for her team.
On the next board, the Germans hit back immediately when Auken and Von Arnim found a fine save, all vulnerable:

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.

```
4.Q 5 3
```

$\bigcirc 4$
$\diamond 109865$

- A 1052
- J 108762
-108
$\checkmark$ QJ 4
\& 97

| N | - AK 4 |
| :---: | :---: |
| W E | PKQJ6532 |
| W E | $\checkmark$ AK |
| S | -3 |
| - 9 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ A9 7 |  |
| $\checkmark 732$ |  |
| \& K Q 86 |  |

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Della Monta | Arnolds | Hackett | Vriend Pass |
| Pass | Pass | $2 \triangleq$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

In the Closed Room, Vriend did not overcall when Hackett opened what proved to be a strong variation of Two Clubs. The Germans thus were allowed to play $4 \checkmark$ in peace for +620 to them.

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Simons | Auken | Pasman | Von Arnim |
| Pass | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | $3 \&$ |
| Pass | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| Pass | $5 \&$ | Dbl | All Pass |

In the Open Room, the Germans, not surprisingly, were more enterprising over East's $2 \triangleleft$ game-forcing opening bid. Von Arnim boldly overcalled 3\%, enabling her partner to take the save when East showed her strong hand with her second bid. This should have gone down two for a 3-IMP gain for Germany, but look at what happened in defence. West led the VIO which declarer won with her ace. She went on to ruff a heart in dummy and got off play with a low spade. East went up with her king and correctly cashed the $\diamond A K$. When next she tried to cash the $\Delta A$ as well rather than exiting in any rounded suit, declarer's third diamond loser suddenly went on the $₫ \mathrm{Q}$. Down just one and a precious 9 IMPs to Germany.
After four boards on which Germany extended their lead from $9-5$ to $10-5$, boards 25 and 26 suddenly settled the issue.

Board 25. Dealer North. E/WVul.

|  | ¢ K |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K}$ Q 2 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 1065 |  |
|  | \% 105432 |  |
| ¢ 18642 | N | ¢ A Q 10 |
| $\bigcirc 643$ |  | $\bigcirc$ A 1085 |
| $\checkmark 83$ |  | $\diamond$ KJ 42 |
| \% A Q 7 | S | \& K 6 |
|  | ¢ 9753 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 197$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A 97 |  |
|  | 2 J 98 |  |

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Simons | Auken | Pasman | Von Arnim |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | INT | Pass |
| $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | $2 \varsigma$ | All Pass |

In the Open Room, the Dutch reached a peaceful partscore when East overcalled INT and West signed off in spades. One overtrick, +|40 to the Netherlands.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Della Monta | Arnolds | Hackett | Vriend |
|  | Pass | INT | Pass |
| $2 \checkmark$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |
| Pass | 2 NT | Dbl | Redble |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dbl | All Pass |  |  |

In the other room, Arnolds considered her hand an obvious pass as dealer, as no doubt many of us would have done. When she later balanced with 2NT for minors, holding 5-4 only, the Germans were happy to pull the trigger. On a forcing defence in spades, declarer lost control and thus had to concede down three, -500 and 8 IMPs to Ger-
many on a pretty innocent-looking hand. I8-5 to Germany now.
And then:
Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.

- A Q 5
$\bigcirc$ KQ9 4
$\diamond$ J 83
- 743
-K 984
- J 10
$\checkmark 105$
* K 10865

| N |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| W | E |
|  |  |
| $\underline{4}$ |  |

- J 10762
$\bigcirc 62$
$\diamond 74$
- 3

A 8753
AKQ962
$\%$

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Simons | Auken <br> Pasman | Von Arnim |  |
|  |  | $2 \Delta$ | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $6 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

Great bidding by Von Arnim and Auken after East's 24 (spades and a minor) opening. $4 \diamond$ showed a fair hand with at least 5-5 in diamonds and the other major and this was all Auken needed for a jump straight to slam. An ace and the $\triangle \mathrm{KQ}$ should do and so it proved. Germany a quickly earned +1430.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Della Monta | Arnolds | Hackett | Vriend |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | 31 |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | 420 |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |

The Dutch started off well enough when left to their own devices, as the heart fit was established easily. 31 was a splinter and 3NT confirmed a spade control. 4\% was a further cuebid but when Arnolds, not unexpectedly, could not find any constructive move at this point, it suddenly came to rest in $4 \oslash$, though South might easily have given it one more try...
Anyway, this early stop gave the Dutch just +710 on a trump lead but the I2-IMP swing went to Germany. They led 30-5 at this stage.
The final six boards produced just one more IMP to Germany, who eventually won 3I-5 or 2I-9VP.


## D'ORSI SENIOR BOWL

## Round 3

## Denmark

by Brian Senior

USA2 had won their first two matches in the D'Orsi Senior Bowl while Denmark had lost both of theirs. It was the Danes, however, who started this match the better.

Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.
\& K Q 96432
$\checkmark 5$
$\diamond$ J 832
$\%$ Q
, 87

- K 10982
$\diamond$ Q 5
\& 10976

- A 10
$\bigcirc$ J 6
$\diamond$ K 1076
\& AK 832
- J 5
- A Q 743
$\diamond A 94$
\& 54

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Boyd | Berg <br> 49 | Robinson <br> All Pass | Jorgensen |
| West | North | East | South |
| Schaltz | Schermer <br> 39 | Auken <br> 3NT | All Pass |

I like Thomas Berg's 44 opening. After all, if I would have opened 3s with 7-2-2-2 and the same honour cards then surely a 7-I-4-I deserves opening a level higher. Four Spades shut everyone else out so was the final contract.
Steve Robinson started with the ace of clubs then switched to a low diamond, ducked to the queen. Peter Boyd returned his remaining diamond to the ten and ace and Berg led dummy's low spade to the king. Robinson won the ace and cashed the king of diamonds then played his last diamond. Having retained the jack of spades in dummy, Berg could now ruff with that card and the even trump split meant he had the remainder for down one; -50 .
John Schermer opened a level lower and Jens Auken overcalled 3NT, where he played. Dummy was a slight disappointment but Auken discovered that with careful play it provided sufficient material for him to come to nine tricks.
Neil Chambers led the jack of spades, ducked, and a second spade to the nine and ace (yes, a diamond shift would have been better but would not have been sufficient). Auken ran the jack of hearts then played a second heart to the eight. A club to the ace was followed by a diamond to the queen. Now two rounds of clubs put South on lead. Chambers could cash his red aces but then had a choice of

## USA 2

leading into either of two red king-tens, both declarer and dummy also having a club winner to provide the ninth trick; a very nice +400 and 8 IMPs to Denmark.

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

West
Boyd
Schaltz
3
North

| Berg |
| :--- |
| Schermer |
| All Pass |


| East | South |
| :--- | :--- |
| Robinson | Jorgensen |
| Auken | Chambers |
| $\mid \diamond$ | Pass |

Identical auctions saw both East players declare the diamond partscore. Both Souths cashed the top hearts.
Geert Jorgensen led the king then ace, Berg following five, eight. Jorgensen was unsure what suit his partner wanted so now switched to a low club to the queen and ace. Robinson played trumps normally to draw them in three rounds then led the jack of clubs. Jorgensen won the king


John Schermer, USA
and switched to a low spade, taking the remaining guess away from declarer; + I IO.
Chambers cashed the ace then king and Schermer followed nine, jack. The second card was a clear suit-preference signal for spades so Chambers duly switched to that suit and collected his heart ruff. He exited with a trump now but the clubs played for one loser so Auken was just one down, but that was 4 IMPs to USA2.

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.

|  | - A 62 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 7 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 6$ |  |
|  | 2 AKJIO975 |  |
| - Q 108543 | N | - K 97 |
| QJ 84 |  | QQ 1032 |
| $\checkmark$ AJ |  | $\checkmark 107543$ |
| - 32 | S | -8 |
|  | 1 |  |
|  | ¢K965 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ KQ982 |  |
|  | ¢ Q 64 |  |



Thomas Berg, Denmark

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schaltz | Schermer | Auken | Chambers |
| $2 \diamond$ | 3NT | Pass | 49 |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | 54 | Pass | $6\rangle$ |
| Pass | 78 | All Pass |  |

Both Wests opened with a multi $2 \triangleleft$ and both Norths overcalled $3 N T$.As the hand is a bit heavy for a 30 overcall no doubt many players would have made the same choice. With 6\% a trivial make, the spotlight now turned on South.
Jorgensen passed 3NT and Berg made ten tricks after a low spade lead from Robinson; +630. Schermer's 3NT showed a strong hand with a long minor plus stoppers, so it was normal for Chambers to move. Unfortunately, he did not have his written defence to the Multi and later misunderstood the auction. The outcome was a hopeless grand slam which was one down for -I00 and 12 IMPs to Denmark - a chance missed for the Americans.

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

|  | $\pm$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| ¢ J 10986 |  | ¢ |  |
| $\bigcirc$ 」 103 |  |  | 8765 |
| $\diamond 2$ | W |  | 9874 |
| 9752 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Boyd | Berg | Robinson | Jorgensen |
|  | INT | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 6NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Schaltz | Schermer | Auken | Chambers |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 2\% |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 24 |
| Pass | 3\% | Pass | $3 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | 4\% |
| Pass | 49 | Pass | 6\% |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Both North/South pairs bid smoothly to a small slam. For Berg, the North hand fitted into his I5-I7 no trump range. Jorgensen used GF Stayman and, on finding that he was facing both red suits, simply jumped to 6NT. Schermer's agreement required a good 15 HCP for a INT opening and the lack of intermediate cards disqualified this hand. He was
able to show both his suits, his club support and the generally balanced nature of his hand quite nicely and Chambers chose to play the club slam after checking on key cards with his 4e bid.
There are twelve tricks in either clubs or no trump even if there is a club loser - so long as South is declarer to protect the spade position - and in practice the club queen appears on the first round so there is an overtrick; +l470 to Denmark, + 390 to USA2, so 2 IMPs to Denmark.


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boyd | Berg | Robinson | Jorgensen |
|  |  |  | 18 |
| Pass | 3 | 31 | Pass |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Schaltz | Schermer | Auken | Chambers |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | Pass | 19 | Dble |
| $2 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 24 | All Pass |

Would you open the South hand? I suspect that most players today would do so, as did Jorgensen, but you can make a good case for passing - weak main suit, bare ace, few intermediates with your II HCP. That was enough to convince Chambers to pass.
Chambers doubled at his next turn but when Peter Schaltz showed a good spade raise the two passed hands were happy to defend. Chambers led a diamond to the jack, queen and ace. Auken led the jack of spades. Chambers won, perforce, and tried a low club. Auken hopped up with the king, drew trumps and knocked out the diamond for +140 .
Jorgensen opened as dealer and Berg made a limit raise. When Robinson's 3s overcall came around, Berg made the odd call of $4 \oslash$ - he has only three trumps and a balanced hand so why come again? Boyd doubled when that got around to him, ending the auction. Boyd led a spade to declarer's bare ace and Jorgensen led a heart to the ten then ran the queen of clubs. That lost and Boyd forced him with a spade. Jorgensen duly ruffed and led a heart. Boyd took his ace and forced declarer with another spade. Jorgensen
again took the force and led a diamond to the king and ace. Back came the ten of diamonds to dummy's queen. Nine tricks were possible now by playing on clubs - West ruffs the fourth round but dummy over-ruffs and the king and queen of trumps are made separately. But Jorgensen instead ruffed dummy's last spade, allowing West to discard a club. Now Jorgensen played on clubs but Boyd could ruff the third round and play a diamond so the contract was two down for -300 and 4 IMPs to USA2. On best play and defence, the only route to nine tricks is to lead a heart to the seven - not a play you'd be likely to find at the table!
Denmark ran out winners by 3I-I3 IMPs, I9-II VPs.


## A Bobby dazzler

by Ron Klinger

In England, a bobby dazzler is a person or thing that is outstanding or excellent. On this deal from the third round robin session in the D'Orsi Senior Bowl, Ron Klinger considered that a play by opponent Bobby Wolff was the real, dazzling thing.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/WVul.
Q 96

- QJ 75
$\diamond$ A 975
\& 103

| - AJ108532 | N | - 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A |  | -K64 |
| $\checkmark 64$ | W E | $\checkmark$ KJ 1082 |
| 2 187 | S | \& K Q 54 |
|  | - K 4 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 109832$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 3 |  |
|  | - A962 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Haughie | Morse | Klinger | Wolff |
|  |  | I $\rangle$ | Pass |
| I | Pass | INT | Pass |
| 4 | All Pass |  |  |

Dan Morse led the $\vee Q$ to declarer's ace. William Haughie led a club to dummy's king, and Wolff took the ace, switching to the $\diamond 3$ from his doubleton queen. Morse took the $\diamond A$ and continued the suit, Haughie going up with the king and dropping Wolff's queen. Now a spade went to the 10 and Morse's queen. On the continuation of a diamond, Wolff ruffed with the king, which promoted Morse's trump 9 to the setting trick.

## Good morning, Veldhoven

by Micke Melander

Most players had to be ready for a real test on the first hand the second day of these championships. If still sleeping, they were surely shaken up hard, since they had to bid or defend against a small slam.

Board I7. Dealer North. None Vul.

- K 742
$\triangleright A$
$\diamond$ K Q 5
\& AKJ43
- 63
$\bigcirc 97542$
$\checkmark$ A 42
\& Q 62


Q QJ 105
$\bigcirc 103$
$\diamond 973$
\& 10985

- A 98
© K Q J 86
$\diamond$ J 1086
- 7

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kusajri | O. Herbst | Majumdar | 1. Herbst |
|  | $1 \&$ | Pass | $1 \diamond *$ |
| Pass | 2. | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | 6NT | All Pass |  |

When Majumdar decided to lead the ten of clubs it was only a question of how long a time it would take for Ophir Herbst to claim his contract. His brother llan did well to make the quantitative invitation for slam, happily accepted by Ophir, who had some extras. The question remains, why lead away from the club sequence when you also have se-


Ophir Herbst, Israel
quence in spades, once declarer had shown a strong hand with both black suits?
At several tables when the queen of spades was led, declarers unblocked the ace of hearts and continued with the king of diamonds, ducked by the defense, and the queen of diamonds followed, won by West. That player now exited with a low club. This defense broke up the communications for declarer squeezing the defense. But most declarers don't like having to commit themselves early, since they want to see what more is in the bag (if they have optional plays) instead of going down at trick four or five. Here you could actually play for hearts breaking, some squeezes or the club finesse. For sure it's more elegant to play for a squeeze than a simple finesse. All those declarers found themselves down, when hearts didn't break and they couldn't take their finesse any longer. But credit to all defenders who returned the low club.
Making the slam meant II IMPs to Israel when the Indian team stopped in 3NT at the other table making 12 tricks.

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.

- KQJIO 9
$\bigcirc 5$
$\diamond$ K Q 3
KJ96
- 643

Q Q 1064
$\diamond 876$

- 874


8752
$\bigcirc 987$
$\triangleleft 52$
\& A Q 32
. A
© AKJ 32
$\diamond$ AJ 1094

* 105

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kusajri | O. Herbst | Majumdar | I. Herbst |
|  |  |  | 18 |
| Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | Pass | 3 - |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | $4{ }^{4}$ |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | 5 |
| Pass | 69 | All Pass |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Barel | Vaidya | Zack | Goel |
|  |  |  | 1980 |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | $2 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | 30 | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | 6NT | All Pass |  |

Ophir Herbst did well to make sure that the contract was to be played from North, securing it against almost any lead, when he found out that there was an ace missing in the auction. That was 14 IMPs to Israel when Barel managed to kick off with a club against 6NT at the other table.


USA 1

## Comeback

by Brent Manley

Coming off their opening-round loss to their countrymen in the Bermuda Bowl round robin, the members of USA I were looking for some redemption. They got it in a 39-17 victory over China.
Playing for USA I were Martin Fleisher/Mike Kamil and Steve Weinstein/Bobby Levin, opposing Ruoyang Lian/Haojin Shi and Jing Liu/Jie Li for China.
The Chinese struck first on the second board of the set.
Board I8. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

- A Q J

คK8
$\diamond$ J 7543
2K 96

- K 1087

Q Q 1075
$\diamond$ K 10

- 843


AJ 10752
The auction was the same at both tables


Bobby Levin and Steve Weinstein, USA

## China

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Weinstein | Lian | Levin | Shi |
| Liu | Fleisher | Li | Kamil |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $1 \varnothing$ | Pass | $2 \vee$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dbl | Pass | $3 \dot{2}$ | All Pass

Weinstein started with a trump, and it was easy for Haojin to collect nine black winners via two spade finesses.
Against Kamil, Liu started with the $\triangleleft K$. Li won the second round of the suit and played a third round. Kamil ruffed with the trump ace and ran the to East's singleton queen, finishing a trick short. China led 5-0.
USA I took the lead for good two boards later.
Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.

- Q 53
$\bigcirc 4$
$\diamond 109865$
2 A 1052

```
- J 108762
ค 108
Q \({ }^{2} 4\)
- 97
```



- AK 4
©KQJ6532
$\diamond A K$
\& 3
$\perp 9$
-A 97
$\diamond 732$
* K QJ 864

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Weinstein | Lian | Levin | Shi |
| Pass | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \vee$ | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | $3 \vee$ | Pass |
| $4\rangle$ | All Pass |  |  |

Levin had no trouble taking II tricks via six hearts, two spades and three diamonds - plus 650.
Fleisher and Kamil engineered a much better result for their team.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Liu | Fleisher | Li | Kamil |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\&}^{*}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| 2 | $5 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Dbl | Pass |
| $5 \boldsymbol{2}$ | All Pass |  |  |

Liu could have saved his side 9 IMPs by sitting for the double of $5 \%$, which is down two for minus 500 , but the vulnerable game bonus apparently was too tempting.

It was over quickly. Fleisher led the 4 A and continued with his singleton heart, taking a ruff at trick three for plus 100 and 13 IMPs to USA I.
China got 5 IMPs back when Levin and Weinstein overbid in the face of preemptive bidding, landing in a no-play $4 \checkmark$, down two for minus 100, while Liu and Li at the other table played peacefully in $2 \boxtimes$, just making.
The next board was an avoidable disaster for China.
Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weinstein | Lian | Levin | Shi |
|  |  | $2 \diamond *$ | 3\% |
| $3{ }^{* *}$ | Dbl | $4 \bigcirc$ | 4NT |
| Pass | 5\% | Pass | Pass |
| Dbl | All Pass |  |  |

* Flannery II-I5 4+ + , 5+
** Game try for I/2 majors
Levin's $2 \diamond$ showed the majors, so Weinstein had no difficulty switching to a heart at trick two after cashing the $\Phi \mathrm{K}$. The doubled contract was quickly one down for minus 100.


| East | South |
| :---: | :---: |
| Li | Kamil |
| 18 | 29 |
| 38 | 4\% |
| Pass | 50 |

## Lost Property

If you found a Mount Blanc Pen after the first match on Sunday morning, it belongs to Vinay Mohan Lal of the Indian Seniors team. The pen has special value to Vinay so please, if you found it or picked it up by mistake, could you look for him to return it.
Thank you

Jing started with the $\mathbb{M}$ and, perhaps not expecting his partner to be holding five spades, continued with the king. Kamil ruffed, pulled trumps and accurately played West for the $\diamond$ Q to make his doubled contract with an overtrick for plus 650 and 13 IMPs to his side.
Another 12 IMPs went to the Americans on this board, again the IMPs representing an available error.

Board 25. Dealer North. E/WVul.


Weinstein might have checked back for spade support with Levin, but the weak spade suit and balanced distribution persuaded him to go for the nine-trick game.
With no attractive lead, Shi started with the $\vee 7$. Levin took North's $\vee Q$ at trick one and cashed the 9 , pleased to see the king drop on his right. Levin cashed two more spades, then followed with the K and a club to the ace. On the run of the black winners, North came down to the QK and $\diamond$ QIO. Levin put North in with a heart and guessed to play the jack when North continued with the $\diamond 10$. That was plus 630 for USA I.

| West | North <br> Liu | Eleisher | Li |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | South |
| :--- |
| Kamil |

Kamil started with a low spade, and Li scuttled his own contract at trick one by playing dummy's jack. He took the \$K with the ace and got the bad news when he cashed the \& 10 . He scrambled nine tricks by guessing correctly in diamonds and ruffing two of them in dummy, but he could not manage a tenth trick. Minus 100 meant a 12 -IMP loss.
In fact, you can recover from the error at trick one. Cash the Q Q at trick two, then play three rounds of clubs, discarding a heart, and lead a diamond to the jack. Assume South wins and exits in hearts. Win $\vee A$, cash $\diamond K$ and ruff a diamond, come to the $\$ 10$, and lead your fourth diamond to score the $\$ 8$ en passant.

# Bermuda Bowl and Venice Cup - Round 3 <br> by Jos Jacobs 

## Italy v. Bulgaria (BB) and France v. Italy (VC)

In Round 3 of the Bermuda Bowl Round Robin, the big clash at the top of the table was between Bulgaria and Italy. Both teams had made a very good start with 48 and 47 V.P. from a possible 50 but those who were hoping for a wellcontested match were soon to be disappointed. It was oneway traffic most of the time and, as we have seen so often in the past, again Italy's way.After two minor swings to Italy on the boards 2 and 3, the first major swing came on board 4 and, once again, it was a slam swing:

## Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.

© A 62
$\triangleright$ A 7
$\diamond 6$
2 AKJIO 975

\& 32


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aronov | Sementa | Stefanov | Duboin |
| $2 \checkmark$ | Db | $3 \bigcirc$ | Dbl |
| 34 | 49 | Pass | 49 |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | 5\% |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Pass | 5 |
| Pass | 51 | Pass | 6\% |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

4\% was natural and 4e a cuebid. 4NT then showed an even number of keycards and 5\% showed a minimum. After three more cuebids the auction then came to an end in a perfect contract. Italy +I370.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Versace | Mihov | Lauria | Nanev |
| Pass | 1\% | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 3\% | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 40 | Pass | 49 |
| Pass | 5\% | All Pass |  |

After the Strong Club and the positive natural $2 \diamond$, uncertainty must have crept into the Bulgarian auction and thus,
the slam was missed. I wonder what would have happened if South immediately over 3e had raised clubs or even splintered.
Next, I am going to present a succession of boards that did not only create swings in this match, but also came up in another match involving Italy, this time in the Venice Cup match. They were playing their transalpine rivals France in Round 3. France had made a solid enough start with 40 V.P. but the Italian start can only be called dismal: I I VP from two matches must have been far away from their hopes.
Here is board 6. This is a very interesting board as 4s can always be defeated, for example if the defence starts off by ducking a round of clubs. A more normal defence, in view of the auction, would be for North to lead the $\vee Q$ which gives the declarers a chance. This chance, however, was not always taken... as you will see below.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
Q Q 96
©QJ 75
$\diamond$ A 975
\& 103

© 7
© K 64
$\diamond$ KJIO 82
\& K Q 54

- K 4

Q 109832
$\diamond$ Q 3
\& A 962


Vladimir Mihov, Bulgaria

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Aronov | Sementa | Stefanov | Duboin |
|  |  | I $\diamond$ | I 8 |
| 49 | Dbl | All Pass |  |

For Italy, Duboin made the defence look ridiculously easy. Sementa led the $>Q$ and declarer won the ace and led a club himself. Now, Duboin might have ducked this to ensure the defeat of the contract but he in fact won his ace and played a diamond. Sementa won the ace and returned the suit, declarer putting up the king to see the queen appear. After this, declarer had a choice of two evils: he might play $\$ \mathrm{~A}$ and another, losing two trump tricks or he might lead a trump to his jack and North's queen, only to see a diamond come back which South would ruff with his king to promote North's $\$ 9$. Aronov duly went for the latter option, but the contract was one down: Italy +100 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Versace | Mihov | Lauria <br> $1 \diamond$ | Nanev |
| $4 \Phi$ | All Pass |  | Pass |

Though the play was not recorded, Versace made his contract after the $\oslash Q$ lead. A sensible winning line now is to lead a diamond up to the king, discard a loser on the 9 K and lead a trump to the jack. Anyway, +620 and 12 IMPs to Italy.
In the Venice Cup match between France and Italy, this board also produced a favourable swing to Italy:

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Olivieri | Cronier | Arrigoni <br> I $\triangleright$ | Willard |
|  |  | Pass |  |
| Is | Pass | INT | Pass |
| $4 \infty$ | All Pass |  |  |

After winning the $\curvearrowright$ Q lead, Olivieri played a club to the king. Willard took her ace and returned a heart. Now, declarer could throw a diamond and play a trump to the jack or her contract. Her job was made even easier when South went in with the QK on the first round of the suit - but this did not matter any more as the contract was already safe. Italy +620 .
In the other room, D'Ovidio misguessed:

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D'Ovidio | Paoluzi | Bessis | Golin |
|  |  | I $\diamond$ | 18 |
| Dble | 3 - | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| 49 | All Pass |  |  |

She too won the $\vee \mathbf{A}$ and led a club, won by South's ace. South returned the suit so D'Ovidio won in dummy, shed
her last club on the $\vee \mathrm{K}$ and played a spade to the king and ace. North won the second round of trumps with her queen and returned a low diamond on which declarer called for dummy's jack...two down as South's return of a club promoted a trump trick as well. I3 IMPs to Italy.
In another VC match, Sally Brock, too, was declaring 44 as West. On a heart lead, she played a club to the king and ace and back came a heart. She now could have made by relying on the spades to play for one loser but instead, she played $\$ \mathrm{~A}$ and three rounds of clubs, hoping for a club break, and that whichever defender ruffed would do so with a trump trick. No luck!
The next board produced some relief for both the French women and Bulgaria:

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.
\& Q 972
○K 8
$\diamond$ Q 986
2 532


## Open Room



Catherine D’Ovidio, France

With every important card placed wrong for declarer and the trumps 4-I, there is little that can be done to avoid going down one. The almost only hope is for a bit of help from our friends, which duly came when Duboin made the reasonable enough lead of the A. Bulgaria +620 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Versace | Mihov | Lauria | Nanev |
|  |  |  | 2\% |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| 3s | Pass | 49 | All Pass |

When Nanev led a low heart, Lauria had no chance whatsoever. Bulgaria +100 and 12 IMPs back.
Ambitions in the Venice Cup match were much lower:

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Olivieri | Cronier | Arrigoni | Willard |
|  |  |  | 180 |
| $1 \checkmark$ | 14 | Pass | 29 |

After Cronier's Is response, Arrigoni was less interested in showing her suits and thus elected to sell out to $2 \boldsymbol{2}$. France +90 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D'Ovidio | Paoluzi | Bessis | Golin |
|  |  |  | 1\% |
| I $\diamond$ | Pass | 19 | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 29 | All Pass |  |  |

When Paoluzi did not show her four-card spades, Bessis had ample time and room to introduce both her suits. This way, the French auction came to rest in an excellent spot. Two overtricks were made so +170 added to +90 for 6 IMPs back to France.
On the next board, it was slam time again:

## Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

- AK 9732

ค103
$\checkmark$ A 86

- K 10

| Q Q 8 | N | Q 165 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 54 |  | $\bigcirc 72$ |
| $\diamond$ QJ 3 | W E | $\checkmark 97542$ |
| 2) 19864 | S | ¢ Q 53 |
|  | -104 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AKJ986 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 10 |  |
|  | - 472 |  |

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aronov | Sementa | Stefanov | Duboin |
| Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | Pass | $2 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | 24 | Pass | 38 |
| Pass | 4\% | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 49 | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | 5 | Pass | 68 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Slam bidding is so easy...Italy +980 . Natural start, some cuebidding and that's it.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Versace | Mihov | Lauria | Nanev |
| Pass | $1 \$$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

The top quality of the hearts did not come to light very well here, so the slam was missed. Another II IMPs to Italy. The French women faced a similar problem in their VC match:

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Olivieri | Cronier | Arrigoni | Willard |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | 28 |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 3\% |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | 38 |
| Pass | 48 | All Pass |  |

Here, it looks as if South started cuebidding too early but both players might have done a little bit more... France +480 .


Gianna Arrigoni, Italy

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D'Ovidio | Paoluzi | Bessis | Golin |
| Pass | 1s | Pass | $2 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | 24 | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 4\% | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 4 | Pass | 5\% |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Pass | 5 |
| Pass | $6 \vee$ | All Pass |  |

At a certain point, Paoluzi seemed to be giving up but then, Golin knew she still had something in reserve. Well done and another slam swing to Italy, II more IMPs to go up by 15 .
On the last board of the match, Duboin earned his side a small swing in exemplary fashion:

| Boar | . Dealer Wes | E/W Vul. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ¢ KJ 10 |  |
|  | Q J 1096 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 62 |  |
|  | ¢ 982 |  |
| ¢ A 7543 | N | ¢ Q 862 |
| ¢ K 42 |  | $\bigcirc 8$ |
| $\diamond 1084$ | W E | $\diamond$ A 9 |
| ¢ 14 | S | \& AKQ 1063 |
|  | - 9 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 753 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K J 753 |  |
|  | \% 75 |  |

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aronov | Sementa | Stefanov | Duboin |
| Pass | Pass | 180 | 18 |
| Dbl | 38 | $4 \bigcirc$ | $5 \diamond$ |
| Dbl | 5 | Dbl | All Pass |

Aronov's first double showed at least four spades. At his second turn, Duboin made the simple bid of $5 \diamond$, both giving his partner a good picture of his hand and establishing the killing lead against a possible 54. Five Hearts proved a good save for -500.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Versace | Mihov | Lauria | Nanev |
| Pass | Pass | 19 | $2 N T$ |
| Dbl | $4 \bigcirc$ | $4 \varrho$ | All Pass |

After Nanev's immediate 2NT overcall, the timing of the auction made all the difference with the proceedings at other table. Over 44, both South and North had every reason to think they had done enough. The costs were only 4 IMPs so no big deal anyway.
The final results of the matches: Italy-Bulgaria 66-I4 (254 V.P.) and France-Italy 19-39 or 10-20 V.P

## Second hand high

by Henry Bethe

In our basic bridge instruction we are all taught "Second hand low, cover an honor with an honor..." In his book, "The Rodwell Files," the author demonstrates a large number of situations where these basic concepts are wrong, wrong, wrong. Board 28 from round 4 of the round robin provided an illustration showing that even if Eric Rodwell is missing his first Bermuda Bowl in many years, his spirit is here.

Board 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

|  | - K 84 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ¢K 10986 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 103 |  |
|  | \& 82 |  |
| Q 95+532 | N | - J63 |
|  |  | $\bigcirc$ A Q J 7 |
| $\checkmark$ Q 9854 |  | $\diamond$ KJ |
| \& 74 | S | \& AKJ9 |
|  | - A 1072 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 4$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 762$ |  |
|  | \% Q 10653 |  |

At most tables, East ended up playing in 2NT or 3NT and received a club lead to the nine.All declarers played the $\triangleleft K$, and most Norths won the second diamond to return a club. East would win and lead a spade, hoping to force an entry to dummy's diamonds. This is a complex position, and one I was unfamiliar with before I read the book. South must work out that North must have the $\Phi$ K to have won the diamond. If East leads a low spade, South must insert the ten! "Second hand high." North-South are now in position to deny declarer an entry. South can duck the $\$ \mathrm{~J}$ or fly ace on another low spade. (It is in fact adequate to fly ace the first time provided you intend to play the ten if declarer plays another low spade.)
On the other hand, if East leads the 0 , South and North must duck - "Don't cover an honour with an honour."
And finally, if declarer leads a low spade and South has an honour without the ten, he must fly with the honour in case declarer has JIOx - "Second hand high." Again.
All of which goes to prove that there are more things than are contemplated in - at least - my philosophy.
Editor's note: Chris Bosenberg of South Africa received a heart shift at trick four. He finessed, cashed $\% \mathrm{~A}$, and found the critical play of a low heart exit. North won and played back a heart, South pitching a diamond and club. Declarer finessed, and only now led a low spade up. The unblock does not work anymore!


## China

## France

told the Rules Official, Lacey, that he was going to play a second ball and appeal to the Rules Committee. But, Palmer said, Lacey wouldn't allow him to do that. The ruling didn't come until the I5th hole, and Palmer was given a 3 instead of a 5. John Morrissett, the Director of Rules of Golf for the USGA, said he believes Palmer originally got a poor ruling, and perhaps the Committee was trying to make up for that when it allowed the second ball to stand. According to Morrissett, it does not appear that Palmer played the second ball correctly. If it happened today, Morrissett said, Palmer would have had to score the first ball. But the way the rule was written in 1958, there was arguably some ambiguity in the interpretation, which has since been rectified. This is Rule 3-3a, Doubt as to Procedure as it is today;
In stroke play, if a competitor is doubtful of his rights or the correct procedure during the play of a hole, he may, without penalty, complete the hole with two balls.
I like this idea - if you're not sure which card to play announce you are going to play two and go with the one that works better.
If you are still with me l'll turn to the play in the match between China and France, two teams who are expected to be there or thereabouts at the business end of the tournament.
China eagled (A score of two under par for a golf hole) the opening deal:
played the ball, gouging it out of the turf, hitting a poor chip past the hole, then two-putting for a double-bogey 5. Feel-
ing he had received a bad ruling, Palmer announced he was past the hole, then two-putting for a double-bogey 5. Feel-
ing he had received a bad ruling, Palmer announced he was playing a second ball, under Rule 3-3. This time, with a drop to a clean lie, he chipped up near the hole and made par. The twosome played on, waiting for a rules committee to decide Palmer's fate. Of course, Palmer should have declared that he was playing a second ball before playing his original ball from the embedded lie and after declaring original ball from the embedded lie and after declaring
which ball he wanted to count provided it was within the Rules. In his book, "Playing by the Rules," he wrote that he
Bridge imitates golf insofar as you can play perfectly one day, producing a score well below par, and yet on exactly the same course play atrociously the next day, and post a score well above par.
I recently spotted a series of articles on the Internet that reminded me that these two sports are also similar insofar as they are both regulated by a complex series of laws.
If you think the Laws of Bridge are complicated try reading some of the Rules of Golf - I particularly recommend Rule 18 - Ball at Rest Moved, which would test the Wisdom of Solomon.
Golf's rules are complex. They have to be so to ensure fair play and a level playing field for all competitors. But they subject the game to ridicule when punishments that barely fit a crime have to be handed out.
In 2008 Padraig Harrington penalised himself one stroke because his ball had moved after he had addressed it, even though the movement was obviously caused by the gusty wind blowing around the course (Rule $18-2 \mathrm{~b}$ ) and in the same year Rory Mcllroy failed to get his ball out of a bunker and then kicked/smoothed the sand. If it had been ruled that he had kicked the sand in frustration he would have been disqualified, as Decision 13-4/0.5 states that kicking the ground in the hazard constitutes testing the condition. However, the Committee eventually accepted his explanation that he had merely smoothed the sand with his foot, which does not incur a penalty, as per Exception 2 to Rule 13-4.
However, this is my favourite, from 1958:
Arnold Palmer landed behind the putting green and plugged in the rough. Under a Local Rule in effect that week Palmer believed that he was entitled to relief because the ball was embedded and Ken Venturi, who he was paired with, agreed. But the rules official on the scene, Arthur Lacey, a former president of the British PGA and double Ryder Cup team player, did not. He ruled Palmer had to play without relief. An argument ensued, and Palmer eventually
Board I7. Dealer North. None Vul.
K K 742
$\triangleright \mathrm{A}$
$\diamond$ K Q 5

- AKJ43

| - 63 | N | Q QJ 105 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 97542$ |  | $\bigcirc 103$ |
| $\checkmark$ A 42 | W E | $\diamond 973$ |
| - Q 62 | S | -10985 |
|  | - A 98 |  |
|  | PKQJ 86 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 1086 |  |
|  | - 7 |  |

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gaviard | Sun | Neve | Wang |
|  | $1 \mathbf{2 0}^{*}$ | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | $2 \mathbf{2 0}^{*}$ | Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ |
| Pass | $2 \mathbf{2}^{*}$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $4 N T$ | Pass | 6NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

19 Precision
24. Fourth Suit

West led the four of hearts and declarer won perforce with dummy's ace (a hole in one) and played on diamonds, West winning the third round.A club now would been very testing, but West tried a spade. Declarer put up dummy's king, returned to hand with the ace of spades and cashed the ten of diamonds which forced West to pitch a club (The implement used in golf to strike the ball. Consists of a shaft, grip and a clubhead of wood or metal). Now came the winning hearts, the last of these compelling East to pitch (a short shot lofting the ball into the air in a high arc and landing with backspin) a club. Declarer could cash the top clubs for +990 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lu | Cronier | Gu | Willard |
|  | 1\% | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | $2{ }^{2}$ | Pass | 38 |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | 5 | Pass | 54* |
| Pass | 5NT | All Pas |  |

Many pairs play (as the French did here) that if you are happy to go on over a quantitative 4NT you can show your aces. However, that was not enough for South, who asked partner to sign off in 5NT. East led a diamond and West took the ace and switched to a club. That held declarer to eleven tricks, so it was perhaps as well that they didn't bid the slam. Even so, it gave China II IMPs.
The French birdied (a score of one under par) the next board:

Board I8. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

- J 10
$\bigcirc$ Q 3
$\diamond$ A 964
- 86432

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { AQ } 73 \\ & 8 \text { J } 109854 \\ & \diamond \text { Q } 105 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | ¢ K 654 |
|  |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 7$ |
|  | W E | $\checkmark 82$ |
|  | S | ¢ KJ1095 |
|  | - 982 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 62 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ KJ 73 |  |
|  | \& A Q 7 |  |

## Open Room

| West | North |
| :---: | :--- |
| Gaviard | Sun |
| 2是* | Pass |
| 2\% Majors |  |


| East | South |
| :--- | :--- |
| Neve | Wang |
| Pass | INT |
| $4 \boldsymbol{1}$ | All Pass |

On a diamond lead North can take the ace and switch to a club. Declarer ruffs and passes the jack of hearts, but so long as South ducks, wins the next heart, cashes the king of diamonds and then plays a third heart the contract will fail. Hardly trivial, and when South led a trump declarer won in dummy and played a heart to the seven and ace. South did her best by trying to force the dummy with the ace of clubs, but there was no way out of this particular bunker. Declarer had eleven tricks, +450 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lu | Cronier | Gu | Willard |
|  |  | Pass | $1 /$ |
| Pass | INT | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \searrow$ | All Pass |  |  |

Spades were never in the picture here (funnily enough you can always take ten tricks in hearts if pressed). North led the jack of spades and declarer won in dummy and played a diamond to the ten and ace. A spade to the ace was followed by a heart to South's ace and a spade gave North a ruff, holding declarer to nine tricks, +140 but a loss of 7 IMPs.
Both teams had their drivers (A long shafted club used for driving the ball a maximum distance from the tee with little loft.) out for the next deal:

Board 19. Dealer South. E/WVul.

- 7
®K9743
$\diamond 1086$
58643


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gaviard | Sun | Neve | Wang |
|  |  |  | 18 |
| 49 | 58 | 59 | 68 |
| 69 | Pass | Pass | Db* |
| Pass | 78 | Dbl | All Pass |

Par (This is the estimated standard score for a hole. Based on the length of the hole and the number of strokes needed by a first class player, in normal conditions, to complete the hole.) bridge, and with 6s a virtual laydown it was right to save in 7 , which cost only 800.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lu | Cronier | $G u$ | Willard |
|  |  |  | $I \boxtimes$ |
| $4 \Phi$ | 5 | 5 | All Pass |

South was more than happy to concede at the five-level and it gave her side 3 IMPs.
France was out-clubbed on this deal:
Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

- KJ86

ค982
$\diamond$ Q 82

- K 97

| - 5 | N | - 103 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| QJ75 |  | $\bigcirc$ AKQ 1063 |
| $\checkmark$ A 74 | W E | $\checkmark$ K 3 |
| \& QJ8642 | S | - A 105 |
|  | , A Q 9742 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 4$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 10965 |  |
|  | + 3 |  |

Open Room


Yan Lu, China

East cashed the ace of hearts and switched to a trump, so declarer escaped for one down, - I00.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lu | Cronier | Gu | Willard |
|  |  | 19** | 21 |
| 3 | $4{ }^{4}$ | Dы | Pass |

West's decision to remove her partner's double delivered II IMPs, as $5 \%$ made in comfort.
The Chinese were guilty of over-clubbing (The selection of a club that sends the ball farther than the intended distance) on this deal:

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.

- K Q J 109
$\triangleright 5$
$\diamond$ K Q 3
\& KJ 96


8752
987
$\diamond 52$
\& A Q 32
© A
8 AKJ3 2
$\diamond$ AJ 1094
\& 105

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gaviard | Sun | Neve | Wang |
|  |  |  | 18* |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | 28 |
| Pass | 3\% | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | 5\% |
| Pass | 5NT | Pass | 68 |
| Pass | 79 | All Pass |  |

It seems clear (at least to me) that there was some confusion after North had bid 4NT. If that was Blackwood the response of $5 \%$ was $1 / 4$. Obviously North was of the opinion that her side held all the aces but she was quickly disillusioned when East led the ace of clubs. +50 .

## Closed Room

| West | North <br> Cu | East | South <br> Willard |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cronier |  |  |  |

N/S made no mistake at this table and +990 was worth 14 IMPs.
France, who had trailed 25 -II at the turn (to start the back 9 holes) was now in the lead and putt (sic) the match out of reach on this deal:

Board 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
, K 84
คK 10986
$\checkmark$ A 103

- 82

Q Q 95
ค 532
$\diamond$ Q 9854
\& 74


上 J 63
$\triangleright$ A Q J 7
$\diamond K J$
\& AKJ 9

- A 1072
$\checkmark 4$
$\triangleleft 762$
\& Q 10653


## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gaviard | Sun | Neve | Wang |
| Pass | Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

South led a club and declarer won with the nine and played diamond, diamond, North winning and switching (erroneously) to the ten of hearts. Declarer finessed, cashed a top club and at double dummy can now get home with a line of play starting by exiting with the seven of hearts. Of course, that is nearly impossible to see and declarer tried a spade. If you refer to Henry Bethe's excellent article in this issue on Page 17 you will see that if South puts up the ten of spades declarer would be stymied (Situation in which one player's ball blocks another player's ball route to the hole. The stymied player was required to play over the top of the offending ball.The stymie was outlawed in I95I by the USGA and the R \& A.) However, she played low and declarer put in the nine and was in control, +430 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lu | Cronier | Gu | Willard |
| Pass | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

Play started in an identical fashion, but here North ducked the second diamond. Declarer tried ace of hearts followed by the jack but North won and simply returned the ten. It was all downhill from here, - 100 and II IMPs to France.
By the time they reached the clubhouse France had won 40-25 IMPs, $18-12 \mathrm{VP}$.
I had hoped to include a reference to the Mashie niblick, but alas it will have to wait.

## Jim Kirkham



Jim Kirkham, former member of the World Bridge Federation Executive Council and a former President of the American Contract Bridge League, died of complications from leukemia on Saturday at St. Luke's Hospital South in Overland Park, Kansas.
Kirkham joined the U.S. Marine Corps upon graduation from the University of Missouri and was a combat Marine artillery battery commander and infantry battalion commander during the Vietnam War. He retired from the Marines in 1978 as a Lieutenant Colonel.
With a master of science in computer science, Kirkham spent the first 12 years after his Marine Corps career in senior management and later in management consulting with systems development businesses. From 1990 to 2008, he taught and played bridge professionally.
A three-time North American champion, he won the Silver Ribbon Pairs and the Senior Swiss Teams (1999) and the Mixed Pairs (2003) - all with his wife, Corinne.
As a bridge theorist, Kirkham developed a threeway Drury (to immediately show four-card support with any range); a modification to Jacoby 2 NT to show keycards with minimum balanced hands, and Suction (nee Kirkham Over Big Bids, or KOBB), a very versatile and effective defense to INT and 2NT openings and strong le and 2 openings.
A bridge volunteer with more than 20 years of service on the District 22 (Southern California) Board of Directors, he spent 15 years on the Western Conference Board of Directors, 12 years on the ACBL Board of Directors (ACBL President in 200I), and six years on the WBF Executive Council.
Kirkham was site coordinator and negotiator for many Southern California regional tournaments: he was also an innovative tournament manager who ran the first four-session one-day "play "til you drop" KO regional events (San Bernardino) and ran the first onsite computer-based regional events (San Diego). He negotiated and started the very successful regional in Palm Springs, where he succeeded in establishing the presidential gavel turnover.

## Meet my malker, the Mad Multi

by Mark Horton

One of the advantages of modern technology is that you can study the results on a single deal without having to search out a host of players. This deal from the first round caught my eye because it was, as the chess players might say, not without theoretical interest:

Dealer East. E/WVul

- A Q J 3
- J 87
$\diamond$ K 432
\& 104

| - 9 | N | -102 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ AKQ 109432 |  | $\bigcirc 65$ |
| $\diamond 105$ | W E | $\checkmark$ Q 986 |
| * Q 5 | S | 2 AKJ86 |
|  | - K 87654 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc-$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AJ 7 |  |
|  | -9732 |  |

In the match I was watching the bidding at one table was short and to the point:

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Stansby | Levin | Migry <br> Pass | Meyers <br> $2 \diamond^{*}$ |
| $3 \triangleleft$ | $4 \infty$ | $5 \triangleleft$ | All Pass |

Should West bid $3 \oslash$ or $4 \oslash$ ? I would bid $4 \oslash$ on the basis that the less you have the more you bid, but whatever the merits of that approach it won't stop North from bidding 4.

What about East's raise to $5 \vee$ ? Might it not be better to bid $5 \%$ in an effort to help partner if the opponents bid on to 54?
North cashed the ace of spades, South following with the eight, and switched to the two of diamonds - one down, +100 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rosenberg | Palmer | Molson <br> Pass | Deas <br> 2$\diamond^{*}$ |
| $3 \odot$ | Pass | $4 \curvearrowright$ | Pass |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | Dbl | Pass |
| $5 \odot$ | Pass | Pass | $5 \$$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dbl | All Pass |

East's double of 44 must have been penalty orientated, which makes one suspect that West was expected to have more in the way of high cards. Here, if one were to bid on it would clearly be best to bid $5 \%$ along the way.

With the queen of diamonds onside declarer was not hard pressed to take eleven tricks, +650 and II IMPs to USA I.
In the Bermuda Bowl match between South Africa and The Netherlands the bidding was:

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Verhees | Bosenberg | Van Prooijen | Eber |
|  |  | Pass | 2 |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | $4{ }^{4}$ | 59 | 5 |
| $5 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |  |

There was no Multi here, but West did bid $4 \triangleright$ and East was careful to bid 5\%. 58 was one down.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Apteker | De Wijs | Gower | Muller |
|  |  | Pass | 2 |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | 41 | 5\% | Dы |

5 $\quad$ All Pass
What meaning would you ascribe to South's double of $5{ }^{2}$ ? Penalties? A suggestion that South is interested in bidding on? A request that partner should not lead a club?

It seems to me that it is vital to be able to differentiate between the meaning of $3 \checkmark$ and $4 \checkmark$, but the bidding in the match between Iceland \& Sweden suggests that the E/W pairs were far from certain:

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Einarsson | Fredin | Jorgensen | Fallenius |
|  |  | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| 38 | 4 | All Pass |  |



## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bertheau | Baldursson | Jorgensen <br> Pass | Fallenius |
| $4 \diamond$ |  | Dbl | All Pass |
| +690 | 49 |  |  |

In Poland v Egypt $4 \checkmark$ was again the overcall of choice:

## Closed Room

| West | North | East <br> Jassem | South <br> Saaid |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nabil |  | Pass | $2 \wedge^{*}$ |
| $4 \checkmark$ | $4 \uparrow$ | $5 \curvearrowright$ | Pass |
| Pass | $5 \uparrow$ | Dbl | All Pass |

Is 5 better than $5 \%$ ? If you follow the latter route you can leave the final decision to partner. The obvious counterpoint is that it is unlikely that partner would ever want to bid 68 over 59.
They didn't do any better at the other table, so it was a flat board.
When Israel met Australia there was a major divergence at one table:

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Barel | Nunn | Zack | Hans |
|  |  | Pass | $1 乌$ |
| 4 | $4 \varrho$ | Dbl | All Pass |

I am reliably informed that Australian preemptive bids are so weak that you almost have to open this type of hand at the one level, as otherwise partner will never play you for so much.
A less charitable commentator might suggest that East doubled because he thought he had his opponents over a barrel (sic). Declarer was not hard pressed to take eleven tricks.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Edgtton | Herbst | Gosney | Herbst |
|  |  | Pass | $2 \diamond *$ |
| 48 | 41 | 5\% | 5 |
| 58 | 5 | Dы | All Pass |

Is this close to the perfect auction? When East bid 5e South countered with $5 \diamond$, making it easy for North to press on to 54. As we have seen from some of the other auctions it is not so easy for East to refrain from doubling, but I recall the words of a former English International, who after a similarly unsuccessful enterprise enquired of his team mate - 'did you need the extra fifty points?'


## WBF NOTICES

## Restaurant information



## Brasserie Porticato

During the Championships this restaurant does not take reservations.
Kitchen opened from 12:00 22:00 hrs.

## Restaurant Binnenhof

During the Championships this restaurant will be open for breakfast from 07:00-10:30 hrs (II:30 on Sundays).
Lunch buffet from 12.00 - 14.00 hrs .
In the evening this restaurant serves a daily changing three-course dinner buffet from 18:30-22:00 hrs. This restaurant does not take reservations.

## Restaurant Uithof

During the Championships this restaurant will be the most luxurious restaurant at the venue. It serves à la carte lunches and dinners of high standard and has a fine choice of wines.

Reservations required, either at the restaurant or call +3I(0)40-258I988/+3I(0)6-520I8028.
Lunch from 12:00-14:00 hrs, dinner from 18:00 22:00.

## Youth Committee meeting

The WBF Youth Committee Meeting will be held on Tuesday 18th October at 16:15 p.m. in Room 7 - the sign on the door says WBF Meeting Room 2.

## Laws Committee

The Laws Committee has scheduled two meetings:
Tuesday 18th
12.30-14.30

Thursday 20th
12.00-14.00


Both will take place in room 7,WBF meeting room\#2

## Minivan to supermarket

A minivan drives every afternoon to a large supermarket in Veldhoven. Departure in front of the hotel at 14.00 , the minivan will be back at 15.00 hrs .

## Chinese slam swings

by Micke Melander

In China v Italy in the Open series 37 IMPs went into the Chinese accounts on three different boards, all on slams. Though the Italians fought back and won many smaller contracts to make the match a draw in the end. One of the more interesting hands was this:

Board I3. Dealer North.All Vul.

> \&

817
$\diamond 984$

- K 987653
- J 6

PAK532
$\diamond K 7$
\& A Q J 2
. A Q 10874
$\bigcirc 94$
$\diamond$ AJ 105
\& 4

- 9532

Q Q 1086
$\diamond$ Q 632

- 10

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lian | Bocchi | H.Shi | Madala |
|  | 3s | 34 | Pass |
| 49 | Pass | 4 | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | 54 | Pass |
| 6 \% | All Pass |  |  |

Madala led the ten of clubs. Shi thought for quite some time before calling for dummy's ace. For reasons unknown, he then continued with the jack of spades from dummy. The six of spades should be more or less automatic, when you know that North is most probably short in the suit and you have a lot of entries to dummy.
The queen of spades confirmed that spades were 4-I and declarer now had managed to create himself a loser in trumps. However, he could play for hearts 3-3 or finding the queen of diamonds. A ruffing finesse in clubs would set up one trick for declarer in that suit.
Shi continued with the ten of spades and then played a heart to dummy's ace. The queen of clubs followed, covered


Haojun Shi, China
by the king and ruffed by declarer. Madala now wisely did the only thing that eventually could have created problems for declarer by discarding a diamond, leaving the following position:

|  | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark 984$ |  |
|  | +987 |  |
| - - | N | - 87 |
| ¢K53 |  | $\bigcirc 9$ |
| $\checkmark$ K 7 | W E | $\checkmark$ AJ 105 |
| * 12 | S | - - |
|  | - 9 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 108 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 62 |  |
|  | 9- |  |

Madala for sure was feeling more and more squeezed. After a long thought by Shi, he finally continued with another heart to dummy's king and then called for the jack of clubs, discarding a diamond from his hand. Madala ruffed and realized that he would be terribly squeezed and had to try to break it up by returning a diamond. That was all Shi needed to be able to claim his contract. We can be pretty sure that Shi would have squeezed Madala if he had returned a heart. That was 12 IMPs to China when the Italy in the other room stopped in 3NT taking twelve tricks.

## 201 I World Championship Book



The official book of these championships will be available in late March/early April next year.As usual, it will consist of 336 large pages. There will be coverage of every deal in both the finals and semi-finals of the Bermuda Bowl and Venice Cup, plus substantial coverage of the earlier stages of those two events, the Seniors Bowl, and the Transnational Championship. The book will include a full results service, including Butler rankings, and many photographs.
Principle analysts will be Brian Senior, Barry Rigal, John Carruthers and Geo Tislevoll. Justin Lall will be this year's guest contributor.
On publication, the official retail price will be US\$3500 . For the duration of these championships, you can pre-order and pay at the special price of US\$25-00 or Euros $18-00$. Your copy will then be sent direct from the printers.
To order please see Jan Swaan in the Press Room Room 83 in the Green section.

