## Van Cleeff Powers to Victory in the Cavendish Teams

The Jan Van Cleeff team (Jan Jansma, Bauke Muller, Wubbo De Boer), seen below smiling politely for the "official" Cavendish photographer, won the 1998 Dreyfus Cup, symbolic of victory in the Cavendish Teams. The Van Cleeff team began yesterday's final session with an 8 VP lead and never looked back. Going into the final match Van Cleeff led Jim Mahaffey's team (Paul Soloway, Gene Freed, Mike Passell, Harry Tudor, Michael Seamon) by 22 VPs. Van Cleeff's 18-12 VP win clinched the event, while Mahaffey finished second. Our congratulations to all of the teams for a hard fought contest. The final rankings of the twenty-six teams entered in the event are on page two.


The winners. Left to right: Jan Van Cleeff, Wubbo De Boer, Bauke Muller, and Jan Jansma.

## Cavendish Teams: Final Rankings

| Rank | Team (Auction \#) | VP |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Van Cleeff, Jansma, Muller, De Boer (7) | 203 |
| 2 | Mahaffey, Soloway, Freed, Passell, Tudor, Seamon (15) | 175 |
| 3 | Chemla, Mari, Abecassis, Quantin (1) | 166 |
| 4 | M. Moss, Fallenius, Camberos, Lambardi (14) | 164 |
| 5 | Onstott, Compton, Hayden, Erickson (20) | 161 |
| 6 | Jacobs, Katz, Sontag, Weichsel, Lazard, Bramley (4) | 156 |
| 7 | Milner, B. Levin, B. Moss, Gitelman, Weinstein (17) | 150 |
| 8 | Ozdil, Zaremba, Marston, Richman (8) | 148 |
| $9 / 10$ | De Falco, Burgay, Pietri, Dimaio (9) | 142 |
| $9 / 10$ | Ekeblad, Sutherlin, Hampson, Greco (13) | 142 |
| 11 | Albert, Jacobus, Letizia, Stewart (22) | 139 |
| 12 | Johnson, Meckstroth, Rodwell, Martel (3) | 138 |
| 13 | Reisig, Shenkin, Courtney, Gill, Woolsey, Boyd (5) | 137 |
| 14 | Whitman, Mittelman, Graves, Baze, Wold (10) | 136 |
| 15 | Mahmood, Gawrys, Lev, Rosenbloom, Polowan (2) | 131 |
| $16 / 17 / 18$ | Glubok, Hallberg, Larsen, Erichsen (18) | 123 |
| $16 / 17 / 18$ | Elinescu, Lungu, Sawin, Pleakoff (19) | 123 |
| $16 / 17 / 18$ | Eisenberg, Friedman, L. Cohen, Melton (23) | 123 |
| 19 | Wei-Sender, Chambers, J. Levin, Levitina (24) | 122 |
| 20 | Kasle, Steiner, Blanchard, Krekorian (12) | 115 |
| 21 | Shugart, Robson, Smith, Cohen (16) | 114 |
| 22 | House (26) | 109 |
| 23 | Wildavsky, Beatty, Doub, Fleisher (25) | 107 |
| 24 | Schwartz, Lair, Pollack, Casen (6) | 103 |
| 25 | Deutsch, Wolff, Schapiro, Gordon (21) | 92 |
| 26 | Sosler, Schulle, Mohan, Bates, Berkowitz, B. Cohen (11) | 91 |
|  |  |  |

# Number Two Has To Try Harder 

As I stumbled into the playing area I must have resembled a white laboratory rat, with my beady red eyes peering out from behind my thick glasses. Six am is no time to get to bed when you have to be up at the crack of dawn (12:30 pm starting time!) to cover the final session of the Cavendish teams. Barry was already watching the contest between the first- and second-place teams, so I headed for a cubicle where the bout between third- and fourth-place had already gotten under way.

From the look on the Director's face I must have required more than the usual amount of help to locate the match. The task of finding where the dozens of spare chairs had been hidden was almost enough to drive me back to the warmth of my bed. Still, with the patience of Job, the will to succeed of Michael Jordan, and the keen sense of direction of Mr. Magoo I headed for the ill-fated green-draped arena.

I dragged my chair through the curtains and sat down next to Bjorn Fallenius, who was seated South. Board 2 was on the tray and I saw the following auction developing:


| West | North | East <br> Jacobus | South <br> Albert |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $1 \boldsymbol{\$}(1)$ | Fallenius |
| Pass |  |  |  |

## (1) Could be short; (2) Checkback

I must admit that even in my then-current state, this auction seemed somewhat transcendental. A bit of careful detective work later disclosed what was really going on here. Albert-Jacobus play weak notrumps nonvulnerable (as here), so when they hold a strong notrump-range hand (15-17) as Mike Albert did here, they open with a "short club"; otherwise, they open their better minor. Hence, Mike's strange-looking 1did.

When North bid 2lbert decided he was good enough to make his natural notrump rebid at the two-level. Jacobus, unfortunately, didn't register North's 24 bid. He didn't think Moss had bid only 1 - he didn't see the spade bid at all! Thus, he conducted the remainder of the auction believing that Albert had jump-rebid 2NT in an uncontested auction, and "knew" that Albert's clubs were his better minor and not a short suit.

Jacobus then checked back for three-card heart support and was only mildly surprised when Albert showed four spades. Well, maybe he had such a notrump-oriented hand that he bypassed his spades to rebid in notrump.

Then Marc made a self-admitted poor bid 3NT. Clearly he should have rebid his excellent diamond suit, looking for bigger and better things opposite Albert's (presumed) 18-19 count. Instead he bid "ends-all-auctions" - but the auction strangely didn't end! What, Marc thought, could 4 mean? Could it be a diamond cue-bid in support of hearts, with say a 4-3-3-3 control-rich hand? If so, Marc should certainly show his diamonds now. Or maybe, somehow, Albert had divined that Marc's 3 bid had been natural. Now that would really be transcendental. Or maybe, with weak clubs and diamond values, he preferred to play game in diamonds. Well, 5 caters to both of these possibilities.

Imagine Marc's and my surprise when Albert bid the sixth and final diamond. I was about twothirds convinced at this point that this was all a bizarre dream, and that 6 am really was far too late to be getting to bed. Marc shrugged his shoulders, passed, and Mike Moss thumbed the
sK on the table - better to set up a second spade trick while he still held the A. (What a wonderful lead a low club would have been. Would Marc have been up to playing the king, as Jill Levin had done when that lead was made against her 6 slam as described on page 8 ?) Marc won the A , cashed the VA (noting the fall of the 10), and played a heart to his . . . king! All thirteen tricks, plus 940, was worth 10 IMPs. Hmmm. Maybe there is something to be said for sleep deprivation after all.

A while later Board 5 was placed on the tray.

| Bd: 5 <br> DIr: North <br> Vul: N/S | ¢ 8532 | , KQJ4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ A3 |  |
|  | - Q8 |  |
|  | -K9842 |  |
| - A9 |  |  |
| $\bullet$ J92 |  | - K8654 |
| - KJ9653 |  | - A4 |
| - J6 |  | -75 |
|  | ¢ 1076 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q107 |  |
|  | - 1072 |  |
|  | - AQ103 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Jacobus | Moss | Albert | Fallenius |
|  | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| $1 N T(1)$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{q}$ | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | $4 \vee$ | All Pass |

(1) Forcing

Bjorn chose to lead the 10 against 4 . Albert won the ace in dummy, played a spade to his king, and then cashed the $\uparrow$ Q pitching one of dummy's clubs, as everyone followed. He then played the J as Bjorn ruffed with the $\boldsymbol{~ 1 0}$, and after some thought Albert pitched dummy's remaining club. Left on lead Bjorn quickly moved his $\vee 7$ to the launch deck (the leftmost card position), gave the play a few more moments' consideration, and then tabled the $\vee 7$. North won his $\vee A$ and quickly returned the three.

Now it was Albert's turn. He struck what appeared to me to be the approximate pose of Rodin's "The Thinker," sat motionless for quite some time, and then played the . . . YK! Down
came Bjorn's queen.
This was great stuff. It reminded me of the old "Spy Versus Spy" comic strip in Mad Magazine. Take that! No, you take that! Pow!

Not to be outdone, the final board of the set gave Bjorn his chance for retribution.

| Bd: 9 |  | ¢ 10953 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North |  | - 84 |  |
| Vul: E/W |  | - QJ542 |  |
|  |  | J764 |  |
| $\triangle$ AKQ8 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ AKJ1076 |  |  | - Q52 |
| - 8 |  |  | - A9 |
| - J4 |  |  | \& 10652 |
| 4 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 93$ |  |  |  |
| -K10763 |  |  |  |
| \& AKQ83 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jacobus | Moss | Albert | Fallenius |
|  | Pass | Pass | 1 |
| 4 | 5 | 5 | 6\%(!) |
| Dbl | 6 | Dbl | All Pass |

Bjorn's 6e bid is the sort of action I love. It has three ways to win: (1) It might get partner off to the right lead if the opponents push on to the sixlevel; (2) It could land you in a great save; or (3) It could actually be your hand (give North something like: «xxxx 『Ax Axxxx exx). And while the bid certainly could lose (for example, if the save is a phantom), I really can't remember the last time this happened to me.

Anyway, Bjorn had his restful green-colored (I really was sleepy) pass card half way out of the bid box when he suddenly stopped, reconsidered his action at some length, and then triumphantly out came his 6\% card. (Lucky for him a 4NT bid wasn't required - there was none in his bid box!)

Take that! Pow! Biff! Blooey! Bam! Zonk! Spy Versus Spy. Now that's a move even Alfred E. Newman could appreciate.

## The Cavendish Teams: Sessions Two and Three

Round 4:

| Bd: 3 | - 72 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: South | - 64 |  |
| Vul: E/W | - QJ9654 <br> - Q97 |  |
| - Q9 <br> - J1075 |  | - J1043 |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ K82 |
| - AK108 <br> - 1052 |  | - 32 |
|  |  | + A843 |
|  | ¢ AK865 |  |
|  | - AQ93 |  |
|  | - 7 |  |
|  | * KJ6 |  |

One of the areas in which strong clubs gain most frequently over natural systems is when a strong hand is facing a hand in the 4-7 HCP range. In standard methods the weak hand responds to an opening bid and gets too high, while the strong club pairs stay discreetly low. I thought Weinstein and Levin handled this deal very well to avoid the trap.

| West | North | East | South <br> Di Dimaio |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Weinstein | Pietri | Levin <br> Pass |
| 1 NT | Pass | $2 \downarrow$ |  |
| Pass | $2 \downarrow$ | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 3 | All Pass |  |

Levin's decision to rebid 2NT (slightly off-center, but the set had not been going well!) made it easy for Weinstein to select the final contract, and Levin passed, albeit with misgivings.

Pietri led a helpful trump and Dimaio took the $\$$ A and played a club to the ace. Weinstein unblocked the and won the club return in hand to drive out the $\$$. Now came the $Q$. He took the $\$ \mathrm{AK}$ and ruffed a spade to hand, then played his top trump. A club to the table and another spade ruff let him endplay Dimaio with the last trump to lead hearts into the ace-queen for the contract.

| Bd: 5 | - K97653 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North | - 643 |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K84 } \\ & \qquad 5 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| ¢ --- |  | \& AQJ104 |
| $\checkmark 9$ |  | - 752 |
| - AQ9765 |  | - J32 |
| * AQJ764 |  | + 92 |
|  | - 82 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AKQJ108 |  |
|  | -10 |  |
|  | - K1083 |  |

Piotr Gawrys and Zia Mahmood really set up their opponents for the kill on Board 5. The normal result was for West to show the minors and drive to 5 . This was frequently doubled and the defense took a heart, a diamond, and two clubs. Things worked out differently - here Zia sat East. To start with, he opened 24 with the East cards. (After all, if North would not do his duty someone had to open 2a!) South overcalled $3 \boldsymbol{\text { , Gawrys bid }} 4 \uparrow$, North bid $4 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$, and Zia corrected to 5 . North decided to double and led a heart.

Can you blame South, looking at dummy's potential source of tricks, for shifting to a club? Gawrys put in the queen successfully and advanced a thoughtful low diamond from hand. North ducked, and Gawrys played dummy's jack. When this held, he repeated the club finesse and just gave up one trump trick, since he could now ruff a club in dummy after drawing trumps; plus 550 !

## Round 5:

Entered in the book of "might-have-beens" is Board 10 (see diagram next page), where at least two declarers reached 4t from the North seat after preempting in diamonds had driven $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$ too high.
"Too high" did I say. Irving Gordon declared 4. doubled on the lead of the $\$$. He ruffed, drew one round of trumps, and played a heart to
the king and ace. Gawrys switched to the J , and now there is a straightforward way home. Win the KC, ruff a second diamond, draw a second trump, finesse the 8C and ruff a heart back to hand to repeat the club finesse. That adds up to 4 club tricks, three spades in hand, one heart, and two diamond ruffs. What could be easier?

| Bd: 10 | , AKQ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | $\bullet 32$ |  |
| Vul: Both | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q8642 } \\ & +K 32 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| ¢ 108 |  | ¢ J 732 |
| - AJ105 |  | $\bullet 98$ |
| - A109753 |  | -KJ |
| \& J |  | \& Q9764 |
|  | ¢ 9654 |  |
|  | - KQ764 |  |
|  | - --- |  |
|  | - A1085 |  |

Alas, Irving decided that the J was Gawrys playing mind games from the queen-jack and misguessed the suit to go down 500!

| Bd: 12 <br> DIr: West <br> Vul: N/S | ¢ 1098 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark 843$ |  |
|  | - A842 |  |
|  | - 1072 |  |
| $\$ 5$ <br> - KQ97652 <br> - Q103 <br> - AK |  | ¢ KQ743 |
|  |  | -10 |
|  |  | - KJ65 |
|  |  | 2 QJ6 |
|  | ¢ AJ62 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AJ |  |
|  | - 97 |  |
|  | -98543 |  |

The contract of $4 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$, reached universally, is not a thing of beauty. Off three aces with a delicate trump holding, it seems as if the cards lie so well that only an initial diamond lead beats the hand by getting a ruff for South.

That is not quite so; consider the effect of a club lead, found by Gunner Hallberg. Declarer won to drive out the $\Phi$ A. South, Brian Glubock,
took the A and played a second club. Declarer won and played a diamond and North hopped up with the ace and played a third club. Declarer won in dummy and ran the $\geqslant 10$, covered by the jack and queen. This was the ending:


At this point West, Billy Cohen, had to read the precise heart position and exit with a low heart to make his contract. When he played the $\vee Q$ South won and led a fourth club, promoting the $\vee 8$ to the setting trick!

| Bd: 13 J |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: North | - AQ842 |  |
| Vul: Both | - AJ3 |  |
|  | - 4987 |  |
| ¢ KQ1098632 |  | ¢ 74 |
| - K93 |  | - J107 |
| -10 |  | -KQ8765 |
| -6 |  | Q Q5 |
|  | ¢ A5 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 65$ |  |
|  | - 942 |  |
|  | - KJ10432 |  |

Almost every table where N/S were playing natural methods were confronted with the auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $1 \boldsymbol{v}$ | Pass | 1 NT |
| 34 | $?$ |  |  |

If you play that double simply shows extras and
a balanced(ish) hand type you have to decide whether to risk it with the North cards. If you did, it got you safely to 3NT or $5 \%$.

However, Jan Van Cleef, for the Dutch team that was leading after six matches, tried 4\%. He assumed that his side was a heavy favorite to make game somewhere and he hoped still to be able to reach diamonds if that was the best spot.

Jan Jansma (with more than the average trump support) elected for a spot of delicate modern science, and leaped directly to 6\%. On a spade lead Van Cleef won the ace, drew trumps, then needed either the heart finesse or three-three hearts to bring home his contract. When both naturalized he had enough homes for his diamond losers to make plus 1390 for a 13 IMP pick-up.

| Bd: 16 | ¢ 1053 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: West | $\bullet 2$ |  |
| Vul: E/W | - J64 <br> \& Q98653 |  |
| $\pm A$ |  | ¢ J862 |
| $\checkmark$ A964 |  | - KQJ108753 |
| - A92 |  | - 5 |
| - AJ1072 |  | ¢ --- |
|  | ¢ KQ974 |  |
|  | - --- |  |
|  | -KQ10873 K4 |  |

How often have you drawn the first round of trumps in a grand slam by leading the $\vee 3$ to the $\vee 4$ ? Not many pairs took the chance here. N/S had a paying save of sorts in 74, so more often E/W had to collect a penalty instead. Rodwell and Martel managed to get plus 2210 against Friedman-Eisenberg.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Martel | Friedman | Rodwell | Eisenberg |
| $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass | $4 \downarrow$ | $4 \uparrow$ |
| 4NT | Pass | 5 | Pass |
| $6 \boldsymbol{*}$ | Pass | Pass | $7 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | Pass | $7 \downarrow$ | All Pass |

Thirteen tricks were easy of course. However, at other tables things were more complicated - at
least partly because E/W seemed to have problems remembering their system. After all, why have an Appeals Committee if you can't keep them gainfully employed?

In one match both E/W pairs started 10-Pass-4•. In one case, West alerted it to South as showing spades! In the other case West alerted it to South as showing a splinter raise of clubs! I draw a veil over the continuation . . . but whoever said Bridge was supposed to be a simple game?

## Round 6:

| Bd: 21 <br> DIr: North <br> Vul: N/S | ¢ Q964 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - AK2 |  |
|  | - 9873 |  |
|  | -106 |  |
| - AK107 |  | ¢ J3 |
| $\checkmark$ Q109 |  | - J7653 |
| - 54 |  | -6 |
| - A743 |  | \% QJ952 |
|  | - 852 |  |
|  | $\bullet 84$ |  |
|  | - AKQJ102 |  |
|  | ¢ K8 |  |

In the final match of the day $N / S$ had an awkward bidding problem. Both tables in the match between Milner and Whitman went a long way to solving this problem . . .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | 1 - |
| Dbl | 14 | $2 \downarrow$ | Dbl(1) |
| Pass | $2{ }^{2}$ | 3\% | 3 |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | 3NT |

All Pass
(1) Three-card spade support

N/S at both tables managed to reach a very playable contract. However at this Graves for the Whitman team scored a goal by doubling 3NT. When Steve Weinstein retreated to 4 that was doubled and set 500. At the other table 3NT was passed out, and Gitelman led the sA, letting through the ninth trick. However, as the cards lie there is no defense to 3NT: if West
leads the $V$ Q South can duck it; if he leads a low heart declarer can block the suit by taking the ace and king as necessary and building a ninth trick in spades. Jan Jansma opened the South hand a 15-17 notrump in the top table match not quite according to the text books. Things looked up when East doubled a stayman 2s inquiry. Now N/S had a straightforward route to 3NT and on a club lead Jansma had nine tricks and 13 IMPs .

## Round 7:

The seventh round was ideal for the reporters there were more than enough potential opportunities for brilliancy to keep us happy.

| Bd: 2 | ¢ KQ97654 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | - Q10 |  |
| Vul: N/S | -43 |  |
|  | - A 8 |  |
| - 8 <br> - KJ972 <br> -KQJ108 <br> - 73 |  | ¢ A102 |
|  |  | $\bullet$ A4 |
|  |  | - A97652 |
|  |  | 2KJ |
|  | ¢ J3 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 8653$ |  |
|  | - --- |  |
|  | Q1096542 |  |

Board 2 for instance gave Jill Levin the chance to shine:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Levin | Mohan | Levitina <br> Bates |  |
|  |  | 1NT | Pass |
| $2(1)$ | 2 | Pass | Pass |
| $3(2)$ | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | 4 | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | 6 | All Pass |

(1) Transfer; (2) Retransfer

Mohan led the 8 ! and Jill put up the king!! We have seen elsewhere the duel on Board 5 between Albert and Fallenius. $4 \downarrow$ was a popular contract and on the spade lead declarer ran four rounds of spades. Both Abecassis and Courtney ruffed in with the $\mathbf{~ 1 0}$, and both
declarers overruffed with the $\boldsymbol{Y}$. Now a club from dummy was won by the king and the defenders played ace and another heart. When the declarers misguessed by running this, the defense had the $V Q$ and a club to cash for down one.

| Bd: 6 | ¢ KJ63 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | - Q5 |  |
| Vul: E/W | - 96532 |  |
|  | -93 |  |
| ¢ AQ1042 |  | ¢ 8 |
| - AK96 |  | $\bullet 42$ |
| K7K 86 |  | - AQJ8 |
|  |  | AKQJ107 |
|  | ¢ 975 |  |
|  | - J10873 |  |
|  | -104 |  |
|  | - 542 |  |

Board 6 was another opportunity to shine, this time in the auction. Reisig and Shenkin had an accident playing 4NT and the Dutch made them pay. Muller and De Boer bid: 12-14; 2-2V; 3\%4๕; 4-4NT (RKCB); 5心-5NT; 6 -7※. De Boer could count a thirteenth trick from a diamond ruff in dummy if necessary when he bid the grand slam.

Board 8 turned out to be a huge swing in the match between Schwartz and Wildavsky. The room played game, making eleven tricks in comfort. But Lev-Schwartz drove to 6『. On the lead of the $\leqslant$ Doug Doub shifted to a spade the only defense to mess up the communications for the dummy reversal to make the slam.

Round 8:

| Bd: 16 | \& KJ2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dir: West | - 4 |  |
| Vul: E/W | - AQ1095 <br> - AJ105 |  |
| - 1086 |  | - 7 |
| - KJ10865 |  | $\checkmark$ Q972 |
| -KJ8 |  | - 763 |
| - 7 |  | - 98632 |
|  | - AQ9543 |  |
|  | - A3 |  |
|  | - 42 |  |
|  | - KQ4 |  |

The match between the two top teams in the event featured two significant swings in favor of the Van Cleeff team, both of which involved how high to preempt once a fit was found. The first of them involved Muller and De Boer:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| De Boer | Lambardi | Muller | Camberos |
| $2 \downarrow$ | Dbl | 4 | 4NT |
| Pass | 5 | Pass | 5 |
| Pass | 69 | Pass | 6 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Camberos' sequence sounded like a clear grand slam try, and Lambardi had great controls but only three spades. Was that enough? Lambardi decided no. By contrast the auction from the other table saw the North hand take a considerably more aggressive posture:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Moss | Van Cleeff | Fallenius Jansma |  |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ | Dbl | $3 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ | $4 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ |
| Pass | $5 \boldsymbol{\varphi}(!)$ | Pass | $7 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ |

All Pass

When Van Cleeff showed extras, Jansma bravely bid the grand slam, and picked up 11 IMPs for his pains. Then it was Jansma-Van Cleeff's turn to steal the pot:

| Bd: 17 | ¢10642 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North | - J103 |  |
| Vul: None | $$ |  |
| ¢ A85 |  | ¢ 7 |
| $\bullet$ Q4 |  | - AK9852 |
| - Q852 |  | - J3 |
| -10852 |  | * AQJ7 |
|  | ¢ KQJ93 |  |
|  | $\bullet 76$ |  |
|  | - AK1076 |  |
|  | -9 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Moss | Van Cleeff | Fallenius | Jansma |
|  | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{~}$ | 3\&(1) |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

(1) Spades and diamonds

44 went quietly down two for 100 to Moss. But at the other table a Michaels $2 \downarrow$ bid was raised only to 3s by Lambardi. Muller rebid 4母, and over 4s De Boer bid 5『. Camberos doubled and led the $\$ K$, then shifted to the $\$ K$.

The play has the potential for complexity (which four-one splits are you going to try to handle?) and maybe the right play is the 210 from dummy at once. Muller played a low club to the jack and when the nine fell, he drew two trumps ending in dummy and repeated the club finesse for plus 650, and an overall win, 27-3.

With one match to go they needed 5 VPS to assure the win, and if you've read this far you know how that turned out.

## Cavendish Pairs: Auction Results

| Rank | Pair | Price | Rank | Pair | Price |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Chemla-Mari | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 55,00 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 29/30 | Lungu-Sawin | \$16,000 |
| 2 | Berkowitz-L. Cohen | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 50,00 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 29/30 | Elinescu-Lev | \$16,000 |
| 3 | Mahmood-S. <br> Weinstein | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 47,00 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31 / 32 / 3 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | Reisig-Schenkin | \$15,000 |
| 4 | Martel-Rodwell | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 45,00 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31 / 32 / 3 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | De Falco-Burgay | \$15,000 |
| 5 | Baze-Wold | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,00 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31 / 32 / 3 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | Graves-Mittelman | \$15,000 |
| 6 | Sontag-Weichsel | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 36,00 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34 / 35 / 3 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | Courtney-Gill | \$14,000 |
| 7/8 | Hamman-Nickell | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 33,00 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34 / 35 / 3 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | Ekeblad-Sutherlin | \$14,000 |
| 7/8 | Silverman-Woolsey | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 33,00 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34 / 35 / 3 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | Marston-Richman | \$14,000 |
| 9 | Boyd-Robinson | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 31,00 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 37/.../40 | Freed-Passell | \$13,000 |
| 10 | Greco-Hampson | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 28,00 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 37/.../40 | Compton-Onstott | \$13,000 |
| 11 | Bramley-Lazard | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 27,00 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 37/.../40 | Beatty-Wildavsky | \$13,000 |
| 12 | De Boer-Muller | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 26,00 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 37/.../40 | Feldman-Polowan | \$13,000 |
| 13/14/15 | Garner-H. Weinstein | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 25,00 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 41/.../44 | Deutsch-Wolff | \$11,000 |
| 13/14/15 | Abecassis-Quantin | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 25,00 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 41/.../44 | Albert-Jacobus | \$11,000 |
| 13/14/15 | Johnson-Meckstroth | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 25,00 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 41/.../44 | Robson-Shugart | \$11,000 |
| 16/17 | Goren-Helgemo | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 24,00 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 41/.../44 | Kaminski-Rosenbloom | \$11,000 |
| 16/17 | B. Cohen-Smith | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 24,00 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 45 | Wiguder-Wright | \$10,000 |
| 18 | Fallenius-M. Moss | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 23,00 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 46/../49 | Jacobs-Katz | \$9,000 |



