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## Welcome

World Bridge Productions welcomes you to the 1998 Cavendish Teams and Pairs. This year we are proud to welcome our new sponsor, Microsoft Internet Gaming Zone. Microsoft will be staffing a table here to demonstrate their new Internet Gaming Zone Bridge program, developed by Fred Gitelman. Stop by and see the new look of FREE bridge on the Internet.

This year's Cavendish differs from last year's in a couple of important ways. First, our premier pair event has been expanded from four sessions to five. This was done to increase the influence of bridge skills on the final placings (not to make the event an endurance challenge). Second, a new bridge event, the WBP Pairs, has been added to the program. This three session event (Friday evening and all day Saturday) is designed for those not able to play in the Cavendish Invitational Pairs, but wishing to play in a similar event.

This year's Cavendish field is truly international in scope. In addition to the many US players we have noticed players here from Argentina, Australia, Canada, England, France, Germany, Israel, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Rumania, Scotland, Sweden, and Turkey. And with this international flavor comes exceptional bridge skill and accomplishments. We have present and past European champions, Bermuda Bowl and Venice Cup champions, Junior World champions, World Transnational Teams champions, Rosenblum and McConnell Cup champions, not to mention many winners of our US national team championships: the Vanderbilt, Spingold and Reisinger.

In the spirit of friendship and good bridge we welcome you all to the 1998 Cavendish Invitational. We wish everyone a fun and successful experience.

John Roberts, Bob Hamman, Robert Blanchard and Bill Rosenbaum

Cavendish Teams: Auction Information

| Number | Team | Auction Price |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Chemla, Mari, Abecassis, Quantin | \$13,000 |
| 2 | Mahmood, Gawrys, Lev, Rosenbloom, Polowan | \$13,000 |
| 3 | Johnson, Meckstroth, Rodwell, Martel | \$12,000 |
| 4 | Jacobs, Katz, Sontag, Weichsel, Lazard, Bramley | \$10,000 |
| 5 | Reisig, Shenkin, Courtney, Gill, Woolsey, Boyd | \$7,500 |
| 6 | Schwartz, Lair, Pollack, Casen | \$7,000 |
| 7 | Van Cleeff, Jansma, Muller, De Boer | \$7,000 |
| 8 | Ozdil, Zaremba, Marston, Richman | \$7,000 |
| 9 | De Falco, Burgay, Pietri, Dimaio | \$7,000 |
| 10 | Whitman, Mittelman, Graves, Baze, Wold | \$7,000 |
| 11 | Sosler, Schulle, Mohan, Bates, Berkowitz, B. Cohen | \$6,500 |
| 12 | Kasle, Steiner, Blanchard, Krekorian | \$6,500 |
| 13 | Ekeblad, Sutherlin, Hampson, Greco | \$6,500 |
| 14 | M. Moss, Fallenius, Camberos, Lambardi | \$6,500 |
| 15 | Mahaffey, Soloway, Freed, Passell, Tudor, Seamon | \$6,500 |
| 16 | Shugart, Robson, Smith, Cohen | \$6,000 |
| 17 | Milner, B. Levin, B. Moss, Gitelman, Weinstein | \$6,000 |
| 18 | Glubok, Hallberg, Larsen, Erichsen | \$6,000 |
| 19 | Elinescu, Lungu, Sawin, Pleakoff | \$5,000 |
| 20 | Onstott, Compton, Hayden, Erickson | \$5,000 |
| 21 | Deutsch, Wolff, Schapiro, Gordon | \$5,000 |
| 22 | Albert, Jacobus, Letizia, Stewart | \$4,000 |
| 23 | Eisenberg, Friedman, L. Cohen, Melton | \$4,000 |
| 24 | Wei-Sender, Chambers, J. Levin, Levitina | \$4,000 |
| 25 | Wildavsky, Beatty, Doub, Fleisher | \$4,000 |
| 26 | House | --- |
|  | Auction Total | \$172,000 |

## The Cavendish Teams: Session One

It can sometimes be a fruitless effort to try to prove what is the right bid from the results of a single hand, but sometimes that result can be terribly convincing!

| Bd: 2 | ¢ 7532 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | $\bullet$ A107 |  |
| Vul: N/S | J1084 $94$ |  |
| ¢ KJ96 |  | - 8 |
| $\checkmark$ K43 |  | $\bullet$ J8 |
| - Q972 |  | -65 |
| ¢ K2 |  | * AQJ87653 |
|  | ¢ AQ104 |  |
|  | - Q9652 |  |
|  | - AK3 |  |
|  | -10 |  |

Where East opened $5 \%$ the auction was easy for N/S; South doubled and collected a painless plus 300. At other tables, where E/W were not as aggressive, a lower level preempt posed different problems. Hector Camberos opened 3\% to show a good suit. Russ Ekeblad doubled and Pablo Lambardi bid 3NT. Though John Sutherlin doubled this, Lambardi stood his ground and the defense could only take their four top tricks, when Lambardi guessed the hearts.

Plus 550 was not always going to be a winning board, though. At the other table Bjorn Fallenius doubled the popular opening bid of 4\&, setting Mike Moss a real problem. He retreated to $4 \boldsymbol{s}$ and mercifully no one doubled. He escaped for minus 300 and a gain of 6 IMPs.

In the match between the two top priced teams Quantin opened 4\%, and when Polowan doubled, Gawrys ran to 4 . No one doubled that, and Quantin led his singleton spade to collect plus 300 . When Zia opened 4\% at the other table Chemla doubled and Mari ran to 44. Lev chickened out of doubling that and also collected plus 300 for a flat board. (When Zia showed Sam the red card from his bid box at the end of the defense Lev commented, "I have no defensive tricks. What if dummy comes down with 4 Q10xxx behind me?")

The Dutch team demonstrated the right way
to handle both the N/S and the E/W cards: when Richman opened 4* Jasma doubled and Van Cleeff sat it out, collecting plus 100. At the other table Muller opened 4\&, Zaremba doubled, and Ozdil retreated to 4s. De Boer doubled to collect plus 800 and a cool 14 IMPs.

| Bd: 4 | ¢ 108 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: West | - J842 |  |
| Vul: Both | - KJ65 <br> \& QJ10 |  |
| - 953 |  | ¢ AKQJ7 |
| - AQ1076 |  | $\checkmark 5$ |
| - A742 |  | - Q |
| -9 |  | AK7542 |
|  | - 642 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K93 |  |
|  | - 10983 |  |
|  | - 863 |  |

In the match between Zia and the French team, both tables had well-judged auctions, and both reached what appeared to be the best contract - on the information available to them. But the net result was 13 IMPs to Zia.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Abecassis | Gawrys | Quantin | Polowan |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{~}$ | Pass |
| 1 | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |
| $5 \mathbf{~}$ | Pass | $5 N T(1)$ | Pass |
| 6 | Pass | 6 | All Pass |

(1) Aces

| Lev | Mari | Zia | Chemla |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | 29 | Pass |
| $2 \downarrow$ | Pass | 24! | Pass |
| 40(1) | Pass | 4NT(2) | Pass |
| 5 (3) | Pass | 79 | All Pass |

(1) Splinter, spade support;
(2) RKCB
(3) Two keycards

Abecassis's jump to 54 suggested a maximum pass, both red aces, and a ruffing value in clubs, but only three spades by virtue of his failure to raise spades. Quantin could see that the grand slam was likely to depend on the club split and so settled for the small slam.

By contrast, Zia chose to force to game, suppress his clubs (at least for the moment), and bid his spades first. Lev's splinter was consistent with a four-card trump holding (although Zia said he didn't play Sam for four - only three to the ten!) and so, never one to be timid, Zia bid the grand. After all, threethree clubs, the $\$ 10$ in dummy, or even a wellplaced four-two club split with the $\$ 9$ in dummy might be enough. As the cards lay Zia was right.

| Bd: 7 | - K7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dir: South | - AJ93 |  |
| Vul: Both | -K5 |  |
|  | \& AJ1065 |  |
| \& J3 |  | - 109864 |
| - 652 |  | - K87 |
| - AJ76 |  | -10932 |
| + K987 |  | + Q |
|  | - AQ52 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q104 |  |
|  | - Q84 |  |
|  | - 432 |  |

Kyle Larson found a neat way to bring home $3 N T$ where the room was failing. After an uninformative auction he became declarer in the obvious game on a small spade lead. He won the trick in hand and advanced a low heart, ducked, and dummy's queen scored the trick. Now he took a club finesse, losing to the singleton queen. The best the defense could do was to shift to a diamond, but Larsen won in hand, crossed to dummy with a spade, cashed the third round of the suit, and repeated the club finesse. Now he drove out the K and had nine tricks - the defense being cut off from their spade winners.

In fact this turned out to be a flat board when Gitelman declared 3NT - also on an uninformative auction and also with a spade lead. He put up the $\uparrow A$ and took a club finesse. When Hallberg won the Q he had to decide if declarer had solid diamonds, and not the $\mathbf{~ A}$, or his actual hand. He got it wrong, returning a heart, and Gitelman put up the VQ playing the $\uparrow J$ beneath it and repeated the club finesse. When Hallberg showed out he unblocked the 4 K and played two more rounds of clubs. West was now on lead but had no winning options. If he led a heart declarer could run it around to dummy, and a low diamond would let declarer
reach the $Q$ in dummy for his ninth trick.
Yet another variation came when RodwellMartel defended 3NT against Weichsel. Martel led a spade and Weichsel took the Q and ran the $\mathbf{V Q}$. Martel took it and returned a heart. Weichsel won the 10 and took the club finesse. Martel won and played a third heart. Weichsel later ducked the to Rodwell in this ending:


Rodwell got out with a low diamond and Weichsel had to guess who had the $\$$. If Rodwell had it, declarer could run the lead around to his $\$$, cash the $\uparrow A$, and take the club finesse for ten tricks. If Martel had the $\$ \mathrm{~A}$ declarer has to put up the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ or he gets locked in his hand to concede another club trick. Weichsel guessed correctly; well done!

In the match between Sosler and Milner the set seemed to hinge on some opening lead problems. Weinstein had the first. He heard Berkowitz-Cohen reach $3 \boldsymbol{v}$ after the auction:

| Bd: 11 | ¢ A75 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: South | - J9 |  |  |
| Vul: None | - A763 |  |  |
|  | * AJ76 |  |  |
| K64 | ¢ J98 |  |  |
| $\bullet$ Q1074 |  |  | 6653 |
| -1095 |  | KJ42 |  |
|  |  |  | \& 8 |
| - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q Q1032 } \\ & \vee 82 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | - Q8 |  |  |
|  | -109432 |  |  |
| West | North | East | Sout |
| Berkowitz | Levin | Cohen | Wei |
|  |  |  | Pas |


| Pass | 1 | 1 | Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | (1) | Pass | 3 |

(1) Raise to 3 with four trumps

Reasoning that a diamond lead was wrong because partner had not taken the opportunity to double the artificial 3 bid, he led the 210 .
Levin took the and shifted to a diamond, and when Cohen played low the defense took their diamond ruff for two down. Since Milner and Gitelman had made plus 110 this was a 5 IMP pick-up. Of course $3 \bullet$ makes on the $\$$ Q lead.

A couple of boards later it was Levin's turn to shine on opening lead.

| Bd: 14 | - J 942 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | $\checkmark$ Q107 |  |
| Vul: None | - J93 |  |
|  | - 487 |  |
| ¢ 3 |  | ¢ AK1085 |
| $\checkmark$ K9862 |  | $\bullet$ J |
| -1054 |  | - AKQ872 |
| - 9652 |  | - 4 |
|  | , Q76 |  |
|  | - A543 |  |
|  | -6 |  |
|  | \% KQJ103 |  |


| West <br> Berkowitz | North <br> Levin | East <br> Cohen <br> $1 \boldsymbol{2}(1)$ | South <br> Weinstein |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass |  |  |  |

(1) Strong, artificial; (2) Negative
(3) Forcing one round; (4) 0-5 HCP
(5) Artificial, game force; (6) Forced

The strong club managed to get the weak hand to declare in 5 , giving the defense some sort of chance. Levin led a trump and Berkowitz had no real way to make his contract. He won in dummy to play the $\boldsymbol{V}$, and Weinstein took his $\vee A$ to underlead the clubs for a second trump back. That was one down, and a 10 IMP pick-up? No! The board at the other table was misduplicated so the good play was wasted.

The Sosler team managed to create a swing when Cohen produced this distinctly sporting sequence to allow Berkowitz to show
his declarer talents:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Berkowitz | Levin | Cohen | Weinstein |
| $1-(1)$ | Pass | $3(2)$ | Pass |
| 5 | All Pass |  |  |

(1) Precision;
(2) Preemptive

The $3 \checkmark$ raise on a five-card suit was distinctly anti-systemic, but the lie of the cards looks very favorable to declarer. Nonetheless, on a spade lead Berkowitz had to judge the play carefully. He won his $\$$ and led a trump to dummy. Weinstein took the $\uparrow A$ and returned a spade.

| Bd: 16 | 4. QJ64 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: West | $\checkmark$ J743 |  |
| Vul: E/W | $$ |  |
| ¢ A |  | ¢ 1053 |
| $\checkmark$ AQ92 |  | $\checkmark 108$ |
| - 9832 |  | -KQJ65 |
| - AJ95 |  | - 1087 |
|  | ¢ K9872 |  |
|  | - K65 |  |
|  | - A7 |  |
|  | - K63 |  |

Berkowitz ruffed and led a second trump to dummy. Now it looks natural to take a club finesse, but a third spade locks you in hand to concede a setting trick in clubs or in hearts. So you need to take a heart finesse before playing on clubs - giving you the necessary reentry to dummy. In fact, when Berkowitz led the $\geqslant 10$ from dummy Weinstein covered with the VK. That let Berkowitz win the $\vee A$ and lead a low heart back. He lost to the $\boldsymbol{P}$, but had two discards for dummy's club losers on the 『Q9. Making plus 600 won Sosler 10 IMPs, and the match.

The match between Sosler and Mike Moss came down to a thin game where Bjorn Fallenius guessed the cards very well:

| Bd: 26 | ¢ 1098 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: East | - KJ863 |  |
| Vul: Both | $\begin{aligned} & \text { - } 653 \\ & \hdashline 85 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| ¢ J76 |  | ¢ AQ543 |
| -1097 |  | - Q4 |
| - Q82 |  | - A74 |
| - Q1063 |  | - 942 |
|  | - K2 |  |
|  | - A52 |  |
|  | - KJ109 |  |
|  | * AKJ7 |  |

West North East South

| Cohen | Fallenius Berkowitz | Moss |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $1 \uparrow$ |
| 24 | $3 \bullet$ | Pass |

All Pass
Fallenius-Moss play an uncomplicated style where the North hand had no way to distinguish between a constructive and competitive raise to $3 \boldsymbol{\vee}$, so Moss was playing with the odds when he raised $3>$ to game.

Berkowitz led the 2 playing third-and-fifth leads, and Fallenius had no real clue as to the location of the cards except that the $\uparrow$ A was surely onside. Taking the immediate club finesse could have been the right play, but he judged that if that were the case East might have led a passive trump. His failure to lead a heart rather suggested he had the $V Q$. Accordingly, Fallenius went up with the A and laid down the $\Psi A$ and $¥ K$. When the $\vee Q$ fell he simply played on diamonds and established two tricks in that suit as a home for his spade loser. (He naturally played diamonds without drawing the third trump: had he made the error of drawing the last trump the defense could have won the $Q$ and shifted to spades, beating him by force.)

Fallenius-Moss sewed up their match against Sosler when Fallenius found an excellent opening lead against a partscore, after a tangled auction:

| Bd: 27 | ¢ 1087 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: South | - AQ5 |  |
| Vul: None | - J976 |  |
|  | * KQ2 |  |
| ¢ AK6543 |  | ¢ QJ |
| - --- |  | - J87643 |
| - Q103 |  | - 5 |
| - AJ53 |  | -9764 |
|  | - 92 |  |
|  | - K1092 |  |
|  | - AK842 |  |
|  | -108 |  |


| West <br> Cohen | North <br> Fallenius | East <br> Berkowitz | South <br> Moss <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | Pass | $1 \mathrm{NT}(1)$ | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | $2(2)$ | Dbl |
| Rdbl | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 34 | All Pass |  |  |
| (1) Non-forcing; (2) | Transfer to hearts |  |  |

Berkowitz responded a semi-forcing 1NT in an attempt to steal the contract, but when he followed a sequence to $2 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ he gave Cohen the fatal opportunity to describe his three-suiter. That let Fallenius find the trump lead which left declarer with two clubs and three diamonds to lose, for one down.

We'll continue tomorrow with hands from sessions two and three of the Cavendish Teams.

Cavendish Teams: Standings After Six Matches

| Rank | Team (Auction \#) | VP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Van Cleeff, Jansma, Muller, De Boer (7) | 132 |
| 2 | Reisig, Shenkin, Courtney, Gill, Woolsey, Boyd (5) | 124 |
| 3 | M. Moss, Fallenius, Camberos, Lambardi (14) | 116 |
| 4 | Albert, Jacobus, Letizia, Stewart (22) | 115 |
| 5 | Johnson, Meckstroth, Rodwell, Martel (3) | 114 |
| 6 | Mahaffey, Soloway, Freed, Passell, Tudor, Seamon (15) | 114 |
| 7 | Onstott, Compton, Hayden, Erickson (20) | 105 |
| 8 | De Falco, Burgay, Pietri, Dimaio (9) | 104 |
| 9 | Milner, B. Levin, B. Moss, Gitelman, Weinstein (17) | 102 |
| 10 | Kasle, Steiner, Blanchard, Krekorian (12) | 90 |
| 11 | Glubok, Hallberg, Larsen, Erichsen (18) | 90 |
| 12 | Jacobs, Katz, Sontag, Weichsel, Lazard, Bramley (4) | 89 |
| 13 | Eisenberg, Friedman, L. Cohen, Melton (23) | 89 |
| 14 | Chemla, Mari, Abecassis, Quantin (1) | 88 |
| 15 | Mahmood, Gawrys, Lev, Rosenbloom, Polowan (2) | 88 |
| 16 | House (26) | 87 |
| 17 | Ozdil, Zaremba, Marston, Richman (8) | 85 |
| 18 | Whitman, Mittelman, Graves, Baze, Wold (10) | 85 |
| 19 | Ekeblad, Sutherlin, Hampson, Greco (13) | 82 |
| 20 | Elinescu, Lungu, Sawin, Pleakoff (19) | 77 |
| 21 | Deutsch, Wolff, Schapiro, Gordon (21) | 70 |
| 22 | Schwartz, Lair, Pollack, Casen (6) | 64 |
| 23 | Wildavsky, Beatty, Doub, Fleisher (25) | 62 |
| 24 | Wei-Sender, Chambers, J. Levin, Levitina (24) | 61 |
| 25 | Sosler, Schulle, Mohan, Bates, Berkowitz, B. Cohen (11) | 57 |
| 26 | Shugart, Robson, Smith, Cohen (16) | 50 |



