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# China rockets ahead in Women's France, Israel tops in Open 

## Open Olympiad

Defending champion France continued to steamroller the field in Group A, taking a I7-VP lead over runnerup Poland after 20 rounds. Yesterday they had three strong victories and one small loss - 14-16 to Germany. Poland had a big day, winning all four matches good for 74 VPs out of a possible 100.

Indonesia, winning two matches late in the day after losing two earlier, were third, followed by surprising Spain, which won three out of four. Denmark had a huge day - 93 out of a possible 100 - to move into contention, only 2 VPs behind the magic fourth position.

In Group B, Israel did not have a stellar day, but their blitz, two small wins and tiny loss were enough to keep them atop the standings. Italy had the same kind of day and wound up just 2.5 VPs behind. Chinese Taipei won two and lost two, but they are in third place, mostly because no other top team had a very good day. Iceland, in fourth place, did a little better than the others with 78 of a possible 100 VPs. Great Britain had a strong day - 92 of a possible 100 - to shoot into fifth place.

Two of the pre-tournament favorites are not among the leaders, and one - the United States appear to have little chance of overtaking the leaders. Norway are still in good position in sixth place, only half a match out of fourth. But the Americans are standing I2th, almost two full matches behind fourth place. If the Americans fail to qualify, we believe it will be the first time the U.S. have failed to reach the knockout phase.

## Women's Olympiad

China scored 66 out of a possible 75 VPs to rocket into first place in Group A after 13 rounds. One of the matches was against South Africa, and China's 18 -12 victory prevented the South Africans from taking over the lead. South Africa is tied for second with Germany, winner of the Venice Cup in China last year. Germany racked up three more victories - they have lost only once, and that was a 16-14 affair. China actually have lost two matches and tied one, but seven of their victories have been in the 20+ VP range.

Sweden had a rough day, losing to the Netherlands and Great Britain, and fell into a tie for fourth with Great Britain. The Netherlands are still very much in the chase, four points back.

In Group B, Israel had a relatively poor day, losing to Poland and just barely topping Chinese Taipei, but that was good enough to hold onto first place by 3 VP over the United States. The Americans had a super day, scoring 70 of a possible 75 VPs , to pull 9 points clear of third-place Austria. Canada won all three matches yesterday to take fourth place. France and Poland are close behind.

## General observations

Palestine came close to winning its first match - they tied Japan in Round 18. That was their second tie, but the Palestinians are not satisfied with ties - they want a victory.

It seems strange that last year's Bermuda Bowl finalists are both having such a difficult time in the round-robin. As mentioned above, the United States are I2th in their group, and Canada are IIth in theirs.

Czech Republic accomplished an unusual feat yesterday. They bid a grand slam off the ace of trumps - and gained 3 IMPs on the deal!

## RRAN NTRMEG

|  | PPEN OPEN PEN OPEN O |  |  | OPEN OPEN OPEN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  |  | B |  |
| I | FRANCE | 410 | 1 ISRAEL | 398 |
| 2 | POLAND | 393 | 2 Italy | 396 |
| 3 | INDONESIA | 378 | 3 CHINESE TAIPEI | l 383 |
| 4 | SPAIN | 375 | 4 ICELAND | 381 |
| 5 | DENMARK | 373 | 5 GREAT BRITAIN | 369 |
| 6 | PAKIITAN | 365 | 6 NORWAY | 368 |
|  | JaPAN | 359 | 7 RUSSIA | 367 |
| 8 | SOUTH AFRICA | 358 | 8 AUSTRALIA | 358 |
| 9 | NEW ZEALAND | 358 | 9 NETHERLANDS | 345 |
| 10 | SWEDEN | 332 | 10 INDIA | 343 |
| 11 | CANADA | 330 | II BRAZLL | 341 |
| 12 | ARGENTINA | 319 | 12 USA | 335 |
| 13 | AUSTRIA | 318 | 13 YUGOSLAVIA | 327 |
| 14 | CROATIA | 316 | 14 TURKEY | 325 |
| 15 | IRELAND | 315 | 15 FINLAND | 319 |
| 16 | BELGIUM | 312 | 16 PORTUGAL | 313 |
| 17 | CHILE | 311 | 17 HUNGARY | 303 |
| 18 | CHINA | 298 | 18 HONGKONG | 295 |
| 19 | CZECH Republic | C 295 | 19 Greece | 295 |
| 20 | MOROCCO | 290 | 20 Slovenia | 294 |
| 21 | LITHUANIA | 289 | 21 ESTONIA | 291 |
| 22 | ROMANIA | 287 | 22 MONACO | 285 |
| 23 | UKRAINE | 280 | 23 SWITZERLAND | 284 |
| 24 | SAN MARINO | 272 | 24 LaTVIA | 281 |
| 25 | GERMANY | 267 | 25 GUADELOUPE | 273 |
| 26 | lebanon | 266 | 26 EGYPT | 265 |
| 27 | BANGLADESH | 264 | 27 venezuela | 261 |
| 28 | PHILIPPINES | 261 | 28 MAURITIUS | 226 |
| 29 | SINGAPORE | 249 | 29 THAILAND | 223 |
| 30 | luxembourg | 248 | 30 MEXICO | 219 |
| 31 | COLOMBIA | 228 | 31 JORDAN | 218 |
| 32 | LIECHTENSTEIN | 222 | 32 FRENCHPOLYNES | 213 |
| 33 | MALAYSIA | 202 | 33 TUNSIA | 213 |
| 34 | BERMUDA | 176 | 34 BULGARIA | 213 |
| 35 | PALESTINE | 92 | 35 CYPRUS | 174 |
|  |  |  | 36 KENYA | 161 |


| Round 17 |  |  |  | Round 18 |  |  |  | Round 19 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| POLAND | CZECH REPUBLIC | 18.12 | 48/35 | NEW ZEALAND | POLAND | 11.19 | $18 / 37$ | POLAND | BELGIUM | 25-3 | 55// |
| NEW ZEALAND | PHILIPPINES | $5-25$ | 23/67 | PAKISTAN | SOUTH AFRICA | 23-7 | 45/12 | SINGAPORE | NEW ZEALAND | 4.25 | 15/65 |
| CROATIA | GERMANY | 22-8 | 64/33 | DENMARK | CHINA | 22-8 | 52/23 | CZECH REPUBLIC | CROATIA | $10-20$ | $14 / 34$ |
| MALAYSIA | CHILE | 0.25 | 2179 | SWEDEN | COLOMBIA | 25-3 | 57/0 | CHILE | PHILIPPINES | 17.13 | 24/16 |
| FRANCE | PALESTINE | 25-4 | 59/12 | BERMUDA | LEBANON | 17.13 | 20/10 | GERMANY | FRANCE | 16.14 | 45/41 |
| ROMANIA | UKRAINE | 21.9 | 61/36 | INDONESIA | ARGENTINA | 14.12 | $38 / 23$ | MALAYSIA | UKRAINE | 16.14 | 35/30 |
| LIECHTENSTEIN | CANADA | 12.18 | 23/37 | LUXEMBOURG | IRELAND | 7.23 | 6141 | PALESTINE | LIECHTENSTEIN | $5-25$ | $28 / 74$ |
| SAN MARINO | JAPAN | 13.17 | $39 / 48$ | BANGLADESH | LITHUANIA | 15-15 | $26 / 26$ | JAPAN | ROMANIA | 15-15 | 47/48 |
| BANGLADESH | SPAIN | 11.19 | 15/32 | MOROCCO | SAN MARINO | 13.17 | $24 / 32$ | SPAIN | CANADA | 12.18 | 36/51 |
| LUXEMBOURG | AUSTRIA | 2-25 | 15/78 | CANADA | AUSTRIA | $10-20$ | $8 / 29$ | AUSTRIA | SAN MARINO | 16.14 | 33/26 |
| MOROCCO | ARGENTINA | 13.17 | 15/25 | SPAIN | ROMANIA | 24.6 | 51/14 | MOROCCO | BANGLADESH | 16.14 | 53/48 |
| LITHUANIA | BERMUDA | 25-5 | $70 / 28$ | PALESTINE | JAPAN | 15-15 | $30 / 28$ | LITHUANIA | LUXEMBOURG | $10-20$ | 30/53 |
| IRELAND | SWEDEN | 15-15 | $44 / 44$ | LIECHTENSTEIN | MALAYSIA | 21.9 | 40/15 | ARGENTINA | IRELAND | 19-11 | 43/25 |
| DENMARK | INDONESIA | 22-8 | 56/25 | UKRAINE | GERMANY | 22-8 | 42/12 | INDONESIA | BERMUDA | 25-0 | 95/5 |
| LEBANON | PAKISTAN | $8-22$ | 30160 | PHILIPPINES | FRANCE | 3.25 | 11/65 | LEBANON | SWEDEN | 4.25 | 13/62 |
| SINGAPORE | BELGIUM | 14.16 | 43/49 | CZECH REPUBLIC | CHILE | 12.18 | $26 / 39$ | COLOMBIA | DENMARK | 2-25 | 15/74 |
| CHINA | SOUTH AFRICA | 15-15 | 31/33 | CROATIA | SINGAPORE | 14.16 | $29 / 33$ | CHINA | PAKISTAN | 17-13 | 48/38 |
| COLOMBIA | Bye | 18 |  | BELGIUM | Bye | 18 |  | SOUTH AFRICA | Bye | 18 |  |
| TUNISIA | ICELAND | $5-25$ | $24 / 66$ | CHINESETAIPEI | FINLAND | 14.16 | $26 / 29$ | FINLAND | EGYPT | 11.19 | 37/56 |
| FINLAND | HUNGARY | $10-20$ | 27/48 | MONACO | GREAT BRITAIN | 11.19 | $9 / 28$ | MAURITIUS | CHINESETAIPEI | $8-22$ | 11/42 |
| CHINESE TAIPEI | INDIA | 23-7 | 45/13 | AUSTRALIA | GUADELOUPE | 24.6 | 4818 | HUNGARY | GREECE | 9.21 | $29 / 54$ |
| GREECE | KENYA | 25-1 | 7717 | VENEZUELA | ICELAND | 9.21 | 9/36 | ISRAEL | INDIA | 17-13 | 43/33 |
| NORWAY | ISRAEL | $16-14$ | 41/38 | THAILAND | PORTUGAL | 12.18 | 10/24 | KENYA | NETHERLANDS | $6-24$ | 27/65 |
| NETHERLANDS | SWITZERLAND | 14.16 | 21/28 | ITALY | BRAZIL | 19.11 | 30/13 | NORWAY | BULGARIA | 25-4 | $59 / 8$ |
| FRENCH POLYNES. | BULGARIA | $13-17$ | 36147 | RUSSIA | HONG KONG | $16-14$ | 20/17 | SWITZERLAND | MEXICO | 22-8 | 44/13 |
| MEXICO | SLOVENIA | 9-21 | $22 / 46$ | ESTONIA | CYPRUS | 24-6 | 61/21 | LATVIA | FRENCH POLYNES | .13-17 | 26/36 |
| TURKEY | LATVIA | 11.19 | $19 / 36$ | USA | TURKEY | 21.9 | 44/17 | YUGOSLAVIA | SLOVENIA | 22-8 | 61/31 |
| ESTONIA | YUGOSLAVIA | 17-13 | 35/24 | SLOVENIA | JORDAN | 25.4 | 50/I | JORDAN | TURKEY | 22-8 | 62/31 |
| RUSSIA | JORDAN | 23-7 | 58/26 | YUGOSLAVIA | FRENCH POLYNES | .17-13 | 49141 | USA | ESTONIA | 23.7 | 57/23 |
| USA | BRAZIL | $8-22$ | 11/40 | SWITZERLAND | LATVIA | 12.18 | 21/34 | CYPRUS | RUSSIA | 14.16 | 45/50 |
| CYPRUS | THAILAND | $9-21$ | 21/47 | MEXICO | NORWAY | 14.16 | 30/34 | BRAZIL | HONG KONG | 18.12 | 45/31 |
| HONG KONG | VENEZUELA | 20-10 | 45/24 | BULGARIA | KENYA | 21.9 | 36/II | ITALY | THAlLAND | 19-11 | 53/34 |
| AUSTRALIA | ITALY | 16.14 | $28 / 23$ | INDIA | NETHERLANDS | 12.18 | 22/35 | PORTUGAL | VENEZUELA | 24-6 | 55/18 |
| PORTUGAL | MONACO | 21.9 | 38/13 | HUNGARY | ISRAEL | 11.19 | $20 / 39$ | ICELAND | AUSTRALIA | 13.17 | 18/28 |
| MAURITIUS | EGYPT | 18-12 | 40/28 | GREECE | MAURITIUS | 13.17 | 27/36 | GUADELOUPE | MONACO | 17-13 | 33/23 |
| GUADELOUPE | GREAT BRITAIN | $8-22$ | 41/69 | EGYPT | TUNISIA | 17-13 | 38/28 | GREAT BRITAIN | TUNISIA | 23-7 | 52/16 |


| LADIES LAD <br> LADIES LAD <br> LADIES LAD <br> LADIES LAD |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | B |  |
| 1 CHINA | 247 | I ISRAEL | 256 |
| 2 GERMANY | NY 243 | 2 USA | 253 |
| 3 SOUTH AFRICA | AFRICA243 | 3 AUSTRIA | A 244 |
| 4 GREAT BRITAIN | RITAIN234 | 4 CANADA | A 236 |
| 5 SWEDEN | 234 | 5 FRANCE | 227 |
| 6 NETHERLANDS | ANDS 230 | 6 POLAND | 226 |
| 7 BRAZIL | 224 | 7 ITALY | 213 |
| 8 MEXICO | 220 | 8 INDIA | 213 |
| 9 DENMARK | K 215 | 9 BELGIUM | 199 |
| 10 SPAIN | 212 | 10 FINLAND | 193 |
| IINEW ZEALAND | AND 201 | II ARGENTINA | INA 188 |
| 12 HUNGARY | RY 196 | 12 JAPAN | 180 |
| 13 GREECE | 182 | 13 AUSTRALIA | $1 \mathrm{~A} \quad 179$ |
| 14 RUSSIA | 179 | 14 THAILAND | I 177 |
| 15 SAN MARINO | RINO 177 | 15 TURKEY | 175 |
| 16 MONACO | O 172 | 16 COLOMBIA | IA 168 |
| 17 MOROCCO | CO 170 | 17 CHINESE TAIP | TAIPEI 167 |
| 18 INDONESIA | SIA 166 | 18 CROATIA | 162 |
| 19 HONG KONG | KONG 143 | 19 JORDAN | 154 |
| 20 PHILIPPINES | NES 124 | 20 MALAYSIA | A 143 |
| 21 VENEZUELA | ELA 122 | 21 JAMAICA | 137 |
| 22 PAKIITAN | N 113 |  |  |



## APPEAL

# GASES SEVEN - EIGHT - NINE 

By Rich Colker \& Tommy Sandsmark

## 7 Olympiad Open Teams.

Round Ten. Kenya versus USA.
Board 26. Game All. Dealer East.

## Sharma

K Q 876
ค 10873
$\diamond$ Q J


The auction was immaterial; South declared 6e

## Facts:

West led the 23 against South's 60 contract, $6,7,8$. South then played the A and exited a club to East's king. East returned a diamond to South's ace and declarer ran his remaining trumps. On the last trump West, who was guard squeezed, had to save his $\diamond K$ and pitched the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$. Declarer then pitched dummy's $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$, coming down to $\$ \mathrm{KQ} 87$ © 10 in dummy and the five major suit cards in his hand; West held $9543 \Delta K$, while East kept $\mathbf{~} / 2$ KK92. At trick nine declarer cashed the A, played the 10 to the king in dummy, and cashed the $\uparrow$ Q. With two cards left and the lead in dummy declarer then said, "Spade." As dummy touched the $\$ 8$ declarer said, "No, a heart." At that point the Director was called to the table. South claimed that he had corrected his inadvertent call of a spade in the same breath, while West claimed that there had been a definite break before the heart call was made. The Director ruled that the $\$ 8$ had been played, and the board was scored as 6\% down two (West taking the last two tricks with the Q9 and $\diamond K$ ), minus 200 for $N / S$.

## The Appeal:

N/S appealed the Director's ruling, reaffirming in the hearing that declarer had corrected his call "in the same breath," before East had played a card to the trick. South stated that his spade utterance had been a slip of the tongue rather than a change of mind caused by his calls for spades on the previous three tricks. E/W testified that declarer's call was not changed in the same breath, and that East's card was played so that South could have seen it even if he didn't actually see it because of the screen.

## The Committee's Decision:

The committee decided that, since dummy had actually begun to play the $\$ 8$, the delay between declarer's original call and his correction must have been significant, and therefore the correction could have constituted a change of mind. The score was adjusted for both pairs to minus 200 for $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$, as the Director had originally ruled at the table.

## Committee:

Steen Moeller, chairman; Mazhar Jafri, Pakistan; and Jean-Claude Beineix, France.

## : Olympiad Women's Teams.

Round Six.
The Committee: Bobby Wolff, USA (chairman); Barbara Nudelman, USA; Virgil Anderson, USA; Dan Morse, USA; Joan Gerard, USA; Steen Moeller, Denmark, and Tommy Sandsmark, Norway (Scribe)

Board 30. Love All. Dealer East.

(1) Multi
${ }^{(2)} 14+\mathrm{HCP}$, says nothing about distribution
${ }^{\text {(3) }}$ To correct
${ }^{(4)}$ Alerted by South: "Asking for a spade stopper." North did not Alert 3 a

5 doubled made 11 tricks $=550 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{S}$.

## TD's statement of facts:

TD was called to the table at the end of play, East complaining that she had led the $\vee \mathrm{A}$, allowing the contract to make, because North failed to Alert 3s (= natural bid).

## TD's ruling:

The TD let the score stand. E/W appealed.

## The parties involved:

East claimed that if she had had the same information as her partner, that 3s asked for a spade stopper, she might have led something else, but when questioned by the Committee, she didn't know exactly what. She felt she had been damaged by the wrong explanation. South believed that 31 would ask for a stopper, since this might be the opponents' suit. North, on the other hand, maintained that they had no special agreement, and that they had never discussed this sequence.

## The Committee:

The Committee found nothing wrong in North's explanation to East, and believed that N/S had no prior agreement as to this sequence. North had taken the consequence of her non-Alert and raised 3s to 4s. Thus, East had no real case. The Committee would like to state that even if there are different explanations on both sides of the screen, this does not automatically give you the right to an adjusted score when you make an unfortunate lead.

## The final result:

The Committee upheld TD's decision: 5 x making $550 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{S}$.The deposit was returned with two votes against.

## Olympiad Open Teams.

 Round Seven.The Committee:Bobby Wolff, USA (chairman); Barbara Nudelman, USA; Virgil Anderson, USA; Joan Gerard, USA; Ernesto d'Orsi, Brazil; Mazhar Jafri, Pak istan; Naki Bruni, Italy; Nissan Rand, Israel, and Tommy Sandsmark, Norway (Scribe)

Board 15. North/South Game. Dealer South.


$$
\text { 64 made } 12 \text { tricks }=1430 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{S} \text {. }
$$

TD's statement of facts: TD was called to the table because South stated that he had made the inadvertent bid of 5 and then changed it to 64. TD found the change in order, according to Laws 25 A and 15.2 in the General Conditions of Contest (Screen Procedure). At the end of the hand, TD was recalled to the table, West stating that he had passed and asked South what the meaning of $5 \%$ was, and got the reply " 0 ", then changed it to "I out of 6 aces". South then changed his bid to 64. Due to language difficulties and differences of opinion, it was from then on impossible for the TD to establish the exact sequence of events.

TD's ruling: Due to the time elapsed before the change of call and the general confusion as to the sequence of events, TD reverted the contract to 5 , with 12 tricks $=680 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{S}$. N/S appealed.

The parties involved: E/W claimed that a long time had elapsed before the change of call was made. South maintained that he had meant to bid 6 all the time, and that he was very surprised when he suddenly saw only 5 on the bidding tray. When asked why he did not object to the TD's original ruling, West said that he was inexperienced. It was still impossible to establish the sequence of events.

The Committee: The Committee first looked into Laws 25 A and 15.2 in the General Conditions of Contest, and established that such a change as had occurred is permitted only if the call made was inadvertent. The Committee unanimously agreed that it was not an inadvertent call, but a change of mind. There was a time lapse here that was not acceptable as far as the Committee was concerned.

The final result: The Committee upheld TD's decision: 5 making $680 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{S}$.

As for E/W, the Committee discussed their score too. Had 61 gone off, the matter would never have reached the Committee, and the question is whether this gave E/W an undeserved double shot. Since TDs have not been instructed to ask E/W (in private) whether they wanted to defend against 5 or before the play started, $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ were regarded as innocent and the score, $680 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{S}$ would be the final score for both parties.

The deposit was returned.

## Belgian blitz

By Jan van Cleeff
Olivier Nève of Belgium displayed his skill on two 3NT contracts in his 16th-round match against Philippines in the Open series. His efforts had much to do with Belgium's $25-5$ blitz victory.

Board 27. Love All. Dealer South.

- KQ62
$\vee$ J 75
$\Delta A 4$
* K 652


West found the best lead - a small heart. East cashed his top hearts and continued the suit. South took the queen and noted that West followed with a suit preference 9. This card gave declarer a strong indication that West had the $\diamond K$. Nève therefore rejected the "normal" plan of playing the $\diamond A$ and a diamond. Instead he led a club to the king, finessed the $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and cashed the A. West discarded a spade and a diamond, but he couldn't avoid being endplayed by being thrown in with a spade to lead away from his $\diamond K$. That was a $10-$ IMP gain for Belgium because the Philippine declarer put his money on the diamonds.

Board 29. Game All. Dealer North.

|  | Q J 73 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | -K964 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 53$ |  |  |
|  | 2 KJ 102 |  |  |
| ¢ K 1084 | N |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ A 3 |  |  | 852 |
| $\checkmark$ J 1064 | S |  | 87 |
| 2 763 |  |  |  |
|  | - A Q 2 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q J 7 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ KQ 92 |  |  |
|  | \& A 98 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | Renard |  | Nève |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \%{ }^{(1)}$ |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

${ }^{(1)}$ For tactical reasons - not a Strong Club.
At both tables West led a small diamond. East took the ace and continued a diamond to the king. In the Closed Room declarer went on with the 8 Q, taken by West. Later, when declarer failed to find the Q , he went one off.

In the Open Room Olivier Nève tried a sneaky $\nabla \mathrm{J}$, which slipped through. He continued with a small heart since he noticed a slight hesitation by West on the previous trick. This maneuver guaranteed declarer three heart tricks and his contract - another 12 IMPs to Belgium.

## Bidding in the modern style

By Michael Rosenblum
The Round 13 match between Russia and Italy in the Open Series might well have been on vugraph had it not been for the WBF Congress which occupied the theatre. It is a pity because it meant that we missed the chance to watch the following board.

Board 9. East/West Game. Dealer North.

- AJ8432
$\bigcirc 43$
$\diamond 53$
\& 652

$2 \triangleleft$ was a multi and $3 \checkmark$ an imaginative effort - what you might call a 'brave extra modern bid'. $4 \Leftrightarrow$ and $4 \diamond$ were natural and $4 \oslash$ was obviously intended as forcing but taken as natural. East's final pass was because he preferred hearts to clubs. His partner didn't, and Duboin did well to escape for one down.

In the other room it went 24 , weak, and after two passes Tim Zlotov made another imaginative 'modern' bid of 3NT. Alexandre Petrounine raised straight to 6NT and it was not easy for North to find the old-fashioned lead of the A , so that was +1470 .

Of course, from time to time Russian players bid in a more scientific manner. Take this deal from the Round 16 match against Bulgaria.

Board 25. East/West Game. Dealer North.


Andrej Gromov passed as dealer and used Drury in response to Andrej Choudnev's $\$ \& opening. Choudnev bid $2 \rrbracket$, showing a minimum, but when Gromov raised that to $3 \checkmark$ he tried $3 N T$. Gromov was going to pass this beautiful contract with his 6-4 major suit fit and only 21 HCP but suddenly West doubled. Now Gromov became afraid of his minors and converted to $4 \bigcirc$, again doubled by West.

After a diamond lead, Choudnev won, drew two rounds of trumps and played a diamond back. The defense decided it was time to take their club tricks, playing three rounds, and that was just what Choudnev needed. He ruffed the third club and ran his trumps and West was squeezed in the black suits so the game was made.


Mexican Hat Dance
By Nissan Rand
Mexico v Israel. Round II. Open Series.
Board 8. Love All. Dealer West.

- AQJ984
$\bigcirc 103$
$\diamond$ Q 42
\& 46


The bidding was hotly contested in both rooms. North/South showed their strength in spades and diamonds while East/West showed theirs in hearts and clubs.

In the Closed Room, Barel/PerImutter, the Israeli North/South, managed to buy the final contract in 54 by North. East led the 84 and Mexico took the first two tricks but declarer had the rest; +450 to Israel.

In the Open Room, the Herbst brothers would not agree to let their opponents play 5 and bid on to 6\%, which would be only two down for -300 if doubled. But North/South continued to $6 \diamond$, East bid $6 \triangleleft$ and South 6 6 . When the merry-go-round continued to the seven level, North finally bought the contract in 74, undoubled!

East would have preferred to bid $8 \%$ rather than have to find an opening lead. He finally chose to lead a club, allowing declarer to make his grand slam.

## Israel $v$ Norway

Open Series (Round I7)

This was a set of boards that spawned slam swings. The first occurred on Board 3.

Board 3. East/West Game. Dealer South.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \& A Q 10762 \\ & >852 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark 94$ |  |  |
|  | 2 A 6 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& KJ } 983 \\ & \text { KJ } 10 \end{aligned}$ | N |  | - - |
|  | $w^{N}$ |  | 8 A 94 |
| $\diamond 5$ | W | E $\quad \diamond$ | $\begin{aligned} & \diamond K \text { Q } 102 \\ & \& Q J 10953 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2K 872 |  |  |  |
|  | - 54 |  |  |
|  | QQ 763 |  |  |
|  | $\triangleleft$ AJ8763 |  |  |
|  | 4 |  |  |
|  | North | East | South |
| I.Herbst | Helness | O.Herbst | Helgemo |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 23 | Dble |
| 3\% | Pass | 38 | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | 6\% | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |

Helness considered for a long time before doubling. His A didn't score, of course, but Ofir Herbst had two other aces to worry about. After ruffing the opening spade lead, he took his best shot - he led the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$. Helgemo thought for a few moments and then took his ace. Herbst still had to lose the ace of trumps for down one. At the other table Norway stopped in 3NT, just making, for a $13-1 \mathrm{MP}$ gain.

Israel got all but I IMP back on the very next deal.

| Board 4. Game All. Dealer West. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ J98763 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 5$ |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 43$ |  |  |  |
| - 984 |  |  |  |
| $\text { AQ } 1042$ | N | - 5 |  |
|  | W E |  | QJ 96 |
| $$ |  |  | K 52 |
|  | S |  |  |
|  | - K |  |  |
|  | 810743 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q J 10 |  |  |
|  | \& Q 10632 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| 1.Herbst | Helness | O.Herbst | Helgemo |
| Pass | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| $4 \checkmark$ | Pass | 5\% | Pass |
| 6 | All Pass |  |  |

Two key bids enabled the Herbst brothers to get to slam. First llan raised to $4 \diamond$ instead of bidding $3 N$ T.Then Ofir indicated slam interest with his $5 \%$ bid. llan upped the value of his $\mathbf{~ K}$ as a result and jumped to the slam. The opening club lead actually gave declarer a losing option. He could have arranged to pitch a heart on the third club and then take a ruffing finesse against the $\oslash \mathrm{K}$. But he wasn't even tempted. After winning the $\mathcal{s}$, he cross to the K and finessed in hearts. He led a spade to dummy and led another heart - and up popped the king. The slam was home when trumps split 3-2. Since Norway stopped in 3NT at the other table, that was 12 IMPs to Israel.

The action during this part of the match was nonstop. Look at the bizarre happenings on the very next deal.


Geir Helgemo, Norway
Board 5. North/South Game. Dealer North.

|  | - 10852 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 98 |  |  |
|  | \& K 984 |  |  |
| @ J 74 | N |  | - 9 |
| $\bigcirc 7$ |  |  | - A 983 |
| $\diamond 11053$ |  | $\mathbf{S}$ |  | 762 |
| \& 47632 |  |  |  | J 105 |
|  | (AKQ6 3 |  |  |
|  | ¢ K Q 6542 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 4 |  |  |
|  | 2- |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | Pass | Pass | 2\% |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 24 |
| Pass | 34 | Dble !! | $4 \checkmark$ |
| 4NT | Dble | Pass | Pass |
| 5\% | Dble | All Pass |  |

At the other table there was a straightforward auction to 44, making five for Israel. But here Ofir got somewhat frisky with his double that forced his side to the four level. Helgemo's $4 \checkmark$ bid took the Israelis off the hook for the moment, but who can blame llan for continuing on to 4 NT , a bid that asked his partner to bid a minor? He knew the fit had to be good. But Helness doubled, and Ofir let llan decide which minor to play in. He chose clubs, and Helness doubled this as well.

The opening lead of the $\oslash$ Jent to the ace, and llan led a spade to Helgemo's queen. Helgemo underled his heart honors, forcing declarer to ruff, and llan ducked a diamond to the 8 . He ruffed the spade return and led the Q Q. It was a bit of a shock to see South show out, and Helness won the king. He got out with a trump to the 10 , and llan lost control of the hand completely when he led the $\triangleleft K$. Helgemo took the ace and led a high heart. This forced declarer to ruff, but Helness overruffed. He got out with his trump and still had the $\diamond$ Q with which to regain the lead and take the rest of the tricks. Down six! That's 1400 - worth 13 IMPs to Norway.

Strangely enough the next deal was a push in this match - but major swings were taking place all over the Rhodes Palace.

Three boards later Israel got to a game with only 20 HCP for a 6-IMP swing that tied the match.

Board 8. Love All. Dealer West.

|  | - 10754 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 974$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 2$ |  |
|  | \& Q J 76 |  |
| - Q 2 | N | - KJ 83 |
| - 532 | $w^{N}$ | Q J 6 |
| $\checkmark$ A9643 | W E | $\diamond$ KQJ 85 |
| ¢ 985 | S | \& K 2 |
|  | - A 96 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 108 |  |
|  | $\diamond 107$ |  |
|  | \& A 1043 |  |


| West | North | East <br> Brogela | South <br> Perlmutter |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Saelensminde | Barel |  |  |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Dble |
| $\mathbf{2} \diamond$ | Dble | $\mathbf{3} \diamond$ | Pass |
| Pass | $3 \vee$ | Pass | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

East/West did the best they could to muddy the picture, but North/South found their heart fit, and Barel liked his hand enough to bid game when partner was able to bid at the three level. With trumps breaking and the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ onside, Perlmutter had no trouble taking 10 tricks, losing just two spades and a diamond.

At the other table Helness opened $2 \triangleleft$ as North, showing a weak hand with the majors. They stopped in two, then went on to three when Ofir Herbst balanced with $3 \diamond$.The score at this point was 26-26.

Although Board 9 was a push, it definitely had points of interest.

Board 9. East/West Game. Dealer North.

- K 54

๑K 109873
$\diamond K$
\& A 5
$\otimes 108$
$\nabla J 52$
$\diamond J 8532$
$\& 1043$

© J 7
$\checkmark$ A Q
$\diamond A$ Q 10764
*K96

- AQ9632
$\bigcirc 64$
$\diamond 9$
- QJ 87

Against the killing lead is a club, setting up the king to go with the three defensive red winners. Brogela actually did lead the 3 , but Saelensminde failed to take his $\forall A$ after winning the $\$ K$. Instead he led a trump. Declarer won this, drew trumps and then pitched his losing diamond on a good club. At the other table the defense never had a chance after West led a diamond. Ofir Herbst switched to clubs, hoping his partner had at least the jack - but no such luck.

This same board was the beginning of the end for the United States in their match against Brazil. Marcelo Branco led a club as West, and Mauricio Figueiredo cashed his top diamond after winning the 2 K . That guaranteed the defeat of the contract for a IO-IMP gain for Brazil inasmuch as the American failed to find the killing club lead.

Board IO. Game All. Dealer East.

|  | Q A J |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 102$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 9842$ |  |
|  | 2K K 962 |  |
| ¢ Q 42 | N | ¢ K 8753 |
| -AK97643 |  | $\bigcirc$ Q |
| $\diamond 3$ | W E | $\checkmark$ AKQJ 6 |
| * Q 7 | S | * AJ |
|  | -1096 |  |
|  | ¢ J 85 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 1075$ |  |
|  | \% 10543 |  |

There were all kinds of results on this one. The most amazing was the 5-IMP gain registered by the Czech Republic against Poland. Would you ever expect to GAIN 5 IMPs when you bid a grand slam off the ace of trumps? Never, you say? Well, it happened! Sure, the Czech Republic went down a trick. But Poland failed by three tricks at 6 NT , and 200 points equals 5 IMPs, does it not?

This also was the deal that sealed the fate of the Americans against Brazil. The United States got to the spade slam and went down when declarer failed to guess the spades correctly and lost two trump tricks. But Brazil was in 6NT. The declarer found the key play of the $\boldsymbol{Q} \mathrm{K}$ and a small spade after cashing the 8 Q . That set up an entry to the hearts via the $\lfloor Q$ - making six.

In the match we were watching, Norway got all the way to 6s and failed when declarer misguessed the spades. At the other table Israel stopped dead in 5 , just making. But that was good for a I3-IMP pickup, putting Israel ahead by 13 .

But Norway scored the last swing.
Board 16. East/West Game. Dealer West.

|  | - J |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PJ109 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ QJIO 985 |  |  |
|  | \& A 2 |  |  |
| - A 10986 | $\mathbf{N}$ |  | Q 7532 |
| $\bigcirc 7$ |  | Q Q 842 |  |
| $\diamond$ K 4 |  | E $\diamond$ |  |
| \% KJ843 |  | $\text { Q Q } 6$ |  |
|  | ¢ 4 |  |  |
|  | PAK653 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 763 |  |  |
|  | * 1097 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| I.Herbst | Helness | O.Herbst | Helgemo |
| 14 | $2 \diamond$ | 3 | $3 \bigcirc$ |
| 49 | 4NT | Pass | $5 \diamond$ |
| Dble | Pass | 54 | All Pass |

$5 \diamond$ no doubt would have been set, and in the opinion of the vugraph commentators Ofir should have let the opponents try to make it. In 5t declarer had to lose three aces for down one. Norway bought the hand for game in the other room for a 12-IMP gain and a 16-14 victory.


## Smoking regulations

Only the players are permitted to smoke in the playing rooms.

Players may ask their opponent(s) to refrain from smoking. Whenever possible smokers should refrain from smoking when so asked.

Kojak

## Spain v Sweden

Open Series (Round 16)
By Barry Rigal
Two excellently played notrump games highlighted this match, which was won by Sweden.

Board 27. Love All. Dealer South

- K Q 62
$\vee$ J 75
$\diamond$ A 4
- K 652
- 」 9754
$\bigcirc 9642$
$\diamond$ KJ 8
2 8

| N | - 103 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AK 8 |
| W E | $\checkmark 1065$ |
| S | \& Q 10743 |
| - A 8 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 103 |  |
| $\diamond$ Q 9732 |  |
| \& AJ9 |  |

Luis Lanteron declared 3NT from the South hand. The defense led three rounds of hearts. Declarer won and played a spade to dummy, finessed in clubs, unblocked the A and cashed the A and K. West was strip-squeezed - he could part with one diamond and one spade, but he got endplayed with the fourth spade to lead a diamond into the tenace at trick 12.

Claudio Capone played 3NT, and East shifted to a diamond $-6,7,8$, ace - after taking one high heart. The club finesse held, and Claudio played the $\vee$ Q, sure that East would win and press on in diamonds. The $\diamond 10$ was covered by the queen and king, and West went back to hearts.

When the jack won in dummy, Claudio called for the 2 K and played a club to his ace. West was squeezed out of either his winning heart, one of his four spades or the $\diamond$ J. When he pitched his diamond, hoping East would have the 9 , declarer actually had an overtrick!

With two boards to go in the match the score was virtually level, but Sweden picked up two game swings. The first came when they played a 5-3 fit instead of a 44. When the side suits did not split, the $4-4$ fit would have been fatally gored.

Board 32. East/West Game. Dealer West.

|  | $\text { J } 1083$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 108 |  |
|  | \& Q 73 |  |
| ¢ ${ }^{\text {AK }} 6$ | N | - Q 952 |
| $\bigcirc$ AK 1074 | N | $\bigcirc{ }^{\text {J }} 3$ |
| $\checkmark 94$ | W E | $\checkmark$ A Q J 7 |
| -954 | S | 21086 |
|  | - 74 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 952$ |  |
|  | $\triangleleft 6532$ |  |
|  | \% AKJ2 |  |

This was the last hand. In the Open Room an ambitious 4s went one down. In the Closed Room this was the auction:

## 1 $\vee$ - is (relay)

INT (balanced minimum) - $2 \diamond$
2NT (maximum) - 3NT
Federico Goded led a fatal M. Magnus Lindqvist took all the spades with the aid of a finesse, then led the QJ from dummy. When South played low he went up with the ace and finessed diamonds twice for his contract.

## A Routine Game

By Mark Horton

When you consider the result at your table to be routine you are always pleasantly surprised to pick up points.

When Germany were scoring at the end of their Round II encounter with Russia, Sabine Auken announced her result on Board 4, "Plus 650".
"Plus 620," replied Anne Gladiator.
Assuming her teammates had entered their result on the wrong side of the card, Sabine enquired further,
"Surely you mean minus 620?"
"No, we made four hearts."
This was the deal in question:

Board 4. Game All. Dealer West.

- K 63

8 A92
$\diamond 103$

* A 10973

$$
Q 102
$$

$\vee K J$
$\diamond K$ QJ 5
$\leqslant 1864$

| N | - 8 |
| :---: | :---: |
| W E | $\bigcirc$ Q 1087643 |
| $W^{\text {c }}$ | $\diamond$ A 942 |
| S | \& 5 |

- AJ 9754
$\bigcirc 5$
$\diamond 876$
\& K Q 2
Open Room

| West | North | East <br> Aanina | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | 14 |
| Kasennikova | von Arnim |  |  |

All Pass
The Polish Club auction gave Daniela von Arnim an easy route into the action.

West led the 9 K and Dani won and tested the spades. When East showed out on the second round she turned her attention to clubs. The position in that suit meant she emerged with an overtrick.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gladiator | Maitova | Schreckenberger | Ponomareva |
| INT | Pass | $4 \curvearrowright$ | All Pass |

A triumph for the weak notrump!
The swing to Germany was 15 IMPs.
It was pretty tough for South to bid 44, but as somebody once said, "No pain, no gain". You don't win at this level without taking risks.


# Great Britain $v$ Denmark 

Ladies Series (Round 8)

By Tony Gordon

Both teams needed to score well in this match, Denmark to maintain their high position, and Great Britain to continue their climb up the table. In the event, poor defence by the Danish pair in the Open Room swung the match in Great Britain's favour. Here are the more interesting hands.

Board 23. Game All. Dealer South.

|  | - 72 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AKQ 3 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 1095 |  |
|  | \& AJ 4 |  |
| ¢ A 98 | N | ¢ Q 10653 |
| -J954 |  | $\bigcirc 1086$ |
| $\diamond$ J |  | $\checkmark 83$ |
| 287653 | S | ¢ K 92 |
|  | - KJ 4 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 72$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K Q 7642 |  |
|  | \& Q 10 |  |

Both teams reached 6$\rangle$ by South. On a red suit lead declarer's best chance seems to be to draw trumps and then lead the Q . If West fails to cover, declarer should apply Zia's Bols tip and rise with the ace on the assumption that West does not hold the king. After a club discard on the third heart, a spade to the jack, on the basis that the opening lead suggests that West holds the $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$, will then bring home the contract. Unfortunately, the \& A was led at both tables so neither declarer was tested.

In another match, West apparently hesitated before playing low on the Q , but a potentially explosive situation was diffused when declarer nonetheless rose with the A and then correctly guessed spades.

Board 28. North/South Vul. Dealer West.

| ¢ 73 | N | - J 52 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| QJ10953 | $w^{N}$ | $\bigcirc$ A 82 |
| $\checkmark$ KJ9654 | W E | $\diamond 1032$ |
| 2- | S | ¢ K 543 |
|  | -1086 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 87 |  |
|  | * QJ9762 |  |



Pat Davies, Great Britain

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Farholt | Smith | Bondo | Davies |
| Pass | $2 \uparrow$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| $3 \diamond$ | 3 | Pass | $4 \Phi$ |

In the Open Room, Ette Bondo led the $\diamond 2$ against Nicola Smith's contract of 44. Smith played a heart at trick two and Bondo rose with her ace and played a second diamond. Smith ruffed, ruffed a heart in dummy and crossed to hand with a top trump. When the did not appear, she then ruffed another heart. This was the ending:

|  | - K Q 9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K}$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ - |  |
|  | * A 108 |  |
| - 7 | N | ¢ J 5 |
| Q J 10 | $W^{N}$ | $\bigcirc$ - |
| $\diamond$ K 965 | W E | $\diamond 3$ |
| - - | S | d K 543 |
|  | Q - |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ - |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q |  |
|  | * QJ9 76 |  |

Smith now played the Q from dummy, intending to play the A even if West did not cover; however, she quickly changed her mind when Farholt ruffed! Farholt now gave Bondo a heart ruff, but Bondo surprisingly exited with a club to let the apparently beaten contract make after all.

Clearly if Smith had ruffed a diamond and drawn trumps instead, she would have emerged with an overtrick, and analysis suggests that this is the superior line, especially if one concludes that West's failure to open with a diamond pre-empt marks her with a secondary heart suit.

Events in the other room resulted in an appeal.
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dhondy | Kalkerup | McGowan | Skaanning-Norris |

Heather Dhondy had alerted her 2 bid and explained to Lotte Skaanning-Norris that it showed hearts and a minor. Liz McGowan had not alerted the 2. bid and when Bettina Kalkerup enquired she said that there was no specific agreement but it may be showing the minors. 3NT went one down and North/South called the director and claimed they had been damaged. Their contention was that if they had been given the correct information they would have played in 4 S instead of 3 NT .

However, the director thought that South could have bid 4s in any case and he let the result stand. North/South then appealed.

Full details of the appeal will be found in the report on Appeal Case 16 in a later Daily News, but my understanding is that although the committee agreed that North/South had been damaged, it decided that North would only make 4 $75 \%$ of the time. Consequently the North/South score was changed from - 100 to +470 and Great Britain's gain was reduced from 12 IMPs to 4 IMPs.

Board 33. Love All. Dealer North.

|  | - AJ 85 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 842 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 963$ |  |
|  | * A 6 |  |
| - K 9643 | N | - 10 |
| $\bigcirc 1063$ |  | $\bigcirc$ K Q 9 |
| $\diamond$ A 54 | W E | $\diamond$ QJ 108 |
| \& 54 | S | \& K 9732 |
|  | - Q 72 |  |
|  | - J 75 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 72 |  |
|  | * QJ 108 |  |

North/South played in INT in both rooms. In the Closed Room, Kalkerup was declarer as North and had no real chance after a club lead.

In the Open Room, Pat Davies was declarer as South and had every chance after a spade lead. Davies won the $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$ and then successfully finessed the $\$ 8$ as Bondo discarded a club. A low heart was now won by Bondo's $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ and she switched inevitably to a diamond. Davies ducked the first diamond but covered the second. Farholt won her $\diamond A$ and switched to a heart, but this enabled Davies to enter her hand with the $\vee \mathrm{J}$ and take the spade finesse for her contract. But suppose Farholt had switched to a club instead - would Davies have found the winning play of rising with the and playing another club to endplay East? I think the correct play can be deduced. If East holds 5 diamonds and the \$K, declarer cannot succeed and if East holds 5 diamonds but no K, then West would have played a heart instead of a club.

So declarer must assume that East has only 4 diamonds. In this case, if West held the K , she would surely play her third diamond so that clubs can be played by her partner. Ergo, East must hold the KK and declarer should not finesse.

## Board 35. E/W Vul. Dealer South.

|  | -102 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 810963 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 108$ |  |
|  | \& Q 10753 |  |
| - AK8 | N | - 94 |
| QJ742 | $\mathrm{w}^{\text {N }}$ | $\bigcirc$ K 85 |
| $\diamond$ J9543 | W E | $\checkmark$ AK 6 |
| -9 | S | 2 AKJ 64 |
|  | - QJ7653 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 72 |  |
|  | 82 |  |

After the auction begins 14-Pass - Pass - Dble - Pass, what should West bid? Applying the principle of 'subtracting a king' when responding to a protective double makes the hand worth only a simple response, but both Dhondy and Farholt viewed to bid $3 \nabla$. Both McGowan and Bondo now decided to raise to 48 and this ugly contract was deservedly defeated. It is easy to say that East should bid 34 and then pass a response of 3 NT , but if West held 5 hearts and a single spade stop, would 3NT necessarily be the correct contract?

The final score, taking the result of the appeal into consideration, was a 40-17 IMPs, 20-10 VPs, win for Great Britain.


## The choice of a new generation

By Toine van Hoof

Ophir and Herbst are the exponents of a new generation of bridge players who are making their mark in this Olympiad. Ophir had an uncommon decision to take on Board 32 of Round 6 in the Open.As North he held:

| @ Q 109754 | - J2 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 932$ | $\bigcirc$ A 865 |
| $\diamond$ Q 5 | $\checkmark 10863$ |
| Q Q J | 2965 |

The bidding went:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ (1) | Pass | $3 \checkmark^{(2)}$ |
| Pass | $3{ }^{2}$ | Pass | 4\% ${ }^{(3)}$ |
| Pass | $4 \checkmark$ | Pass | 5\% |
| Pass | 5 | All Pass |  |

${ }^{(1)}$ Multi-colored
${ }^{(2)}$ Natural and forcing
${ }^{(3)}$ Natural, though Alerted by South
West sleepily led the $\triangle \mathbf{A}$ and opened the screen. He immediately covered the card when South made clear that it was East's turn to lead. The tournament director (TD) decided that, though both East and North stated they hadn't seen which card was led, they might have seen it so the $\vee A$ was a lead out of turn (LOOT). He asked Ophir to choose, either:
I. Accept the lead, and
a. let South play the hand, or
b. let North play the hand
2. Forbid a heart lead by East
3. Require a heart lead by East
4. Let East lead whatever he wanted and make $\nabla \mathrm{A}$ a major penalty card (MPC)
What would you have done in Ophir's place?
After considerable thought, Ophir chose to accept the lead and let his partner play the hand. That turned out to be a right decision as this was the layout:

Q 109754 - 932
$\diamond \mathrm{Q}^{5}$
Q


A AK 863
Q Q J 7
$\diamond 94$

* 1087
- K 104
$\diamond$ AKJ 72
\& AK 432
The lead established the 8 K as declarer's eleventh trick; 400 to North-South. Option 4 would have given the same result as declarer can demand West to play the $\vee A$ on the fourth club. A choice of option 2 or 3 could have led to one down as East-West can force declarer in spades and establish a trump trick.

Israel lost I IMP on the board as North-South at the other table made ten tricks in 3NT.
The case of the misinformed looter
The hand might have presented an interesting case (IC) for the TD. At the South-West side of the screen the $4 \%$ bid had been Alerted. This led West to believe that South was cuebidding so he stayed out of slam because NS lacked a heart control. That's why he selected the LOOT of the 8 A. So actually, West was misinformed. Had he known that South merely showed a two-suiter, he might have led another suit. Of course, North again would have been given the opportunity to forbid or require a lead or whatever, but in all options East-West would have been able to defeat the contract. The question is: could West have argued that he was misinformed and be allowed to make another (better) lead out of turn?

Unfortunately, this question is academic (AQ) since East-West didn't make any fuss about the hand. However, I would certainly be interested in hearing the experts' opinion (EO) on this case.

invites you to participate in

## the 2nd IBPA JOURNALIST WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP

The tournament will be a one-session pairs event.
The players in a pair need not come from the same nation, but both players must be members of the IBPA.

Saturday, the 26th October 1996
at 12.30
Place: will be published later.
Entrance fee: US\$10 or 2500 DR per player.
Prizes:The three best pairs will receive big cups with an inscription, and the winners will keep "the Salsomaggiore Cup" for four years. The prizes have been sponsored by the town of Salsomaggiore and the Italian Bridge Federation, FIGB.

If you want to participate, please write your names on the flip-over in the Press Room by Saturday, 26th October at 10 a.m.

# There's More Than One Way To Eight Tricks 

By Herman De Wael

The European Union Championships in Ostend last April saw the first appearance of the new look Austrian Women's Team. The defending Olympiad champions, taking part for the first time in the European Union, appeared with the well-known names in new partnerships. They proved too strong for the field and were champions with one match to go. The field was strong though, with powerful French and Belgian teams in second and third places. Italy did not send their strongest team to Ostend, but when Austria and Italy met here on Thursday, it was the top match of that round.

Here's Doris Fischer at work.
Board 14. Love All. Dealer East.

|  | - K 964 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ¢K92 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 1096$ |  |  |
|  | 2 AK 6 |  |  |
| - Q 10852 | N |  | - A 73 |
| Q AJ 104 |  | E $\quad \bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc 73$ |
| $\checkmark$ Q |  | S |  | $\checkmark$ A 43 |
| - J 42 |  |  |  | \% Q 10987 |
|  | - J |  |  |
|  | ¢ Q 865 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ KJ8752 |  |  |
|  | - 53 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bamberger | Olivieri | Fischer | $r$ Golin |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 2\% | All Pass |

The spade lead produced the most expensive trick in the book. When Doris returned a low spade, this produced one of the cheapest tricks, South taking a ruff. The third trick contained four honors again, with the $\rangle$ K being led. Doris allowed South to ruff another spade. She took the heart return on the table and led spades once again. By now, she knew she would only lose the top trumps: spade ruff with the nine, diamond ruff, and the $\$ 10$ gave a heart discard.

The result was a 23-7 victory for Austria.

## Evcharisto Para Poly Caddies

By Jan Boets

A special thanks is needed towards our caddies. All thirty of them have to juggle school work and sometimes night jobs with their jobs here. With never-ending enthusiasm and boundless energy they fulfil their function admirably.

But players, please don't forget that they are NOT bridge players. So help them a little. If you like your boards to arrive in order, put them in order before you send them away. If you want to get all your boards to your partners, put your boards in ONE place, always the same place, and in order.

And don't forget also that the intervals between play that you find so terribly short are even shorter for them. There is a lot of work in cleaning the rooms and preparing them for the next session. Putting the boards in order after you've finished with them takes you one minute, but saves them thirty.

# Denmark v Indonesia 

Open Series (Round 17)

Two real contenders met in the first match on Thursday morning. Denmark, the team who needed the win a little more, started better.

| Board I. Love All. Dealer North. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ¢ AKQ 10763 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 10$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 652 |  |
|  | \& 10 |  |
| Q J 84 | N | - 92 |
| $\bigcirc$ AKQ 8 | $w^{N}$ | $\bigcirc 97642$ |
| $\checkmark 74$ |  | $\checkmark$ AJ 9 |
| \& K Q 98 | S | 2 742 |
|  | - 5 |  |
|  | 8 J 5 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 1083 |  |
|  | \& AJ65 |  |

For Indonesia, Denny Sacul opened a quiet Is and Lars Blakset doubled the INT response for takeout. Sacul rebid 2s and competed with 3 over Soren Christensen's 38 . The favourable lie meant Sacul made eleven tricks; +200.

In the other room, Dennis Koch-Palmund made the opening bid I would have chosen - a scientific 44. He played there for +450 and a useful 6 IMP start to Denmark.

Board 3. East/West Game. Dealer South.


Is that West hand an opening bid in second seat? The answer makes a big difference to the auction on this board. For Eddy Manoppo the answer was no, and Koch-Palmund got to open Is as North. Henky Lasut, East, overcalled 2e and it went: Dble - 3e - Pass - Pass


Jens Auken, Denmark
$-3 \diamond$ from Jens Auken, South. Lasut competed with 4e and made II tricks quite easily; +150 .

For Blakset the answer was yes. That kept Sacul quiet and Christensen responded with a game-forcing $2 \&$. Franky Karwur took the opportunity to bid $2 \triangleleft$ for the lead and Blakset passed. Now Christensen bid 3NT, when 2NT would have been forcing. This suggested a strong desire to play there and duly ended the auction. Had Sacul been able to double for a spade lead, or had Karwur been sufficiently inspired to find one on his own, 3NT would have been defeated. As it was, Karwur tried a heart and Christensen knocked out the club and soon had nine tricks; +600 and 10 MPs to Denmark.

Maybe double normally asks for partner's suit, but where declarer has shown such a positive desire to play in no trump there is perhaps a case for its asking for dummy's suit. Then, would the Danes have stayed in 3NT?

Board 5. North/South Game. Dealer North.

- 10852

Q J 10
$\diamond$ Q 98

* K 984

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| @ J 74 | N | - 9 |
| $\bigcirc 7$ |  | $\bigcirc$ A 983 |
| $\diamond$ J10 53 | W E | $\diamond$ K 762 |
| \& 47632 | S | Q QJ 105 |
|  | (AKQ6 3 |  |
|  | ¢KQ6542 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 4 |  |
|  | \% - |  |


| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | Pass | Pass | 1\% |
| 14 | Dble | Pass | Pass |
| INT | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| 2* | 24 | Pass | 4\% |
| Pass | 44 | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | 54 | All Pass |  |

Blakset's overcall of the strong club was random, "could be anything"- though I always have my doubts about such explanations as there must be many hand types which would make some other call. Sacul doubled to show values. It soon became clear that North/South had spades and Karwur first splintered then made a general try with 4 NT . Sacul wasn't having anything to do with a slam and subsided in 54. After a club lead declarer drew trumps and made 12 tricks; +680 .

The auction was short and sweet in the other room. Auken opened $I \nabla$, Koch-Palmund responded Is and Lasut made a takeout double. Auken just bid 64. The contract is reasonable enough but Lasut led an unerring ace and another heart and that was one down; -I00 and I3 IMPs to Indonesia.

Board 6. East/West Game. Dealer East.

|  | - 87 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 10753$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 1072$ |  |
|  | \& 10543 |  |
| - 4 | N | - 1932 |
| $\bigcirc$ AK Q 862 |  | $\bigcirc 19$ |
| $\diamond$ KJ | W E | $\diamond$ A Q 986 |
| * A Q 72 | S | \% 86 |
|  | 4 AKQ 1065 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 4$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 543$ |  |
|  | \& KJ9 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manoppo | Koch-P | Lasut | Auken |
|  |  | Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ |
| Dble | Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ | 24 |
| $3 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Blakset | Sacul | Christensen | Karwur |
|  |  | Pass | 14 |
| Dble | Pass | 3 - | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| 49 | Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 6 | All Pass |  |  |

The key was East's response to the takeout double. Where Lasut bid only $2 \wedge$, slam was never really in the picture. When Christensen jumped to $3 \diamond$ then admitted to heart support, Blakset cuebid then jumped to slam. Both tables made twelve tricks for a 12 IMP swing to Denmark.

As an aside, had Karwur found a 3s rebid on the South hand over Christensen's $3 \wedge$, Blakset would presumably have bid $4 \vee$ but now Christensen would not be likely to bid on. 3s is relatively safe within a strong club base as partner cannot expect much more in the way of high cards. At the very least, life would have been made tougher for the Danes.

Board 7. Game All. Dealer South.

| - QJIO |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ K 7 |  |
| $\diamond$ KQ 4 |  |
| *KQJ65 |  |
| N | - K 2 |
| W E | $\bigcirc 1052$ |
| S | $\diamond 107632$ |
| 4 A976 |  |
|  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 63 |  |
| $\checkmark$ AJ 9 |  |
| \% 984 |  |

North played 3NT at both tables but the auction and opening lead varied. Given a free run, Koch-Palmund/Auken got there via a INT opening and Stayman sequence. Lasut led his fourth best diamond and declarer took twelve tricks; +690 .

In the other room, Blakset had opened the West hand with a $2 \checkmark$ bid showing at least $4-4$ in the majors and a weak hand. Sacul overcalled 2NT and was raised to game but now Christensen found the killing heart lead for one down; - 100 and 13 IMPs courtesy of the Dane's favourite gadget.

Board 9. East/West Game. Dealer North.

- K 54
- K 109873
$\diamond K$
\& A 52
- 108

8152
$\diamond 18532$
\& 1043

Koch-Palmund opened I $\vee$, Lasut overcalled $2 \diamond$ and Auken jumped to 34, raised to 44. Eddy Manoppo
found the necessary club lead to beat the game; -50 .
Sacul also opened $1 \otimes$ but Christensen overcalled INT. Karwur doubled and Blakset redoubled as a singlesuited rescue. Sacul rebid 28 and Karwur took a slightly cautious view and passed. Sacul won the spade lead on table and played a heart to the ten and queen. The club switch was won by dummy's queen and a second heart to the 9 and ace soon led to 10 tricks; +170 and 6 IMPs to Indonesia.

Board IO. Game All. Dealer East.

|  | - AJ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 102$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 9842$ |  |
|  | \& K 9862 |  |
| ¢ Q 42 | N | ¢ K 8753 |
| -AK97643 |  | $\bigcirc$ Q |
| $\diamond 3$ | W E | $\diamond$ AKQJ 6 |
| - Q 7 | S | * AJ |
|  | -1096 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 185$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 1075$ |  |
|  | \& 10543 |  |

Open Room

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Manoppo | Lasut |
|  | 19 |
| 18 | 14 |
| $2 \rrbracket$ | 4 NT |
| 5 | $6 \varnothing$ |
| Pass |  |

Closed Room

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Blakset | Christensen |
|  | $1{ }^{1}$ |
| 2 | 3 |
| 38 | 4\% |
| 5 | 68 |
| Pass |  |

Both pairs bid confidently to the slam, Manoppo/Lasut with a strong club sequence and Blakset/Christensen in a natural base. Lasut launched into RKCB as soon as Manoppo repeated his hearts. That looks slightly precipitate to me but it worked out O.K. And Christensen was also willing to play in hearts when Blakset repeated the suit. He cuebid 4\% and Blakset's $5 \bigcirc$ showed two key cards but denied a club control or a diamond honour. Again, $6 \boxtimes$ was the logical conclusion. Both made twelve tricks; no swing.

Board 16. East/West Game. Dealer West.

|  | Q J |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Q J 109 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ QJ 10985 |  |
|  | \& A 52 |  |
| - A 10986 | N | ¢ KQ7532 |
| $\bigcirc 7$ |  | $\bigcirc$ Q 842 |
| $\diamond$ K 4 | W E | $\checkmark 2$ |
| \& KJ843 | S | 2 Q 6 |
|  | 1. 4 |  |
|  | PAK65 3 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 763 |  |
|  | -1097 |  |

This one was all about North's action, or inaction, over the lse opening. Sacul passed, the Indonesians not being infected with the weak jump at any excuse disease. But this was a time when intervention was a good idea. The Danes bid quickly to 44, making exactly; +620. In the other room, Koch-Palmund overcalled $3 \diamond$ and it went: $3 \searrow-5 \diamond$ - Dble, but Lasut had huge undisclosed spade support and felt obliged to show it - and who can blame him? 5as one down, of course, so Denmark finished off the set with a 12 IMP pick-up and ran out winners by $56-25 \mathrm{IMPs}, 22-8 \mathrm{VPs}$.

## Mixed Teams

## World Championship

## starting on Tuesday October 29

Pre-registered teams have to confirm before Saturday at the latest and pay their entry fees to the assistant treasurer, Christine Francin.

Other teams,intending to play, who have members from the Olympiad who are not likely to qualify for the quarterfinals, should register with Mrs. Francin prior to Sunday, October 27. You will find her at the first floor, in the Room Epsilon (Jose Damiani's office).

- On Friday, October 25 from IOh to 12 h
- On Saturday, October 26 from IOh to 12 h
- On Sunday, October 27 from I8h to 19 h
- On Monday, October 28 from 9 h 30 to I Ih and 18h30 to 19h30

Those teams who will make their team from the Open and Women's series should register as soon as you know but no later than October 28.

Mixed pairs looking for teammates may leave their names at the hospitality desk.

## Special announcement for players born in 1941 or earlier

The two highest ranking teams (where all team members were born prior to 1942) in the Swiss, who did not qualify for the semifinal, will play a 30 board playoff at 20 h on Friday, November I. The winning players will receive a certificate of recognition as the best senior mixed team and 50 WBF masterpoints.

## SPECIAL I996 WORLD BRIDGE OLYMPIAD BOOK

The 1996 World Bridge Olympiad Book will be available at a very special price of US $\$ 25.00$ including postage and handling (regular price $\$ 29.95$ plus postage) to the participants of this Olympiad.

## Highlights:

- Expert editorial analysis comments by Eric Kokish, Richard Colker, Barry Rigal and Brian Senior
- Approximately 288 pages - more than a $50 \%$ increase in size over the 1995 edition
- List of names of all players and captains
- Plenty of pictures
- Illustrated history of the Olympiad by Henry Francis
- Expected publication date: March 1997

Please submit interesting hands for possible publication.
Please complete the order form and leave it, together with your payment, with Elly Ducheyne in the Press Room prior to Saturday, November 2, 1996.

## Bridge is a friendly game

By A.S. Viswanathan, Tournament Director

We had an interesting situation yesterday afternoon when both ( $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{W}$ ) curtain cards from one room showed the same country name.

On enquiry, one of the pairs, who had written correctly, observed that hopefully the opponents were also playing for them!

## New Zealand v Poland

Open Series (Round 18)
New Zealand had plenty of opportunities to use their relays, but they gained nothing from the experience. They lost two game swings, both on the play of the cards, and both might have been avoided.

Board 23. Game All. Dealer South

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \& K Q 73 \\ & \curvearrowright 5 \\ & \diamond K 753 \\ & \& K J 62 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - J 2 | N | -10984 |
| ¢K8643 | $w^{N}$ | -Q 97 |
| $\checkmark$ J 8 |  | $\checkmark$ Q 1092 |
| - A 1054 | S | * Q 9 |
|  | - A 65 |  |
|  | 8 AJ 102 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 64 |  |
|  | 2 873 |  |

Grzegorz Gardynik played 3NT as South and got a heart lead. He won the ace and immediately finessed the $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathrm{j}}$. He covered the 89 return and now West could surely have won and played the $\$ 8$ - to beat the contract by force. When he did not do this, the defense still had chances, but declarer came home with his contract. On vugraph Marek Szymanowski led a club, and after much thought Martin Reid played low. Krzysztof Martens won the queen and played the 89 to the 10 and king. Back came a second club and again after much

By Barry Rigal
thought Reid played low. Martens led a spade and Reid won in dummy to knock out the When a second spade came back, Reid took his ace and cashed dummy's top black-suit winners, triple squeezing Martens!

Alas! Reid misread the position and still went down.
Board 26. Game All. Dealer East.

- K Q 1084
\& 932
$\diamond A$ Q
2 Q 108

| - A632 | N | - 975 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 8$ | $w^{\text {c }}$ | ¢K754 |
| $\checkmark 1087$ | W E | $\checkmark 19643$ |
| 4K9752 | S | +4 |
|  | 4 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q J 106 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 52 |  |
|  | * AJ 63 |  |

What looks like the most routine of $4 \supset$ contracts was played upside down, due to a quirk of the relays. Peter Newell as North got a club lead and had to decide whether it was from shortage or length. When he finessed the roof fell in and the defense cashed out for down one. Obviously if you read the position you will succeed in a number of ways, but it is wrong to criticize declarer unduly.

# Olympic Bridge Festival 

## JUDY TUCKER AND JACK GREENBERG WIN THE MIXED PAIRS

In the 2-session event of Mixed Pairs 5I pairs participated from 17 countries. The New Yorkers Judy Tucker and Jack Greenberg did well in both sessions, and finished first after a tough competition. Behind them only $0.34 \%$, a Dutch pair Agnes Wesseling and Niels Van der Gaast took second place.

## AGNES WESSELING AND NIELSVAN DER GASST BRUGGEMANN TAKE THE LEAD AFTER THE MORNING SESSION OF THE MIXED PAIRS EVENT

The Dutch pair, Agnes Wesseling and Niels van der Gaast win the first session of Mixed Pairs with $65.38 \%$.Three other pairs surpass $60 \%$.

The results of the first session are :

| I. Wesseling A. | (NTH) | Van der Gaast N. | (NTH) | $65.55 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. Xagorari H. | (GRE) | Manailoglou L. | (GRE) | $64.13 \%$ |
| 3. Tucker J. | (USA) | Greenberg J. | (USA) | $63.90 \%$ |
| 4. Honkavuori T. | (FIN) | Honkavuori R. | (FIN) | $60.91 \%$ |
| 5. Moustaka E. | (GRE) | Kannavos P. | (GRE) | $59.12 \%$ |
| 6. Snellers A. | (NTH) | Nobel K. | (NTH) | $57.89 \%$ |
| 7. Kulmala S. | (FIN) | Nieminen M. | (FIN) | $57.72 \%$ |
| 8. Alberti A. | (GER) | Bausback N. | (GER) | $57.60 \%$ |

## STAVROULA KIRITSI AND DIMITRIS VARELAS WIN THE SECOND SESSION OF MIXED PAIRS

In the second session of the event, a couple from Athens, Stavroula Kiritsi and Dimitris Varelas finished first with $61.62 \%$ ahead of Tucker and Greenberg.

The results of the second session are :

| I. Kiritsi S. | (GRE) | Varelas D. | (GRE) | $61.62 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. Tucker J. | (USA) | Greenberg J. | (USA) | $60.04 \%$ |
| 3. Enander U. | (SWE) | Enander A. | (SWE) | $59.71 \%$ |
| 4. Vivi | (FIN) | Maj | (GRE) | $59.50 \%$ |
| 5. Snepvangers I. | (NTH) | Mommers M. | (NTH) | $58.57 \%$ |
| 6. Kulmala S. | (NTH) | Nieminen M. | (FIN) | $58.06 \%$ |
| 7. Wesseling A. | (NTH) | Van der Gaast N. | (NTH) | $57.87 \%$ |
| 8. Alberti A. | (GER) | Bausback N. | (GER) | $57.84 \%$ |

After their steady performance the pair from USA won the event.
The Final Standings of the Mixed Pairs event are :

| I. Tucker J. | (USA) | Greenberg J. | (USA) | $\mathbf{6 2 . 0 5 \%}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2. WesselingA. | (NTH) | Van der Gaast N. | (NTH) | $61.71 \%$ |
| 3. Kiritsi S. | (GRE) | Varelas D. | (GRE) | $58.92 \%$ |
| 4. Honkavuori T. | (FIN) | Honkavuori R. | (FIN) | $58.29 \%$ |
| 5. Xagorari H. | (GRE) | Manailoglou L. | (GRE) | $58.27 \%$ |
| 6. Kulmala S. | (NTH) | Nieminen M. | (FIN) | $57.88 \%$ |

## Register for today's event

## Swiss Teams

Ist session (morning at II.00)
Total PRIZES: \$ 7500 and silver cups

## Open Pairs

Ist session (evening at 21.00 )
Total PRIZES: \$ 13600 and silver cups

TOMORROW'S EXCURSION

## FRIDAY

ISLAND TOUR
Departure 09.00
Return 17.30
Price GRD 8,800
Please notice that the entrance fees to the archaeological sites are not included in the above prices.

The Hospitality Desk of Rodos Palace and

## A criss-cross for an overtrick

Board 24. Love All. Dealer West

|  | - K 643 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 97 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 965 |  |
|  | 2 K 9 |  |
| - 75 | N | - Q J |
| $\bigcirc 86543$ | N | $\bigcirc \mathrm{KJIO}$ |
| $\checkmark 7$ | W E | $\diamond$ K 10432 |
| Q C 865 | S | - A 107 |
|  | - A 10982 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 2 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AJ 8 |  |
|  | ¢ 432 |  |

In this board of the Ist session of the Open Pairs some $N / S$ pairs reached the excellent game in spades. If declarer is South a probable lead is the singleton diamond. After covering East's card South must guess the trump position. Then, after two rounds of trumps he leads a small club towards dummy's king which looses to the ace. If West fails to cover his partner's 10 possible return, in order to switch in hearts, declarer can grab eleven tricks by winning the diamond continuation or ruffing the club continuation in dummy and reaching the following ending after cashing out all his trumps :

| Dummy | Declarer |
| :---: | :---: |
| - - | - - |
| $\bigcirc$ A | $\bigcirc$ Q 2 |
| $\diamond$ Q 9 | $\diamond$ A |
| - | - |

Now if East keeps 8 KJ and $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ declarer scores his $\bigcirc Q$ and if East keeps $\nabla K$ and $\forall K I O$ declarer scores his $\diamond$ Q. It is obvious the defenders can easily break declarer's communications for the criss-cross squeeze early in the play. In the real play five N/S pairs made eleven tricks in spades but their line of play was not recorded...

## Did you spot the mistake?

By Sam Leckie
In the "How do you play it" hand which appeared a few days ago (Daily News issue: 3) I deliberately gave the right play but the wrong percentages, to see if anyone would spot it.

I congratulate all of you who did!
Remember the ending position:


The total chances of course should have been:
Original diamond finesse $50 \%$ + either defender with K and $\mathrm{Q} 25 \%+$ North last diamond and Q $6.25 \%=81.25 \%$

