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## The NEC Cup Quarterfinals: Goldilocks and the Three Bears

"Well, it's still the same old story, a fight for love and glory, a case of do or die..." (As Time Goes By...) The Polish team entered their quarterfinal match against Japan's HIRATA hitting on all four cylinders and emerged with the expected win. Goldilocks 1 , Bears 0 . Such was not the case for the other three higher seeds. European Alliance, after a slow start in the Swiss, won their last three matches handily and entered their quarterfinal match against Japan's other surviving team, TAJIMA, with bristling confidence. Whack! TAJIMA outscored Alliance 140 to 39 IMPs; Goldilocks 1, Bears 1. Hungary, the third qualifier, coasted into the playoffs on the strength of a couple of ties after having experienced moderate early-round success. Then again, England was the defending champion. Still, Hungary was the higher seed and their .5-IMP carryover guaranteed them a win in case the match ended in a tie. Tie, schmie! England outscored the Hungarians 126 to 53 and the Bears had the lead, 2-1. Hackett versus USA was too close to call, but in a closely contested slugfest the feisty Americans unseeded Hackett by a mere 4 IMPs. Final score: Bears 3, Goldilocks 1.

Quarterfinal Results

| Team | Carry | $\mathbf{1 - 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 - 4 0}$ | Final |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Poland | .5 | 40 | 43 | $\mathbf{8 3}$ |
| HIRATA |  | 34 | 19 | 53 |
| European Alliance | .5 | 12 | 27 | 39 |
| TAJIMA |  | 35 | 105 | $\mathbf{1 4 0}$ |
| Hungary | .5 | 16 | 37 | 53 |
| England |  | 63 | 63 | $\mathbf{1 2 6}$ |
| Hackett | .5 | 42 | 40 | 82 |
| USA |  | 33 | 53 | $\mathbf{8 6}$ |

## Poland, England Advance to NEC Cup Final

In one semifinal top-seeded Poland (Krzysztof Martens, Marcin Lesnievski, Michal Kwiecien, Jacek Pszczola, Witold Wasak and npc Radoslaw Kielbasinski) easily outdistanced TAJIMA in a match that was never really close. In the other semifinal between England (Brian Senior, Brian Callaghan, Pablo Lambardi and John Armstrong) and USA it was anyone's match until midway through the second half. But beginning on Board 10 England started a 63-0 run over the next seven boards to put the match out of reach. USA picked up 12 IMPs over the last four boards but it was a case of too little, too late.

Semifinal Results

| Team | Carry | $\mathbf{1 - 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 - 4 0}$ | Final |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Poland | .5 | 60 | 49 | $\mathbf{1 0 9}$ |
| TAJIMA |  | 28 | 40 | 68 |
| USA | .5 | 29 | 34 | 63 |
| England |  | 30 | 65 | $\mathbf{9 5}$ |

## NEC Cup 2003: CONDITIONS OF CONTEST

An 8 round Swiss, qualifying the top 8 teams to the Knockout phase; no playbacks.

| V.P. Scale | WBF 20-board scale (a copy can be found in the score book provided in your <br> NEC Bridge Festival bag). |
| :--- | :--- |
| Seating Rights | Toss of coin 5 minutes before start of match. Failure will constitute loss of rights. |
| KO-Phase SeatingThe winner of a coin toss has the choice of seating in either of the two 20-board <br> segments. In the four 16-board segments of the final, the choices will alternate <br> over segments. |  |

Swiss Pairings For the first and second Swiss matches, pairings will be determined by randomly pairing each of the teams numbered 1-21 with one of the teams numbered 2242. Subsequent match pairings will be based on current VP totals.

Home and visiting 1st numbered team sits N/S in open room, E/W in closed room.
Tie-Breaks At the end of the Swiss: ties will be broken by the result of the head-to-head match (if one was played) or an IMP quotient otherwise. If more than two teams are involved, WBF 2002 Conditions of Contest procedures will apply.

In the Knockout Phase, the team with the higher position from the Swiss will be assumed to have a $1 / 2$-IMP carryover.
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Systems } & \text { No HUM methods will be permitted in this event. } \\ \text { In the Swiss, no Brown Sticker methods will be permitted. } \\ \text { In the KO Phase, Brown Sticker methods will be permitted only if filed before the } \\ \text { start of the Swiss. Written defenses to such methods may be used at the table. }\end{array}$
Length of Matches 2 hours and 50 minutes will be allotted for each 20-board segment (or 2 hours and 20 minutes for each 16-board segment of the final). In addition a 5-minute grace period will be allotted to each team. Overtime and slow play penalties as per WBF 2001 Conditions of Contest.

Appeals The WBF Code of Practice will be in effect. The Chief Director will have 12C3 authority. Appeals which are found to be without merit may incur a penalty of up to 3 VPs.

Match Scoring Pick-up slips are to be completed and all match results are to be verified against the official result sheet (posted at the end of each match); score corrections and notifications of appeals will be permitted up until the start of the next session.

KO Draw The team finishing $1^{\text {st }}$ in the Swiss may choose their opponent from the teams finishing $4^{\text {th }}-8^{\text {th. }}$. The team finishing $2^{\text {nd }}$ will have their choice of the remaining teams from the $4^{\text {th }}-8^{\text {th }}$ group. And so on.

In addition, before the start of the Knockout Phase and after all quarter-final draws have been determined, the team that finishes $1^{\text {st }}$ in the Swiss chooses their semi-final opponent from any of the other three quarter-final matches.

Smoking No smoking in the playing areas. You may not leave the playing room to smoke.

## Boards 21-40:

Our coverage for the second half of the quarterfinals will concentrate on the closest of the four matches, featuring the heavily favored Polish team against the perennial contenders from Japan. Apart from hoping that the bridge will be good, I confess that I have a rooting interest: Kyoko Ohno/Akihiko Yamada are weak notrumpers; need I say more?

| Bd: 21 | North |
| :--- | :--- |
| DIr: North | $ゅ$ J8743 |
| Vul: None | $\diamond$ QJ1074 |
|  | $\diamond 2$ |
|  | $\$ 104$ |


| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| - 102 | - 96 |
| $\checkmark$ A862 | $\bigcirc 9$ |
| $\checkmark$ A1064 | $\diamond$ KQJ985 |
| - K62 | - AJ53 |

South

- AKQ5

ค K53
$\diamond 73$
\& Q987
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hayashi | Lesniewski Hirata |  | Martens |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Dbl |
| 18 | 19 | 2 - | 24 |
| 34 | Pass | 4* | Pass |
| 5 | All Pass |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Kwiecien | Yamada | Pszczola | Ohno |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Dbl |
| Rdbl | 19 | $2 \diamond$ | 2 |
| 34 | 4 | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | Pass | 5\% | Pass |
| 5 | All Pass |  |  |

It's not clear what would have happened had Yamada jumped to $4 \diamond$ (pick a major) over the redouble but it's quite likely that E/W would go on to $5 \diamond$ rather than defend $4 \uparrow$ doubled. Here the gentle 1s let East get his minimum and long suit off his chest early and when Michal

Kwiecien did not double 44, it was intuitive for Jacek Pszczola to continue with 5\%.


Against $5 \diamond$, Ohno led the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$, got a count card, cashed the A, got a suit-preference jack, and switched to the $\vee 3$. Pszczola eventually lost the club finesse: -50.

I was expecting Marcin Lesniewski to open $2 \checkmark$ (5+ソ/5+any, about 5-11 HCP) but apparently the man has discipline. His reticence thereafter seems to be more a matter of tactics, but if that is so, the rationale escapes me. As a consequence, Nobu Hayashi and Makoto Hirata were able to exchange a great deal of useful information and reached the same contract as their counterparts. Here Lesniewski followed to the $\$ \mathrm{~A}$ with the discouraging eight and to the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ with the seven, present count. Krzysztof exited safely with a trump and here too declarer took the club finesse for his contract. One down, -50 . No swing.

| Bd: 22 | North |
| :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | - AQ876432 |
| Vul: N/S | $\bigcirc 5$ |
|  | $\checkmark 2$ |
|  | * A64 |
| West | East |
| - 109 | 4 --- |
| $\bigcirc$ AKJ86 | $\bigcirc 92$ |
| $\diamond 86$ | $\checkmark$ AKQJ1075 |
| -10852 | \& QJ93 |
|  | South |
|  | ¢ KJ5 |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q10743 |
|  | $\checkmark 943$ |
|  | ¢ K7 |


| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hayashi | Lesniewsk | Hirata | Martens |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | 18 |
| Pass | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| Dbl | All Pass |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Kwiecien | Yamada | Pszczola | Ohno |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 18 | 49 | 5 | Pass |
| Pass | Dbl | All Pass |  |

Yamada did well to double $5 \triangleleft$ but Ohno felt it would be easier to take three tricks on defense than 11 on offense. That's the sort of decision that's just too close for comfort and the action that lets you sleep better at night also happens to be the winner here-taking out to 54. When Ohno led the K rather than the K (it's nearly impossible to get this right) Pszczola coasted home with 11 tricks: +550 .

Contrast Ohno's decision with that of Martens and the risk vs gain factor is highlighted rather dramatically. Lesniewski was +850 and Poland gained 16 IMPs to extend its lead to 22 IMPs, 56-34. It's a positive sign when both your pairs have a terrible result on the same deal because that compresses the overall loss, but too many positive signs of this nature are certain to produce a negative result in the match.

| Bd: 23 | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: South | - K653 |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\bigcirc$ QJ763 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 94$ |  |
|  | -87 |  |
| West |  | East |
| - QJ87 |  | - A94 |
| $\bigcirc$ AK4 |  | $\bigcirc 52$ |
| $\diamond$--- |  | $\checkmark$ K107532 |
| AKQJ109 |  | \& 65 |
|  | South |  |
|  | - 102 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 1098$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AQJ86 |  |
|  | -432 |  |


| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hayashi | Lesniewski Hirata |  | Martens |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 180 | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 2. | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Kwiecien | Yamada | Pszczola | Ohno |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 20* | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 4\% | Pass | 5\% | All Pass |
| * Artificial, game-forcing |  |  |  |

6\% is excellent for E/W but it's very difficult to reach. The Poles might have gotten there had Pszczola tried 4s over 4\% and the Japanese had Hayashi tried $3 \checkmark$ over $3 \diamond$, catching 3¢ from Hirata, but ferreting out the doubleton heart in combination with two trumps seems like too tall an order. Hayashi held himself to +630 on a heart lead by playing ace and another spade, then ducking when Lesniewski switched to a diamond. Martens won the jack and wisely cashed the ace. There was nothing to the play in 5e: +620 . No swing.

| Bd: 25 | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North | - 97 |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\bigcirc 9$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A1094 |  |
| \& Q109853 |  |  |
| West | East |  |
| - AQ852 | ¢ KJ1064 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ QJ72 | $\bigcirc 103$ |  |
| $\diamond$ K65 | $\checkmark 73$ |  |
| K | $\bigcirc 7642$ |  |
| South |  |  |
| - 3 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ AK8654 |  |  |
| $\diamond$ QJ82 |  |  |
| \& AJ |  |  |
| Open Room/Closed Room |  |  |
| West | North East | South |
| Hayashi | Lesniewski Hirata | Martens |
| Kwiecien | Yamada Pszczola | Ohno |
|  |  | 18 |
| 1. | Pass 40 | All Pass |

When North did not compete with a negative double, East's 4 finished off his opponents, who could take 11 or 12 tricks in a minor. 4 was two down at both tables on a heart lead. No swing at E/W -100.

| Bd: 26 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: East | - A10 |  |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\bigcirc$ QJ3 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A7 |  |  |
|  | * 1086542 |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| - KQ876 | - 3 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ K2 | $\bigcirc 9865$ |  |  |
| $\diamond$ Q104 | $\diamond$ J98632 |  |  |
| \% J 97 | * AQ |  |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | - J9542 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A1074 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K5 |  |  |
|  | \& K3 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North East |  | South |
| Hayashi | Lesniewski Hirata |  | Martens |
|  |  | Pass | 14 |
| Pass | 20* | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | 2NT* | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| Closed R | oom |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Kwiecien | Yamada | Pszczola | Ohno |
|  |  |  | 14. |
| Pass | 1NT* | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | 2NT | All Pas |  |

3NT is not much of a contract on a diamond lead and deserved to fail by two tricks, as it did, but as Yamada's 2NT was also going down (one), the Polish loss was just 2 IMPs. Lesniewski's 2NT was forcing, Yamada's was not. Lesniewski did not have a forcing 1NT response at his disposal, so his $2 \%$ response was more attractive than it was for Yamada. Poland, 56-36.

| Bd: 27 <br> DIr: South | NorthAQ10765 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Vul: Both | $\bigcirc$ K7 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A4 |  |  |
|  | \% J82 |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| - J42 | 4 --- |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ AJ82 | $\bigcirc$ Q1053 |  |  |
| $\checkmark 7632$ | $\diamond$ J10985 |  |  |
| - K4 | * AQ97 |  |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | - K983 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 964$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ KQ |  |  |
|  | - 10653 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hayashi | Lesniewski Hirata |  | Martens |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 14 | Dbl | 2NT* |
| Dbl* | 4 | All Pass |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North <br> Yamada | East | South |
| Kwiecien |  | Pszczola | Ohno |
|  | Yamada |  | Pass |
| Pass | 14. | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | Pass | Dbl | Rdbl |
| 38 | 34 | All Pass |  |

There is no limit to how often a bridge reporter can be surprised. Pszczola's pass over 14 is the latest action (or non-action) to cause me to bounce out of my seat. Can it be better to double a major with some 4333 14-count than with this shape-perfect chunky 9 -count? Maybe Ohno would have duplicated Martens' mildly aggressive limit-raise over a takeout double but when Pszczola passed she was content with a near-maximum (4-9 HCP) raise to 24 . Although East reopened, N/S were in partscore mode by then and simply competed to 3s. The defenders can take four tricks against a spade contract as long as they exercise a modicum of care, and Kwiecien/ Pszczola managed to unblock their clubs in time: +140 .

It was more important for the defenders in the Open Room but they passed the test and defeated the pushy 4s: -100. 6 IMPs to HIRATA,42-56.

| Bd: 28 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dir: West | - 93 |  |  |
| Vul: None | $\bigcirc 10743$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 103$ |  |  |
| \& AQJ92 |  |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| - AQJ75 | - K1084 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$--- | $\bigcirc$ AJ86 |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ K752 | $\diamond$ AJ864 |  |  |
| \% K1054 | ¢ --- |  |  |
| South |  |  |  |
| ¢ 62 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ KQ952 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ Q9 |  |  |  |
| \& 8763 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hayashi | Lesniewski Hirata |  | Martens |
| 14 | Pass 2 |  | Pass |
| 3 - | Pass 34 |  | Pass |
| 4\% | Dbl | Rdbl* | Pass |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 5 | Dbl |
| Rdbl* | Pass | 6\% | Pass |
| 6> | All Pass |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Kwiecien | Yamada | Pszczola | Ohno |
| 14 | Pass | 49** | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | 64 | All Pass |
| * Splinter raise |  |  |  |

The somewhat gratuitous Polish doubles in the Open Room offered their opponents the opportunity to show first-round control by redoubling and helped them to reach $6 \diamond$, the best slam. Hirata ruffed the club lead and could afford ace-king of trumps: +940.

Diamonds were never a factor in the Closed Room (which highlights the advantage in proceeding as Hirata did, via $2 \diamond$ ) and 6 was far less comfortable on Yamada's trump lead. Declarer can get one discard from hand on the $\bigcirc A$ and another on the long diamond and requires two club ruffs in dummy, but if there is a diamond loser he can't concede it at a point when dummy is out of trumps lest the defense cash the Kaiecien saw the potential
problems and won the first trump in hand to lead a diamond to the jack. South won the queen and switched to the $\vee \mathrm{K}$. Kwiecien ruffed, ruffed a club and came to a second trump. When both followed he could claim. He could not afford a second trump earlier as South might be able to play a third one if she had a diamond "winner."

Although the chance of a singleton diamond in North is diminished to an extent by his failure to lead the suit, the risk is not insignificant. An alternative line would be to ruff a club, lead a diamond to the king and a second diamond, finessing if North follows. If North shows out, discarding (if he ruffs, declarer is cold), win the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$, concede a diamond. Now the entries are fluid for a second club ruff and the long diamond has been established. If South wins the second diamond (the finesse losing), she may play a trump but declarer wins in hand takes a second club ruff, ruffs a heart, and draws the last trump if South started with three.

What an interesting deal! +980 for Kwiecien and 1 IMP to Poland, ahead 57-42.

| Bd: 29 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: North | ¢ 1082 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J7 |  |  |
| $\diamond$ J1072 |  |  |  |
| \& 10874 |  |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| ¢ K97653 | - AQJ |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ A93 | $\bigcirc$ K86542 |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ A6 | $\diamond 8$ |  |  |
| KQ |  |  |  |
| South |  |  |  |
| - 4 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q10 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ KQ9543 |  |  |  |
| ~ AJ93 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hayashi | Lesniewsk | Hirata | Martens |
|  | Pass | 18 | $2 \checkmark$ |
| 21 | Pass | 34 | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | 5e* | Pass |
| 5 | All Pass |  |  |


| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West | North | East | South |
| Kwiecien | Yamada | Pszczola | Ohno |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| $1 \leftrightarrow$ | $3 \diamond^{*}$ | $3 \diamond$ | $5 \diamond$ |
| Dbl | All Pass |  |  |

Although 6 isn't wonderful (it needs two-two hearts) it's certainly playable and it looks as if Hayashi's 4NT was not the way to get there because he stopped short although only one key card was missing. He was worried about a diamond lead but the time to worry was before embarking on a key card search. Plus 710 for Hayashi on a diamond lead: $\diamond \mathrm{A}$, diamond ruff, $\uparrow A, \uparrow$, heart to the ace, $\uparrow K, \gtrdot 9$ to the ace. I'm adding to my personal Department of Surprises Lesniewski's failure to raise diamonds at the prevailing vulnerability, knowing he was facing a relatively long suit.

Contrast his approach with that of Yamadasan, who was willing to jump raise an opening bid that might have been $4=4=3=2$ with 15-19 HCP. The sagacity of Lesniewski's strategy was demonstrated when Ohno was beaten four tricks in $5 \diamond$ doubled: K to the ace, low trump, ace, ${ }^{2}$ Q (East following six-five to the club tricks), $\vee \mathrm{A}$, heart to the king (encouraging deuce), club ruff, spade. Down 800, 3 IMPs to Poland, 60-42.

| Bd: 30 | North |
| :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | ¢ K102 |
| Vul: Both | $\bigcirc$ K10 |
|  | $\checkmark$ A982 |
|  | - QJ73 |
| West | East |
| - Q7 | - A653 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q976 | $\bigcirc$ A42 |
| $\diamond$ K765 | $\diamond 3$ |
| -652 | \% AK984 |
|  | South |
|  | - J984 |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J853 |
|  | $\diamond$ QJ104 |
|  | ¢ 10 |


| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hayashi | Lesniewski Hirata |  | Martens |
|  |  | 190 | Pass |
| 18 | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| 1NT | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 3\% | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Kwiecien | Yamada | Pszczola | Ohno |
|  |  | 19* | Pass |
| 18 | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| 1NT | Pass | 2 | All Pass |

Both Easts showed extra values with their sequence to $2 \bigcirc$, but when Hayashi tried to play in the safest partscore Hirata interpreted his 3e as a game try. In practice, even $2 \checkmark$ was too high. Yamada led the $\$ 7$ (third from even) to dumnmy's ace. A diamond went to the king and ace and Yamada switched to the 810 , ducked to the queen. Diamond ruff, spade to the queen and king, spade to the ace, spade ruff, club, three, king, ruff. Ohno exited with a trump and Kwiecien scored the 89 en passant by leading dummy's remaining spade;-100.
$4 \checkmark$ needed several miracles. After $\diamond A$, diamond, Hayashi ruffed in dummy and played $\checkmark A$, heart to the queen. He finished four down, -400. 7 IMPs to Poland, 67-42.

| Bd: 31 DIr: South Vul: None | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | , KQ72 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 85$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AJ73 |  |
|  | * AQ2 |  |
| West |  | East |
| - 65 |  | - 10843 |
| $\bigcirc$ AJ943 |  | $\bigcirc$ Q10 |
| $\diamond$ Q1062 |  | $\diamond$ K85 |
| - J10 |  | \& K983 |
|  | South |  |
|  | - AJ9 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K762 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 94$ |  |
|  | \% 7654 |  |


| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hayashi | Lesniewski Hirata |  | Martens |
| 2 ${ }^{*}$ | Dbl | Pass | 24 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| * 5+¢/4+m, weak |  |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Kwiecien | Yamada | Pszczola | Ohno |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | 1NT | All Pass |  |

Yamada's 1NT depicted 15-17 and did not deny four spades. He got a club lead from Pszczola and took his seven winners, +90 .

Hayashi's $2 \triangleleft$ jockeyed his opponents into their four-three spade fit, which was an interesting contract to play and defend. Hayashi led the J and Martens took the ace to lead a low diamond. Hirata erred by going in with the king to switch to the $\vee Q$, which held. Hayashi overtook the $\vee 10$ with the jack to lead the $\$ 10$, which declarer covered. Hirata played the rest of his clubs, forcing dummy to ruff, but Martens came to the $\quad$ J and finessed the $\diamond$ J, cashed the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$, and ruffed dummy's last diamond. The had the rest with high trumps: +110. 1 IMP to Poland, 68-42.

Poland gained 3 overtrick IMPs on Board 32 in a quiet 1NT, 71-42. Then both N/S pairs defended sensibly (nicely) to defeat a normal 44, no swing.

On Board 34 the North players held, with neither side vulnerable: $\uparrow$ K84 $\gtrdot$ QJ873 $\diamond 43$ A109. To partner's $1 \diamond$ they responded $1 \diamond$. South rebid 2\%. What now?

Yamada tried 2NT and was left to rot there, one down. Lesniewski passed 2\%, which was fine, as Martens had a suit-oriented minimum. Martens made 2\%. 4 IMPs to Poland, 75-42.

"My Rodan is better than your Rodan."

| Bd: 35 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: South | - AK63 |  |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\bigcirc$ AKQJ9 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 105$ |  |  |
|  | \& A 3 |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| - Q4 | ¢ J10852 |  |  |
| $\checkmark 632$ | $\bigcirc 1074$ |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ AKQ83 | $\diamond 74$ |  |  |
| \% K106 | - 875 |  |  |
| South |  |  |  |
| - 97 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 85$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ J962 |  |  |  |
| 2 QJ942 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North East |  | South |
| Hayashi | Lesniewski Hirata |  | Martens |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 1NT | Dbl* | 2^* | Pass |
| 24 | $3 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |
| *Dbl=5/4 majors or $5 \mathrm{~m} / 4 \mathrm{M}$ |  |  |  |
| *2 2 = |  |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Kwiecien | Yamada | Pszczola | Ohno |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 1NT | Dbl | 24 | Pass |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | Pass |
| Dbl | All Pass |  |  |

The play was similar at the two tables, with the stakes appreciably higher in the Closed Room. In 3 Lesniewski got a diamond lead and a heart switch. He drew trumps, cashed AK and led the $\diamond 10$. Hayashi won and played his remaining high diamond butdeclarer discarded a spade and now had to get both the club finesse and a diamond trick. Very pretty; +170.

In 3NT doubled Yamada got a neutral heart lead. He ran the hearts, cashed AK, and led the $\diamond 10$. Same position, equally pretty: +750 . 11 IMPs to HIRATA, 53-75.


| Bd: 37 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North | - A943 |  |  |
| Vul: None | $\bigcirc$ AK65 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 973$ |  |  |
|  | -108 |  |  |
| West | Eas |  |  |
| - J8 | - 107652 |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ Q109 | $\bigcirc$ J4 |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ AQ2 | $\diamond$ J54 |  |  |
| AK542 | - J 73 |  |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | - KQ |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 8732$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K1086 |  |  |
|  | * Q96 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hayashi | Lesniewski Hirata |  | Martens |
|  | 19* | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | $2 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Kwiecien | Yamada | Pszczola | Ohno |
|  | 1NT | Pass | Pass |
| Dbl | Pass | 24 | All Pass |

Martens was able to take two finesses in diamonds to bring home $2 \vee,+110$.

Pszczola's 2 looks much more challenging. However, he got a diamond lead from the king, ran it to his jack, and started hearts. Yamada switched accurately to a club but Pszczola built a heart winner and took it to discard his club loser. Then he ran the J to the queen. South cashed the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ and exited with a heart but that was just what declarer needed. He ruffed, finessed the $\diamond J$, cashed the $\diamond A$, and had to take a trick with the 10 behind North's ace; +110. 6 IMPs to Poland, the last significant swing in the match. The last three deals were not dull but they were uneventful. Poland won the second half 43-19 and won the match 8353. Poland would meet TAJIMA, winners over European Alliance by over 100 IMPs , in one semifinal. In the other, England, 126-53 conquerors of Hungary, would face USA, who bested Hackett 86-82 in a real cliffhanger.

"They don't call me 'Winkler' cause I take finesses."

## The Semifinals: Part 1

## Boards 1-20:

Poland vs TAJIMA, USA vs England. The Japanese team, despite their Australian ringer and a big win over European Alliance, figured to have their hands full with mighty Poland. We can't see anything in our crystal ball to suggest the winner in USA vs England, so we'll remain silent.

The match began with a partscore deal that could easily have been a game deal in disguise...

| Bd: 1 | North |
| :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North | - AJ6 |
| Vul: None | $\bigcirc$ Q97643 |
|  | $\diamond$ K |
|  | 2 AQ3 |
| West | East |
| - Q1095 | - 8 |
| $\bigcirc$ A5 | $\bigcirc$ J108 |
| $\checkmark$ AQ92 | $\diamond 875$ |
| * K95 | \& J108742 |
|  | South |
|  | ¢ K7432 |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K2 |
|  | $\checkmark$ J10643 |
|  | -6 |


| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Feldman | Armstrong | Osberg | Callaghan |
|  | 18 | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | 29 | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 34 |
| Pass | 49 | Pass | Pass |
| Dbl | All Pass |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lambardi | Sutherlin | Senior | Wolff |
|  | 18 | Pass | 14 |
| Dbl | Rdbl* | 4\% | 4 |
| Dbl | All Pass |  |  |
| * 3-card spade support |  |  |  |

John Armstrong's 2 rebid had a lot going for it and enabled him to show three-card spade support with some extras (whether or not he had them is another story). When the English pair seemed to be struggling to reach game Mark Feldman doubled on the auction, hoping that he wouldn't give away the trump position as a result. He led the $\diamond A$, saw Sharon Osberg's reverse-count eight, and continued with a low diamond. Brian Callaghan elected to ruff to play a heart to the king and ace, and now Feldman could continue with the $\diamond$ Q to ensure that he would take two trump tricks. That was all for the defense, however: -100 .

Pablo Lambardi decided to enter the auction over 1s and his atypical takeout double prompted Brian Senior to bounce all the way to 4*. Bobby Wolff, knowing of John Sutherlin's three-card spade support, took the push to 49, and Lambardi doubled at least in large part because he didn't want to see Senior bid 5\&, not that Brian is the sort of player to bid four and five. Lambardiled a low club and Wolf won the ace to lead a heart to the king and ace. Lambardi played $\diamond \mathrm{A}, \diamond 2$, and Wolff discarded a club from dummy and took East's seven with the jack to ruff out the hearts. Lambardi did not over-ruff, discarding a club. Now Wolff ruffed a diamond low, ruffed a club, and ruffed a diamond with the J . Although he was doing well so far, he couldn't quite get home from here and finished one down; -100. No swing.


With a pile of high cards, Lambardi decided to attack with his best suit, hoping to catch partner with some weak length. Dummy produced a few more stoppers than usual in opening leader's suit, but Lambardi was allowed to hold the first trick with the K , so it could have been worse. He switched to a heart around to the queen, and Wolff led a club to the jack and cleared the suit: +600. Had Lambardi switched to a diamond at trick two, it's likely that he would have beaten the contract. Declarer can't afford to duck lest he lose dummy's delayed diamond entry prematurely and when he wins in hand to establish clubs, West can continue with the $\diamond Q$ and wait to get in with a major-suit king.

Feldman elected to lead the $\vee 3$, fourth best. Callaghan took the nine with the queen and led the 8 , deuce...ten. Suddenly, he could no longer make the hand. He played A , club, Osberg discarding seven-five of spades, discouraging, marking her with the 810 (else a heart discard). Feldman continued hearts and Callaghan took the third heart, crossed to a diamond, and lost the spade finesse. He could take only seven tricks and so was two down, -200. 13 IMPs to USA, 14-0 in the match.

The winning play in clubs is not one you see very often, but it's a classic illustration of preserving entries. Declarer should run the eight of clubs when West follows low. If it loses to the blank nine in the relevant worst case scenario, low to the jack next time deals with king-queen-fourth onside. In effect it's the other side of the coin we saw in the Open Room, where Wolff ducked the k to conserve an internal entry in the suit, leaving the delayed entry in diamonds for later. The point is that you can afford to lose the first club trick cheaply.

Curiously, the same pair of results was registered in the other semifinal, Michal Kwiecien ducking Tadashi Teramoto's lead of the N , Mitsue Tajima following Callaghan's line in clubs after a low heart lead from Krzysztof Martens. Note that declarer can identify West's lead of the $\vee 3$ as the lowest outstanding heart spot, so hearts will normally be four-three and declarer can afford two club losers. The secondary danger in spades is probably a minor concern as declarer can win a spade shift from East with the ace, then later (if necessary) play the queen on the third round. He will lose the contract only when East has two club entries and West started with four spades to the king and East shifts to spades.

Lesniewski went down in 3NT in the other semifinal when Ino allowed the J to win on the first round and Lesniewski, after accurately knocking out the $\vee \mathrm{K}$ first, later tried a diamond to the nine and ten, then played the king and ace and later still misguessed the club position.

"It is so my coat. I had two of them when I got here this morning."


In different ways the auctions perpetrated by both English pairs could be considered sporting. Against Lambardi's 3NT, Sutherlin led the 10. Wolff overtook with the jack and declarer might have taken the trick as he had a slow second stopper. However, when he ducked, Wolff switched to the 85 , queen, three, deuce, a club to the queen held and declarer played $\diamond \mathrm{K}$, diamond to the ace, club. North won and reverted to hearts, but declarer finished that suit and the diamonds and exited in spades. Wolff won and had to give Lambardi his $\mathbf{4} \mathrm{K}$ in the end. Whew! +600.

Armstrong/Callaghan were much too high in 4 . South's sequence ( $2 \Leftrightarrow$ was a puppet to $2 \diamond$ ) describing a game-forcing hand with long spades but no slam interest. Feldman led the $\bigcirc Q$ to the king and ace and Osberg cashed the $\checkmark 10$ before switching to $\diamond K, \diamond 5$ to the ace. Feldman tried to cash a third diamond so

Callaghan could pitch a heart on a club and escape for two down, -100. 11 IMPs to England, 11-14.


Armstrong's 2NT was a forcing spade raise, usually with four trumps and as $4 \diamond$ denied a club control $4 \bigcirc$ promised one. Hence Armstrong's willingness to use RKCB. As Callaghan did not show his void, Armstrong signed off, expecting two key cards to be missing: +510 .

Sutherlin's 2 was neither forcing forever nor particularly descriptive, and when Wolff rebid 24 , a raise to 34 would not have been forcing. Thus, 44 was a value raise to game, perhaps with something in reserve. Wolff could hardly move forward. A Natural and forcing 2NT would have worked well as North could follow up with
$4 \diamond$ over 3s, allowing South to appreciate the power of his club void. A direct 2NT would have been a forcing spade raise, however. Given what transpired, perhaps the lie about the missing fourth trump would have been a lesser evil than 2\%. Wolff also made seven for +510 and an undistinguished push.

Kwiecien/Pszczola reached 64 in the other match when North used RKCB after South's $4 \bigcirc$ implied a club control. Although South did not show his club void he went on to six when North signed off at five, reasoning that once North had denied a club control the club void had to be as good as the ace. Interesting indeed.

| Bd: 12 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dir: West <br> Vul: N/S | - 4 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 109875$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 1043$ |  |  |
| 2 K1063 |  |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| - Q3 | ¢ AJ1087 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ A42 | $\bigcirc 6$ |  |  |
| $\diamond$ AQ865 | $\checkmark 92$ |  |  |
| - A72 |  |  | 854 |
| South |  |  |  |
| ¢ K9652 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ KQJ3 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ KJ7 |  |  |  |
| \& J |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Feldman | Armstrong | Osberg | Callaghan |
| 1NT | Pass | 2 ${ }^{*}$ | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | 4\% | Pass |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 49 | All Pass |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lambardi | Sutherlin | Senior | Wolff |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| 1NT | Pass | 20* | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | 34 | All Pass |

I'm not sure why Lambardi replied 24 to Senior's inquiry but as he stayed out of a thin game, it seems to have worked well enough. Senior won the heart lead in dummy
and started clubs. North followed low to the second club and Wolff ruffed declarer's nine to force declarer in hearts. Senior finessed the $\diamond$ Q to lead a third club and Sutherlin won the king, Wolff discarding the $\diamond J$. Senior took the second heart force and led the eq, Wolff discarding the $\triangleleft K$, then ruffed his last club with the $\triangle Q$ as South parted with his last heart. Wolff ruffed the $\diamond$ A and exited with a trump but declarer had nine tricks: +140.

Osberg, in 44, also started on clubs, but by leading low to her queen. Now a club to the ace (diamond from Callaghan) and a third club (another diamond from South). Osberg ruffed the heart return, over-ruffed a club with the $\uparrow Q$, led a spade to her ace and knocked out the $\mathbf{~} \mathrm{K}$, but she couldn't find a tenth winner: -50.5 IMPs to England, 16-14.

| Bd: 13 | North |
| :--- | :--- |
| DIr: North | ¿ J8 |
| Vul: Both | $\diamond$ Q65 |
|  | $\diamond$ K763 |
|  | 10754 |


| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| - K96543 | - 107 |
| $\checkmark$ A108 | $\bigcirc$ J9743 |
| $\diamond$ Q82 | $\diamond 94$ |
| -6 | \% AQ82 |

South

- AQ2
$\bigcirc$ K2
$\diamond$ AJ105
\& KJ93
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feldman | Armstrong | Osberg | Callaghan |
|  | Pass | Pass | 10* |
| 14 | Pass | Pass | 1NT |
| Pass | 2NT | All Pass |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lambardi | Sutherlin | Senior | Wolff |
|  | Pass | Pass | 120 |
| 14. | Pass | Pass | 1NT |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Callaghan did well to take ten tricks on a spade
lead but he was only in 2NT: +180 .
Against 3NT, Lambardi tried a surprise attack in diamonds, which didn't hurt Wolff much. He won the $\diamond$ J, led the $\diamond 10$ to the queen and king, and called for the 10 . Senior took the to return the $\$ 10$ and Wolff played the queen to try for a spade entry to dummy. Lambardi ducked, however, and now Wolff played the $\odot \mathrm{K}$ to the ace, took the 810 with the queen, took a club finesse and settled for nine tricks; +600.9 IMPs to USA, 23-16.

| Bd: 15 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: South | ¢ 10754 |  |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\bigcirc 643$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 63$ |  |  |
|  | - Q964 |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| - AQJ3 | - K86 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q7 | $\bigcirc$ A10 |  |  |
| $\diamond$ J8754 | $\diamond$ AKQ9 |  |  |
| - 103 | * AJ72 |  |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | - 92 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ KJ9852 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 102$ |  |  |
|  | * K85 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Feldman | Armstrong | Osberg | Callaghan |
|  |  |  | 2 ${ }^{*}$ |
| Pass | 2 ${ }^{*}$ | Dbl | Pass* |
| 34 | Pass | 49 | All Pass |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lambardi | Sutherlin | Senior | Wolff |
|  |  |  | $2 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

Senior took 12 tricks in 3NT on a club lead and Feldman 11 in 4 on a heart lead, ducked to the king. The Multi gave the Americans a fairly hard ride, but it's a bit surprising that Lambardi didn't do more at his table in a different scenario. 1 IMP to England, 17-23.

Teramoto/Del'Monte reached 6ater a Multi $2 \triangleleft$ by Kwiecien when East launched into RKCB when his partner jumped to 3 s over his double
of the pass-or-correct 28 reply by North. A heart lead through the ace ended declarer's chances.

| Bd: 16 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: West | - 865 |  |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\bigcirc$ J32 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J8 |  |  |
|  | \% K9854 |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| - KQ7 | ¢ 2 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ AK84 | $\bigcirc$ Q9765 |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ K3 | $\diamond$ A654 |  |  |
| - Q1073 | * AJ6 |  |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | - AJ10943 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 10$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q10972 |  |  |
|  | * 2 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Feldman | Armstrong | Osberg | Callaghan |
| 1NT | Pass | $2 \diamond^{*}$ | 24 |
| 2NT* | Pass | 31 | Pass |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lambardi | Sutherlin | Senior | Wolff |
| 18 | Pass | 34* | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | 4 | 4 |
| Dbl | All Pass |  |  |

With the club finesse right, Feldman was +680 in $4 \vee$ after a transfer and a super-acceptance. In the Closed Room, Wolffie's unilateral 4s worked well. He lost only six tricks and so conceded 500. 5 IMPs to USA, ahead 28-18.

"Let's see, it goes, 'fa,-la-la-la, la-la-la-la-la-la..."


Both Wests led a low diamond against 3NT and the declarers started spades. Both declarers eventually crossed to the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ to finish spades. Osberg discarded a couple of hearts on the spades, Senior a heart and a diamond. Callaghan decided to lead a heart to the king, as if the queen did not drop he could still play West (out of hearts) for the A Bingo! +600.

Wolff, with less to go on, led a heart to the jack and had five losers: -100.12 IMPs to England, ahead now, 30-28.

| Bd: 20 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: West | ¢ AKJ1064 |  |  |
| Vul: Both | $\bigcirc 543$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J42 |  |  |
|  | * 6 |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| - Q72 | - 9 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ A | $\bigcirc$ KJ10872 |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ K987 | $\diamond 10$ |  |  |
| - AK854 | - J10972 |  |  |
| South |  |  |  |
| - 853 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q96 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ AQ653 |  |  |  |
| * Q3 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Feldman | Armstrong | Osberg | Callaghan |
| 1\% | 2. | 3 | 34 |
| Pass | Pass | 4 | All Pass |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lambardi | Sutherlin | Senior | Wolff |
| 1\% | 24 | 3 | 4 |
| Dbl | Pass | 5\% | All Pass |

An unlikely club lead would have defeated Osberg's $4 \bigcirc$ as with the trumps blocked she would have no fast entry to hand and the defenders would get two aces, a trump and a club ruff. On a spade lead and club shift, however, she was able to cross to hand with a spade ruff after unblocking the $\triangle$ A to play $\triangle \mathrm{K}$, ©10: +620.

Lambardi's 5e was unassailable: +600. 1 IMP to USA, 29-30.

A fascinating set of boards featuring some pretty good bridge left England 1 IMP ahead, awaiting a concession. The Americans decided to play the second half, however.

In the other semifinal, where TAJIMA had been ahead 25-12 after eight deals, Poland had finished strong to win the set 60-28. While a 32-IMP margin is not safe in any match, it would take some terrific bridge to upset the Polish steamroller on their current form.


"First, the shadow wraps himself in his invisible cloak and..."

"...ouch! I just hate it when that happens."

"I use Brut aftershave, and she's glad I do."

## Boards 21-40:

With 20 deals remaining in the 2003 NEC Cup semifinals, Poland led TAJIMA 60-28 while England was crushing USA by 1 IMP, 30-29. Let's stick with the close match.

The first four deals were small potatoes. three of them involving 1-IMP swings. The fifth deal, which also featured a 1-IMP swing, was more serious...

| Bd: 25 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: North | . 10943 |  |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\bigcirc$ AKQJ2 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q93 |  |  |
|  | \& Q |  |  |
| West |  | East |  |
| - AKJ7 |  | - 8 |  |
| $\bigcirc 843$ |  | $\bigcirc 109$ |  |
| $\diamond 7$ |  | $\checkmark$ AKJ10842 |  |
| - A10742 |  | \& K93 |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | 4. Q652 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 765$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 65$ |  |  |
|  | d865 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| Sutherlin | North | East | South |
|  | Armstrong | Wolff | Callaghan |
|  | 18 | $2 \diamond$ | All Pass |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West <br> Lambardi | North | East | South |
|  | Feldman | Senior | Osberg |
|  | $2 \diamond^{*}$ | 3 - | All Pass |
| * 49/5『, 11-16 HCP |  |  |  |

Even if your two-level minor-suit overcalls are not always serious attempts to reach 3NT, it looks like a big position for West to pass $2 \diamond$. It's not as if you're planning to double the opponents in $2 \checkmark$ at IMPs if they get there via a reopening double.

And even if you have to stretch on occasion to introduce a long suit at the three-level over an opponent's normal-strength two-level opening, that doesn't mean you're less likely to have a full value overcall when you stick your neck out
to compete.
Which gives you some idea of how I feel about those passes by West. Not that any bid stands out or comes with any security, but it's bad for morale to pass and be wrong. Partner will start to overbid with fairly good hands because he'll remember this deal. Sutherlin might have tried $2 \triangleleft$ or 3 or a fancy 2 and Lambardi had an easier advance in spades. Here both pairs might have reached $5 \triangleleft$ and made it. Wolff made five, Senior only four. After five deals, England led 32-31.

In the other semifinal, where Imakura also opened a Flannery, Martens advanced $3 \diamond$ with $3 \checkmark$ and when that got doubled, tried $4 \%$ on the way back. Lesniewski was pleased to bid $5 \diamond$ now but was less pleased when he decided not to take the diamond finesse. At the other table, Pszczola opened $1 \checkmark$ and Del'Monte jumped to $3 \bigcirc$, asking for a heart stopper. Well, he was down over 30 IMPs and was willing to gamble a bit. Teramoto couldn't bid 3NT but he had so much strength that he drove Ish to 5$\rangle$. Declarer took the diamond finesse and gained 10 IMPs.

| Bd: 26 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: East | - 9542 |  |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\bigcirc$ A8 |  |  |
| $\diamond$ J84 |  |  |  |
| \& AKJ9 |  |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| - A83 | - QJ107 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q10964 | $\bigcirc$ J532 |  |  |
| $\diamond 6$ | $\checkmark$ AQ9 |  |  |
| * 10763 | \& Q5 |  |  |
| South |  |  |  |
| - K6 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ K7 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ K107532 |  |  |  |
| - 842 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sutherlin | Armstrong | Wolff | Callaghan |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 18 | Dbl | 28 | All Pass |


| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lambardi | Feldman | Senior | Osberg |
|  |  | 1NT | Pass |
| $2 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dbl | Pass | 3 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The auction came up much better for Feldman/Osberg than for their counterparts. $2 \checkmark$ made an easy three, +140 . In $3 \diamond$, Osberg got the trumps right but the clubs wrong, +110.6 IMPs to USA, who took the lead, 37-32.

| Bd: 27 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: South | - AK8 |  |  |
| Vul: Both | $\bigcirc$ KJ75 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q |  |  |
|  | 2 AK983 |  |  |
| West |  | East |  |
| - 932 |  | . 10754 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ AQ62 |  | $\bigcirc$--- |  |
| $\diamond$ J8754 |  | $\diamond$ K10962 |  |
| \& J |  | \& 7542 |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | - QJ6 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 109843$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A3 |  |  |
|  | 2 Q106 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sutherlin | Armstrong | Wolff | Callaghan |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 19** | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | $3{ }^{*}$ | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $6 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lambardi | Feldman | Senior | Osberg |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 1\% | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | $3{ }^{*}$ | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

If Feldman's $3 \diamond$ splinter was forcing to game, Osberg's signoff jump to $4 \checkmark$ looks quite conservative, but slam is no bargain, so in theory the Americans got it right. Osberg
played as safely as possible and conceded two trump tricks, +650 .

In the Open Room Sutherlin would have beaten $6 \bigcirc$ easily had he led his long suit, often a good idea if forcing the strong hand to ruff is a possibility. Instead he led a club, perhaps hoping to talk declarer out of a trump finesse in a position like this one. And right he was. Callaghan won the club lead in hand and led a trump to the king, reducing the number of ways East could gain the lead to give West a club ruff. Well, you can see what declarer was thinking. One down, -100.13 IMPs to USA, 5032.

Teramoto doubled $5 \checkmark$ in the other match and Pszczola made six, +1050. At the other table,
Tajima lost her concentration and went down in $4 \bigcirc$ for a double disaster. 15 IMPs to Poland.

| Bd: 29 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North | ¢ Q1095 |  |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\bigcirc 72$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AK93 |  |  |
|  | * 975 |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| - 83 | - A62 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 109543$ | $\checkmark$ AK |  |  |
| $\diamond$ J | $\diamond$ Q1084 |  |  |
| - KQJ63 |  |  |  |
| South |  |  |  |
| ¢ KJ74 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ QJ86 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond 7652$ |  |  |  |
| -8 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sutherlin | Armstrong | Woiff | Callaghan |
|  | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 28 | All Pass |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lambardi | Feldman | Senior | Osberg |
|  | Pass | 1\% | Pass |
| 18 | Dbl | 1NT | 24 |
| 3\% | All Pass |  |  |

The E/W hands fit unbelievably well and they can make 5e but it's difficult to see how they
can bid it. Wolff/Sutherlin don't play transfers so West could could start with 2 and guess an action over $2 \triangleleft$ or $2 \downarrow$, but it would be strange not to make any attempt to reach a heart contract. And Lambardi, who at least knew his partner has some clubs, might have jumped to $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ over $2 \boldsymbol{4}$, but it's not likely that this sequence had been discussed. $2 \checkmark$ yielded +140 , $3 \boldsymbol{s}$ +150 . No swing.

| Bd: 30 | North |
| :--- | :--- |
| DIr: East | 10863 |
| Vul: Both | $\diamond 6$ |
|  | $\diamond$ A742 |
|  | A942 |


| West <br> . AK974 |  | East <br> - J5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ KJ72 |  | $\bigcirc 1098543$ |
| $\checkmark$ KJ10 |  | $\checkmark 96$ |
| - J |  | 1063 |
|  | South |  |
|  | , Q2 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AQ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q853 |  |
|  | * KQ875 |  |

Open Room


It's not every day that you can offer six-card support for a suit partner has gone out of his way to show, but Wolff decided to go quietly over Armstrong's bold 3NT. Had Sutherlin divined to lead a heart accurate defense would have beaten the contract, but there was no reason for him to stay off his promising fivecard suit. The lead of the brought the three, jack and queen. Callaghan tested clubs, then led a spade towards dummy. Sutherlin won the king and tried the $\triangleleft \mathrm{K}$. That gave declarer nine
tricks and when he gave West the lead in diamonds later, there was a tenth coming. Plus 630 for Armstrong, a handsome result.

At the other table, it's difficult to tell what Feldman was doing. His hand suggests that 2e was Stayman but Osberg's 5 suggests that 2e was natural. In any case, the right thing to do was double or pass $4 \bigcirc$ because declarer can't reach his hand to lead towards dummy's trump tenace. 5e doubled was two down on the lead of the $\checkmark 9$, covered all around; -500.15 IMPs to England, within 4 IMPs now, 47-51.

| Bd: 31 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: South | - AK107 |  |  |
| Vul: None | $\bigcirc 9$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 97$ |  |  |
| - KJ10952 |  |  |  |
| West |  | East |  |
| - QJ86543 |  | ¢ --- |  |
| $\bigcirc 32$ |  | $\checkmark$ AQ107 |  |
| $\checkmark$ A |  | $\diamond$ QJ865432 |  |
| - AQ7 |  | $\bigcirc 3$ |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | - 92 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ KJ8654 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K10 |  |  |
|  | - 864 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sutherlin | Armstrong | Wolff | Callaghan |
|  |  |  | $2 \diamond^{*}$ |
| 34 All Pass |  |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lambardi | Feldman | Senior | Osberg |
|  |  |  | $2 \bigcirc$ |
| 34 | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

Is West worth a strong jump overcall of 34? His length suggests that his bid is acceptable, but the quality of his suit is far from what East will expect, and that's a big negative. If West's decision strikes you as difficult, what can you say about East's, over 3 ? Both pass and 3NT feel wrong, but $4 \diamond$ gets you past 3NT, a contract that might be easy opposite some sort of diamond fit. Once again, the vulnerability makes it less scary to pass, but I know I could
never bring myself to do it. I would bid either 3NT, like Senior, or $4 \diamond$, like a normal mortal, without much conviction other than bidding has a much higher upside than passing. 3s went down three on the lead of the 99 . Who doubled? Minus 150.

Senior's 3NT would appear to be a nightmare, but a strange thing happened on the way to the Boulevard of Broken Dreams...South's heart lead ran to the ten and Senior crossed hopefully to the $\diamond$ A, willing the king to fall. It didn't, but when he called for a low spade and discarded a diamond on it, South allowed North's $₫ 7$ to win the trick rather than overtake to lead a club through, and North returned ...the $\diamond 9$. Brian doesn't show much emotion at the best of times, but we can't imagine him looking morose at that point. Plus 430 for Senior and 11 IMPs to England, ahead now 58-51.

| Bd: 32 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: West | - AKJ2 |  |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\bigcirc$ J32 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 752$ |  |  |
| - QJ10 |  |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| - 985 | - Q10763 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ K1084 | $\bigcirc$ AQ7 |  |  |
| $\checkmark 963$ | $\checkmark$ A104 |  |  |
| - K93 |  | \& |  |
| South |  |  |  |
| - 4 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 965$ |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ KQJ8 |  |  |  |
| -87542 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sutherlin | Armstrong | Wolff | Callaghan |
| Pass | 19* | 19 | Dbl* |
| 2 | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| 34 | All Pass |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lambardi | Feldman | Senior | Osberg |
| Pass | Pass | 14. | Pass |
| 1NT | All Pass |  |  |

Lambardi managed 10 tricks in 1NT on a club lead and continuation, North putting up a fairly
gentle defense: +180.
Wolff, in 34, ducked the lead of the $\diamond K$, but took the continuation of the $\diamond J$ with the ace, crossed to the K , and led the $\$$. Armstrong won the king and played a second club to the ace. Wolff crossed to the 8 K and led the $\uparrow 9$, taken by Armstrong with the ace. He tapped declarer with a club, which was just what Wolff needed to shorten himself for the impending coup. Had he cashed the $\vee A Q$ and exited with his remaining diamond, he would have taken the last two tricks with the queen-ten of trumps over North's guarded jack. Instead, Wolff cashed the 4 Q to go one down; -50. 6 IMPs to England, 64-51.

| Bd: 33 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North | ¢ K10985 |  |  |
| Vul: Both | $\bigcirc 109$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 107$ |  |  |
|  | - KQ82 |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| - AQJ74 | - 3 |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ AKJ | $\bigcirc 7543$ |  |  |
| $\diamond$ QJ4 | $\checkmark$ AK9832 |  |  |
| ¢ J6 | \& A4 |  |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | - 62 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q862 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 65$ |  |  |
|  | 209753 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sutherlin | Armstrong | Wolff | Callaghan |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| $2 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West <br> Lambardi | North | East | South |
|  | Feldman | Senior | Osberg |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 19 | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | 5 | Pass |
| 5NT | Pass | 6 | All Pass |

Neither E/W auction is entirely satisfying (from West's point of view East needn't hold the ace
or king of clubs) but Lambardi's approach worked an awful lot better than Sutherlin's.
$4 \checkmark$ made five, +650 . In $6 \diamond$ Senior won the club lead, played two rounds of trumps, A , spade ruff, $\gtrdot A, \stackrel{\wedge}{ }$, and ran it, discarding a club. He eventually took the heart finesse for an overtrick: +1390. 12 IMPs more to England, 7651.

Both E/W pairs reached slam in the other match and Teramoto/Del'Monte did well to bid seven because they needn't something big. Unfortunately, Ish misguessed the play and went one down, so Poland gained 16 instead of losing 13.

| Bd: 34 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | - AJ972 |  |  |
| Vul: None | $\bigcirc 9$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q1098 |  |  |
|  | - A74 |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| - 64 | - 108 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q62 | $\bigcirc$ AKJ1084 |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ KJ64 | $\diamond 75$ |  |  |
| Q Q865 | * K92 |  |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | - KQ53 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 753$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A32 |  |  |
|  | 2 J103 |  |  |
| Open Room/Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sutherlin | Armstrong | Wolff | Callaghan |
| Lambardi | Feldman | Senior | Osberg |
|  |  | 18 | Pass |
| $2 \checkmark$ | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Both Easts cashed a high heart against 44, West encouraging. Senior switched to a passive trump, Wolff to an aggressive diamond, the seven. Feldman mucked around for a few tricks but eventually started diamonds by leading the queen. He had to lose two diamond tricks for -50 . Armstrong rose with the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$, drew two rounds of trumps and led a diamond to his nine. He crossed to a third spade to lead another diamond and so developed a third
diamond winner to discard a club from dummy: +420. 10 IMPs to England, 86-51.

A couple of overtrick IMPs to Engand made it 88-51. Then...

| Bd: 36 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dir: West | ¢ K4 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K98543 |  |  |
| $\diamond$ KJ103 |  |  |  |
| - A |  |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| - Q87 | - J5 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ J10 | $\bigcirc$ Q2 |  |  |
| $\checkmark 64$ | $\diamond$ AQ9872 |  |  |
| - KQJ953 |  |  |  |
| South |  |  |  |
| - A109632 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ A76 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 5$ |  |  |  |
| - 862 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sutherlin | Armstrong | Wolff | Callaghan |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | 14 |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pas |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lambardi | Feldman | Senior | Osberg |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | 14* |
| 29 | Dbl* | $2 \diamond$ | 31 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| *14. suggests 5+4 |  |  |  |
| *Dbl=2-card support |  |  |  |

$4 \bigcirc$ made five: +450. 34 made four: +170. 7 IMPs to England, 95-51. England had run off 63 IMPs without reply to lead by 44 with four deals left.

"I'm taking my convention card and going home."

$6 \diamond$ is excellent but neither pair got there, the Americans coming close. The vigorish in playing $5 \diamond$ rather than 3NT is illustrated by the actual layout, which has diamonds three-zero offside. Thus, justice was served, at least as far as it goes. 3NT was two down: $-100.5 \diamond$ made five for +400.11 IMPs to USA, 62-95.

There wasn't much in the last three deals, but there was one more deal of interest:

"Ven I'm done pooshing tray under, then you close screen."

| Bd: 40 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: West | ¢ KJ96 |  |  |
| Vul: Both | $\bigcirc$ J54 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A7 |  |  |
|  | \& K863 |  |  |
| West |  | East |  |
| ¢ 43$>8$ |  | - A1082 |  |
|  |  | $\bigcirc$ KQ93 |  |
| $\diamond$ KQ1098542 |  | $\diamond$ J63 |  |
| -107 |  | \& 42 |  |
| South |  |  |  |
| - Q75 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ A10762 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$--- |  |  |  |
| 2. AQJ95 |  |  |  |
| Open Room/Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sutherlin | Armstrong | Wolff | Callaghan |
| Lambardi | Feldman | Senior | Osberg |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | Dbl |
| Pass | 49 | All Pass |  |

Double or $4 \vee$ ? Both Souths doubled, which would be my choice also, but here $4 \checkmark$ would have led to a safer strain, Both declarers ruffed the opening diamond lead in dummy and played $\uparrow Q$, spade to the king and ace. East switched to the $\vee \mathrm{K}$, but declarer was in control: SA, K , J , heart: +420.

England won the second half 65-34 and won the match 95-63, and did so with some impressive bridge, some luck, and some help from their opponents.

In the other semifinal, Poland won the second half 49-40 to defeat TAJIMA 109-68. Today's final will pit the defending champions against the betting favorites. Could we have hoped for a better match?

I sure wish he'd quit sucking on that stupid plastic cigarette


## Picking Dafyddils



Behind the " 8 " ball?
The following play situation arose in the fifthround Swiss match between the team from Wales and the Japanese team SCOTII. Dafydd Jones was sitting North, his dad Gary South, and the deal in question is shown at the right.

Against Dafydd's $3 \triangleleft$ contract the $\diamond 10$ was led to dummy's jack. Dafydd played a spade to the queen, ducked a club to West's jack, won the diamond return, and played ace and a club, ruffing. When the third round of diamonds was led from dummy West ruffed and played a spade. Dafydd won, cashed $\vee A$, then played $\diamond$ K pitching a spade from hand as West ruffed in with the $\vee \mathrm{K}$. With West on lead and dummy left with only the PJ 108 , Dafydd could not be prevented from scoring two of the last three tricks. A nifty "dummy reversal" for +140 .

(1) You'd have opened something else
(2) Transfer to hearts-what else!

## Images of Our Game


"I suppose I could lie just this once..."

"It's amazing how quickly he can score up with our smoke in his eyes."

"Can he do that, go back to Warsaw just because I pulled his penalty double?"

Justin Hackett approached us at breakfast yesterday morning with this little gem from the English trials. We'll present it to you as a bidding problem.

Sitting East, at game all, you pick up the unenviable collection: xxx $\vee x x \diamond$ Qxxx xxxx. As your eyes begin to glaze over and thoughts of "Pass the marmalade, s'il-vous plait" waft through your mind LHO opens the bidding $2 \diamond$ (natural, weak), followed in rapid succession by double, redouble-to you! Well, isn't that a revolting development. What now?

To review (it's always best to stall in these situations), the auction has been:

| West <br> Partner | North <br> RHO | East <br> You | South <br> LHO |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dbl | Rdbl | $?$ | $2 \diamond$ |

Pass is always an attractive option, primarily because it allows dear partner the honor of extricating the two of you from the mess he's gotten you into. Some would bid their longest suit (4e), while others would bid a "confident" 34, hoping to stay as low as possible when the doubling begins.

If you pass (perhaps for the express reason stated above) the auction would have proceeded...well, that's just it, it wouldn't have proceeded-it would have ended at $2 \diamond$ redoubled. That is precisely what happened. The complete deal, along with the persona curia...


| DIr: South <br> Vul: Both | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | , AQx |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AK98x |  |
|  | $\diamond$--- |  |
|  | * AQJ9x |  |
| West |  | East |
| (1) K10xx |  | ¢ xxx |
| $\bigcirc$ QJxx |  | $\bigcirc x x$ |
| $\checkmark$ Ax |  | $\diamond$ Qxxx |
| -K10x |  | * xxxx |
|  | South |  |
|  | ¢ Jxx |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 10 x$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ KJ10xxxx |  |
|  | \% x |  |

## Table One

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brian | Tony | David | Paul <br> Hackett |
| Callaghan | Waterlow | Burn | $2 \diamond$ |
| Dbl | Rdbl | All Pass |  |

Declarer, "Papa" Hackett, scored up 11 tricks for what surely figured to be a great result, +1960—only to lose 1 IMP! The reason...

| Table two |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West | North | East | South <br> Justin |
| John | Jason | Danny <br> Armstrong | Hackett |
| Davies | Hackett |  |  |
| Dbl | Rdbl | Pass | Pass |
| $3 \triangleleft$ | Dbl | $4 \dot{2}$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dbl | All Pass |  |

Poor Danny Davies managed only three tricks (and he was probably lucky to get them) in 4e doubled and ended up seven down, -2000. Les Enfants Terribles had struck again, this time ensnaring their dear pater familias along with poor Mr. Davies.

# An Early Lesson in Humility 

by Eric Kokish

This year bridge players everywhere have the opportunity to compete in the new European Open Championships being staged in the French Mediterranean resort of Menton between 14-28 June 2003 at the Palais de l'Europe. As part of a series world-famous writer and player Eric Kokish recalls a very important early lesson in his bridge career.


кемıол и! әбр!я

I started to play seriously in 1967, at the Summer North American Championships in Montreal, my home town. As I had less than 100 master points I could not play in the Life Master Pairs, the Spingold, or the Master Mixed Teams. However, my lifelong friend George Mittelman and I made our mark (or so we thought) in the secondary events, one day scoring over 225 on a 156 top in two separate single-session side games. Okay, so it wasn't the big time, but we were barely 20 years old and unbelievably keen, and I still remember hurrying over to the major events to kibitz the great players of the day, hoping some of their wisdom would rub off on us. Although I confess that today I don't hurry quite as much, my interest in seeking the truth about the game still keeps me coming back for more.

Four years later, most of my friends and I believed we had become pretty good players, and we had all enjoyed some success at the national and North American level. At the 1971 Can-Am Regional, I was playing with my great and good friend Joey Silver, who had taken me under his wing a couple of years earlier, ostensibly to play set "needle matches" for coin of the realm against his unsuspecting rubber bridge cronies.

The Can-Am was our most important local tournament, and as there were far fewer events at each tournament in those days, winning one of them was still a special achievement. Joey and I were playing in the Open Pairs and faring quite well at the table but less well away from it, as we were following a slow pair and never seemed to have more than ten minutes per round to play two deals.

As luck would have it, on one of these "short" rounds the first board took most of the available time, and when we extracted our cards for the second deal there were only a couple of minutes left to play. These were the cards (directions altered):

| DIr: East <br> Vul: Both | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | QJ1098 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AK3 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 4$ |  |  |
|  | * AKQ10 |  |  |
| West |  | East |  |
| - 5 |  | ¢ A742 |  |
| $\bigcirc 10864$ | $\bigcirc$ Q |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ J6 |  | $\diamond$ K1098732 |  |
| -986542 |  | \& J |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | ¢ K63 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J9752 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AQ5 |  |  |
|  | \% 73 |  |  |
| West | NorthSilver | East | South |
|  |  |  | Kokish |
|  |  | 3 | Pass |
| Pass | Dbl | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | 4 | Pass | 5 |
| Pass | 5 | Pass | 5NT |
| Pass | 6\% | Pass | 64 |
| Pass | 6NT | All Pa |  |

We bid quickly but with notable efficiency to 6NT, a particularly promising contract at matchpoints and one that seems destined to succeed when we look at all the cards. However, in my haste to catch up I took the lead of the $\diamond J$ with the queen and played on
spades without cashing either a high club or a high heart in dummy, either of which would have produced a positive result. (Let us not mention the absence of a plan to counter the possibility of being tucked in dummy on the third or fourth round of spades.) East took the third spade and played a second diamond, which I won with the ace, discarding dummy's $\bigcirc 3$, staking the fate of the deal on the club suit. As East was marked with eleven cards in spades and diamonds, West was an enormous favourite to hold the J , so I stifled a giggle at my carelessness and confidently led a club to the ten and jack, at which point I could not prevent myself from laughing rather more loudly.

East thought it was pretty funny too and demonstrated his joy at being given an unexpected entry by loudly thumbing each of his five remaining high diamonds onto the table as the Director hovered over us.

As you may already have foreseen, my greatest moment in bridge was not yet complete. As East led his last diamond, we were down to a three-card ending:

|  | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | , Q |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A |  |
|  | $\diamond--$ |  |
|  | \& |  |
| West |  | East |
| - --- |  | - 7 |
| $\bigcirc 10$ |  | $\bigcirc$ Q |
| $\diamond$--- |  | $\checkmark 2$ |
| - 92 |  | - --- |
|  | South |  |
|  | ¢ --- |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J9 |  |
|  | $\diamond--$ |  |
|  | ¢ 7 |  |

I knew that East held another spade, but was his remaining card a heart or a club? Perhaps trying to justify my club play to an extent only a masochist could appreciate, I decided to play East for a second club and so discarded the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ from dummy.

East's delight in showing me the $\vee Q$ came as no surprise.

And so it came to pass that the young and (I confess) somewhat arrogant Eric O Kokish, aspiring to be one of Canada's greatest players, finished minus 600 in a slam that was cold...umm...without a finesse...

It occurred to me that I might have a future in the game when I was able to report the deal to the Daily Bulletin (perhaps only moments ahead of the thundering hordes, it's true) with a smile on my face, despite the gaping wound in my heart.

We did not win the 1971 Can-Am Open Pairs.
Although I can't confirm with confidence that this incident convinced me not to take myself so seriously, it certainly contributed mightily. Years later, my Australian mate Bobby Richman pointed out that "we're all little error machines" with an unlimited capacity to make them, batteries not included. Appreciating that makes it so much easier to deal with our inadequacies.

I still look forward to the next major tournament because there's sure to be something new and interesting that I haven't experienced beforeplaces to go, people to see-something special worth keeping. Knowing that there will be high moments more than makes up for the inevitable disappointments.

To find out how to meet Eric and a host of other stars visit www.ecatsbridge.com

## COME TOGETHER IN MENTON

## FORMAT

The championship will include:

- Mixed Teams
- Mixed Pairs
- Open, Women=s and Senior Teams
- Open, Women=s and Senior Pairs
- Side Games


## RIGHT OF ENTRY

Bridge players (registered members of WBF NBOs) from all WBF zones, in good standing with their Federation, are entitled to participate. All events will be TRANSNATIONAL and there will be no restrictions on numbers of entries per NBO.

## VENUE

Palais de I=Europe, Menton, Côte d=Azur, France

## REGISTRATION

Must be made through your own Federation before $\mathbf{3 0}^{\text {th }}$
April 2003 and sent to:
European Bridge League
Gianarrigo Rona B President
Via Ciro Menotti 11/C
20129 Milano B Italy
Tel. +39 0270000333
Fax +39 0270001398
E M ail: ebl@federbridge.it
Non-European players may also register by internet
as from October 2002.

## ENTRY FEES

To be paid in cash (Swiss Francs, Euros, and US Dollars) at the Tournament Reception and Registration Desk in Palais de I=Europe in Menton:
Mixed Teams - Swiss Francs 1200
Mixed Pairs - Swiss Francs 400
Open Teams - Swiss Francs 1400
Women's Teams - Swiss Francs 1400
Senior Teams - Swiss Francs 1200
Open Pairs - Swiss Francs 700
Women's Pairs - Swiss Francs 700
Senior Pairs - Swiss Francs 500

## HOTEL ACCOMODATION

Please contact:
Syndicat des Hoteliers de Menton
Tel. +33493359803
Fax +33493571010
E-mail: info@hotelmenton.com

## HOW TO REACH MENTON

- By plane: Nice Côte d=Azur Airport (30 mins.)
- By train: Menton Railway Station


## FURTHER INFORMATION

Please contact:
Christina MacEachen B EBL
Via Ciro Menotti 11/C
20129 Milano B Italy
Tel. +39 0270000333 / 70000022
Fax +39 0270001398

E-mail: ebl@federbridge.it

## INFORMATION ON INTERNET

http://www.eurobridge.org
http://www.worldbridge.org
http://bridge.ecats.co.uk/
PROGRAMME \& SCHEDULE OF PLAY
Saturday $14^{\text {th }} \quad$ - Opening Ceremony

Sunday $15^{\text {th }}$
Monday $16^{\text {th }}$ - Mixed Teams (16- \& 8-Final/ Consolation Swiss)
Tuesday $17^{\text {th }} \quad$ - Mixed Teams (4- \& Semi-final)

- Mixed Pairs (Qualifying 1st \& 2nd Sessions)
Wednes. $18^{\text {th }} \quad$ - Mixed Teams (Final)
- Mixed Pairs (Qualifying 3rd \& Final 1st Sessions)
Thursday 19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ - Mixed Pairs (Final 2nd \& 3rd Sessions)
Friday $20^{\text {th }}$ - Men, Women \& Senior Teams (Qualifying Sessions)
Saturday 21th - Men, Women \& Senior Teams (Qualifying Sessions)
Sunday $22^{\text {nd }} \quad-$ Men, Women \& Senior Teams (Qualifying Sessions)
Monday $23^{\text {rd }}$ - Men, Women \& Senior Teams
(16- \& 8-Final / Consolation)
Tuesday $24^{\text {th }} \quad-$ Men, Women \& Senior Teams (4- \& Semi-final)
- Men, Women \& Senior Pairs
(1st \& 2nd Qualifying Sessions)
Wednes. $25^{\text {th }} \quad-$ Men, Women \& Senior Teams (Final)
- Men, Women \& Senior Pairs (3rd Qual. \& 1 st Semi-final)
Thursday $26^{\text {th }} \quad$ - Men, Women \& Senior Pairs (2nd \& 3rd Semi-final)
Friday $27^{\text {th }} \quad-$ Men, Women \& Senior Pairs
(1st \& 2nd Final \& Consolation)
Saturday $28^{\text {th }} \quad-$ Men, Women \& Senior Pairs (3rd Final Session)
- Closing Ceremony \& Prize-Giving at
7.30 p.m. followed by Victory Banquet

Play will start at 10/10.30 a.m. and finish at 8/8.30 p.m. each day, except for Saturday 14th June, when play will start in the afternoon after the Opening Ceremony.

## AWARDS

Gold, silver and bronze EBL Medals will be awarded. Winners will receive the title of European Open Champion. Honour prizes will be presented to the best ranking pairs and teams in each category. MasterPoints will also be awarded.

COME TO MENTON TO ENJOY TOGETHER THE FIRST EUROPEAN OPEN CHAMPIONSHIP
$8^{\text {th }}$ NEC Bridge Festival Daily Schedule

| Day/Date | Time | Event | Location |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Saturday (Feb. 8) | $10: 00-12: 20$ | NEC Cup Final 1 \& Playoff for 3 rd | E204/206 |
|  | $12: 30-14: 50$ | NEC Cup Final 2 \& Playoff for 3 |  |
|  | $14: 50-16: 00$ | Lunch Break |  |
|  | $16: 00-18: 20$ | NEC Cup Final 3 |  |
|  | $18: 30-20: 50$ | NEC Cup Final 4 | F203-206 |
| Sunday (Feb. 9) | $10: 00-17: 00$ | Yokohama Swiss Plate | F203-206 |
|  | $10: 00-17: 00$ | Asuka Cup | F201-202 |
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## Ms. Manners Calling

The Manners Committee of JCBL has been practicing Zero Tolerance and is appealing to players to recommend a good mannered player. In this NEC Cup, if anyone notices his partner's or opponent's highly ethical conduct, please tell either the Daily Bulletin editors or Haruko Koshi, chairperson of the Manners Committee.

## News and Notes

Registration: Those wishing to play in Sunday's Asuka Cup (Pairs) should register in the Secretariat (E202; x7202) by 18:00 hours (6:00 pm) on Saturday, February 8.

## Partner Wanted

For Sunday's Asuka Cup. Contact Paul Hackett.

## NEC Cup Bridge Festival on the Web

Call your friends and tell them that your exploits are being chronicled on the World Wide Web. They can follow all of the action at the $8^{\text {th }}$ NEC Cup Bridge Festival by surfing to:
http://bridge.cplaza.ne.jp/necfest.html

- or -
$h t t p: / / w w w . j c b l . o r . j p ~$


[^0]:    * Note time change

