## NEC Cup: Standings After Day One (Three Matches)

| Place Team | VPs | Place | Team | VPs | Place | Team | VPs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 England/Norway | 64 | 1410 | Austria/Denmark | 49 | 2724 | Girasol | 36 |
| 112 e-bridge | 64 | 1429 | MATSUBARA | 49 | 2725 | SKOTII | 36 |
| 37 Sweden | 62 | 1615 | PABF Open | 48 | 2727 | HANAGUMI | 36 |
| 39 Australia | 62 | 1617 | HANA | 48 | 3035 | COSMOS | 35 |
| 316 PABF Women | 62 | 1637 | Koyuzu | 48 | 3111 | Canada | 34 |
| 66 England | 60 | 1923 | NAITO | 46 | 3131 | 2002 | 34 |
| 78 USA | 58 | 201 | Chinese Taipei | 44 | 3313 | Taiwan Amethyst | 31 |
| 83 India | 56 | 2022 | Three Diamonds | 44 | 3420 | PS-JACK | 28 |
| 95 Russia | 53 | 2026 | GEEZER T | 44 | 3538 | My-bridge | 27 |
| 918 SLAM DUNK | 53 | 2333 | SWAN | 42 | 3621 | ESPERANZA | 25 |
| 112 Netherlands | 52 | 2428 | CITRUS | 40 | 3630 | TORNADOS Plus | 25 |
| 1214 GOING AT' EM | 50 | 2534 | K.S. | 38 | 3832 | Merry Queens | 16 |
| 1219 OKAY | 50 | 2636 | Kinki | 37 |  |  |  |


| Today'sStarting Times <br> Starting Time |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Swiss Match | Stioms |  |
| 4 | $10: 00-12: 50$ |  |
| Lunch Break | $12: 50-14: 00$ |  |
| 5 | $14: 00-16: 50$ |  |
| 6 | $17: 10-20: 00$ | $416-419$ |
| 6 |  | $416-419$ |

Tomorrow's Starting Times

Swiss Match
7
8
NEC Cup QF1

Starting Time
10:00-12:50
13:10-16:00
17:10-20:00

Rooms
416-419
416-419
416-419

## 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 $7^{\text {th }}$ NEC Cup Bridge Festival by surfing to:
http://bridge.cplaza.ne.jp/necfest.html

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { - or - } \\
\text { http://www.jcbl.or.jp } \\
\quad \text { - or - } \\
\text { http://e-bridgemaster.com }
\end{gathered}
$$

## NEC Cup 2002: 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 NEC |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bridge Festival bag). |  |

Seating Rights Toss of coin 5 minutes before start of match. Failure will constitute loss of rights.
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { KO-Phase Seating } & \begin{array}{l}\text { The winner of a coin toss has the choice of seating in either of the two 20-board } \\ \text { segments. In the four 16-board segments of the final, the choices will alternate over } \\ \text { segments. }\end{array}\end{array}$
Swiss Pairings For the first and second Swiss matches, pairings will be determined by randomly pairing each of the teams numbered 1-19 with one of the teams numbered 20-38. Subsequent match pairings will be based on current VP totals.

Home and visiting
1st numbered team sits $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$ 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 2001 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.
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Systems } & \text { No HUM methods will be permitted in this event. } \\ \text { In the Swiss, no Brown Sticker methods will be permitted. } \\ \text { In the KO Phase, Brown Sticker methods will be permitted only if filed before the }\end{array}$

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 $4^{\text {th }}-88^{\text {th. }}$. 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 semifinal opponent from any of the other three quarter-final matches.

Tuesday's Match Results

| Match 1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CHINESE TAIPEI (37) | 10-20 | HANAGUMI (59) |
| NETHERLANDS (83) | 25-2 | PS-JACK (16) |
| INDIA (79) | 25-1 | MERRY QUEENS (6) |
| ENGLAND/NORWAY (67) | 21-9 | 2002 (37) |
| RUSSIA (62) | 23-7 | CITRUS (23) |
| ENGLAND (51) | 20-10 | SKOTII (26) |
| SWEDEN (79) | 25-5 | ESPERANZA (28) |
| USA (56) | 23-7 | MY-BRIDGE (18) |
| AUSTRALIA (71) | 25-5 | TORNADOS PLUS (22) |
| AUSTRIA/DENMARK (33) | 15-15 | NAITO (34) |
| CANADA (73) | 25-5 | K.S. (24) |
| e-bridge (59) | 23-7 | COSMOS (21) |
| TAIWAN AMETHYST (14) | 2-25 | GEEZER T (86) |
| GOING AT ‘EM (62) | 21-9 | KINKI (34) |
| PABF OPEN (66) | 22-8 | SWAN (33) |
| PABF WOMEN (32) | 17-13 | THREE DIAMONDS (23) |
| HANA (93) | 25-0 | KOYUZU (11) |
| SLAM DUNK (75) | 21-9 | MATSUBARA (45) |
| OKAY (69) | 25-3 | GIRASOL (9) |
| Match 2 |  |  |
| INDIA (35) | 15-15 | HANA (33) |
| GEEZER T (30) | 13-17 | NETHERLANDS (42) |
| OKAY (26) | 9-21 | SWEDEN (54) |
| CANADA (32) | 7-23 | AUSTRALIA (72) |
| RUSSIA (18) | 16-14 | USA (11) |
| PABF OPEN (24) | 9-21 | e-bridge (51) |
| ENGLAND/NORWAY (51) | 21-9 | SLAM DUNK (23) |
| ENGLAND (32) | 15-15 | GOING AT 'EM (30) |
| HANAGUMI (17) | 9-21 | PABF WOMEN (48) |
| NAITO (45) | 22-8 | THREE DIAMONDS (13) |
| CHINESE TAIPEI (61) | 21-9 | AUSTRIA/DENMARK (33) |
| SKOTII (50) | 16-14 | KINKI (43) |
| 2002 (38) | 10-20 | MATSUBARA (61) |
| SWAN (54) | 17-13 | COSMOS (43) |
| CITRUS (52) | 17-13 | MY-BRIDGE (42) |
| TORNADOS PLUS (37) | 10-20 | K.S. (60) |
| GIRASOL (39) | 13-17 | ESPERANZA (48) |
| PS-JACK (63) | 23-7 | TAIWAN AMETHYST (25) |
| MERRY QUEENS (14) | 7-23 | KOYUZU (53) |
| Match 3 |  |  |
| SWEDEN (63) | 16-14 | AUSTRALIA (55) |
| e-bridge (44) | 20-10 | NETHERLANDS (22) |
| HANA (33) | 8-22 | ENGLAND/NORWAY (68) |
| RUSSIA (36) | 14-16 | INDIA (40) |
| GEEZER T (10) | 6-24 | PABF WOMEN (55) |
| USA (64) | 21-9 | NAITO (37) |
| GOING AT 'EM (39) | 14-16 | OKAY (45) |
| ENGLAND (73) | 25-2 | CANADA (4) |
| PABF OPEN (64) | 17-13 | CHINESE TAIPEI (54) |
| SLAM DUNK (56) | 23-7 | HANAGUMI (19) |
| MATSUBARA (44) | 20-10 | SKOTII (20) |
| K.S. (64) | 13-17 | SWAN (75) |
| AUSTRIA/DENMARK (82) | 25-3 | PS-JACK (19) |
| KINKI (35) | 14-16 | CITRUS (43) |
| KOYUZU (81) | 25-3 | ESPERANZA (17) |
| MY-BRIDGE (28) | 7-23 | THREE DIAMONDS (65) |
| COSMOS (40) | 15-15 | 2002 (38) |
| GIRASOL (74) | 20-10 | TORNADOS PLUS (51) |
| MERRY QUEENS (25) | 8-22 | TAIWAN AMETHYST (58) |

Match One saw the top 19 seeds go 16-2-1. Congratulations to HANAGUMI and GEEZER T for their wins and to NAITO for their tie.

| Bd: 1 <br> DIr: North Vul: None | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ¢ AK104 |  |
|  | - K109 |  |
|  | $\diamond 2$ |  |
|  | \% AK864 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { West } \\ & \text { Q Q863 } \end{aligned}$ |  | East |
|  |  | ¢ 72 |
| $\bigcirc$ J75 |  | $\bigcirc 64$ |
| $\diamond$ A1098 |  | $\diamond$ J643 |
| \& 107 |  | * QJ953 |
|  | South |  |
|  | ¢ J95 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AQ832 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ KQ75 |  |
|  | \& 2 |  |

Slam is not easy to reach on the N/S cards once South learns that his diamond values are opposite shortness. Of the 38 N/S pairs, 25 bid a slam but only 10 succeeded in making it (one tried $7 \triangle$ with the expected result while another bid and made 6NT). The $\diamond A$ lead makes life easy for declarer but on any other lead he must play for the Q to be onside rather than for clubs to split-not exactly the percentage line.

| Bd: 2 <br> DIr: East <br> Vul: N/S | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ¢ AKJ1032 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J6 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ KJ2 |  |
|  | - 98 |  |
| West |  | East |
| A Q98 |  | $\bigcirc 4$ |
| $\bigcirc$ KQ |  | $\bigcirc$ A982 |
| $\diamond 106$ |  | $\diamond$ A9854 |
| K KQJ754 |  | \& A102 |
|  | South |  |
|  | - 765 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 107543$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q73 |  |
|  | \& 63 |  |

Board 2 was an easy 10 tricks in notrump for those Wests who were put off by their soft values and wasted $\uparrow$. But for those five pairs who made it to 6e life was beautiful on a nondiamond (and non-trump) lead. The winning defense is quite difficult to find: North must knock out the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$, declarer's late entry to the $\checkmark A$, when he comes in with a spade.

| Bd: 4 <br> DIr: West <br> Vul: Both | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - 8 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A9763 |  |
|  | $\diamond 1095$ |  |
|  | \& AJ75 |  |
| West |  | East |
| a AKQJ4 |  | ¢ 1053 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q54 |  | $\bigcirc 82$ |
| $\diamond$ QJ8 |  | $\diamond$ K6432 |
| - 82 |  | - 1063 |
|  | South |  |
|  | ¢ 9762 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{KJ10}$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A7 |  |
|  | * KQ94 |  |

After a 1 st opening by West N/S reached one of their cold games ( $4 \bigcirc$ or 5 ) at only 9 of the 38 tables. North is somewhat light to double 14 by our standards and a $2 \sim$ overcall makes us cringe. If East passes 14 South is likely to balance with 1 NT and now N/S are cooked. If East bids 2a (either immediately or after 1NT) North will balance with a double but then 32 looks to be the end of $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}^{\prime}$ s intervention. If West opened 1NT at some tables North might have tried an aggressive two-suited overcall to show hearts and a minor. So how did the 9 pairs really do it? If they tell us we'll get back to you later with "the rest of the story."

On Board 5 (see the diagram on the next page) North is likely to open $1 \&$ and East can show his hand nicely with an Unusual 2NT. West will resign himself to a reluctant $3 \triangle$ and East will likely drive his side to the cold $4 \triangle$ game, which was bid and made at a number of tables but at several others went down. At two tables N/S went plus in 3NT(we presume on a low red-suit
lead and a double club finesse). Other results were diamond and heart partials by E/W (some doubled) and spade and club contracts by N/S (also some doubled). All things considered, this was probably the wildest board of the set.

| Bd: 5 <br> DIr: North Vul: N/S | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - A92 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ QJ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ QJ10 |  |
|  | - AKQ93 |  |
| West |  | East |
| - J 87653 |  | ¢ --- |
| $\bigcirc 102$ |  | $\bigcirc$ AK965 |
| $\diamond 3$ |  | $\diamond$ AK9862 |
| \& J1086 |  | - 75 |
|  | South |  |
|  | ¢ KQ104 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 8743$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 754$ |  |
|  | - 42 |  |



Most Norths will open 1s in third seat and East will have to decide how many hearts to bid. If he tries $4 \triangle$ South will likely bid 4a and West, with nothing clear to say, will likely pass. If one chooses to bid $4 \triangle$ the first time with the East cards one must now double, which gives West a difficult decision. Passing should net E/W +500 (with an accurate suit-preference signal at trick 1 or 2 ) but bidding $5 \triangle$ is also tempting. If South leads a top club E/W will score +650 while on any other lead -100 is normal.

If East overcalls 1s with 28 (or 38) E/W should have a much better chance of working out to double a spade contract.

| Bd: 8 | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: West | - 6 |  |
| Vul: None | $\bigcirc$ QJ109 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J64 |  |
|  | * AK1064 |  |
| West |  | East |
| - Q84 |  | ¢ AKJ9 |
| $\bigcirc$ AK6543 |  | $\bigcirc 72$ |
| $\diamond$ Q1072 |  | $\diamond 9$ |
| 2 --- |  | \& QJ9872 |
|  | South |  |
|  | ¢ 107532 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 8$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AK853 |  |
|  | - 53 |  |

With trumps breaking badly, 40 was not a success at any table that attempted it, nor was 3NT much better (although one pair did make it). The E/W pairs who did best seemed to be those who avoided being doubled.

| Bd: 10 | North |
| :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | ¢ K102 |
| Vul: Both | $\checkmark$ AK94 |
|  | $\diamond$ A10532 |
|  | -9 |
| West | East |
| ¢ J6543 | ¢ A987 |
| © J107 | $\bigcirc$ Q653 |
| $\diamond$ QJ7 | $\diamond 6$ |
| - A5 | - KJ32 |
|  | South |
|  | ¢ Q |
|  | $\bigcirc 82$ |
|  | $\diamond$ K984 |
|  | \& Q108764 |

This seemingly innocent little partscore hand has more twists and turns than most involving games or slams. For example, suppose E/W push N/S to $4 \diamond$ and East leads a trump (as good as anything). North can win in hand and lead a spade. East wins, leads a club to West's queen, and a second trump is won in dummy.

Declarer draws the last trump, ruffs a club to hand, and plays PAK and a third heart. If East ducks declarer lets it ride to West's jack and he's endplayed, while if East is up to the crocodile declarer can ruff and the $\mathcal{V 9}$ in his hand is now good for his tenth trick. If declarer wins the opening trump lead in dummy he leads a club. West wins and continues with a second trump, won in hand. Now declarer ruffs a heart in dummy, ruffs a club in hand, knocks out the $\uparrow$, ruffs his last heart, and eventually endplays West for two spade tricks.

"32 doubled, $-1100, \ldots$ now you owe me three bottles of water."

| Bd: 16 | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: West | - J2 |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\bigcirc$ Q6 |  |
|  | $\diamond 109543$ |  |
|  | - QJ104 |  |
| West |  | East |
| - K985 |  | - 63 |
| $\bigcirc$ J3 |  | $\bigcirc 754$ |
| $\diamond$ Q86 |  | $\diamond$ AKJ72 |
| AK53 |  | - 982 |
|  | South |  |
|  | ¢ AQ1074 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AK10982 |  |
|  | $\diamond$--- |  |
|  | \& 76 |  |

It's hard to imagine South not getting his side to game after either 1NT-P-P or $14-\mathrm{P}-1 \diamond$, yet in virtually every match one or both of the N/S pairs missed game. Very strange.

# $7^{\text {th }}$ NEC Bridge Festival Daily Schedule 

| Day/Date | Time | Event | Location |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |
| Wednesday (Jan. 30) | $10: 00-12: 50$ | NEC Cup Swiss - Match 4 | Room 416-419 |
|  | $12: 50-14: 00$ | Lunch Break |  |
|  | $14: 00-16: 50$ | NEC Cup Swiss - Match 5 |  |
|  | $17: 10-20: 00$ | NEC Cup Swiss - Match 6 |  |
| Thursday (Jan. 31) | $10: 00-12: 50$ | NEC Cup Swiss - Match 7 |  |
|  | $13: 10-16: 00$ | NEC Cup Swiss - Match 8 |  |
|  | $17: 10-20: 00$ | NEC Cup Quarter-Final 1 | Room 416 \& 417 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Friday (Feb. 1) | $10: 00-12: 50$ | NEC Cup Quarter-Final 2 |  |
|  | $12: 50-14: 00$ | Lunch Break |  |
|  | $14: 00-16: 50$ | NEC Cup Semi-Final 1 |  |
| Saturday (Feb. 2) | $17: 10-20: 00$ | NEC Cup Semi-Final 2 |  |
|  | $10: 00-12: 20$ |  | NEC Cup Final 1 \& 3rd Playoff |
|  | $12: 30-14: 50$ | NEC Cup Final 2 \& 3 |  |
|  | $16: 00-18: 20$ | NEC Clayoff |  |
|  | $18: 30-20: 50$ | NEC Cup Final 3 |  |
|  | $10: 00-17: 00$ | OUCHI Cup |  |
|  |  |  | Room 5 $501 \& 502$ |
|  | $10: 00-17: 00$ | Asuka Cup |  |
|  | $18: 00-19: 00$ | Closing Ceremony | Room 301 \& 302 |
|  |  |  |  |

# NEC Cup Feature Match One: Chinese Taipei vs Hanagumi 

## by Eric Kokish

The subtitle for this match was going to be "Being Brian Senior," but my 20 deals replacing the late (coming) Brian as the partner of Pablo Lambardi was not the stuff of high drama, so you're getting instead a blow-by-blow account of Chinese Taipei vs Hanagumi, which resulted in an upset victory by the home side. In each round we will focus on one Swiss match, for which we will have bidding and play records.

| Bd: 1 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North | ¢ AK104 |  |  |
| Vul: None | - K109 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 2$ |  |  |
|  | 2. AK864 |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| Q Q863 | - 72 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ J75 | $\bigcirc 64$ |  |  |
| $\diamond$ A1098 | $\diamond$ J643 |  |  |
| -107 |  |  | QJ953 |
| South |  |  |  |
| ¢ J95 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ AQ832 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ KQ75 |  |  |  |
| * 2 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Miyashiro | Lee | Sakamoto | Yen |
|  | 18 | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | $2 \diamond^{*}$ |
| Pass | 30 | Pass | 40 |
| Pass | 50 | All Pass |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Chang | Naito | Hu | Umezu |
|  | 1\% | Pass | 10 |
| Pass | 19 | Pass | $2 \diamond^{*}$ |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | 40 |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | 5\% |
| Pass | 65 | All Pass |  |

It's easy to see how you might make $6 \triangle$ on a lead other than the helpful $\diamond A$, but Yukiko Umezu had an easy ride. After $\diamond A$, spade switch, she won the ace, played A , club ruff,
diamond ruff, $\vee \mathrm{K}$, ®10 to the king. When everyone followed she could draw the last trump and her third spade went on the $\boldsymbol{\$ K}$. It would have been better to play $\vee K$, heart to the ace first because it might have been necessary to pick up jack-fourth in East; +980. Lee/Yen stopped in five and on the same defenseDingMin Yen followed the recommended line; +480 . The swing was in the bidding. For the record, I much prefer Jung-Fu Lee's $3 \triangle$ and $5 \bigcirc$ (suggesting equal black-suit honor holdings and a trump honor) to Etsuko Naito's 28 and committal 4NT. 11 IMPs to Hanagumi, which gives you some idea about how important the aesthetics of the bidding might be.

| Bd: 2 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | ¢ AKJ1032 |  |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\bigcirc$ J6 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ KJ2 |  |  |
|  | \& 98 |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| - Q98 | $\bigcirc 4$ |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ KQ | $\bigcirc$ A982 |  |  |
| $\diamond 106$ | $\diamond$ A9854 |  |  |
| * KQJ75 |  |  | A102 |
| South |  |  |  |
| ¢ 765 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 107543$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ Q73 |  |  |  |
| - 63 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Miyashiro | Lee | Sakamoto | Yen |
|  |  | $1 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass |
| 24 | 24 | 3\% | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Chang | Naito | Hu | Umezu |
|  |  | $1 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass |
| 24 | 24 | Dbl | All Pass |

Toshiko Miyashiro made an overtrick in 3NT on a high spade lead and a low diamond switch; +430.

In the Closed Room, it looks as if Hsui-Hen Hu intended his double of 2 as takeout and WeiMing Chang thought it was closer to penalty. This sort of misunderstanding often leads to a doubled contract that can be made and this was no exception, but the Chinese Taipei guys survived. Hu led the \& A, then the ten after Chang signaled with the king. Chang switched to the $\diamond 10$, Hu playing ace and another. That forced Naito to guess spades then and there, and fortunately for Chinese Taipei it was not clear to her that it was imperative to take the first-round trump finesse. She played ace-king and so went one down; -200. Still, that was 6 IMPs to Hanagumi, 17-0.

| Bd: 4 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: West | - 8 |  |  |
| Vul: Both | $\bigcirc$ A9763 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 1095$ |  |  |
|  | \& AJ75 |  |  |
| West |  | E |  |
| - AKQJ4 |  |  | 1053 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q54 |  | $\bigcirc$ | 82 |
| $\diamond$ QJ8 |  |  | K6432 |
| - 82 |  |  | 1063 |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | - 9762 |  |  |
|  | - KJ10 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A7 |  |  |
|  | \% KQ94 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Miyashiro | Lee | Sakamoto | Yen |
| 14 | All Pass |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Chang | Naito | Hu | Umezu |
| 1NT | All Pass |  |  |

Perhaps North should double 19 for takeout, but it's really a matter of style. And perhaps South should reopen with 1NT, but even if he does, it's not obvious how North should continue. It would not be ridiculous to pass 1NT or correct to 2V. In any case, Miyashiro played peacefully in 1s and made three after the lead of the $\diamond 10$, ducked to the queen, ace-king of trumps, $\diamond J$ to the ace, $\& \mathrm{~K}$, 4 to the jack and...a third club.

Either the West hand is a strong notrump or it isn't. If anyone asks me I promise to say that it isn't, even under torture (which at the moment amounts to no lunch, with the demise of the Queen's East fantastic food department). The defenders ran the hearts, using transportation in clubs to achieve this. Then they finished the clubs. Then they took the $\diamond A$. Then Chang claimed the last three tricks: -400.11 IMPs to Hanagumi, who were having fun, 28-0.

The next deal brought no respite for the visitors.

| Bd: 5 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North Vul: N/S | $\pm$ A92 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ QJ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ QJ10 |  |  |
| * AKQ93 |  |  |  |
| West |  | East |  |
| - J87653 |  | ¢ --- |  |
| $\bigcirc 102$ |  | $\bigcirc$ AK965 |  |
| $\diamond 3$ |  | $\diamond$ AK9862 |  |
| - J1086 |  | \& 75 |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | ¢ KQ104 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 8743$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 754$ |  |  |
|  | + 42 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Miyashiro | Lee | Sakamoto | Yen |
|  | 13 | $1 \diamond$ | Dbl* |
| Pass | 2NT | All Pass |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Chang | Naito | Hu | Umezu |
|  | 14. | $1 \diamond$ | Dbl* |
| Pass | 3NT | 40 | Dbl |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Yayoi Sakamoto allowed Lee's 2NT rebid to cow her, which was just as well. She led a low heart to the ten and jack and Lee played his high cards in the black suits before giving up; -100 .

In contrast, Hu followed through with his plan to bid hearts even though his opponents were a level higher. Umezu led a club to the jack and
queen and Naito switched to the $\triangle Q$. Hu won, played $\diamond A$, diamond ruff, spade ruff, $\vee \mathrm{K}$, felling the jack. When the $\diamond K$ split out the suit Hu could have cashed the $\wp 9$ and played diamond winners to make his contract. Instead, he played another diamond. Umezu ruffed in with the $\triangle 7$ and played a club. Now a third round of clubs promoted the V 8 for down one; -100 . Hanagumi led 33-0.

| Bd: 7 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: South | ¢ KJ1095 |  |  |
| Vul: Both | $\bigcirc$ A105 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ QJ86 |  |  |
|  | \& J |  |  |
| West |  | East |  |
| - A2 |  | 4 |  |
| $\bigcirc 83$ |  | $\bigcirc$ KQJ9762 |  |
| $\diamond 10752$ |  | $\diamond$ AK |  |
| * A9632 |  |  | 1075 |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | - Q8764 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 4$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 943$ |  |  |
|  | * KQ84 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West <br> Miyashiro | North | East | South |
|  | Lee | Sakamoto | Yen |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 19 | 40 | 49 |
| Pass | Pass | Dbl | All Pass |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Chang | Naito | Hu | Umezu |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 14 | 20 | 49 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

There are several strategies that one might adopt with the East hand. Here we see two of them. Sakamoto combined immediate preemption with a later statement about compensation and Toshiko Miyashiro did very well to pass the double with a hand that might well have produced 11 or even 12 tricks in hearts. Sakamoto cashed the $\diamond K$, then the $\diamond A$, Miyashiro following deuce-five. Sakamoto duly shifted to the 5 , treating her partner's plays as suit preference. When Miyashiro won the A, however, she returned...a heart. Down
just one; -200.
I confess that I prefer Hu's $2 \bigcirc$ overcall, but I don't envy him his decision at his next turn. I can't imagine bidding $5 \triangle$, but double, the only real alternative, is not much of a description of his shape and defensive values either. To that extent, Sakamoto's two-step approach came closer to describing her hand than Hu's one-and-out simple overcall. Hu led the OK , so the diamond ruff did not materialize at this table either; -100. 3 IMPs to Hanagumi, ahead 36-3.


Chang might have passed $3 \bigcirc$ but with his spade holding and club shortage both potentially worth a great deal he took the aggressive course. He ruffed the opening lead of the K , led a spade to the ace and tried the \& Q, ruffing when South followed low. A low diamond went to North's nine and South's... king. Umezu gave her partner a spade ruff and now the third round of clubs allowed Umezu to uppercut with the $\vee 8$. Declarer over-ruffed and
cashed the $\vee A$ and finished three down when the defenders killed the spade suit and took a late diamond trick with the eight to go with the ace; -150.

Miyashiro showed no fear in reopening 2e with a takeout double, and Sakamoto had to count her trumps more than once before passing for penalty. Lee did very well to get out for one down, which will surely encourage him to keep overcalling with undercalls like this one. He ruffed the second spade, conceded a heart, won the low diamond switch with the jack, ruffed a heart, ruffed another spade, and played a diamond. East ruffed and exited with the Q Q but when she ruffed the next diamond, she had to allow declarer to score the 10 one way or another; -100. 6 IMPs to Hanagumi, ahead 423.


Lee had no trouble in 24; +110. Although 1NT
didn't have to show the world, I think Miyashiro owed her partner 3o general principles, rather than sell out to $2 \boldsymbol{A}$.

When Naito did not respond 14 in the Closed Room, her opponents sorted out their assets and competed to 3e. A trump lead, ducked, might have forced declarer to guess the play correctly, but on a spade lead declarer won in dummy and passed the $\odot J$. South won and cashed the $\diamond K$ before playing a second spade. Declarer discarded the $\diamond$ J belatedly and coasted home after that; +110. 6 IMPs to Chinese Taipei, 9-42.

| Bd: 13 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North | ¢ K964 |  |  |
| Vul: Both | $\bigcirc$ A8 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 10542$ |  |  |
|  | \& AJ3 |  |  |
| West |  | East |  |
| - A872 |  | - 105 |  |
| - K10 |  | $\bigcirc 97654$ |  |
| $\diamond$ KJ6 |  | $\diamond$ Q983 |  |
| * KQ106 |  | \& 74 |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | 4 QJ3 |  |  |
|  | - QJ32 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A7 |  |  |
|  | * 9852 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Miyashiro | Lee | Sakamoto | Yen |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 18 |
| Dbl | Pass | 14 | All Pass |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Chang | Naito | Hu | Umezu |
|  | 1® | Pass | 18 |
| Dbl | Pass | 19 | 1NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

It could not have been much fun for East to respond to his partner's takeout double for the black-suits, but both bid 1 s before worse befell them. Hu escaped but Sakamoto did not. Umezu could have taken eight tricks in 1NT but settled for seven; +90 . In 1 s, Sakamoto got the lead of the $\Phi 3$ from Yen, ducked to the king. A second spade went to the jack and Sakamoto
ducked. Now Yen underled the $\diamond A$ to the six, ten and queen. A club to the ten lost to the jack and a third spade knocked out the ace. The $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ lost to the ace and Yen switched to the $\triangle Q$ to the king and ace. Lee cashed the 9 and returned a heart to the jack. Yen led the 9 to the king and ace and North had to give dummy the queen-six of clubs or declarer the good hearts. Down only two; -200. 3 IMPs to Chinese Taipei, 12-42.

| Bd: 14 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: East | ¢ 5 |  |  |
| Vul: None | - KJ32 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J9872 |  |  |
|  | \& A95 |  |  |
| West |  | East |  |
| - J732 |  | ¢ KQ984 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q1094 |  | $\bigcirc$ A8 |  |
| $\diamond$ AQ4 |  | $\diamond$ K103 |  |
| - 82 |  | * Q64 |  |
| South |  |  |  |
| ¢ A106 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 765$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond 65$ |  |  |  |
| \& KJ1073 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Miyashiro | Lee | Sakamoto | Yen |
|  |  | 1NT | Pass |
| 23 | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | 49 | All Pass |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Chang | Naito | Hu | Umezu |
|  |  | 19 | Pass |
| $3 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | 34 | All Pass |

E/W don't belong in 4s and Hu/Chang were able to stop in three after a Bergen-style sublimit raise; +140 on a heart lead to the jack and ace. Miyashiro/Sakamoto's auction to 4s suggests that 1NT was strong and 4¢ hopeful. Yen led the $\diamond 6$ and the queen. Yen won the first trump and continued diamonds. Sakamoto won the ace, cashed the $\uparrow \mathrm{J}$ and led a heart, low, eight, low. And that was that. She drew the last trump and conceded two clubs; +420. 7 IMPs to Hanagumi, 49-12.

| Bd: 15 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: South | ¢ QJ5 |  |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\bigcirc 10982$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A72 |  |  |
|  | \& Q97 |  |  |
| West East |  |  |  |
| - A9642 |  |  | K73 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q6543 |  |  | AKJ |
| $\diamond$ Q10 |  |  | 843 |
| -6 |  | * KJ43 |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | $\pm 108$ |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 7$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ KJ965 |  |  |
|  | * A10852 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Miyashiro | Lee | Sakamoto | Yen |
|  |  |  | 24(1) |
| Pass | 3*(2) | 3NT | All Pass |
| (1) Weak, majors or minors, illegal! <br> (2) Pass or correct |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Chang | Naito | Hu | Umezu |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | Pass | 1NT | 2NT |
| 34 | All Pass |  |  |

If our facts are correct, Yen/Lee used an illegal convention to jockey Sakamoto/Miyashiro into 3NT. A club lead gave Sakamoto her eighth trick but there was no ninth; -50 . Facing a strong notrump, it's hard to imagine West stopping short of game even with the impending bad breaks after South's bold (you might prefer a different adjective) 2NT, so I would bet that Chang intended his 3s as forcing. The defenders cashed their three minor suit tricks and waited for a trump; +140. 5 IMPs to Chinese Taipei, pending a score adjustment, 17-49.


| Bd: 16 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dir: West | ¢ J2 |  |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\bigcirc$ Q6 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 109543$ |  |  |
|  | \& QJ104 |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| a K985 | - 63 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ J3 | $\bigcirc 754$ |  |  |
| $\diamond$ Q86 | $\diamond$ AKJ72 |  |  |
| * AK53 |  |  | 982 |
| South |  |  |  |
| ¢ AQ1074 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ AK10982 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$--- |  |  |  |
| \& 76 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Miyashiro | Lee | Sakamoto | Yen |
| 10 | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Dbl |
| 2ऽ | Pass | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | 30 | Pass | 48 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Chang | Naito | Hu | Umezu |
| 19 | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | 24* |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | 48 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Both N/S pairs did well to bid this one, with Lee in particular making a good bid.

| Bd: 17 <br> DIr: North <br> Vul: None | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\triangle$ A84 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ KJ3 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AK5 |  |
|  | 2 J876 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { West } \\ & \text { a Q95 } \end{aligned}$ |  | East |
|  |  | ¢ K6 |
| $\bigcirc$ A10854 |  | - Q976 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \diamond \text { Q10 } \\ & \leqslant \text { K109 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\diamond$ J76432 |
|  |  | * 2 |
|  | South |  |
|  | ¢ J10732 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 2$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 98$ |  |
|  | \% AQ543 |  |

Open Room

| West <br> Miyashiro | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lee | Sakamoto | Yen |
|  | 1NT | Pass | $20^{*}$ |
| Dbl | 24 | 40 | 49 |
| Pass | Pass | $5 \bigcirc$ | Dbl |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Chang | Naito | Hu | Umezu |
|  | 1NT | Pass | $20^{*}$ |
| Pass | 24 | Pass | 30 |
| Pass | 34 | Pass | 4s |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Hu led the 2 against 44. When Naito played low from dummy the defenders negotiated two club ruffs to take the first four tricks and West had another trump to come for two down; -100. Sakamoto read much more into Miyashiro's double of 28 than the doubler intended, and $5 \triangle$ doubled went three down; -500.12 IMPs to Chinese Taipei, 29-49.


Etsuko Naito

Yayoi Sakamoto



Yukiko Umezu


Toshiko Miyashiro

| Bd: 19 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dr: South | - 875 |  |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 654$ |  |  |
| * KQ9432 |  |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| - A10 | - Q963 |  |  |
| ○ K87643 | $\bigcirc$ AQ92 |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ AK8 | $\diamond 109$ |  |  |
| - 108 |  |  | 765 |
| South <br> a KJ42 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 105$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ QJ732 |  |  |  |
| - AJ |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Miyashiro | Lee | Sakamoto | Yen |
|  |  |  | $1 \diamond$ |
| 18 | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | 48 | All Pass |
| Closed R | oom |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Chang | Naito | Hu | Umezu |
|  |  |  | $1 \diamond$ |
| 18 | 1NT( ${ }_{\text {( }}^{(1)}$ | 28 | All Pass |

$4 \checkmark$ was easy to make. So was $2 \checkmark .10 \mathrm{IMPs}$ to Hanagumi, 59-32. Hu's $2 \triangle$ doesn't feel like enough, but Chang might have bid again anyway.

| Bd: 20 <br> DIr: West <br> Vul: Both | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | -106 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AQ7632 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A5 |  |
|  | \& J84 |  |
| West |  | East |
| ¢ Q98 |  | ¢ AK7 |
| $\bigcirc 109$ |  | $\bigcirc$ K54 |
| $\diamond$ J10742 |  | $\diamond$ K96 |
| * AK2 |  | - 9765 |
|  | South |  |
|  | ¢ J5432 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J8 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q83 |  |
|  | \& Q103 |  |

The bidding was the same at both tables: North opened $1 \nabla$, then rebid $2 \varnothing$ over partner's 14 , ending the auction. Hu led a club and the defenders took all six of their tricks. Sakamoto led the $\diamond 6$, allowing Lee to win dummy's queen for +110.5 IMPs to Chinese Taipei to close out the match. Hanagumi won 59-37, 20 VP-10.

## Images of Our Game


"That can't be the same hand he held during the auction."

"The Russians said it's vodka."

"3s doubled, $-1100, \ldots . O y-y-y$."

"Look, we're not in last place any more."


# NEC Cup Feature Match Two: India vs Hana 

by Eric Kokish

The spotlight for the second round falls on two teams that recorded maximum wins in the first round, Japan's Team Hana and India's national team that reached the quarterfinals of the 2001Bermuda Bowl in Paris.

| Bd: 1 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: North | ¢ 4106 |  |  |
| Vul: None | $\bigcirc$ A98653 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 96$ |  |  |
|  | \& QJ |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| - 9754 | ¢ QJ8 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 104$ | $\bigcirc$ K72 |  |  |
| $\diamond$ J1073 | $\diamond$ AKQ4 |  |  |
| - 532 |  |  | * A97 |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | - K32 |  |  |
|  | Q QJ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 852$ |  |  |
|  | \& K10864 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hayashi | Venky | Maeda | Gupta |
|  | Pass | 1® | Pass |
| Pass | 20 | All Pass |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Satya | Hirata | Nadar | Hanayama |
|  | 18 | Dbl | 1NT |
| Pass | 28 | Dbl | 30 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

There was no bonus to India for buying the contract one level lower than Hana. 28 and 30 both yielded nine tricks; +140 .

The first swing came on Board 3, and it was a substantial one...


Mrs. Nadar


Mr. Gupta

| Bd: 3 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: South Vul: E/W | ¢ J432 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 1065$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AQ102 |  |  |
|  | \& KJ |  |  |
| West |  |  | East |
| - Q109 |  |  | AK85 |
| $\bigcirc 97$ |  |  | AKQJ842 |
| $\diamond$ K954 |  |  | --- |
| - Q542 |  |  | - A10 |
| South |  |  |  |
| $\pm 76$ |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 3$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ J8763 |  |  |  |
| \& 98763 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hayashi | Venky | Maeda | Gupta |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Dbl | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | Pass | 48 | All Pass |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Satya | Hirata | Nadar | Hanayama |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 1ヶ | $2 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | 4令 | Pass |
| 49 | Pass | 60 | Pass |
| 64 | All Pas |  |  |

Takashi Maeda, in $4 \checkmark$, got a diamond lead through the king, ruffed the queen, and played three rounds of trumps, then the A . When the jack dropped, he conceded a club and had a parking place for his fourth spade; +680 .

When Kiran Nadar (one of two women to reach the knockout stage of the 2001 Bermuda Bowl-the other being Rose Meltzer, who won it) improvised with a Michaels Cue-bid to buy some time, Bachiraju Satya Narayana showed no sign of life, giving preference to spades, then signing off over East's splinter slam try. When Nadar suggested 60 as an alternative Satya really should have passed, but instead he converted to 64. As we've seen, the
lie of the club suit allows declarer to take 12 tricks in hearts, but 6a West seems much more difficult after the lead of the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$. Satya ruffed, drew three rounds of trumps and started hearts. Clearly, North can't ruff in too early because he'll have to lead a club from the king or a diamond, giving West his king. So here's what develops...

|  | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ¢ J |  |
|  | $\bigcirc-$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q |  |
|  | \% KJ |  |
| West |  | East |
| 人 --- |  | Q --- |
| $\bigcirc$--- |  | $\bigcirc 42$ |
| $\diamond$ K9 |  | $\diamond--$ |
| Q5 |  | \& A10 |
|  | South |  |
|  | - --- |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$--- |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J8 |  |
|  | - 98 |  |

On the penultimate heart, declarer (West) discards the $\diamond 9$. What is poor North to do? He is squeezed in three suits, one of which is trumps. If he releases the diamond, declarer can discard the $\diamond K$ on the last heart. If North does not ruff, he must discard the J . Now declarer cashes the A and North gets the last trick with the master trump. How odd!

In the event, Makoto Hirata ruffed the fourth heart and led a diamond, so Satya was not extended; +1430. 13 IMPs to India.


Mr. Satya Narayana


Mr. Venkataraman

| Bd: 6 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | ¢ J3 |  |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 93$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J1092 |  |  |
|  | - 4932 |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| - 108 | ¢ Q96 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ QJ72 | $\bigcirc 865$ |  |  |
| $\diamond 754$ | $\diamond$ AKQ3 |  |  |
| * Q1065 | - KJ7 |  |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | AK7542 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A104 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 86$ |  |  |
|  | ¢ 84 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hayashi | Venky | Maeda | Gupta |
|  |  | 1NT | All Pass |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Satya | Hirata | Nadar | Hanayama |
|  |  | 1NT | $28^{*}$ |
| Pass | 24 | All Pa |  |

In 24 Hirata made three by building a diamond trick after East led two high diamonds and switched to a club; +140. Subhash Gupta did better than his counterpart by passing over 1NT. He cleared spades and Maeda could take only five tricks after knocking out the \&A; -200. 2 IMPs to India, 15-0.

| Bd: 7 | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: South | - 73 |  |
| Vul: Both | $\bigcirc$ Q52 |  |
|  | $\diamond 52$ |  |
|  | \& A108762 |  |
| West |  | East |
| - 54 |  | - Q92 |
| $\bigcirc$ K97 |  | $\bigcirc$ A8643 |
| $\diamond$ AK10973 |  | $\diamond$ QJ4 |
| d J5 |  | * K9 |
|  | South |  |
|  | ¢ AKJ1086 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ V10 |  |
|  | $\diamond 86$ |  |
|  | - Q43 |  |


| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hayashi | Venky | Maeda | Gupta |
|  |  |  | 29 |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 30 | Pass |
| 40 | All Pass |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Satya | Hirata | Nadar | Hanayama |
|  |  |  | 19 |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 28 | Pass |
| 30 | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ | All Pass |

I like Gupta's evaluation on this one, although opening at the two level had no real effect on the outcome. Both Souths led three rounds of spades against $4 V$. Nadar discarded a club from dummy so Hirata ruffed and cashed the \&A. Trumps fell two-two after that for one down; -100 . Maeda ruffed the third spade with the $\vee 7$ and was over-ruffed. Later, when the $\odot J$ fell under dummy's king, he ran the nine and lost to the ten, playing North (R Venkataraman) to have over-ruffed the third spade with the queen from Q1052; -200. 3 IMPs to India, 18-0.

| Bd: 10 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | ¢ KQ654 |  |  |
| Vul: Both | $\bigcirc 8$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q72 |  |  |
|  | * Q984 |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| - J7 |  |  | -10832 |
| $\bigcirc 976$ |  |  | $\checkmark$ AQ10532 |
| $\diamond$ K1084 |  |  | $\diamond$ J9 |
| * AK103 |  |  | * J |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | - A9 |  |  |
|  | จ KJ4 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A653 |  |  |
|  | * 7652 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
|  | North | East | South |
| Hayashi | Venky | Maeda | Gupta |
|  |  | 28 | Pass |
| 30 | 34 | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |


| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West | North | East | South |
| Satya | Hirata | Nadar | Hanayama |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $1 \Delta$ | $2 \varnothing$ | Pass* $^{*}$ |
| Pass | Dbl | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| $3 \Omega$ | All Pass |  |  |

Nadar's decision to pass as dealer led to a scenario in which N/S were able to bid themselves out at $2 \boldsymbol{4}$, so Satya's delayed raise to 30 bought the contract. Takeshi Hanayama led the $\$ 5$ against $3 \triangle$. Nadar played 2 AK to discard a diamond, and led the $\uparrow 7$. Hirata won the queen and switched to a trump, ducked to the jack. South exited with a club and declarer ruffed to lead the $\diamond$ J. Hayashi won the ace, so declarer could discard a spade on the $\diamond K$ and ruff a spade after losing the second round; -100. As macho bids go, Venky's 3 will not take a back seat to many. Gupta must have thought he'd be playing for overtricks in 3NT but when Maeda ducked two rounds of hearts to maintain communications, Gupta could do no better than two down; -200. 7 IMPs to Hana, 718.

| Bd: 12 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: Wes | ¢ J 975 |  |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\bigcirc$ AQ10 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 965$ |  |  |
|  | - A92 |  |  |
| West |  | East |  |
| $\rightarrow$ A |  | - Q432 |  |
| $\bigcirc 8643$ |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{J} 92$ |  |
| $\diamond$ KJ10743 |  | $\diamond$ AQ2 |  |
| \& 75 |  | * J106 |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | 4 K1086 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K75 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 8$ |  |  |
|  | 2 KQ843 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hayashi | Venky | Maeda | Gupta |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | 13 |
| 2ऽ | Dbl | Pass | 24 |
| Pass | 34 | All Pa |  |


| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West | North | East | South |
| Satya | Hirata | Nadar | Hanayama |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | 12 |
| $2 \diamond$ | Dbl | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dbl | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $4 \hookleftarrow$ | All Pass |  |

Nadar's raise to $3 \diamond$ improved Hirata's hand, although he could hardly bank on a singleton diamond opposite. As long as South held four spades, however, it made sense notto hang a trick short of game, especially vulnerable. You might argue that Hanayama should have jumped to $4 \boldsymbol{s}$ himself over the second negative double, but facing a passed hand, his reticence is understandable. Perhaps Venky should have tried $3 \diamond$ over $2 \Delta$ at his table, but you could argue that Gupta had a good hand in context and should have bid game over 34. Perhaps it's simply a partnership matter.

Gupta got a heart lead, won the queen, ran the Q9 to the ace, ruffed the second round of diamonds, crossed to the A, finessed the ¢10, and played three rounds of clubs to discard dummy's last diamond as East ruffed; +170.

Hanayama was treated to two rounds of diamonds. He ruffed, went to the $\vee Q$, and led a spade to the ten and ace. Now Satya played a second heart so the position was the same as for Gupta; +620. 10 IMPs to Hana, 17-18.

| Bd: 13 DIr: North Vul: Both | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - 9852 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 52$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 632$ |  |
|  | * K952 |  |
| West |  | East |
| - AK6 |  | Q Q10743 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q7 |  | $\bigcirc$ A108 |
| $\diamond$ QJ8754 |  | $\diamond$ A9 |
| - J8 |  | - 473 |
|  | South |  |
|  | ¢ J |  |
|  | - KJ9643 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K10 |  |
|  | Q1064 |  |

Hana took the lead on Board 13 when Maeda made two overtricks in 4s on a heart lead. He won cheaply and played $\diamond A$, diamond. South won and switched to clubs but Maeda won, played $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}, \stackrel{\wedge}{ } \mathrm{A}$, then diamonds, He could overruff North and return to the LK for the rest of the diamonds; +680.

At the other table the opening lead was a more challenging club. Nadar won the first club, led a trump to the ace, and conceded a club. A third club was ruffed with the $\uparrow 6$ and Nadar cashed the $\$ K$, came to the $\diamond A$, drew trumps, and led a diamond. A fourth club forced her last trump, but when South won the $\vee \mathrm{K}$ there were no clubs left in the game to cash; +620. 2 IMPs to Hana, 1918.


Venky's 3NT was cold and he made four on the
lead of the $\diamond 8$ from Maeda; +430 .
Hirata's 3NT would also have been cold but he decided not to pay for the privilege of finding out. 4e could have been beaten on three rounds of diamonds and a shift to either major, as East can guard hearts, but Satya led a heart; +130. 7 IMPs to India, back in front, 2519.

| Bd: 16 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: West | ¢ Q7 |  |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\bigcirc$ J84 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K3 |  |  |
|  | 2 AKQ1098 |  |  |
| West |  | East |  |
| - 92 |  | ¢ AK83 |  |
| $\bigcirc 7$ |  | $\checkmark$ AKQ653 |  |
| $\diamond$ QJ976 |  | $\diamond A$ |  |
| - J64 |  | ¢ 72 |  |
| South |  |  |  |
| ¢ J10654 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 1092$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond 1082$ |  |  |  |
| - 53 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hayashi | Venky | Maeda | Gupta |
| Pass | 1NT | $2 \diamond(1)$ | Pass |
| Pass | 2NT | All Pa |  |
| (1) Hearts and spades |  |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Satya | Hirata | Nadar | Hanayama |
| Pass | 1NT | Dbl | 20* |
| Pass | 24 | 48 | All Pass |

As Maeda could have taken eight tricks in 28 Venky's 2NT wasn't an awful sacrifice-down four for -200-but it wasn't pleasing to the eye. Maeda is an early leader in the race for the Barry Goldwater trophy for the most conservative action in a calendar year ending in 002.

Given the auction at her table, Nadar must have fancied her chances in $4 \bigcirc$ on three rounds of clubs, but Hanayama's over-ruff and trump exit left her with only eight winners; -200. 9 IMPs to Hana, back in the lead, 28-25.

| Bd: 17 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dir: North Vul: None | 4 QJ85 |  |  |
|  | - AJ52 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J75 |  |  |
|  | \& A3 |  |  |
| West |  | East |  |
| - K1042 |  | ¢ A 963 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q1096 |  | $\bigcirc 8$ |  |
| $\diamond 10$ |  | $\diamond$ AQ632 |  |
| - KQ84 |  | \& 1072 |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | ¢ 7 |  |  |
|  | - K743 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K984 |  |  |
|  | ¢ J 965 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hayashi | Venky | Maeda | Gupta |
|  | 1ヶ | Pass | 10 |
| Dbl | Pass! | 24 | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 30 | All Pa |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Satya | Hirata | Nadar | Hanayama |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 18 |
| Dbl | 20 | 34 | All pass |

Nadar made 34 on two rounds of hearts, discarding a club, then cross-ruffing and scoring a club, a heart, a diamond and six trump tricks; +140 .

Gupta took eight tricks in hearts on the lead of the K , running into two diamond ruffs whenhe won and played a diamond at trick two; -50.3 IMPs to India, tying the match at 28-all.


| Bd: 18 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East <br> Vul: N/S | ¢ Q854 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 832$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ KQ96 |  |  |
|  | - 52 |  |  |
| West |  | East |  |
| - J 1063 |  | Q K |  |
| - J94 |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{KQ} 7$ |  |
| $\diamond 84$ |  | $\diamond$ A7532 |  |
| ¢ K984 |  | * AQJ10 |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | - A972 |  |  |
|  | - A1065 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J10 |  |  |
|  | - 763 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| Hayashi | North | East | South |
|  | Venky | Maeda | Gupta |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 2NT | All Pass |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Satya | Hirata | Nadar | Hanayama |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 34 | Pass |
| 30 | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

In 2NT, Maeda got a club lead, which he won in hand to lead the $\$$ K. When Gupta ducked Maeda drove out the $\triangle A$ for eight tricks; +120 .

In 3NT Nadar got a heart lead to the eight and king. She ducked a diamond but the defenders played three rounds of spades to establish a third winner in that suit. Hanayama won the second round of hearts to cash the setting trick in spades; -50.5 IMPs to Hana, 33-28.

| Bd: 20 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: West Vul: Both | ¢ 10743 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A98654 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 7$ |  |  |
| West | \& K5 |  |  |
|  | East |  |  |
| - 86 | ¢ J2 |  |  |
| \% QJ10 | $\bigcirc$--- |  |  |
| $\diamond$ Q9843 | $\diamond$ AKJ105 |  |  |
| \& A106 |  |  | QJ9842 |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | ¢ AKQ95 |  |  |
|  | - K732 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 62$ |  |  |
|  | ¢ 73 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hayashi | Venky | Maeda | Gupta |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | 19 |
| 24 | 49 | 53 | Pass |
| $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Satya | Hirata | Nadar | Hanayama |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | 14 |
| $2 \diamond$ | $3 \bigcirc(1)$ | 42 | 48 |
| $5 \diamond$ | 58 | Pass | Pass |
| Dbl | All Pass |  |  |
| (1) Fit-showing |  |  |  |

The bad trump break beat Hirata's 5®doubled one trick; -200. The losing club finesse beat Maeda's $5 \diamond$ one trick; -100 . 7 IMPs to India, who won the match 35-33, but the VP score was 15-15, an honorable draw.


Mr. Maeda


Mr. Hayashi


Mr. Chang

$\mathrm{Mr} . \mathrm{Hu}$

The top of the draw in Match Three featured Sweden and Australia, but in the interest of reader comprehension we decided not to tackle the Swedish systems on the first day and instead covered the Table Two confrontation between the defending champions re-incarnate and the Dutch Masters, men without cigars.


With both red suits lying as beautifully as declarer might wish them to lie, there were 12 tricks available in $4 \checkmark$. Getting there was much more than half the fun, however, and Jean-Paul Vis, on the lead of the $\Delta \mathrm{K}$, lost a trick in both red suits ( $\Delta A, \nabla J, \nabla A, \diamond Q$, concede a diamond) and finished with "only" 11 winners; +450 .

It looks as if Lev/Blanchard do not play support doubles and they came to rest in $3 \diamond$ without knowing that they held a five-three heart fit. Blanchard took ten tricks in $3 \diamond$ on the lead of the \&K; +130. First blood (this tired cliche never ceases to create the image of smiling vampires in my tortured mind, so why should you be so lucky as to escape unscathed?) to Netherlands, 8-0.

| Bd: 2 North |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | - QJ93 |  |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\bigcirc \mathrm{J} 987$ |  |  |
| $\diamond 95$ |  |  |  |
| 2. 884 |  |  |  |
| West |  | East |  |
| - A108 |  | - 762 |  |
| $\checkmark 2$ |  | $\bigcirc 1065$ |  |
| $\diamond$ A104 |  | $\diamond$ K872 |  |
| * KQ976 |  | -1053 |  |
| South |  |  |  |
| ¢ K54 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ AKQ43 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ QJ63 |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{*}{*}$ |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bertens | Lev | Bakkeren | Blanchard |
|  |  | Pass | 18 |
| 24 | $30^{*}$ | Pass | 48 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jassem | Vis | Gawrys | van Cleeff |
|  |  | Pass | 18 |
| 2\% | 30* | Pass | 48 |
| Dbl | Pass | 5\% | All Pass |

Against Bob Blanchard's 4ワ, Huub Bertens led the \&K. Blanchard won, cashed two high hearts, led a low spade to the queen, a third trump to his queen, and a second low spade. He could build a third spade trick painlessly now; +620 .

From Jan van Cleeff's point of view he might
not have been beating $5 \boldsymbol{*}$, but as he had bid $4 \bigcirc$ to make it behooved him to take some sort of action...unless he thought his pass was forcing. I noted no bruising on the throat of either Jean-Paul or Jan the last time I saw them so if they disagree on this issue they have not come to blows over it. 5* went down three, not doubled; -150. 10 IMPs to e-bridge, 10-8.
"But of course I doubled," said Jan, with a twinkle in his eye, "didn't you all hear me?"

| Bd: 3 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: South | ¢ KJ102 |  |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\bigcirc$ Q7532 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A94 |  |  |
|  | * 6 |  |  |
| West |  | East |  |
| - A764 |  | - 985 |  |
| \% KJ108 |  | $\bigcirc$ A4 |  |
| $\diamond$ Q |  | $\diamond$ J73 |  |
| 2 A1054 |  | * QJ932 |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | - Q3 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 96$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K108652 |  |  |
|  | - K87 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bertens | Lev | Bakkeren | Blanchard |
| Dbl | $3 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jassem | Vis | Gawrys | van Cleeff |
|  |  |  | $3 \diamond$ |
| Dbl | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

Look, ma, a six-card suit! Let's bid with it, quick before someone else gets a turn. It would not have been ridiculous for Ton Bakkeren to compete to 4e, but he didn't, and Blanchard made $3 \diamond$ by picking up trumps; +110. The hairy-chested Professor van Cleeff also guessed the diamonds, but his macho three-bid had landed him a level too high; -50. 4 IMPs to e-bridge, 14-8.

| Bd: 5 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North | - AQ6 |  |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\bigcirc$ K86532 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 8$ |  |  |
|  | \& 1095 |  |  |
| West |  | East |  |
| - 1054 |  | ¢ K973 |  |
| > Q74 |  | - J109 |  |
| $\diamond 965$ |  | $\diamond 1074$ |  |
| A863 |  | * QJ7 |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | - J82 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AKQJ32 |  |  |
|  | * K42 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bertens | Lev | Bakkeren | Blanchard |
|  | 28 | Pass | 40 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jassem | Vis | Gawrys | van Cleeff |
|  | $2 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 30 | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

If you believe the North hand qualifies for a weak two-bid at unfavorable vulnerability, no one will be able to convince you that your woeful suit and extreme suitability for two other strains should talk you out of your first choice. Not me, anyway.

Van Cleeff's 3NT was bulletproof on Krzysztof Jassem's unexpected lead of the $87 ;+630$. Sam Lev's $4 \triangle$ needed more than a bit of luck but he got it, Bakkeren's trump lead proving nonconfrontational when three rounds of diamonds stood up. Lev played the fourth diamond to throw his last club and lost only two trumps and a spade after that; +620. Bo swing.

| Bd: 6 | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | ¢ 9 |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\bigcirc$ Q862 |  |
|  | $\diamond 842$ |  |
|  | * AJ842 |  |
| West |  | East |
| - Q62 |  | ¢ AKJ743 |
| $\checkmark$ A974 |  | © K103 |
| $\diamond$ K75 |  | $\diamond$ J103 |
| - 765 |  | \& Q |
|  | South |  |
|  | - 1085 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{J} 5$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AQ96 |  |
|  | * K1093 |  |

Both E/W pairs reached 44. Blanchard, who knew that declarer was short in clubs, led the \& 3 to the ace. A diamond switch would have been best here but that was hardly obvious to Lev, who continued clubs. Declarer ruffed, drew trumps, and led the $\vee 10$. Blanchard would have done well to cover, but that too was hardly obvious. Lev won the $\triangle Q$ and played another club but it was too late; +620.

Van Cleeff led a trump against Piotr Gawrys, who drew a second round and led the 810. Here too South did not cover, and declarer had three top heart tricks coming after the ten lost to the queen, providing a parking place for a diamond loser; +620. No swing.

| Bd: 8 | North |
| :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: West | ¢ AQ10954 |
| Vul: None | $\bigcirc 1094$ |
|  | $\diamond$ K7 |
|  | -104 |
| West | East |
| - 2 | ¢ K6 |
| $\bigcirc$ A8 | $\bigcirc$ KQJ7 |
| $\diamond$ A10963 | $\diamond 85$ |
| - AKQ92 | \& J8765 |
|  | South |
|  | - J873 |
|  | $\bigcirc 6532$ |
|  | $\diamond$ QJ42 |
|  | \& 3 |


| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bertens | Lev | Bakkeren | Blanchard |
| $1 \diamond$ | 24 | Dbl* | 34 |
| 63 | All Pass |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jassem | Vis | Gawrys | van Cleeff |
| $1 \diamond$ | 14. | Dbl* | 34 |
| 58 | All Pass |  |  |

If North doesn't cash the A he doesn't beat 6s. Lev cashed it; -50 . Vis led the $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$ against $5 \boldsymbol{2}$; +400. 10 IMPs to e-bridge, 25-8.

| Bd: 9 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North | $\pm$ AK2 |  |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\bigcirc 64$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 7654$ |  |  |
|  | * AQ42 |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| ¢ 109876 | ¢ J5 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q5 | - KJ108 |  |  |
| $\diamond$ KQ83 | $\diamond$ J102 |  |  |
| - J3 | * K975 |  |  |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | - Q43 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A9732 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A9 |  |  |
|  | ~ 1086 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bertens | Lev | Bakkeren | Blanchard |
|  | 120 | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | 1NT | Pass | 2** |
| Pass | $2 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jassem | Vis | Gawrys | van Cleeff |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 10 |
| Pass | 1NT | Pass | 20* |
| Pass | $2 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | 2NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

In trying to make his pushy 3NT after the lead of the $\diamond J$, Lev played on hearts and eventually came to only six tricks; down three, -150 . In

2NT, Vis could a club lead to the ten, jack and queen. He ducked a heart, won the club continuation, and ducked another to the queen. Jassem switched to a spade but that wasn't good enough. Vis won and cleared hearts; +120. 7 IMPs to Netherlands, 15-25.

| Bd: 10 <br> DIr: East <br> Vul: Both | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - 432 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K10 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ KJ9 |  |
|  | * KQ1092 |  |
| West |  | East |
| Q QJ109 |  | - AK86 |
| $\bigcirc$ AJ943 |  | $\bigcirc 8765$ |
| $\diamond 83$ |  | $\diamond$ AQ76 |
| - 85 |  | \& J |
|  | South |  |
|  | - 75 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q2 |  |
|  | $\diamond 10542$ |  |
|  | - A7643 |  |

Both Easts opened $1 \diamond$ and raised $1 \diamond$ to two. Both Wests passed. Both declarers made five for an undistinguished push. Some of you are shaking your heads, wondering why East didn't raise to $3 \bigcirc$ or why West didn't try for game. Some of you may have been East or West in other matches. Get a grip, kids. This is a biddable game but whether East or West should do more is a partnership matter and certainly not something that should be addressed only when it comes up at the table.


Mr. Van Cleeff


Mr. Bertens

| Bd: 11 <br> DIr: South <br> Vul: None | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ¢ AKQ5 |  |
|  | - KQ942 |  |
|  | $\diamond 7$ |  |
|  | - J107 |  |
| West |  | East |
| - 642 |  | ¢ J103 |
| $\bigcirc 863$ |  | $\bigcirc 10$ |
| $\checkmark$ A10 |  | $\diamond$ KQJ6543 |
| A8643 |  | \& KQ |
|  | South |  |
|  | - 987 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AJ75 |  |
|  | $\diamond 982$ |  |
|  | - 952 |  |

Both N/S pairs reached $4 \bigcirc$ after East overcalled $1 \checkmark$ with $2 \diamond$. Bakkeren led the 2 K and continued with the Q when Bertens followed with the six. Bertens did not overtake but Bakkeren switched to the $\diamond J$ and Bertens won the ace and cashed the A for one down; -50 . At the other table Gawrys led the $\diamond K$ and Jassem elected to follow with the ten. Gawrys switched to the 2 K and continued with the queen. Jassem overtook and returned a low club for Gawrys to ruff; -50 . No swing.

In England vs Canada John Armstrong led the $\diamond$ K. Brian Callaghan overtook and switched to a low club. Armstrong won the king and returned the queen, so Callaghan had no problem whatsoever in overtaking to play a third club. What an interesting position! Three altogether different plans, all of them getting the job done.


| Bd: 16 | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: West | ¢ 76 |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\bigcirc$ Q107 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AJ75 |  |
|  | \& J874 |  |
| West |  | East |
| - A1043 |  | Q Q952 |
| $\checkmark$ A94 |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K}$ |
| $\diamond 9632$ |  | $\diamond$ KQ108 |
| \& Q5 |  | \% K1063 |
|  | South |  |
|  | ¢ KJ8 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J86532 |  |
|  | $\diamond 4$ |  |
|  | * A92 |  |

Both E/W pairs pushed to reach 44. Both Souths won the A early and switched to the $\diamond 4$. Both Norths withheld the ace, playing South for two diamonds and a trump entry. It would have been better this time to take the ace and play a diamond. No swing at +620 .

| Bd: 17 | North |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: North | - QJ1062 |  |  |
| Vul: None | $\bigcirc 4$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AQ865 |  |  |
|  | - 32 |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| a K54 | $\triangle$ A |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ A105 | $\bigcirc 983$ |  |  |
| $\diamond$ J432 | $\diamond$ K1097 |  |  |
| * KJ8 |  | \% | Q10964 |
| South |  |  |  |
| ¢ 9873 |  |  |  |
| - KQJ762 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$--- |  |  |  |
| * A75 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bertens | Lev | Bakkeren | Blanchard |
|  | Pass | Pass | 20 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jassem | Vis | Gawrys | van Cleeff |
|  | 24(1) | Pass | 49 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| (1) 5++/4+m, about 5-10 |  |  |  |

Bertens led the 8 against $2 \checkmark$ and was allowed to win the trick. He switched to a low trump, which was good enough to hold Blanchard to eight tricks, but Bertens went in with the king on the first spade lead towards dummy; +140 .

A club lead also would have been effective against Vis' 4@, but Gawrys led the $\vee 8$, Jassem ducking dummy's king. Now the OK ruffed out the ace and a trump lost to East's ace. Vis won the club switch and simply played on trumps, Jassem switching to a diamond when he won the $\mathbf{~ K} ;+450.7$ IMPs to Netherlands, 22-31.


Anyone for seven? +710 and $+1460,13$ IMPs to e-bridge, who won the match 44-22, 20-10 in VP.

## Meet the Defenders: Team e-bridge

(Much of the following material was adapted from e-bridgemaster.com)

Robert W. (Bob) Blanchard was born in 1951. He is a graduate of Case Western Reserve and the University of Oregon, and now runs a company that manufactures electromechanicaldevices. He and his current wife, Lynn, live in New York City. In the early 1980s he and his exwife, World Champion Jill Levin, championed a well-publicized fight for Women's right in bridge.

Bob was the ACBL Rookie of the Year in 1975. He finished second in two NABC events in 1982 and then just missed out on his first NABC title again in 1989, finishing second in the Reisinger. In 1991, he qualified to play in the US Team Trials. In 1996, he finally won his first North American championship-the Blue Ribbon pairs. He has


Bob Blanchard
since added a second NABC title, the 1997 Open Board-a-Match Teams.

He has also represented the USA in internationalcompetition, finishing 13th in the 1986 Rosenblum Teams, and 17th in the same event four years later. He has also enjoyed the Cavendish Invitational Pairs over the years, finishing third in 1984, fourth in 1982 and sixth in 1981. He has for many years been involved with the organization of the Cavendish, which is by far the world's largest cash-prize tournament.

Bob was Chairman of both ACBL Unit 128 and District 24 in 1992.

Away from the bridge table, he enjoys tennis, sailing, cooking and water-skiing.

Krzysztof Jassem was born in 1965 in Poznan, Poland. He graduated from his hometown university with a degree in Mathematics in 1988, and in 1997 earned his Doctorate in Computer Science. He still resides in Poznan, where he is a research worker at the University of Adam Mickiewicz. He teaches programming and computational linguistics. His current project is in the field of 'Machine Translation,' where he is involved in developing a Polish-English machine translation system called 'POLENG'.

Krzysztof and wife Magdalena have two sons (14 and 11) and a two-year old daughter, Malgosia. "My sons play bridge with aunts, uncles and grandparents," says Krzysztof, "although not yet with their father. My daughter will play too, very soon, and they are hoping that we will add a fourth child one day so that they can have an independent table. My plan is, however, to have two more so they can make up their own basketball team. No bench players, though, thank you."

When asked if he had any pets, Krzysztof responded, "Malgosia, our two-year old, takes the job of our family pet. Everyone loves her."


As a child, Krzysztof was a keen soccer player. He was also one of the top ten Polish table tennis players of his age. He has an older sister who moved to the US in 1988 to further her scientific career and now lives in Canada.

Krzysztof's first notable partnership was with Krzysztof Oppenheim, a member of the gold medal winning Polish junior team in 1983. "He was probably the best Polish junior player in history," comments Jassem. "In 1984, at the age of 23, he won the Open ranking in Poland. We played together for two years (1993-95), but he gave up bridge after our third consecutive failure to qualify for the Polish national team.

Krzysztof teamed up with his current partner, Piotr Tuszynski in 1995. Their first major international success together came at the 1997 World Championships in Hammamet, Tunisia, where
they earned Silver medals in the World Transnational Open Teams. Krzysztof made his debut in the Polish national team at the 1999 European Teams Championships in Malta, where he and Tuszynski were the best Polish pair in the Butler rankings. Krzysztof also won the award for the 'Best Played Hand' at the tournament.

In 2000, Jassem-Tuszynski finished third in the prestigious Cap Gemini Invitational Pairs in The Hague, The Netherlands. Their most gratifying but also their most disappointing result to date came at the 2000 World Teams Olympiad in Maastricht, where their team bowed to Italy in the final of the Open Teams, losing the lead in the last few deals.

Krzysztof won his first Polish National title in 1985-the Polish First Division championship (the most important team title in Poland). At the time, he was playing for the Budowlani Poznan Club, in partnership with Marek Szukala, with top Polish internationals Andrzej Milde/Marek Kudla as teammates.

Piotr Gawrys was born in 1955 in Warsaw, Poland. A bridge professional and former architect, he currently runs a company that imports coffee, espresso and coffee machines.

He was a member of the only Polish team ever to win either of the two major World Championship team events-the 7th World Teams Olympiad, in Seattle in 1984. In 2000 he added a second World Championship title to his list of achievements, winning the World Transnational Mixed Teams in Maastricht, The Netherlands, as a member of Team e-bridge in partnership with Migry Zur-Campanile. Piotr also has two World Championship Silver medals, losing to Iceland in the final of the 1991 Bermuda Bowl in Yokohama and to the USA in the final of the 1994 Rosenblum Cup in Albuquerque. He is a WBF World Grand Master (\#17 in the current world rankings).

Piotr was a member of the last Polish team to win the European Teams Championship in Menton in

He has since won more than ten Polish National titles, including the First Division four times, each for a different club.

A successful bridge journalist, since 1992 Krzysztof has been the Editor of the top Polish bridge magazine, Brydz, and for the past seven years he has also conducted the magazine's Expert Bidding Panel. One of his three books, Do You Bid Higher, Expert? was based on the panel's opinions on tough bidding problems. His other two books, published in 1995 and 2000, were both on the subject of The Polish Club.

Away from bridge, Krzysztof is a keen sportsman. "I play basketball in the NBA," he said, although he went on to explain further. "The NBA in Poland is an acronym for Nurt Basketballu Amatorskiego, an amateur league in the Poznan area. I also play football in the second (used to play in the first) division of the local amateur league and I enjoy court tennis, although any thoughts of a career in that sport were interrupted a year ago by a heavy loss to a 12-year old girl."
1993. With Krzysztof Lasocki he also won the 1995 European Pairs Championship in Rome. They did not just win it, they finished first in all three semi-final sessions and then, after an above-average first-final session, wonthe second. They were so far ahead of the field that they won the event with fifteen boards still remaining in the last session of the final.

Piotr has won most major European events at least once, including the 1994 European Cup and the 1992 Generali Masters Individual. He also won the 1990 Cavendish Invitational Pairs in partnership with Elyakim Shoufel. In 2000 he finished second in the Generali Masters Individual tournament in Athens. He also has countless Polish National titles to his credit.

Piotr Gawrys


Schmuel 'Sam' Lev was born in 1947 and broke onto the international bridge scene as a member of the Israeli Open Team at the European Championships at the age of just 22. He earned a B.Sc. in chemistry from the Haifa Institute of Technology (Technion) but spent most of his early years in Israel running the Tel Aviv Bridge Club, which he managed and co-owned for twenty years. In that time, he represented Israel many times, collecting a silver medal at the 1975 European Teams Championships and twice earning a bronze medal in the Bermuda Bowl (in 1976 and 1985).

In 1989 Sam and his family relocated to the US. He has since won numerous US National titles including the Reisinger Board-a-Match Teams twice (in


Sam Lev
of just 26 when he won the very first European Pairs Championship in Germany. He was a member of the Israeli team that finished second to Italy in the 1975 European Championships in Brighton, England. This performance won Sam's team a place in the 1976 Bermuda Bowl in Monte Carlo, where they finished third.

Besides his successes at the world level, Samhas won many major international events including the Pan-American Championships, the Cavendish Invitational tournament, the Deauville International Pairs in France, the Forbo Teams in The Hague, The Netherlands, and events in places as far afield as Monte Carlo, Crans-Sur-Sierre (Switzerland), Paris, Brussels, London, Salsomaggiore (Italy), Biarritz, Poland, San Francisco, and Buenos Aires.

Away from the bridge table, Sam's interests include international politics, chess, a rooting interest in most sports, and Internet Bridge. He is also fluent in six languages.
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