



# NEC Bridge Festival

Monday, February 10, 1997  
Bulletin Number 2

Editors: Eric Kokish  
Richard Colker

Congratulations to the winners:

Flight A: Hiroshi Hisatomi, Tadashi Teramoto, Hiroya Abe, Chen Da-Wei

Flight B: Hiroko Ohta, Quin Bei-Li, Nobuko Setoguchi, Midori Sakamoto

Flight C: Atsushi Kikuchi, Takehiko Tada, Mr. & Mrs. Ryohei Orihara

## Results of the OUCHI CUP

### Flight A:

- 1st H. Hisatomi, T. Teramoto, H. Abe, D. Chen
- 2nd Y. Nakamura, K. Miyakuni, R. Tanaka, S. Morimura, T. Hirata
- 3rd S. Fukuda, Y. Shimizu, H. Kaku, M. Mizuta
- 4th A. Yamada, K. Ohno, M. Ino, T. Imakura, M. Hirata, T. Hanayama
- 5th A. Kimura, K. Namoto, N. Tanai, A. Muto
- 6th M. Kanazawa, K. Kawahara, R. Illingworth, A. Yanagisawa
- 7th R. Geller, S. Ogihara, K. Yamada, K. Takahashi, H. Narita, Y. Ito
- 8th H. Liu, Z. Shi, E. Naito, N. Nishida  
T. Hara, K. Tatai, K. Ito, T. Jomura, T. Miyashiro

### Flight B:

- 1st H. Ohta, B. Quin, N. Setoguchi, M. Sakamoto
- 2nd S. Amram, C. Hamada, M. Goto, N. Sano
- 3rd E Kokish, R. Colker, D. Sacul. E. Manoppo, H. Lasut, T. Asbi
- 4th Y. Kobayashi, Y. Ohtsuka, M. Takayama, K. Furuta
- 5th O. Kameda, J. Sawai, K. Hayashida, M. Hamano
- 6th M. Abe, M. Shida, K. Matsuzaki, K. Toyofuku
- 7th E. Mizutani, R. Fujuwara, M. Hein, K. Umehara
- 8th H. Takeuchi, Ka, K. Asai, K. Tokiwa

### Flight C:

- 1st A. Kikuchi, T. Tada, Mr. & Mrs. Orihara
- 2nd M. Iwata, Y. Matsumura, M. Tanabe, M. Kohno
- 3rd Y. Sakamoto, Y. Umetsu, T. Suzuki, C. Ichikawa
- 4th K. Izaki, Y. Tsuji, K. Asaoka, S. Inoue
- 5th M. Ando, M. Nomura, T. Kawaguchi, H. Tsubahara
- 6th N. Narita, K. Sasaki, K. Higashiguchi, H. Takano
- 7th F. Sakabe, K. Honme, S. Nakagawa, E. Hamaguchi
- 8th M. Shioya, R. Namiki, N. Manabe, J. Nishimura

# “SEVEN CITY” SEVEN

by Kaz Yamada

Bd: O-F1-1	North
Dir: N	♠ 2
Vul: None	♥ KQ98432
	♦ J986
	♣ Q
West	East
♠ K9543	♠ AQ87
♥ A	♥ J75
♦ K32	♦ A1074
♣ A1052	♣ KJ
	South
	♠ J106
	♥ 106
	♦ Q5
	♣ 987643

TABLE ONE			
West	North	East	South
K. Ito	Yomada	Jomura	Takahashi
	3♥	DBL	Pass
4♥	Pass	4♠	Pass
4NT	Pass	5♠(1)	Pass
5NT	Pass	6♣(2)	Pass
6♥(3)	Pass	6♠	All Pass
(1) Two key cards plus ♠Q; (2) ♣K			
(3) Still interested in 7			
TABLE TWO			
West	North	East	South
Y. Ito	Tatai	Narita	Hara
	2♠(1)	2NT	Pass
3♥(2)	4♥	4♠	Pass
4NT	Pass	5♠	Pass
5NT	6♣(3)	Pass	7♠
All Pass			
(1) 5+ of either major & 4+ diamonds, weak			
(2) Transfer; (3) ♣K			

At TABLE ONE, after North’s normal preemptive 3♥ bid, E/W tried mightily to reach the grand slam, but ultimately settled for just six. At TABLE TWO North had a new gadget to try out, which his side had been given permission to play in this event, and that gave East just enough room to show his strong notrump range hand. West then judged the rest of the auction perfectly, and placed his side in 7♠. Congratulations to the bravery of Messers Narita and Ito.

After the ♥10 lead, the play was simple at both tables. Declarer drew trump, cashed the ♣K, and claimed thirteen tricks. But what if South had held the ♣Q? The hand is still cold. Declarer draws trump in three rounds, cashes the ♣K, and finesses South for the queen. A diamond to the king and a club ruff follow, after which declarer ruffs a heart back to his hand. The thirteenth spade then squeezes North between the red suits.

Perhaps there is a moral to this story. Never abuse your own conventional openings. Showing a four-card suit ahead of a fair seven-card suit is asking for trouble. Here it came in a rare seven-sided package.

## THE ULTIMATE DRAMA

Flashback to the Rhodes Olympiad Open Teams Semifinals. The eight-board playoff in the Indonesia vs Denmark match had been remarkably dull. After seven deals, there was just one chance left for the Indonesians, who were 8imps behind, 218-226. Would it be a dull game, a partscore with only limited potential, or something more lively?

Bd: PO-7	North	
Dlr: S	♠ 3	
Vul: Both	♥ KJT2	
	♦ T6	
	♣ AQJT73	
West		East
♠ AK74		♠ J9852
♥ ---		♥ A943
♦ AK87542		♦ QJ
♣ K8		♣ 62
	South	
	♠ QT6	
	♥ Q8765	
	♦ 93	
	♣ 954	

Open Room			
West	North	East	South
Auken	Lasut	Koch-Pmd	Manoppo
1♦	2♣	DBL(1)	Pass
3♣	Pass	3♦	Pass
3♠	Pass	4♠	Pass
4NT(2)	Pass	5♣(3)	Pass
5♦(4)	Pass	6♠	All Pass
(1) NEG; (2) RKCB-1430;			
(3) Here 1 key card; (4) ♠Q?			
Closed Room			
West	North	East	South
Watulingas	Chrstnsn	Panelewen	Blakset
1♦	2♣	DBL(1)	Pass
3♣	Pass	3♠	Pass
4♦	Pass	4♥	Pass
4♠	All Pass		
(1) NEG			

When the final deal appeared on the Vugraph screen, it had become clear to everyone that the script writers had been burning the midnight oil to produce this dynamic offering.

The bidding started the same way in both rooms, West cue-bidding 3♣ to advance the auction after East's negative double. Santje Panelewen reacted to the cue-bid by introducing his longest suit and Giovani Watulingas, with serious slam potential but a particularly tenuous holding in the enemy suit, was faced with a difficult bidding problem. He chose 4♦, angling for 6♦ in order to protect his ♠K, but when Panelewen countered with an ambiguous 4♥, he settled for 4♠, hoping that his partner would move with a suitable hand.

With East declaring spades, it's a good idea to avoid the five-level on this combination, and when Lars Blakset led a club through the king, the defense got two clubs and a trump. Panelewen scored plus 620, a good result for Indonesia on this dangerous layout; their supporters took heart.

It was up to Jens Auken and Dennis Koch-Palmund to save the day for Denmark, as they had done on Board 93 in regulation time, and Koch-Palmund did something very good for his side when he tried 3♦ over the 3♣ cue-bid. This thoughtful effort paved the way for Auken to introduce a four-card major and at the same time protect a dangerous holding in clubs; it deserved a better fate. Koch-Palmund contented himself with a simple raise to 4♠ and Auken was back in the spotlight. The Danish supporters were willing him to pass, but how could he do that? He needed nothing more than four spades to the queen and three small diamonds to have a good play for slam, and Koch-Palmund was known to hold quite a bit more overall strength than that. It was inevitable that he would bid on, but there was no call that was sure to give him the information he

required. After considerable thought, he continued with 4NT, Roman Keycard Blackwood for spades, hoping that if Koch-Palmund showed one key card, it would be the ace of hearts and not the ace of clubs. When Koch-Palmund obliged by responding 5♣, showing one key card (or four, on some other deal), Auken was able to continue with 5♦, asking about the queen of spades. Now it was the turn of the the Danish supporters to take heart. Koch-Palmund did not hold the ♠Q and so would sign off at 5♠, would he not? But Koch-Palmund, who had promised only four spades, thought that his fifth trump might be nearly as good as the queen, and jumped to 6♠. Pandemonium in the Vugraph theatre.

But it was not over yet. Henky Lasut led the ♣A and continued the suit. It was still open to Auken to pick up the trump suit.

But there was no reason to do that. He played the suit normally, cashing the ace first. Eddy Manoppo had a trump trick and the slam was one down; minus 100. That was 12 imps to Indonesia on the final deal shown on Rama, which brought them victory in one of the most emotional matches in the history of the World Championships by 4 imps, 230-226.

Had Koch-Palmund elected to deny the trump queen, he would have missed a slam that was (as he thought) slightly better than 50%, but Denmark would have been in the final. It is impossible not to sympathize with the Danes, who had played with great heart, considerable skill, and ample inspiration. But the Indonesians had shown plenty of grit themselves under pressure and deserved their place in the final.

They would meet the French later that evening to begin the 128-board final, with the Olympiad Open Teams title at stake. It would be Indonesia's first appearance the final of a World Championship, where they would face a nation with a rich tradition of success at this level.

# TIGHTROPE

by Rich Colker, USA

Doing appeals work can be a little like walking a tightrope, or solving a murder mystery. In the modern world of top-level bridge, when a case comes before an Appeals Committee, everyone is suspect. The real trick is often deciding who is doing what, to whom, and in what way, keeping in mind that the Committee may be the one being done to. As Bobby Goldman has said, when an appeal is filed, the offenders become highly suspect of having committed a bridge crime, and the non-offenders suspect of trying to get something they don't deserve.

Here are two cases from the Marlboro 1995 World Bridge Championships in Beijing where Appeals Committees (in my opinion) walked the tightrope successfully. See how you fare at the delicate balancing game of appeals work.

The first case comes from the round robin phase of the Venice Cup: Colombia (N/S) versus South Africa (E/W).

Bd: 7	North	
Dir: S	♠ 1094	
Vul: Both	♥ 872	
	♦ Q109752	
	♣ 8	
West		East
♠ AK6		♠ 73
♥ AJ109		♥ KQ63
♦ AKJ8		♦ 63
♣ 74		♣ J10965
	South	
	♠ QJ852	
	♥ 54	
	♦ 4	
	♣ AKQ32	

West	North	East	South
			2♠ (1)
DBL	Pass	2NT(2)	Pass
3NT	All Pass		
(1) 5 spades & a 5-card minor, 11-13 HCP			
(2) Intended as Lebensohl (modified); not ALERTED.			

South led the ♣A, cashed the ♣K, and then shifted to the ♥5, after which declarer made ten tricks (plus 630 for E/W). South summoned the Director at the conclusion of the play and informed him that there had been a failure to Alert 2NT. She further claimed that with the Alert she would have led a spade, after which the contract would have been defeated. E/W confirmed the failure to Alert 2NT. Based on Laws 40B and 75A (failure to Alert an agreement) and Laws 12 and 12C2, the Director adjusted the score for both pairs to 3NT down one (plus 100 to N/S). E/W appealed.

At the hearing E/W testified that South should have known from North's failure to run from 2♠ doubled that North preferred spades, suggesting the spade lead. However, even after the club lead the dummy's spade holding clarified that East's 2NT wasn't natural, and indicated the spade switch. In addition, it was argued that the contract was always makable, even on a spade lead, by ducking one round of spades, stripping the rounded suits, and throwing North in with a diamond (after the "marked" inference that South was five-five in the black suits). Make up your mind how you would rule before reading on.

First, the Committee considered the merits of each side's case separately (Remember; everyone is suspect!). In evaluating E/W's side of the issue, the Committee rejected their arguments about

North's failure to run from 2♠ doubled and the "marked" inference that South must be five-five in the black suits (South could easily have held, a priori, something like: ♠QJxxx ♥x ♦Qxxxx ♣AQ, and still have opened 2♠; if South leads a sensible high club, however, declarer can test clubs safely). Since East could fail in 3NT on some reasonable lines of play, and since E/W were responsible for causing the problem in the first place, they were assigned the most unfavorable result that was at all likely (as prescribed by Law 12C2): 3NT down one (minus 100).

Next the Committee considered N/S's claim. Contrary to South's assertion that she would have led a spade if given the proper information about East's 2NT bid, it was felt that a club lead was pretty much inevitable. Further, it was noted that without a spade shift at trick two the hand would always be made (and might even be made with it). Given the somewhat questionable heart shift which South made on the actual deal, the Committee decided not to redress N/S for the possibility that they might have set 3NT if not for the misinformation they received. They were assigned the result at the table, 3NT making four (minus 630).

Finally, the Committee decided that the two assigned scores should each be IMP'ed against the result at the other table, and the resulting imps averaged to yield a single result for both teams.

The second case comes from the quarterfinals of the Bermuda Bowl: Netherlands (N-S) vs. Sweden (E-W).

Bd: 9	North	
Dir: N	♠ 10	
Vul: E/W	♥ A942	
	♦ 92	
	♣ AJ10982	
West		East
♠ 8542		♠ AKQ93
♥ QJ1076		♥ 3
♦ 753		♦ AJ106
♣ 5		♣ K74
	South	
	♠ J76	
	♥ K85	
	♦ KQ84	
	♣ Q63	

West	North	East	South
	Pass	1♣ (1)	Pass
1♦ (2)	3♣	Pass	Pass
DBL(3)	Pass	3♠	All Pass
(1) Strong, 17+ HCP; (2) Negative			
(3) After a hesitation; described by			
West (to South) as takeout.			

The Director was called to the table after the completion of the hand. N/S complained that West had hesitated unduly (approximately one minute) before doubling, and because of this East had bid only 3♠. Applied to the present case, Law 16A2 authorizes the Director to assign an adjusted score whenever it is determined that, following West's (alleged) hesitation, East selected from among logical alternatives an action which could have been suggested by the hesitation. The Directors did not feel that 3♠ met this criterion, so the result at the table was allowed to stand. N/S appealed this ruling.

At the hearing N/S stated that E/W were normally a very aggressive pair, and that stopping short of game on the East cards opposite a West hand good enough to reopen (East's pass of 3♣ was not forcing) was unusual. They also observed that people in the Vu Graph room were surprised that East bid only 3♠, and that 4♠ was the final contract at nearly all the other tables. Finally, they

pointed out that West's description of his double as "takeout" had been incorrect (which West confirmed; it could have been based on a balanced hand of 5-7 HCP, and should have been described as "value showing").

East stated that he had considered three alternative bids after West's double: 3♠, 4♣ and 4♠. 3♠ was selected because of its flexibility, including allowing for a possible 3NT contract. 4♣ was considered a better bid than 4♠ because it allowed for a possible diamond contract. Finally, East felt that 3♠ also carried the implication of being a five-card suit, since red suits of equal or longer length would be bid at the three-level before a four-card spade suit. (West, however, seemed unaware of this inference.) Once again, decide how you would rule before reading on.

This case was quite complex, the final decision resting on several delicate issues. First, the testimony, together with East's club holding, suggested that East had good reason to attribute the hesitation on the other side of the screen to West. (Lacking a club fit with North, South was unlikely to be thinking of bidding opposite a partner who had passed initially, and then preempted.) Second, E/W didn't dispute the assertion that they were very aggressive, and the 4♠ game was bid by most of the other E/W pairs. Third, East's hand was strong enough (even though minimum in high cards for the 1♣ opening) to produce a good play for 4♠ opposite many West hands containing only three spades and values too modest to raise to game (e.g. ♠J8x ♥Qxxxx ♦Qxx ♣xx). And finally, it was felt that a huddle by West would suggest that caution by East was more likely to be successful than aggression.

It was therefore decided that East should be forced to take the aggressive action of forcing to game (by bidding at the four-level) over West's double, resulting in a 4♠ contract. The most likely result would be down one, so the score for 4♠ by E/W, down one, was assigned to both pairs (N/S plus 100, E/W minus 100).

In each of these cases the Committee had to make some difficult judgments. For example, given a spade lead in the first case would declarer have made the hand anyway? Or, could the player in the second case who was responsible for the hesitation be identified beyond reasonable doubt (necessary for determining that unauthorized information was present), even though the hesitation had occurred behind screens? Once the initial point had been established, other conditions had to be assessed. For example, did the partner of the hesitator in the second case select from among logical alternatives an action which could have been suggested by the hesitation? Was the action selected one which that player might not have chosen otherwise? Did the non-offending side do anything to break the chain of causality between the infraction and the damage? Only by considering each of these questions in the correct order could the Committee come to a proper conclusion.

Finally, in each of these decisions it is important that the Committees refrained from awarding the offending side a "compromise" score. For example, in the second case the Committee, after finding that East had unauthorized information about West's double, did not award E/W a score which was, say, a 50-50 average of 3♠ making and 4♠ down one (since he might have bid only 3♠ part of the time even without East's hesitation). The reason, in my opinion, that such decisions should be avoided is that they pave the way for players to use them to create no-lose situations for themselves. An example will help explain what I mean by this.

A player who acts on his partner's hesitation will get to keep his illicitly obtained result whenever the opponents (perhaps out of naivety) don't call the Director, or whenever the Director (misguidedly) rules that the player's action stands (and the opponents don't appeal the ruling, perhaps again out of naivety). Alternatively, the player will also avoid a poor result if the case is

appealed to a Committee which assigns a score based on the belief that the player would probably have made the same bid part of the time even without the hesitation (as described above). Thus, the unethical player can insure that he either wins, or at least avoids losing entirely. Clearly this is not a desirable situation, but luckily it is one which is easily avoidable.

Well, how did you do? If you disagreed with either of the Committees' judgments about whether or not a redressable infraction occurred, then welcome to the uncertain world on the tightrope. If, on the other hand, you found there was an infraction but adjudicated it differently from what was described, then we may have a more serious departure to overcome. Maybe you'll think over the arguments I presented and come to a new conclusion about how such rulings should be decided. In any event, at least we'll have something to talk (argue?) about the next time we meet.

## TEAM EFFORT

Bd: 26 Dir: E Vul: Both  West ♠ K1054 ♥ Q ♦ KQ853 ♣ 954	North ♠ 862 ♥ AK107653 ♦ 4 ♣ 106  East ♠ Q ♥ J9842 ♦ AJ762 ♣ 32  South ♠ AJ973 ♥ --- ♦ 109 ♣ AKQJ87
---	---

TABLE ONE			
West Hanayama	North Yamada	East Hirata	South Takahashi
1♦	1♥	4♦	1♣
All Pass		Pass	4♠
TABLE TWO			
West Geller	North Ino	East Ogiwara	South Imakura
1♦	1♥	3♥	1♣
Pass	4♥	5♦	3♠
All Pass			DBL

This  
s

was a deal from Round Eight of the Flight A Swiss Final of the OUCHI CUP. At TABLE TWO, Ogiwara-san saved at 5♦ before Imakura-san could convert 4♥ to 4♠, depriving herself of the opportunity to find a pretty defense. Imakura doubled 5♦, which had to go two down; minus 500.

At the other table, Makoto Hirata followed up a good piece of competitive evaluation (based to some extent on a Law of Total Tricks projection in which he placed his side with ten trumps and N/S with eight, give-or-take) with the aforementioned fine defense. When Takeshi Hanayama led the ♦K, Hirata overtook with the ♦A and played a second diamond. Katsumi Takahashi had to ruff in dummy, and when he played a trump to the queen and ace and a second trump, Hanayama could win the ten and play a third diamond, forcing the long trump hand. Whatever Takahashi did, he could not prevent Hanayama from taking a third trump trick, and the contract went one down. 12 well-deservedimps to Japan's national team.



## SINGLETON OVERLOAD

OUCHI B	North	
Dlr: S	♠ 52	
Vul: E/W	♥ AJ9754	
	♦ AQJ	
	♣ K2	
West		East
♠ KQJ9743		♠ A10
♥ 10		♥ Q862
♦ 8		♦ K105
♣ J943		♣ AQ107
	South	
	♠ 86	
	♥ K3	
	♦ 976432	
	♣ 865	

TABLE ONE			
West	North	East	South
Asbi	Nagasaka	Sacul	Kito
			Pass
3♠	4♥	DBL	All Pass
TABLE TWO			
West	North	East	South
Sato	Colker	Okamoto	Kokish
			Pass
3♠	4♥	DBL	All Pass

The West hand certainly looks like a 3♠ opening at unfavourable vulnerability, but at the table, neither East seemed to believe that West would have such an appropriate hand. Both of them doubled North's overcall of 4♥ rather than raise to 4♠, which would have produced an easy plus 650 on this layout. That wouldn't be a tragedy for E/W if they could collect 500 against 4♥, and when East started with ace and another spade, prospects seemed good for the defense.

It's not every day that you are dealt two singletons, and in the course of history I believe that in situations like this one you will find that most players cannot resist the temptation to seek a ruff with their singleton trump. And that is just what happened at both tables in our featured match. West won the second spade and switched to his singleton diamond. Both declarers won the ♦A, depriving West of a moment of instant gratification.

At one table, declarer crossed to the ♥A, felling the ten, and played two more rounds of hearts. East won the queen and exited with his remaining trump. Declarer won and tried to sneak the ♦J through, but East won the king and exited with the ten and declarer had to lose two club tricks for three down; minus 500.

At the other table, Rich Colker did a trick better than his counterpart. When he won the ♦A, he led the ♥J. East did not cover, but it didn't matter. When the jack collected West's ten, Rich led the ♦J. East won the king and exited with a trump to dummy's king, but the handwriting was on the wall and he saw it all too clearly. Rich came to the ♦Q, and played ♥A, heart to East's queen. East was down to nothing but clubs and had to concede a trick to the ♣K. Two down; minus 300. That was 5 imps to Team Indonesia-North America, who had gained 11 imps on an earlier deal to lead 16-6 going into the last board of this second-round Swiss match. However, they were heading for ...

## A MAJOR MINOR REVERSAL OF FORTUNE

OUCHI B	North		
Dir: W	♠ 5		
Vul: Both	♥ AKQ62		
	♦ 85		
	♣ AKQ53		
West		East	
♠ KQ9863		♠ 74	
♥ J85		♥ 1074	
♦ Q9		♦ AK10742	
♣ 74		♣ 98	
	South		
	♠ AJ102		
	♥ 93		
	♦ J63		
	♣ J1062		

TABLE ONE			
West	North	East	South
Asbi	Nagasaka	Sacul	Kito
2♠	2NT(1)	Pass	3♣
Pass	3♠	Pass	3NT
Pass	4NT(2)	Pass	5♦
Pass	6♣	DBL	All Pass
(1) Strong takeout; (2) Blackwood			
TABLE TWO			
West	North	East	South
Sato	Colker	Okamoto	Kokish
2♠	4♣(1)	Pass	5♣
All Pass			
(1) Hearts and clubs; strong			

At TABLE TWO, N/S were able to stop at 5♣, which was just as well, since Okamoto-san cashed two high diamonds; plus 600.

At TABLE ONE, the vagaries of the N/S competitive methods enabled them to declare a club contract from the South side, and although 6♣ was a slam with an obvious flaw, it was hardly obvious to West what it was. East doubled to try to attract a diamond lead, well aware that the slam might be cold all the time. That was a good idea here, but West was on a different wavelength and led a spade, trying to give East a ruff. That was plus 1540 for Kito-san, and a 14-imp gain, enabling their team to snatch victory from the jaws of defeat, 20-16.

## ORIHARA AND THE TALE OF THE CALCULATED UNDEBID?

Here's a teaser for you? With both sides vulnerable, you hold as East:

♠1084    ♥AJ2    ♦3    ♣KJ10965

North passes and you pass. South opens 1♥ and West, bless her, overcalls 2♦. The 64,000,000 Yen question is this: How did you arrange to become declarer in a contract of 2♣?

Bd: 13 Dir: N Vul: Both  West ♠ KJ96 ♥ K3 ♦ KQ854 ♣ Q2	North ♠ Q73 ♥ 85 ♦ A109762 ♣ 83  East ♠ 1084 ♥ AJ2 ♦ 3 ♣ KJ10965  South ♠ A52 ♥ Q109764 ♦ J ♣ A74
--	---

TABLE ONE			
West	North	East	South
N Orihara	Hamaguchi	R Orihara	Nakagawa
	Pass	Pass	1♥
2♦	1NT	2♣	All Pass
TABLE TWO			
West	North	East	South
	Pass	Pass	1♥
2♦	All Pass		

You might not agree with West's vulnerable 2♦ overcall, but the bid was made at both tables in this match, and would have been made in many others. At TABLE TWO, poor West was left to languish in 2♦, and took six tricks for minus 200.

At TABLE ONE, Ryohei Orihara found a solution to the impossible problem posed at the outset of this tale. He had a bit of help from his friends, however. Over 2♦, Hamaguchi-san tried 1NT with the North cards, perhaps overlooking the bidding card played on the right. Orihara-san now took the opportunity to introduce his clubs at the two-level, condoning the insufficient bid on his right. No one disturbed that and so 2♣ bought the auction. Orihara-san took eight tricks for plus 90 and a most unusual 7-imp gain.

## SOMETIMES A GRAND NOTION

Bd: 4	North	
Dir: W	♠ AKJ2	
Vul: Both	♥ 52	
	♦ A765	
	♣ AQJ	
West		East
♠ 108		♠ 97654
♥ J976		♥ K43
♦ 832		♦ J1094
♣ 10853		♣ 9
	South	
	♠ Q3	
	♥ AQ108	
	♦ KQ	
	♣ K7642	

On this deal from the fifth-round Swiss match in the OUCHI CUP A Final, only three of eight pairs at the top four tables reached an excellent grand slam with the N/S cards. 7NT is better than 7♣ since it's cold with clubs not five-zero, and if they are, the heart finesse might work; that's why it's best to play 7NT from the South side.

Only Kanazawa-san and Kawahara-san reached 7NT. They disappeared before we could catch their auction, but we'll try to find out the truth and publish it in an upcoming edition.

But their counterparts were Messrs Shi and Liu from China, who reached 7♣ on a Precision auction ...

NZ Shi	SH Liu
North	South
1♣(strong)	2♣
2♦(relay)	2NT
3♣	3♠
4♣	4♥
4NT	5♥
5NT	6♦
6NT	7♣

...so the swing was only 2 imps in that match.

The other grand slam bidders were Mizuta-san and Kaku-san ...

Mizuta	Kaku
North	South
1♣(strong)	2♣
3♣(trumps?)	3♥(1 top honour, fifth)
4♥(♥ ask)	5♥(AK or AQ)
6♣	7♣

Kaku-san had such a good hand on the auction that he knew seven would be good, so he went on over Mizuta-san's 6♣. Since North had shown interest in seven after the trump ask, it was more than reasonable for South to do what he did.

## SOLO SUCCESS

Bd: 21	North		
Dlr: N	♠ 873		
Vul: N/S	♥ 8763		
	♦ 10874		
	♣ Q9		
West		East	
♠ KQJ5		♠ A	
♥ KJ10		♥ Q54	
♦ Q		♦ AKJ952	
♣ J10875		♣ A32	
	South		
	♠ 109642		
	♥ A92		
	♦ 63		
	♣ K64		

In Round Seven of the Flight A Swiss, Board 21 provided a test for the E/W pairs. If you're going to bid a slam, the one you would like to reach is 6♦, but that seems like a tall order. One pair reached 6♣, which had to fail, and another (Goto-san and Nakajima-san) reached 6NT, which made easily enough when South did not find the killing club lead.

The heroes of this deal are Illingworth-san and (Akiko) Yanagisawa-san ...

Yanagisawa	Illingworth
West	East
	1♦
2♣(FG)	2♦
2♠	3♣
3NT	4♣
5♣	6♦

In the strong two-over-one style favoured by the partnership, East was able to go slowly with his big hand. Since he had denied solid diamonds on this sequence, his jump to 6♦ left West with a choice between 6♦ and 6NT, and she chose wisely indeed. Bravo.