



NEC Bridge Festival

Wednesday, February 12, 1997
Bulletin Number 4

Editors: Eric Kokish
Richard Colker

NEC CUP

The rankings after 6 rounds:

CHINESE TAIPEI	112
INDONESIA/NA	106
GREAT BRITAIN	106
JAPAN (WOMEN)	94
CHINA	92
JAPAN (GELLER)	91
JAPAN (HISATOMI)	90
JAPAN (YAMADA)	79
JAPAN (NAKAMURA)	66
JAPAN (YOUTH)	62

Round 4

Japan (Youth)	(59) 21 - 9 (32)	Japan (Yamada)
China	(26) 9 - 21 (53)	Chinese Taipei
Japan (Nakamura)	(28) 5 - 25 (81)	Japan (Women)
Great Britain	(16) 4 - 25 (72)	Indonesia/NA
Japan (Hisatomi)	(43) 18 - 12 (28)	Japan (Geller)

Round 5

Japan (Nakamura)	(60) 17 - 13 (51)	Japan (Youth)
Chinese Taipei	(39) 15 - 15 (41)	Great Britain
Japan (Women)	(52) 14 - 16 (58)	Japan (Geller)
Japan (Yamada)	(42) 13 - 17 (52)	Indonesia/NA
Japan (Hisatomi)	(42) 8 - 22 (74)	China

Round 6

Japan (Youth)	(22) 4 - 25 (78)	Great Britain
Japan (Women)	(47) 15 - 15 (47)	Japan (Yamada)
Japan (Geller)	(48) 12 - 18 (64)	Indonesia/NA
China	(78) 24 - 6 (31)	Japan (Nakamura)
Japan (Hisatomi)	(22) 11 - 19 (40)	Chinese Taipei

AAARRGHHH!

Bd: 3-6	North	
Dir: E	♠ AQJ98	
Vul: E/W	♥ J4	
	♦ Q7	
	♣ K1062	
West		East
♠432		♠ 10765
♥ K1062		♥ 9753
♦ 106		♦ J93
♣ J953		♣ A4
	South	
	♠ K	
	♥ AQ8	
	♦ AK8542	
	♣ Q87	

West	North	East	South
Justin	Ino	Jason	Imakura
		Pass	1♦
Pass	1♠	Pass	3♣
Pass	4♣	Pass	4♦
Pass	4♠	Pass	4NT(1)
Pass	5♥(2)	Pass	5NT(3)
Pass	7NT	DBL	All Pass
(1) RKCB for ♣; (2) 2 key cards, no ♣Q;			
(3) 5♠ would ask for kings			

Great Britain vs YAMADA in Round 3. Ino and Imakura for YAMADA lost their way in the auction and fetched up in 7NT from the South side (Imakura's 5NT being the root of most of the evil after his jump to 3♣). Jason the Hackett suspected that the contract would fail if Justin the Hackett could be persuaded to lead a club, so he doubled. Alas, Justin led something else -a spade. Given a breath of life, Tadashi Imakura saw his chance for fame -he took the heart finesse. Justin won the ♥K and led a club over for two down; minus 300. Since Paul the Hackett and John Armstrong had stopped in 4NT, Great Britain gained 13imps. Had Ino and Imakura stopped at 6NT, they would have gained 11imps. That would have made it 16-14 for YAMADA instead of 20-10 for Great Britain.

TWELVE FOR TAI

Bd: 2-9	North	
Dir: N	♠ A84	
Vul: E/W	♥ Q1043	
	♦ A3	
	♣ AJ64	
West		East
♠ KQJ6532		♠ 97
♥ J		♥ K52
♦ 2		♦ QJ9854
♣ KQ75		♣ 109
	South	
	♠ 10	
	♥ A9876	
	♦ K1076	
	♣ 832	

West	North	East	South
Kokish	Tai	Colker	SR Wu
	1NT	Pass	2♦(♥)
3♠	4♥	All Pass	

MF Tai of Chinese Taipei put on a virtuoso performance on this deal from Round 2. He was the only declarer to take twelve tricks, although he was under no pressure to do so. He won the spade lead and, without much thought, advanced the ♥Q, low, six, jack. Now ♦A, ♦K, diamond ruff, spade ruff, diamond ruff with the ♥10, heart to the nine, ace of hearts, low club to the jack; plus 480. West was caught in a strange sort of squeeze on the last trump. He had to come down to one spade in order to keep a guard for his club honours, so it would not have helped him to split them when Tai led the first

club from dummy. Tai could simply duck, of course, but even if he won the ace to ruff a spade and lead a club, West would have to concede a trick to the ♣J. Bravo, MF.

At the other table, Lasut-Manoppo took the push to 5♥ rather than take the money from 4♠ doubled. Lasut won the spade lead and played ♦A, diamond to the king. West thought for quite some time before ruffing with the ♥J, apparently planning his defense. Unfortunately, this had the effect of conving declarer that he had started with king-jack doubleton in trumps, and when the ace did not drop the king, 5♥ went one down. That was 11 imps to Chinese Taipei, one of four major swings they recorded en route to a 21-9 win over Indonesia.

NOT SO EASY

Bd: 2-10 Dir: E Vul: Both West ♠ 65 ♥ 10742 ♦ 98 ♣ A9842	North ♠ K42 ♥ Q5 ♦ 73 ♣ KQ10653 East ♠ QJ10983 ♥ 63 ♦ Q1064 ♣ 7 South ♠ A7 ♥ AKJ98 ♦ AKJ52 ♣ J
---	--

Open Room			
West	North	East	South
CH Wu	Lasut	Kuo	Manoppo
		2♥(1)	Pass
2♠(2)	Pass	Pass	4♥
All Pass			
(1) Weak 2♠ or 5+♥/5+m; (2) Pass or correct			
Closed Room			
West	North	East	South
Kokish	Tai	Colker	SR Wu
		2♠	DBL
Pass	3NT	Pass	4NT(1)
Pass	5♣	Pass	6NT
All Pass			
(1) Blackwood			

This was another big gain for Chinese Taipei in their second round win over Indonesia. In the Open Room, Che-Hung Kuo's "either-or" 2♥ opening hit one of Eddy Manoppo's five-card suits. His prepared defense to this convention involves a direct-seat pass with this hand, but on the way back, there must have been some systemic treatment to describe this two-suited mountain. 4♥ ended the auction; plus 680.

At the other table, Rich Colker's natural 2♠ might have inconvenienced some players, but not SR Wu, who started with a hopeful takeout double. MF Tai's jump to 3NT was enough to convince Wu that there was some slam in the cards and he happened to have an ace-asking 4NT in his arsenal. When Tai disappointed him by denying the missing ace, Wu settled for 6NT. We can see that this is ice cold, but at the table, Tai had an anxious moment after making a slightly careless play. He won the spade lead in dummy and led the ♣J, which held. Then he crossed to the ♥Q and knocked out the ♣A. When a spade came back, Tai had to guess whether the hearts were four-two or five-one. In the latter case, he would need the diamond finesse. He did the right thing, of course, discarding diamonds on the clubs, but he breathed a lot easier when Colker followed to the second heart. To spare himself the agony, it was incumbent upon Tai to play ♥A, heart to the queen before knocking out the ♣A.

Adequate disclosure of partnership agreements has been an important issue for the World Bridge Federation for many years. With the release in 1994 of the Guide to Completion (of the new WBF Convention Card) /Conventions Booklet, a revised Systems Policy, and the first version of an on-line Convention Card Editor, a serious attempt was made to clarify for the players their responsibilities in this area. Furthermore, with Bobby Wolff's dedication to the notion of "active ethics," the word was getting out that Directors and Appeals Committees would expect players to be forthcoming and helpful in their explanations of their methods.

Inevitably, the 1994 World Championships in Albuquerque tested the definition of adequate disclosure on many occasions. One such incident in the Rosenblum semifinals prompted a member of the Swedish team to write this topical article ...

SIGNALS

by Daniel Auby, Sweden

When defining your system of signalling there are basically two approaches to consider:

(1) Try to identify as many situations as possible and for each situation decide what kind of signal you should use, e.g. attitude, count, suit preference, etc. This method is, of course, tedious, and new situations (which you had not considered) are bound to crop up.

(2) Decide that in each situation the signaller should make the kind of signal that is most useful to partner. This method is, in a way, the optimal method, but it is obviously suitable only for well-tuned partnerships — misunderstandings will still occur.

My guess is that the second method is more popular the nearer you come to the so-called top level (of play).

Explaining your signal system:

When a player using the first method is asked what his partner's signal means, he will classify the type of situation, search for the applicable rule for this kind of situation and give a clear answer to his opponents, e.g. "That is attitude," or "That is suit preference." According to my experience this is the normal thing to happen when you ask for clarification at the table. As a matter of fact I don't think I have ever had another type of answer than that. I have always received a clear answer as to what kind of signal it is. This is true both of my experiences at home and during this championship (meeting teams from many different countries). At least until the recent incident that will be described below occurred.

When a player using the second method (i.e. always make the signal that is most useful for partner) is asked the same question, he will be in a slightly different situation. For him, the analysis of which signal is being sent will depend more often on the cards held by both members of his partnership. As a result, he will sometimes be less cooperative toward his opponents since he is afraid that his answers to their questions will often reveal something about his hand, his partner's hand, or both.

Perhaps this analysis of the disclosure inclinations of partnerships using these two signalling methods is a bit presumptuous. Still, some answers I got from a pair using the second method confirmed for me that such partnerships will tend to be less helpful to their opponents than those using the first method.

What happened at the table:

During a match against strong opponents, I was declarer in the stupid contract of 4NT and received the lead of a small diamond.

♠ 1086	♠ AKQ7
♥ J10	♥ AK9
♦ 864	♦ AQ32
♣ KJ1063	♣ Q9

It went small, jack, and I won the queen. When I then cashed the ace-king of spades, RHO played first the four and then the deuce. I was interested, of course, and asked my LHO what the echo meant. I got the answer that it was either count or suit preference or a Smith Echo, whichever was most useful to partner. When I curiously asked which of these three kinds of signals it was this time, I was told that it depended on the situation. When I inquired further as to what it meant in this type of situation he answered that it would have to be deduced from bridge logic and that I was not going to be given any further answers from him — I would have to rely on my own bridge logic.

I now tried a new angle and stated that though it may be correct that they had no explicit agreement on this type of situation, they would surely have some experience of similar situations and that therefore they had, through experience, an agreement that had to be disclosed according to the Laws. My opponent then stated that he had no experience with KJ10 to five in clubs, J10 doubleton of hearts and so on (this was perhaps ironically meant). Both the TD and the chief TD were called. I don't think that either one grasped the situation to the full extent. My opponent was barred from telling me to use my bridge logic, but I think that the heart of the matter was not dealt with. The ruling was, I believe, perhaps more an order to be polite.

When I received similar answers later during the match, the TD at the table declared that a defender was not required to explain a signal any more specifically (than he had) because it would reveal or might reveal some-thing about his hand.

As it turned out, the missing information had no substantial influence on the outcome of the match. The opposing team played better bridge and won deservedly.

Thoughts:

Is it correct that the defenders do not need to provide a clear answer as to what kind of a signal is supposed to be given in a particular situation? Not even when it is not a totally new situation, in which case an answer like — "This type of situation has not cropped up before and we have not discussed it. I am not able to draw any conclusion at all from similar types of situations that have occurred between us" — may be both inaccurate and unfair. Yes, this might be true once in a while, but it would surely be the exception rather than the rule.

When declaring a hand, you always try to form a picture of the whole hand. You use the different kinds of available information (the auction, leads, skill factors, personalities, and so on). Also among these information sources are defensive signals. Normally there is no difficulty in analyzing the signals to identify their nature. Either you know or you ask the opponents (keeping in mind that the signal may be false or that the player was perhaps just following suit indiscriminately).

This was, however, not the case this time. I felt very unsure of what was happening at the table. It was in a sense like playing in a vacuum, iso-lated from the opponents' exchange of information

after the lead was made.

When the chief TD kindly asked me to give evidence as to whether damage had ensued through false information by the opponents, I had to say that it was not possible to do this as I had not received any information at all (other than the obvious -- that they use different kinds of signals, as we all do, and that what the signals meant depended on the situation, as it does for all of us).

I would appreciate it, and so (I am sure) would the rest of the bridge community, if the WBF would make a clear statement on this issue so that we can play the game we love in a friendly and open atmosphere.

In Defender's Heaven, the defenders would be able to signal to one another without revealing any vital information to declarer. Several years ago, there were some interesting articles written about "encrypted signals," which suggested that the defenders would vary their signalling methods from one hand to another (e.g. standard signals versus upside down), basing this decision on a "key" suit in which the defenders alone had specific information. The idea stimulated a lot of discussion but it never really caught on due to its complexity, time constraints, and a strong negative lobby from sponsoring organizations.

In effect, Mr Auby's opponents were trying to pass off their signalling methods as something akin to these encrypted signals: "We know what they mean but we don't have to tell you because they depend on something other than advance agreement." In fact, these defenders were playing normal methods (of the second kind), as Mr Auby points out in his penultimate paragraph, and they had a very real duty to explain their priorities and anything else that they knew as a matter of partnership experience, style, and discussion. That is what the notion of adequate disclosure is all about.

That this exacting standard would help the declarer may be true, but if we settle for anything less from the defenders, we are making it attractive for them to have no firm agreements at all. Or at least to say so. And that is not the game that we want to play at any serious level. If you want to keep declarer in the dark, follow low to every trick and rely on your inestimably excellent bridge logic to see you through. Or "always" give count and hope that this information will help the defenders more than declarer. But please don't insult your opponents' intelligence by telling them that you also play some other signals in certain situations and have no obligation to reveal them.

Perhaps the day will come when we hold some events where anything goes and there are no disclosure obligations. That might be great fun and perhaps the best players would win that kind of contest (too).

But that is not the essence and spirit of the game we all love.

FLYING SOLO, PARTS I and II

Bd: 3-8	North	
Dir: W	♠ AKQJ102	
Vul: None	♥ 74	
	♦ 852	
	♣ 104	
West		East
♠ 953		♠ 874
♥ Q9		♥ K8652
♦ 10963		♦ Q74
♣ J982		♣ KQ
	South	
	♠ 6	
	♥ AJ103	
	♦ AKJ	
	♣ A7653	

Paul Hackett and John Armstrong were the only pair to bid and make a slam, 6♠, with the N/S cards in Round Three on Monday evening. Here's how they did it:

Hanayama	Armstrong	Hirata	Paul H
West	North	East	South
Pass	1♠	Pass	2♣
Pass	2♠	Pass	3♦
Pass	4♠	Pass	5♥
Pass	6♠	All Pass	

Not that 6♠ is laydown. Armstrong got a heart lead, put in the jack, and lost to the queen. He won the trump return and drew trumps, discarding a heart, and then a club from dummy. A second heart finesse gave him a discard for a club, and he was able to try for three-three clubs before settling for the diamond finesse.

Bd: 3-19	North	
Dir: S	♠ K1042	
Vul: E/W	♥ 10975	
	♦ 4	
	♣ KQ63	
West		East
♠ QJ983		♠ 6
♥ J86		♥ K2
♦ A87		♦ KQJ109532
♣ A10		♣ 52
	South	
	♠ A75	
	♥ AQ43	
	♦ 6	
	♣ J9874	

Geller	Shi	Ogihara	HT Liu
West	North	East	South
			2♣(1)
2♠	3♣	3♦	Pass
3NT	All Pass		
(1) Precision			

Bob Geller and Setsuko Ogihara were the only pair to bid and make a game with the E/W cards in Monday evening's Round 3. That's not totally shocking since it looks as if you need to do brilliantly to reach 3NT.

Somewhat remarkably, HT Liu's ugly Precision 2♣ opening coupled with Shi's gentle raise to 3♣ created a scenario in which the E/W bidding was

almost straightforward. If North bounces to 4♣ (how far wrong can it be to try 5♣ instead?), E/W can no longer go plus in practice.

3NT had nine top tricks; plus 600. That was 12 imps to GELLER when 5♦ went one down; minus 100.

THE ART OF BEING A GOOD PARTNER

At the 1996 Cap Volmac World Top Pairs in the Hague, the Netherlands, Denmark's Dennis Koch-Palmund found a pretty play on the first deal of the War Between the Aukens, in which he and Jens of that ilk faced Jens's wife Sabine and Daniela von Arnim . . .

Bd: I-1	North	
Dlr: N	♠ A1065	
Vul: None	♥ Q2	
	♦ A10972	
	♣ AK	
West _____		East
♠ 9742		♠ KJ
♥ A874		♥ 9653
♦ 43		♦ KQ5
♣ 1096		♣ J873
	South	
	♠ Q83	
	♥ KJ10	
	♦ J86	
	♣ Q542	

Three notrump was permitted to make at four of the eight tables in play, three times after a gentle spade lead from West, once after East, Massimo Lanzarotti, led a neutral club against Gabriel Chagas, who had opened 1NT with the North hand, and continued the suit after winning the first diamond.

At the other four tables, West led a heart, the defense clearing hearts when East won the first diamond, West retaining the high heart for his side. At three of those tables, East returned his last heart when he won the second round of diamonds. When West won, he had to play a spade to establish the setting trick while the clubs were blocked, effectively tangling declarer's transportation. Fred Gitelman, Geir Helgemo, and Jeff Meckstroth all found the essential spade switch to set the contract.

Dennis did not return his remaining heart, however. Instead he exited with his remaining diamond, relieving his partner of the opportunity to do the wrong thing. Daniela could win in either hand, but could not enjoy the ♣Q without letting Dennis in with the ♠K. Only then did Dennis play his last heart, but at that point it was the setting trick.

After winning the third heart, declarer could have made 3NT by unblocking the club honours and leading a low spade from dummy, but it's difficult to find a reason to take such an obscure line when there is such a sound alternative available.

LOVE IS A MULTI-SPLENDURED THING

by Yasuo Otsuka

OUCHI B	North	
Dir: E	♠ AK3	
Vul: N/S	♥ AQJ932	
	♦ J3	
	♣ 64	
West		East
♠ Q6		♠ 752
♥ ---		♥ K108764
♦ 852		♦ K7
♣ AKQJ9853		♣ 107
	South	
	♠ J10984	
	♥ 5	
	♦ AQ10964	
	♣ 2	

Here are two examples of the Multi 2♦ pushing the opponents into wrong contracts ... on the same deal!

	TABLE ONE		
Manoppo	Furata	Lasut	Otsuka
West	North	East	South
		2♦(1)	Pass
4♣(2)	4♥	All Pass	
(1) Multi; (2) No agreement			

From North's point of view, East's 2♦ could only be a weak two in spades, so Furata more-or-less had to bid 4♥ at TABLE ONE. From South's point of view, if East's weak two is in spades, passing 4♥ should not be a bad decision, so he passed. Lasut led the ♣10

and when it won, he switched to the ♥7. Everyone laughed when West showed out, but the contract went only one light; minus 100.

At the other table:

	TABLE TWO		
Kobayashi	Asbi	Takayama	Sacul
West	North	East	South
		2♦(1)	Pass
3♣	3♥	Pass	3♠
Pass	3NT	All Pass	
(1) Multi			

Takayama led the ♣10, so Taufik Asbi went down four in a great hurry. From his point of view, Denny Sacul's 3♠ was a cue-bid, asking for a spade stopper. Well, maybe.

6♦, played by South, goes down only if West underleads this clubs to get a heart ruff.

All of which helps to explain why the Multi 2♦ is such a popular convention.

CRUISING THROUGH ROUND FOUR

Bd: 1	North		
Dlr: N	♠ A105432		
Vul: None	♥ KJ4		
	♦ 6		
	♣ K73		
West		East	
♠ K86		♠ ---	
♥ 1086		♥ AQ3	
♦ K9742		♦ AQJ103	
♣ 82		♣ AJ1054	
	South		
	♠ QJ97		
	♥ 9752		
	♦ 85		
	♣ Q96		

E/W can make 6♦ without much difficulty on this one, and in Hisatomi vs Geller and China vs Chinese Taipei, both pairs bid and made this slam.

In Japan Youth vs Yamada, the board was also flat, but this time at plus 420, E/W. Hiroko Ota-Nobuko Setoguchi won a swing for Japan Women against Nakamura by bidding 6♦ while T Hirata-Morimura stopped at game at the other table. That was a good start for the unsung squad of "poor little sheep," who went on to crush Nakamura 81-21 for their third win in succession.

In Great Britain vs Indonesia, Paul Hackett and John Armstrong quit at 5♦, but the twins saved a couple of imps for their team by sacrificing at 6♠ at the other table, down only 800 for a 9-imp loss.

Bd: 4	North		
Dlr: W	♠ KQ4		
Vul: Both	♥ KQ10		
	♦ KJ109		
	♣ 963		
West		East	
♠ J952		♠ 10863	
♥ J54		♥ A62	
♦ 753		♦ 84	
♣ QJ5		♣ AK74	
	South		
	♠ A7		
	♥ 9873		
	♦ AQ62		
	♣ 1082		

This was a N/S partscore at most tables, but three pairs drove to 3NT, played by North, a function of notrump range, no doubt. Imakura-Iino gained a swing for Yamada by defeating 3NT, getting around to clubs early enough.

In Great Britain vs Indonesia, both Norths declared 3NT and got the lead of the ♠2, West signaling encouragement under dummy's ace. When declarer led a heart to the king, both Easts won the ace and continued spades. Declarer neutralized the ♥J and soon claimed ten tricks for an unusual push. East might have ducked the heart or cashed a high club, and West might have signaled gently rather than mightily in spades and might have tried some negative Smith Signal in hearts to minimize his already-given interest in spades. In any case, that was an opportunity missed at both tables.

Bd: 5	North	
Dlr: N	♠ AQ5	
Vul: N/S	♥ KQ5	
	♦ KJ105	
	♣ 1074	
West		East
♠ 1092		♠ J8
♥ 84		♥ AJ109
♦ AQ97		♦ 6432
♣ Q532		♣ 986
	South	
	♠ K7643	
	♥ 7632	
	♦ 8	
	♣ AKJ	

This was nearly everyone's 4♠, N/S (Tony Chong and MF Tai reached 3NT and made four). Where South declared, a club lead gave declarer a relatively easy ride, but it was not quite as comfortable from the North side on a club lead through the AKJ. The contract was made several times when declarer won in dummy and led a diamond. West won the ace and played a heart, East taking the ace to return an honour. North won and played king-jack of diamonds, discarding dummy's remaining hearts. West won the ♦Q but could do declarer no harm, dummy's ♣J going on the ♦10. All very nice, but what if East ducks declarer's king of hearts? When West comes in with the ♦Q, he leads a second heart and a third round promotes a trump trick for the defense. Declarer can't draw three rounds of trumps because he needs the entry back to hand to use the ♦10, and drawing only two rounds doesn't shut out West's ten of trumps.

Bd: 6	North	
Dlr: E	♠ 109853	
Vul: E/W	♥ J10	
	♦ Q9653	
	♣ 7	
West		East
♠ ---		♠ AJ4
♥ AQ3		♥ K762
♦ K87		♦ A104
♣ J1086532		♣ AK9
	South	
	♠ KQ762	
	♥ 9854	
	♦ J2	
	♣ Q4	

Left to their own devices, E/W might well reach 7♣ (CA Liu-Sun for China) or even 7NT (chalk one up for Messrs Imakura and Ino for Yamada), but it's not so easy when N/S get into the bidding and bounce around. If we can, we'll try to find out what happened at some of the tables. Nakamura's Hirata-Morimura got all the way to 5♣, handing Japan Women 13 imps in the process. Messrs Hisatomi and Teramoto picked up 7 imps for their team by buying the auction at 6♠ doubled, down only 1100. Hisatomi defeated Geller 18-12, so these 7 imps were critical.

In the Great Britain vs Indonesia Open Room, the bidding went:

Open Room			
West	North	East	South
Kokish	Jason	Colker	Justin
		1♣	2♠
3♠	5♠	DBL	Pass
6♣	All Pass		

The twins did a nice job here. From West's point of view, there is more to the deal than simply striving to be as accurate as possible. At the prevailing vulnerability, it would seem that N/S will have something close to a paying sacrifice at every level, so buying the auction might well be more important than reaching the optimum level. West can start with a 4♠ splinter bid and try to sort it out later, but it might be better to start lower, trying to convince North that there is no need to go wild at his first turn to speak. Here, it was mostly academic. E/W were not going to bid seven unless pushed, and N/S were not going to save at the six-level once they had bid five. An interesting tactical deal.

Bd: 8	North		
Dir: W	♠ AK87		
Vul: None	♥ 9654		
	♦ AKQ92		
	♣ ---		
West		East	
♠ 643		♠ 5	
♥ 8		♥ AKQ107	
♦ J543		♦ 76	
♣ AKJ82		♣ 109543	
	South		
	♠ QJ1092		
	♥ J32		
	♦ 108		
	♣ Q76		

Par on Board 8 is for E/W to declare 5♣ doubled and go two down, the defenders getting two diamonds, a spade, and an overruff in diamonds. A search through the match records reveals that this happened precisely once at our ten tables, the Hackett twins collecting 300 against Kokish-Colker.

At the other table, Paul Hackett and Armstrong did not find their clubs, but Lasut-Manoppo did not find their spades, selling out to 3♥, which they doubled. That went just one down; minus 100. 5 imps to Great Britain.

In Yamada vs Japan Youth, both N/S pairs took the push to 5♠. Furuta led his singleton heart to defeat the contract, but Imakura tried a high club and there was no recovery. 11 somewhat random imps to the juniors.

In Chinese Taipei vs China, Sun led the ♣A against Tai; minus 450. At the other table, Liu-Shi finished in 5♦, missing spades after being preempted by CS Shen-Cs Wu, and the hearts were on lead. 11 imps to Chinese Taipei.

In Japan Women vs Nakamura, Hirata-Morimura sold out to 4♠, which they couldn't beat, and Ota-Setoguchi scored a real coup against Nakamura-Miyakuni by buying the hand at 4♣, one down. With West declaring, it was relatively easy to defeat the contract, but that was 9 imps to the women.

Not so easy, perhaps, because Hisatomi-Teramoto took only three tricks against Geller's Narita-Ito in 5♣ undoubled. 5♠ went one down in the other room so the swing was 3 imps to Hisatomi.

Bd: 11	North		
Dir: S	♠ KJ6		
Vul: None	♥ J94		
	♦ KQJ763		
	♣ 8		
West		East	
♠ 85		♠ Q43	
♥ AQ1076		♥ K832	
♦ A1042		♦ 8	
♣ 76		♣ Q10942	
	South		
	♠ A10972		
	♥ 5		
	♦ 95		
	♣ AKJ53		

You can decide for yourself whether the West hand is a suitable 2♥ overcall after a 1♠ opening on the right. It looks as if several of the Wests thought that it was, because we see Ino-Imakura going minus 500 at 5♥ doubled and HT Liu-Shi and Chong-Tai going minus at 5♠, surely having been pushed there. You have to take some risks if you want to get rich. Even 4♠ is touch-and-go, but it's easy to see why N/S might take the push to 5♠.

Only two declarers failed at 4♠ - Kyoko Ohno on a trump lead (she will need the club finesse after that in most variations) and Eddy Manoppo on a club lead (which looks more helpful for him).

Bd: 13	North
Dir: N	♠ J4
Vul: Both	♥ AK32
	♦ 104
	♣ Q8652
West	East
♠ 8732	♠ 65
♥ J765	♥ Q1084
♦ Q5	♦ AJ973
♣ K97	♣ A10
	South
	♠ AKQ109
	♥ 9
	♦ K862
	♣ J43

This was a quiet N/S partscore at nearly every table, but Mizuta-Kaku milked it all the way to 4♠ for Japan Youth, one down, wiping out an excellent plus 110 turned in by Furuta-Otsuka at the other table for 2♥, making two with the E/W cards.

The main action came in Great Britain vs Indonesia

Open Room			
West	North	East	South
Kokish	Jason	Colker	Justin
	Pass	Pass	1♠
Pass	2♣	DBL	Pass
2♥	Pass	Pass	DBL (takeout)
All Pass			

Everyone but declarer was quite busy in the auction on this one. Against 2♥ doubled, Jason Hackett led three rounds of trumps. Declarer won in dummy and led a low diamond toward the closed hand. Justin ducked and the queen won, but it would not have helped to put up the king. Declarer played a diamond to the ace and the ♦J. Justin kept his king and declarer threw a spade, giving Jason his last trump, but there was no defeating the contract. Declarer lost only two spades for plus 670 and 13imps when Manoppo made 140 in 2♠ at the other table. That initiated a long run of successes for Indonesia, who went on to defeat the leaders 72-16, or 25-4 in VP.

Speaking of the exuberance of youth, consider Board 15 ...

Bd: 15	North
Dir: S	♠ 652
Vul: N/S	♥ QJ87
	♦ A10
	♣ K873
West	East
♠ 7	♠ AKQ1043
♥ K94	♥ 632
♦ 432	♦ Q865
♣ QJ6542	♣ ---
	South
	♠ J98
	♥ A105
	♦ KJ97
	♣ A109

Open Room			
West	North	East	South
Kokish	Jason	Colker	Justin
			1NT
Pass	3NT	DBL	All Pass

Why did Jason bid so much? Because Justin's 1NT opening was supposed to be 14-16 HCP and all ten-counts bid game. It is true that South's impressive collection of spot cards makes the hand worth considerably more than its simple point count, but on this layout none of those spot cards pulled any weight at all. The twins got particularly unlucky when East was dealt a "find my suit" penalty double and West was dealt an easy hand from which to lead. Justin lost six spades and a heart for three down, minus 800. 13

imps to Indonesia when Paul Hackett went one down in 2♠ at the other table.

There was an eerie symmetry about Board 18, at least in Great Britain vs Indonesia ...

Bd: 18	North	
Dlr: E	♠ Q104	
Vul: N/S	♥ K87	
	♦ AQ7	
	♣ J542	
West		East
♠ A986		♠ 52
♥ Q1095		♥ J432
♦ 964		♦ J105
♣ 73		♣ AK96
	South	
	♠ KJ73	
	♥ A6	
	♦ K832	
	♣ Q108	

Open Room			
West	North	East	South
Kokish	Jason	Colker	Justin
		Pass	1♠
Pass	1NT!	DBL	Pass
2♥	DBL(1)	All Pass	
(1) Cooperative penalty double			

So here were E/W in 2♥ doubled once again, and with the same trump holding as they had on Board 13. Once again, Jason led trumps and the defenders cleared the suit. There were only six tricks left for declarer, and this time N/S collected 300 (how about that takeout double by Mr Macho in the East seat?). But once again, doubling 2♥ turned out badly for the twins (how about that heavy 1NT by Mr Leeway in the North seat) when Lasut-

Manoppo bid and made 3NT at the other table for plus 600. 7 imps more to Indonesia.



And finally, for all of you Appeals fans...

KING SOLOMON IS WELL, AND LIVING IN TOKYO

Tuesday it finally happened; the first appeal of the tournament. An Appeals Committee, comprised of five of the brightest luminaries of the (available) appeals world, was hurriedly formed between the fifth and sixth sessions of the NEC CUP. They were asked to adjudicate a situation which arose during the fifth-round match between GREAT BRITAIN and CHINESE TAIPEI.

The CHINESE TAIPEI declarer (MF Tai) was playing 4♥ doubled, and the BRITISH defenders had already taken three tricks, with an inescapable fourth trick yet to come...yeah, inescapable. At trick eleven declarer led a high spade. South (Paul Hackett), pitched one of his two remaining losers (he held the defense's fourth trick), dummy pitched a club, and North (John Armstrong), apparently in the midst (or mist) of a brief "walkabout" (as they say down under), and whose hand was immaterial, pitched an immaterial club while still holding a spade. Ooops.

The three players (excluding North) agreed that dummy and declarer immediately turned their cards face down, while South's card remained face up on the table. However, perhaps under the influence of the same mind-numbing agent that North was suffering from, none of the players (including North) was certain whether North's card had been turned face down. Anyhow, with the eleventh trick not yet fully quitted declarer led to trick twelve. South, who claimed that he was a bit surprised (and maybe "startled") by declarer's premature lead while his card was still face up, emitted a brief unintelligible grunt of sorts.

South claimed that his vocalization was directed at declarer, whose lead to trick twelve had been made quickly (completely out of tempo, in his words) and improperly (with the previous trick not yet quitted). The declaring side argued that South's vocalization was directed at his partner, but in any event had the unmistakable effect of drawing his partner's attention to the revoke — an action

specifically disallowed by the regulations governing the event (and the tournament).

The Director (Richard Grenside) was called, and he instructed that play continue. When declarer went down one, and the facts surrounding the incident could not be illuminated any better than they have here, Richard ruled that there had been a revoke, and that a one trick penalty would be imposed. (No trick was won with the revoking card, nor was a subsequent trick won with a card in the suit of the revoke, else a two-trick penalty would have been indicated.) However, because his ruling was based upon disputable facts, he allowed the case to be brought to appeal (rather than holding that his ruling was based upon law, and hence was not subject to be overturned by Committee).

Well, how would you rule on this case? You might decide before you read on.

The Committee members were in agreement that neither side was without fault in this incident. First, both South and East admitted that they knew immediately that North had revoked. East had led prematurely to the next trick, perhaps without allowing the defenders adequate time to quit the "revoke" trick, but certainly improperly (given South's still-exposed card). This gave the Committee the impression that he was purposefully trying to establish the revoke when he led to trick twelve. On the other hand, South had clearly left his card to the "revoke" trick on the table, while both of his opponents (and perhaps his partner) had quit their tricks, and a lead had been made to the next trick. Given that he was admittedly aware of the revoke, and that his hand was immaterial to the subsequent play, the Committee believed that there was no good reason for his card to be left exposed for an unduly long time at trick twelve. In fact, that very act (apart from any vocalizations) could have acted to alert his partner to his revoke, and give him time to realize and correct it.

Based upon these considerations the Committee decided that both sides were partially at fault for the incident, and that neither side deserved to benefit from their actions. Both pairs were thus assigned the worst result they might have achieved on the board: the declaring side (CHINESE TAIPEI) 4♥ doubled down one, minus 100, and the defending side (GREAT BRITAIN) 4♥ doubled making, minus 590. Each pair then had their assigned score IMPed against the result at the other table (3♥ down one, minus 50 for E/W), and the two resulting IMP scores were then averaged to get the final result on the board.

(Afterword: Justice may have been served when the Committee's decision, unbeknownst to them at the time, ended up throwing the match into a virtual tie, 39-41.)