

Marlboro Bermuda and Venice Cup
Beijing, China

October 8th - 21st, 1995

Issue 12, Thursday, October 19th, 1995

Editor: Henry Francis and Brian Senior

Bermuda Bowl Final After 64 Boards

Boards	16	32	48	64	Cum
Canada	25	23	29	36	113
USA II	34	31	35	14	114

Play Off for 3rd Place (Finished)

Boards	16	32	48	Result
Sweden	19	20	52	91
France	59	50	42	151

Venice Cup Final After 64 Boards

Boards	16	32	48	64	Cum
USA I	29	35	36	18	118
Germany	24	12	65	18	119

Play Off for 3rd after 32 boards

Boards	16	32	Cum
China	27	27	54
France	45	21	66

US open team leads by 1
-- and so does Germany!

Once again both matches will be available for Vugraph. The closer match usually will be featured, but that's a tough choice this morning!

The finalists in the Marlboro Bermuda Bowl and the Marlboro Venice Cup have played 64 boards, but this morning it will be almost as if they're starting from scratch. Both matches are incredibly close. In the open event the United States is 1 IMP ahead of Canada. And Germany is exactly 1 IMP ahead of the United States in the women's championship.

The Americans got off to the faster start in both events. In the Marlboro Bermuda Bowl, United States led 23 after 48 deals, but Canada scored 36 while holding the U.S. to 14 over the final 16 deals of the day. As a matter of fact, the Americans scored on only two deals in that last set.

In the Marlboro Venice Cup, the Americans had a 28-point lead after 32 boards, but Germany scored five double-digit swings on Boards 33-48 and closed to within one point. In the final set, both teams scored only 18 IMPs -- a very tight set with only a little more than 1 IMP per board given up by both teams.

The women have another 64 boards today, but the open teams still have 96 -- 64 today and 32 tomorrow.

France will be awarded two medals at the Victory Ceremony Friday. The French open team performed very powerfully against Sweden to win, 151-91, in a 48-board match to decide the bronze medal. The battle for the bronze among the women was much closer, but once again France was the winner, defeating China. 66-54.

Here are the personnel of the finalist teams:

Marlboro Bermuda Bowl.

Canada -- Irving Litvack, npc. Eric Kokish, Joey Silver, Boris Baran, Mark Molson, George Mittelman, Fred Gitelman;

United States -- Edgar Kaplan, npc. Bobby Wolff, Bob Hamman, Eric Rodwell, Jeff Meckstroth, Dick Freeman, Nick Nickell;

Marlboro Venice Cup

United States -- Steve Sanborn, npc. Kerri Sanborn, Karen McCallum, Kitty Munson, Carol Simon, Rozanne Pollack, Sue Picus;

Germany -- Klaus Reps, npc. Daniela von Arnim, Sabine Auken, Karin Caesar, Marianne Moegel, Pony Nehmert, Andrea Rauscheid;

Victory Ceremony

The Victory Ceremony for the Marlboro Bermuda Bowl and the Marlboro Venice Cup will take place Friday 2t 19.30 in Hall 1 of the Beijing International Convention Centre.

Appeals Committee Ruling
Case 10
by Richard Colker

Venice Cup:
USA I (E/W) vs. China (N/S).
Board 44. N/S Vul. Dealer West.
(Zhang Ya Lan)

S K854
H QJT3
D 97
C AJ9

(Sanborn, Kerri)

S J96
H 4
D AKT632
C T82

(McCallum, Karen)

S A32
H 85
D QJ84
C Q753

(Gu Ling)

S QT7
H AK9762

D 9

C K64

West	North	East	South
3D	Pass	4C (1)	4H
4S (2)	5H	6D	Pass (3)
Pass	6H	Pass	Pass
7D	Dbl	All Pass	

- (1) Alerted. (Trump asking--not asked.)
 (2) Alerted. (AK of trump--not asked.)
 (3) Alerted by North and explained to East as forcing.
 Not Alerted by South.

Committee members: Jens Auken (Chair), Jean-Claude Beineix,
 John Wignall, George Retek.

Facts: The Director, who was at the table monitoring for slow play, observed South's pass over 6D Alerted by North but not by South. At the conclusion of the play East asked West whether the pass in question had been Alerted to her as forcing. When she replied "no" East claimed damage, stating that with the proper Alerts either she would have doubled 6H or West would have passed (depending on whether the Alert had or had not been correct).

Director's ruling:

The Director determined that E/W's bad result was not the result of any infraction by N/S, and ruled the result stood. This was appealed by E/W.

Testimony:

E/W's testimony was quite complex, but (to summarize it briefly) it was that East had tried to create a problem for N/S, who were likely cold for a vul. game or slam, by making a strong-sounding trump ask (4C). This told East what West's defensive potential might be so she could better judge what to do later if N/S competed, but also left West uncertain as to whose hand it was (East could have been strong and looking for game/slam herself).

If South's pass of 6D had been forcing (as East was told), East's pass of 6H suggested saving in 7D with some defense against 6H (what East actually intended). If South's pass was nonforcing (as West believed), East's pass of 6H invited West to bid 7D to make (what she actually did).

If East had been told that South's pass had been nonforcing she would have doubled 6H for several reasons including: (a) North bid 6H uninvited after previously bidding only 5H, (b) she knew E/W had good defense against 6H, (c) a pass would be interpreted by West as a strong hand (as actually happened), (d) to prevent any possible misunderstanding, and (e) because she suspected a save would be too expensive.

If West had been told that South's pass had been forcing

she would have passed out 6H knowing East held some defense (given her defensively oriented hand).

Committee's decision:

If there had been trouble on the hand it came from E/W, who had tried to bluff N/S (and succeeded). However, this success came at the cost of creating a very complex situation which also confused N/S. Since this confusion was of E/W's own making, and since, in the Committee's opinion, the different Alerts had no bearing on E/W's bridge decisions, the result at the table was allowed to stand. E/W's deposit was forfeited.

A Fine Bidding Sequence
By Toine van Hoof, The Netherlands

In the semifinals Canada kept up the good work and had a clear win over Sweden. Eric Kokish and Joey Silver showed their fine bidding skills on this hand:

Board 69. N/S Vul. Dealer North.

	S J		
	H J6432		
	D 965		
	C Q643		
S 972		S AK843	
H KT75		H A98	
D QT83		D AKJ2	
C A8		C K	
	S QT65		
	H Q		
	D 74		
	C JT9752		

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
Kokish		Silver	
	Pass	1S	Pass
2S	Pass	3C	Pass
3H	Pass	4D	Pass
5D	Pass	6D	All Pass

In their methods, 2S is "not a terrible" raise; 3C showed a short suit and 3H was natural (4+). Now Silver bid his diamond suit on the four level, showing slam interest in the process. Kokish cooperated with 5D, also promising extras. Now Silver finished the job by bidding the slam in the four-four fit. Twelve tricks were made easily.

In the other room East-West reached the inferior contract of 6S, which failed by two tricks: 14 IMPs to Canada.

FRANCE vs. GERMANY
VENICE CUP SEMI-FINAL BOARDS 17-48
by Tony Gordon

Everyone expected this contest between perennial rivals to

be close with France possibly having the edge based on their recent exploits. The match was indeed close after 16 boards since the score then was Germany 36 France 30, however, by half-way the match was as good as over with Germany holding a massive 117 IMPs lead. This is the story of those fateful (fatal?) 32 boards.

The first swing was the biggest of the set.

Board 18. N/S Vul. Dealer East.

	S Q	
	H 6532	
	D 8	
	C AKQ9432	
S 98742		S J3
H AT4		H KQJ987
D KQ2		D AJ976
C T8		C --
	S AKT65	
	H --	
	D T543	
	C J765	

Open Room

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
Rauscheid	Willard	Nehmert	Cronier
		1H	1S
Dbl	2C	3D	5C
5H	6C	6H	Pass
Pass	7C	Dbl	All Pass

Closed Room

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
Bessis	Auken	Saul	von Arnim
		1H	1S
2H	3C	4H	5C
Pass	6C	All Pass	

France misjudged the hand in both rooms. There was nothing to the play - both declarers making 12 tricks, but Germany had gained 17 IMPs.

On Board 20, the North players held the hand below at Game All and heard West open 1C.

S 8
H JT8432
D QJ963
C 8

For France, Willard passed throughout and her opponents bid and made 4S. For Germany, Auken bid an uninhibited 2NT and enabled her side to save in 5H for one down and 9 IMPs to Germany.

Board 22. E/W Vul. Dealer East.

	S KT864	
	H K942	
	D A5	
	C Q9	
S 732		S AQ9
H J5		H QT3
D T96		D J432
C T6543		C AJ8
	S J5	
	H A876	
	D KQ87	
	C K72	

Open Room

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
Rauscheid	Willard	Nehmert	Cronier
		1NT	Dbl
2C	3C	Pass	3D
Pass	3S	Pass	3NT
All Pass			

Closed Room

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
Bessis	Auken	Saul	von Arnim
		1D	Pass
Pass	Dbl	Pass	2NT
Pass	3S	Pass	4H
Pass	4S	All Pass	

In the Open Room, Rauscheid's 2C over the double showed either clubs or 4-4 in any two suits. France then proceeded to end up in 3NT played by the wrong hand. Rauscheid led the C3 and Cronier tried the C9 from dummy. Nehmert covered with the CJ and Cronier had to duck. Nehmert checked the club position by playing the ace and then, unlike the defender in the same position in the Bermuda Bowl, found the winning heart switch. Now the defense had to make a heart trick to go with their two clubs and two spades and the contract went one down.

In the Closed Room, Auken and von Arnim reached a 4S contract that appeared to have four losers, but Auken engineered a Morton's Fork Coup to bring home the contract. Saul led a diamond and Auken won in hand and led a spade towards dummy's jack. Saul won with the SQ and continued diamonds. Auken continued spades and Saul won the ace and played a third round of diamonds. However, Auken ruffed, drew the remaining trumps and led the C9 from hand leaving Saul without recourse. In practice she ducked, so Auken ditched her CQ on the DK and just lost a heart trick. If Saul had risen with the CA, Auken could have pitched her heart losers on dummy's DQ and CK.

It is interesting to note that Saul could have beaten the contract by finding the same heart switch at trick three that Nehmert found in the Open Room against 3NT. However, Germany had gained a thoroughly-deserved 10 IMPs and the

segment score was 36-0 in their favor at this point.

 France got on the scoreboard in this segment with a 4 IMP gain on Board 24, but on Board 25 Willard did not play 4H to the best advantage and lost 10 IMPs when Auken made the contract in the other room. Although France stemmed the bleeding for a while, they suffered another major loss on the penultimate board of the set.

Board 31. N/S Vul. Dealer South.

	S T8653	
	H AJT95432	
	D --	
	C --	
S --		S J974
H K8		H Q6
D JT97654		D KQ32
C Q642		C K83
	S AKQ2	
	H 7	
	D A8	
	C AJT975	

Open Room

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
Rauscheid	Willard	Nehmert	Cronier
1C	3D	4H	5D
Dbl	All Pass		

Closed Room

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
Bessis	Auken	Saul	von Arnim
			1C
3D	3H	5D	Pass
Pass	5H	Pass	6C
Pass	6S	All Pass	

In the Open Room, Willard reluctantly passed out 5D doubled, but +500 was small compensation for the missed small slam in either major.

In the Closed Room, von Arnim started with a strong club and then made a forcing pass over 5D. The message of her 6C bid was that she was prepared to play outside of hearts and, of course, Auken was only too happy to bid 6S. The 4-0 trump break held declarer to 12 tricks, but that was 14 IMPs to Germany.

 After sixteen traumatic boards a stunned France had lost the segment 64-5 and were facing an overall deficit of 65.

For the third segment France replaced Bessis - Saul with Blouquit - Lise, but a buoyant Germany were unchanged. However, the third segment followed the pattern of its predecessor. France gained on only one board and Germany again scored over 60 IMPs.

France's biggest loss came when they bid to a hopeless slam on board 44, but most of their remaining losses were attributable to missed games. Board 43 was a case in point.

Board 43. Love All. Dealer South.

	S QJT96	
	H -	
	D QT98	
	C 8753	
S 52		S 74
H Q2		H AK98764
D A6532		D 4
C KQJ9		C A64
	S AK83	
	H JT53	
	D KJ7	
	C T2	

Open Room

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
Lise	Auken	Blouquit	von Arnim
			1H
Pass	1S	Pass	2S
Pass	Pass	3H	Pass
Pass	3S	All Pass	

Closed Room

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
Rauscheid	Willard	Nehmert	Cronier
			1D
Pass	1S	4H	All Pass

In the Open Room, the four-card major opening made life difficult for France. Sweden had faced a similar problem in the Bermuda Bowl and indeed had passed out 2S. Blouquit was made of sterner stuff, however, and she protected with 3H. Lise might have been tempted to bid one more, but she passed and passed again when Auken competed to 3S. To have missed the game was bad enough, but France then failed to defeat 3S when they took only one diamond ruff.

Nehmert had no problem in reaching 4H in the Closed Room and that was 11 IMPs to Germany.

When the smoke had cleared, Germany had won the third segment 65-13 and the overall score was Germany 165 France 48.

Meet Michel Lebel

Yesterday we ran short bios of the French team, but somehow Michel Lebel was omitted, for which we apologize. Lebel, who is 51, has five children. He is a bridge writer and a journalist. Distinguishing feature: he could sleep on his

copyrights but suffers from scratching his boyd when there are important championships ahead.

Luck Is Part Of The Game

By Brian Senior

I didn't go to Albuquerque last year but I did read the bulletins and was horrified by some of the views on ethics of an American named Jeff Polisner. Mr Polisner is not here in Beijing but instead we have Rich Colker, who seems to have gone to the same school.

I am all for Active Ethics, but the whole thing is being taken too far by a small group of influential people. For example, if my partner's tempo causes me a problem I agree completely that I should bend over backwards not to take advantage of the unauthorized information. This is, after all, covered in the Laws of the game.

At the same time, I am not at all happy with the notion that an appeals committee might decide that whatever action I take must be deemed unlawful if it happens to work once partner has hesitated. Bridge is a thinking game, and we cannot rule on the basis that only one member of a partnership is allowed to think on each deal. This is the way things are in danger of going, and this will destroy the game we all know and love.

I was inspired to write this piece when I saw Rich Colker's article, 'Luck Isn't Always What It's Cracked Up To Be' (see page 00). He discusses the deal where Auken/von Arnim got lucky to make 6H as reported in Monday's Daily News and states that it is bad for the game when this sort of thing happens.

I disagree. One of the great strengths of our game is that there is a significant luck factor. Take that away and you reduce the chance of upset results. In turn, you lose many players who live for the chance to create an upset, whether it be a couple of LOLs getting a top against the club expert or an unfancied team knocking the top seeds out of the Vanderbilt.

If you have a bidding misunderstanding the odds are that you will lose out because of it. Sometimes you will get lucky, which is as it should be. That's like the lazy declarer who can't be bothered to count the hand out may play against the odds who may bring home a contract that the hard working expert fails in. Perhaps the next step is to legislate against that sort of luck?

In my view, if I have forgotten the system and am therefore in a stupid contract, it is absurd to tell my opponents of the fact. Let's see if they can work it out through their own skill and accurate defensive carding. So the Germans got lucky on this deal? Good luck to them! The only time that ethics come into the equation is if there is a

suggestion of a deliberate attempt to mislead.

Mr. Colker tries to clarify a point by suggesting that you agree to play a complex defense to a strong club but don't actually agree what defense -- as if that is in some way a parallel situation. Rubbish! Of course that would be wrong. It is certainly right to expect a pair to agree their methods properly and know them but when there is an occasional memory lapse we should accept that it happens in good faith. As I say, it will lead to a bad score far more often than a good one.

Mr. Colker's piece ends with two points: to remember that we are talking strictly about the top-level game and to keep in mind, 'What is truly best for the game of bridge?'

I would suggest that what is best for bridge is to reduce the gap between the top-level game and the rest of the bridge world, thereby making it more accessible. This is essential if we are ever to attract much needed money to the game. And we cannot close the gap by diffusing more and more rules and regulations down through the ranks. We have to bring the top-level game back into the real world.

You try telling Mrs Guggenheim that every time she forgets her system she must get a bad result; there is no room for luck in this game. See how long she keeps playing.

Can you think of another sport where luck is legislated against?

This all started out as a fun article about a basically fun occurrence (albeit a little rough on the opposition). Take the fun out of the game, take the luck out of the game, legislate down to the tiniest detail, and in a generation bridge will be dead, played only by a few aging lawyers and chartered accountants who enjoy the cut and dried nature of what used to be a game.

The Active Ethics Brigade mean well but they want to take it all too far. If we let them, they will destroy the game we love. It's time for those of us who live in the real world to speak out. Let's take what is good in the concept of active ethics and treasure it, but let's not take on the whole package without discrimination.

Watching on the Internet
by Matthew Granovetter

Board 58 of the quarterfinals, which produced so many swings, would have been a successful deal for one of my favorite lead conventions: the double of a slam calling for the highest ranking unbid suit, rather than dummy's first bid suit.

Board 58. Game All. Dealer East.

S 9
 H AK9
 D T
 C AJT96543

S Q873 S AKJT54
 H JT8 H 43
 D KQ9875 D A32
 C -- C 87

S 62
 H Q7652
 D J64
 C KQ2

Here was one auction in the Canada vs. South Africa match:

West	North	East	South
Kokish	Mansell	Silver	Cope
		1S	Pass
2D	3C	3S	5C
5S	6C	Pass	Pass
6S	All Pass		

South led the CK, and that was curtains for South Africa. In the method I suggest, North can double for a heart lead, not a diamond lead, and that makes a big difference. I picked up this double idea from the old rubber bridge days at the Mayfair Club in New York, when another form of bridge, called Cut-throat, in which Goulies were dealt, produced lots of slams. So double of the final slam contract was used for the highest unbid suit.

This is not only a matter of frequency (which lead is more likely to defeat a slam, dummy's suit or an unbid suit?) but playing traditional Lightner, where you double with a void in dummy's suit, you sometimes alert the opponents to run to another suit or notrump.

Bridge Today Magazine can be obtained by email through a credit card via Email at "gran@harel.tau.ac.il".

The cost is \$27 for one year plus a \$10 fee for surface mail or \$22 airmail. Identify yourself as one of the players or press at the Beijing tournament and take a \$5 discount.)

Bridge is #1 with Joey

"I never let my law practice get in the way of my bridge," says Joey Silver of the Canadian team. "One time I was involved in a major drug trial in Montreal, and the Canadian National Team Championships came up right in the middle of the trial. Playing was more important than defending, so I asked for an adjournment. And I got it! I played in the CNTC, than went back to defending my client after I finished playing."

Luck Isn't Always What It's Cracked Up To Be
by Rich Colker

A hand reported in Monday, 16 October Daily News No. 9 from the 11th match of the round-robin raises a somewhat different issue from what was explored in the original article. The deal was:

Board 16. E/W Vul. Dealer West.

	S J		
	H 76		
	D QT863		
	C KQ972		
S T8643		S KQ975	
H 83		H AKQJT92	
D KJ74		D --	
C J3		C A	
	S A2		
	H 54		
	D A952		
	C T8654		

West	North	East	South
Pass	Pass	4NT	Pass
5D	Pass	6H	All Pass

According to E-W's partnership agreement (which East had forgotten) the 4NT opening showed both minors. West picked diamonds, and East interpreted her bid as showing the (useless) ace of that suit (4NT having been intended as asking for specific aces). East then bid 6H, ending the auction.

South led the SA on which declarer alertly dropped the king. South, now believing that East might have relied on West's having the DA for the success of the slam, tried to cash that ace next, and the slam came home. Needless to say (but I'll risk it anyway) a spade continuation at trick 2 would have met with a quite different fate.

In the other room E-W reached the same (inferior) slam, but South unerringly led and continued spades, sinking E-W's contract. When I watched this board the E-W pair bid to 5H, making only five, while in the other room 6H was again defeated. The Daily News No. 6, commenting that the book on how to bid the East hand had yet to be written, contained another report of 6H being set. And so on...

Was it just coincidence that the pair who had the bidding misunderstanding made their slam, while many (most?) other E-W's were being set (or held to 11 tricks)? What role did E-W's unusual methods, which they then forgot, play in all this?

Please, I am not criticizing these particular E-W players for either their methods or the fact that they forgot them.

How many of us have not been there (more than once) ourselves? Still, the problem I wish to call your attention to remains the same: another favorable result for the confusion created when players roll out their own "home-grown" system and then end up forgetting it.

Yes, I know. I can hear those of you who are saying, "But most of the time when players forget what they are playing they get the worst of it. Even here E-W reached the wrong (6H) contract instead of the much safer 6S, placing them in jeopardy. They just 'lucked out' this time." Well how many pairs reached the superior 6S contract using any methods, with or without bidding misunderstandings? And how many of those who reached it normally made it?

"And what if the players have psyched their bids?" you say. Certainly psyching is an integral part of the game, but psyching methods which are already unusual, complex or obstructive carry with them their own ethical baggage. Just how much do players have to contend with before the game becomes a contest of luck rather than bridge skill?

It certainly isn't good for the top-level game (or any level, for that matter) when things like this happen. Doesn't it leave you feeling a bit uneasy when players (especially top players) profit after a (supposedly) disastrous bidding misunderstanding because their opponents don't have the proper information about their bidding methods? Well, what can be done about it?

Law 75 says that, as long as the opponents have been properly informed about a partnership's understandings, a player is not obligated to disclose information about his own hand just because it does not agree with the stated understandings (as when that player has forgotten his agreements, or psyched)--as long as his partner is subject to the same misconception as the opponents.

On the other hand, Active Ethics suggests that when the opponents are a-priori more likely to be damaged they should be told the truth about the player's intentions (actual holding). In other words, when a deviation from their understandings gives a pair an "unfair" advantage, it is not in keeping with the spirit of the game to withhold the correct information from the opponents.

An example may help to clarify this point. Playing against a strong 1C opening one of the most effective defenses is simply to not discuss what you are playing, but agree to play something complicated and artificial (and Alert partner's bid, but explain it as "either this or that, we really haven't discussed it.") The confusion will almost invariably work in your favor. In such situations players should be required (in accordance with Active Ethics) to disclose their bidding intentions to the opponents (in their partner's absence, of course).

In the deal that began this article the East player could tell the opponents that the 4NT bid was intended as asking for specific aces IF the declarer is likely to derive an unfair advantage from with holding that information. This still leaves it up to the East player to decide whether or not to inform the opponents (subject, of course, to a Director's and/or Committee's later judgment).

It is also possible to remove the player's discretionary rights by requiring that the opponents always be informed. Whether or not disclosure is required, this procedure cannot be used in situations where the player's partner is still actively involved (i.e. when the auction is still open, or the informing side is on defense), and sending him away from the table would itself be too informative.

Well, what do you think? Let me know, and maybe in a future article you'll see your (collective) reaction to this issue. Remember, we are talking here strictly about the top-level game.

And one more thing. Keep in mind, "What is truly best for the game of bridge?"
