von Arnim \& Auken 76 Sadek \& Elahmady 85
er; neither side vulnerable

| 3 | EAST <br> - K <br> $\bigcirc$ AK <br> $\diamond$ K 764 <br> \&A Q 10874 |
| :---: | :---: |
| im | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Auken } \\ & 2 \AA \\ & 3 \\ & 6 \% \end{aligned}$ |

Elalimacty
106
20
30
3 NT
40
4 NT
5
6 NT
g opened with a nonvulnerable 2-HCP notrump, von Arnim difficult evaluation problem aken transferred to clubs. Her as minimum, but her clubs ong. It could not be far wrong either liking or disliking for 1d West did both: She decided urage but accidentally made em bid to encourage. East an1 short spades, but with lots of ength drove to slam even after -arrival weak jump to game. cial issue of diamonds came us but not into sharp focus.
Egyptians started with four bids (three clubs was strong), owed controls before Elahmady three notrump. Sadek liked his f diamonds, so he made a move, nich there was no keeping East id a maximum, a good suit, and nt controls) out of slam.

BWS Auction: Pass - 1 \& - 1 $2 \diamond-3 \&$ (game-force) $-3 \diamond-3 \propto$ $3 N T(?)-$ ? We confess that we could not bring ourselves to pass three notrump with four useful honors; thereafter, East would need to turn very conservative to keep the partnership out of six.

Awards: 5 NT 10; $5 \boldsymbol{4} 6$; slams 4.

12
von Arnim \& Auken 80 Sadek \& Elahmady 89

West dealer; North-South vulnerable

| West | EAST |
| :---: | :---: |
| *- | ¢ K 76 |
| OAKQ 765 | $\bigcirc 10942$ |
| $\diamond$ A 7 | $\diamond$ K 843 |
| ¢ K 6432 | -0. A 7 |
| von Arnim | Auken |
| 10 | $2 \diamond$ |
| 20 | 2 NT |
| 30 | 3 - |
| 3 NT | $4 \%$ |
| 4 NT | $5 \%$ |
| 6 \& | 70 |
| Pass |  |
| Sadek | Elahmady |
| 10 | 380 |
| $4 \%$ 4 | $4 \diamond$ |
| 4 - | 50 |
| $6 \%$ | 78 |
| Pass |  |

${ }^{4}$ Auken's response to the big club showed 8-10 HCP in a balanced hand. Her rebid indicated four-card heart support. Next, von Arnim indicated extra trump length (a sometimes-useful technique that is uncommon among expert methods). Fast continued with two ace-or-king control-bids, facilitated by West's space-saving three-notrump "serious" slam-try. After a key-cardask and reply, West asked for thirdround control of clubs. This time, the focus was exactly where it belonged.

Elahmady's response was a fourtrump raise, and, fortunately as it turned out, he was obliged to show a cheap-tohid control when Sadek made an effort $\sqrt{0 \text { reach slam. Here, also, six-clubs }}$ tusked about third-round control. BWS Auction: $1 \circlearrowleft-3 \circlearrowleft-4 \%-4 \diamond$ -$50-6 \%-6\rangle-7 \vee$-Pass. Five spaders shows a void, and East should treat it as Exclusion Key-Card Blackwood. When West then invites seven, he presumably needs third-round control of clubs, ostensibly his long side suit.
Awards: $7 \circlearrowleft 10 ; 6 \triangleleft 4 ; 5 \diamond 2$.

## 13

von Arnim \& Auken 90
Sadek \& Elahmady 99
North dealer; both sides vulnerable


The only reasonable chance is to induce
Sadek
$1 \diamond$
$2 \diamond$
Pass

In the context of a v ing style, with a misfi Arnim had a marginal to game with three dia system offered no par ant alternative. She w unlucky when Auken h feature and drove the three notrump.

Elahmady was not suit texture to open in high cards. He did his the impression of the o Sadek, with a void in wasn't interested in gar

BWS Auction: 1 \& $2 \diamond(?)-3 \diamond(?)-3 N 7$ open light nowadays works well, sometimes

Awards: $2 \mathrm{NT} 11 ; 2 \diamond$ 3\& 7; 3NT 5; 4थ, 4»

West to duck the lead of a my's ten. To achieve thi: create the illusion that he should he win the trick. his shape is $2=5=1=5$ (as absence of a spade lead) that your shape is $3=1$ you should win with the round of trumps, play ruff a heart, cash ace-ki dummy's last heart, anc West might, and arguab

What mistake did I way, I drew the last t learns that South has on illusion of the endplay

