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## Open to All

The EBL is pleased to confirm that the 9th European Open Bridge Championships will be held between 15 and 29 June 2019. The venue will be confirmed as soon as possible.

## Who wants to be a Millionaire

The next edition of the Cavendish, the world's richest bridge tournament, will be played in Monaco 3-8 February 2019. For information go to www.cavendish.bridgemonaco.com or write to Jean-Charles Allevena at: Cavendish@bridgemonaco.com

## On the Podium

England's Juniors captured two bronze medals at the European Youth Pairs Championships in Croatia.
Tommy Brass \& Ian Robson finished third in the U26 Pairs, and with Stephen Kennedy and Michael Alishaw finishing fifth England were the only country with two pairs in the top 16. Meanwhile, Henry Rose and Oscar Selby were third in the U16 Pairs.
In the U26 Women's Pairs Liz Gahan \& Yvonne Wiseman finished fourth, with Alex Birchall \& Laura Covill next in line.
In the President's Cup -the consolation event alongside the Pairs Championships - Jonathan Clark \& Daniel Winter finished second.

## Eyes on the Prize

England's U16 team has reached the final of the WBF Youth Teams Online Championships,
defeating the USA 102-89 over 42 deals. With the World Youth Team Championships starting in August it's a good omen for the team, which is spon-
 sored by Tetragon: https://www.tetragoninv.com/

## To Francesca a Daughter

The world's number one Layout Editor, Francesca Canali, gave birth to Anna Margot on 12 July.


## Fantunes Update

The Federal Appeal Tribunal of the Italian Bridge Federation has approved the appeal submitted by Fantoni \& Nunes asking for a review of the decision to suspend them for 3 years. Their appeal followed their acquittal by the Court of Arbitration for Sport in Lausanne. The FIGB lifted the 3 -year suspension on the grounds that following the CAS ruling the defendants must be judged innocent. The pair has stated that they will not play together in the future.

## State of the Union

The Constitution of the United States of America says that the President, shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.
By tradition, the President must be in office for a year before delivering
his first State of the Union address, but he can still deliver a speech to a joint session of Congress. A New Bridge Magazine is only eight months into its first year of publication but it is important to keep you posted as to our progress.
Our readership continues to increase, although after the surge of the first few months things have slowed down, which is only to be expected. It includes players at every level, from World Champions to beginners. That presents us with a logistical problem - we can please some of our readers all of the time and all of our readers some of the time - but can we please everyone all of the time?
We have plans as to how to improve and move forward (see this month's


Bridgegent Letter from France) but when there only two of you involved in the production of something of this size things tend to take a while to come to fruition. Your input is important. If you have a comment, query or observation, don't hesitate to get in touch. The best way is at forum@newbridgemag. com but you can also use editor@newbridgemag.com
A big thank you to everyone supporting the magazine financially, be it by one-off payments or monthly contributions. You ensure that our writers get paid and that the Layout Editor can enjoy the odd 'apero'. If everyone donated $£ 5$ tomorrow we would have enough capital to see us safely through to 2023!
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## Test Your Technique

with Christophe Grosset see Page 57
Matchpoints. Dealer West. All Vul.

- 9864
- QJ 1075
- 7
- J93
- QJ53
$\checkmark$ A84
- KJ64
- AQ

The bidding:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | 1 | $1 N T$ |
| Pass | $2 \Downarrow^{*}$ | Pass | $2 \downarrow$ |

## All Pass

2 Transfer to Hearts
Lead: ace of spades.
After a pretty straightforward auction phase, you seem to be in the normal contract that you expect everybody to reach. Overtricks will matter!
At trick 2, West plays the king of spades and East discards the $\mathbf{2}$. West now plays the 10 ruffed with the $\vee 2$ by East who now switches to the 4 . What is your plan of play?

1

## Sea of Slains

The Editor reports on the 54th European Team Championships.

For the third time in recent years Europe's finest players assembled in Ostend to contest a major European Championship. Quite an achievement for a Federation with a relatively small number of members and a testament to the efforts of the Royal Belgian Bridge Federation, its President, Marc De Pauw and the local organiser Bart Magerman. The rationale behind the repeated visits to the city is simple: having 1700 players and officials for the best part of two weeks delivers over $€ 1.6$ million to local hotels and restaurants.

Searching for a different way to report on the Championships I recalled that Jeremy Flint was of the opinion that scoring heavily on the slam deals was vitally important and he wrote a number of articles reviewing the performance of the British Open team for Bridge Magazine.

Slam bidding clearly has a significant role to play. Missing a good slam (or perhaps an easy grand) will usually be expensive, and by the same token bidding a poor slam will be costly, although every once in a while a bad contract gets home.
How important were the slams in Ostend?
Judge for yourselves.

## Round 1

It did not take long for the first slam to appear - this was from the opening session:

Belgium v Monaco
Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.

- AJ1087
- J93
- J973
- 6


Two Diamonds was a three-way Multi, East's 3\% over the 'pass or correct' $2 \boxtimes$ showing a strong single suited hand.

North led a spade so that was +690 .

## Closed Room



With the $\vee A Q$ protected, there was nothing to the play. As it happened, half the tables in play missed the slam.

In the match between Norway and Greece, the Greeks stopped in 3NT but at the other table after 2e-2-3*-3NT Brogeland bid $4 \boldsymbol{e}$. He then rebid $5 \boldsymbol{2}$ over Lindqvist's $4 \diamond$ but it was easy for his partner to advance to $6 \boldsymbol{*}$.

## Round 2

In Round 2 these deals came along:

```
Board 18. Dealer East. N/S Vul.
            A AQ1094
            * AJ4
            * A106
            * AK
    \ J2
    \veeQ93
    -742
    * J6432
```



```
4 765
- 10865
- QJ9
a K83
- K72
- K853
- 1097
```


## Latvia v Hungary

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rubenis | Hegedus | Neimanis | Szegedi |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{e}^{*}$ | Pass | $2 N T^{*}$ |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ |
| Pass | $6 \boldsymbol{i}$ | All Pass |  |

If I have interpreted the convention card correctly 2NT promised three controls.

East led the $\diamond Q$ and declarer won in hand, drew trumps and played the $\$ 10$ for the jack and king. He came to hand with a club and played a diamond, not needing the heart finesse, +1430 .

## Closed Room



Missing this slam cost 12 IMPs - and 17 pairs failed to reach it. One E/W pair tried saving in 5\% - a tad expensive at -2000 - and their teammates missed the slam.

Board 21. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

- AK43
- K962
- KJ
\& AJ 10

- Q8
- AQ873
- AQ5

962

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rubenis | Hegedus | Neimanis | Szegedi |
| - | 19 | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | 4** | Pass | 49* |
| Pass | 4NT* | Pass | 69 |

All Pass

| 4. Balanced game raise |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4@ | RKCB |
| 4NT | 3 key cards |

That was a painless +1430 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Dumbovich | Germanis | Winkler | Jansons |
| - | 19* | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | 29 | Pass | 3\% |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | 5NT |
| Pass | $7{ }^{7}$ | All Pass |  |
| 1* Strong |  |  |  |
| 4NT RKCB |  |  |  |

Something went wrong here. Did South think 4 NT was quantitative and bid 5NT to ask his partner to pick a slam? On a good day a defender will
hold four spades and the 2 KQ but today this cost 17 IMPs.
Only one pair missed $6 \uparrow$, but six tried the grand slam.

## Round 3

Let's move on to Round 3:

## Sweden v France

```
Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.
4 A103
` K4
K K87
* A10973
```



Clearly you would like to reach 6 with North as the declarer, but that looks impossible.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| O. Rimstedt | T. Bessis | M. Rimstedt | Volcker |
| - | - | - | 180 |
| Pass | 2** | Pass | 29 |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 39 | Pass | 34 |
| Pass | 4\% | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | 6\% | All Pass |  |
| Inverted |  |  |  |

The key to this auction was probably South's 3 fragment bid, which showed his partner that he was probably 1-4-3-5. West led the $\star,+920$.

1

| West | orth | East | outh |  | ¢ A 103 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lorenzini Up | mark | R Rombaut | strom |  | - K4 |
| _ | _ | _ | 18 |  | - K87 |
| Pass | 17 | Pass | 19* |  | - A10973 |
| Pass | 1NT | Pass | 2\%* | $\xrightarrow{\text { 人 }} 9654$ | $N$ Q ${ }^{\text {Q }}$ |
| Pass | 27 | Pass | 24* | - A1096 | W E Q43 |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 30* | +4 | $S$ ¢ 62 |
| Pass | 37 | Pass | 34* |  | ¢ K |
| Pass | 4 | Pass | 6\% |  | - AQJ9 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |  | - J52 <br> * KQJ85 |
|  | S | Strong Club |  |  |  |
|  | 5 | $5+\mathrm{zz}$ points | thout a |  |  |
| 1 |  | Relay |  |  |  |
|  | R | Relay |  |  |  |
| 2 | R | Relay |  |  |  |
|  | R | Relay |  |  |  |

Upmark-Nystrom's relays meant a longer auction, but the end result was the same.

Nine pairs stopped short.
No-one found the testing lead of a low diamond.

## Round 4

Two slams (rather like London buses) arrived more or less simultaneously: Ireland v England

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.

- 743
- A 1082
- K

Q QJ 1075
Q Q 9865 - Q

- 109842
- 3

A AK
- K53
- AQ5
- AK984

| Open Room |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | West | North | East | South |
|  | Carroll | Malinowski | Garvey | Bakhshi |
|  | - | - | - | Pass |
|  | 24* | Pass | 2NT* | Pass |
|  | 3** | Pass | 3 | Pass |
|  | 44 | All Pass |  |  |
| 24 | Weak |  |  |  |
| 2NT | Asking |  |  |  |
| 32 | Weak hand |  |  |  |

When West showed a weak hand East made one more effort but shut up shop when his partner jumped to game. On the lead of the queen of clubs declarer was not hard pressed to record twelve tricks.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Allerton | Hanlon | Jagger | McGann |
| - | - |  | Pass |
| 24* | Pass | 2NT* | Pass |
| 3** | Pass | 4* | Pass |
| 4* | Pass | 4 | Pass |
| 54 | Pass | 64 | All Pass |

2. Weak, 4-9(10) 1st/2nd Maybe 5-card suit 1st NV/3rd Sound: 6-card

2NT suit in 2nd seat, wide range ( $0-12$ ) in 3rd Constructive 9-12 in 4th Asking
3\% Lower range
The commentators thought that $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ was a keycard enquiry where West eventually showed the queen of trumps but no kings. If North cashes his ace the chance of the diamond suit playing for no loser is $13.56 \%$. When he did not the slam rolled home along with 11 IMPs.

16 pairs reached $6 \mathbf{~ - ~ o n l y ~ t w o ~ o f ~ t h e m ~ w e r e ~ c o n f r o n t e d ~ w i t h ~ a ~ h e a r t ~}$ lead.

## Board 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.



Open Room


The meaning of the bids after $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ is unclear. Why Did East prefer 3s to
 tricks for a disappointing +440 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allerton | Hanlon | Jagger | McGann |
| $1{ }^{\text {d }}$ | Pass | 29 | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | 34 | Pass |
| 49 | Pass | 5\% | All Pas |

An identical sequence to the same spot.
11 pairs missed this one - two went down in $6 \leqslant$ and two reached $7 \boldsymbol{*}$, one going down.

## Round 5

There was no let up in the next round:

## Scotland v Czech Republic

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

|  | 」 J3 +632 $+J 752$ $+J 652$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| , KQ9 <br> - K10974 <br> - AQ9 <br> $\div 3$ | $\begin{array}{\|lll\|} \hline & \mathrm{N} & \\ \mathrm{~W}^{2} & & E \\ & \mathrm{~S} & \\ \hline \end{array}$ | - A652 <br> - Q8 <br> - K6 <br> \& AKQ98 |
|  | - 10874 <br> - AJ5 <br> - 10843 <br> - 104 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hay | Volhejn | Wilson | Macura |
| 19 | Pass | 2e* | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | 4NT | Pass |
| 6NT | All Pass |  |  |

With a maximum and decent intermediates West was happy to accept his partner's invitation.

North led the $\downarrow 2$ and declarer won with the ace and played a heart to the queen South winning with the ace and returning the $>5$. In my experience a player who does this always has the vital missing card, but declarer went up with the king and subsequently discovered there were now only eleven tricks.

Declarer might have cashed a couple of clubs before broaching the hearts (the chance of five tricks is $38.75 \%$ ). The appearance of the $\mathbf{\$ 1 0}$ might be enough for declarer to take the winning view in hearts.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Medlin | Pinder | Medlin | Barton |
| $1 \downarrow$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass |
| $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |  |

Only two pairs stopped in game - 10 of the declarers in 6NT going down.

## Round 6

## France v Portugal

Board 20. Dealer West. Both Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sarmento | Bessis | Barbosa | Volcker |
| 1 1 | 5 | All Pass |  |

North put the question with his bid of Five Diamonds and East decided to go quietly which is shall we say, surprising. Declarer was allowed to escape for one down.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lorenzini | Pereira | Rombaut | Dias |
| $1 \uparrow$ | $4 \downarrow$ | $4 \uparrow$ | 5 |
| Double | Pass | 6 | All Pass |

At this table North was more circumspect, giving East no problem. South's heroic 5 would have been a good save, but East was not interested in a penalty and took the (choose your own adjective) decision to bid a slam. This was an almost hopeless proposition, although as Ron Tacchi pointed out an imaginative North might have led a low diamond at trick one! After the ace of diamonds the inevitable heart trick took the contract down.

No-one else attempted 64.
Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.
AK75
$\bullet 6$
-
+8692
$+\quad 863$


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sarmento | Bessis | Barbosa | Volcker |
| - | - | - | 2** |
| Pass | 2ヶ* | Pass | 34 |
| Pass | 4* | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | 4, | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | 5* | Pass | 64 |
| Pass | 74 | All Pass |  |
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Perceived wisdom is that 4a was Blackwood, 4 NT showed three keycards, and 5\% was asking for the trump queen which was shown but without an extra king. North thought long and hard before bidding the grand slam.

East led the $\$ 10$ covered by the jack, queen and king. Declarer now ran the trump suit. On the third round West discarded a club whilst declarer had let
 two small clubs go. Another round of trumps brought diamonds from the defenders and another club from declarer. The fifth trump got a spade from West and North now made the mistake of discarding his last club (a diamond is best) whilst East released a club. On the penultimate trump West now fell from grace and held onto his small spade and let go a diamond and declarer could establish his long diamond for the thirteenth trick. The winning line is, having discarded a diamond on the fifth trump, to cash the ace of spades and ruff a spade so when the last trump is led from dummy West must keep three diamonds and only one club so declarer can now throw a diamond and then squeeze East in the black suits by cashing the top diamonds.

To defeat the slam East must lead a diamond, disrupting declarer's communications.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lorenzini | Pereira | Rombaut | Dias |
| - | - | - | 2** |
| Pass | 2** | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 24 | Pass | 39 |
| Pass | 4 | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | 530 |
| Pass | 69 | All Pass |  |

No heroics here and a loss of 11 IMPs.
Only three pairs attempted $7 \Downarrow$ - the other two, despite the absence of a diamond lead, failing to make the contract.

One pair reached 7NT - and Paul Barden sent this analysis:

Jorgensen-Thorvaldsson for Iceland bid 1-2 - 2 Which was strong club, 4441 positive, and I guess shape then control asks.

Lars Blakset led the $\mathbf{~} 5$, declarer ran six rounds, on which the defensive cards played were:
-5 マ9

| $\checkmark$ | マ2 | ( |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 94 | -10 | ( 4 true count - high odd) |
| 2 | 20 |  |
| 46 | ¢ 4 | (both gave true count) |
| -7 | -6 | (both gave true count) |

## Leaving:

| - AK7 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ - |  |
| - AK9 |  |
| -8 |  |
| N | $\bigcirc 1098$ |
| W E | - |
| S | - 10 |
| ¢ J2 |  |
| $\checkmark 4$ |  |
| - J |  |
| \& A97 |  |

It looked fairly clear that West had abandoned clubs, presumably being under pressure in three suits. For any sort of squeeze to have worked, he needed to have sole guard of either spades or diamonds, but which? Both defenders had pitched one of each.

Declarer led his last heart, West played $\$ 4$, and declarer misguessed, discarding a spade, rather than the diamond which would have enabled him to squeeze East in the blacks.

It was good defence by Blakset and Bilde to obscure the position, but technically speaking declarer got this one wrong. This is not a standard compound squeeze where you have to guess which suit has been abandoned. Suppose West did have sole guard of spades, and both defenders guarded diamonds - swap the $\$ 108$ for the $\$ 108$ say. Then West's winning defence, fairly obviously, is to abandon diamonds. There can be no double squeeze with the diamond and club guards both over the menace.
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Consider also a similar deal with $\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{~} 10$ exchanged．Then West abandons spades，and now there＇s no double squeeze because declarer can＇t cash his tricks in the right order，which would be spades followed by the last heart－give declarer one of the spade winners instead of dummy and this works．

So the compound squeeze can work against accurate defence only if West has sole guard of diamonds，and the queen of spades．

The most accurate order of play in the 7－card end position is A ，in case the queen falls，$\star$ AK in case $\vee 10$ fall，ed heart to squeeze East．

An opening lead of the $\downarrow Q$ or a small club would have beaten 7 NT ．To beat $7 『$ you have to lead the $\diamond$ ．

## Round 7

## England v Poland



North＇s 4『 clearly showed a major－minor two－suiter，so South could have bid 4NT over 4ヶ．Declarer had no problems in 6母．Poland +1010
after South＇s trump lead．


North again showed his two－suiter and then came again．South had an easy 6NT，askingpartner to bid his minor．Declarer misguessed trumps， losing to West＇s queen，but four down and－800 and was still worth 5 IMPs．

Only three pairs failed to get past game．The strangest result was where E／W attempted 64，which went 9 down．

## Monaco v Netherlands

Board 16．Dealer West．E／W Vul．



Declarer ruffed the diamond lead in dummy, crossed to a heart, ruffed a diamond, ruffed a spade, ruffed a diamond with the $Y Q$ and returned to hand with a spade ruff to draw trumps, +1770 .


It looks obvious to bid 54 but not knowing about the diamond void meant South could do no more than bid $6 \mathbb{}$. Would North have done better to bid $6 \Downarrow$ ? While you are considering that, anyone not burdened by the popular '5NT pick a slam' could bid 5NT with the North hand, wanting to play the grand slam as long as partner has the top trumps.

One pair stopped in game, one E/W pair found the save in $7 \boldsymbol{L}$ and 12 pairs reached $7 \vee$, seven of them doubled.

## Round 8

So far a majority of the matches had contained a couple of deals with slam potential and the trend continued.

## Norway v Netherlands

```
- 97
- AJ86
- K43
K K963
```



Open Room


North led the 9 and declarer won with dummy's king and and played a heart for the ten, king and ace. He took the spade return with the ace and continued with a trump to the queen, going two down when South discarded.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nab | Kvangraven | Drijver | Tundal |
| － | － | － | Pass |
| 120 | Pass | 19 | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 39 | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | 44 | All Pass |

Stopping in game was worth 11 IMPs， declarer taking eleven tricks after a club lead．


15 pairs attempted a slam－and of course they all failed．
Board 28．Dealer West．N／S Vul．
－AQJ2
－A4
－AQ9852
$\therefore \mathrm{A}$


As pointed out by David Bird，North might have bid 6e over 5e，hoping to see a diamond cue－bid from his partner．

Declarer won the club lead，took two rounds of trumps ending in dummy （retaining the $\boldsymbol{L}^{2}$ ）and advanced the jack of diamonds．No doubt pleased
to see West＇s king he continued with the queen and when East showed out he ruffed a diamond and was forced to take the heart finesse，one down．

How big a position would it be to go back to dummy with a trump and take a second round diamond finesse？

| Closed Room |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | West | North | East | South |
|  | Nab | Kvangraven | Drijver | Tundal |
|  | Pass | 18 | 4＊ | 4， |
|  | Double | Redouble | Pass | Pass |
|  | 4NT＊ | 5\％＊ | Pass | 54 |
|  | Double | Redouble | Pass | Pass |
|  | 6\％ | 6＊＊ | Pass | 64 |
|  | 78 | 74 | All Pass |  |
| 1＊ | Strong |  |  |  |
| 5＊ | Cue－bid |  |  |  |
| $6{ }^{*}$ | Cue－bid |  |  |  |

West＇s first double was a cunning move，but when North introduced the blue card he showed his true colours．He tried a similar tactic over 5 before taking the save over 64．North knew that his partner did not have a diamond control，but no doubt suspecting 7\％would be cheap he went on to the grand slam．

The early play was identical，but West did not cover the $\$ \mathrm{~J}$ and declarer was able to establish the diamonds．

7 a was made 6 times and failed 5 times．
While all this was going on the first champions were crowned，Tur－ key＇s Ferda Zorlu \＆Nilgun Kotan winning the Women＇s Pairs while Piotr Tuszynski \＆Andrzej Pawlak took the Senior Pairs for Poland．

## Round 9

## England v Finland

Every Championship tends to deliver one or two truly spectacular deals． Brian Senior reported this one：

When is a sure trump trick not a sure trump trick？Well，take a look at Board 13 from Round 9 of the Open Series．The match was England v Finland and，before this board，England led by 68－11 IMPs．The English E／W pair，David Bakhshi and Artur Malinowski，had played in 3NT down
one after a club lead for - 100. It looked as though the board might be flat when Finland's Artur Karhulahti and Clas Nyberg bid to $6 \star$, a contract which was apparently doomed by the five-zero trump split.


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nyberg | Forrester | Karhulahti | Robson |
| - | Pass | 18* | Pass |
| 1** | Pass | 2** | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | 4* | Pass |
| 49 | Pass | 4NT | Pass |

6. All Pass

One Club was Polish, three-way, and 1 either a negative or some (semi-) positive hand with diamonds. Two Diamonds was an artificial game force and $3 \lessgtr$ showed long diamonds. From here the auction quickly got slightly overboard and led to a small slam, which would have been defeated on a club lead whatever the trump break. However, Tony Forrester led a low heart to Andrew Robson's ace. At this point Robson must have felt reasonably good about life, looking at his trump holding. He returned a spade to dummy (would you have found the entry killing club switch. Editor) Nyberg won that, cashed the ace of diamonds and got the bad news. He unblocked the king of hearts, went back to dummy with a spade, and played the queen of hearts. Suddenly, Robson's sure trump trick started to look less secure. If he ruffed low everything would be easy for declarer, who would then be in a position to draw trumps after overruffing and unblocking the trump
queen. But if Robson ruffed with the nine or ten, he would also be overruffed. The play would then continue on essentially the same lines as if he did not ruff at all. If South does not ruff in, declarer's club losers go away on the major-suit winners. He then ruffs a heart or a spade in this position:


If South discards a club, declarer next leads a club to the ace and continues with another side-suit card. Down to nothing but trumps, South finally has to split his $\$ 109$. Declarer over-ruffs, leads low to the $\downarrow$ Q, and any card from dummy at trick 12 sees the $\downarrow$ K8 pick up South’s $\$ 107$. If South ruffs in earlier he just gives up his trump holding earlier and declarer can draw trumps then take the discards on dummy's remaining winners. There is no escape from the trump coup. For example, if South ruffs in with the ten of diamonds at his first opportunity he is over-ruffed and declarer crosses to the queen of diamonds to lead more major-suit winners in this position:

| $$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| - |  |
| K K107 |  |
| N | $\stackrel{\text { Q6 }}{ }$ |
| W E | - J7 |
|  |  |
| S | \& AJ |
| ¢ 7 |  |
| -- |  |
| - 107 |  |
| Q Q96 |  |
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If South ruffs in, he is over-ruffed once more, trumps are drawn and declarer crosses to the ace of clubs to cash more side-suit winners. If South does not ruff in a second time, once he has got rid of his club losers declarer ruffs a major-suit card to shorten his trumps to the same length as South, essential for the trump coup to be operated successfully. Then he crosses to the ace of clubs at trick 11 and the next lead trump coups South again. A club lead would have defeated not just $6 \star$ but even $5 \checkmark$ as the defence would come to a heart, a club and a trump trick. Five Diamonds will make after a heart lead to the ace, whatever South plays back, but $6>$ can be defeated if South finds a club switch at trick two as this knocks out a late dummy entry which is required to operate the trump coup. Finland gained 16 IMPs on the deal.
For the record, $6 \star$ was also made by Sweden's Simon Hult, as East, in his team's match against Latvia after two rounds of hearts. At the other table, $6 \uparrow$ was down one for 16 IMPs to Sweden. The lead was the ace of hearts from Mikael Rimstedt was followed by a second heart so declarer had an opportunity to succeed but mistimed the play. Six Diamonds was also played at five other tables, always being defeated.
It was not the only slam of the round:

## Belgium v Netherlands




East led the $\$ 3$ and declarer drew trumps and played a spade, East going in with the ace and exiting with a spade. On the run of the trumps West, having already parted with two spades, threw two low clubs and heart and another spade. East discarding two spades and two clubs.

Declarer crossed to the $\boldsymbol{\$ A}$ and cashed the $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$, West pitching a second heart. Now, you cross to the A and cash the $\boldsymbol{\$}$ K on which West discards another heart. Declarer discarded the e and took the heart finesse through West to go one down.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| De Wijs | De Donder | Muller | De Roos |
| - | - | - | 2NT |
| Pass | 3e* | Pass | 3NT* |
| Pass | 4 | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | 6 | All Pass |  |
| 3e |  |  |  |
| Puppet Stayman |  |  |  |
| 3NT |  |  |  |
| No major |  |  |  |

Here too East led a trump but West discarded the $\uparrow 4$. Play then went along the same lines as at the other table but at the end, declarer threw two clubs on the $₫ \mathrm{KQ}$ and then took the heart finesse through East for a great +1370 and 16 IMPs to Belgium.
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22 pairs tried 6 , ten of them bringing home the bacon.

## Round 10

Bulgaria v France

```
Board 30. Dealer East. None Vul.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Q105 } \\
& \text { AKQ842 } \\
& \text { A75 } \\
& \text { K }
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline ¢ 74 & & ¢ AJ862 \\
\hline - J109 & & - 763 \\
\hline - 103 & W E & - J94 \\
\hline -1087532 & S & - 64 \\
\hline & - K93 & \\
\hline & \(\checkmark 5\) & \\
\hline & - KQ862 & \\
\hline & \& AQJ9 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Open Room


In general terms most Precision pairs use $1 \leqslant$ followed by 2 to show nine cards in the minors, but it can be 4-5 or 5-4. Unsure of the position North settled for $4 \boldsymbol{V}$ and took all the tricks when East led a diamond.


West led a spade, but declarer took the rest for a 9 IMP swing to France. 10 pairs failed to reach a slam.

## Round 11

## Sweden v Norway

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

- KJ2
- 1053
- K
* AKJ962

| $\begin{aligned} & 96543 \\ & +K 76 \\ & \text { J62 } \\ & 84 \end{aligned}$ |  | ¢ 1087 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | - QJ82 |
|  | W E | - A9874 |
|  | S | -10 |
|  | - AQ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A94 |  |
|  | - Q1053 |  |
|  | - Q753 |  |



East led a heart, which led to declarer's downfall, -100.


West led a spade and the early appearance of the $\$ \mathrm{~J}$ gave declarer his twelfth trick.

Norway +1370 and 16 IMPs to them.
The slam was made three times and defeated five times.

## Round 13

At this point the Women and Seniors entered the lists.

## France v Belgium

Board 12. Dealer West. N/S

|  | - KJ3 <br> - 6 <br> - K1094 <br> \& J 8765 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1082 \\ & \text { Q108543 } \\ & \text { J3 } \\ & \text { Q2 } \end{aligned}$ |  | ¢ 974 |
|  |  | - J2 |
|  | W E | - 8765 |
|  | S | - K1094 |
|  | - AQ65 |  |
|  | - AK97 |  |
|  | - AQ2 |  |
|  | - A3 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ Bessis | Angelini | Puillet | Couteaux |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | 2** |
| Pass | 2** | Pass | 2NT* |
| Pass | 34* | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | 4** | Pass | 4NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| Multi |  |  |  |
| Pass or correct |  |  |  |
| Strong balanced |  |  |  |
| Minors |  |  |  |
| Longer clubs than diamonds |  |  |  |

There were exactly eleven tricks, +460 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1082 \\ & \text { Q Q108543 } \\ & \text { J3 } \\ & \text { Q2 } \end{aligned}$ | K KJ3 <br> 6 <br> K1094 <br> J 8765 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East South |  |  |  |  |
| DriessensHuberschwillerDobbelsMourgues |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | 2** |  |  |  |
| Pass | 2『* | Pass | 2NT* |  |  |  |
| Pass | 49 | Pass | 59 |  |  |  |
| Pass | 6\% | Pass | 6 |  |  |  |
| Pass | 64 | Pass | 6NT |  | - AK97 |  |
| All Pass |  |  |  |  | - AQ2 |  |
| 2* | Multi |  |  |  | * A3 |  |

It looks as if 4@ showed the minors (it might have been a picture bid, promising 3-1-4/5-5/4?) However, 5 then looks a little odd - maybe it was asking for the longer minor. If North had passed 64 they would have been the only pair in the Women's Teams to not only reach but also play the best slam.

In the cold light of day it looks as if North did too much.
Having said that, take a look at this auction from the match between Norway and Russia in the Open:

In the Open Room Lindqvist and Brogeland had reached 4 after Khiuppenen had started with a weak $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$, North responding $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ to South's double, then bidding $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ over South's $3 \vee$ and passing out 4


I confess to having no idea what $4 \boldsymbol{\sim}$ meant, but when North introduced his three-card suit South was happy to try for the slam bonus.

In the Seniors match between France and Poland Abecassis and Levy got no higher than 3NT, North responding $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ to South's double of $2 \boldsymbol{V}$ and then passing 3 NT .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lebel | Starkowski | Soulet | Kwiecien |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | 19** |
| Pass | 1** | Pass | 2NT* |
| Pass | 3** | Pass | 3NT* |
| Pass | 4** | Pass | 4** |
| Pass | 4** | Pass | 5NT* |
| Pass | 63 | Pass | 6 |

All Pass
12 Polish Club: (a) 12-14 HCP balanced (b) 15+ HCP unbalanced with clubs (c) any $18+\mathrm{HCP}$
1* Usually 0-7 HCP
2NT 21-23 HCP balanced
34 Minor-suit slam try, 5/4 either way
3NT No 4-card minor
4\& 5 clubs/4 diamonds
$4 \diamond$ Diamond preference
4• Heart control
5NT Pick a slam, hoping for 6NT
Declarer was off to a good start when East led a trump, the jack forcing declarer to win with the king. Ace and another club, saw West win with the queen, and the trump continuation was perforce won in dummy, declarer returning to hand with a spade and ruffing a club. Had declarer now returned to hand with a spade he would have been able to draw trumps and claim, but he cashed the ace of hearts and ruffed a heart. When East eventually ruffed a spade he had a club to cash for two down and 13 IMPs to France.

In the Open, three pairs hit the jackpot by reaching 64, three more attempting $6 \uparrow$, which made once. The six pairs who tried 6 NT went down, as did the pair who reached 6e.

6NT was reached six times in the Women's event and twice in the Seniors.

## Round 14 <br> Italy v Hungary

Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.


- KJ75
- AK1092
- 8
\& AJ 10863
- 4

K754


- 972
- 10932
- QJ92
$\perp 5$
Q6
- QJ653

A1063
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Donati | Hegedüs | Duboin | Szegedi |
| - | $1 \star$ | Pass | $2 \star^{*}$ |
| $2 \star$ | $2 N T$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| Pass | $4 \downarrow^{*}$ | Pass | $5 \star^{*}$ |

Inverted raise
RKCB
2 keys $+\uparrow$ Q
North liked his hand and right he was -+920.
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dumbovich | Bocchi | Winkler | Sementa |
| - | 1** | Pass | 1NT |
| 24 | 39 | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | 4NT* | Pass | 54* |
| Pass | 6NT | All Pass |  |

1 $\downarrow \quad 11+, 5+\star($ not $5 \uparrow 332)$ or $4 \star 441$
Game forcing balanced or $4+\star$ or 5
54. 2 keys $+\diamond$ Q

This required a major defensive error, which was not forthcoming, 14 IMPs to Hungary.

Six Open pairs missed the slam, while two attempted 7 *.
Nine pairs missed out in the Women's event, six in the Seniors.

## Round 15

## England v Netherlands

Board 6. Dealer East. EM Vul.


- 54
* AQJ963


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Robson | De Wijs | Forrester | Muller |
| - | - | Pass | 19* |
| Pass | 2** | Pass | 2** |
| Pass | 3** | Pass | 3** |
| Pass | 3** | Pass | 34* |
| Pass | 3NT* | All Pass |  |
| Strong |  |  |  |
| Natural GF |  |  |  |
| Relay |  |  |  |
| 6/7 no shortness |  |  |  |
| Relay |  |  |  |
| 3226 |  |  |  |
| Control ask |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |

After the strong opening a series of relays followed at the end of which South knew they were missing an ace and a king. After a spade declarer recorded +460 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Nab | Malinowsk | Drijver | Bakhshi |
| - | - | Pass | 1\%* |
| Pass | 2『* | Pass | 24* |
| Pass | 3\% | Pass | 4\% |
| Pass | 4『* | Pass | 49 |
| Pass | 6\% | All Pass |  |
| 2 - In |  | Inv. NT or 6+minor |  |
|  | 24 A | ing |  |

West led the jack of diamonds taken by declarer's ace. A club to the queen was followed by a heart and when East played low declarer won with the king. The simplest line now is to cash two diamonds disposing of the losing heart and then play to ruff a spade in hand. East could prevent this taking the $\vee A$ and exiting with a club, when declarer should come up short.

No doubt worried that the third diamond might be ruffed, declarer decided to play a few trumps. West pitched the two and three of spades and then, fatally, the eight of spades on the fourth trump. Declarer cashed one more trump, came to hand with a diamond and played a third round of the suit disposing of dummy's remaining heart.

This was the position with East still to play:


- 10
- QJ
- 10
*     - 



When East pitched a spade declarer could play two rounds of the suit, establishing a winner in dummy. If East throws a low heart declarer can exit with a heart forcing a lead into the split spade tenace and if East parts with the $\vee$ A declarer ruffs a heart and then advances the $Q$ to pin West's ten, eventually taking the last trick with dummy's $₫ 7$.


North's intervention made life awkward. North led the $\vee Q$ and declarer had time to try the diamonds before turning his attention to the spade suit, +490 .

## Closed Room



South led a heart and declarer won perforce in dummy and ducked a club. After that the 4-1 trump break spelt his downfall.

As the cards lie you can make 6 by testing trumps and then playing on spades, even if South finds a club lead. 11 IMPs to England.

In the Women's match between Denmark and Norway both teams reached $6 \uparrow$. For Norway declarer won the heart lead, cashed three diamonds and then played on spades for an easy +920 .

Denmark's declarer won the heart lead and cashed dummy's top spades pitching a club. She then took dummy's remaining heart, came to hand with a trump and ruffed a heart, but she had to lose a trick in each minor to surrender 14 IMPs.

In the Open Series 15 pairs made a slam - the only plus scores for N/S were England's +50 , which was matched by a failing 7 .

Eight pairs made a slam in the Women's event, but there were six scores of -50, five of those in grand slams.

Six pairs made a slam in the Seniors, the only minus was for $7-1$.

## Round 16

Iceland v France
Board 18. Dealer East. N/S Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jorgensen | Rombaut | Thorvaldsson | Lorenzini |
| - | - | 2** | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3** | Pass |
| 3** | Pass | 34* | Pass |
| 4NT* | Pass | 5** | Pass |
| 69 | All Pass |  |  |
| 2, Multi |  |  |  |
| 2NT Asking |  |  |  |
| 3. Hearts |  |  |  |
| 34 Shortage |  |  |  |
| 4NT RKCB |  |  |  |
| 5 1 key card |  |  |  |

North led the 7 and declarer won with the ace, crossed to the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$, unblocked the $\uparrow$, came to hand with the $\geqslant$ A and pitched dummy's diamonds on the top spades, +980 .

A diamond lead would have left declarer with too much to do.
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## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SegaineauBaldurrs' Sebbane |  |  | Haralds |
| - | - | 2》* | Pass |
| 4 | All Pas |  |  |
|  | $2 \vee$ | earts and | minor |

When West made no move towards slam Iceland had 11 IMPs.

In the Open five pairs bid the slam one of them was defeated by the lead
 of the A .

Four pairs reached $6 \checkmark$ in the Women's series, one of them failing after the diamond lead.

In the Seniors four pairs attempted $6 \vee$, one of the doubled. Two were successful, but the other failed, despite getting the opening lead of the \& K.

## Round 17 <br> Monaco v Greece

## Board 1. Dealer North. None Vul.

- 1083
- KQ106
- 109
- J987

```
\ J2
` AJ872
- K762
* AK
```



- AK765
- 95
- AQJ
\& 1052

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Helgemo | Doxiadis | Helness | Roussos |
| - | Pass | $1 \mathbf{1 a}$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2 V}$ | Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

A club lead and a 3-3 spade break meant eleven tricks, +460 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kontomitros | Multon | Koukouselis Zimmermann |  |
| - | Pass | $1 \mathbf{1}$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2 N T}$ | Pass | $2 N$ | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | $3 \mathbf{1}$ | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | 4 | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | 6 | All Pass |

Where did things go wrong?
Was West wrong to bid 3 with just a four-card suit? Should East have moved over 3NT? Was 4NT an attempt to play there?

The bottom line is that West was being optimistic facing a rebid that promised at most 14 points.

In an attempt to set up the hearts declarer finished three down, handing Monaco 12 IMPs.

As you might already have guessed, East/West were almost flying solo on this deal, only being joined by a Senior pair.

## Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

- K964
- K765
- 1053
- J5


##  <br> - 10875 <br> - QJ 1092 <br> - AQ <br> \& 87

Open Room


Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kontomitros | Multon | Koukouselis Zimmermann |  |
| - | - | 1NT | 23* |
| 3 | 34 | 3NT | Pass |
| Pass | 4 | Double | All Pass |

Four Hearts doubled finished four down for -800, but that was a loss of 11 IMPs.

Three pairs reached in the Open, one in the Women and one in the Seniors.

Only the Women contested the last round of the sixth day.

## England v Netherlands

Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul.

- Q1043
$\checkmark$ Q2
-KQJ1032
- 9


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kolen | Senior | Arnolds | Dhondy |
| - | - | - | $1 \mathbf{2}$ |
| Pass | 1 | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{2} *$ | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | $5 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | 5 |

All Pass
3* Asking
5. Cue-bid

There was nothing to the play, +400 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Brock | Bruijsteen | Brown | Dekkers |
| - | - | - | 120 |
| Pass | $1{ }^{\text {d }}$ | Pass | 1NT |
| Pass | 20* | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | 4** |
| Pass | 4* | Pass | 4 * |
| Pass | 5 | Pass | 6 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
|  | 2* Ch | Checkback |  |
|  | 4* Cu | cue-bid |  |
|  | $4 \checkmark \mathrm{Cu}$ | cue-bid |  |

Only South knows why she went on to $6 \uparrow$. It cost 10 IMPs. Another three pairs went overboard.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kolen | Senior | Arnolds | Dhondy |
| Pass | 1 NT | Pass | $2 \downarrow *$ |
| Pass | $2 \downarrow$ | Pass | $3 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |
| Transfer |  |  |  |

After a club lead for the queen and ace declarer knocked out the ace of spades and finished with ten tricks, +630 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | West | North | East | South |
|  | Brock | Bruijsteen | Brown | Dekkers |
|  | Pass | 1NT* | Pass | 2 * |
|  | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass | 3 |
|  | Pass | 3NT | Pass | 4 |
|  | Pass | 4 | Pass | 5\% |
|  | Pass | 6 | All Pass |  |
| 1NT | 15-17 |  |  |  |
| 29 | Trans |  |  |  |

North's hand is worth 15.15 on the Kaplan-Rubens Hand Evaluator. Had she opened $1 \%$ making it clear that there would be wasted values in that suit South would not have been tempted to go past game. 6 needed some luck and it was not forthcoming, East overruffing the third round of hearts as declarer finished two down to lose 13 IMPs.

This time two more pairs joined the party.

## Round 19

## Iceland v Italy

Board 7. Dealer South. Both Vul.

- 86432
$\downarrow 6$
- 1063
- Q653



## Closed Room

West North East South JorgensenBianchediThorvalds' Madala

| - | - | - | 1\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | Pass | 2『* | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | 4NT* | Pass |
| 5** | Pass | 67 | All Pass |
|  | 29 | Forcing |  |
|  | 4NT | RKCB |  |
|  | 5 | 1 key card |  |

South led the ace of clubs and switched to the $\mathbf{~} 5$. Declarer won in dummy, drew two rounds of trumps, and then played three rounds of diamonds, +1430.

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sementa | Baldursson | Bocchi | Haraldsson |
| - | - | - | $1 \downarrow$ |
| $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $2 *$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass | $4 \vee$ | All Pass |

Having started with $2 \diamond$ East might have bid $3 \vee$, but he would then have had a decision to take over his partner's raise. +680 and 13 IMPs to Iceland.

Nine pairs bid 6 6 in the Open, 12 in the Women (two pairs languished in $2 \vee$ ) and 7 in the Seniors.

## Round 20

Hungary v Iceland
Board 32. Dealer West. E/W Vul.


Declarer played safely and did not take the club finesse, +650 .
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dumbovich Thorvaldsson | Winkler | Jorgensen |  |
| $2 \boldsymbol{s}$ | Pass | $2 N T^{*}$ | $5 \uparrow$ |

I cannot tell you if $5 \checkmark$ was the right action with the South hand, but it put East in a position where he had to make a guess.

Declarer ruffed the heart lead, and ran the $\mathbf{\$}$. When it held he cashed two diamonds, discarding a heart, ruffed a diamond, and played a heart
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towards dummy. If he is allowed to ruff this he can ruff another diamond, play two rounds of trumps and then discard his losing clubs on the high diamonds. When North ruffed in with the $\$ 10$ and played a club, declarer had to take the club finesse, +1430 and 13 IMPs to Hungary.

Nine pairs in the Open bid $6 \mathbf{-}$ - two of them went down. Five got there in the Women (one getting all the way to 74) and it was a similar story in the Seniors, although one declarer failed.

## Round 21

Netherlands v Denmark

## Board 4. Dealer West. Both Vul.



| Open Room |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | West | North | East | South |
|  | Nab | Bilde D | Drijver | Blakset |
|  | 10* | 19 | 2** | Double |
|  | Pass | 3 | 5** | Pass |
|  | 54* | Pass | 7\% | Pass |
|  | Pass | 7* | Pass | Pass |
|  | 7NT | All Pass |  |  |
| 2 | 10+4+2 |  |  |  |
| 5 | Exclusion Blackwood |  |  |  |
| 5 | One keycard outside diamonds |  |  |  |

North and South attempted to make life difficult but to no avail.

When North decided to save West, looking at the undisclosed $\downarrow$ A was happy to push on.


Four pairs missed out on the grand slam in the Open, five in the Women (three Easts playing in diamonds) and seven in the Seniors.

## Round 22

## Monaco v Iceland

## Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.
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Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jorgensen | MultonThorvaldssonMartens |  |  |

With his hand limited by the Precision $1 \curlyvee$ West was prepared to splinter in support of diamonds, but then signed
 off. Confident that his partner must have a club control (or that they would not be led) East went on to the slam.

South led the 2 and North won with the queen, declarer following with the four. Looking at the convention card it suggests that leads were 3rd and 5th, but writing in the Bulletin David Bird pointed out that the two is consistent with the Polish style of leading low from a doubleton. After considerable thought, and perhaps having regard to East's $\mathbf{4} \boldsymbol{\mathscr { E }}$ bid, North switched to a spade. Declarer won and played two more spades, discarding dummy's remaining clubs.

Declarer ruffed a club, returned to the $\vee \mathrm{A}$, and led the J . Martens ruffed with the $\downarrow 9$ and declarer overruffed with the $\downarrow$ Q. There was a prolonged pause and it transpired that North had called the director. An eye-witness explained that declarer had pointed at the $\downarrow \mathrm{Q}$ but at the same time mistakenly said 'queen of hearts', quickly corrected to 'queen of diamonds'.

The BBO operator removed the $\downarrow$ from the screen. Eventually the Q was reinstated.

Declarer ruffed a heart, led his last spade and ruffed with dummy's $\star \mathrm{K}$, According to BBO he then played a diamond to the ace, dropping the jack. However, the video confirmed that he had finessed the $\downarrow 10$ and gone one down.

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Helgemo | Baldursson | Helness | Haraldsson |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| $1 \downarrow$ | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| $3 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass | $4 \mathbf{\varrho}$ | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | 6 | All Pass |

The bidding was identical and this the the was led, the convention card suggesting it was 'second and fourth'. North won with the queen, declarer again contributing the 4 . As before, North switched to a spade. Declarer won, cashed the $\vee \mathrm{A}$, crossed to the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ and led the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$, ruffing in his hand. He cashed two spades to take care of dummy's clubs, ruffed the 9 and returned to hand with another heart ruff. When he led the $\boldsymbol{j}$, the record shows that South ruffed with the $\downarrow \mathrm{J}$ (which seems unlikely), overruffed with the $\leqslant \mathrm{Q}$ and declarer could now cross-ruff for 14 IMPs.

11 pairs in the Open tried 6 - four of them getting home - two where West was declarer.

Two pairs reached 6 in the Womens, one going two down as East, the other making as West. Seven Seniors took a shot at 6 ${ }^{*}$, two getting it on the card.
Norway v Sweden

## Open Room



When North did not come in over 14, it was virtually impossible for her side to get beyond game, +480 .

Closed Room


When West stayed silent, North was able to open the bidding and the double fit encouraged South to look for bigger things, +980 and 11 IMPs to Sweden.

Only seven pairs reached $6^{\circ}$ in the Open, while there were six in the Women's and three in the Seniors.

## Round 23

Russia v England
Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.
$\rightarrow$ A

- AJ876532
- 2
- A62

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { K K9754 } \\ & 4 \\ & \text { QJ76 } \\ & 1075 \end{aligned}$ |  | ¢ J863 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | - K9 |
|  | W E | - 10854 |
|  | S | ¢ KJ4 |
|  | - Q102 |  |
|  | - Q10 |  |
|  | - AK93 |  |
|  | - Q983 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Khiuppenen | Forrester | Kholomeev | Robson |
| - | 19 | Pass | 2e |
| Pass | 29 | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 39 | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | 4NT* | Pass | 52* |
| Pass | 69 | All Pass |  |

2. Game forcing

4NT RKCB
5* 1 key card
East led a diamond and declarer won with dummy's ace and ran the queen of hearts. When that lost to the king he needed a mistake from the defenders, but it was not forthcoming, -100 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allerton | Matushko | Jagger | Khokhlov |
| - | $1 ष$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $3 \downarrow$ | Pass | $4 \vee$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

That was worth 13 IMPs.
No less than 27 pairs bid $6 \uparrow$ in the Open and four of them made it when East led the 4 . Fourteen of the Women's pairs tried it - only one getting home after East led the $\boldsymbol{\$}$ and West covered dummy’s $\boldsymbol{\$ 1 0}$. Fourteen Senior pairs reached $6 \vee$, all failing, and two more went all the way to $7 \vee$.

## Round 24

Monaco v Italy

```
Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.
- Q986
\(\downarrow 8\)
- KJ9762
- Q5
```



```
A
K1092
- 5
\& AKJ9843
© K5
- QJ653
- AQ1083
- 10
```

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Multon | Bocchi | Zimmermann | Sementa |
| - | Pass | $1 \mathbf{2}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{*}^{*}$ |
| Double | 5 | $6 \boldsymbol{2}$ | All Pass |

The North-South barrage left East with a nasty decision. When the necessary singleton heart honour was not forthcoming from North $6 \boldsymbol{e}$ had to go one down.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Donati | Helness | Duboin | Helgemo |
| - | Pass | 1\% | 19 |
| 24* | Pass | 3\% | 3 |
| 49 | 5 | All Pass |  |

With perfect defence (club lead, $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$, heart switch and a spade ruff the defenders can collect four tricks). In practice they took three - and the same number of IMPs.

Five pairs attempted a slam in the Open (one of them in 64) and one of them was allowed to make it. Six pairs tried a slam in the Women (one was $6 *$ ) and two made it, one after the lead of the $P$. Eight Senior pairs reached a slam (both $6 *$ and 6 ) usually doubled and all failing.

## Round 25

Iceland v England

## Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

Open Room
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Was $3>$ the right bid with the East hand?
Should East bid over 4?
As David Bird pointed out a Kickback 4@ would have allowed E/W to avoid the ignominy of playing in a slam missing two aces.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jorgensen | Allerton | Thorvaldsson | Jagger |
|  | - | 19* | Pass |
| 14* | Double* | 29 | 44 |
| 4NT* | Pass | 5** | Pass |
| 5 | All Pass |  |  |
| 12. $16+$ |  |  |  |
| 14.5+9 |  |  |  |
| Dble Spades |  |  |  |
| 4NT RKCB |  |  |  |
| 5. 1 key card |  |  |  |

Despite the intervention East/ West were able to stop at a safe level and collect 13 IMPs.

Three pairs bid the doomed slam in the Open, six in the Women and one in the Seniors.

## Round 27

## France v Norway

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W


- AKQ986
- A

- AQJ942
- J52
- 6
- A32
$\stackrel{-}{-}$
743
\& J976


## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Marstrander | Lebel | TBakke | Soulet |
| - | - | $1 \uparrow$ | 3 |
| 3 | 5 | 5 | Pass |
| 6 | 7 | Double | All Pass |

West was willing to gamble that either there would not be two black suit losers or that a diamond lead would give him the tempo. The sacrifice cost -500 .

```
Closed Room
```

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lasserre | LStabell | Poizat | TStabell |
| - | - | $1 \uparrow$ | 3 |
| $3 \psi$ | 5 | $5 \downarrow$ | Double |

South ruffed the spade lead, but declarer had the rest, +1050 and 11 IMPs. In the Open a slam was bid 20 times, the biggest number being the +2940 for 7a redoubled. There were 12 slams in the Women's event and 10 in the Seniors.

## Round 17 Women

## Estonia v France

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.



| 180 | 16+ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 14 | 8+, balanced or 4-4-4-1 |
| 1NT | Relay |
| 2* | balanced |
| 2* | Relay |
| 34 | 2-3-5-3 |

With such powerful trumps South felt entitled to raise, +1390 when East led a heart.


West led a club and the defenders took the first five tricks and 16 IMPs.

Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Huberschwiller | Oras | Mourgues | Iher |
| - | - | - | 1 Pass |
| $5 \boldsymbol{*}$ | 5 | Pass | Pass |
| Double | All Pass |  |  |

West led the and declarer ruffed in dumm and played the 10 for the king and ace. She ruffed a club and led the $\geqslant 7$ for the eight and nine. Declarer had to lose a spade, two hearts and two diamonds for -500.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Piibeleht | Puillet | Taube | Bessis |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| 19** | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 3\% | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 4\% | Pass | 4NT | Pass |
| 6\% | All Pass |  |  |
| Strong |  |  |  |

The exact meaning of 4NT is unclear - most likely it showed some slam interest.

When North led a spade declarer no longer had to guess the suit, +920 and 9 IMPs.

## Round 28

Monaco v France
Board 19. Dealer South. EM Vul.

$\boldsymbol{\Delta}-$

- AK6
- AQJ10432
Q QJ8
Open Room


Surprisingly South decided against bidding $5 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$, which would have kept the grand slam in the picture.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Multon | T Bessis | Martens | Volcker |
| - | - | - | $2 \star^{*}$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{*}$ | $3 \boldsymbol{*}$ | 3 |
| Pass | $5 \boldsymbol{*}^{*}$ | Pass | 7 |

Here North's jump to $5 \boldsymbol{\&}$ had to be a void and South went all in, gaining

## 11 IMPs.

Only five pairs in the Open stopped in 6 - but one rested in game and another doubled $3 \%$. Six of the Women and four of the Seniors missed 7 . Iceland v Israel

```
Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
ค J 9732
- 853
- 86
- 865
- AQ64
- K976
-AKQJ74
\& Q7
```



```
- J10
- 10
* AK 10942
- K85
- AQ42
- 9532
- J3
```

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Levin | Baldursson | Roll | Haraldsson |
| - | - | 120 | Pass |
| $1{ }^{\text {d }}$ | Pass | 19 | Pass |
| 2** | Pass | 3** | Pass |
| 49 | Pass | 4 | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | 44 | Pass |
| 6 | All Pass |  |  |
| Artificial game force |  |  |  |
| 4- +6* not minimum |  |  |  |
| Cue-bid |  |  |  |
| Cue-bid |  |  |  |
| Cue-bid |  |  |  |

Two Diamonds was an artificial GF and 3e then showed 6-4 in the blacks and not minimum.

It was mildly surprising that West did not ask for key cards - East could have followed the same sequence with the $\vee \mathrm{A}$.
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The heart lead saved a trick, giving Israel 13 IMPs.
14 pairs got to a slam in the Open, 7 in the Women and 5 in the Seniors.
Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.

- J98743
- 85
- 9643
$\dot{3} \mathrm{~J}$


When South came again with 5 West was able to show his heart support and that was enough for East to punt the slam. Right he was, although he may have had an anxious moment when South led the $\$ 10$. When

North could not produce the king that was +980 .


It proved to be much tougher after the one-level opening, 11 IMPs for Israel.

7 Open, 6 Women and 4 Seniors played in $6 \curlyvee$.

## Round 30

England v Sweden

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.

- Q732
- KQ7
- 3
- J7653
( K1096
-     - 

-KQ654

- AK108


## Open Room

| West | North | East | South | $\underset{\sim}{\text { a K K }} 1096$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& Q732 } \\ & \text { KQ7 } \\ & 3 \\ & \text { J7653 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Robson | Rimstedt Forrester Rimstedt |  |  |  |  |
| - | - | _ | Pass |  | - 5 |
| 1 | Pass | 19 | Pass |  | $W^{N}=$ AJ108643 |
| 19 | Pass | 20* | Pass | KQ654 <br> - AK 108 | S : AJ8 |
| 3\% | Pass | 3 | Pass | - AK 108 | AJ84 Q4 |
| 4\%* | Pass | 4¢* | Pass |  | - 952 |
| 54* | Pass | 6 | All Pass |  | - 10972 |
|  | 2\% | th-suit | orcing |  | - 92 |

It's not clear why East bid $4 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ rather than $4 \diamond / 4 \vee$.
North led the $¥ K$ to dummy's ace and declarer played the $\uparrow 5$, South taking the ace and playing a second heart. Declarer ruffed and tried three rounds of clubs, South ruffing and returning a trump so declarer could win in dummy, ruff a heart and draw trumps ending in dummy to enjoy the hearts, one down,- 50 .


I wonder if 3NT asked for keycards, with 5 showing 2 plus a void?
Here the heart lead saw declarer try to set up the suit. According to Brian Senior this line was doomed by the 4-1 trump break and the contract went one down. I doubt anyone would find a winning line in practice - but one does exist.

After ruffing a heart at trick two declarer crosses to dummy with a club and ruffs a third heart. He then plays two more rounds of clubs disposing of dummy's spade. South ruffs but is then stuck. A trump return is no use, but forcing dummy with the A allows declarer to ruff, cash the $>J$ and then play winning hearts.

4 pairs attempted $6 \leqslant$ in the Open - they all failed. So did the three Women's pairs and two Senior pairs (one of them got a club lead from North, after which I think you should make it).

```
Board 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
@ J1096
* A5
- J43
& K1043
```



```
Open Room
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline West & North & East & South \\
\hline Robson & O. Rimstedt & Forrester & M. Rimstedt \\
\hline Pass & Pass & \(1{ }^{\text {d }}\) & 19 \\
\hline Pass & 14. & Double & 24 \\
\hline 3\% & Pass & 34* & Double \\
\hline Pass & Pass & Redouble & Pass \\
\hline 49 & Pass & 6\% & All Pass \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
    34. Cue-bid
    Rdbl First round spade control
    4. Cue-bid
```

6* is playable, requiring decent breaks in both minors, but could not be made on this layout, declarer finishing one down on a gentle defence.
 clubs, North winning with the king, cashing the $\$ \mathrm{~J}$ and exiting with a spade. Declarer got the clubs wrong to emerge with ten tricks, +130 and 5 IMPs.

Monaco were the only other team to attempt $6 \boldsymbol{2}$ in the Open, they were joined by just one pair from the Seniors.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Robson | O. Rimstedt | Forrester | M. Rimstedt |
| - | - | Pass | 24* |
| Pass | 2NT* | Pass | 3** |
| Pass | 4** | Pass | 5** |
| Pass | 64 | All Pass |  |


| 2 | 5+4, 5-10 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2NT | Invitational plus relay |
| $3 \%$ | Minimum with six spades |
| 4* | Cue-bid |
| 5* | Cue-bid |

West led the two of diamonds. Not wanting to go down at trick one, declarer won with dummy's ace, drew two rounds of trumps, cashed the king of clubs and then ran the jack. When it held he could cross to dummy with a trump and discard the losing diamond on the $\mathrm{A},+980$.

## Closed Room



East led a club, a quick +980 .
17 Open pairs bid a slam - three of them going down. The ratio in the Women was $12 / 2$ while in the Seniors it was $13 / 3$.
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## Board 32. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

| Q Q53 <br> - J5 <br> - KJ7 <br> - 96532 | $$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ¢ A9864 |
|  | N | - 3 |
|  | W E | - Q952 |
|  | S | -874 |
|  | - J107 |  |
|  | - 109 |  |
|  | - A10863 |  |
|  | \& QJ 10 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Robson | O. Rimstedt | Forrester | M. Rimstedt |
| Pass | 2** | Pass | 2** |
| Pass | 2** | Pass | 24 |
| Pass | 3** | Pass | 4** |
| Pass | 4NT* | Pass | 5** |
| Pass | 69 | All Pass |  |

2* Weak with (5) 6+ or 22+ balanced or any game force
2 Pass or correct
$2 \downarrow 5+\uparrow$ or $24+$ balanced
24 Relay
3. Hearts

4 Cue-bid
4NT RKCB
5\% 1 key card
East led a diamond and declarer won with dummy's ace and ran the jack of spades, +980 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | West | North | East | South |
|  | Nystrom | Malinowski | Upmark | Bakhshi |
|  | Pass | 19* | Pass | 1NT |
|  | Pass | $2 \vee$ | Pass | 4** |
|  | Pass | 4NT* | Pass | 5** |
|  | Pass | 69 | All Pass |  |
| 120 | Polish Club |  |  |  |
| 4 | Cue-bid |  |  |  |
| 4 NT | RКСВ |  |  |  |
| 5 | 1 key card |  |  |  |

East led a club so declarer could win, draw trumps and unblock the club before crossing to dummy's $\forall A$ to take a discard on the queen of clubs; +980 and a flat board.

2 pairs missed the slam - another went down on a diamond lead by going wrong in spades. It was missed six times in the Women - one pair tried $7 \boldsymbol{\square}$ - and four times in the Seniors, with two failures after a diamond lead.

## Round 31

## Sweden v Netherlands Seniors

Board 14. Dealer East. Neither Vul.


## Open Room

 to the occasion by playing the king, +50 .

## Closed Room



Here declarer played the low spade at trick three and when North failed to play the king he was subsequently endplayed for the overtrick, +420 , 10 IMPs for Sweden.
$6 \checkmark$ was declared 14 times in the Open - it was defeated seven times. In the Women the figures were six and three, while in the Seniors there were nine attempts (one in 7ヶ) with six failures.

## Round 32

Norway v Germany
Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.


Open Room


Declarer took no risk whatsoever after the diamond lead, cashing the $\geqslant$ A and claiming +1430.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Welland | Livgard | Auken | Aa |
| - | - | Pass | 3 |
| Double | Pass | $4 \star$ | Pass |
| $4 \downarrow$ | Pass | $5 \star *$ | Pass |
| $6 \downarrow$ | Pass | Pass | Double |
| Redouble | All Pass |  |  |
| $5 * \quad$ Cue-bid |  |  |  |

The pre-empt left E/W with little room to manoeuvre, but East was able to bid 4 to show interest in the majors.
Playing safe for his contract, declarer did not make an overtrick, but still had +2070 , and a 12 IMP gain.
$6 \checkmark$ was reached thirteen times in the Open, 5 times in the Women and 6 times in the Seniors.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dumbovich | Bareket | Winkler | Lengy |
| - | $1 \downarrow$ | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass | $2 \Downarrow^{*}$ |
| Pass | $2 \downarrow$ | Pass | $4 \downarrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

On a club lead, declarer has to get rid of three losers before he can afford to lose a trick. If trumps are $2-2$, he is home but with trumps 3-1 he will survive if spades are 4-3 (or 5-2 with the doubleton not holding the trump queen).


I'm not sure about the meaning of $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ and what followed, but after a spade lead declarer was +1010 and 11 IMPs better off.

| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Brogeland | Bocchi | Lindqvist | Sementa |
| - | 19 | Pass | 2** |
| Pass | 29 | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 3\% | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | 49 | Pass | 5\% |
| Double | 5 | Pass | 69 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| 2. Gamefor | ing relay |  |  |

The game force was followed by a series of relays at the end of which South knew enough to jump to 6『, Italy +1010 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 97 \\ & 96 \\ & \text { J972 } \\ & \text { QJ } 1042 \end{aligned}$ | - Q |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |  | - AJ 10842 |
| Donati | Livgard | Duboin | Aa |  | - A653 |
| - | 19 | Pass | 14 |  | - 108542 |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | 2** |  | - Q7 |
| Pass | 29 | Pass | 2NT |  | Q643 |
| Pass | 3\% | Pass | 3 |  | - ${ }^{\text {ck K9 }}$ |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | 4 |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\sim}$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |  | - A85 |
| Missing the | e slam | t Norw | y 11 IM |  | - 87 |

Missing the slam cost Norway 11 IMPs.

I have not had time to compute the number of points that changed hands on these slam deals, but it must be several thousand.

When the last card was played the new Champions of Europe were, Norway in the Open Teams, Poland in the Women's Teams and in the Senior's France.

A thrilling finish in the Open saw the additional places on the podium go to Israel \& Russia, while Sweden \& Norway took the limelight in the Women's event. In the Seniors' the other medals went to Sweden \& Poland.

These teams are joined by fifteen remaining qualifiers who have earned the right to represent Europe in the Bermuda Bowl, the Venice Cup and the d'Orsi Trophy next year.

In the Open, Sweden, Netherlands, Monaco, England \& Italy.
In the Women's, Denmark, England, Netherlands, Scotland, \& France.
In the Seniors', Ireland, Denmark, Norway, Netherlands \& England.
England, Netherlands, Norway \& Sweden are to be congratulated on qualifying all their teams.

24 teams go to Sanya, with the hopes of Europe resting on their shoulders. Good luck to them all.
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## Close Encounters Book 1:

Bridge's Greatest Matches - 1964 to 2001
Eric Kokish and Mark Horton


Close Encounters is a two-book series that describes some of the most memorable bridge matches of the last fifty years. It features titanic struggles for World and National titles, involving the greatest players from North America and Europe. There are amazing comebacks, down to the wire finishes, overtime victories, and an insight into how the game has changed over the last half century.

Book 1 starts with Italy's asserting its supremacy over Great Britain in 1964, and ends with Germany's dramatic Venice Cup win over France in Paris, in 2001.
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## FUNBRIDGE

## Misplaced Confidence

In the final of a Bracketed Knock Out I pick up the following:


- A983
- 52
* A653

With neither side vulnerable I open 1 NT and my partner's raise to game leaves this auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | $1 N T$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

West leads the four of spades and I get a fair dummy:

```
- 73
- J52
- AQJ63
K72
- AKJ
- A983
- 52
- A653
```

When East plays the nine I win with the jack and naturally play a diamond to the jack which holds, West following with the four and East the nine. I come to hand with a club to the ace and repeat the diamond finesse. If both minors are 3-3 I will make twelve tricks. When East wins with the king I have to revise my estimate. I win the spade return in hand, cross to dummy with the king of clubs and cash the ace of diamonds. When East discards the four of hearts I get a sinking feeling. I play a club but when that suit does not divide I am out of ammunition and have to concede one down. This was the full deal:


## Post mortem

If East had won the first diamond (which is what happened at the other table) declarer would have been in control, scoring three spades, a heart, three diamonds and two clubs. However, declarer missed a way to improve his chances. After winning the first trick he should simply duck a diamond. He wins the spade return and plays a diamond to the jack. The king of clubs remains as an entry to the diamonds even if East is able to win with the king.

## Premature Claim

During the second round of a Bracketed KO with both sides vulnerable I pick up a promising hand as dealer:

```
* AK95432
* KJ6
& KQ4
```

 which I take to be a cue-bid in support of hearts. When I cue-bid 4 partner bids 4 NT , asking for key cards. I reply 5 NT , which we play as promising 2 keys and a void. Partner now goes $6 \star$, which I take to be a try for a Grand Slam. If my queen of clubs was in hearts I would go 7『, despite the void in partner's suit, but eventually I settle for the small slam. This is how the bidding went:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | 1\% |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | 39 |
| Pass | 49* | Pass | 4** |
| Pass | 4NT* | Pass | 5NT* |
| Pass | 6** | Pass | 69 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West leads the two of diamonds (third and fifth) and I am slightly surprised when dummy is displayed:

```
4 A10765
` }8
A A104
& AJ5
4-
* AK95432
* KJ6
KQQ
```

It would not have occurred to me to resort to Blackwood when a cue-bid of $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ was available.

I win in hand with the jack of diamonds and continue with the ace of hearts, already leaning forward, when West discards the three of diamonds. With no way to avoid two trump losers my intended claim turns into a concession and I am one down.
This was the layout:


## Post mortem

Declarer should put up dummy's ten of diamonds at trick one and play the eight of hearts, intending to run it if it not covered. When East does cover, declarer wins, crosses to dummy with a diamond and ruffs a spade. Dummy is entered twice more with clubs, declarer pitching a diamond on the A , ruffing two spades and cashing the queen of clubs. In the three-card ending declarer plays a heart to dummy's seven. East wins but must then lead into declarer's $\downarrow$ K 9 .
At the other table N/S got all the way to $7 \uparrow$ and East doubled, collecting +500 when West led the nine of clubs - a lead that would have defeated $6 \vee$.

Jean-Paul Meyer was born in Paris on 13 December 1936, the son of Georges Meyer and Paulette Blum. He was bright, obtaining a License in Physics at the Faculté des Sciences followed by a Degree in Engineering at the Ecole Supérieure d'Optique the following year.

He became the Finance Director of the Société Transports et Entrepôts Frigorifiques, a position he held until 1978. That same year he became the Chief Editor of Le Bridgeur, and dedicated a huge part of his life to it. Two years later he took over as the Chief Executive Officer. Although he 'retired' in 1998 he continued to be involved as an advisor, member of the editorial board and correspondent. He wrote extensively in the French press, amongst other things being the correspondent of L'Express, from 1977.

Earlier this year he celebrated his 50th wedding anniversary with his wife Michelle - they were married on the ninth of February 1968. Their daughter Karine is the General Manager of Le Bridgeur, and like all parents they delighted in their grandchildren, Jules and Nicolas.

I cannot tell you when or how he developed an interest in bridge, most likely it was in his student days, but it soon became apparent that he was a gifted player. Of his innumerable victories perhaps the sweetest was to win the European Pairs Championship in Paris in 1987 with Gérard Leroyer. Outstanding at the table he was equally brilliant away from it, serving two terms as Vice-President of the French Bridge Federation.


He was President of the Ethics and Discipline Committee of the FFB and headed the European Bridge League's enquiry into the recent cases that propelled bridge onto the front pages of newspapers around the world.

He was an inspirational Captain, his many achievements in that field included leading France to the Bronze medals in the 1995 Bermuda Bowl.

He was a superb analyst and inevitably he became one of the best VuGraph Commentators, co-ordinating that with his experience as a Bulletin Editor for both the World Bridge Federation and the European Bridge League. In recent years the Bulletins he helped to produce in Monaco for the Cavendish and the Winter Games became the benchmark by which other Bulletins should be judged.
This deal comes from the 1987 Championships in Paris:
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Jean-Paul was South attempting to make 3NT after the lead of the $\geqslant 10$. He won in hand with the jack and played the for the jack and king, East returning the $\$ 3$ to West's jack. Declarer took the heart return with the ace and exited with the $\leqslant$. West won with the king and exited with a club, leaving the diamond suit blocked.

Declarer cashed four rounds of clubs to reach this position:

|  | - J <br> - K9 <br> - 10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ A5 | N | ¢ Q9 |
| - - |  | - Q8 |
| - 98 | W E | - - |
| $9-$ | S | $9-$ |
|  | - K7 |  |
|  | - - |  |
|  | - A2 |  |
|  | - - |  |

# Books, Learning Materials, Duplicate \& Rubber Bridge Supplies, Cifts, Lames \& More. 

WWW.BARONBARCLAY.COM 800.274.2221
$\square$
男

## Deals that Caught My Eye

David Bird looks at the semi-finals of the Spring Foursomes

The 2018 Spring Foursomes was displaced from Stratford to Warwick for just one year, losing out to a double booking with a wedding. The field was of the usual high standard and we will look closely at some of the biggest swings from the semi-finals. The unbeaten GILLIS squad faced BARTON (the Ireland team) on this early deal:


West's 1 response was a transfer, showing $4+$ hearts. With so many sidesuit winners, declarer needed only to avoid the loss of four trump tricks. Sadly, the 5-0 trump break made this impossible. Lindqvist won the $\downarrow$ lead in dummy and led a trump. Garvey rose with the ace, continuing with king and another trump. Lindqvist played on clubs, conceding two further trump tricks to North, and was one down. Unlucky! Would East/ West avoid the doomed heart game at the other table?

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boland | Saelensminde | Moran | Gillis |
| - | Pass | 120 | Pass |
| 19 | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| 3\% | Pass | 39 | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | 44 | Pass |
| 5\% | Double | All Pass |  |

West's $4 \diamond$ cue-bid, encouraging $4 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ from his partner, took the bidding to the five-level. With no advantage then of choosing hearts as trumps, they landed in $5 \boldsymbol{e}$. From North's point of view, it seemed that the East/West heart fit might be only 4-3. He therefore doubled, to encourage his partner to lead a singleton heart. The 5-0 heart break, which had proved so costly to declarer at the other table, came to the rescue of $5 \%$. South had no heart to lead. When the $\downarrow 3$ appeared on the table, Mark Moran paused for considerable thought before rising with dummy's ace. He discarded one heart on the $\uparrow$ K and ruffed a diamond with the 8 . He then played the A and ruffed the $\$ 3$. He continued to cross-ruff and conceded two hearts at the end, collecting +550 for a gain of 12 IMPs.

In the other semi-final ALLFREY faced OLDFIELD. Andrew Robson made $6 \boldsymbol{*}$ doubled on this board. He finessed the $\$ J$ at trick 1 and subsequently ruffed one spade and took a ruffing finesse in spades. This combination of amazing luck and good play netted the Allfrey team 16 IMPs against $5 \vee$ doubled and two down at the other table.

The unbeaten GILLIS team suffered further misfortune on this deal from the second stanza of 8 boards:
Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

| A A10632 <br> - K4 <br> -KJ <br> 2 K1074 | $$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $$ |  |
|  | - K9 <br> - 1082 <br> - AQ42 <br> * QJ65 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Brogeland | Hanlon $1 \%$ All Pass | Lindqvist Pass | McGann |
|  |  |  | 4 |
| Double |  | All Pass |  |

A spade lead looks eminently reasonable from the East hand but it was the only one (other than the to allow the contract to make. Tom Hanlon played low from the dummy, Boye Brogeland winning with the ace and returning a spade. A trump to the queen was followed by a diamond to the ace, dropping West's jack. Declarer played a second trump and subsequently ducked a diamond to the bare king, setting up dummy's $\$$. A ruff of the $\boldsymbol{\top}$ brought his total to ten.
At the other table North opened a weak $2 \mathbb{Y}$ and West subsequently went two down in 3\& the BARTON team picking up 9 IMPs.

On this 3NT contract from the third stanza, Graham Osborne had to choose which black suit to play. What would your decision have been?


The $\$ 3$ was led and Graham Osborne won West’s jack with the king. It was not practical to duck the first heart, since a diamond switch might be damaging. As you see, playing on spades would have found a perfect lie and an easy nine tricks. It seemed better to play ace and another club. This would net four club tricks against a 3-3 break, Kx or 10x onside, or 10x offside. To bump the total from eight to nine, declarer would then need to find the A onside. The Q lost to West’s king and a heart return put the game two down.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allfrey | Cope | Robson | Crouch |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{i}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{i}$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{i}$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

At the other table, South became the declarer in 3NT. Alexander Allfrey led the $\$$ to the jack and Robson switched to the $\$ 3$, declarer’s jack
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winning. Ace and another club, to the queen and king, was followed by the 6 to the queen and ace. Declarer cleared the club suit and soon had his nine tricks for a swing of 13 IMPs.

In the other semi-final Hanlon and Saelensminde both played 3NT from the North hand on a heart lead. They followed Osborne's line for -200.

The Irish outbid Gillis and the Norwegians on the next board:

```
Board 21. Dealer North. N/S Vul.
    4 42
    * K9852
    -10875
    & 103
```

| - J8 | N | - AQ9763 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Q |  | $\checkmark 43$ |
| - KJ963 | W E | - AQ |
| - 97542 | S | 2 K86 |

\& K105

- AJ 1076
- 42
: AQJ

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Carroll | Saelensminde | Garvey | Gillis |
| - | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | 1 NT |
| Pass | 2 | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | $3 \boldsymbol{3}$ |
| $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ | All Pass |  |  |

The $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ contract can be beaten by force but not after the $\vee$ A lead. Gillis switched to the $\downarrow 4$, won with the ace. Garvey could now have cashed the $\star$ Q, ruffed his heart loser and led the $\diamond$ K, ditching a club. When South ruffed with the $\uparrow 5$, he would have had no safe exit and nine tricks would be made.

Garvey preferred to lead a low trump from his hand at trick 3. South can defeat the contract by rising with the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ and returning anything but a club. When he played low, declarer won with dummy's $\boldsymbol{\$}$ J. He then returned to the $\downarrow$ Q, ruffed his heart loser and called for the $\checkmark \mathrm{K}$. Gillis ruffed with the $\mathbf{1 0}$ and played a third round of hearts. Garvey ruffed, drew
the last two trumps with his ace and conceded two club tricks for +140 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brogeland | Hanlon | Lindqvist | McGann |
| - | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{q}$ |
| Pass | $4 \vee$ | Double | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | $5 \boldsymbol{i}$ | Double |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Hanlon's 4Y raise was bold indeed but on the lie of the cards this contract was unbeatable. $4 \boldsymbol{\Phi}$ would have been a cheap sacrifice for East/West. How much would $5 \boldsymbol{e}$ doubled cost?

McGann launched the defence with ace and another heart, ruffed in the dummy. Declarer does best now to play the two diamonds in his hand, followed by a low trump. South wins and cannot prevent declarer escaping for two down.

Lindqvist preferred to run the $\mathbf{\$ J}$ at trick 3 . He was then booked for four down. McGann won with the $\mathbf{~} \mathrm{K}$ and returned the $\boldsymbol{\Phi} 10$ to the ace. Declarer played the ace and queen of diamonds, continuing with the Q . Hanlon ruffed and played a diamond, which McGann ruffed with the $\boldsymbol{e}$. South had two trump tricks to come and that was +800 for a 14-IMP swing.

There was interest in the cardplay on this deal from the final stanza:
Board 27. Dealer South. Neither Vul.
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| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| O Rimstedt | Gold | M Rimstedt | Bell |
| - | - | - | $1 ष$ |
| $4 \Phi$ | 5 | 5 | Double |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

David Gold led the $\vee 8$, Michael Bell winning with the queen and switching to a trump. How should declarer play after winning with dummy's ace?

Ola Rimstedt drew trumps and
 played a club to the queen. If Bell won with the king, the contract would be made. When he held up the king, declarer had to go one down. He would lose no club tricks but had nowhere to ditch his two diamond losers.

A better line of play was to take a diamond ruff with the $\$ 10$, return to hand with a high heart ruff and draw trumps. Declarer could then finesse the E into a safe hand. North was likely to hold seven diamonds for his 5 bid and South would have no diamond to play if the club finesse lost. Eleven tricks would be there whether South won the first round of clubs or not.

At the other table the overcall was passed out. Osborne won the $\star \mathrm{K}$ lead, ruffed a diamond with the 10 and conceded a heart to South's 9 . A trump return removed dummy's A, but declarer could then follow the line just mentioned, drawing trumps and finessing the Q . That was +450 and a gain of 11 IMPs.

The penultimate board of the semi-finals provided some splendid action at all four tables.


Bell's pass of the take-out double seems clear-cut to me, even at the score. Looking at all four hands, you would expect N/S to collect 500. In your dreams, you might even imagine that South would duck the first round of trumps and North might score his $\$ 10$ for +800 .

Gold led the $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathrm{K}$ and switched to the $\boldsymbol{\rho} 10$, killing the +800 dream. Bell won and drew a second round of trumps. He then switched to the $\vee$ Q, allowing declarer to score three heart tricks and escape for just 300. Would N/S find their way to a comfortable 3NT at the other table?

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Osborne | Cope | Forrester | Crouch |
| - | - | - | 1 |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| Pass | $4 \$$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ |
| Pass | 5 | All Pass |  |

Simon Cope's 2 is described as $3+$ diamonds, invitational plus. He subsequently showed his spade strength and 3NT was safely reached. A few moments later the much more precarious contract of $5 \diamond$ had been reached. How should declarer play this when the $\mathbf{7}$ is led?

Playing for quick discards on the spades was unattractive after East's
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2 bid. Peter Crouch attempted a novel play, running the $\mathbf{~ 1 0}$ ! If East had held the jack and let the 10 pass, declarer would doubtless have tried to discard three of dummy's hearts on his A-K-Q. When Osborne won with the $\$ \mathrm{~J}$ and returned a second spade, Crouch ruffed dummy's spade winner and played the \&A-K, throwing two hearts from the dummy. Forrester ruffed with the $\$ 10$ and switched to king and another heart. The diamond game was three down and ALLFREY picked up 12 IMPs.

Let's hop over to the other semi-final to see the action on this board

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Saelensminde | Hanlon | Gillis | McGann |
| - | - | - | 1 |
| Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | 2 | Double |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

This time it was North who let a take-out double stand for penalties. McGann cashed the king and queen of clubs and seemed to have dropped a trick when he switched to the V Q. However, Gillis won with dummy's ace and eventually lost 500 for three down.

My final firework in this report will now be lit. Please stand well back!

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| McGann | Lindqvist | Hanlon | Brogeland |
| - | - | - | 1 |
| Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | $1 \uparrow$ | Double |
| Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | $4 \vee$ |
| Pass | 6 | All Pass |  |

The GILLIS team was seriously behind in this match, which may provide some excuse for the exuberant auction. McGann led the $\$ 7$, won in the dummy and Brogeland called for a trump, East rising with the ace. Did Hanlon now try to give his partner a spade ruff, allowing the slam to be made? No, but he did switch to a club, which had the same effect. Brogeland won with the \& A and claimed twelve tricks for a 13-IMP swing. A slam had been made where game in the same suit went three down in the other match.

In this semi-final BARTON beat GILLIS 78-54. Under the recently changed rules, the unbeaten team would not be granted an extra 8 boards and had been knocked out. In the other semi-final, ALLFREY won the fourth stanza 32-5 to defeat OLDFIELD by 95-81. For the third year in succession they would face BARTON in the final.

1 CHESS \& BRIDEE $40 \%$ BRIDGE SHOP. .om London Bridge Centre


Visit our central London Store: Chess \& Bridge Shop 44 Baker Street, London, W1U 7RT www.bridgeshop.com 02074867015 |info@bridgeshop.com

## Obituary

Eric Murray died on May 19, aged 90. Murray was one of the true giants of bridge and one of the great characters of the game. He'd have won four Bermuda Bowls had he not been thwarted by the Blue Team in the final on each occasion. Those silver medals, the three bronze medals he won playing for Canada and the 14 NABC events he won with various partners made Murray the most successful Canadian player ever. Unique in WBF history, Murray and Sami Kehela played in the first six Olympiad Teams together. Murray and Kehela are members of both the ACBL and CBF Halls of Fame.
Murray was a shrewd administrator. He engineered the merger of the Ontario Bridge League into the ACBL in the 1950s. As Murray said, "As President of the OBL and District Director of the ACBL, I held a meeting with myself and we decided on a merger. There was no dissent." Murray was also a founder of the Canadian Bridge Federation.

As a trial lawyer, Murray was equally as accomplished as he was as a bridge player. He won the first million dollar settlement in Canadian legal history when his client, who had suffered a stroke while on the birth control pill, approached Ortho Pharmaceutical to ask for $\$ 75,000$ to offset extra medical expenses and retire her mortgage, as she was no longer able to work. Her physician was

of the opinion that the pill was the cause of the stroke. Ortho refused to pay, so Eric took them to court. The trial was a cause célèbre in Toronto, with Eric being quoted daily in the media. At the conclusion of the trial, Eric received a hand-written cheque for $\$ 1,050,000$ from the president of Ortho (this was long before the days of e-transfers). He built himself a mansion outside Toronto with his share of the proceeds. It may have been during this trial that Eric earned the nickname "Outrage" at his law firm.

Nevertheless, perhaps Murray's greatest talent was oration and the acerbic wit that went along with it. When the foot-soldier scandal broke in Bermuda in 1975, Murray sent a telegram to Freddy Sheinwold, the North American NPC, which stated: "I am available to play. I wear a size-14 shoe." Upon the announcement of his and longtime partner Sami Kehela's induction into the ACBL Hall of Fame at the Toronto NABC in 2001, Eric asked Sami if he wanted to play. Sami replied that he played so seldom then that, when he did, he was hopeless. "So nothing has changed," intoned Murray. When I telephoned Eric to ask him to introduce me at my CBF Hall of Fame induction, he replied, "What is the procedure for resigning from the Hall of Fame?"
Eric Rutherford Murray was one of a kind. We miss him terribly. He was pre-deceased by his lovely, wonderful wife Helen and is survived by three sons, Jamie, John and Fraser and four grandchildren.
John Carruthers

## Acol club Coriner

## Transfers over 2NT opening

This series is for the Acol club player.
Last time we looked at 5-card Stayman over 2NT, this time we look at other auctions:

## Transfers

| 2NT | 3 | or |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2NT | 3 |  |

Both of these responses are transfers to the next suit up:
3- shows a 5-card or longer heart suit and requests Opener to bid $3 \%$.
3ヶ shows a 5-card or longer spade suit and requests Opener to bid 34
Although these bids are forcing on Opener, Responder is allowed to pass the responses ( $3 \vee$ and 3 ) with a bust.

Simple so far. Most of the time Opener will bid the suit as requested, but he is allowed to break the transfer with a suitable hand:

$$
2 \mathrm{NT} \quad 3
$$

Responder is showing at least a 5 -card $\vee$ suit and is requesting Opener to bid $3 \vee$. However if Opener has a very good opening with a fit for hearts then he can insist on playing in game. In this instance he cue-bids his lowest ace:

## 2NT 3

49
This auction says: I have good 4-card support in hearts, and my lowest ace is in clubs, i.e. I don't have the spade ace. Responder cue-bids a control below game if he has one, or he signs off in $4 \checkmark$ to show a hand that doesn't want to go beyond game.

## Side point:

The Opener has lots of high cards but Responder may only have a few, so many players agree that Responder can bid kings, or shortages (singletons and voids) for example, with :

```
\& Q7
- KJ873
-K73
2 KJ7
```

Although the hand is semi-balanced, and Opener is balanced or semi balanced Responder should cue-bid $4 \uparrow$. If Opener has a holding of say AQxx then he will know the hand fits well.

## Continuations:

Cue-bidding can continue, or Blackwood can be used after cue-bidding, or either player can bid game to say there is nothing else that can be shown below game.

## Partnerships' rebid

Opener has already painted a fairly accurate description of his hand with his first bid, so it is the Responder who dictates where the bidding should go (or stop). However, opener should help in placing the final contract by giving further indications to his partner.

Showing a 2nd suit

```
2NT 3*
3` 4*
```


 only have enough for game.

Agreeing a Minor Suit:
2NT 4 A slam try with a six-card suit
4V lowest control accepting slam exploration (some partnerships agree to show aces or kings)

2NT 4*
$4 \vee$ ?
4ヘ control
4NT denies control and has not a lot else to cue-bid
5를 control (denying a spade control)
2NT
4e A slam try with a six-card suit
4 ${ }^{*}$. lowest control accepting slam exploration (some partnerships agree to show aces or kings
By the way, you don't use $4 \boldsymbol{\&}$ as Gerber do you?
How else can you look for a club slam if you can't bid the suit naturally?
Using 2NT-3e-3y 4e as Gerber is not a good method. It's much better to play 2NT-3e-3V-4⿷ as a cue-bid agreeing hearts.

2NT 4e
$4 \vee$ ? control, denying a diamond control
4 control
4NT denies control and waits for Opener to cue-bid, if still interested in slam
5* control (denying a spade control)

## Quantitative 4NT

2NT 4NT
Says: if you are maximum partner bid 6NT, otherwise pass.

## Bidding game in a minor

2NT 5
This simply states that this is where we ought to play (please pass partner). Typically:

```
4}
-65
-KJ105432
```

- 975


## Responding 3.

## 2NT

This is a free bid so we ought to use it in some way. Two options that are common are: A hand showing 5 spades and 4 hearts

## Minor suit Stayman

You can also agree to play 34 as Baron, asking partner to bid four-card suits up the line or as a transfer to 3 NT after which Responder can use four-level bids to show various types of minor suited hand.

5 spades and 4 hearts
We can show a Responsive hand of: 4 spades and 5 hearts by transferring into hearts ( $3 \uparrow$ ) then bidding spades:

| 2NT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $3 \vee$ | 34 |

How about the auction:
2NT 3 ${ }^{\text {P }}$
34 4 4
Is this showing $5 \mathbf{s}+4 \vee \mathrm{~s}$ or $5 \boldsymbol{s} \mathrm{~s}$ and $5 \vee \mathrm{~s}$ ?
If you use: 2NT-3 to show 5 as +4 s then:
2NT 3
34 4 4
Will show 5-5 or better

## Minor suit Stayman:

2NT
3NT Opener does not hold a 4-card minor suit
4* Opener promises a 4-card suit
4 Opener promises a 4-card $\downarrow$ suit
$4 \vee$ Opener signals slam interest in the suit or is looking for a slam in NTs. It promises maximum values and at least a 5-card \& suit.
44 Opener signals slam interest in the suit or or is looking for a slam in NTs. It promises maximum values and at least a 5-card - suit.

Subsequent bidding could be via cue-bidding or RKCB (Roman Key Card Blackwood).
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## Bidding Tests

Partner opens 2NT，20－22．What would you bid with：
1 －KJ975 『J32 A A $\mathbf{~ 1 0 7 3 ~}$
2 KJ9753 ©973 73 （107

4 － 1073 －AQJ653

6 － 7 ҮK753 10753 Q 753
7 \＆K73 ソK73ヶK73 \＆ Q 73
1 Bid a forcing $3 \vee$（transfer）．Partner will bid 3a and you can bid 3NT． If Opener has 3－card spade support（or better）he will bid 44．
$2 \operatorname{Bid} 4$ ．This is a demand for partner to pass．A fast route to game is weaker than a slow route．（Eric Crowhurst prefers to play this as a mild slam try．Responder can start with a transfer and then bid 44，making sure the opening lead is not through the strong hand． Editor．）
3 Bid 3 （transfer）．Partner will bid 3a and you can pass．Your hand will win tricks in a spade contract but will be useless in NTs．
4 Bid $3 N T$ or $5 \diamond$（but see the $2 N T-4 \diamond$ route above）．Playing match points you may want to take a chance in 3NT as it scores well when Opener can make lots of tricks in diamonds．However playing teams you want to be sure of making game．If you adopt five－card Stayman then you could look for 5－3 spade fit．
5 Bid 3e（Stayman）．This artificial bid asks partner to bid his lowest 4 card major，else bid $3 \downarrow$ ．If partner bids a major，raise to game in the suit．If he bids 3 you can sign off in 3 NT ．Using 5－card Stayman you may unearth a 5－4 major fit．
6 Bid 3e（Stayman）．If partner bids $3 \uparrow$ ，raise to $4 \vee$ else convert 3 §or 3s to 3NT．But if you are playing 5－card Stayman（as sug－ gested last month）you will have a different auction．
7 Bid 4NT：quantitative slam invitation．If partner has a hand above a minimum，you want to be in 6NT．
$15^{\mathrm{n}}$ World Bridge Series Marriott World Center，Orlando，Florida September 21－October 6， 2018

＂Bridge for Peace＂

| OPENING CEREMONY | FRIDAY，SEPTEMBER 21 |
| :---: | :---: |
| WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP EVENTS | START DATE |
| ROSENBLUM OPEN TEAMS＊（2 days Qual．to KO round of 64） | SATURDAY，SEPTEMBER 22 |
| MCCONNELL WOMEN＇S TEAMS＊（2 days Qual．to KO stage） | SUNDAY，SEPTEMBER 23 |
| RAND SENIOR TEAMS＊（2 days Qual．to KO stage） | SUNDAY，SEPTEMBER 23 |
| OPEN PAIRS（7 days playthrough；A \＆B final） | MONDAY，SEPTEMBER 24 |
| WOMEN＇S PAIRS（6 days playthrough；A \＆B final） | TUESDAY，SEPTEMBER 25 |
| SENIOR PAIRS（6 days playthrough；A \＆B final） | TUESDAY，SEPTEMBER 25 |

＊Players eliminated from the KO stages of the Teams，up to and including the semi－finals，will be eligible to drop into the Pairs events．
＊Players eliminated from any team qualifier or Rosenblum round of 64，can play in one－day Swiss event for free．

| MIXED TEAMS＊＊（2 days Qual．to KO stage） | MONDAY，OCTOBER 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| MIXED PAIRS（4 days playthrough； $\boldsymbol{A}$ \＆ $\boldsymbol{B}$ final） | WEDNESDAY，OCTOBER 3 |

＊＊Players eliminated from the KO stages of the Teams，up to，but not including the semi－finals， will be eligible to drop into the Mixed Pairs．
YOUTH TRIATHLON EVENT（6 days；Teams，Pairs，Individual）SATURDAY，SEPTEMBER 22 SENIOR WORLD TRIATHLON（4 days；Teams，Pairs，Individual）MONDAY，OCTOBER 1 In addition，there will one－and two－day Pairs and Swiss events（see schedule online） Check the WBF website，www．worldbridge．org for full Schedule，entry fees，conditions of contest and online registration．
Hotel reservations must be made through the WBF website，www．worldbridge．org
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## Boas Mighlights and New Features

## Create your own bridge tournaments on Funbridge!

Do you know the "Exclusive Tournaments" game mode on the Funbridge app?
Exclusive tournaments allow you to create customised tournaments directly on Funbridge.

They are fully customisable. You can set the frequency, number of deals, duration and scoring type (IMP/MP) of the tournament.
They can be open to all Funbridge players or protected by a password if you want to organise a tournament with your friends only for the members of your club or for your students for instance.
Their built-in messaging makes them a place where you can share and learn. Once you have played the deals of a tournament, you can discuss them with other players and ask advanced players for advice.
To create your first exclusive tournament or enter one, download the Funbridge app for free (available on smartphones, tablets and computers) and go to Practice > Exclusive Tournaments.
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## Dis P(1)TM




Partner leads the king of clubs, won by the ace, the nine falling on your left. Declarer leads a low heart to the king and ducks a heart to you, partner following both times. What is your plan?
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## Book Review <br> Hand of the Week: 52 Bridge Stories Joal Martineau <br> Master Point Press 2018 224pp. US\$ 19.95 CD\$ 22.95 GB£ 12.95

Joel Martineau may not be a name much known in bridge circles outside his native Canada, but that hasn't stopped him producing a first book that will be useful to improving players around the world. More advanced players will find interest in many of the hands too.
It is written in the over the shoulder format and, as you would expect from an ex-professor of literature, in a pleasing narrative style. The hands all come from his own real-life experience, and so there is a prevalence of matchpoints over IMPs, which is no bad thing since it is the commonest form of the game for most improving players.

In his introduction he says: "Most bridge instruction and writing focuses on bidding, introducing students to all sorts of tempting tidbits - 'Do this, don't do that' that typically emphasize numbers. The instructors and writers have little to say about declaring and even less advice about defending." I must say I'm far from convinced that this is so.

What will prove most beneficial to readers looking to improve their performance is the detailed commentary on the thought processes involved in analysing the likely distribution of points and suits around the table, during both the bidding and the play, in particular before playing to the first trick. This is instructive in the true sense of the word.

I very much approve his regular commentary on tempo in bidding and play, and he also offers useful thoughts on aspects beyond systems, bidding and play, such as the potential effects of diet and sleep. On the
 Page 56 sary at the end. do so if they use this book well.

Consistent with this approach there is a comprehensive and useful glos-

Any player below expert level who wants to improve their game will
other hand some of his prescriptions smack of the kind of thing you find in self-help books: "The wolverine often appears in aboriginal mythology about the North, signifying wisdom and ferocity (.........) Try thinking like a wolverine."

A number of maxims and lessons recur throughout. Good declarers lose tricks early
Lead our suits not theirs
Be easy to play with not against
Discuss after the event not during
The use and explanation of the Law of Total Tricks These are all true, but the repetition is annoying if you read several chapters in a short space of time, though less so of course if you dip in and out over time. A more rigorous edit when transforming a weekly column into a book might have obviated this.

To quote again from the Introduction, "I try to highlight vocabulary, believing that if readers become comfortable with the terms they will discover opportunities to apply them and gain confidence in their card play and their strategic thinking." This latter reflecting Eric Rodwell's method as described in his and Mark Horton's seminal The Rodwell Files.號號 .
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## AOBOA FUNBRIDGE

## with Christophe Grosset

## Test Your Technique

Matchpoints. Dealer West. All Vul.

| $$ |
| :---: |
| ¢ QJ5 |
| - A84 |
| - KJ64 |
| \& $A Q$ |

```
QJ 1075
7
* J93
4 QJ53
` A84
KJ64
* AQ
```

The bidding:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \star$ | 1 NT |
| Pass | $2 \downarrow *$ | Pass | $2 \downarrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

2
Transfer to Hearts
Lead: ace of spades.
After a pretty straightforward auction phase, you seem to be in the normal contract that you expect everybody to reach. Overtricks will matter!

At trick 2, West plays the king of spades and East discards the 27.
West now plays the 10 ruffed with the $\$ 2$ by East who now switches to the 4 . What is your plan of play?
Answer:
First of all, let's count the points. West showed 7 points with the ace and king of spades. N/S have 22 points between them, so there are 11 points left. When West passes 1 NT and East opens $1 \downarrow$, you can safely assume that East has all the remaining points, so the club finesse is safe and making 8 tricks will not be a problem... But you can try for 9 without risk.

To make 9 tricks, you need to reach dummy, which proves quite complicated, while preventing West from taking the lead as you don't want him to give his partner a ruff. A safe way to do this is to exit with the king of diamonds at trick 5 as we know that East has the ace. He will now play a club, which you take and you can now ruff a diamond in dummy in order to take the heart finesse. Now if East started with three hearts, you will be able to make the rest of the tricks, ruffing your third club with South's third heart.


## The Entertainer

'I was directing this tournament on Tuesday afternoon,' said Munchkin Bob, self-appointed raconteur-in-residence of the club.
'We don't have a tournament on a Tuesday afternoon,' the Tin Man objected. He had suspicions about the veracity of a lot of Bob's stories.
'Not here,' said Bob. 'At a small club on the edge of town. The Happy Friends. Not your sort of place at all.' He winked at Dorothy.
'So at the break this old man comes up to me.' Bob smiled at them, knowing it was totally wasted on the Tin Man. 'And he says, 'I've got a bone to pick with you. ' 'What's that, says I?' 'Well,' he says. 'I'm entitled to open the bidding one hand in four. We've played twelve boards and I haven't opened yet. I want you to check the other hands. If I don't have three openings then I'm going home.' 'Well,' I says, remembering the two twelve counts I'd already seen him pass. 'I will do one thing for you. I'll make sure that in the second half you are dealer three times, so you will definitely get the chance to open before anyone else.' And off he goes, happy as Larry.'
Bob chuckled. Dorothy smiled politely. She had decided that was the best approach to Bob's jokes. Laughing might encourage him. She saw the Tin Man looking puzzled.
'Who is your partner tonight Bob?' she asked quickly, before the Tin Man could give voice to any questions. She didn't want yet another embarrassing conversation where the Tin Man asked question after question until a joke, which started with only limited humour, turned into a tedious cross-examination.
Munchkin Bob did not have a regular Wednesday night partner. On this occasion he was playing with the Lion, the Scarecrow being away for a short holiday. Dorothy looked more amused by the new partnership than by Bob's joke. If he found passing twelve counts funny, he would have a few more stories added to his repertoire by the end of the evening.
Bob and the Lion were to play their first set against Miss Gulch and Professor Marvel. The Lion was delayed as Glinda had expressed interest in a glass of water. Almira Gulch looked annoyed, not that that was unusual. Having had limited exposure to Miss Gulch, Munchkin Bob decided
to fill the time, and lighten the mood, with a joke.
'So there were these three lads from Munchkinland and three lads from Poppyfield, and they were all getting the train from here to Emerald City. The three Poppyfield lads buy their tickets while the Munchkins only bought one ticket for the three of them. 'How's that going to work?' the Poppyfield lads asked. 'Watch and learn, watch and learn,' say the Munchkins.
'So they get on the train and the three Munchkin lads go into the restroom. When the guard comes past shouting 'tickets please', they open the door a crack and an arm shoots out with the one ticket. The guard checks it and passes on.' Professor Marvel chuckled. Miss Gulch sat absolutely still with a face like granite. Bob decided to address the rest of the story to the Professor. It wasn't easy telling a joke to a totally non-responsive audience.
'A few days later the six lads are on their way back,' he continued. 'The Poppyfield lads buy one ticket between them, but this time the Munchkins don't buy a ticket at all. 'How's that going to work?’ ask the Poppyfield lads. 'Watch and learn, watch and learn,' they are told.
'So the train gets going. The Poppyfield lads go into a restroom. The Munchkins wait a few minutes, then one goes up to the restroom and shouts 'tickets please'!'

Professor Marvel laughed heartily and patted Munchkin Bob on the shoulder. Miss Gulch's face remained like stone, but with a reddish hue. 'So you think that defrauding the railway company is funny do you? Every fare dodged means higher charges for everyone else, you know.'

Bob was beginning to appreciate the merits of the Tin Man as an audience for his jokes. Luckily, the Lion was now taking his seat. They withdrew their cards, and this is what Bob picked up:

- 97432
- K4
- 983
\& 1042
Almira Gulch, on his left, opened One Club and the Lion doubled.
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Professor Marvel passed so Bob bid One Spade．Miss Gulch came back in with Two Clubs，over which the Lion，after much agonising，jumped to Three Spades．The Professor passed again and so did Bob．With a sigh， Miss Gulch added a third pass．＇At least I can be assured that if we have missed game then it isn＇t my fault，＇she informed the table．

The full auction had been：

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lion | Prof Marvel Munchkin Bob Miss Gulch |  |  |

She led the A and the Lion tabled：
－AKQJ5
－A52
－A5
Q QJ3
＇Your quite right，＇Munchkin Bob quipped．It＇s definitely not your fault if game has been missed．I can only assume that either the quality of defence on a Wednesday night is super human，or that your opinion of my declarer play is not high，＇he told his partner．

The defence continued with two more club tricks，Professor Marvel ruffing the third．There was still an inevitable diamond loser，so the con－ tract of Three Spades made exactly．
＇I can＇t see what you were criticising your partner for，＇Miss Gulch remarked，turning a haughty gaze on Bob，who had by now been added to her very lengthy list of club members she disapproved of．＇He prob－ ably foresaw the potential problem with the hand．＇The Lion sat a little taller in his chair，and puffed out his chest an inch or two．＇Yes indeed，＇ he thought to himself，＇good careful bidding is my style．＇

This was the second board：

Dealer West．N／S Vul．


The auction had a familiar ring to it：

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lion | Prof Marvel Munchkin Bob Miss Gulch |  |  |
| $1 \downarrow$ | Double | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{a}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{a}$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The Lion led the A and as Professor Marvel was about to lay dumm down Bob turned to him in mock earnestness，＇I hope you＇ve been pay－ ing attention here and your trump support is going to be up to strength I＇m expecting at least as good as my partner had on the last hand．＇

Professor Marvel laughed．＇Your partner is well known as a very sound bidder．I may not be from the same mould！＇

Having won the first trick，the Lion switched to the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ ，won by dum－ my＇s ace．Miss Gulch called for the A，played a diamond to her ace and then finessed the $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ ．Munchkin Bob won the $\boldsymbol{Q}$ and was reaching for a club when Miss Gulch bellowed，＇Tournament director！’

Aunty Em appeared at the side of the table，rule book in hand．＇Yes， what＇s the problem？＇

Almira Gulch told Aunty Em the auction，then pointed at Munchkin Bob．＇Then this man deliberately gave me misinformation．Before dummy came down he asked my partner if he had all the spade honours．By doing so he was clearly stating that he did not have any of these cards．I there－ fore took the spade finesse and am now going to go down in a contract
that I would have made were it not for his speech play.'
‘That was a joke!' protested Bob. ‘Everyone knew it was a joke! Professor Marvel laughed!'

Aunty Em considered the hand for a moment. 'It would seem that you were in a close to lay down contract, Miss Gulch. All you had to do was avoid losing a trick to East. After everyone has followed to the ace of spades a second top spade seems clear cut. Even if West started with three including the queen, then you will be able to play diamonds for discards until he ruffs in. As long as he has a minimum of three diamonds, you will be able to discard all your club losers.

However, I can see that East's comment may have led you to believe that you could safely guard against that situation. I'm going to award a split score of Four Spades making fifty percent of the time and going two down fifty percent of the time. And as for you, Bob. We all know that you can joke and jest until the cows come home. But this time your cows have come home to roost.'
'Interesting. I hope you aren't in charge of the sleeping arrangements for the animals on your farm,' he chuckled, 'but I'll bow to your wisdom in this matter.'
'Just be careful.' She gave him a very stern stare. 'Don't joke during the hand.'
'I may appeal,' said Almira.
'Appeal if you want,' said Aunty Em. 'I would have to warn you that you might not get your money back.' She swept off doing her best to suppress her amusement.

Now behind the rest of the field, the players hurriedly drew their cards for the final board of the set.

Almira Gulch had been dealt a good hand:

```
- AJ 1062
- A84
- KJ74
```

- 3

After a pass from Munchkin Bob, on her right, she opened One Spade. Her partner responded 2NT, Jacoby, showing a balanced hand with sixteen plus points and four-card support. She jumped to Four Clubs, to show her shortage. When her partner cue-bid Four Diamonds she decided to take control of the auction. She bid 4NT, over which her partner bid Five

Spades. Missing a key card she settled for Six Spades.
With the opposition silent, in every sense, throughout, this was the full auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lion | Prof Marvel Munchkin Bob Miss Gulch |  |  |
| - | - | Pass | 14. |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 4\% |
| Pass | 4* | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | 54 | Pass | 64 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The Lion led face down and Bob decided to find out what it all meant.
'Five card majors?' The Professor nodded pleasantly.
'2NT?' he asked.
'Jacoby. Sixteen plus points, four or more spades, essentially balanced.'
'Four Clubs?' He turned to the Professor.
'Shortage, singleton or void.'
'Four Diamonds? Cue-bid?'
Miss Gulch nodded stiffly.
'4NT? Blackwood?'
'Roman Key Card Blackwood,' said Professor Marvel.
'Ah, yes. The Lion has got me playing that. Kind of hoping it won't come up. So, let me see.' He checked his hand carefully. 'Five Spades is two keycards without the queen of trumps?'
'No. Two AND the queen.'
'Okay, thank you both. Fire away, Lion.'
The was led, and dummy came down with:

- K9875
- KQ2
- AQ103
\& K
'I hope you aren't too even suited,' said the Professor.
'You seem to have lost your queen of trumps,' quipped Munchkin Bob, making a show of looking for it under the other spades. 'Forget what the trump suit was? Granted, you would have been right half the time.'
'Ah, you see, when we have a ten card fit we show that as the queen,' explained Professor Marvel.
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Miss Gulch was not amused at the dummy. '2NT with a singleton king,' she exclaimed. 'And then going on when I splinter into it? How much worse could your hand be? Just bid Four Spades and leave it to me if I want to go on!' It was important to assert herself when the Professor deviated from the system, especially if she then had to play the hand. Fortunately, this seemed to be a perfectly good contract. However, getting the blame in first was always a good policy in Almira's view.

The Lion won the first trick and switched to the $\vee$ J.
Miss Gulch knew that she was going to make the slam if trumps were two - one. If they were three - nil then she had to play high from the right hand. Munchkin Bob's mistaken explanation of the Five Spade bid, and his comment when dummy went down clearly indicated to her that he held the missing $Q$. She won the heart in the dummy and called for the $\uparrow$ K. Bob pulled out a club and before it had hit the table Almira had begun to bellow 'Director!'

Aunty Em appeared again.
'I hope that this isn't going to be one of these nights, Almira. Two calls in the first three boards. What is it this time?'
'This Munchkin has cheated me again! At the end of the auction he asked us about all our bids. When it came to partner's Five Spade response to Key Card he asked if it showed two without the queen. When dummy came down and he saw my partner's holding he made another comment about the lack of the queen!'
'Listen,' said Bob, in exasperation. 'I explained to our opponents that I am new to playing this convention. I don't know what all the responses mean, which is why I asked! I even checked my hand to make absolutely sure that I didn't have the queen of trumps before I put the question! What more can I do? Am I not allowed to find out what their bidding means? And then the Professor says he has the queen and when dummy comes down I can't see it. Am I just supposed to tug my forelock and not try to find out what's going on? I thought the Wednesday night was supposed to be a better tournament, not some sort of mad house! It seems that if I say something when I have the queen of trumps then I am trouble and if I say something when I don't then I'm still in trouble. Do you want club members from the other nights to play on a Wednesday or not?'

Aunty Em shook her head at the table.
'You can't go on like this. I am warning both pairs that I expect no
more trouble from either of you tonight. Munchkin Bob is entitled to ask questions and he did so at the appropriate time. If you read things into them then that's your problem, Miss Gulch. I'm sure that you would not want it to be said that you were trying to have your cake and eat it by making this sort of director call. I am ruling one down.'

Almira was fuming and spent the next three sets mentally composing a letter to the committee.

Aunty Em had had the pleasure of dressing down a woman that she couldn't stand, and spent the next three sets preparing her rebuttal to any complaint that Almira might make. She couldn't possibly suppress her smile now.

Munchkin Bob was happiest of all. He went to the next table chuckling to himself under his breath. 'Two without the queen!' This was a story worth telling!


## From Our French Correspondent

"Ne'er cast a clout till May is out." Is a well-known English proverb dating from at least 1732 and in the horticultural world is generally taken to mean 'don't plant anything that could be damaged by frost until after the end of May'. There are some etymologies that suggest 'May' may refer to the flowering of the Hawthorn as it is known as the 'May Tree' and (surprisingly) tends to flower in May. In France there is similar folklore but the date is May 15, however an interesting point is that nearly every amateur gardener that is seriously into vegetable production plants his seeds according to the phases of the moon. Simply stated they plant crops that mature above ground when the moon is waxing and crops that develop underground when it is waning. Whilst I do not know whether there is scientific evidence for this I do know that gardeners of my acquaintance who follow this procedure produce bumper crops of excellent veggies, so much so that they tend to dispense largesse to all and sundry.

Here in France the month of May is also the month of Bank Holidays this year we have four in the space of 21 days: Fête du Travail (May Day), Victoire 1945 (VE Day), Ascension (Ascension) and lundi de Pentecote (Whit Monday) and this year as they all fall on weekdays they are all proper days off for the workers. Here if a bank holiday falls on a weekend then that is just tough luck, no day off. Two of these are religious holidays which I find strange as France has a strong separation of church and state. So much so that a church wedding is not recognised as valid by the authorities. For the folk at chez Tacchi this has another consequence. Mrs T is a devout visitor to the various vide greniers (a car boot sale held in the streets of a village - vide grenier literally means 'empty the attic') which normally occur on a Sunday morning, but also take place on a jour ferié (bank holiday) and thus I also have the pleasure of accompanying her to see what treasures we can find amongst the detritus of others. I had one great success when I found a gold Dupont cigarette lighter for €4.00 which I sold for over a $1500 \%$ profit.

The upshot of this is that eight days of this month have been radically
curtailed as to the possibility of productive effort, couple this with the fact that I had five days of competitive bridge you might think my decision to try and undertake some training courses at the same time as also producing the magazine as bordering on folly. I certainly do. I have decided that the ANBM website needs to be more professional and so in a fit of enthusiasm I signed up on a well-known educational website that gives you a thirty day free trial. Once I started to investigate Dreamweaver I also discovered I would need to teach myself HTML and that led to a requirement for CSS and then the consequence of Javascript, a further investigation also showed that PHP would be necessary. This was topped off by the fact that to be able to test all of this I would have to master Apache Server and if I wanted to do data processing on the server then the final cherry would be MySQL. Having mastered all that I could then take on the nuances of Dreamweaver. The on-line tutorials add up to at least 60 hours of screen time plus probably a similar amount of time on practical exercises. You begin to see that I was not burning my candle at both ends but all three of them.

It is not my intent to have a newly designed website in a few weeks but allow several months of development. If any of you out there have any ideas as to how you think the site could be improved, also would anyone be interested in helping out with testing, especially on those machines that start with an 'I', though obviously this would not be for some considerable time. Please remember if you suggest that something should be white then there almost certainly will be someone who else will suggest it should be black, so I will have to moderate the (hopefully considerable) responses. Please use the address of 'web@newbridgemag.com' for any ideas or correspondence on this matter.

I had an interesting conversation the other day about probabilities and percentages with Watson about a hand that came up. I have simplified the layout to concentrate the discussion as to the best line of play.
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```
J J098
* A3
K}\textrm{K}
* }7654
A AQ5432
` K2
* A3
* AK2
```

Contract 6 by South, lead a non-descript red card.
'Well Watson, what's your line of play and what do you reckon the odds of making your contract with that line?'
'Simples, (yes Watson is a meerkat) win in dummy and take the spade finesse - 50\% - next hand please.'
'Firstly some simple percentages so we have a base from which to work - a 3-0 split is $22 \%$ and unsurprisingly a $2-1$ split is $78 \%$ according to Messrs Kelsey and Glauert. I agree with you that a priori the finesse is $50 \%$ but is it still $50 \%$ after East follows with a small spade. One thing you always have to remember is that the odds change, albeit imperceptibly, every time a card is exposed.
'Let's take just this case of the finesse when East follows suit. Is the finesse now still $50 \%$, I think the answer is no - can you see why?'
'Not really - I can vaguely see that the theory of vacant spaces predict that West is slightly more likely to hold the king.'
'That's true and on that basis we would say the finesse is now only $48 \%$ (East has the king 12 out of 25 times). However there is also another way of looking at it. As soon as East furnishes a card several distributions are no longer available, in this case it rules out a singleton king or a void with East. So you have ruled out 13 cases from the East hand one third of the chances of him holding a singleton king ( $78 \% 2-1$ split, thus $39 \%$ East has the singleton and so gives $13 \%$ for a singleton king with East) and eleven cases from the West hand (22\% 3-0 split and half of those are for West, i.e. 11\%). So having ruled out 24 cases there remain 76 of which 37 place the king with East and 39 with West giving a $48.7 \%$ chance that the finesse will succeed. Why are the two answers different? I don't really know. I have some ideas but now is not the time for them.'
'Is there not a paradox? You said the chances of the finesse succeeding
are now less but we know West does not have Kxx, so doesn't that mean the finesse is more likely?'
'No, because as I said before we have also ruled out the more likely case of East holding a singleton king. That's enough about the minutiae of the finesse now back to my original question. Can you think of an alternative line of play?'
'Not obviously.'
'Well, think about this. Suppose I cash the ace of trumps then if the king falls I am immediately home. If not then I cash the red suit winners and the ace king of clubs and exit with a trump.'
'Ok, as you say you will win whenever the king is singleton. So exiting with the trump will win if the person with the king does not have an exit card, i.e. a trump or a club. So I now need to work out the chances of that.'
'Correct, not necessarily a trivial task, but do your best.'
'The singleton king is easy, one third of $78 \%$ or $26 \%$. Now comes the more difficult bit: evidently the rests $74 \%$ of cases where the king is not forthcoming and of these $78 \%$ are a $2-1$ split which calculates to nearly $58 \%$. The next question is what is the probability that the hand with two trumps has two or less clubs.'
'You are working well today Watson. See if you can continue the good work.'
'Wow, praise, a rare occurrence! Obviously before anything else is known the chance that you can predict which hand has more clubs is $50 \%$ but here it is slightly different as one hand has two trumps and the other only one, so the hand with one trump has twelve spaces for clubs whilst the other has only eleven so we can approximate that the 'good' distribution is twelve out of twenty-three. So doing the sums we arrive at about $56 \%$ in favour of not taking the finesse.'
'That's exactly what I think, though I suspect our calculations are a trifle inexact but close enough for government work.'
'So to have the best chance we have is to refuse the finesse. There will not be many who have done that, I must confess that it comes as a surprise to me.'
'Well Watson, you have done well today, in a fit of rare generosity I will buy the apero.'
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## Answers to "Defend With Julian Pottage"

- K 10632

104

- Q1093

2 QJ


Partner leads the queen of hearts; you overtake with the ace, felling the king. What do you return?
With only one heart trick available and no trump trick unless partner unexpectedly holds the ace, prospects do not look too bright. If your side makes just one trick in the majors, you will need four in the minor suits.
Since your king of clubs will be useless unless partner holds the ace, you have to assume this is the case. Declarer is then bound to hold the pointed suit aces.
Do you sit back, hoping that declarer loses two diamond tricks? This is unlikely to happen. For one thing, the normal play with the ace facing the queen-ten-nine is to take two finesses. For another, declarer could well be in a position to strip your side's exit cards and guarantee the contract by running the queen of diamonds.
Andrew Robson, East at the table, switched to the two of diamonds. Thinking this was a singleton, declarer hopped up with the ace.

## 2

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ث J72 } \\ & \text { Y5 } \\ & \text { J83 } \\ & + \text { KQ865 } \end{aligned}$ | $$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline{ }^{N} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q Q954 } \\ & \text { \&J10 } \\ & \text { K1076 } \\ & \text { K } 104 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { A A106 } \\ & \text { KQ87432 } \\ & \text { 4 } 4 \\ & \text { J9 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUT |
|  | - | - | $1{ }^{19}$ |
| Pass | 2. | Pass | 29 |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | 4 |

Partner leads the king of clubs, won by the ace, the nine falling on your left. Declarer leads a low heart to the king and ducks a heart to you, partner following both times. What is your plan?
Your side has so far made a club and a trump. You are sure to make the ace of trumps for a third trick. If declarer has to take the diamond finesse, you will come to a fourth trick that way. Whether declarer plans a finesse or a squeeze, you do not want to lead a diamond.
You are going to have to lead spades at least once. You can choose whether to do so once or twice by cashing or not cashing the ace of hearts. Unless partner holds the jack and ten, it will be unsafe to lead the suit twice. You thus cash the ace of hearts next.
If you exit with a low spade, this will expose the queen to a finesse if declarer has the ace-ten. Is it better to lead the queen or the nine? Leading the queen risks leaving partner in charge of the third round of spades and hence the possibility of a simple squeeze in the black suits. The nine has to be the right card. If partner holds J7x, that will be help enough in protecting the spades to save you from a squeeze in the pointed suits.

## Bridge with Larry Cohen

The brilliant American player, writer and teacher presents a series of articles aimed at intermediate players.

## Which Game?

You open 1NT. You hold:

- K93
- KJ2
- AQ32
\& Q92
Partner bids $2 \diamond$, and you accept the transfer by bidding $2 \vee$.
Now, partner bids 3NT, offering you a choice of games. Which game?
Should you pass, or correct to $4 \vee$ ? Does it depend on whether it is IMPs or Matchpoints?

These are often difficult decisions. I'd probably opt for $4 \vee$ with this hand (at either form of scoring), but it is very close. Change the clubs to \&UJx, or maybe even elox, and I'd pass. With a side doubleton, I'd "always" go back to the major. With a doubleton in partner's suit, I'd almost always play 3NT. With 4-3-3-3, I'd often choose no-trumps.

But, here is my special tip. Everything changes when you face this same dilemma after a 2 NT opener. Change the above hand to:

```
A AKJ
-KQ10
- AQ32
& Q92
```

You open 2NT and partner transfers to $3 \vee$, then bids 3NT. Your call?
This is now an easy removal to $4 \boldsymbol{\top}$. In fact, whenever partner transfers to a major after your 2NT and then bids 3NT, I recommend playing in the major every time you have 3 card support.

Why?
Because after 2NT, partner doesn't have room. When he transfers and bids 3NT he can be off shape. Don't assume he has a nice balanced 5-3-3-2 shape. He could have a singleton. Consider this hand:

```
A A43
` Q10543
- }876
* 3
```

After partner's 2NT, what else could you do but transfer to hearts and then bid 3NT? This would be the right contract opposite, say: KJ2 叉A2 -AKQ32 $\mathbf{~ K}$ K102

After a 1 NT opener, when responder transfers and then bids 3NT, he is balanced. He can't have a singleton (he would have bid out his shape). But, after a two no-trump opener, responder will often have a side singleton. He has no room to show his shape -he is forced into showing his major and then bidding 3NT with numerous 5-4-3-1 patterns. He could even be 5-5, something like:

```
@ J
* KJ642
* }10843
& 102
```

Opposite my partner's 2NT, I see no other option but to transfer to hearts and then bid 3NT, offering a choice of games between 3NT and 4ソ. This hand is not good enough (or strange enough) to transfer to hearts and then persist with $4 \diamond$, maybe bypassing a laydown 3NT.

So, as the 2 NT opener, I am always aware that my partner's transfer-then-3NT sequence does not guarantee a balanced hand.

This is why my tip for the month is:
When partner offers you a choice after your 2NT opener, "never" leave it in 3 NT when you have 3 card support.

Special related bonus tip:
Consider this auction:

| 1NT | 2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $2 \downarrow$ | $2 N T$ |
| $? ?$ |  |

Let's say the 1 NT opener has a minimum. He has 3-card trump support and a flat hand (say, 4-3-3-3). Should he pass 2 NT, or correct to $3 \vee$ ?
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My advice: "Always" correct to the suit. Why? Use the same logic as the main article above. The responder might not be 5-3-3-2. He might have a singleton. Consider this hand for the responder:

```
& Q
` J8652
- A32
* Q532
```

He transfers and wants to invite game. He can't bid 3e next, because that would be forcing to game. His only choice is to transfer to hearts and then bid 2NT invitational.

Because the 2NT-bidder in these auctions will sometimes have a singleton, the opener should always correct to 3 of the major. Contrast this with:

| 1 NT | 2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | 3NT |
| $? ?$ |  |

Now, responder won't have any singletons. If he was off shape he could have easily bid his second suit. On this auction, opener will often choose no-trump if he is 4-3-3-3.

## Should I Transfer?

Your partner opens 1NT. You hold:

```
& J7642
` 102
- Q32
* J32
```

Should you transfer to $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ ? Or should you leave it in 1NT? What about:

- 87642
- 82
- 832

832
What about all the other lousy hands with a five-card major?
I used to try to use my judgment. Maybe with the second hand (no outside help), I would have transferred. Perhaps the first hand (with the side queen and jack) was more suitable for notrump, so I would have passed.

Sometimes I guessed right, sometimes not. I'd drive myself crazy.
Now, I have a better solution. I always (as in 100\%) transfer. Whenever I have a bad hand (no game interest) with a 5-card major, and partner opens 1 NT , I transfer to the major. This has been working more than well enough, and I can free my brain to worry about other (more difficult) areas of the game. I no longer have to worry about zigging when I should have zagged.

## A few notes:

1. If partner has made a 1 NT overcall, that changes things a bit. Now, I don't automatically transfer with all five-card majors. If I have length in the opponents' suit and/or lots of no-trump-looking cards, I might leave it in 1 NT. For example, LHO opens $1 \vee$ and partner overcalls 1 NT , I'd probably pass with:

- J7642
- J32
- J32
- 32

With partner likely having heart length (picture Q1054), we rate to do poorly in spades. Furthermore, partner's 1NT overcall could sometimes be off shape, and might even include a singleton.

He might overcall their $1 \checkmark$ opening with 1 NT holding:

```
AK
` Q1054
- AQ103
& KQJ3
```

Opposite such a hand, it would not be fun to play in $2 \boldsymbol{a}$.
2. If partner overcalls (typically after an opposing pre-empt) with a strong and natural 2NT or 3NT, I don't automatically transfer. High-level no-trump overcalls, while "natural and balanced," are often off-shape. Especially a 3NT overcall can be based on a running suit. So, when my partner overcalls no-trumps at a high level, I am not in any rush to transfer to a so-so 5-card major.

Those 2 little notes are minor points. Please don't lose my main lesson, which is to try my theory of always transferring to any five-card major when partner opens 1 NT and you have a bad hand.

## From The Archives - The Art of Being Lucky Part 2 <br> by Brian Senior

Last month we took a look at a couple of deals on which declarer could give the defenders an extra chance to go wrong. Let's look at a few more.

Dealer West. All Vul.


West led the four of diamonds, an obvious singleton. Declarer won in hand with the ten and led a low heart to the king. Assuming a three-two trump split, the contract is now secure, while it is doomed to failure if trumps are four-one. Rather than simply play a second trump, losing to East's doubleton queen, and settling for ten tricks, declarer crossed to hand with the ace of clubs and led the jack of hearts. Sure enough, West went up with the ace, crashing his partner's queen. And, as declarer had so helpfully established West's club winner, he tried to cash it. There was no diamond ruff now and declarer had 11 tricks and a lot of matchpoints.

The club play is not technically sound. If hearts are actually four-one, releasing the club control may lead to extra undertricks - but the table feel was not of a bad break, and East had never looked like joining in the auction, which he might well have done with ten black cards. And,
after all, it was matchpoints, which is responsible for a multitude of sins.

## Dealer South. None Vul.



West led the two of hearts, fourth-best, to the king and ace. There is no point in ducking here - indeed, it is much better to win as LHO may not then be sure of the heart position, whereas he will know everything after a duck.

There are nine top tricks so in a Teams event the board would be of little interest. At Pairs, however, an overtrick could prove to be very valuable. How should declarer decide between the black finesses for his tenth trick?

Declarer crossed to dummy with a diamond at trick two and led the queen of spades. At this early stage in the hand it would have been very difficult for East not to cover if he held the king. When he played low without any sort of a problem, declarer went up with the ace and rattled of all the diamonds. West held onto the heart winners and $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$, throwing clubs away, and it was heavy odds on that the club finesse would be working so declarer took it - ten tricks and yet another pile of matchpoints.
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| $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& } 1094 \\ & \text { Q1073 } \\ & \text { KQ5 } \\ & \text { \&KY } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \& \quad A 752 \\ & \hdashline \quad J 2 \\ & 10843 \\ & \& Q 106 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| - | 18 | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | 29 | Pass | 49 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West led a trump so they were drawn in three rounds. The contract was secure, with one club and either one or two spades to be lost. There was the possibility of cashing the diamonds then playing three rounds of clubs in the hope that the suit would break evenly with West winning the third round, when he would be forced to open up the spade suit or give a ruff and discard, but declarer preferred a deceptive play.

On the third diamond declarer threw the jack of spades from hand, then led the 10 from the dummy, attempting to look like a man trying to sneak past the ace to make a bare king. Had East played low, he would have run the ten on the basis that if East held the ace he would go in with it a significant proportion of the time, so it was better to play him for the queen. But, of course, that did not prove to be necessary. East rose with the ace of spades and there was no longer a guess; 11 tricks.

If you look for them, you will find a never-ending number of opportunities to put your opponents under pressure in the defence. Some will work against one level of player, some against another. The important thing to remember is that you will get lucky more frequently if you give yourself a chance to do so.


## 2018 Book of the Year

"The ABTA wishes to award its first-ever Newcomer Book of the Year Award to Jeff Bayone for his amazing work, A Taste of Bridge.

It's magic how much they know when they finish without realizing just how much they learned."
Betty Starzec, ABTA President.
"If I could recommend just one book for beginning players it would be A Taste of Bridge."
Barbara Seagram.
"I'm reviewing your book and I absolutely love it." Chip Dombrowski, ACBL Bulletin editor.
"This is the only beginner book I know that begins by concentrating almost $100 \%$ on card play. I like this approach."

## Phillip Alder.

A Taste of Bridge is fun, but it is only half of the Honors Bridge Club beginner course. The amazing Israeli online teaching site, bestebridge. com, is the other half. Teacher and student notes, along with all the example hands your beginners will ever need, are included in the program. Contact sally@masterpointpress.com and ask that she send you a complimentary e-book, course material, and free access to BeB.

This fun combination of $A$ Taste of Bridge and bestebridge.com work wonders. Together they helped, and continue to be instrumental, in building Honors into the largest bridge club in the world.

Jeff Bayone
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## FUNBRIDGE

## opay bridge wherever and whenever you

are

Funbridge is a game available on smartphones, tablets and computers allowing you to play duplicate bridge anywhere, anytime.
As you know, bridge is played with four people sitting at a table and it may be hard to find four players... With Funbridge, this problem is a thing of the past! Indeed, you don't have to wait until your partner or opponents are available to play a deal with you because on Funbridge, they are managed by the artificial intelligence. Yes, you partner a robot and play against robots that are available 24/7!
Robots offer many advantages. Among them, you can pause and resume the game later. You are the game master! Moreover, and this is precisely the very essence of Funbridge, you are judged fairly against thousands of other players of the app who play the same deals as you.
As the app is easy to navigate around and well-designed, you will easily and quickly discover the various game modes offered that are split into three main themes: tournaments, practice and challenges between players. Each of them comes along with sub-game modes that are equally attractive. You won't get bored!
Funbridge will be the perfect ally if you want to take up bridge or just improve your skills. Indeed, you will make rapid progress thanks to the practice modes available including "exclusive tournaments", i.e. customised tournaments created by other community players providing opportunities for exchanges about the deals played. You will thus be able to ask your questions to advanced players and to increase your knowledge.
The app is full of very useful small features: watch a replay of other players' moves (bidding and card play), replay deals to score better, get the meaning of the bids played by the other players sitting at the table, ask the computer for advice, get an analysis of the way you play by the artificial intelligence at the end of a deal played... You will definitely learn from the app!

When you will feel ready, you will be able to pit yourself against thousands of other players by playing tournaments on Funbridge: tournaments of the day, series tournaments and Team Championships. As you can understand, this is the competition part of the app. In these different game modes, you will join rankings and see your rank change live based on your results.
You will also find "federation tournaments" in that section of the app. Several national bridge federations including the English Bridge Union and the French Bridge Federation have placed their trust in Funbridge to hold official tournaments awarding federation points allowing their members to increase their national rank directly via the app. You can't find your federation on Funbridge yet? Be patient, it is only a matter of time! Meanwhile, you can take part in tournaments of other federations since they are open to all.
Finally, you will enjoy comparing yourself with the other community players thanks to short individual tournaments called "challenges". The aim is to get the best scores on all the deals of the tournament to beat your opponent. May the best win!
Note also that the developers of the app are surrounded by experts... Indeed, Jérôme Rombaut, 2017 Vice World Bridge Champion with France, is by their side. He is in charge of the artificial intelligence of the app. His objective? Make it behave like a human player.
Funbridge is the perfect bridge app. It suits all players with its comprehensive and various game modes. Its weak point? It is highly addictive! We strongly encourage you to try it out if you have not already done so, especially since you get 100 free deals when you sign up. Once you have used them up, you receive 10 free deals every week or you can opt for one of our subscription offers with unlimited deals (from €9 per month). A few figures
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8 bidding systems (ACOL, SAYC, French 5-card major, 2/1, Polish Club, Nordic system, NBB Standard, Forum D)
Over 150 countries represented
50,000 active players every day
1 million deals played every day
Download Funbridge
To download Funbridge (free), just open your favourite application store (App Store or Google Play Store) and enter "Funbridge" in the search bar or go to our website www.funbridge.com.


ADABx
FUNBRIDGE.com
Play bridge wherever and whenever you like!

iPhone, iPad, Mac, PC, Android, Amazon

Compare yourself to thousands of players
Challenge players in one vs one matches
Improve your skills
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## Kit＇s Corner

by World Champion Kit Woolsey

World Champion Kit Woolsey reveals how an expert thinks，using real deals from major events．Sit beside the master and compare his thoughts with your own．

## Safe Strip

In the round of 16 of the open trials，you have to choose the best way to deal with an enemy Precision $1 \$$ opening．

As South，you hold：

## Dealer East．None Vul．

－AJ2
－ 98762
－ 10
2 AK 104


1 Precision， $2+$ diamonds，11－15 points
In your style，a takeout double of the Precision $1 \diamond$ would imply at least 4－4 in the majors．

## Your call？

You can＇t afford to pass，that＇s for sure．You have to get into the auction with this hand．

The heart suit is weak．But you do have 5 of them．If you were the dealer，you would have no qualms about opening $1 \vee$ ．There is no reason you should feel differently about a one－level overcall．It is true you proba－ bly wouldn＇t want a heart lead，but who says partner will be on lead？Your goal right now is to get to your best contract．A takeout double distorts your major－suit holdings，which could be serious if the bidding is up to $3 \diamond$ or higher at your next turn．After you overcall $1 \vee$ you can make a take－ out double of diamonds later which will describe your shape perfectly． If you start with double，showing the 5 －card heart suit may be too risky．

You overcall 1『．The bidding continues：

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | 1 | $1 \psi$ |
| 3 | 3 | 4 | $?$ |

## 3．Pre－emptive

3ヶ Limit raise．If partner just wanted to compete to $3>$ he would double，which you play is a relay to $3 \vee$ ，usually some weak com－ petitive hand．

## Your call？

You have nice primes and a singleton diamond．On the downside your heart suit is oh so weak．If partner＇s limit raise is on 3－card support，which it easily could be，you may be off 4 tricks before you can get started．It looks like $4 \checkmark$ doesn＇t figure to be a favourite to make，although it might be making．

If you had the option of playing in $3^{\vee}$ ，that would probably be the percentage choice．However，East＇s $4 \diamond$ call takes that option away from you．They are probably going down in $4 \diamond$ since you have 3 likely top tricks，but you can＇t be confident enough about defeating $4 \diamond$ to double． You don＇t know what distribution you are up against．If $4 \diamond$ is making， you certainly want to take your chances in $4 \Downarrow$ ．If $4 \diamond$ is going down you are only going to collect 50 a trick，which won＇t add up to much．Bid－ ding $4 \vee$ looks reasonable．

There is one more reason to bid $4 \boldsymbol{\Downarrow}$ ．The opponents have already shown interest in bidding a lot of diamonds．If you bid 4『，maybe they will go to $5 \star$ ，and you know what to do if that happens．This extra pos－ sibility appears to tip the scales in favour of bidding．

You bid $4 \checkmark$ ，ending the auction．
West leads the $\$ 8$（3rd from even，low from odd）．
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```
4 10843
` KQJ43
* K5
* J8
+ AJ2
`98762
-10
& AK 104
```

What do you play from dummy at trick 1 ?
The bidding and lead make it clear that West started with 6 diamonds to $\$ 98$ or $\$$ J98. West should have a 6-card diamond suit for his $3>$ call, since the Precision $1 \diamond$ opening could have been on a doubleton.

Is there any chance that West has underled the $\forall A$ ? It would be hard to imagine. He can expect from his partner's $4 \diamond$ call that they have at least a 10 -card diamond fit. If West has the ace of diamonds he can't have much else, so why would he need his partner in so badly?

Is there any chance that East will go up ace if you play small? Not really. East can count also. If East has $\begin{aligned} & \text { AJxx, he will know from the lead that }\end{aligned}$ you have a singleton. If that singleton is the queen that would give West $\$ 1098 x x x$, and from that holding West certainly would have led the $\$ 10$.

It looks offhand like it doesn't make any difference which diamond you play. However, there is a good reason to play small. If you play the $\star K$, East can win the $\forall A$ and lead back a small diamond, since he will know you started with a singleton. Thus, you will not know who has the Q and who has the $\$$. By playing small, you force East to reveal the honour position. It probably won't matter, but the more you can find out about the enemy hands the better placed you will be.

You play small from dummy. East wins the $\downarrow \mathrm{J}$, and continues with the $\downarrow$ A. While there probably won't be any need to save the $\geqslant 2$ for a late dummy entry, it can’t hurt to ruff with the $\vee 9$ just in case. Good technique may come in handy in unexpected ways.

After ruffing with the $\vee 9$, how do you continue?

```
@ 10843
` KQJ43
-
& J8
4 AJ2
`8762
- -
AK}10
```

You have a trump trick which must be lost, so the hand is going to depend upon not losing 2 spade tricks. Riding the $\boldsymbol{j}$ J would work if East doesn't cover, but you can't count on East to make this mistake. Furthermore, what would you do if you lead the $\mathbf{\xi J}$ and East plays small? If you finesse and lose, you are down. It doesn't look right to play for an unlikely mistake when you have legitimate ways to handle the spade suit for one loser. Ruffing out the $\$ \mathrm{Q}$ won't do you any particular good, since you would have only one discard and that would come from the long hand.

The general plan is to draw trumps and strip out the clubs before touching spades. You already have the diamond count from the bidding and lead. You will get the heart count when you draw trumps, and if you can arrange to ruff out the clubs you will get the club count also. From this, you will definitely have the spade count. How you play the spades will depend upon this count. There are 3 possibilities:

West might have 4 spades. This is unlikely considering his $3 \$$ call, but it is possible. If West has four spades, your plan will probably be to lead a low spade to the jack and play East for honour doubleton unless there is some indication that West has both honors, which is unlikely. If West has both honours, you can go up with the 10 on his forced spade return.

The spades might be 3-3. Your best play is small to the jack. This wins if East has both honours. It also succeeds if West has honour-9-third, since he will be end-played. You can insert the $\$ 8$ on his forced spade return and make the contract.

East might have 4 spades. Now your best play will be to lead the $\mathbf{1} 10$. East will have to cover. You can win the ace, cross back to dummy, and lead another spade. If the hand is sufficiently stripped and you still have a trump in dummy you won't have a guess, since if your jack loses to East's honour he will have to give you a ruff and a discard. If the entries
aren't right for the end-play, you will have to guess the spades.
It looks intuitively right to start on trumps, planning on ruffing the clubs later. But the entries might not be right for this. Let's suppose you lead a trump. East wins the ace (West following), and exits with the last trump. You win, play two top clubs, and ruff a club. Now what? You know West started with 6 diamonds, 1 heart, and at least 3 clubs, but you don't know where the thirteenth club is. If West's shape is 3-1-6-3 you need to lead a small spade to your jack, end-playing West if he has honour-9-third. Leading the 10 would allow East to cover and defeat the contract. However, if West's shape is 2-1-6-4, you need to lead the ゅ 10 if West started with honour-doubleton of spades. Leading a spade to the jack fails when East has honor-9-fourth.

Perhaps it is better to take the club ruff before leading trumps. The position might transpose, but you may be able to ruff the last club in dummy before being forced to touch spades. An opponent might have the singleton $\vee A$ and be forced to lead a club and give you the needed ruff. The singleton $\geqslant 10$ might come down, and you will have a heart entry to your hand for the second club ruff.

The danger with ruffing a club before drawing trumps is that you might run into an overruff. Is it a safe strip?

Suppose East has a doubleton club. His distribution would then be $4-3-4-2$, giving West 2-0-6-5 shape. Can you imagine West not bidding $5 \star$ with that shape after hearing his partner compete to $4 \downarrow$ ? Not a chance.

Suppose East has a tripleton club. That would be okay unless East also has 3 hearts. This would give East $3-3-4-3$ shape, and West 3-0-$6-4$ shape. Once again, West might well bid $5 \downarrow$ with his heart void. More important, East isn't going to be bidding $4 \diamond$ on 3-3-4-3 shape. So that is not a possible hand. You don't have to worry about East overruffing the fourth round of clubs if he has only 2 trumps, as you will be able to afford to ruff high. You don't have to worry about West having a singleton club, since that would give East 6 clubs and he would have opened 2 instead of $1 \star$. It looks like it is a safe strip.

You play the AK and ruff a club small. Both opponents follow small to 3 rounds of clubs. You lead the $\vee K$ off dummy. East plays the $\vee 10$, you play the $\geqslant 8$ (just in case), and West wins the $\vee$ A. West exits with the $\vee 5$. How do you play from here?

```
@ 10843
\vee QJ4
-
-
A AJ2
`762
-
< 10
```

The fall of the $\geqslant 10$ gives you the option of winning this trick in your hand to ruff your last club. You now know that West can't have 3 spades, since he has shown up with 6 diamonds, 2 hearts, and 3 clubs. Therefore, when you break spades you will plan to lead the $\$ 10$.

Suppose you do win in your hand, ruff your last club, and lead the $\$ 10$. East will cover, of course. Now what will you do? If you duck East will continue spades, and you will have to guess who has the missing spade honour. If you win the ace you will have to cross back to dummy if you want to lead another spade from dummy, and that will be dummy's last trump so you will go down if you guess wrong. You could lead a low spade from your hand which will work if West has either the other spade honour or the $\$ 9$ since West will be end-played, but this loses if East started with $₫ \mathrm{KQ9x}$. East will have shown up with 3 points in spades (he will always cover with the king from $\uparrow \mathrm{KQ}$ since he is known to hold that card), 5 points in diamonds, and 2 points in clubs. That would be a light opening bid if he doesn't have the $\mathbf{4}$, but Precision players do open light especially when they have some distribution as you now know East has.

You don't have to ruff the last club in dummy now. You already have the count. West has 6 diamonds, 2 hearts, and at least 3 clubs. He can't have a singleton spade, since that would give East 5 spades and East opened $1 \downarrow$. West's distribution must be 2-2-6-3. All you have to do is win the heart return in dummy and lead the $\$ 10$. If East doesn't cover you duck, and West will be end-played immediately. If East covers, you win the ace, ruff your last club, and lead a spade to your jack, secure in the knowledge that if the jack loses West will be end-played. This is $100 \%$.

You win the heart return in dummy, and lead the $\$ 10$. East plays low, and you do also. The $\$ 10$ holds, and you have 10 tricks. The full hand is:
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|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& } 10843 \\ & \text { KQJ43 } \\ & \text { K5 } \\ & \text { J8 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| @ 95$\bullet$ A5Q98632+732 |  | - KQ76 |
|  |  | - 10 |
|  | W E | - AJ74 |
|  | S | * Q965 |
|  | - AJ2 |  |
|  | - 98762 |  |
|  | -10 |  |
|  | \& AK104 |  |

East did the best he could by ducking the 10 . He could see that declarer is cold if declarer has the $\boldsymbol{1}$, so East took his only chance. If he covers and his partner has the $\mathbf{\Phi}$, the suit will be blocked and his partner will be end-played.

As the cards lie pretty much any sensible line of play would have succeeded. However, it was pleasant to find the safe strip of taking the club ruff before playing trumps.

Do you agree with North's evaluation of his hand as a limit raise?
It looks to be on target. If South has a minimal overcall, 4『 could have no play. The heart honours may be overkill, and the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ could be worthless. On the other hand the extra trump length along with the two doubletons give North a lot of playing potential, so it has to be right to invite game.

Pairs playing normal methods would not have this option available. With double as purely responsive, North would have to choose between $3 \vee$ and $4 \vee$. Bidding $3 \vee$ could easily result in a missed game, since North might have to bid $3 \vee$ on a weaker hand which didn't want to sell out to $3 \uparrow$. Bidding $4 \curlyvee$ could simply be a hopeless game.

Our relay double solves the problem of distinguishing between a competitive $3 \vee$ call and an invitational $3 \vee$ call. If North just wants to compete to $3 \curlyvee$ he doubles, and South will bid $3 \curlyvee$ unless he has a very strong overcall. If North wants to invite he bids $3 \vee$, showing a limit raise. In addition, the relay double allows North to stop at $\mathbf{3} \boldsymbol{\mathcal { L }}$ or even $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ if North has a weak hand with long spades or long clubs. This is impossible playing normal responsive doubles.

We don't miss the responsive double at the three-level. It is an awkward bid anyway, since the only time you can stop in a new suit is when you hit a fit there, and this is the time you probably want to shoot out game. If we have a true responsive double with which we are willing to force to game, we can make the relay double and follow with 3NT or a cue-bid, which converts the call into a normal responsive double.

## Master Point Press the bridge publisher

## EMTERPRISIMC BRIDGE TALES

THE ORIGINAL STORIES


## Enterprising Bridge Tales

 The Original Stories> By Marc Smith

Follow the adventures of Captain Quirk and First Officer Sprock as their team competes against some of the best bridge players in the universe in a major championship.

First published in 1990, this is an updated edition of internationally-acclaimed, awardwinning author Marc Smith's debut novel.

AVAILABLE FROM A BRIDGE RETAILER NEAR YOU
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http://kbbo.kibicbridge.com

A BRIDGE FESTIVAL THAT HAS A REAL ATMOSPHERE! YOU WILL NEVER FORGET BUDAPEST;)


3 round Open Pairs Competition from Friday to Sunday 3 different side events - one-round Tournaments

> * Prizes in all Tournaments

* Venue is located at the foot of Budapest's Castle District
* $500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ hall with 10 m interior height
* Natural air conditioning
* Surprise for every player

Previous winners and Famous Hungarian players said


8th KIBIC BUDAPEST BRIDGE OPEN
AUGUST 23-26, 2018

##  Expert Traveller



You could find yourself surrounded by all the natural beauty of Madeira as you immerse yourself in a varied bridge programme, including sessions from master of bridge, Sally Brock. Indulge in the five-star Vidamar Resortís superb leisure facilities which boast panoramic views across Funchal and the ocean.

## Price includes

- Seven night half-board stay in a side sea view room at the five-star Vidamar Hotel
- Return British Airways flights from Gatwick with transfers
- Daily duplicate bridge with Masterpoints and prizes awarded


## Exclusively with <br> ARENA <br> Departs October 18, 2018

SEVEN NIGHTS FROM £1,199* per person

## TO BOOK CALL 03301605037 QUOTE code KM163

thetimes.co.uk/bridge-tour
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## Brother Xavier As Analysis

The monastery pairs was into its third round when the Abbot faced Lucius and Paulo. 'What a beautiful afternoon we had,' observed Brother Paulo, taking the South seat. 'Blue sky and the smallest of breezes. If I closed my eyes, I could imagine I was back in Tuscany.'
'I didn't notice,' the Abbot replied. 'I had the usual mountain of paperwork to process. Even if I wanted to wander around outside, I would have no time for it.'
'I was helping Brother Martin to repair the old greenhouse,' continued Brother Paulo. 'It is more or less back in shape now.'
'Oh yes,' said the Abbot. 'Shall we play this one?'


|  | - 106 <br> - KQ93 <br> - 10542 <br> - Q102 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { AKQ93 } \\ & 10 \\ & \text { Q863 } \\ & \text { J74 } \end{aligned}$ |  | - 752 <br> - J8754 <br> - J9 <br> - 985 |
|  | - J84 <br> - A62 <br> - AK7 <br> - AK63 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brother | Brother | The | Brother |
| Xavier | Lucius | Abbot | Paulo |
| - | - | - | $1 \downarrow$ |
| $1 \uparrow$ | Double | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | $3 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $4 \varphi$ | All Pass |  |

Brother Paulo ended in a 4-3 fit and Brother Xavier launched the defence
with his three top spades. 'Ruff with the three-spot,' Paulo instructed, noting that East followed to the trick.

When the king of trumps then drew the 10 from West, the Abbot maintained a passive disposition in the East seat. It was only fair that, once in a while, Brother Paulo should encounter the sort of breaks that every other player had to suffer. If there was a luckier player on the planet, he had yet to meet him.

Brother Paulo played his two top diamonds, East's jack falling on the second round and continued with the three top clubs. All followed and these cards remained in play:


When the $\$ 7$ was led, the Abbot had to ruff his partner’s $\downarrow \mathrm{Q}$. Brother Paulo won the trump return with dummy's nine and scored the last two tricks on a high cross-ruff.
'You had only three trumps?' queried Brother Lucius.
Brother Paulo chuckled to himself. 'Yes, it was a strange deal,' he replied. 'If trumps are $4-2$, I go down. I would lose three side-suit tricks and a trump.'
'As the cards lie, perhaps a diamond lead would beat it,' suggested Brother Lucius.

The Abbot perked up in the East seat. How many times had he suffered
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from Brother Xavier's absurd suggestions about double-dummy opening leads. 'That's what we needed, partner,' he said. 'Once you lead a spade, declarer is always one step ahead of us.'

Brother Xavier was less than happy to have his play criticized. 'It's a pity you weren't sitting West, really,' he retorted. 'After your diamond lead, one down would be a good board for us.'
'No, no, you mustn't blame yourself,' continued the Abbot. 'It was a rather interesting point that Lucius made.'

Two rounds later, the Abbot faced his least favourite opposition, the disrespectful Brother Cameron and his partner. This was the first board of the round:


The Abbot decided to risk a pre-empt, despite the prevailing vulnerability. Opening $3>$ wasn't a sound bid, according to his methods, but most of the field would do the same. In any case, he had no intention of giving these particular opponents an easy ride.

Brother Cameron overcalled Three Spades and soon found himself in
a grand slam. West led the jack of diamonds and down went the dummy. 'King of hearts and two potentially useful jacks,' observed Brother Damien. 'Hope it's enough.'

Brother Cameron nodded. Once East had opened Three Diamonds, the Theory of Vacant Spaces made the heart finesse an 11-to-6 favourite. 'Ace, please,' he said.

After drawing trumps in three rounds, Brother Cameron played two top clubs. When East showed out on the second round, he paused to count the hand. The Abbot could be relied upon for seven diamonds for a vulnerable pre-empt and had shown up with two trumps. His shape was now marked as 2-3-7-1. What could be done if his three hearts included the missing queen? A spark came to the novice's eye. Yes, a trump squeeze would be possible!

Brother Cameron played his two remaining club winners, throwing hearts from the dummy. These cards remained in play


Brother Cameron tossed back an unruly lock of his black hair and played the ace of trumps, discarding the heart jack from dummy. The Abbot did not like what he was seeing. If he threw a diamond honour, declarer would cross to a heart and establish the $\$ 9$ with a ruff. If instead he discarded a heart, declarer would play dummy's ace-king of hearts and return to hand with a diamond ruff to score his thirteenth trick with a heart.

Brother Cameron turned towards the Abbot, 'End of the road?' he asked.

The Abbot was not amused by this disrespectful announcement. Pretending not to hear, he discarded the $\geqslant 5$. Brother Cameron crossed to
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the $\vee \mathrm{A}$, cashed the $\bigvee \mathrm{K}$ and returned to his hand with a diamond ruff. He then flipped the $>8$ onto the table by way of claiming the grand slam.

The scoresheet revealed that no other declarer had made thirteen tricks.
'It was the Three Diamond bid that cost us, partner,' observed Brother Xavier. 'Most Easts will have passed, vulnerable against not. Declarer then has no reason not to take the heart finesse.'

Before the Abbot could issue a suitable riposte, Brother Cameron came to his aid. 'It was an obvious Three Diamond bid,' he declared. 'KQ10 to seven and an outside Q10x? If my partner ever passed such a hand, I'd be worried he was ill.'

The Abbot nodded his agreement as he returned his cards to the wallet. 'Players used to pass such hands,' he said, 'but that was several decades ago.'

A round or two later the Abbot again faced opposition from the novitiate, Brother Kyran and Brother Jake. He thumbed resignedly through his cards, noting no card higher card higher than a ten. This was the deal

```
Dealer West. East-West Vul.
                            4 AQJ10
                            ` A9
-Q9
* AKJ85
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 4 8 & N & ¢ 9743 \\
\hline - KQJ875 & \(\cdots\) & - 102 \\
\hline -K7 & W E & - 1086532 \\
\hline - 9742 & S & -6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
( K652
- 643
- AJ4
- Q103
```

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brother | Brother | The | Brother |
| Xavier | Jake | Abbot | Kyran |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2 v}$ | Double | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $4 N T$ | Pass | $5 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $6 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

Brother Xavier led the $\downarrow \mathrm{K}$ and the blonde-haired Brother Jake laid out
a sturdy dummy. Ace, please,’ said Brother Kyran.
The young declarer continued with the ace and queen of trumps. Finding a 4-1 break, he paused to re-assess the situation. Nine tricks in the black suits and two red aces would give him a total of eleven tricks. He therefore needed a heart ruff or a successful diamond finesse to bring the total to twelve. 'Nine of hearts, please,' he said.

The Abbot won with the $\geqslant 10$ and returned the $\$ 4$. Brother Kyran had no inclination to finesse, since it was a near certainty that he could ruff a heart successfully. He rose with the $\forall A$ and ruffed his last heart with the $\$ 10$. The Abbot was quick to discard his singleton club on this trick.

Brother Kyran played dummy's last trump and led a club, hoping to reach his hand and claim the remaining tricks. It was not to be. The Abbot ruffed and played a diamond to his partner's king. The slam was two down.
'Unlucky,' declared Brother Kyran. 'It's only one down if I finesse in diamonds but that wouldn't be much of a score for us anyway.'

Brother Xavier leaned forward. 'Perhaps you should play low on the first trick,' he suggested. 'That avoids a lead through your diamond holding. You win the next heart, play three trumps and cross to a club to take the heart ruff. Then you can cross to the $\forall A$ to draw the last trump.'

The Abbot could see a flaw in Brother Xavier's analysis. 'You wouldn't play another heart, surely?' he said. 'You should play a club while the heart suit is blocked. Then he's one entry short for ruffing a heart and returning to draw the last trump.'
'Yes, that beats it if he still goes for the ruff,' agreed Brother Xavier. 'If he draws four rounds of trumps instead, he would have to guess who has the king of diamonds. If you have it, he has to finesse. If I have it, he can discard two diamonds on the long clubs and there's a criss-cross squeeze against me.'

The Abbot's mouth fell open. How come Brother Xavier could spot these advanced plays when analysing someone else's efforts and hardly ever when he was playing the contract? He sighed as he replaced his cards in the board. It was one of life's great mysteries.
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11 ${ }^{\text {TH }}$ WORLD BRIDGE SERIES
Orlando, Florida $\cdot \mathbf{2 1}^{\text {ST }}$ September $-6^{\text {TH }}$ October, 2018

The World Bridge Series is an incredibly exciting and challenging tournament, with many different Championships available to participants.

It is made even more interesting due to the fact that all the events are transnational, so that players from across the world, from different National Bridge Organisations, can come together as team-mates or in partnership to compete.
The venue is the magnificent Marriott Orlando World, where we have obtained special rates for all participants please see below for how to make your reservation.

There are several restaurants and lounges within the complex, and excellent amenities that we feel sure you will enjoy ... and if you are bringing the family there is even a shuttle service to Walt Disney World®! Orlando is, of course, a very well-known and popular resort, with plenty to see and do in the area. It's not all Disney - there is the Epcot Centre and Universal Studio as well as other museums and galleries. For the golfers among you there are golf courses, and there are several parks and lakes to enjoy.
The Opening Ceremony will be held on Friday 21st September
The following is the outline schedule of the main events. A full detailed schedule will be published here in due course.
The first events are the Open, Women's and Senior Teams Championships: the Rosenblum Open Teams will start on Saturday 22nd September, the McConnell Women's Teams and the Rand Senior Teams are expected to start a day later.

The Teams Championships are followed by the Open, Women's, and Senior Pairs - the Open Pairs starts on Tuesday 25th September, the Women's and Seniors on Wednesday 26th September. Players eliminated from the KO stages of the Teams, up to and including the semi-finals, will be able to drop into the Pairs events, following the regulations that will be specified in the Supplemental Conditions of Contest for the Championships which will be published here in due course
The Mixed Teams will start on Tuesday 2nd October and the Mixed Pairs on Thursday 4th October.
Junior Players will also be able to enter the Youth Triathlon event starting on Monday 1st October.
In addition there will be the Joan Gerard Cup - a pairs event - starting on Sunday 30th September, a Seniors Triathlon starting on Tuesday 2nd October, as well as a Pairs Short Track starting on Friday 5th October and an IMP Pairs starting in the afternoon of Friday 5th October.
Alongside all these tournaments there will be a number of other WBF events of one or two days (pairs or swiss) available for those wishing to participate in shorter tournaments. Details of these will be announced on the website in due course.

Players in good standing with their National Bridge Organisations are eligible to compete in any of these events, providing of course they meet all the WBF Eligibility requirements (including those relating to the ages of Senior or Youth players).
Registration must be made through the WBF Website, and the pages for this will be available from April 2018. We look forward to welcoming many players to Orlando where we are sure it will be an enormously successful Championship!

Stay tuned on championships.woridibridge.org/oriandows 18 for further information, including accomodation details


## The Auction Room

Mark Horton

Welcome to the Auction Room, where we examine bidding methods from recent events.
This month we pay a visit to the European Team Championships in Ostend. Our featured matches are England v Belgium in Round 20 of the Open and England v Poland in Round 8 of the Seniors'.

## The Hands

(This month all the deals were played at IMPs.)
Hand 1. Dealer East. None Vul.

| - AK 10432 <br> - Q109 | N | - Q7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | - K754 |
| - J3 | W E | -K108 |
| - Q9 | S | - K753 |

If West opens 1 North doubles

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| De Roos | Allerton | De Donder | Jagger |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| 1a | Double | Redouble | Pass |
| 2 | All Pass |  |  |

North’s hand was $\uparrow$ J AJ2 A9654 AJ84 and he led the $\star$ A and continued with the six. Declarer won with dummy's king, drew trumps pitching a club from dummy and played West for the $\geqslant \mathrm{J}$ to record +170 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Forrester | Bahbout | Robson | Vandervorst |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| 14 | Double | 1NT | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{~}$ | All Pass |

Here too North started with two rounds of diamonds and declarer won with dummy's king and played five rounds of trumps pitching a heart and two diamonds from dummy. West parted with a club so declarer was able to set up a long club, +420 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mayo | Bizon | Cliffe | Szymanowski |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| 1ヵ | Double | Redouble | Pass |
| 2 | All Pass |  |  |

Here North tried leading the $\$ 5$ and the defenders collected two tricks in the suit, +140 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kwiecien | D Muller | Starkowski | Pryor |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Double | Redouble | Pass |
| Pass | 2 | Double | All Pass |

East led the Q and West overtook it with the king and now needed to find a switch to the $\vee 10$ to give the defenders a chance. When he continued with the declarer took the ace and should now play two rounds of diamonds. When he preferred a low diamond East could have pounced with the king, cashed the K and given his partner a ruff after which the defenders will be on top. When he played low declarer won with dummy's queen and could now afford to play clubs himself. West scored a club ruff here, but the timing was now right for declarer who was soon claiming eight tricks, +180 .

Recommended auction: The combination of West's six-card suit and North's double make game a reasonable speculation. I cannot fathom West's failure to rebid $2 \boldsymbol{A}$.
Marks: 4@10, 2ゅ 6, $2 \uparrow \mathrm{X} 5$.
Running score: England 10 (6) Belgium 5 (0) England S 6 (8) Poland 5 (0)

## Hand 2. Dealer North. E/W Vul.



Although the convention card is silent, it looks as if $4 \vee$ was intended as a transfer to spades.

North held $4 \vee 103$ A8763 109852 and leading either major suit should be good enough to defeat the contract. Neither was easy to find and when North went for the 10 South took the ace and switched to a diamond, South taking the ace and returning the seven. Declarer ruffed, crossed to the $\vee \mathrm{A}$, returned to hand with a club and played a heart to the jack. South's queen was the last trick for the defence.

|  | West | East |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Robson Forn | Forrester |
|  | - | 1NT |
|  | 4**(Dble) | ) Pass |
|  | Redouble* | 49 |
|  | Pass |  |
| 4* | Spades |  |
| Rdbl | 1 Retransfer |  |

South led the $>5$ and North took the ace and switched to the $\vee 10$. Declarer won, played a spade to the king and the $\$$, South taking the ace and exiting with the $\$ 9$. Declarer won, unblocked the clubs and played a spade, claiming.

In the Senior match both teams reached $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ and recorded eleven tricks with a little help from the defenders.

Recommended auction: If you want to get to $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ use whatever agreements are to hand. Otherwise you can jump yo 4ヵ
Marks: 4^ 10, 4『 6.
Running score: England 20 (6) Belgium 11 (0) England S 16 (8) Poland 15 (0)

Hand 3. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

| @ J 97 | N | ¢ AK862 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Q102 |  | - J864 |
| - Q9543 | W E | - AK10 |
| ¢ K4 | S | -3 |

South overcalls $2 \vee$

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| De Roos | De Donder |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{a}$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{a}$ | $2 N T$ |
| $3 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ | $4 \boldsymbol{a}$ |
| Pass |  |

South's overcall was based on 1043 AK 975 \& 2 A1097 and he started with three rounds of hearts. North mysteriously ruffed with the $\boldsymbol{\wedge} \mathrm{Q}$ so declarer escaped for only one down.

| West | East |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Forrester | Robson |  |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |  |
| $2 \downarrow^{*}$ | $3 \uparrow$ | (Dble) |
| $3 \uparrow$ | $4 \uparrow$ |  |
| Pass |  |  |
| $2 \varphi$ | $3+\uparrow, 8^{+}$ |  |

The defenders made no mistake here, North ruffing the third heart low, putting partner in with a club and then overruffing dummy with the Q for two down.

I wonder if Forrester considered bidding 3NT - on this layout he would almost certainly have made it.

In the Senior match Engalnd's 4@ was only one down, North returning a diamond after the first heart ruff.

In the replay Poland bid $1 \boldsymbol{\Phi}-2 \boldsymbol{Q}-4 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ and South was kind enough to lead his singleton diamond, +420 .

Recommended auction: 1-(2Ү)-2-3NT. Perhaps it is better to ignore the heart suit and show the powerful diamond holding that gives partner a chance to make a good decision.

## Marks: 3NT 10, 4^ 3.

Running score: England 23 (6) Belgium 14 (3) England S 19 (8) Poland 25(11)

Hand 4. Dealer South. Both Vul.

| - QJ62 | N | - A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Q63 |  | - AKJ8 |
| - Q98 | W E | - KJ652 |
| \% QJ9 | S | -1074 |

South overcalls 2ه

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Allerton | Jagger |
| Pass | 1 |
| 1NT | $2 N T$ |
| 3NT | Pass |

South's delayed entry into the auction was based on $\mathbf{~} 1098753 \vee 109$ \& 7653 . North led the $\vee 5$ and declarer won with dummy's ace and played a diamond for the queen and ace. North's club switch was taken by South's ace and the defenders played two more rounds of the suit, declarer winning, playing a diamond to the king, returning to hand with a heart and running the $\$ 8$ for ten tricks, +630 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bahbout | Robson | Vandervorst | Forrester |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | Pass | 1 | $1 \uparrow$ |
| 1NT | Double | Redouble | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | All Pass |  |

After East's strength showing redouble West, despite that miserable collection of queens and jacks (worth only 6.60 on the K \& R Hand Evaluator) might have done something over $2 \boldsymbol{4}$. Declarer did not divine the trump position and was two down.

It might have been better for East to raise to 2NT, as there was little chance that 1 NT redoubled would be the final contract.

In the Senior match Mayo overcalled $2 \boldsymbol{\text { but Bizon bid } 2 N T \text { and was }}$ raised to game, taking ten tricks after the lead of the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$.

Kwiecien also overcalled 2 $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ and when Pryor reopened with a double Muller let it go. Declarer won the diamond lead and played three rounds of clubs, subsequently ruffing a club with the $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} \mathrm{K}$ and going only one down.

Recommended auction: If West is happy to bid no-trumps after a spade
overcall then there is no reason why the notrump game should not be reached.
Marks: 3NT 10, 2ヘX (S) 5, 2 (S) 3.
Running score: England 33 (16) Belgium 17 (3) England S 24 (8) Poland 35 (21)

Hand 5. Dealer West. None Vul.

| $\begin{array}{r} \text { H J10 } \\ \bullet 876 \\ 6432 \\ \& ~ J 543 \end{array}$ |  | 4 AK865 <br> - 5 <br> - AJ <br> * AKQ109 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Allerton | De Donder | Jagger | De Roos |
| Pass | Pass | 14 | 29 |
| Pass | 39 | Double | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | 4\% | All Pas |

South overcalls $2 \vee$ and North raises to $3 \vee$
East had clearly shown a powerful hand, but it was not easy for West to go on to $5 \boldsymbol{\xi}$. It might be better to rebid $4 \boldsymbol{\&}$, although it is not obvious that West should advance to game.

South's overcall was on 9732 AKQJ4 Q109 and he started with two top hearts, declarer ruffing high, drawing trumps ending in dummy and running the jack of spades for eleven tricks.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bahbout | Robson | Vandervorst | Forrester |
| Pass | Pass | 2** | 29 |
| Pass | Pass | 24* | Pass |
| 3** | Pass | 49 | Pass |
| 49 | Pass | 4NT* | Pass |
| 5** | Pass | 5** | Pass |
| 54 | Pass | 6* | All Pass |

20 Weak with diamonds or various strong types
2 Strong two-suiter
Notice Robson did not raise hearts - he did not want to advertise the fit. It looks as if $3 \vee$ was looking for the second suit or 3NT. 4@ was obviously
an attempt to play there, but East was not to be denied.
6e was not hopeless, but on this layout it had to go one down.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mayo | Bizon | Cliffe | Szymanowski |
| Pass | Pass | 2** | 29 |
| Pass | 34 | 4** | Pass |
| 5** | All Pass |  |  |

## 4 $\downarrow$ Strong two-suiter

5\% Pass or correct
Declarer ruffed the second heart high and cashed two top trumps. He then played three rounds of spades, ruffing with dummy's $\$ 5$, but North's overruff meant he was one down.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kwiecien | D Muller | Starkowski | Pryor |
| Pass | Pass | 120 | 1\% |
| Pass | 34 | 4. | Pass |
| 5* | All Pass |  |  |

3Y was described by the operator as 'week' (there are no proof-readers on BBO). Declarer ruffed the second heart and immediately played three rounds of spades for the same one down.

I was toying with the idea of using this deal in one of my Misplay articles, but perhaps it is too easy. After drawing trumps, the simple line is to play a low spade. North wins and plays a heart but declarer ruffs, crosses to the $\$ 10$, comes to hand with a diamond and cashes three more spades pitching diamonds, a diamond ruff being the game going trick.

Recommended auction: If East opens (it would be my choice) then E/W should reach 5*. England's Seniors had a decent auction.

You can make $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ - ruff the second heart, cross to dummy with the ${ }_{2} \mathbf{J}$ and play the $\mathbf{~ J}$. North covers but declarer wins, goes back to dummy with a spade, returns to hand with a diamond, cashes the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ and then plays clubs for ten tricks.

## 

Running score: England 36 (21) Belgium 21 (3) England S 34 (8) Poland 45 (21)

## Hand 6. Dealer West. None Vul.

| $\pm 987$ N |  | $$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { A10932 } \\ & 3 \\ & \& \text { AK75 } \end{aligned}$ | W E |  |
|  | S |  |
| West East |  |  |
| De Roos De Donder |  |  |
| 19 | $1{ }^{1}$ |  |
| 24 | 49 |  |
| Pass |  |  |

South led the A from his 42 V 654 AKJ OJ 106 and switched to the \&6. Declarer took dummy's ace, came to hand with the $\vee_{K}$, ruffed a diamond, cashed the $\geqslant A$ and the K and played a heart, ruffed and overruffed by declarer who cross-ruffed his way to ten tricks.

To defeat 4@ South must lead a trump on the go.

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Forrester | Robson |
| $1 \uparrow$ | $1 \uparrow$ |
| $2 \uparrow$ | Pass |

Here South cashed a diamond and then switched to a spade, but it was a trick too late and declarer took ten tricks.

Cliffe and Mayo duplicated Forrester/Robson's sequence and result while Kwiecen/Starkowski followed De Roose/De Donder.

South cashed a diamond and switched to the 10 and declarer won in dummy, crossed to the $\uparrow$ K, ruffed a diamond, cashed the $\vee$ A and ruffed a heart, West discarding his remaining club. Declarer ruffed a diamond and can still get up to ten tricks by cross-ruffing, but he tried to cash the K and North ruffed and played a trump restricting declarer to nine tricks.

$4 \uparrow$ ? The $\urcorner \mathrm{K}$ is a good card, but you know partner is minimum and you may be playing a 4-3 fit. On balance it feels right to be cautious. Now if E/W were vulnerable....

## Marks: 2^10, 4^ 8.

Running score: England 46 (21) Belgium 29 (10) England S 44 (14) Poland 53 (21)

Hand 7．Dealer South．N／S Vul．

| ¢ A3 |  | 4 K1098542 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| －J852 |  | $\checkmark$ Q |
| －A1072 | W E | － 54 |
| － 1032 | S | －AK8 |

North opens $1 \mathbf{~}$ and if East bids $1 \mathbf{4}$ South doubles and North bids $2 \boldsymbol{4}$

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allerton | De Donder | Jagger | De Roos |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{e}$ | $1 \boldsymbol{Q}$ | Double＊ |
| Redouble | $2 \boldsymbol{Q}$ | $4 \boldsymbol{s}$ | All Pass |

Was West＇s double Rosencrantz，promising a top spade honour？
South held 76 K963 J9863 Q9 and led the a route to eleven tricks and as the play went he was given a shot at twelve． He took ten．

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bahbout | Robson | Vandervorst | Forrester |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{e}$ | $1 \boldsymbol{~ D o u b l e ~}$ |  |
| Redouble＊ | 2 | 4 | All Pass |

South led the so declarer was never taking more than ten tricks．
Cliffe opened 1NT and Szymanowski＇s 3p ended the auction，declarer soon claiming ten tricks．

In the replay，after 1e－（1s）－Dble Muller raised to $2 \boldsymbol{\Delta}$ and Pryor jumped to game．

Recommended auction：After 1 （1ヶ）Double a Redouble by West （regardless of the precise meaning）should be enough for East to jump to 44．
Marks：4＠10，3ヵ 4.
Running score：England 56 （21）Belgium 39 （10）England S 54 （20） Poland 57 （21）

## Hand 8．Dealer West．E／W Vul．

| \＆AQ9754 | N | ¢ J63 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark 1032$ |  | $\checkmark$－ |
| － 4 | W E | －AKQ853 |
| －J53 | S | ＊AQ106 |

South overcalls 5

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Allerton | Jagger |
| $2 \boldsymbol{a}$ | $2 N T^{*}$ |
| Pass | $6 \vdots$ |
| Pass |  |

South＇s $5 \uparrow$ was based on $\$ 8$ AKJ 987654 － 72 and declarer ruffed North＇s heart lead and ran the $\mathbf{\Phi}$ ．When North won and returned the 8 declarer let it run to his jack，drew trumps and claimed．

| West | East |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bahbout | Vandervorst |  |
| 2『＊ | 2NT＊ | （4V） |
| Pass | 5》＊ | （6Y） |
| 64 | Pass | （7V） |
| Pass | Double |  |
| Pass |  |  |

Don＇t you just love Tony Forrester＇s sequence of bids．
West led his diamond and declarer ruffed the second round with the jack and played a spade．West took the ace and switched to a club，East cashing the queen and ace and then playing a diamond to promote West＇s $\vee 10$ ，five down，-1100 ．

After ruffing with the $\nabla \mathrm{J}$ declarer can cross to dummy with the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ and play the $\downarrow$ J，pitching a spade when East covers．That way he escapes for four down．

In the Senior match the Open Room duplicated their counterparts auction to 64 ．

In the Closed Room West passed（he had a Multi $2 \star$ available）and East opened $1 \downarrow$ ．South jumped to $5 \checkmark$ and that kept everyone quiet．Declarer followed Forrester＇s line and was three down．

Recommended auction：After 2 $\mathbf{2}$－2NT I prefer $4 \vee$－jumping to $5 \vee$ could
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push E/W to a slam they might not reach under their own steam. However, there is not much in it and East is just about a racing certainty to bid $5 \vee$ over $4 \vee$.
Marks: 6^ 10, 5^ 7 5ソX (S) 5, 5 (S) 3 .
Running score: England 66 (29) Belgium 49 (10) England S 57 (20) Poland 67 (37)

The teams that had the better of the bidding arguments won the matches - England 42-23 and Poland 41-28.

You can play through the deals mentioned in this article.
Just follow the links:
Hands 1-8
http://www.bridgebase.com/tools/handviewer.html?bbo=y\&linurl=http://www.bridgebase.com/tools/vugraph_linfetch.php?id=57565
http://www.bridgebase.com/tools/handviewer.html?linurl=http:// www.bridgebase.com/tools/vugraph_linfetch.php?id=57566
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## Trick One by David Bird

## The Right First Move

With 125 instructive deals, David
TRICK ONE
 Bird covers all aspects of the first card played from dummy, the first move by the defender in third seat and the card chosen by declarer from his hand.

Perfect your cardplay at trick one and you will be difficult to beat!

AVAILABLE FROM A BRIDGE RETAILER NEAR YOU

## Bridge at the 5* Amathus Beach Hotel, Rhodes

3-10 Oct 2018, 7 nights half board excl. flights from $£ 799$ per person We will be joined by David Bird, who will give three interesting \& amusing bridge seminars. Eddie and Kathy Williams will direct our duplicate bridge sessions.

## TWO FABULOUS EXCURSIONS INCLUDED

- City tour of Filerimos - Discover the Ancient statium, temple of Apollon and enjoy a guided tour of the old Town of Rhodes
- Half day trip to Lindos - visit the Acropolis of Athena Lindia


## Quote 'BRIDGEMAGRHODES' at the time of booking to receive a free signed book by David Bird!*



Call 01473660802 or visit www.firstforbridge.com
for more information

```
*Applicable to new
bookings only
```


## The Master Point Press Bidding Battle Set 7

Well, the panel has survived my first month in charge unscathed and only one of our guest panellists is missing for my second effort. Our first problem is an interesting one and collected six different answers from the panel.

## PROBLEM 1

IMPs. Dealer East. None Vul.

- $A Q$
- 98632
- 10643
* J8

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| - | - | $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |
| $1 \downarrow$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| 1NT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |


| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 49 | 7 | 10 |
| 3\% | 6 | 7 |
| 4* | 4 | 8 |
| 30 | 2 | 7 |
| 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 4* | 1 | 5 |

The first question is what shape partner has promised?
Sime: 4e. This looks worth a move. If partner's sequence promises six clubs, as I think it should, we belong in clubs.
Brock: 3\&. I know I have some good black-suit

## THE BIDS \& MARKS




Brian Senior - your Moderator universally and affectionately known as Mr. Grumpy
cards but if partner is 6-5 he doesn't need that much. 4s on a 5-2 fit could be hopeless if partner is forced, and 5\% might have three top losers. At least by bidding $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ rather than passing he can bid again if he wants. I tend to underbid slightly non-vulnerable.

They assume that opener is 6-5 or better. Others also agree with that style but mention the possibility of 5-5:
Rigal: 3e. partner rates to be 5-6 and the hand will play better in the worse suit perhaps than the better even if partner is $5-5$, which few would hold these days. No need to do more is there? Lambardi: 3e. Would 24 have been strong ? Is he guaranteeing 6-5 or could he be weakish with $5-5$ ? In any case, I fear his suits may not be good, as opponents silence does not bode well. It
is hard for me to believe they have so many red cards with all the honours and remain mum. If he has a stiff ace or king somewhere we won't get too far. Being non-vulnerable I will content myself with a part-score if he cannot find another bid. Could easily be wrong, however.

Certainly he will not be weakish, even if he plays the style where he might be 5-5.
Lawrence: $4 \boldsymbol{4}$. East has a good hand that is shy of rebidding $2 \boldsymbol{4}$. I wish you had commented on what East is supposed to have. (Well, then I would be going a long way toward answering the problem for you, wouldn't I? Much of the idea of these problems is to find out what the panel thinks things should mean.) i.e, his range. His shape. Is $5-5$ OK? This auction is so rare (at least for me) that agreements would be nice and in fact, I would have them. I never, for example, open 1* and rebid spades with 5-5. I've seen people bid this way with good clubs and poor spades and normal opening bid values, an approach that I abhor. A bid that I would like to use is $4 \vee$ which would be a Bloomer bid showing slam interest in one of the black suits with this exact shape. Caters to 5-6 hands. Good problem in that it's legal.
Mould: 4※. In my book partner is 5-6 at least (all 5-5 in blacks open 14 no matter what Marc Smith says). The fact that I have no high cards in the red suits is very good news, and sufficient for me to try $4 \boldsymbol{e}$. Just consider some hands for partner: $\uparrow K J x x x \vee A \& K Q x x x x$ and game is excellent; $\uparrow$ KJxx $\geqslant x$ AKxxx and game is almost no play, but partner will pass 4e on that; $\stackrel{\mathrm{KJxxx}}{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{x} \downarrow \mathrm{x}$ AQ10xxx and game is OK (partner would still pass $4 \boldsymbol{4}$; $\mathrm{Kxxxx} \downarrow$ - $\uparrow$ AQxxxxx
and game is pretty good; even $\uparrow$ Kxxxx $『-\wedge$ Ax \&K109xxx gives game some play. Second choice is obviously $3 \boldsymbol{*}$, and it is very close between the two. I cannot see what else you can bid. Don't fancy playing in spades getting forced.

And the man himself:
Smith: 44. What else? Call me old-fashioned, but when I learned to bid one opened a decent hand with 5-5 in the blacks with $1 \boldsymbol{2}$ and bid spades twice, and only weak hands with this shape were opened $1 \boldsymbol{4}$. Assuming partner is of similar vintage, it doesn't seem unreasonable to expect something like $\downarrow$ KJxxx $\geqslant \mathrm{x} \geqslant \mathrm{xx}$ \&AKQxx opposite (and perhaps a bit better), in which case my three fitting black-suit honours should be exactly what partner needs. If he gets forced, has a hole in the club suit, and trumps don't break, tough as I don't see I can bid less. Cope: $3 \boldsymbol{A}$. We do not have much, but the little we have may well be golden. Much depends on style as to what we open with 5-5 in the blacks some will always open 14 (so this auction will show 5-6), whilst I prefer to open intermediate hands where If I feel I am strong enough to bid the spade suit twice $1 \%$ (so round about the $15-17 \mathrm{pt}$ range.) As something like $₫ \mathrm{KJxxx}$ $\geqslant x x \geqslant A K Q x x$ is enough for game we must make a move despite.

Well, I have to confess that I too like to bid good 5-5s this way. I think that opening 1s and having to rebid 3* can lose the fifth club, while at worst opening 1* then bidding spades twice loses the sixth club, and actually the space saved means that even that will be rare. However, I understand that I am in a small minority. You won't be surprised to read that this is not the only area of life
where I am in one of those.
The rest assume that partner will be at least 6-5. However, they show differing levels of enthusiasm, starting with two who opt for simple preference to clubs:.
 x $\boldsymbol{x}$ AKxxxx then still spades have to be 3-3 for $4 \boldsymbol{A}$ to make. So even though I've got all my honours in his suits, let's keep modest. If he has extra values, he can go on (but won't do so because of probable misfit).
Cannell: 3\& This is a simple preference to clubs. Partner will have to do the heavy lifting from here.

Then we have the group who favour giving preference to clubs but committing to game:
Kokish: 4e. If we have to lose a black trick, clubs, with 8 or 9 trumps, will often play much better than spades. What I'd really like to do is offer a clear choice of games, but bids in either red suit will not send that message without agreement, I might bid $4 \star$, for example, with: $\triangle \mathrm{QJx} \vee \mathrm{J} 10 \mathrm{xxx}$ AJx $\boldsymbol{J x}$, as a strong spade raise with the $\uparrow$ A. Of course I could just raise to $4 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ with the actual hand and hope for the best.
Teramoto: 4e. Showing some clubs and good hand. In spades looks dangerous for getting forced.

From their comments, both the above appear to be bidding 4e as a force while committing to clubs. A substantial minority prefer to play the 5-2 fit and invite or bid game in spades:
Bird: 49. Partner shows a strong hand by opening $1 *$ instead of 14 . With all my points in his suits, a raise to 3 a would be wimpish.
Carruthers: $3 \boldsymbol{4}$. I expect to take 10 or 11
black-suit tricks but I'll give him a little leeway in case he has a hole in clubs. With something like $\uparrow K J 10 \mathrm{xx} \geqslant \mathrm{x} \downarrow \mathrm{x}$ AKQxxx, he’ll surely bid on. McGowan: 34. Yes, he might get forced and lose control. And they tell me this sequence shows longer clubs these days (personally I bid this way with $₫ \mathrm{KJ} 10 \mathrm{xx} \geqslant \mathrm{xx} \geqslant \mathrm{x} \& \mathrm{AKQxx}$, but then I am a dying breed that opens a natural 1\%) But I have to do something and nothing seems better.
Alder: 49. This ought to have play. Partner might be: \&KJ10xx $\vee x \geqslant x$ AKQxxx. Even if his clubs are weaker, he might be able to ruff one in my hand and still draw trumps safely before running the clubs.
Byrne: 44. What a great problem! With 100\% working cards I have to bid game (partner could have bid 2 on a bad hand and hidden the fifth spade) and it is merely a question of which one. Facing $\uparrow K J x x x \geqslant x \diamond x A K x x x x 4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ is good with $5 \boldsymbol{\infty}$ off in toppers, facing $\uparrow 10 \mathrm{xxxx} \vee \mathrm{A}$ \&AKQxxx 6* has play with 44 an enormous struggle. I shall stay true to my first hand and try 4a, if nothing else, partner will have fun in the play.

I think your first example is far more likely, and he could be better than that, while the second hand might have bid 2 rather than $2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}$.
Apteker: 44. My hand has improved enormously after partner has shown 5-6 in the black suits. While I am short a spade, the AQ more than compensates.
Rosen: 4h. Massive black suit cards - even if not enough of them!

Ben ploughs a lonely furrow (not for the first time):
Green: $3 \uparrow$. Far too strong in my view to sign off
in 3\&, but not strong enough to blast game. I was debating what the difference is between a fourth suit $3 \boldsymbol{}$ followed by $4 \boldsymbol{\mathcal { E }}$ and a direct $4 \boldsymbol{\mathcal { E }}$ over $2 \boldsymbol{4}$. Perhaps a direct $4 \boldsymbol{*}$ should show threecard support and 3 followed by $4 \boldsymbol{*}$ would show a doubleton? Perhaps only in my dreams?

Nobody else addressed the issue of going through fourth-suit or not. A direct 4* showing better support than a delayed $4 \boldsymbol{i}$ sounds reasonable though.

And finally:
Robson: $4 \downarrow$. An impossible splinter to show the best hand in context. $6 \boldsymbol{*}$ could easily be laydown, although I imagine we'll stop in $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ if partner is not slam-interested.

I agree with the meaning you give the bid but, in context of supporting spades, we could have a third card, and also possibly more than 7 HCP, so I'm far from convinced that we have the best hand we could possibly have.

I am confident that partner's auction is strong, whether or not it promises the sixth club (and a large majority clearly believe that it does so). The majority love that spade holding, and who can blame them? They therefore force to game, though a substantial minority are unwilling to do so (the vote in favour of game is 13 to 8). The vote on clubs versus spades is still closer, but with 44 the single most popular action. Getting forced in 44 or having three losers in 5*? I'm not sure that the panel knows which is the greater risk, and neither do I. I'm trusting partner not to rebid a weak spade suit, in which case he can ruff a club with the $\uparrow$ A if need be then overtake the $\boldsymbol{Q}$ to draw some trumps. That makes my vote go to $4 \mathbf{~} \mathbf{- j u s t}-$ but it could be very wrong.

## PROBLEM 2

## IMPs．Dealer North．E／W Vul．

\＆AQ7
－KQJ9854
－J62
\＆－

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | $2 \Phi^{*}$ | 3 | $3 \boldsymbol{L}$ |

？
2．Weak

| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $6 ゅ$ | 9 | 10 |
| $4 \boldsymbol{7}$ | 7 | 9 |
| 5NT | 1 | 8 |
| Dble | 1 | 8 |
| $5 \downarrow$ | 2 | 7 |
| $4 \square$ | 1 | 3 |

Neil was our sole pessimist：
Rosen：4ソ．Initially bid 5 as a natural slam invitation，but decided I might go down in five on a bad day．I can understand a slam drive，but just feels wrong with South sitting after partner．

That just doesn＇t look to be enough to me， although I suppose he could be the only one to go plus on a bad day．

Then we have the inviters：
Robson：5४．Highly slam invitational－6ヶ needs so little．Diamonds may not play quite as well，with my A entry knocked out early．
Green： $5 \uparrow .4 \vee$ could be the limit，but a grand slam could also be making so I feel that $4 \vee$ is too little．A jump in a new suit here should just show a strong hand and not be asking for a con－ trol in the opponents＇suit．If the auction had
proceeded（2ゅ）－ $3 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}-(3 \boldsymbol{\wedge})-$ ？， 5 would ask for a spade control．

OK，but can it hurt to show the spade control on the way，as these next group？
McGowan：49．I would like to bid hearts，but $4 \vee$ is not forcing and there is too much slam potential to make a non－forcing bid．I toyed with $5 \vee$ ，but he would probably tell me that was Exclusion Keycard．．．Also toyed with 4\＆ so he could cue the $\vee A$ ，but that has too much chance of being misunderstood．

Yes，I don＇t see why $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ would be anything other than natural and forcing，so it is begging to be misunderstood．
Kokish： $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ ．Then $5 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ over 5 or $5 \boldsymbol{*}$ ．Too easy to be off two cashing aces or the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ to bash a slam．As against that，though，is the fact that East will have a tough time raising to slam when it is cold．I can understand $6 \uparrow$ or $6 \uparrow$ ，which are just different bets．
Alder： $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ ．Then $6 \vee$ ．I am tempted to bid $6 \vee$ immediately，but partner with the likes of $\mathbf{x}$ $\checkmark$ Ax $\begin{aligned} & \text { AKQxxxx } \\ & \text { xxx will be worried about an }\end{aligned}$ immediate spade loser．
Lambardi：4ヵ．Will get very excited in the （admittedly very unlikely）case he does not have a club control（but would $5 \diamond 100 \%$ deny a club control？）．Hearts may easily play better than diamonds，but how to find out？ $4 \vee$ would very probably end the auction．I guess I will have to make that decision later on，as if he has $\vee \mathrm{A}$ we surely belong in hearts．
Teramoto：4ヵ．It means strong raise in dia－ monds．I will bid $6{ }^{\circ}$ at my next turn． $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ then $6 \vee$ looks better than an immediate $6 \vee$ ．

But others are intending to play in diamonds．

Cannell：4＾I want to make a slam try in dia－ monds for partner，and this might be the only way．I don＇t think a $4 \vee$ bid will get us anywhere． But，who knows？
Carruthers：4＠．We could easily lose two heart tricks in a heart contract and no heart tricks in a diamond contract．I plan to pass Five Diamonds or bid Five Diamonds over his Five Clubs．We could have big duplication of values here．If the auction goes well for me I may even be able to suggest hearts later by bidding 5NT then pull－ ing clubs to diamonds．

Can we get extra information to help to pick a trump suit and level？
Leufkens：Double．Partner won＇t pass when I＇ve got this spade holding．Anything he says might yield new information．Although I＇m doubtful if I＇ll learn a lot，I don＇t have alternatives to gather more useful info．To go to a diamond slam is easy but possibly wrong：either too low or too high． $6 \downarrow$ can be better with spades protected．

Enri is surely correct that double will never be passed，isn＇t he？Well，it is almost certain，but at this vulnerability the opposition might only have an eight－card fit，and a 2－2－6－3 partner might just pass and collect whatever penalty was available as he has nothing else to show．

Or we can commit to slam and offer a choice of slams：
Mould：5NT．Marvellous！！Anything from $4 \vee$ to $6 \vee$ via $6 \diamond$ could be right．Since $\downarrow A K Q x x x$ and out gives $6 \diamond$ play I will guess to bid a slam．If I were playing with John Holland I would have to bid $6 *$ as 5 NT would be old fashioned Josephine， but here I will wheel out 5 NT ，pick a slam，and correct $6 \boldsymbol{*}$ to $6 \uparrow$ ，hopefully suggesting hearts as
a strain．I doubt it will do the slightest good，but once in a while partner might correct．Though come to think of it on hands where $6{ }^{\circ}$ is bet－ ter，partner will have bid 6＊，not 6＊，over 5NT． Will I then convert？I ought to，I think．Anyway， I have written it down now．Don＇t expect many marks for this effort．
Are we all confident that 5NT is pick－a－slam？If so， given that some panellists intend to play in dia－ monds，some in hearts，it must have some merit．

The plurality goes for the simple jump to 6『．As Alan says，when hearts is better than diamonds partner may choose diamonds anyway if we offer a choice，and it will be hard for him to know when to play in hearts．I have a lot of sympathy with this bid，if we are going to commit to slam．
Sime： $6 \boldsymbol{}$ ．It is quite likely that partner has a couple of the missing hearts，but that may not be essential．The alternative of 5 NT （pick a slam）then $6>$ over $6 *$ wrong－sides hearts as well as diamonds． 5 NT would also risk partner preferring diamonds where $6 \checkmark$ will make and 6 won＇t．
Brock：6ソ．I can＇t really see there being any sense in bidding either $4 \vee$ or $6 \vee$ ．I think the odds favour the latter．
Bird： $6 \uparrow$ ．My wife doesn＇t like me to gamble but（whisper it softly）she doesn＇t read this magazine．
Rigal：6ソ．Bid what you think you can make？A spade lead might disrupt us in $6 \checkmark$ facing short hearts but we retain control in hearts．
Byrne： $6 \boldsymbol{}$ ．Another good hand and another wild punt．Holding the $\vee 10$ as well I would bid $6 \vee$ for sure but as it is I need to give it a lot of thought．Partner appears to be 1－2－6－4，or
else the opponents have a lot of clubs between them．Will it play well in hearts？I think so with the spade tenace protected by the lead．I could try 4 to agree diamonds，will that get us any where？I am not convinced diamonds will play as well，we will need partner to hold a solid suit since we are presumably off the $\vee \mathrm{A}$－mind you if he has the $\begin{array}{ll}\text { AK } 6 \vee \\ \text { will surely be better．Ah sod }\end{array}$ it，I＇ll try $6 \vee$ ，at least if partner has the $\vee A$ and solid diamonds he might take a shot at grand！

He might，but he＇ll be doing well to realise that we have first－round club control so will proba－ bly need the $\boldsymbol{s} A$ as well．Solid diamonds and two aces－nope，that doesn＇t sound like a simple over－ call to me，more like a 3s stopper－ask，I think．
Lawrence： $6 \uparrow$ ．Get Alan back．He would never concoct hands like these．I＇m guessing $6 \vee$ ．Pro－ tects against a spade lead in the modest chance partner has two low spades－I don＇t see useful science here．

No concoction，honest－a real－life hand．
Apteker：6Y．Practical as I don＇t think I can find out everything I need to bid seven of either red suit．There may also be bad breaks given the pre－emptive bid． $6 *$ will rarely be better than $6{ }^{\circ}$ and I want the lead up to the spade tenace to safeguard the unlikely event that partner has a doubleton spade．
Cope： $6 \vee$ ．Anything could be right and the opponents have not given us room to manoeu－ vre a sensible auction－so I bid what I think I can make．I cannot see myself stopping short of slam，and partner＇s likely spade shortage leaves more room for one or two hearts．Occasionally a diamond slam may play better，but hearts looks safer with the lead round to my $\Delta \mathrm{AQ}$ and
the possibility of ditching diamond losers if say partner has \＆K as side values．
Smith：6ソ．I have to guess． $4 \vee$ is feeble and partner is all too likely to pass or raise a $5 \checkmark$ bid depending on how many spade losers he has rather than how many red－suit honours he is looking at．Starting with 4a seems unlikely to solve the problem－partner bids $5 \boldsymbol{*}$ and when you now bid $5 \bigcirc$ he thinks that＇s a cue－bid with diamonds agreed so you not only get to slam whether it＇s right or wrong，but you play it in diamonds，when the lead through your spades might be significant．What＇s more，you might also survive in $6{ }^{\circ}$ opposite something like $\boldsymbol{4}$

$\checkmark$ Ax AxxxxAKxxx, whereas slam in diamonds has no chance. Of course, opposite x $\geqslant x x$ AKQxxxx *AKx you'd rather be in diamonds. As I said, it's all very guessy.

Marc gives partner both top clubs but in hands that still give slam decent play. My concern would be that partner could have plenty of wasted values in clubs in a hand that makes slam no play or very much against the odds. I think it will be tough to make an informed decision regarding which red suit should be trumps in slam, so 67 would be my choice if bidding slam, but I'm with those who invite slam, and once we are doing that I like 4ه followed by $5 \mathbf{5}$ a lot more than I do an immediate jump to 5 5 . I think we should play in hearts because there is a danger of being cut off from the long hearts in a diamond contract after a spade lead through the ace.

## PROBLEM 3

## IMPs. Dealer South. E/W VuI.

ค J87

- AQ1053
- 107

K K86

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | 2ヶ* |
| Pass | 20* | 4NT* | Pass |
| 5\% | 5 | Double | Pass |
| Pass | 5 | Double | 5 |
| ? |  |  |  |
| 2* Multi |  |  |  |
| 2 Pass or correct |  |  |  |
| 4NT Minors |  |  |  |

Bid Votes Marks

| 62 | 11 | 10 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 5NT | 1 | 9 |
| Pass | 5 | 8 |
| Dble | 4 | 6 |

This one set the panel to a fair amount of head-scratching - what on earth is going on?
McGowan: Double. No idea what is going on, cannot fathom why partner doubled $5 \vee$, but it sounds as though he wants to defend and I have some defence. Suspect diamonds are breaking badly, so I would need greater club length to try slam
Teramoto: Double. We have some defence and not too much minor-suit length.
Rosen: Double. What a strange problem- I thought of abstaining since $6 \boldsymbol{2}$ must be cold to be a problem. What do partner's later doubles show? Defence or just extra values?

Neil's comment suggests that he thinks it only possible to bid because it is a problem. As we will see shortly, much of the panel disagrees.
Bird: Double. North's antics are somewhat childish. Had he bid $5>$ instead of $5 \downarrow$, East would not have had the chance to make two doubles. What do they mean? The double of $5 \vee$ seems to warn me against bidding on. Does the double of $5 \checkmark$ show a strong hand, though? If so, my two good cards would merit some ambition. Perhaps he is expecting a $5 \boldsymbol{s}$ contract and wants me to lead a diamond rather than a club. It's a close decision but on this occasion I will be a chicken rather than an eagle.

If the many panellists who opted for $6 \boldsymbol{2}$ are correct, North's 'childish' antics, have talked you out of a slam, so perhaps not so childish after all.
Cannell: 6\%. My cards appear to be working
overtime. I expect we will make this contract. They may save in $6 \mathbf{4}$, and we may have to negotiate that occurrence.
Rigal: 6*. I'm not sure what partner is asking me to do, but since I was very close to bidding $6 \boldsymbol{2}$ before I'll do it now. And prepare my apologies in advance.
Byrne: 6\%. I am not sure I've got this auction (isn't the $5 \diamond$ bidder going to be on lead anyway?) but partner appears to have the rock of Gibraltar and I have good cards for him. I would have thought we're closer to seven than five if partner has the void spade I am expecting so I shall go for the jackpot.
Robson: 6e. I think partner has quite a good hand. And I could have nothing. North's antics suggest he is happy in 5a so a void spade opposite is very likely.
Apteker: 6\%. Can't say I understand what North is doing and why he has not jumped to the four level at his first turn. I don't think partner's double of $5 \square$ necessarily shows any heart values but rather a strong hand with aces and kings in the context of the 4 NT minor-showing bid. Notwithstanding, partner is probably void in spades as North is likely to have four and I have much more than I showed for my previous bid. I don't take much from North's 5 bid as I think he was just trying to muddy the waters. If I was certain that partner would understand my pass as forcing, I would do that and let him decide whether to double or bid $6 \boldsymbol{*}$.

North's original two-level response puzzles a number of panellists.
Alder: 6\%. This is surely making. Given that I have promised nothing, if partner has sufficient
hearts to double $5 \vee$, he must be very short in spades. North's auction is very strange, initially risking playing in $2 \vee$, then being willing to play in $5 \uparrow$. Now you can explain it to us!
Smith: 6e. "Would you like another cake," asked the dormouse, as I tried to make sense of the auction at this most extraordinary of tea parties. North seems to have strong support for both majors, probably $5-5$ but at least $4-5$, since he was willing to force his partner to disclose his suit at the five-level. Having already shown extra values with his double of $5 \downarrow$, partner had the option of passing $5 \checkmark$, so his double sug-
 one thing that seems almost certain is that he has very short spades. Second choice double and lead a trump.
Leufkens: 6e. What's going on? 5 by North must be a little joke, as he has to lead himself if we bid on. You could argue that partner's double is suggesting bidding higher as he could have passed and doubled later to insist on defending (makes N/S bidding also slightly more difficult). But whether that's valid in this panel is unclear to me. Is it even clear whether this situation is forcing? I've got a nice hand although chances are big that $\vee \mathrm{K}$ is behind me (heart length at least). All in all, I trust in my partner's capabilities and expect 6e to beod, as I've got two valuable key cards.
Brock: 6e. Very mysterious! I might well have bid 6e directly over 4NT, since if partner can bid 4 NT at unfavourable vulnerable I have quite a lot for him. The only reason I might not bid this is if the sequence suggests that partner does not have the minors after all. Maybe he has the red
suits, but that would mean North bid $5 \checkmark$ with an awful lot of clubs. On the other hand, North's $2 \checkmark$ is usually short(ish) in that suit and South doesn't have hearts either, so maybe partner has hearts and clubs. But, if so, why would he double $5 \star$ ? It's all too much for me! Anyway, as I passed over the Multi on the first round I don't feel that partner needs to play me for a million clubs if he happens to have the red suits. If he pulls to $6 \diamond$ then I will obviously bid $6 \vee$.

I don't think partner can have the red suits as that makes North's bidding even more weird. He surely must have substantial support for both majors to justify bidding at the five level, even if that leaves the puzzle as to why he only bid $2 \vee$ at his first turn.
Kokish: 5NT. Did we see this one at the club just last week? If North could not bid $5 \vee$ for fear that East would treat that as his own hearts rather than pass or correct, we're confident you would have told us that, conductor dearest, (You are living in fantasy land if you think you would have got a footnote to explain what might have been going through the mind of a player to explain his eccentric actions. It's your job to try to unravel what is going on.) so perhaps we are to assume that North wanted to suggest some defence on the way to $5 \vee /$ lest we go on to six. Or that North was creating a diversion to have us waste our energy for the rest of the match. More relevant is what East was doing when he doubled $5 \checkmark$ and then the inevitable escape. My view is that East was telling us that he expected to make 5* although I might have nothing useful, and when he doubled $5 \vee$ rather than pass (forcing IMO because of the double of $5 \uparrow$ ) he admitted
that he had some tricks outside the minors. All of this convinces me that we are going to make at least six, so I am bidding 5NT to say I have a strong $6 \boldsymbol{e}$ bid. Check? Check.

I agree. The double of $5 \checkmark$ surely showed that partner had a good 4NT bid, otherwise he would have just passed, having already shown his hand. But now, are we really worth a grand slam invite? We have two key cards, true, but did the double of $5 \checkmark$ really mean that he expected to make 5e opposite nothing, or more likely that he hoped to make it if we had something useful? Partner won't often have such a hand that he can underwrite a five-level contract before he knows anything about our hand. Well, I suppose that in real life we would be familiar with partner's style and general level of optimism.

Pablo considers the grand to be possible:
Lambardi: 6e. That was a lot of bidding from pard. We might be cold for seven but I cannot bring myself to play him for all we need. Even with no losers in the majors (void spade) a bad break in one of three suits might wreck us. The $2 \diamond$ opener has at least six cards in the minors so a missing jack in clubs may beat the grand if I need to ruff a diamond in my hand. Since LHO has no more than four spades, he must have four hearts to remotely justify his $5 \checkmark$ bid. Even then, if he has no minor singleton it would be risky enough. So the opener must have at most one heart .Would probably PASS with my favourite partner (never such a thing tread the earth, however) (And I thought I was your favourite partner, Pablo. I'm devastated!) and convert his double to 6 e as an invite. He could not make any other bid I suppose, with my holding two key cards. If he
did bid 6e himself I would surely raise to seven. Lawrence: 6e. East has followed 4NT with two strong bids. I haven't shown anything yet and what I have is excellent. Not sure if pass here is forcing. I can be convinced. For the record, I expect East is void in spades and that North is playing games.

So, is Pass forcing?
Sime: Pass. This comes within the 'it is obvious that they are sacrificing' clause of our Forcing Pass definition. North was willing to play in $2 \vee$ opposite a weak two in hearts; then he was willing to play in $5 \vee$ opposite a weak two in hearts. I have enough to suggest a slam and I don't expect +1400 on defence.
Green: Pass. I think that pass is forcing when partner has bid at this vul. and then doubled twice. I don't feel I can underwrite slam so I will leave the final decision to partner. If he doubles I will respect that.
Mould: Pass. This is a deeply curious auction. Why, with majors good enough to go to the five level, did North only bid $2 \vee$ ? Presumably there are some strong options in this multi and North did not want to pre-empt the auction. Partner seems to have a very good hand. Pass is surely forcing here (the oppo were prepared to play at the two level apparently and are now clearly saving). It is not impossible pard is say 0-2-6-5 (in fact quite likely) so I have a very good hand in context. Maybe I should actually bid $6 \boldsymbol{e}$. However, if we are on the same wavelength and I would double with a non-constructive hand, this should get the job done.
Carruthers: Pass. Encouraging, I hope. I have some good cards for partner and I'll be content
with whatever decision he makes.
Cope: Pass. I think I am good enough to make a forcing pass without committing to slam. In a way partner's flurry of red cards should be treated as warning doubles - it is a forcing pass auction from their side of the table as well as the opponents are in a sacrificial auction. Partner may have had the right to expect one piece from me when they bid 4NT, but my two pieces make my hand good enough to invite partner to bid slam with say a spade void.

It seems to come down to the meaning of partner's doubles. Do they, as Eric suggests, show a hand which expected to make 5 , so extra values, or are they a warning, as suggested by Tim, in which case no extras? I get the logic of Tim's point that a forcing pass situation applies to both partners, but it just feels natural to me that partner's double of $5>$ should show extras. I am convinced that we are in a forcing pass situation. Both the vulnerability and North's strange actions surely tell us so, don't they?
As for why North bid only $2 \vee$ at his first turn who knows? Maybe he didn't want to cut across a possible strong option in the South hand, maybe he had a Baldrick-esque 'cunning plan', or maybe he was just dozing and only woke up at his next turn. If partner's doubles suggest extras, then our two key cards surely justify our bidding on. If those doubles are warnings not to bid on, we still have two key cards and are worth a forcing pass. The panel is split on the meaning of the doubles. Given that I have said that I think the double of $5 \diamond$ showed extras for me, I guess I should be bidding either 6er Eric's 5NT.

## PROBLEM 4

## IMPs. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

| - KQJ87 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - AKQ98 |  |  |
| - 4 |  |  |
| 2 Q8 |  |  |
| West | North | East |
| 19 | 5 | Pass |
| ? |  |  |
| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| Dble | 9 | 10 |
| 5 | 9 | 10 |
| Pass | 3 | 5 |

This one is rather more straightforward - which is just as well, as the panel needs a break after Problem 3.

There are three possible actions - the committal $5 \vee$, the less committal middle ground of double, or the wimpish pass. Well, wimpish may of course be read as well-judged in real life.

Let's see how the panel view the situation.
Bird: Pass. Certainly not $5 \downarrow$. Nor can I see why I should double. Partner might have doubled if he had a defensive card or two.

Well, he might need more than a card or two, as few of us would be expecting trump tricks for a double so would feel free to bid on opposite his convertible values.
Lawrence: Pass. We're not in a force and I'm missing four key cards and we have no assurance of a fit. Not close.
Smith: Pass. I seem to have three options, Pass, Double and $5 \uparrow$. If partner has enough to make $5 \checkmark$ playable, he would probably have had
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enough for a value-showing double of 5 , so bidding doesn't look right, which leaves Pass and Double. Have I any particular reason for expecting this to go down? Not really, and Double seems all too likely to offer partner a choice between - 550 and - 500 .

Everything you say could be true, and you may inherit the Earth, but a big majority felt that they had to do something more dynamic:
McGowan: $5^{\bullet}$. Don’t we all?

## Apparently not.

Brock: Double. Maybe I should bid 5 ${ }^{\text {P }}$, but then we can't defend 5 . Just hope partner doesn't bid 6e.
Robson: $5^{\boldsymbol{\vee}}$. Pretty random really but I'll trust the opponent to have his bid. Doubling with my hidden trick-source probably hitting North's void may work out very poorly. Wouldn't be


Sally Brock
surprised if the winning call is Pass but that's so chicken.
Rigal: Double. This does not come with guarantees but what does?
Cannell: $5^{\vee}$. North got me - or, did I get me? Brian will let me know.
Kokish: Double. Just a guess between this, 5 甲 and a very cautious Pass. Hard to imagine someone having a convincing argument to support any choice. FWIW, double just shows a good hand without values in diamonds. Not that this will help East bid $5 \vee$ on $\geqslant 10 \mathrm{xxx}$, but at least there will be chances each way, which $5 \checkmark$ does not offer.
Byrne: 5ヶ. A huge gamble and could be 800 against nothing. But people normally have a solid suit when they leap to the five level and I don't think partner would stretch to double with $\boldsymbol{N}, ~ \mathrm{~A}$ etc when I will often be passing.

A solid suit? I'm not sure about that.
Mould: Double. It is this or $5 \vee$, and I just do not have the offence for $5 \vee$ IMHO. I would bid $4 \vee$ over $4 \star$, but the five level with all these losers is just too much. If partner's options are now 650 and - 800 so be it. Pass is losing bridge in my view.
Lambardi: 5 - I hate the bid, but whenever opps bid like this against me, it seems to work for them. I may escape a double (what would double mean anyway?) when - 500. Perhaps Pass is the reasonable thing but I don't believe it is winning bridge. Would consider passing at Pairs. BTW, I am assuming partner's Pass means Pass, or does it?

Yes, Pass means Pass.
Leufkens: Double. Passing is more dangerous
than to bid. I don't promise an ideal take-out double, so more than happy to bid this. I don't like taking blind gambles like $5 \vee$.
Teramoto: $5^{\vee}$. We may have game, so I bid.
But:
Apteker: Double. Not enough shape to bid $5 \checkmark$ and can't pass out with the extra strength. Happy if partner passes or pulls.
Carruthers: Double. Since we are already at the five level, partner will lean over backwards to bid five of a major, and this allows him to pass with some balanced hands with no spade support.

But he won't bid $\vee 10 x x x$, surely, which is what we want him to do.
Alder: $5 \uparrow$. Pass, double or $5 \uparrow$ ? Each could be right. Now you can tell me that five of a major costs 1100 when 5 had no chance.

I wouldn't tell you that.
Cope: Double. Tempting to pass but too much upside (and maybe downside) at this vulnerability to let it go. If we are going to bid it is a choice between $5 \vee$ and Double - the latter gives more flexibility if partner has a nothing hand with a defensive trick
Green: Double. This one is a bit of a guess. We may well be making a vulnerable game and so I want to protect some of my equity (though $5 \checkmark$ could be cold). I can't stomach a $5 \checkmark$ bid on a potential misfit.
Rosen: Double. I want partner to pull if they think we are making something but not on average rubbishy old hands. Hence double not $5 \vee$. Sime: $5^{\bullet}$. We are potentially in Double Game Swing territory, so I ain't passing. I won't double as partner may pass or bid clubs when we belong in $5 \uparrow$.

The potential game swing is indeed a concern．
I am generally in favour of the more flexible option－which is obviously double in this case－ but I think partner will often fail to bid hearts when we want him to do so as he has no way to imagine that we have such a good five－card suit． Overall，I lean towards 5४，but with Double as a very close second．I would not pass－five level belongs to the opposition or not．

## PROBLEM 5

## IMPs．Dealer East．None Vul．

－ 7
－ 10876
－ 94
\＆AQ9753

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | $1 \nabla$ | Double |


| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ | 13 | 10 |
| $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | 4 | 8 |
| $3 \boldsymbol{4}$ | 2 | 6 |
| $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ | 1 | 6 |
| 4 | 2 | 2 |

Green： $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ ．According to the system notes 4e is a splinter so that＇s out．I am desperate for a club lead and happy to paint a picture（via my fit jump）for partner in case the opponents bid 4s．

Well done Ben for knowing the system．4\＆as a double jump，is indeed a splinter according to the published methods．
Lambardi：4\％．Hopefully I have discussed whether that shows a side suit or shortness．

If I haven＇t，I will trust partner to guess by his shape．To bid $4 \checkmark$ is literally to force LHO to bid 4 ，and what are we to do then？After that type of bid，double of 4a by me should be Action－ whatever that means．A couple of club tricks and spade shortness．Let partner make the last mistake．

Guess by his shape－scary！We can perhaps forgive Pablo，who is new to the panel，but the following have no excuse：
Leufkens： $4 \boldsymbol{\top} .4 \boldsymbol{e}$ ．I expect this to be a fit－bid after a take－out double．If not，put me down for $4 \vee$ ．
Carruthers：4ケ． 4 ．I play these jumps in com－ petition as fit－showing．If this is not part of the system here，please change my bid to $4 \boldsymbol{V}$ ．I＇d like a different hand to splinter if that＇s allowed．
Alder：4ヶ．4e Assuming this is a fit－jump．I am a little light in point－count terms，but now partner should judge correctly should the oppo－ nents bid four spades．If $4 \boldsymbol{i}$ is a splinter in A New Bridge Magazine Standard，I guess I have to bid $4 \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}$ ．This is why fit－jumps are so useful．

The above at least covered themselves．
Kokish： $4 \boldsymbol{\%}$ ．Either you believe in this sort of thing or you do not．Speaks for itself，which other actions might not．

Speaks for itself apart from being mildly unde－ scriptive－showing five fewer clubs than are actu－ ally held．Andrew was also cautious enough to cover himself．
Robson：2\％．More a methods problem．Adjust my bid to $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ if $4 \boldsymbol{*}$ is a splinter．I must bid my clubs－the whole deal is dependent on my part－ ner knowing that＇s where I live．

Which will help with the opening lead，but not
with his judging how far to go in hearts as we won＇t have shown our support．Well，I guess we will be outbid more often than not，so the lead may prove to the the key to the hand．
Cope： $4 \boldsymbol{\curlyvee}$ ．I truly hate this bid mainly because I expect a $4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ bid from LHO and that will make my next action all the tougher．But no other choice seems better－a 4\％fit jump should promise more values（or a 3s splinter if not playing fit jumps），and trying to walk the dog with a $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ bid will make the later auction even more con－ fusing．That leaves $4 \vee$ as the least of all evils－ but I still hate it．

The majority of the panel either knew the sys－ tem or thought a three－level Fit－bid was the right level anyway．
Sime：3．Fit Jump．Gives partner the informa－ tion to make a decision if they bid $4 \boldsymbol{A}$ and sug－ gests a club lead if we defend．
Brock：3＊．If West has spades，I＇m sure if I bid $4 \vee$ West will bid $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ anyway．So I＇m going to show my suit and my fit．Would prefer to do it a level higher，but for me $4 \boldsymbol{2}$ would be a splinter．
Bird：3\＆．A fit－jump is obvious．After a heavy gin－and－tonic tasting session last night（at the Hampshire School of Wine），it will be too much effort to look up whether 4 would be a fit－jump too，or a splinter bid．
McGowan：3\＆．4民 would not be Fit for me，but if it were I would go for that．
Rigal： 3 e for me would be fit，so I＇ll bid it（and $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ would be more fit）．Assuming this isn＇t the agreed system we need a mixed raise，which some play as a jump in the other major，and if none of that is available I＇ll take my ball and go home（OK $3 \vee$ if you insist．）

No, 4\% would not be more fit, and this shapely hand doesn't look like my idea of a Mixed Raise either - far too much offensive potential.
Mould: 3\&. Just to raise hearts here is bonkers. You know the auction is going to be competitive, and you have to help partner gauge the level to go to. This hand is a very good advert for $4 \boldsymbol{\ell}$ being a fit jump as well, but we do not have that club in our bag. The system says: 'Fitjumps after opponents overcall or take-out double. Fit jumps after our overcalls. Jump cue-bid is a mixed raise (about 6-9 with four-card support). Double jumps are splinters.' So $4 \boldsymbol{\&}$ would be a splinter. Hence $3{ }^{\circ}$ it is, and I do not seriously consider any other bid.
Byrne: 3\&. Essential to get the lead in before the inevitable 4a arrives. A little light on high cards but rich in tricks and playing strength.

Interesting. I've never played a style where I needed significant high-card strength for a Fitjump - just an offensive raise to the appropriate level.
Teramoto: 3e. I would like to show clubs plus a heart fit so the fit-jump is ideal.
Apteker: 3\&. Perfect hand for the fit jump, allowing partner to evaluate game prospects and if the opponents compete further. Would bid 4 if it were defined as a fit jump but I think it is a splinter.

Well done for knowing the system.
Cannell: 3e. According to the system notes this is a fit-jump. It also works as a lead director if it comes to that.
Rosen: 3\&. Fit-showing, preparing the way for further competition.
Smith: 3e. At last, a breather. The only question
here is whether we are worth $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ rather than three. Jumps (except in the opponents' suit) should all be fit-showing in competition, and here it seems essential to tell partner as much about our hand as possible so that he can make a decision over North's expected 4@, I don't think I have quite enough for a raise to the four-level, ergo 3* rather than 4*.

Lucky boy.
And lastly, someone who prefers to show shortage rather than length:
Lawrence: 3A. Splinter. An overbid. Caters to a possible slam ( $864 \vee$ AKQ432 Ax $\boldsymbol{2} 10 x$. Gives partner a broad ball-park estimate of my hand. I could bid $4 \vee$ and then bid $5 *$. That, however,

means East doesn't get to participate in a slam try. He will think I'm showing a different hand. I have the agreement that splinters in competition can be light. Got this idea from Grant Baze. Convenient here. Not a bad agreement given that when RHO shows values, you are less likely to have a big hand.

If Mike Lawrence and Grant Baze believe in something that something is worthy of our respect. My issues with a spade splinter would be that we may end up on defence to a spade contract and partner will not be impressed if declarer picks up his spade holding because we have shown a shortage. Also, 3d may give LHO an easy way into the auction via a double, while a crude raise to $4 \vee$ may put more pressure on.

The system is what the system is, and plenty of people play that way. Personally, I prefer to play Fit-jumps at all levels so I can show trump support, side-suit, and level of raise all in one go. Fitjumps simply work better if you don't have to bid a second time to show the extra playing strength. My clone and I (a partnership for which the world is not yet ready) would therefore be able to splinter only in the opponents'suit (so not at all after a take-out double). A big proportion of the world's experts prefer to have one way to show the sidesuit, and one way to show the shortage, and that is reflected in ANBM Standard.

Despite 4i being mentioned by so many people, it is anti-system and so is marked harshly. Sorry, but reading the system would have avoided this just as is the case in real life at the table, anyone who doesn't know their agreed system often loses a bundle of points.

This is perhaps a good opportunity to say that

I do intend to have a look at our published methods and try to expand on them in some areas. However, what I do not intend to do is to add the complete relevant system in footnotes with each problem. Quite apart from so much being already covered in the system notes, many problems are there precisely to discover the panel's views on what something should mean and what is the best approach to a particular situation.

## PROBLEM 6

## IMPs. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

- A 2
- AJ873
- 82

2. A987

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | $1 \stackrel{y y y}{c}$ | Pass |
| $1 \%$ | Pass | $3 \mathrm{NT}^{*}$ | Pass |

3NT Based on long and strong, but not necessarily solid, diamonds

| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | 10 | 10 |
| 4 | 6 | 10 |
| 5NT | 2 | 8 |
| 6 | 2 | 6 |
| 4NT | 1 | 5 |

Perhaps I could have given a fuller explanation in the footnote, but I thought it was obvious that the 3NT bid also showed a good hand. That must mean too good for a $3 \forall$ rebid, else that would have been the bid chosen. Sorry to anyone who didn't understand that. I know, one man's obvious is

## another man's puzzle.

Sime: 4e. Cue-bid for diamonds. Certainly worth a move as partner considers his hand too strong to rebid 3 .
Rosen: 4\&. cue-bid for diamonds - clear cut, I expect a heavy majority here.

Only roughly half the panel go for $4 \boldsymbol{4}$, though everyone is bidding or moving towards slam.
Brock: 4\&. Definitely bidding a small slam, but hopefully allowing the possibility of bidding a grand. He will probably bid $4 \star$, and then I'll bid $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ ( $4 \curlyvee$ is a bit dangerous as he might think I have some huge heart/club two-suiter). If he can't bid 4NT now, then over $5 \diamond$ I'll bid $5{ }^{\circ}$ and he should get the picture.
Bird: 4e. If this is a cue-bid with diamonds agreed, as it should be, then bidding $4 \diamond$ would deny a club control. It's tempting to bid an immediate $6 \leqslant$ but I don't like to be agricultural. Rigal: 4\&. To be going on with; not sure where we want to go but a later 5 NT call will maybe help us out. NOT Gerber.

Well, quite. Thanks for clarifying that last bit. Lambardi: $4 \boldsymbol{\varrho}$. Must be a cue. I have the type of hand where Blackwood says it all (but, of course, $4 N T$ would not be Blackwood here), and it must be up to partner to count the tricks. Will bid 49 over $4 \diamond$ or $4 \checkmark$. He is unlikely to have long diamonds AND three hearts, as that would leave him very short in one of the blacks and he would have tried to find out my heart length.

As you say, three-card heart support is very unlikely as he would have tried to keep $4 \vee$ in the game, quite apart from the black-suit shortage issue.
Cope: $4 \boldsymbol{2}$. This must be a cue agreeing
diamonds - though the explanation of the bid seems a little lacking - long and strong but not solid I can understand, but the quantity of outside strength is unstated. If I start with a cue (and am lucky enough to get $4 \vee$ ) at least I can then key-card on my way to $6 \uparrow$ or $7 \uparrow$.
Green: $4 \boldsymbol{\%}$. It is a question of agreement whether $4 \%$ here is a cue agreeing diamonds or whether it could be a two suited hand. If 4e is natural then this is a clear $4 \diamond$ bid.
Smith: 4*. Cue-bid agreeing diamonds. Is 5 safe? As safe as 3NT might be if his diamonds don't run. How much chance is there of finding a decent slam? Something like $\boldsymbol{\wedge} \mathrm{Kxx} \geqslant \mathrm{xx}$ AKQJxx 2 Kx , a minimum for $3 N T$, is good (with the spade ruff the twelfth trick in diamonds). The best case scenario is that partner can Blackwood (preferably via $4 \diamond$ or $4 \checkmark$ depending on methods) and then he'll virtually know my hand, and thus make the right decision.
Leufkens: $4 \boldsymbol{e}$. Should be a cue for diamonds. Chances are very slim you want to bid an extreme heart/club hand opposite long diamonds. After response of partner take charge with RKC.

Yes, it is possible for responder to have a big club/heart two-suiter, but that hand-type will be very rare in this auction and on frequency grounds it looks right to play 4e as a cue-bid. Some, however, are not certain of the meaning of 4* and choose the clearcut bid of $4 \uparrow$.
Apteker: $4 \downarrow$. The hand is worth a move towards slam given the three bullets and potential ruffing value in spades. $4 *$ may be an advance cue for diamonds but I don't think we are on solid ground as it may be considered natural so I
make the unambiguous $4 \diamond$ bid.
Teramoto: $4 \star .4 \diamond$ is support and slam try. Opener has six or more diamonds, so I can support with only two cards.
Byrne: $4 \downarrow$. Agree the suit and look for a slam, seems clear cut. I think $4 \%$ in this sequence is more ambiguous key card, although if we have them all then partner will either be bidding seven over 5NTor we won't make it.
Lawrence: $4 \diamond$. RKCB. Second choice, $4 \diamond$ Natural, Third choice $6 \star$. Aside. I'm expecting partner has one heart.
Mould: 4». Let's have a MFZ (murk free zone) in Andrew Robson's phrase of a couple of months ago. 4 really ought to be a cue for diamonds but just in case I will unambiguously agree diamonds. I am going to six but there is no reason to rush as seven could easily be on ( $\boldsymbol{~} \mathrm{Kxx} \geqslant \mathrm{x}$ $\rightarrow$ AKQ Jxxx $K$ Kx is completely consistent with partner's bidding for example.
Robson: $4 \star$. I have a huge hand and clearly it's $6 \diamond$ or $7 \star$. As little as $\uparrow$ Kxx $\geqslant x \diamond A K Q J x x \& K x x$ is a grand slam on normal splits (establishing 5th heart).

What about 4NT?
Carruthers: 4 NT . I want to invite in case he has the classic seven solid and outside stops, preferably something like $₫ \mathrm{Kxx} \nabla \mathrm{x} \diamond$ AKQxxxx ${ }_{\mathrm{e}} \mathrm{Kx}$. He should bid 5NT if he accepts in case I want to choose $6 \downarrow$, which I would with my actual hand as it should be safer.

Natural and invitational says John, and nobody is arguing with that. And then there are those who are willing to commit to slam and invite the grand if partner's trumps are solid. He must have two or three high cards outside diamonds, so it would be
unlucky if there was no play for 13 tricks.
McGowan: 5NT. I guess I could bid 4£, which must be a cue, then 4 NT for keycards, but don't see how that would help. I think this should ask for solid diamonds - he must have 2 of the top 3 honours - and I am guessing he must have something outside the diamond suit to bid this way... Maybe he has $\uparrow \mathrm{Kxx} \geqslant \mathrm{x} \star \mathrm{AKQxxxx} \stackrel{\mathrm{Kx}}{ }$. Or a black queen...Or an eighth diamond...
Cannell: 5NT. Partner should bid $7 \star$ if the suit is solid - 6 if not.

Yes, I am sure that 5NT asks for solid diamonds. We have one more suggestion:
Alder: $6 \uparrow$. This surely cannot be far wrong. I could go slower with $4 \star$, but would 4 NT by partner definitely be RKCB?


Possibly not. Some would argue that it was a sign-off, but that if partner cue-bids $4 \vee / \mathbf{L}$ then we can use RKCB at our next turn.
Kokish: $6 \star$. The only way to show all the aces unambiguously. Pretty unsound convention (this 3 NT ) as before judging whether to pass 3NT or take it out partner can't tell whether there is a loser in the long suit and whether he is facing a singleton heart and/or full stoppers in both side suits. Perhaps if we had a key-card bid available we could use that instead. I think one footnote was not enough to get enlightened responses from the panel.

No methods are perfect. If we wait for a solid diamond suit before being able to jump to 3NT, we are left stranded when we have a one-loser suit in a hand that is too strong to rebid 37 . If we must have or not have a singleton heart, likewise. Jumping in three-card suits is a more unsound idea in my view, so how to handle what used to be Acol strong $2 \diamond$ openings with an only semi-solid suit?

I have no doubt that you believe that 6 unambiguously shows all three aces, but I wonder what the vote would have been had we been able to poll the panel on that? I'm betting many would just think it was a punt to the most likely contract to give away as little as possible to the defence. Just as I thought it 'obvious' that 3NT had to be a better hand than $3 \checkmark$ and failed to specify that in the footnote, we all have things we think are obvious but prove not to be.

Anyway, if we are clear that 4 is a cue-bid, then it looks best. If we have any doubt, then $4 \diamond$ is safer, and that may depend on who is our partner at the time. I can't see us stopping short of slam, whatever route we choose.

## PROBLEM 7

## IMPs．Dealer East．None Vul．

－KQ7
－J6543
－AJ1097
2－

| West | North | East | Sou |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| － | － | 19 | Pass |
| 19 | Pass | 29 | 3\％ |


| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $4 \mathbf{~}$ | 9 | 10 |
| 3 | 8 | 9 |
| $4 \vee$ | 4 | 7 |

We could just settle for the obvious game．
Rigal：4『．The opponents have told me my club void is not a draw back；I believe them．
Robson：4『．Bidding what I think I can make， expecting not too much wastage in clubs oppo－ site now．
Leufkens：4ワ．Practical．Let them save in 5\＆ and partner decide about that．
Green： $4 \uparrow$ ．Bid what you think you can make．
But maybe slam is a possibility if partner has weak clubs？
Kokish：4※．Makes a difference whether the raise implies four trumps and whether we are playing weak or strong no trumps．Doesn＇t take much to make a slam if it＇s in the right places，and South＇s 3\％hints that East won＇t have half his hand in clubs．This is clearer than 3 and at the same time will attract a cheap diamond control bid from East．

The point about attracting a diamond cue－bid from partner is a good one，though whether said
cue－bid will be the king or a shortage makes a dif－ ference to our chances on this hand．
As for how many hearts partner promised：
Mould：4※．I prefer to play this raise as either four－card support or three and unbalanced（all balanced hands rebid NTs）．This is also what our system says（wonder who wrote it？）．The 3\＆bid has improved our hand hugely，suggesting few wasted club values．I will thus make a splinter bid of $4 \boldsymbol{\mathcal { E }}$ and rapidly give up over $4 \boldsymbol{\square}$ and bid that over $4 \diamond$ as well．
Lawrence：4\＆．The bid，coincidentally，that I would have made if South had passed．
Smith：4e．Even opposite an unsuitable minimum， game is still playable．Opposite a minimum with no club wastage such as $\uparrow$ Axx $\vee$ KQxx $\downarrow$ KQ slam could be excellent so I have to make some sort of try below game．The only alternative seems to be 3 ，but if partner then shows extras by accepting my game try with a jump to 4 ，I am surely com－ mitted to bidding again，and there is no certainty that the five－level is safe．Having bid 4\＆，I＇ve made my try below game and the rest is up to partner．
Teramoto：4e．It is a cue－bid and slam try as we may have slam if partner has points out－ side clubs．
Apteker：4e．Worth one try to see if partner gets excited．While partner has made a mini－ mum bid the 3 e bid suggests that partner may have few to no high card points in clubs and that everything may be working．He may have a hand like $\uparrow$ Axx $『$ AKxx $\downarrow$ Qxx exxx．
Cope：4\％．One small try for slam and at least it is descriptive．Partner＇s $2 \vee$ raise may be 3 －or 4－card support－opposite the right 4－card sup－ port slam is possible，but all the further running
must come from partner as all my next actions will be sign－offs．
Carruthers：4e．Thank you South．A well－fit－ ting minimum could produce a slam and now partner will be better able to evaluate his cards． Lambardi：4\％．If partner＇s honours are out－ side the suit we may be on our way to slam． 3 may be misleading as partner is told to value Qxx－which is not what I am dreaming of．Part－ ner might jump to $4 \vee$ and we would be short of space then．

But $\diamond$ Qxx is not a bad holding－a finesse through the opponent who has bid at the three level－and a significant minority go for the 3 game／slam try．
Sime： $3 \downarrow$ ．Cheap，descriptive，forcing，inter－ rogative，what more reasons／excuses do you want？OK，diamonds might even be our best trump suit！
Brock：3 $\downarrow$ ．Not quite sure how short partner＇s clubs can be，but it sounds a good idea to bid 3 ＊ in case he has a perfect hand for me for slam， and／or North bids more clubs．
Bird： $3 \star$ ．If partner has some near－minimum with three hearts，I don＇t want to make a strong slam move like $4 \boldsymbol{\&}$ ．I will see what he can man－ age over my pretend game－try．The poor trumps sound a warning note．

But if he does have a near－minimum with only three hearts he will not co－operate in a slam hunt anyway so we should stop safely in game what－ ever our slam try．
McGowan： $3 \downarrow$ ．Tends to show a second suit in a competitive auction．
Alder： $3 \uparrow$ ．Preparing for more opposition bidding．
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Cannell: $3 \star$. A game-try for now. Though, I am actually thinking slam is possible! If partner has no high cards in clubs all things are possible! Rosen: 3४, I considered this or 4\&. Prefer 3 with such a nice suit.
Byrne: $3 \uparrow$. There will be more bidding and I am sure showing my second suit will be the most helpful thing at this stage, we could make anything from game to a slam (or nothing!)

Yes, whether we eventually get involved in a slam hunt or in judging whether to take the push over a 5acrifice, showing our second suit cannot be a bad idea.

Nonetheless, I prefer to show the club shortage so that partner knows immediately that we are in a potential slam auction. It's close though, and I have plenty of respect for the $3 \diamond$ bid.


## PROBLEM 8

## IMPs. Dealer North. All Vul.

↔ 85

- AQ98
- 10
\& KQ9732

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 34 | Double | Pass |


| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5\% | 7 | 10 |
| 49 | 4 | 9 |
| 4NT | 2 | 9 |
| 4 | 5 | 8 |
| 6\% | 2 | 5 |
| 5 | 1 | 5 |

Sime: $4 \curlyvee$. If $4 \curlyvee$ was right, this one would have been consigned to the memory bin. But, in this feature, they can never cash ace-king of the suit of a first seat vulnerable pre-empt. They might easily have a minor-suit ace as well. Alan Mould promised to include a hand where it was wrong to make a marginal slam try. Nobody ever sent him one.

You think it is so completely automatic to play in $4 \sqrt{4}$ rather than 5 then? Partner will want to hold four hearts but he cannot guarantee it, so the six-card suit could easily be the place to play. Ian had support:
Lawrence: $4 \boldsymbol{\vee}$. Disgusting problem. Alternative is 5 which won't convey these values. Very frustrating.

Hard to express these values. $4 \checkmark$ doesn't do that either, of course.

Leufkens: $4 \boldsymbol{\vee}$. Sure, $5 \boldsymbol{*}$ can lead to 6 more easily, but chances for $4 \vee$ are bigger than $5 \boldsymbol{e}$ (partner can even have 2-4-5-2). So, although this aims only for one shot, at least it's the best shot.
Green: $4 \boldsymbol{\text { ® }}$. Tough hand. 5 could be right and on a good day might catch a raise to six, but it could also be off three top tricks. Slam could be cold in hearts and $4 \vee$ won't get us there but with two low in spades I am happy to take the low road and go plus (I hope).

Yes, 5 at least shows some reasonable values so is more likely to get a raise from partner. He can, of course, also be 1-3-4-5.
Mould: $4 \boldsymbol{\Downarrow}$. Horrible, horrible problem where anything could be right. Easily the toughest of the set. I will make the guess that $4 \vee$ is right in that we can (a) make it (b) cannot make 5* and (c) cannot make a slam. Any or all of those could be wrong, but bidding anything else could equally be wrong. Other options are $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ and $5 \boldsymbol{*}$. I do not see that I have enough to bid a slam, and I have no method of inviting. PS: Doubtless I will be proved wrong Brian, but it seems to me that a number of these problems fail the 'three viable choices test' in that there are only two real options (problems 1 and 4 in particular). We shall see!

Problems 1 and 4, Alan? Well, only three different answers to Problem 4, but Problem 1 had six! One other problem also garnered only three different responses; 38 different answers to the eight problems so nearly an average of five.

Anyway, what about 5*?
Lambardi: 5e. I May buy a raise when it's right. So many clubs do make me hesitate,
however -too good to be true. Do we play equallevel conversion, where my clubs could be useless?. Yet $4 \vee$ is too wet; I could bid 4ヶ and convert diamonds to hearts, but is it clear that I do not promise spade control? $5 \geqslant$ is an option but would hate to play $5 / 6{ }^{\circ}$ in a Moysian (Yes, partner sometimes does have three hearts only !). Alder: 5※. An underbid, but if I cue-bid 4^, and partner bids $5 \star$, then what? I can hardly bid $6 \boldsymbol{*}$ with two spade losers. And although $5 \vee$ should promise clubs, partner will not anticipate 4-6 or two spade losers. This would be even harder at matchpoints.
Apteker: 52. We don't have much room to investigate both strain and level so 5 seems like good middle ground showing extras and hoping partner can bid to slam with the right cards. If I had anything other than a doubleton spade, I would force to slam.
Rosen: 5*. Very difficult. I considered just 4『, or also 4 . Bit of a guess relative to possible three top loser problem in $5 \boldsymbol{*}$ to dubious 4-3 possibility in $4 \boldsymbol{\Downarrow}$. Who knows?!
Teramoto: 5\%. Clubs is an excellent suit, I avoid a 4-3 Heart fit, also I would like to show strength to partner. Partner can raise to slam easy, but difficult after $4 \vee$.
Carruthers: 5 . Readying my apologies if this goes down and $4 \vee$ makes. A hint in this direction is no raise from South, perhaps indicating some spade length with partner.
Cope: 8. 5e. Colour me yellow but the lack of a raise to 44 has made me cautious as partner may have two spades. As its IMPS I'm happy to play clubs rather than hearts as that could succumb to an evil heart break. The old adage of
getting a plus score as the first priority when the opponents pre-empt is not unreasonable.

A good point that there was no spade raise. If partner has two or even three spades prospects are much less promising.

Then there are the true optimists:
Smith: 6\%. $4 \checkmark$ could be the limit if partner has stretched to double (eg. ^xx $\upharpoonright K J x x \diamond$ KQxx AJx), when even game in clubs is hopeless. However, it is just as easy to construct minimum doubles opposite which slam is cold, and plenty where clubs is better than hearts (eg. $4 x$ $\geqslant$ Kxxx AKxx Axxx). I'll be interested to hear what the panel think 4 NT is. If it was Blackwood, that would be a good alternative, as we could then at least avoid bidding a two-ace slam, but I have a feeling it should be pick a minor here, which leaves me with a complete guess. I suspect some may start with $4 \boldsymbol{4}$, but I don't see how that will help, since you then have a guess over just about anything partner bids next.
Bird: 6\%. I wrote down 5\% at first with the learned comment: 'This is better than $4 \vee$ because it is a jump and shows values.' Then I had a dreadful vision of 20 or so panellists laughing at this spineless effort and the new director explaining that you could make $7 \vee$ but not 7\%. I can hardly risk that.

Well, that looks a bit wild to me with two low spades and no reason to think that partner has a control in the suit.
Then there is:
Robson: 5४. Can't do everything here. I think $5 \checkmark$ suggests two losing spades. If we belong in clubs, sorry partner.
Andrew is a lone wolf on this one. There are
some who would like to get both their suits into the game, and who can blame them?
Cannell: 4NT. Good problem. Two places to play - maybe three. How do I get partner to realize that I have a slam try? Neither $4 \vee$ nor $5 \boldsymbol{e}$ works. I could jump to 5 to ask partner to venture slam with a spade control, but that locks us into hearts. At least this way I get clubs involved as well. Of course, I pull $5 \diamond$ to $5 \vee$ and cross my fingers!
McGowan: 4NT. He will think this is minors and bid $5 \star$. When I convert to $5 \uparrow$ he will know exactly what I have....(Could it be Keycard for Hearts? Not without discussion, and it might not matter anyway).

Yes, that works and seems to imply some interest in greater things.
Brock: 49. I think this shows hearts and a minor and a good hand. If he bids 5 I'll pass, and if 5 I'll bid $5 \uparrow$. I'm not bidding a slam on my own. Byrne: $4 \uparrow$. This I have no $f^{*} \&^{\wedge} \% \$ \%$ clue about. The absence of a raise makes me think partner has a fair hand and a doubleton spade so I will take a chance at looking for the best strain and level. I think this shows hearts and a minor but don't quote me on this.
Rigal: 44. I can't bring myself to bid only $4 \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{4}$ or $5 \boldsymbol{e}$ so this is really all that is left. Will bid 5 over 5 and let partner decide what to do next. Kokish: 44. Could be foolish, of course, but neither $4 \checkmark$ nor 5 is particularly clean either. As we might well make slam opposite as little as:
 Partner will bid 4NT with extras, else bid his cheapest four-plus-card suit.

That also looks reasonable, and has the edge
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over $4 N T$ in that it leaves room for partner to bid 4NT himself to show slam interest, à la Eric.

I could not bring myself to bid $4 \vee$, the same bid as if I held a 3-4-3-3 Yarborough, and I am less major-suit obsessed than many people so would not wish to rule out a club contract. While it risks playing $5 \mathbf{V}$ instead of $4 \boldsymbol{\top}$, I would opt for 4 as that not only keeps both my suits in the game but also leaves open the possibility of bidding to slam in either of those suits.

Congratulations to Alon Apteker, this month's winner with an almost perfect 79, a point ahead of Michael Byrne.


SET 7 - THE PANEL'S BIDS \& MARKS

|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alon Apteker | South Africa | 44 | 69 | 6\% | Dble | 3\% | 4* | 40 | 5\% | 79 |
| Michael Byrne | England | $4{ }^{4}$ | 6 | 6\% | 5 | 38 | 4* | 3 | $4{ }_{4}$ | 78 |
| Sally Brock | England | 38 | 69 | 6\% | Dble | 38 | 40 | 3 | 44 | 75 |
| Barry Rigal | USA | 3\% | 69 | 6\% | Dble | 3\% | 4* | $4 \checkmark$ | 44 | 73 |
| Drew Cannell | Canada | 3\% | 49 | 6\% | 5 | 3\% | 5NT | 3 | 4NT | 72 |
| Tadashi Teramoto | Japan | 43 | 49 | Dble | 5 | 3* | 4* | 40 | 53 | 71 |
| Tim Cope | South Africa | 34 | 6 | Pass | Dble | 4 | $4{ }^{3}$ | 40 | 53 | 70 |
| Ian Sime | Scotland | 4\% | 6 | Pass | 5 | 3\% | 4* | 3 | $4 \checkmark$ | 70 |
| Marc Smith | England | $4{ }^{4}$ | 6 | 63 | Pass | 38 | 4* | 48 | 63 | 70 |
| Alan Mould | England | 43 | 5NT | Pass | Dble | 3\% | 4 | 4* | $4{ }^{\circ}$ | 69 |
| Mike Lawrence | USA | 44 | 69 | 6\% | Pass | 34 | 4* | 4\% | 4 | 69 |
| Enri Leufkens | Netherlands | 38 | Dble | 63 | Dble | 4 | 4* | 4 | $4 \checkmark$ | 68 |
| Pablo Lambardi | Argentina | 3\% | 49 | 6\% | 5 | 4\% | 4* | 4* | 5\% | 68 |
| Neil Rosen | England | 44 | $4 \checkmark$ | Dble | Dble | 3\% | 4* | 3 | 5\% | 66 |
| Liz McGowan | Scotland | 34 | 49 | Dble | 5 | 38 | 5NT | 3 | 4NT | 66 |
| Phillip Alder | USA | 49 | 49 | 6\% | 5 | $4 \checkmark$ | 6 | 3 | 5* | 66 |
| John Carruthers | Canada | 3\% | 49 | Pass | 5 | 4 | 4NT | 4\% | 5\% | 64 |
| Eric Kokish | Canada | 40 | 49 | 5NT | Dble | 40 | 6 | 40 | 44 | 63 |
| David Bird | England | $4{ }^{4}$ | 6 | Dble | Pass | 38 | 43 | 3 | 62 | 63 |
| Ben Green | England | 3 | 5 | Pass | Dble | 3\% | 4* | $4 \checkmark$ | $4{ }^{4}$ | 62 |
| Andrew Robson | England | 4* | 5 | 6\% | 5 | 2\% | 4* | $4 \checkmark$ | 5 | 60 |

## Master Point Bidding Battle Competition - Set 8 <br> Open to All - Free Entry

## PROBLEM 1

IMPs. Dealer South. E/W Vul.
^ AK9632

- Q
- K875
- A2

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | 1 1 |
| 10 | Pass | 1NT | Pass |

## PROBLEM 2

IMPs. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- 82
- K4
- Q10963
\& 10643

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | $1 *^{*}$ | Double |
| $?$ |  |  |  |
| 1 | $4+$ | cards, unbalanced, not a weak NT |  |

## PROBLEM 3

IMPs. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- J2
- K10964
- 76532
- 4

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | $1 \%$ | 1 | Double |

## PROBLEM 4

IMPs. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- A
- J10653
- QJ62
* AQ7

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | $1 \diamond$ | $2 \downarrow^{*}$ | 3 |
| $?$ |  |  |  |
| $2-5+$ | Majors, | 10+ HCP if only $5-5$ |  |

## PROBLEM 5

IMPs. Dealer East. All Vul.
↔ A97642

- KQJ5
- 10
- 85

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | 1 | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 36 | Pass |
| $?$ |  |  |  |

## PROBLEM 6

IMPs. Dealer North. None Vul.
© K74

- AKQJ543
- 5
- 105

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | $1 N T$ | Pass | Pass |

## PROBLEM 7

IMPs. Dealer East. All Vul.

- K9853
-     - 
- 103
\& KJ9874

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | $1 \downarrow$ | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | Pass | Double | Pass |
| $?$ |  |  |  |

## PROBLEM 8

IMPs. Dealer East. N/S Vul.
\& J9843

- AKJ 107543
-     - 

© -

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | $1\rangle$ | Pass |
| $1 \nabla$ | Pass | $1 \Phi^{*}$ | Pass |

?

1. Natural, unbalanced hand as a weak NT would have rebid 1 NT

Send entry to biddingbattle@newbridgemag. com or enter via the website www.newbridgemag.com.
Entries to arrive before the end of the month.
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## A New Bridge Magarine Bidding System

Basic Method

## Natural

## Five－card majors

Minors are three cards in length minimum． Always open $1 *$ with $3-3$ or $4-4$ ，so $1 \star$ is cards only if precisely $4-4-3-2$ shape
15－17 no－trump in all positions and vulnerabilities
Two over one is game forcing in all uncontested auctions
A 1 NT is up to a non－game force but it is not－forc－ ing．However the only hands that Pass are weak no－trump types．
Jumps at the two－level are weak（eg， $1 \leqslant-2 \boldsymbol{*}$ ）and at the three－level are invitational（eg 1『－3\＆） $1 \mathrm{M}-3 \mathrm{M}$ is a limit raise
Inverted minors are played． $1 \mathrm{~m}-2 \mathrm{~m}$ is F2NT and $1 \mathrm{~m}-3 \mathrm{~m}$ is pre－emptive．Over $1 \mathrm{~m}-2 \mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{NT}$ is a WNT and is non－forcing， 3 m is unbalanced and non－forcing．All other bids are at least quasi－nat－ ural and FG
2 shows $23+$ balanced or any game forcing hand Weak $2 \diamond$ ， $2 \uparrow$ and $2 \boldsymbol{( 5 - 9}$ ，six－card suit）．In response 2 NT is a relay asking for a high－card feature if not minimum with 3 NT showing a
good suit，non－minimum． $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ asks for a single－ ton with 3NT showing a singleton 4 is RKCB Three－level openings are natural and pre－emp－
 is RKCB．
3NT opening is Acol gambling－solid suit and at most a queen outside．
Four－level openings are natural．

## No－trump bidding：

After 1NT 15－17，2 $\boldsymbol{2}=$ Stayman， $2 \uparrow / 2 \uparrow=$ trans－ fers， $2 \boldsymbol{s}=\mathrm{s}$ with $2 \mathrm{NT} / 3$ denying／showing a fit， $2 \mathrm{NT}=\$$ with 3 e $/>$ denying／showing a fit．After this new suits are splinters． 3 e is 5 card Stay－ man， $3 \downarrow$ is $5-5 \mathrm{~ms} \mathrm{FG}, 3 \vee /$ 1－3－（4－5）／3－1－（4－5） and FG． $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ is $5-5$ majors，game only， $4 \diamond / \downarrow=\uparrow / \boldsymbol{s}$ （then $4 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{RKCB}$ and new suits are Exclusion）． 1 NT rebid $=12-14$ with 2 a puppet to $2 \diamond$ to play in $2 \diamond$ or make an invitational bid， 2 is game forcing checkback，new suits at the 3 level are 5－5 FG and higher bids are auto－splinters．
Jump 2 NT rebid $=18-19$ with natural continuations．
After 2 over 1， 2 NT is 12－14 balanced or 18－19 balanced and 3 NT is $15-17$ range with a reason not to have opened 1 NT
3NT rebid after a one－level response shows a
good suit and a good hand．
After 2NT，20－22， $3 \boldsymbol{\sim}=$ Stayman， $3 \uparrow / 3 \uparrow=$ trans fers， $3 \mathbf{a}=$ slam try with both minors．Four－level bids are as after 1 NT opening．
Kokish is played after $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ opening（ $2 \boldsymbol{2}-2 \boldsymbol{-}$ $2 \boldsymbol{2 N T}$ is $25+$ balanced FG，and $2-2$－ 2 NT is 23－24 balanced NF）

## Initial response：

Jump shifts are weak at the two－level and invita－ tional at the three－level．Bidding and rebidding a suit is invitational，bidding and jump rebidding a suit is FG（eg $1 \downarrow, 2 \downarrow$ is weak， $1 \diamond, 1 \vee, 2 \downarrow$ is invitational； $1 \diamond, 1 \vee, 2 \&, 3 \vee$ is FG）．
2 NT after $1 \boldsymbol{e} / 1$ is natural and invitational with－ out 4M．
2 NT after $1 \uparrow / 1 \stackrel{\perp}{\boldsymbol{L}}=$ game－forcing with $4+$ card support．Continuations in new suits are splin－ ters， $3 \mathbf{V} / \mathbf{a}$ extras with no singleton， $3 \mathrm{NT}=18-19$ balanced， 4 new suits are 5－5 good suits，4 $4 / \mathbf{\square}$ minimum balanced．

## Continuations：

$1 \mathrm{x}-1 \mathrm{M}-2 \mathrm{M}$ promises four－card support or three－ card support and an unbalanced hand．Balanced hands with three－card support rebid 1NT
Reverses are forcing for one round after a one－level

## How to Enter

Send your chosen bid in each of the eight problems，by email to biddingbattle＠newbridgemag．com or enter via the website www．newbridgemag．com． Entries must be received before the end of the month．Include your name，email address and number of the set which you are entering．
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response. The lower of 2NT and 4th suit encompasses all weak hands, responder's rebid of own suit is F1 but not necessarily strong, all other bids are FG.
All high reverses are game-forcing.
Jumps when a bid of the suit one level lower is forcing are splinters, as are four-level responses in a lower-ranking suit to $1 \boldsymbol{V} / 1 \boldsymbol{\perp}$. Jumps when the previous level is forcing are splinters.
4 th suit = game-forcing.
When responder's suit is raised a return to opener's suit is forcing.

## Slam bidding:

Roman Key Card Blackwood (1 or 4, 0 or 3, 2, 2 + trump Q).
Exclusion Blackwood only in clear circumstances including a jump to the five-level in a new suit and after $1 \mathrm{NT}-4 \diamond / \downarrow$. Responses are $0,1,2$.
Cue-bids are Italian style, that is the lowest control is shown regardless of whether it is first or second round or a positive or negative control and skipping a suit denies a control in that suit. Exception: a negative control in partner's suit is not shown immediately.
The default for 5 NT is "pick a slam".

## Competition:

Responsive and competitive Doubles through 34 - after that, Doubles are value-showing, not penalties.
Negative Doubles through 3 - after that, Doubles are value showing, not penalties.
After a 1 M opening bid and an overcall, 2NT = four-card limit raise or better and a cue-bid
is a three-card limit raise or better, raises are pre-emptive, change of suit forcing one round but not FG. New suits at the three-level are FG.
After a 1 m opening and an overcall, 2 NT is natural and invitational and the cue-bid is a limit raise or better, raises are pre-emptive, change of suit F1 but not FG, new suit at the three-level is FG .
Fit-jumps after opponents overcall or take-out Double.
Fit jumps after our overcalls. Jump cue-bid is a mixed raise (about 6-9 with four-card support) Double jumps are splinters.
Lebensohl applies after interference over our 1 NT . An immediate 3NT shows a stopper but not $4 \mathrm{oM}, 2 \mathrm{NT}$ then 3 NT shows a stopper and $40 \mathrm{M}, 2 \mathrm{NT}$ then cue-bid shows no stopper but 40 M immediate cue-bid shows no stopper and no 40 M . In summary 3 NT at any time shows a stopper and cue-bid at any time denies one, a jump to 3中 (eg 1NT-2凶-3 ) is FG.
2 NT is rarely natural in competition (except as defined above). Possibilities include Lebensohl or scramble if game is not viable.

## Overcalls:

After a 1 M overcall, 2 NT = four-card limit raise or better and a cue-bid is a three-card limit raise or better, raises are pre-emptive, change of suit forcing one round. Fit jumps, jump cue is a mixed raise (about 6-9 and four trumps)
After a minor-suit overcall, 2NT is natural and invitational and the cue-bid is a limit raise or better, raises are pre-emptive. Fit jumps, jump cue is a mixed raise (about 6-9 and four trumps)

Weak jump overcalls, intermediate in 4th.
Michaels cue-bids. $1 \mathrm{~m}-2 \mathrm{~m}=\mathrm{Ms}, 1 \mathrm{M}-2 \mathrm{M}=\mathrm{oM}$ and $m$ with $2 N T$ asking for the $m$, inv+ and 3 m P/C

## Defences:

Against all pre-empts, take-out Doubles with Lebensohl responses - same structure as above.
2 NT is rarely natural in competition (except as defined above). Possibilities include Lebensohl or scramble if game is not viable.
Over 2M, $4 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ are Leaping Michaels ( 5,5 in $/ \downarrow$ and oM, FG). Over Natural weak $2 \star, 4 \boldsymbol{\omega}=$ Leaping Michaels ( 5,5 in \& a M with $4 \diamond$ to ask for
 as P/C. Over $3 \star$, $4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}=$ Nat and $4 \diamond=$ Ms. Over
 $4 \Phi / \checkmark / \downarrow=$ nat, $4 \Phi / 4 N T=$ two-suiter
Over their 1NT, Double = pens, $2 \boldsymbol{2}=$ majors, $2 *$ $=1$ major, $2 \uparrow / \mathbf{Q}=5 \vee / \& \& 4+\mathrm{m} 2 \mathrm{NT}=$ minors or game-forcing 2 -suiter.
Over a strong $1 \boldsymbol{1}$, natural, Double = majors, 1 NT $=$ minors, Pass then bid is strong.

## Grand Prix

In addition there is an annual Grand Prix with Master Point Press prizes of $£ 100, £ 50$ and $£ 35$. Only scores of 50 and over will count and the maximum score is 400 . Each contestant's Grand Prix total is their five best scores over the year (January - December).
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## WEST

Hands for the August 2018 The Auction Room

Bid these hands with those on the following page with your favourite partner; then turn to The Auction Room inside to see how your score compares to that of the experts

Hand 1. Dealer East. None Vul.

- AK10432
- Q109
- J3
* Q9

If West opens $1 \mathbf{1 4}$ North doubles
Hand 2. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- K1087653
- 652
- Q
- QJ

Hand 3. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- J97
- Q102
- Q9543
- K4

South overcalls $2 \downarrow$
Hand 4. Dealer South. Both Vul.

- QJ62
- Q63
- Q98
- QJ9

South overcalls $2 \boldsymbol{1}$

Hand 5. Dealer West. None Vul.

- J10
- 876
- 6432
- J543

Hand 6. Dealer West. None Vul.

- 987
- A10932
- 3
* AK75

Hand 7. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

- A3
- J852
- A1072
- 1032

North opens 1 and if East bids 1 South doubles and North bids $2 \downarrow$
Hand 8. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

- AQ9754
- 1032
- 4
- J53

South overcalls 5 -

## MASTER POINT BIDDING BATTLE

## Results - Set 6

The first set conducted by Brian Senior. As you can read in Brian's comments on the following page, problem one was deleted, and everybody's score was multiplied by $8 / 7$.
June's winner were Mark Bartusek and Jeff Callaghan with 72 points (obviously after adding one seventh). Mark receives a voucher of $£ 40$, Jeff gets $£ 30$. Third was Mike Ralph on 72. A tie for fourth, with 70 points each, was between Stuart Nelson and Mike Perkins, Stuart receives the voucher for $£ 10$.

## Other Good Scores

69 Bill Gordon, Derek Markham, Chris Shambrook, George Willett 67 Colin Brown, Lajos Hajdu

## Grand Prix standings:

The top eleven scorers currently are:

| Mike Ralph | 364 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Mark Bartusek | 363 |
| Stuart Nelson | 357 |
| Rodney Lighton | 351 |
| Michael Prior | 351 |
| Nigel Guthrie | 348 |
| Alex Athanasiadis | 347 |
| Colin Brown | 344 |
| David Barnes | 342 |
| Andrew King | 340 |
| Bill Gordon | 340 |

## How to Claim Your Prize

The winners will receive an email from Master Point Press sending you a Gift Certificate. You will then need to create an account using your email address in order to validate your Certificate.
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## Comments on Bidding Battle Scores

This would perhaps be a good time to give a little insight into how I intend to score the Bidding Battle, having just taken over the reins from Alan.

Firstly, you may have noticed that I spread the scores out more than Alan did. In other words there are likely to be fewer problems on which the scoring for the different bids goes $10,9,8,6$, and more that go 10,8 , 5,2 . This will not always be the case, but where the panel and I agree that one bid is distinctly superior to another that will be reflected in a significant gap in the awards for the two bids.

Similar bids may be grouped together to some extent to decide what awards to give. So, for example, a game bid may be scored higher than a non-game bid even though the non-game bid gets more votes, if the overall balance suggests that the panel believes that it is right to make a game bid of some kind. Obviously, the low-scoring game bid has to be a sensible option for this to apply.

It is conceivable, though not likely to be very common, that the above could even lead to the panel's top choice not getting the top award. Normally, however, the bid which gets the highest panel vote will score 10 marks, my own personal preferences not being used to over-rule the panel.

There was never, so far as I am aware, a readers' poll in the manner of the Bridge World to decide on the (New) Bridge Magazine system. The conductor therefore found that he was left to decide on the methods himself, simply to fill the void, and some of those methods have been a long way from mainstream - and, of course, mainstream in the UK and in the US, never mind the rest of the world, can be very different in some areas. A particular case in point would be Problem 1 in Set 18.06, where only one panellist even knew that a 3\% response to a weak two bid was a shortage ask, so that $80 \%$ of the panel made the bid to show clubs. I have never played this method and have never had it used against me, so it never even occurred to me that $3 *$ was other than clubs when I set the problem. As of today, the 3e response becomes natural and constructive but non-forcing, just like a two-level response in a new suit. You may prefer it to be forcing, but neither is universally played so I've made the decision as one had to be made. Personally, I would bid 3e on the actual hand whether or not it was forcing.

I think, however, that the afore-mentioned Problem 1 is sufficiently flawed that it should not be part of either the monthly or annual competitions. So the monthly competition will be decided solely on the basis of Problems 2 to 8, and the readers' scores will be factored up by one-seventh for the purposes of the annual competition.

I have said that I will update the published system, but that will not happen immediately because I don't have the time to do it yet - I am in the middle of a four-week trip away from home and, while part of that is holiday (and I am writing this whilst on that holiday), I no more wish to do more work than is absolutely essential than would anyone else whilst on holiday. Much of the change may happen gradually as we go along.

Which brings us to the readers' comments on Set 18.06.
Problem 1:
I think I have covered this above. This problem will be scrubbed as far as the competition scoring is concerned.
Problem 2:
' 3 \& : 3 ought to be game try with Hearts self-agreed, I'm worth natural return try (or last train).'

Sorry, but I don't know any expert who plays 3* here as other than natural, as described by the panel. However:
'In respect of Q2,I think it is disappointing that 3 is not allocated a mark. Whereas most chose to guess whether to bid $3 \vee$ or $4 \vee$, with many assuming their $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ has no value, this bid makes an effort to consult partner. I don't see much merit in it being natural after we left partner in $2 \uparrow$. Whilst the panel all think partner is $6-4$ with weak Clubs, I think it would be an intelligent thing to do with three good Clubs, as partner will not pass it unless he detests Hearts, probably void, can we not hold 3055? Thus I am allowing for partner to hold something like 2623, and showing some life on the way to 3 『.'

You can be 3-0-5-5, but I'm still not comfortable with the idea of bidding 3e on a three-card suit. We will be left to play the 4-3 fit when we have a 6-1 in hearts and, if partner has zero game interest, when we have a 6-2 heart fit. If opener is less than 6-4 and wants to make a third bid, he can double. That will get us to a 5-3 minor-suit fit if one exists, I think.

Having said which, I agree that $3>$ should not be natural after we left partner in $2 \downarrow$. His third bid makes it less likely that we belong in diamonds, so why now try to play in our own suit? If we agree that $3>$ is not an attempt to play there, then it can indeed be used to hedge our bets regarding how far to go in support of one of partner's suits - Last Train, if you will. Accordingly, I will add an award of 4 points for a 3 call, even though no panellist mentioned the idea.
'On problem 2 there is no score for $4 \boldsymbol{\&}$ which turns out to be a successful contract and gets a mention although no votes.'

OK, 4 is probably harmless and is far from being an absurd choice. Plus, it did get a mention, so we'll give it 4 points.

However, the fact that a contract is successful does not make bidding it a good idea. This is why I am less keen than was Alan to give partner's hand on a regular basis. What would have worked in real life may be nice to know, but is irrelevant to our discussion. What I fear is that a reader gives an answer and scores very badly because the panellists disagree with him, but his choice would have worked in real life so he ignores everything the experts have to say and believes that his answer was correct all along - he learns nothing. Believe me, this happens. I have been asked so many times at a tournament for my opinion on a bid. When I give the answer the asker is seeking he goes away happy and often tells his partner that he was right and the partner was wrong, 'because Brian Senior says so'. And if I don't give the hoped for answer? - no problem, he just goes and asks another expert until he finds one who agrees with him.

So, where the object of a problem is to work out what partner is showing, it is entirely appropriate to give partner's hand at the end of the discussion. Where partner's handtype is known and the problem is more a matter of judgement, I will sometimes give partner's hand, sometimes not (even supposing that I know it, of course).

## $4 \boldsymbol{*} / 3$ - 4

5\% $\quad 1$
Problem 3:
'3\&, forcing. first step to discover partner's controls. 6* in mind with - K and ${ }^{\boldsymbol{*}} \mathrm{K}$ '

I'm not sure how bidding clubs rather than diamonds is going to get us to the right level in diamonds. Of course, I get that the two minor-suit kings are key to that, but I really think that bidding clubs is going to make life harder rather than easier, accordingly, I will make one grumpy reader by not awarding any points to 3 e.

Pass
2

Problem 4:
'3\&: Not helpful system is not defined. Trying to agree diamonds, before bidding spades.'

I've covered this pretty thoroughly in the article. Common sense tells us that 3* must be the bid used to show the sound diamond raise. However, to create a general rule: Where an opponent makes a two-suited overcall and we know both suits, the cheaper cue-bid shows a constructive raise of opener's suit, the other cue-bid shows a forcing bid in the fourth suit. It follows that an immediate raise of opener's suit is shaded, while a bid of the fourth suit is natural but not forcing. We are assuming here defence to two-level or Ghestem 3\& overcalls, not high-level two-suited bids.

And, just for the sake of completeness: Where only one suit is defined by the overcall, a cue-bid in that suit shows a constructive raise of opener's suit and a bid of the fourth suit is natural and forcing.
Problems 4, 6 \& 7
No additional marks
Problem 5
5/6
2
Problem 8:
' 2 "bad" was available, so think $4 \Upsilon$ is worst hand, one that might not have responded'

I cannot see how a hand that might not have responded can bid this way. Also, the methods are mildly contradictory, in that $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ would indeed be 'bad', the 'Lebensohl weak bid', according to the published methods, yet $2 \vee$ would also only be a one-round force, showing a fifth heart. Would 2 $\mathbf{2}$ therefore deny five half-way decent hearts, as well as showing a weak hand (weak hand meaning not enough to go to game opposite a minimum reverse)?

I think that, given that responder has a self-sufficient suit, the 2 thing is a red herring - but well spotted to notice something that was not mentioned by the panel.

If we are not careful, we will end up with a book, never mind sufficient detail to avoid difficulties answering the Bidding Battle problems, but it seems to me that one would bid 2『, one-round force, here with $\uparrow$ KQxxx and out, but 2 with $\vee 109$ xxx and five scattered points outside. Does that fit with how others would bid if having the $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ bad option available to them?

6
2
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| XXI MADEIRA <br> BRIDGE OPEN <br> VIDAMAR RESORT HOTEL MADEIRA <br> 1ST - 12THNOVEMBER 2018 <br> RE-TOURNAMENT EVENTS <br> MAIN EVENTS: <br> WARM-UP: 5 T COOL-DOWN |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## A grand slam <br> of pleasures

Since the seeds of tourism were sown in the early 19th century, Madeira has grown famous as a holiday destination. The temperate climate, the natural beauty of the island and the lush landscapes ... combine these with Madeira's cosmopolitan and welcoming people and it's an unforgettable experience for visitors. It is in this wonderful setting that the Madeira Bridge Association is hosting the 21st Madeira International Bridge Open, in partnership with the VidaMar Resort and Intertours.

## VidaMar Resort Hotel Madeira

Estrada Monumental 175-177 9000-100 Funchal - Madeira Tel: (+351 ) 291768447 | Fax: (+351 ) 291768449 E-mail: sales@madeira.vdm.pt Website: www.vidamarresorts.com


Do you love playing against good opponents?

Then today's your lucky day: some top players will once again be in Funchal for the 21st Madeira International Bridge Open.
Come and enjoy good bridge in a hotel that measures up to the occasion.
VidaMar's rooms all have sea views.
Natural daylight floods the public areas and the playing-rooms. The VidaMar Resort Hotel Madeira offers many leisure and sports facilities, including restaurants and bars, indoor and outdoor swimming pools, a sauna, a whirlpool and a fitness centre. It is also home to the sensational Thalasso Sea Spa.

INTERTOURS: RESERVATIONS
Tânia Cruz or Rosana Pereira
Tel.: ( + 351) 291208906 (direct) or
(+351) 291208900 Fax: ( + 351 ) 291225020 E-mail: groups@intertours.com.pt Website: www.intertours.com.pt

Bridge package includes:

- 7 nights' stay including breakfast
- Entry fees for both main events
( Pairs and Teams )
- Airport transfers
- Welcome cocktail party
- Prize-giving and gala dinner
- Light lunch on Saturday $10^{\text {th }}$ NOV'18
- Social programme
( bookable through Intertours )

| PRICES | $\begin{gathered} \text { double } \\ \text { ROOM B\&B } \end{gathered}$ | SINGLE ROOM B\&B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Early booking (1) ( by 31st July ) | € 637.50 | € 928.00 |
| Extra nights (per person per night ) | € 49.50 | € 91.00 |
| Standard bridge rate (1) ( bookings from 1st August ) | $€ 708.00$ | € 1030.00 |
| Extra nights ( per person per night) | € 55.00 | € 101.00 |

Pre- and post-tournament side events 1st Nov - 9pm | National Simultaneous Pairs $2^{\text {nd }}-3^{\text {rd }}$ Nov - 4.30pm | IMP Pairs $5^{\text {th }}$ Nov $-9 p m$ | Warm-up Pairs 12th Nov-9pm | Cool-down Pairs

Main tournament programme 5th Nov-6pm | Welcome cocktail 6th- 8th Nov - 4.30pm | Open Pairs 9th- $11^{\text {th }}$ Nov | Open Teams
Start times: 9th Nov-8.30pm
$10^{\text {th }}$ Nov -11.30 am and 3.30 pm 11th Nov-3pm
PRICES ${ }^{(1)}$
OTHER HOTELS
Price per person

DOUble ${ }^{(2)}$ $\underset{\text { B\&B }}{\text { DOUBLE }}$ $\underset{\substack{\text { SINGLE } \\ B \& B}}{ }$ B\&B for 7-night package
$€ 463.00$
(1) Package price per person, 7 nights
(2) Minimum occupancy 2 persons

For other accommodation options please contact Intertours.

For more information and FAQs visit www.bridge-madeira.com Please check the tournament website for changes to the programme.

## BRIDGE MADEIRA CONTACTS

Miguel Teixeira Carlos Luíz

## *

Tel.: (+351 ) 914440580 | E-mail: cluiz57@gmail.com José Júlio Curado
Tel.: ( + 351 ) 937951515 | E-mail: j.curado@yahoo.com Website: www.bridge-madeira.com


Secretaria Regional
de Educacão
de Educacăal
Diregão Regional de Juventude e Desporto


## Associação de bridge da madeira
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## EAST

Hands for the August 2018 The Auction Room

Bid these hands with those on the previous page with your favourite partner; then turn to The Auction Room inside to see how your score compares to that of the experts

Hand 1. Dealer East. None Vul.

- Q7
- K754
- K108
- K753

If West opens $1 \wedge$ North doubles
Hand 2. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- A2
- AKJ84
- J104
- K43

Hand 3. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- AK862
- J864
- AK10
- 3

South overcalls $2 \varphi$
Hand 4. Dealer South. Both Vul.
$\rightarrow$ A

- AKJ8
- KJ652
- 1074

South overcalls $2 \boldsymbol{1}$

Hand 5. Dealer West. None Vul.

- AK865
- 5
- AJ
- AKQ109

Hand 6. Dealer West. None Vul.

- AQJ3
- K8
- 9754
- 832

Hand 7. Dealer South. N/S Vul.
ـ K1098542
$\checkmark$ Q

- 54
- AK8

North opens $1 \mathbf{~ c h}$ and if East bids 14 South doubles and North bids $2 \downarrow$
Hand 8. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

- J63

४ -

- AKQ853
- AQ106

South overcalls 5 -

## Running Costs

In order to meet our production costs we are relying on sponsorship, advertising revenue and donations.

Sponsorship can come in many forms - one that is proving popular is the sponsorship of a particular column - as you will see from the association of FunBridge with Misplay these Hands with Me and Master Point Press with The Bidding Battle.

We have set ourselves a target of 50,000+ readers, which should be enough to attract a significant level of advertising. As that number increases we will be able to approach more famous companies who might wish to associate themselves with the bridge playing community.

You can help us to achieve our aims in several ways.
Firstly - and by far the most important - by telling all your bridge playing friends that we exist and making sure they register at our web site, www.newbridgemag.com

Secondly by becoming a sponsor. That could take many forms - I have already mentioned the possibility of being linked to a column within the magazine and you will see from this issue that is already popular. There is also the possibility of linking directly to the title.

Thirdly by becoming a Friend of the magazine. That would involve a donation. Anyone donating $£ 500$ would become a Golden Friend.

It is possible to make a donation by credit card - just go to the appropriate page on the web site. A number of readers are making regular donations by bank transfer.

If you would like to discuss any of the above contact me at: editor@newbridgemag.com

Ask not what A New Bridge Magazine can do for you - ask what you can do for A New Bridge Magazine.

