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## Following the Law

The World Bridge Federation's Laws Committee has released its Commentary on the 2017 Laws of Duplicate Bridge.
http://www.worldbridge.org/wp-content/ uploads/2019/01/2017LawsCommentary.pdf
From this lengthy document (that all tournament players should read at least once) we have selected the following extracts:
Law 1 - The Pack This Law now requires that the reverse side of the playing cards be symmetrical. Some older cards might not now comply with this Law. For instance, those with a single logo on the back may look different when pointed up to down. The Committee also recommends the use of symmetrical card faces.
Law 6 - The Shuffle and Deal This Law is now clear: two consecutive cards in the deck should not be dealt to the same player's hand. There is also a recommendation that the cards be dealt in four piles clockwise.
Law 7B - Inspection of an Opponent's Hand After a board is played, a player may look at a hand if either of his opponents agree or if the TD allows it.
Law 7C - Returning Cards to the Board After play, each player should mix his cards before returning them to the board. This is to avoid unauthorised information being obtained from the order in which cards were played at a previous table.
Law 9A3 - Prevention of an Irregularity The Laws allow any player to try to prevent another player from committing an infraction or irregularity. Once an irregularity has occurred, it can
no longer be prevented from happening. A common example is dummy stating that declarer has led from the wrong hand. Before declarer leads from the
 wrong hand, dummy may try to prevent him from doing so; once declarer has done so, this irregularity can no longer be prevented. Dummy cannot be the first to point out an irregularity or to summon the Director before attention has been legally drawn to the irregularity by another player.
Law $\mathbf{4 5 C 1}$ - A card from a defender is deemed to be played when it is possible that his partner has seen it. The question is not whether his partner did see it, only whether it was possible that he could have seen it. This means that if both declarer and dummy have seen the face of the card, then it is almost certain to have also been visible to partner.
Law 45C2 - For declarer the manner in which he exposes the card is very important. Declarer is allowed to discover that he detached the wrong card from hand and attempt to retract it. Such a card is not necessarily played, even if it has become visible to one or both of the defenders. Bringing the card to the table and retracting it in the same movement also does not make it 'played'. The definition of a declarer's played card is only fulfilled at the moment when the card comes to rest.
Law 61B3 - Inquiries Concerning a Revoke The controversy created by an earlier version of the code where the Regulating Authority could
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prohibit defenders from asking each other whether they had revoked has been removed. The laws now say that players are allowed to ask. The laws still mention the possibility of creating UI by asking partner, but normally this will not be the case. An example where it would be UI is when the purpose of the question is not to avoid a revoke, but to draw attention to an unexpected situation with an opponent still holding cards in that suit. If players ask routinely, it is hard to imagine UI being transmitted. If they ask rarely, or if the tone of the question indicates surprise, then there will be UI. Example 45:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | $1 N T$ |
| Pass | $2 \downarrow$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West leads the Q ; the dummy has $\uparrow \mathrm{K} 9873 \vee \mathrm{~K} 94 \diamond 632 \star$ A 95 . When East discards a club West asks: "no diamonds partner?" and declarer turns out to have AJ4 PA7 AK10854 J 6. The TD should be suspicious of a defender who only asks when he is surprised: this tells their partner that declarer has more cards of the suit than might otherwise be expected.

## Keep Bridge Alive

The Keep Bridge Alive campaign is gathering momentum. If you want to see the many comments from some of the world's best players go to:
https://www.facebook.com/search/str/Keep+Bridge+Alive/ keywords_blended_posts?epa=SEARCH_BOX


## Player of the Year

In 1990, the American Contract Bridge League introduced Platinum Points, and has been using them ever since to determine their 'Player of the Year'. Four players, Zia Mahmood (5) Jeff Meckstroth (3) Bob Hamman (3) and Michael Rosenberg (2) have won more than once. They have been joined by a member of the magazine's Master Point Press Bidding Battle panel, Eric Greco, who has repeated his success of 2016 in winning the 2018 title.
That set me thinking about the creation of a similar award for English players. Not one based on the accumulation of master points, but on a combination of results and actual performance at the table.
Looking back over 2018 it seems to me that the outstanding player was Sally Brock, who, apart from all sorts of domestic success, won gold and silver medals at the World Championships. I am going to search out a sponsor so that at the end of 2019 we can announce the first recipient of A New Bridge Magazine's Player of the Year award.

## Card Game Books

Bridge books, ephemera, other card games and playing cards

Gordon Bickley Gordon Bickiey
Card Game Books
208 Strines Road, Strines, Stockport Cheshire SK6 7GA
Tel: 0161-427 4630 or 07530553594 e-mail: gordonarf@aol.com
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Test Your Technique
with Christophe Grosset see Page 37
Matchpoints. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

- A864
- A986
- 1094
- 63
- KQJ7
- 105
- AQJ73
- J8

The bidding goes:

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

West leads the 7 and East plays the king, and switches to a low diamond. How do you play?


By plane: Örebro has a small airport but not may flights. However, the most convenient and least expensi way would be to fly to Gothenburg or Stockholm, then take the train (see below).

By train: Trains from all major cities in Sweden go to Örebro. The venue is just 200 meters from the Örebro Södra train station. Tickets at www.s.j.se.

By car: 200 km from Stockholm (E18 towards Oslo). 280 km from Gothenburg (E20 towards Stockholm). 500 km from Malmö (E4(E6) towards Stockholm, then road 50 towards Örebro).

How to get to the Bridge Festival venue: Conventum Arena (Fabriksgatan 28) is situated in the middle of the city, just 200 meters from the Örebro Södra train station, and straight across the street from Scandic Grand Hotel.
 ENTRY FEES \& PRIZES

The entry fees for our tournaments are as follows: Bronze tournaments Silver Tournaments I ticket Gold Mine Pairs $\quad 3$ tickets

Tickets may be pre-bought at our hospitality desk for 100 SEK/ticket (more or less $10 €$ ).
$40 \%$ of the entry fees are going back as cash prizes in all tournaments.

Chairmans Cup entry fee $2800 \mathrm{SEK} /$ team, if pre-paid 2400. Fixed prizes with 50000 SEK to the winning tea 2nd to 6th get $25000,15000,10000,7500$ and 7500 .

Masterpoints in all tournamaments in three categories: bronze, silver and goldpoints.


## Around the World in Eighty Deals <br> The Editor reports on interesting deals from around the bridge world

In the Classic Jules Verne novel, Around the World in Eighty Days, Philleas Fogg and his valet, Passepartout set out to travel around the world in 80 days. The hero was fond of playing whist and would no doubt have been a fine bridge player.

During the course of his journey, Fogg visited many different countries, including France, Italy, Egypt, India, Singapore, China, Japan, the USA and Ireland.

Thanks to the power of the Internet and courtesy of BBO, this month we present just a handful of the deals played in the last few weeks from around the world.

Our adventure begins in Sydney, Australia, where the ABF hosted a Mixed Team Playoff for the 2019 World Championships at the end of January.

When the last session of the final started, Tutty led Gold 107-72.

| Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - KJ32 <br> - 10 <br> - 106 <br> * K95432 |  |  |  |
| - $A Q 7$ <br> - AQ8432 <br> - AJ <br> \& A8 | $\mathrm{W}^{\mathrm{N}}$ | - 964 <br> - J96 <br> - KQ8543 <br> - Q |  |
|  | 4 10 <br> - K7 <br> - 97 <br> - J 1 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Beauchamp | Muntz | Tutty | Gold |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| 2** | Pass | 3** | Pass |
| 3** | Pass | 4** | Pass |
| 6 | All Pass |  |  |

The precise meaning of 3 and $3>$ is unclear, but it resulted in 6 being played from the strong hand. North led the $\geqslant 10$ and declarer won with dummy's jack, unblocked the diamonds, cashed the $\boldsymbol{A}$, ruffed a club, drew the outstanding trump and played a heart for +1390 .

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Frazer | Cooper | Ebery | Thompson |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \mathbf{e s}^{*}$ | $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ | $3 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| $3 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass | $4 \downarrow$ | All Pass |

Is the West hand worth $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ ? If you are worried partner might pass $1 \vee$ you can always start with 2 NT . That is debatable, but East's decision to raise to game rather than cue-bid $4 \boldsymbol{*}$ is perhaps more open to question. Even then West's decision to let matters rest at $4 \checkmark$ is conservative - especially with a 35 IMP deficit.

Declarer won the club lead with dummy's queen, played a heart to the queen and a heart to the nine and king. The spade return was taken by the ace and declarer now drew the outstanding trump, taking twelve tricks when the diamonds behaved, a loss of 12 IMPs that more or less settled the outcome, Tutty eventually winning 140-93.
You can replay this deal here or https://tinyurl.com/yb9bzjsy
We stay in Australia for the final of the NOT between Milne (Liam Milne Andy Hung - Sartaj Hans - James Coutts, Shane Harrison - Sophie Ashton) and Leibowitz (Tony Leibowitz - Peter Gill, Ashley Bach - Michael Cornell, Michael Whibley - Matthew Brown).

By the time the last session started, Leibowitz led 125-69.

## Board 24. Dealer West. None Vul. <br> - 103 <br> - 63 <br> - AKJ943 <br> \& K73 <br> 

| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bach | Milne | Cornell | Coutts |
| 39 | Pass | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | 4** | Double | 5* |
| Pass | 5NT | Pass | 6 |

The commentators speculated about the meaning of $4 \boldsymbol{A}$, suspecting that it was a keycard ask with diamonds as trumps. South did eventually alert 4^, but the BBO operator could not see exactly what was written - his impression was that South though it showed clubs.

West led the $\$ 8$ and declarer took East's queen with the ace, played the $\boldsymbol{N}^{\mathrm{J}}$ to dummy's king, finessed the $\boldsymbol{\$ 9}$, went to dummy with a diamond drew trumps via the marked finesse and claimed.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hung | Whibley | Hans | Brown |
| $2 \boldsymbol{3}$ | 3 | $3 \downarrow$ | $3 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West led the $\vee 10$ and declarer ducked, won the next heart and cashed six rounds of diamonds. The last of these forced East to pitch a club,
but declarer did not finesse and finished with ten tricks for a loss of 10 IMPs. That made the set score 42-11 in favour of Milne, but they could not maintain their charge, Leibowitz winning 161-125.
You can replay this deal here or https://tinyurl.com/y9thjuz7
Our next stop is in Turkey, for the Istanbul Open Teams Championship. Later in the year the City will host the European Open Championships. In the last of the ten rounds Dedehayir faced Yilankiran.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Karaivanov | Kandemir | Basaran | Kolata |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | 2** |
| Pass | 4** | Pass | 49 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| 2* Drury |  |  |  |
| 4* Splinter |  |  |  |

East led the 3 and declarer won with the jack, crossed to dummy with a diamond and ran the $\mathbf{\$ 1 0}$. He repeated the finesse, drew the outstanding trump, crossed to the $\$$, pitched a heart on the $\diamond$ K and took the heart finesse for all the tricks.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Cubukcu | Ozcan | Cubukcu | Kaya |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | 2** |
| Pass | 29 | Pass | 4. |
| Pass | 4NT* | Pass | 5* |
| Pass | $6{ }^{4}$ | All Pass |  |
| 2. Drury |  |  |  |
| 4NT RKCB |  |  |  |
| 5 1 key card |  |  |  |

Here too the opening lead was a club and declarer followed a similar line for all the tricks and 11 IMPs to Yilankiran.

| Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $$ | - K8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { QJ965 } \\ & \text { QJ92 } \\ & 8 \\ & \& \text { Q53 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\checkmark$ K84 |  |
|  | - Q1043 |  |
|  | - AK108 |  |
|  | N |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | W E |  |
|  | S |  |
|  | - A 104 |  |
|  | - A |  |
|  | - AKJ972 |  |
|  | - 762 |  |

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Karaivanov | Kandemir | Basaran | Kolata |
| Pass | 1NT | Pass | 3e* |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | 3** |
| Pass | 34* | Double | 4NT* |
| Pass | 5** | Pass | 5** |
| Pass | 5NT* | Pass | 6 |
| Pass | 7 | All Pass |  |

It looks as if 3e promised very good diamonds, with $3 \boldsymbol{r}$ and $3 \boldsymbol{p}$ being cue-bids. South might have redoubled to confirm his first round control, but preferred to ask for key cards. Whatever North's 5NT promised South hesitated before bidding $6 \$$ and when North went on to the grand slam the Director was called and the result was adjusted to $6>+1$.


You can understand why North bid $4 \diamond$, but it may have been better to continue with $4 \boldsymbol{\vee}$. South then bids $4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ and continues with $5 \vee$ over North's 5e. When North bids 6\% South knows that if North has two spades the grand slam is cold. The only distribution that could lead to a hopeless contract would be 3-3-4-3 and even then North might turn up with a vital queen. However, one tends not to bid a grand slam unless you can count the tricks so even going down this road might not lead to the top spot.

In passing you can also make 7 NT on this deal.

Declarer will unblock the $\vee \mathrm{A}$, cross to dummy to cash the $₫ \mathrm{~K}$, the $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{K}}$ and a top club and then play diamonds to reach this position:

|  | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & -\frac{1}{2} 10 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - 7 |  | Q QJ |
| $\checkmark 10$ | N | - Q |
| - - | W E | - - |
| \& J9 | S | Q |
|  | - A 10 |  |
|  | - - |  |
|  | - 7 |  |
|  | - 7 |  |

When declarer cashes the $\downarrow 7$ West and dummy pitches a spade East must throw a heart. Then the A squeezes West.

Yilankiran won the match 22-7 and presumably the tournament. You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/yb3crf3q We move on to Poland for the final of the trials to select the Polish team for this month's European Mixed Team Championship in Lisbon, Zawada v Wojcieszek.

With only two of the eight sets remaining Zawada led 151-124.

| Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q10985 } \\ & \text { J873 } \\ & 102 \\ & \& \text { Q7 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| A - <br> - A54 <br> -KQJ875 <br> - KJ93 | $\begin{array}{\|lll\|} \hline & N & \\ \hline W & & E \\ & S & \\ \hline \end{array}$ | KJ32 <br> - K1062 <br> - A6 <br> - A64 |
|  | $$ |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Marks | Zawada | Ogloblin | Sarniak |
| 1 | Pass | 19 | Pass |
| 24* | Double | Redouble | Pass |
| 3\% | Pass | 34 | Double |
| Pass | Pass | 4 | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | 4NT* | Pass |
| 5NT* | Pass | 6 | All Pass |

It looks like $2 \boldsymbol{\$}$ showed a shortage and with diamonds agreed West cuebid in hearts and then showed two key cards and a void.

North led the 10 and dummy's jack was covered by the ace and ruffed by declarer, who now had a parking place for a losing heart. A diamond to the ace was followed by the spade king, declarer pitching the $\vee 4$, and trumps were drawn. Declarer then cashed the $\vee$ A and crossed to dummy's king. A third heart was ruffed, South discarding a spade and declarer continued with a club to the ace and a club for the jack and queen. That meant South took the setting trick with the 10 .

After ruffing a heart declarer should cash the K , cross to dummy with the A and play a third round, scoring the three tricks needed $84.72 \%$ of the time.


Here too North led the $\$ 10$ and declarer ruffed South's ace, drew trumps, cashed the VA, crossed to dummy's king, ruffed a spade and played a heart, claiming twelve tricks when North took the jack.

Clearly a spade lead helps declarer enormously, but you might make 6
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even if North leads something else. Suppose North starts with a trump. Declarer takes three rounds, then plays the top hearts, ruffs a spade and plays a third heart. North wins and can only exit with a heart. Declarer wins in dummy pitching a spade and South has to part with a club. Declarer ruffs a spade and cashes the last trump pitching a club from dummy. South has to throw a second club and now declarer is unlikely to go wrong.

Board 9. Dealer North. EW Vul.

- J7653
- Q9
- 1074
- Q64

| - A4 <br> - AJ842 <br> - KQ82 <br> \& 52 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \qquad \text { KQ10 } \\ & \vee K 1053 \\ & 93 \\ & \& \text { AK83 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Marks | Zawada O | Ogloblin | Sarniak |
| - | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 2** | Pass | 39 | Pass |
| 34* | Pass | 4** | Pass |
| 4** | Pass | 4 | All Pass |
| 2* Transfer |  |  |  |
| 34. Cue-bid |  |  |  |
| 4* Cue-bid |  |  |  |
| 4* Cue-bid |  |  |  |

With trumps 2-2 and the red ace onside there were twelve tricks.


Slam swings on consecutive deals added up to 23 IMPs for Zawada who took the set 35-3 to lead 186-127, enough for their opponents to call it a day.
You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/yaelovm7
Now we head North West to Sweden to drop in on a Swedish Team Trial featuring Sylvan-Fredin, Nystrom-Upmark, Rimstedt O-Rimstedt M, Ekenburg-Hult, Ahlesved-Warne and Michielsen-Cullin. Sweden has qualified for the upcoming Bermuda Bowl, but are in no rush to decide which three pairs will represent them. Their Captain, Jan Lagerman (probably the best Captain in the World) is going to consider results in the Cavendish, the Slava Cup and the US Nationals before making a decision.

This deal is from the second of seven sessions:


North led the $>4$ and declarer put up dummy's queen, so +1430 .
As you can see, if declarer retains dummy’s $\downarrow$ Q South gets squeezed in the minors for an overtrick.

In the other room E/W (I can't tell you who) reached 6NT and took all the tricks to pick up an 1MP.
You can replay this deal here or https://tinyurl.com/y9j2wo65
From Sweden, we move on to Denmark for the Observation tournament for national teams played in Blaksets Bridgecenter in Copenhagen. The BBO commentary team included National Coach Jacob Røn, Leif Thomsen \& John Møller Jepsen.

These deals are from the sixth and last round between the pairs at the top of the standings:

Board 18. Dealer East. N/S Vul.
ค J 9642

- 5
- 754
* KQ72

| - - 986 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AK10 } \\ & \text { AKJ104 } \\ & \text { A9 } \\ & \text { J83 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| -KQJ1063 | W E |  |
| - A64 | S |  |
|  | ( Q8753 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 732$ |  |
|  | - 82 |  |
|  | \& 1095 |  |

Open Room


The Operator assumed 4@ promised a void with heart support, 4NT then asking for keycards, but one of the commentators thought it might be exclusion Blackwood. Whatever, it led to the laydown grand slam.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dahl | Nielsen | Berg | Boesgaard |
| - | - | $2 \boldsymbol{*}^{*}$ | Pass |
| $3 *$ | Pass | $4 *$ | Pass |
| 4NT* | Pass | $5 * *$ | Pass |
| 5NT* | Pass | $7 \star$ | All Pass |

Playing in diamonds cost a couple of IMPs.

## Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.

- 95
-KQ108643
-K3
$\div 72$

- AKQ72
- A975
- A95
- 9

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P Schaltz | Caspersen | D Schaltz | Graversen |
| Pass | $3{ }^{1}$ | Pass | 4\%* |
| Double | Pass* | Pass | 4NT* |
| Pass | 5\%* | Double | 69 |

## All Pass

| 4e | Cue-bid |
| :--- | :--- |
| Pass | Denies first-round control |
| 4NT | RKCB |
| 5 | 1 key card |

That was a painless +1430 .
Assuming N/S find their diamond ruff, $7 \boldsymbol{2}$ would cost only 1100.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Dahl | Nielsen | Berg | Boesgaard |
| Pass | $3 \downarrow$ | Pass | $6 \vee$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

East led the $\mathbf{~ J}$, no swing.

## Board 21. Dealer North. N/S Vul.



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PSchaltz | Caspersen | DSchaltz | Graversen |
| - | $1 \mathbf{2}$ | Pass | 1 |
| $3 \boldsymbol{y y}$ | Pass | Pass | Double |

All Pass
West went for the full blooded overcall. North led the $\boldsymbol{2}$ K and switched to his diamond, South winning with the queen, cashing the A and the $A$ and then switching to a trump. Declarer was booked for five down, -1100 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | West | North | East | South |
|  | Dahl | Nielsen | Berg | Boesgaard |
|  | - | 1980 | Pass | $1{ }^{*}$ |
|  | 29 | Pass | Pass | 4** |
|  | Pass | 4 * | Pass | 4NT* |
|  | Pass | 5** | Pass | 6 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |  |
| $4 *$ | Sets diamonds as trumps and asks for a cue-bid |  |  |  |
| 4 | Cue-bid |  |  |  |
| 4NT | RКСВ |  |  |  |
| 5* | 1 key card |  |  |  |

West led the $\upharpoonright \mathrm{K}$ and declarer won with dummy’s ace and tried the
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diamonds. When they failed to divide declarer had to lose a trump and a spade, a 15 IMP swing.
You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y8tmc6aa
Our next stop is the Netherlands where we visit the final of the Dutch
Major Class between The White House 1(Sjoert Brink - Bass Float, Vincent Ramondt - Berry Westra) and BC 't Onstein 1 (Bauke Muller - Simon de Wijs, Ricco van Prooijen - Louk Verhees, substitutes Bob Drijver Bart Nab).

The five-session final was staged at the NDC Den Hommel in Utrecht where Wubbo de Boer and Joris van Lankveld provided expert commentary.

When the last session got underway the White House led 121-98.


2NT 3+fit, invitational up to a bad game force

The meaning of $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ is uncertain - Al Hollander speculated it might simply be game forcing, but it might also have been promising a shortage, with $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ confirming it was a void.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brink | v Prooijen | Drijver | Verhees |
| - | - | 2* | 29 |
| Pass | 4 | Pass | 44* |
| Pass | 5\%* | Pass | 5** |
| Pass | 6 | All Pass |  |

West led the $\$ 10$ but declarer won, cashed the top trumps, pitched a diamond on the a ruffed a club, crossed to dummy with a spade, ruffed a club and played a spade to the queen, claiming all the tricks and 11 IMPs.

By the time the anti-penultimate deal was reached BC't Onstein had taken the lead by a single IMP, 123-122.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| de Wijs | Westra | Muller | Ramondt |
| - | - | $3 \vee$ | Pass |
| $4 \vee$ | All Pass |  |  |

The $53 \%$ chance that hearts would play for no loser failed to materialise and the contract had to fail by a trick.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Brink | v Prooijen | Drijver | Verhees |
| - | - | $3 \vee$ | All Pass |

That was worth 6 IMPs.
On the penultimate deal de Wijs and Muller bid 6 with Q 4 Q1073
 onside. Was that the match winner? Not quite, as Brink \& Drijver duplicated that result and for once the last board had no significant role to play, the White House winning 130-123.
You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/ycg4btg9
Al Hollander mentioned that there will be test matches for open and women's teams later in the year, but they always seem to have something going on in the Netherlands to make sure their top players get the best possible practice and my next deal comes from the last session of a practice match between the Netherlands and Norway, which the home team won 546-329.

Board 25. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- 9843
$\checkmark 1054$
- 8753
- J3

| 4 AK 106 <br> - Q863 <br> - AQ6 <br> - 104 |  | , Q <br> - A2 <br> - J92 <br> - AK98765 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - J 752 <br> - KJ97 <br> - K 105 <br> \& Q2 |  |

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tundal | van de Bos | Kvangraven | $v$ Lankveld |
| - | Pass | 2e* | Pass |
| 2** | Pass | 2NT* | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

2e 9-15 HCP NV vs. V 11-15 HCP other vuln
2 Forcing for one round
2NT Maximum, single suiter
East had the option of rebidding 3d to show a maximum with $6+\boldsymbol{e}$ and a spade shortage.

South led the $>7$ and declarer took North's ten with the ace, unblocked the Q and exited with the 5 . South won with the queen and tried the $\geqslant 9$ but declarer put up dummy's queen and claimed.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Verhees | Livgard | $v$ Prooijen | Aa |
| - | Pass | 2** | Pass |
| 2** | Pass | $3 * *$ | Pass |
| 3** | Pass | 3NT* | Pass |
| 4e* | Pass | 4》* | Pass |
| 6\% | All Pass |  |  |


| $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ | $10-14(15) 6+\boldsymbol{e}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Relay |
| 3 | Maximum, one-suiter, short spades |
| 3 | Relay |
| 3 NT | $1(32 / 23) 7$ |
| $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Asking for controls $\mathrm{A}=2, \mathrm{~K}=$ with a maximum step 1shows 4 |
| 4 | 5 controls |

Declarer won the spade lead, cashed the top trumps and took a diamond finesse for all the tricks and 12 IMPs.
You can replay this deal here or https://tinyurl.com/y7hojdyg
Now we step across the border into Belgium for the sixth and last session of the Finale between Riviera 1 and BCOB, the latter having already having sown up the match by outscoring their opponents 257-107.

| Dealer North. None Vul. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - AKQ <br> - K854 <br> - 97 <br> * K753 |  |  |  |  |
| - 876 <br> - QJ106 <br> - J82 <br> - Q96 |  | $$ | 」 J10432 <br> - 92 <br> - K6 <br> 2 J1084 |  |
|  |  | - 95 <br> - A73 <br> - AQ10543 <br> - A2 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |  |
|  | West | North | East | South |
|  | Backes | Amsel | Coenraets | Greens |
|  | - | 1NT | Pass | 2NT* |
|  | Pass | $3 * *$ | Pass | 4** |
|  | Pass | 4* | Pass | 4** |
|  | Pass | 4** | Pass | 4NT* |
|  | Pass | 5** | Pass | 6 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |  |
| 2NT | Diamonds |  |  |  |
| 3 | No fit |  |  |  |
| 40 | Cue-bid |  |  |  |
| $4{ }^{4}$ | Cue-bid |  |  |  |
| $4{ }^{4}$ | Cue-bid |  |  |  |
| 4NT | RKСВ |  |  |  |
| 5* | 1 key card |  |  |  |

Declarer won the spade lead and played a diamond to the ten. West won and switched to the heart queen, but declarer won and played a diamond, claiming when the king appeared. They stopped in 3NT in the other room so that was worth 10 IMPs.

\section*{Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul. <br> - A742 <br> - KQ92 <br> -K97 <br> \& KJ <br> | ค J6 <br> - 10876 <br> - AJ84 <br> \& Q87 |  | $$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - KQ53 <br> - A543 <br> - 6 <br> - A942 |  |

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Backes | Amsel | Coenraets | Greens |
| - | - | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | 1** | Pass | 18* |
| Pass | 19 | Pass | 29 |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 49 |
| Pass | 69 | All Pass |  |

West led the A (nothing helps) and declarer was soon in a position to claim, ruffing just one diamond in hand. This slam was worth 13 IMPs against the game in the other room but the 23 IMPs on these two deals were a pinprick as BCOB 1 cruised home 275-136.
You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/ybraqave
We move along the coast into France for our penultimate exhibits from the top division of the French League, which come from the Round 9 match between Fleury and Vinciguerra. After a low-scoring first half Fleury led 11-7.

## Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stamatov | Charletoux | Danailov | Dupuis |
| - | - | Pass | $3 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $6 \vee$ | All Pass |  |

Didn't we just see this auction in Denmark?
Declarer ruffed the club lead in dummy, played a heart to the king, unblocked the $\varangle \mathrm{K}$ and drew the outstanding trump, claiming the rest, as the diamonds could be established.

Could Vinciguerra find a route to $7 \vee$ in the replay?


The answer was a resounding no.
North might have done better to jump to $4 \boldsymbol{\sim}$ over $2 \boldsymbol{4}$. South can then
bid $4 \diamond$ and rebid $5 \diamond$ after North's 4 . Then North will surely bid at least $6 \%$.

It was 11 IMPs for Fleury now ahead 25-8.
Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.
3
AQJ7543
QJ6

* 42
Q QJ 1065
$\bullet 9$
+ 
+ 



- AK987
- K2
- A
- 42
$\checkmark 1086$
- 109754
- 987

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stamatov | Charletoux | Danailov | Dupuis |
| - | - | 10** | Pass |
| 19 | 29 | 21 | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | 3** | Pass |
| 4** | Pass | 4** | Pass |
| 4** | Pass | 4NT* | Pass |
| 5\%* | Pass | 64 | All Pass |
| Strong |  |  |  |
| Cue-bid |  |  |  |
| Cue-bid |  |  |  |
| Cue-bid |  |  |  |
| Cue-bid |  |  |  |
| T RKCB |  |  |  |
| 1 key car |  |  |  |

North led the $\vee$ A, which the commentator surmised might save an IMP.

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Guillaumin | Eisenberg | Palau | Vinciguerra |
| - | - | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $3 \vee *$ | $4 \vee$ | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |
| $3 \vee$ | Mini－splinter |  |  |

If East had bid 5 ，would West have jumped to $6 \boldsymbol{A}$ ？I think you should，as you know partner has gone to the five－level with at least two losing clubs． Indeed，you might prefer to bid $6 \boldsymbol{*}$ ，in case partner＇s heart king is the ace．

It was 13 IMPs to Vinciguerra，suddenly ahead 34－25．


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stamatov | Charletoux | Danailov | Dupuis |
| Pass | Pass | 1ヵ | Double |
| Pass | 1NT | Pass | 2ゅ＊ |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |
| 2．Game try |  |  |  |

East led the $\$ 5$ and declarer won with the eight and played a heart to the nine and jack．East took the spade return with the king and switched to the 10 ．When dummy＇s jack held，declarer came to hand with a dia－ mond and played a heart to the queen for eleven tricks．

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Guillaumin | Eisenberg | Palau | Vinciguerra |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Double |
| Pass | $2 \mathbf{n}^{*}$ | Pass | $3 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $4 \downarrow$ | All Pass |  |

West led the $\$ 7$ and East played three rounds of the suit，declarer ruff－ ing with the nine of hearts，West overruffing with the jack and exiting with the 6 ，for the two，queen and king．Declarer went to dummy with a diamond and played the $\geqslant 3$ to the queen．That held，but now East＇s『K8 were worth a trick．

As you will already have realised declarer must play dummy’s $\vee 10$ ， intending to run it．If East covers with the king，declarer wins，returns to dummy with a club and takes the heart finesse．

It＇s possible that West started with the ${ }^{\text {J }} 877$ ，but then he might some－ times have followed with the eight on the first round of trumps－a variation of the theory of restricted choice．

It cost Vinciguerra 13 IMPs and the match，37－46．
You can replay these deals here or https：／／tinyurl．com／y85khlsu
Finally，just like Philleas Fogg we return to London，for the Lady Milne Trials．

## Board 7．Dealer South．All Vul．



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rosen | Caplan | Senior | Godfrey |
| - | - | - | $1 \boldsymbol{q}$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

North led the $\geqslant 9$ and declarer safely negotiated the first hurdle by rising with dummy's ace. She unblocked the but then fell from grace by playing a diamond. South went up with the ace and cleared the hearts, leaving declarer with only eight tricks.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nettleton | Dhondy | Gold | Anoyrkatis |
| - | - | - | $1 \%$ |
| 1NT | Pass | $2 \nabla^{*}$ | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |

After the same lead and play to the first two tricks, declarer played the 3 at trick three and South defended well by putting in the ten (if she takes the ace declarer unblocks the king). Having won with the $\mathbf{~ K}$ declarer cashed her clubs. South could afford to pitch a spade but was then forced to pitch two hearts or one heart and a diamond. Realising if she pitched two hearts declarer would cash the $\geqslant \mathrm{K}$ and then exit with a spade, she threw the $\downarrow 9$. That allowed declarer to exit with a small diamond, but she misread the position, playing South for the $\$ A Q 9$ and only five hearts, cashing the $¥ K$ before exiting with a spade, so she was also one down.

Sally Brock and Gilly Cardiff recovered from a poor start to win the trial with 91.67 IMPs, ahead of Susanna Gross and Catherine Draper who scored 84.34. These two pairs are guaranteed a place in the England team. Nicola Smith and Yvonne Wiseman, finished third on 78.67 IMPs and as no other pair managed a positive score they will surely get the third spot on the team.
You can replay this deal here or https://tinyurl.com/y6ww34tn


## In this issue we launch

## GOTO Bridge 19

The must-have bridge software for more than 20 years. Lessons, practice and competition directly at home.

## Lessons and exercises

GOTO Bridge 19 bidding and card play lessons and exercises are an excellent source of learning and progress.

## Easy deals

Ideal to take up bridge or have fun, it is the perfect game mode to practisewithout any constraints.

## Bidding practice

GOTO Bridge 19 allows you to practise the auction of your choice.

## Card play practice

The software makes bids on your behalf for the contract you want to play.

## Play bridge offline

Take the new GOTO Bridge 19 software everywhere with you and play whenever you want!
On the plane, the train, the underground... You can play anywhere without an Internet connection.
GOTO Bridge lessons and exercises are made for you! Written by bridge professionals, they will help you learn the basics of bridge in all game areas (bidding and card play). Then you will be able to apply what you have learned with exercises.
Evaluate your level, strengths and weaknesses thanks to the various practice exercises offered by GOTO Bridge. Select the game area of your choice (bidding or card play, attack or defence) and make progress thanks to the corrections suggested by the software.
Pit yourself against the best players in the "Tournaments" mode! At the end of each deal, you will be compared to them on the same deals and in the same conditions.

The game mode "Challenge the best international players" will even give you the opportunity to compare yourself to world champions.
The deal manager is made for you. This tool can be used as teaching material for your bridge lessons since it allows you to prepare and import your own deals, save them and sort them as you see fit. Besides, thanks to the printing module included, you can print your deals, bidding boards, tricks and commentary.

## Developed by bridge experts

Among them is Jérôme Rombaut, 2017 Vice World Bridge Champion.
The team is not new to this game. They are also behind the Funbridge app with a community of 400,000 players worldwide

## Corrections to your bidding

GOTO Bridge 19 suggests corrections to your bidding and explains why.

## Corrections to your card play

The app tells you which card you should play to take as many tricks as possible on the deal.

## Tips given by the computer

Ask the computer for advice and it will tell you what it would play if it were in your shoes.

## Play all hands

Play all players' hands at the table.

## "Show cards" feature

GOTO Bridge 19 shows you the cards held by the other players sitting at the table.

## A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE - MARCH 2019

## Reverse, forward and replay buttons

Navigate through the deal as you want and replay tricks.
GOTO Bridge is seen as the reference among bridge software in France. Thanks to its numerous game modes and features, it allows players of all ages and levels to have endless fun.

## Playing bridge has never been easier

Feel the atmosphere of a game of bridge wherever you are (at home, in public transport, travelling abroad...)
thanks to GOTO Bridge numerous assets and features.

- Unlimited deals.
- Immediate comparison on all deals played.
- Tips and help given by the computer.
- Analysis of your bidding and card play at the end of each deal.
- Par score and contracts most often played on the deal.
- Bidding and card play lessons with exercises.
- Practise bidding and card play in the sequence and contract of your choice.

- Assessment of your bidding and card play on thousands of deals and for 10 game levels.
- Undo: you can cancel your last action if you made a mistake.
- Claim: as at a real table, claim the tricks you are certain you can take without being obliged to play the deal until the end.
- History: GOTO Bridge manages the history of the deals you play. Therefore you will always be able to search for a deal that you particularly liked.
- Force a bid or the lead, play the hands of your choice: with GOTO Bridge, you are completely free at the table. You can view and play all hands, replay a card and force the lead. In a nutshell, you do what you want.
- $\quad$ Save a deal and play it again later.


## Unlimited deals

- The ideal game mode for a quick game.


## "Unlimited deals" game mode

- This game mode allows you to play an unlimited number of deals, one after the other.
At the end of the deal, you are compared to the software which has played the same deal as you in the same conditions.
You have access to its auction and card play to be able to analyse your deals in minute detail.
- Lessons and exercises
- Enrich your knowledge thanks to GOTO Bridge lessons.


## "Lessons and exercises" game mode

GOTO Bridge lessons and exercises are an excellent source of learning and progress.
In this game mode, you will take lessons on:

- Bidding: 19 topics (major two-suiters after 1 NT , natural responses after an overcall, etc. with corrected exercises).
- Card play: 17 topics (defence in a trump contract, squeeze*, etc.
with corrected exercises).
*This lesson is based on the book entitled "Le Squeeze au bridge" ("The squeeze in bridge") by Romanet, available at lebridgeur.com.
- Practice
- Improve your skills in different game areas.


## "Practice" game mode

This game mode allows you to practice the different areas of the game. It includes the following features:

- The "correction" mode behind the success of the previous versions of GOTO Bridge. Its principle is simple. During card play, GOTO Bridge will show you the best card to play to take the highest number of tricks on the deal. During the bidding phase, it will correct your bidding cards and will explain your mistakes to you. At the end of the deal, you will have the possibility to replay your deal from the moment when you made a mistake.
- Easy deals to take up bridge or have fun: excellent practice without any constraints.
- Card play practice: GOTO Bridge makes bids on your behalf in the type of contract that you want to play.
- Bidding practice in the auction of your choice.
- Random deals requiring special attention as when playing in a club.
- Save your deals while playing tournaments and replay them.


## Tournaments

- Compare yourself to other players and challenge champions.


## "Tournaments" game mode

This game mode allows you to compare yourself to other players and to be ranked among the best ones: this is the competition part of GOTO Bridge.

- Assessment of the way you play on thousands of deals and for 10 game levels

- $\quad$ Statistics per game area (bidding, card play, attack or defence)
- Head-to-head comparison with the best international and Funbridge players
- Card play tournaments: you are compared (card play only) to other players who have played the same contract
- Challenge "Argine": pit yourself against the latest version of GOTO Bridge game engine (i.e. the artificial intelligence playing with you) in a 5 -deal tournament in IMP scoring. Win 10 tournaments in a row and get a 1-year subscription to the online bridge game Funbridge!


## Set your own conventions

Select your bidding system in "Settings" among the SAYC (Standard American Yellow Card), the English ACOL system, the French 5-card major system, the Polish system, the Nordic system, the NBB Standard system and the $2 / 1$ system. A free profile also allows you to set your own conventions.

## Bidding systems and conventions

GOTO Bridge allows you to play several bidding systems:

- SAYC system.
- English ACOL system.
- French 5-card major system.
- Polish system.
- Nordic system.
- NBB Standard system.
- $\quad 2 / 1$ system.
- Forum D system.

Several profiles are available for each system: beginner, intermediate, competition and strong 2.
You also have the possibility to create a free profile with your own conventions to play GOTO Bridge as you wish.
But since a picture is worth a thousand words, the opposite screen shot should speak for itself.

## Deal manager

Sort, prepare, view and print your deals thanks to the brand-new deal manager.

## "Deal manager" game mode

Useful resource for your bridge lessons. Thanks to this tool, you can:

- Prepare your deals as you want: set distribution, vulnerability, dealer, bidding sequence and lead.
- Import your deals, edit them and play them from any hand.
- Sort, view and save the deals you have created or imported.
- Print your deals thanks to the customised printing module: print all or part of the deal (i.e. bidding, card play or players' hands) and add your own commentary.


## New « Goulash » game mode

Challenge GOTO Bridge 19 artificial intelligence "Argine" on deals with freak distributions (also called "Goulash deals")!

## Goulash mode

It consists of a challenge against Argine on 8 deals.
What makes it special is that some deals are "Goulash", i.e. with freak distributions.
You play the first deal as usual:

- If the contract bid is at least a game, a slam or if it is doubled or redoubled, you play the deal.
- If the contract is a part-score or the deal is passed out, the pair who has bid the contract gets the score that goes with it.
If the contract is a part-score, on the next deal, each player sorts his 13 cards by suits. All four hands are stacked back in the deck which is cut once. Cards are then dealt in groups of 5-3-5 for instance instead of one at a time as usual. It allows to create deals where the suits are more unevenly distributed between the players. On this deal, you follow the same rules as above and so on.
Once the 8 deals are played, the winner is the one who has scored the highest number of points: Argine (E/O) or the player in South. So this is not duplicate.


## 15,000 new deals

- 5,000 new easy deals for practice
- Challenge Argine on 5,000 new deals
- 2,000 new deals in series tournaments
- Challenge elites on 2,00 new deals
- 1,000 new deals in card play tournaments
- Latest version of the game engine Argine
- Accurately mimicking human behaviour Same robot as in the Funbridge app
- Win a 10 -year subscription to Funbridge
- All you have to do is challenge Argine


## cocosx FUNBRIDGE

## Misplay These Hands With Me

## Spot the Mistake

Senior Events are all the rage, and as more experts attain the requisite status, they are becoming stronger. During a round robin I pick up a hand with potential:

```
4 AKQ1042
\ K8
-
J9865
```

With both sides vulnerable I open 14 and my partner responds with a game forcing $2 \diamond$. I show my second suit with $3 \boldsymbol{*}$ and partner bids $4 \boldsymbol{e}$, which we play as agreeing clubs and asking for key cards. I respond $4 \leqslant$ to show 1 or 4 key cards and partner continues with $4 \boldsymbol{\vee}$, asking about the queen of trumps. When I bid 4 to deny it he jumps to $6 \boldsymbol{\xi}$. This has been our scientific auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | 19 |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 32 |
| Pass | 4** | Pass | 4** |
| Pass | 4** | Pass | 49* |
| Pass | 6\% | All Pass |  |

West leads the ten of hearts and I get a very impressive dummy:

```
4 5
|
- AK98653
* AK74
4 AKQ1042
` K8
* -
&9865
```

I win with dummy's ace (East following with the six) and cash the ace of clubs, East discarding the three of hearts. That's a blow, but I still have chances. I duck a club to West's ten, win the heart return and play the six of clubs. Annoyingly West puts up the queen preventing me from winning with the seven and ruffing a diamond. I take the king, pitch two spades on the top diamonds and then have to decide how best to play the spades. By now East has played five hearts and I'm inclined to place him with four spades so I play a spade to the ten. When West wins with the jack I am one down.

Time to look at the full deal:


## Post mortem

Declarer's play in the spade suit was well thought out, but unnecessary. At trick two he should play the eight of clubs under the ace followed by a club to the nine and ten. By retaining the 65 declarer will have two entries to dummy allowing him to ruff a diamond and establish the suit.

In the other room South jumped to 3 $\boldsymbol{4}$ over North's 2 $\downarrow$, implying a solid suit and North leapt to $7 \boldsymbol{4}$ which East doubled. When West led a diamond declarer ruffed and cashed the top spades for a spectacular swing.

## Ruff Justice

30 years ago my local club could boast a host of International players amongst its membership. They are thinner on the ground now but the standard is still quite high.

During a single session team game I pick up the following collection:

```
- 32
`
-KJ97642
& AQ9
```

With only the opponents vulnerable, East the dealer opens $2 \boldsymbol{2}$. This turns out to be Precision, promising a long club suit with $10-15$ points. I could overcall 3 which we play as a weak bid in an attempt to take up some space, but I don't want to rule out a possible 3 NT so I content myself with $2 \downarrow$. West bids a constructive but non forcing $2 \downarrow$ and when my partner has nothing to say East rebids 3e. Rightly or wrongly I bid $3 \checkmark$ and when no one has anything to add we are left with this auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | 2 |
| 2 | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ | 3 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West leads the ten of clubs and partner gives me a fair dummy:

```
4 K854
` AJ832
- Q10
* 52
4 32
`
-KJ97642
* AQ9
```

I take the ten with the queen and cash the ace of clubs - at least I attempt to, but West ruffs and continues with the ace and another diamond as East discards a couple of clubs. I overtake dummy's queen with the king, draw the outstanding trump and try a spade to the king but East produces the ace and I have to go one down.

This was the full deal:

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K854 } \\ & \text { AJ832 } \\ & \text { Q10 } \\ & \stackrel{52}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q Q96 } \\ & \text { KQ1074 } \\ & \text { A853 } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AJ } 107 \\ & 96 \\ & \text { K } \bar{K} \text { J87643 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $$ |  |

## Post mortem

Declarer could have made a certainty of the contract by playing the nine of clubs at trick two! If West ruffs and plays two rounds of diamonds declarer can no longer ruff a club, but the ace of clubs will be the ninth trick.

At the other table East opened $1 \boldsymbol{2}$ and when South overcalled $3>$ West bid $3 \vee$. North could not resist doubling but then found it could not be defeated. Declarer ruffed the diamond lead in dummy and ran the nine of hearts to North's jack. After a club to the queen and a diamond return declarer took the ace and played the king of hearts to North's ace. He ruffed the club continuation and ran the nine of spades, followed by the queen.

## Crossword - Getting lnto The Bidding

(NOTE: Nine solutions are of a kind, not otherwise defined)

## Across

6

## Down

Criticise really good artist? (7)
Carve the roast (5)
No place for palindromic rodents (4)
Software workers are close to finding bugs in there -- they're looking for empty slots (10)
Gutenberg's lines are the ultimate answer (5-3)
Position of cards could be 'and lit.' (6)
Bewildered by Hamlet's troubles? (4)
An electrical unit? The reverse (5)
Nothing gets an A in old sci-fi book (4)
Gets a better job on Broadway, maybe, but misbehaves $(4,2)$
I'm okay being around a heartless crook (8)
Releases record -- races around -- force of nature? (10)
American non-U snack? (4)
Eastern river backs up for 9s that go bang (5)
Dig up Yellowstone, but not fast (7)

Plus it airs Songs of Praise? (10)
17th century house, acceptable in the beginning (6)
Carry on like angels are supposed to (4)
Hit musical (8)

Send back your starter -- this will heat it up (4)
Short measure to Hamlet's friend would be 5:7 (5)
21
22
Kind of illusion from working in a coalpit? (7)
Celtic inscription from Robin's town -- he's home with nothing on! (5)
As Zlatan sounds -- someone who's sinned badly? (3-7)
Bridge includes auction (but not at first) (7)
Google, possibly, the way of the Lord? (8)


Galaxy in LA, maybe? No, these 9s were in New York (6) Terra incognita (5)
Look out -- a dark passage! Give up (4)
She's grown right out of her dress! (4)

## Deals that Caught My Eye <br> David Bird looks at some big swings from the final of the 2019 Australian Open Teams Play-Off in Canberra.

It's time for us to look at some bridge from the far side the globe. There won't be any feeble jokes about upside-down signals, let me reassure you. Neill faces Hans and we will inspect some of the biggest swings, hoping to assess fairly the balance between blame, credit and luck.

We start with the largest swing in the first set of 16 boards:


Gill opened a strong 12 and the response showed an 8-10 balanced hand. Gumby led the $\uparrow 5$ against 3NT, drawing the 10 , ace and 9 . Lazer returned a spade and Gill was happy to enter +660 on his card. What do you make of that?

The $\$ 5$ could not be fourth best, so declarer was marked with the $₫ \mathrm{~K}$. West had made no attempt to locate a 4-4 major fit, so North must hold at least three hearts. If he holds $\vee \operatorname{Axx}(\mathrm{x})$ or $\geqslant \mathrm{Qxx}(\mathrm{x})$, a heart switch will set up three tricks in that suit. It's a bit much to hope for $\geqslant A Q x(x)$, it's true.

Well, I don't want to be accused of judging the matter when I can see all 52 cards. I will leave you to decide whether South should have diagnosed a heart switch.

At the other table the bidding was $18-1 \mathrm{NT}-3 \mathrm{NT}$ and all was easy for the defenders when Edgtton led the $\uparrow 6$ from the South hand. It was an early 13 IMPs to Hans, who led by 35-15 after the first set of 16 boards.. This was the biggest swing of the second set:

```
S2 Board 26. Dealer East. Both Vul.
    & K84
    ` QJ10862
    - 654
    * }
```


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gill | Kanetkar | Hans | Neill |
| - | - | Pass | $1 \mathbf{1}$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{a}$ | $2 N T$ | Pass |
| 3NT | Double | All Pass |  |

Neill led the $\$ 3$ to partner's king and Kanetkar was faced with a similar 'continue or switch?' decision as on our previous board. If declarer had ventured 2 NT on a mere Q 75 , and held the $\vee \mathrm{A}$, a spade continuation would be the winning play.

Kanetkar expected East to hold $\mathbf{4} \mathrm{QJx}$ and switched to the 9 . A
handsome +1100 was the result．As it happens，it would have been the same on a spade return．After winning with the A，South would know that East had a spade stopper．He would surely have tried his luck with the $\geqslant$ A．On that basis，perhaps there is something to be said for a spade return from North at trick two，catering also for $\$ \mathrm{AJxxx}$ with South．

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Beauchamp | Hung | Thomson | Edgtton |
| － | － | Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ |
| 20 | 2＊＊ | Double | $2 \%$ |
| 3\％ | $3 \%$ | Pass | Pass |
| 48 | All Pass |  |  |

North＇s $2 \diamond$ showed hearts，East＇s double indicating diamond values．There was no prospect of $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ playing in 3NT when the hearts were raised and ＋130 in helped to reel in 15 IMPs．After two sets Neill led by just 61－58．

Edgtton＇s crystal ball was working magically on this deal：
S3 Board 37．Dealer North．N／S Vul．
－ 1094
－KQ2
－A3
＊KQJ97

－ 53
－KJ108
－A852
\＆AQ53
－AJ103
－Q72
106

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Edgtton | Kanetkar | Hung | Neill |
| - | $1 N T$ | Pass | Pass |
| Double | Pass | Pass | $2 \dot{2}$ |
| Pass | Pass | Double | Redouble |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{D}$ | Double | All Pass |

Even if West＇s double showed＇majors or minors＇（no convention card is available），it seems a dubious move at IMPs．Imagine for a moment that the East hand was a fruit machine．You can see that Edgtton very much hit the jackpot．

Neill took flight and ended in $2 \vee$ on a 4－3 fit，doubled by East．The \＆ 10 lead seemed the most attractive available，but in fact it reduced the penalty from 1100 to 800.

At the other table Lazer sat West．There was an apparent malfunction of his crystal ball，and he allowed North to play undoubled in 1NT．After a spade lead and a diamond switch，it looked like three down．Declarer cleared the clubs and Gumby was on lead at trick nine with $\geqslant$ AJ104 $\uparrow 7$ ． Two further diamond tricks in the West hand，plus the $\vee$ A，would have collected +300 ．The $\uparrow 4$ switch allowed declarer to win and cash his clubs， going only one down．

It was 12 IMPs to Hans，who took the set 62－7 and now led by 120－68．
Big IMPs were exchanged on this heart－spade bidding battle from the next set：

```
S4 Board 52. Dealer West. Both Vul.
                            A AK9532
* }
- }6
* 9865
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline - 8 & & - QJ6 \\
\hline - AKQ102 & N & - J8543 \\
\hline -J987 & W E & -K3 \\
\hline - Q42 & S & - K103 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
- 1074
- 97
- AQ1042
- AJ7
```



Hung did not have a text-book hand for his $4 \vee$ bid - he had too much defence and was somewhat short on playing strength. Edgtton had every reason to expect $4 \uparrow$ to be made and his $5 \downarrow$ sacrifice would have cost 500 against their 620 .
Now we come to what I regard as the first really bad bid of the auction, 51 by North. He had no idea of partner's hand type and no justification for bidding five over five. South would have doubled $5 \vee$ for a 500 pick-up, whereas 5 doubled went one down for 200 away.


East's $2 \downarrow$ was an accurate expression of his values. The remainder of the auction was similarly impressive. East had his double of 4^, it seems, but
the contract could not be beaten and it was 790 away. 14 IMPs to Hans. More one-way traffic produced a winning set of 54-9 and an overall half-time lead of 174-77 for Hans.

Edgtton and Hung produced a fine auction on this deal:


| A AKQ63 | N | ¢ J1092 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - QJ6 | W E | - K7 |
| J9 | ${ }^{+} \mathrm{S}^{-}$ | - AKQ |

-     - 
- A985432
- J7632
- 2

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Edgtton | Thomson | Hung | Beauchamp |
| 1ヵ | Pass | $2 N T$ | $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | $6 N T$ | All Pass |

West's 5a asked partner to bid a slam with a heart control. If the control was first-round (ace or void), East would have the option of bidding $6 \vee$ in response. Hung closed the auction with the splendid bid of 6NT. Not only did this prevent a lead through the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$, it also precluded any risk of an adverse ruff. Beauchamp led the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and declarer claimed a well-deserved +1440 .

If the other table can match this score, I will be impressed. (I will also be surprised, since this series is billed as featuring big-swing deals.)

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beauchamp | Hans | Thomson | Gill |
| 19 | Pass | 2\％ | 4 |
| 5\％ | Pass | 5NT | Pass |
| 6\％ | All Pass |  |  |

Beauchamp and Thomson play a 2NT response as $3+$ spades and $8-12$ points． East＇s 2 was artificial and game－forc－ ing．5NT was＇pick a slam＇．If West had
 picked 64，East might have corrected to 6NT．When West chose $6 \boldsymbol{\&}$ ，the $\uparrow$ K would be protected from the lead anyway，and Thomson passed．The $\checkmark$ A，a heart ruff and a spade ruff put the slam a cruel two down for 17 IMPs away．

The gale of IMPs had continued at full force and，with five of the eight sets played，Hans led by 223－83．

The wind changed direction in the next set，Neill winning it by 80－9． Remarkably，they picked up no fewer than five 12－IMP swings in 16 boards．Let me try to pick out the most interesting one．

While I＇m considering the matter，try this opening lead problem．
S5 Board 80．Dealer North．N／S Vul．

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Edgtton | Neill | Hung | Kanetkar |
| - | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

What will you lead from：\＄964 १KJ53 \＄10543 \＆ 53 ？
Hung led the $\geqslant 3$ ．Was it any surprise that the 2 －opener held $\vee A Q 10$ and the heart lead presented declarer with a ninth trick？At the other table Thomson led the $\checkmark 3$ to beat the game．A spade lead would also have been successful．

Hung may have saved himself $£ 10.95$ by not buying the book＇Winning Notrump Leads＇，which uses computer simulation to justify the advice given．He did have to pay out 12 IMPs on this board，though．The computer would have been horrified by his lead from $\vee$ KJxx into a powerful hand．

Right，this is the other 12－IMP swing that I have deemed worthy of your attention：

```
S6 Board 87. Dealer South. Both Vul.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
－ \\
－ 73 \\
－AK109653 \\
2 AQ109
\end{tabular}} & \[
\] & \multirow{8}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
－Q97 \\
－AJ 10942 \\
－ 4 \\
2 J 76
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline & N & \\
\hline & & \\
\hline & W E & \\
\hline & 4．KJ52 & \\
\hline & －K5 & \\
\hline & －J8 & \\
\hline & \＆K8532 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```


## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Edgtton | Neill | Hung | Kanetkar |
| - | - | - | $1 \uparrow$ |
| 1 | $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \downarrow$ | $2 \uparrow$ |
| Double | $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass |
| 5 | All Pass |  |  |

North led the 4 and dummy＇s was allowed to win．As we will see in a moment，declarer does best to play trumps next，Edgtton preferred to lead the $\mathbf{2 6}$ ，finessing the queen．How should Neill defend in the North seat？

He ruffed and found the necessary switch to the $\geqslant 6$ ．If declarer finesses， South will win and beat the contract by giving North a second club ruff （or returning a second heart）．Edgtton won with the $\vee$ A and drew trumps． He could not avoid subsequent losers in both clubs and hearts and went one down．

Let＇s return to trick two，after dummy＇s $\boldsymbol{2}$ J has won．Suppose declarer draws two rounds of trumps and concedes a trick to North’s $\vee Q$ ．If North plays spades，declarer ruffs and leads a heart towards dummy．A low card from North will allow two heart finesses and the resultant club discards． If instead North rises with the $\vee$ ，declarer can win with the $\vee$ A and take
a second club finesse. When he plays his remaining trumps, South will be left with V K K8. Thrown on lead with a heart, he will have to give declarer two more club tricks.

As you may have noticed, there is no need for such fancy play. Declarer's error was in playing the on the first trick. He should play low, winning in his hand. After ace, king and another
 trump to North's queen, he can use the $\uparrow$ A entry to run the J and pick up the club suit. Easy!

As the cards lie, only an outrageous heart lead can ensure the defeat of the diamond game.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beauchamp | Hans | Thomson | Gill |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| 1 | 1 | Double | $3 \diamond *$ |
| Double | 3 | $4 \vee$ | All Pass |

The $\$ 5$ was led, Thomson ruffing in the dummy. He played the $\downarrow A K$, throwing a spade and continued with a third diamond. North won and declarer threw his last spade. After ruffing North's fourth round of spades in his hand, Thomson finessed the 9 and led a trump to the jack and king. North ruffed the $\boldsymbol{\aleph}$ K return and played the $\boldsymbol{A}$, but declarer was able to ruff, draw trumps and claim the remaining tricks.

Thomson's +620 was worth 12 IMPs and the 80-9 set win reduced the margin to 232-163. The leaders resumed control, winning the 7 th set by 20 IMPs, and the match was then conceded with the scores standing at 277-188. The Hans team had deserved their win.

## Crossword Solution

see page 35


## Enterprising Bridge Tales: The Next Generation

New BRIDGE Magazine is pleased to present a series of custom-written adventures featuring the characters from the much-awaited sequel to "Enterprising Bridge Tales: The Original Stories". These articles are a continuation of the new book, which was published by Master Point Press in September 2018.

Captain's log, stardate 21316.85. Of the four USS Competitor teams that entered the Universal Bowl, three have qualified for the knockout stages, which begin today. My own team has been drawn against a Vulcan team, whilst the team led by Chief Engineer O'Brain have a tough match against a team from Virgo V. The highly fancied team including Daniel Prussia and Lieutenant-Commander Dieter have been drawn against an unknown team from the Delta quadrant.

With 64 teams surviving to the first knockout round of the Universal Bowl, the huge ballroom is packed. Daniel and Dieter fight their way through the noisy throng of players and spectators in search of their assigned seats. Having led their group at the end of the two-day qualifying stage, they have been drawn against a lowly seeded team, but they know that they cannot afford complacency. Their opponents may be an unknown quantity from the other side of the universe, but they have managed to survive the group stage so they cannot be taken lightly.
"I think that's where we are," indicates Daniel, pointing at a table where two of the seats are already occupied by what appear to be children. "It's unusual to see the caddies taking a break at what is surely a busy time for them," he adds.
"I don't think they're caddies," responds Dieter.
"We're playing against them?" asks Daniel, disbelievingly.
"I think they're Ocampas," Dieter accesses his internal memory banks, "a race from the centre of the Delta quadrant who have a life expectancy of only nine Earth years."

The starship pair take the empty seats between a boy and a girl, waifish humanoids with close-cropped dirty-blond hair and Vulcanesque-shaped ears.
"Greetings. I am Fek and my partner is Job," says the young girl. "And
you needn't worry about our telepathic abilities. The UBF technology that stymies them is very effective."
"Well, that's good to hear," agrees Daniel, rather nonplussed.
"It doesn't affect my powers of pyrokinesis, though," she adds, "but don't worry... I haven't accidently boiled anyone's blood since I was about five."

Somewhat alarmed, Daniel stares across the table with an inquiring look.
"She's just kidding you," interjects Job, smiling at his partner. "People hear all sorts of strange stories about those of us from the Delta quadrant, but we're not all fire-breathing dragons you know."
"Well, that's good to hear," comments Daniel as a caddy places the boards on their table.

The players draw their cards for the first of the day's 48 boards. Vulnerable against not, Daniel picks up a rather uninteresting collection. He passes Fek's opening One Club bid and then takes a few moments to glance at the Ocampa convention card, discovering that his opponents seem to be playing some sort of Polish-Club type of system. When his attention returns to the bidding tray, he finds that the auction has escalated somewhat unexpectedly.

Daniel's previously dull-looking collection has grown in potential and he is now faced with a high-level decision in this position:

```
A KQ6
\bullet 10862
- }85
* A84
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Fek & Daniel & Job & Dieter \\
1e & Pass & 2NT* & \(3 \%\) \\
\(5 *\) & \(?\) & &
\end{tabular}
```

Daniel establishes that the possibilities for the opening One Club bid include natural clubs, a weak notrump type, or various strong hands,
whilst Job's jump to Two Notrumps shows a weak hand with both minors.
"What a nasty guess to start with," thinks Daniel. "Eleven tricks will
 we're not likely to get rich from defending Five Diamonds."
Daniel eventually talks himself into bidding Five Hearts. There is little to the play and Dieter is soon claiming a disappointing ten tricks for one down. This was the full deal:

Dealer North. N/S Vul.
^KQ6

- 10862
- 853
- A84

| ¢ AJ83 |  | - 1074 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - 973 |  | - - |
| -KQ4 | W E | - J10972 |
| - Q96 | S | - KJ732 |

- 952
- AKQJ54
- A6
- 105
"That's some Five Diamond bid," observes Daniel. "It certainly stuck it to me."
"Non-vulnerable, what else can I do?" shrugs the diminutive girl.
"I just hope our teammates find it so 'obvious'," comments Daniel, deciding that he rather likes the spirit of these small creatures.
Towards the end of a tightly-fought first set, the players are faced with this layout:

Dealer North. EWV Vul.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { A103 } \\ & \text { KJJ83 } \\ & \text { KO94 } \\ & \& \text { Q104 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|cc\|} \hline & \\ \hline \mathrm{W}^{\prime} & \\ \hline & \mathrm{S} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A KJ9762 } \\ & \text { \& AQ105 } \\ & \text { Q Q } \\ & \dot{\text { J }} \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & +\quad-7642 \\ & \mathbf{j} 7653 \\ & \mathbf{~} 962 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Fek | Daniel | Job | Dieter |
| - | 1* | 1. | Pass |
| 20 | Pass | $3{ }^{3}$ | Pass |
| 4, | 4NT | Pass | 5 |
| Double | All Pass |  |  |

Daniel opens the bidding and then watches as the Ocampan pair bid to game. One option is to double Four Spades, hoping to attract a heart lead for a ruff and then relying on at least three of his minor-suit winners to stand up.

Feeling that more positive action is called for, Daniel instead essays Four No-trumps, seeking a profitable minor-suit sacrifice. Fek produces a sharp double of Dieter's Five Diamond response and lays down the $\uparrow$.

The android appears to glance only briefly at dummy before playing, but experience has taught Daniel that a nanosecond is an eternity for his partner's computer brain. Dieter ruffs the spade lead, plays a club to dummy's king and ruffs a second spade. Re-entering dummy with a second high club, he then takes a third spade ruff before exiting with a third round of clubs to West's queen.

Fek does her best, forcing dummy with a heart, but Dieter ruffs and then ruffs dummy's fourth spade with the $\downarrow$ J. West is unable to overruff and now declarer cashes dummy's two high trumps. West is left with a trump winner, but Dieter simply plays winning clubs until Fek ruffs.

Eleven tricks and N/S +550: a profitable sacrifice, indeed!
The starship pair meet up with Sartak and T'Grau to score at the end of the 16 -deal set. They fall behind by 14 UMPs when the Vulcans allow their opponents to play Four Hearts on the first board of the set, but they steadily chip away and move ahead when Dieter's +550 is matched by +620 at the other table when the opposition do not find the heart lead. They have established a 15-UMP lead after the first set, but any preconceived notion that this match would be a cakewalk have certainly been dispelled.

Damien and Dieter sit out the second set, and spend their time relaxing in the resort's exceptional facilities. Daniel also manages to procure a more than satisfying lunch from the poolside bar, and they are in a positive frame of mind when they join their teammates to score the second set. The team have gained on a low-scoring set, and they are 19 UMPs ahead as Daniel and Dieter reenter the fray, this time in tandem with the Romulans.

Dieter and Daniel are again playing against the Ocampans, whilst Mickstorm and Radwill take on their rather more vociferous teammates. The Talaxians are humanoids with heads that appear too large for their amply-proportioned bodies: their main physical characteristics are high, ridged foreheads that extend not only across the front of their prominent domes but also along each side, and the thin, wispy covering of rather unruly yellow hair.

Life at the Ocampan table is peaceful by comparison, but no one seems able to silence the garrulous Talaxians for long. The problem is exacerbated when Jeffrey Mickstorm makes the innocent mistake of letting on that he has become something of a 'foodie' since he began traveling outside Romulan space. It so happens that Sousix, the older of the Romulans' opponents and Mickstorm's screen-mate, is the chef on the space trading vessel where the Talaxian pair live. Thereafter, the Romulan is regaled with an apparently never-ending stream of strange-sounding dishes, all apparently Delta quadrant staples, which he "simply must try".

Fortunately, they also manage to play some bridge, despite the banter. Any thought that Mickstorm's concentration is in the slightest impaired by distractions at the table is totally dispelled on our final deal. Although there are a handful of boards still remaining, the Romulan defense is devastating, and extracts the last breath from the sails of any comeback hopes the Talaxians might have harboured. This is the full deal:

Dealer North. Both Vul.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ↔ J8652 } \\ & \vee \mathrm{J} 83 \\ & 9652 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | - KQ9 <br> - AKQ7 <br> -KJ4 <br> \& K72 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& A74 } \\ & 6 \\ & \text { AQ } \\ & \& \quad A J 108643 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& } 103 \\ & \uparrow 109542 \\ & 10873 \\ & \& \text { Q9 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Radwill | Pewtix | Mickstorm | Sousix |
| - | 2 | 3* | Pass |
| Pass | Double | Pass | $3 \%$ |
| Pass | 4 | Double | All Pass |

The opening Two Diamond bid is a Multi variation, and Pewtix's re-opening double shows a balanced 20-21 count. Sousix's best option is to pass, since Three Clubs-Doubled is booked to go a couple down, but he instead chooses to pull the double to his motley heart suit. Perhaps enamored by his superb trump support, Pewtix raises to game and Mickstorm expresses his opinion of declarer's chances with a red card.

Radwill leads the 5 to his partner's ace, and Mickstorm returns a suit-preference $\boldsymbol{\&} \mathbf{3}$ for his partner to ruff. Radwill's continuation of the $\checkmark 2$ is another suit preference signal, suggesting that a further club play might he beneficial to the defense. Trusting his partner, Mickstorm wins with the $\downarrow \mathrm{Q}$ and then cashes his two pointed-suit aces before playing a third round of clubs. Declarer ruffs more in hope than expectation with the $\geqslant 10$, but Radwill overruffs with the jack and plays a third round of diamonds, allowing Mickstorm to score the seventh defensive trick by ruffing with his singleton trump.

The Romulans inscribe +1100 onto their solid scorecard. Although Damien and Dieter also reach the same contract at the other table, no one doubles and the defenders drop one trick to let declarer out for - 300 .
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That is their only poor-looking board, though, and the 13 UMPs gained on it contribute to an impressive final set that sees the tournament's 'Dream Team' move smoothly into the Round of 32 with an apparent-ly-comfortable 57-UMP victory.
"The Ocampans played solidly against us," comments Daniel, as the six teammates await the arrival of dinner that evening.
"The quality of the opponents rates to get higher each day," points out Mickstorm, philosophically.
"There are certainly plenty of strong teams still alive," agrees T'Grau.
"It might also help if you didn't encourage our opponents," suggests the more subdued of the two Romulans.
"Oh, he was pleasant enough and totally harmless," observes Mickstorm. "And I have to say that some of those Delta quadrant dishes he was telling me about do sound worthy of investigation."
"You could think about something other than your stomach," smiles Radwill, good-naturedly.
"Why on Romula would I want to do that?" retorts the bear-like creature as the waiter places a heavily-laden plate in front of him. "But I will shut up for now as my mouth has far more important things to do than talk."
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## Highlights and New Features

## Funbridge News - March

After focusing on the new features and enhancements brought to their app in 2018, the Funbridge team is now presenting what is seen as the first major new feature of 2019: the new chat system.

Funbridge has also welcomed the Czech Bridge Federation and the Polish Bridge Union as partners. Get ready for new tournaments!

Lastly, the Funbridge team has released a brand-new tool called "bid decoder". Find out more below.

New chat system coming soon! With group conversations and image sharing


In a few days you will discover its new design and features including among other things group conversations that are just perfect to talk about bridge (but not only) with your friends, members of your club or your family!

## New partnerships: Czech Bridge Federation and Polish Bridge Union

Funbridge is pleased to announce that they have been licensed by the Czech Bridge Federation (ČBS) and the Polish Bridge Union (PZBS) to run new official tournaments

These tournaments will allow players to earn Masterpoints and thus improve their national ranking (if they are members of these federations).

## Funbridge News - March

## ČBS tournaments

- Every other Friday
- 00:01-23:59
- IMP
- 20 deals


## PZBS tournaments: starting $1^{\text {st }}$ March

- 1 daily tournament from Monday to Saturday
- 2 tournaments on Sunday
- 00:01-23:59
- IMP (Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday and Sunday) and MP (Monday, Wednesday, Friday and Sunday)
- 16 deals


## Discover the "bid decoder"



The bid decoder is an interactive tool that will allow you to get the meaning of any bid, whatever the previous sequence played is. No more misunderstandings with your partner thanks to this online tool based on Funbridge AI!

Click here to try the bid decoder.
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1. Five-card majors

You lead the ten of hearts. Partner cashes the king and ace (six and eight from declarer) before playing a third round (the three) on which declarer plays the jack. What do you do?

You lead a low spade covered by the eight, ten and ace. Declarer plays a trump to the ace (ten from partner), ruffs a spade, cashes three hearts (spade from partner on the third round) and exits with a trump (another spade from partner). What do you lead now?
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## Test Your Technique

with Christophe Grosset

```
see Page 4
```

Matchpoints. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

```
- A864
- A986
- 1094
- 63
KQJ7
- 105
-AQJ73
\& J8
```

The bidding goes:

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

West leads the 7 and East plays the king, and switches to a low diamond. How do you play?

## Solution

Neither of the opponents have an opening bid, and after the lead, East is marked with the AK and is highly likely to have a heart honour, indeed, with $\vee K Q$ or $\vee \mathrm{OJ}$, West would have led the suit instead of a club. That makes it close to impossible that East has the king of diamonds (it would give him $12+$ HCP). So you play the $\$$ A and are very satisfied when you drop the stiff king.

Well done Zia for making this nice play as the speed of light during the Rejkjavik Festival.

Dorothy's face looked very serious as she pushed her chair back. 'It's a great idea,' she said, 'but it leaves so many open questions.'

They were sitting on the terrace of her Aunty Em's farmhouse, drinking coffee and sampling the home baking for which Aunty Em was famous.
'We could have a good chance of reaching the final stages, and then, who knows!' Dorothy continued after a pause.
'We make a great partnership,' Aunty Em mused. Dorothy shuddered slightly. It was true, up to a point. They did play well together, but bidding with Aunty Em was rather like taking a Saint Bernard for a walk; it wasn't you who made the decisions where the partnership was going!
'And I have to admit,' Aunty Em continued, 'that the two of them really are quite effective.' For Aunty Em to regard any pair as other than cretinous was unusual. For her actually to voice the compliment was remarkable. 'Professor Marvel has a style all of his own. And it clearly works.'
'And the Tin Man actually respects him. I've been playing with him for years, and I still feel he regards me as the best of a bad lot as far as partners go.' Dorothy and Aunty Em both chortled.
'But if we ask them to play with us in the Ozian Cup,' Dorothy continued, 'it leaves rather a lot of loose ends. The Lion and the Scarecrow won't have teammates, and who would want to play in a team with the Scarecrow? And Uncle Henry and Miss Gulch won't have partners.'
'I'm sure we could sort out something for the Lion and the Scarecrow. After all, Hank would be delighted to join any team. And I'll soon find a team for your Uncle Henry.' Aunty Em was well used to her wishes being commands. 'And as for Almira Gulch,' she spat out the name,' the phrase 'couldn't care less' isn't really strong enough.'

Aunty Em wasn't one to leave matters to chance. By the end of the week it had all been arranged, and the astonishing thing was that everyone in each of the other teams that she created thought it had been their own idea.

The day after their discussion Aunty Em's carefully laid plans were put into action. As luck would have it, Almira Gulch had already told the Professor that his services would not be required for the Ozian Cup. Earlier in the week, the Tin Man had taken great delight in showing her the new national master point list, and pointing out that she had been reduced to third in the club. This was not a situation she could tolerate, especially after the Tin Man had displayed his usual tact in their discussion of the matter. It was very clear from his tone that she should feel honoured to appear on the same page as him. She was in no doubt that it was well worth the cost of three professionals to ensure a satisfactory haul of blue points from this year's Ozian Cup.

There had been a sparkle in Glinda's eye when Aunty Em had told her, apparently in passing as they stood in the queue for coffee, that the Lion really liked her careful bidding style, and had decided to ask her to play in a very important event with her. The Lion had turned a deep shade of pink when Aunty Em had casually remarked to him at the bridge table that Glinda had asked her if she could possibly arrange a team for her in the Ozian Cup, playing with one of the better players. She had, according to Aunty Em, thought that good players like the Lion wouldn't want to play with her.

Aunty Em almost burst into laughter later that evening as she watched the conversation between the Lion and Glinda. 'I hope you're not developing a cold, my petal,' Uncle Henry looked concerned, as his wife appeared to be having a difficult time with her hankie covering her face.

The other half of this team was easy. She had simply gone up to the Scarecrow and wished his team success. 'Actually, I don't think I've made any arrangements yet,' replied the surprised Scarecrow.
'Nonsense,' replied Aunty Em. 'I distinctly heard Shy the Munchkin arranging to play with you, Glinda and the Lion. You really can't let him down, and it will be such a nice team to play in. Better than having to score up with the Tin Man, wouldn't you say?'

Shy was quite astonished when the Scarecrow casually confirmed the arrangement with him. The Lion had been trying to work out how to break the news to his regular partner that he would be playing with Glinda and was immensely relieved when the Scarecrow told him about their team.

Sorting out her husband was even easier. All she had to do was laugh at one of Munchkin Bob's jokes and he was so delighted that he agreed immediately to partner Uncle Henry. Zeke and Hickory, her own farmhands, were simply commanded to enter as Uncle Henry's teammates.

Arranging her own team had been no problem whatsoever. The Professor, having been dismissed by Almira Gulch, had only commented that he would make sure he brought a good supply of camomile pills for his partner's blood pressure. The Tin Man actually gave the impression to Aunty Em that he thought the Professor might be good enough to play with him. He recognised that the new line-up should be a big improvement on his previous team.

$$
* * * * *
$$

Six weeks later the draw had been drawn, arrangements had been arranged, and the first round had been rounded up. The social area of the Over the Rainbow Bridge Club resounded to the raised voices of eight of its members. There was laughter and there was mirth. Not a critical word was heard. Aunty Em beamed with delight at seeing her plans work out so well. Glinda was relaxing, a deep glow of pleasure on her face. Partnering the Wicked Witch of the West, compliments were a rarity; the Lion had given her more praise in the five minutes that had passed since the opponents left, than she had received in the last ten years. The Tin Man was explaining one of his master plays to a glazed-eyed Dorothy. She had lost track of the hand but was relying on her years of experience of such situations to know when to contribute a heartfelt 'Well done!' The Professor was telling the Scarecrow about the ointment he had given one of the opposition to help with her hearing. Thinking back later that evening, Dorothy thought that she had actually seen Shy the Munchkin speak. His lips had definitely moved, though she could not be sure if she had made out any sounds emerging.

The Lion's team had been drawn against a team from Poppyfield. The initial contact to set up the match had been a bit fraught. The Poppyfield captain had called him, and, in frosty tones, had asked who was in his team. The Captain remembered the Scarecrow from the social matches
played between the clubs, but seemed to need reassurance that 'Glinda' and 'Shy' weren't nicknames. Eventually with a sigh of relief he relaxed when he got the answer he wanted to the crucial question: 'So no Tin Man then?'

The Captain's relief had faded as he entered the Over The Rainbow Club for the match, and the first person he saw was object of his ire. He stomped up to the Lion. 'What do you mean by this?' he spluttered.
'What is HE doing here?' The Lion calmly explained that there were two matches taking place, and the Tin Man was playing in the other one. The Captain and all of his team, his partner, the Secretary, and the pairing of Clara and Margaret, had still looked suspicious.

Aunty Em's team had been drawn against players from the Emerald City that they didn't know, two married couples, Alex and Freda Stout, and Frederick and Alexandra Stark. It had been agreed that both matches would play the same boards.

The Lion's match had finished first. With constant nervous glances across at the Tin Man, the Poppyfield team never really looked settled. They had left by the time the Tin Man came up to the Lion to find out his result. 'I barely know them,' the Tin Man explained, 'But they're not complete duffers, so I would have thought that you were underdogs by about 30 IMPs.' He couldn't hide his astonishment that his discarded teammates could possibly win a match even against nonentities. 'I'm thinking about your other pair, of course,' he added in an attempt at tact.'

Now, as all the members of both teams sat with glasses of wine or cups of coffee, Dorothy started to compare the Scarecrow's scoresheet with her own. 'How did you gain twelve IMPs on board ten?' Dorothy looked surprised. 'Our opponents played in Four Spades while the Tin Man at the other table played in Four Hearts. Both look unstoppable.' She looked at the hand record. 'Wait a minute, Deep Finesse suggests we could have beaten Four Spades. I can't see how.'

This was the layout:

Dealer East. Game All

| - 86 <br> $\checkmark$ J4 <br> - AJ874 <br> 2 KJ94 | a KJ <br> - AK108752 <br> - 3 <br> \& Q102 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | - A105 |
|  |  | - Q6 |
|  | W E | -KQ10952 |
|  | S | \& 87 |
|  | - Q97432 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 93$ |  |
|  | - 6 |  |
|  | - A653 |  |

The full auction was:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dorothy | Alex Stout | Aunty Em | Freda Stout |
| - | - | 1 | $1 \boldsymbol{a}$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{a}$ | 3 | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{a}$ |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{a}$ | All Pass |  |

'We might have done better in the auction by bidding on to Five Diamonds. Both Aunty Em and I thought we had defensive values and with no singletons or voids, neither of us felt we should do more. I led the ace of diamonds, but couldn't see any continuation that would do any damage to the contract. Surely there is at most only a club and a spade to take?'

The Scarecrow looked at the hand record, at first blankly and then a red flush crept across his face. 'I'm so sorry about this,' he bumbled, 'I've apologised to my whole team. I don't know how many IMPs I cost us. You see, our auction was almost identical, in fact absolutely identical after the opening bid. I pulled out One Club instead of One Diamond. And so my poor partner led the suit. He hasn't said a word to me about it, but I felt so guilty after the queen won the first trick in the dummy.'

Dorothy stared at the hand diagram. 'That's a brilliant defence. Now when declarer plays trumps, you win the first round, and play another club. After playing the second round of trumps, declarer is in dummy, and cannot get back to hand.'

She scribbled the position on the back of her score sheet:
'Now whatever is played from dummy, West still has the ace of diamonds as an entry to cash the winning club and then give you a club ruff.' Dorothy gasped. 'That's really brilliant. It's lucky I wasn't playing with the Tin Man. I would have been told it was routine to find the club lead! It has to be found at trick one to beat the contract.' She turned to Shy who had been following the conversation, and noticed what she thought was a small smile. The Scarecrow was still apologising.

Dorothy scanned further down the Scarecrow's scoresheet. She blinked when she saw that he had beaten the spade slam on board eighteen, and gained thirteen IMPs against game making at the other table. This was the hand:

Dealer East. N/S Vul.

[^0]| ¢ Q98 | N | - 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark 432$ |  | - Q97 |
| - 104 | W E | - KJ9873 |
| - A9863 | S | \& J104 |

At her table Aunty Em had played Six Spades from the North hand after a weak Two Diamond opening from East. The lead went to the ace, followed by a second round of clubs. Aunty Em had won that, of course, cashed the $\Delta \mathrm{A}$, then the $\star$, ruffed a diamond in the dummy and discarded her two remaining diamonds on the two top hearts. Her hand was now down to trumps and the mas-
 ter club. Guided by East's opening, she played West for spade length, successfully finessing against the queen.

Alexandra Stark, in the East seat apologised to her partner. 'I'm sorry, I think my lead might have given that away. She doesn't have the entries to dummy to lead clubs up to her hand.'

Frederick Stark took a look at her hand. 'You'll be glad to know that there was nothing better,' he reassured her. 'A diamond runs round to her ace-queen, giving her an extra trick, a heart allows her to take a free finesse and discard all of her clubs, and a trump picks up my queen.'

Despite this, Dorothy and Aunty Em had been hopeful of a gain on the board, but the result had been duplicated at the other table.

Dorothy looked at the hand record. 'Deep Finesse says our teammates could have beaten this. We thought that the lead of any card from the East hand gave a trick and the contract was unbeatable. So how did the play go at your table? Did declarer get trumps wrong?' She looked at his card. ‘You led your singleton trump!' Her voice rose in surprise. ‘You’ve just cooked your partner's queen. How could declarer possibly go down now?'

The Scarecrow had a familiar puzzled look on his face as he tried to piece together what had happened at his table. Dorothy, who knew the signs and the futility of waiting for him to answer, ticked off the cards on the hand record as she went through the play.
'North would win the lead and play on diamonds, ruffing the second round, and then take two discards on his hearts.' She took a deep breath. 'I see it now.' She drew the situation after the first top heart had been cashed:

'If declarer discards a club on the king of hearts, your partner can overruff when declarer tries to ruff his last diamond in the dummy, and then cash the ace of clubs. If instead declarer discards his last diamond, your partner has to duck the club when it is played off dummy, and you have to play the jack or ten.' She turned to Shy. 'Is that what happened?' This time he definitely smiled as he gave a small nod of affirmation.

She stroked out the cards. 'Now everyone is down to this.'

'Yes, if you had kept hold of the jack and ten of clubs then declarer would still have made by playing back a small one. If you were left on lead then you could not play a trump and declarer would be able to ruff his king of clubs in the dummy while if Shy overtakes, that sets up declarer's king of clubs. Amazing! So why did you play a high club under the queen?'
'Well you see,' the Scarecrow stammered, 'the Lion taught me that
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if our defence is going to take a trick it is generally better if he wins it rather than me. So I thought that if I got rid of the jack there was more chance that Shy would get in than me. I suppose it worked?' The Scarecrow looked timidly at Dorothy and his partner.

Dorothy sought for the right words. 'Yes, indeed,' she stuttered. 'Superb stuff, and all stemming from two killer leads.'

The Lion had been following the conversation. He leaned over to Dorothy. 'Clearly the secret of this game is to ensure you have good quality teammates.' He spoke in a voice that he ensured was just loud enough for the Tin Man to hear. Putting his large paws round the Scarecrow and Shy he said, 'It's a pleasure to play in such a friendly team, and you came up with a couple of brilliancies there. In fact I might say 'lead on MacDuffers!' He roared with laughter as they left the club together.
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## Close Encounters

Воок 2: 2003-2017 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. 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.
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## Keep Bridge Alive

The Sociology of Bridge is a research project and an emerging academic field exploring interactions within the mind sport, well-being, healthy ageing and social connection as experienced in the bridge world.


## How you can help

We need players, bridge clubs and organisations and other supporters to join us in the Keep Bridge Alive campaign so we can publicise and promote bridge more widely. We would also be delighted to hear from you if you have research ideas, expertise or even time to support the campaign.
Please contact us at alumni@stir.ac.uk

G6 I totally support the Keep Bridge Alive Campaign which hopefully will become a global campaign by generating momentum to get people together to tackle the sustainability issues that the game faces.98
Zia Mahmood,
International Bric
Zia Mahmood,
International Bridge Player

For more information, search:
'Keep Bridge Alive Crowdfund'

66 I welcome the Keep Bridge Alive initiative to reach out to young people - indeed everybody - informing them of all the reasons why they have to play bridge. Any research to confirm to all my students what they feel already - that bridge is a life-enhancing activity for so many reasons - is very welcome. 9
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## Answers to "Defend With Julian Pottage"

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { a } 109 & 2\end{array}$

- AKJ85
* KQ85

| ${ }_{\square} \mathrm{A} 5$ | N |
| :---: | :---: |
| -107 | W E |
| $$ | ${ }^{*} \mathrm{~S}$ |

( KJ8742 - J86 2 AJ 104

| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | $1 \boldsymbol{N}^{*}$ |
| Pass | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Pass | 4 | All Pass |  |

1. Five-card majors

You lead the ten of hearts. Partner cashes the king and ace (six and eight from declarer) before playing a third round (the three) on which declarer plays the jack. What do you do?
You have a choice of three options here. You can ruff the heart high, ruff low or discard. If you ruff high, you will win the trick and need to decide what to lead next.
Although the jack of hearts is a winner, dummy tells you that no useful discards is available, so in that sense you do not have to ruff. Then again, it is hard to see how it can cost to play a low trump on an opposing winner.
If partner is void in diamonds, you can play the ace of trumps and then a diamond to deliver a ruff. There are two contraindications to this. Firstly, with no diamonds, partner would have played the hearts differently, the nine now and maybe ace before king earlier. In any case, you could give a ruff after taking the first trump.
The big gain to ruffing low comes if partner has Qxx because, after overruffing, dummy has insufficient length for declarer to finesse twice against the queen.

2

- J8

KJ5

- A862

K K974

| ¢ K964 | N | - Q107532 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - 98732 |  | - 64 |
| -KJ | W E | - 10 |
| \& Q5 | S | * A1062 |

- $A$
- AQ10
- Q97543
- J83

| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}^{*}$ | 3 |
| 4 | 5 | All Pass |  |

You lead a low spade covered by the eight, ten and ace. Declarer plays a trump to the ace (ten from partner), ruffs a spade, cashes three hearts (spade from partner on the third round) and exits with a trump (another spade from partner). What do you lead now?
You have the lead and might rather you did not. It will help you to count the shape of the deal. Declarer ruffed the second spade while partner has shown out on the the third round of hearts and on the second diamond. Having a count on three suits gives you a complete count because everyone began with 13 cards. Declarer must have started with 1-3-6-3 shape. If you lead either major, you will be doing so into a double void and giving a ruff and discard. Is this so bad?
If partner has the ace and jack of clubs, you will still make two club tricks after declarer has discarded one. Moreover, you will also do so if partner has the ace and ten because you can cover the jack with the queen. In contrast, attacking clubs may blow your side's second club trick if you lead the suit. If you lead low, declarer must run it. If you lead the queen, dummy covers and the contract would make even if declarer lacked the eight of clubs because partner would be endplayed.

## Bridge with Larry Cohen

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

## Bidding 6－5 Hands

I constantly get asked about this topic．That＇s usually a clue that there are many different teaching methods／explanations floating around．It also means that there is probably no one＂exact＂right answer．I agree with all of this．

So，the best I can do is give my opinions and discuss the situation in general．
It is true that 6－5 hands should＂come alive．＂The shape alone makes the hand worth much more than its HCP．

But，the real problem is which suit to bid，how many times，and in what order．

## 6 cards in a MAJOR and only 5 in the minor

The opening bid decision is easy．Start with the MAJOR．For example， open $1 \checkmark$ with each of these：

↔A2 『K108765＊AJ765 『－
－－ソQJ8654 $\downarrow$ AKQ32 『65
Open 14 with：
－AJ7654 3 － 2 AQ876 or
－J108765 PA2－－AK652
After partner responds，should you rebid the major or introduce the minor？There are two schools of thought：

1）Always introduce the second suit on your second turn．
2）Introduce the second suit only with extra values．
I＇m not a fan of either rule．I like to evaluate it on a hand－by－hand basis． The relative strength of the two suits is important．With AKQJxx in the major and Jxxxx in the minor，I＇d be likely to rebid in the major．Unfor－ tunately，there is no universal or exact answer to this rebid conundrum （probably why I get asked about it so often）．

## 6 cards in a minor and only 5 cards in the MAJOR

Here，it isn＇t clear which suit to open．The order and quality of the suits is relevant．Opener must consider his rebid problem．With clubs and spades，it is usually okay to open $1 \mathbf{4}$ ，because it is convenient to get the spades in next．But，when the major is hearts，you risk losing the heart suit （because a heart rebid will often be a reverse）．Here are some examples：

```
A AQJ74
\bullet 32
-
* AK8765
```

This is a comfortable $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ opening．You likely will find it convenient to rebid in spades（twice）．

```
\Delta 32
\vee AQ1074
-
* AK87654
```

This one is tougher．If you open $1 \boldsymbol{2}$ and partner responds $1 \$$ ，you＇ll be able to easily bid hearts now and then again later．But，if partner responds 1 1hor 1 NT ，you would have to reverse to show the hearts．Are you worth it？Maybe．This is quite a good hand．So，1\％is acceptable（yet not $100 \%$ clear）．Now，make it a little worse：

```
@-
* AQ874
-65
* AJ8765
```

A 1 1 This hand，with only 11 HCP and a spade misfit is nowhere near worth a reverse after $\mathbf{1 0}_{\mathbf{2}}^{\mathbf{2}}$－Pass－14．I＇d like to get the hearts in with a $1 \vee$ opening and bid clubs next（several times if possible）．
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## 6 HEARTS and 5 SPADES

If you open $1 \checkmark$ and partner responds 1 NT , a $2 \boldsymbol{\Delta}$ rebid would be a reverse, showing a strong hand. So, if you were too open $1 \checkmark$ with, say:

## ↔AJ765 PAQ7652 ${ }^{4} 4$

and partner responded 1 NT , you would have to bid $2 \vee$ next (suppressing the 5 -card spade suit and possibly missing a 5-3 spade fit). For that reason, you could open this hand 1s and bid hearts at the next turn and the next turn and the next turn ad nauseum. With more strength, maybe
-AQJ76 PAKJ765 $\uparrow 43$ -
you could open $1 \checkmark$ and would have enough strength to reverse into $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ after a 1 NT response (and you would bid spades on your third turn as well).

## Other issues:

With 5-5-in the black suits, I prefer a 1 s opening, but don't feel strongly about it.

Sometimes I will open a weak 2-bid with 6-5. If the hand isn't worth opening bid strength, why not a weak-2? For example, I'd gladly open $2 \curlyvee$ with: $\uparrow 3$ AJ10876 Q6543 2. I can’t see any reason not to.

## Summary:

There is no "one size fits all" answer for how to bid 6-5 hands.
Next month Larry looks at the related topic - Reverses

> Books, Learning Materials, Duplicate \& Rubber Bridge Supplies, Cifts, Games \& More.

WWW.BARONBARCLAY.COM 800.274.2221
$\square$

## European Champions cup <br> Martin Cantor reports on the Final of the French Mixed Teams Trials

## The Final of the French Mixed Teams Trials

I commentated on BBO on the last two sessions of the Fédération Française de Bridge's Trials for the European Mixed Teams Championships, to be held in Lisbon in February 2019. At the start of the fifth of six sets of 16 boards the Rolland team (Sabine Rolland, Nicolas Lhuissier, Marlene Duguet, Michel Duguet, Sophie Dauvergne, Lionel Sebbane) led the Cronier team (Bénédicte Cronier, Danièle Gaviard, Thomas Bessis, Philippe Cronier, Frédéric Volcker, Nathalie Frey) by 113-106.

This hand in the fifth set posed a tough problem for Nathalie Frey as declarer


- J 1096
- A83
- J4
- A973

| ¢ A72$\stackrel{y}{*}$+12 |  | ${ }_{\sim}$ Q43 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N |  |
| - K7 | W E | - A10863 |
|  | S | ¢ 1082 |
|  | - K85 |  |
|  | - KQJ64 |  |
|  | - Q952 |  |
|  | 2 J |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Marlene | Volcker | Michel | Frey |
| - | - | - | $1 \%$ |
| Pass | $3 \star *$ | Pass | $4 \vee$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

All Pass

The 3 bid was presumably some sort of mixed or invitational heart raise, and Nathalie bid the game on thin values, not makeable on best defence. West led the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ to dummy's ace, and the 6 went to the 3,8
and ace. A small club was ruffed in hand to lead the $\$ 2$. West gave this some thought but made the potentially fatal mistake of going in with the king. She led another club, ruffed again, and now it was declarer's turn to think, needing all the tricks bar one in this position.


While there is only one obvious loser in the ace of diamonds, there aren't the entries to dummy to both finesse in spades and then enjoy the long one. Not to mention the small but important matter of drawing trumps. But GIB said the contract could be made, and with the benefit of the sight of all four hands I spotted the answer. It seemed that declarer had too, as she drew trumps ending in dummy (East discarding a diamond) and led a spade, East ducking. The winning line, as you can see, is to play another spade then exit with a diamond to the jack, endplaying East to lead into the diamond tenace. But declarer played for East having started with 4-4 in spades and diamonds, so she exited the diamond jack without a third round of spades. One down, -50 . In the other room Thomas Bessis in West reopened $3 \boldsymbol{*}$ after $1 \boldsymbol{\top}-2 \boldsymbol{\vee}$, got doubled, and went 2 down for -300 and 8 IMPs to team Rolland instead of 3 to Cronier if $4 \vee$ had made. Should Frey have got the endgame position right? I think probably yes, based on two clues. Firstly Michel Duguet's $\boldsymbol{\$} \mathbf{3}$ on the first round suggesting an odd number, and while opponents do sometimes false-card, they do it less in the early rounds of play when it is important to help partner
get a picture of the hand. And secondly Marlene Duguet rising with the $\star \mathrm{K}$ is more consistent with a holding of Kx than Kxx . Small indicators, no certainties.

As we entered the final set the score was 154-123 to Rolland, a useful but by no means emphatic lead. After a further 8 boards Rolland still led, now by just 10 IMPs, when the decisive deal arrived.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dauvergne | Philippe | Sebbane | Bénédicte |
| - | $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | 4is |

## All Pass

Philippe Cronier found an aggressive pre-empt at favourable vulnerability, Lionel Sebbane surprisingly passed (see below) and Bénédicte Cronier did well to raise to 4^, else Dauvergne would surely have bid 3NT. And that was enough to shut the opponents out, when 4NT makes $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$, as does 6 which was the successful contract in the other room after this auction:


6* made easily for 1370 while 4s went 4 off for - 200, a 15 IMP swing to Cronier, taking the lead for the first time for a long time. I don't know whether E/W were playing non-leaping Michaels, where a 40 bid by Sebbane would have shown a game forcing club-heart two-suiter, but I can't think of any other good reason not to overcall 4\&, even vulnerable against not. And if $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ is ruled out by your system, I think you need to double. This hand certainly exemplifies that old bridge adage, oft espoused by Bobby Wolff, that it might be dangerous to bid, but it can be equally dangerous to pass. Not to mention that other old adage: preempts work. So all credit to the Croniers for the aggressive pre-empt and raise, also to Bessis-Gaviard for bidding the slam in a crowded auction.

Trials need to test not just bridge technique, but also other attributes like stamina and resilience. I don't know whether the psychological blow of letting 4@ play undoubled on board 25 had any effect, but on the very next board the Cronier team again outbid their opponents to gain a further 9 IMPs:


5 made for +600 while 4 was 2 down and -200 , a further 9 IMPs to Cronier, now leading by 14 with six boards to play.

Board 29 was possibly the slowest played board I have ever watched on BBO - at 27 minutes certainly the longest I have ever commentated on. Fortunately I had now been joined by four other commentators, from Denmark, France, Switzerland and USA, so as the advantage swung back and forth between declarer and defenders there were enough points of interest and enough of us to keep the comments flowing.

## Board 29. Dealer North. All Vul.



## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dauvergne | Philippe | Sebbane | Bénédicte |
| - | 180 | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ |
| 14. | 2 | Pass | 4 |

Another vulnerable game bid, confidently, on wafer thin values. Despite the lack of values the only lead to ensure defeat is the trump ace. After some thought Dauvergne quite reasonably led the $\downarrow$, handing the initiative to declarer who ducked but took the subsequent $\downarrow$ J with the ace. Bénédicte now went into the first of a series of long thinks, during which we commentators were still trying to find the winning line. It was Roland Wald of Denmark who found it, not easy to see at double dummy, and so extremely hard to find at single dummy. After taking the diamond ace you have to take the intra-finesse in clubs, leading low to the 8 , so that you can subsequently run the queen to pin West's 10 . Declarer chose the 48 , finessing the queen, and putting the defence back in control. Next came a heart to the 4, 8 and ace, and now it was Sophie's turn to go into the tank. At this point any red card keeps the defence on top, any black card allows declarer to make.

By now the other room had finished this board and we could see that West there had made $2 \star$ after an unopposed auction of $1 \boldsymbol{-}-1 \mathrm{NT}-2 \downarrow$, for +90 . Meaning that if Cronier made this contract they would gain 12

IMPs and lead by 26 with just three boards to play - not quite home and dry, but very nearly. And one down here would be a flat board, leaving them still in a strong but by no means unassailable position.

Eventually Dauvergne led the spade king to dummy's ace - advantage declarer. We could see that if declarer now ruffed a spade to hand the club intra-finesse would again lead to success. Cronier, without sight of all four hands, took a further five minutes or so trying to analyse the position, and led ..... a heart to the nine - advantage defence. Now she made the club play of small to the 8 , but too late as the timing no longer works. Winning the $\boldsymbol{e}$ Jionel quickly found the killing return of the $\geqslant \mathrm{J}$, and when declarer took this with the queen in hand she ended up two down for -200 and 3 IMPs to Rolland.

I have made much of the time taken on this hand, but this is no criticism. I made the point in my BBO commentary that all the players were absolutely right to take as much time as necessary on a complex and potentially decisive hand, especially towards the end of a long and gruelling event. And that another of the important attributes of champions is the ability to resist the pressure of the clock at key moments.

That was the last swing in the match, and as champions so often seem to do, team Cronier had come from behind to win 172-161. Congratulations to them, and commiserations to the losers, who led for so long, but can maybe take some small comfort in the knowledge that they have prepared their compatriots for the tough matches they will face in Lisbon.
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## FUNBRIDGE

## Play bridge wherever and whenever you like!

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).
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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

AODOA FUNBRIDGE.com

Compare yourself to thousands of players
Challenge players in one vs one matches
Improve your skills

on

The app that takes you to the right contract in a split second.

Join us and

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.

## One Suit Squeeze

In the round of 16 of the open trials, you face a difficult opening lead problem.

As West, you hold:

## Dealer West. E/W Vul.

- Q97
$\checkmark 98753$
- AQ7
$\div 73$

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $2 *$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{*}$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{*}$ |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | $3 N T$ |

All Pass
2* Artificial 4th suit, forcing to game
Your lead. Attitude leads vs. NT. From honour holdings, ace from AK, king power lead, Rusinow from lower sequences with 8 being the swing card.

A club lead into their 4-4 fit doesn't make sense. A spade lead might set up some tricks, but it also might give declarer a finesse he wouldn't be able to take for himself. A heart lead is safe, but may lose an important tempo.

A diamond lead could well work. Partner figures to have some diamond length, since South has spades and clubs and North has hearts and clubs. Partner didn't double 3 , but he wouldn't be doubling for a lead with something like Jxxxx.

It is often correct to lead the queen from $A Q x$. The idea is to force declarer to take his king so if partner has Jxxxx you will then be able to
run the suit. If you lead the ace, declarer will be able to hold up from Kxx. However, this is necessary only if partner doesn't have an entry. On this hand, you must assume partner has an entry, or you aren't going to defeat this contract. Therefore, you might as well lead the $\downarrow$ A. This will avoid giving declarer a second diamond trick if declarer has $\diamond \mathrm{Kx}$ and dummy $\downarrow$ Jxx, which is quite possible. Also, the appearance of dummy and partner's signal may indicate that a shift is called for. You don't have to commit yourself at trick 1. It is easier to defend when you are looking at 26 cards than when you are looking at 13 cards.

You lead the $\begin{aligned} & \text { A }\end{aligned}$


Partner plays the $\$ 4$ (standard attitude signal at trick 1 on honour lead vs. NT) and declarer plays the $\downarrow$. What do you do now?


What do you know about South's hand? He definitely has at least 4 clubs for his 3e call. He has at least 4 spades, probably 5, since partner didn't bid over the $1 \checkmark$ call and with 4-2-3-4 shape East might not have bothered showing the club support.

The 2 is missing, Partner could well have been encouraging diamonds,
with the $\$ 4$ being the highest spot he could afford. This would be consistent with East having 5-2-4-2 distribution.

Could it be right to continue with the $\downarrow \mathrm{Q}$, playing partner for $\downarrow \mathrm{K} 10 \mathrm{xx}$ or $\downarrow$ K9xx? That is possible. But you would still need another trick to defeat the contract. If partner has a heart or club entry, it won't be necessary to cash the diamonds. What if partner has the $\boldsymbol{A}$, and declarer the $Q$ and AKxx or AJ10x? Now cashing out is necessary. This would give declarer something like $\uparrow \mathrm{KJxxx} \geqslant \mathrm{Ox} \leqslant 10 \mathrm{x}$ AKxx. Would declarer have bid 3NT with that hand? He can't know that his partner has such a good diamond holding - in fact, many players would raise $2 \diamond$ to $3 \diamond$ with that hand, showing the $0-5-4-4$ shape. South would certainly have bid $3 \checkmark$ with that hand, keeping open the possibility of playing in a 5-2 heart fit with the diamonds unstopped.

It looks like declarer has at least Kx of diamonds. Would partner have encouraged in diamonds with $\$ 10942$ ? Yes, he would. You lead ace from AK vs. notrump, so from his point of view you have AKx of diamonds and he wants diamonds continued to set up his fourth diamond before his entry gets knocked out. And it is always possible that declarer started with K62 of diamonds, in which case continuing diamonds is really disastrous.

So, what should you shift to? Either black suit might cost a trick, and it doesn't look like you can establish enough quick tricks to defeat the contract. A passive heart shift looks best. Partner could have the queen. Declarer won't have any particular reason not to take the finesse, since from his point of view you are just trying to find a safe exit.

If you do shift to a heart, you should lead an honest $\geqslant 9$. This won't mean anything to declarer, but it might to partner. If partner has the stiff $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ and declarer finesses, partner will know from your $\geqslant 9$ shift that declarer has only 3 heart tricks. This knowledge might help partner's defence.
 leads back the $\langle 2$ to declarer's king. Declarer leads a heart to dummy and cashes another heart, partner discarding the 4 and 5 and declarer the $\boldsymbol{4}$. Now declarer leads a club to his ace ( $\boldsymbol{6}$ from partner), cashes the king of clubs ( 10 from partner), and leads the 9 . What do you discard?

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { - } \\ & 104 \\ & \text { J8 } \\ & \text { Q8 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| ¢ Q97 |  |
| $\checkmark 87$ | w E |
| - Q | W E |
| S- | S |

Obviously you can't afford to discard a diamond or a heart. It seems normal to discard the $\mathbf{~} 7$.

You discard the $\mathbf{\$ 7}$. Dummy's queen of clubs wins, partner playing the jack. Now the 8 from dummy. Partner discards the $\$ 9$. What do you discard now?


It is clear that partner has the A , as otherwise declarer has 9 top tricks. Once again you must discard a spade. However, the $₫ \mathrm{Q}$ might be a liability. Suppose, for example, partner started with $\$ 10854$ of spades. If declarer cashes the heart he is down, so he will exit with a small diamond to your queen. You must lead your last spade, of course. If you still have the queen, partner can't afford to overtake since declarer would have 2 spade winners. And now declarer, who will have a count on the hand, will also duck and you will be forced to give dummy the last 2 tricks.
$\Delta \mathrm{It}$ is vital that you discard the $\mathbf{Q}$. Now when you lead the $\$ 9$ partner can overtake with the 10 , and it is the defence which is victorious. The full hand is:

| - Q97 <br> - 98753 <br> - AQ7 <br> $\div 73$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AKJ } 104 \\ & \text { J853 } \\ & \text { Q854 } \end{aligned}$ | $$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  | N |  |
|  | W E |  |
|  | S |  |
|  | ¢ KJ632 |  |
|  | - 62 |  |
|  | - K6 |  |
|  | * AK92 |  |



When declarer leads the diamond off dummy, which spade does he discard? If he discards the $\boldsymbol{\$ 3}$, he can no longer duck West's $\boldsymbol{\$} \mathbf{7}$. If he discards the $\uparrow 8$, now East can afford to overtake with the 10 and will get 2 spade tricks. This is one of the most unusual variations of a one-suit squeeze I have ever seen.
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## Flags and Scrambles

an excerpt from Mark Horton and Eric Kokish＇s Rabbi＇s Rules；this month＇s Master Point Press Bidding Battle book prize

## Flags \＆Scrambles

It is universally acknowledged that developing the auction after an open－ ing bid of 2NT is particularly difficult to do with any degree of accuracy， particularly when the responder ．
has a distributional hand．
The methods outlined here use major suit transfers，but include var－ ious ways of breaking a transfer to show a fit for partner＇s suit．These transfer breaks rejoice in the name＇Flags＇because the opener is delighted partner has shown the suit．

When opener does not have an immediate flag one might still be made if responder introduces another suit．

When the opener does not want to flag he can use a＇Scramble＇to keep the auction under control．

There are some advanced ideas，but the basic concepts are quite simple and worthy of general revelation．So we＇ll start with the bare bones and attempt to deal with the more delicate stuff later on．

## Major Suit Superflags

（NOTE：throughout this analysis we will deal with a 20－21 2NT opening but adjustments can be made for different ranges and other 2NT family bids）
The control Superflag：jump in the major fit
Some hands have so many controls（together with a good fit）that they justify a shot at game opposite any hand with 5 －card length in the known major．We use a jump to four of the major to show this hand rich in controls．It＇s a bulky bid for slam purposes so we＇ve attempted to keep it pretty specific：exactly nine controls（four aces and a king or three aces and three kings）and four－card support and no side suit as good as KQJ2（concentration）．This is a hand that won＇t produce slam on the basis of a source of tricks
but won＇t kill a slam，on the other hand，owing to fast losers．Later we will get into some interesting follow－up sequences but for now we＇ll settle for some simple illustrations．These are control Superflags after responder transfers to spades：

ゅK1032 『AK2 AK86 A8
\＆AQ85 A5 A1092 \＆AK4
¢AJ102 AK98 AJ10 \＆A2
－АК92 『K6 $\begin{gathered}\text { AK96＊A98 }\end{gathered}$
These pure hands are rather infrequent but when they come up the con－ trol Superflag can simplify the auction rather spectacularly

| －AJ 103 <br> －A102 <br> －AK8 <br> －A109 |  | $$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | East |  |
| 2NT | 3＊＊ |  |
| 4＊＊ | 74 |  |

Here responder was going to introduce clubs next and look for a delicate slam in one suit or the other without commit－ ting his side to six．The auction was bound to be awkward．It ＇s never easy to try for slam in clubs and play game in spades without clouding the distributional issue．

Here responder gets a good break．When opener shows exactly nine controls and four or more spades，the grand slam is suddenly easy to bid．Note that there is room in opener＇s hand for the queen of trumps（instead of the jack）but that responder is in a position to risk the 3－0 break if he wishes to （with no intermediates in the trump suit a 2－1 break might be required）．

This little example helps to clarify something that we might already have known：When opener is known to have
nine controls (ace=2, king=1), responder can always identify their nature if he himself holds two controls. If responder holds an ace he can tell that opener holds three aces and three kings; if responder holds two kings, opener must hold four aces and a king. There's no other way to make up nine controls. As responder will usually hold at least two controls to make a slam try opposite a 2 NT opening bid, this control information will generally be available and will clarify the slam search. If responder holds only one control himself, he will sometimes be better off if opener holds one combination rather than the other and we will see later that it is not too difficult to graft a discovery mechanism onto the basic framework. One more illustration:


Here responder's slam interest was real but fuzzy and his plan of exploration was hardly well-marked. Of course, many players would simply check for aces and shoot out six, perhaps rightly. If responder chooses to start with a 3-level transfer (prior to his slam try) he gets lucky and finds that he can count 13 winners at no-trumps (opener must have three aces and three kings).

## The concentration Superflag: bid a new suit

A second family of great hands in support of a known 5-card suit is the group that includes a source of tricks as well as excellent controls and decent trumps. We call this subgroup the Concentration Superflag and define the requirements thus: eight or nine controls including at least three aces, four-card support to at least two of the top four honours, a side-suit at least as good as K-Q-J-2. i.e. concentration. To nail things down, concentration means specifically: AKQ6, AKJ7, AQJ8, KQJ5. If you choose to open a concentrated 5422 hand with 2NT then you might have an even more promising trick source or particularly exciting trumps. Responder should not, however, count on more than four cards in the concentration suit. Some examples of concentration Superflags after a transfer to spades:

↔ AJ102 『 K2 * AKQ4 \& A92 bid 4

- KQ87 『 A2 A74 AKJ10 bid 4~
- AK85 - KOJ5 A32 A2 bid 4
- KJ105 A9 AJ10 AKJ2 bid 4*

These are all good hands for game but the real bonus comes in the slam zone when responder, with the fourth honour in the "concentration" suit, can count four sure tricks. Let's take a look at a couple of illustrations:

- AJ 102
- K2
- AKQ4
- A92

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2NT | 3 ® $^{*}$ |
| 4 ® $^{*}$ | 7NT |

Responder had intended to transfer at the 3-level and raise himself to game, a mild slam try if Jacoby Transfers are used in conjunction with Texas Transfers. Suddenly, the potential is dramatically altered. Responder knows that he's facing four trumps to the ace and a second honour, the club ace and precisely AKQ6 of diamonds. That's only seven controls so opener must have another king. What's more responder can now identify opener's remaining trump honour as the jack! With the queen he'd have 22 HCP, a point more than the announced range. From a position that looked touch-and-go for twelve tricks, responder can now visualise a tremendous play for thirteen winners in the safest possible strain. Inevitably, things won't always be this easy, but sometimes the picture becomes astonishingly clear.


Here again responder was worth no more than a mild try (many would simply settle for game, perhaps rightly). When opener rejected the transfer with a concentration Superflag, however, responder was faced with a
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plethora of useful information that altered his expectations considera－ bly．In fact he could construct opener＇s entire hand within one red card （3－2 or 2－3）．He could count twelve tricks in no－trump or spades but thir－ teen in clubs if that suit were to divide $4-2$ or better．The ruff in the short hand became the deal maker．The game－slam decision had become the infinitely more pleasant choice between 6 NT and seven clubs．

It wouldn＇t be fair，even at this early stage of development，to suggest that the concentration Superflag will solve all the complexities inherent in the accompanying follow up sequences－indeed the new information can often breed a new set of frustrations：


Without any mechanism to show a quasi－balanced hand with slam inter－ est（serious partnerships are advised to consider the work of George Rosenkranz：Confi and Superconfi to solve this problem．See below．） responder has to content himself with a transfer and a quantitative no－trump bid of some sort．When opener rejects his transfer and shows concentration in clubs，responder solves his game／slam decision．He can now count twelve tricks in no trumps．Good，yes？Well，only to a degree． If opener holds three hearts and two diamonds there are thirteen tricks in spades．If he＇s two－three in the red suits there＇s no extra ruffing trick． Having recognised this problem we think that it＇s worth solving．Perhaps you already see an easy answer．

We will deal with just this problem in a later installment．For now we＇ll have to be satisfied with reaching six notrumps in the last exam－ ple．Not so bad，really．

## The General Superflag：bid 3NT

Quite obviously there are other very good hands in support of the major that would suggest special treatment，i．e．more than simple acceptance of the transfer．We suggest lumping these general Superflags into one last basket：3NT．

While these hands might well produce a slam opposite the right com－ bination，we see them hands as flawed in some way，at least in terms of the requirements of our other two Superflags．In some ways these gen－ eral types may seem more promising．They are limited，however，by the tight definitions we＇ve assigned to the control and concentration sub－ groups．We can identify several other types，but we can＇t slot them into a convenient pigeonhole．Assume a transfer to spades：
－AOJ84 KQ 2 －AQ7 \＆K9
This is a very good hand for game，but only so－so for slam（only 6 controls）．The immediate concern is not missing game so we realise that this hand can＇t just settle for three spades．We＇ve got to draw the line somewhere，however，and we think that 6 controls is the lower limit．And then only with great trumps．
－KQ102 『AJ98 AK2 \＆A2
This is a very good hand for spades：four trumps and eight controls． Yet it doesn＇t fit into the other two Superflag categories．We lump this type into the 3NT Superflag，and we do so with no regrets．It looks right to do so．Note that there is no concentration in this eight－control type．
© AJ104－K2 $\downarrow$ KQ2＊AKJ2
This looks like our concentration Superflag and it is indeed similar． What this hand lacks is an eighth control．It is fair to say that we approve of a 3NT Superflag on hands blessed with four trumps，concentration and only 7 controls．

↔ AK2 $\vee 54$ AKQ75 A84
For the first time we come across a hand with only three card support that looks like a Superflag．On the surface it seems easy to pin this one down：three very good trumps，a solid－looking 5－card side－suit，lots of con－ trols．We like that，of course，but is the 8 －control requirement realistic？

How about：
© KQ2 『A4 AKQ76 \＆K109？
Can we then reduce our requirements to something like 7 controls plus the queen of trumps？If we like this refinement，how do we deal with：

↔A85 『A2 AKQ86 \＆A104？
That＇s 9 controls but three not－so－good trumps．Is this hand worth a Superflag？How about other balanced hands with 9 controls and no side－ suit or 4－card＂concentration＂that nevertheless contain a three－card fit， good or indifferent？These are very fuzzy hand types．It could be right
to go either way．Despite the dangers in missing a decent game we feel that it＇s a good idea to draw the line at three very good trumps，i．e．two of the three top honours．Even the 9－control example above with A85 and the solid－looking diamonds will not produce a game that often opposite a very poor responding hand．So even with the maximum 9 controls we recommend that you do not Superflag without some security within the trump suit itself．If we don＇t add this constraint we feel that we＇re going to overload 3 NT and cloud the slam search with trump worries．As we＇ll see later on，there will usually be an opportunity to Flag for the major without resorting to an immediate Superflag．

Another rule that seems to have some merit is this one（perhaps self－evidently）：it is impossible to Superflag without 2 aces．Four kings and an ace（6 controls）is simply not good enough．We＇d like to be able to stipulate that when opener holds fewer than 8 controls he should hold no dangerous side－suit（i．e．two quick losers）but we feel that：
\＆KQ8 『 54 AKQ97 AK2
is certainly good enough for 3NT．Perhaps we can say that if opener has neither 8 controls nor 7 controls plus the queen of trumps（together with his meaty 5 －card side－suit）he must hold no dangerous side－suit．Yes， that might well be playable．

So we can see that the 3NT Superflag is not the specific tool that the other two Superflags appear to be．Yet we feel that a general rejection of the transfer is a necessary refinement and we feel that some definition can be provided．Within the guidelines we have suggested above，we feel that constructive bidding can still be greatly simplified，at least beyond the level that go－as－you－please would seem to allow．For example：

| －AK2 <br> － 87 <br> －AKQ32 <br> \＆A54 |  | －QJ654 <br> －A2 <br> －J4 <br> K863 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | East |  |
| 2NT | 3\％＊ |  |
| 3NT＊ | 4¢＊ |  |
| 5＊＊ | 7NT |  |

The jump to Five Diamonds gets the hand－type across perfectly：three good trumps，solid looking side－suit， 8 controls（since responder is look－ ing at the trump queen）．There＇s something especially appealing to us
about being able to confidently value a jack so highly．

## THE MAJOR－MINOR CAMPAIGN

## REQUIREMENTS

Once opener fails to Superflag responder＇s major，responder is faced with a borderline decision on many hands：should he introduce a minor suit or simply continue with 3NT over opener＇s transfer acceptance？The danger in bidding beyond 3NT with a marginal hand is usually only too clear－3NT might have been the last plus．To settle for 3NT，however， might be to preclude a slam or better game in the minor suit．We had hoped to be able to spell out some firm rules for responder to follow in close cases but we soon realised that many of these decisions are per－ sonal things．In a pinch，each of the following hands might well transfer to the major and bid the minor．


－ 108752 ҮK Q 109754 \＄3


\＆KJ972 © Q 87 －K1065
↔ 7 ソAQ1042 $\uparrow 754$ ※K764
↔ AJ762 『4 © QJ 95 ※ Q 76
－Q10865 K 104 －KJ65 9
－ 3 VQJ972 ${ }^{\text {－} 652 ~} \mathrm{AQ} 87$
↔ K2 『Q10982 A1074 \＄64
－ 43 『AJ1053 $\uparrow$ K1095
As we said earlier，we feel that 5332 are best handled with CONFI or per－ haps even Baron－search for suits upwards．We believe that 5422 hands are in the same family and should usually be left out of this major－minor adventure．Still，most pairs have not adopted Confi（it seems intimidat－ ing although it certainly is not complicated）and so 5422 hands are part of the present sample．We can state from the outset，though，that 5422 hands should usually contain at least 3 controls（or lots of extra high card content and good intermediates）． 5431 hands should come close to 3 controls or 10 HCP or at least contain decent texture．With ten cards in two suits responder should try to hold at least 2 controls with a
kicking queen. With eleven cards in his suits the requirements are virtually non-existent. We must remember, after all, that the major minor sequence is not a clear slam try. The best game is often at issue. With a hand like 108752 K $\downarrow 109754$ responder might just transfer to spades and bid 3NT but who's to say this course of action will work out better than the more natural development of showing both suits?

Once opener doesn't Superflag the major, responder, with a marginal hand, is really only concerned with the best game or slam in the minor or slam in a fragment suit if he owns one. His decision to bring the minor into the game is based on risk versus gain. A tricky but profitable exercise is to mentally construct two fairly normal 2NT openings that will produce a very good slam. If you can do that, by all means bid your minor with a clear conscience. So often it will be no more than the right minimum that you will require for slam. Many of these minimums will require something like A6 or K7 in the major and some length in the minor or 5-card length in a 3-card fragment, certainly a reasonable hope. Remember that opener needs a relatively specific hand to love the major immediately. There are still plenty of very good hands left for him to hold in support of another suit.

Another consideration, and one that goes the other way, is this: even by settling for 3NT rather than four of the minor at this juncture, a good minor suit slam might still be reached if opener expresses interest in the major over 3NT, viz.

| - A953 |  | - 64 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - AQJ | N | - K10743 |
| - AJ | W E | - 73 |
| - KQ62 | S | - A1063 |

These hands provide excellent play for $6 \boldsymbol{*}$ and we will later suggest that the slam should be reached even after the auction begins:

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| $2 N T$ | $3 * *$ |
| $3 ヵ *$ | $3 N T$ |

## THE BASIC FLAG-SCRAMBLE FRAMEWORK

Once we've eliminated the Superflags we are left with only four basic major-minor sequences. Three of these are essentially similar:

## 2NT

| 34* | 48 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2NT | 3** |
| 34* | 4 |
| 2NT | 3** |
| 3** | 4* |

One of the four sequences is anomalous, as we shall see a little later:

| $2 N T$ | $3 * *$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $3 \uparrow *$ | 4 |

Once responder has shown a major and introduced a minor, opener's next bid will often be crucial. He wants to be able to express a favourable opinion toward the minor, the major (although limited by his failure to use a Superflag) and perhaps towards no-trumps. He'd like to be able to say: "I'd rather not get too high if you (responder) don't have much extra" on a variety of hands -fair support for either suit or no fit at all. On better hands he'd like to be able to say: "I've got a good hand but I'm not sure where we're going." What we propose to do here is suggest a scheme of bids for opener over responder's four clubs or four diamonds that will enable him (opener) to ensure that his desired message is properly received. We feel that we can do just this with a network of Flags and Scrambles.

Let's start with one of the three similar sequences above and explore opener's various options in the light of our suggestions for Flags and Scrambles.

```
2NT 3**
34* 4*
```

4 $\quad$ The cheapest bid by opener is a Scramble -a hand not rich in controls or not blessed with a proven fit, tentatively no desire to proceed beyond 44 (perhaps a 5-2 fit). If opener Scrambles and bids again he shows preference for a given strain without much enthusiasm for slam, i.e. less than the values for a Flag.

4V The next available bid by opener is a Flag for responder's major -given the failure to Superflag for the major, opener can still have a good hand in support of the major (usually with only 3-card support). We suggest these requirements: 6+
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"working" controls (ace=2, king in one of responder's suits=1) or 5 "working" controls plus two key queens in responder's suits.
4. The next available bid by opener is a Superflag for responder's minor -this needn't be as good a hand as a major-suit Superflag as responder has already shown strength by introducing a new suit. The "super" element here is the requirement of $a$ slammish holding in responder's major, i.e. at least ace or king doubleton, together with a 4+ card fit for the minor and at least 6 controls (usually 3 aces or compensating fillers).

5* Raising the minor is a Flag for that suit lacking ace or king in responder's major. There must be 6+ controls (usually more) and by inference very good trumps.

Note that with "lesser" minor suit support types opener may Scramble and convert a minimum rebid to 5 of his minor.

4NT We call this one the "fitless" Flag-opener has a good hand with lots of controls, perhaps a personal source of tricks, but no "known" 8-card fit. This non-forcing bid encourages responder to keep bidding with a real two-suiter or say, 5431 pattern, as he will buy a prime hand opposite. With a hand that looks "slow" and might not produce four of a major on a five-two fit, opener first Scrambles then pulls to 4NT. With some "slow" notrumps, opener will indeed settle for game in the major and hope to 'scramble' home.

This is the basic structure, but there's a lot more. As we'll see later, we suggest that opener can go beyond five of responder's minor. That, however, we consider more than a "simple pleasure."

Sequences (2) and (3) above work exactly the same way, opener using each of the five bids through five of responder's minor to Scramble and Flag in the same progression.

4NT always constitutes the fitless Flag; the cheapest bid is always the Scramble; the next available bid Flags the major; the most expensive bid (the minor suit raise) is the minor-suit Flag without a high picture in the major; the penultimate non-no-trump bid is always the minor suit Superflag. Please note that it is of no significance that opener sometimes actually bids the major to Flag it and sometimes doesn't. What is relevant is the order of the available bids between four of the minor and five of the minor. We thought originally that it might be a useful memory aid to Flag the major by bidding it but we found that we sometimes need the extra step provided by the scheme that we're presenting to you. As there are only
five cipher bids available in each sequence and because they have a common thread in three of the four cases, we decided to go with the present scheme. Please accept it as it is.

We mentioned above that sequence (4) is not quite the same as the other three. This is because the first available bid, $4 \vee$, can be passed by responder if used as a Scramble.

After all, hearts is his main suit. We realised that we still required a Scramble that would not get us beyond $4 \boldsymbol{\vee}$, the most probable game once 3NT had been passed. Finally we concluded that $4 \vee$ had to be retained as the Scramble, awkward as this seemed. In this one major-minor sequence opener can no longer Scramble and then convert to 4NT ("slow" no-trump) or to 5 (Scramble for the minor). This then is the scheme:
2NT 3**

3** 4
4• Scramble, but remember responder will often
pass it.
44 Flag for hearts, responder's "known" major.
4NT Still a fitless Flag. We feel that this is a vital hand to show.

5\% Superflag for diamonds, high doubleton in the major, etc.

5 $\quad$ This is the key point of departure in this system. It seems to us that there might be a wide variety of hands that would prefer to play $5 \diamond$ rather than $4 \vee$. Because $4 \checkmark$ can be passed there's very little choice here: $5 \star$ or $4 \geqslant$. We think that 5 here is not quite the Flag that would be in (1), (2) or (3) above. Rather, $5 \$$ might better be described as a diamond Grope. Of course, most of these hands will contain weak doubleton hearts and so they will generally fit our minor suit Flag standards. We merely wish to point out that responder should make allowances here.

Let's take sequence (2) of our basic scheme and work with some illustrations:

| $2 N T$ | $3 * *$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $3 \wedge^{*}$ | 4 |
| $?$ |  |

Let's give opener the following hands:
\＆A3 • AQ7 KJ8 \＆AQ964
\＆AQ5 『 K54 AQ7 \＆AJ106

- A2 『 A87 AQ76 AK54
- 65 『 AK76 AQ76 AK6
－A5 $\downarrow$ AK5＊K98 \＆AK65

4•：Scramble
44：Flag
5\％：Superflag
$5 \star$ ：Flag
4NT：Fitless Flag
If we stopped right here we feel that we＇d be well ahead of the＂stand－ ard＂players．In fact this is as far as we＇re going to bring you in our simple pleasures section．

This next section covers a variation to the sequence 2 NT－ $3 \uparrow$ ．

## Jacoby Transfer Sequences

The Walsh Substructure（if you prefer 3 to just be hearts you can skip to a relevant section）

2NT 3＊＊
Transfer to hearts，but responder may not have a genuine heart type．
If he doesn＇t have hearts，he has a three－suited slam try or a slam try with heart shortness and $4 \uparrow / 6 \leqslant$ or $4 \boldsymbol{*} / 6 \uparrow$ ．

Opener may break the transfer only by bidding $3 \mathbf{Q}^{*}$ ，which promises $4 / 5$－card heart support and a slam－suitable hand．

Responder confirms the genuine heart type by bidding 3a＊or 3NT＊ over $3 \vee$ ，or by bidding 3 NT over the $3 \boldsymbol{Q}^{*}$ transfer break．All other actions deny $5+$ hearts and pinpoint the shortness．This double transfer is known as Walsh．

2NT 3＊＊Hearts or a strong three－suiter or splinter in hearts， $6 / 4$ or $4 / 6$

3ヶ 3＊Alert！I have a＂normal＂5＋hand：Please describe your heart support

3NT＊Alert！I have a very weak hand with 5
$+5 \boldsymbol{*} / \diamond(4 \boldsymbol{e}=$ pass $/$ correct $; 4 \star=$ great for clubs $)$

## 4e＊ 4414

4＊＊ 4144
4＊＊ 1444
4＠＊ 4441
4NT＊2146，F1
5＊＊2164，F1

2NT 3＊＊Hearts or a strong three－suiter or splinter in hearts， $6 / 4$ or $4 / 6$ minors

34＊This is the only transfer break：4／5－card heart sup－ port with slam－suitability

3NT＊Alert！I have 5＋hearts，any strength
4e＊ 4414
4＊＊ 4144
4＊＊ 1444
4＠＊ 4441
4NT＊2146，F1
52＊2164，F1
After the three－suiter description，opener can sign off in a suit or 4 NT or he can ask for controls by bidding responder＇s short suit（1st step＝0 or $1,2,3$ ，etc）；follow－up rebid of short suit asks for specific queens）．Over opener＇s signoff，responder can ask for controls himself by bidding his short suit（opener starts with 6，etc unless he＇s confirmed $25+$ and so starts with 7）and his follow－up short suit rebid asks for specific queens （queen asks show interest in seven）．If responder has shown 2 controls already with（say）an artificial control showing $2 \boldsymbol{v}$ response to $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ ，he shows specific queens immediately in reply to the first short－suit con－ tinuation by opener．If responder has shown $3+$ controls（perhaps via an artificial control－showing 2 response to 2 ）he clarifies，starting with 3 ，4，etc，next shows queens．

Because we use the transfer to hearts as a multi－meaning bid we need to engage in some artificial continuations，but we gain on these hands by knowing early whether opener has two hearts or a more favourable number．If you like that，it＇s yours，but if you use a more straightforward $3 \downarrow=5+\uparrow$ method，your FLAGS and SCRAMBLES need to take into account the full spectrum of opener＇s heart length．

2NT $3 \wedge^{*} \quad$ Hearts or a strong three－suiter or splinter in hearts， $6 / 4$ or $4 / 6$ minors．

3ヶ 3＾＊Alert！I have a＂normal＂5＋hand：Please describe your heart support

3NT Natural，two－card heart support

```
4＠＊Three－card heart support，slam－suitable（responder＇s 4 ＊＊\(^{*}=\) Last Train）
4＊＊Three－card heart support，not slam－suitable
4V Four－card heart support，but not slam－suitable
```

Responder may continue over 3NT with a natural bid in a minor，after which FLAGS and SCRAMBLES will apply but essentially related to slam suitability for the minor or strains other than hearts．

When opener confirms heart support，however，there is less room to manoeuvre． $4 \boldsymbol{\top}$ is a signoff and 4 4 by either partner is Kickback RKCB 1430 for hearts．4NT shows an undisclosed four－card or longer minor， over which opener may introduce a minor himself to investigate alter－ native strains．Other bids show controls．

2NT 3＊＊Hearts or a strong three－suiter or splinter in hearts， $6 / 4$ or $4 / 6$ minors．

3＾＊The only transfer break：4／5－card heart support with slam－suitability

3NT＊Alert！I have 5＋hearts，any strength
4e＊I have a four－card minor if you＇re looking for a four－four fit：then $4 \diamond$ forces $4 \vee$

4 I have a hand rich in controls with no obvi－ ous lead value

4『＊I do not have a four－card minor
When opener confirms 4／5－card heart support and a slam－suitable hand， however，there is little room to manoeuvre． $4 \boldsymbol{\text { is a signoff and } 4}$ by either partner is RKCB 1430 for hearts．4NT directly over 4 or after first bidding $4 \diamond$ to force $4 \vee$ shows an undisclosed four－card or longer minor， over which opener may introduce a minor himself to investigate alter－ native strains．Other bids show controls．

2NT 3＊＊Hearts or strong three－suiter or SPL $\vee, 6 / 4$ or $4 / 6$ minors

3ヶ 3＾＊Alert！I have a normal 5＋H hand
3NT＊Natural，only two hearts
4＊Natural 5＋（switching for is an attractive alternative）

4• Mild slam try with 6／7（else start with Tex－
as）
2NT $3{ }^{*}$＊Hearts or a strong three－suiter or splinter in hearts， $6 / 4$ or $4 / 6$ minors．

3ヶ 3＊＊Alert！I have a normal $5+\odot$ hand
3NT＊Natural，only two hearts

$4 \Downarrow^{*} \quad$ Scramble－no special positive direction；
$4 \checkmark$ still possible opposite decent five－card suit，but opener can try
$4 \mathrm{NT} / 5 *$ next，which would not be encouraging
4『＊Flag－positive for hearts but trumps limited to $\downarrow$ or HH，5233／3253／4243

4．＊Flag for clubs，rich in controls
4NT＊Fitless flag rich in controls，no known 8－card fit
5\％＊Flag for clubs，based on strong trumps（what it
sounds like）
5＊＊Superflag for clubs，e．g．AAxx $\because K x \geqslant A x x$ \＆AKQ10x
2NT 3＊＊Hearts or strong three－suiter or SPL $\upharpoonright$ ，6／4 either way in the minors

3ワ 34＊Alert！I have a normal 5＋hand
3NT＊Natural，only two hearts
4＊Natural 5＋ツ／4＋
4४＊Scramble，but more suitable for 4ソ（ $\vee$ or HH ）than 4 NT or 54 ．Although this is the worst case＂scramble＂scenar－ io it is improvable by also using 4a as a scramble．

4®＊Scramble，but more suitable for $4 N T$ or $5 \diamond$ than for $4 \vee$（usually weak hearts）

4NT＊Fitless flag，rich in controls
52＊Flag for diamonds，good controls
5＊Flag for diamonds，good trumps
5＊＊Superflag for diamonds（you＇ll know it when you see it，to drive to slam）
Summary（After responder’s 3＊＂transfer＂and 3e＊－3NT；natural 4e／4ヶ）：
(1) Cheapest step is always the scramble (opener NEVER has $3+\vee$ )
(2) When cheapest=4 $\downarrow$ it shows preference for play in hearts rather than NT or diamonds
(3) When cheapest $=4 \boldsymbol{\vee}$, $4 \boldsymbol{\Phi}$ is also a scramble with preference for NT or diamonds
(4) When $4 \diamond=$ scramble, $4 \vee$ is a "flag" (in context) for hearts with $\vee$ or HH (good doubleton)
(5) 4 NT is always the fitless flag
(6) $5 \mathrm{~m}-1$ (excluding 4 NT ) is always the flag for the minor, based on good controls
(7) 5 m is always the minor suit flag, based on good trumps
(8) $5 \mathrm{~m}+1$ is a superflag for the minor (truly sensational hand)

For you, the exception you'll want to make is for 2NT-3* ; 3४-4», where $4 \checkmark$ would be a weak preference with three and 4 NT would be NAT, not the so-called Fitless Flag.

NOTE: You will also want to jump to $5 \vee$ over $4 \diamond$ (or $4 \boldsymbol{\&}$ ) to show a double fit for responder's suits.

After 2NT-3 $\quad$ Unambiguous transfer to spades, $5+$
Opener may "super-accept" (break) the transfer via:
3NT "General" superflag: typically 8 controls, big trumps, no concentration

4@ "Control" superflag: 9 controls, $4+\mathrm{H}$, no "concentration (KQJx+)

4V/4e/4 "Concentration" superflag: 8/9 controls, 3+ aces, two honours to four+ in $\mathbf{4}$, a side suit of at least KQJ6 Responder's $4 \mathbf{}^{*}$ over a transfer break is a RETRANSFER, not a cue-bid
2NT 3**

34 4ヶ* Specifically 5044, slam interest.
Other Standard JTB sequences
2NT 3४*
34 4e Natural, 5+9/4+\%; opener continues:
$4{ }^{*} \quad$ Scramble, i.e. no special positive direction; 4 still possible, but opener can try $4 N T / 5$ next, which would NOT be encouraging

4 * Flag i.e. positive for spades (limited by non "su-

44* Flag for clubs, rich in controls
4NT* Fitless Flag, rich in controls, no known 8-card fit
5**
sounds like)

5** Superflag for clubs, as above with a second spade honour perhaps

5^* Dbl Flag with $3+\boldsymbol{s} / 4+\boldsymbol{\mu}$, critical in evaluating best
strain for slam
After a "scramble," responder continues to bid out his shape, as secondary and tertiary $8+$ card fits are still possible; after a Flag, however, responder's new suit bids show shortness (as strain is established; this follows the shortness rule: 9+ card in two suits, prime fit, FG auction), cheapest no-trump suggests 5422 with some extra values.

34 4 Natural, $5+4+4$; opener continues:
4** Scramble
4^* Flag for spades (cheapest available non-scramble
is FLAG for M )
4NT* Fitless Flag
5** Flag for diamonds, good controls
5 * Flag for diamonds, good trumps
5** Superflag for diamonds (you'll know it when you see it, to drive to slam)

5^* Double Flag, $3+$ + $/ 4+$
SUMMARY (After a transfer to spades and responder's natural $4 \boldsymbol{*}$ $4 \diamond$ rebid):
(1) Cheapest step is always the Scramble
(2) Next step is always the (limited) Flag for the major
(3) 4 NT is always the Fitless Flag
(4) $5 \mathrm{~m}-1$ (excluding 4 NT ) is always the Flag for the minor, based on good controls
(5) 5 m is always the minor suit Flag, based on good trumps
(6) 5 M is always the Dbl Flag
(7) Any other available bid is a Superflag for the minor (truly sensational hand)

## Appendix

SuperConfi (subsequently described as SuperConfit by George Rosenkranz) was developed from Confi to search for grand slams with two balanced hands and operates when all 12 controls are known to be held. Initiating Super Confit creates a force to 6 NT and the responder is expected to sign off (usually in 6 NT ) if a control is missing.

The workings of Super Confi are similar to Confi. Opener makes an opening bid (or rebid) of NT that has a range of three or less points. Responder judges that a grand slam is close, so he checks for controls by making the first "meaningless" bid.

For example, over 2NT (20-22, say) most people play:
3e Stayman $3 \uparrow / \downarrow$ Transfers into hearts/spades 3NT to play.
Thus, $3 \boldsymbol{4}$ can be used for Confi (a small slam try) and $4 *$ can be used as SuperConfi (a grand slam try). If you play $4 \boldsymbol{\leftarrow}$ as Gerber then $4 \diamond$ can be SuperConfi.

After Super Confi is initiated, opener's rebid announces the number of controls held. With a $20-21$ balanced hand, he rebids 1st step minimum number of controls (3-6) 2nd step 7 3rd step 8 and so on.

If the opener makes the ambiguous cheapest control showing response then he must next make the cheapest no-trump rebid unless holding the maximum number of 6 controls for that bid.

If responder learns that a control is missing he signs off in 6 NT . Any lower bid keeps a grand slam in the picture, but only in a limited way.

If all the controls are present responder can rebid in any suit, searching for a possible fit. Note that in Confi the suit must be at least Qxxx, but in SuperConfi the suit can be any quality as the mechanics of SuperConfi ensure that a grand slam will not be bid if a top honor is missing.

If opener fits the suit he can either raise if missing the queen of that suit, or, with the queen, cue-bid another queen (he bids notrump with no queens) by making the cheapest 'impossible bid' - a bid that could not correspond to a suit length he wants to show, which might sometimes be a jump bid.

With no fit opener bids a suit of his own and the same rules apply.
If there is no fit either partner may bid 6NT to sign off. If responder wants to continue to investigate for seven he makes an otherwise meaningless bid as a quantitative invitation and opener can accept by bidding queens up the line.

If opener wants to continue he makes an 'impossible’ bid to show a maximum in high cards.

Before we leave this topic take a look at this deal from San Diego 2009:

```
@ Q74
-85
* A
* J987643
4 AK83
- AQJ6
- 84
* AK5
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
- & - & - & \(2 \star^{*}\) \\
Pass & \(2 \star^{*}\) & Double & \(?\)
\end{tabular}
```

South's decision to open 2* rather than 2NT is open to question. Before we consider the best way to proceed after East's double of $2 \star$, would you be able to reach the excellent club slam after a 2 NT opening?

One method that I helped to refine with the famous partnership of Sandra Landy \& Sally Brock (Sowter as she then was) would have seen the auction go like this:

| North | South |
| :---: | :---: |
| - | 2NT |
| 34* | 3NT |
| 4** | 49* |
| 5** | 5** |
| 6\% | Pass |

34 asks South to bid 3 NT and then $4 \vee$ shows a slam try in clubs ( $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ would be clubs and diamonds, $4 \diamond$, diamonds and clubs, 4 4 diamonds and 4NT $5-5$ or better in the minors). After a club-agreeing cue-bid by South it is easy enough to cue-bid to slam.

Going back to our first auction, the best move for South is to pass the double. That allows North to bid $3 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ and if South then raises to $4 \boldsymbol{\&}$ North cue-bids $4 \diamond$ and once again the slam is easily reached.

However, South elected to bid $3 \uparrow$ over the double, asking for a fourcard major. North bid $4 \boldsymbol{2}$ and when South raised to $\mathbf{5} \boldsymbol{*}$ North decided to call it a day.

9th European Open Championships
15-29 June 2019 - Save the dates for Turkish Delight! Situated in the seafront 5 star Green Park Hotel \& Convention Center in Pendik, a secure residential suburb on the outskirts of Istanbul, these championships will give you an opportunity to play bridge in an excellent fully air-conditioned venue against top class opponents from around the globe.

- In an ancient city that has become one of the most advanced in this part of the world, you can join the many visitors to take in the wonderful sights of Istanbul that we have seen in so many films - for example Topkapi Palace, Basilica Cistern, Aya Sofya, Grand Bazaar.
- Ample opportunities to enjoy international and Turkish cuisine in nearby restaurants suitable for every budget
- You can boost your well-being by availing of the opportunity to have a Turkish bath and massage where they were first developed.
All you need to do is
- visit the microsite for the Championships on the following: http://db.eurobridge.org repository/competitions/19Istanbul/microSite/Participants.htm
- for the specific playing schedule, where all events are transnational -

7 days of Mixed Teams \& Pairs followed by
8 days of Open, Women and Senior Teams and Pairs;
By popular request, Mixed and Open Team Knockouts will start from the round of 32
Guaranteed play every day for the duration
for a new entry fee structure with opportunities to save on a weekly package deal

- Special rates for early birds
- for substantially reduced entry fees for Women's and Seniors' events
http://db.eurobridge.org/repository/competitions/19Istanbul/microSite/Information.htm\#Fees
- Book your flight to the nearest international airport in Istanbul, Sabiha Gökçen (SAW), just 15 minutes away
Reserve your accommodation at the venue hotel ( $500+$ rooms at very attractive rates) or one of the many local excellent hotels of various categories linked to Prowin, the Turkish Bridge Federation accommodation liaison at https://eobc2019.com/\#!/hotels

The second round of the Crockford's Cup required the Abbot's team to travel to London. The match would be played at the George Wall bridge club in Shoreditch.
'I won't be happy, leaving my car in such a dubious part of town,' said the Abbot. 'Every chance that it won't be there by the time the match is over.'

Brother Lucius maintained a straight face. Who in his right mind would choose to steal an old Morris Minor with a large dent in the front offside? It was barely worth the scrap metal value.
'Brother Shayne usually washes the car for me every Friday,' continued the Abbot. 'I'll tell him not to bother this week. There's no point inviting interest from the local villains.'

The day of the match soon arrived and the Abbot's team entered the club premises no more than ten minutes late.
'No need to worry yourselves, gents,' Geoff Stimmer informed them. 'We've saved some time by dealing all the hands.'

The Abbot had rarely seen anyone who looked more like a lifelong criminal. Could someone like that be trusted with dealing the hands in advance? It was not an easy question to answer.

Play started and this was an early board at Brother Lucius's table:
Dealer South. None Vul

```
a AJ2
- K6
- A753
- KQ62
```

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

```
- 653
- Q8752
- 8
```

- KQ10984
- A4
- KJ62
- 5

```
```

\& }

```
& }
 J1093
 J1093
- Q1094
- Q1094
* A943
```

* A943

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline West & North & East & South \\
\hline Geoff & Brother & Arthur & Brother \\
\hline Stimmer & Paulo & Docke & Lucius \\
\hline - & - & - & \(1{ }^{1}\) \\
\hline Pass & 23 & Pass & 2 \\
\hline Pass & 29 & Pass & 34 \\
\hline Pass & 4NT & Pass & 5 \\
\hline Pass & 64 & All Pas & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Geoff Stimmer, who made a tidy living from his large garage nearby, led the jack of hearts against the spade slam. Brother Lucius won in the dummy and drew trumps in three rounds, ending in his hand. His next move was a low club towards dummy's honours.

Stimmer was in no hurry to commit himself on this trick. His partner had shown an odd number of hearts on the first trick, so declarer was marked with \(6=2=4=1\) shape. He surely held the \(\diamond \mathrm{K}\) for his bidding and would be able to discard his two diamond losers on the KQ if West played the club ace on this trick. With a glance to his right, he tossed the \(\$ 3\) onto the table. Dummy's \(\$\) then won the trick.
'Low diamond,' said Brother Lucius. When the \(\$ 8\) appeared on his right, he contributed the \(\leqslant 2\) from his hand. He won the heart return and then played his remaining trumps. If diamonds had started 3-2, the rest of the suit would be good. If East had started with \(\upharpoonright\) Qxxx, West would show out when the \(\boxtimes A\) was played and a finesse of the \(\forall J\) would then be marked.

As it happened, it was West who held four diamonds. Since he had to retain the A against dummys When he chose to release a diamond, declarer made three tricks in that suit to land the slam.

Brother Lucius smiled at his opponent. 'Nothing you could do,' he said. 'It was a nice try, ducking the club.'

Stimmer returned his cards to the wallet. A draw against four monks from Hampshire had appeared to be something of a gift. Perhaps they wouldn't be such a pushover after all.

At the other table, the Abbot and Brother Xavier faced Angie Brooker, the 50 -year-old proprietor of a very popular escort agency. She was partnered by her second husband, Bill, who looked after the security side of her business. Largely due to his reputation as a hard man, no rival escort agency was to be found within a 10 -mile radius of Shoreditch.

The players drew their cards for this deal:
Dealer South. Both Vul.


The crop-haired Angie Brooker knew full well that a double would have shown her hand better than \(2 \boldsymbol{\vee}\). Her cardplay was a good half-trick better than Bill's, though, particularly at the start of a match. She won the queen of spades lead with dummy's ace and played a trump to the ace, West discarding a diamond. It was just as well she was playing the contract. Bill tended to go off the rails when he encountered a bad break.

A club to the queen was allowed to win and declarer continued with the jack of clubs. Brother Xavier won with the ace and persisted with the jack of spades, won with the king. All followed to the club king and these cards were left in play:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
4. 8 \\
- KJ8 \\
- Q97 \\
- -
\end{tabular} & \\
\hline - 105 & & ¢ - \\
\hline \(\stackrel{-}{ }\) & N & -10654 \\
\hline - K10865 & W E & - AJ3 \\
\hline 2- & S & 2- \\
\hline & - 74 & \\
\hline & - Q97 & \\
\hline & - 2 & \\
\hline & -10 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Angie Brooker resisted the temptation to play the good club, throwing dummy's last spade. East would ruff and return a trump. When she subsequently surrendered a diamond trick, East would play a further trump and she would be one trick short. She led her singleton diamond instead, heading for a crossruff ending.

Brother Xavier rose with the king of diamonds and cashed the \(\mathbf{~ 1 0 ,}\) the defenders' third trick. Declarer then had the remainder. She ruffed the diamond return with the \(\geqslant 7\), ruffed a club with the \(\geqslant \mathrm{J}\), and ruffed a diamond with the \(\uparrow 9\). She then ruffed her last spade with the \(\nabla_{K}\) and claimed the \(\mathbb{Q}\) as her tenth trick.
'Well done, love,' said Bill Brooker, whose voice had deepened after fifty years of smoking. 'Nasty trump break, there.'
'Yeah, but I was always OK if he had three clubs,' his wife replied. 'Be a flat board, I expect.'

The Abbot had not enjoyed this confident display of expertise by a female opponent. His expectations of an easy match were slipping away rapidly.

Back on the other table, Brother Lucius had just arrived in a game contract.

Dealer South. N/S Vul.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { K873 } \\
& \text { AKQ943 } \\
& 108 \\
& 10
\end{aligned}
\]} &  & & \\
\hline & \(3 \mathrm{~W}^{\mathrm{N}}\) & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
- 6 \\
\(\checkmark 82\) \\
- 9643 \\
\& J86432
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { AQJ5 } \\
& 75 \\
& \bullet A K J 2 \\
& \bullet \text { A95 }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline West & North & East & South \\
\hline Geoff Brot & Brother & Arthur & Brother \\
\hline Stimmer & Paulo & Docke & Lucius \\
\hline - & - & - & \(1{ }^{\text {c }}\) \\
\hline 19 & Double & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Pass} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{4.} \\
\hline All Pass & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Stimmer scored his two top hearts and continued with the \(\mathbb{Q}\). On this trick the bespectacled East ruffed with the \(\boldsymbol{\omega}\), overruffed with the \(\boldsymbol{\square}\). Brother Lucius considered his next move carefully. Suppose he continued with the ace and queen of trumps. If West had begun with four trumps including the king, he could allow the trump queen to win. Trump control would then be lost. If declarer played a third trump, West would win and force dummy's last trump with another heart. If instead declarer played side-suit winners, West would score two trump tricks.

Once the potential problem had been identified, it was not too difficult to spot the solution. At trick four, Brother Lucius led the queen of trumps from his hand. When this was allowed to win, he led the \(\$ 5\).

West had no counter. If he won with the king and led a fourth heart, declarer would ruff in his hand with the ace and cross to dummy to draw the remaining trumps. When West chose instead to duck, Lucius won in the dummy and returned to the trump ace. He then played side-suit winners, claiming the contract for the loss of two hearts and a trump trick.
'Yeah, standard play,' muttered West, thrusting his cards back in the
board. 'Angie'll find it, don't worry.'
The first half was drawing to a close when this deal arose at the other table:
```

Dealer West. None Vul.

```

```

4 A752
` K754

* K10
* AKQ

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brother | Bill | The | Angie |
| Xavier | Brooker | Abbot | Brooker |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ | Pass | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

```

Brother Xavier led the king of spades against 3NT, and the Abbot discarded a low club. Angie Brooker paused to assess her prospects. She had eight tricks on top, and it seemed she would have to make something of the diamond suit. If the suit divided 3-3 or West held a doubleton honour, everything would be easy. What if East held four or five diamonds headed by the queen-jack?

Angie Brooker won with the spade ace and ran the \(\$ 10\) at trick 2 . If the Abbot ducked, this would concede a ninth trick. He won with the diamond jack and returned the 8 . Declarer won with the ace and led the king of diamonds, overtaking with dummy's ace. It was then a simple matter to lead the \(\downarrow 9\). This set up the \(\downarrow 87\) giving her a total of three tricks in the suit. The contract was hers.
'Well done, love,' said her husband. 'You played a hand like that on Wednesday, didn't you?'

Angie Brooker laughed. 'Yeah, a nice top against that horse-face,

Sandra Willis. She didn't like that too much!'
At half-time, the monastery team found they were 18 IMPs adrift. 'We'll take a pie and a pint at the Wenlock Arms, if that's OK for you gents,' said Bill Brooker. 'It's only a two-fag walk, up the High Street. The fresh air'll do us good.'

The Abbot had no intention of consuming any alcohol during such an important match - not with an adverse margin of 18 IMPs, anyway. It took almost fifteen minutes to reach the pub and he lagged well behind the other players, aiming to avoid their cigarette smoke. He entered the hostelry to see that the three other monks had already accepted a pint of some strong-looking real ale. What an attitude! As always, he would have to do the lion's share of the work in the second half, if victory was to be achieved.
'What's yours?' asked Bill Brooker, clamping a friendly arm on the Abbot's shoulder. 'We're all drinking Stone-age Thunder. Brewed on the premises.'
'I don't think I will,' the Abbot replied, easing himself from the rival captain's grip. 'A half of lemonade and lime for me!'

The A 66 ot

\section*{Swiss Open \\ "formerly Zurich Open"}

Hotel Hilton Zurich-Airport
Tournament Director: Peter Eidt


Friday, April 05, 2019 - Imps (Butler)
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Program: & Mise en place 2.15 pm \\
& Session starts 2.30 pm \\
Tournament fee: & SFr. 40.-per player
\end{tabular}

Red points (Swiss Federation) awarded
Saturday, April 06, 2019 - Pairs
2 tournaments: Open I for all players and Open II for 2nd série players
Program: Mise en place 11.45 am
Session 1 starts 12.00 am Session 2 starts 4.00 pm
Tournament fee: SFr. 60.-per player

Red and green points (Swiss Federation) awarded

\section*{Sunday, April 07, 2019 - Teams}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Program: & Mise en place 09.45 am \\
& Session starts 10.00 am \\
Tournament fee: & SFr. 60.-per player
\end{tabular}

Red points (Swiss Federation) awarded

\section*{Prize ceremony after each tournament}

Accommodation:
Accommodation has been reserved at the Hilton Hotel at the special rate of SFr 160.-- per night including breakfast and VAT for double or SFr 140.-- for single occupancy. For reservation please contact Andrea Schoellkopf.

Registration: Andrea Schoellkopf - (+41) 792221118 -aschoellkopf@bluewin.ch Fernando Piedra - (+41) 796103514 -ferpiedra@hotmail.com

\section*{A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE－MARCH 2019}

\section*{The ubid Auction Room}

Welcome to the Auction Room，where we examine bidding methods from recent events．

This month we pay a visit to qualifying rounds of the Cavendish Teams in Monaco．

22 squads contested a seven round Swiss，with the top four going for－ ward to the knock out stage．

\section*{The Hands}
（This month all the deals were played at IMPs．）
Hand 1．Dealer North．None Vul．


North opens \(2 \diamond\) Multi；South bids \(2 \vee\) and if West doubles North bids \(2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}\) ．
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
West & East \\
Jassem & Zatorski \\
- & 2NT＊ \\
6甲 & Pass \\
2NT & Weak with both minors
\end{tabular}

In The Mysterious Multi Jan van Cleeff and I suggest the following responses to 2 NT ：
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 30 & to play，preference \\
\hline 3 & to play，preference \\
\hline 3 & natural，invitational with a six card suit \\
\hline 30 & natural，invitational with a six card suit \\
\hline 3NT & to play \\
\hline 4\％ & natural，invitational \\
\hline 4 & natural，invitational \\
\hline 4 & natural，to play \\
\hline 49 & natural，to play \\
\hline 4NT & 6 Ace Blackwood \\
\hline 50 & to play \\
\hline 5 & to play \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

They would not help West here．
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Sementa & Gierulski & Bocchi & Skrzypczak \\
- & \(2 \wedge^{*}\) & Pass & \(2 \Downarrow^{*}\) \\
Double & \(2 \wedge^{*}\) & \(3 \star\) & \(3 \uparrow\) \\
\(6 \uparrow\) & All Pass & &
\end{tabular}

Could West have done more？I suppose he could have bid 4a，but even if East then bids \(5 \diamond\) is it clear that shows the \(\forall A\) ？

Four pairs reached \(7 \Upsilon\)－and two of them made it redoubled．The only negative score on the deal went to the pair who bid 7 NT －only one down when North did not find a club lead．

Recommended auction：If you can find a cast－iron route to \(7 \vee\) then in the words of Rudyard Kipling，＇you＇re a better man than I am Gunga Din＇． Marks：7『10，6『 5.

Running score：Cavendish Stars 5

\section*{Hand 2．Dealer West．N／S Vul．}

\begin{tabular}{cc} 
West & East \\
Levin & Roll \\
\(5 \%\) & Pass
\end{tabular}

In principle the bids of 3 and \(3 \boldsymbol{1}\) showed stoppers for no-trumps. Then after a couple of cue-bids West bid a 'rolling' 4NT and the laydown slam was reached.

11 pairs reached 6\%. One played in 6NT. Four pairs bid a grand slam. When North was on lead the A put paid to 7e. When East declared 7NT doubled South could not find the spade lead and the same thing happened when East was in \(7 \boldsymbol{\text { e }}\) (!) and in \(7 \diamond\) (!!).

Recommended auction: Were West to open 3NT East would have an easy jump to 6 NT. After \(1<-1 \%-3 N T\) would have the same effect if it promised
 suggested that he was not happy to bid an immediate 3NT, and knowing his partner held very good clubs Lauria was willing to go past 3NT.
Marks: 6NT/6e 10, 5*/3NT 5.
Running score: Cavendish Stars 15
Hand 3. Dealer East. None Vul.


I can't find \(2 \boldsymbol{2}\) on the convention card - perhaps it was some sort of spade raise or more likely a game-forcing bid.

7 depended on the location of the V . It was onside.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline West & East \\
\hline Jassem & Zatorski \\
\hline - & 19* \\
\hline 14 (2) & Double \\
\hline 29 & 3** \\
\hline 34 & 4* \\
\hline 4** & 4NT* \\
\hline 5\%* & 5 \\
\hline 54 & 64 \\
\hline Pass & \\
\hline Polish Club & \\
\hline Cue-bid & \\
\hline RКСВ & \\
\hline 1 key card & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

That was a well controlled auction to the top spot.
No less than 7 pairs bid 7 .
 one way to get there.
Marks: 6థ 10, 7¢ 5.
Running score: Cavendish Stars 25

\section*{Hand 4. Dealer West. Both Vul}


Again we see the 2 response to 14 was a splinter and the combination of the Pass and Redouble confirmed it was a first round control. 5\&
was a cue-bid but when East bid 5 West's jump to 7 revealed that West thought his partner had diamond support and was cue-bidding the A .

South held A87 『KJ72 Q10 \(\boldsymbol{\aleph} \mathrm{J} 1052\) and his partner led the \(\$ \mathrm{~K}\). Declarer won with dummy's ace and played on spades. South took the second round and could have exited with a spade for two down - but he returned a club and declarer could cross-ruff clubs and hearts, eventually drawing the last trump and finding a lucky position in diamonds.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
West & East \\
Jassem & Zatorski \\
1ヶ & \(3 \star *\) \\
\(3 \downarrow\) & \(4 \downarrow\) \\
4NT* & \(5 \uparrow\) \\
\(6 \uparrow\) & \(6 \uparrow\) \\
Pass &
\end{tabular}

Once again we have a silent convention card. I wonder if \(3>\) promised a splinter, with \(3 \vee\) asking where? That would explain the bid of \(6 \vee\), asking East to bid \(7 \boldsymbol{4}\) with the A and a void in hearts. (It's 10.44 so blame this implausible rambling on the coffee!)

North led the K and declarer won with dummy's ace, ruffed a club, crossed to dummy with a heart, ruffed a club, ruffed a heart and ruffed a club with the (an essential move). So far so good, but now declarer ruffed a heart before playing a spade. The king won, but South took the next round with the A and played the \(\uparrow \mathrm{K}\), promoting the into the setting trick.

7 pairs bid 64. Agustin Madala had no chance when Diego Brenner led a heart at trick one, but the other six all received a club lead. Only Mantineo Emanu found the winning line.
 \(4 \mathrm{NT}^{*}-5 \mathbf{V}^{*}-6 \mathbf{4}\). In this sequence \(3 \boldsymbol{*}\) is a shortage and then we have some cue-bids before West checks on key cards. West can be reasonably sure that 6 d is worst on the diamond finesse - and might be laydown.
Marks: 6® 10, 4@ 7.
Running score: Cavendish Stars 35

\section*{Hand 5. Dealer East. Both Vul.}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
\] &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { A10 } \\
& 86 \\
& \text { AQ9 } \\
& \& \text { A98643 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline West & East & \\
\hline Birman & Winkler & \\
\hline - & 1NT & \\
\hline 24* & 2** & \\
\hline 3NT & Pass & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

You would like to reach 6 on these cards. North held Q ) 7532 K1072 \&OJ5 so the 3-0 split complicates matters. It did not matter in 3NT, declarer recording eleven tricks.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline West & East \\
\hline Soulet & Vinciguerra \\
\hline - & 1NT \\
\hline 2** & 2** \\
\hline 3* & 49 \\
\hline 4** & 4** \\
\hline 5\% & 6* \\
\hline Pass & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Philippe Soulet struck gold with his 3\& bid.
North led the Q and declarer won in dummy and played the no doubt expecting to be able to claim after drawing trumps. South's discard of the \(\checkmark 4\) was a blow and declarer won with dummy's king and continued with a club to the ace and club, North winning and switching to the \(\$ 7\). When declarer put up dummy's ace the contract went up in flames. If declarer puts in dummy’s \(\Downarrow\) Q he can then cash the \(\star\) A, ruff a diamond, cash the \(\Delta K\), ruff a spade and play his remaining trumps, the last of which will squeeze South in the majors.

You will have realised that North could have defeated the contract by switching to a heart (it was difficult to lead the suit at trick one).

Palma and Wrang were another pair to reach the excellent \(6 \boldsymbol{\%}\) and again North led the \(\mathbf{\perp} \mathrm{Q}\). Declarer won in dummy, cashed the \(\downarrow \mathrm{A}\), ruffed a diamond and played the \(\$ \mathrm{~K}\). When South discarded declarer took the
ace, ruffed a diamond, cashed the \(\varsigma \mathrm{K}\), ruffed a spade and exited with a trump. North won and carefully exited with a heart for one down.

It is clear that as long as trumps are 2-1 6e is cold, so the only danger is that they break 3-0. When South discards on the first round it should be clear that only a squeeze can deliver a twelfth trick. Having won with the K declarer must play a diamond to the queen. He then cashes the A, ruffs a diamond and plays a club. If declarer wins this and exits with a club a heart switch from North will break up the squeeze, but declarer has an answer - he ducks the second round of clubs. North can exit with a heart, but declarer wins with the ace and can now play four rounds of clubs to put South to the sword.

Six pairs reached 6 (well bid!) - but five of them went down. The strange thing is that the one who made it received the lead of the \(\uparrow \mathrm{K}\), after which it looks impossible to avoid the loss of two tricks.

Recommended auction: Suppose we start \(1 \mathbf{~ - ~} 1 \mathbf{- 2}-3\) * (a splinter in support of clubs). Now it should be easy enough for E/W to reach 6\% Marks: 6210, 3NT/5 \(\mathbf{e n}^{\mathbf{2}}\).

Running score: Cavendish Stars 45
Hand 6. Dealer West. None Vul.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline - AK97 & N & - Q654 \\
\hline - KQ873 & & \(\checkmark\) A4 \\
\hline - J87 & W E & - AKQ943 \\
\hline - 5 & S & - 2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

If West opens 1V North bids and South raises to 6
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Rombaut & Multon & Lorenzini & Zimmermann \\
\(1 ष\) & \(4 \boldsymbol{~}\) & Double & \(6 \boldsymbol{~}\)
\end{tabular}

North’s hand was \(\$ 10\) 『J1065 \(\$ 10\) \&AKQ8643.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{West} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{East} \\
\hline & Gawrys & & Klukowski \\
\hline & 17 & (2¢) & 2 \\
\hline & 3 & & 4** \\
\hline & 4* & & 4 * \\
\hline & 4** & & 4NT* \\
\hline & 5** & & 6 \\
\hline & Pass & & \\
\hline 4* & Cue-b & & \\
\hline 4 & Cue-bid & & \\
\hline \(4{ }_{4}\) & Cue-b & & \\
\hline 4NT & RKCB & & \\
\hline 52 & 1 key & card & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

North's gentle overcall did not overly embarrass E/W. The key bid was East's 4e, appreciating the power of his hand when partner raised diamonds.

11 pairs reached a slam with the N/S cards - the only casualties being the pair who attempted \(6 \vee\).

Recommended auction: If North overcalls \(3 \boldsymbol{e} / 4 \boldsymbol{e}\) then I would still introduce the diamonds. After \(1 \uparrow\)-( \(4 \boldsymbol{2})-4\) if South passes West can bid \(4 \uparrow\) which must agree diamonds and put \(\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}\) on the road to \(6 \star\).

Running score: Cavendish Stars 55


West was unwilling to go past 3NT.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline West & East \\
\hline O Rimstedt & M Rimstedt \\
\hline 2＊＊ & 2\％＊ \\
\hline 2＊＊ & 34＊ \\
\hline 3NT＊ & 4NT＊ \\
\hline 6 & Pass \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

I asked systems guru Al Hollander if he could decipher this auction：
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 2＊ & 18－19 balanced，no 5 card major \\
\hline 2 & Spades or one－suiter，S／T（if S／T not hearts） \\
\hline 24 & 2／3 \\
\hline 34 & 44 and \(5+\) \\
\hline 3NT & Slam negative because of bad holdings in partner＇s suits \\
\hline 4NT & Quantitative with 5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Al pointed out that in the version of this method played by Lauria－Ver－ sace their bids over 3 NT show exact shape，where \(4 N T=4252\) and \(4 \uparrow\) would promise 4351 ．Al thinks responder may be able to show \(6 \$\) with \(4 \checkmark\) being either 4351 or 4261.

Al is not sure why Ola guessed to play in diamonds nor if he had a way to offer a choice between \(6 \uparrow / 6 \uparrow / 6\) NT depending upon Mikael＇s round suits．Following the Lauria－Versace structure，maybe Mikael＇s 4NT was an error and Ola wanted to play \(6 \leqslant\) opposite 4252 rather than guessing／ offering 6NT．

13 pairs reached a slam and with South holding 972 『65 there was nothing to the play．

Recommended auction：After 1－1 \(\downarrow\)－2NT－3 West should bid \(4 \star\) which will lead to either \(6>\) or 6 NT ．
\[
\text { Marks: 6NT(W)/6ャ10, 6NT(E) 8, 3NT/5»/4@ } 5 \text {. }
\]

Running score：Cavendish Stars 65
Hand 8．Dealer East．None Vul．


South overcalls \(3 \vee\)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline West & North & East & South \\
\hline Hurd & Birman & Demuy & Winkler \\
\hline － & － & 1NT & \(3 ¢\) \\
\hline 34＊ & \(4 \checkmark\) & 49 & Pass \\
\hline 5\％ & All Pass & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

I suspect most pairs would be playing transfers over West＇s \(3 \vee\) ，but you need to be clear about the meaning of 1NT－（3V）－3NT．Holding 54 East felt entitled to bid them，but saw no reason to go past 5\％．
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & West & North & East & South \\
\hline & Roll & M Rimstedt & Levin & O Rimstedt \\
\hline & － & － & 1NT & 2＊＊ \\
\hline & 2NT＊ & 39 & 34 & Pass \\
\hline & 4 & All Pass & & \\
\hline 2 ＊ & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Multi Landy \\
Lebensohl
\end{tabular}}} \\
\hline 2 NT & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

What went wrong？
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline West & North & East & South \\
\hline Palma & Soulet & Wrang & Vinciguerra \\
\hline － & － & 1NT & 2＊＊ \\
\hline 2『＊ & 24 & Pass & Pass \\
\hline 4a＊ & Pass & 5\％ & Pass \\
\hline 5NT＊ & Pass & 6\％ & All Pass \\
\hline Majors Transf Shorta & clubs & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

I＇m guessing about the auction－but then I think West was guessing to some extent about bidding a slam－unless 4 4 was asking for key cards．
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & West & North & East & South \\
\hline & Rombaut & Upmark & Lorenzini & Nystrom \\
\hline & － & － & 14 & 39 \\
\hline & 43 & 49 & 4NT＊ & Pass \\
\hline & 54＊ & Pass & 6\％ & All Pass \\
\hline 4NT & T RKCB & & & \\
\hline 5 & 2 key c & ＋eQ & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE - MARCH 2019}

When West introduced his clubs at the four level East, already suspecting his partner held at most one heart, asked for key cards.

14 pairs bid a slam - the only ones to fail had the misfortune to attempt 7 NT . The lucky pair were the one that bid 6 NT and somehow made it after the lead of the \(\vee \mathrm{K}\).

Recommended auction: I prefer Lorenzini's opening bid of 14. After that, you can't improve on their auction.

\section*{Marks: 62 10, 5.}

\section*{Running score: Cavendish Stars 75}

You can play through the deals mentioned in this article.
Just follow the links:
Hand 1: here or https://tinyurl.com/y4yfzkzl
Hands \(2,3 \& 4\) : here and here or https://tinyurl.com/y2cj2rpa and https://tinyurl.com/y5gkm33s

Hand 5: here or https://tinyurl.com/yy6lbvz9
Hand 6: here or https://tinyurl.com/y6gzmxbo
https://www.bridgebase.com/tools/handviewer.html?bbo=y\&linurl=https://www.bridgebase.com/tools/vugraph_linfetch.php?id=61307

Hands 7 \& 8: here and here or https://tinyurl.com/y4oupp3z and https://tinyurl.com/yy7il4dw

\section*{aces: FUNBRIDGE.com}

\author{
Press Release - 27 February 2019
}

\section*{The Polish Bridge Union Joins Funbridge}

The online bridge app Funbridge is pleased to welcome the Polish Bridge Union among its many partners and to run new weekly tournaments from March.

\section*{FUNBRIDGE IN FIGURES}
- 1 million deals played every day

Following the Czech Bridge Federation (ČBS), it is now the turn of the Polish Bridge Union (PZBS) to join Funbridge this year and to license Funbridge to run official tournaments. Masterpoints will be awarded to participants who are PZBS members, enabling them to improve their national ranking.

New PZBS tournaments will include \(\mathbf{1 6}\) boards and will take place from Monday to Saturday ( 1 daily tournament). Two tournaments will be held on Sunday. They will be scored by IMPs or MPs depending on the day of the week. The first tournament will take place on Friday 1st March. You can already register via the Funbridge app. Install the latest update available on app stores or on our website www.funbridge.com.

Please note that in order to celebrate this new partnership, PZBS and Funbridge have decided to make all tournaments taking place this month available for free!
- 65,000 online players every day
- Over 200 countries represented
- Available in 13 languages


PZBS in figures
Created in 1956
- 6003 members
- 2018-19 season: 559 teams, 16 districts
- 8 weekly tournaments on Funbridge


\section*{The Master Point Press Bidaling Battle Set 14.}

A number of problems with a clearcut majority and fewer minority choices this month, suggesting that scoring might be higher than usual. We shall see.

\section*{PROBLEM 1}

\section*{IMPs. Dealer South. E/W VuI.}
- A9732
- AJ9653
- 86
-
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline West & North & East & So \\
\hline - & Pass & 19 & Pas \\
\hline 19 & Pass & 20 & Pas \\
\hline 20* & Pass & 2NT & Pas \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
?
\(2 \boldsymbol{C o n s t r u c t i v e ~ a s ~} 1 \boldsymbol{\sim}-2 \boldsymbol{~ w o u l d ~ h a v e ~}\) been weak.
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Bid & Votes & Marks \\
3a & 13 & 10 \\
Pass & 3 & 5 \\
3NT & 1 & 2 \\
4ゅ & 1 & 4 \\
3甲 & 0 & 2
\end{tabular}

At the table, my partner jumped to 4V over 2NTwhich I thought was bonkers. Were the \(2 \uparrow\) bid not constructive, 2NT would be a rare animal indeed and would surely have to be based on some kind of a heart fit, but the fact that \(2 \vee\) is constructive means that opener will go on with many more maximum hands.

There were the pessimists:

\section*{THE BIDS \& MARKS}

Bid No. of Votes Marks Bid No. of Votes Marks
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{5}{*}{1.} & \(3{ }^{3}\) & 13 & 10 & 5. & Pass & 13 & 10 \\
\hline & Pass & 3 & 5 & & 3NT & 5 & 6 \\
\hline & 3NT & 1 & 2 & 6. & & 12 & 10 \\
\hline & 4. & 1 & 4 & & 6 & 3 & 6 \\
\hline & 3 & 0 & 2 & & Pass & 2 & 4 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{2.} & Pass & 11 & 10 & & 5NT & 1 & 5 \\
\hline & 2 & 7 & 8 & 7. & 3a & 16 & 10 \\
\hline & 2 & 0 & 2 & & 5NT & 1 & 5 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{3.} & 5 & 13 & 10 & & 4NT & 1 & 4 \\
\hline & 4 & 4 & 6 & & 3 & 0 & 2 \\
\hline & 6 & 1 & 4 & 8. & Dble & 11 & 10 \\
\hline & 4 & 0 & 2 & & 5 & 7 & 8 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{4.} & 2 & 10 & 10 & & & & \\
\hline & 1NT & 6 & 7 & & & & \\
\hline & 2 - & 2 & 5 & & & & \\
\hline & 3 & 0 & 2 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


Brian Senior-your Moderator-universally and affectionately known as Mr. Grumpy

Bird: Pass. There is no point in bidding \(\mathbf{3} \boldsymbol{A}\), since this would surely be forcing. Partner may well hold 3-1-3-6 shape, so I suppose I might hazard a leap to \(4 \boldsymbol{4}\). I don't fancy making 10 tricks there and will hope that \(15+9\) points will somehow yield eight tricks in no trump.

There is no point bidding 3a but I could consider a jump to 4 - I'm lost looking for the logic in that. How can 3a be worse than 4@?
Rigal: Pass. I would have bid \(2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}\) over \(2 \boldsymbol{*}\), rightly or wrongly. Now can 2NT really be a better spot than a spade or heart contract...maybe not, but it might well be a better spot than a doubled high-level contract. I pass and give up, washing my hands a la Pontius Pilate.

History has not been particularly kind to Pontius Pilate and...

McGowan: Pass. I give up. With three good spades he would prefer \(2 \Delta\) to 2 NT , so he has good cards in the minors. When you find a misfit - stop bidding. Hate the whole situation. Always happy to apologise if I have missed some 'obvious' inference.

Why on earth would he prefer 2a to \(2 N T\) if he had strength in both unbid suits?
I find it hard to believe that 2NT is the right spot, nor do I fancy this next one:
Alder: 3NT. Why didn't I respond 14 if I was not going to force to game with \(2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}\) on round two? Now I am in Calcutta. My immediate reaction was to bid 3^, but how would partner ever divine what I was doing? So, since we are vulnerable at IMPs, I will hope partner has ten-doubleton in hearts and can scramble nine tricks.

Everyone else seemed happy enough to have responded in their longer suit, and believe me, keeping this panel happy is no easy task.

A 14 initial response could clearly work out better sometimes - here we could easily have been left in \(2 \vee\) when having an eight-card spade fit, which might not have been very clever. AS we will see, the bulk of the panel think that partner should be able to work out what we are doing if we bid 34 - or is that just wishful thinking on their part? Green: 3^. A bit of a gamble but it looks like partner has a singleton heart and constructive values, with a minimum and a miss-fit I think he would just pass or bid \(3 \mathfrak{\text { e. The question is }}\) does he have three spades? He could easily be 3-1-3-6 in which case \(3 \boldsymbol{1}\) or \(4 \boldsymbol{A}\) could be making but on the other hand he could be 2-1-4-6 in which case it might be out of the frying pan into the fire. Since 2NT will not likely be a barrel of
laughs I will try and improve the contract and hope not to get doubled.
Cope: 34. Playing 2NT seems to have little chance with no great communication between the hands as I am short in partner's suit and vice-versa. Offering spades at this stage should show a 5-6 hand and if partner reverts to 3NT that is just one more down than 2NT was.

Yes, though we are known to be limited so if things are laying badly we could be doubled in \(3 N T\) - or indeed in anywhere else we wind up.
Teramoto: \(3 \boldsymbol{4}\). It should be \(5-6\), because \(2 \boldsymbol{2}\) bid denies four spades. 2NT says no heart support, I expect he often has three spades.
Apteker: 34. May well hit partner with three spades who should read me for this type of shape. With partner short in hearts, any level NT contract is going to be poor so I don't have much to lose.
Sime: 34. A torture opportunity! Partner may think that this shows concern about diamonds rather than a good \(6 / 5\) in context. If he bids 3NT, I can remove to Four Hearts which should clarify.
Cannell: 34. Good problem. Game is unlikely after partner's Two Club and 2NT rebids. Trying to land on a pinhead in either Three Hearts or 2 NT is problematic. There is a chance for a \(5-3\) spade-fit that would lend itself to a making Four Spade game. Does this Three Spade bid show 5-6 in the majors? I think it should given the previous auction. Here we go.
Zia: 3a. Sounds like five to this old man.
Brock: 3a. I've no idea really. There is a bit of a feeling that someone might start doubling soon! Does 2NT imply a partial heart fit? Would he go
ever upwards with no fit? Maybe I should just bid \(4 \checkmark\) and keep my spades a secret (my usual tendency)? As I don't know, it makes sense to involve partner.
Lawrence: 34. I have a maximum for my auction and partner is showing extras. This bid can't hurt.
Robson: 3a. I think we've shown a 5-6 hand of this ilk - perfect.
Stabell: 34. Hopefully, partner will read this as 5-6 in the majors and not just as worry about diamonds. Tempting to blast \(4 \uparrow\), but \(4 \bigvee\) could be better if partner has a singleton honour. Will pass 3NT if that is all he can manage.
Kokish: 34. Haven't had this one before and perhaps 4 a would be more to the point, but as East seems to have stoppers in both spades and diamonds 34 should not be interpreted as concern about diamonds for no trump. If East turns out to be \(2-1-3-7\) or \(2-1-4-6\), we will be too high everywhere and in significant jeopardy of being doubled, but we will have done our best to describe this awkward strength-shape combination.
Mould: 34. I know this one as I held the hand. I suppose I might bid 4ヵ as pard rates to be 3-1-3-6 or so, but it is entirely possible that hearts could still be the place to play. I will bid 3a and see what happens. Clearly, I will bid game on this. My partner at the table passed \(2 \checkmark\) on the identical auction with the identical inferences so I was not challenged in either the bidding or the play (pause for cheap shot from the conductor....)

A number of panellists have mentioned 44, and Marc actually chooses that bid.

Smith: 4a. We expect partner to have a hand nearly worth 3 at his previous turn, with short hearts and, presumably something in spades and diamonds, so something like \(\uparrow \mathrm{Kxx} \nabla \mathrm{x} \upharpoonright \mathrm{AJx}\) \&AOJxxx. I expect the majority to bid 3a, but I cannot see the point of that. Will partner not assume that I am offering him some sort of choice of game with spade values and diamond weakness? Can I really expect him to realize I want him to choose between \(3 \boldsymbol{s}\) and \(4 \boldsymbol{\text { ? }}\) ? Best to take the bull by the horns and bid the game we think might make rather than confuse the issue.

Many seem happy that 3a shows this distribution, but few address the point as to whether


3@ should be forcing. I would have thought that it clearly should not be forcing. Both partners have made limited bids, and if opener prefers to play in spades then surely he should be entitled to decide at what level - he will know, for example, that two minor suits headed by aces will be far more valuable in a spade contract than two minors headed by king-queens.

I could understand passing out 2NT if there was a strong likelihood that this would be a good contract, but this six-five shape screams suit contract to me, and 3s is the descriptive bid that allows partner to make a decision - albeit he may have no winning choice.

\section*{PROBLEM 2}

IMPs. Dealer South. N/S Vul.
- 7653
- AKJ64
- 93
* 72


This one was me being imaginative at the table, I'm afraid. I wondered if the panel could work out what was going on. Well, I gave them a headache, which is always fun.
Let's look at the majority.

Alder: Pass. Partner's auction is supposed to show both minors, but that does not gel with what our opponents are doing. If we are making \(4 \vee\), I might have to apologise, but perhaps not! Apteker: Pass. Can't say I understand what partner is doing and why he has not bid \(1 \diamond\) first time round. The only logical explanation is that he has some club length, lacks heart length (otherwise would double), and is pre-balancing with 5 weak diamonds or four very good ones. If the opponents double for penalties, I will run Rigal: Pass. I'd expect partner to be e.g. 2-2-5-4 with a weak suit. I certainly don't expect him to have hearts or fewer than five diamonds. I'm passing again, and the resemblance to Pilate is getting stronger I admit.
Cannell: Pass. Partner failed to call after the One Club bid. The auction leads me to believe that partner is somewhat two-suited in the minors and not all that strong. I see no compelling reason to remove Two Diamonds to Two Hearts.

So maybe partner has both minors? Not this time, but maybe that is what he should have? Or how about decent hand but bad suit?
Zia: Pass. I can't think of a hand where this bid makes sense. As my son would say, 'What
 (though I would bid the first time).

As would I and, I imagine, most of the panel. Brock: Pass. I never bid like this and have no idea what it means. Presumably should be a decent hand with a long terrible suit - frightened that bidding \(1 \diamond\) the first time might encourage me to make a poor lead.
Stabell: Pass. Partner probably has a good hand
and weak suit since he didn't act immediately. On a good day, we might have nine easy tricks in NT, but chances are that he is short in hearts and we are high enough.

How about a lead-director?
Cope: Pass. Partner's failure to bid first time round (or double second time round) tends to suggest a lead directing overcall with an antipathy to the suit they expect me to lead should the next hand bid 2NT.

Or maybe he has two suits but is missing one, hence no take-out double at his first turn?
McGowan: Pass. Why did partner not bid diamonds last time? Why is he bidding them now? I guess he has a major, but it is not hearts - he does have a double card in his box? If this goes Dble - P - P I shall think again - if my \(2 \vee\) is doubled I can always try 2 .
Sime: Pass. As partner did not overcall One Diamond, it is likely that his values are in the black suits. Let's not hang him for pre-balancing.
Mould: Pass. This is a new one on me! Pard cannot bid over 1s but charges in over 2e. I play double of \(2 \boldsymbol{e}\) as take-out here, so pard cannot have the red suits. Even if they have, why did they not bid over \(1 \boldsymbol{2}\) with (say) \(4-5\) in the reds? I have no idea what partner is doing, but if \(s /\) he has chosen to make up system at the table (on say 4-4 in the reds), this will teach them not to.

I agree - he could have doubled \(2 \boldsymbol{*}\) to show both red suits.
Green: \(2 \vee .2\) is a very curious bid. How can partner not bid 1 at favourable and then suddenly spring to life on the second round. I wonder if he has both red suits (in which case perhaps I should bid 3४)? But what would his shape
be? Most hands that want to compete in a red suit would simply double 2 . I honestly don't know what partner has but I don't think bidding hearts can be far off the mark.
Smith: \(2 \boldsymbol{\vee}\). What is partner doing here? What sort of hand can bid Two Diamonds now but could not overcall either One Diamond or Two Diamonds over One Club? The lack of opposition bidding suggests that he has a decent hand, so perhaps his suit is something like Qxxxxx. The only options seem to be Pass or Two Hearts, but there seems a fair chance that if I pass now North will back in with Two Spades (or even Three Clubs). Given that the hand may belong to us, I want partner to compete to Three Hearts if he has a fit, but he obviously won't do so unless I bid the suit now.
Bird: \(2 \uparrow\). It is anyone's guess what sort of hand would persuade partner to pass on the first round and bid \(2 \diamond\) on the second. Since I am not a psychiatrist, I have no idea. Bidding 29 should give me a fair chance of surviving his eccentric action.
Kokish: \(2 \boldsymbol{\text { ® }}\). East has a good hand and did not need a good suit to overcall 1 with five, so it sounds like he should have only four, which would be consistent only with four or five cards in ... clubs. He can't really have five on the auction and would not be in a hurry to enter the auction with four decent clubs, so we are in the Twilight Zone (welcome to my world). Playing with EOK, EOK can't figure out what EOK is doing, but as abstention is not an option I have to assume East is not an EOK and has a good hand but terrible suit. As I have something to contribute to our cause I'm not going to pass,

and will bid where I live rather than raise to 3 * and subject myself to universal scorn. Am I the only perplexed participant?
Lawrence: \(2 \boldsymbol{V}\). I expect partner to have two suits which I expect will be diamonds and hearts. Could be diamonds and spades. Weird.

And \(2 \vee\) would be a good lead-director.
Teramoto: \(2 \vee\). This is for the lead, expecting future competition.
Robson: \(2 \boldsymbol{V}\). Confess I'd have put in a lead-director last time at these colours. I don't much like partner's pass-and-bid sequence and frankly I've no idea what he's got but I'll bid where I live i.e. \(2 \vee\) - can't be far wrong.

Time for me to confess, I suppose. I held:
- AQJ4
- 105
- AQ76
- 985

The table feel was that the opposition were limited and I couldn't bear to pass over 2a. Double would have shown the red suits, so that only left \(2 \downarrow\), hoping to push them up a level. That didn't work out as I was left to play 2 down one.

What was weird, apart from my bidding, was that I was right about the opposition being fairly limited, but South had psyched and didn't have spades at all - he had diamonds, of course. Had we been able to find a way to \(2 \mathbf{2 a}\), we would have been playing for overtricks.

PROBLEM 3
IMPs. Dealer North. N/S Vul.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{¢ AQJ98654} \\
\hline - K94 & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{- J3} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{- -} \\
\hline West & North & East \\
\hline - & 1* & Double \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{?} \\
\hline Bid & Votes & Marks \\
\hline 54 & 13 & 10 \\
\hline 44 & 4 & 6 \\
\hline 64 & 1 & 4 \\
\hline 4* & 0 & 2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

This one will sort out whose glass is always half full and whose half empty. The half-empty brigade:
McGowan: 4^. Tempting to get clever, but for me that usually backfires.

Sime: 44. Possibly two diamond losers and it is not certain that we can make the rest. If I bid Five Spades, partner would surely raise with ↔Kxxx QUJx \(\boldsymbol{x}\) AKQxx or similar.
Yes. I believe he would.
Green: \(4 \boldsymbol{4}\). Where are the clubs? Although I am very good for my bidding there is no safety at the five level as we could easily be off three top tricks if partner has good clubs. If I didn't bid \(4 \boldsymbol{A}\) I am struggling to think of an alternative. 5 perhaps, asking for a diamond control? But that is a big overbid in my view.

Ben has got it right on the actual hand, though of course that doesn't necessarily mean that he is right in theory - still, most partners and teammates prefer the actual deal to theory anyway.
Brock: 49. Probably I should do more but if I bid \(4 \diamond\) partner might then remove my subsequent \(4 \boldsymbol{A}\) because he also has clubs. I am not prepared to do anything that forces me beyond game.

Yes, if we start with \(4 \diamond\) we may get to the five level if partner converts a subsequent 4@ over 4จ to 5-after all, we would bid this way with four spades and five clubs and game values, would we not? He would then pass when we rebid 54, but that could be a level too high on a bad day. The majority, however, feel that 4 is just not enough on this hand and commit to the five level immediately to invite slam.
Bird: \(5 \boldsymbol{\$}\). It is just about possible that we will have three losers. It is much more likely that bidding only 4a on such a monster will result in general hilarity from the rest of the panel.
Smith: \(5 \boldsymbol{d}\). Hopefully, partner will interpret this jump as asking him to bid slam with a diamond control, which is surely what I want him to do.

It seems I can hardly bid less, or more, whilst starting with a Four Diamond cue-bid only rates to confuse the issue.
Alder: \(5 \boldsymbol{A}\). In for a penny, in for a euro. Or should that be "in for a pound, out for a brexit"?

Phillip! Wash your mouth out with soap and water for using the b-word.
Stabell: 5 ¢ .Too strong for a simple jump to 4^, and I hope this denies a diamond control since I didn't bid \(4 \diamond\). Of course, diamonds might not be our only problem on this hand.
Cope: 5 . Since I am prepared to bid that high if the opposition go to \(5 \downarrow\), I might as well bid it myself now either as a general value bid or as most would play it asking partner to bid 64 with a diamond control.
Teramoto: 54.It's the simple way to make a slam try.
Apteker: \(5 \boldsymbol{A}\). Asking partner to bid slam with a control in diamonds and allowing for the Grand investigation with first-round diamond control
Cannell: 54. I think this asks partner to bid Six Spades with second-round diamond control, bid Six Diamonds with first-round diamond control, and Pass with no diamond control. I am gambling that partner does have the \(\boldsymbol{K}\) and PA. Scientific gobbledygook!
Zia: \(5 \boldsymbol{4}\). I would bid 5 . This does not ask for a diamond control -just too good for 44.
Lawrence: \(5 \boldsymbol{4}\). I could bid 4a, craven, but our chance of Six or Seven Spades is too great for that.
Rigal: 54. Some would say this was solely about diamond control; I think partner can take a position with second-round control and an unsuitable hand, but I can't imagine bidding
to lower than the five level.
Robson: 54. Quantitative/two diamond losers. There is then some debate about whether a jump to 5asks specifically for second-round diamond control, or is a more general slam try. I'd go with Barry ( a novelty for us both), and say that I am mostly asking about diamonds but partner can take a view with a second-round diamond control but poor hand in context. Our next panellists knows the deal:
Mould: 54 . I know this hand as well. It seems to me impossible to get a plus score on this hand after this start (Four Spades is the limit) since \(4 \boldsymbol{4}\) just looks so wet and \(4 \diamond-4 \vee-4 \boldsymbol{~}\) isn't this hand, surely. I shall issue a general slam try with two losing diamonds (else \(4 \diamond-4 \vee-5 \boldsymbol{\text { P }}\) ) and accept my 13 IMPs out. This was a completely random effect of which minor you open with 4-4.

Yes, partner held:
- K32
- QJ76
- 109
- AQJ4

Had the opening bid been \(1 \boldsymbol{2}\), partner might not have doubled, and we wouldn't have this problem. As it is, anything above the four level is doomed. Which tells you that this final effort is not a winner:
Kokish: 64. If we can't make it they might save. If they can cash two diamonds or two aces they may not do so. If we can make Seven I don't see how to get partner sensibly involved. Maybe the right move is \(5 \downarrow\), Exclusion Blackwood. That will be TGZ's choice, I'm sure, and Mr Grumpy will love it.

Disappointingly, The Great Zia did not go for the psychic Exclusion bid - I would have loved it, of course. Yes, I suppose that they might save at this vulnerability, though they probably shouldn't, as 6^ does look like a bit of a punt from a player who doesn't know whether he can make it.

I think I would have bid 54. The one thing that is clear, apart from that I am inviting slam, is that I do not have first-round diamond control. If I had, I would start with \(4 \diamond\) and follow up with 54, suggesting that partner needs to look at other aspects of his hand.

\section*{PROBLEM 4}

\section*{IMPs. Dealer East. None Vul. \\ - 6 \\ - K10953 \\ - AQJ542 \\ - 5 \\ \begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
- & - & 1. & Pass \\
\(?\) & & &
\end{tabular} \\ \begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Bid & Votes & Marks \\
2 & 10 & 10 \\
1NT & 6 & 7 \\
\(2 \downarrow\) & 2 & 5 \\
3 & 0 & 2
\end{tabular}}

Once again, Liz's glass is half empty:
McGowan: 1NT. 2-over-1 is a wonderful method, is it not? This might be a major misfit, so I shall not overbid.

It's fair to say that Acol is not ideal for a hand like this either - you still have to pick a suit in which to respond then force to game if you want
to get the other one into the game.
Cope: 1NT. Not prepared to make a GF bid on a hand that may end up being a total misfit. Maybe they will surprise me with their rebid.
Bird: 1NT. No, I am not willing to make a game-forcing suit response. I will recover with some spirited effort on the next round.

If there is a next round.
Cannell: 1NT. Forcing for one round. So close to a \(2 / 1\) response, but I fear a misfit. Not to mention do I respond Two Diamonds or Two Hearts. Perhaps 1NT will work better.

Sorry Drew, but we don't play 1NT as forcing. Stabell: 1NT. Hope is won't end there, but I cannot bring myself to force to game opposite what could be a weak black two-suiter. Will bid \(2 \diamond\) over 2 and hope that partner bids \(2 \vee\) with a useful 5-3-1-4.

I suppose he might do that with a very good \(2 \boldsymbol{s}\) rebid, though the misfit will discourage him, while of course he will raise diamonds with 5-1-3-4.
Apteker: 1NT. Tempting to overbid and force to game with \(2 \star\) in order to describe the hand, fully accepting the risk that we may find the right strain but at too high a level. This looks, however, like it may be a big misfit, so I will take the low road for now and see what partner has.

It's as much a personality thing as anything, isn't it. Some look at the upside of making a 2-over-1 response, while others see the downside. Given my Mr. Grumpy persona, you would expect me to be in with the pessimists - not so, I am with the majority.
Rigal: 2•. Not elegant I admit but I plan to get both suits in and want to find the 5-3 heart fit. Maybe even a 5-2 fit? At pairs you could sell
me on 1 NT if forcing but not a non-forcing NT. Teramoto: \(2 \vee\). Would like to avoid missing a heart fit if we have one. Game Force may be an overbid but it has good chance to make.

I see where they are coming from regarding finding the five-three heart fit, but the remainder of the panel all preferred to start with the longer and stronger suit.
Green: \(2 \downarrow\). To game-force or not to game-force? I could try 1 NT but describing my hand after that will be an uphill struggle to put it mildly. With such potential I prefer to overbid a little. With such a disparity between the two suits I think \(2 \diamond\) followed by \(3 \diamond\) is a better description than \(2 \checkmark\) followed by \(3 \uparrow\).
Alder: \(2 \uparrow\). I think it is worth overbidding to describe my hand shape accurately.
Lawrence: \(2 \downarrow\). I'm going to risk getting my suits in at cost of facing a misfit. Like the previous hand, we have slam chances and starting with anything else risks missing them.
Zia: \(2 \uparrow\). I know the majority will bid \(2 \vee\), but I like bidding my length and will go through unless I receive heavy warning signs.

Not this time - the vote was in favour of the longer suit.
Sime: \(2 \star\). Potential misfit I know, but that is over-pessimistic. 1NT can be a disaster for different reasons, e.g. playing a red-suit game or slam in 1NT.
Brock: \(2 \star\). I'll probably regret it. I really need to guess now whether or not this hand is a complete misfit. If yes then I'd be better bidding 1 NT ; if not, then \(2 \downarrow\) will probably work best. Non-vul I should probably go for the former, but I can't bear the thought of playing in 1 NT
when we are cold for \(6 \uparrow\).
Mould: \(2 \diamond\). I do not see what else I can do other than overbid by treating this hand as FG. I shall bid diamonds, then hearts then hearts to show my 5-6, unless pard gets in the way. I suppose I could bid \(2 \uparrow\), then \(3 \uparrow\), but I hate distorting my suit lengths. Bidding 1NT on this hand has no positive outcomes I can see (including if it goes All Pass!)
Smith: \(2 \star\). Of course, the hand could be a complete misfit and we can't make anything, so forcing to game will be the wrong option. However, equally stupid results might be produced by starting with 1 NT (i.e. he passes 1 NT with ↔Axxxx \(\vee A Q x \diamond K x\) exxx and we make +120 instead of +980 ), so I guess to take the option with the larger upside. Since I am forcing to game anyway, I don't see the need to distort my shape by starting with Two Hearts.
Kokish: \(2 \downarrow\). If 1NT were forcing it would have more appeal, but East will pass with balanced minimum hands that are good for game. \(3 \diamond\) buries hearts and \(2 \vee\) would be OK with \(\uparrow\) AQJxx \(\star\) K109xxx x , but not with this hand. If we use the 'would I open?' test, this hand would be a solid 'yes', so I'm planning to bid out the shape accurately because the upside is so much greater than the downside.

Yes, we would virtually all open the hand, and that is a reasonable test for whether to make a 2-over-1 response.

Nobody else mentioned an invitational 3 response, and of course Eric quickly dismissed the idea, but that would be what the hand would worth if keeping these high cards but changing the shape to something like 1-3-6-3. Of course,
we cannot choose a response which completely buries hearts.
Robson: 2ヶ. Don't I have longer and better diamonds?

Simple question - simple answer. Yes, \(2 \diamond\) could lead us way too high, but the upside is so much greater than the downside that I am with the optimists.

\section*{PROBLEM 5}

IMPs. Dealer South. N/S Vul.
- A1032
\(\downarrow 8\)
- AK107
* AQ85
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline West & North & East \\
\hline - & - & - \\
\hline ? & & \\
\hline Bid & Votes & Marks \\
\hline Pass & 13 & 10 \\
\hline 3NT & 5 & 6 \\
\hline Double & 0 & 2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Smith: Pass. A take-out double is close to certifiable, which seems to leave just two sensible options, Pass and 3NT. Yes, we have a fair number of points, but the hand is also relatively trickless. In the perfect world, partner will reopen with a double, and 3NT gives up that faint hope of a massive penalty, so I settle for collecting some 100s rather than donating some 50 s .

I agree - a take-out double with this hand is certifiable. Nobody suggested that as a possibility, I'm mildly comforted to say.

There were two possibilities as far as the panel

\section*{was concerned.}

Brock: Pass. Only at this vulnerability. Anybody's guess.
Alder: 3NT. Vieux chapeau.
McGowan: Pass. I could bid 3NT, but it looks easier to collect several hundred from 3\%. Double would offend me if I were East
Cannell: 3NT. Robert Hamman's first rule.
Even the Great Man can be wrong on some hands.
Lawrence: Pass. Whatever happens, I remain in contention to get a good result and I'm not going for a number. Brian. Could you possibly have found a more annoying set of hands? Glad you're enjoying them.
Kokish: 3NT. Sorry, Harry, it's ugly, but this is what they dealt me. Pass and 3 are different gambles that will have appeal for those whose personalities and experiences fit those choices. Green: Pass. I think it's close between 3NT and Pass. Pass has a big upside if partner re-opens with a double as I would expect 800 or more. If partner doesn't have enough to re-open then we may not make 3 NT and taking a couple of hundred is not the end of the world. I would also be worried that partner might take out 3NT to \(4 \vee\), which could be a perilous contract.

It could indeed. How to turn a sure plus into a minus. But:
Rigal: 3NT. Ugh; enough of being non-committal. I just can't pass and await a double (and we might get 800 for our grand slam anyway). Transfers and Stayman I suppose will help get us somewhere silly.
Bird: Pass. It's either 3NT, with not many tricks in my hand, or Pass and collect in 100s if partner
has some values. Once every 10 years, partner might even find a protective double.
Mould: 3NT. I know this as well, as it was from the recent EBU trials for the European Mixed Teams. This seems a two-horse race and I shall predict that the only bids the panel make are Pass and 3NT (cue for Brian to tell me how wrong I am). Only at this vulnerability is Pass remotely attractive, as you will certainly be collecting a few hundreds if partner has enough to make 3NT. However, I have to say that these passes never seem to work out for me, so I shall just bid 3NT, particularly if I was a lot up in a knockout match, as was Michael Byrne when he held this hand. Mind you, Michael never has any green cards in his box, so it was not really a decision for him.

You are spot on with your prediction - except, of course, that the panel made only the two calls you predicted, not the two bids (yes, pedantry is alive and well and resides in Nottingham, UK).
Stabell: Pass. 100 per undertrick is OK with me if it goes all pass. Yes, we might make a game even if partner can't balance, but on a bad day, we have the same five tricks in NT as in clubs. Cope: Pass. It is IMPs and they are vulnerable, so if this ends the auction we collect in 100s. I hope that partner with club shortage can protect with a light take-out double and then the 100s start multiplying. If partner cannot protect in fourth then I am not sure that the popular choice of 3 NT will end in success.
Teramoto: Pass. Would like to defend 3e doubled and await a double from partner. If 3e goes All Pass, it is not bad to defend \(3 \boldsymbol{2}\) at this vulnerability.

Apteker: Pass. Seems like a straight choice between passing and bidding 3NT. At these colours I pass hoping that partner can reopen with a double, even if that is unlikely. Passing ensures the positive as I am almost certain that we will defeat the contract by two or possibly three tricks which, at these colours, will not be such a loss against 3NT making. There is also the added possible upside, albeit small, that North might act if I pass.
Sime: Pass. If partner cannot balance, I doubt that we will have missed anything. If I bid 3NT now, I expect a heart lead. I may have traded in 1100 or a slam for a minus score. If I double, what is the most likely response when we have game?
Robson: Pass. Can't resist trying for the number. Plus, 3 passed out netting +300 will be almost as good as game - and if partner can't reopen (with short clubs), we may well not have game.
Zia: Pass. At this age I have to get my turn ons by passing and letting partner reopen with a double.

I don't believe that for a moment.
There is a clear majority for the Pass. Yes, we might miss something, but this pretty much ensures a plus score and, even without a reopening double from partner, the penalty will often be worth more than anything we can make - even supposing that bidding gets us to our best spot. Maybe the chance of partner reopening is not all that high, but if he can scrape up a double we will be hoping for a four-figure penalty.

\section*{PROBLEM 6}

\section*{IMPs. Dealer North. E/W Vul.}
- AK875
\(\bullet\) A
- J8

2 KQJ64
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
- & \(1 \varphi\) & \(1 \Phi\) & \(3 \varphi\) \\
\(4 \varphi\) & \(5 \varphi\) & \(5 \$\) & Pass
\end{tabular}
?
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Bid & Votes & Marks \\
\(6 \mathbf{4}\) & 12 & 10 \\
64 & 3 & 6 \\
Pass & 2 & 4 \\
5NT & 1 & 5
\end{tabular}

We'll start with the majority this time.
Zia: 64. One for the road is the English expression?

Yes it is.
Bird: 64. Partner has a very shapely hand, but I am still guessing as to his minor-suit controls. Even if machismo levels are out of control and a grand slam is thought possible, partner would reject any such try anyway.
Smith: 64. Very close to just bidding Seven Spades, since I don't need much more than two aces opposite, but there is no way to find out for sure. (Would partner not bid this way with opposition bidding, there is also the additional chance that the clubs will not produce five tricks and we'll be left with a diamond loser anyway. Bidding Six Hearts is just about pointless, since partner is not going to accept the grand slam
try with \(\uparrow\) OJxxx \(\boldsymbol{v}_{\mathrm{x}} \diamond\) Axx Axx.
Possibly not, but there will be other hands with which he might accept.
Sime: 64. After checking the backs of the cards. It is tough to put partner with a hand which is bidding 5 ahead of me lacking the ace and king. He didn't start with Michaels or a pre-empt. I am guessing \(\mathrm{O} J 10 \times x x\) and a decent diamond suit, perhaps headed by an unleadable ace-queen.
Cannell: 64 - We are vulnerable after all. Partner DID bid Five Spades. I am pretty sure we are off an ace, but which one? They may have to guess to lead a diamond to have a chance to defeat slam. Or, we get an unlucky singleton club lead from South to North's and go down on a club ruff. This is my guess in this cramped auction.
Brock: 64. I surely didn't need anything like this much for \(4 \checkmark\). Partner presumably expects to make 5 as he has bid it at adverse vulnerability. Rigal: 64. Not a grand slam try I think - even if we get there we might be off the club ruff. Could partner have heart control, QJ-sixth of spades and e.g. AQxxx of diamonds? Surely he could; but slam still has play.

Then there are those who don't risk a grand slam try in case it warns the opposition off the safe heart lead and attracts a killing diamond.
Teramoto: 64. We may have a Grand but I don't bid \(6^{\circ}\) as a try for 7at. A diamond lead may be fatal for \(6 \boldsymbol{A}\), and if I bid \(6 \boldsymbol{v}\) that may suggest a non-heart lead.
Alder: 64. This could well turn +650 into - 100, but maybe even if they can cash two diamond tricks immediately, they won't.
Lawrence: 64. I doubt I will be allowed to play
it. And if we do play it, it may take a diamond lead to set it.
Robson: 64. They may bid 7ヶ anyway. But not \(6 \vee\) for that may induce an unwanted diamond lead versus 6a.

Liz's glass isn't just half empty, I think it's broken.
McGowan: Pass. I believe this is a forcing pass situation, so pass from partner would be stronger than \(5 \boldsymbol{A}\). I expect two top losers in the minors. (Have I set a record for Passes in a bidding challenge?)

Surely Pass from partner would be weaker or stronger than bidding 54? Pass would cover hands that intend to defend if we double, as well as hands that intend to pull our double as a slam try.
Green: Pass. This feels like a guess to me and may depend on partner's style. For example if partner held \(\uparrow Q J 10 x x x \geqslant x \diamond K Q x x x \boldsymbol{*}\), would that be a 1 s bid, or would partner make a Michaels cue-bid (or perhaps even bid 3a)? If that's a Michaels bid for this partnership then I might take a shot at 64. I think we could be off two aces so I pass, but that could easily be wrong. Even if we avoid a heart lead the diamonds may not all go away on the clubs. North hasn't opened \(4 \boldsymbol{\checkmark}\) at favourable vulnerability so I think he must have some defence.

Passing could be the winner - I guess that partner would bid 5a with that example hand, assuming that he would have started with a simple overcall, of course. But we are so much better than we could have been and he has bid in front of us, so I think we should bid on.

Some are sufficiently confident that they are willing to make the grand slam try.

Cope: \(6 \uparrow\). Partner has bid in front of us, rather than using the pass-pull slam try, so we cannot except the earth - I would bid 5 © on QJ 10 xxx \(\geqslant x \diamond A K Q x\) exx. So our best route to the possible Grand is to show our first round control and for partner to bid Seven with first-round controls in both minor suits.
Mould: \(6 \vee\). If pard expects to make \(5 \boldsymbol{1}\) and I have this lot then a slam should be on ice. The minor aces are all I need for Seven.
Apteker: 6『. I have too much not to punt slam. The question seems to be whether to suggest the Grand to partner via \(6 \vee\), which with even both minor suit aces partner may not accept given his poor spades, or whether to conceal information and not assist the opponents with the lead. South may well lead hearts if I bid 64 but may find the potential killing lead of a diamond if I bid \(6 \vee\). As South may find the diamond lead anyway or misguess with a club, I prefer to involve partner.

Or how about:
Stabell: 5NT. I hope 5 NT is RKCB when we didn't have the chance to ask for aces with 4 NT . Partner could have made a forcing pass, so should have a real hand for 5 as. Will bid 7a if he has two aces since he would have made a two-suited overcall if there is an inescapable diamond loser.

I'm pretty sure that 5NT as RKCB is not part of the system, but it has always made a lot of sense to me that it should be so. Leif-Erik brings up a key point - what about partner's minor-suit distribution?
Kokish: 64. Duplicated heart shortness suggests East may have too many clubs and diamonds
to permit discarding all the required diamonds for 13 tricks. Still, a rolling 5 NT then \(6 \vee\) over 6\% might get the job done if Seven is good. As I was not going to pass a retreat to \(4 \uparrow\) perhaps I should have bid Blackwood over \(3 \vee\) to at least resolve that problem. If there are two fast diamonds to lose do we really want to help South with the lead?

Partner did have too many minor-suit cards to get rid of all the diamonds, though this was a touch unlucky. His hand was:
QJ10432
- 8
- A754
- A3
and clubs were five-one.


\section*{PROBLEM 7}

\section*{IMPs．Dealer North．N／S Vul．}
－ A 4
－AQ4
－K8
－A96432
\begin{tabular}{lccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
- & Pass & \(1 \uparrow\) & Pass \\
\(2 \boldsymbol{2}\) & Pass & 2 & Pass \\
2NT & Pass & 3 & Pass
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lrc} 
Bid & Votes & Marks \\
3a & 16 & 10 \\
5NT & 1 & 5 \\
4NT & 1 & 4 \\
34 & 0 & 2
\end{tabular}

While there were a couple of minority votes，this one appears to be very straightforward．
Green：34．Happy to show a doubleton spade and keep the ball in play． 3 NT would be very committal and would almost always end the auction．
Bird：3a．To bid 3NT would miss many a slam when partner has a strong hand，or even a mini－ mum hand with the right cards．The subsequent auction may still be difficult but at least I will not have to shoulder all the blame．

Nobody else even mentioned \(3 N T\) ，which would be a huge underbid，I think．
Alder：3a．For the nonce．
McGowan：34．Please partner，do ask about my controls
Teramoto：34．Shows two－card spades．
Rigal：34．As usual in such positions raising
partner can hardly be wrong．．．can it？We＇ve denied much fit so in context we have trumps to spare！
Robson：34．Preference，for now．Great cards in partner＇s suits，and two aces in partner＇s short suits excites me too．
Smith：34．This seems blindingly obvious for now（I already denied three spades when I failed to bid Two Spades last time）．The real prob－ lem comes when partner simply raises to Four Spades，since he could easily have something like \(₫\) KQJxxx \(\geqslant x \diamond\) Axxxx \(\boldsymbol{e}\) ，which is what I need for slam．
Apteker：3a．If partner is 6－5 or has five good spades or more than a minimum opening，slam prospects are good．This seems like the most unambiguous base from which to explore．If partner bids 3 NT ，I will raise to 4 NT ．

Or indeed has five good diamonds－that too could be a trump suit for slam purposes．
Stabell：34．We should be able to make a slam if partner＇s suits are good－even opposite a com－ plete minimum．Will try again with \(4 \diamond\) if he signs off in 3 NT ，then respect a sign－off in \(4 \boldsymbol{4}\) if that is all partner can manage．
Kokish：3a．Level and strain are far from clear as East＇s range is very wide，but showing two－ card support has to be a good way for us to pro－ ceed．If East continues with a NF 3NT he won＇t have the good suits we＇re looking for in a slam investigation，but I intend to continue with 4 ＊ as one good suit may still be OK for Six．

That looks a good plan．We must keep dia－ monds as well as spades in the picture．
Sime： \(3 \boldsymbol{a}\) ．Must be \(\boldsymbol{\downarrow}\) ．Problem 4 was a bad hand for Two－Over－One，no doubt to the amusement
of the Acolsaurs．Now we see the advantages； we can make descriptive bids below game to explore the correct level and strain．Having to put this hand through fourth－suit forcing would have left us with an awkward decision over \(3 \uparrow\) ．

Playing Acol we would have bid \(2 \vee\) over \(2 \triangleleft\) and could still now bid 3ه over 3＞，but we might bid the same way with three－card support，so there is much less definition in our auction．
Zia：3a．Lots of bidding left and Ax is not chopped liver．
Brock：34．Presumably I have already denied four spades．He can always sign off in 3NT with poor suits．
Lawrence： \(\mathbf{3 \boldsymbol { a }}\) ．Shows just two spades．Partner＇s bidding judgment will appreciate this．Failure to make this bid can be costly later in the bidding．
Cannell：34．Let＇s see how partner reacts to this probe．I fear that a Three Heart bid would be ambiguous for strain and level．

FSF is always to a degree ambiguous as to strain and level，being used precisely when we do not want to make a more committal call．Here， it might help us as regards strain，with partner repeating a strong suit，but he would also repeat a not so strong suit to show a sixth card in it，and might feel that he had a problem even with five－ five and nothing in hearts－our sequence might express doubt about NT，so he may be scared to sign off in 3NT merely to deny anything better to say．

I don＇t see FSF as being as helpful as the Eric／ Leif－Erik plan of 3 \＆followed by \(4 \diamond\) over \(3 N T\) ．

There were two other suggestions．
Mould：4NT．In my world 3NT on the last round was about 15－17．I therefore treated it as more
than that last time and to be consistent with that I bid 4NT natural and invitational now. This does not really get my excellent pointed suits into the mix, but has the merit of clarity. If I bid 3 an now and partner bids 4a as is very likely, I shall have to go on and really I am then just guessing. May as well let partner guess instead!

OK, you have shown your strength well enough, but not that you have the two golden cards in partner's suits plus the other two aces. You could bid this way with a lot more in clubs and hearts, or with poorer controls, so have not convinced me that this beats the alternative plan.
Cope: 5NT. For once I like my hand - we have a high percentage of the points if partner has a club shortage, and it is just a question of playing

in the right strain (I am assuming partner had a reason to bid \(3 \diamond\) ). If partner's pointed suits are KQJ10x and AQxxx then 6 will be right, but if KQxxx and AQJ10x then 6 will be best, so 5NT pick a slam seems to hit the mark.

As long as partner has one strong suit this should get us to the right strain. What it might make more difficult is getting to the right level. Not just getting too high, but also making it tough for partner to bid a grand slam - don't forget that he is still unlimited, so Seven is not yet out of the picture. No, \(5 N T\) solves a problem and were partner more limited I could be tempted by it, but I still prefer the slow approach, though I prefer \(5 N T\) to \(4 N T\).

\section*{PROBLEM 8}

IMPs. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
- 84
- AKQJ87
- 963
- Q8
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
- & - & \(1 母\) & \(2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}\) \\
\(3 \varphi\) & \(4 \uparrow\) & Pass & Pass
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Bid & Votes & Marks \\
Double & 11 & 10 \\
5 & 7 & 8
\end{tabular}

This was as much a matter of system as judgement for most - was partner's pass forcing?
Yes say:
Lawrence: \(5^{\circ}\). I'm assuming \(3^{\circ}\) created a game-force.

Green: Dble. Partner has made a forcing pass ( \(3>\) set one up) and I don't feel that I have enough to bid at the five level so that leaves me with double.
Robson: 5》. I think partner's pass must be forcing at these colours so he probably has a singleton spade. I'll take my chances in \(5 \vee\) with every high card saying, "bid, don't defend".
Kokish: \(5 \curlyvee\). As \(3 \vee\) was FG, East's forcing pass implies that he has no strong opinion about defending versus declaring. I have the right queen to vote for declaring but the wrong spade holding and pattern to make 5 P a comfortable action, but East might well be short in spades on the auction and might be able to raise to slam knowing my opinion when asked for it. If we were not getting rich against 4a doubled bidding on has much more going for it.
Stabell: \(5 \uparrow\). Partner has made a forcing pass with nothing in hearts, so \(5 \square\) should have a chance. Cannot do more with this 7-loser hand. Sime: \(5 \boldsymbol{} \boldsymbol{V}^{\text {. Another high level guess. Might }}\) be -800 for a plus score, might be a double game swing. My only clue is that partner has passed the decision to me, so probably has a stiff spade and long clubs.
Alder: \(5 \uparrow\). What would partner's double have meant in comparison to his forcing pass? I like to play that double says East thinks it is right for us to bid higher, but I may pass if my hand is more defensive in nature. Then his pass is less encouraging, and since I have no short suits, I think we should try for a penalty - rightly or wrongly. If instead partner's pass in encouraging me to bid and double would have shown a hand with a low offence ration, then I would
bid \(5 \uparrow\). Four spades could be cold if they have a double fit in the pointed suits.

Your way of playing double and pass may work very well, but I'm pretty sure that most play it the other way around - pass encourages partner to bid on, while double warns him off. You, of course, also have the pass then pull route in your structure.
Smith: Double. After a number of two-option problems, we now seem to have found one with only one realistic choice. However, I seem to recall that double was the wrong thing to do at the table, as partner had \(\mathrm{x} \geqslant \mathrm{xx}\) Axxx AKJxxx and we were cold for slam in either hearts or clubs, but it is hard to see what else we can do. Some combinations are just too difficult. Perhaps a jump to Four Hearts at our last turn would have enabled partner to do something more helpful over Four Spades, or is that just wistful thinking?

That doesn't suggest that he sees pass as forcing. Liz definitely doesn't, and David again does not look as though he plays pass as forcing.
McGowan: Double. Don't think this was a forcing pass, but don't think I should Pass this time. Bird: Double. Call me unadventurous but I'm not going to the five-level with so many top losers. Nor will I let them play undoubled. However dubious some of my previous answers may have been, I have some hopes of 10 points here.

Well predicted - 10 points it is - though maybe a closer vote than you expected.
Cope: \(5^{\downarrow}\). A lot may depend on how your partnership plays the pass of \(4 \boldsymbol{a}\) - is it a forcing pass that shows suitability to bid on (which it would if it were a fit auction) or just any minimum opening bid. Since the auction sounds as

if partner has a stiff spade I will take my chances and bid on whatever the agreement.
Apteker: Double. Partner has made a forcing pass and so far expressed uncertainty whether to declare or defend. The opponents may only have nine trumps between them given the colours and we are likely to have eight to nine trumps in hearts. Based on the Law, it is therefore correct to double and to take the money.
Mould: Double. I play 3 as FG here, so partner's pass is forcing. Since I do not know what partner will do on a WNT with nothing much in spades, and since \(5 \checkmark\) seems a lot of tricks to make with this balanced hand, I will double and hope for the best. It would not surprise me if my options here were -590 and -500 or
even -690 and - 800 .
Teramoto: Double. \(4 \boldsymbol{4}\) doubled is not interesting, but \(5 \checkmark\) is too high with this hand.
Cannell: Double. Co-operative in nature. The ball is in partner's court.

Co-operative means"You take the blame partner"?
Zia: Double. I would have preferred 4V last time. Now I try and tell my part it's 'our' hand though that's not clear!

You are not the only one to prefer 4V on the previous round. I assume that this means that you don't think that \(3 \vee\) set up a force, as then partner's pass would normally be played as encouraging and we would not be doubling to show that it's 'our hand', rather that we think we should be defending.
Brock: Double. I don't really fancy the fivelevel but \(4 \boldsymbol{4}\) could easily make. I guess I want partner to pass with a doubleton spade, and bid with a singleton. Or maybe his pass is forcing. If North had passed, then East would have had to bid 3NT on some balanced 12 -counts, making 3 effectively game-forcing, and therefore partner's pass forcing. Sometimes this game is too difficult.
Rigal: Double. I'll win or lose the event on the next deal, leading a top heart I think. We don't need another hero.

I wouldn't have picked Barry to be a Tina Turner fan.

As for winning or losing the event on the next deal, are you really sure that your decision on this one might not be decisive?

I would take partner's pass to be encouraging, our 3 『 bid having forced to game so set up
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forcing passes, and with a solid suit and nothing in spades would bid 5 ¢ . The majority, however, prefer to play for a penalty.

Congratulations to Zia, who has scored what I believe to be the first perfect 80 of my relatively brief tenure as conductor.


SET 14 -THE PANEL'S BIDS \& MARKS
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & Total \\
\hline Zia Mahmood & USA & 34 & Pass & 54 & 2 & Pass & 64 & 34 & Dble & 80 \\
\hline Sally Brock & England & 34 & Pass & 49 & 2 & Pass & 6 & 34 & Dble & 76 \\
\hline Mike Lawrence & USA & 34 & \(2 V\) & 54 & 2 & Pass & 64 & 34 & 5 & 76 \\
\hline Andrew Robson & England & 34 & \(2 \vee\) & 54 & 2 & Pass & 6 & 34 & 5 & 76 \\
\hline Iain Sime & Scotland & 34 & Pass & 49 & 2 & Pass & 64 & 34 & 5 & 74 \\
\hline Alon Apteker & South Africa & 34 & Pass & 54 & 1NT & Pass & 6 & 34 & Dble & 73 \\
\hline Drew Cannell & Canada & 34 & Pass & 54 & 1NT & 3NT & 64 & 34 & Dble & 73 \\
\hline Tadashi Teramoto & Japan & 34 & \(2 \vee\) & 5 & 2 & Pass & 6 & 34 & Dble & 73 \\
\hline Marc Smith & England & 49 & \(2 V\) & 54 & 2 & Pass & 6 & 34 & Dble & 72 \\
\hline David Bird & England & Pass & \(2 \vee\) & 54 & 1NT & Pass & 64 & 34 & Dble & 70 \\
\hline Leif-Erik Stabell & Zimbabwe & 34 & Pass & 54 & 1NT & Pass & 5NT & 34 & 5 & 70 \\
\hline Ben Green & England & 34 & 2V & 49 & 2 & Pass & Pass & 34 & Dble & 68 \\
\hline Tim Cope & South Africa & 34 & Pass & 54 & 1NT & Pass & 6 & 5NT & 5 & 66 \\
\hline Phillip Alder & USA & 3NT & Pass & 5 & 2 & 3NT & 64 & 3 \({ }^{1}\) & 5 & 66 \\
\hline Alan Mould & England & 34 & Pass & 54 & 2 & 3NT & 6 & 4NT & Dble & 66 \\
\hline Barry Rigal & USA & Pass & Pass & 5 & 2 & 3NT & 6 & 34 & Dble & 66 \\
\hline Eric Kokish & Canada & 34 & 2 V & 64 & 2 & 3NT & 64 & 34 & 5 & 66 \\
\hline Liz McGowan & Scotland & Pass & Pass & 49 & 1NT & Pass & Pass & 34 & Dble & 62 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\section*{A New Bridge Magazine Bidding System}

\section*{Attention!!!}

The Bidding System has been modified - please read carefully, this is the system to be used for the Bidding Battle from now on

\section*{Basic Method}

\section*{Natural}

\section*{Five-card majors}

Minors are three cards in length minimum. Always open \(1<\) with \(3-3\) but 1 with \(4-4\), so \(1 *\) is 3 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 response is up to a non-game force but it is not forcing. However, the only hands that pass are weak no-trump types.
Jumps at the two-level are weak (eg, \(1 \downarrow-2 \boldsymbol{\perp}\) ) 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 F 2 NT and \(1 \mathrm{~m}-3 \mathrm{~m}\) is pre-emptive.
Over \(1 \mathrm{~m}-2 \mathrm{~m}\), next step is a WNT and 2 NT is GF with the next step suit; 3 m is unbalanced and non-forcing. All other bids are at least qua-si-natural and FG.
After, say, 1e-2 -2 - 2 NT/ \(3 \boldsymbol{c}\) are WNT/long
clubs minimum so NF, anything else is GF. Weak \(2 \uparrow, 2 \downarrow\) and \(2 \wedge\) ( \(5-9\), six-card suit).
In response 2 NT is a relay asking for a highcard feature if not minimum with 3NT showing a good suit, non-minimum. \(4 \boldsymbol{2}\) is RKCB. 2any 2new = NAT Constructive NF; 2any - 3new = NAT Forcing.
Three-level openings are natural and pre-emptive. Over \(3 \uparrow / \mathbf{/ Q}, 4 \boldsymbol{*}\) is RKCB and over 3\&, 4 is RKCB.
3NT opening is Acol gambling - solid suit and at most a queen outside.
Four-level opening are natural.

\section*{No-trump bidding:}

After 1NT \(15-17,2 \boldsymbol{2}=\) Stayman, \(2 \boldsymbol{2} / 2 \vee=\) transfers, \(2 \boldsymbol{s}=\mathrm{s}\) with \(2 \mathrm{NT} / 3\) denying/showing a fit, \(2 \mathrm{NT}=\leqslant\) with \(3 \boldsymbol{*} /\) denying/showing a fit. After this new suits are splinters. 3 e is 5 card Stayman, \(3 \rightarrow\) is \(5-5 \mathrm{~ms} \mathrm{FG}, 3>/\) 1-3-(4-5) / 3-1-(4-5) and FG. \(4 \boldsymbol{e}\) is \(5-5\) majors, game only, \(4 \downarrow / \downarrow=\uparrow / \mathbf{~ s}\) (then \(4 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{RKCB}\) and new suits are Exclusion).
1 NT rebid \(=12-14\) with 2 a puppet to 2 to play in \(2 \diamond\) or make an invitational bid, \(2 \diamond\) 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, 2NT is 12-14 balanced or 18-19 balanced and 3 NT is 15-17 range with a reason not to have opened 1NT.
3NT rebid after a one-level response in a suit shows a good suit and a good hand. Where the response was 1 NT , 3 NT may be a flat 19 -count.
After 2NT, 20-22, 3s = Stayman with Smolen, \(3 \uparrow / 3 \uparrow=\) transfers, \(3 \boldsymbol{Q}=\) slam try with both minors. Four level bids are as after 1NT opening. Reverse Kokish is played after opening ( \(2 \boldsymbol{2}-2-2-2 \mathrm{NT}\) is \(23-24\) balanced, and \(2-2 \mathrm{NT}\) is \(25+\) balanced GF).

\section*{Initial response:}

Jump shifts are weak at the two-level and invitational 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; \(1 \diamond, 1 \vee, 2 \boldsymbol{*}, 3 \vee\) is FG).
2 NT after \(1 \boldsymbol{e} / 1\) is natural and invitational without 4M.
\(2 N T\) after \(1 \vee / 1 \boldsymbol{\perp}=\) game-forcing with \(4+\) card support. Continuations in new suits are natural, 3 partner's suit extras with no singleton, 3NT
\(=18-19\) balanced, 4 of new suits are splinters but deny a second suit. 4 of partner's major shows a bad opening. Such as \(1 \mathrm{M}-2 \mathrm{NT}-3 \vee-3 \mathrm{M}-4 \boldsymbol{*}=\) splinter (3NT is 5M-4-2-2).

\section*{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 rebid1NT. Reverses are forcing for one round after a one level 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 \(1 \Upsilon / 1\). Jumps when the previous level is forcing are splinters.
Where responder jumps in a third suit after opener has bid and rebid a suit, that is a splinter, with a non-jump new suit NAT F1.
Sequences such as \(1 \diamond-1 \stackrel{-}{-}-2 \downarrow\) are F1; \(1 \boldsymbol{c}-1 \boldsymbol{c}-2 \boldsymbol{*}=\) ART GF, while \(2 \boldsymbol{*}\) would be NF but opener is can raise. \(1 \diamond-1 \stackrel{\wedge}{\wedge}-2 \downarrow-3 \vee=\) splinter in support of \(\downarrow\).
4th suit = game-forcing.
When responder's suit is raised a return to opener's suit is forcing.

\section*{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 \(0,1,2.4 \mathrm{NT}\) followed by 5 NT is for specific kings.
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 normally denies a control in that suit, except that a player may revert to traditional cue-bidding, e'g. spades are trumps, cue-bidding \(4 \diamond\) then \(5 \boldsymbol{*}\) with 1 st-round \(\star\), 2nd-round if he feels that to be appropriate and he is happy to commit to the five level.
Exception: a shortage control in partner's suit is not shown immediately.
The default for 5NT is "pick a slam" unless following on from 4 NT by the same player.

\section*{Competition:}

Responsive and competitive doubles through \(4 \diamond\) - after that, doubles are value-showing, not penalties.
\(1 \mathrm{x}-\) Dble \(-1 \mathrm{y}-\) Dble \(=4 \mathrm{y}\) and some values; 2 y \(=5 \mathrm{y}\) and a hand that would have bid 2 y over a pass from RHO.
Negative doubles through \(4 \diamond\) - after that, doubles are value showing, not penalties.

Game try doubles where no space for any other game try.
After our 1M 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, raise 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). Where we overcall 1 M , a 2 NT response is a fourcard limit or better raise, a cue-bid could contain four-card support if only worth a two-level raise, but is otherwise a three-card raise.
Double jumps are splinters.
Lebensohl applies after interference over our 1 NT and facing our T/O double of a weak two bid or of 2 M after they opened a multi 2 against us. An immediate 3NT shows a stopper but not 4oM, 2 NT then 3 NT shows a stopper and \(4 \mathrm{oM}, 2 \mathrm{NT}\) then cue-bid shows no stopper but 4oM immediate cue-bid shows no stopper and no 40 M . In summary 3NT at any time shows a stopper and cue-bid at any time denies one, a jump to 34 (eg

\section*{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.
\(1 \mathrm{NT}-2 \boldsymbol{\varphi}-3 \boldsymbol{\perp}\) is FG). Note that most relatively balanced hands with no stopper will start with a T/O double.
We open 1 NT and they overcall. Whatever its meaning, double of the overcall is T/O of the suit BID. Pass then double is also T/O and therefore implies length in the first opposing suit.
2 NT is rarely natural in competition (except as defined above). Possibilities include Lebensohl or scramble if game is not viable. Scramble will tend to apply in balancing situations, Lebensohl (Good/Bad) where game is still a live possibility. This includes the Good/Bad 2NT in situations where it is appropriate.
We double their Stayman or transfer over 1NT: if \(1 \mathrm{NT}=14+\), double shows the suit doubled. If 1 NT is maximum 15 HCP , double is PEN of 1 NT .

\section*{Our Overcalls:}

After a 1M 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. Fit single-jumps, splinter double-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.

\section*{Defences:}

Against all pre-empts, take-out doubles with Lebensohl responses against two-level openings - same structure as above.
2NT is rarely natural in competition (except as defined above). Possibilities include Lebensohl or scramble if game is not viable.
Over 2M, \(4 \boldsymbol{\mu} /\) are Leaping Michaels (5,5 in \(/ \downarrow\) and oM, FG). Over Natural weak \(2 \star, 4 \boldsymbol{*}=\) Leaping Michaels ( 5,5 in \& a M with \(4 \diamond\) to ask for
 as P/C. Over \(3 \star, 4 \boldsymbol{e}=\boldsymbol{\&} \& M\) and \(4 \star=\) Ms. Over
 \(4 \boldsymbol{\Phi} / \uparrow / \uparrow=\) nat, \(4 \oplus / 4 \mathrm{NT}=\) two-suiter.

Over their 1 NT , Dble = pens, \(2 \boldsymbol{2}=\) majors, \(2=\) 1 major, \(2 \uparrow / \boldsymbol{\wedge}=5 \uparrow / \boldsymbol{\&} \& 4+\mathrm{m} 2 \mathrm{NT}=\) minors or game-forcing 2 -suiter.
Over a strong 1*, natural, double = majors, 1 NT = minors, pass then bid is strong.
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\section*{WEST}

Hands for the
March 2019 The uBid 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 North. None Vul.
. AKQ7
- AKQ 109542
- J
-
North opens \(2 \diamond\) Multi; South bids \(2 \gtrdot\) and if West doubles North bids \(2 \boldsymbol{A}\).
Hand 2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
- Q64
-
- 53

2 AKQJ10943
Hand 3. Dealer East. None Vul.
- Q9876
- AQ85
- 9
- Q43

Hand 4. Dealer West. Both Vul
- KQ1063
- Q64
- AKJ3
- 7

Hand 5. Dealer East. Both Vul.
- K842
- AJ109
- J
- K1072

Hand 6. Dealer West. None Vul.
- AK97
- KQ873
- J87
- 5

If West opens \(1 \uparrow\) North bids \(4 \boldsymbol{e}\) and South raises to 6
Hand 7. Dealer South. N/S Vul.
- Q105
- AKQ3
- Q86
* AQ3

Hand 8. Dealer East. None Vul.
- J
- 3
- A93

2 KQJ109742
South overcalls 3 -

\section*{MASTER POINT BIDDING BATTLE}

\section*{Results - Set 13}

The first set of the new year saw the following three readers get a book:

Mark Bartusek (73), Dean Pokorny (72) and Mike Perkins (71). A fourth recipient will be drawn from Mrs. T's hat.

In a valiant attempt to save the planet, the names of all the participants were not printed onto paper and then placed in Mrs T's hat but were transferred electronically to Mrs T's iPad. Whereupon the randomising routine I loaded onto her machine selected Mike Perkins when the button was pushed. As you can see this was a flaw in my system, but a second attempt drew the name Stuart Nelson and it is he who gets the fourth voucher.

\section*{Other Good Scores}

69 Klaus Polap
68 Wladyslaw Izdebski
66 Bill March, Todd Holes, Dominic Connolly
65 Nigel Guthrie
64 Nelson Pearson, George Willett
63 Rodney Lighton, Alex Athanasiadis, David Barnes
62 Steven Handley, Erika Lindenthal, Carles Acero, Bazil Caygill, Brian McDowell 60 Simon Hil, Bill Linton

\section*{The Yearly standings:}

These are obviously the same as this month's results.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{PROBLEM 1} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{IMPs. Dealer East. All Vul.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{- 103} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{- 52} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{- A9} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{2 AKQ8532} \\
\hline West 10 & North Double & East 1 & South Pass \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{?} \\
\hline Bid & Panel & Read & rsMarks \\
\hline 36 & 22 & 10 & 43 \\
\hline 3NT & 2 & 5 & 2 \\
\hline 2* & 0 & 3 & 5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

One reader, Stuart Nelson, commented on one of the calls chosen by a couple of the panel:

Stuart Nelson: 3NT - hope partner expects less after competition.
From the point of view of looking for slam, partner will surely take the double into account. However, the bulk of the panel simply thought that 3NT was too much and committed us to what might be a hopeless game. Hence the vast majority voted for 3\%.

There were also five reader votes for a simple \(2 \boldsymbol{2}\). That may fit the 13 HCP contained in the hand, but overlooks the likely eight running tricks, so is at the other extreme to 3 NT . I think it is a serious underbid, but I suppose I should have awarded it 3 points as it could win IMPs if others are going down in 3NT.

\section*{PROBLEM 2}

\section*{IMPs. Dealer West. All Vul.}
- K9
- J94
- AKJ 10962
\(\because \mathrm{A}\)
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
\(1 \downarrow\) & Pass & \(1 \downarrow\) & Double
\end{tabular}
?
\begin{tabular}{lccc} 
Bid & Panel & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ ReadersMarks } \\
Rdbl & 18 & 10 & 28 \\
3 & 4 & 7 & 14 \\
3NT & 1 & 3 & 6 \\
\(4 \diamond\) & 1 & 3 & 0 \\
2NT & 0 & 2 & 1
\end{tabular}

We one other call:2NT . It seems a bit distorted with 10 red-suit cards, but at least gets the all-around strength across reasonably well so I'll award a couple of marks. However, there is too much risk that we belong in a red-suit contract and will get trapped in no trump, so I am not a fan of the bid.

\section*{PROBLEM 3}

IMPs. Dealer East. None Vul.
- J
- 1094
- Q85
* AQ10953
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
- & - & 14 & Pass \\
1NT & Pass & 3 & Pass \\
\(?\) & & & \\
\begin{tabular}{c} 
Bid \\
\(4 \mathbf{~}\)
\end{tabular} & Panel & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ ReadersMarks } \\
& 9 & 10 & 12
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lllr}
\(3 \uparrow\) & 6 & 8 & 3 \\
3NT & 4 & 6 & 17 \\
4 & 3 & 5 & 11 \\
\(3 \uparrow\) & 2 & 4 & 3 \\
5 & 0 & 2 & 2 \\
Double & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
Pass & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Double
\[
?
\] & Pass & 24 & Pass \\
\hline Bid & Panel & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Readers Marks} \\
\hline Pass & 13 & 10 & 16 \\
\hline 34 & 4 & 6 & 15 \\
\hline 2NT & 4 & 6 & 2 \\
\hline 320 & 3 & 6 & 5 \\
\hline 24 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
\hline 3 & 0 & 0 & 5 \\
\hline 4, & 0 & 0 & 6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

There were three minority actions on this one but I'm afraid that I won't be awarding anything to any of them. The \(2 \boldsymbol{\perp}\) chosen by one reader has a rather obvious flaw - was this the same reader who tried to double partner's bid on the previous problem? The \(3 \vee\) cue-bid and jump to 4s are simply gross overbids when there are so many other strong but less committal options available to us. Regarding the jump to 44, we must bear in ind that \(2 \boldsymbol{a}\) is the default rebid partner will normally select on all bad hands, so it does not promise a fifth spade.

Stuart Nelson: \(\mathbf{3 \boldsymbol { e }}\) - very interesting. \(2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}\) could exceptionally be a 3-3 fit. \(3 \boldsymbol{e}\) can't be totally natural, as didn't bid it last turn.

Well, \(3 \boldsymbol{e}\) is natural, as double twice followed by just shows a stronger hand than double once followed by 3\&, but there is perhaps some suggestion of a less club-orientated hand than had the suit been bid a round earlier. 3 is a serious contender on this hand.

\section*{PROBLEM 5}

IMPs. Dealer East. N/S Vul.
- KJ104
- 93
- 105
* QJ 1094
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
- & - & Pass & Pass
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lccc} 
Bid & Panel & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ ReadersMarks } \\
Pass & 15 & 10 & 40 \\
10 & 6 & 7 & 7 \\
3 & 3 & 5 & 1 \\
\(1 \boldsymbol{~}\) & 0 & 2 & 1
\end{tabular}

Three readers passed comments along with their answers:
Michael Alexander: 14 if playing Drury else Pass
Carles Acero: Pass - don't play poker
Bill Linton added a ! to his Pass
Fair enough - this sort of thing is a matter of personal style, even if we all of course believe our style to be the winning one.

\section*{PROBLEM 6}

IMPs. Dealer North. All Vul.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{- 43} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{- A105} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{- AKJ962} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{- 105} \\
\hline West & North & East & South \\
\hline - & Pass & 180 & 19 \\
\hline 2 & 39 & 4* & 4 \\
\hline Pass & Pass & 5\% & 5 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{?} \\
\hline Bid & Panel & Read & rs Marks \\
\hline 62 & 13 & 10 & 20 \\
\hline Dble & 7 & 7 & 26 \\
\hline Pass & 4 & 6 & 3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

There were two reader comments:
Alex Athanasiadis: 6 clubs (or pass if it is forcing)
Unfortunately, you have to decide - you can't have two bites at the cherry.
Stuart Nelson wrote in (after seeing the answers): Q6 - I can't think this one makes much sense. Everyone is guessing whether they have previously made a forcing pass, with many (but not all) assuming they have (either because of their hand, or wrongly believing \(2 \downarrow\) was still
systemically GF). Others criticise specifically that they do not believe the sequence qualifies for a FP, especially those who know \(2 \star\) was not GF here

If our previous pass was forcing by agreement a FP, where is the footnote? - we aren't playing by alerting regulations - and are entitled to know what our side's agreements are.

Thus half the panel award themselves another forcing pass, even some of those who thought the first was forcing think it over-egging the pudding to play another FP, and the rest of us playing the problem as it is stated are left with guesswork (although I suppose I am content to get 7 for doubling knowing we could not make 6*).

This is how the problem came to us. The panel's discussion as to the forcing or non-forcing nature of the previous pass, and also whether pass should be forcing in the position which we have reached, was much of the purpose of setting the question. To add footnotes would therefore have rather defeated the object of the exercise. The logic that our previous pass must have been intended as forcing, given that we surely would have bid otherwise, is compelling, is it not? So when I looked at the actual problem I based my judgement on that assumption. Once you agree that the previous pass was forcing, it is perfectly reasonable to assume that another pass at this point would also be forcing.

I don't believe that the panel considered the previous pass to be forcing because they misunderstood to what level \(2 \star\) was forcing. Rather, it was a question of whether the free \(4 \boldsymbol{e}\) bid set up a force. That discussion also was part of what the problem was about.
```

PROBLEM }

```

IMPs. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
- AKQ108754
\(\downarrow\) -
- A1098
\(\therefore 2\)
\begin{tabular}{lcrr} 
West & North & East & South \\
1 & Pass & \(1 N T\) & \(2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}^{*}\)
\end{tabular}
2. Hearts and a minor

Bid Panel ReadersMarks
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 4 & & 12 & 10 & 12 \\
\hline 4* & & 2 & 8 & 0 \\
\hline 3 & & 4 & 7 & 4 \\
\hline 49 & & 3 & 5 & 20 \\
\hline \(3{ }^{4}\) & & 2 & 4 & 5 \\
\hline Pass & & 1 & 2 & 0 \\
\hline 34 & & 0 & 0 & 2 \\
\hline \(5{ }^{5}\) & 0 & 2 & & \\
\hline 54 0 & 0 & 1 & & \\
\hline Double & 0 & 2 & 3 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

There were no fewer than four calls chosen by one or more readers that were not selected by a panellist.

Two readers chose 34. That bid is not forcing, and looking at nine likely running tricks it is simply too little. Five Hearts is the other extreme, committing us to slam facing the ace of clubs with no idea what is going on in diamonds - slam could easily be a zero \(\%\) contract when partner has wasted heart or club values. Five Spades just doesn't get partner to look at anything in particular, doesn't show that we want diamond values rather than club values, doesn't show the heart void... And finally, double - I guess this is harmless, in much the same way as is Pass, and might glean useful information, though personally I think both suffer from the problem that the opposition may take away sufficient of our bidding space that we are no longer able to make as clear and descriptive a bid at our next turn as we can do now. I'll award Double the same 2 points as were awarded originally to Pass.

Carles Acero: \(3 \boldsymbol{\square}\) - no rush
Except that \(4 \checkmark\) specifies the void while \(3 \curlyvee\) sounds more like a singleton, so it doesn't give the clearcut spade slam try message. However, two panellists agreed with you.

Nelson Pearson: Double (I reserve 3『 for later). And afterwards: And on Hand 7 you are not considering my Double bid, but award points to a Pass? Pass is one choice, \(3>\) is a better one, \(4 \checkmark\) is an obvious one but prevents partner from eventually showing \(\downarrow\), and \(4 \boldsymbol{4}\) is a conservative bid sacrificing any chance of slam while trying to prevent interferences; but what about a double that shows strength while keeping the lines open for further information? I could understand if you also discarded

\section*{a Pass, but then...}

OK, I've mentioned that already.
Martin Turner: \(5 \curlyvee\) (Exclusion Blackwood)
And that.
PROBLEM 8
IMPs. Dealer North. All Vul.
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
AJ 10 & & \\
AJ98752 & & \\
A102 & & & \\
West & North & East & South \\
- & Pass & 1\& & Pass \\
1* & Pass & 1NT* & Pass
\end{tabular}

1NT(11)12-14, Does not deny a four-card major
\begin{tabular}{lrrr} 
Bid & Panel & Readers & Marks \\
3 & 11 & 10 & 3 \\
2 & 10 & 9 & 11 \\
2 & 2 & 2 & 7 \\
6 & 1 & 4 & 0 \\
2 & 0 & 2 & 1 \\
3 & 0 & 0 & 11 \\
3NT & 0 & 0 & 5 \\
4 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
4 & 0 & 2 & 2 \\
4 & 0 & 10 & 7 \\
5 & 0 & 2 & 1
\end{tabular}

What fun, with this one gathering a number of comments and no fewer than seven bids which did not receive any support from the panel. These were the comments(or rather, most of them):

Dean Pokorny: 2-if still 2-way CB, else 2\%.
Michael Alexander: 2 gf checkback
Wladyslaw Izdebski: 3४ splinter

Paul de Weerd: \(2 \diamond\) checkback gf Simon Hill: \(2 \diamond\) GF checkback.
Yes, 2 is GF Checkback.
And these were the bids chosen:
2*. This was surely intended as one-way Checkback. We'll probably survive its use so I'll award 2 points. 3 is invitational. That is insufficient on this hand so no award I'm afraid. 3NT could see us down in 3NT while slam is cold. It is seriously unilateral and no award. \(5 \diamond, 6 \diamond\) or, on a really good day, even \(7 \diamond\) could be on if partner has no heart wasteage.

Four Clubs - I'm not sure what the bidder intended by this but there is no guarantee of a club fit, we surely don't play Gerber and even if we did it is unlikely to solve our problem, and it doesn't help us find a diamond contract. Four Diamonds - well, it isn’t as good as \(2 \diamond\) followed by3 \(\downarrow\), but at least it does look like long diamonds, though possibly a stronger suit than this, and slam interest, so I'll award a couple of points.

If we are going to make a clear-cut slam try, then a \(4 \vee\) auto-splinter (two in a row!) is surely going to be more helpful than \(4 \star\), so that gets 4 points. It does, however, commit us to diamonds, giving up on 3NT. Four Spades is another bid which I don't understand, so no points, and \(5 \downarrow\), while getting us to a probably perfectly decent contract, does give up on slam as well as giving upon 3NT- 2 points though.

Stuart Nelson then wrote in:
\(4 \vee\) - Lovely - a test to see if any of your panel have read the system. I don't see what the point of this competition is now if the 10 point answer \(3 \vee\), described unanimously by the panel as an auto-splinter, and in the system as GF 5-5+.

Stuart's long comment deserves a serious response. Firstly, the system actually says that jumps to the three level are \(5-5\), not \(5-5+\), but that is splitting hairs and we know that it would mean \(5-5+\). The problem is that the system also says that unnecessary jumps are splinters. The two statements are in conflict. The whole panel read the system as saying what it was intened to say, which I agree is not what the wording actually says, namely that jumps below the first suit are 5-5+ GF. So \(1 \boldsymbol{2}-1 v-3\) is GF \(5-5+\). It was not intended to mean that \(1 \boldsymbol{2}-1 v-\) 1 NT -3 was \(5-5+\). The intent was that bids above three of responder's original suit are shortages and, probably because all of the panel plays that way, they understood it that way. In the same way, even those who
play \(1 \vee-2 \boldsymbol{2}-3\) as \(5-5+\) GF, normally play \(1 \vee-2 \boldsymbol{2}-3\) as shortage.
Presumably this sequence should show \(6+\star\) and \(5 \uparrow\), and that seems functional to me, and a hand type you might hold often enough opposite a weak NT. Lesser distribution can use the GF checkback option and 2 M can be used as weakish 4 M , to play \(2 \mathrm{M} / 3 \star\), or infrequently find 4 M with a perfect fit.

There is a flaw in your logic here, namely that we bypass diamonds to show a major with our first response, the popular Walsh convention, so that a weakish hand with six diamonds and four+ hearts would have responded \(1 \vee\) in the first instance. That is another inconsistency in the situation that might have tipped someone off that there was something wrong - but, yes, I agree, you shouldn't have to work these things out.

Higher bids are described in the system as auto-splinters, hence I chose \(4 \vee\), but received no marks!!!

Apparently The Conductor is still no more aware of the contents of the system file than the panel
final comment.
The problem was, as you will see above, that the conductor was perfectly well aware of what the system was, just he knew what it was supposed to say, and not the actual illogical wording.

I'm going to award \(4 \vee\) the same 10 points as were awarded to \(3 \vee\). I actually consider \(3 \vee\) to be the superior bid, as it allows partner to bid 3NT and us to play there, while also leaving an extra level to explore slam when partner does not have a stack of wasted heart strength, but the systemic problem made it impossible for some readers to bid \(3 \vee\).

This was a far superior feature when it was Acol based with an absolute minimum of interesting system arrangements. It was highly irritating when this first changed, to try to teach Mr Mould how to play his esoteric methods. I don't mind if it has to be 5 M strong NT, but please find a simple enough system that the panel can remember, or get right accidentally

I seem to recall this feature was predicated on two expert players sitting down with the minimum of discussion, I think it has now drifted too far from that to be an enjoyable exercise, or worthwhile competition.

I agree that things were much simpler when the system was Acol. I remember that the IPBM system notes fitted into a small box in the middle of the problems page. Now we seem to need more and more agreements and someone, either panellist or reader, will moan when
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there are no footnotes under every problem. The trouble with putting the footnotes in is that this cuts out a large chunk of the discussion as to what things actually should mean in a a given situation.

I suppose that ANBM wants to be more than just a domestic UK-based magazine, and even in the UK more and more people are playing strong NT and five-card majors, frequently 2 -over- 1 and more and more often with a short club. If we based this feature on Acol, we would be getting steadily less and less relevant to the sort of target audience the editor has in mind. Probably most of the panellists who still play Acol do so when they partner clients, and otherwise play something closer to this magazine's methods. The trouble is, that there is so little uniformity in the detail of what they assume to be normal.
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\section*{EAST}

Hands for the March 2019 The uBid 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 North. None Vul.
- -
- 86
- A10982
- J98743

North opens \(2 \diamond\) Multi; South bids \(2 \checkmark\) and if West doubles North bids \(2 \boldsymbol{1}\).
Hand 2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
- K5
- AJ743
- AKQJ4
- 5

Hand 3. Dealer East. None Vul.
- AKJ 105
- 109
- AQ6

2K2
Hand 4. Dealer West. Both Vul
- J9542
- A
- 875
- A863

Hand 5. Dealer East. Both Vul.
- A10
- 86
- AQ9
- A98643

Hand 6. Dealer West. None Vul.
- Q654
- A4
- AKQ943
+ 2
If West opens \(1 \%\) North bids \(4 \boldsymbol{e}\) and South raises to 6
Hand 7. Dealer South. N/S Vul.
- AKJ8
- 1074
- KJ 1032
- 10

Hand 8. Dealer East. None Vul.
- K10642
- A42
- K10
- A53

South overcalls \(3>\)

\section*{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.```


[^0]:    AK10742

    -     - 

    AQ52

    * KQ5
    - J65
    - AKJ 10865
    - 6
    - 72

