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## Bridge Masters

If you are looking to improve your declarer play, one of the best options currently available is to pay a visit to:
http://www.bridgebase.com/ v3/?bridgemaster=y\&cb=lijJt5KarR
There you will find Bridgemaster 2000, a wonderful piece of software that affords you the opportunity to test yourself against a variety of problems at five different levels. Andrew Robson suggests it has the potential to improve your speed and quality of thinking at the table.
The program, which was a great commercial success, was created by Fred Gitleman and is now available to everyone free of charge. Every one of the constructed deals illustrates a technical point. Taking the correct line will lead to your making the contract, but if you make a mistake the program will exploit your error and ensure the contract fails. At the end of each deal you can listen to (or read) an explanation that explains the correct line and the thought process behind it.
It's another wonderful contribution to bridge players around the world by Fred and Sheri Winestock, talking of which BBO will be broadcasting live from the Yeh Bros Cup, later this month, April 9-13, where many of the world's top players will be competing for massive prizes.

## The Merry-go-Round

In the March issue of the ACBL's Bridge Bulletin, George Jacobs revealed in his regular column that Meckwell, Eric Rodwell \& Jeff Meckstroth are leaving the team captained by Nick Nickell. Other sources reported that the resulting
vacancy is to be filled by Geoff Hampson and Eric Greco and it appears that their spot on the team captained by Marty Fleisher will be taken by Thomas
 Bessis and Frederick Volcker.
Meanwhile, Eric has confirmed that he has no plans to retire!

## The Impregnable Quadrilateral

Searching for a way to describe Bobby Jones achievement in winning the Open, the US Open and both the British and US Amateur Championships in the same year (1930) one writer described it as a Grand Slam, but it has become enshrined in the annuls of golf as The Impregnable Quadrilateral. As Manchester City advance to what would be a historic season of four trophies, I started thinking about a possible bridge equivalent.
Could one team so dominate the game that they could win say the Reisinger, Spingold \& Vanderbilt in the same season, while adding a world title in the same year.
The English equivalent would be to win the Gold Cup, Crockfords, the Schapiro Spring Fours and the world title.
Glancing briefly at the records I noticed that in 1944 B.Jay Becker was a member of teams that won the Vanderbilt and Spingold and finished second in the Reisinger. In 1993, 1994 \& 1995 Nick Nickell, Richard Freeman, Bob Hamman, Bobby Wolff, Jeff Meckstroth \& Eric Rodwell
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won the Reisinger and the Spingold, adding the Beijing Bermuda Bowl in 1995 -the closest any team has ever come to immortality.
In the UK more than one team has won two out of the Gold Cup, Crockfords and the Schapiro Spring Fours, but a treble (let alone a quadruple) remains elusive.


## Card Game Books

Bridge books, ephemera, other card games and playing cards

208 Strines Road, Strines, Stockport
Cheshire SK6 7GA
Tel: 0161-427 4630 or 07530553594 e-mail: gordonarf@aol.com


As you may know the magazine's staff consists of your illustrious editor, responsible for the words, and myself who is responsible for all the technical stuff. This includes laying out the magazine and maintaining the website along with the database of subscribers. In all these areas, as in most areas of my life, I am self-taught.

You are also probably aware that last month there was a delay in the magazine as a result of a catastrophic technical glitch in the layout office. In the cold light of dawn I discovered it was almost certainly due to the aged and failing laptop I use when remote from my office. Thus Mr Dell was approached who delivered a new state-of-the-art portable PC in return for a handsome shed-load of sterling. You may think all problems and anxieties were resolved, but, like most of my decisions about finessing, WRONG.

I use the Adobe Cloud Suite for all the work for the magazine. This includes 'Muse' for maintaining the website. I was vaguely aware that Muse was not a long term member of the Adobe family but imagine my chagrin when I came to install the Cloud Suite on the new equipment when I found out that Muse was no longer available. It transpires that if you have Muse installed then it will continue to function for some time yet but it will not be updated or available as a new download. As my licence only allows two current machines I had already removed all Adobe programs from the aged laptop and thus the new one does not have the same software installed. This means, currently, when I am remote I cannot update the magazine's website.

I had always planned that at some future date to migrate to Dreamweaver (another web maintaining software from Adobe) but it is not something that can be done overnight. It frequently happens (as per this month) that I am travelling at the end of the month and not in my office and thus need to be able to finalise the magazine whilst on the road. What I am hoping is that there is some subscriber out there who has either a suggestion as to a short term fix for this situation and/or can assist in migrating the website. Should you be that miracle worker then please contact me at info@newbridgemag.com.
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Test Your Technique
with Christophe Grosset see Page 95

|  | $$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | * | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K10 } \\ & \text { K732 } \\ & 732 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| - | - | - | 18 |
| 2\%* | 2 | Pass | 4 |

You play $4 \checkmark$ from the South hand on the king of diamonds lead. West has shown a two-suiter with spades and diamonds. Plan the play after winning with dummy's $\$ \mathrm{~A}$.

## Lisbon 2019

By any standard, the first European Mixed Teams Championship was an outstanding event.

The venue was close to the airport, in an area of the City that offered a wide range of restaurants in reach of the hotel. The combined efforts of the European Bridge League and the Portuguese Bridge Federation ensured that everything ran on oiled wheels.

Apart from the prestige attached to winning a major title the prize on offer for the eight leading teams was a trip to China later in the year to contest the World Championships.

Which eight countries would carry the European flag?

## The Golden Tickets

30 teams came to Lisbon, competing for the title of European Mixed Team Champions. That would earn them (and seven others) the right to represent Europe in the World Mixed Teams Championship in China later this year.
Who would earn one of these golden tickets?
It is not easy to predict in a contest where so many of the players are World, European and National champions while others are taking their first steps on a major stage and may prove to be stars of the future.
This is how I summed things up in the Bulletin:
Austria has an experienced squad and should be in contention. Belgium is playing five-handed, which might affect their chances. Bulgaria can never be discounted, and Croatia include two World Champions. There are familiar names in the team representing the Czech Republic and Denmark, while England's team is a mixture of youth and experience, and will be one of the favourites.

Estonia is an unknown quantity, as are Finland, but then we come to France, who will certainly qualify and are my tip for the title. Germany will have something to say about that, while Greece, Hungary and Iceland may prove to be three of the 'dark horses'. Ireland might spring a surprise, while Israel has made the brave decision to play four-handed.

Italy will be in the mix, Latvia will hope for a good run and Netherlands
are sure to be competitive. Norway will be one of Scandinavia's hopes, while Poland will surely challenge for a medal. Portugal has the advantage of playing at home - will that be enough? Watch out for Romania, and the powerful Russian team. Scotland and Serbia are both teams of four, which may be a challenge in such a strong event. Spain will be optimistic, as will Sweden, who are also playing as a foursome. Switzerland will be hoping to do well, as will Turkey, who play host later in the year in Istanbul.
I asked the journalists working for the Bulletin to offer their predictions: David Bird selected Austria, Bulgaria, England, France, Germany, Poland, Russia \& Sweden; Jos Jacobs opted for Sweden, Russia, Poland, France, England, Denmark, Bulgaria, Austria and Ron Tacchi nominated Poland, England, France, Germany, Netherlands, Sweden, Russia \& Norway. I went for Germany, England, France, Bulgaria, Netherlands, Russia, Sweden \& Poland.

The smart money was clearly on England, France, Russia, Sweden and Poland, with Germany \& Bulgaria not far behind. You can judge how good we are at forecasting as the event unwinds.

The teams would contest a complete round-robin over seven days - a demanding schedule, especially for those playing four-handed.

## Round 1 Netherlands v France

David Bird watched this encounter between the favourites and another European powerhouse. (I had expected the Netherlands to be one of the front-runners, but Anton Mass told me they were not optimistic about their chances.)
When you have to report on a match of only 12 boards, the first worry is that there may not be four boards worthy of note. What self-respecting writer puts his name to: 'There was an interesting battle for an overtrick on this 2 contract'?
The Great Dealer decided to favour me and the opening match of this great new tournament was packed with interesting boards. Let's see the first one straight away.

## Board 1. Dealer North. Neither Vul.

a A75

- KJ643
- 1087
* Q9

| ^ K1096 |  | - J84 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - A10952 | N | - 87 |
| - 43 | W E | - 9652 |
| \& AJ | S | - K763 |
|  | ( Q32 |  |
|  | - Q |  |
|  | - AKQJ |  |
|  | * 108542 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Van Ipenburg | T.Bessis | Janssens | Gaviard |
| - | Pass | Pass | 1 |
| 1े | Pass | Pass | Double |

What action would you take on the North hand? It makes sense to pass $1 \checkmark$ only if you intend to pass out a subsequent protective double. Otherwise you should respond 1 NT, as I see it. Bessis judged to defend at the one-level and Gaviard won the $\checkmark 7$ lead with the queen. A second diamond winner was followed by a club switch, declarer winning with the ace. After a club to the king, declarer ran the 8 to North's ace. Declarer ruffed the diamond exit and played king and another spade to South's queen. North overruffed the club return and collected +100 for one down.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| P.Cronier | Stienen | B.Cronier | Schippers-B. |
| - | Pass | Pass | 1 |
| $1 \varphi$ | Pass | Pass | Double |
| Pass | 1NT | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Here North also passed but then removed to 1 NT . We can tell from the 3NT raise by Schippers-Bosklopper that the Netherlands duo were on the same wavelength. A spade lead would have worked well, but Bénédicte Cronier made the normal lead of the $\vee 8$, drawing the queen and partner's ace. To beat the contract now, West had to find a spade switch away from the king, giving declarer two spade tricks! The defence would then score two spades, two clubs and a heart.

This was an impossible task, of course. Declarer won the $\vee 10$ return, crossed to a diamond and played a club to the jack and queen, which won. After a club to West's ace, declarer won the $\vee 2$ return with the jack, crossed to a diamond and cleared the clubs. An overtrick was made, and the Netherlands gained 8 IMPs.

France struck back on the next board:
Are you ready for a big slam deal? It's coming, ready or not!


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Van Ipenburg | T.Bessis | Janssens | Gaviard |
| Van | 19 | Pass | 29 |
| Pass | 37 | Pass | 4* |
| Pass | 4** | Pass | 4NT* |
| Pass | 54* | Pass | 5NT* |
| Pass | 6 * | Pass | 7NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

It may look like an easy grand slam to reach, but deals where there is no trump suit to agree can be tricky. Marc Smith suggested bidding $4 \diamond$ at South's second turn, agreeing hearts, but North has several losers in spades and diamonds and might not be able to take control. I rather liked the 4 rebid. After a con-trol-bid from North, South bid RKCB.

Which suit was agreed, do you think?

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { K } 103 \\ & 96432 \\ & 109 \\ & 965 \end{aligned}$ | A AJ6 <br> - AQJ 1087 <br> - K73 <br> - 10 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  | ( 854 <br> - K <br> - A54 <br> - AKQJ72 | Bessis responded 54, showing two aces and the trump queen, so it seems that hearts were agreed. Anyway, who are we to quibble when the best contract was reached a few moments later. Well done!


| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| P.Cronier | Stienen | B.Cronier | Schippers-B. |
| - | 19 | Pass | 2** |
| Pass | 29 | Pass | 30 |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | 4* |
| Pass | 4** | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | 4** | Pass | 4NT* |
| Pass | 5** | Pass | 6\% |

Playing Precision, the Netherlands pair were not off to the best of starts when Stienen opened an 11-15 point $1 \boldsymbol{V}$. The $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ response showed various strong hands and the $2 \vee$ rebid was game-forcing. The three bids after 4 were presumably control-bids, but it was difficult for either hand to judge that the playing strength for a grand slam was present. It was another 11 IMPs to France, who now led by 29-20.

The last board of the match provided a final firework. This was the lay-out:


## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Van Ipenburg | T.Bessis | Janssens | Gaviard |
| 1\& | $4 \stackrel{y y}{*}$ | Pass | Pass |
| Double | All Pass |  |  |

What do you make of this auction? It seems to me that West does not have a re-opening double, when holding only three spades. In addition to that, should East not have bid $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ at his second turn? If West had held the expected four spades, the East/West hands might have offered a productive double-fit in the black suits.

As the cards lay, it seemed to the kibitzers that East might have judged the deal well. On a spade lead there was every chance that $4 \checkmark$ would be defeated. East found the strong lead of the $₫ \mathrm{~K}$ and I was beginning to fear that I would have to retract my harsh words about the E/W bidding. West followed with the 8 (their card says 'upside-down count on a king lead’). Perhaps fearing AJX with declarer, although West was likely to hold $\boldsymbol{A x x}$ or $\boldsymbol{J} \mathrm{xx}$ for his protective double, East switched to the $\$ 2$. West won with the J and needed to switch back to spades. No, he tried to cash the K .

Declarer ruffed with the Q and drew trumps. He then crossed to the $\star$ A and led the $\uparrow 8$. West failed to take his king and that was an overtrick. +990 for France.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P.Cronier | Stienen | B.Cronier | Schippers-B. |
| 18 | 19 | Double* | 2NT* |
| Pass | 4 | All Pass |  |

East led a club to partner's king and the $\$ 8$ was returned. East won cheaply and played back the $₫ \mathrm{~K}$. There was no way to avoid four losers and the contract was one down. France picked up 14 IMPs and won the match 43-26. It had been an enjoyable start to the championship for the 1150 kibitzers watching at our table.

Looking for a new twist I came up with this idea:

## Misdefend this Hand with Me

After years of telling the world about misplayed deals it's time to turn to another area.

## No Sense of Danger

Playing in a brand new mixed team event that offers an opportunity to advance to the World Championships I pick up this modest collection:

Dealer North. None Vul.
\& QJ
Q10876
A73
-973

After two passes, I decide to chance my arm by opening $1 \vee$. West overcalls 1NT and East, doubtless looking for a spade fit responds $2 \boldsymbol{2}$, jumping to 3NT when West rebids $2 \downarrow$. This is the complete auction:

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

Ignoring my opening bid my partner leads the $\$ 10$ :

| N | ¢ A986 |
| :---: | :---: |
| W E | $\checkmark$ J543 |
| S | - 864 |
|  |  |
| \& QJ |  |
| - Q10876 |  |
| - A73 |  |
| - 973 |  |

I take the ace, declarer following with the two, and return the seven, covered by the jack and queen. Partner exits with the $\$ 9$ and declarer wins with the king and plays the 2 for the four and jack. When declarer continues with the $\geqslant 3$ I play the seven and am somewhat disconcerted to see declarer insert the nine, which holds the trick, partner playing the two. When declarer continues with the partner takes the ace and cashes the $\$ 5$ and exits with the $\$$. Declarer wins with the ace, cashes the $\vee$ AK and the Q before playing a spade to dummy's ace, partner following with the ten, which means the $\$ 9$ is declarer's game going trick.

This was the full deal:

## Dealer North. None Vul.



## Post mortem

This was the position when declarer cashed his last heart:


North was squeezed in the black suits.
I could have prevented this by playing the $\vee 10$ on the first round of the suit. Declarer can score three heart tricks, but only by using a vital entry to dummy.

In the other room North led the $>5$ and the defenders played three rounds of diamonds, declarer winning and playing a club to the jack. When it held she played a second club and North won, cashed the 10 and exited with the $\geqslant 2$, making it easy for South to put in the $\geqslant 10$. Declarer could cross to dummy with a spade to take the heart finesse, but there was no squeeze so we lost 10 IMPs.

Only four of 30 pairs made 3NT.
At the end of day one, only three teams were undefeated, Denmark, England and Italy.

## Round 6 Russia v Switzerland

Fortified by a seemingly endless supply of the Portuguese Pastel de Nata (which has more of a ring to it than 'custard tart') Ron Tacchi was on hand to watch the play unfold in this match.

After five rounds our two antagonists were languishing adjacent in the bottom quartile with Russia one and a half VPs ahead of Switzerland. I must confess to bias here as Russia are in my pick for qualification. I can only hope commentator's curse does not come into play. Both teams need to start on an upward trend if they are to have any chance
of qualification for China.
Our first board certainly has scope for a swing.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Catzeflis | Gromov | Grey | Gulevich |
| - | $4 \uparrow$ | $4 N T^{*}$ | $5 \uparrow$ |
| $6 \boldsymbol{2}$ | $6 \uparrow$ | $7 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Double |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

North applied maximum pressure with his four-level pre-empt, which as you can see was continued throughout the auction. East's 7\& requires a lot for it to be the correct bid, either it must make or 64 must make, neither seems likely to this casual observer but then I have the benefit of seeing all four hands. The former requires no major suit loser and the second needs the ace of spades to be in the South hand and your aces not to stand up.

The lead was a diamond ruffed in dummy and then inexplicably declarer failed to ruff a second diamond and so finished two light and -500.

Closed Room


In this room, North and South were less forceful. Additionally East had a


Michaels bid available to get across her shape. After the lead of the ace of spades, declarer was able to claim twelve tricks for a massive 18 IMP swing.

The convention card is not forthcoming on the meaning of $2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ but game was reached. East led the five of spades won by the seven in dummy. The jack of hearts was taken by East who switched to a diamond and after a low card from dummy West won with the queen. The queen of clubs was taken by the ace in dummy and declarer unblocked the queen of hearts, cashed the ace of diamonds and exited with the ten to West's king. West exited with a club to declarer's king, who cashed his top hearts and led the queen of spades whereupon East surrendered an overtrick by not covering with her king. East could have got into the bulletin if she had found the double dummy lead of a club to break the contract.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dubinin | Saesseli | Ponomareva | Zikovic |
| - | - | - | $1 N T$ |
| Pass | $2 \mathbf{e n}^{*}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | All Pass |  |

The consensus in the bulletin room was that North's bid of 2NT was conservative. Declarer played safely to garner eight tricks but lost 11 IMPs.

```
Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.
4 AQ84
- }97
-92
* A863
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\]} & & - 9 \\
\hline & N & - Q532 \\
\hline & W E & - 853 \\
\hline & S & - KQ752 \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ه K } 1076 \\
& \vee \mathrm{~A} 10
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline & -KQJ107 & \\
\hline & -109 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

 or two light for the bid her hand has only five losers and those diamonds must be worth more than their six points. North also has two aces and we all know these are worth more than just eight points. Well over half of the field bid and made the spade game.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Dubinin | Saesseli | Ponomareva | Zikovic |
| - | Pass | Pass | 1 |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ |

After the natural $1 \diamond$ opening and minimum raise of the 14 response South needed no further encouragement to bid game after the trial bid from North. In spite of the 4-1 trump split the power of the diamond suit gave declarer no problem in bringing him his contract along with six IMPs.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Catzeflis | Gromov | Grey | Gulevich |
| - | - | $2 \star^{*}$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{e n}^{*}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{*}^{*}$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | All Pass |  |  |
| Multi |  |  |  |
| What's your major? |  |  |  |
| Spades |  |  |  |

The defence started with two top hearts and switched to a diamond. Declarer cashed the other diamond and drew trumps finishing in dummy. The contract now hinges on not losing two club tricks and it seems to me that there are two possible plays. Firstly, play South for the king and queen of clubs, roughly $24 \%$ a priori, or secondly play North for doubleton honour, plus the legitimate chance of South holding the KQ, K10 or Q10 which I make to be slightly in excess of $21 \%$. There is also the chance that South might be asleep at the wheel and fail to unblock with a doubleton honour, especially if the first lead of the club suit is from dummy. How to estimate that I am not sure, but both are practical chances. Here declarer simply led a small club from dummy and ducked, I am not sure for what he was hoping but it failed along with the contract.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dubinin | SaesseliPonomarevaZikovic |  |  |
| - | - | 2** | Pass |
| 4\%* | Pass | 4》* | Pass |
| 4¢ | All Pass |  |  |
| 2 | Multi |  |  |
| $4 \%$ | What's your major? |  |  |
| 4 | Spades |  |  |

North started with two top hearts and
 continued with.... the queen of clubs.
This did not exactly paralyse declarer who ducked the trick. When she continued with the ten, declarer was home and dry, holding his club losers to one. That was 12 IMPs to Russia who won 55-22 or 17.86-2.14 VPs which moved them up to fourteenth spot, less than 17 VPs behind eighth place, thus giving them hope for the matches to come.

## Round 8 Italy v England

The Undefeated
In round 8 the two undefeated teams faced off - who would triumph?

## Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul.

```
-
- K862
- QJ1042
& J1093
```


## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chavarria | Brown | Gandoglia | Byrne |
| - | - | $1 \Delta$ | Double |
| 4a | Double | All Pass |  |

South led the $\diamond$ K and switched to the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ at trick two. That was pretty much the end of the deal, declarer finishing with nine tricks, -100 .

North's alternative was to bid 4NT, looking for a minor suit game. Which would you choose? I would be inclined to look for the game, trusting partner to have nothing wasted in spades.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Osborne | Attanasio | Hinden | Manara |
| - | - | 19 | Double |
| 34 | 4 | 49 | Pass |
| Pass | 4NT* | Pass | 5\% |
| All Pass |  |  |  |



West led the $\$ 2$ and declarer ruffed and played the 9 . West could win, but there was no good move from here and declarer soon had eleven tricks and 7 IMPs, giving Italy a 4 IMP lead.

## Board 19. Dealer South. E/W Vul.



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chavarria | Brown | Gandoglia | Byrne |
| - | - | - | $1 \mathbf{~}$ |
| $1+$ | $4 \vee$ | $4 \boldsymbol{~}$ | Pass |
| Pass | Double | All Pass |  |

4』 was a wild effort. South led the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ and declarer was allowed to win with the king. He decided to play trumps and South won the second round and played a third spade. Declarer won in dummy and played a diamond for the queen and ace and South exited with 3 . Declarer got that right, but North could win and cash two hearts, so the contract was three down, -800.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Osborne | Attanasio | Hinden | Manara |
| - | - | - | $1 \star *$ |
| Pass | $1 \nabla$ | Pass | $1 N T$ |
| Pass | $4 \vee$ | All Pass |  |
| $1 *$ | $0+\star$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

East led the J and that was covered all round, declarer cashing the ace of hearts and playing a second round for an effortless twelve tricks - still 8 IMPs to England.

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

- $A 7$
- Q654
- 10973
\& 653


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chavarria | Brown | Gandoglia | Byrne |
| - | Pass | 1\% | Pass |
| $1 *$ | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 34 | Pass |
| 4, | All Pass |  |  |

Declarer lost two spades, +450 .
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Osborne | Attanasio | Hinden | Manara |
| - | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| 14* | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| 3** | Pass | 34 | Pass |
| 4** | Pass | 44 | Pass |
| 4NT* | Pass | 63* | All Pass |
| $2+$ |  |  |  |
| $4+$ |  |  |  |
| Fourth-Suit Forcing |  |  |  |
| Cue-bid |  |  |  |
| RKCB for spades |  |  |  |
| 2 key c | ds and a void |  |  |
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South led the $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{J}}$ and declarer won in hand, took dummy's $\boldsymbol{2}$ J10, ruffed a diamond, drew the outstanding trump and eventually emerged with 12 tricks and 10 not unfortunate IMPs.

Board 24. Dealer West. None Vul.


| Open Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chavarria | Brown | Gandoglia | Byrne |
| Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | Double | $2 \star$ |
| Pass | $2 \downarrow$ | All Pass |  |
| $2 *$ | Hearts |  |  |

Did North break Meckstroth's Law?
On this layout there was no stopping eleven tricks, +200 .

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Osborne | Attanasio | Hinden | Manara |
| Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | Double | Redouble |
| 2 | $2 \downarrow$ | Pass | $3 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $3 \downarrow$ | Pass | $4 \downarrow$ |

All Pass

Redouble looks a better way to treat the South hand and it resulted in a 6 IMP swing - not enough for Italy who lost 33-25 IMPs, 12-61-7.39 to leave England as the only undefeated team.

## Round 9 Norway v. Sweden, Croatia v. Greece

Before the start of Saturday's last round, Sweden were leading the field, 3.5 VP ahead of England and over 11 VP ahead of Romania. Tradition has it that any Sweden-Norway encounter would revive the eternal rivalry between the two large Nordic countries so a tight match was in sight. A little lower down the table were Croatia, in 9th position with less than a VP difference with 8th placed Poland. A big win over Greece, who had not made a good start to the event, thus would be good for their chances to make it into the top eight who would qualify for the World Championships in September.

```
Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.
4 87653
-107
|
& QJ874
```



```
Open Room
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline West & North & East & South \\
\hline Papakyriakopoulos & Sver & Kaliakmani & Borevkovic \\
\hline - & - & Pass & Pass \\
\hline 2e* & Pass & 2** & Pass \\
\hline 2** & Pass & 24* & Pass \\
\hline 34* & Pass & 4 & All Pass \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

West's was undefined strong and his 3 confirmed five hearts and four spades at least. East apparently was unsure about the system and thus the poor Greeks ended up in a strange contract. When the trumps broke 5-2, this went down five. Croatia +250 .

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zoric | Liossis | Pilipovic | Sirakopoulou |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass | $2 \imath^{*}$ | Pass |
| $2 \downarrow$ | Pass | $4 \vee$ | All Pass |

West showed a strong hand with hearts and East just bid what she hoped partner could make. Right she was...Croatia another +450 and 12 IMPs.


This auction is a typical example of the way Nordic matches are being played, I feel. The auction is pretty normal but it's the final double for just one down that makes the board worth a mention in this report. Norway an easy +200 when declarer led the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ from hand at an early stage.

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anjer | M Gronkvist | Svendsen | IGronkvist |
| - | - | $1 N T$ | $2 \boldsymbol{q}^{*}$ |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 2 |

No experiments in the other room. Two Spades was left alone and the Swedes scored a quiet +110 , losing 3 IMPs in the process.

In our other match, the same two final contracts were reached. Croatia had scored +110 in $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ in one room and had bid up to 3 in the other. After three rounds of spades, declarer started drawing trumps but North won the ace and returned a diamond. When this ran to South's $\$ \mathrm{~K}$, she had to return a heart quickly but when she failed to do so, declarer's losing heart disappeared on the 13th diamond for another +110 and 6 more IMPs to Croatia.

On the next board, we saw interesting differences in defensive and declarer plays, though at both tables in the Nordic match the contract was the same.

Board 10 was an easy slam for the Swedes.

## Board 10. Dealer East. All Vul.

- 73
- KJ87
- A 1098
- 1085
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 Clementsson had no trouble in checking for keycards and settling for the spade slam. Sweden a fine +1430 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anjer | M Gronkvist | Svendsen | IGronkvist |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| 19 | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass |
| 4i | All Pass |  |  |

Anjer, at the other table, was far less inspired opposite partner's natural GF or invitational or better spade raise and thus settled for game to lose 13 more IMPs.

A systemic uncertainty caused a big swing on the penultimate board of the Croatia v. Greece match:


## Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul.



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Papakyriakopoulos | Sver | Kaliakmani | Borevkovic |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| 10 | $1 \varphi$ | Double | All Pass |

This unexpected Greek gift did not bring them the legendary result but a rather unpleasant two adverse overtricks. Croatia thus scored an unusual number: +360

At the other table, the Croatians reached a more normal contract.
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zoric | Liossis | Pilipovic | Sirakopoulou |
| - | - | - | 1 |
| Double | Redouble | $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \downarrow$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | 3 | $3 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

With both black suits behaving well, the play presented no problems. Croatia another +140 and 11 IMPs to them.

Board 12. Dealer West. N/S Vu.
↔ A2

- 1065
- K5
- AK9654
( KQJ5
- AQJ984
- Q98

人 -


- 108764
- K732
- 107

82
The last board produced the same auction at 28 out of 30 tables. North overcalled 2 after West's opening $1 \vee$ bid and was doubled. One, two, three and even four down resulted.

The two odd tables out were in $5 \diamond$ just made and even $6 \star$, down one.
Once dummy's trumps are gone in doubled, the defence can force declarer in diamonds which will lead to down three if East leads $\forall A$ and another at an early stage and thus create a situation in which they can force declarer with repeated diamond or spade plays. This is what happened when the Norwegians were defending. As the Swedes put this contract only two down, Norway gained 7 IMPs on this final board to lose the match only 19-27 or 7.39-12.61 VP. Sweden would clearly stay top of the table.

In the other match, the result of this board was a push at 500 for down two. Croatia won 44-8 or 18.28-1.72 VP.

England looked set to go into day three without a single blot on their escutcheon until they lost 20 IMPs on the last two deals of the day against Scotland. Meanwhile Sweden opened up a commanding lead at the top.

## Round 10 Serbia v England

David Bird was at the helm for England's next match.
The England team, 2nd in the table, faced Serbia in 30th place. They were no doubt hoping for a big win, as were the (not totally unbiased) voice commentators, Marc Smith and I. Let's see who ended with smiles on their faces.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Byrne | Djuricic | Brown | Zoranovic |
| - | $2 \downarrow$ | Pass | Pass |
| Double | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

How would you play 3NT when South leads the $\vee 6$ to North’s $\vee 7$ ? You have four spade tricks as the cards lie. So, if you can score two diamonds, you will bring the total to nine. Should you win the first heart or not?

On many deals where you are missing two top cards in a suit that you will need to develop (diamonds here), it's right to duck the first heart. They continue hearts but when South takes her winner (assuming they have one top diamond each), she will have no heart to play. The flaw with that line on the present deal is that the defenders can switch to clubs, either at trick two or when South wins a with diamond honour and has no heart to play.

As I see it, the correct line is to win the first heart. Finesse the $\mathbf{~} \mathbf{J}$ next if you want, but essentially you will play on diamonds. When South wins, it will not help the defence to switch to clubs. Declarer will lose just two clubs and two diamonds.

Let's see what actually happened. Brown ducked and won the second heart. She was now going down against best defence. A diamond to the ten was allowed to win. South won the second round of diamonds and needed to switch to the 5 . She switched to the 3 and Brown was back
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in the game. North won with the 2 and returned the K . As the cards lie, declarer wins by ducking this. The defenders never score their $\star A$ and she has two clubs and four spades for the contract. When the club was won, declarer was one down.

At the other table Brock's $2 \vee$ opener was passed out. Eight tricks were made for a flat board.

Can I describe the next board without a tear coming to my eye? Let's see.

Board 14. Dealer East. Neither Vul.


| Open Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Byrne | Djuricic | Brown | Zoranovic |
| - | - | Pass | 1 |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | Pass | $2 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | $3 \downarrow$ | Double |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \downarrow$ | Double |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | Double |

All Pass
Competing with $2 \checkmark$ on the East cards is slightly risky, but England survived. North took the push to $3 \boldsymbol{e}$. There was every chance that this might be a 4-4 fit for North/South, with West staring at five trumps. Is it conceivable that East should bid again? When East's $3>$ flashed up
onto screen, I was confidently awaiting an 'Undo’ from the BBO operator (even though they have been near faultless in this tournament). No, South doubled and a few painful seconds later, England ended in $4 \diamond$ doubled. This could be five down for 1100 on a major-suit lead. The $\& \mathrm{~K}$ was led and it went four down for 800 away.

I am told that 3 showed spades and hearts. Ah yes, but North had bid spades. It was a puzzling lapse from a truly world-class player, with several gold medals in her locker.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Pepic | Brock | Parezanin | Myers |
| - | - | $2 \star^{*}$ | All Pass |

East's Ekren $2 \diamond$ showed at least 4-4 in the majors and 4-10 points. It was passed out, and went two down for -100 and 12 IMPs in the plus column. Sorry, I had to take a 5-minute break. I'm back now. Let's see Board 17.

```
Board 17. Dealer North. Neither Vul.
    & KQJ10
    * Q10
    - A92
    & A1076
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 4 A976 & & ¢ 853 \\
\hline - KJ & & - A74 \\
\hline - J764 & W E & - KQ853 \\
\hline ¢ J93 & S & 2 Q5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
    442
    ` 986532
    -10
    K K842
```

| Open Room |  |  |  | - A976 <br> - KJ <br> - J764 <br> - J 93 | 4 KQJ 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |  | Q Q10 - A92 |
| Byrne | Djuricic | Brown | Zoranovic |  | \& A 1076 |
| _ | 1NT | Pass | 2** |  | N 853 |
| Pass | 27 | Pass | Pass |  | $N=\because$ A74 |
| Double | Pass | 3 | 39 |  |  |
| All Pass |  |  |  |  | 42 |
| Brown led the 0 , after which ten tricks can be made. Declarer did not finesse |  |  |  |  | - 986532 |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & \& K 842 \end{aligned}$ | later, so a safe +140 was recorded.


| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Pepic | Brock | Parezanin | Myers |
| - | $1 \uparrow$ | 1 | $2 \downarrow$ |
| 3 | 4 | All Pass |  |

The fortunate trump lie gave England supporters some hope of a useful swing. (After a spade lead, there is a double-dummy defence involving a fourth-round spade ruff to kill one of declarer's discards).

West led a diamond to dummy's ace and now Deep Finesse likes a diamond ruff to hand. It was natural to lead a spade and dummy's $\boldsymbol{\Phi} 10$ was allowed to win. Only now did Myers ruff a diamond in his hand (mutterings of 'too late' from Deep Finesse). When declarer led a trump, West does best to play the $\uparrow$, which leads to the fourth-round spade ruff defence that I mentioned. No, she rose with the $\geqslant \mathrm{K}$ and played a club to the queen and king. A trump from declarer works well now. Myers played a spade and West went up with the ace, returning the 9 . It was essential to finesse dummy's $\boldsymbol{\$ 1 0}$ but declarer rose with the $\boldsymbol{\$}$. He then had to lose a trump and a club for one down. That was minus 50 and five IMPs away.
Prayers for a sizeable swing to England were heard rather late in the day:


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Byrne | Djuricic | Brown | Zoranovic |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \downarrow$ | Pass | $4 \downarrow$ | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ |

My co-commentator, Marc Smith, does not tend to hold back when he disagrees with a bid or play. It's not for me to repeat his words on this occasion. Let's just say that he did not admire South's initial pass. I don't always agree with him, but I do here. Does it not look like a 'normal' 1s opening?

England still sorely needed whatever IMPs they could get. South thought for a long time over the $4 \Upsilon$ raise and we were getting hopeful. No, she bid 4s and that was passed out. On the favourable lie of the cards even five of a red suit can be made by East/West.

Against 4a a heart was led to the king and ace. The and a diamond switch put the spade game one down, as expected.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Pepic | Brock | Parezanin | Myers |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \downarrow$ | Pass | $2 N T^{*}$ | $3{ }^{*}$ |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

Myers passed the South cards too, entering later with a Michaels bid. East led the against $4 \boldsymbol{d}$. With the odds seemingly in his favour, he then switched to a low heart in the search for a club ruff. Sadly for him, it was declarer who produced the $\geqslant \mathrm{K}$ and the game was made for 12 IMPs to England. They were 21-14 down and needed further IMPs from this board:

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { J8 } \\ & \text { Q } 104 \\ & \text { AJ } 1076532 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $$ | $4 W^{N}$ |  |  |
|  | - $A$ <br> $\checkmark$ A <br> - A9 <br> 298 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Byrne | Djuricic | Brown | Zoranovic |
|  | - | - | 19 |
| 14 | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| Pass | 38 | Pass | Pass |
|  | 40 | All Pass |  |

Marc Smith's blood pressure was tested again by North's first-round pass. It seemed to me that West's 3a bid was dubious too. He had six trumps, but little defence opposite a single raise. North bid $4 \boldsymbol{2}$ and we
were dreading a fifth club from South. No, we were spared such a horror (from an England supporter's point of view).

Declarer played ace and another diamond, at a late stage, and recorded +150 . Right, surely the club game would be bid at the other table. Fingers crossed!

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Pepic | Brock | Parezanin | Myers |
| - | - | - | 19 |
| 24 | 3\% | 34 | Double |
| Pass | 59 | All Pass |  |

Here West chose to make a weak jump overcall. This persuaded Brock to take two diamond finesses through East and the game went one down, for 6 IMPs away.

So, Serbia won the match by 32 to 14 . Well done to them!

## Round 11 Latvia v. Spain, Ireland v. Belgium

At the end of day 1 , Latvia had found themselves at the top of the table but after the long day 2, they had dropped to 4th. A useful win on Sunday morning saw them rise to 2nd again and from this position, they had to face Spain at the start of Sunday afternoon. This set of boards was quite interesting, I thought, so I will show you many of the deals. From time to time, I will make an excursion to the Ireland v. Belgium match, to see how the proceedings in matches between not too well-placed teams may differ (or not at all) from what happens at the top of the table.

The first difference between the two teams occurred straight on board 1. In the Ireland-Belgium match, the scheduled board 1 was fouled, so they had to play a substitute board... so much for the differences.
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Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Panadero | Romanovska | Passarinho | Lorencs |
| Pass | 1 Ne* $^{\star}$ | Pass | 1NT |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

Simple and effective. West led a spade and when dummy's $\boldsymbol{\wedge} 10$ held the first trick, declarer soon had his 11 tricks. Latvia +660 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Rubins | Gonçalves | Alfejeva | Matut |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $1 \vee$ | All Pass |  |

South's $1 \diamond$ response did not suit the North hand very well so he kept quiet, for the time being, hoping for a second chance. North's $1 \checkmark$ rebid did not suit the South hand very well either so she refrained from giving partner his much needed second chance. Eleven tricks here too but worth only +200 , so 10 IMPs to Latvia.

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A Labaere | Onishuk | V Labaere | Holland |
| Pass | $1 \mathbf{e}$ | Pass | $1 \mathbf{1}$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

No problem in getting to game for the Irish: +660 on a neutral heart lead.

```
Closed Room
```

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rigney | Dewasme | Keaveney | Dehaye |
| Pass | $1 \mathbf{1}$ | Pass | 1 |
| Pass | $1 \mathbf{~}$ | Pass | $1 \mathbf{Q}^{*}$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ | All Pass |  |

North apparently had not expected that partner would pass in a 4th suit situation that looked like forcing...two overtricks, +170 to Belgium but 10 IMPs to Ireland.

Two boards later, we had a slam.

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

|  | - A 1092 <br> - KQJ10 <br> - A542 <br> $\stackrel{A}{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $$ |  | ¢ Q7 |
|  | $\mathrm{N}^{\text {N }}$ | - 98653 |
|  | W E | - KQ7 |
|  | S | ¢ KJ9 |
|  | ¢ K854 |  |
|  | - A2 |  |
|  | - J6 |  |
|  | \& Q8632 |  |

## Open Room

West North East South PanaderoRomanovskaPassarinho Lorencs

| - | - | Pass | 1NT* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | 20* | Pass | 24 |
| Pass | 3\% | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 34 | Pass | 4『* |
| Pass | 64 | All Pas |  |


| 1NT | 10-12 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2s | Stayman |
| 4 | Cue-bid |

West led the $\$ 10$ which was the best lead but declarer made no mistake. He won the ace, unblocked the A, crossed to his $\geqslant$ A and ruffed a club. His next move was to ruff himself back to hand in diamonds but when he played dummy's top hearts for a diamond discard, West ruffed and returned a diamond for declarer to ruff. Lorencs' only chance now was that West had ruffed from a three-card holding and also that the x would appear on time. So he continued $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$ K and $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$, diamond ruff, club ruff (yes!) and the last diamond ruffed for an exciting +980.

Slam was bid (and made) four times in all. At one other table, E/W found a cheap sacrifice:.

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rubins | Gonçalves | Alfejeva | Matut |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| Pass | 1 | $1 \downarrow$ | Double |

All Pass

On the lead of the $\$ \mathrm{~J}$, this contract went only down three because the defensive communications were far from ideal. The defence could never come to its second club trick so the contract was just down three, +800 to Spain but 5 IMPs more to Latvia.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Panadero | Romanovsk | Passarinho | Lorencs |
| Pass | 19* | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | 19 | Pass | 27 |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | 30 |
| Pass | 4 | All Pass |  |

Opposite the conventional $1 \boldsymbol{2}$ (in most cases a balanced hand, 12-14 hcp) 1 already showed $8+$ hcp but the final contract was quite normal. West led a club which enabled declarer to establish a few spades for discards before drawing more trumps after using dummy’s $\vee$ A as an entry. This way, he lost a spade and just two trumps as West could not ruff the 4th spade on which declarer's last loser disappeared. Latvia +420 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rubins | Gonçalves | Alfejeva | Matut |
| Pass | $1 \stackrel{\omega}{2}$ | Pass | 1NT |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | $2 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | $3 \downarrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Well, South might well have bid $4 \vee$ over $2 N T$ and North might have bid
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$4 \checkmark$ any time but as it was, Spain had to be content with +170 only on the same club lead. Latvia scored 6 more IMPs on the deal.

In the other match, one West found the killing lead!

| Open Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A Labaere | Onishuk | V Labaere | Holland |
| Pass | 1 NT | Pass | $4 \diamond \star$ |
| Pass | $4 \vee$ | All Pass |  |

When East, on lead after the transfer sequence, led a spade to the queen, king and ace, making no less than 11 tricks had become easy. Ireland +450 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Rigney | Dewasme | Keaveney | Dehaye |
| Pass | $1 \Lambda$ | Pass | 1 NT |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | $4 \varphi$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Rigney, for Ireland, found the diamond lead away from her king. Declarer immediately won the ace and could do little else but play $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Phi}$, taking a ruffing finesse. When West took the $\mathbf{~ K}$, the defence could continue diamonds and thus declarer lost a spade, a diamond and two trumps in the end for a fully deserved +50 and 11 IMPs to Ireland.

Board 10. Dealer East. All Vul.

- AK5
-J752
- 9
- KJ953
- 98
- AQ4
- 10852
* AQ62


4 1076432

- 3
- AK743
\& 8
- QJ
- K10986
- QJ6
- 1074

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Panadero | Romanovska | Passarinho | Lorencs |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| 1 | Double | 1 | 2 |
| Pass | Pass | 4 | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | Pass | Double |

West's pass over $2 \checkmark$ denied three spades but when West also happened to hold quite the wrong cards for her partner, $5 \$$ proved just too high when the trumps broke 3-1. The "unfriendly" double gave Latvia +200 on the deal rather than +100 .

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rubins | Gonçalves | Alfejeva | Matut |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| 1e | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |
| 1NT | Pass | 3i | All Pass |

The Latvians never mentioned diamonds and thus were never in danger. With the diamonds 3-1, however, nine tricks were the maximum in spades. Latvia another +140 and 8 more IMPs.

The next deal was a matter of talking too much.

## Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul.

|  | - A63 <br> $\checkmark 1076$ <br> - K8643 <br> - K10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& } 875 \\ & \text { Q3 } \\ & \text { AQ2 } \\ & \text { A8743 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|lll\|} \hline & N & \\ W^{2} & & E \\ & S & \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { KJ94 } \\ & \text { AK942 } \\ & \text { J95 } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | © Q102 <br> - J85 <br> $-107$ <br> * QJ962 |  |

Well, 3NT looks the proper contract but in the Latvia-Spain match, both E/W pairs were in $4 \checkmark$ against silent opponents. This might have been made if declarer had at any point played a spade from dummy to the king in hand. When neither declarer did, down they went.

In the Ireland-Belgium match, one North produced an overcall with an interesting effect.

| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| A Labaere | Onishuk | $\checkmark$ Labaere | Holland |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| 1\% | $1{ }^{\text {d }}$ | 19 | Pass |
| 1NT | Pass | 3NT | All Pas |

North led a diamond to declarer's queen and declarer's next move was a low spade from hand to dummy's king. Alain Labaere had noticed the overcall and realised that he would need some luck in hearts anyway plus a quick spade trick...

Nicely done for a fine +400 to Belgium.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rigney | Dewasme | Keaveney | Dehaye |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| 1ヵ | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| 1NT | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

With no overcall to guide her, Rigney was quickly down in her 3NT when she won the diamond lead and led a spade to South's $\$ 10 .$. .Belgium another +50 and 10 IMPs to them.

On the last board, Spain collected a few IMPs when the Latvians showed too much aggression.

```
Board 12. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
- A95 \\
- KQJ8 \\
- 532 \\
- A65
\end{tabular} & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{8}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { \& Q1063 } \\
& \text { 643 } \\
& \text { Q7 } \\
& \text { QJ32 }
\end{aligned}
\]} & & ( K74 \\
\hline & N & - 9 \\
\hline & W E & - AJ 10984 \\
\hline & S & - K94 \\
\hline & - J82 & \\
\hline & - A10752 & \\
\hline & - K6 & \\
\hline & - 1087 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Panadero | Romanovska | Passarinho | Lorencs |
| Pass | 10* | 1 | Double |
| 14 | 29 | 24 | 39 |
| Pass | 4 | All Pass |  |

South's double showed four hearts but both North and South were unsure about partner's strength. Two down, Spain +200 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rubins | Gonçalves | Alfejeva | Matut |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{2}$ | $1 \downarrow$ | $1 \downarrow$ |
| Double | $2 \downarrow$ | Double | Pass |
| $2 \uparrow$ | $3 \uparrow$ | $3 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

The second-round doubles by West and East showed four and three spades respectively but East misjudged by bidding on over $3 \vee$. With the cards lying friendly for declarer, Rubins went only one down but this +50 to Spain added up to the +200 and thus gave Spain 6 IMPs to lose the match $18-46$ or $2.92-17.08 \mathrm{VP}$.
The final score in the other match: Ireland-Belgium 25-41 or 5.3014.70 VP.

## Round 12 France v Norway

The bookmakers choice for the title had struggled so far-Ron Tacchi was on hand to see if they could get back on track.

France, the bookies favourite before the start of the Championships, were languishing in sixteenth place after eleven rounds more than a full match behind the eighth qualifying spot for China. Their opponents Norway had consistently been in the top eight until the last round when they suffered a heavy loss to Scotland which dropped them to twelfth position. Both teams are in need of a win to bolster their chances of a foreign trip later this year.

```
Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul.
A A10742
\square-
-87
& KJ8754
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline ¢ 986 & N & ¢ K5 \\
\hline - K95 & N & - QJ1087 \\
\hline - J10942 & W E & - AKQ3 \\
\hline - 103 & S & - 9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
*
* }10
- AKQ3
\(\div 9\)
- QJ3
- A432
- 65
* AQ62
```

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bakke | Volcker | Harding | Frey |
| - | - | $1 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ | 4 | $5 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | Pass | Double | All Pass |

West's bare-minimum raise was mildly pre-emptive. The convention card of Volcker and Frey is the sparsest I have witnessed so I cannot tell if they a method for showing a two-suiter in this situation. The upshot of the $3 *$ bid was that the spade suit was overlooked and when South took the insurance East made a brave double. East took two diamond tricks from the off and sat back to wait for her spade king to score for a one trick set.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Cronier B | Svendsen | Cronier P | Anjer |
| - | - | 19 | Pass |
| 1NT | 2** | 4 | 49 |
| 59 | Pass | Pass | Double |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| 2 - \& \% |  |  |  |

When West bid a non-forcing 1NT it gave North the chance to show both his suits at a low level. East did his best with a bid of $4 \vee$ but that was Texas Piques as we say in France as South produced the 4a card from her bidding box. Again the French took insurance and South's double concluded the auction. Norway were not hard-pressed to cash out their three aces for a one-trick defeat and five IMPs to go with the one they gained from an overtrick on the first board.

## Board 15. Dealer South. N/S Vul.



In my book the South hand is worth an opening bid of $1 \uparrow$. North took a pessimistic view of his holding and made a pass or correct bid of $2 \vee$, which South of course passed. Ten tricks were easily taken but no game bonus.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cronier $B$ | Svendsen | Cronier $P$ | Anjer |
| - | - | - | $2 \downarrow^{*}$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |
| 24 | $8-11,6 \varphi$ |  |  |

The Norwegian pair use the multi for weak two bids and use $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ and $2 \boldsymbol{a}$ to show hands with a six-card suit and 8-11 points so North had no hesitation in bidding the game. When East led a fourth-best three of spades, declarer won, crossed to dummy with a heart and took a losing diamond finesse. East persisted with spades, ducked by declarer, who forcibly took the continuation. The queen of clubs was now led to establish the ninth
trick and with the spades splitting 4-4 the contract was safe for a gain of ten IMPs.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bakke | Volcker | Harding | Frey |
| 1P | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

West took the simple route and when South started with a fourth-best three of spades to her partner's ace, declarer unblocked the queen. North continued spades ducked to dummy's jack. The queen of clubs followed, also ducked so declarer just took her nine tricks.
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The 2 NT bid was presumably a game force and East's 3 a agreed diamonds. When no one could cue-bid spades they settled for $5 \uparrow$. North led a club and after much thought declarer played low and South's king took the trick. An equally long pause before South returned a trump and now declarer was home for a flat board. As I mentioned above is there not an inference that West does not have a spade control? A bullet dodged by France.
To make the contract declarer should rise with the ace of clubs and embark on cross-ruff lines and with careful play will make dummy's last trump en passant.

## Board 19. Dealer South. E/W Vul.



What is the best play for only one loser in the club suit? It always surprises me that leading the queen and letting it run gives you the best chance. It gives you a $76 \%$ chance of only losing one trick and about $6 \%$ to make all the tricks. As expected at this level declarer took the correct option.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Went | North | East | South |
| Cronier B | Svendsen | Cronier P | Anjer |
| - | - | - | $1 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | 1 | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $5 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $6 \boldsymbol{2}$ | All Pass |  |

After North showed a strong hand and delayed support for clubs, he settled for the small slam when his partner could not make any forward move. This declarer likewise made the correct play in the club suit but lost two IMPs for playing in a minor rather than no-trumps.

```
Board 22. Dealer East. EMN Vul.
4 A85
* A52
- J1043
* A53
```


Open Room


When North found the diamond lead declarer had no hope as he had to
lose three aces and two diamonds.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Cronier | BSvendsenCronier P | Anjer |  |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| 1e | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| 14 | All Pass |  |  |

I think West had a 2 NT bid available to show an 18-19 count but contented

herself with a simple bid of 14 which was passed out. Declarer took nine tricks with spades as trumps and six much needed IMPs.
At the end Norway had triumphed $22-9$ or 13.97-6-03 VPs which moved them two places up the leaderboard.

## Italy v Turkey Round 13

## Triskaidekaphobia

If you are in the least bit superstitious then the number 13 might hold some significance for you. At least in the odd-numbered rounds the players do not have to contend with this deal, which frequently features a disastrous outcome. Third placed Italy was looking to consolidate while Turkey was hoping to move up from ninth into one of the qualifying positions.



West led the $>9$ and East won with the jack and continued with the queen. Declarer took dummy's ace, crossed to the $\uparrow$, pitched a heart on the A and played the $\uparrow 10$, covered by the jack, queen and king, +420 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Chavarria | Kokten | Gandoglia | TAluf |
| - | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ |
| Pass | $2 N T^{*}$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

2NT was clearly some sort of game try, but it is not defined on the convention card. East led the $\vee \mathrm{K}$ and declarer won immediately, crossed to dummy with a diamond and ran the $\$ 8$. East won and played three rounds of hearts, promoting West's $\mathbf{\Phi} \mathbf{J}$ into the setting trick - a fast 10 IMP start for Italy.

Turkey halved their deficit on the next deal - it came down to guessing $\uparrow$ KJ opposite $\$ 86$ for a trick in $3 \downarrow$ and Kutuk got it right by putting up the king.
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## Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

| $$ | A AK73 <br> - KJ <br> - A1092 <br> - K72 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|lll\|} \hline & N & \\ W^{W} & & E \\ & S & \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { H J86 } \\ & \text { Q4 } \\ & 53 \\ & 5 \text { J } 109865 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q942 } \\ & \uparrow \text { KJ3 } \\ & \leftarrow \text { AQ4 } \end{aligned}$ |  |


| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Kolata | Attanasio | Kutuk | Manara |
| - | - | - | 1** |
| 19 | 14 | Pass | 24 |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | 52* | Pass | 5** |
| Pass | 5** | Pass | 64 |

## All Pass

1* $0+\star, 11-14,11+-16$ unbalanced with 5 clubs possible
5* Cue-bid
5 $\quad$ Cue-bid
$5 \downarrow$ Cue-bid
If South's 4ヵ was operating on the principle of 'fast arrival' then North's decision to look for a slam was somewhat optimistic.

East led the PQ and West took the ace and returned the five. When East followed declarer was still in the game and when the trumps broke it only remained to negotiate the diamond suit. Having pitched a diamond on the $\geqslant 10$ declarer tabled the $\$ \mathrm{~J}$ and West was kind enough to cover, +1430 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chavarria | Kokten | Gandoglia | T Aluf |
| - | - | - | 1\% |
| 19 | Double* | Pass | 2a |
| Pass | 39 | Double | 34 |
| Pass | 4** | Pass | 4** |
| Pass | 44 | All Pass |  |

West led the $\vee 2$, but declarer went up with dummy's king, drew trumps and played West for the $\downarrow$ Q +680 but a loss of 13 IMPs $-j u s t ~ t h e ~ s o r t ~ o f ~$ number you don't want to see in R13.


West's 1NT was no doubt designed to try and cut out the majors and when his subsequent retreat to was passed out he had scored something of a triumph. I leave you to ponder the merits of North bidding $4 \stackrel{\square}{ }$ over $4 \boldsymbol{\varkappa}$, or South doubling for a third time.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Chavarria | Kokten | Gandoglia | T Aluf |
| Pass | Pass | 1NT* | All Pass |
| 1NT $15-17$ |  |  |  |

East's tactical opening was a positive triumph, as South could not double for penalties and was unwilling to bid 2 to show a major. What's more it rolled home when South led the $\mathbf{Q}$, so Italy pocketed another 5 IMPs for a 24-11 win.

## That's not a Pre-empt

The great thing about movies is that they are full of memorable lines you will all have your favourites. I am reliably informed that the number one is 'Frankly, my dear I don't give a damn.' which might (or might not) be suitable for use at a mixed event. Perhaps you prefer 'I'm as mad as hell, and I'm not going to take this anymore!'

I have always liked the little exchange, where Crocodile Dundee, threatened by mugger with a switchblade says 'That's not a knife' draws a large Bowie knife, adding the line 'That's a knife.'

I was reminded of this during Round 14.
Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.

- K8743
- 105
- K53
\& 943

( QJ 10965
$\checkmark$ K
- QJ92
- Q5

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chavarra | Sver | Gandoglia | Borevkovic |
| - | Pass | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ |
| Double | $4 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass |
| Double | Pass | $5 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West gave some though to going on over $5 \uparrow$.
South led the Q and declarer won in dummy and cashed the A .
South's pre-empt and North's raise had taken away a lot of space maybe the same sort of thing would happen in the replay?

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Mestric | Vanuzzi | Brkljacic | Uggeri |
| - | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2 q}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| $4 \mathrm{NT*}^{*}$ | Pass | $5 \boldsymbol{e}^{*}$ | Pass |
| $6 \boldsymbol{4}$ | All Pass |  |  |

Here too declarer took all the tricks.
Discussing the deals at the end of the match did Brkljacic, having heard Borevkovic explain his 3s bid, retorted, 'That's not a pre-empt. $2 \vee$ - that's a pre-empt.'

## Slams Galore

Round 14 was positively awash with deals where it was possible to contemplate a slam. This one escaped the attention of most pairs:

Board 18．Dealer East．N／S Vul．
－AJ 10
－ 10952
－ 97
\＆Q1072


In the other room，Bulgaria had collected +460 in the popular contract of 3NT（reached 24 times）．

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Symonds | Karakolev | Short | Mitovska |
| － | － | Pass | Pass |
| $1{ }^{1}$ | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| 29 | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 3e＊ | Pass | 5 | Pass |
| 6 | All Pass |  |  |

I saw several players open the East hand－if you start with $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ then you would really like West to be able to reply with a forcing 3 ，when you have every chance of reaching $6 \star$ ．

Here East was content to pass which allowed West to open the bidding．
North led the $\$ 7$ and as you can see there is no losing line available． However，the question is what＇s the best line？

Suppose you win the lead and play a spade？
Let＇s say South wins and plays a second trump．Now you cross to dummy with a club，ruff a spade，ruff a club and ruff a spade．If the spades break，or someone has the doubleton AK you are home and otherwise you will need the $Q Q$ to appear on the first three rounds of the suit．My resident statistician tells me this is around $60 \%$ ．

Whichever way you look at it，it added up to a 10 IMP swing for Scotland．

## Round 14 Sweden v Latvia

David Bird reported on this top of the table clash．
This promised to be a great match to watch．Sweden was fielding four brilliant youngsters，who had occupied first place for two or three days and were now lying third．Latvia had been playing well above expecta－ tions，at one point also enjoying first spot on the leader－board．

We will not waste any writer＇s or readers＇precious time on the first three boards．This was the fourth board：

```
Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul.
                                    * J2
                                    * A8
                                    * K102
                                    * AJ10862
    & KQ87
```



```
106543
－K762
－J6
KQ7
J
－ 9873
953
A9
－Q109543
AQ54
\(\because 4\)
```

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lorencs | M．Gronkvist Romanovska | I．Gronkvist |  |
| $1 \mathbf{2} *$ | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2 v}$ |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| Polish Club |  |  |  |

The heart game was clearly a better spot，but would Lorencs find the necessary spade honour lead to defeat 3NT？He did！When the king of spades appeared on the table，East played the $\$ 3$ to show her odd count and Ida Gronkvist won with the ace．She played the 4 ，West putting in the queen，and dummy＇s ace won the trick．On the 5 East played the 5
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(would the 9 have suggested good spades?) and West won with the
When West played the $\mathbf{Q}$, declarer followed with the $\$ 9$ and the only remaining problem for the defenders was to avoid blocking the spade suit. West continued with the $\mathbf{~} 8$, and the seconds ticked by as Romanovska consider whether to play her $\uparrow 10$. What clues were available? Firstly, declarer would surely have held up the ace for two rounds if he had started with A97. Secondly, it actually says on the Latvian convention card that they lead the queen from KQx. I was not supporting either team in this match, but I do like to see justice done. Sweden had bid the wrong game and West had found a great opening lead. Surely Latvia deserved to pick up a solid handful of IMPs?

Romanovska eventually played low and overtook the next spade, putting the game one down. Well defended, indeed!

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ekenberg | Rubins | Clementsson | Alfejeva |
| $1 \mathbf{2}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | $4 \vee$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Latvia headed straight to the best contract, making +450, and scored 11 well-deserved IMPs.



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lorencs | M.Gronkvist Romanovska | I.Gronkvist |  |
| - | Pass | $3 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| $6 \vee$ | All Pass |  |  |

Watching on BBO, we could see that thirteen tricks would be made in hearts. There was no entry to dummy to finesse in hearts, but the マK would fall under declarer's ace. Although $7 \vee$ was a terrible contract, Latvian supporters had high hopes that it would be reached when Romanovska opened with a $3 \vee$ bid that is described on their card as 'destructive'.

With plenty of bidding space available, the raise to $6 \stackrel{\square}{ }$ was surprisingly unambitious. Would East not also have opened $3 \vee$ when holding seven hearts to the king-queen? The $\downarrow$ was led and declarer had 13 tricks when the $\vee \mathrm{K}$ fell on the first round.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Ekenberg | Rubins | Clementsson | Alfejeva |
| - | Pass | $2 \star^{*}$ | Pass |
| $3 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$ | Pass | $3 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| $7 \downarrow$ | All Pass |  |  |
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East's multi is billed as ‘6-card suit, 4-9 points’, and Ekenberg’s 3e was natural. When partner admitted to six hearts, West leapt to $7 \uparrow$. So, he blasted a grand opposite a weak-two, whereas his counterpart had immediately settled in six facing a three-bid!

Let's admit that both Wests were adrift in their valuation and had made virtually no use of the available space. The Swedish team was extremely fortunate to collect 11 IMPs for a final contract that deserved to lose a big number.

The cards lay well for declarer on the following board, but one East was able to give declarer a worrying moment.

We have space for one more board. Are you hoping for a big firework? Try this one for size!


Open Room

## West

North
East
South
Lorencs
M.Gr

| - | - | - | 19* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | 14* | Pass | $2 \vee$ |
| Pass | 2NT* | Pass | 3** |
| Pass | 34* | Pass | 4** |
| Pass | 44* | Pass | 5** |
| Pass | 54* | Pass | 6 |
| Pass | 7* | All Pass |  |

Like many auctions that go off the rails, the arrival of each bid grew slower as the heights were scaled. We were relying on the great Al Hollander, who was doing the written commentary, to decipher the Swedish system. The initial interpretation was that South had shown $4-6$ shape in hearts and clubs. But according to Al's notes, $3 \vee$ would not then show a diamond singleton on the side.

Whatever South was showing, it seemed to us that North was doing a lot of bidding on a rather modest hand. For a few seconds I switched to the Closed Room, to save the hand records from there. When I returned, a new interpretation had been placed on South's sequence of bids. North had read South's $3 \vee$ bid as showing $1=4=4=4$ or $0=4=4=5$ shape. This explained his exuberance in supporting diamonds.

West very wisely did not double $7 \uparrow$. Many deals have been recorded, over the years, where an unwise double caused the opponents to jump elsewhere and collect a plus score.

East led the A and the grand slam was four down vulnerable. Sadly for the brilliant young Swedish pair, some 1736 kibitzers had witnessed the event.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ekenberg | Rubins | Clementsson | Alfejeva |
| - | - | - | $1 \boldsymbol{e}$ |
| Pass | 1 | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{i}$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

The $\$ 8$ was led and twelve tricks were made for a gain of 15 IMPs. Although I don't believe in the Great Dealer, there will be those who think He placed this deal into the set to counteract the lucky Swedish gain on Board 17. Latvia won the match by 28 IMPs to 16.

## Round 15

Jos Jacobs followed these two matches involving four teams in the top eight.
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## Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.



In the Denmark v. Latvia match, we saw one interesting and one very interesting auction.

| Open Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lorencs | Krefeld | Romanovska | Hammelev <br> - <br> $1 N T$ |
|  | - | - | Pass |

North's ill-timed jump overcall solved East's problem and also shut out South. Down three, Latvia +150.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| J Henneberg | Rubins | M Henneberg | Alfejeva |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| 1NT | $2 *$ | 2 | 2 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The Danish West also opened a normal 15-17 1NT but here, North launched a Multi-style overcall in his major, which left East in the dark. From her perspective, North could hold either major. After $2 \vee$, South no doubt knew what was going on but her shot at led to a playable contract, even more so when West led a logical $\uparrow$ K. Just made, Latvia another +110 and 6 IMPs to them.

On the next board, the cards were lying well for $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$, or were they?

```
Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.
```



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lorencs | Krefeld | Romanovska Hammelev |  |
| Pass | 1 | $3 \boldsymbol{4}$ | All Pass |

When South led partner's suit, 11 tricks were no problem. Latvia +200 which looked a bad result for them.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $J$ Henneberg | Rubins | M Henneberg | Alfejeva |
| 19 | 2NT* | 3e* | 5 |
| Double | Pass | 54 | Pass |
| Pass | Double | All Pass |  |

In the replay, West found a light opening bid which enabled North to show his minors. East showed her suit by cue-bidding in North's lower suit but then took a risk by not sitting partner's double. Now, it was up to South to find the killing lead but this proved no problem for her, no doubt helped by partner's overcall. Out came the A and the ensuing ruff put the contract one down for another +200 and 9 more IMPs to Latvia..

In the Poland v. Bulgaria match, the scoreboard started moving even faster on this board.

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nanev | Zmuda | Nikolova | Zatorski |
| $1 \downarrow$ | $2 N T^{*}$ | $3 \star^{*}$ | $4 \star$ |
| Pass | $4 \downarrow$ | Double | 5 |
| Pass | Pass | $5 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| Pass | Double | All Pass |  |

When West found an opening bid, North could show her minors at this table, too, and East could show her suit by cue-bidding one of North's suits. So the Bulgarians reached the same contract as their Danish counterparts in our other match and, not surprisingly, South found the same killing lead as his Latvian colleague. Poland +200 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Kazmucha | Karakolev | Tuszynski | Mitovska |
| $2 \downarrow^{*}$ | 3 | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

Over the Polish-style two-suited opening bid by West, North could show only one of his suits and East thus simply bid what he was hoping to make. On a diamond lead by South, declarer had an easy overtrick for another +650 and 13 IMPs to Poland.

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

| a K <br> - 10842 <br> - A7 <br> - KQ6432 | - J96 <br> - Q9753 <br> - Q104 <br> \& 95 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AQ7542 } \\ & \text { AJ } \\ & 862 \\ & \text { J7 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | W E |  |
|  | S |  |
|  | - 1083 |  |
|  | - K6 |  |
|  | -KJ953 |  |
|  | \& A 108 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lorencs | Krefeld | Romanovska | Hammelev |
| - | - | $1 \uparrow$ | 2 |
| Double | 3 | 3 | Pass |

4a
Pass
All Pass

On a black suit lead, 4a might come home but when South led a diamond, declarer's hopes were gone, even though the trumps turned out to be 3-3. Denmark +100 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| J Henneberg | Rubins | M Henneberg | Alfejeva |
| - | - | $1 \Lambda$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

A much less shaky game was reached at the other table. To beat it, a diamond lead would be necessary and this would only help the defence if the suit were 5-3 (or possibly worse).

When North led a more natural heart, declarer was quick to call for dummy's ace and thus not only block the suit but also save one of his entries to dummy. When the clubs broke, he was home and dry for two overtricks when South won the first round of clubs to cash her $\$ \mathrm{~K}$. Denmark +660 and 13 IMPs back to them.

In the Poland v. Bulgaria match, both tables reached the inferior 4s.

| Open Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nanev | Zmuda | Nikolova | Zatorski |
| - | - | $1 \mathbf{~}$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | Pass |
| $2 N T$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | All Pass |  |  |

When South led a trump, declarer soon had 12 tricks. Bulgaria +680 .


When South led an inspired $\vee \mathrm{K}$, declarer could not reach his hand to draw trumps any more and thus suffered an uppercut for down one. Bulgaria another +100 and 13 IMPs back.

On the next board, the Bulgarians had a serious (and expensive) transfer misunderstanding.


Once you realise that East's $2 \diamond$ response was taken as a heart transfer, you will understand the auction. Down three for +300 to Poland with even a club slam in the E/W cards.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kazmucha | Karakolev | Tuszynski | Mitovska |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| $1 \boldsymbol{q}$ | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 3\& | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\xi}$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{\infty}$ | Pass | $5 \boldsymbol{e}$ | All Pass |

No transfer accidents here but a natural Polish auction. On a low heart lead by North, Kazmucha made all 13 tricks which was worth +640 and 14 IMPs to her team.

Board 10. Dealer East. All Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lorencs | Krefeld | Romanovska | Hammelev |
| - | - | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{a}$ |
| Pass | $3 \varphi$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{a}$ |

East's pass over invitational $3 \vee$ was alerted as showing a good suit, which looks a useful gadget. One wonders who should have taken a shot at game here...Denmark +170.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| J Henneberg | Rubins | M Henneberg | Alfejeva |
| - | - | $2 \downarrow$ | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

In the replay, North himself took an immediate shot at game and was duly rewarded when East led a heart and thus immediately gave away the 9th trick. On a diamond lead by East (can you find it??), the contract should go down six tricks for 600 the other way...

Latvia thus gained 10 IMPs instead of losing a possible 13...
Please note that $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ should also be defeated, on e.g. a trump lead.
Meanwhile in Poland v. Bulgaria:
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nanev | Zmuda | Nikolova | Zatorski |
| $2 \star^{*}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{Q}$ |  |  |
| Pass | $3 \downarrow$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\$}$ |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{Q}$ | All Pass |  |

After East's Multi, the Polish N/S duly got to the spade game. When West led a top diamond first and only then shifted to a trump, it was too late for the defence as the third possible diamond loser would go on the 13th club now. Poland +620 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kazmucha | Karakolev | Tuszynski | Mitovska |
| 2** | 24 |  |  |
| Double | Redouble | 39 | Pass |
| Pass | Double | All Pas |  |

Bulgaria reached the par result when they doubled the opponents for +200 with no legitimate game on for them. This was good for a 9-IMP loss, however. As so often, there was no justice... ©

The next board again produced big swings in both our matches.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lorencs | Krefeld | Romanovska | Hammelev |
| - | - | - | 1NT |
| 2『* | Double | 37 | 34 |
| 4930 | 44 | Double | All Pas |

After East's 10-14 1NT opening, the Danes easily got to their normal enough spade game, upon which Romanowska unveiled her unpleasant surprise. On the $\mathrm{V}^{\mathrm{J}}$ lead to the ace and a club back, this contract went down two, of course, for a useful +300 to Latvia.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| $J$ Henneberg | Rubins | $M$ Henneberg | Alfejeva |
| - | - | - | $1 \uparrow$ |
| $2 \AA^{*}$ | $3 *$ | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

West showed hearts and a minor. Against 4a, he led a diamond, which enabled declarer to escape for just one down when East had to follow suit to three rounds of diamonds. Denmark only +50 and 6 more IMPs to Latvia.

In Poland v. Bulgaria:

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nanev | Zmuda | Nikolova | Zatorski |
| - | - | - | 14 |
| $3 \boldsymbol{*}$ | $4 \boldsymbol{e}^{*}$ | Double | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ |
| $5 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Double | All Pass |  |

Nanev also showed his rounded two-suiter but with his overcall, he also launched his partner into the auction. Then Bulgarians thus managed to find the phantom sacrifice: one down, Poland +100 .


When Karakolev took his faith in his own hands, Tuszynski told him this had been the wrong decision. Same defence as in the other match: $\upharpoonright J$ to the ace and a club. Down two, Poland another +400 and 9 IMPs to them.

The final scores:
Denmark-Latvia 20-39 or 4.63-15.37 VP
Poland-Bulgaria 57-13 or 19.24-0.76 VP
Latvia had stayed at the top of the table and Poland had risen to 3rd place at the halfway point of the championship.

## Round 16 Latvia v Italy

Ron Tacchi covered the match featuring the two teams at the top of the table.

This encounter was between the two current leaders with Latvia eight VPs ahead of Italy. If they could win then they could open up a substantial lead.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chavarria | Romanovska | Gandoglia | Lorencs |
| - | 1e* | $1 \%$ | Pass |
| 1a | Pass | 2 | All Pass |

Before you analyse this deal, what is your estimate of the number of tricks to be taken by South? South found the best lead of his singleton trump. North cashed his ace and king and exited with the jack, removing all of dummy's trumps. A small heart from hand to dummy's ten was ducked by North. Declarer now essayed a small club from dummy upon which North pounced with his king felling declarer's singleton queen. North exited with the jack of clubs to dummy's ace. A small club was now ruffed in hand bringing declarer's tally to four tricks. To make his contract declarer needs to cross to dummy via the ace of spades and then make his last trump en passant by ruffing another club and exit with a spade for a heart to be led into his tenace. However the position was not clear and he decided to try the spade finesse. This was not a success. North took her king, cashed her master trump and exited with a spade to lock declarer in dummy and leave South with an unexpected three master cards. Three down.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rubins | Attanasio | Alfejeva | Manara |
| - | $1 ヵ$ | $1 \%$ | Pass |
| 1ヵ | Pass | 2 | All Pass |

A similar auction to the Open Room but with a different result. South noted North's opening bid and led her partner's suit, taken in dummy by the ace. The ten of hearts was led from dummy which held the trick, club ruff, ace of hearts cashed, heart ruff, and a diamond from table taken by North's king. He then cashed the ace and got off lead with the jack to the queen. Declarer now played his master hearts and North had the unenviable choice of ruffing and leading into the spade tenace or letting the heart win. A difference of five tricks and ten IMPs to Latvia.

Board 15. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

```
^ KQ83
- AKJ86
- A
* J92
```



The convention card does not make it clear as to the meaning of $3 \vee$, in fact it mentions every other possible response except $3 \uparrow$, but I think it is safe to say it was strong with hearts and a spade fit. How do you play after a cue-bid has been doubled? There was talk on BBO that bidding showed a second-round control of diamonds and obviously a redouble would be a first-round control. As it was a $50 \%+$ slam was bid but with the queen of hearts offside it was doomed to failure.


Here South showed a minimum, the slam was reached and foundered for the same reasons as in the Open Room.

Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.

- 532
- 9
- 986
- K109762

```
- 8
- K104
- J107432
- AJ3
```

 doubt would have selected clubs, but as it was he led the ace of spades and now it was too late when he switched to the queen of clubs. Declarer was not severely tested as he took two rounds of trumps and cashed two spades discarding two clubs from dummy and then ruffed his losing club in dummy.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rubins | Attanasio | Alfejeva | Manara |
| - | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | $1 \downarrow$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}^{*}$ | Pass | $4 \downarrow$ | All Pass |

In this room South was obviously a keen disciple of the above mentioned author's oeuvre for she unerringly selected the queen of clubs for her devastating opening salvo. Ten IMPs back to Italy now only one IMP behind Latvia.

Board 19. Dealer South. EM Vul.

- K2
$\bullet 43$
- 2
\& AQJ97632



## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chavarria | Romanovska | Gandoglia | Lorencs |
| - | - | - | 3a* |
| Pass | Pass | Double | Pass |
| 49 | 5\% | 54 | Pass |
| 69 | All Pass |  |  |
| Pre-em | pt, destructive |  |  |

One cannot criticise South's bid with respect to its meaning on the convention card. East countered with a double and West showed his strength and spade control. North now ventured into the fray with his club suit and East gave his partner a choice of suits. Could West have now bid 6 en showing her partner the club control? This might have given East a chance to be the only team to bid the grand slam. There was nothing to the play and declarer made the obvious overtrick.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | West | North | East | South |
|  | Rubins | Attanasio | Alfejeva | Manara |
|  | - | - | - | 2** |
|  | Pass | 2\%* | 34 | Pass |
|  | 5 | 6\% | 69 | Pass |
|  | Pass | 79 | Pass | Pass |
|  | Double | All Pass |  |  |
| 2 | Multi |  |  |  |
| 29 | Pass or correct |  |  |  |

In this room South started with a multi and though theoretically it gave more bidding space it did not give the same opportunity for cue-bids as in the Open Room. After East showed his heart suit West enquired as to the quality of East's trumps but North muddied the waters by introducing his club suit at the six-level. East's trumps could not have been better and so she accepted the invitation to bid slam. North was not finished and calculated that even six down would show an IMP profit. Initially on BBO it came through as $7 \boldsymbol{e}$ passed out though the error was subsequently corrected. He only lost five tricks but gained eight IMPs
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## Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul. <br> @ J9542 <br> - A103 <br> - 4 <br> - Q872 <br> 

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chavarria | Romanovska | Gandoglia | Lorencs |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | $1 \star *$ |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $3 \star$ |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{*}$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

South could not bid $2 \checkmark$ as this would have denied three spades and so a wafer thin game was reached. After East wisely chose to lead from his club sequence declarer is forced or if she ducks the defence switches to hearts, either way the contract fails

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rubins | Attanasio | Alfejeva | Manara |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | 1 |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | 2 |

All Pass

The system here allowed South to make a minimum rebid of her diamond suit and North had no reason to advance. If declarer minded her work, she was always going to make ten tricks and six IMPs.

## Board 24. Dealer West. None Vul. <br> ^ AKJ87632 <br> $\vee 10$ <br> -KQ <br> - 93 <br> 

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chavarria | Romanovska | Gandoglia | Lorencs |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | 1NT |
| Pass | 2\%* | Pass | 2** |
| Pass | 3)* | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | 49 | Pass | 5 |
| Pass | 54 | All Pass |  |
| Gazilli |  |  |  |
| 8+ |  |  |  |

When West failed to open his glorious eleven count North started with a bid of 1s and then deployed Gazilli perhaps trying to show a strong hand. Whatever the meaning the outcome was to reach a level too high and the result was two down.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rubins | Attanasio | Alfejeva | Manara |
| 10 | 49 | All Pass |  |

A simple and straightforward auction to reach the spade game. East led the six of clubs to West's ace who cashed the ace of diamonds for North's queen and East's five. There was obviously a case of 'What we have here
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is a failure to communicate' as West blithely continued with a diamond. North did not need to be given a second chance as he took his king and then crossed to dummy with a heart and disposed of his losing club on the jack of diamonds to make his contract and take 11 IMPs and the match by 38 to 19 , or 15.79-4.21 VPs. That gave Italy the lead over Latvia by nearly three VPs.

## Never Say Die

Tihana Brkljacic sent this interesting deal from Croatia's Round 15 match against Iceland.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Saevarsson | Sver | ThorsteinsdottirBorevkovic |  |
| - | - | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $2 \downarrow$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $3 \star *$ |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

In the Open Room, the auction was kind of revealing so Saevarsson found the best lead of a trump. Declarer won perforce in dummy and ran the $\star 9$, West winning with the ten and returning a spade. Declarer won in dummy and tried a low heart, East putting in the queen which declarer ruffed. The $\downarrow$ Q lost to the ace and West switched to the which made
the subsequent defence very easy, one down, -100 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Mestric | Jorgensen | Brkljacic | Palsdottir |
| - | - | $2 \downarrow$ | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | Pass | 4 |

In the closed room, auction was far less scientific $\cdot$, so the natural lead of the $\varangle$ A helped declarer. West switched to the $\geqslant$ J, covered by the queen and ruffed by declarer who crossed to dummy with a trump and played a diamond for the queen and king. A spade put declarer back in dummy and a heart ruff allowed the outstanding trump to be drawn. When declarer continued with a low club West put up the jack and when it held he continued with the 3 for the eight, nine and ace. When declarer continued with a club to the ten he was down.

Did you spot declarer's mistake?
If she cashes the $\$$ J before playing a third club East’s discard will reveal that West started with $3 \boldsymbol{4}, 2 \boldsymbol{v}$ and $5 \downarrow$ and cannot have more than three clubs!

## Misdefend this Hand with Me

## Far Sighted

Playing in the European Mixed Teams against a famous married partnership, I pick up this modest collection:

```
Dealer North. Both Vul.
& KJ65
` J65
-109
& Q983
```

When my partner passes the player on my left opens 1 NT, promising 12-14 and is raised to game, leaving us with this simple auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |
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As West has made no attempt to find a major suit fit I decide to start with the 5 and dummy is revealed:


Declarer plays dummy's seven and partner produces the queen and returns the three for my jack, declarer following with the two and ten, again withholding dummy's ace. When I play the $\boldsymbol{\wedge} \mathrm{K}$ declarer wins and plays a diamond to the king and a second diamond. Partner takes the ace and cashes a spade, but declare then claims the rest.

This was the full deal:
Dealer North. Both Vul.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { A97 } \\ & \text { K98 } \\ & \text { QJ8732 } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | Q Q843 <br> $\checkmark 1043$ <br> - A64 <br> 2 K42 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | $W^{\text {c }}$ |
|  |  |
|  | 4 KJ65 |
|  | - J65 |
|  | - 109 |
|  | - Q983 |

## Post Mortem

After trick two South knew that the spades were 4-4. If declarer held the AK and the AK there would be nine tricks, but that was clearly impossible, as declarer would hardly duck in spades, risking a perspicacious switch from say V J65 and finding partner with $\vee$ AQ10. That indicates that partner must have at least one high club and/or a high diamond. If partner has the $\Downarrow A$ and the $\vee A$ then I can safely continue with a third
spade, but if anyone has two aces it is more likely to be declarer. If she has the $\vee \mathrm{A}, \diamond \mathrm{K}$ and A then it is clear that playing a third spade will be too slow and the only hope for the defence is for me to switch to a club at trick three.

From a practical point of view, it was possibly easier for partner to work this out at trick two, but returning a spade is the type of play that it is easy to make without thinking.

In the other room West was the declarer and North led a fourth best $\Delta 3$. That should have pointed declarer to the winning line but she ducked twice and was lucky to survive when North played a third spade.

22 pairs reached 3NT-no-one was defeated.

## Round 17 Bulgaria v Sweden

This was an important match for Bulgaria, who had dropped down the table after collecting only 10.07 VP from the first three matches of the day. They could expect no favours from their opponents.

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ekenberg | Karakolev | Clementsson | Mitovska |
| - | - | Pass | 1 |
| Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | 4 | Pass |
| Pass | Double | Pass | $4 \downarrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
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East led the $\uparrow 9$ and declarer won with dummy's ace, played a heart to the ace and the $\$ 8$ to the queen. When it held he ruffed a diamond and played a second spade, East winning and switching to the Q . Declarer ducked, won the next club with the jack, cashed the $\mathbb{P Q}$ and played a spade. West could ruff, but declarer had the rest, +620 .

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nanev | M Gronkvist | Nikolova | I Gronkvist |
| - | - | 3 | Pass |
| Pass | Double | Pass | $4 \star^{*}$ |
| Pass | 4 | All Pass |  |

East led the $\$ 2$ and declarer won with dummy's ace, ruffed a diamond, cashed the $\vee$ A and then played a spade to the king. That was followed by a diamond ruff, the $\vee Q$ and a second spade. East won and returned a spade and West ruffed and played the $\mathbf{4} 3$, East taking declarer's jack with the queen. All she needed to do now was play a diamond to promote the $\mathrm{VJ}^{\prime}$, but she returned a club and declarer could win, ruff a club and draw the outstanding trump.

To be sure of making $4 \vee$, declarer must play a club at trick two! This destroys the defenders communications and creates a way for declarer to get back to hand later in the play.


South led the $\vee 10$ and declarer won with dummy's ace, overtook the $\downarrow \mathrm{J}$ with the queen and played the $\boldsymbol{\varsigma} 2$. When South followed with the three, declarer put in dummy's nine and had twelve tricks.
This was the only table where a slam was made.
I daresay that at the other tables declarer started with two rounds of spades, intending to claim as long as the suit was no worse than 4-2 and then fell back on a 3-3 club break.

That was probably declarer's intention here, but I am reliably informed that she noticed an almost imperceptible hesitation when she played the spade.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Nanev | M Gronkvist | Nikolova | I Gronkvist |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3** | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | 4 | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | 4NT* | Pass |
| 5** | Pass | 6 | All Pass |

3ヶ Transfer, game forcing
4NT RKCB
5 3 key cards
Declarer won the heart lead and cashed the A , getting the bad news, -100 and -17 IMPs.

```
Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.
- A93
- Q87
- 108732
\& K10
```



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ekenberg | Karakolev | Clementsson | Mitovska |
| 18 | Pass | 1** | Pass |
| 19 | Pass | 4 | All Pas |

North led the $\$ 3$ and declarer won with dummy's queen and played a spade for the queen and ace. North switched to the K and three rounds of the suit saw North ruff, so that was two down, -200 .


North led the $\leqslant 8$ and declarer won with dummy's queen and played a spade for the queen and ace, North returning the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ and continuing with the ten, which speeded up the play and gave Bulgaria 13 IMPs.

Board 10. Dealer East. All Vul.

- 1053
- AJ108
- K98
- J75


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ekenberg | Karakolev | Clementsson | Mitovska |
| _ | - | 1. | All Pass |

South led the 8 so that was +200 .
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nanev | M Gronkvist | Nikolova | IGronkvist |
| - | - | $1 \AA^{*}$ | 1 |
| Pass | 2 | $4 \star$ | All Pass |
| 16 | $16^{+}$ |  |  |
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That will be one of the easiest 10 IMP swings of the tournament - and it happened no less than eight times.

Sweden held on to win 33-27.

## Round 18 France v Germany

David Bird was our man 'on the spot' for this important encounter.
These two teams featured in my original 'Predicted Top 8' but both had started slowly. By the time this match started, they had gathered speed. Germany was in 8th position and France 9th. Marc Smith and I were looking forward to a well-fought match with big names in every seat.


Von Arnim surprised us somewhat with her leap to 4s and Rohowski corrected to $5 \%$. Declarer won the $\$ 3$ lead with dummy's ace, ruffed a diamond and returned to the $\boldsymbol{k}$. The $\boldsymbol{A}$ brought good news, dropping North's ${ }^{2}$, and declarer set up the diamonds with another ruff in her
hand. After drawing the last trump, she was able to discard two losers on the $\diamond \mathrm{KJ}$ and claim the contract.

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bessis | Auken | Gaviard | Welland |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | $2 \vee$ | Double | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | $3 \vee *$ | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

What should North lead? A diamond would allow her to be end-played with a subsequent diamond, forced to give the lead to West’s $\geqslant$ K. Leading the ace and another heart would allow South be endplayed in spades, forced to give declarer several club tricks for the contract.

Sabine Auken avoided these pitfalls, reaching for the PJ. Bessis won and finessed the $\downarrow$ Juccessfully. He then cashed the two top diamonds and had to concede one down. It was 10 early IMPs to Germany.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Von Arnim | Volcker | Rohowski | Frey |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | Double |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\$}$ |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | All Pass |  |

The single-jump 2a response suggested 8-10 points and a classic text-book auction carried Germany to $4 \boldsymbol{4}$. The defence of ace and another heart made the risk of a heart ruff evident. Volcker therefore played the ace and king of trumps, rather than risk a finesse either way. The Q did not fall but a subsequent club finesse was successful. +620 was safely in the bank.


I don't think 14 is enough on the North cards, even after West's 1 response. It has a whiff of the discredited 'free bid' argument, prevalent during the 50 s and 60 s in the USA. North would be entitled to bid 1 s on 5 or 6 points with four reasonable spades. I don't see that Welland can do any more than raise to $2 \boldsymbol{s}$ on this auction. Eleven tricks were made for +200 and a loss of 9 IMPs.

The next board had the kibitzers (more than 1000 at each table of this match) leaning forward. There was the chance of a rare end position.

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Von Arnim | Volcker | Rohowski | Frey |
| - | - | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | 19 | Pass | 39 |
| Pass | 5** | Pass | 5** |
| Pass | 54* | Pass | 6 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

North's 5\% was Exclusion Blackwood, with hearts agreed. Frey spent so long deciding her next bid that some kibitzers feared a misunderstanding As I see it, it's a good idea to play simple step responses to an Exclusion enquiry. Since you have less space than opposite 4NT, you need to be able to bid the first step with no useful key-card. Presumably Frey's response showed one key-card outside clubs and 5a then asked for the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$.

Six Hearts was reached and it looks as if trump holding will spell defeat. However, if declarer can reach an end position where East holds only the QUJ8, it will be possible to endplay him. On the present lay-out only a club lead can prevent a top-class declarer from landing the slam. We were all hoping for, say, a spade lead. We would then see if Volcker could find the memorable play that was necessary.

No, Rohowski led the 8 and the slam was one down.
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bessis | Auken | Gaviard | Welland |
| Pass | 14* |  |  |
| Pass | 19* | Pass | 2** |
| Pass | 29 | Pass | 2NT* |
| Pass | 3** | Pass | 3NT* |
| Pass | 4** | Pass | 4** |
| Pass | 4** | Pass | $5 *$ |
| Pass | 69 | All Pass |  |

Right, let me explain all these bids for you. (Don't blame me if the editor, Mark Horton, has to cut out my long description for reasons of space.) (I didn't, but I did mention to David that I thought the chances of anyone making $6 \vee$ were virtually zero!)
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It was an excellent auction，as you see，and again $6 \vee$ was reached． Gaviard also led a club and the much－desired end position could not be reached．

I have just looked at the results from all 30 tables and see that only one East／West pair recorded a plus score．They made 11 tricks in 3NT． Well done！Three pairs failed in a grand slam and were lucky that a small slam could not be made．
The final board of the match produced a worthwhile swing．Let＇s see it．


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Von Arnim | Volcker | Rohowski | Frey |
| Pass | $1 \stackrel{1}{2}$ | 1 | $4 \diamond *$ |
| Pass | $4 \Downarrow$ | All Pass |  |

South＇s 4 showed length in both major suits and asked North to choose a trump suit．Sorry，but I don＇t admire the bid．First of all，you can see that hearts will make a splendid trump suit，with or without support． If North has no great length in either major，you might well end in the wrong trump suit．Secondly，the bid takes up so much space，you will have little chance to investigate a possible slam．

East led a club and +450 was made．


Welland＇s 1 was a game－forcing relay．You will have to forgive me for not knowing the meanings of the bids in such a technical auction．The best guess from the system guys at this table was that and 5 asked for key－cards and side－suit kings．The bidding then ground to a halt in $5 \Downarrow$ ．

Gaviard led the $\$ 5$ to the king and West＇s ace．A trump was returned and a second trump played when declarer ducked a spade．Declarer could take one spade ruff but was down when the suit failed to divide 3－3．It was 11 IMPs to France，who took the match by 26 IMPs to 13.

## Round 19 England v Denmark

Ron Tacchi was on duty for this important match．
Both of these teams are currently in the eight qualifying spots but not occupying a podium position．Neither team has an easy run in to the end of the competition，especially England．To get into a medal position both teams will have to play at the top of their game for the next two and a half days．A good win here could be the start of a good run．

After five boards one small part－score swing and an overtrick IMP was all the excitement that was available．
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## Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

|  |  | $$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - 10853 <br> - Q92 <br> - Q109 <br> - 876 |  | $\mathrm{W}^{\mathrm{N}}$ | - 72 <br> - J10654 <br> - 4 <br> - AJ1092 |  |
|  |  | $\triangle$ A <br> $\bullet$ A <br> - K <br> \& K |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |  |
|  | West | North | East | South |
|  | Osborne | Schaltz D | Hinden | Schaltz P |
|  | - | - | Pass | 19* |
|  | Pass | 2NT* | Pass | 4 |
|  | Pass | 4** | Pass | 5** |
|  | Pass | 5 | Pass | 5** |
|  | Pass | 6 | All Pass |  |
| 120 | Strong Club |  |  |  |
| 2NT | Game forcing, 6+ diamonds |  |  |  |

When North had a means of showing a game-forcing hand with diamonds, a series of cue-bids propelled the Danes into the diamond slam. Declarer had no reason to play West for three diamonds to the queen and so failed by one trick


Yet again North had a method for showing a diamond suit. South, who was minimum for his bid did not encourage and so he rested in 4 NT . West led the eight of clubs which ran round to declarer's queen. Declarer showed good technique when he crossed to dummy with a spade to lead a diamond. When East played the four this was covered with the eight and West's nine. This secured the contract with eleven tricks and a similar number of IMPs.

| Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { K97653 } \\ & \text { J65 } \\ & \text { J7 } \\ & \text { J7 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { a } 102 \\ & \vee 1084 \\ & 109543 \\ & \& \text { Q103 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $3 \mathrm{~W}^{\text {N }}$ | - QJ8 <br> - AKQ <br> - AK2 <br> * A965 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |  |
| West |  | North | East | South |
| Osborne |  | Schaltz D | Hinden | Schaltz P |
|  | - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass |  | Pass | 2** | Pass |
| 2** |  | Pass | 2NT* | Pass |
| 32* |  | Pass | 3** | Pass |
| 34* |  | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |
| 2NT | 23-24 |  |  |  |
|  | Stayman |  |  |  |
| $3 ¢$ | No four-ca | card major |  |  |

South started with the seven of hearts which ran to declarer's queen. She then cashed the two top diamonds and exited with a diamond to South's queen who persevered with a heart to declarer's king. A small club was the next card to hit the green baize and when South interjected
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the king East was saved any further mental effort as she now had sufficient tricks for her contract.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hammelev | Brock | Krefeld | Myers |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | $2 * *$ | $3 N T$ | All Pass |
| 2*Multi |  |  |  |

Believing partner's suit to be spades South commenced with the ace and another spade to partner's king who then cleared the suit with dummy discarding a small heart. Declarer now knows that should North regain the lead that the contract will fail. She can either play for South to have three diamonds (or North singleton honour) and the king of clubs or to make three club tricks. Both of which work on the actual layout. Declarer embarked on a different route, cashing her five red top honours before exiting with a diamond. South won this trick and cashed his now established thirteenth heart and perforce had to exit with a club. Declarer's dilemma was that with this approach there was a decision to make, but it was not her day. She chose the ten and when North produced the jack she was booked for one down and 12 IMPs in the out column.


Denmark vs. England: The Open Room

## Board 10. Dealer East. All Vul.



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Osborne | Schaltz D | Hinden | Schaltz P |
| - | - | 19* | 19 |
| 24* | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| 34* | Double | Redouble | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | 4 | Pas |
| 5 | Pass | 6\% | All Pass |

After South's bold interference, a series of forcing bids from West meant that the small slam was reached. South led a small spade to the queen and ace. Declarer now cashed the ace and then the king of trumps before cashing three rounds of diamonds discarding the losing spade. After conceding the outstanding queen of trumps she claimed. Declarer should have started with the K as if South held all four trumps he would have only three red cards and be able to ruff a diamond before the spade could be discarded.
 after his partner had opened the bidding. After a diamond lead declarer was under no pressure and so cashed the ace of trumps and finessed against the trump queen in the North hand, playing the pre-emptor for shortage. The overtrick gave Latvia an overtrick IMP.

At the end of the match England had won by 24-9 or 13.45-6.55 VPs not enough to deliver a resounding blow but it kept both teams in qualifying positions.

## Round 20 England v Latvia

A quick check of the cross-table before the start of play revealed that England had a tough run in, having to play six of the teams in the top eight, including the current top four. Having lost to Norway, they then did well to defeat Denmark but then had to face Latvia.

## Board 13. Dealer North. All Vul.



## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Byrne | Romanovska | Brown | Lorencs |
| - | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\psi}$ | All Pass |  |  |

Is it deals like this that have made Gazzilli popular? Well, I suppose East might have raised to $3 \uparrow$.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rubins | Osborne | Alfejeva | Hinden |
| - | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| $3 \boldsymbol{4 \varphi}$ | Pass | $4 \downarrow$ | All Pass |

A painless eleven tricks and 10 IMPs.

```
Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul.
                            @ J4
                            * K653
- A64
K K872
```



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Byrne | Romanovska | Brown | Lorencs |
| - | - | $4 \vee$ | All Pass |

South led the $\mathbf{2} 10$ and declarer went up with dummy's ace, pitched a
 dummy's top spades pitching a diamond and then ran the $\geqslant 7$, South winning with the jack and playing a spade. Declarer ruffed and cashed the $\geqslant$ A. When South showed out it is clear declarer should play on clubs simplest is a club to the jack, but she continued with the $\mathbb{P}$ and North won and switched to the $\downarrow$ A. Declarer ruffed, drew the outstanding trump and played a club to the jack. North won and exited with a diamond, forcing out the last trump which meant there was a club to lose at the end, 11 IMPs for England,

Just in case you don't know, in isolation the best line in the trump suit is to play low to the queen, which delivers six tricks $55.95 \%$ of the time.


## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Byrne | Romanovska | Brown | Lorencs |
| - | - | - | 19* |
| 19 | Double* | 39 | Pass |
| Pass | Double | Pass | 34 |

West led the A and continued with the six. There is way to make nine tricks now by ruffing, cashing the $\mathbf{~} \mathbf{K}$ and playing on clubs, but in practice declarer pitched a diamond on the second heart and East won and now made the mistake of playing a third heart. Declarer ruffed in hand pitching another diamond from dummy and played two rounds of clubs followed by the two top spades, soon claiming nine tricks and +140 .


North led the 3 and South took the ace and switched to the $\$ 3$ for the jack and ace, North cashing the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ and then playing the $\$ 9$. Declarer won and drew trumps, had to lose two spades and a diamond,-500 and 8 IMPs for England.

England picked up 6 IMPs when they stopped out of 3 NT with a combined 24 count - right they were, as perfect defence would have defeated even 2NT.

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



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Byrne | Romanovska | Brown | Lorencs |
| - | 10 | 30 | $6 \%$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

I'm surprised South did not ask for key cards but it was a regulation +1460 when West did not lead a diamond.


Why did South run to 6NT? I sent Ron Tacchi to find out, but as anticipated, he failed to get an answer. My vote would be for a redouble, which rates to bring in either 12 or 14 IMPs.

As it was Latvia pocketed 17 IMPs and took the lead by a single IMP.

```
Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.
                            & A109863
                            \bullet 76
* KJ 103
&4
```


Open Room


That was a missed opportunity, but it's not easy to suggest a route to $6 \boldsymbol{8}$ facing what might be a doubleton.


Do you think West should double 3e to show length in the suit? I'm not sure it would help much. 12 tricks in both rooms gave England a couple of IMPs.

Only 6 pairs found a route to slam, five of them playing in clubs.


With a nasty hand to lead from East went with the $\downarrow$ A, West following with an encouraging two. When East continued with the $\$ 9$ declarer won with the king, played a heart to the jack and then ran the queen of clubs. With diamonds breaking she soon had nine tricks, +400 .

Was there any way for East to find the essential spade switch at trick two?

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Rubins | Osborne | Alfejeva | Hinden |
| Pass | Pass | 1NT | All Pass |

I'm not certain this was the auction, but declarer went one down which meant England lost 8 IMPs and the match, 35-30. They dropped to eighth and now had to face the leaders, Sweden.

## Misdefend this Hand with Me

## Signal Failure

We are nearing the end of the European Mixed Teams Championship when I pick up these cards:

```
Dealer West. All Vul.
4 A84
* Q8765
- }54
& }10
```

When the dealer passes my partner opens $1 \vee$, which promises a limited hand with at least four hearts. East overcalls $2 \diamond$ and with a nod to Larry Cohen I raise to $3 \uparrow$. West comes to life with a double and when my partner passes East bids 4e. When West continues with 4a everyone passes, leaving us with this auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | $1 \%$ | 2 | $3 \boldsymbol{q}$ |
| Double | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | All Pass |  |  |

Partner leads the 9 (3rd and 5th) and dummy is revealed:


I play the queen and declarer wins with the ace and plays the $\downarrow 6$. My partner takes the ace and switches to the 3 . When declarer plays dummy's four I put up the ten and declarer wins with the king, ruffs a heart, pitches a heart on the $\diamond$ K and plays the $\mathbf{\Phi}$. That runs to partner's king and he exits with a club. Declarer wins with the jack, ruffs a diamond and plays the $\boldsymbol{\$ 9}$. I win with the ace and play a heart, but declarer ruffs and plays the Q , claiming when we both follow. This was the layout:


## Post Mortem

There were several ways to defeat this contract (a trump lead for example) but after the early play it was asking a lot for partner to switch to a spade after taking the $\vee$ A. The club switch was fine, but I should have risen with the A and played a second club. That way I will score a club ruff. I should have got that right, but partner might have given me a wakeup call by following to the second round of hearts with the king rather than the four. That would be a clear indication that he held something useful in spades.

## A Little Vigorish

Terence Reese and Roger Trézel wrote a series of instructional books, one of which was entitled Those Extra Chances in Bridge (Incorporated into Imaginative Cardplay by Master Point Press).

If anyone ever writes a sequel this deal might be included.

```
Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.
```



In the other room Zmuda and Zatorski also reached $6 \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and after a diamond lead declarer drew trumps and ran the Q . West won and exited with a low heart and declarer won and lost a second club - a $76 \%$ chance that failed.

Here East led the $\$ 10$ and declarer won, drew trumps and then played three rounds of hearts, ruffing, before running the E . West won, but was now endplayed.

Seven of the eight who went down in failed after a diamond lead. Four lucky declarers received a club/heart lead, which simplified matters.
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## Round 21Romania Italy, Sweden England

Jos Jacobs covered the last round of the day.
The luck of the draw once again was with us because two matches between teams within the top eight were scheduled. Sweden had gone back to the top of the table and Romania had been doing well all week already, no surprise because their team consists mainly of established partnerships who have also been playing in the national Open Team in recent years.

Right on the opening board, the fireworks were lit:
Board 1. Dealer North. None Vul.


North showed spades and a minor, Polish style.
On a forcing defence, 4 4 would have been defeated easily but $5 \checkmark$ was not down immediately when North led the $\mathbf{\Delta Q}$ and shifted to...the $\boldsymbol{\&} \mathrm{A}$. Declarer ruffed, crossed to the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and led a diamond up. When the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ won the trick, she ruffed a spade in dummy and shed two of her losing diamonds on the KQ before exiting with a diamond. South had to win this and could return a trump to set the contract. It would not have helped declarer to exit in clubs, throwing her last diamond on it, as South would
(could?) have ruffed this trick in front of partner and returned her last trump. One down, Romania +50.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| G Mihai | Vanuzzi | R Mihai | Uggeri |
| - | 24* | Double | 2NT* |
| 39 | 4* | 49 | 49 |
| 5 | Pass | Pass | Double |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The Italians took the longer route to $4 \boldsymbol{d}$ but at this table, too, West took the (phantom) sacrifice. South doubled, which looked O.K. but a slight variation in the sequence of plays occurred. North led the $Q \mathrm{Q}$ and continued the rather than the create the same position as in the Open Room. Declarer ruffed, ruffed a spade but then, she first cashed het two top clubs for diamond discards before leading a diamond off dummy. South, unsure of the situation, rose with the ace and that was all declarer needed. Romania another +650 and 12 IMPs to them.

In the other match, the English took the right decision when 4a came along.

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Byrne | M Gronkvist | Brown | I Gronkvist |
| - | Pass | 1980 | Pass |
| 19 | 14 | $3 \%$ | 34 |
| 4 | 49 | Double | All Pass |

The forcing defence led to an easy down two: England +300 . Please note that North never showed his clubs.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ekenberg | Brock | Clementsson | Myers |
| - | Pass | 1 | Pass |
| 19 | 2** | 24 | Double |
| Redouble | 38 | Double | 34 |
| 4* | Pass | 4 | Double |
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In the replay, too, North did not open but showed her two-suiter at a later stage. When North, no doubt influenced by partner's double, led the A, declarer had an easy road to ten tricks. Sweden thus scored +590 and registered their first 7 IMPs of the match.

\section*{ <br> - KQ872 <br> - QJ87 <br> - A <br> Q62 <br> Open Room <br> | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manara | lonita | Attanasio | Stegaroiu |
| Pass | Pass | 1 NT | $2 \boldsymbol{n}^{*}$ |
| Pass | $2 \star^{*}$ | Double | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | 4 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |}

South showed majors with $2 \boldsymbol{*}$ and 2 already suggested some values, so South did not have to bid more than $2 \boldsymbol{s}$ initially. The rest was easy. Romania +650 when East returned the K , sort of his only chance after winning his first heart trick.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| G Mihai | Vanuzzi | R Mihai | Uggeri |
| Pass | Pass | 1 NT | Double* |
| Pass | $2 \star$ | Pass | $2 \star *$ |
| Pass | $2 \star$ | All Pass |  |

As both North and South were a little unsure about partner's values, game was missed by the Italians, though South's $2 \diamond$ confirmed the majors. Italy +170 but 10 more IMPs to Romania.

| Open Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Byrne | $M$ Gronkvist | Brown | I Gronkvist |
| Pass | Pass | $1 N T$ | $2 \boldsymbol{2 0}$ |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | 4 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

For the Swedes, $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ also showed majors but when North showed some interest, game was easily reached. One overtrick on the same defence as in the other match, Sweden +650 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Ekenberg | Brock | Clementsson | Myers |
| Pass | Pass | $1 N T$ | 2 ** $^{*}$ |
| Pass | $2 * *$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2 *}$ |

South showed his majors but N/S did not solve the strength issue here either. England +170 but 10 IMPs to Sweden who led 17-0 now.

## Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul. <br> 

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manara | Ionita | Attanasio | Stegaroiu |
| - | Pass | Pass | 1 NT |
| $2 \star *$ | Pass | $2 \downarrow^{*}$ | Pass |
| Pass | Double | $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ | $3 \boldsymbol{\$}$ |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{a}$ | All Pass |  |

West's $2 \diamond$ showed one major but on this auction, E/W subsided. Romania +620 on a heart lead but a club lead would not hurt declarer.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G Mihai | Vanuzzi | R Mihai | Uggeri |
| - | Pass | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | 2NT* | $3 \downarrow$ | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ |
| 5 | Pass | Pass | Double |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

With the clubs behaving well for declarer, +300 was all the Italians could get, so Romania scored another 8 IMPs.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manara | lonita | Attanasio | Stegaroiu |
| Pass | 19 | Pass | 14. |
| Pass | 1NT | Pass | 2** |
| Pass | 2 | Double | 24 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

South's 2 was the modern transfer to $2 \star$, showing an invitational hand later on. After North's opening bid, it was difficult for East to show his red two-suiter. That's why only four N/S pairs stayed as low as $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ and also why only four E/W pairs reached game in diamonds and made it, two of them even doubled. Romania +110 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| G Mihai | Vanuzzi | R Mihai | Uggeri |
| Pass | $1 \mathbf{1}$ | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ |
| Pass | $1 N T$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\imath}$ | All Pass |  |

The Romanian E/W never entered the auction but they collected +150 when West led the 10 on which dummy put up the Romania thus scored 6 more IMPs.
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On the next board, we again saw two entirely different auctions at the two tables of the Romania v. Italy match.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manara | Ionita | Attanasio | Stegaroiu |
| - | $3 \boldsymbol{y}$ | Pass | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | All Pass |  |  |

When the pre-empt ran to her, Manara bid what she hoped she could make.
With four losers in the side suits, $4 \boldsymbol{\text { w }}$ would have gone down anyway but the Romanians found an elegant defence. North led the $\vee 2$ and thus duly got his two club ruffs when South returned her 2 at trick two. A joy to watch, Romania +100 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G Mihai | Vanuzzi | R Mihai | Uggeri |
| - | Pass | Pass | $1 \mathbf{e}$ |
| $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{e r}$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ |
| $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ | All Pass |  |  |

When North did not pre-empt, E/W were in a position to judge better at what level they should stop bidding. Just made, Romania another +140 and 6 more IMPs to lead 43-0 at this point.

## Board 10. Dealer East. All Vul. <br> 

No matter whether East opened $1 \boldsymbol{2}$ or $1 \uparrow$, South led a club at most tables against the normal contract of 3NT. North wins the ace and now has to return a spade to defeat 3NT. If North continues clubs, declarer has all the time in the world to establish the hearts and get to 9 tricks.

Only against a Czech and a Russian defender 3NT was defeated after a club lead. At two other tables South took his fate into his (her) own hands by leading a spade honour. Italy's Uggeri was one of them (the other one being Serbia's Jovana Zoranovic) and this way, he collected a much-needed swing of 13 IMPs for his side to make the final score 43-13 or 17.4-2.6 to Romania.

On the next board, the ambiguous lead of the $\vee \mathrm{J}$, which might also show the ace or king in the suit, caused trouble for one declarer.

```
Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul.
    & K5
    * A4
    - AKQ96
    * 10863
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline - A1098 & N & @ J74 \\
\hline - 972 & & - KJ106 \\
\hline - 843 & W E & - J75 \\
\hline - K97 & S & - QJ2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
- Q632
- Q853
- 102
- A54
```

In the Romania $v$. Italy match, both declarers had called for dummy's $\because Q$ when East led a heart honour and thus had come to nine tricks. In the Sweden v. England match, the Swedish declarer ran into trouble by winning the equally ambiguous $\vee$ J lead with his ace and returning a low heart immediately to dummy's eight. When West produced the $\uparrow 9$, there was no way back. When the English declarer also put up the PQ on the $\uparrow$ J lead by East, England had won 10 IMPs to still lose the match 11-17 or 7.99-12.01 VP.

## En Passant

Early one morning I spent a few minutes watching a series of Blitz chess games between World Champion Magnus Carlson and Russian Grandmaster Peter Svidler (Magnus won 5-0). Then in Round 23 I spotted this deal:


West led the A and East followed with the That was not easy to read and West cashed the K before switching to the K . When that held she continued with the 9 and declarer ruffed in dummy and played the $\geqslant$ J. West won and played another club, ruffed in dummy. Declarer cashed the $\vee \mathrm{K}$, played three rounds of diamonds, ruffing, drew the last trump and cashed the Q , East taking the setting trick with the A .

Do you see how declarer could have prevailed?
Having ruffed the third club declarer plays three rounds of diamonds, ruffing, cashes the Q pitching a diamond, ruffs a club and plays a diamond, picking up East’s 9 . A neat variation on the en passant rule in chess.

They made $2 \downarrow+1$ in the other room, so Germany picked up 5 IMPs instead of losing one.
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## Round 23 Germany v Switzerland

Ron Tacchi took up the conductor's baton for this encounter.
With Germany resting in tenth place with six matches to play it was important for them to score a substantial win against Switzerland who were in penultimate place. However to assume it would be an easy match could be folly as Switzerland had won one in three of all their previous encounters.

## Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.



Both East and West seemed to view their hands through rose tinted glasses and arrived in 3NT. North was not strained to find a double and it will not surprise you to know that the contract failed by one trick.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Von Arnim | Grey | Rohowsky | Catzeflis |
| - | - | $1 \mathbf{2}$ | Pass |
| 2e* | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3e | All Pass |  |  |

Here it seems a more reasonable contract was reached rather than the 3NT in the other room, but when the defence found their heart ruff it failed by two tricks. The Double in the Open Room flattened the board.

```
Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.
                            @ J1076
                            ` J1054
            - }98
            & K10
\begin{tabular}{|ll|}
\hline & \\
\hline & \\
& \\
& \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
- KQ9
AQ96
- Q4
\& A982
- A2
- K832
- KJ653
\& Q4
```

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Abou Chana | Auken | Thompson | Welland |
| All Pass | - | - | 1NT* |
| 1NT 14-16 |  |  |  |

Welland 'found' a point and opened his hand with a $14-161 \mathrm{NT}$. On the lead of a club declarer was booked for three down but the defence lost its way in the middle-game and gave up a trick, but it was still two down, 100 to Switzerland.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Von Arnim | Grey | Rohowsky | Catzeflis |
| - | - | - | $1{ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| Pass | 19 | Double | 2 |
| 2 | Pass | 3** | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

South opened a more conservative One Diamond. I am not privy to the East/ West methods but West's bid of 24
 would show a stronger hand in my partnership. The upshot was a delicate 3NT. South could have got his name into the bulletin by leading the king of diamonds - the only card to guarantee the failure of the contract. I will leave you and my finessing friend to see why that particular lead works. At the table he found the more natural lead of a heart which went to the jack and queen. Declarer cleared the clubs and North continued the attack in hearts, ducked twice by declarer but South persisted with the suit and it was finally taken by declarer, who continued with the nine and another club leaving him in dummy. The winning line is not to cash the last club but to play a spade - if he cashes the last club he has no good discard - in effect he squeezes himself - instead he plays a spade. If North does not split his honours then the nine forces the ace and if he does split declarer covers and South can give declarer his ninth trick in either diamonds or spades as he sees fit. Since declarer can place the ace of spades and king of diamonds in the South hand, there are not many other options available. Unfortunately for declarer he persisted with the fifth round of clubs and thus finished one down giving four IMPs to Switzerland.

## Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul. <br> - A32 <br> - 1084 <br> - Q5 <br> * AK642 <br>  <br> - KJ84 <br> - J5 <br> - 10642 <br> 753 <br> , Q1097 <br> -AKQ9632 <br> A <br> 88

Open Room

|  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Abou Chana | Auken | Thompson | Welland |
|  | Pass | 1\% | Pass | 14* |
|  | Pass | 1NT | Pass | 2** |
|  | Pass | 2V* | Pass | 3** |
|  | Pass | 3)* | Pass | 34 |
|  | Pass | 3NT* | Pass | 4\%* |
|  | Pass | 4NT* | Pass | 5\%* |
|  | Pass | 5** | Pass | 6** |
|  | Pass | 6 | All Pass |  |
| $2 \vee$ All Pass |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Minimum |  |  |  |
| 3 | lengthens ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |  |  |  |
| 30 | Optional RKCB |  |  |  |
| 3NT | Reject |  |  |  |
| 4* | RKCB |  |  |  |
| 4NT | 2 keys, no queen of hearts |  |  |  |

After five rounds of bidding even Al Hollander was beginning to be unsure as to the meaning of all the relays and responses. However, they finally arrived in the good contract of $6 \vee$. On the lead of the queen of clubs declarer had enough entries to test the clubs to be 4-3 and thus not have to guess how to play the spades.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Von Arnim | Grey | Rohowsky | Catzeflis |
| Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | $1 \downarrow$ | $1 \downarrow$ |
| 3 | Pass | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | 4 | All Pass |  |

Some very aggressive interference by East and West seemed to put the opposition off its stroke and they subsided into $4 \vee$, making the same twelve tricks but losing 13 IMPs.

```
Board 10. Dealer East. All Vul.
@ 2
` J94
* AQJ65
* Q943
* N7543 N KJ1086
Q10 N 『 752
-K2
* J862
    S
    ` 752
    - }1097
    & K
A AQ
` AK863
- }8
* A1075
```

| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Abou Chana | Auken | Thompson | Welland |
| - | - | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | 2** | Pass | 2** |
| Pass | 3\% | Pass | 4 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| 2* 3ヶ, 9-13 |  |  |  |
| 2. $4+\boldsymbol{e}$, slan |  |  |  |

As usual we are indebted to Al Hollander for his explanation of the sometimes tortuous auctions of Sabine and Roy. As he pointed out there are thirteen tricks as the queen of hearts is doubleton, both the kings of
diamonds and spades are on side as is the singleton king of clubs. A probability I vaguely estimate to be less than $0.2 \%$. So you will need to play this deal at least another 500 times before you make the grand slam! Or just once more if Karapet from the Griffins Club is defending.

Welland played with the maximum of safety and made ten tricks.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Von Arnim | Grey | Rohowsky | Catzeflis |
| - | - | Pass | 1NT |
| Pass | $3 \mathbf{a}^{*}$ | Double | $4 \downarrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| 3. 1354 |  |  |  |

Surprisingly the cold grand slam was also not found at this table. Switzerland gained two IMPs when they brought home twelve tricks.

After twelve boards Germany had won 26-8 or 15.15-4.85VPs.

## Round 24 Latvia v Turkey

Latvia who had performed superbly so far were looking for a win to keep up their chase for the title, while Turkey need one to maintain their hopes of a top eight finish.

Board 15. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

- AK84
$\bullet$ A
- QJ743
* AJ8



| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Gur | Rubins | M Aluf | Alfejeva |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| $2 \downarrow$ | Double | $4 \vee$ | Pass |
| Pass | Double | Pass | $5 \$$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Would you have found the diamond lead?
When West led a heart declarer won perforce with dummy's ace, crossed to hand with a club, ruffed a heart with the A, drew trumps and played a diamond, soon able to claim,+600 and 11 IMPs.

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

```

    4 A764
    ```
    4 A764
@ & A764 
@ & A764 
\ & A764 
\ & A764 
    &2
```

    &2
    ```
```

Board 22. Dealer East. ENWVU.

```
Board 22. Dealer East. ENWVU.
4 KQ5
- AKJ843
- }108
-9
```



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lorencs | Kutuk | Romanovska | Kolata |
| $2 \mathbf{n}^{*}$ | $2 \psi$ | $2 \boldsymbol{3}$ | $3 \psi$ |
| Pass | $4 \psi$ | All Pass |  |

East led the and switched to the 10 , declarer winning with the ace, cashing the $\vee \mathrm{A}$, crossing to the $\geqslant \mathrm{K}$ and playing a diamond. West took the ace and returned a diamond and declarer won with the king and played a club. It would not help East to ruff, so she pitched a spade and declarer ruffed, ruffed a diamond and exited with a heart, forcing East to lead into dummy's spade tenace for a well played +420 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gur | Rubins | M Aluf | Alfejeva |
| 1\% | 19 | 14. | $2 \downarrow$ |
| 3\% | 4 | All Pass |  |

East led the K and switched to the $\$ 4$, West winning with the ace and returning the six to declarer's king. He ruffed a club, played a spade to the ace and ruffed another club as East pitched the $\$ \mathrm{~J}$. When declarer tried to cash the $₫ \mathrm{~K}$ West could ruff with the $\geqslant 2$ and declarer had to go
one down for a loss of 10 IMPs.
It was unlucky, but cashing the $\downarrow \mathrm{K}$ first would have saved the day. 6 declarers failed to make $4 \vee$.

Latvia won 27-18, maintaining their challenge for the title.

## Round 25 France Romania, Poland Russia

When the last round of the penultimate day got underway, Jos Jacobs was in the chair. Romania were 2nd and France 4th in the table. Poland and Russia were 5th and 7th respectively, So once again, two tense matches looked in prospect. When the first board hit the table (or the wall, for that matter), one could only hope that the tension would mount as the players had strong 6-6 and 7-5 distributions to deal with.

```
Board 1. Dealer North. None Vul.
    & J1092
    * }108
    & 1042
```



In the France v. Romania match, both South players let the opponents play $6 \checkmark$ which makes, even if South leads the $\boldsymbol{s}$. When the trumps proved to be 3-0, you have to test spades first and thus will find out that the long spades are with the long trumps. So you ruff out the spades and take the trump finesse thereafter. Without the lead, you will thus make an overtrick, as Nathalie Frey did for France.

In the other match, there was a big swing.

| Open Room |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q83 } \\ & \text { Q } 972 \\ & \text { A974 } \\ & \leqslant \text { K96 } \end{aligned}$ | - J1092 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |  | - Q84 |
| Stegaroiu | Bessis | Ionita | Gaviard |  | - 1082 |
|  | Pass | 180 | 4NT* |  | A AK6 |
| Double | Pass | 6 | All Pass |  | $\checkmark$ AKJ1065 |
| Somewhat to my surprise, South showed her strong minor 6-6 only once, so she conceded -980 in spite of her $\downarrow$ K |  |  |  |  | :3 |
|  |  |  |  | . 7 |
|  |  |  |  | - |
| lead. With the contract already in the bag, declarer did not bother about the |  |  |  |  | - KQJ653 <br> - AQJ875 |
|  |  |  |  |  | overtrick.


| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Kazmucha | Gromov | Tuszynski | Gulevich |
| - | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | 4NT* |
| Pass | $5 *$ | 5 | $6 \&$ |
| Double | All Pass |  |  |

Opposite partner's $5 \star$, the $\downarrow$ A looked a useless card so Kazmucha took the penalty at the six-level already. Down two, Poland +300 but 12 IMPs to Russia.

Board 3 was an easy enough grand slam, as far as grand slams are easy at all. It was missed at about half the number of tables in play.

On the next board, one team might be in game at both tables.
Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.
( K8632
$\downarrow 3$

- AJ4
- K754

```
@ 105
\ KJ72
-KQ65
    & 1092
\begin{tabular}{|ll|}
\hline\(W^{2}\) & \\
\hline & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

- $A$

```
- A109864
- 1032
- QJ974
- Q5
- 987
\& A63
```

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stegaroiu | Bessis | lonita | Gaviard |
| Pass | Pass | 19 | Pass |
| 2\% | 24 | 3 | 34 |
| 4 | All Pass |  |  |

Vulnerable, $4 \Upsilon$ is a reasonable contract but not on this diamond layout. One down, France +100.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Volcker | Balint | Frey | Marina |
| Pass | 14. | 29 | 2NT* |
| 34* | Pass | 4 | 49 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| 2NT Spade | port |  |  |

South took the sacrifice against the heart game, only to find out that it was "phantom" after all. One down, France another +100 and 5 IMPs to them.

| Open Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Dubinin | Zmuda | Ponomareva | Zatorski |
| Pass | 1ヵ | Pass | 2NT* |
| Pass | 4 $\boldsymbol{A}$ | All Pass |  |
| 2NT | Spade support |  |  |

In the other match, the Poles bid their spade game without any intervention and East led the $\boldsymbol{2}$. Declarer won the $\boldsymbol{N}$ in hand and led a spade to East's ace. Back came the $\boldsymbol{j}$ but declarer took dummy's ace, drew the last trump and played a heart from her hand. West won, cashed the $\$ 10$ and exited in hearts but declarer ruffed and, rather than shedding a diamond on the 13th club, crossed to dummy with a trump and led a diamond to the jack in her hand. West did not split so the jack held the trick and only now, Zmuda shed a diamond loser on the 13th club for her contract. Poland +620 !

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Kazmucha | Gromov | Tuszynski | Gulevich |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \downarrow$ | $3 \downarrow^{\star}$ |
| Double | $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ | All Pass |  |

Disciplined bidding by the Russians led to the fine score of +140 to them but still a loss of 10 IMPs.

```
Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.
    - AK2
    - KQ85
    - A
    \& K10853
```



| Open Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stegaroiu | Bessis | lonita | Gaviard |
| - | - | Pass |  |
| Pass | 10 | Pass | $1 \mathbf{1 0}$ |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | $3 \mathbf{0}$ |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | 3NT |

The French ended up in the second-best contract and West led a natural diamond to dummy's ace. Declarer went on to misguess the jut, rather than returning another low diamond, West tried to find her partner for a diamond lead through declarer and thus shifted to a heart. This proved not good enough because declarer won the $\vee \mathrm{K}$ and continued clubs. East won the 3 rd round of the suit but when he continued the $\downarrow \mathrm{J}$, declarer simply covered with the queen to block the suit for the defence. France +600 .

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volcker | Balint | Frey | Marina |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{i}$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{*}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{*}$ |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{*}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{i}$ | Pass | $5 \boldsymbol{i}$ |

East led a diamond to declarer's ace. Balint's next move was a club to dummy's nine, so with the spade finesse also wrong for her, she had to concede one down. France another +100 and a somewhat lucky 12 IMPs to them to lead 24-0.

Another big board came next:


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stegaroiu | Bessis | Ionita | Gaviard |
| 19* | $1{ }^{\text {d }}$ | Pass | 19 |
| 1NT | 24 | Pass | 3\% |
| Pass | 49 | All Pass |  |

In spite of West's Strong Club, the French were soon in their legitimate $4 \oplus$. France +420 .
 and 11 more IMPs to France to lead 35-0 now.


- AQJ42
- K1096
- 64
$\div 42$


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stegaroiu | Bessis | Ionita | Gaviard |
| - | - | Pass | 1 |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Double | Pass | 2 |
| $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | All Pass |  |

Opposite South's opening bid, North raise to game was more or less automatic. So was the defence for one down. Romania +100.

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volcker | Balint | Frey | Marina |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| 1NT | $2 \boldsymbol{2 *}$ | Pass | 2 |
| $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

South did well not to open the bidding but showed some interest by bidding $2 \star$ when partner showed her majors. When North abstained, South's 34 was more than enough. Just made, Romania a disciplined+140 and 6 more IMPs to them to lose the match 12-35 or $3.82-16.18$ VP.

In the other match, they had the same problems. One South opened the bidding, the other South did not and thus won the board. Here are their auctions:

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dubinin | Zmuda | Ponomareva | Zatorski |
| - | - | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{N}^{*}$ |
| 2a | Double | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | 4 | All Pass |  |

One down, Russia +100.
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kazmucha | Gromov | Tuszynski | Gulevich |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| 1NT | $2 \boldsymbol{\omega}^{*}$ | Pass | 2NT |
| 3\& | Pass | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ |

North showed his majors, South showed some interest but North stayed quiet. Russia +140 and 6 IMPs to them as well, to win the match 20-11 or 12.9-7.1 VP.
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## Round 26 Russia v Germany

For the first match of the last day David Bird was carrying the torch.
Hats off to whoever decided that a European Mixed Teams championship would be good idea! It has been a wonderful success. At the start of the final day, only 2 VPs separated the teams in 8th, 9th 10th and 11th place. With 80 VPs to be contested, there was bound to be plenty of great action.

Marc Smith and I took our seats to watch the clash between Russia (6th) and Germany (8th). We had not seen a dull set so far in the week and I was hoping for some exciting boards worthy of a place in my final bulletin report.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Von Arnim | Gromov | Rohowski | Gulevich |
| - | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2 a}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{a}$ | All Pass |

It seemed that declarer would have some work to do here. North probably held the two minor-suit aces for his opening bid. The $\downarrow \mathrm{Q}$ was onside but declarer might need a diamond discard on dummy's clubs to have a chance. Gromov, who had opened with a Precision natural 2*, led *. He then put declarer to an immediate guess by continuing with the 2 . Should she finesse or not?

Several factors might deter declarer from a finesse. North was perhaps more likely to lead a club from an ace-high suit than one headed by the ace-queen. Secondly, if North did hold AQxxxx, might he not worry that declarer had started with a singleton and that a second club would allow a free finesse? Thirdly, if declarer could bring in the trump suit without loss, she could afford to lose two diamonds but could not afford to risk losing a second club trick.

Von Arnim called for dummy's $\boldsymbol{\$ K}$ and was rewarded by the sight of South's $\&$. She played the A and finessed the J successfully, North showing out. She continued with king and another trump, South winning and switching to a diamond. Declarer played low and North’s $\star$ A appeared. It was a fine +620 for the German scorecard.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Dubinin | Auken | Ponomareva | Welland |
| - | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $1 \downarrow *$ |
| $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \downarrow$ | $3 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |  |

North opened at this table too, and the $1 \diamond$ response showed hearts. Auken led the $\vee 3$ against the spade game, and the game could not then be made (except by double-dummy play). Dubinin won with dummy's king. After the $\boldsymbol{A}$ and a finesse of the $\mathbf{\Phi}$, declarer played a club to the jack and queen. A club to North's ace was followed by a second round of hearts. Declarer ruffed the good $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ to reach dummy and led the $\boldsymbol{2} \mathrm{K}$, ruffed and overruffed. He had to lead diamonds from his hand and was three down for a loss 14 IMPs.

## Board 14. Dealer East. Neither Vul. <br> - AK82 - 6 <br> - Q1072 <br> \& AJ 105

| Open Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Von Arnim | Gromov | Rohowski | Gulevich |
| - | - | $2 * *$ | $3 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ |
| $4 \boldsymbol{q}^{*}$ | $6 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ | All Pass |  |

East's $2 \star$ showed either a weak-two in a major or 24-25 balanced. The $4 \checkmark$ response was pass-or-correct and North had to guess how many clubs to bid. Testosterone won the day and the small slam was reached. How would you play the slam when the $\uparrow 3$ is led?

Facing a natural $2 \downarrow$ opening, Von Arnim would probably have led a heart. Here she did not know which major her partner held. Spade length was slightly more likely, since she held one fewer cards in that suit. The $\$ 3$ appeared on the table. How should Gulevich play? Since she would have only one discard on dummy's diamond suit, she decided to run the lead. When the $\$$ won, she drew trumps and claimed the slam.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Dubinin | Auken | Ponomareva | Welland |
| - | - | $2 \star^{*}$ | Pass |
| $4 \star *$ | Pass | $4 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| Pass | Double | Pass | $5 \star$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

## 2. Multi

4. Bid your suit, no slam interest

Welland did not overcall at this table. North was able to enter with a take-out double of $4 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$, but it was hardly possible to reach $6 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ after this start. (Nor perhaps would they want to be in six on these cards.)

West led a heart, won with the ace. Welland drew trumps in three rounds and then... led the $\boldsymbol{\Phi}$ ! He read the lie of the spade suit as $4-1$ after West's $4 \diamond$ response, and it was twice as likely that East would hold a singleton 10 or 9 , rather than a singleton queen. The jack, queen, king and 9 completed a heavily laden first round. A subsequent finesse of the $\$ 8$ then demonstrated how the slam could be made even without a spade lead. Russia clawed back 11 IMPs.

```
Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
- AK76 \\
- 6 \\
- K732 \\
\& J 1054
\end{tabular} & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{8}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 98543 \\
& \text { 42 } \\
& \text { QJ965 } \\
& \text { K }
\end{aligned}
\]} & & ¢ J \\
\hline & & - QJ1074 \\
\hline & W E & - 10 \\
\hline & S & - A98732 \\
\hline & 4. Q102 & \\
\hline & - AK985 & \\
\hline & - A84 & \\
\hline & \& Q6 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Von Arnim | Gromov | Rohowski | Gulevich |
| - | 1 | 2NT* | Double |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{*}$ | Pass |
| Pass | Double | All Pass |  |

East entered with the Unusual No-trump, with the vulnerability against him. You will have your own opinion as to whether this was justified. It's not fair for us to criticise the bid merely because it happened to end expensively on this occasion.

Gulevich doubled to show interest in defence. Von Arnim had no wish to express a preference for one suit or other immediately. Once in a blue moon North might rescue her with some bid or other. In any case, she had no desire to play the hand! Rohowski could have redoubled if he held equal length in his suits (also to let partner know that he didn't want to play the hand either).
 Gulevich passed 3e and Gromov was able to double on the North cards.

South led the A , switching to the 6 . A heart went to the queen and king, South then cashing the $\mathbf{q}$. At this stage the dummy could safely have been dispatched to a nearby wastepaper basket. Declarer was four down for the loss of 1100.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Dubinin | Auken | Ponomareva | Welland |
| - | 120 | Pass | 14* |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 29 | Pass | 24 |
| Pass | 39 | Pass | 3NT |

The opening bid of $1 \boldsymbol{e}$ suppressed any suicidal tendencies that Ponomareva might otherwise have had. Welland employed his 1s game-forcing relay response and $3 N T$ was reached. West led the $\$ 6$ to the 10 and ace, won the Q with the king and took tricks with the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ and $\Downarrow \mathrm{J}$. A spade switch went to the jack and queen. Declarer then had nine tricks for +400 . Russia gained 12 IMPs.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Von Arnim | Gromov | Rohowski | Gulevich |
| - | - | $2 \star^{*}$ | Pass |
| $3 \mathbf{n}^{*}$ | Pass | $4{ }^{*}$ | Pass |
| 4 | All Pass |  |  |

I have said many times during BBO commentary that many players overbid facing a weak-two opening. Of course, it depends on your style of weak-twos. In Europe they are generally played as destructive - often on a 5 -card suit. In the USA they are a trick and a half stronger, nearly always with a 6 -card suit. USA teachers recommend that their students should hold two of the three top honours! This may provide useful information to your partner on the odd occasion when you pick up such a hand. Meanwhile, you are giving your opponents an easy ride whenever you pass with a lesser suit.

Marc Smith, my fellow commentator during this tournament, has been known to rebuke his partner (after a wayward defence) with: 'How could I possibly hold five spades? I didn't open a weak-two!'

Right, back to this deal. Von Arnim rated her hand as worthy of a game-try and bid an invitational 3e. I assume that the bidding could still stop at the three-level but Rohowski jumped to $4 \diamond$, a transfer to hearts. Was his hand much more than a minimum, with a singleton in partner's main suit?

Declarer won the lead and discarded a spade on the $\boldsymbol{\sim}$, South ruffing. A spade to the ace was followed by another club, South overruffing the $\$ 6$ with the $₹$ J and returning a trump. North won with the ace and played another trump. Declarer still had to lose two diamond tricks and was three down. She had encountered an unfavourable lie of the cards, I concede.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lorencs | Volcker | Romanovska | Frey |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| $1 \downarrow$ | Pass | $1 \Delta$ | Pass |
| $2 \vee$ | Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |

When West opened $1 \checkmark$ in Precision style, East quickly lost part of her interest in a possible slam. Twelve tricks, Latvia +690 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bessis | Rubins | Gaviard | Alfejeva |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| 19 | Pass | 23 | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 3\% | Pass | 4* | Pass |
| 5\% | All Pass |  |  |

The French easily found the club fit but apparently, West thought he had done enough already by opening the bidding at all. Here too, East cannot have been pleased with her heart void. Thirteen tricks when the clubs broke: France +640 but a possibly unexpected 2 IMPs to Latvia.

It could still be worse, however. Look at what happened in the Italy v. Poland match.

## Open Room

West North East South KazmuchaAttanasioTuszynskiManara

| - | - | - | Pass |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | 12* | 17 |
| Pass | Pass | 20 | Pass |
| 27 | Pass | 29 | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |
|  | 12 Polis | Club |  |

When West passed in second position,
 South could overcall $1 \checkmark$ over the Polish Club. This made life rather difficult for the Poles who just settled for 3NT and scored +690 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Vanuzzi | Zmuda | Uggeri | Zatorski |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | Pass | $\mathbf{1 e}$ | $1 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | Pass | Double | All Pass |

At the other table, Zatorski as South also overcalled $1 \vee$ but he did not get away with it so easily. West led the $\checkmark \mathrm{K}$ and then shifted to the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and another, a play that certainly helped declarer's cause. When West later ruffed some of partner's natural spade tricks, the contract went down just one for the remarkable score of only +200 to Italy but 10 IMPs to Poland. The Poles must have been very surprised to find out, afterwards, that they had gained a double-figure swing on this missed slam

In their match against Turkey, Sweden gained a 12-IMP slam swing when they reached 6* as E/W.

More slam troubles on the next board:

## Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lorencs | Volcker | Romanovska | Frey |
| $1{ }^{*}$ | $3 \times$ | 4\% | Pass |
| 4** | Pass | 4** | Pass |
| 59\% | Pass | 6 | All Pas |

Over the nasty 3 overcall, Romanovska could bid a natural $4 \boldsymbol{2}$ but when she raised to $6 \diamond$ immediately rather than suggest either minor as a possible final denomination, declarer was confronted with a 5-1 trump break which proved too much for him. Down two, France +100 .


Rubins overcalled just $2 \vee$, which gave more than enough room to E/W to investigate and thus reach the proper denomination, albeit at an inferior level. Still, France scored +940 which was worth 14 IMPs to them.

As I already said about the previous board: in their match against
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Turkey, Sweden gained a 14-IMP slam swing (this time) when they reached $6 \boldsymbol{*}$ as E/W

In the Italy v. Poland match, neither side solved the problems posed by North's $3 \vee$ overcall. The board was a push at $6 \star$, down two.

The penultimate board of the set was another slam.
Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul.
a AKJ 10

- AK8652
- K

2 K 10

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $$ | N | ¢ 76 $\bullet 7$ |
|  | W E | - J96432 |
|  | S | * Q965 |
|  | ( Q85 |  |
|  | - J103 |  |
|  | - AQ7 |  |
|  | * AJ43 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lorencs | Volcker | Romanovska | Frey |
| - | - | - | 1\% |
| Pass | 19 | Pass | 1NT |
| Pass | 2** | Pass | 29 |
| Pass | 39 | Pass | 39 |
| Pass | 4NT* | Pass | 5** |
| Pass | 7NT | All Pass |  |
| Game |  |  |  |

Knowing about three-card heart support without the queen, Volcker nevertheless opted for the absolute maximum. When declarer won the spade lead in dummy and cashed the AK , she was quickly one down when East held on to all her clubs in the end. Latvia a much needed +50 .

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bessis | Rubins | Gaviard | Alfejeva |
| - | - | - | $1 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | Pass | 1 NT |
| Pass | $2 *$ | Pass | $2 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | Pass | 5 |
| Pass | $6 \downarrow$ | All Pass |  |
| 2* Game forcing |  |  |  |

The Latvians reached the normal contract, just made when declarer lost a trump trick. Latvia thus gained 14 IMPs to lose the match 16-40 or $3.63-16.37$ VP. France would stay firmly in the hunt but because Sweden got 18.54 VP against Turkey, the French deficit went up to 17.5 VP now with two to play, among them the France v. Sweden encounter in the final match...

In our other match, Poland beat Italy 28-6 or 15.99-4.01 VP. As a result of this, Italy dropped to 9th with two to play and England climbed back into the top eight.

## Play or Defend

The first deal of the penultimate match looked like this:

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{5}{*}{\[
\]} & \begin{tabular}{l}
- A73 \\
- AJ10 \\
- Q65 \\
- K982
\end{tabular} & \\
\hline & & \\
\hline & N & \(\stackrel{\text { - }}{\bullet}\) \\
\hline & W E & - 1087 \\
\hline & S & * QJ10764 \\
\hline & - J962 & \\
\hline & - KQ863 & \\
\hline & - KJ92 & \\
\hline & * - & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 19 | Pass | $1 \%$ |
| $1 \Phi$ | Double | Pass | $3 \%$ |
| Pass | 4 | All Pass |  |

Almost everyone found a rout to $4 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ - do you prefer to play or defend?

Suppose West leads a trump. Declarer wins and, assuming the diamonds behave can see nine tricks. A tenth trick might come from a lucky
 position in the spade suit. You might be able to ruff a spade, but that relies on the defenders not being able to play three rounds of trumps.

Let's say declarer plays a diamond at trick two, West winning with the ace and playing a second trump. Declarer wins in dummy and can now play two more rounds of diamonds. When the suit breaks one winning line as the cards lie is to draw the last trump and play a low spade from dummy, hoping that East's probable singleton is the K,Q or 10.However, this would fail if East's singleton is a small card A stronger line is to leave the trump outstanding and simply play a spade to the ace. On the actual hand declarer can then duck a spade to West, executing a neat endplay. Even if East does not contribute an honour declarer can continue with a second spade. West wins, but cannot prevent declarer from ruffing a spade.

Even better is to cover West's spade - if it is the five and East has the four, playing the $\$ 7$ will get you an overtrick. Most of the time it will not matter who has the third heart.

Here is what would happen on the actual layout:
East would win the spade with the queen and exit with a trump. Declarer plays a club from dummy and pitches a spade from hand. Assuming East has taken the trick declarer ruffs the next club and cashes the two red winners squeezing West in the black suits.

The three declarers who went down in $4 \vee$ must be kicking themselves.
A few days after the event, John Carruthers dropped me a line about this deal:

Just looked at "Play or Defend" in the final Bulletin. As it happens, it looks to me as if four hearts is cold - just reverse the dummy.

Win the trump lead, ruff a club and lead a diamond.
(i) If West wins to lead another trump, win in dummy and ruff another club. Lead a diamond to the $Q$ and ruff another club (A falls); lead a spade to $A$, draw last trump, cash K run $\leqslant$ for 11 tricks. (ii) So West must duck the $\downarrow$. Ruff a club, lead a yourself, ruff a club, to A, draw trumps, cash \&K (or not). Knock out $\forall A$, but keep Jx of spades to prevent the run of the suit. West can win $2 n d \geqslant$ to lead a third (you had to discard one to keep Jx of ) and make the last 2 spade tricks, but that is 10 tricks anyway.

At worst, declarer makes 6 trump tricks, 2 diamond tricks, a spade and a club.

Or, if you don't cash the $\boldsymbol{\aleph}$ K, West either lets you make $3 \diamond$ tricks or $2 \star$ tricks and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$.

As I replied to John, having written up so many deals where a dummy reversal was missed, it was suitably humbling to overlook one myself!

## Round 29 The Race to China

This was how the top of the table looked going into the last round:

| 1 | SWEDEN | 376.43 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | LATVIA | 349.96 |
| 3 | FRANCE | 349.29 |
| 4 | POLAND | 339.11 |
| 5 | DENMARK | 330.77 |
| 6 | ENGLAND | 329.16 |
| 7 | ROMANIA | 327.52 |
| 8 | ITALY | 326.00 |
| 9 | RUSSIA | 321.16 |
| 10 | CROATIA | 311.24 |

With the title decided, the question remained, who would secure one of the coveted spots in the World Championships in China?

Sweden, Latvia \& France were safe, and Poland and Denmark were well placed, but England, Romania and Italy would be hoping that things went their way. It was eight from ten.

Sweden were playing France, Latvia faced Croatia, Poland and England were in opposition, Denmark had to take on Norway, Romania met Turkey, Italy were up against Germany and Russia were tangling with Bulgaria.
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## Here's the timeline:

17.08 England drop 5 IMPs to Poland thanks to an extra undertrick in $2 \checkmark$ doubled and drop to seventh; the same thing happens to Russia and Croatia:
17.25 Romania trail Turkey 4-11 and are down to eighth, but they are on 335.64 to ninth placed Russia's 329.78. Croatia are losing 7-0 and on 320.47.

## Board 3. Dealer South. EN Vul.



## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kazmucha | Hinden | Tuszynski | Osborne |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| 18* | Pass | $1{ }^{*}$ | Pass |
| $1 \%$ | 29 | 29 | Pass |
| Pass | Double | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 3\% | All Pass |  |
| Polish C |  |  |  |


| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Myers | Zmuda | Brock | Zatorski |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{i}$ | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

England are +150 and -460 to lose 7 IMPs but they are back up to sixth on 335.71 to Italy's 335.64.
17.33 Romania are back on level terms with Turkey and move up to sixth while England drop to eighth, only 4.83 ahead of Russia.

```
Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.
\(\Perp 43\)
+1098753
+ AK8
- 98
```



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kazmucha | Hinden | Tuszynski | Osborne |
| - | Pass | 1NT | $2{ }^{*}$ |
| Pass | $2 \downarrow^{*}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| $3 *$ | All Pass |  |  |


| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Myers | Zmuda | Brock | Zatorski |
| - | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{*}^{*}$ | $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | $2 \downarrow$ | Pass | Pass |
| $2 N T$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Double |
| 3 | Double |  |  |

You can't prevent nine tricks in diamonds so England get 8 IMPs back and move back to sixth.
17.43 Board 6: Romania fail in a 3NT that Turkey make to lose 10 IMPs and fall to eighth. However, Russia are not putting any pressure on the teams above them as they trail 2-9. Italy are 6-1 upon Germany.
18.05 A succession of easy to bid and play games is just what the leading teams want to see and it looks like Russia are going to be unlucky.
18.09 Sweden have beaten France 26-17 to cap a brilliant performance. Latvia are looking good for second while Poland have an outside chance of depriving France of third place.
18.15

## Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul.

- 107543
- J 1063
- AQ7
\& J

| - A62 <br> - Q74 <br> - 954 <br> * AK82 |  | 4 Q8 <br> $\checkmark 2$ <br> -KJ1063 <br> \& Q7543 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4 KJ9 <br> $\checkmark$ AK985 <br> - 82 <br> \& 1096 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kazmucha | Hinden | Tuszynski | Osborne |
| - | - | - | $1 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | 3e* | All Pass |  |
| 3. Limit raise |  |  |  |

There are nine tricks, +140 .
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Myers | Zmuda | Brock | Zatorski |
| - | - | - | $1 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | 4 | All Pass |  |

West cashes a top club and switches to a diamond so England score 5 IMPs and are safe.

The last board is another dull game which Poland miss, England win the match, France finish third and Russia \& Croatia are left to try again in two years time.

Sanna Clementsson, Simon Ekenberg, Ida \& Mikael Gronkvist claimed the first European Mixed Teams Bridge Championships for Sweden, a remarkable achievement for a team playing four-handed. With an average age of under 24, the future of Swedish and European bridge is in safe hands. The runners-up were Latvia, who secured their first ever medals in a major event another extraordinary performance from a foursome, Jelena Alfejeva, Martins Lorencs, Maija Romanovska \& Karlis Rubins. Third place went to France, Thomas Bessis, Philippe \& Bénédicte Cronier, Nathalie Frey, Daniele Gaviard \& Frederic Volker.

The medallists were joined by Poland, England, Denmark Italy and Romania. We wish them all the best of fortune in China.


## 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.
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## 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 1NT, natural responses after an overcall, etc. with corrected exercises).
- Card play: 17 topics (defence in a trump contract, squeeze*, etc.
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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.
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- English ACOL system.
- French 5-card major system.
- Polish system.
- Nordic system.
- NBB Standard system.
- $2 / 1$ 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.
- $\quad$ 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


## asasex FUNBRIDGE

## Misplay These Hands With Me

## A Technical Tragedy

Playing in the Mixed Pairs in Juan Les Pins (one of the many fine French Festivals that take place each summer) I pick up a good-looking hand:

```
* A64
` J
* A872
& AKQ103
```

With both sides vulnerable I open $1 \%$ and when partner responds $1 \vee$ I continue with $2 \downarrow$. Partner bids a fourth suit $2 \boldsymbol{\Delta}$ and I decide to jump to 3NT. That elicits a leap to $6 \boldsymbol{2}$. I briefly consider converting to 6 NT , but as any making slam is usually a good score in a big field I let matters rest. This has been our uncomplicated sequence:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | $1 \%$ |
| Pass | $1 \%$ | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | $2 \omega^{*}$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| Pass | $6 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | All Pass |  |

West leads the nine of clubs and I get a sound dummy:

```
4 K82
    - A742
    * KQ9
    * J65
    A A64
    ` J
    * A872
* AKQ103
```

I win the opening lead in hand and take a second round of trumps to which both defenders follow. With eleven tricks on top, I need to hope the diamonds will break or that I can ruff a diamond in dummy.

I cash dummy's king and queen and play a third round. If East ruffs this trick I will subsequently be able to pitch a spade on the ace of diamonds and a spade ruff will be my twelfth trick. However, East follows and when I play the ace it is West who ruffs, leaving me a trick short.

This was the full deal:
K82

+ A742
- KQ9
$-J 65$
Q1093
- K1098
- 65
987

J75

- Q653

J1043

- 42

A A64

- J
- A872
- AKQ 103

Post mortem
Declarer's play was reasonable, but once both opponents had followed to the second round of trumps there was a stronger line available, one that is frequently missed - a dummy reversal. Declarer crosses to the ace of hearts and ruffs a heart. Dummy is entered twice with diamonds for two more heart ruffs and then the king of spades allows declarer to draw the outstanding trump.

Notice that an initial diamond lead would thwart this plan.
In 6NT declarer would have to get the ${ }^{\mathrm{T}}$ J past West’s king, when a non-simultaneous double squeeze can be developed.

## Lack of Finesse

My partner in a two-session pairs is a scientific player with more than one world title to her name. Towards the end of the second session, I pick up:

```
& AQJ98
`765
-K6
& K43
```

East, the dealer at favourable vulnerability opens $3 \uparrow$. Despite the obvious risks involved I overcall $3 \boldsymbol{A}$ and my partner bids $4 \diamond$ which I take to be a cue-bid in support of spades. When I bid 49 partner bids 5*. I show my diamond control with 5 and partner bids $5 \vee$. I think it must be right to show further interest so I try $6 \boldsymbol{\mathcal { E }}$. Now partner bids $6 \uparrow$. No doubt partner is hoping I will be able to bid $6 \vee$ but when I bid 6s she lets matters rest, leaving us with a long auction.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | 3 | 34 |
| Pass | 4** | Pass | 49 |
| Pass | 5\%* | Pass | 5** |
| Pass | 5** | Pass | 69* |
| Pass | 6** | Pass | 64 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West leads the nine of diamonds and dummy is about what I expected:

```
& K1076
- AQ42
A4
* AQ6
4 AQJ98
` 765
K K6
& K43
```

Given that I did not bid $4 \vee$ over $4 \diamond$ partner might have saved some time by jumping to 64, but I did say she was the scientific type.

There are eleven tricks on top and the heart finesse will get me up to twelve. After winning the opening lead and drawing trumps (they break

2 -2) I play a heart to the queen. When East wins with the king, I have to lose another heart and am one down.

The full deal:


## Post mortem

Declarer was far too hasty. After winning the opening lead and drawing trumps, the best line is to cash the ace of hearts and eliminate the minor suits ending in hand. When declarer plays a heart to the queen East wins, but must return a diamond providing declarer with a ruff and discard.
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Currently the hottest ticket around is one that will gain you entry to a showing of Aces \& Knaves, a documentary that takes you into the world of bridge. It focuses on world-class players, scandals and the fierceness of competition.
The popular misconception that bridge is strictly for the older generation is debunked as it is revealed that bridge is a battle for supremacy between a microcosm of the millions who play every day, encapsulating inventors, lawyers, musicians, scientists, Wall Street Wizards and students.
In part, the film reveals the story of the individuals who worked tirelessly to expose the dishonest play by two world-class pairs that put bridge into the headlines all around the world.
Aces \& Knaves combines vintage stills and old movie footage with coverage of international tournaments. An original score by Bessie winner and STOMP veteran Nicholas Van Young and striking animation and graphics by Lucien Harriot compliment the look, the sound, and the beautiful imagery woven throughout the film.
Following a recent showing at the ACBL Nationals in Memphis, the film is an official selection at the 2019 Boston International Film Festival.
Aces \& Knaves is a must see for every bridge player, but it will also be enjoyed by those who have never held a hand or cards. Bridge is a mirror to the human spirit at its best and worst. Like life, it's about the cards you're dealt and how to make the best of them.
"A gem! Humorous, frank, and personal. A story that even non-bridge players will find entertaining and completely accessible." ACBL Bulletin
Aces \& Knaves premieres at the Boston International Film Festival on Saturday, April 13th, 2019, at 11am at Cambridge College (500 Rutherford Avenue). Tickets available at www.bifilmfestival.com
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## Deals that Caught My 5ye

David Bird looks at some big swings from the 2019 Norwegian Premier League.

Several countries in Europe run a Premier League. It's a beneficial outing for their top players and sometimes (as in England) used as a qualifier for international matches and tournaments. We will take a look at some recent big swings in the Norwegian Premier League, hoping to assess fairly the balance between blame, credit and luck.

OSLO I faces ROGALAND I on the first two deals.
Board 10. Dealer East. Both Vul.


| Open Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kristoffersen | Thoresen | E.Berg | Stabell |
| - | - | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ |
| 2 | $2 \downarrow$ | 3 | $4 \downarrow$ |

What would you have bid at South's second turn? Stabell went straight to $4 \checkmark$ and Kristoffersen gave the defence a chance by playing ace and another club, to the 10 and king. Declarer drew trumps with the ace and king, continuing with the 9 to East's queen.

Dummy's $\$$ was set up for a spade discard. Nevertheless, a switch to the $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ K would have beaten the game. Dummy’s only quick entry, to
reach the $\boldsymbol{J}$, was the Q and this was needed for a diamond ruff. When East returned a diamond instead, declarer had a diamond-ruff entry to the table and the game was made.

The decision to switch to diamonds is puzzling. Was East hoping that his partner held the ${ }^{\mathrm{V}}$ ) Declarer would surely have played differently if he held only AKxxx .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Høyland | Saelensminde | Ovesen | Svendsen |
| - | - | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ |
| 2 | $2 \downarrow$ | 3 | Double |
| Pass | $3 \downarrow$ | All Pass |  |

Svendsen contented himself with a game-try double, declined by his partner. The play followed exactly the same path, except that Ovesen did switch to the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$, holding the contract to nine tricks. It was a $10-\mathrm{IMP}$ swing to OSLO I

## Board 12. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- A86
- KQ854
- AQ53
\& $Q$



J92

- AJ 10976
- 6

K104


East led his singleton diamond and West allowed dummy's jack to win. Declarer started well by playing the king and ace of spades and ruffing a spade. A diamond to the queen was ruffed by East and the 4 was returned. West won with the ace and declarer ruffed the club continuation. He was down to VKQ 85 A5 and could escape for one down, unless he played a trump honour. When he reached for the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$, he was two down for 500 away.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Høyland | Saelensminde | Ovesen | Svendsen |
| $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{2 \varphi}$ | Pass | Pass |
| Double | All Pass |  |  |

It was the same auction, but this time West covered the diamond jack at trick one. Three rounds of spades followed, as before. Saelensminde then found a better shot than his counterpart by leading the 2 from dummy. This was the key moment. To beat the contract, Høyland needed to rise with the $A$, continuing with a spade or a diamond. When he chose to play low, East won with the K .

Declarer ruffed the club return and led a diamond, East ruffing with the $\geqslant 6$ and playing back the $\geqslant$ J. Saelensminde won with the king and played a diamond to the 10 , followed by a diamond to the queen. East had to ruff and give declarer an eighth trick with the Q . It was +670 to N/S and a swing of 15 IMPs to ROGALAND I

Our next board comes from the match between TELEMARK I and OSLO I:

```
Board 14. Dealer East. Neither Vul.
                                    \ J1083
                                    - Q5
                                    - AKQJ10
                            * A5
```


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Høyland | Hogstad | Ovesen | Øberg |
| - | - | $2 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| Pass | Double | Pass | $3 \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2}$ |
| Pass | $3 \downarrow$ | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

East opened with what one might call a 'European weak-two bid'. In North America they would bid $2 \checkmark$ on the East cards only if they had missorted the hand in some way. Amazingly, some teachers there insist on a 6-card suit including two of the three top honors. South's 3 response to the double showed some values, otherwise he would have bid a lebensohl 2NT. (I have been using a capital 'L' for several decades, but Larry Cohen tells me that this is incorrect...)

West led the $\vee 6$ and dummy's queen was covered with the king and ducked. Two more rounds cleared the heart suit. Declarer then led the \& O, covered by the king and ace. Declarer ran five rounds of diamonds, East keeping the A and his good hearts. When a club to the did not drop the 10, the contract was one down.

Let's look at the bidding first. 3NT would have been easy played by North. If North had bid a forcing $3 \lessgtr$ over $3 \boldsymbol{*}$, might the auction have continued $3 \vee-3 N T$ ?

Deep Finesse points out that declarer can block the heart suit by
playing the $>5$ from dummy at trick one. So long as declarer takes the ace on the first or second round, West's $¥$ J 9 will prove an embarrassment to him. At double-dummy, West needs to lead the $\vee \mathrm{J}$ or $\vee 9$ to beat the contract.

At the other table East (can you believe it?) decided to pass. Realizing that the responsibility for making a slightly bent opening bid had passed to him, Thoresen opened 1NT on the North cards. He was raised to 3NT and recorded +460 . That was an 11-IMP swing to OSLO 1

Both declarers had some chance of making ten tricks in their spade game on this deal from a match between MIDT-TRONDELAG I and TELEMARK I:


## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Øberg | Austberg | Hogstad | JT Berg |
| - | - | - | $1 N T$ |
| Pass | $2 \downarrow$ | $2 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| $3 \downarrow$ | Pass | $3 N T$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{D}$ | Double | All Pass |  |

South had a mini 1 NT opening at the score, and the $2 \checkmark$ response was natural. North doubled the final contract of $4 \boldsymbol{A}$. Perhaps he was expecting a point or two more from his partner, because East's 3NT bid had suggested that the $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{K}}$ might be a dead duck.

A trump to the king and ace represented a good start for declarer. He ran the 8 to the jack, won the next trump in dummy and finessed the $\geqslant$ Q successfully. He ruffed the $\geqslant 2$ with dummy’s last trump, ruffed a club in his hand and drew the last trump. A diamond to South's 10 and dummy's ace meant that declarer could now set up an endplay on South by ruffing another club in his hand. (He would remove South's last heart with the $\vee A$ and exit in diamonds, scoring dummy's $\downarrow 9$ at the end.)

When declarer preferred to play a diamond to the $>7$ and jack, South cashed the $\diamond$ K and played his last club. Declarer had to ruff and surrender a trick to North's $\downarrow$ K for one down doubled.

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $A a$ | Bergheim | Livgard | Frydenberg |
| - | - | Pass |  |
| Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | $1 \uparrow$ | Double |
| 2 | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

Don't place a substantial bet on it, but West's $2 \diamond$ may have been a transfer to hearts, therefore showing a good spade raise. Again a trump was led to the king and ace. Declarer played the 8 to the 10 and jack, won the trump return in dummy and finessed the $\mathcal{Q}$. A heart ruff was followed by a low diamond to the 7 and a thoughtful jack from Frydenberg in the South seat.

Declarer ruffed the return and drew the last trump. The queen of diamonds was covered by the king, declarer ducking in the dummy. If South had played the now, declarer would have had a count on the North hand and could have finessed in diamonds with some certainty. Frydenberg avoided this by returning the $\downarrow 4$.

Perhaps recalling that South had won the first round of diamonds with the jack, declarer played for the drop in diamonds. North showed out and he was one down. So, only 3 IMPs changed hands, but either side might have scored well on the board.

I will just have time to write up one more board before the need for some lunch overcomes me. Let's see what happened on this slam hand:
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You will not thank me for a detailed explanation of this auction. (That's one reason why I will not be providing it.) East led the $\$ 6$ to the 9 and queen. Declarer drew two rounds of trumps with the king and ace. He continued with the king and ace of spades and ruffed the 10 in dummy. He then cashed the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$, crossed to the $\forall \mathrm{A}$, drew East’s last trump and claimed 12 tricks. One of his club losers would disappear on dummy's third top diamond.

What could be simpler than that, you might wonder. Not declarer's line of play at the other table, that's for sure.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Aa | K.Jørstad | Livgård | R.Jørstad |
| - | - | Pass | $1{ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| Pass | 19 | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 4 | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | 44 | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | 5* | Pass | 69 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

At least we can understand the bidding here: two control-bids and RKCB. Declarer again won the club lead with the queen. He drew two rounds of trumps with the queen and jack. His next move was to play the three top diamonds for a club discard, the $\$$ J falling from West.

Declarer scored the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ and $\boldsymbol{\wedge} \mathrm{A}$, ruffing the $\$ 10$ with the $\$ 8$. Dummy was now down to $\geqslant \mathrm{K} \leqslant 8 \propto \mathrm{~K} 7$. He could still succeed by ruffing a diamond low and scoring the ace and king of trumps separately. What did not work was to lead the \& K to West's ace. A third round of clubs promoted a trump trick for East’s $\geqslant 109$, and the slam was one down. It was 14 IMPs to MIDT-TRONDELAG I.
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## Bridge Educational Software

www.bid72.com

## Your Bid Please

The World's Smallest Bidding Panel offered by bid 72
This month's bidding problem is fairly easy (we think), but you never know. With East the dealer and love all as West you have:
\&A10983 862 \$J103 883

With silent opponents East opens (semi- or game forcing). You respond with $2 \downarrow$ (waiting) and East rebids $3 \vee$ (long and ultra solid hearts). Your bid please.

## The Panel

David Bakhshi (multiple Gold Cup winner and winner of several North American Bridge Championships events such as the Vanderbilt)
3 - I would expect that $3 \boldsymbol{v}$ sets hearts, and would be willing to cooperate towards slam, so I would make a control showing bid of 3 a.
Jan van Cleeff (National Champion and co-founder bid72) 4 NT - Key card asking. I expect slam nearby. Yes, i do realize that we might have not covered a minor suit, but hopefully they don't find the
killing lead. From my experience the suprise element is all important.
Tim Verbeek (European and Junior World Champion)
30 - With my regular partner I intend this bid as a non-serious slamtry. So 34 does not necessarily show a control.

## Sally Brock (European and World Champion)

3 - This is a hand from my (bridge) childhood with a formulaic answer. $3 \uparrow$ has set trumps. You cue-bid an ace, or bid 3NT to show (a) king(s), or bid $4 \checkmark$ with neither. So here you would bid $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ to show the ace. If partner bids 3NT (probable) next you bid $4 \boldsymbol{V}$ to show no king.
Simon de Wijs (European Champion and Bermuda Bowl Winner)
3^ - For me 3 『 sets hearts as trumps, so I would bid 3a, not showing a suit, but showing a cuebid in support for $\vee$. After that I will bid $4 \vee$ over practically any bid partner makes and leave it up to him or her.
Mark Horton (Editor A New Bridge Magazine and prolific author)
3a - I have some distant memory that when partner jumps to show a solid suit a new suit from me is a cue bid, so this looks obvious. One should give some thought to what 3NT should indicate in this situation.

The whole hand:


Download bid72, the revolutionary bidding app, for an ocean of interesting hands, by clicking below.
ares
Keep Bridge Alive
UNIVERSITY of STIRLING

## 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 Bridge Player |

G6 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)
Andrew Robson,
English Bridge Player

BE THE DIFFERENCE
$\$$

BRIDGE SHOP.com London Bridge Centre

Books | Equipment | Tables | Cards | DVDs | Software | Gifts


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

## FUNBRIDGE

## Mighlights and New Features

Last month Funbridge gave us a first glimpse of their top innovation of 2019: the new chat system. This time it's official, this new feature is available to all with the latest update of the app.
And that's not all. You can now also adjust the brightness at the table when playing.
Finally, Funbridge and the American Contract Bridge League are pleased to announce a partnership to run ACBL tournaments on the online bridge platform.

NEW CHAT SYSTEM


## Share easily

Send messages and share your pictures with your Funbridge friends for free! Funbridge uses the Internet connection of your phone, tablet or computer to send messages at no extra cost.

## Create group conversations

Group conversations allow you to stay in touch with the people who mean the most to you: your Funbridge friends, your bridge club friends, your family and your colleagues!

They are fully customisable: give a name to your group, add a picture, mute incoming messages and much more!

## Your conversations available anywhere, anytime

You like switching devices to play Funbridge? As with your game activity, no matter which device you use, you will always have access to your conversations.

## BRIGHTNESS SETTING AT THE TABLE

It is now possible to adjust the brightness at the table. Go to Menu > Settings > Game table, display and ergonomics and drag the cursor to reduce or increase the brightness.
Tip: Tap the < symbol in the lower-right corner of your screen to have a quick access to the app settings from the table.

## NEW ACBL TOURNAMENTS

As part of their new collaboration with the ACBL, Funbridge will soon host ACBL tournaments. Masterpoints will be awarded to any ACBL members taking part who will thus have a chance to try to move up the ACBL ranks.

These tournaments will become available on Tuesday 26 March. Registration is already open! Go to Play a tournament > Federation tournaments > ACBL-Masterpoints.

## ACBL tournaments in a nutshell

18 boards
2 daily tournaments
IMPs and MPs
All-day tournaments


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.
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##  JTUIAN P 1 Tix

Solutions on page 101


Partner leads the five of clubs, on which go the six, ace and three. What do you return? What is your plan?
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## AOCOA FUNBRIDGE

## Test Your Technique



You play $4 \checkmark$ from the South hand on the king of diamonds lead. West has shown a two-suiter with spades and diamonds. Plan the play after winning with dummy’s A.

## Answer:

This hand is tricky and there are so many ways of playing that it can make your head explode, like it did to me at the table. How to handle your thinking process?

What do we know about the distribution? West is knows to have at least 5 spades and 5 diamonds, leaving him with a singleton heart or club.

If he has a singleton club, you can strip him of trumps and clubs (duck a club before playing small to the ace) then play AK and a spade. He will have to play either a diamond giving you an extra trick in the suit or a spade allowing you to ruff in hand while discarding a club in dummy. You can now just ruff a club.

If he has a singleton heart and two clubs, we can still ruff a club but will have to try to score all five trumps in hand, ruffing two diamonds. It feels like the line will be, ace of diamonds, diamond ruff, club to the queen (you want to take the chance of the king of clubs onside). Say
they take the king and return a spade. You take it, cash another spade, play a club to the ace, ruff a second diamond, draw one trump with the queen, and exit a club. East will win and return a heart but you can now ruff your club in dummy for 10 tricks.

Which line should you go for then ? Well, a very detailed analysis can help you realise that the second line will also work if West has a singleton club. Having won the spade return when you lead a club towards dummy for the second time, it will not help West to ruff, so he discards. Now you know the distribution and need to be very careful. After the ace of clubs, ruff another diamond, cash your other top spade and the ace of hearts and exit with a club to East. If he exits with a trump, you win the king, ruff your last club and play a diamond to score your last trump en passant. Had East existed with a club, you would overruff West's trump with the queen in dummy and pay a diamond in order to score your low trump one way or another.
This was the full deal:


Easy bridge ? I must confess I went down at the table.

## It Aint What You Do, lt's The Way That You Do lt

Aunty Em settled herself into a seat strategically placed with a view of both the North and West hands. On her left, the Unpleasant Witch of the North sniffed loudly. 'Where's my partner?' Another sniff. 'Can't do anything right, not even get to the table on time!'

The Irritable Witch of the South came into the card room and took her seat with a look of disgust at her partner. Munchkin Bob, sitting East, was amused by all this but knew his opponents well enough not to be taken in by their antics. If any normal partnership started an event on these terms, it would be difficult to imagine them performing effectively together. With the Northern and Southern Witches a display of animosity and loathing was their equivalent of a polite 'good afternoon'. He was well aware that their purpose was to unsettle and distract their opponents and he had decided to sit back and enjoy the show. 'Good afternoon, ladies,' he said jauntily. 'Hrrrumphhh!' came from both witches, probably the first thing they had publicly agreed on all day.

Uncle Henry sat passively waiting for play to begin. Having Aunty Em at his left elbow was more terrifying than any opponent could ever be.

The Ozian Cup had been going fairly well after all Aunty Em's planning. Her own team had comfortably seen off a team from the Emerald City and, rather surprisingly, the Lion's team, which included the Scarecrow, had beaten the top Poppyfield team. The only negative had been that Almira Gulch's team had also progressed to the second round. With three professionals in it, that was to be expected, but one could at least hope for something nasty to happen to Miss Gulch, thought Aunty Em.

Today's match was the last in round one that involved Over The Rainbow Club players. Two club teams had been drawn against each other: Uncle Henry's four and the team captained by the Wicked Witch of the West. Aunty Em had been tutoring Uncle Henry and Munchkin Bob for the last three weeks, and encouraging their teammates, Zeke and Hickory. She had impressed upon them the importance she attached to them winning this match. If the witches progressed and were let loose on any
team from the outside world, the whole reputation of the club would be in jeopardy.

The situation was even worse now. Glinda, the only good element usually associated with the witches, wasn't in the team of the Wicked Witch. The Wicked Witch had actually been delighted when a very shamefaced Glinda had told her about the Lion's invitation to play in his team. Five minutes later, Glinda had been in tears, assuring her erstwhile partner that she would come back and tell the Lion how much leaving the team would upset the poor Wicked Witch. Standing on her dignity, the Wicked Witch had proclaimed that, while she would still deign to play with her in some club events, she would not accept her back into her Ozian Cup team on a second-choice basis.

The Wicked Witch had already been planning to ditch Glinda, clearly the weakest element in her team. This was now a great opportunity, especially with Munchkin Meg having just joined the club. After a couple of games together, the Wicked Witch had recognised that Munchkin Meg was a better bidder, declarer and defender than Glinda, though that was hardly a great compliment. Her bridge playing ability, however, was only part of the skill set that had earned Wicked's admiration. Winning was all that mattered to Munchkin Meg, and the means to achieve this were very much a secondary consideration. Rumours had followed hard on the heels of her arrival in Munchkinland. Some said that she had run out of partners in the Emerald City and was now looking for fresh victims. Others said that she had run out of places to play, being banned or suspended from every club in the City. No-one knew how much truth, if any, there was in these stories. Aunty Em liked to think that she was a fair-minded person who gave everyone a chance, but she had already seen enough to know that fair-mindedness had its limits!

She was worried about this new pairing. The Wicked Witch and Munchkin Meg were both good players. They were also clearly well suited to each other. But it still seemed like a partnership formed in the deeper reaches
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of hell. She was fairly sure Zeke and Hickory would be able to cope with them when they played each other in the first half of the match, but was worried how Henry and Bob would cope in the second half.

She relaxed a little as the first sixteen boards progressed. Her husband and his partner seemed to be producing a stream of steady results. Not that she couldn't have done better, of course! She would tell Henry later about how he should have found better spots on boards seven and ten, a much better line of play on board eight, and how he should really have defended on boards two, four and twelve.

The Unpleasant Witch of the North threw board sixteen on to the table, the last board of the set:

## Dealer West. E/W Vul.

|  | - AJ643 <br> - QJ2 <br> - Q74 <br> \& 85 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q872 <br> $\checkmark 94$ <br> - 982 <br> - K 1087 |  | ¢ K109 |
|  | N | -103 |
|  | W E | - AK1053 |
|  | S | 2 Q32 |
|  | 4. 5 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AK8765 |  |
|  | - J6 |  |
|  | - AJ94 |  |

The full auction was:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Uncle Henry | UnpleasantMunchkin Bob | Irritable |  |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | $1 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | Pass | $2 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $3 \downarrow$ | Pass | $4 \downarrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

It had been a difficult decision for the Unpleasant Witch of the North. She had avoided the obvious error of raising her partner's five-card major rather than showing her own, but when the annoying woman rebid it she really had no option but to accept that her partner would be playing the
hand. Three Hearts was a delicately chosen bid, based on their unspoken strategy of trying to give partner the last chance to go wrong. She sat back in her chair, contented that she had maximised her opportunities to criticise should Irritable not find the best line, or, even better, the successful line.

Uncle Henry led $\$ 8$, and Munchkin Bob won the first trick with his king. In the time it took Bob to lead $\begin{aligned} & \text { A to the second trick, Henry had }\end{aligned}$ decided to follow with the $\leqslant 2$, proclaiming to declarer and partner that he had a doubleton. With a sure club loser and nothing obvious to discard from her hand, the Irritable Witch of the South ruffed the third diamond with her ace of trumps, and gave a mild grunt when Bob followed suit.

At trick four, she went over to dummy with a spade, and followed with a club putting in her nine, losing to Henry’s ten. He played his $\vee 4$, won in dummy with the jack. Irritable now played a club to her ace, and ruffed a club. She came back to hand by ruffing a spade. The situation was as follows, with the lead in the south hand:


Irritable trumped her last club in dummy with the $\uparrow \mathrm{J}$. Bob was aware of Aunty Em watching the table and was fully alert. He discarded his master $₫ \mathrm{~K}$. When declarer now tried to get off dummy with a spade, Bob ruffed in, forcing declarer's ace. His partner's nine of trumps had been promoted as the setting trick.

Aunty Em beamed. 'Well done,' she said, 'a very pretty defence.' She beamed even more as the Unpleasant Witch of the North finished nursing her wrath, and let it lose with full force on her partner. It sounded as though she had been studying a thesaurus for alternatives to 'idiot'
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and 'cretin'. A good time for this, thought Aunty Em, as they should be suitably unsettled for the second half.
Aunty Em smiled as she sipped her tea and bit into a slice of lemon drizzle cake. Even ten minutes after the end of the first session, the Unpleasant Witch of the North still hadn't let up about board sixteen. She had been ably assisted by her teammates.
'That's the oldest trick in the book.' The Wicked Witch hissed. 'My partner did exactly the same and that ploughman also fell for it, but at least he played the hand sensibly after it.'
'Can't you see it?' Munchkin Meg glared at the unfortunate Irritable Witch of the South. 'Once you've ruffed high, you're going to need a 2-2 trump split.' The Unpleasant Witch of the South grinned like a Cheshire cat as Meg continued. 'It's much better now to play a spade to the ace, ruff a spade and enter dummy twice with the queen and jack of trumps to ruff your spades good, and you still have a trump left in dummy. You are going to duck a club, win the ace of clubs, ruff a club and discard the last one on the long spade.'

The Unpleasant Witch of the North added the final twist of the knife. 'And that's only if you're mug enough to believe that diamond signal!'

Eventually, even the Wicked Witch could see the effect this was having on team morale and, with regret, decided to call a halt to the recriminations. 'What are you lot waiting for?' she said pointedly to Uncle Henry, calmly ignoring the half-full cups still in front of her team. 'I can quite understand why you want to savour your ten IMP lead. It won't be there for long.' She stood up along with the rest of her team, and they marched over to take their seats in the playing rooms.

Aunty Em once more took up position, moving herself a little closer to the West seat. Uncle Henry was on her right as before, but this time the Wicked Witch was on her left. Aunty Em tightened her grip on her handbag. Board seventeen was placed on the table:

Dealer North. None Vul.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q965 } \\ & \text { Q654 } \\ & \text { A6 } \\ & \text { K54 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { KJ73 } \\ & \text { K1092 } \\ & \text { K42 } \\ & \text { Q9 } \end{aligned}$ |  | - 1042 |
|  | N | - 8 |
|  | W E | - J10973 |
|  | S | - J 1076 |
|  | ¢ A 8 |  |
|  | - AJ73 |  |
|  | - Q85 |  |
|  | - A832 |  |

The auction was simple and uncontested:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Uncle Henry | Wicked | Munchkin BobMunchkin Meg |  |
| - | Pass | Pass | 1NT |
| Pass | $2 \mathbf{2}$ | Pass | $2 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | 4 | All Pass |  |

Munchkin Meg surveyed the table. Uncle Henry on her left was clearly having difficulty selecting a lead. Eventually he placed $\$ 2$ on the table, and she won the trick with her queen. She cast a quick glance to her left. Aunty Em's face revealed nothing, but Uncle Henry seemed very focussed indeed. That could, of course, simply be fear with his wife sitting breathing down his neck, but that and the lead suggested he probably held the key hand for the defence. What exactly did he have? Munchkin Meg decided this required a full investigation.
'Partner, can you please pass me you're your packet of paper hankies?' she asked, with a politeness which took all by surprise. As attention was focussed on the Wicked Witch digging into her capacious handbag, Munchkin Meg suddenly came out with an ear-splitting sneeze, which seemed to throw her off balance. To her left! Aunty Em glared. If looks could kill, this one would have hung, drawn and quartered.

Investigation over, she now considered the play of the hand. She had an inescapable loser in each black suit, and had to avoid two trump losers, a problem she set herself to solve in the full knowledge of the four-one
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split. At trick two she led a spade from hand, taken by Uncle Henry with his king, and she won the spade return with the ace.

She switched attention to trumps, cashing the ace followed by a low one towards the dummy. Uncle Henry played the $\geqslant 9$ and dummy's queen won the trick. With a broad smile on her face and a leer at Uncle Henry, she cashed her winner in each of spades and diamonds, and then her two club winners, ending in dummy. Declarer had eight tricks in the bag in this four-card ending:

|  | $\begin{aligned} & 99 \\ & -65 \\ & \frac{5}{5} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a J |  | - - |
| - K10 | N | $\stackrel{-}{\square}$ |
| - K | W E | - J10 |
| 2- | S | - J 10 |
|  | ¢ - |  |
|  | - J7 |  |
|  | - 8 |  |
|  | -8 |  |

Uncle Henry and Munchkin Bob could only watch in horror as she ruffed a spade and then a diamond leaving them with only the last two tricks. The club loser had evaporated.
'Well played partner,' said the Wicked Witch. It was against her principles normally to give praise to her partner, but she was genuinely impressed at the brazenness of Meg's 'technique', and she had the added pleasure of knowing that Aunty Em had steam coming out of her ears.
'Oh yes indeed,' Aunty Em had just regained her voice, 'a wonderful discovery play.' Munchkin Meg had just risen to top equal in Aunty Em's hate list.
'An obvious line for a good reader of the table! This man's body language made the whole deal an open book' Munchkin Meg hadn't learnt the meaning of the word 'humility', but was sufficiently aware of the need to create a fig leaf of plausibility for her actions.
'Looks like that's the ten IMP lead away,' grinned the Wicked Witch. 'I can't see that pair of yokels working out how to cope with a four-one trump split. Anyway,' she added, 'our teammates will find the safer trump
lead. It can still be made by end playing West but I can't see a good declarer playing for that.' She sat back with a satisfied smile, knowing that she had added upsetting Uncle Henry to the ten IMPs her partner had gained.

The match continued in silence, broken only by Aunty Em's deep breathing. Most of the hands were flat and there seemed to be little opportunity for swings. Ever since the fateful board 17, Uncle Henry had held his cards tightly about three inches from his face. Board 28 was placed on the table and Uncle Henry peered at his hand.

## Dealer West. N/S Vul.



After two passes, Munchkin Bob opened the East hand Two Spades, and Meg with a cursory glance at her hand and a glare at Bob, overcalled 2NT. Her partner raised her to game.

The full auction was:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Uncle Henry | Wicked | Munchkin BobMunchkin Meg |  |
| Pass | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1 a}$ | 2NT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

With the thought of what Aunty Em might say afterwards, Uncle Henry wasted no time in leading his partner's suit, and, when that was ducked, continuing it. Winning the second trick, Munchkin Meg considered the situation. 'Thanks you partner,' she said belatedly, 'that club suit of your looks promising.'
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In a perfect example of good partnership understanding, the Wicked Witch didn't need any further encouragement. Clearly the contract depended on the clubs, and some sort of discovery play was once again needed. She formed her plan. Henry's hand could not have been safer in Fort Knox.
'I'll leave you to look after dummy partner, while I go to the toilet.' The Wicked Witch rose quickly from the table, lurching suddenly to the left to pick up her bag. Bob tried to close his hand quickly.
'No problem, partner,' Munchkin Meg smiled, watching her partner as she went to the door. 'I'll just be one minute', said the Wicked Witch, raising a single finger.

Munchkin Meg adopted a pose of serious concentration. Aunty Em knew something was afoot but she couldn't quite work it out. When Meg played $\boldsymbol{K}$ followed by $\boldsymbol{e}$, Aunty Em stared and seethed.
The rest was easy for Meg. After Uncle Henry covered her jack, she returned to hand with a diamond and played another club. Her nine tricks were there: four in clubs, two in diamonds, one in hearts and two in spades.
'I have a vacancy in my beginner's class which you might be interested in,' Aunty Em addressed Munchkin Meg with a coolness bordering on absolute zero. 'We'll be looking at percentages this very week, and I'm sure the lesson says that backward intra-finesses are somewhat inferior to the normal variety.'
'Indeed they are,' retorted Munchkin Meg. 'But perhaps you might be interested in an advanced class on safety plays. My contract is always coming in if clubs split three-two. My line also ensures it if West has any four-card holding in clubs, or a singleton queen or ten. I am aware, of course, that I could start with a normal finesse, but that would require one more entry to dummy than I can be sure of.'

Aunty Em sat back stunned. Meg was right. How could she have missed it? But on the other hand, was that why Meg played it that way, or was that long pause working out her excuse? Aunty Em had a shrewd idea which.

The air was electric as the last four boards were played, but all were quiet routine contracts. As she watched the subsequent scoring, Aunty Em's mind was racing. She would have that woman banned from the club, closely followed by the Wicked Witch of the West. She would write to the Ozian Bridge Union. She would write to the World Bridge Federation.

She was so angry that it barely registered when Zeke told her they had lost by three IMPs.
'We had better congratulate them,' Uncle Henry rose from his seat.
Aunty Em jumped up. 'You will do nothing of the sort,' she roared. 'If you were to shake hands with any of these women I wouldn't let you back in the house until you had been washed with Dettol!' As she left, she could still be heard muttering.


## Master Point Press

THE BRIDGE PUBLISHER
Sleeping on the Couch: The adventures of Dave playing bridge with his wife, Anne

## David Caprera

"I don't bid like that because if I do I will end up sleeping on the couch." - Mike Passell

All profits from the sale of this book will be donated to the United States Bridge Federation Junior Program.

## Answers to "Defend With Julian Pottage"

## - Q76 <br> - AQJ102 <br> - 103 <br> - J106

|  | $\begin{array}{\|cc\|} \hline \mathrm{W}^{\mathrm{N}} & \\ \hline & \mathrm{~S} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $$ |  |  |
| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
| - | - | - | $1 *$ |
| Pass | $1 \stackrel{1}{ }$ | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | $3 \%$ | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Partner leads the five of clubs, on which go the six, ace and three. What do you return? What is your plan?
With the two of clubs missing and diamond length plus a spade stopper likely on your left, there is an excellent chance that the lead is from a five-card suit headed by an honour. Taking the ace of clubs and returning the suit seems right.
If declarer intends to take a diamond finesse, which you know will lose, partner will get in that way and be able to run the clubs. Might you defeat the contract even if declarer's diamond suit is solid?
If the diamonds are running, you need partner to hold the ace of spades. In this case, your opponent has only eight tricks: one heart, six diamonds and a club. Having calculated thus, your play in the heart suit should your opponent decide to play it is clear. You win the first heart that you can and switch to a spade. This deal is not one for ducking the first heart smoothly in the hope that declarer repeats the apparently successful finesse.

## 2

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { QJ106 } \\ & \text { Q875 } \\ & \text { Q953 } \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \& \text { A7 } \\ & \& \text { Q10642 } \\ & \qquad 764 \\ & : 743 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{~} 9532 \\ & +\quad \text { A3 } \\ & \text { J10 } \\ & \dot{\&} \text { QJ1095 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& K84 } \\ & \text { Y KJ } \\ & \text { AK82 } \\ & \text { AK822 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
|  | - | - | 2NT* |
| Pass | 3** | Pass | 34 |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

Partner leads the queen of spades, won by the king. Declarer leads the king of hearts, on which partner plays the eight. Do you win the trick? After you take the ace of hearts on this round or the next, what do you lead?
If declarer has decided to play in 3 NT despite holding three hearts, it is unlikely to matter when you play the ace. The heart suit is going to run and the contract will surely make because a count of points tells you that putting partner with the ace of clubs would leave a maximum of 19 on your left. Fortunately, given partner's eight of hearts, you do not expect that to be the layout.
If declarer has king and low heart, your opponent should make two heart tricks and no more. You might slightly prefer to take the first heart in case declarer ducks the second in heart in dummy and later endplays partner with a diamond to concede a free heart finesse.
The more important situation to consider - and quite a likely one if you think partner would play the nine rather than eight from J98x - is that declarer has king-jack doubleton. In this case, it is vital that you win the first heart, blocking the suit, and return a spade to remove the side entry to the hearts.

## Bridge with Lariy Cohen

The brilliant American player，writer and teacher presents a series of articles aimed at intermediate players．This month he examines a few＇Rules＇．

## The Rule of 2，3，4

Just what we need－another rule！Actually，this one is a bit archaic， but has some merit．It concerns preempting and vulnerability．

## Unfavourable－＂2＂

I am a big believer in observing the vulnerability when preempting．If ＂Unfavourable＂（Vulnerable against Not Vulnerable），I recommend being sound and cautious．The Rule of $2,3,4$ states that when at this unfavour－ able vulnerability，you should be within 2 tricks of your bid．So，let＇s say you have this hand，vulnerable against not：
\＆KQJ1095～54 \＄J 52 － 54
You have 5 tricks in your hand，so should not preempt with $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ ．You are not within＂ 2 ＂of your bid．But，change it to：
¢KQJ1095～54 \＄52 \＄54
and you have 6 tricks（you count a supported king as a trick）and can open 24.

Similarly，with：
©AKQ10875 654 －42 2
you can open 34 at unfavourable vulnerability，because you are within ＂ 2 ＂of your bid（you have 7 of the 9 tricks you are contracting for）．This is good advice not just for safety（avoiding $-1,400$ ，for example），but for describing your hand to partner．If he can count on your being roughly within two of your bid when unfavourable，he can often put you in game based on that knowledge．

What about other vulnerabilities？

## Equal Vulnerability－＂3＂

＂Equal＂means both sides are not vulnerable or both sides are vulnerable． In other words，each partnership（ $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ ）are at the same vulner－ ability．In this case，the Rule of 2，3，4 suggest that you be within 3 tricks of your preempt．

So，with neither side vulnerable，you can open $2 \vee$ with：

You expect 4 heart tricks and the A for 5 tricks，thus preempt on the 2－level（you are within＂ 3 ＂of 8 tricks）．

## Favourable Vulnerability－＂4＂

As my good friend and fellow teacher，Roberta Salob likes to say：＂Unhook your bra，baby！＂Or，as my long time partner and friend Marty Bergen says： ＂Favourable vulnerability is not bridge．＂In other words－bid like crazy！ The＂Rule＂says to be within 4 tricks of your bid，so you can open $2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ with：
－ Q J 10876 － 543 －4 $\mathbf{4} 543$
That（optimistically）looks like 4 tricks（all in spades），so you are within 4 of your contract．What if your convention card says＂ $5-11$ HCP＂ for a weak 2－bid？Not a big deal．Maybe you should write＂3－11，＂－but it is understood that the range should be affected by vulnerability．
What do I think of the Rule of $2,3,4$ ？
It is a reasonable guideline，but can＇t be taken too seriously．First of all， everyone has their own style and aggression－comfort level．Some might play the Rule of $3,4,5$（wild preemptors）and others might be closer to $1,2,3$ ．Personally，I prefer to look more at my own vulnerability．When I am vulnerable，I tend to be within 2 tricks（roughly）of my bid．When not vulnerable，I am more lax．

I am a big believer in suit quality．If I have a suit of $\begin{aligned} & \text { J } 98764 \text { ，I am }\end{aligned}$ not likely to preempt－no matter how many tricks I think my hand is worth．I want my partner to be able to lead my suit．I also live in fear of： Pass－Pass－Double－All Pass．When I have a decent suit，this isn＇t likely to happen．My general guideline is to preempt on the two－level with a 6 －card suit and the three－level with a 7－card suit．

Position also is a big factor．In second seat，I am always sound（even not vulnerable）．When RHO has passed，there is a good chance the hand belongs to our side，so preempting should be well－defined and disciplined． On the other hand，in 3rd seat（when my partner has passed），I know it isn＇t our hand，so I take more liberties when preempting．As dealer，I am
somewhat＂in the middle－normal．＂
Summary of position：1st seat－normal．2nd seat－sound． 3rd－seat－aggressive．

Also note that you can＇t always calculate how many tricks you have． Who is to say what $\mathbf{~ K 1 0 9 7 6 5 ~ c o u n t s ~ a s ? ~ H o w ~ a b o u t ~ a ~ s u i t ~ s u c h ~ a s ~}$ PAQ8764？

## Summary

The Rule of $2,3,4$ is a nice guideline to be aware of．Try to base your preempts on vulnerability，suit quality and position at the table．

## CRIFS

My former bridge partner，Marty Bergen，has 11 conventions named after him．Bergen Raises，Bergen over Notrump，BROMAD（Bergen Raise of Major After Double）and on and on ad nausea．

I would like just one＂Cohen＂convention and I will get to it at the end of this article．
Meanwhile，let＇s talk about 4th seat．
After Pass－Pass－Pass，there are some items to consider such as：
FOURTH－SEAT WEAK 2－BIDS
The normal range for a weak 2 －bid is $6-10$ ．But，after three passes， surely you wouldn＇t open the bidding with 6 points（nor 7，8，or 9）．Really， the range for a 4th－seat weak two should be about 10－14．After three passes，I＇d be happy to open 2 with： NQ 10965 ҮK3 $\$ 98$ KJ5．This com－ bines preemption with description．Of course，you can＇t open this hand 2 a in any other seat，because it is too strong．Three－level preempts in fourth seat also show close to opening－bid values．

## RULE of 15

The＂book＂rule on whether or not to open with a 1－level bid in 4th seat says to add your HCP to your number of spades．If the total is 15 ，open the bidding．If less than 15 ，pass it out．The theory is that it will be a part score battle，and if your side doesn＇t have enough of the high－ranking suit，you could easily lose the battle．So，you would pass out this hand：
 876 （ 10 HCP＋ 5 spades＝15）．This rule is commonly called either ＂Pearson Points＂or＂Casino Count．＂

## DRURY

When you open in 4th seat，you are often on the light side．If you open 1 with KQ1092 \＆AJ4 $876 \leqslant 53$ ，you don＇t want partner to get too excited． Say that he has a good hand with game interest（4AJ5 76 \＄J42 AJ872． You wouldn＇t want to get too high opposite that hand（ 8 tricks are the limit）．The responder is too strong for $2 \boldsymbol{\Delta}$ ，but rather than bid $3 \wedge$ ，he can bid an artificial to say he has a limit raise（it is just a coincidence that this example contains a club suit－the Drury $2 \boldsymbol{i}$ bid says nothing about clubs）．Playing modern Drury，the opener would then rebid $2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ to say he is not interested in game and the partnership stops safely on the two level． （Technically，this is called＂Reverse Drury，＂but it is the way＂everyone＂ plays it．）Drury is also used after 3rd－seat openings（also potentially light）．

## CRIFS

Now，forget the Rule of 15 for deciding whether to open or pass out the deal in fourth seat．I prefer CRIFS－＂Cohen＇s Rule in Fourth Seat．＂Any time it is borderline（like 10，11， 12 HCP），evaluate your opponents！Yes， I am serious．If you are playing against Jeff Meckstroth and Eric Rod－ well（or the best pair at your local duplicate game），then pass it out．You will likely get a middlish score／result．Who needs to open and have to do battle with an expert pair who will fight hard for the part－score and play or defend well？Conversely，if you look up at your opponents and see Schlemiel and Schlimazel（the worst pair），then open the bidding． You can push them around in the auction and will get an extra trick or two in the play／defence．You rate to go plus－so don＇t pass the board out．

I ask just two small favours：
1．Please publicise this treatment with the＂CRIFS＂acronym．
2．Please don＇t tell your opponents why you opened that 10 －count in fourth seat（I don＇t want them to know what we think of their game）．
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## Book Reviews

A Bumper Crop of Book Reviews by Martin Cantor

## A Simpler Blue Club System : Mississauga Style by Dan Berkley

Foreword by Benito Garozzo
An Honors eBook from Master Point Press 264pp. $\$ 25.95 £ 15.95$

The Blue Team were the most successful bridge team in history. As well as the brilliance of their players and the skills and dedication of their non-playing captain, their success was partly due to their bidding systems, the Roman, Neapolitan and subsequently Blue Club. The contribution of the systems to their success should not, however, be over-rated because, as their captain says in his history of the team, the opponents' unpreparedness for the system played a major role.

Dan Berkley has developed a simplified version of the system for aspiring partnerships, but I have to wonder whether there will be many takers. It's not something for beginners to start with, not least because they wouldn't find many partners to play with. And if more advanced partnerships decide they want to switch to Blue Club, why would they choose a simplified rather than the full system? Alternatively, if they want a less complex strong club system, Precision would be an obvious choice.

The two principal simplifications are: that the 1 NT opening is restricted to $15-17$ in place of the original 13-17; and that the use of the $2>$ opening for a strong three-suiter has been dropped. Both of these however bring complications in their wake. The narrowing of the no-trump range means that a 1 opening can now be a three (or even two) card suit. Strong three-suiters are a problem in all systems but most of all in strong clubs, so it I consider it remiss of the author to suggest that partnerships work out their own methods for them (although he does offer one possible method, he seems unconvinced by it himself). I was also a bit puzzled that there was no reference to what the $2 \diamond$ (or for that matter $2 \vee$ or $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ ) opening should mean, so I guess they would all be the standard American weak twos.

Chapter 1 sets out the main principles and approaches of the system, which I'm afraid I didn't find at all easy to follow. This for example: "The approach to the negative double is either standard or Sputnik, as agreed upon." I'm happy to say that the main explications in the following chapters are very much clearer, and are amply supported by a plethora of example hands and bidding sequences, coupled with clear summary tables, and complemented by a quiz at the end of each chapter. Sensibly, the strong $1 \mathbf{2}$ opening is left almost to the end of the book -sensibly because it is the frequent usage of canapé in other openings that most will find new and challenging.

This isn't the only variant of the Blue Club that has been developed, but if you're looking for a simpler version this should suit you, provided you can avoid being irritated by some poor proof reading and English that sometimes sounds like it was written by a non-native speaker.

## Attack and Defense: Winning Cardplay at Bridge by Marc Smith 184pp.

Available from Amazon, Paperback $£ 12.95$ / \$19.95; Kindle $£ 7.65$ / \$10.07

Marc Smith has produced a comprehensive reworking of his 2002 Bridge Cardplay: Attack and Defence, with two new chapters and twenty additional deals. It's a good manual for intermediate or advanced players looking to take their game to the next level, particularly if they plan to play much teams (or rubber), since the focus is primarily on making or breaking contracts.

As the title suggests, the book has two sections, one each for declarer play and defence. The explanations of the various devices, coups and tactics are clear, and not just in what they are and how they work, but also in the reasoning behind them and when, how and why to deploy them. Smith offers a small number of essential maxims to help readers improve their game. Not of the kind that beginners learn, such as 'second
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hand low, third hand high', which are often wrong. But of how to think about the play, like 'why did partner/opponent do what (s)he just did?'. An abundance of example hands supports the explanations.

The declarer play section doesn't contain anything that you won't find in other books aimed at this level, but it is clear and concise and worthy of study. The section on defence, on the other hand, goes where few have gone before, in particular the chapters on signalling. These go into more depth and detail than most textbooks and teaching aids, discussing not just first signals but signals throughout the hand, again stressing the need to be guided by one of the author's maxims on how to think: 'what information will help partner towards the best defence'. Most players, and even more so most partnerships, would gain by studying and discussing the questions raised.

Any little grumbles? Of course, but only little. The illustrative hands are often presented as problems, which is of course the optimal approach. But laying them out initially as just two hands, rather than all four, would make it easier for readers to tackle them as problems. As would a note detailing the range of 1 NT opening bids, which are sometimes strong and sometimes weak, and of course you can't tell which if you've covered that hand up.

## Multi-Landy: The Killer Defense Versus One NoTrump. Expanded Second Edition by David Oakley

an Honors e-Book from Master Point Press 283pp. £15.95 US\$24.95
There are more defences to a one no-trump opening bid than you can shake a stick at. To claim that one defence is the best of them all is bold, but David Oakley makes a pretty good case for his preference. But not, I think, a completely compelling one.

For readers who don't know Multi-Landy, it consists of four elements. After opponents open 1NT 2s is Landy, showing both majors. 2 is Multi, showing one $6+$ major. $2 \vee$ or 2 are Capaletti showing 5 of that major and a $4+$ minor. And Double is Woolsey, showing either a $6+$ minor OR a $5+$ minor with a 4 card major OR a strong hand (although some play double as only showing the minor-major two-suiter). Three level bids are pre-emptive. Simple it isn't, as the author readily admits, but he
gives a comprehensive explanation of each of the elements, including details of how the overcaller's partner (the advancer) should follow up. He also considers how to deploy the convention differently against a weak no-trump as against strong. And he offers a comparison with several other common defences -common at least in North America, some of them less so in Europe.

The book is logically structured, taking the reader through each of the elements in turn against both no-trump ranges, with example hands for each scenario taken from real life or from simulations. There is also ample statistical evidence to back up the author's arguments.

It is natural for a proponent of a convention to paint it in the most favourable light, and given the book's egregious sub-title it is no surprise that this is the case here, particularly, one suspects, with the selection of example hands. He fails to adequately address the problems that can arise with conventions where no suits are known -although to be fair those can turn out to be problems for either (or indeed both) sides. Oakley's general writing style is clear, but he sometimes makes cognitive leaps, or compresses his explanations, leaving the reader struggling to follow him.

Despite those caveats, the book is worthy of study by serious players. You may or may not end up being convinced to play Multi-Landy, but either way you will have been provoked into some serious thinking about defending against 1NT, and that can only be good for your game.

## Startup Bridge - And Beyond by Lynn Berg

An Honors eBook from Master Point Press 205pp. £12.95 US\$19.95
The aims of this book are both clear and praiseworthy - to help bridge players make their first ventures into bridge clubs and into bridge tournaments. It is full of both practical advice and moral reassurance.

It takes readers through their first steps inside a bridge club, explaining how to make yourself known, find the director, find a partner, find a table. It tries to allay their worries about the fearsome reputation of duplicate bridge and duplicate bridge players. It moves on to talk about developing one or more partnerships, not just agreeing systems and styles, but making sure you don't land yourself for the long-term with
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an incompatible partner. It emphasises the importance of polite and considerate behaviour, and of not being afraid to call the director. Later, perhaps a little too abruptly, it introduces readers to the world of tournament bridge.

Most of the most important tips (and some of the less important ones) are repeated several times, which is no bad thing. On the other hand the repeated use of certain 'bon mot' phrases to underline these can prove irritating. There is advice on conventions and signalling which, as ever with bridge books, reflects the author's own preferences - a fact that she readily admits, making it clear that what systems you play is less important than finding something that you and your partner are comfortable with together.

I have my doubts about how big the market for this book is, at least in Europe, where the days of large numbers of social bridge players enjoying occasional or regular rubbers at home are now sadly in the distant past, and newcomers to the game have mostly learned in a club. The book is very North America oriented in much of its content, for example the rules on alerting and announcing, or the way clubs and tournaments operate, and the grading structures of events.

The majority of bridge clubs are worried that their membership numbers are reducing, and that the average age of their members is increasing. Anything that can help to reverse those trends is welcome.

## Win at Duplicate Bridge : Bid Difficult Hands Like a Bridge Expert by Fred Parker

Master Point Press. 208 pp. $\$ 19.95 £ 12.95$

I'm sorry to say this, but there is really no need for this book. It's not that it's terribly bad. It's just that there are many others out there that do the same thing and do it better.

What the book aims to do is to provide inexperienced and ambitious club players with a comprehensive bidding system that will help them to do better, or, as Parker says in the introduction, "This book will teach you which conventions are worth playing and how to play them". What it actually does is to provide readers with the author's preferred set of conventions. He divides conventions into four categories: mandatory;
highly recommended; only for seasoned partnerships willing to make an effort; don't play these.

And the author's choices are, to say the least, somewhat individual. Included in mandatory is to play 1 NT - Pass - 3 y as 5-5 majors invitational and 34 as 5-5 majors forcing. Included in don't play are Bergen raises. According to the author "The reason these don't play conventions exist at all is because 'experts' who write about bridge are always trying to find new wrinkles." This from a man who has invented, and of course recommends, his own "Parker Convention" as a defence to strong club openings.

So do I have anything good to say about the book? Yes. It is chock-a-block full of example hands and quizzes, which means that readers will easily understand and apply the conventions covered, and those conventions will equip them adequately for a decent club game or local tournaments. And Parker explains his recommended lucidly, albeit a few times not entirely accurately.

What this book won't help readers with however is improving their judgment, not only because it makes no claim or attempt to, but because it lapses all too often into talking about rules and their dreaded concomitants 'ever', and 'never'.
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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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## A few figures

8 bidding systems (ACOL, SAYC, French 5-card major, 2/1, Polish Club, Nordic system, NBB Standard, Forum D)
Over 150 countries represented

## ancen

 FUNBRIDGE.com
iPhone, iPad, Mac, PC, Android, Amazon

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

## Kitis Corner

by World Champion Kit Woolsey

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

## Full Picture

In the fourth session of the Cavendish Pairs, you have to decide what a near-yarborough is worth.

As West, you hold:

## Dealer West. None Vul.



If partner had doubled $2 \boldsymbol{A}$, that would have been a takeout double. Double of $3 *$ by either you or partner would also be takeout.
Your call?
South has shown the minors. North was willing to play 3 of a minor, so the opponents have a fit. Partner could have a very strong hand yet not have a convenient action over $2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ because he has some spade length. North doesn't have to have long spades for his $2 \boldsymbol{a}$ call. In fact, there is a good chance that he is longer in one of the minors than in spades. If he were longer in spades and were willing to play 3 of a minor he would presumably also be willing to play 3 a so he would have bid 3 of the minor for his pass or correct call.

You don't have much. But you have already shown that with your 0-4 pass over $1 \diamond$ so partner won't be playing you for any strength. You have perfect shape to compete with a takeout double. Probably hearts is your best fit, but it might be spades, and partner will know where you belong. Passing doesn't do justice to this hand, and could easily result in losing a part-score battle or even missing a game.
You double. The bidding continues:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{*}^{*}$ | $1 \star^{*}$ |
| Pass* | 2 \& $^{*}$ | Pass | $3 \star$ |
| Double | Redouble | $4 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| Pass | $4 N T$ | Double | 5 |
| $?$ |  |  |  |

Your call?
Clearly you are in a force. Partner's double of 4NT presumably shows more interest in defending than in going to the 5-level. Your hand isn't particularly offensively oriented in context of what you have already shown. Therefore, you should double. If you had a singleton in one of the minors, then it would be right to make a forcing pass.

You double, ending the auction.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | 19* | 1** |
| Pass* | 24* | Pass | 3\% |
| Double | Redouble | 4 | Pass |
| Pass | 4NT | Double | 5 |
| Double | All Pass |  |  |

Your lead? Third and fifth best leads.
It doesn't appear that this will be the most important opening lead you have ever made in your life. Still, it is worth trying to get a picture of the other hands from the bidding information.

First, let's look at South's hand. He clearly has more diamonds than clubs. If he had equal length in the minors, he would have passed the
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double of 4 NT and let his partner choose. So, he probably has 5 diamonds and 4 clubs. You can't tell yet about his major-suit distribution.

What about North's hand? He must be at least 4-4 in the minors, since he is willing to save in 5 of partner's minor. Clearly he is short in hearts to justify his 4 NT call. He was willing to play $2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ if his partner had the majors, so he must have some spade length. It is looking like his distribution could well be 4-1-4-4.

If this is the minor-suit distribution, that gives partner 2 diamonds and 3 clubs. He has longer hearts than spades, since with equal length he would have cue-bid 4eto let you pick the major. If he has 6 hearts he probably was worth a $3 \bigcirc$ bid over $2 \boldsymbol{s}$ since he is known to have a good hand from his $4 \vee$ call. That makes his shape 3-5-2-3, leaving South with 2-2-5-4. Everything checks out. It is all consistent. That is the full picture.

So, what is the right opening lead? There doesn't appear to be any need to cash, since if your construction is right the opponents don't have any discards coming. Nor is there any need to lead a trump, since you can't draw more than 2 rounds of trumps and they will have plenty left over to do the necessary ruffing.

What about a club lead? It isn't an intuitive choice, but now that you see the full picture it makes a lot of sense. You have a doubleton club, and your partner has a tripleton. Partner has a lot of high cards. There is no reason why his collection of high cards couldn't include AK of clubs, or both minor-suit aces, or the king of clubs behind dummy's ace along with the ace of diamonds. If any of these layouts exist, the club lead will get you a third round ruff. Leading the wrong major might not.

Is there any danger in leading a club? And if you don't lead a club, what should you lead?

Normally it would potentially be costly to lead the enemy's side fit, since it could solve a guess in the suit. On this hand, that isn't likely. Partner is known to have almost all of your side's high cards, so declarer isn't going to misguess any honours in the club suit. He will play partner for any missing honours. If partner has $\boldsymbol{\&}$ K10x or $\mathbf{Q} 10 \mathrm{x}$ the club lead could cost, since declarer would have to guess which opponent to play for the doubleton club, and if he chooses to play you for the doubleton club he would have to guess which opponent has the 10 . This isn't a likely layout. Partner did jump to $4 V$ with what appears to be a balanced hand when you are known to be broke. He probably isn't going to make this
call with wastage in clubs.
The other danger with the club lead is that dummy might have 5 clubs. It would be sensible for North to bid 4NT with 4-0-4-5 or 3-1-4-5 shape. He knows his partner won't bid $5 \$$ without longer diamonds than clubs. If South's distribution is 2-2-5-4, there is a potential discard of value if diamonds are trumps but not if clubs are trumps. For example, the full hand might be something like:

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ↔ } 876 \\ & \bullet 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

```
& Q1043
> 109432
-102
& 65
© AKJ5
- AKJ76
- 98
* 92
- 92
- Q5
- AQ765
\& A 1074
```

Such a layout is possible, and a club lead would be a disaster if this is the hand. However, it would mean that North had bid $2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ on a 3 -card suit, and partner had picked hearts on his own rather than bidding $4 \boldsymbol{q}$ to give you the choice since you might have more spades than hearts.

If you do lead a major, a spade lead is probably best. Heart losers aren't going anywhere, but, as seen, a spade loser could go on a long club. It is unlikely that a spade lead can cost a trick. If the enemy spades are 3-3, dummy will surely have more clubs than diamonds so the third round of spades won't live anyway. The spade lead could cost if dummy has the king and declarer the jack, but that is a very specific layout.

If you are leading a spade, you might as well lead the queen. This will make life easier for partner if he has AJ of spades over dummy's king, if the opponents are 3-3 in spades it might be necessary to lead an honour in order to take 3 spade tricks. Also, if partner has AK of spades you will be holding the lead, and the club shift may be easier for you to find.

All things considered, it looks like the club lead is the winner if there is a winner. The club ruff scenario appears more likely than any of the other possibilities.

You choose to lead the $\$$.

- 8765
$\checkmark 8$
-KJ43
* KQJ8


Partner's $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ K loses to declarer's ace. Declarer leads a diamond to dummy's king and partner's ace. Partner tries ace and a club, but it is too late. You collect only 300 . The full hand is:

|  | - 8765 <br> - 8 <br> -KJ43 <br> - KQJ8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& Q1043 } \\ & 109432 \\ & 102 \\ & -65 \end{aligned}$ | N | 4 KJ9 |
|  | N | - AK765 |
|  | W E | - A9 |
|  | S | - A92 |
|  | - A 2 |  |
|  | - QJ |  |
|  | - Q8765 |  |
|  | * 10743 |  |

It turns out that a heart lead would have been successful. East would win the trick, and the winning defence would be obvious to him. But that is just happenstance, since East could just as easily have had the A and not the $\vee \mathrm{A}$. West should have led a club, which defeats the contract three tricks regardless of which major-suit ace East holds. The actual hand is exactly what should have been pictured.

Suppose E/W had pressed on to $5 \boldsymbol{\vee}$, putting South on lead. Do you think South has enough information to find the winning diamond lead?

South has the same information from the bidding that West has. He can assume his partner is 4-4 in the minors. The defence is more likely to have a club trick than a diamond trick, but it is still right to lead a diamond. The club trick can't go away, since the opponent who has the doubleton club figures to have the long spade as he does in the actual
hand. The diamond trick, however, may need to be established immediately if the enemy diamonds are $2-2$, since that loser can be discarded on the long spade.

Clearly East's 4 call was successful. Was he just lucky, or was it a good bid?

It looks like a fine evaluation. North must have clubs for his redouble, so West has at most a doubleton club. Opposite virtually nothing there will be a chance of losing only 1 trick in each side suit. West must have some reason for his takeout double. Anything at all such as the $\mathbf{Q Q}$ or a singleton club will make game very good. The actual West hand is a fine illustration.

I think that if the West hand were presented as an opening lead problem, most experts would work out to find the club lead. But at the table you don't have somebody ringing a bell and alerting you to the fact that there is a problem which requires some extra thought. At the table, I think most experts would not think of the club lead, since leading declarer's side suit is usually not in the picture as a candidate. It is necessary to train yourself to think of every decision as a problem.
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## GOMBBRDGEMO

The must-have game to improve at bridge!
Game modes for all levels And ideal features to progress


NBM special offer
USD20 off - From USD59.99 only
Click to enjoy
www.gotobridge.com


YOU LOVED THE WINTER GAMES 2018! YOU WILL ADへRE THE WINTER GAMES 2020!

February 29 - March 6, 2020: Teams events March 6-8, 2020: Pairs tournament


Special Hotel Rates at Le Fairmont $\star \star \star \star \star$ Starting from $199 €$ per room per night
Rich buffet breakfast included Rich buffet breakfast included Low Cost Housing In Beausoleil, at walking
distance from the venue
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An Excerpt from Patrick Jourdain's Problem Corner this month's Master Point Press Bidding Battle book prize


## Prize Problem

How should West play 5 en a low diamond lead?

| - A1043 | N | - KQ2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - K63 |  | $\checkmark 874$ |
| - 6 | W E | - A9 |
| * KQ975 | S | * AJ832 |

## Non-prize Problem

How should West play 4? North opened $1 \boldsymbol{4}$ but cashes the and then switches to a low diamond.

| - - |  | ¢ K743 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - KQ9873 | N | - J10 |
| 3 |  | - A72 |
| - KQ1052 | S | - J943 |

## Prize Problem

How should West play 5 on a low diamond lead?

| - A1043 | N | - KQ2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - K63 |  | - 874 |
| - 6 |  | - A9 |
| KQ975 | S | 2 AJ832 |

You can make sure of the contract. Win the $\star A$, draw trumps, ruff the second diamond and play king, queen and another spade. Then, if South follows small, finesse the ten! If North wins, he is endplayed. If the $\$ 10$ wins you have eleven tricks. If South shows out on the third spade, go up with the ace and exit with a spade, throwing a heart from table. North is endplayed.

## Non-prize Problem

How should West play $4 \boldsymbol{?}$ ? North opened $1 \boldsymbol{4}$ but cashes the A and then switches to a low diamond.

| ¢ - | N | - K743 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - KQ9873 | N | - J10 |
| - 83 | W E | - A72 |
| 2 KQ1052 | S | - J943 |

Win the diamond lead at once and play the $\mathbf{~} \mathrm{K}$, discarding a diamond from hand if South does not cover. This Scissors Coup avoids the danger that North has led the singleton and is planning to win the first trump and put South on lead with a second diamond in order to get a club ruff.

## Prize Problem

How should West play 3NT on a spade lead?

| - AQ4 | N | - 873 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - AJ10 | $\cdots$ | $\checkmark 943$ |
| - AK62 | W E | - 95 |
| \& KJ4 | S | - A10982 |

## Non-prize Problem

How should West play 4@ on a trump lead from North?


## Prize Problem

How should West play 3NT on a spade lead?

| - AQ4 | N | - 873 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - AJ 10 | , | - 943 |
| - AK62 | W E | - 95 |
| \% KJ4 | S | - A10982 |

Win the spade, play the K and (unless South shows out) a low club from both hands! If the defence wins the second club you can later overtake the $\boldsymbol{j}$ to ensure nine tricks. If, on the second club, dummy's eight wins but either defender still has Qx, then take a heart finesse, and another later using the $\boldsymbol{A}$ as your entry. Note that running the $\boldsymbol{m}$ fails when South, with ©xxx, holds up. (You can run the sJ. If South ducks you play a club to the eight. If South wins you have nine tricks by overtaking the K and ducking allows you to take a heart finesse and then overtake the K for a second finesse. Editor)

## Non-prize Problem

How should West play 4@ on a trump lead from North?

| ¢ AJ 1087 | N | ¢ KQ6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - AJ103 |  | - Q2 |
| - A | W E | - 98632 |
| - KJ2 | S | - 874 |

Win the lead in dummy and lead the $\vee 2$ to the ten (or jack). If this finesse wins, try to ruff two hearts in dummy - the third round with the six, then back to the $\forall A$ for a ruff with the last trump honor.

If the heart finesse loses you still have the $\mathbb{Q}$ and the high trump as entries to take two club finesses.

## Prize Problem

West plays $4 \boldsymbol{@}$ after South has overcalled $1 \boldsymbol{~}$. North leads a heart and ruffs the third round, dummy throwing a diamond. West wins the trump switch and draws a second round on which South throws a heart. What now?

| $\triangle$ AKQJ |  | - 432 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - 8732 |  | $\checkmark$ J6 |
| - 542 |  | - AKJ6 |
| - 46 | S | - KQ43 |

## Non-prize Problem

South pre-empts in diamonds and West is pushed to 4NT. North doubles and leads a diamond. How should West play?

| A Q874 | N | \& A93 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bullet 8$ |  | $\checkmark$ K975 |
| - AQ6 | W E | - 9 |
| - J10962 | S | - AK874 |
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## Prize Problem

West plays $4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ after South has overcalled $1 \boldsymbol{\vee}$. North leads a heart and ruffs the third round, dummy throwing a diamond. West wins the trump switch and draws a second round on which South throws a heart. What now?

| \& AKQJ | N | - 432 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - 8732 | N | - J6 |
| - 542 | W E | - AKJ6 |
| - A 6 | S | 2 KQ43 |

Cash the three top clubs, throwing a diamond from hand. Then cash one top diamond and finish drawing trumps, throwing dummy's last club. South should be squeezed in the red suits. South will throw a diamond on the third trump. If he throws a club on the last trump then his shape was 1-5-3-4 and you will have to guess who to play for the diamond queen.

## Non-prize Problem

South pre-empts in diamonds and West is pushed to 4NT. North doubles and leads a diamond. How should West play?

| - Q874 | N | - A93 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - 8 | $\mathrm{N}^{\mathrm{N}}$ | - K975 |
| - AQ6 | W E | - 9 |
| - J10962 | S | - AK874 |

In the 1984 Cavendish the winner, Larry Cohen of the USA, took the intra-finesse in spades. He won the diamond, crossed to dummy with a club and led a spade to the seven and jack. Later he led the Q from hand to pin South's now bare $\boldsymbol{1} 10$. He finished by leading a heart toward the king. North held: $\mathbf{4} \mathrm{KJ} 52$ AQ1062 $\$ 52 \mathrm{Q} 5$

## Master Point Press

THE BRIDGE PUBLISHER

## Presenting the New

## TEACH*•BRIDGE

## The Website for Bridge Teachers

## A fresh design for engaging content, TeachBridge.com is now live.

The website features articles, quizzes, interviews, and newsletters geared to keep bridge teachers informed and provide some of the best deals for the classroom.


VISIT TEACHBRIDGE.COM AND SIGN UP FOR OUR NEWSLETTER

## 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/191stanbul/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


## Angie Brookers Bold ldea

The Abbot was somewhat out of breath as the two teams arrived back at the George Wall bridge club for the second half of their Crockford's match. Was it normal practice to visit a public house for half-time refreshments in the middle of a 32-board match? Not as he saw it. The other three monks had accepted the invitation to sample some powerful real ale, brewed by the landlord. The Abbot, who had declined the offer, could hardly accuse the opposing captain of skulduggery, trying to intoxicate the visiting team. His own four players had sunk a good few pints themselves.

The Abbot reflected that there would be only one sober player participating in the second half. Perhaps he would be able to play a big role in eclipsing the 18-IMP deficit, producing a notable victory.

The match restarted and this was an early board:

- A7652
- A6
- 8754
- A3
- Q
$\checkmark 82$
-KQJ102
- J984


KJ1093

- 10974
- A6
- 105
- 8
- KQJ53
- 93

KQ762

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brother | Bill | The | Angie |
| Xavier | Brooker | Abbot | Brooker |
| - | - | - | $1 \vee$ |
| Pass | 1. | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 30 |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | 4 |

Brother Xavier led the king of diamonds, the Abbot overtaking with the ace and returning the suit. Angie Brooker, the crop-haired proprietor of the well-known Shoreditch Angels escort agency, ruffed the third round in her hand. 'I usually play better with a couple of pints down me,' she informed her opponents.

Drawing trumps first would not be good enough if hearts and clubs both broke 4-2. Angie Brooker crossed to the ace of clubs and played a second club to the king. She continued with a third round of clubs from her hand. 'Ruff with the ace, Bill,' she said.

Declarer continued with the ace of spades, followed by a trump to the king. A second $4-2$ break materialized when she played two more trumps, but it was a simple matter to switch back to clubs. The Abbot ruffed with his trump winner and declarer's last trump gave her a tenth trick.
'Bit of a dull contract to start the second half,' Angie Brooker declared. 'Flat board if ever I've seen one.'
'Neat line of play, love,' her husband observed. 'That Stone-age Thunder is a reliable brew. Usually works well'

On the other table, two unremarkable part-scores were followed by this deal:

Dealer East. N/S Vul.

| 4 K62 <br> - J85 <br> - J76 <br> - 10842 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $32 \mathrm{~W}^{\text {N }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& } 1097 \\ & 64 \\ & \text { A9542 } \\ & \text { Q97 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A AQJ8543 } \\ & \text { AQ } \\ & 83 \\ & \text { AJ } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| West N | North | East | South |
| Geoff Brot | Brother | Arthur | Brother |
| Stimmer | Paulo | Docke | Lucius |
| - - | - | Pass | 19 |
| 29 | 2 | Pass | 44 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Geoff Stimmer led the king of diamonds against the spade game, his partner signalling with the $\$ 9$. When he continued with queen and another diamond, Brother Lucius ruffed in the South hand. The ace of trumps revealed a 3-0 break and he sat back in his chair. What should he do next?

Lucius saw that he could avoid a club loser by setting up a discard on the third round of hearts. It was risky to play the ace and queen of the suit. If West held six hearts for his overcall, he would be able to lead a third round. Declarer could overruff East but the discard on the heart jack would be lost.

Brother Lucius soon spotted the best next move. He led the queen of hearts from his hand. There was nothing that the defenders could do. Stimmer won with the king and returned another heart to declarer's ace. Lucius then drew trumps, ending in the dummy, and discarded his club loser on the jack of hearts. The game was his.
'That's not good,' declared Arthur Docke. 'Lead the $\$ 10$ at trick two, partner! I win with the ace and switch to a club. He's stuffed, then.'

Geoff Stimmer scoffed at this suggestion. 'Ah, so you'd switch to a
club, would you?' he exclaimed. 'You wouldn't switch to a heart instead, or play a third diamond to give me a ruff?'
'Well, at least we'd have a chance of beating it,' Docke replied. 'Queen and another diamond gives him the contract on a plate.'

Despite the Abbot's best efforts, he and Xavier had made little early headway at the other table. The players had just extracted their cards for this board:

```
Dealer South. E/W Vul.
```



```
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
West & North & East & South \\
Brother & Bill & The & Angie \\
Xavier & Brooker & Abbot & Brooker \\
- & - & - & \(1 \mathbf{1}\) \\
Pass & \(4 \diamond\) & Pass & \(4 N T\) \\
Pass & \(5 \uparrow\) & Pass & \(6 \boldsymbol{\$}\) \\
All Pass & & &
\end{tabular}
```

A brief splinter-bid auction carried the London pair to a small slam, and Brother Xavier led the 4 . The Abbot discarded a diamond and declarer won with the $\$ 8$. Angie Brooker peered at the dummy. She had three side-suit winners, so one trump winner plus eight more trump tricks on a crossruff would bring her total to twelve. Since some of the ruffs in dummy would have to be in the heart suit, she might need to duck a heart. If West won this trick, though, he would surely play another trump and that would leave her a trick short. What could be done?

After a few seconds of tapping her long nails on the card table, Angie

## A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE - AprIL 2019

Brooker spotted quite a reasonable chance. She played the ace of diamonds and continued with the $\$ 9$. 'Throw a heart,' she said, when Brother Xavier followed with a low diamond. The Abbot won with the $\$ 10$ and had no trump to play. Declarer took the king of hearts return with the ace, crossed to the ace of clubs and ruffed a club with the $\$ 3$. She then faced her cards. 'I've got the rest of a high crossruff,' she said.

Brother Xavier shrugged his shoulders as he returned his cards to the board. 'I can cover the $\$ 9$ with the queen,' he observed, 'but that's no good. She ruffs in the dummy, returns to the ace of clubs and passes the jack of diamonds to your king.'

Angie Brooker nodded. 'Yeah, I needed you to hold only one of the three high diamonds,' she replied. 'Fifty percent chance.'

Back on the other table, Brother Lucius had just arrived in another slam.
Dealer South. Neither Vul.

- AQ86
- K75
-K6
K K1085

| ( KJ10754 <br> $\checkmark 93$ <br> - 9542 <br> - 4 |  | - 2 <br> - 862 <br> - J10873 <br> \& QJ97 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $$ |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Geoff | Brother | Arthur | Brother |
| Stimmer | Paulo | Docke | Lucius |
| - | - | - | $1 \vee$ |
| 24 | 34 | Pass | 420 |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | 50 |
| Pass | 5 | Pass | 6 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

In response to Roman Key-card Blackwood, Brother Lucius showed three key-cards and the queen of trumps. The $\mathbf{2}$ was led against the heart
slam and down went the dummy. Declarer won East's $\mathbf{7}$ with the ace and drew trumps in three rounds. A club to the king confirmed that the opening lead had been a singleton. Three tricks would now be required from the spade suit.

Lucius reached his hand with the diamond queen and played one more trump winner. These cards were still in play:


The $\mathrm{V}^{\mathrm{J}}$ put West to a further discard. If he pitched a spade, declarer would be able to finesse the $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$ and set up a long card in the suit, discarding the $\star$ A on the third round. West threw a diamond and Brother Lucius's next move was to lead the 9 , intending to run the card. When Geoff Stimmer covered with the $\mathbf{~} 10$, the trick was won with dummy's queen. Lucius overtook the diamond king with the ace and led the $\$ 3$ towards dummy's A86. West inserted the jack of spades and this card was allowed to win. At trick 12, West had to lead from his $\uparrow \mathrm{K} 7$ into dummy's A8 and the slam was made.
'Painful!' exclaimed Stimmer. 'Nothing we could do, was there?'
'I don't think so,' Brother Lucius replied. 'The lucky spade position made up for the bad lie in clubs.'

The match drew to a close and an anxious comparison revealed that the London team had squeaked home by just 6 IMPs. The four monks congratulated their opponents and trudged somewhat despondently back to the Abbot's car.
'They played a good game,' said Arthur Docke, pulling on a well-worn overcoat. 'We did well to beat them, really.'
'Yeah, I feel sorry for them,' Angie Brooker replied. 'Just imagine how
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miserable their lives must be.'
'What d'you mean, love?' asked Bill Brooker.
'Well, probably none of them has ever enjoyed having a pretty girl in their arms,' his wife continued. 'I was 'alf tempted to offer them the services of four of my girls before they left.' She broke out into a laugh. 'Not sure 'ow that would have gone down. A novel experience for the girls, anyway!'

## ON THE OTHER HAND



An Honors Book from Master Point Press

## Master Point Press <br> THE BRIDGE PUBLISHER

## On The Other Hand: Bridge cardplay explained David Bird and Larry Cohen

In this unusual book, David Bird and Larry Cohen present cardplay instruction in a new way. 100 pairs of deals are shown, that look similar, but an entirely different line of play is necessary to make the contracts. Only by clearly understanding the techniques involved will you be able to tackle such deals at the table.

'Malahide regional bridge club has announced the revival of Malahide bridge congress. First organised in 1965 the congress was subsequently discontinued. The renewal of the festival will take place at the home of the original event, the Grand hotel over the weekend of March 6th to 8th, 2020.

Irish Times
Irish Times
Seamus Dowling Bridge Notes March $9^{\text {tin }}$.

The Programme will have Gala Open Pairs, Mixed Pairs and Novice Pairs on its Opening night of Friday March $6^{\text {th }}$. Saturday is a Pairs day of 2 sessional Congress, Intermediate A and B categories and these categories will be Saturday is a Pairs day of 2 sessional Congress, Intermediate A and B categories and these categories will be
repeated for 2 sessional Teams on Sunday $8^{\text {th }}$ finishing around 5.30 pm . These competitions are all pre entry and alongside them will be one sessional Open Pairs with No pre entry required.

The Grand Hotel Malahide is an excellent Congress venue with superb facilities and it has much more to offer with its gorgeous view of Dublin bay and being situated in the historic and homely village of Malahide.

Visit http://www.visitmalahide.ie/ to know more about Malahide and all it has to offer from Medieval Castle to beaches with coastal walks and it is a 10-minute drive from Dublin Airport.
You might consider adding Malahide Bridge Congress to your diary for 2020!
For more information:
Malahide Regional Bridge Club email: malahidebridgecongress@mrbc.ie
Brochure will be found on
...when ready....
The Grand Hotel Malahide
Quote Bridge Congress
http://malahideregionalbridgeclub.com/ email: info@the grand.ie Phone: +353 18450000
https://www.thegrand.ie/contact-us

MALAHIDE BRIDGE CONGRESS March $6^{\text {th }}$ to $8^{\text {th }} 2020$ GRAND HOTEL MALAHIDE will be run under the auspices of the Contract Bridge Association of Ireland (CBAI)

## AVAILABLE FROM A BRIDGE RETAILER NEAR YOU

## The ubid Auction Room

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

This month we are in Moscow for the Slava Cup．
A top class field played a 16 round Swiss to determine the winners． Brian Senior was at the venue，the historic Metropole Hotel，while Franc－ esca Canali set the Bulletins from her home in Italy．

## The Hands

（This month all the deals were played at IMPs．）
Hand 1．Dealer West．EIW Vul．


South overcalls 3＠，North raises to 4e and South passes and then bids 5＊

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fredin | Pavlushko | Sylvan | Yakovleva |
| 19 | Pass | 14 | 3\％ |
| Double | 4＊ | Pass | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | Pass | 5\％ |
| Double | All Pass |  |  |

 cost 800 but with 10 of 31 pairs reaching 6 it gave N／S 2 IMPs．

Recommended auction：Could East bid $4 \diamond$ over West＇s take－out double？ Although he is short on points he does have concentrated values and six－card support for a suit his partner is known to hold．Then it would be easy for West to bid $6 \uparrow$ ．
Marks：6＊10，5\＆X 7 5 5 ．
Running score：Slava Cup Stars 7

Hand 2．Dealer West．N／S Vul．

$4 \vee$ is easy，but enough pairs bid $6 \vee$ to make it worth 2 IMPs for N／S．South held $\uparrow$ KQ $9 \vee 73$ 9654 J1093 so if the defenders start with two rounds of hearts there is a spade diamond squeeze for twelve tricks．

However， $6 \vee$ is not a great contract－if South leads a top spade declarer could play to ruff a diamond in dummy，but that would risk whoever holds the $\vee$ A also having four diamonds and being able to give partner a ruff．So declarer would have to choose another line and might play a diamond to the ten at some point，with an unfortunate outcome．
Recommended auction：1－1NT－3：－4ワ．
Marks：4甲／3NT10，6『 6.
Running score：Slava Cup Stars 17
Hand 3．Dealer North．N／S Vul．
－J94
－AQ75
－A63
－ 742

\＆A7
－K964
－K8
\＆AKQJ10

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gulevich | Aluf | Gromov | Kokten |
| － | Pass | 19＊ | Pass |
| 1NT | Pass | 2＊＊ | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | 2NT＊ | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | 34＊ | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | 7 | All Pass |


| 12 | Precision |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1NT | 8＋Balance |
| 2e | Relay |
| 2NT | Relay |
| 3ీ | Relay |

2e initiated a series of relays，the answers revealing enough for East to bid the grand slam．Trumps were 3－2 so there was nothing to the play． With many pairs missing $7 \vee$ it was worth 12 IMPs．

Recommended auction：2NT－3e＊－3＊＊－3\＆＊－4e＊－4＊＊－4NT＊－5＊＊－7ヶ．
West asks for five－card majors and then shows four hearts．After a couple of cue－bids East asks for key－cards and discovers West has two aces and the $P$ ．
Marks：7『 10，6『／6NT 7，4ソ／3NT 5.
Running score：Slava Cup Stars 27
Hand 4．Dealer East．All Vul


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Baldursson | Matushko | Haraldsson | Khokhlov |
| － | － | 19 | Pass |
| 20＊ | Pass | 34 | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | 49 | Pass |
| 5\％ | Pass | 5 | All Pass |

2＊Game forcing relay
3＾was clearly a splinter，effectively setting hearts as trumps．No doubt West intended 3NT to be to play but East was unwilling to call a halt
to proceedings．After that confusion reigned．South held $\downarrow$ K86 『KQ974 K42 510 and 5 finished six down，-600 ．Although in theory you can－ not make a game on the E／W cards，3NT by West has reasonable chances －only an unlikely club lead is sure to defeat it．

There were no plus scores for $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ so this adventure cost 12 IMPs．

Marks：4『10，3NT 8.
Running score：Slava Cup Stars 27

```
Hand 5. Deoler South. Both Vul.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline －K643 & N & －AQ107 \\
\hline － 642 & & － \\
\hline －K52 & & AJ 1074 \\
\hline \＆A107 & S & －KJ42 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

North opens $2 \vee$ and South raises to $3 \vee$ ．

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gusev | Baldursson | Nikitina | Haraldsson |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | 2 | Double | $3 \downarrow$ |
| Double | All Pass |  |  |

North＇s hand was $\mathbf{J} 2 \mathrm{~V} \mathrm{KJ} 108753 \leqslant 8 \mathrm{Q} 98$ so there was no way to avoid two down，-500 ．With most E／W pairs playing in game and four in 6 that was worth 6 IMPs to N／S．

It seems clear that West＇s double was intended to be responsive．Per－ haps $4 \checkmark$ is a possible alternative，suggesting a hand that has good support for spades．East＇s next move is unclear，but how about a bid of $5 \checkmark$ when E／W will surely reach 64 ．

Recommended auction：If you consider the auction outlined above to be too esoteric then West might jump to 49．If East makes any sort of move there is a good chance slam will be reached．
Marks：6↔10，4↔／5 7，6ヶ5，3४X 4.
Running score：Slava Cup Stars 31

Hand 6．Dealer West．N／S Vul．

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q2 } \\ & \text { Q754 } \\ & \text { AQ95 } \\ & \text { Q74 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | AKJ9 $\text { AK } 1083$ <br> AK2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Gulevich | Sotnikau | Gromov | Medusheuski |
| 1NT | Pass | 2＊＊ | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 2NT＊ | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | 4＊＊ | Pass |
| 4＊＊ | Pass | 4＊＊ | Pass |
| 5\％ | Pass | 5 | Pass |
| 6 | Pass | 79 | All Pass |
| 2＊Stayman |  |  |  |
| 2NT Forcing |  |  |  |
| 4＊Cue－bid |  |  |  |
| 4＊Cue－bid |  |  |  |
| 4．Cue－bid |  |  |  |

Three pairs failed to reach the top spot，but that was not enough for E／W to collect a swing．
 shown two key cards and the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ while denying any kings．
Marks：7甲／7NT 10，6ソ／6NT 7，4ソ／3NT 4.
Running score：Slava Cup Stars 41
Hand 7．Dealer North．Both Vul．


South overcalls $2 \star$ and North raises to $5 \star$

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zorlu | Gromov | Kubac | Gulevich |
| - | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | 2 |
| $4 * *$ | 5 | Pass | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | $6 \downarrow$ | All Pass |
| $4 *$ | Splinter |  |  |

East＇s pass was forcing and when West went on to $5 \vee$ he judged it right to try for the slam bonus．With eight pairs stopping in game and two attempting 7『 this was worth 6IMPs as South＇s hand was $\mathbf{4 Q}$ 『K10 －AQ9865 \＆ $\mathbf{~ J 7 5 2 .}$

Recommended auction：You can＇t improve on the Turkish pairs sequence． Marks：6『10，7『5，5ヤ4．

Running score：Slava Cup Stars 51

## Hand 8．Dealer East．E／W Vul．

| － 9 |  | －Q743 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| －AJ842 | N | －K9 |
| － 62 |  | －AK10 |
| \％K9865 | S | －A743 |

If East opens $1 N T$ South bids $2 \checkmark$（spades and another suit）and North bids 2

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gromov | Matushko | Gulevich | Khokhlov |
| － | － | 18＊ | 1NT＊ |
| 29 | 24 | 2NT | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | 49 | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | 4NT | Pass |
| 68 | All Pass |  |  |
| Precision$\boldsymbol{\Delta}+\boldsymbol{\text { or }} \boldsymbol{\vee}+\boldsymbol{\mu}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

 were easy，and +1370 proved to be worth 13 IMPs．

Recommended auction：If East opens 1NT South might come in．For example $1 \mathrm{NT}-\left(2 \diamond^{*}\right)$ promising spades and another suit．West bids $2 \varphi$ and North comes in with $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ ．If East passes West continues with $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ ．If East now bids 3 NT West will pass，but if East raises to $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ it is possible
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that 6 will be reached.
The slam is modest, but essentially, it needs clubs to break, a $40.69 \%$ chance. With 3NT hardly laydown I am going to upgrade the slam.

## Marks: 5^10, 6e 7, 3NT 5.

## Running score: Slava Cup Stars 58

An exciting finish saw the Cup go to Iceland's Jon Baldursson and Sigurbjorn Haraldsson, just a whisker ahead of Norway's Terje Aa and Allan Livgard, while Russia's George Matushko and Yuri Khokhlov finished third.

You can play through most of the deals the deals mentioned in this article.

Just follow the links:
Hand 3: here or http://tinyurl.com/y3vxn7kt
Hand 4: here or http://tinyurl.com/y5h7wg5v
Hand 5: here or http://tinyurl.com/y5ocgr81
Hand 6: here or http://tinyurl.com/y6d9pzse
Hand 7: here or http://tinyurl.com/y2v7q2ve
Hand 8: here or http://tinyurl.com/y4m3y5mo

## accasix FUNBRIDGE.com

Press Release - 27 February 2019

## 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.

## 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



## The Master Point Press Bidding Battle Set 15

We kick off this month with what most panellists saw as a reasonably easy 10 points.

## PROBLEM 1

## IMPs. Dealer South. All Vul.

```
    \vee A6
    - K632
    & J10954
```

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | 10 |
| Pass | $1 \Phi$ | 2 | Double* $^{*}$ |

Dble Three spades
Bid Votes Marks
24 1610
3\% 27
3NT $1 \quad 3$
2NT $0 \quad 2$
For the large majority this one was very straightforward:
Sandsmark: 2a. Must show a very good raise to $3 \uparrow$ (which, by the way, is just what you hold!) Apteker: 2 Straight forward, a constructive raise with diamonds.
Zia: $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$. Have I read this wrong? Not a problem to these old eyes. Going to bid for a while. Sime: 24. I have a good hand with diamond support. Please tell me about yours partner. An easy start to the auction.... and the set.
Cannell: 24. An unassuming cue-bid for

## THE BIDS \& MARKS

Bid No. of Votes Marks

| 1. | 2 | 16 | 10 | 5. | 5 | 15 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 32 | 2 | 7 |  | Pass | 1 | 6 |
|  | 3NT | 1 | 3 |  | 5 | 1 | 3 |
|  | 2NT | 0 | 2 |  | 6 | 1 | 3 |
| 2. | Double | 7 | 10 |  | Double | 1 | 3 |
|  | 4* | 4 | 6 |  | 6 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 5* | 3 | 7 | 6. | Double | 8 | 10 |
|  | 3NT | 2 | 7 |  | 5 | 4 | 7 |
|  | 4 | 2 | 7 |  | 6 | 4 | 6 |
|  | Pass | 1 | 2 |  | 4NT | 2 | 7 |
| 3. | 2 | 11 | 10 |  | Pass | 1 | 2 |
|  | 3 | 6 | 7 | 7. | Pass | 10 | 10 |
|  | 2NT | 1 | 4 |  | 5 | 7 | 8 |
|  | 3 | 1 | 3 |  | Double | 2 | 5 |
| 4. | 3NT | 12 | 10 | 8. | 4NT | 8 | 10 |
|  | 3 | 5 | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | 6 |
|  | 3 | 2 | 4 |  | 4 | 3 | 5 |
|  | 32 | 0 | 2 |  | 49 | 3 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 1 | 4 |



Brian Senior-your Moderator-universally and affectionately known as Mr. Grumpy
diamonds. Something like a limit raise in diamonds as I passed South's 19 earlier. A redouble might be more ambiguous as to strength and diamond length.
Mould: 2a. I am tempted just to bid 3NT, but I suppose will start here. No idea where it will finish. Not that my judgement should mean anything since I am a man who played this weekend a hand in $2 \diamond$ which Zia made $7 \diamond$ redoubled on. Green: $2 \boldsymbol{a}$. I want to show a good raise in diamonds. I don't think there is any rush to jump to 3NT. I can always do that later. Imagine partner held $₫ K x \geqslant K Q x$ x $A Q x x x x$ x he would pass in a heartbeat and wouldn't thank me missing a laydown slam. I would discount redouble as although about right on values I would not consider it holding four card support for partner.

As they say, there is no rush to bid $3 N T$. Several panellists plan to bid that at their next turn. Teramoto: 24. It's limit raise or better. I will bid 3NT at my next turn, probably.
Lambardi: $2 \boldsymbol{\sim}$. To be followed by 3NT-opps allowing - as a choice of games. Even a slam might be there if partner is shapely. I have good cards for a suit contract so I see no need to rush into the - admittedly- more likely 3 NT.
Lawrence: $2 \boldsymbol{A}$. I intend to follow with 3 NT . Hoping this shows mild doubt about no-trump with strong interest in diamonds. My partner can easily have six diamonds to the ace and a trick. Brock: $2 \boldsymbol{4}$. Then 3NT next time if legal.
Robson: 2 $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$. For now. Will follow with 3NT to offer a choice of games
Kokish: 24. If N/S are going to bid a paying 4^, jumping to 3NT won't stop them, and because 3NT may not be our best contract I can't see a reason to bid 3NT yet. Redouble is reserved for hands of roughly average strength and twocard support, so won't often help East contribute sensibly to the discussion.
Bird: $2 \boldsymbol{4}$. That's awkward. If I had a sound raise in diamonds, I could just bid an obvious $2 \boldsymbol{A}$. Oh, I do have a sound raise.

It's the way you tell 'em, David.
Smith: 24. I seem to have a high-card raise of diamonds, so that's what I show. Indeed, it is hard to imagine bidding anything else at this point. I await with interest to see if any of the panel allow you to avoid the dreaded unanimity. Carruthers: $2 \boldsymbol{A}$. I'm not quite sure why this is considered a problem - perhaps Brian or the panel can enlighten me. My hand is better than a limit raise and the club suit is not appropriate
for a fit jump which, in any case, would carry us past 3 NT . And there is no rush to grab the no trump.

OK, we all agree that we have a constructive diamond raise and that there is no rush to bid no-trump, but what about:
Rosen: 3\%. I know 3NT is tempting - but no rush as I see it.
Rigal: 3※. planning to get to 3NT but suggest only one spade stopper. $\mathbf{3 e}^{\boldsymbol{*}}$ shows club values in a diamond raise angling for 3 NT , but I want partner to remove with short spades.

Unless we believe that 3* would simply be a natural bid, we have the choice of two UCBs - 2 a and 3s. No doubt a regular partnership would have some agreement regarding the difference between the two - overall strength of hand, number of trumps, which of the opposition's suits we have strength in...

For me, it feels more natural to cue-bid our stronger suit then follow up with $3 N T$, suggesting that perhaps we would appreciate a little help from partner in the other suit. Here, we have more points in spades than in clubs, but it is spades which we fear, so there is an argument for cue-bidding 3* then following up with $3 N T$. Of course, 2 leaves us a little more space, but it also offers an extra non-committal option, namely double, to North. Which is a long-winded way of saying that I agree with Neil and Barry - much though it pains me to do so.

There was also one vote for 3NT, but Leif-Erik chooses the bid partly for tactical reasons.
Stabell: 3NT. A problem with the mandatory support double is that partner has no idea of how strong you are. Let North guess and hope
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that he goes wrong. We only need Axxxxx in diamonds and the king of hearts for this to be a good contract.

So, an easy10 points for most? But I wonder how many readers will choose 3\& rather than 2^? As I see no real problems with $3 \boldsymbol{4}$, it gets a hefty upgrade.

Partner held:

- Q7
- J874
- QJ9874
- K

So a diamond part-score was the limit.


## PROBLEM 2

## IMPs. Dealer North. All Vul.

## - A 9

- J 1042
- 3
\& AJ 10865

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | Pass | 1* | 14 |
| 24 | 2NT* | 3\% | 3¢* |

?
2NT Constructive three-card spade raise
34 Weaker than pass

| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Double | 7 | 10 |
| 420 | 4 | 6 |
| 5\% | 3 | 7 |
| 3NT | 2 | 7 |
| 4V | 2 | 7 |
| Pass | 1 | 2 |

If the first problem was relatively straightforward, this one is far from being so, with no majority choice and six different answers in all from the panel. We start with everyone's favourite contract: Sandsmark: 3NT. YOLO! This is the only way to tell your partner that you hold close to an opening hand and have a spade stopper. With his unforced $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ partner shows some additional strength, and there might be any number of tricks in 3NT.
Green: 3NT. 5e looks odds against (though it could make opposite the right hand) and 4e seems wet as it will almost certainly end the auction. 3NT could easily be cold (sometimes partner has a top spade) and the only way we
are going to get there is if I bid it now.
Well, there may be another way to get to $3 N T$, but we'll see that in a moment.

Some were willing to commit to a different game:
Mould: $5 \boldsymbol{e}$. Even if $6 \boldsymbol{e}$ is cold I cannot see how I can sensibly get there. Yes, pard is probably $3-1-5-4$ on the auction, but so what? If 3 NT is right I have to bid it now and that seems so unlikely. I suppose I could try double and float 3NT but even so it could be the wrong contract. Here I just want to get to $5 \boldsymbol{2}$ as quickly as possible and let them guess what to do.
Robson: 5e. All depends upon partner's hearts. Will he know $\leqslant x x \geqslant x \diamond$ Axxx ${ }^{*}$ Kxxx is a game? I doubt it.
Lambardi: 5\%. Not very sophisticated but I don't think my hand is good enough to invite slam. I would need to be sure partner has guaranteed 4 trumps, which I don't believe he has. Cannot think of a less conclusive bid as $4 \boldsymbol{\mathcal { E }}$ sounds simply competitive and anything else would be an overbid in my book.

Then there were those who were willing to settle for $4 \boldsymbol{\AA}$, accepting that it is just competitive:
Rosen: 4\%. I need perfect stuff to make 3NT including a fast not slow diamond holding - so odds against. Double (competitive) is my alternative option.
Teramoto: 4ㄹ. Competitive and NF, partner may raise only if he has a good hand.
Bird: 4e. 3NT is too ambitious for me, and Pass is too timid. I'll go down the middle with $4 \boldsymbol{e}$.
Smith: 4\%. 3NT is obviously the alternative, but that requires partner to hold fairly specific cards (eg. \&xx $\mathrm{xxx}_{\mathrm{x}} \diamond \mathrm{AKxxx} \boldsymbol{\$} \mathrm{Kxx}$ or similar).

There seem to be plenty of hands that are consistent with his bidding where we cannot make either game. Perhaps I have been hanging out with Mr Conservative for too long, or maybe it's just the onset of old age.

3NT Obviously the alternative? Not according to these panellists:
Apteker: 4`.I am bidding game to show my second suit and shape. I guess it must have been my plan initially to show hearts at my second turn otherwise I should have doubled at my first turn. Stabell: 4ソ. This must have been the plan when I decided not to make a negative double over 1 a .
 so I cannot afford not to mention hearts.

Yes, I guess he could have that hand, when 4 is the only game that has a chance.

Drew and Iain also looks toward a heart contract.
Cannell: Double.-Competitive in nature. Whether this informs partner that I have four hearts I am not certain. It feels like the most flexible bid at this juncture.
Sime: Double. Game try, although I doubt if partner will think of Four Hearts rather than Five Clubs. I would have doubled on the previous round.

Double may also get us to 3NT:
Zia: Double. Not penalty, but will play 3NT if he bids it. Sophisticated treatment..
Brock: Double. Game try. I expect him to bid 3NT with a stopper, or else something else intelligent.
Lawrence: Double. Good hand. Keeps games in the picture (murky). I don't want to bid 3NT here since it's too final. If partner finds a pass,

we should do well. By the way, is that explanation of their overcall structure for real? Seems suicidal.

That's what they told us at the table. Kokish: Double. If pass were forcing that might sometimes solve this problem, but if I pass, East could sell out to 3 -, which must to be wrong. As one or more of $3 \mathrm{NT}, 5 \boldsymbol{\mathcal { e }}, 3 \boldsymbol{4}$ doubled and perhaps $4 \checkmark$ will surely be best. This hand has grown up with East's raise, so competing to $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ is not on my radar. 3NT needs clubs to run or a second spade guard and probably more, and might be playable only from East's side, so it would be presumptuous to bid it. As double is the only action that keeps everything in play, I
believe that is pretty much foisted on us (who's on foist? Who? No, who's on second).
Carruthers: Double. Now this is a problem. Pass, Double, Four Clubs, Four Hearts and Five Clubs are all possible. Double is a game try in this situation (I hope!). This occurs most often when we overcall the suit immediately above theirs and they compete to a level where we do not have a natural game try available (they compete to Three Heart over our raise from One Spade to Two Spades, for example). This situation is a little different, but analogous, I believe. On the bidding so far, I'd expect Partner to be something like $2=2=5=4$, meaning that unless I can get an immediate discard on a diamond, I'll have a spade to lose, then whatever other losers we may have. If Partner has an averagely bad hand for me ( $\boldsymbol{\Delta x x} \vee \mathrm{Qx} \upharpoonright$ KQxxx ${ }^{\mathrm{E}} \mathrm{KQxx}$ ), I could be one off in four clubs, while a very good hand for me ( $\boldsymbol{\wedge} \mathrm{xx} \nabla_{\mathrm{xx}} \diamond$ AKxxx $\boldsymbol{\aleph} \mathrm{KQxx}$ ) would produce a good play for game. One might Pass as a tactical strategy, hoping the bidding goes no further, but the deal looks like it belongs to us with my aces, singleton in Partner's suit and Partner's opening bid, so I'm not worried about bidding on. My hand is a little too good for a merely competitive Four Clubs, with my aces and sixth club. Four Hearts might work, bullying them into bidding Four Spades, which I'd happily double. Five Clubs is a bit of a shot, giving the oppo the opportunity to Double when my partner has the first hand I mentioned previously and Pass when he has the second. An excellent, practical problem.

Yes, double is the most flexible option and the only one that both keeps hearts and NT in the
picture without committing to that denomination or to game. I like it.
Rigal: Pass. No reason to bid on here with no real extras and a comfortable lead against 3a.

Well, we have a sixth club, which provides extra playing strength. I'm afraid you are on your own on this one Barry - which I doubt will worry you unduly.

Pass has to score poorly with the rest of the panel bidding on, while 4 is downgraded because there is a big majority for either bidding or at least inviting game.

## PROBLEM 3

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

- K
- AQJ863
- K874
\& KQ

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \varphi$ | Pass | 14 | Pass |


| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 11 | 10 |
| $3 \vee$ | 6 | 7 |
| 2NT | 1 | 4 |
| 3 | 1 | 3 |

We'll start with the solo flyers.
Teramoto: 2NT. I would like to show 18 points and avoid missing a game. $2 \star$ may see Pass with 7 or 8 points sometimes.

I see where you are coming from, but 2NT is a serious misdescription of our distribution, so I
can't say that I'm a fan. Also, when partner does pass, we are surely in the wrong partscore.
Sime: $3 \downarrow$. No Gazilli, so a choice between $2 \star$, 3 and $3 \vee$. Vulnerable at teams, I will go for the game force.

I don't think the hand is worth a game-force, though I expect a much bigger reader-vote for the bid. $3 \diamond$ on king-to-four disturbs me, and I think the short honours in the black suits are a good reason to downgrade a little. Ben and Alon were close to bidding $3 \uparrow$ :
Green: $2 \star$. I wouldn't criticise a $3 \diamond$ bid, I think it's close. I'm downgrading my KQ doubleton and the stiff spade isn't great either.
Apteker: $2 \checkmark$. Slightly heavy but I prefer that to the $3>$ game-forcing overbid.

While Alan was not,
Mould: $2 \downarrow$. Not close to $3 \star$ for me, nor $3 \vee$, nor 3 NT , though that is my second choice and I suppose I could just about live with that.

Nobody else mentioned 3NT, though there were a couple who considered Tadashi's $2 N T$ call.
Smith: $2 \star$. Plenty of alternatives here $-3 \downarrow, 3 \vee$, 2 NT all have some merit and although I suspect my choice won't be the most popular, I still think it is correct. Three Hearts seems to be the best of the rest, but what's the rush? Wouldn't we rather play in diamonds opposite something like Axxxx $\vee \mathrm{x} \leqslant$ Axxxx exx? If partner passes Two Diamonds, my lack of aces suggest that it's unlikely we are missing game. If he manages to continue, then I can probably describe my hand fairly accurately with Three Hearts at my next turn
Brock: $2 \uparrow$. Difficult. Don't really like it but like the alternatives - $3 \vee, 4 \vee, 2 N T, 3 N T-$ less.

Sally did not even mention $3>$ as an option. Meanwhile, there was more support for the quiet 2 rebid.
Rosen: 2 $\downarrow$.
Bird: $2 \uparrow$. It doesn't look like a $3 \uparrow$ rebid, with 11 points outside hearts. I'll keep the bidding low and see what partner does next.
Stabell: $2 \downarrow$. This is probably meant to test the upper limit for a simple $2 \diamond$ rebid, and I think we have reached it here. But since a pure hand like Axxxx $\vee$ QJ10x $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { c }} \mathrm{xxx}$ gives little play for game, $2 \checkmark$ - hoping for another bid from partner - is probably enough.

Yes, we must be close to the limit for a $2 \diamond$ bid, but that was the choice of the majority.
Rigal: $2 \downarrow$. Not perfect but if I can get past this round...not suitable for $3>$ or $3 \vee$ and while I won't be happy to hear my partner pass I'd like to let partner describe his hand rather than set up a GF.
Lambardi: $2 \star$. If partner cannot bid we are unlikely to have a game. He will only Pass 2 if 1-3 in the reds and a very weak hand (4-7). If the bidding does come round to me, rebidding the hearts will show this hand type.

Yes, he will often give false preference with 2-3 in the reds, so will rarely pass $2 \star$.
Kokish: $2 \star$. I've been accused of underbidding before, but $3>$ is not close for me. $3 \vee$, a tad heavy on high cards but with uncertain black values and plenty of losers, not to mention the missing nine or ten of hearts, is a compromise second choice, but $2 \checkmark$ gets at least nine of my cards into the picture without strictly limiting my strength. In 2025 maybe $2 \checkmark$ will be the plurality choice.

You don't have to wait until 2025, and you already have a majority, not merely a plurality, in favour of your choice.

The main opposition came from the invitational heart jump rebid.
Sandsmark: 3 ४. In my book a jump to $3 \diamond$ would show 5-5 in the red suits. Then, again, we may not have read the same book! I think the rebidding of hearts should be preferred, as the hearts are so much longer and stronger than the diamonds, and it will surely make the bidding easier for partner!

It would be nice if 3 could guarantee five cards, but we could have opened a 3-5-4-1 21-count, with which nobody would be happy rebidding $a$ non-forcing $2 \star$ - and playing $2 \diamond$ as forcing also has obvious flaws.
Cannell: 3 ४. Or, $21 / 2$ diamonds. The singleton spade king is a dubious value so I will try to portray the good six-card heart-suit and an invitational hand-type.
Zia: ${ }^{\text {P }}$. If partner was not passé I would bid $2 \star$. Now just look towards the most likely game Robson: $3 \vee$. Normally I like $2 \diamond$ on these handtypes but being left there is too unappealing; my diamonds are so poor relative to the rest of the hand.
Lawrence: $3 \vee$. Close between $2 N T$ and $3 \vee$. Difficult.
Carruthers: 3४. The alternatives, I suppose, are Two Diamonds and Three Diamonds. Neither of those gladdens my heart. The prospect of playing in Two Diamonds is abhorrent and I have neither the hand nor the suit for Three Diamonds; 2NT anyone?

I have sympathy for 3 - the hand looks to be
of invitational strength and the hearts are OK for the bid. However, the majority have the best of the argument I think - just!
I started my commentary by saying that I didn't like Tadashi's $2 N T$, but we see a number of panellists mentioning it as an option, even if none actually choose the bid.

Partner held:
\& Axxxx
$\vee-$

- 10x
\& A108xxx
3NT by the strong hand made after a diamond lead, while $4 \vee$ or 5 would have failed.


## PROBLEM 4

## IMPs. Dealer South. All Vul.

- 9743
$\downarrow 9$
- KJ87
- 9843

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | Double | Pass |
| $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \downarrow$ | Double | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ | Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass |


| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 3NT | 12 | 10 |
| 3ゅ | 5 | 7 |
| 3 | 2 | 4 |
| 3\& | 0 | 2 |

We have 4 HCP and have to date shown nothing. With no long suit to bid, is the following not automatic?

Rosen: 3NT. Sounds like partner expects this. Apteker: 3 NT . It may be that partner was hoping I would pass $2 \vee$ and only has a 19-20 balanced type hand but he could have more and, if not, this is teams and 3NT may still make if the cards lie right.
Cannell: 3NT. Partner's second double sometimes portrays three-card spade support and approximately 17-19 HCP. When partner then bids 2NT after Two Spades I expect three spades and 20-22 HCP, or so. My diamonds may just be enough for partner to negotiate a ninth trick in no-trumps.
Smith: 3NT. This is clearly the companion hand to the 20 -count we had a couple of months ago. Having shown a zero-count so far, this is now a clear raise to 3 NT , which confirms the majority view that passing Two Spades on partner's hand was right. Obviously, we're not even considering the Three Clubs which would have been the winning action now.
Robson: 3NT. Partner has announced a rock. I have plenty I think.
Carruthers: 3NT. Partner has only three spades and is crying out to be raised. I'll humour him. Bird: 3NT. Partner sounds like someone blessed with at least a 22 -count. He will expect me to raise on this. If his heart stopper is inadequate, that's not my fault.
Sime: 3NT. Enough for game with finesses working. I considered $3 \boldsymbol{*}, 3 \diamond$ or $3 \vee$, then $3 N T$ over $3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ to show doubt about strain. The problem is, partner might then bid 4s on Axx or similar.

There were some complaints about our 2a rebid. Green: 3NT. Why did I bid 24 over the second double (and not 3 m )? I'll bid 3NT now as I have more than I've promised.
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Mould: 3NT. Haven't we seen this hand last month? If so I bid the cold 5*. In the real world I bid 3NT. I might not have bid 2 last time, but 3 $\uparrow$. Stabell: 3NT. With the second double, partner asked me to try something else, so was a questionable choice even though it did describe my strength. I suppose this is the strongest possible way for partner to get to 2NT without committing to game, so my king and jack should give 3NT some play. I cannot bid anything else for fear of getting $4 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ from the other side.
Lambardi: 3NT. Partner seems to be showing a 2NT opening sitting behind the opener. I really should pass but cannot bring myself to try for exactly $+120.3 \square$ as a choice of games might drive us to a good 5 m , but I am very worried

about ending up in a no-play 4 so I'll settle for second best. Would pass if green or at Pairs.
$3 \vee$ as a choice of games is the wining action as partner held only a single heart stopper.
Sandsmark: 3४. I don't think any of partner's doubles are for penalty. If that hypothesis is correct, partner has an enormous hand with length in both minors. Then the best way of telling him about a good fit in both minors is simply to say 3४. He knows already that I am not strong, but $3 \vee$ may be exactly what the doctor prescribed. If he misunderstands and pulls in 3 NT , believing me to hold a heart stopper, I will take out in $4 \boldsymbol{e}$, and then he will know for sure!

I was going along quite happily with that until the last sentence. If partner bids $3 N$ T over $3 \vee$ we should trust him to have at least two heart stoppers and pass. How can we know that he has misunderstood us?
Zia: $3 \uparrow$. I don't understand the $2 \boldsymbol{\infty}$ bid. I would have bid $3 \uparrow$. Now I bid $3 \vee$. And if partner bids 3a I will be haunted by 2 .
Lawrence: $3 \uparrow$. Having submitted the question, I'm not sure this vote should count. 3NT isn't out of the question. I do have values. $3 \curlyvee$ keeps other options alive.
Rigal: $3 \boldsymbol{\vee}$. Not sure where to go and $3 \boldsymbol{v}$ lets partner avoid 3NT if he is unable to produce a second stopper. I'll bid 3NT over 3a But I would not have bid $2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ over the double. $3 *$ then 4 certainly possible here.
Kokish: 3ヶ. Then 3NT over 3ヶ to express strain doubt. Will pass 3NT. This hand is strong enough for game. Three of a minor would be an offer to play.
I agree with all of that.

There were two panellists willing to settle for a partscore.
Teramoto: $3 \uparrow$. 2 NT is very strong but may not be enough.
Brock: $3 \uparrow$. No idea really but it doesn't sound as if partner is that wedded to NTs, so I might as well bid where I live.

Partner was $3-5$ in the minors and $3 \diamond$ does not work very well. Three Clubs, on the other hand, is a great success - but why would we bid our four small rather than the king-jack-to-four?

## PROBLEM 5

IMPs. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

- 7543
- AK543
- 9

K108

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | 3 | 3 | 5 |

?

| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $5 \boldsymbol{1}$ | 15 | 10 |
| Pass | 1 | 6 |
| $5 \boldsymbol{1}$ | 1 | 3 |
| 6 | 1 | 3 |
| Double | 1 | 3 |
| $6 \boldsymbol{1}$ | 0 | 2 |

We are a passed hand and hold four-card trump support, a good side-suit headed by the ace and king, a shortage in the opposition's suit, and are very close to having an opening bid. A big majority felt that we were well worth a slam try and that
the obvious slam try was：
Rosen： $5 \vee$ ．Doesn＇t everyone？
Not quite，but most do．
Teramoto：5४．I passed already，so don＇t have long excellent heart suit．I should have some Spades and a good hand．

Yes，you should．
Stabell：5 ${ }^{\boldsymbol{v}}$ ．Clearly worth a slam try as a passed hand． 6223 with AKQ and should be enough for slam． $5 \vee$ might also help partner if they press on with $6 \star$ ．
Apteker： $5^{\vee}$ ．Not clear if it actually shows hearts or merely a control in hearts or is last train，but it unambiguously shows spade sup－ port given the initial pass，and slam interest．
Cannell： $5 \uparrow$ ．Fit－showing non－jump？Heart cue－ bid in support of spades in a cramped auction？ What the heck－I have both．
Green： $5 \vee$ ．As a passed hand this must be a raise to 5 with heart values．I can＇t drive to slam as it could be no play so this is my only option．
Sime： $5 \vee$ ．Curious hand．When the opponents pre－empt，one often wishes that one had opened a marginal hand．However，now I can conven－ iently make a slam try without overstating my hand．
Zia： $5 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ ．Probably futile attempt to get to slam facing AKxxxx $\mathrm{xxx}_{\mathrm{x}}^{\boldsymbol{*}} \mathrm{Axx}$ ．
Carruthers： $5 \downarrow$ ．For the lead or a help－suit slam try，or both，take your pick．The danger is that Partner may not think I have four－card spade support when I bid Five Hearts，then miseval－ uate accordingly．Nevertheless，whatever he thinks，he＇ll know I cannot possibly be wanting to play in Five Hearts，having passed initially． Lambardi： $5^{\circ}$ ．Inviting a slam in spades．Could
pass and convert the（obligatory？）double，but then I would have to bid 5 as 5 natural．
Lawrence： 5 • ．My notes specifically say that this is a forcing situation．A forcing pass is an option．However，I have a terrific hand，good enough to make what，logically，is a fit－showing bid．On this auction，I should have a good hand to bid $5 \uparrow$ ．Sadly，this can backfire．On the one hand，if East has $\uparrow$ AKxxxx $\nabla_{x x}^{*}$ Axx，we have a good play for slam．But there are other layouts where doubling them on an auction where maniacs roam，may earn a much bigger than normal penalty．Wondering how many will suggest opening $1 \vee$ ．

The answer to that question is two．
Bird： $5 \vee$ ．Since I am a passed hand（I don＇t know why，with this obvious $1 \vee$ opening），I must bid something stronger than 5 now．
Smith：5『．It is hard to imagine bidding any－ thing else．Even if I weren＇t a passed hand this should surely be a slam－suitable spade raise with a top heart．Having passed earlier（did I need a toilet break and someone bid the hand for me on the first round of the auction？）Five Hearts now seems blindingly obvious．

If you regularly open this type of hand in sec－ ond seat and at adverse vulnerability it may be your partner who needs a toilet break．
Brock： $5 \vee$ ．I could hardly be better as a passed hand，but he did bid only 3 s so I am not going to bid slam all on my own．

Quite，so the slam invitation is perfect．
Rigal：5ソ．A little pushy but why shouldn＇t we make slam here opposite the right hand？ $₫ A K Q x x \geqslant$ Qxx $\uparrow x x$ Axx．Yes I＇m only dreaming

I know．．．but it could happen．
Only one panellist was willing to commit to slam－and rightly so，as this is surely an overop－ timistic valuation of our hand：
Sandsmark：6४．Must show shortage and a good hand with good spade support．I expect to be the only one in the jury who makes this bid！

I like the prediction better than I like the bid． Quite apart from not believing the hand to be worth a slam bid，I think that $5 \vee$ rates to be far more helpful to partner than $6 \leqslant$－assuming that he takes $5 \square$ to show hearts and not just a control． Mould：54．We have duplicated shortages．This hand is not as good as it looks．Against some opponents you can bid $6 \boldsymbol{1}$ and stampeded them into $7 \star$ ，but that tactic works less and less．

Sorry，but once we decide to bid， $5 \downarrow$ is so far superior to 5a that I am amazed that anyone would choose to bid 5a．How could we have a better hand than the actual one？We have a 5 bid for free．At worst，we will miss a cold slam，but we are wildly unlikely to get to a bad one．

This next is the best alternative to $5 \vee$ though， as Eric says，the subtleties of an immediate 5 versus pass and pull are very much for individual partnerships to decide on．
Kokish：Pass．Forcing here because a passed hand facing a pre－empt can＇t be permitted to play for 11 tricks without being doubled（even if they can make 5 doubled）．That＇s just the start，of course，as it＇s a partnership matter to make meaningful distinctions between pass and pull to $5 \vee$ or $5 \boldsymbol{\text { a }}$ and making those bids directly， assuming $5 \curlyvee$ won＇t be treated as natural after passing originally．That makes the problem a bitch to score sensibly，so the best any of us can

## A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE－AprIL 2019

do is explain our preferences．As this hand is among the best we could hold for a second－seat pass，I＇m choosing the strongest action，which is pass and pull a double to $5 \vee$ ．One reason why it＇s better to play this as stronger than a direct 5 M is that pass leaves East room to do other than double $5 \triangleleft$ ，giving West more useful information．I＇m putting on my sound－killing headphones if you＇re going to tell us that our best result is defending 5 doubled，or that－ 500 in 5 doubled is better than the -550 for $5 \diamond$ doubled making．

A number of other panellists mentioned that pass was forcing，and of course it is forcing．A pre－empt facing a passed hand bidding to the five level at favourable vulnerability cannot be left to play there undoubled once we have come into the auction．
Andrew was out on his own：
Robson：Double．＂Five is for the other side＂． Two ways to win－they go for more than our game，or 54 doesn＇t make．I expect many will bid $5 \cup$ which，as a passed hand，should agree spades．True，but still not my choice as I can＇t see a likely slam．

The quote is sound，but we have a great hand and slam cannot be far away，hence nobody else was prepared to settle for a penalty．Partner held：
－AKQ96
－ 82
－A7
＊A754
The penalty would have been sizeable，but not enough to cover the making slam，which we would surely reach if we make any try．

PROBLEM 6

## IMPs．Dealer East．All Vul．

－A64
－ 1097653
－A84
\＆J

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | $2 \mathrm{NT}^{*}$ | $4 \boldsymbol{a}$ |

？
2NT 20－21

| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Double | 8 | 10 |
| $5 \odot$ | 4 | 7 |
| $6 母$ | 4 | 6 |
| 4NT | 2 | 7 |
| Pass | 1 | 2 |

Is this a forcing pass situation？Yes，says：
Smith：Pass．With controls in all three side－ suits facing a 2NT opening，this seems a bit good for Five Hearts now．I pass（obviously forcing） then pull partner＇s likely double to Five Hearts to show slam interest．If he has good trumps it should be obvious to raise，which is surely what I want him to do．

That is surely what we want him to do，but no－one else seemed confident that the pass was obviously forcing．

Some take the bull by the horns and bid what they think they can make－don＇t you just love an optimist？
Cannell：6『．I will bid what I＇think＇we can make．I do not know if there is a scientific way forward after this．
Stabell：6『．A gamble，but I have reason to
believe that partner has two small spades and South KQJxxxxx．In that case，any 20－point hand opposite will give a play for $6 \vee$ ，since $\uparrow x \vee$ AJx $\bullet K Q J x \& A K Q x$ is about the worst he can have， and some other 2－3－4－4 hands make the slam laydown．
Brock：6ソ．Could be no－play but it＇s my best guess．
Zia：6甲．Suicidal and most likely a mistake． Why do I feel（know）the trumps aren＇t going to break？But can＇t resist and $5^{\circ}$ seems so fee－ ble．My experience is that a 4 4 bidder，vulner－ able，WANTS to be doubled．

Although some of those who want to be doubled do so just because of their masochism．

If 6Y is too much for you on a ten－high suit， how about：
Apteker： 5 ソ．On a good day where the cards are running for our side，I may punt $6 \uparrow$ ，expecting to find partner with at least three trumps，hope－ fully no 4－0 trump split，North unable to lead spades and most of the remaining values out－ side of spades．Today does not feel like my day though，so 5 it is which will end the auction． Teramoto： $5 \vee$ ． 4 © when vulnerable looks like trying to make sometimes，so it may be like 7－5． Bird： $5^{\top}$ ．It＇s not my style to bid $6 \downarrow$ ，needless to say．I like to drive right in the middle of the road．

And a bloody menace you are too on those roads， David．
Kokish：5४．Wow！With a spade ruff almost cer－ tain and with South possibly having a diamond void or heart void we may not belong in hearts（or， obscurely perhaps，diamonds）even from our side． As finding the right strain（no trump is certainly in the picture）and level will be a guess our best
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possible result can be to settle for what we can get from 4a doubled, which might not be much (if anything). If East has all his honours outside spades our potential is quite high. Whether I can get us to diamonds when that is best is probably too difficult (5NT-6४; Pass?) so $5 \uparrow, 6 \gtrdot, 6 \mathrm{NT}$ or 4 NT . I believe without great conviction that takeout would be a more popular interpretation than natural for 4 NT , and I would vote for a take-out $4 N T$ to be followed by a NAT slam try of $5 \mathbf{V}$. I am aware that many would treat the delayed $5 \checkmark$ as weaker than a direct $5 \vee$, but we're flying blind on this issue here. Without any real agreement I'd guess to bid $5 \vee$ rather than $4 N T$.

I think you are right - in a strange partnership $4 N T$ followed by $5 \vee$ should be stronger, though I am in the camp which believes that the direct 59 should be the stronger route - if you bid $4 N T$ and partner responds $5 \checkmark$ your $5 \checkmark$ bid merely shows hearts and clubs, not a good $5 \checkmark$ bid, and you would rather lose your message when holding the weaker hand-type.
So, what about bidding $4 N T$ ?
Green: 4NT. OK I know this hand. At my table 2NT was 22-23. First question, is pass forcing? I think in theory it should be but in practice most do not play it as such. If pass is non-forcing then double just shows values and so what is 4 NT ? For me 4 NT would show a two-suiter unless followed by a $5 \vee$ bid, which shows a sin-gle-suited slam try. With a direct $5 \checkmark$ being to play. One could play this the other way round by agreement.
Rigal: 4NT. Two-suited hand, typically minors, but correcting to $5 \vee$ shows a better $5 \checkmark$ bid than acting directly? Yes this won't be a popular
choice but I'll bravely sacrifice my marks to educate the public. (I understand the Japanese PM may have recommended me for a Nobel Prize...)

The biggest vote, however, went to the ubiquitous double.
Sandsmark: Double. I think my hearts are too feeble and I can find no secure way to bid any good, safe slam. The enemy is vulnerable and I have an obvious choice as for the lead: \&J, which will probably give me a couple of ruffs, and the opponents will go at least 800 down. If I should have to make a bid here, it would be $5 \downarrow$, but that is more or less a punch-drunk blow into thin air, and partner will never manage to understand that I can hold two Aces. I can never say 4 NT , which for most partners would produce the idea that I have two suits. South's bid is named pre-emptive for a reason. A good pre-empt always diminishes the other side's possibilities, take away nearly all their opportunities and land them in an awkward situation, as they already are so high that it is practically impossible to exchange information. 4a makes you guess, and thus it qualifies as a very good pre-empt.
Lambardi: Double. As I see no way of exploring the heart slam at this stage, the penalties will surely compensate for the game bonus. If partner takes it out - as doubles are never doubles any more than openings are openings nowadays, I will bid $5 \square$ and let partner figure it out. Sime: Double. A cast list would help. Let's assume that South is not on the lunatics list, and is not colour blind. He will probably have at least KQJ10xxx and an ace. Slam seems like a long shot, and defending may be our best result.

Rosen: Double. Tricky. Could just blast a dubious slam (love those aces). Double then $5 \varphi$ - is this discussed? Maybe stronger than direct?!
Robson: Double. Maybe I should infer partner has the perfect cards (no wasted spade values) and bid $6 \uparrow$. Perhaps I should.
Carruthers: Double. My suit is just not good enough to mention. This is why they pre-empt. Lawrence: Double. Cards with penalty overtones. I'm hoping that my singleton club, something declarer will not have expected, will prove enough to get us 800 . East has a good hand but my aces and shape may be enough to hurt him. Obviously, bidding can be best but I would need a wire on the board to guess correctly.

Tadashi and Zia are concerned that South will be happy to be doubled, with the contract maybe even making, while others are merrily counting their money, expecting at least 800. At least looks like a bit of an insult to South, who could see that he was vulnerable when he joined in the auction, but maybe he has a semi-black-two-suiter and Mike will be correct that his singleton will mean ruffs enough to get to 800. The only trouble is, that this layout sounds like the one when $6{ }^{\circ}$ is closest to being successful also. Mould: Double. Absolutely no idea! But we do have two aces and my six-card suit is ten-high. I suppose this is cold as well as $6 \vee$ being cold. Did I mention that you are asking questions of a man who has just played in $2 \diamond$ when Zia etc....? BTW, would passing $4 \Phi$ be forcing?

Only Marc is convinced of the forcing nature of a pass, so I'll say that, no, pass is not forcing here. The panel, on balance, seems to believe that double is largely for penalty, and the plurality prefer that to the committal heart bid on such a weak suit.

## PROBLEM 7

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

- AK3
- 875
- AJ 10964

2 $Q$


Double $2-5$
Whether a pass is forcing is often a contentious issue, but on this one the panel was pretty happy that, as $3 \vee$ was GF and we are at adverse vulnerability, pass over 4@ must be forcing. Pass therefore garnered a narrow majority.
Stabell: Pass. Just about enough for a forcing pass, despite some wastage in spades.
Teramoto: Pass. $3^{\top}$ is GF, so partner must double if he doesn't have anything better to do. If he doubles, I will defend 4 doubled.
Sime: Pass. Forcing, I trust, in which case I can pass the buck.
Rigal: Pass. Yes, $3 \downarrow$ has set up a GF auction so pass is forcing, and that being so I guess I'm worth a pass. Note that the discard on the spades means a hand like $\uparrow$ © AKQxxx $\downarrow \mathrm{xx}$ \&KJxx makes slam playable.

A point also made by Mike.
Lawrence: Pass. Forcing. For once, this bid feels just right. If partner bids on, I'm happy. My AK of spades actually may have value since they will
allow East to get rid of diamond losers should we play in hearts.
Zia: Pass. I think this is forcing after 3『.
Green: Pass. I'm not strong enough to pass and then pull partner's double as that shows a strong hand. So for me this is between a direct $5 \vee$ and a forcing pass ( $3 \vee$ clearly set up a forcing pass in my opinion as it forced our partnership to game). I opt for the latter as my trumps are poor and my spades may be useless in a heart contract. If partner doubles I will happily pass.
Brock: Pass. I will pass if partner doubles. Maybe I should double myself but I am reasonably suitable if he wants to bid on in hearts.

## But:

Kokish: Pass. 3 was a GF, although East would have to stretch on occasion and double here would be a regressive action, but as this hand has both offense and defence it would be presumptuous to express a strong opinion about defending. Passing sends the intended (initial) message of doubt. I will take out a double to 4 NT to show more than one place to play and convert 5 to 5 to keep hearts in the picture. In diamonds we may be able to discard heart losers on clubs, but as it's quite likely that East has mainly hearts and could be short in diamonds, we want to keep both strains in focus. Passing East's reopening double could be best but it's worth taking some risk for the vulnerable game bonus, with an upside at the slam level. While Marc is making a definite slam try.
Smith: Pass. Déjà vu all over again, as Yogi Berra would have said. I Just repeat my answer to Hand 6 at this point. With such good controls (even though the $\uparrow$ K may be wasted), I think I
am too good just to bid Five Hearts now. So, I pass and pull partner's likely double to Five Hearts as a slam try.

What about double?
Sandsmark: Double. The only thing you can say with any degree of certainty here is that there is nothing about this bidding that points towards any action at the five level by me. However, I will be really surprised if the enemy can make 4d.

So double is for penalty and discourages partner from bidding on?
Robson: Double. The bidding isn't over - partner can pull. I'm merely announcing a hand, not ↔KQJ10. But if partner does pass, I'm more than happy with my defensive spades.

Or maybe double shows extras so encourages partner to bid on?

I'd have thought that, where pass is forcing, it is more popular to play double as suggesting that we defend.

The real alternative to passing came from those who were willing to commit to hearts.
Lambardi: $5^{\bullet}$. I do have minimum high-card values and the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ is not particularly fascinating, but three trumps and a side shortness tempt me into action. $5 \downarrow$ is not a strong bid in any case. Pass is a very close alternative.
Rosen: $5^{\downarrow}$. Not defending here.
Apteker: $5 \downarrow$. Given the poor heart values and amount of values I have in the opponent's suit, I don't believe I have enough to suggest slam via a pass and pull should partner double.
Cannell: $5 \checkmark$. I believe we are in a forcing pass situation at this vulnerability. I do not think I quite have the goods for a pass and pull = extra values with this collection. A bit of a guess, but
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I think I may have enough for the Five Heart bid. Mould: $5 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$. Now passing $4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ is definitely forcing since $3 \vee$ is FG. With these wasted spade values and poor trumps I do not think I have quite enough to do that, but I am not settling for a penalty out of 4ه.
Bird: 5४. I will keep one wheel either side of the cat's-eyes on this one too. I don't like to take any stronger route (via a forcing pass) with such poor trumps.
Carruthers: $5 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$. While I realise that Partner has at most one spade, my ace-king may provide a diamond discard for him. My only concern is that we have two trump losers and a club, but that would be rather unlucky.
I don't like committing to the five level with three low hearts - not when I can pass to invite partner to bid on - but it's a close call. $6 \uparrow$ was making while 4ه doubled would have collected +800, facing:

- Qx
- AKQ
- KJx
* AQ9xx

PROBLEM 8

## IMPs. Dealer West. None Vul.

^ KQ1075

- AKQ1062
- A

2 K

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\psi}$ | Pass | $3 \dot{2}$ | Pass |
| $3 \boldsymbol{y}$ | Pass | $4 \dot{e}$ | Pass |


| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 4NT | 8 | 10 |
| $4 \downarrow$ | 4 | 6 |
| 4 | 3 | 5 |
| $4 \uparrow$ | 3 | 5 |
| 6 | 1 | 4 |

The 2onening is not a strong point of standard methods as we start the auction at an uncomfortably high level and a positive response cramps the bidding still more. Let me say from the outset that I would have opened the hand with $1 \vee, a$ point made by one or two of the panel, of course. Some repeat their strong heart suit:
Rosen: 4ワ. Gosh - don't know! Might use RKCB for clubs, might wait with $4 \diamond$, might bid our spades? I know! I'll bid my hearts again! Final answer lol.....So 4V.
Stabell: $4 \Downarrow$. An artificial $4 \diamond$ would have been nice here, but since partner could easily have the same distribution as I have (1-1-5-6), I have to be careful. I would assume that $4 \diamond$ would be natural and $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ would not - how can you otherwise make a strong raise in clubs? Maybe I should try 4@ anyway, but I try a conservative $4 \checkmark$ and intend to raise $5 \boldsymbol{*}$ to Six.
Sandsmark: $4 \boldsymbol{\top}$. My bid will more or less depend on what means. If it is a Cue-bid with heart support, I will bid 4NT (Blw). If he only means to show long clubs and no heart support I will retreat with $4 \boldsymbol{P}$ (possibly even 5\%). Unfortunately, I find nowhere in the system sheets that even begins to cover this bidding sequence! However, I am not going to stop below game level here!
Hardly surprising that this would not be covered in the system notes, but partner made a club

positive at his first turn and to play a repeat of the same suit as other than natural would be a bit perverse, don't you think?
Apteker: $4 \boldsymbol{\Downarrow}$. This may be the last making game. I don't think we can assume that partner has at least AOJxxx that would give play for $6 \boldsymbol{e}$; he may have a lesser holding with nothing else to bid. May need much more than that on a diamond lead, as need to get off the table to draw trumps. Time to switch to a strong club system.

Well, possibly - a bit late to solve the current problem, however.

Others were more willing to trust to partner's clubs.
Zia: 4NT. Must be keycard ...Otherwise sack the director!

Sack the director? More like reduce his sentence

## if he was got rid of!

Smith: 4NT. It's unlikely that I am going to be able to bid a grand with any certainty, since I cannot see if partner holds the J10 of clubs to go along with the A and AQ. However, if I get a Five Spade response to Blackwood and then bid 5NT, confirming all of the key cards, partner should be able to bid the grand if his clubs are solidified by confirmation of my king.
Lawrence: 4NT. 2 worked poorly here. Perhaps $1 \%$ was better. Just wondering. Given the bidding, I bid 4NT, KC for clubs. Will bid 7\% if he East shows two plus the queen. Not beautiful but at least it is a plan.
Lambardi: 4 NT . I will settle for clubs as my stiff king has started to look good. $4 \diamond$ may attract a heart preference but it might as easily buy a diamond raise. Spades are by now out of the question, I'm afraid. Partner has a good 6-card or 7 -card suit so the hand will be best played there in any case. If we have all the Key cards and $\mathcal{Q}$ we may be on our way to Heaven.
Cannell: 4NT. RKCB for clubs. Partner has shown a positive hand with clubs and then rebid them. My singleton $\& \mathrm{~K}$ is massive support. I may as well find out if partner has the right key-cards so I can place the contract.
Mould: 4NT. cannot think of anything other than Blackwood. If pard's clubs are not good enough, well, so be it.
Carruthers: 4NT. He can hardly have less than AQJxxxx in clubs. RKCB will tell me exactly what I want to know for slam/grand slam purposes. Bird: 4 NT. No, I don't think that is natural. We will play in $6 \boldsymbol{\mathcal { E }}$ unless he has a $5 \mathbf{4}$ response (when I will bid 5NT to ask him to look again at
his trump suit). I don't see that $4 \diamond$ is superior, even if it is 'obviously' a control-bid.
'Obviously' would be a stretch, I think. I'd bet that if we switched around the spades and diamonds there would be a bigger vote for a natural $4 \diamond$ than is actually the case for a control-showing $4 \uparrow$. Having said which, it is surely a matter of partnership agreement and depends to a large degree on just how good partner's clubs must be for the rebid.
Green: $4 \downarrow$. It is a matter for partnership agreement as to whether a new suit here is natural or a cue-bid. For me it's a cue and therefore I choose to show a suitable hand, singleton king here feels like gold dust.
Sime: $4 \downarrow$. I would like to bid 4 NT RKCB for clubs, but my expert partner may not see it that way. Sometimes, having an expert partner is a handicap.

It's sometimes not much fun being the expert partner either.
Brock: $4 \downarrow$. Looks as if clubs will be the right trump suit. Tempting just to bid 6e, but I guess he could have the ace of spades.
They are all happy to make a control-showing bid and assume partner's clubs to be adequate to the task. Then there are those who show their second suit:
Rigal: 44. Should be natural and forcing if $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ is natural - and I don't see what else it could be! If partner bids $5 \boldsymbol{} 1$ I'll try $6 \boldsymbol{*}$.
Kokish: 44. It's deals like this that highlight the importance of having a systemic response to show a one-loser suit (2NT is the bid I prefer, and that includes the ten). With AQJxxx, KQJxxx, AKJxxx - no ten - I would transfer to the long
suit. In this feature all we know is that East has a decent long suit. Could that be AJ to seven? Well, why not? Could East have the $\$$ ? Sure. I won't nit-pick about the opening but over 4\& West really has no idea whether to settle for $6 \boldsymbol{*}$, try for seven, give East an out in $5 \boldsymbol{*}$ or angle for spades or hearts. Will East interpret 4a as NAT, at least five-six? Without agreement the answer ought to be yes, although that leaves West no way to deal with the right level in clubs other than Blackwood or a guess.
Good idea. A natural 2NT response to a 2\% opening is a bit of a waste of space - literally! Showing a self-supporting (one-loser or better) suit in response to 20 is a great idea.
Robson: 4@. Abstain. Would never have opened 2*, envisaging these problems. Fancy not being able to show these spades. I would have opened $1 \vee, 99 \%$ confident someone would do something. If am forced to bid now, erm 4a (no idea what it means).

Noble soul - couldn't quite bring himself to abstain. As I said at the beginning, I too would have opened $1 \Upsilon$.

And finally:
Teramoto: 6\%. I expect that he has something like AQJxxxx. He may bid Seven with A.

Yes, if he has those clubs plus the $\boldsymbol{A}$ he should indeed raise to Seven.

A number of the panel have assumed partner to hold AOJxxx or better. It does seem, as Alon pointed out, that he might occasionally have nothing better to do than repeat his suit when it is weaker than that. Ace to seven and the $A$, for example, or $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{A J x x x x}$ and $\diamond K Q x$ - must the latter hand bid 3NT with nothing in spades?
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In real life, partner held:

- 96
$\checkmark$ J8
- 5

AQJ98432
Congratulations to this month's joint winners, John Carruthers and Pablo Lambardi, who each scored 75, one point ahead of Mike Lawrence.


SET 15 - THE PANEL'S BIDS \& MARKS

|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| John Carruthers | Canada | 24 | Dble | 3 | 3NT | 5 | Dble | 5 | 4NT | 75 |
| Pablo Lambardi | Argentina | 2 | 5\% | 2 | 3NT | 5 | Dble | 5 | 4NT | 75 |
| Mike Lawrence | USA | 24 | Dble | 3 | $3{ }^{4}$ | 5 | Dble | Pass | 4NT | 74 |
| Drew Cannell | Canada | 2 | Dble | 3 | 3NT | 5 | 69 | 5 | 4NT | 71 |
| Zia Mahmood | USA | 24 | Dble | 3 | 39 | 5 | 6 | Pass | 4NT | 70 |
| Ben Green | England | 24 | 3NT | 2 | 3NT | 5 | 4NT | Pass | 4* | 69 |
| Alon Apteker | South Africa | 24 | 4 | 2 | 3NT | 59 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 68 |
| Alan Mould | England | 24 | 5\% | 2 | 3NT | 54 | Dble | 5 | 4NT | 68 |
| Iain Sime | Scotland | 2 | Dble | 3 | 3NT | 5 | Dble | Pass | 4 | 68 |
| Marc Smith | England | 24 | 4* | 2 | 3NT | 5 | Pass | Pass | 4NT | 68 |
| David Bird | England | 24 | 4* | 2 | 3NT | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4NT | 67 |
| Neil Rosen | England | 3\% | 4* | 2 | 3NT | 5 | Dble | 5 | 4 | 67 |
| Sally Brock | England | 2 | Dble | 2* | 3) | 5 | 6 | Pass | 4 | 65 |
| Eric Kokish | Canada | 2 | Dble | 2 | 3 | Pass | 5 | Pass | 49 | 65 |
| Leif-Erik Stabell | Zimbabwe | 3NT | 4 | 2 | 3NT | 5 | 67 | Pass | 4 | 62 |
| Tadashi Teramoto | Japan | 2 | 4* | 2NT | 3 | 5 | 5 | Pass | 69 | 62 |
| Barry Rigal | USA | 3\% | Pass | 2 | $3 \%$ | 5 | 4NT | Pass | 49 | 58 |
| Andrew Robson | England | 24 | 5\% | 3 | 3NT | Dble | Dble | Dble | 49 | 57 |
| Tommy Sandsmark | Norway | 2 | 3NT | 3 | 39 | 6 | Dble | Dble | 4 | 55 |
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## A New Bridge Magarine Bidding System

## Attention！！！

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

## Basic Method

## Natural

## 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 F2NT 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 $2 \downarrow, 2 \downarrow$ and $2 \wedge$（ $5-9$ ，six－card suit）．
In response 2 NT is a relay asking for a high－ card feature if not minimum with 3NT showing a good suit，non－minimum．4\＆is RKCB．2any－ 2new＝NAT Constructive NF；2any－3new＝NAT Forcing．
Three－level openings are natural and pre－emp－
 is RKCB．
3NT opening is Acol gambling－solid suit and at most a queen outside．
Four－level opening are natural．

## No－trump bidding：

After 1NT $15-17,2 \boldsymbol{2}=$ Stayman， $2 \uparrow / 2 \uparrow=$ trans－ fers， $2 \boldsymbol{s}=\mathrm{s}$ with $2 \mathrm{NT} / 3$ denying／showing a fit， $2 \mathrm{NT}=\leqslant$ with $3 \boldsymbol{*} /$ denying／showing a fit．After this new suits are splinters． 3 e is 5 card Stay－ man， $3 \rightarrow$ 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 1 NT ．
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，20－22，3e＝Stayman with Smo－ len， $3 \uparrow / 3 \uparrow=$ 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）．

## Initial response：

Jump shifts are weak at the two－level and invita－ tional at the three－level．Bidding and rebidding a suit is invitational，bidding and jump rebidding a suit is FG（eg $1 \downarrow, 2 \downarrow$ is weak， $1 \diamond, 1 \vee, 2 \downarrow$ is invitational； $1 \diamond, 1 \vee, 2 \boldsymbol{*}, 3 \vee$ is FG）．
2 NT after $1 \boldsymbol{e} / 1$ is natural and invitational with－ out 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
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$=18-19$ balanced, 4 of new suits are splinters but deny a second suit. 4 of partner's major shows a bad opening. Such as $1 \mathrm{M}-2 \mathrm{NT}-3-3 \mathrm{M}-4 \boldsymbol{e}=$ splinter ( 3 NT is $5 \mathrm{M}-4 \diamond-2-2$ ).

## 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 2 NT 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 $1 \Upsilon / 1 \boldsymbol{A}$. 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. $1 \diamond-1 \stackrel{\wedge}{-}-2 \downarrow-3 \vee=$ splinter in support of $\downarrow$.
4th suit = game-forcing.
When responder's suit is raised a return to opener's suit is forcing.

## 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 , 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.

## Competition:

Responsive and competitive doubles through 4 - 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 3 NT shows a stopper but not 4 oM , 2NT then 3NT shows a stopper and 40 M , 2NT 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

## 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.
$1 N T-2 \varphi-3 \boldsymbol{A}$ 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 1NT.

## 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 $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{C}$.

## 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 ( $5,5 \mathrm{in} \mathbf{~} \mathbf{~ / ~}$ 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 $3 \star 4 \boldsymbol{*}=\boldsymbol{\&} \& \mathrm{M}$ and $4 \star=$ Ms. Over
 $4 \boldsymbol{\Phi} / \uparrow / \uparrow=$ nat, $4 \oplus / 4 \mathrm{NT}=$ two-suiter.

Over their 1NT, Dble = pens, $2 \boldsymbol{2}=$ majors, $2 \downarrow=$ 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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## WEST

Hands for the
April 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 West. E/W Vul.

- A4
- AK8752
- AK82
- 8

South overcalls 3e, North raises to $4 \boldsymbol{k}$ and South passes and then bids 5
Hand 2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- AJ763
- K3
- K10
- AK75

Hand 3. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

- J94
- AQ75
- A6
- 742

Hand 4. Dealer East. All Vul.

- AQ 10975

106

* AQ763

Hand 5. Dealer South. Both Vul.

- K643
- 642
- K52
- A107

North opens $2 \odot$ and South raises to $3 \bullet$ Hand 6. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- Q2
- Q754
- AQ95
\& Q74
Hand 7. Dealer North. Both Vul.
- J109532
- Q984
-     - 
* AK9

South overcalls $2 \star$ and North raises to $5 \diamond$ Hand 8. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
$\rightarrow 9$

- AJ842
- 62
- K9865

If East opens 1 NT South bids $2 \star$ (spades and another suit) and North bids $2 \boldsymbol{a}$

## MASTER POINT BIDDING BATTLE

## Results - Set 14

For the first set of the new year we have the following winners:
James Carpenter missed out on a maximum by bidding $2 \vee$ on question 2, so he wins the month with a score of 78. Bill March came second on 75 , and there was a tie for third between Tony Burt and Todd Holes both on 72. Mrs T's iPad selected Todd for the third copy of the book

The other participants, names were transferred electronically to Mrs T's iPad. Whereupon the randomising routine I loaded onto her machine selected Mark Bartusek when the button was pushed. He too will receive a copy of the eBook.

## Other Good Scores

71 Alex Athanasiadis
70 David Barnes, Peter Becker
69 Mark Bartusek
66 Jeff Callaghan
65 Dudley Leigh
63 George Willett
62 Jaak Känd, Erika Lindentha

## The Yearly Standings:

After two contests, Mark Bartusek totals 142 points, leading by one from Bill March.
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## Comments on Bidding Battle Set [4

Brian Senior examines the responses of the readers and compares them against those of the panel.

As usual, this month saw the readers come up with a number of responses not selected by any of the panel. So, who has convinced me that I need to award marks to calls which I had previously overlooked?

## PROBLEM 1

```
IMPs. Dealer South. E/W Vul.
- A9732
- AJ9653
- 86
-
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline West & North & East & South \\
\hline - & Pass & 1\% & Pass \\
\hline 19 & Pass & 28 & Pass \\
\hline 2\%* & Pass & 2NT & Pass \\
\hline ? & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

| Bid | Votes | Marks |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | Readers

The only calls selected by readers but not by members of the panel were $3 \vee$ and $4 \Upsilon$. I had already awarded 2 points to $3 \vee$ but I will increase that by one to 3 points - sorry, hardly an earth-shattering change, I know simply because $3 \vee$ could be the best spot available to us, though I much prefer to get spades into the game. And again, $4 \checkmark$ could be the winner, but when it is partner is likely to choose it over 34, which is more flexible and keeps more options on the table, so 2 points to $4 \vee$.

## PROBLEM 3

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

| ¢ AQJ98654 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - K94 |  |  |  |
| - J3 |  |  |  |
| * - |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| - | 1* | Double | $3{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| ? |  |  |  |
| Bid | Votes | Marks | Readers |
| 54 | 13 | 10 | 9 |
| 49 | 4 | 6 | 26 |
| 6 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Double | 0 | 2 | 3 |

Three readers voted for a responsive double. I am having trouble deciding whether that is completely bonkers or very clever - my inclination is to go for bonkers, but maybe there is a logic to it. Double will look very foolish if partner, with a balanced hand, passes and plays for the 'sure' penalty, which may prove to be non-existent. If partner does bid, however, we can follow up with 4 4 or 5 and maybe that says something different to an immediate jump to $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ or $5 \boldsymbol{\$}$ ? Maybe one jump to $5 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ asks specifically about diamonds, while the other asks partner to look at their whole hand? Anyway, I'll award a couple of points just to soften the sting of being accused of being bonkers.

## PROBLEM 5

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

- A1032
$\checkmark 8$
- AK107

2 AQ85

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | $3{ }^{2}$ |


| Bid | Votes | Marks |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | Readers

There are two reader-calls to consider. The first is $3 \star$, which looks odd on a four-card suit but was mentioned by Eric in the main article, and not in a disparaging way, so I think we can justify awarding it 2 points. Had we held a fifth diamond $3 \star$ would have been at least considered by more than just the one panellist, so it is not a million miles away from being a good choice, and it does avoid the big - or should that be, gigantic, pitfall of this next call. Of course, if partner responds 3 ${ }^{\vee}$, we will have another decision to make over that.

A take-out double was described by one panellist as certifiable, while not a single one said anything positive about the call. We know in our heart of hearts that partner is going to bid hearts in response to a double, and if that is with a jump we will be completely *******. Even if he bids only a quiet $3 \vee$, to continue with $3 N T$ is an overbid. I can't bring myself to award anything to a double - sorry.

## PROBLEM 6

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

4. AK875

- A
- J8
- KQJ64

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | $1 \varphi$ | $1 \varphi$ | $3 \varphi$ |
| $4 \varphi$ | $5 \varphi$ | $5 \uparrow$ | Pass |

## ?

| Bid | Votes | Marks |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 64 | 12 | 10 | 22 |
| 6甲 | 3 | 6 | 4 |
| Pass | 2 | 4 | 13 |
| 5NT | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| 62 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| Double | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Every month we seem to get a few weird answers from people who maybe haven't read the question carefully enough - there was a $1 \checkmark$ response to partner's 14 opening on Problem 4, for example, and here one reader wants to double partner's 5 bid. We can dismiss that without points, of course, but the other action chosen by two readers was 6 , which has more merit. I think that $6 \vee$ makes more sense as our grand slam try, as we need partner to have both minor-suit aces before we can even contemplate a grand slam, but $6 \boldsymbol{*}$ is OK , so gets 3 points.

## PROBLEM 7

IMPs. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

| - A4 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - AQ4 |  |  |  |
| - K8 |  |  |  |
| - A96432 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| - | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| 23 | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| ? |  |  |  |
| Bid | Votes | Marks |  |
| 3 S | 16 | 10 | 16 |
| 5NT | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| 4NT | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| 3 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| 3NT | 0 | 2 | 9 |
| 49 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 49 | 0 | 2 | 1 |

Three reader-calls on this one.
Four Clubs just feels wrong. It over-emphasizes the empty club suit while making it very tough to get back to either of partner's suits with any confidence - those two honour-doubletons really do offer great potential for a trump suit in slam - so no points for $4 \boldsymbol{e}$.

Four Spades and 3NT both suffer from the same flaw of sounding far weaker than what we actually hold. It is a pretty well established principle that 3 a would cover stronger hands than a jump to 4@, the latter being limited even if playing picture jumps, and this hand contains 17 HCP with great controls. We are already limited as regards our spade support so 3 a cannot cause us problems and could be the key to a successful slam hunt. I'm not surprised by the nine votes for 3NT, but the bid shows a serious lack of appreciation for the potential of our hand. I'll give both the game bids a couple of points, but I think those readers need to reread the panel's discussion and avoid such underbids in the future.

PROBLEM 8
IMPs. Dealer East. E/W Vul..
↔ 84

- AKQJ87
- 963
- Q8

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | $1 \&$ | $2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ |
| $3 \boldsymbol{4}$ | $4 \boldsymbol{Q}$ | Pass | Pass |

?

| Bid | Votes | Marks |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | Readers

Several people had remarks such as "Double if partner has passed, Pass if he has doubled". Apparently the question as published was not entirely clear. Most people did understand that 4@ meant four spades, but some thought the $x$ could have been a double. It wasn't, and we don't believe the four passers thought it was. Anyway, though passing out 4a is clearly wrong, I will award it a generous 4 points in case the passers were genuinely confused as to what was going on.

How did the mysterious 4 get into the magazine? Good question, and one to which I don't have the answer. Once upon a time, we used to use $\boldsymbol{\imath}, \downarrow$, and as replacements for the four suit symbols whilst typing because none of those letter combinations appear in normal English, so we could then do a global change to an actual symbol later on in the process of producing the article without risk of affecting the rest of the text. But in recent years we have typed in a specialised font for bridge which automatically converts a group of brackets into the four suit symbols, so etc should no longer be involved in the process.

Herman also tells us that Dudley Leigh said it was a great set of problems where often every bid is dangerous. Passing (his choice) on question one is horrible but all the options look worse-it looks more like a Brexit discussion!

One day we will be able to look back on the Brexit pantomime and laugh - I hope. At the time of writing, is there anyone who is not completely sick of the whole thing?
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## Final Peebles SBU Congress 6th to 8th December 2019



The last SBU Congress after 46 years at the Peebles Hotel Hydro, and the only one in 2019, will take place in December this year. The format is shown below, but we aim to have a truly special event with some additional features

- 'Play through the ages' with Liz McGowan. We have a special set of boards for you with a booklet providing analysis and entertaining stories from the history of the SBU congress
- A 'nightcap with the experts' late on Friday evening, hosted in the hotel's brand new gin lounge. This will give you a chance to ask the experts about the hands played that day in a seminar format
- A celebratory Gala Dinner on Saturday, followed by a speedball pairs event.

To mark this final congress, participants will be encouraged to follow the evening dress code which was once the standard at Peebles congresses - strictly black tie, lounge suit or equivalents.

| Friday |  | Saturday |  | Sunday |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14:00 | Play through the ages | $10: 45$ | Swiss Pairs session 1 | $13: 40$ | Swiss Teams session 2 |
| 19:45 | Swiss Teams session 1 | $15: 00$ | Swiss Pairs session 2 |  |  |
| $23: 00$ | Nightcap with the experts | $18: 45$ | Gala Dinner | Swiss Teams session 3 |  |
|  |  | Speedball pairs |  |  |  |

## Join us in marking the end of an era and saying goodbye in style.

See over for costs and entry details.
Congress fees:

| Full congress (includes Friday afternoon and the speedball) | $£ 75$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Congress Swiss Teams only (three sessions) | $£ 45$ |
| Congress Swiss Pairs only (two sessions) | $£ 30$ |

## Hotel prices:

We have worked hard to agree value-for-money rates with the hotel. Resident prices cover all meals including buffet lunches and the Gala Dinner.

| Accommodation | Three nights (Friday lunch to Monday breakfast) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Single room | $£ 340 \mathrm{pp}$ |
| Double room used as a single | $£ 395 \mathrm{pp}$ |
| Double room | $£ 315 \mathrm{pp}$ |

The Gala Dinner is available to non-residents for $£ 45$ pp.
Note that spaces are limited and there is much enthusiasm for the event. Residency for the whole weekend will secure a space - after that non-resident places will be allocated on a first come, first served basis.

## Entries:

Visit www.sbu.org.uk or contact Hasan or Julie at sbucongressdesk@gmail.com or on 01313433838.
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## EAST

Hands for the April 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 West. E/W Vul.

- KQ95
- 9
- J97543
- 52

South overcalls 3e, North raises to $4 \boldsymbol{a}$ and South passes and then bids 5\%
Hand 2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- 84
- QJ10854
- AQ82
* 6

Hand 3. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

- A7
- K964
- K8
* AKQJ 10

Hand 4. Dealer East. All Vul


- AJ1086532
- AJ8
- K8

Hand 5. Dealer South. Both Vul.

- AQ107
-     - 
- AJ 1074

KJ42
North opens $2 \varphi$ and South raises to $3 \varphi$ Hand 6. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- AKJ9
- AK1083
- 7
- AK2

Hand 7. Dealer North. Both Vul.

- AK
- AJ6532
- J42
- 106

South overcalls $2 \star$ and North raises to $5 \star$ Hand 8. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

- Q743
- K9
- AK10
- A743

If East opens 1 NT South bids $2 \diamond$ (spades and another suit) and North bids 2 ©

## 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 Mis play 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.

