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## Last Minute

If you are taking part in the European Open Championships in Istanbul make sure you have a Visa. You can get one online - the best way is via the official site:
https://www.evisa.gov.tr/en/

## Marathon

Last month saw the 40th edition of the Telenor Copenhagen Marathon (the London Marathon started in 1981 - both events are babies compared to the Boston Marathon which began in 1897!). Congratulations to Christina Lund Madsen, who finished in 7999th place averaging 6:36 per km for a time of 4:38:31 - not bad when she revealed that she had been out dancing and drinking two nights before the race. (The winner, Jackson Kibet Limo averaged 03:05 with a time of 2:09:54.)

## The Numbers Game

The English Bridge Union recently announced its top clubs ranked by the number of player sessions in the previous year. These are the top ten:
1 Richmond Bridge Club
2 Wimbledon Bridge Club
3 Stamford Bridge Club
4 West Midlands Bridge Club Limited
5 Cheltenham Bridge Club
6 Kenilworth Bridge Club
$7 \quad$ Tunbridge Wells Bridge Club
8 South Bucks Bridge Club
9 Bristol Bridge Club
10 Oxford Bridge Club CIO

Richmond and Wimbledon were in the same positions last year and if you look back at previous lists you will find that these results are fairly con-
 stant. However, the top ten had better watch out, as the club in eleventh place, Ilkley's Olicana Bridge Club climbed 30 places this time.

## Freedom

Writing in his excellent column in The Times Andrew Robson noted that although bridge at club level is flourishing, tournament bridge is in decline, raising the question of how to get club players to compete in tournaments. On the same day, listening to one of the endless political debates that take place on the Radio, I heard a suggestion about how to get more people to leave their cars at home and start using public transport; make all bus travel free!
That set me thinking; to encourage players to compete in tournaments why not offer everyone a free entry to their first event? I'm due to share a taxi with EBU Chairman Gordon Rainsford on the way to the European Open Championships in Istanbul - I'll sound him out about this idea.
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## Vanderbilt 2019

The Editor reports on the 2019 edition which was staged in Memphis

## Quarter Finals

## Nickell v Spector

On the opening deal of the match South held $\mathbf{\$ J 1 0 9 8 4 \vee 4 ~ Q 8 5 2 ~ Q 5 4 ~}$ and saw his partner open IV, doubled by East. When West responded 1 North doubled. What would you do?

Ignoring Edgar Kaplan's advice that take-out doubles should be taken out, Weinstein elected to pass, while Spector bid $2 \downarrow$.



North led his spade and declarer won with the king, cashed two diamonds, ruffed a diamond, crossed to dummy with a spade and ruffed a diamond, completing a neat dummy reversal for +160 .

If North starts with four rounds of hearts declarer can ruff in dummy, but South overuffs and exits with the 4 after which there are only six
tricks.
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Katz | Wolpert | Nickell | Spector |
| - | $1 \downarrow$ | Double | Pass |
| $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Double | Pass | 2 |

Declarer was not inconvenienced by the 4-1 trump break and easily recorded nine tricks for a 7 IMP pick up.

```
Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.
                                    @ KJ7
                                    ` J982
                                    K
& QJ1076
```



```
Open Room
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Demuy & Levin & Kranyak & Weinstein \\
- & - & - & Pass \\
\(1 \boldsymbol{4}\) & Pass & 1NT & Pass \\
\(2 \boldsymbol{2 4}\) & Pass & \(4 \boldsymbol{~ A l l ~ P a s s ~}\)
\end{tabular}
```

North led the $\mathbf{Q}$ and declarer ruffed and played the $\mathbf{3}$, North rising with the
king and continuing with the Jeclarer ruffed, played a heart to the king and a diamond to the nine and king. Hoping West might be 5-5 in the majors North exited with the $>9$ and declarer won with the ten and played back a heart allowing South to ruff and play a diamond, North's ruff representing the setting trick.

Having won with the $>10$ declarer could have drawn trumps and taken the diamond finesse for eleven tricks.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Katz | Wolpert | Nickell | Spector |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 29 | Pass | 34 | Pass |
| 44 | All Pass |  |  |

Declarer ruffed the club lead, crossed to dummy with a heart and played a diamond for the nine and king. He ruffed the club return and played the $\$ 5$, North taking the king and playing a third club. Declarer ruffed, cashed the A, went to dummy with a heart, drew the outstanding trump and advanced the $\downarrow \mathrm{J}$ for eleven tricks and 13 IMPs.

Board 10. Dealer East. Both Vul.

- K962
$-93$
- AJ64
- A98

```
$1084
* A1042
-94
* KJ72
```

- 3
- KQJ65
-KQ102
1053

```
- AQJ75
- 87
- 873
\& Q64
```


## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demuy | Levin | Kranyak | Weinstein |
| - | - | $1 \downarrow$ | $1 \downarrow$ |
| $3 \star *$ | $4 \uparrow$ | 5 | Pass |
|  | Pass | Double | All Pass |
| 3. | Heart support |  |  |

Why East's thought his aceless wonder was worth a $5 \vee$ bid is a mystery. South led the A and continued with the queen. Declarer did not make the best of the play and finished two down, -500 .


West led the $\diamond 9$ and when declarer tried dummy's jack East won with the queen and played the $\geqslant \mathrm{K}$ followed by the six, West winning with the ace and returning the $\$ 5$. Declarer took dummy's ace, played a spade to the ace and a diamond. West pitched a heart and East won and continued with the $\checkmark$ K, and declarer ruffed high, drew trumps and played the 8 , ducking it to West, who was endplayed, so one down but a 12 IMP swing to Nickell who led 31-26.
You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y6d2osp7
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## Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.



The chess-playing engine Alpha Zero is raising the bar, playing in a highly aggressive style. Welcome to the Alpa Zero bridge partnership sitting N/S, who's tactical approach at the table has been confounding their opponents for years.

West led the $\$ 6$ and declarer ruffed in dummy and played the $\$ 8$, East going in with the king and fatally continuing with the $\downarrow$ A. Now declarer could ruff in dummy, come to hand with a heart, ruff a diamond, play a heart, ruffed by East with the $\mathbf{\$ J}$ and overruffed by declarer who played a club to the ace and the $\vee$ A, claiming ten tricks. If East ruffed declarer would throw his losing club, ruff the club return and ruff a diamond. +790 .

After taking the $\vee \mathrm{K}$ the simplest defence is to play two rounds of spades, after which declarer can only get up to nine tricks.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Katz | Wolpert | Nickell | Spector |
| Pass | Pass | 1 | Pass |
| $1 \downarrow$ | Double | 3 | All Pass |

Declarer took ten tricks, +130 and 14 IMPs.

```
Board 21. Dealer North. N/S Vul.
@ J1062
- A104
* J7
& K964
\begin{tabular}{|ll|}
\hline & \(N\) \\
\hline & \\
\hline & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Q8754
- AK93
- KQJ8
- Q943
- 5
- -
\(\checkmark 97652\)
- 108
* AQ8732
```

- 

```
- AK652
- J10
```

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wooldridge | Rodwell | Hurd | Meckstroth |
| - | Pass | 14 | 3** |
| 3** | 4V | 49 | Pass |
| 5\%* | Pass | 5** | Pass |
| 54 | Pass | 64 | All Pass |
| Hearts | Clubs |  |  |

If East was trying to convey that by bidding $4 \boldsymbol{a}$ he had a poor hand the message did not get through. The contract was two down, -100 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  | 4. AK93 <br> - KQJ8 <br> - Q943 <br> $\div 5$ | ¢ J 1062 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |  | A 104 - J7 |
| Katz | Wolpert | Nickell | Spector |  | - K964 |
| - | Pass | Pass | Pass |  | $N \stackrel{\text { Q8754 }}{ }$ |
| 1 | Pass | 14 | 1NT |  | $W^{N}=\stackrel{\text { V }}{ }$ |
| 34 | 4\% | 4 | 5\% |  | S AK652 |
| Doubl | All Pass |  |  |  |  |
| If E/W h doubled | bid $5 \leqslant$ S <br> or a spad | outh mig e lead. | ht well have |  | $\begin{aligned} & 97652 \\ & 108 \\ & \& \text { AQ8732 } \end{aligned}$ | time by claiming nine tricks, -500 and a 12 IMP loss.

During their incredible career as partners, Jeff Meckstroth \& Eric Rodwell have made countless contributions to the history bridge. One of the less obvious ones is their ability to make tricks out of straw, especially in what I call the Meckwellian 3NT - contracts that confound the normal rules about the high card points required for a game contract.


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ AK5 | N | - J942 |
| - J5 |  | - K742 |
| - A982 | W E | - J76 |
| ¢ 10762 | S | 2 K4 |

- Q10763
- AQ863
- 5
* Q8

In the Closed Room Nick Nickell had played in 1NT after the sequence $1 \downarrow$-(Pass)-1 -(1中)-Pass-(Pass)-1NT and, with a little help from the defenders, managed six tricks.

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Woolridge | Rodwell | Hurd | Meckstroth |
| $1{ }^{\text {d }}$ | Pass | 18 | 14 |
| Pass | 29 | 2 | 29 |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

Despite having no fit, Eric Rodwell introduced his clubs, no doubt trusting that his powerful diamonds would come in handy. When his partner bid for a second time he did not hesitate to try for the vulnerable game bonus.

East led the $\downarrow 6$ and as he tabled his hand Jeff Meckstroth asked his partner to 'hold down the damage'.

West took the $\checkmark$ A and returned the nine. Declarer went up with the king, pitching a heart from dummy and played the 3 . When East played the king it was accompanied by dummy's queen and West's seven. When East switched to the 4 West took dummy's ten with the king and returned the $\$ 8$. Declarer played the queen and the fall of the jack allowed him to cash two more diamonds. A heart to the queen was followed by a club to the nine and a claim, limiting the damage to a mere +630 .

Had Joel Wooldridge found the inspired play of ducking the first round of diamonds then the defenders would have been on course to prevail, but as it was, yet another Meckwellian 3NT had rolled home, this one delivering 11 IMPs.

## Board 29. Dealer North. All Vul.


 heart for the jack and ace. North switched to the $\$ 2$ and when declarer played dummy's queen South won with the king and played a club - once again a ruff was the setting trick.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Katz | Wolpert | Nickell | Spector |
| - | Pass | 1 | Pass |
| $1 \downarrow$ | Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass |
| $3 \star *$ | Pass | $3 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

South led the 4 and declarer took North's jack with the queen and played a heart for the jack and ace. North returned a spade and declarer won the third round and played the king of clubs, followed by the jack. When North's ten appeared declarer played a third club and South won, cashed his spade and exited with the $\vee$. Declarer played low from dummy and could claim, +600 and 12 IMPs.

Nickell had taken the set 68-2 to lead 99-28 and when they increased their lead to 134-42 in the next session Spector threw in the towel.

You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y2k47qth

## Lavazza v Mittelman

```
Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{- A 10932} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{- J98642} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\& Q3}} \\
\hline & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\& K7 \(\quad\) N 6} \\
\hline - K7 & & \(\checkmark 53\) \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{-KQ72 W E AJ10643} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{5}{*}{\& K9764} & S & - A 852 \\
\hline & ( QJ854 & \\
\hline & - AQ10 & \\
\hline & - 985 & \\
\hline & 2 J 10 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mittelman | Duboin | Bercuson | Donati |
| 1NT* | 2\&* | $3 * *$ | 4* |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| 1NT | Good 13-16 |  |  |
| 2\& | Majors |  |  |
| 3* | Invitational |  |  |

Do you think West might have bid $5 \checkmark$ as a two-way shot - it might be making or a cheap save?

The first five tricks were a game of ping-pong as declarer ruffed the opening lead and played a club. At trick six, declarer played a heart to the ace and ran the $\mathrm{Q},+620$.


West led the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ and declarer ruffed in dummy and played a heart to the queen. West won and switched to the 4 , one down and 13 IMPs for Lavazza.

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - K10643 <br> $\checkmark 42$ <br> - AQ3 <br> \& AK7 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 103 <br> 53 |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Mittelman | Duboin | Bercuson | Donati |
| 14 | Pass | 2* | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 2 | Passs |
| 3\% | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | 3NT | Pass |
| 4 | All Pass |  |  |

North led the $\checkmark 5$ and declarer won in dummy and played a spade. The appearance of the ace meant there was nothing to the play, +420 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sementa | Pachtmann | Bocchi | Zatorski |
| 10 | Pass | 3NT* | All Pass |

South led the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ and declarer won with the king, played a diamond to the queen and spade to the queen and ace. South returned the $\checkmark 6$ and declarer won in hand and played a spade, ducking when South pitched
the 26. North won and went back to hearts, declarer winning and clearing the spades. When North produced a third heart the contract was one down, 10 IMPs to Mittelman.

When South pitched a club on the second spade declarer could have eliminated diamonds and played three rounds of clubs. South could win, cash two clubs and play the V , but declarer would duck, forcing a lead into the $\vee$ A9. To avoid this, South should pitch a diamond on the second round of spades. However, if declarer wins the diamond switch with dummy's ace South will have no defence, as now pitching a diamond on the second spade allows declarer to play on spades. North wins and is stuck. A diamond return allows declarer to execute the aforementioned endplay, while a heart sees declarer play the nine, after which he can establish a ninth trick in spades.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mittelman | Duboin | Bercuson | Donati |
| 18 | Pass | 39 | 4e |
| 4 | 5\% | Pass | Pass |
| Double | All Pass |  |  |

West led the $\downarrow$ A and switched to the $\geqslant 2$, the defenders scoring three tricks, -200.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sementa | Pachtmann | Bocchi | Zatorski |
| $1 \downarrow$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ | Pass | Pass |
| Double | All Pass |  |  |

North's $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ is extraordinary - but the VuGraph operator thinks he may have misread South's Pass, as a Double makes more sense.
Declarer won the heart lead with dummy's ace and ran the $\boldsymbol{\downarrow} \mathbf{J},+790$ and 14 IMPs.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mittelman | Duboin | Bercuson | Donati |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| 1ष | Pass | 3 | Double |
| $4 ष$ | All Pass |  |  |

North led the $\$ 5$ and declarer was soon claiming +480 .


If you use 4130 responses to RKCB then its best to reverse them in exclusion, as there is a greater chance of responder having no key cards.

North led the $>3$ and declarer won with the seven and played a spade for the queen and ace. When South could not return a trump declarer could pitch a diamond on the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ and claim on a high cross-ruff, +980 and 11 IMPs to Lavazza, who trailed 34-37 at the end of the set.

You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y53t72de
Board 18. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

- AQJ9764
- J87
-     - 

1095

- 82
- A94
- KJ97
- J876

- 103

32

- Q1065
- K5
- KQ1065
- A8432
- A


That was an easy +1430 and 17 IMPs.

## Board 24. Dealer East. None Vul.



Open Room


North led the $\uparrow$ K and declarer won with dummy's ace, crossed to the $\vee \mathrm{K}$, pitched a spade on the diamond ace and played a heart to the jack, +420 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Donati | Bercuson | Duboin | Mittelman |
| 1NT* | 24 | Double* | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | 34* | Pass |
| 4\%* | Pass | 5** | Pass |
| 6 | All Pass |  |  |
| Good 14-17 |  |  |  |
| Take-out |  |  |  |
| Cue-bid |  |  |  |

If $5 \curlyvee$ was asking for good trumps West decided $\upharpoonright$ K653 was enough (he could have held four small hearts). The contract was two down when
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South was able to overruff the third round of spades, -100 and 11 IMPs to Mittelman, who led 76-46.

```
Board 25. Dealer North. E/W Vul.
```



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zatorski | Bilde | Pachtmann | Madala |
| _ | $4 \vee$ | All Pass |  |

East started with two rounds of spades and declarer ruffed, played a diamond to the ace and a heart to the king - one down.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Donati | Bercuson | Duboin | Mittelman |
| - | 19 | 23 | 2 |
| 24 | 5 | 5** | Pass |
| 5 | 6 | Double | Pass |
| 64 | Pass | Pass | 7 |
| Pass | Pass | Double | All Pass |

64 strikes me as a brilliant bid - to have cue-bid a heart control East had to have good spades and a decent club suit. South did well to save. There were three tricks to lose, -500 and 10 IMPs for Lavazza.

## Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zatorski | Bilde | Pachtmann | Madala |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| 1e | $3 \boldsymbol{a}$ | 4 | Pass |
| 4NT | All Pass |  |  |

North started with two rounds of spades, declarer ducking, and then switched to the $\vee 3$ for the nine, king and ace. There were only nine tricks, -50 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Donati | Bercuson | Duboin | Mittelman |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| 13* | 24 | 3 | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | 49 | Pass |
| 49 | Pass | 5\% | Pass |
| 59 | Pass | 6\% | All Pass |

Declarer won the spade lead, cashed the K and played a diamond for the king and ace. He ruffed the diamond return and claimed, +920 and 14 IMPs for Lavazza, who had turned the match around to lead 93-76. They went on to win 170-148.
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You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y62harwb Wolfson v Pepsi


Declarer lost a diamond, a club and two hearts, two down, -300 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Crouch | Drijver | Hydes | Brink |
| - | Pass | Pass | 1 |
| Double | 2 | $4 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ | 5 |
| Pass | Pass | $5 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | 6 |
| Double | All Pass |  |  |

Declarer could not avoid the loss of a heart and a club, -200 and 11 IMPs to Wolfson.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pszczola | Becker | Blass | Kamil |
| - | Pass | 1 1e* | 1NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| 12 | $12-14$ balanced, $16+$ with |  |  |

West led the $\vee 8$ and East took the ace and returned the queen, declarer winning with the king, cashing the and continuing with the East won and switched to the $\downarrow 9$ which ran to dummy's king. Declarer played a spade to the king and exited with a diamond, West winning and returning the $\boldsymbol{\$ 7}$. The defenders were in control now, declarer finishing one down, -50 .

When East switched to a diamond declarer needed to play the queen. If West wins and returns a diamond declarer has more than one way to get to seven tricks-the simplest being to duck, win the next diamond, play a spade to the king, cash the $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{J}}$ and then play two rounds of clubs, endplaying East.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Crouch | Drijver | Hydes | Brink |
| - | Pass | 1NT* | Double |
| 2 | Pass | Pass | Double |
| Redouble | Pass | 2 | Double |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
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There is no way to defeat $2 \boldsymbol{a}$ - a low diamond would give the defenders a chance to hold it to eight tricks - but South started with the $₫ \mathrm{~K}$ and declarer won and returned a spade to dummy's ten. South won the next spade and exited with a diamond, North winning with the king and returning a heart. Declarer won with the ace, ran the $\$ 10$ and played two more rounds of diamonds pitching a club. A heart to the queen endplayed South for an overtrick, +870 and 13 IMPs for Wolfson.


West led the $\vee 4$ and declarer took East's queen with the ace and returned the eight. When West ducked declarer played a low diamond to the queen, East taking the king and exiting with a spade for the jack and king, declarer finishing with eleven tricks, +430 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crouch | Drijver | Hydes | Brink |
| - | - | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{1 Q}$ |
| Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}^{*}$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

West led the $\$ 10$ and when Declarer put up the queen East withheld the king. Declarer played a club to the nine and West won with the jack and played his remaining diamond, switching to the $\$$ when it held. Declarer won with dummy's king and continued with the $\$$, East following with the four and six. This was the critical point. When declarer put in the ten there were only eight tricks.

Putting in the $\mathbf{7}$ and cashing two clubs is the way to bring home the bacon - as it was Wolfson pocketed another 11 IMPs and a commanding lead, 59-15.
You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y64e3geg

 two hearts and two diamonds for +100 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Garner | Nowosadzki | Wolfson | Kalita |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| $3 \boldsymbol{i}$ | $3 \varphi$ | $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ | 4 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Declarer ruffed the second round of clubs and played a diamond, East winning with the king and returning a third club. Declarer ruffed, crossed to the $\downarrow$ Q and ran the $\mathbf{\Phi}$. When it held he played a heart to the ace followed by the jack and was soon claiming ten tricks,+620 and 11 IMPs.

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.
ค J983
$\checkmark 1065$

- A952
- J3
- A652
$\downarrow 9$

- 104
- Q32
- Q107
\& K9865
- KQ7
- AKJ874
-     - 
- Q742

West led the and switched to the 2 . Declarer won with the queen, cashed the $\vee A$ and played a club, East taking the ace, returning a spade and ruffing the third round of the suit for one down, -100 .

If declarer plays dummy's jack on the spade switch he can then pitch a club on the $\downarrow$ and take the heart finesse. Were West to lead the 10 (in your dreams) East could win and switch to a spade when the defenders can deny declarer the dummy entry he needs.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Garner | Nowosadzki | Wolfson | Kalita |
| $1{ }^{\text {d }}$ | Pass | 1NT | 29 |
| 3 | 34 | 34 | $4 \checkmark$ |
| 5 | Double |  | All Pas |

South took the heart lead with the jack and switched to the $₫ \mathrm{~K}$, the defenders scoring a trick in each major and two trumps for +500 and 12 more IMPs for Pszczola, back in the match at 38-59.
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Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pszczola | Hydes | Blass | Crouch |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| 19* | 29 | Double* | 4** |
| 44 | 5 | Pass | Pass |
| 5 | All Pass |  |  |

1* 12-14 balanced, $16+$ with e, $18+$ any
Declarer won the diamond lead, drew trumps and played the $\vee 10$, going up with the king when North followed with the three. That meant he was one down, -100 .

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Garner | Nowosadzki | Wolfson | Kalita |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | All Pass |  |  |

Here North led the 10 . Declarer won, drew trumps and played two rounds of diamonds. Here too declarer got the hearts wrong, but +620 was worth 12 IMPs.

## Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { KQ7543 } \\ & \bar{K} 643 \\ & \text { J } 108 \end{aligned}$ | - J86 <br> - AJ1096 <br> - J2 <br> 2 K64 | $$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | W E |  |
|  | S |  |
|  | ¢ A 102 |  |
|  | - K72 |  |
|  | - Q5 |  |
|  | * AQ953 |  |

Open Room


South won the club lead with the ace and switched to the $\$ 2$, ensuring two down, -500 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Garner | Nowosadzki | Wolfson | Kalita |
| - | - | - | $1 N T$ |
| $2 \star *$ | $3 \star *$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | Pass | Double | All Pass |

West led the $\boldsymbol{\varsigma} \mathrm{K}$ and declarer won and played a heart, East winning with the queen and exiting with the $\$ 7$ for an easy two down, -500 and 14 IMPs.

Wolfson led 92-38 and although Pszczola scored 26 IMPs on the remaining 7 deals of the session they gave up 25 and trailed 64-117.

The match looked over, but Pszcola kept going and at one point during the last session they levelled the scores before going down 143-150.

## A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE - June 2019

You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/yxv4no6h

## Rosenthal v Levine

Going into the last set Rosenthal led 87-80. They allowed their opponents to score only 14 IMPs over the first14 deals (a $2,5,2,4 \& 1$ ) but they could only muster three themselves to trail by 4 IMPs going into the last board.
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pratap | Ginossar | Koneru | Willenken |
| - | - | $1 \boldsymbol{\imath}$ | Pass |
| $1 *$ | Pass | 1 NT | Pass |
| $2 *$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\psi}$ | Pass |
| $3 \boldsymbol{*}$ | Pass | $3 \star$ | Pass |
| $3 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |

South led the 4 and when declarer played dummy's five North won with the queen and returned the six, declarer winning with dummy's king and playing the $\upharpoonright$ K. North ducked as South pitched the $\vee$ J. Declarer's next move was to play three rounds of clubs, South winning and exiting with a spade. Declarer won in dummy as North parted with the $\$ 5$. Declarer cashed the 10 and North parted with a diamond. When declarer now played a low diamond North followed with the eight. Declarer could win and play a diamond, but North won and exited with a heart, claiming
the last two tricks for one down.
Declarer should have cashed the $\vee$ A before playing a diamond. After winning with the jack he can exit with a heart to endplay North.

Would that cost Rosenthal the match?

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Berkowitz | Hinze | Migry | Grainger |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| $1\rangle$ | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| $3 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | Pass | 4 | Pass |
| 5 | All Pass |  |  |

North led the $\uparrow 4$ and declarer won and played the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$. He finished up losing two diamonds and a club for a flat board.

You can replay the deal here or https://tinyurl.com/yxrucwaq

## Semi - finals

Wolfson's squad faced Lavazza, while Nickell took on Levine's team.

## Wolfson v Lavazza

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- A 103
- J4
- 1087
* AQ543
- QJ964
- Q9872
- 43
- 9

- K852
$\checkmark 1053$
- 962
\& K76

| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Donati | Becker | Duboin | Kamil |
| - | Pass | 1 | Pass |
| 14 | 2\& | Double | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

South led the 6 and the defenders took the first three tricks in the suit. When North continued with a fourth club declarer had the rest, +630 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Crouch | Bochi | Hydes | Sementa |
| - | $1 \& *$ | 1 | All Pass |

South led the $>3$ and declarer won and settled for ten tricks, +130 but an 11 IMP loss. It was the only double-digit swing of the session, but Wolfson only lost on one deal to lead 31-14.

You can replay this deal at:
https://www.bridgebase.com/tools/handviewer.html?bbo=y\&linurl=https://www.bridgebase.com/tools/vugraph_linfetch.php?id=62126

Board 18. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

- 754
$\checkmark 982$
- K103
- J963

| ${ }_{\sim}^{\text {a }}$ AJ863 | N | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K92 } \\ & \vee \mathrm{AKQJ} 76 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - A865 | W E | - Q742 |
| -KQ102 | S | 2- |
|  | 4 Q10 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 10543$ |  |
|  | - J9 |  |
|  | - A8754 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Donati | Wolfson | Duboin | Garner |
| - | - | 19 | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 2NT* | Pass |
| 3\% | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 4* | Pass | 4 | All Pass |

2NT possibly showed a good 6-4 hand.
South led the and declarer was soon claiming all the tricks.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | West | North | East | South |
|  | Hydes | Bilde | Crouch | Madala |
|  | - | - | 19* | Pass |
|  | 1** | Pass | 20* | Pass |
|  | 2 | Pass | 29 | Pass |
|  | 3\% | Pass | 4 | Pass |
|  | 5 | Pass | 69 | All Pass |
| 14. | $16+$ unbalanced or $17+$ balanced |  |  |  |
| 17 | Game forcing, $4+$ |  |  |  |
| 2* | $5+凹$, not 4 spades |  |  |  |

North led the $\$ 3$ and when dummy's queen held declarer was soon claiming +1010 and 11 IMPs.

On the next deal Donati opened a 14-17 1NT with his $\uparrow$ K86 VK6 A53 A10853 and when Duboin used Stayman Garner doubled with -1032 $103 \leqslant$ K84 KQ974. Donati redoubled and found his partner with AQ 54 A 752 Q 72 which resulted in -1160 when declarer made an overtrick.

The same thing might have happened at the other table but Bilde bid ${ }^{2} \downarrow$ over the redouble and a defensive slip saw him escape for -500 and a 13 IMP pick-up.

Wolfson took the set 53-21 to lead 84-35.
You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y3pk6qyo

\section*{Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul. <br> - J8 <br> $\checkmark 972$ <br> - A1096 <br> - AQJ2 <br> | - A3 |  | A KQ9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Q653 | N | $\checkmark 84$ |
| - Q743 | W E | - 85 |
| \& K106 | S | - 543 | <br> 4 1065 <br> - AKJ 10 <br> - KJ2 <br> - 987}

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Madala | Becker | Bilde | Kamil |
| Pass | 1 | $2 \boldsymbol{a}$ | Double* |
| Redouble | $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{v}$ | All Pass |  |

West led the $\uparrow 6$ and declarer won with the jack and played a spade, West winning and switching to the $\downarrow$. Declarer won with dummy's ace and played a second spade, East winning and returning the $\$ 8$. Declarer won with the king, played a club to the queen, cashed the top hearts and repeated the club finesse, claiming ten tricks, +620 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Garner | Bocchi | Wolfson | Sementa |
| Pass | $1 \mathbf{2} \star$ | $1 \mathbf{\omega}$ | Double* |
| Redouble | Pass | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ |
| Double | Pass | Pass | Redouble |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ | All Pass |  |

Declarer took ten tricks, but lost 10 IMPs, Wolfson now ahead 94-42.

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

- J63
$\checkmark 642$
- 982
- 9652

| - Q8 |  | ¢ K1094 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N |  |
|  | - Q95 N | -103 |
| - KJ 1073 | W E | - AQ65 |
| \& J107 | S | \& AK4 |
|  | - A752 |  |
|  | - AKJ87 |  |
|  | - 4 |  |
|  | 2 Q83 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Madala | Becker | Bilde | Kamil |
| - | Pass | 19** | $1 \checkmark$ |
| 14 | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |
| $2+$ |  |  |  |
| Not |  |  |  |

South led the $\vee$ A and continued with the king, followed by the eight. Declarer won with dummy's queen and played five rounds of diamonds. The last of these saw South pitch a club and declarer now played the $\boldsymbol{j}$, going up with the ace when it was not covered and cashing the king, a splendid +400 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Garner | Bocchi | Wolfson | Sementa |
| - | Pass | 1NT | 2e* |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |
| 2 | Majors |  |  |

The play followed a similar pattern save that declarer cashed a top club before playing off all the diamonds. South pitched the 8 on the last of these but declarer ran the $\mathbf{1 0}$ to go two down and lose 11 IMPs.

## Board 10. Dealer North. All Vul.



| Open Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Madala | Becker | Bilde | Kamil |
| - | - | Pass | 1 NT |
| Pass | Pass | Double* | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | All Pass |  |  |

Dble One Minor or both majors
North led the 2 and when declarer played low from dummy South won with the king and switched to the $\mathbf{~ J}$. Declarer won with dummy's king (unblocking the queen from his hand) and played the 2 , covered and ruffed. Declarer played a diamond to the king and South won and played a second trump, declarer winning with dummy's ten and advancing the $\uparrow$ Q. When it was covered he won with the ace, cashed the A and played hearts,+620.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Garner | Bocchi | Wolfson | Sementa |
| - | - | $1 \mathbf{2}$ | 1NT |
| Double | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | Pass |
| 2 | All Pass |  |  |

Should East have doubled $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ ? He had a poor hand and perhaps he felt that it would be best to see if partner could double for a second time. The BBO operator reported that Garner asked Wolfson why he didn't double 2*. "Because I only had 2 tricks." "It's what your clubs look like; I don't care what the rest of your hand looks like."

Declarer managed eight tricks after North's trump lead to lose 11 IMPs - Lavazza now only 40 behind.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Madala | Becker | Bilde | Kamil |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| $1{ }^{\text {d }}$ | 2** | 3\% | 49 |
| 4NT | Double | Pass | Pass |
| Redouble | 5 | Pass | Pass |
| 6\% | Pass | Pass | 69 |
| Double | 64 | Double | All Pass |
| Majors |  |  |  |

West cashed his top diamonds, +100 .


South led the Q and declare ruffed and played a club to the king, North pitching the 3 .

If declarer now draws trumps he needs the diamonds to come in. He preferred to play three rounds of diamonds pitching a heart and a grateful South ruffed for one down and 5 IMPs.

Declarer was not happy, but his partner told him 'don't worry about it.'


24 Limit raise or better.
East led the $A$ and declarer claimed eleven tricks, +650 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | West | North | East | South |
|  | Garner | Bocchi | Wolfson | Sementa |
|  | Pass | 19 | 14 | 24* |
|  | Pass | 3\%* | Pass | 3** |
|  | Pass | 3** | Pass | 30 |
|  | Pass | 3NT | Pass | 4\% |
|  | Pass | 4 | Pass | 4 |
|  | Pass | 49 | Pass | 5\% |
|  | Pass | 6 | All Pass |  |
| 24 | Heart support |  |  |  |
| 3\% | Minimum with a shortage |  |  |  |
| 3 | Where? |  |  |  |
| 39 | Clubs |  |  |  |

In a sense South was unlucky that North's singleton was the K. Turn that into the $\varangle \mathrm{K}$ and $6 \vee$ makes. East led the 7 . If either defender had held $0 x x$ declarer would have prevailed - as it was he was one down and lost 13 IMPs.

Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul.

- 532
- KJ9654
- A54
$\because 9$
- AQ4
ץ A
- J109
+ KJ8743


KJ 10
2

- Q87632

A A106
9876

- Q10873
- K

Q Q52
 ace and played a second diamond. Declarer could draw the outstanding trump and cash two more spades, so he could be reasonably confident that North was 3-6-3-1. Getting the clubs right meant +400 .


From West's point of view if partner held the $\diamond$ K and the $\boldsymbol{*} \mathrm{Q}$ then $6 \boldsymbol{*}$ would be on no more than the $\downarrow Q$ being onside - and it might be better than that.

North led the $\vee 5$ and declarer won (The BBO operator reports: Garner laughing. Wolfson asks "what are you laughing at?" Garner: "I'm just wondering if I'm ever going to get more than 10 points in the dummy.") and cashed the top clubs, conceding one down and 10 IMPs which meant Lavazza had won the set 45-23 to trail 80-107.

You can replay the deals here or https://tinyurl.com/yyc91hve


Open Room

|  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Madala | Becker | Bilde | Kamil |
|  | - | Pass | 1NT* | Pass |
|  | 2v* | Pass | $3 * *$ | Pass |
|  | 39 | Pass | 34 | Pass |
|  | 3NT | Pass | 49 | Pass |
|  | 4* | Pass | 4 | All Pass |
| 1 NT | T 10-13 |  |  |  |
| 2 | Transf |  |  |  |
| 3 | 4ヘ, ma |  |  |  |

South led the $\vee$ A and continued the suit, the defenders scoring the first four tricks. North had followed to the A with the five and had returned the four for South to ruff, a signal for diamonds.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Crouch | Bochi | Hydes | Sementa |
| - | Pass | $1 \star *$ | Pass |
| $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{*}$ | Pass |
| $1 *$ | All Pass |  |  |

North led the $\mathbf{j}$ and declarer claimed +450 and 11 IMPs.

## A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE - June 2019

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

| - A65 <br> - 73 <br> - A862 <br> * AK 108 | - Q4 <br> - K85 <br> - 753 <br> - 57532 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | - J72 <br> - AJ62 <br> -KJ1094 <br> * $Q$ |
|  | $$ |  |

## Open Room



Even Al Hollander didn't know what all this meant - it looks as if 3a and 5 were intended as cue-bids, but what 4 showed is anyone's guess.

However, $6 \star$ had the virtue of being cold on this layout. Declarer won the club lead with the queen (North played the jack) and cashed the $\diamond$ K. When the queen appeared he crossed to the A , pitched two spades on the top clubs, ruffed a spade and claimed, +920 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crouch | Bocchi | Hydes | Sementa |
| 1NT* | Pass | 2NT* | Pass |
| 3** | Pass | 34* | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |
| 14-16 |  |  |  |
| Asking for a five-card major |  |  |  |
| No |  |  |  |
| 4 , denies spades |  |  |  |

North led the 5 and declarer collected 10 tricks. It was a loss of 10 IMPs, but not enough for Lavazza who lost the set 21-32 and the match,101-139. You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y347yf56

## Nickell v Levine

```
Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
                                    4 J86
                                    \bullet}
                                    -10632
                                    & QJ985
            4 K2
            ` Q62
            * KQ854
\begin{tabular}{|ll|}
\hline & \(N\) \\
& \\
\hline & \(E\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
                            * AJ10854
                                * J97
            * 1043
                & AQ1097543
                `K73
                -A
                * }
```

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kriegel | Katz | Levine | Nickell |
| - | - | $1 \downarrow$ | $4 \boldsymbol{\$}$ |
| Double | All Pass |  |  |

The defenders took a spade, a heart and a club, +590 .


The same losers meant -100 and 12 IMPs to Nickell.

| Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $$ |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { AJ874 } \\ & \stackrel{8}{*} 876532 \\ & -5 \\ & -5 \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{W}^{\mathrm{N}}$ | , Q <br> - KJ4 <br> - AQJ82 <br> - KJ109 |  |
|  | - 10 <br> - AQ <br> - K7 <br> \& $A$ |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Kriegel Pass | Katz | Levine | Nickell |
|  | Pass | 1 | Pass |
| 19 | Pass | 29 | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | 49 | Pass |
| 5 | All Pass |  |  |

Apparently declarer looked perplexed at the sight of dummy - as well he might.

North led a club and declarer finished two down, North managing to get in a fourth round club ruff with the $>10$.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Levin | Koneru | Weinstein | Pratap |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | 1NT |
| $2 \boldsymbol{e}^{*}$ | Pass | $2 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| $3 \psi$ | Pass | $4 \vee$ | All Pass |

South led the 10 and declarer won with dummy's ace, played a diamond to the ace and played the $\forall J$, covered and ruffed. A spade ruff was followed by the $\downarrow$ pitching a club and declarer then ran the 9 , pitching a spade. He ruffed the next club, ran the $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ J and ruffed a spade. South could overuff and cash the A but declarer had ten tricks and 11 IMPs, Nickell winning the session 41-16.
You can replay the deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y3bzms3k
Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pratap | Rodwell | Koneru | Meckstroth |
| - | Pass | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Double | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

Koneru told his partner he had overbid.
North led the $\vee 10$ and South overtook it with the jack and switched
to the $\$ 4$. Declarerput in the queen and played the J, North taking the king and going back to hearts. Declarer won, cashed the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$, played a spade to the ace and exited with the E . North, who had unblocked the $\mathbf{\Delta 9}$, won and exited with the $\mathbf{5}$. That left declarer with only eight tricks, -50 .
To get home declarer should follow the $₫ \mathrm{~K}$ with the queen. He then cashes the $\varangle$ A, crosses to dummy with a spade and exits with a top club. In due course North will have to give dummy three club tricks.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Nickell | Hinze | Katz | Grainger |
| - | Pass | Pass | 19 |
| 14 | 1NT | 24 | 3 |
| Double | $3 \%$ | Pass | Pass |
| Double | All Pass |  |  |

West led the $\mathbf{j}$ and declarer won in dumm and pitched a spade on the king, West ruffing and switching to the $\boldsymbol{\$}$. East won and played a top club and when declarer ruffed with the $\geqslant J$ West pitched a spade. He took the next heart with the ace and exited with a heart, declarer winning in dummy and playing a diamond to the king, finishing three down, -500 and 11 IMPs.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pratap | Rodwell | Koneru | Meckstroth |
| - | - | $3 \varphi$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | $5 \%$ | Pass | 5 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

All Pass
To defeat $5 \diamond$ West has to find a low spade lead. His choice of the $\vee$ A saw declarer ruff in dummy, cash the $\boldsymbol{A}$, ruff a club, ruff a heart and pitch a heart on the $\$$ when East ruffed in with the $\$ 10$. When East switched to the $\$ 3$ West's jack was allowed to hold and when he continued with the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ declarer had the rest, +600 .

As the cards lie the winning line for declarer is to draw trumps after ruffing the heart lead, take a club finesse and ruff a club. He then cashes two more trumps squeezing West. Forced to keep a heart and two clubs he can only retain two spades and now declarer plays two rounds of that suit. Whoever wins will be endplayed.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nickell | Hinze | Katz | Grainger |
| - | - | $2 \downarrow$ | 3 |
| $4 \vee$ | Double | Pass | $5 \$$ |
| Pass | 6 | All Pass |  |

## A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE - June 2019

Declarer followed Meckstroth's line but there were only ten tricks, -200 and 13 IMPs away.

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



## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pratap | Rodwell | Koneru | Meckstroth |
| $1 \downarrow$ | Pass | Pass | $1 \stackrel{1}{l}$ |
| Double | $2 \downarrow *$ | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $4 \downarrow$ | Pass | Pass | Double |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

North led the 7 and South won and switched to the 10 . With nowhere to go declarer was soon three down, -500 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nickell | Hinze | Katz | Grainger |
| $1 \%$ | Pass | $1 N T$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2 i}$ | Pass | 3 | All Pass |

Declarer had to go one down, but that was another 10 IMPs to Nickell who won the set 57-1 to lead 98-17 and their opponents gave up.
You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y568ee5l

## Final

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.

- AKQJ10
- J8
- 105
* KQ43

| 4 973 <br> - A632 <br> - 84 <br> - AJ96 |  | ( 6542 <br> - K4 <br> - KJ6 <br> - 10875 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Katz | Becker | Nickell | Kamil |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | Pass | $1 N T$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

North led the and switched to the declarer winning in dummy, cashing three more spades and then playing the $\geqslant 8$. When it held he cashed the A and the $\boldsymbol{\$ \mathrm { KQ }}$ and took the diamond finesse - that was eleven tricks as East had pitched a diamond, +660 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crouch | Levin | Hydes | Weinstein |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | 1 NT |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $2 \downarrow *$ |
| Pass | $2 \downarrow$ | All Pass |  |

## A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE - June 2019

Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul.

- QJ3
- 106
- QJ 102
- AJ83

10764

- AQJ
- AK86
\& 75

( K85
- 94
- 9543
- KQ106

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Katz | Becker | Nickell | Kamil |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| $1 \vee$ | Pass | $1 \varphi$ | Pass |
| $2 \downarrow$ | All Pass |  |  |

In passing $2 \downarrow$ East flouted Meckstroth's Law and the reasonable heart game was missed. With hearts 2-2 there was no way to prevent ten tricks, +170.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | West | North | East | South |
|  | Crouch | Levin | Hydes | Weinstein |
|  | - | - | - | Pass |
|  | 1NT* | Pass | 2** | Pass |
|  | 29 | Pass | 3** | Pass |
|  | 34* | Pass | 4 | All Pass |
| 1 NT | $\begin{aligned} & 14-16 \\ & 5+\varphi, \text { not } 4 \uparrow \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | $6+\boldsymbol{\text { ¢ }}$, invitational |  |  |  |
| 34 | Accepting the invitation |  |  |  |

That gave Wolfson another 6 IMPs and they finished the set with 33 IMPs. They held their illustrious opponents to a single IMP.

You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y6hzg5jo

## Board 16. Dealer West. EM Vul.



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Katz | Hydes | Nickell | Crouch |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \dot{2}$ | $1 N T$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{*}^{*}$ | Pass | $2 \downarrow^{*}$ |

All Pass
West led the $\$ 4$ for the ten, jack and king and declarer ruffed a club and ran the $\$ 9$. West won and exited with a diamond, ten tricks, +130 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Garner | Rodwell | Wolfson | Meckstroth |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \mathbf{1 0}$ | Double |
| Pass | $2 \downarrow$ | Pass | $4 \downarrow$ |

East led the A and switched to the $\mathbf{~ K}$, declarer winning with dummy's ace pitching a spade, cashing dummy's three top hearts and then playing the top diamonds, claiming when the suit divided, +420 and 7 IMPs.

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | © K <br> - KQ104 <br> - 97652 <br> - A52 |  |  | 4 $9852$ |
|  |  | $$ | $1083$ $343$ |  |
| Open R | Room |  |  |  |
|  | West | North | East | South |
|  | Katz | Hydes | Nickell | Crouch |
|  | - | Pass | 2** | Pass |
|  | 2NT* | Pass | 3** | Pass |
|  | 4** | Pass | 4 | Double |
|  | 4 | Pass | 6 | All Pass |
| 2 | Flannery,1 | 1-16, 49 and | 5/6 |  |
| 2NT | Relay |  |  |  |
| 3* | Shortage |  |  |  |
| 4* | Forces 4* |  |  |  |
| $4{ }^{4}$ | Slam try |  |  |  |

North led the $\downarrow$ J and declarer won with dummy's ace, unblocked the $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{K}} \mathrm{K}$ and came to hand with a heart to pitch a diamond on the A. He exited with his spade and North took the ace and returned a trump leaving declarer a trick short.

At double-dummy declarer can play a spade after cashing the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Garner | Rodwell | Wolfson | Meckstroth |
| - | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

North led the $\mathbf{~} 5$ and when the $\mathbf{~} \mathrm{K}$ scored declarer claimed ten tricks and 10 IMPs

Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.

- KJ9643
- A3
- 1064
\& AJ


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Katz | Hydes | Nickell | Crouch |
| - | - | - | $1 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $2 \psi$ |
| Pass | $2 \Downarrow^{*}$ | Pass | $2 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $3 \star^{*}$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |

## All Pass

2. Fourth-suit forcing
3. Looking for a stopper

West led the Q for the king and ace and East switched to the $\downarrow$. Declarer won with the queen and ran the Q . When it held he played a heart to the ace and the j , covered by the queen and king. Now declarer played a spade and when West followed with the two he put up dummy's jack. It was downhill from here, the contract failing by three tricks, -300 .

Closed Room

| West | North <br> Garner | East <br> Rodwell | South <br> WolfsonMeckstroth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | 1 |
| Pass | 1 | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 4 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

East led the 10 and declarer won with the jack, unblocked the A and played
 a diamond, East taking the ace and returning the $\geqslant 4$ for the queen, king and ace. Declarer crossed to dummy with a heart and played a spade to the king and ace. He won the diamond return with dummy's king, pitched a diamond on the K and played a spade for the ten and jack, +620 and 14 IMPs to Nickell.


West led the $\$ 10$ and East went up with the ace and cashed the $\vee \mathrm{A}$,
collecting the nine and seven. When he continued with the $\downarrow \mathrm{Q}$ declarer ruffed and played a spade to the queen and ace. Had East now played a third diamond declarer might well have ruffed, but the $\$ 8$ allowed declarer to win and draw trumps, +620 .

To be sure of defeating 4↔ East needs to play a second heart at trick three, intending to play a third round when in with the $\uparrow$.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Garner | Rodwell | Wolfson | Meckstroth |
| - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Pass | 1 NT | 2 | 3 |
| Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 4 | All Pass |  |

West led the $\downarrow 2$ and East defended perfectly, taking the ace and playing two rounds of hearts followed by a third heart when in with the $\mathrm{A}, 12$ IMPs to Wolfson.

## Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.

@ Q8764

- AK98
- 

2KQ95


| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Katz | Hydes | Nickell | Crouch |
| - | - | - | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| - | $4{ }^{*}$ | 5 | Pass |
| Pass | 5 | Pass | $5 \uparrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West found the devastating lead of the
$\% 8$ and East's ruff ensured a one trick defeat.


Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Garner | Rodwell | Wolfson | Meckstroth |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | 5 | $5 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| $6 \mathbf{2}$ | Pass | 6 | Pass |
| Pass | Double | All Pass |  |

South led the $\uparrow$ J and after three rounds of the suit he ruffed and cashed the A for -500 and 11 IMPs.

## Board 29. Dealer North. All Vul.

- J 1075
- 532
- A 105
\& 983
- $A Q$
- QJ984

KJ976

* 7
- 643
- 76

43
\& QJ10652

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Katz | Hydes | Nickell | Crouch |
| - | Pass | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| $1 \downarrow$ | Double* | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\$}$ |

West led the $\mathbb{Q}$ and declarer won with the ace and played the 9 , west winning with the queen and returning the $\$ 9$. Declarer won with the ten and played the $\mathbf{2}$, West taking the ace and playing the $\geqslant \mathrm{J}$ for East to ruff. That was two down, -200 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Garner | Rodwell | Wolfson | Meckstroth |
| - | Pass | Pass | 1 ® $^{*}$ |
| 1ヶ | Double* | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |
| 1* | RM Precision |  |  |

West led the 6 and declarer won with the eight and played the $\boldsymbol{2}$, West winning and switching to the P . Declarer took that with the ace and played a second spade and West won and continued with the $\vee 8$. That speeded up the play, +600 and another 13 IMPs to Nickell who took the set 49-32 to trail 50-65.

You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/yyqtmuja

## Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ث } 87 \\ & \text { A32 } \\ & \text { AK943 } \\ & \text { J98 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - AQJ542 <br> $\bullet$ A5 <br> - QJ8 <br> - Q2 | $\begin{array}{\|lll\|} \hline & \mathrm{N} & \\ \mathrm{~W}^{2} & & E \\ & \mathrm{~S} & \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& } 106 \\ & \text { Q1087 } \\ & \text { ( } 16 \\ & \text { A10743 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | a K93 <br> - KJ64 <br> - 1052 <br> \& K65 |  |

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Garner | Rodwell | Wolfson | Meckstroth |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| 1a | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

With little to go on South led the $\vee 4$ and declarer won with the ten and played spades, +400 .

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Levin | Kamil | Weinstein | Becker |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| 1@ | Pass | $1 N T$ | Pass |
| $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{a}$ | All Pass |

North cashed his diamond winners and switched to the 9 . Declarer played low from dummy and when South played the king he failed to unblock the queen. South exited with a club and declarer won, ruffed the $\diamond$ Q, pitched a heart on the A and took the spade finesse. South's ゅK was the setting trick, 10 IMPs for Wolfson who won a low scoring session 17-11 to go into the final 15 deals leading 82-61.

You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y26qlgt5

## Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.

| A AK97 <br> - A3 <br> - Q863 <br> - AK10 | - 5 <br> - 974 <br> - AJ 109 <br> - 876 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q10864 } \\ & \text { QJ85 } \\ & \text { K } \\ & \text { Q52 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|ll\|} \hline & N \\ \hline & \\ \hline & \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
|  | - J32 <br> - K1062 <br> - 54 <br> - J943 |  |

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Levin | Becker | Weinstein | Kamil |
| - | $2 \star$ | Pass | Pass |
| Double | Pass | $3 *$ | Pass |
| $3 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{~}$ | All Pass |

With the $\uparrow$ K onside that was an easy 12 tricks, +480 .


That gave Wolfson an extra cushion of 11 IMPs.

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



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Levin | Becker | Weinstein | Kamil |
| - | - | - | $1 \uparrow$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ | 3 | 4 | 4 |

West led the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ and found the lethal switch to the $\uparrow 5,+50$.


West led the $\checkmark K$ and continued with the ace. Declarer ruffed, played a spade to the ace, a spade to the king and a diamond to the jack and ace. When East returned aclub declarer ran it to dummy, drew the outstanding trump and claimed, +590 .

The line that is sure to make the contract as the cards lie is to ruff a heart after taking one round of trumps. Declarer then draws trumps ending in dummy and plays a low diamond.

No matter, Nickell had 12 IMPs and was back in the hunt.


North led the $\$ 7$ and declarer won with the queen and played the $\$ 4$, North going in with the ace and switching to the $\mathbf{4}$. Declarer took South's king with the ace and crossed to dummy with a club. When he continued with a heart to the nine North won and exited with a club and declarer could take no more than nine tricks.

If declarer guesses to play a heart to the king he can continue with a second heart and must come to ten tricks.


North led the $\downarrow 7$ and declarer won with the queen and played the $\vee K$. South
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ducked and North won the next heart and switched to the $\uparrow 3$, declarer winning with the ace and playing a low club. North took the ace and continued with the $\boldsymbol{Q} \mathbf{Q}$ but declarer ruffed in dummy, ruffed a diamond, crossed to the Q and cashed the $\star$, claiming 10 tricks and 12 IMPs.

Board 22. Dealer East. EM Vul.


Open Room


West started with the $\vee$ A followed by the queen and declarer won, cashed five diamond and ran the 12 tricks.

Closed Room


Crouch informed his partner that he was 'sorry if this is wrong'.
South led the $\underset{\sim}{\mathrm{J}}$ and continued with the ten. Declarer ruffed and played a spade, putting in the nine when South followed with the eight. He then cashed the A and claimed, a whopping 15 IMPs to Wolfson, now ahead 120-73.

Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.

- 104
- QJ9763
- 5

Q Q985

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Levin | Becker | Weinstein | Kamil |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| 19 | Pass | 14* | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | 3NT | Pass |
| 44 | All Pass |  |  |
| 54 |  |  |  |

Declarer took eleven tricks, +650 .
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crouch | Rodwell | Hydes | Meckstroth |
| - | - | - | 3 |
| 3NT | Pass | 4NT | Pass |
| 6NT | All Pass |  |  |

North led his diamond and declarer won and played five rounds of spades before testing the hearts-one down and 13 IMPs for Nickell, running out of boards.
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## Board 30. Dealer East. None Vul.

|  | - Q75 <br> - K5 <br> - AK 1062 <br> - 952 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $$ | $$ | - A82 <br> - 42 <br> - 987 <br> KJ1073 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 106 \\ & \text { A } 10983 \\ & \text { QJ5 } \\ & \& \text { AQ8 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Levin | Becker | Weinstein | Kamil |
| - |  | Pass | 17 |
| 14 | 2 | 2** | 3 |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | 4 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West led the $\mathbf{\$ 3}$ and East won and switched to the $\boldsymbol{\$ 3}$. Declarer put in the queen and when it held he cashed the and played a heart to the king and a heart to the ace, finishing with nine tricks.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Crouch | Rodwell | Hydes | Meckstroth |
| - | - | Pass | 1NT* |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |
| 1NT | $14-16$ |  |  |

West led the 4 (naturally you would have preferred the $\mathbf{\$}$ !!) and East won and switched to the 3 . Declarer won with dummy's eight and took ten tricks and 10 IMPs making the final score 127-102 in favour of Wolfson - a famous victory.

You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y3d6sxg7

## More Conventions, More Practice

## Barbara Seagram and David Bird

an e-Book from Master Point Press 144pp. \$15.95 £9.95
If you want to do well at the bridge table you do best to have an established partnership. If you want to produce a good bridge book it's less essential but it's still an advantage. There are few more established partnerships than this one between one of North America's top teachers and the world's most prolific author of bridge books. Part of the publisher's " 25 " series, this is the companion book to 25 More Bridge Conventions You Should Know.
The conventions are divided into three sections: Learn These First which includes Bergen Raises, Four Suit Transfers and the love it or hate it Flannery (I hate it); More Complicated including Exclusion Blackwood, Support Doubles and Puppet Stayman; and Sophisticated Stuff such as Inverted Minor Raises, Leaping Michaels and Multi-colored Two Diamonds. Every bridge player would have his or her own view of the importance and value of the 25 , as well as of which category they should fall into, but that is just in the nature of bridge and bridge players.
The format is simple. A succinct explanation of a convention is followed by four example hands, which almost without exception offer excellent practice - including on occasion times when the convention should not be used. The analysis of the bidding and play in each hand is easy to follow. As you could expect, learning points on declarer play feature more prominently than on defence.
I spotted a mistake in just one of the analyses, which is

perhaps one more than you might expect. And the chapter on Ace and King (Italian) Cue-bidding surprisingly fails to say anything about short suit controls.
The Introduction sets out the aim of the book: "To improve your game, and have fun". It should succeed on both counts, particularly the first.
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## Sleeping on the Couch: The Adventures of Dave Playing Bridge with his Wife Anne

## David Caprera with a Foreword by Mike Passell

An Honors eBook from Master Point Press 202pp. £12.95 US\$19.95
A collection of articles originally written for ACBL District 17, the premise of this book is that whenever the author makes a significant mistake playing bridge with his wife Anne - or more accurately whenever he does something that she considers a mistake - then he is consigned to sleeping on the couch. I guess the author can count himself lucky that the articles were monthly not weekly (or, heaven forfend, daily), else both his bridge results and his back would have suffered grievously.
Of course the 'sleeping on the couch' punchline is just a literary device, but it reflects the humour with which the articles are written. Mind you, running gags tend to pale after a while, and concentrated into a book rather than spread out over five years this one does become a little wearisome. The humour is even carried onto the back cover, where thirteen top players offer their own take on his sleeping arrangements, like this one from Chris Compton: "When they travel to tournaments, Dave chooses their hotel by the comfort of the sofas". So, what about the articles themselves? The hands are all taken from real life, and all have some genuine interest to them. Many of them involve bidding disagreements, and the fact that Dave and Anne have a fairly complex set of agreements mean that some of the issues are a little abstruse, although he does generally try to relate them to more standard bidding systems. The author's analysis is accurate, and for the most part clearly explained. In his introduction he makes it clear that he wrote the articles primarily for himself, and the complexity level is therefore very variable. While most are relatively straightforward, a
 number entail difficult squeeze positions, and others are about calculating the odds of various lines of play to a depth that I for one was neither interested nor willing to follow.
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## 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.
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.
- 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
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## COME JOIN US

## EBL Women Team Practice Matches

## Online -

 Top Teamsfrom the $54^{\text {th }}$ European Team Championships in Ostend last year.

313.92 WORLD BRIDGE TEAMS CHAMPIONSHIPS

| 2 | SWEDEN | 300.03 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | NORWAY | 275.10 |
| 4 | DENMARK | 273.24 |
| 5 | ENGLAND | 272.54 |
| 6 | NETHERLANDS | 266.08 |
| 7 | SCOTLAND | 263.68 |
| 8 | FRANCE | 257.75 |

## New and aspiring

 teams to We started matches for this second group a couple of weeks ago with Cyprus and israelshowing interest. This is to help teams prepare for playing internationally and we hope Women Bridge Co Ordinator's (WBC)s of which we have 28 and all NBOs will consider this project for Bridge Co Ordinator's (WBC)s of which we have 28 and ali NBOs wili consider this project for
developing Women's Bridge in their countries. It is also a form of networking. Again, please contact us for information at eblwomen@gmail.com

EBL WOMEN TO WORLDS
EBL Womens Teams playing for the Venice Cup at the

Wishing All the Best to the 8 Teams representing the EBL he World Championships in China this September. Here are the teams that qualified
Norway, Sweden, Estonia, Scotland, Poland, Israel, Turkey, Italy, Spain, Germany, Hungary and France have been taking part in Practice matches Online each week; for some an opportunity
to practice for the Venice Cup. These matches finish on May $28^{\text {th }}$ and will re commence in to practice for the Venice Cup. These matches finish on May $28^{\text {th }}$ and will re commence in October after the Worlds in China.
The format is to suit players. The schedule is for each Tuesday 20.00 CET but Team Co Ordinator's may arrange a date and time to suit both teams and decide the number of boards to play. Analysis can happen with coaches afterwards.

One Co Ordinator wrote '... Thanks a lot ...Now we have a lot of boards to play against the best teams in Europe!'

This is deemed a useful tool so if you wish to participate next October let us know at eblwomen@gmail.com
We started matches for this second group a couple of weeks ago with Cyprus and Israel
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## ISTANBUL June 2019


$9^{\text {th }}$ European Open Championships

Istanbul，Turkey

## Links to microsite

Venue：Green Park Pendik Hotel and Convention Center
http：／／www．eurobridge．org／repository／competitions／191stanbul／microsite／information．htm http：／／www．eurobridge．org／calendar／european－championships／

## EBL Partnership Desk

Find a partner for
the EOC 1 Istanbul 2019
http：／／championships．eurobridge．org／partnership／partnership－desk


A note from
EBL Women＇s
Committee
Sevinç Atay
Chairwoman
——＊＊v

Dear Women Players，
I look forward to welcoming you to my country and to Istanbul for these Championships．
Istanbul is steeped in history and I hope you will enjoy all that it has to offer．
C．．．．Istanbul is a major city in Turkey that straddles Europe and Asia across the Bosphorus Strait．Its Old City reflects cultural influences of the many empires that once ruied here．in the Suitanahmet aistrict，the open－air，Roman－era Hippoarome was for Bentic Hal Sof chat a aling Gth－century dome and rare Chis
 mosaics．
．．．even if you have only a day there is much you can see and do．
Please say Hello to me and be assured our Hospitality Desk will help you in any way they can．

Sering

## KEEP BRIDGE ALIVE

## c3cs <br> 

Keep Bridge Alive

Campaign
by University of
Stirling in Bridge of
Allan，Scotland，United Kingdom

Message from Sam
Prof Samantha
Punch｜Professor of Sociology I University of Stirling

Room 4S47，
Faculty of Social Sciences， Colin Bell Building University of Stirling， Stirling，FK9 4LA

## Dear Women Players，

The University of Stirling in Scotland has launched the international＇Keep Bridge Alive＇ CrowdFunder to establish the Sociology of Bridge and to communicate messages about the benefits of bridge beyond the bridge world．This emerging academic field explores interactions within the mind sport，well－being，healthy ageing and social connection as experienced in the bridge community．The key goals of this research are to transform the image of bridge，to increase participation and enhance the sustainability of the mind sport． The Keep Bridge Alive（KBA）campaign aims to attract new players to our game via innovative and collaborative approaches（including targeted resources aimed at children， young people，families as well as policy－makers，employers and teachers）．Keep Bridge Alive is about taking action to share best practice，pool resources and develop an evidence－base to re－brand and grow the bridge world．This as an excellent opportunity to do something different and create momentum for change within the bridge community．

Part of the Keep Bridge Alive initiative is to build a network with countries who are interested in being part of the ongoing research and／or in developing the work further．Part of that process is to find out what is happening in different parts of the world regarding the promotion of bridge，in particular what countries see as the key issues that they face including barriers and opportunities．

We have 350 donors from over 30 countries so far．We＇re keen to get the number of donors to over 400 so every ten euro donation really does make a difference．

See links：－
https：／／www．crowdfunder．co．uk／u5c0e5e7810869
https：／／sociologyofbridge．wordpress．com／home／keep－bridge－alive／

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require further information．

## Best wishes，

Sam

Tel： 01786467985
E－mail：s．v．punch＠stir．ac．uk
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## WE HAVE A FRIEND FOR WOMEN'S BRIDGE - HAVE YOU?

Friend to
Women's Bridge
Thank you
Mark Horton


The Women's Committee is working to bring alive the vision of our founder Anna Maria Torlontano. A powerful tool for us has been the press in the person of Mark Horton with articles in EBL Championship Bulletins and in NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE. Mark has promoted the revivai of the Nationai Women's Pairs in Budapest 2016, Ostend 2018 and EBL Open Championships. He has published reports for us and along with one of NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE contributor and Women's Gold Medallist, Sally Brock, provided information for our presentation at the NBO Seminar in Belfast last year.

We consider Mark a 'friend' to Women's Bridge and wish to say 'Thank You Mark'!
Do you have a media friend in Bridge? Do let us know us know and let them know about us!

## You can subscribe to A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE for free.

 Here is the link http://www.newbridgemag.com/Prepared by Mary Kelly Rogers for the ....

|  | EBL Women's Committee <br> Sevinç Atay <br> Chairwoman |
| :--- | :--- |
| Members: Katarina Dufrat, Kari-Anne Opsal, Silvia Valentini, Mary Kelly Rogers |  |
| Email: eblwomen@gmail.com |  |

Email: eblwomen@gmail.com

## coses FUNBRIDGE

## Misplay These Hands With Me

## Love's Labour's Lost

The English Bridge Union's Schapiro Spring Foursomes in Stratford upon Avon usually attracts a world-class field. Unlike many events it continues to be popular with a record number of teams for the 21st Century entering in 2019. Part of the attraction is that no team is eliminated until defeated twice. During one of the preliminary rounds, we are on the way to a comfortable win when I pick up a useful looking hand:

```
A AKQ9742
\bullet }64
* -
* AK2
```

With only our side vulnerable my partner opens $1 \vee$ and I respond with a slightly old fashioned $2 \boldsymbol{a}$. Partner bids $\mathbf{3 e}$ which is a promising development and I mark time by rebidding 34. When Partner raises me to 4@ I consider my options. The scientific bid is $4 \diamond$, hoping to elucidate a $4 \checkmark$ cue-bid from partner. However, recapturing the spirit of my youth I jump to 6 leaving West with a blind lead.

That gives us this auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 19 | Pass | 24 |
| Pass | 3\% | Pass | 34 |
| Pass | 44 | Pass | 64 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West leads the king of diamonds and dummy has nothing to spare:

```
@ J
    MQQ873
    - AJ7
    &9863
    A AKQ9742
    \vee 642
-
AK2
```

I ruff the opening lead, cross to the jack of spades, come to hand with a club and draw trumps. When I play a heart to the king East wins with the ace and returns the ten of hearts. By killing my only entry to dummy East removes my squeeze chances (they would have worked) and I am one down.

The full deal:


## Post mortem

Declarer missed a simple extra chance. Win the diamond lead with dummy's ace discarding a club. Unblock the AK, cross to dummy with a spade and ruff a club high. With the suit 3-3 declarer can draw trumps and play a heart, dummy's long club taking care of the heart loser.
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## Mirror Mirror

Our cosmopolitan team in the Summer Nationals includes stars from France and Austria. My Parisian partner is a legendary figure, amongst other things a brilliant card-player.

In the semi-final of a Bracketed KO I pick up this collection:


With only our side vulnerable my partner opens $1 \boldsymbol{2}$ and East overcalls $1 \downarrow$. I make the obvious jump to 3NT which leaves us with this auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | $1 \stackrel{1}{2}$ | $1 \%$ | $3 N T$ |

West leads the eight of diamonds and dummy reflects my own hand, both in points and distribution.

- AQ 10
- A76
- 1064
- QJ 107
\& K43
- KQ4
- AJ7
~ 9843
After the diamond lead there are eight certain tricks but the only possibility of developing a ninth is to play on clubs. When I play low from dummy East plays the queen of diamonds and I win with the ace and play a club. West plays the ace and continues with the two of diamonds and East wins with the king and plays a third round, West discarding the six of spades.

When I play a second club East wins and cashes two diamonds, so I am one down.

This was the full deal:

| full | - AQ 10 <br> - A76 <br> - 1064 <br> \& QJ 107 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ J 9876 |  | 4 52 |
| - J53 |  | - 10982 |
| - 83 |  | - KQ953 |
| - A52 | 2 | K6 |
|  | ¢ K43 |  |
|  | - KQ4 |  |
|  | - AJ7 |  |
|  | \& 9843 |  |

## Post mortem

West did well to go up with the ace of clubs, but not for the first time the decisive mistake came at trick one. When East plays the queen of diamonds declarer should duck. If East plays a second diamond, declarer wins and plays a club. Now, with no diamond to play it will not help West to go up with the ace and if East wins and clears the diamonds declarer simply forces out the ace of clubs.

At the other table, an identical auction saw an identical lead from West. However, our East played low on the eight, forcing declarer to win the first round of diamonds. When he played a club West put up the ace and returned a diamond and the defenders were one step ahead.
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## bid72 <br> 

## Bridge

 Educational Softwarewww.bid72.com

## Bid72

If bridge is to prosper in the 21st Century, it will be linked inextricably to the advance of technology. With virtually everyone owning a mobile telephone, a computer and/or an ipad all sorts of opportunities are available to bridge players and we will make sure that the best of them feature in A New Bridge Magazine.
We are delighted to announce that we have negotiated some special terms for readers with Bid 72, an outstanding app that offers a wide range of features:
bidding with an app
suitable for smart phones and tablets, iOS and Android
working on your partnership with your own partner, coach or teacher unlimited number of highly interesting boards
every system, every level (beginners, club, expert)
interesting Topics of 100 games each, such as: Defense against 1NT, 2-way Check Back Stayman, Limit raises

## Try the app for free for 21 days

download bid 72 via the buttons below (iOS or Android)
free trial period for 7 days, or 21 days if you sign up for our newsletter
What does bid72 cost?
per month: US\$ 3.49 ( $€ 2,99$ )
per year: US\$ $28.99(€ 24,99)$

## What does a topic cost?

One Topic (100 boards) costs 100 bid points
100 bid points: US\$ $1.99(€ 2,29)$
500 bid points: US\$ $6.99(€ 7,99)$
1000 bid points: US\$ 12.99 (€13,99)

## Special offer:

100 bid points for free for each reader of A New Bridge Magazine who downloads bid72 and registers to our News Letter.
An additional 100 bid points for free for each reader of A New Bridge Magazine who purchases an annual subscription.


## Deals that Caught My 5ye

David Bird looks at the match between England and Scotland at the Lady Milne

The two top teams in this year's Lady Milne (women's Camrose) were England and Scotland. They were neck-and-neck until the final round, when England pulled away to win by a respectable margin. The standard of play was rather mixed. I will present some of the more interesting boards and you can see what you make of them.

## Board 3. Dealer South. EM Vul.

( KQ53

- J104
- 75
* A962


It seemed that it would be a good result for the $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ (spades + minor) opening bid. No, Anne Symons did well to find a double and Scotland collected +600 for their diamond game.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Smith | McGowan | Wiseman | McQuaker |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| 1 | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\psi}$ | Pass | $4 \vee$ | All Pass |

The England pair required no such heroics, allowed an uncontested auction. That was an easy +650 , after a club to the ace and the $\mathbf{~} \mathrm{K}$ switch. Symons had reduced the loss to a mere 2 IMPs.


Some players say that they never pass partner's opening one-bid with an ace in their hand. Sally Brock did pass and so did East, perhaps expecting that the opponents had a better spot in spades. I will not waste any
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of our precious time on the play details. England scored +90 for eight tricks.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Smith | McGowanWisemanMcQuaker |  |  |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | Double |
| 2 | 2 | Pass | 4 |

Nicola Smith's 2 was a transfer,
 showing a respectable raise to $2 \downarrow$. Should North bid 24 on her limited resources? It is borderline, but I'm not prepared to condemn it. I would rather criticise those who say 'I like $7-9$ points for a free bid of $2 \mathbf{s}$ '. I'm not so happy about South's raise to $4 \boldsymbol{4}$, with only three spades and a wasted Q. Smith doubled the spade game and collected +500 to gain 11 IMPs. Scotland retrieved the IMPs, two boards later:

Board 6. Dealer West. Both Vul.


3NT is better than Five Clubs, since it may still make if there is a club
loser. (Spades may break 4-4, or a red suit may be led.) Looking only at Helen Kane's hand, though, it seems precipitate to bid an immediate 3NT. This would have gone down on a spade lead. Brock had no reason to stray from the $\vee 9$, and nine tricks were then easy.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Smith | McGowan | Wiseman | McQuaker |
| - | - | $1 \mathbf{2}$ | $1 \%$ |
| $2 \downarrow$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

Smith's $2 \bigvee$ showed $11+$ points and club support. If Yvonne Wiseman had rebid just 2NT, Smith would have raised to 3NT anyway.

McQuaker led the $\mathbf{Q}$. Dummy played low and North signalled with the 4 (upside-down attitude). Since dummy's $\boldsymbol{A}$ A was now bare, South continued with the $\boldsymbol{~} 2$ instead of the $\boldsymbol{~ K}$. Was it right to block the suit, when the 4 presumably showed the $\mathbf{~}$ ? I can see that North might hold $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ Jxxx to declarer's $\boldsymbol{\$ 1 0 x x x}$, but the contract has to be beaten somehow.

It did not cost. When Wiseman cleared the clubs, McQuaker threw a heart and then the blocking $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$. That was one down for a swing of 12 IMPs to Scotland.

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

- J632 - 4
- 10973
\& K653
- Q109
- 10952
- AJ85
- Q7

K84
$\checkmark$ AK3
-KQ642
\& J2

- $A 75$
- QJ876
-     - 

A 10984
 played the 6 . A grateful Symons alertly managed to avoid falling off her chair and won with the $\boldsymbol{j}$. Only eight tricks were on view. When declarer played five rounds of diamonds, though, Cardiff had to keep her $\oplus$ A and QUJ. She was forced to throw a club winner and declarer could then set up a ninth trick in spades.

The question on everyone’s lips was now: 'Could lightning strike twice?'

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Smith | McGowan | Wiseman | McQuaker |
| - | - | $1 \dot{e}$ | $1 \mathbf{2}$ |
| Pass | $1 \stackrel{1}{2}$ | $1 N T$ | $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

Here McQuaker bid her clubs, on a hand known to be a minimum, before leading the 10 . Whatever you make of the failure to play the $\boldsymbol{K}$ at the other table, surely here McGowan should have found the winning card. If declarer happened to hold AJ, playing the K would not cost. She could hardly hold EAJx, or South would have introduced a 10xxx suit on what was likely to be an 11-count. It was a surprising lapse by two world-class players.

There was only one double-figure swing in the second 16 boards. Let's see it.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| McQuaker | Draper | McGowan | Gross |
| - | - | $1 \vee$ | $2 N T$ |
| $3 \vee$ | All Pass |  |  |

Should West bid $3 \vee$ (showing a normal raise to $2 \vee$ ) or $3 \diamond$ (Unusual over Unusual, showing a raise to $\mathbf{3}^{\vee}$ )? When she chose to go low, discounting the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$, McGowan had no reason to advance on her cards.

The heart game is not particularly good. If trumps break 3-2, South may lead a singleton spade and score a ruff. If instead trumps are 4-1, declarer may lose a trick in every suit. Against $3 \downarrow$, Gross led the $\$ 10$, won with the queen. Declarer finessed in trumps and made eleven tricks for +200 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Smith | McGowan | Wiseman | McQuaker |
| - | - | $1 N T$ | 2NT |
| Double | Pass | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \varphi$ | Pass |
| $4 \varphi$ | All Pass |  |  |

Wiseman opened a 15-17 1NT and England reached 4『, scoring the same eleven tricks on the $\$ 10$ lead. That was 10 IMPs to England, who won a
low-scoring match by 36-35.
What did you make of the England bidding in the Closed Room? It seems to me that East might have bid $3 \diamond$ instead of $3 \vee$. If this is read as showing both majors, they would then reach 4 4 . This is a much better game than $4 \vee$.

The final scores were:

| 1st | England | 72.64 VPs |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2nd | Scotland | 65.18 |
| 3rd | Ireland | 47.74 |
| 4th | Wales | 46.93 |
| 5th | N.Ireland | 33.93 |
| 6th | CBAI | 33.59 |

ON THE OTHER HAND


An Honors Book from Master Point Press

Master Point Press THE BRIDGE PUBLISHER

## On The Other Hand:

 Bridge cardplay explainedDavid 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.

## AVAILABLE FROM A BRIDGE RETAILER NEAR YOU

## Letter from Germany? the Westiflen Regional League

Regular readers will recall, as I do with a mixture of shame and chagrin, that our Bielefeld team was relegated from the 3rd Bundesliga last year. To regain our place we have to successfully navigate a two-stage process. First we have to win our regional league. Then we have to battle it out with the winners of seven other regional leagues to come in the top three of that group.

As I have previously reported, the first weekend went well for us as we won the two matches with a combined score of 37.92 VPs . The second weekend, where only one match was played, also went well not just because we won our match $13.99-6,01$, but also because our likely nearest challengers forfeited their match when one of their pairs failed to find the venue, having travelled with neither mobile phone nor satnav.

Match 4 saw us rack up a 62-14 IMP lead from the first half of 14 boards when we, unlike our opponents, did little wrong. The high scoring continued in the second half, which we won 50-39 for an overall VP score of 18.61-1.39. Opponents' defensive mistakes allowed teammate Ecki Renken to make 44 on this deal, while Silvia Klasberg-Brawanski and I were beating it by two tricks in the other room.


However, Ecki fell from grace six boards later when he went down in this makeable (and made at our table) 4 contract, costing us our biggest swing out of 12 IMPs:

```
Board 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{5}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 10954 \\
& \vee 874 \\
& \text { J95 } \\
& \text { AJ8 }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { AK73 } \\
& 3 \\
& \text { AK10873 } \\
& 102
\end{aligned}
\] & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} \\
\hline & & \\
\hline & N & \\
\hline & W E & -642 \\
\hline & S & Q Q973 \\
\hline & ¢ QJ862 & \\
\hline & - K92 & \\
\hline & - Q & \\
\hline & 2 K654 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

The 4-0 trump break makes the play a little awkward after a heart is led to the ace and the e is played through for three rounds of the suit, but there are many ways to make, especially when diamonds are 3-3.

Match 5 was against those likeliest challengers, and the first half went badly as we reached the break 29-41 down. However teammates produced a splendid second half score of 41-2 to give us 15.08 VPs. As a result of which we had a substantial lead going into the final weekend, needing just 13 VPs from the last two matches to guarantee winning the league.

In the first half of match 6 teammates conceded 17 IMPs on this board
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## Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

| - K 1052 <br> - Q652 <br> - K10532 <br> - | $$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \quad 3 \\ & \quad 9743 \\ & \text { QJ4 } \\ & \text { Q7532 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | - AQ97 <br> - AJ8 <br> - A986 <br> 2- | $64$ |

Omid Karimi, playing North for our team, unsurprisingly couldn't find the double dummy way to make after East led the $\mathbf{\$}$ against his $6 \boldsymbol{2}$ contract. This was the auction in the other room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hübner |  | Köster |  |
| - | 120 | Pass | 14 |
| Pass | 3\% | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | 54 |
| Pass | 6NT | All Pass |  |

Where North South were unsure whether 4NT was ace asking or not, and so 5 might or might not have been meant as natural. Peer Köster sitting East for our team, quite reasonably on the auction, led the $\vee 7$, declarer calling for the 8 from dummy. Horst Hübner in West now had to find the counter-intuitive play of rising with the queen to deny a second entry to the closed hand - whereas if dummy's jack had been played, he would have had to find the even more counter-intuitive duck. I think he would have found the right play if the North hand had been exposed, but with the cards hidden and a not very revealing auction he didn't, so 6NT duly made. Notwithstanding that we won the first half $46-18$, and went on to win the second half by a further 37-7, partly due to this board:

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

```
@ }876
\bullet Q94
-42
* KQJ3
```



This was the auction at our table:

| West North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Klasberg-Brawanski | Cantor |  |
| 2** Pass | 2NT* | Double |
| 30* Double* | 3** | Double* |
| 3¢* Pass | 4 | 5 |
| All Pass |  |  |
| 2 $\quad$ weak 2 in one major |  |  |
| 2NT forcing enquiry |  |  |
| 3\% maximum |  |  |
| Dbl lead directing |  |  |
| 3* which suit? |  |  |
| Dbl lead directing |  |  |
| 34 hearts |  |  |

Silvia and I, defending, only collected our three aces for one down, while at the other table Ecki was somehow allowed to make 44 after the lead of the $2.12 \mathrm{IMPs}, 18.53 \mathrm{VPs}$, and the league title secured.

And so we were pretty relaxed as we started the final match. You know that fortune is on your side when you gain 14 IMPs on a board where teammates miss a vulnerable game - like this one:
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## Board 10. Dealer East. All Vul.

|  | - 76 <br> - J3 <br> - QJ105 <br> \& 108532 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { KJ9842 } \\ & 1054 \\ & 4 \\ & \& \text { A97 } \end{aligned}$ |  | - Q105 |
|  |  | - K762 |
|  | W E | - A62 |
|  | S | 2 KJ6 |
|  | - A 3 |  |
|  | - AQ98 |  |
|  | -K9873 |  |
|  | - Q4 |  |

Peer and Horst played in 2 making 10 tricks, which you always can, but only double dummy. Even if North leads a club and you guess right, you still have to strip the minors, and play a $\vee$ towards East covering whatever North plays. On any other lead you have to drop the Q and then find the same series of plays.

Meanwhile we had this auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cantor | Klasberg-Brawanski |  |
| - | - | 10 | 1 |
| 14 | 3 | Double | All Pass |

and when the defenders failed to attack spades early enough Silvia could discard one on a long club for an overtrick and +870 .

In the second half doubles were our friend again. We gained 15 IMPs on this board when opponents at the other table went off in a makeable game - but we would have still gained 12 even if it had made:

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



Making 3NT is far from routine on the North South cards, and after the 9 was led opponents ended with eight tricks. Whereas:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cantor | Klasberg-Brawanski |  |
| - | - | Pass | 1 |
| Double | Redouble | 2s | 2 |
| Pass | Pass | 3\% | Double |
| 34 | Double | 49 | Double |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

I wasn't terribly happy about my redouble, with so much playing strength, and uncertain that I would want to defend a doubled club contract. But in the end I decided to, on the grounds that if opponents bid a major I'd be happy, and if Silvia doubled a 2 contract I could still bid on if I wanted. I'm not sure why Silvia bid $2>$ rather than doubling $2 \boldsymbol{2}$, but as you can see it worked out well for us as opponents just kept digging. Four down and 1100.

And finally, with doubles still the keynote, this was the penultimate board:
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## Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.

- Q8632
- AKQ102
-KQ4
* 
- A1094 $\checkmark 98743$ - 1086
- 7

- 
- AJ752
( KJ5
- J65
- 93
- KQ1086

The auction was much the same at both tables, this being ours:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cantor | Klasberg-Brawanski |  |  |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | $1 \Phi$ | 2 NT* $^{*}$ | $3 \boldsymbol{3}$ |
| Pass | $4 \varphi$ | $5 \&$ | Double |
| 5 | Double | All Pass |  |

In the play Horst managed to go one fewer down, conceding just 800 to the (again) 1100 that we scored. Helping us to an overall match score of 99-24 translating to 19.74 VPs.

So in the end we ran out comfortable winners, 41 VPs ahead of second place, but to be fair I think that 'variable' would be a reasonable description of the standard. Full details of all the teams and all the matches can be found at www.bridgeverband-westfalen.de. On now to the promotion round in July, when the standard will certainly be much higher.

## New Honors Books from

Master Point Press
THE BRIDGE PUBLISHER


## Transfer Responses to

 One Club with Relays Lyle PoeThis book is an ideal introduction for players wanting to try an effective new approach to bidding that is not too complicated, and capable of extension and refinement as the partnership gains experience with it.

## The MOSSO Bidding System MOSSO: Example Auctions and Quizzes

Richard Granville and David Burn
For the last three years, the authors have been developing MOSSO, a new bidding system derived from $2 / 1$, Fantunes and Polish Club. Volume One describes the full system, Volume Two contains example auctions and quizzes.


## bid72 <br>  <br> Fit tobid!

## Bridge Educational Software

www.bid72.com
Your Bid Please
This series is offered by bid72, educational bridge software - bidding on an app. Check our SPECIAL OFFER for readers of A New Bridge Magazine.

Teams. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | You |
| - | 34 | Pass | 4* |
| 4. | 4NT* | 54 | ? |



## Sally Brock (European and World Champion)

6४. I am sure partner does not have a diamond control or he would have bid it over $4 \mathbf{4}$. His 4 NT bid shows a spade control. The question is how likely they are to lead a diamond. 54 could be very cheap for them, so I do not need the usual odds to bid a slam. I think my chances will be increased by making a psychic cue-bid - hopefully partner will not bid a grand (though that contract is probably as likely to make as a small slam). Perhaps I am trying too hard to be like Zia!
Tim Verbeek (European and Junior World Champion)
$6 \vee$. We might lose $\downarrow$ A and king though, but I don't see a way to find that out. It all depends on the lead.
David Bakhshi (multiple Gold Cup winner and winner of several North American Bridge)

5NT. When my vulnerable partner shows slam interest with a cooperative 4 NT bid, it feels like we ought to have chances in $6 \vee$ or even $7 \odot$.

It sounds like partner has at most one spade, so it all depends on their diamond and heart holdings. Trying for $7 \curlyvee$ risks telling the opponents what to lead, so we could either bid $6 \vee$ or $7 \vee$ and hope they don't find a diamond lead or try to find out about partner's diamonds. When there is no room for RKCB, I like to play 5 NT as a form of substitute RKCB, and would bid that now if available. If not, then 5 NT would presumably show some form of grand slam interest, so I would bid 5 NT hoping to hear partner bid at least $6 \diamond$ with the $\downarrow \mathrm{A}$ and $\vee \mathrm{K}$.
Mark Horton (Editor A New Bridge Magazine and prolific author)
6४. Slam interest? Could that be some $0=7=3=3$ or the like with good hearts and the $\downarrow$ K? I suppose it could be the ace, but then partner might have bid $5 \leqslant$ intending to bid $5 \boldsymbol{s}$ over my possible $5 \uparrow$.
Simon de Wijs (European Champion and Bermuda Bowl Winner)
$6 \vee$. I realize partner might be void in spades and we might lose the first two diamonds, but they still have to lead and also, they might misjudge and bid 64.
Jan van Cleeff (National Champion and co-founder bid72)
5NT. Grand slam try. Enough tricks, but not sure about a possible leak (in diamonds). Partner has still enough room to do something intelligent, like bidding $6>$ or $7 \downarrow$.
Marshall Lewis (represented Croatia internationally, as a player and as a coach)
5NT. This should be taken as a grand slam try (rather than "Pick-A-SmallSlam"). Hopefully partner will bid seven with the Diamond ace and stop at six without it. Perhaps I should be more worried about a misunderstanding, but just bidding six seems insufficiently ambitious.

## Post Mortem

The hand derives from a practice match on BBO. At the table South concluded the bidding with $6 \vee$ where seven was cold:
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## Boas Mighlights and New Features

The Funbridge team has recently reviewed the calculation formula used to award Funbridge Points in Funbridge Points tournaments. So what is changing and why? Find all the details below.


## WHAT ARE FUNBRIDGE POINTS?

These points allow you to get ranked and see how you compare with all Funbridge players.
You can earn Funbridge Points by playing two types of tournaments: Funbridge Points tournaments and any federation tournaments.
WHY IS THE CALCULATION FORMULA CHANGING?
In order not to treat players who don't participate in federation tournaments unfavourably, the Funbridge team has decided to improve the formula.
This is why from 1 June you will get 10 times more points than currently when playing Funbridge Points tournaments!

## THE NEW FORMULA

For those who are good at maths $\boldsymbol{X}$
( 2 x (no. players +1 - rank) / $\log 10(r a n k+2)$

## HOW TO TAKE PART IN FUNBRIDGE POINTS TOURNAMENTS?

You want to participate in Funbridge Points tournaments and pit your skills against all players?
On the main screen of the app, tap Play a tournament > Federation tournaments > Funbridge Points.
Have fun playing tournaments on Funbridge!

## $2: 30$ <br> 

## Bridgeur

PRESS RELEASE • PARIS, 24 MAY 2019
When the leading bridge app and the leading bridge publisher come together to promote bridge.

GOTO Games and Le Bridgeur have announced that they have just come together.
A few months after the merger between BBO and Funbridge, GOTO Games steps up its development with the acquisition of Le Bridgeur, increasing its presence in the bridge market as part of a global strategy.
With two magazines (Le Bridgeur and Bridgerama) and many popular books and software, Le Bridgeur will add a new stone to the Group edifice.

## Play and inform...

With this merger, the objective of GOTO Games and Le Bridgeur is to encourage bridge addicts to play and inform them of the latest bridge news.
Thanks to the expertise of Le Bridgeur in terms of content, the Group will be able to share even more information and reports.

## ... and progress

Renowned authors and teachers will serve both companies to provide numerous tools intended to help players make progress (educational resources, learning approaches, etc.).

## Digital and paper brought together

 Thanks to digital and/or paper supports, everyone will be able to choose how to play and learn bridge. Indeed, our ambition is to offer the most comprehensive range of services to bridge lovers.
## Bridge supplies

Last facet of our activity: we will provide private individuals as well as professionals with all the necessary equipment

It is thus quite natural for both companies to come together in order to promote bridge worldwide and attract new players to the game.


Olivier Comte comments: "The arrival of Le Bridgeur is an important step in our development and shows our commitment to offering a global ecosystem to our communities. The quality of the magazines, the number of titles published and the e-commerce expertise are real assets that will benefit all our current clients."

Karine Meyer-Naudan says: "This is a unique opportunity for us to take part in the creation of this new key player in the global bridge market and we are very proud of bringing our content and expertise as a publisher. We will now be able to speed up our digital transition on the one hand and open our contents to the international market on the other."
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## ABOUTLE BRIDGEUR

The company Le Bridgeur was founded in 1958 and is focused on two areas related to bridge: the production and sale of bridge products and publishing (books, software and two magazines, namely 'Le Bridgeur' and 'Bridgerama').
Le Bridgeur has a history of more than half a century. It now has a flagship shop in Paris, professional partners (clubs, committees and resellers), enthusiastic clients
and effective mail-order and online sale systems. Among the previous owners of the company were illustrious names of bridge in France such as Bauche, de l'Epine, Damiani, Descours and Meyer. In 1996, it entered the group HM Éditions, a French independent family group specialised in publishing and communication.
www.lebridgeur.com

## ABOUT FUNBRIDGE

Created in the 1990s under the impetus of 2017 World Vice-Champion Jérôme Rombaut (among others), the Funbridge app was first launched on PC and quickly became highly successful. At that time, players could see how they compared to others online on the same boards. From that date, Funbridge has continued to enhance its offer with new features (introductory bridge module, practice, competitions, federation
tournaments, Team Championship, group chat, etc.) and is also compatible with a wide range of devices. Indeed, the Funbridge app is now available on smartphones, tablets, Mac and PC. More than 100,000 players play over 1.2 million deals every day. Translated into 13 languages, the app gathers players from over 180 countries
www.funbridge.com

## ABOUT BRIDGE BASE ONLINE, INC.

Created as a byproduct of World Champion Fred Gitelman's award winning software series Bridge Master 2000, the free online bridge website Bridge Base Online was launched in 2001 and quickly became one of the most popular bridge platforms in the market with an all-encompassing set of products serving the
needs of bridge educators, serious or casual players. Bridge Base is available as both a web and mobile app. BBO in figures: over 2.5 million deals played every day, over 175,000 players online every day, over 180 countries represented, available in 29 languages. www.bridgebase.com


By plane: Örebro has a small airport but not many flights. However, the most convenient and least expensiv 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 6 th get $25000,15000,10000,7500$ and 7500 .

Masterpoints in all tournamaments in three categories: bronze, silver and goldpoints.
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## Diverex JTUIAN PTMTM

## The Questions

Solutions on page 70



Partner leads the six of spades, covered by the queen. What is your plan?
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## Leading Questions

## 7 solutions are of a kind, not otherwise defined.

## Across

$1,23 \ldots$. but Jill owns up? $(4,6)$
3 Crashed cab has bell and airbags by the seaside. $(5,5)$
10 Security Council veto used to get rid of a king, perhaps. (7)
11 Short trick I get in my present. (7)
12 First, no reporters in something that makes us cry - in fact, no press at all. (3-4)
13 Let Red shuffle. (6)
15 Catch the coffee group just after they've begun. (5)
16 Come across pilot hung up unexpectedly. $(5,4)$
18 Kilns I saw fired up. (9)
21,27 Summit of imaginary mountain? $(5,7)$
23 See 1ac.
25 Dadaist keeps calm, but unclear in bright light $(3,4)$
27 See 21 across
28 Either I'm one off in 3NT or I fold. (7)
29 Dubbed 'clot', he's wrapped himself in these (10)
30 See 9. (4)

## Down

1 The little woman has a big pot - and something she might take to the supermarket. (10)
2 Old system I take home for storage. (7)
4 Three players hold an e-reader - it starts a fire. (9)
5 Point count unit for diamonds, maybe? (5)
6 Vehicle that is on the road most used. (7)
7 Idle pun rearranged neatly. (5,2)
8 Sayings with a cutting edge? (4)
9,30 Leading non-medallist $(6,4)$
14 Upset a fine inkpot, nervous perhaps at this? (10)
17 Arsenal fan docked for using emphasis? Now he'll fly solo. $(2,2,5)$


19 As signaler, Ted held up a warning for his screenmate. (7)
20 First changing Italian, swapping one for one. (7)
21 Upside-down signal at the racecourse - or just a ploy? (6)
22 Cooler Under Armour? That'll please. (7)
24 Alas, time for something for the traveler. (5)
26 Slight? Bottoms up! (4)

## Test Your Technique

Dealer South. None Vul. IMPs


Lead: ${ }^{\text {PJ }}$
The first trick goes, jack, five, eight. Plan the play.

## Solution

At first sight, it seems that you will either need the ace of hearts onside or the spades 3-3 with the queen onside, not such a bad contract. If you follow that thought, you take the lead and immediately play $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ and spade to the jack. You need to keep the clubs as an entry to the 4th spade if, say, East has the ace of heart and $\stackrel{\mathrm{Qxx}}{\mathrm{Qx}}$.
The main issue with this plan is that, in the real world, no east would duck the ace of hearts if they have it. It is too likely to give away a trick if partner has $\geqslant \mathrm{KJ} 10$. If we assume that the ace of heart is with West, it has to be right to duck the first heart, cutting communications in case hearts are 5-2 and East has AK (very likely if West has $\geqslant \mathrm{AJ} 10 \mathrm{xx}$, as he didn't bid over 19).
After you duck the opening lead, West cashes the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and exits with a heart, East discarding a diamond. You now know for sure hearts are 5-2, and that East probably has $\Downarrow$ AK. Having lost two hearts and missing the top two diamonds, you will need the $\mathbf{Q} \mathrm{Q}$ to be onside but you need to start playing on diamonds before spades, if you start with two rounds of spades and they are 4-2, East will take his king of diamonds and return a spade, establishing his fourth spade.
Argine, the Funbridge AI, found this play in 3NT while I didn't, hence losing my challenge against it. Can you do better and beat Argine regularly? Try your luck at Funbridge!
(West, pardon, Argine, did not find the diamond switch at trick two - if declarer tries dummies queen, East can win, but must then return a low diamond. Editor)

## swinging In The Rain

How did we get a draw like this?' Trevor was not in a good mood. 'We've been travelling for hours, I think your wipers have been on the entire time, and look at that sign; we still have ten miles to go.'
'Calm yourself! We're in the last sixteen. This is a dream draw.' Erica was fed up with her moaning teammate. 'We could have met a top seed and instead we're playing a team of Munchkins. Dorothy is quite good and her partner must be OK as they won the National Pairs last year, but I don't know either of the others. Actually I think she said her aunt was in the team.'
'Well we could have made them play at a halfway house.' Trevor wasn't inclined to stop moaning. He might even have admitted that he was enjoying it.
'The Conditions of Contest are quite clear.' Erica’s voice no longer concealed her impatience with her young teammate. 'It has to be over 150 miles or four hours travel before the home team is obliged to agree to that. And Dorothy did say her aunt was quite old.' She sometimes wondered why she put so much effort into coaching and mentoring the Ozian Junior Team.

Detecting the edge in Erica's voice, Trevor allowed the remaining twenty minutes of the journey to pass in silence. As she parked in front of the Over the Rainbow Bridge Club, he shook his partner, Ben, who had been asleep most of the way. 'We're here. We passed the Middle of Nowhere a couple of hours ago, bypassed the Back of Beyond, and have landed up in its less fashionable twin town. We're supposed to play four twelve-board sets. Let's make them give up after 36. Or even earlier,' he added. 'Then we can try to get back to lovely, dry civilisation before the college beer bar closes. Watch out for the massive puddle, Ben. Drainage doesn't seem to have made it to Munchkinland. Give it another century, maybe.'

Dorothy greeted Erica, whom she had known for several years. 'This is my regular partner, Abigail,' Erica told her. 'I don't think you've met.'
'No, indeed we haven't,' said Dorothy shaking Abigail's hand. 'Have you met my Aunty Em, whom I'll be playing with today?'
'Oh you're not playing with your regular partner, then,' Erica queried as she withdrew her crushed hand from Aunty Em's grip.
'Let me introduce you to Professor Marvel who will be partnering the Tin Man,' Dorothy continued.

As Erica and Abigail each shook hands with the Professor, Abigail smiled. 'I love your jacket,' she said in a strong Australian accent, 'but I'll need to wear sunglasses when we're playing you!'

The first few boards at Dorothy's table were quiet, unusually so for Ben and Trevor's style. Neither Dorothy nor her Aunty Em could detect any likely swing. The fourth board, however, was a very different matter:

## Dealer West. Both Vul



The auction took considerably less time than the recriminations after the hand:

'A lot more sensible than your vulnerable One Spade overcall,' Trevor responded.
'That's just a noise,' Ben was now defensive, 'and even with all their values, they can't make game.'

Aunty Em sat back and watched. A bit of juicy discord between the two opponents early in the match was a good sign.

Forty minutes later, the board was played at the other table, with Erica in the South seat. Having run up against Ben and Trevor before, the Tin Man knew that he was going with the field in making a One Spade overcall. The Professor, sitting East, contented himself with a raise to Two Spades. The full auction was:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tin Man | Abigail | Professor | Erica |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ |
| $1 \uparrow$ | Double | $2 \boldsymbol{s}$ | $4 \downarrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The Tin Man led the seven of spades, Erica played low from dummy and the Professor won his ace. He switched to the two of diamonds.

This was clearly a singleton. Erica assessed the situation. If she rose with the ace, she would avoid a ruff, but she would never be able to enjoy dummy's diamonds, and would have four losers. Playing the queen was safe. If the opposition took the ruff, then as long as the trump queen fell, she would have plenty of diamonds tricks on which to discard her clubs.

After she played the queen, it was the Tin Man's turn to think. If he took this and gave his partner a ruff that would be the end of the defence. He ducked, and Erica exited with the eight of clubs. Whatever the defence did now, she would be able to get a club ruff and finesse the queen of
trumps. All she lost was a club, a diamond and a spade.
'Well played and well defended,' the Professor smiled. It should be a flat board but who knows?'

Erica laughed. 'With our teammates, flat boards are relatively rare.'
This prediction, while accurate on this board, proved surprisingly wrong on the rest of the set, and Aunty Em's team went into the second set leading by ten IMPs. As they walked to the table for the next set, Trevor whispered to Ben. 'I don't know the multi-coloured guy playing North, but we can certainly have some fun with his rather over-sensitive partner.' In a louder voice as they approached the table, he looked seriously at Ben. 'Good player, Dorothy. She won the National Pairs last year with some unknown partner. Oh hi guys.' He took his seat. 'Oh, I think we've met,' he announced turning to look at the South seat. 'You're the Thin Man, aren't you?'
'Ah, yes. Yesterday's juniors, if I recall correctly,' the Tin Man's lip curled. He and Dorothy had suffered a heavy defeat to this pair in the previous year's Ozian Cup but he had gained some revenge when they had met again in the National Pairs Final.
'Good to see youngsters getting this far in the cup,' the Professor tried to shake hands with both of them at the same time. 'When you get a bit more experience, you might be able to get to the later rounds.'

Verbal sparring over, the early boards seemed to provide a few small swings to each pair. The state of the match was unlikely to have changed much when this board appeared at the table:

## Dealer North. Both Vul
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The Tin Man opened the bidding with One Spade in third position, and Ben overcalled Two Spades to show a twosuiter with hearts. The Professor passed and Trevor asked which minor partner had with Two Notrump. The Tin Man bid on with Three Spades, and Ben, not to be silenced, bid Four Clubs.

The Professor looked at his hand. His king of hearts seemed well-placed, and if his partner could freely bid to the three-level by himself, he was worth a raise. Trevor's double closed the proceedings. The full auction had been:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ben | Professor | Trevor | Tin Man |
| - | Pass | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\infty}$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | Pass | $2 N T$ | $3 \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ |
| $4 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | $4 \boldsymbol{~}$ | Double | All Pass |

To the first two tricks, Ben led his top clubs, the Tin Man ruffing the second round. Going over to dummy's $\geqslant \mathrm{K}$, he tried the $\uparrow 9$, which was covered by the $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} 10$ and won in hand with his $\mathbf{Q}$. He sat back and considered the hand. Trevor was clearly impatient, so the Tin Man sat and thought for longer. For East to have anything resembling a double, he had to have all the remaining trumps. He played his $\forall A$ and another diamond to the $\star \mathrm{K}$, and ruffed a club.

Declarer now played his $\vee$ A and had seven tricks neatly lined up in front of him. They were down to the following cards:


He exited with his diamond giving the defence their second trick but Trevor was now end-played and could only take one more. The contract was made. 'Well played,' the Professor congratulated his partner, 'I'm hoping that might be a big gain.'
'Five IMPs from the double seems like small change to me,' Trevor observed. The Professor smiled, 'True, but it's more than the three IMPs you felt it was worth doubling for.'

The two teams gathered to score up the second quarter. There had been a few ups and downs, but the Over the Rainbow team were making a little headway. Then came the Four Hearts doubled hand. 'Plus 790,' the Tin Man called out proudly. 'That's another thirteen,' Aunty Em announced.'

The Professor leaned over to look at Dorothy's score sheet. 'I thought you would beat that Four Spades contract. It just needs a bit more thought than they gave it.'
'I can guess what happened,' Dorothy interrupted. 'Did your West help declarer shorten his trumps by playing out two rounds of clubs?'
'The benefit of experience,' Aunty Em had the broadest smile possible on her face. 'How could it possibly help the defence to make declarer ruff a club? I switched to the queen of hearts at trick two, and he just doesn't have the entries to dummy to handle it after that.'

For once, the Professor looked serious. 'We now have a handy lead of 30 IMPs. Having seen their style, I imagine our two juniors will decide it's up to them to recover it all.' He turned to Aunty Em. 'Good luck with them.'

The first few boards of the next set seemed relatively innocuous to the Professor and then this hand came along:

Dealer South. N/S Vul

| $$ | - K1084 <br> - J9 <br> - K2 <br> - AKQ 109 | $$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N |  |
|  | N |  |
|  | W E |  |
|  | S |  |
|  | - A76 |  |
|  | - AK8 |  |
|  | - AQ93 |  |
|  | * J64 |  |

The Tin Man opened the South hand with One Diamond and rebid Two Notrump over the Professor's Two Club response. The Professor considered his hand. With 34 or 35 points between them, the only question was whether to play in a small or a grand slam. Judging by what he had seen of their psychological make up, there seemed every chance that the two desperate juniors would take the high road. Wanting to check on aces, he bid Three Clubs, which he and the Tin Man had agreed was natural and forcing. After exchanging cue-bids, he used Roman Key Card Blackwood to go to the grand slam which he felt sure would be bid in the other room.

The full auction was as follows:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Erica | Professor | Abigail | Tin Man |
| - | - | - | 1 |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $3 \mathbf{\omega}$ | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | Pass | $4 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $4 N T$ | Pass | 5 |
| Pass | $5 \$$ | Pass | $6 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | 7NT | All Pass |  |

With no obvious suit to lead, Erica tried the $\$ 3$. The Tin Man won with the ace in his hand. He could see twelve tricks on top, and the thirteenth would have to come from a squeeze. He cashed the ace and king of hearts, and then ran his club suit, discarding a small spade from his hand.

On the lead of the last club, the position was as follows:

|  | K108 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - K2 |  |
|  | * 9 |  |
| - 2 | N | - QJ |
| - Q6 |  | $\bullet$ - |
| - 1085 | W E | - J764 |
| - - | S | - - |
|  | - 7 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 8$ |  |
|  | - AQ93 |  |
|  | \% - |  |

Abigail sitting East had discarded a heart and a spade, but on the last round of clubs, she thought for a while before jettisoning a diamond. The Tin Man pitched his heart, cashed dummy's $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$ K and laid down his hand. 'If diamonds are coming in I have the rest.'. 'Contract made,' said Abigail, gathering her cards. 'Well played,' the Professor beamed, 'at the very least we will have flattened the board.'

The Tin Man had a lighter step than usual as he walked into the social area behind the Professor. They had bid and made all the games available and hadn't let anything through. And then there was the grand slam!

He sat down opposite Aunty Em, and called out their scores one by one. Aunty Em always did the scoring in any team she was a member of. As her teammate read out a score, she computed the IMPs mentally. After all these years of playing she knew the scale off by heart.

The first board was flat and as he read out the second score Aunty Em called out, 'plus ten'. Then another twelve appeared on the third board while the fourth was flat. The fifth board was the grand slam and he proudly called out, 'plus 2220'. 'Twenty IMPs' announced Aunty Em. A further eighteen IMPs appeared on the remainder of the boards with only two IMPs being lost, making a net total gain of 58 IMPs. They were 88 IMPs ahead.
'Well done,' said Aunty Em, 'though I didn't think your scorecard mattered on that third set.' She smiled. 'Your prediction about Ben and Trevor was spot on,' she told the Professor. 'We just sat back and brought out the double card when needed.'
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'And your defence against the grand slam was excellent, Aunty Em,' Dorothy interrupted. 'You discarded the nine and jack of spades so smoothly, I was beginning to think I did have the queen. It's no wonder that he finessed the ten of spades at the end.'

The Professor chuckled. 'Yes, our defender didn't seem to see the squeeze coming until the last critical discard. She took an extra couple of seconds which really gave the game away.' He smiled again, and then saw the Tin Man's face. Displeasure was written all over it. 'Of course,' the Professor added, 'my partner played the hand smoothly at a good tempo and that made it so much harder for Abigail to plan her defence.'

Dorothy had also been quick to pick up on the Tin Man's expression as it appeared that his moment of glory was not receiving the adulation he had been expecting. After many years of experience, she knew the importance of massaging the Tin Man's ego, particularly if they wanted his partnership with the Professor to perform well in the next round. 'You must have done very well,' she said turning to the Tin Man,' seeing that squeeze so quickly. Trevor did seem to labour over it.'


The Tin Man's face relaxed. Not only had he made a good grand slam, but he had shown up that young twerp, who couldn't even remember his name.

The atmosphere in the car going back to the Emerald City was tense. Erica's wipers were up to top speed as they plunged into the deepening gloom. 'You got your way then, Trevor.' Erica's voice had an acid tone. 'I hadn't realised just how badly you wanted to get back to the college beer bar before it closed. When I said we had a good draw, I didn't mean that we could play blindfold. And do try to remember that you have team mates. As a rule, they like to feel involved in deciding the result.'



The famous London-based YC bridge club has launched a monthly bidding quiz open to all players. Participants can win prizes and progress in bidding whatever their levels, by benefiting from views and comments from experts and the panel, a group of 20 International players from the UK and abroad. To name a few, Sally Brock, Paula Leslie, Phillip Alder, Phil King.
To participate, one just needs to register once at http://ycbc.co.uk/quiz YCBC Quiz March 2019
At IMPs as South, non-vul. vs. vul. you hold 2542 - AKQ42 2 KJ102

|  | West <br> 1• | North 14. | East | South <br> ? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Methods |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Cue- |  |  |  |
| 3*/4 | Natu |  |  |  |
| 4 | Splin |  |  |  |
| 4*/* | Norm | splinter |  |  |
| 2NT | Natu | uless part | play |  |

This board \#2 from the March Quiz produced no less than 9 different answers from the panel! Cue-bid of $2 \boldsymbol{\vee}$ ( 6 votes) and splinter $4 \boldsymbol{~ ( 5 ~ v o t e s ) ~}$ , $3 \uparrow$ (fit bid) attracted most votes from the panel and top "theoretical" scores of 100, 95,90 respectively. Also provided is a "practical score" representing the likely gain (in IMPS) at the table and provides additional ranking for participants. Here the best practical bid was $5 \boldsymbol{\square}$ (exclusion Blackwood) which allows you to bid this great 6 Spades slam as partner's hand was $\uparrow \mathrm{KJ} 1087$ 『J1032 $\$$ AQ7 (the slam was missed at most tables).

Here are some of the panels comments
Phillip Alder: 3 "I like fit-jumps. Here, a four-heart splinter would leave partner no room. Over three diamonds, if he signs off in three spades, I can control-bid 4 .
Sally Brock: 2NT "We have always played 2NT as a 4-card limit raise (stronger than 3 which is mixed) but we have just agreed (after a very similar problem) that if partner is going to bid game he must bid 3NT in case I have a real slam try."
Brian Callaghan: $4 \checkmark$ Not sure this will get the job done in all cases, but looks to be a good description of the hand.
Drew Cannell: $4 \checkmark$ Splinter. Best chance to get partner to cue-bid Five Clubs. I would jump to Six Diamonds after that to show the solid diamonds. Partner would bid Seven Spades holding $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$ / $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$ / \&A.
Stelio Di bello : $4 \checkmark$ start splintering, will probably do an other bid on 4 S other option is to bid $2 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ and follow with $4 \vee$
Espen Erichsen : $2 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ I bid $2 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ and then splinter $4 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ over partners $2 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$. If I splinter $4 \boldsymbol{\checkmark}$ straight away I give partner a problem when he like my splinter but he is minimum. If you bid $2 \boldsymbol{\text { first and partner has showed }}$ a minimum hand easy for him to move now with xxx in $\varphi$
Christophe Grosset: 5 Exclusion keycard
Phil King : 2 "Complicated. I usually prefer a more direct approach but splintering immediately is unlikely to help. We have the boss suit so let's start low."
Paula Leslie: $2 \downarrow$ "Keeps the bidding low so gives partner more room if they have a good hand."
Ulf Nilsson: $4 \vee$ Shows void since $3 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ is available as regular splinter.
Stefan Skorchev: 2NT Many options are possible, don't see how my call is so important now. $4 \vee$ I play as limit SPL raise to 4 M , I feel much stronger now, so 2NT seems like a reasonable start...
Tom Townsend: $2 \boldsymbol{V}$ We're too good for 4 so let's go slowly.

## Crossword Solution

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

|  | A) ${ }^{2} \mathrm{C}$ |  |  |  | $A^{5}{ }^{5}$ C |  |  |  |  | $L^{8}$ s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 |  |  | F |  |  |  | U |  |  | A |
| U | B |  | 0 | c |  | U | s |  |  | W |
| R |  |  | U |  |  |  |  |  |  | s |
| ${ }^{2} \mathrm{~N}$ | O N |  | R | O N |  | R | E |  |  |  |
| A | E |  | T | D |  |  | S |  |  | ${ }^{\text {k }}$ K |
|  |  |  | H |  |  | H | - |  |  | 0 N |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | A | $\mathrm{w}^{2}$ |  | N | K |  |  | - |  | - F |
|  |  |  | N |  |  |  | - |  |  | E |
|  |  | N |  | E |  | R | c |  |  | M P |
| S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |
|  | - | H |  | N G |  | R |  | G |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N |
|  |  |  |  |  | H E |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Answers to "Defend With Julian Pottage"

## 2



- Q

K KQJ4

- 1084
- 108642
- K

10765

- KJ6


Q97532
K5

- 9732
- A

| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | $3 \star$ | $3 \star$ |
| Pass | $4 \star *$ | Pass | $4 \downarrow^{*}$ |
| Pass | $4 N T^{*}$ | Pass | $5 \star^{*}$ |

## $4 \diamond, 4 \vee$ Cue-bids

4NT RKCB
5\% One key card, may have the Q
Partner leads the king of diamonds. What is your plan? In a suit contract, when dummy has a singleton, it is customary for any signal to be suit-preference rather than count or attitude. If you want the suit continued (or a trump switch), you normally play a middle card and hope that partner works out what to do. Since the bidding and what you can see tell you that partner cannot have any picture cards apart from the king of diamonds, you have no desire for a switch.
East, Filip Kurbalija of Wales, saw that this was not the moment for a signal of any kind because the lead might be a singleton. He overtook the king of diamonds with the ace and returned the jack, which dummy ruffed low, West having thrown a club. Not wishing to have to ruff a subsequent diamond with an honour, declarer took the ace of clubs, crossed to dummy with a heart and discarded two diamonds on the clubs. Kurbalija, when he came in with the ace of spades, then played a fourth round of clubs, enabling West to score the trump ten.


Partner leads the six of spades, covered by the queen. What is your plan? A deal very similar to this came up in a Camrose match between England and Wales. At the table Wales went overboard and bid a hopeless slam. I have given you a problem that I expect Andrew Robson as East would have solved had he faced it.
With a nine-card spade fit your way and three spades in dummy, a second round will not stand up. Realistically you have to hope that partner holds a high honour in one of the minors and some sort of slow heart winner. While the high honour is unlikely to run away, do you see how the hoped for slow heart winner might do?
Having lost whatever fast loser there is and and taken whatever club ruffs are available in dummy, declarer will run the trumps. Unable to keep the king of spades and heart length, your side's heart winner disappears.
The solution is to play a spade at trick two. Then partner can lead a third spade later, removing the menace card.

## Bridge with Lariy Cohen

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

## Forcing or Non-Forcing?

Due to (constant) requests, I have given in and written about this annoyingly tricky topic.

How hard can it be? "Just tell us Larry, which bids are forcing and which are not."

It is very hard. It requires study, memory and sometimes partnership agreement (PA).

## Forcing versus Game Forcing

In this series, it is important to recognize the difference between Forcing (F) and Game Forcing (GF). "Forcing" (F) means your partner "cannot" pass the bid. If he does pass, he does so at his own peril. I might pass a forcing bid once a decade. Suppose my partner opens $1 \boldsymbol{e}$ and I dredge up a response with a very weak shapely hand. Partner (opener) now makes a forcing rebid (like a jumpshift) but I decide to bail out with a pass. I'd better be right!
"Game Forcing" (GF) means neither partner can pass below game.
In this 5-part series, I plan to break it down as follows:
Our opening bid, response and opener's rebid (with no interference) The fourth bid and beyond of our auction (with no interference) After Overcalls (by us or the opponents)
Auctions with Doubles
Other/Conventions
In this article, we address:

## Our opening bid, response and opener's rebid (with no interference)

The obvious forcing opening bid (though not GF) is $2 \boldsymbol{2}$. Any other forcing opening bid would have to be conventional (such as Namyats or a special use for a 4 NT opening).

I recommend a two-level response (in a new suit) to be played as GF. That ends any need to know what is forcing, because everything is forcing
until game is reached.
But, even in "old-fashioned," a 2-level response (in a new suit) is forcing one round.

A jump-shift to the two-level (for example, $1 \boldsymbol{2}-2 \mathbf{V}$ is a matter of partnership agreement (if it is played as weak, it is not forcing; if a strong jump-shift, then it is GF).

What about other responses? One-level responses (in a suit) are forcing (such as $1 \mathbf{1 v}$ ) and responses of 1 NT are not (unless your partnership plays 1NT forcing after a major-suit opener). A response of 2NT or 3NT is a matter of partnership agreement.

A raise is certainly NF. Conventional raises (such as Bergen Raises or Splinter bids are forcing if they are artificial bids; the opener will have to return eventually to the real trump suit).

Opener's notrump rebid is NF (2NT after a one-level response is 18-19, but passable).

Opener's bid (non-jumps and non-reverses) in a new suit is NF. For example: 1e-1v-1s or $1 \boldsymbol{1}$. While not forcing, these rebids do have a fairly wide range (up to about 17 or even 18).

Opener's rebid of his own suit is NF (a jump rebid such as $1-1-3$ is only invitational).

Opener's raise of responder's suit (such a 1e-1『-3`) is NF (the higher the raise, the more the opener has).

Opener's artificial raises (such as a splinter bid like 1-1 obviously be forcing.

Opener's reverse or jumpshift is forcing and covered in this article.
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## QUIZ

In each auction below, is the final bid shown F or NF?

| 1. | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 18 | Pass | 19 |  |
| 2. | West | North | East | South |
|  | 120 | Pass | 29 |  |
| 3. | West | North | East | South |
|  | 18 | Pass | 2NT |  |
| 4. | West | North | East | South |
|  | 1* | Pass | 19 | Pass |
| 5. | West | North | East | South |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \% \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| 6. | West | North | East | South |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | Pass | 19 | Pass |
| 7. | West | North | East | South |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \\ & \text { 2NT } \end{aligned}$ | Pass | 19 | Pass |
| 8. | West | North | East | South |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1e } \\ & 38 \end{aligned}$ | Pass | 19 | Pass |

Answers (which are all explained in the article):

1) F
2) PA
3) PA
4) NF
5) $F$
6) $F$
7) NF
8) NF

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

66 I welcome the Keep Bridge Alive initiative to reach out to young people - indeed everybody - informing them of all the reasons why they have to play bridge. Any research to confirm to all my students what they feel already - that bridge is a life-enhancing activity for so many reasons - is very welcome. 99
Andrew Robson,
English Bridge Playe

For more information, search:
'Keep Bridge Alive Crowdfund'
y
@soc_of_bridge
BE THE DIFFERENCE
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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

## acted

 FUNBRIDGE.com
iPhone, iPad, Mac, PC, Android, Amazon

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


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.

## Lightner Double

In a round of 16 match in the open trials, you have to decide how to handle a strong hand opposite partner's positive response.

## EW Vul. Dealer West.

As North, you hold:
106

- AK86
- AK3
- AK93

Your call?

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{1 e}$ | Pass | $1 \%$ |
| Pass | $?$ |  |  |

14. 16+ points. 2NT opener would be weak with both minors.

1v $9+$ points (maybe 8 ), $5+$ spades, game-forcing.
1s by you would ask for number of controls, after which all your bids would be asking bids. You would be in complete control of the auction.

Other calls are natural, with natural bidding following.
This is definitely not the hand to launch into an asking sequence. You have no idea where you are headed. Any suit or no-trump could be the right strain.

1NT is natural, and what your hand looks like. A suit bid would be expected to be a $5+$ card suit. This gives partner room to show his shape, which is what you are most interested in right now.

You bid 1NT. The bidding continues:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $\mathbf{1 e}$ | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{q}$ |
| Pass | $1 N T$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{q}$ |
| Pass | $?$ |  |  |

## Your call?

$3 \vee$ is your obvious and correct call. This lets partner know you have at least an 8-card heart fit, and he can now make whatever move he deems appropriate. The golden rule of slam bidding is to set the trump suit as soon as you can, so the partnership isn't bidding at cross purposes. You don't yet know if you have slam material here, but it is certainly possible.

You bid $3 \uparrow$. The bidding continues:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $1 \mathbf{2}$ | Pass | $1 \%$ |
| Pass | $1 N T$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2 V}$ |
| Pass | $3 \%$ | Pass | $4 V$ |
| Pass | $?$ |  |  |

Partner's bids would have had the following meanings:
3a: Good spade suit, suggesting that spades might be a better trump suit than hearts. This would not be a cue-bid for hearts. In general, unless a 9-card major-suit is guaranteed, there are no cue-bid slam tries below 3NT.

## 3NT: Offer to play.

$4 *$ and $4 \diamond$ : These are both "cue-bids", showing some kind of slam interest. While they might be showing a control, they definitely do not promise a control. In particular, the cheaper call, $4 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$, might be made on any hand which is somewhat decent. This gives you room for a last train $4 \diamond$ if necessary.
$4 \sqrt{ }$ : This shows a true minimum positive response, with little or no slam interest. It is almost like a fast arrival jump. Partner needs very little excuse to do something other than $4 \vee$.
Available to you are:
44: RKC for hearts
4NT, $5 \boldsymbol{*}$, and $5 \downarrow$. These are all asking bids in the suit named, with 4NT asking in spades. Partner will sign off with no control in the suit, but will do something else if he has a control.

5v: Just a general slam try. Does not show anything in particular, other than the inability to take one of the other routes. Partner will evaluate
depending on his hand and what he has previously shown.

## Your call?

Can you have a slam opposite partner's minimum positive? AKxxx Qxxx xx exx produces a great slam, although it isn't clear that partner would consider that a minimum even though it is only 9 HCP. Make
 slam is quite decent. These examples indicate that you are in the slam zone even opposite partner's minimum positive, and that while you could be in danger at the 5 -level it is unlikely that $5 \stackrel{y}{ }$ will go down and that this is a risk worth taking if there is an approach which is likely to be successful.

One possibility is RKC. That will avoid a bad slam when partner has neither the ace of spades or the queen of hearts. But if partner has just one of these cards, can we be confident that we want to be in slam? Not really. Slam would be pretty bad opposite something like AJxxx ${ }^{\text {JJxxx }}$ Qx $\boldsymbol{2} \mathrm{Jx}$. RKC is not the answer.

Another possibility which comes to mind is 4 NT , asking in spades. This avoids slam if we are off the AK of spades. But as the previous example hand shows, partner can have a spade control and slam can still be pretty bad.

What about a straight invite with 5 ? ? That might do the trick. Keep in mind that partner has already shown with his $4 \checkmark$ call that his hand is minimal for the positive response. Hence, the $5 \checkmark$ invite would be asking him to evaluate his hand within the context of what he has already shown. If he has the worst possible, he will reject. But if he was close to making a move, he will accept.

Let's see how he will react with some of the prototype hand we have been looking at. He will like heart honours and top spade honours. Other honours are okay, but not as valuable. ©AKxxx $\mathrm{Qxxx}_{\mathrm{xx}}^{\mathrm{exx}}$ will be a clear acceptance. Make it slightly weaker (such as the king of spades being the queen or the queen of hearts being the jack) and now partner would have a close decision. And slam would be around $50 \%$. With the


It looks like if you bid 5 partner is probably going to make the right decision. That is the route to take.
You bid $5 \uparrow$. The bidding continues:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | 19 | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | 1NT | Pass | 29 |
| Pass | 39 | Pass | 49 |
| Pass | 59 | Pass | 69 |
| Pass | Pass | Double | Pass |
| Pass | ? |  |  |

Redouble by either you or partner would be business. Your call?

Partner will be declarer in $6 \uparrow$, so East has made a Lightner double. What does he have for this double? He might be looking at 2 trump tricks, but almost nobody would double with that for fear of a runout to 6NT. He might have ace-fifth of spades and be trying to tell his partner to lead a spade. Or he might have a void in a minor and be trying to tell his partner to hit that void.
Whatever East is doubling on, it looks like slam will go down if East gets the lead he wants. You are on minimal values to begin with. If the opponents get a ruff, you aren't making this. You certainly don't have a redouble.

What about running to 6 NT ? You do have both minors double-stopped, which is a good start. Will there be enough tricks? That you can't know. If East is doubling on a club void, which seems most likely, you will be able to play the suit optimally and your $\$ 9$ may come into play. If partner has a decent spade holding your $\boldsymbol{\$} 10$ might make the difference. It isn't hard to see how there might be 12 tricks in notrump.

What about the possibility that East psyched the Lightner double in order to chase you out of a making $6 \vee$ and into a failing 6 NT ? You read about this sort of thing in the books, but it just doesn't happen in real life. On the actual auction East knows very little about the hand except that you have bid a close slam. He has no way of knowing that you have a hand which can even consider running to 6 NT , and it is hard to see how he could expect that $6 \vee$ is making while 6 NT is going down. It just isn't happening. East has it.

You can't be sure. But all things considered it looks best to run to 6NT.
You choose to pass, ending the auction.
Over you go to partner's seat.
West leads the $\mathbf{\$ 6}$.

```
4 106
* AK86
AK3
& AK93
4 AJ954
* Q754
- J
* Q107
```

You play small. As feared, East ruffs. East returns the 2 . What do you play? Your only chance to make is that East is underleading the KQ of spades. That just isn't happening. East simply isn't going to risk letting the doubled slam make when he is looking at a sure set in his own hand. Nobody would take that risk.

In theory East could make this play, since he knows you have to go up ace in order to avoid another club ruff. He knows that you will never play him for underleading, so he can afford to underlead which might result in a 2 -trick set when you go up ace. In practice, these things just don't happen. The defender never underleads the KQ, and declarer never plays him for having done so. There is probably some game-theoretic answer that East should underlead the KQ some small percentage of the time and declarer should finesse some small percentage of the time as optimal strategy for both sides. But, in real life neither player will take the risk of being wrong.

You go up ace. West drops the king. You draw trumps and concede a spade trick for down 1. The full hand is:

- 106
- AK86
- AK3
- AK93

| @ K |  | - Q8732 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - J2 | N | - 1093 |
| - Q742 | W E | - 109865 |
| - J86542 | S | 2- |
|  | ¢ AJ954 |  |
|  | - Q754 |  |
|  | - J |  |
|  | Q Q107 |  |

As can be seen, running to 6 NT would have been successful. South has the needed stuff in the black suits, and there are 2 spade tricks, 4 heart tricks, 2 diamond tricks, and 4 club tricks in no-trump.

What do you think of East's double?
While the double survived on this hand, there are several reasons why East should not have doubled:

NS might run to 6NT when East was getting a club lead anyway. This is a serious danger. East has very little in the other suits, and his queen of spades is onside if declarer needs some finesses. Considering East's minor suit lengths, West is likely to be leading a club without the double. This is exactly what could have happened on the actual deal.

The double might tell declarer how to play the hand. Imagine declarer with something like AK10x of clubs in dummy and Jxx in his hand. If there is no double and West leads a club, declarer will naturally go up ace and then have only 2 club tricks. After the double, it will be easy for declarer to duck and get 3 club tricks. That third club trick might make the difference.

The club lead could be the losing lead. The opponents are probably in a 4-4 fit, and East has the long trump holding. The club lead could be from an honour holding that blows a club trick. The ruff gets the trick back, but getting that long trump out of the way may be what declarer needs to be able to draw trumps and take enough tricks without having to worry about an enemy ruff or overruff. East's spade holding and the bidding suggests that declarer has a 5-2 spade fit, and a possible line of play for declarer might be to try to ruff out the spades.

West may misinterpret the double. Suppose East had AJxxx of spades. If North's 1NT call is to be believed, North probably has a doubleton spade. That gives West a singleton spade. West might not want to lead a singleton in declarer's long side suit, since that could pick up the suit for declarer. West might interpret the double as showing the ace of spades (or possibly the ace of trumps) and letting him know to lead that singleton. After all, the general meaning of a Lightner double is to ask for an unexpected lead, and a spade lead is certainly the most unexpected lead. On this hand West was protected from this error since he had the stiff king. We will never know what he would have led with a small singleton.

For these reasons, the Lightner double looks like a poor choice on this hand.

Do you think South's bidding was accurate?
South's first two calls are automatic. Whether South should indicate the minimum with $4 \mathbb{Y}$ or show a sign of life with $4 \mathcal{E}$ is a close decision. South has 10 HCP when he could have as few as 8 . His ace of spades and queen of hearts are clearly nice cards. He is $5-4-3-1$ as opposed to 5-4-$2-2$, which might make a difference. This is definitely not the worst hand South might hold.

On the other hand, some of South's queens and jacks might not be working. South's hand is unlimited, so he could have a far stronger hand than this. While it could well be right to show that sign of life with 4e and give no further cooperation, South is probably better off downgrading his soft values and treating this hand as a minimum.

Once North invites, South has an easy acceptance. In the context of what South has already shown, he is at the top. He was an inch away from showing a sign of life instead of bidding $4 \boldsymbol{\top}$. It is not South's job to figure out what North has or what North needs to make a slam. North has already figured that out, and is simply asking South if he has the absolute worst or not. South definitely does not have the absolute worst.

South can't run to 6NT on his own. He has no idea what North has. Running is entirely North's responsibility.

The question of how to proceed on a possible slam hand is often a difficult one. Do you just give up on slam since it is too unlikely and you can't find what you need? Do you drive to slam, making a last minute check with something like RKC? Do you try to find out something about partner's hand which will help you? Or do you bring partner into the loop by describing your hand and letting him make the decision? The key is often that the player with the source of tricks should be taking control. If you can see the source of tricks, then you don't need partner's help. You can drive it in, making sure that you aren't off two key cards (via RKC) or a cashing AK (via Q-bids or asking bids depending on your agreements). It is when you can't see the source of tricks that you need to bring partner into the loop. These are hands which are control rich but trick poor. I call these hand types "aces and spaces". The actual North hand is a perfect example, and the good $6^{\circ}$ contract was reached with good judgment.

At the other table, $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$ was unable to diagnose how good the fit was after the bulky opening and they missed the slam. This is another
example of how much smoother the auctions flow after a strong 1s opener with a big balanced hand and a positive response. We were very unlucky to suffer a big loss on this hand, but the ill-advised Lightner double gave us a chance to turn it into a big gain.
(This article reminded me of a session from a Camrose trial. Richard Winter and I bid three slams, all the victims of Lightner doubles by Barry Rigal and Peter Czerniewski. Running to 6NT would have worked on all three deals! Editor)


## Master Point Press

THE BRIDGE PUBLISHER
Bridge and the Romantics
An Honors eBook
Nick Smith
Nick Smith has unearthed a series of unchronicled episodes in the life of poet and bridge player Percy Shelley. "Historically accurate" and beautifully illustrated, this is a book for fans of classic literature as well as bridge players.
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## GOMBBRDGEGO

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

## A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE - June 2019


this month's Master Point Press Biddling Battle book prize

## Whist Players Altack Their Offspring

Most of the top whist players certainly did not embrace bridge. Even though bridge was recognized as an offspring of their beloved game, they attacked many of its features.

Their strongest complaint was that it was such an excellent game for gambling. They thus saw the game as leading the general population, and, worst of all, fine decent whist players, down an immoral path. In an encyclopedia one usually expects information, but Butler's The Whist Reference Book included this editorial opinion:

Now we come to the most objectionable feature of the game. The dealer or his partner having made a declaration, the opponents have the privilege of going 'over' or 'doubling' the value of the tricks, if they do not think the other side can make the odd trick. The latter may 'redouble' and then the others again have the say; and thus the thing may go on, like the 'raise' in draw-poker, until one side or the other backs down. Here is where 'bridge' reaches the level of poker

The fact that this new game was well suited for gambling cannot be denied. In Chapter 1, I listed three important characteristics of great gambling games: bridge had all three. The unlimited doubling and redoubling feature enabled wagers to grow to ridiculous levels in a few seconds. Your partner, who might be both a stranger and a lunatic, could place you in a very high stakes game by doubling or redoubling numerous times. You lacked the ability to shut him up. It was quickly obvious to the bridge world that a cap on doubling was needed, and etiquette rules were modified to limit the doubling and redoubling to 100 points per trick. This was adopted as a rule at many clubs, but hardly solved the problem. You could name spades at 2 points a trick and end up watching your absurd partner and opponents make you play for 64 points per trick. Bets still could grow way too quickly. That feature alone made it a great gambling game. But in addition, the large values associated with honors made bridge results very depen-
dent on luck. The score obtained by winning tricks was secondary to the points received for honors. Being dealt great cards was much more important than skill.

Whist historians around 1900 fully appreciated the appeal of gambling. Almost one hundred years earlier, whist had gone through its greatest revision. The sole motive behind the transformation from the long game to the short game was to make whist a better game for gambling. That change, which only made the game quicker, was enough to create a whist revolution. Bridge gave up nothing in quickness and also greatly improved on the other gambling features. Surprisingly, as we shall see later, individuals holding a strong moral objection to gambling saw a virtue in bridge. They correctly figured it would take the gamblers to the bridge tables and away from their whist tables, which would therefore become pure and clean. They had not foreseen that they would be unable to get four players at the purified whist table.

Another very common complaint was that many whist experts objected to exposing one hand on the table. They felt this greatly simplified the game and lessened the skill required to draw proper inferences in the play. The mental reconstruction of the three unseen hands was a source of great pleasure to the whist expert; it required sophisticated signaling and communication with partner. Archibald Dunn was an early bridge enthusiast who conceded that point. In his article 'Bridge v. Whist' in the Badminton Magazine he compared the two games and pointed out the virtues of bridge. He did, however, include the sentence: 'But for what it is worth we may admit that the exposed hand at Bridge does simplify matters, and on this point Whist has the advantage.'

The exposure of the dummy certainly enabled decent cardplay by relative beginners. From the days of Hoyle it was understood that the most important principle of play for beginners is: play through strength and into weakness. Exposing the dummy certainly made it much easier to follow this maxim, and it also lessened the importance of the sophisticated signaling practiced by the top experts. The expert advantage was also reduced in this new game because of the great luck factor in choosing trumps and the large rewards for holding honors.

Many top experts did see some virtue in the game of bridge: it could be useful as an instructional tool for whist. C. R. Keiley was a well-known whist player, teacher, and writer. In a letter dated Oct. 11, 1897, he wrote, 'An exposed-hand game may not be whist, but one must learn to crawl before he can run, and "bridge" gives an opportunity for acquiring this primary knowledge' (quoted in The Whist Reference Book).

A third criticism of bridge was based on its complicated method of scoring, and particularly the way points for honors varied with the trump suit. George Fitch wrote a humorous book making fun of bridge. He primarily attacked the scoring system but also talked about the gambling problem and the large luck factor. Here are some excerpts from his 1910 book, Bridge Whist:

Bridge Whist is ordinary whist with a wheel-of-fortune attachment. Bit is a cross between double-entry bookkeeping and roulette, and is played with a deck of cards, an adding machine, and a promissory note. It is listed as a game, but generally varies between a vice and a life-calling...

The participants generally play a rubber of three games, and spend the rest of the evening doings sums in simple addition, to find out who won...

Just how bridge whist got its name is not generally known. It is possible that it is called 'bridge' because so many people get 'cross' over it...

When the evening's play is over the players retire for refreshments, leaving their secretaries and tellers to post up the books and compute the returns...

Whist writers had several other minor criticisms of bridge. As already mentioned, some whist players found fault with the idea that one could win two games, thereby winning the rubber, but still be way behind on points and owe a good deal of money. Slam bonuses, doubled contracts, and honor values could be large factors. It was strange that one could make a grand slam in spades or clubs, receive the 40 -point bonus, and still not make enough trick points below the line for game.

In summary, the major criticisms of bridge whist were:

1. It reduced the importance of skill by exposing a hand, thereby simplifying cardplay
2. It reduced the importance of skill by attaching a very large value to honors
3. The unlimited doubling and redoubling features made it too appealing for gamblers
4. Tabulating the score was a great burden

## Bumblepuppies Rush to the Bridge Table

In light of all these negative comments from whist experts, how did bridge manage to survive? Actually, it did not so much survive as reign supreme. Obviously, serious gamblers loved the game. But what about players who played solely for amusement or small wagers? Why would bridge appeal to them?

Mostly, they had a new sense of competence and pride in their ability. No longer were they playing bumblepuppy. At this new game, former whist players got a fresh start. The mediocre whist players and the top whist players were on relatively equal footing. This new game had the potential of being the beginning of a long and very happy relationship. Whist had become just too complicated: for a player to be competent, he had to devote a great deal of time and energy to the study of the game. Whist had become less like amusement and more like work. The top experts kept improving the game for themselves. The complicated signaling techniques were making the average player, who was merely hoping for an evening of amusement, feel capable of only bumblepuppy play.

The Boaz/Badsworth book states:
|ntelligent men do not care to accept a permanently subordinate position in a partnership of two, and to have much of their amusement taken out of a game by feeling that a little more knowledge on their part would have materially altered the result of many a hand. The elevation of Whist from a game to a study lessened its general attractiveness.

In his October 1901 article 'The Chaos of Bridge', Archibald Dunn writes,

It is an offshoot of whist, which has been with us now for many generations, and which has been discussed and rediscussed until its theory and practice has been reduced to an exactitude almost equal to that of mathematics.

As a mathematics professor, I can assure you that Dunn was not complimenting the game.

I have not mentioned how Cavendish, the king of whist, reacted. Apparently, not well: 'It is disgusting to think that the temple of whist has been thus desecrated' was his view (quoted in The Whist Reference Book). Cavendish avoided the Portland Club for over a year because bridge was so popular there. Yet many whist writers pointed to
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Cavendish as the major culprit in the growth of bridge. They felt he had destroyed whist by encouraging a very sophisticated game. The Boaz/Badsworth book states, 'Whist was carried to such a high scientific point by the researches and writings of Dr. Pole and 'Cavendish', that it is doubtful if there are one hundred men in England who are indisputably admitted to be really fine players.' It must have been very painful for Cavendish that his whist innovations were often blamed for destroying the game. As we shall see, by 1898 , he was ready to hoist a white flag in face of the onslaught of bridge.

In his Whist Reference Book, Butler writes,
| $\dagger$ is to be regretted that 'bridge' has found its way also to America, and that many of our whist-players have yielded to its temptations. They will undoubtedly live to regret it, and more especially its introduction into whist clubs, where it is as much out of place as poker or other games of chance; especially as the by-laws of nearly every club prohibit play for money, and the American Whist League is on record as opposed to such play.

In the late 1890s the Whist journal speculated about an international match where a team representing The American Whist League would compete against an English team. It would have required an organization (proposed name, British Whist League) to be formed to select a team. The editorial comment in the Nov. 1899 issue of Whist states: 'The chief hindrance to the formation of the English League seems to be the declining interest in Whist, due chiefly to the prevalence of "Bridge". The editorial includes a letter from an English correspondent who laments, 'I am sorry to say that Whist in London - and, I hear, in the Provincial Clubs, also - is nearly defunct. The recent innovation, "Bridge", has supplanted it.' He goes on to write that at his club, '... the chances of a rubber at Whist were infinitesimal.' He adds: 'The Portland Club, always considered the headquarters of Whist in Great Britain, has succumbed to the fascinations of the invader, and I am told that Whist is seldom played there.'

The very popular Punch magazine ran the following full page cartoon titled 'DISCARDED' on April 17, 1901:


Fashion (to ‘Mr. Bridge'): ‘Come along partner! That dear old Mister Whist is such a bore! He is vieux jeu!’
[The book held by the old man reveals that the title starts with HOYLE.]

Even the most adamant whist lover and bridge hater had to confess that bridge was a great success. Their only hope was to label it a fad. They truly hoped, and somewhat believed, that bridge players would come to their senses and return to the whist tables. The whist literature often described bridge using the expressions 'passing fancy', 'passing whim' and 'passing game'. Since bridge involved bidding and passing, these expressions had a cute double meaning.

Actually, two interesting entries in the Whist journal did not merely speculate that bridge was a passing fancy: they said it had already died! In the Nov. 1899 issue the following letter appeared:

Bridge Whist is being driven out of some of the New England clubs by what is called 'Auction Whist,' a new game in this section, and no one get-at-able knows its origin. You bid for the trump, same as auction pitch, and if you fail to make the number of points bid, you are set back. It is quite interesting, and does not vary from strait Whist after the bid. The buyer makes the first lead and the game ends when forty points are scored.

I can't help but wonder how closely this game resembled the game of Swedish Whist that was being played in the Midwest. No edition of Hoyle's Games contained auction whist until several decades had passed.

The July 1899 issue had an even more interesting letter saying that bridge was dead. In this letter, bridge supposedly thrived and then died of its own failings. It was sent from Belgaum, Western India over the signature 'Ace of Spades', and included the following:

6 Dear Sir — I don't think Mr. Tormey need torment himself about the approaching extinction of Whist. "Bridge", which he thinks is going to do the killing, is, as its name imports, a very ancient pastime, but it is little curtailed now - it was formally, and should still be, known as the Pons asinorum - preeminently the asinine game [...]

Pluck up your spirits, Mr. Tormey. Bridge will never kill Whist. Even as a gambling game it is a showy fraud.'

Throughout this book, I have mentioned my annoyance with pseudonyms. An Indian author wrote several bridge books under the name 'Ace of Spades'; was it the same person?

Dunn's 1902 article 'Bridge v. Whist' in Badminton Magazine was written by a convert to bridge, and was an endorsement of bridge rather than a fair comparison. The same Badminton Magazine carried a rebuttal in its August 1902 issue. It was written by C. B. Harrison and titled not surprisingly 'Whist v. Bridge'. This attack on bridge included a very perceptive prediction about the game's future. Harrison did not simply dismiss it as a temporary fad. He recognized that bridge was much simpler to play than whist and therefore whist could not compete with bridge in the arena of popularity. But bridge was simple only because it was in its infancy: given time it would become every bit as complicated as whist:

Bridge will soon be as scientific and specialised as Whist. [...] Already we have Bridge-experts who feel aggrieved at having to play with inferior players, and Bridge-novices who, when asked to play, say, 'they are so frightened of playing with Mr. A. - he is so awfully good.'

## St Geoffic's World-cclass sulbstitute

The Abbot had been enjoying the excellent cuisine at the Order of St Geofric the Beneficent, in Devon. It had been less of a pleasure to teach the monks there the basics of bridge. Their average age exceeded 75, it was true, but was it unreasonable to expect a modicum of intelligence and common sense? Some of them even went so far as to claim failings in his own impeccable play. How absurd was that, when he was a Bermuda Bowl veteran and they were rank beginners?
'Tomorrow afternoon we're playing a match against four churchwomen from St Ada's in the next village,' Dom Francis informed the Abbot. 'When we last played them, a few months ago, we rather embarrassed ourselves. It was only a 24 -board match, but we lost by 61 IMPs.'
'We had hoped to do much better,' said the overweight Father Dennis. 'They take the game very seriously, though. Two of them went on a bridge cruise recently.'

Dom Francis turned towards the Abbot. 'We were wondering if it would be a good idea for you to play in our team this time,' he said. 'If we all pull together, we might be able to reduce the size of the defeat.'

It was a 40 -minute walk to the next village, so the St Geofric team were happy to accept the Abbot's offer of a ride in his Morris Minor. They soon arrived at the stone-built village hall, and this was an early board.

## Dealer South. None Vul

> K K6
> AK5
> 854
> Q7532

```
4 Q10873
` 1064
- AJ97
& 9
```



```
- 954
- QJ92
- Q10
- AJ2
- 873
- K632
\& AK4
```

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Norma | Dom | Beryl | The |
| Goode | Francis | Batson | Abbot |
| - | - | - | 1NT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

Norma Goode was wearing the same smart outfit that she deemed appropriate for a Sunday morning service. She saw nothing strange in wearing a hat for a bridge game. They were playing on church premises, after all. She led the $\$ 7$ and the white-haired Dom Francis laid out his dummy. 'I'm afraid I have no cover for you in diamonds, Abbot,' he said. 'Would you have preferred a $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ response?'
'3NT was fine,' replied the Abbot. 'Play low.' He won the first trick with the spade jack and saw that four club tricks would bring his total to the required nine. One small problem was that the spades were blocked. Ah yes, he would be able to impress them all with a clever play in clubs. By ducking an early round, retaining a club entry to his hand, he would be able to survive a 4-1 club break and untangle the spade suit.

The Abbot played a spade to dummy's king, continuing with a club to the ace and the 4 . 'Having none, partner?' asked a surprised Beryl Batson, when her partner showed out. A low club was played from dummy and East won the trick. The Abbot took the spade return with the ace and cashed the $\& \mathrm{~K}$. He then crossed to a heart to score his nine tricks.

Norma Goode leaned towards the Abbot. 'That situation was covered by Sally Wainwright, the bridge expert on our recent cruise,' she informed the Abbot.

The Abbot raised an eyebrow. Surely such an advanced piece of cardplay would be beyond a cruise audience?
'It works better if you start with the high cards in the shorter holding,' continued Norma Goode, speaking somewhat loudly. 'Begin with the ace and king of clubs and you have a little club left. Do you see? You can use it to cross to dummy's queen.'

For a brief moment the Abbot closed his eyes, as if in pain. 'My play
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was deliberate,' he replied. 'I needed an entry to make the ace of spades.'
Norma Goode was not listening. These old men from St Geofric's would never learn. They always made some foolish excuse when she tried to help them by explaining something. 'What did you have in diamonds, Beryl?'

Beryl Batson retrieved her cards from the table and inspected them closely. 'I had the queen and 10 ,' she replied.

Norma Goode sighed, 'Switch to a diamond and we take four diamonds to beat the contract,' she declared. 'That's another reason for this man not to play clubs in such a strange way.'
'Yes, but you led spades,' Beryl Batson replied. 'I was hoping that he had started with QJx and you held the ace.'

The Abbot sat back in his chair. What a hopeless standard! Did they really think that he would have crossed to dummy's $\boldsymbol{\leftrightarrow} \mathrm{K}$ if his last spade was the queen? As for a diamond switch beating it, did they not realize that he could hold up the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ for two rounds, guarding against any diamond position?
'Don't worry, Abbot,' said Dom Francis. ‘You made it, that's the main thing.'

The Abbot wrote an oversize 400 in his plus column. It was too much to expect players at this level to appreciate his fine line of play. On any lead but a spade, even a player of his magnitude would have gone down. There was no percentage in mentioning it. Explaining such matters to the present entourage would send his blood pressure off the scale.

A few boards later, the Abbot was once again in a game contract.

## Dealer East. E/W Vul.

- 75
- 763
- AJ74
- AJ75

```
@ QJ1096
v -
* K1093
& K943
```

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Norma | Dom | Beryl | The |
| Goode | Francis | Batson | Abbot |
| - | Pass | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ |
| $1 ゅ$ | $3 \varphi$ | $3 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| Pass | $4 \varphi$ | Double | All Pass |

Norma Goode led the $\mathbf{Q}$ and Dom Francis displayed his dummy. 'Ten points and two aces,' he announced proudly. 'I could hardly be much better on a passed hand!'

East won the first trick with the spade ace and returned a spade to the Abbot's king. There was no law against a favourable trump break, thought the Abbot. Maybe East had doubled just because she held several points opposite her partner's overall.
The $\vee$ A put paid to this rosy assessment of the lie of the cards. To make the game now, he would have to score all the trumps in his hand. The Abbot crossed to a club and ruffed a club. He then ruffed his last spade in dummy and ruffed another club. A diamond to the ace was followed by yet another club ruff in his hand.

The Abbot's last four cards were two losing diamonds and the $\uparrow$ KJ. Нe exited with a diamond and claimed ten tricks for the contract.
'Amazing!' exclaimed a delighted Dom Francis.
The Abbot nodded modestly. Even by his standards, it had been an inspired piece of dummy play.
'I go to game on a 9-loser hand and it's there!' continued Dom Francis. 'Who else would have bid my hand that way?'
It was a difficult question to answer, thought the Abbot, particularly as $3 \vee$ should have shown a pre-emptive hand on that auction.
'You didn't have much of a double, Beryl,' observed Norma Goode.
'What do you mean?' replied her partner. 'I scored three tricks in my hand and you'd made a vulnerable overbid!'
'Of course I had to bid,' exclaimed Norma Goode. 'We can make 4^, can’t we? Holding 10 points, you should have sacrificed in $4 \boldsymbol{\$}$ on your hand.'

Much to the Abbot's amazement, after his heroic efforts, the half-time comparison revealed that the four churchwomen were 9 IMPs in the lead.
'Excellent!' declared Father Dennis. 'The last time we played them, we were nearly 40 IMPs behind at half-time.'
'Well, my inspired bid of $4 \vee$ on Board 9 made a big difference,' observed

Dom Francis. ‘I had a 9-loser hand, but ten tricks were there!'
The second half of the match saw the Abbot and his partner facing two retired teachers.

## Dealer South. N/S Vul.

|  | - 852 <br> - KJ3 <br> - AKQJ7 <br> \& 84 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{W}^{\mathrm{N}}$ | \& KQJ+8752105$-A K 62$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } 10973 \\ & \text { AQ1094 } \\ & 8 \text { Q7 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Dom | Doris | The | Valerie |
| Francis | Bedell | Abbot | Faye |
| - | - | - | 14 |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 29 |
| Pass | 3* | Pass | 39 |
| Pass | 4 | All Pass |  |

Dom Francis led the and the Abbot scored two tricks on the suit. He paused to consider his next move. It seemed obvious to return the $\boldsymbol{\wedge} \mathrm{K}$, but would the studious-looking declarer not then make five trump tricks, four diamonds and the A ?

What shape did declarer have? She had announced at least 5-5 shape in the majors, and then followed twice in clubs. If she had a singleton diamond, a diamond return might cut her off from the dummy. His mind made up, the Abbot returned the $\$ 10$.

Looking somewhat surprised at this play, the retired geography teacher won with the $\star$ A, continuing with the ace and jack of trumps. When West showed out on the second trump, she called for the $\diamond$ K, discarding a spade. If one more diamond stood up, allowing a second spade discard, she would make the contract. When the Abbot ruffed the fourth round,
she would overruff and return to dummy with the $\uparrow$ K, to take a third spade discard on the established $\downarrow 7$.

It was not to be. The Abbot ruffed the third round of diamonds, overruffed by declarer. After a trump to the king, only one further spade discard was available on the diamonds. Two spade tricks had to be lost, and the game was one down.
'What a great lead I found!' exclaimed Dom Francis. 'Do you see, Abbot? If I lead anything else, declarer can discard her clubs on dummy's diamonds.'

The Abbot surveyed his partner impassively. Was his opening lead from an honour sequence in the unbid suit worthy of note? Did the man never notice when his partner found a truly great play?
'Once two club tricks were in the bag,' Dom Francis continued, 'we could even afford your return into dummy's strong suit. What did you have in spades?'
'He had the KQJ,' Valerie Faye informed her opponent.
Dom Francis laughed to himself. 'Ah well,' he said. 'Perhaps he didn't want to lead your main suit.'
'It was certainly a very strange defence,' Valerie Faye replied. 'As it happens, it was rather awkward for me. On a spade return, I could have drawn trumps and made four diamond tricks for the contract.'

Dom Francis displayed further signs of amusement. 'How remarkable!' he exclaimed. 'Bridge can be a strange game at times.'


The match was approaching its conclusion when this deal arose:
Dealer South. Both Vul.


Dom Francis led the 4 and Valerie Faye won the Abbot's 9 with the queen. She crossed to the $\geqslant \mathrm{K}$ and called for the $\downarrow 2$. The Abbot contributed the $\$ 9$ and declarer’s 10 was won with West’s king. The spade suit was cleared and declarer now needed three more diamond tricks. With the defenders' spades ready to run, it would be too late to take advantage of a 3-3 break in hearts or clubs.
'There's just one chance left, Doris,' Valerie Faye reported. 'It's against the odds, mind you, according to Bill Slater at the club. Cross your fingers for me!'

The elderly declarer played the $\upharpoonright$ Q, the Abbot dropping the jack. 'All or nothing now,' she said, leading her last diamond. 'Ace, please.'

With a pained expression, the Abbot contributed the $\downarrow 8$ to this trick. His masterful false-carding, which would have graced a Bermuda Bowl, had fallen on stony ground. Declarer soon had nine tricks before her and the game was made.
'Well played, Valerie,' the North player exclaimed.
'Not really,' her partner replied. 'It was the only chance. I just had to hope for a 3-3 diamond break.'

The Abbot leaned forward. 'Did you see the diamond cards that I played?' he enquired.
'To tell the truth, I wasn't very interested in them,' Valerie Faye replied. 'Not once the suit had broken 3-3.'
'I played the jack and nine,' persisted the Abbot. 'You had the option of finessing dummy's seven on the third round.'

Valerie Faye looked puzzled. 'Would that have worked better, then?'
'I don't think so,' declared Doris Bedell. She turned towards the Abbot, as if he were some errant pupil in one of her classes. 'Perhaps you're forgetting that you held the eight of diamonds. You would have won with it and played a spade back.'

The players soon reconvened to compare scores. It transpired that the four churchwomen had won the match by 21 IMPs.

Dom Francis surveyed his team mates proudly. 'A truly excellent improvement,' he declared. 'That's er... 40 IMPs better than last time!'

## Card Game Books

Bridge books, ephemera, other card games and playing cards

Gordon Bickley Card Game Books<br>208 Strines Road, Strines, Stockport Cheshire SK6 7GA Tel: 0161-427 4630 or 07530553594 e-mail: gordonarf@aol.com

## The ubid Auction Room

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

This month we are at the Lady Milne which was played at City North Hotel, Gormanston, Co. Meath, Ireland
Here is how the teams lined up:

| Ireland | Hilary McDonagh, Gilda Pender, Joan Kenny,Teresa Rigney, <br> Emer Joyce, Kathleen Vaughan, Peter Pigot (NPC) |
| :--- | :--- |
| CBAI | Valarie Burke-Moran, Ann O’Connell, Dolores Gilliland, <br> Lucy Phelan, Louise Mitchell, Maureen Pattinson, Diar- <br> muid Reddan (NPC) |
| England | Sally Brock, Gilly Cardiff, Susanna Gross, Catherine Draper, <br> Nicola Smith, Andrew Murphy (NPC) |
| Scotland | Liz McGowan, Fiona McQuaker, Sam Punch, Paula Leslie, <br> Anne Symons, Helen Kane, Alex Adamson (NPC) |
| Wales | Sarah Amos, Andrea Knox, Susan Ingham, Gilly Clench, <br> Maggie Pierce, Ceri Pierce, Tony Disley (NPC) |
| N. Ireland | Anne Fitzpatrick, Mary Kelly-Rogers, Norma Irwin, Sheila <br> Sharkey, Toni Sproule, Dymphna Friel, Alan Hill (NPC) |

## The Hands

(This month all the deals were played at IMPs.)
Hand 1. Dealer West. None Vul.
A AQ4

- AQ962
- Q52
\& J 10

- 95
- K107543
A84
- Q8

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Vaughan | Joyce |
| 1NT (3¢) | 4 |
| 4. | Pass |

This unfortunate contract went seven down, South holding $\uparrow$ KJ1072 \% $\% 10973$. The only consolation for E/W was that it was on the very first deal of the event, so there was plenty of time to resolve this misunderstanding.

| West |  | East |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brock |  | Cardiff |
| $1 \checkmark$ | (2) | 4 |
| Pass |  |  |

North cashed two clubs and switched to the $\uparrow$ J. Declarer won with dummy's king, took the spade finesse and eliminated the suit. She then played a diamond, ducking when South played the jack. She played low on the next diamond for +420 . Do you think that is the best line?

This was the match between the CBAI and N.Ireland:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gilliland | Fitzpatrick | Phelan | Kelly-Rogers |
| 1NT | Double | $3{ }^{4}$ | 4 |
| 4 | Pass | Pass | 5 |
| Double | All Pass |  |  |
| West | East |  |  |
| Irwin | Sharkey |  |  |
| 18 | (2) 4 |  |  |
| Pass |  |  |  |

The play followed similar lines - two rounds of clubs followed by the elimination of spades, but here declarer preferred to cash the $\downarrow$ A and then play low to the queen. She was pretty sure North was $3-1-2-7$, so she did not risk going down if South had held the $\diamond$ K.

| West | East |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| McGowan McQuaker |  |  |
| $1 ष$ | （20） | 4 |
| Pass |  |  |

North cashed two club and then switched to the $\downarrow$ K．Declarer won with dummy＇s ace，drew trumps，cashed the $\downarrow$ Q，went to dummy with a trump and played a spade．When West played the seven，declarer followed with the four，which looks like an unfortunate fingerfehler－one down．

In the other room，Clench and Ingham had no trouble making $4 \vee$ ．
Recommended auction：This is a classical opening bid problem－1NT or $1 \boldsymbol{V}$ ．After the latter East will always insist on $4 \boldsymbol{V}$ ．After 1NT－（3๕）it would be nice to be able to bid $3>$ as a transfer to hearts，South then raising to game．

## Marks：4ソ10， 3 ソ 5.

Running score：England 10 （13）Ireland 0 （0）CBAI 10 （9）N．Ireland 10 （0）Wales 10 （10）Scotland 10 （0）


Unless someone has changed the rules recently $1 \checkmark$ is a forcing bid．Was this another fingerfehler？It was +230 as South held 649865 J53

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Pender | McDonag |
| 1NT＊ | 2＊＊ |
| 2＊＊ | 3＾＊ |
| 4 | 4NT＊ |
| 5 | 69 |


| 1NT | 11－14 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Stayman |
| 2 | No major |
| 38 | 4 +5 |
| 4NT | RKCB |
| 54 | 2 key card |

North led the $\vee 10$ and declarer drew trumps in four rounds and advanced the Q ．

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Kelly－Rogers | Fitzpatrick |
| 120 | $1 \vee$ |
| 1NT | 2＊＊ |
| 29 | 4NT＊ |
| 54＊ | 69 |
| Pass |  |
| West | East |
| Burke－Moran | Phelan |
| 120 | 19 |
| 1NT | 24 |
| 2NT | 4 |
| 49 | 5＊ |
| 5 | 6NT |
| Pass |  |

North found the excellent lead of the $\$ 10$ and declarer won perforce with dummy＇s ace and played five rounds of hearts，pitching a club and a spade．North was down to $\mathbf{~} \mathrm{J} 1042 \star$ K $8 \mathbf{~} \mathrm{~J} 2$ and can throw either a spade or a low diamond．However，she opted to part with the $\boldsymbol{\&} 2$ ．That gave declarer a chance，but here next card was the $\$ 7$ and she was one down．

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| M Pierce | C Pierce |
| 1980 | $1{ }^{18}$ |
| 1NT | 2＊＊ |
| 29 | 34 |
| 4＊＊ | 4＊＊ |
| 4 | 4NT＊ |
| 54＊ | 5NT＊ |
| 6》＊ | Pass |


| 2 | Checkback |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4＊ | Cue－bid |
| 4＊ | Cue－bid |
| 4NT | RKCB |
| 51 | 2 key cards＋ $\mathrm{Q}^{\text {Q }}$ |
| 5NT | Side Kings？ |
| 6 | No |

South led the 3 so declarer took all the tricks．

|  | West | East |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Punch | Leslie |
|  | 18＊ | 1＊＊ |
|  | 18＊ | 2＊＊ |
|  | 2『＊ | 3＊＊ |
|  | 34＊ | 4＊＊ |
|  | 40＊ | 4NT＊ |
|  | 54＊ | 5NT＊ |
|  | 6『＊ | Pass |
| 1＊ | $2+$ |  |
| 1＊ | $4+$－ |  |
| $1{ }^{19}$ | 11－13 | ced 2／3 ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |
| 2 | Game | ng check b |
| $2{ }^{4}$ | 39 |  |
| 34 | Slam |  |
| 34 | Cue－b |  |
| 4 | Cue－b |  |
| 4＾ | First | control in |
| 4NT | RKCB |  |
| 54 | 2 key |  |
| 5NT | Side |  |
| 69 | No |  |

There are no star bakers in this magazine，but this auction was certainly a show stopper．

North led the $\downarrow 9$ but she pitched a club while trumps were being drawn and when declarer then played the Q that meant a flat board．

Recommended auction：After a 1 NT opening the Irish auction is almost a model．However，there is a caveat：if West holds $\uparrow A 73$ Q $72 \downarrow 842$ \＆AK104 then you have an easy grand slam，so to get top marks you should ask for side kings with 5 NT as Wales and Scotland did．

The simple sequence is $1 \boldsymbol{2}-1 \mathrm{NT}-2 \boldsymbol{c}^{*} *-2 \downarrow-4 \mathrm{NT}^{*}-5 \boldsymbol{Q}^{*}-5 \mathrm{NT}^{*}-6 \uparrow$ ． Marks：6『10，4『 5，6NT 4，1『 2.

Running score：England 12 （13）Ireland 10 （15）CBAI 14 （9）N．Ireland 20 （17）Wales 20 （10）Scotland 20 （0）

## Hand 3．Dealer West．None Vul．

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AJ87 } \\ & \text { AQJ3 } \\ & 1065 \\ & \& \text { Q5 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q5 } \\ & \text { K10976 } \\ & \text { AKQJ4 } \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | West | East |  |
|  | Smith | Wiseman |  |
|  | 19＊ | $1 \checkmark$ |  |
|  | 29 | 3 |  |
|  | 34 | 3NT |  |
|  | 4 | Pass |  |
| 120 | 1＋ |  |  |
|  | West | East |  |
|  | Pender | McDonagh |  |
|  | 1NT | 2＊＊ |  |
|  | 29 | 3＊＊ | （Dble） |
|  | 4 | 5\％＊ | （Dble） |
|  | 54＊ | 6 |  |
|  | 69 | Pass |  |
| 1 NT | 11－14 |  |  |
| 2 | Transfer |  |  |

I＇m uncertain as to the meaning of $3 \boldsymbol{m}$ was clearly a cue－bid but
 pass, allowing her partner to redouble with first round club control. The slam depended on the spade finesse - unlucky.

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Kelly-Rogers | Fitzpatrick |
| $1 \mathbf{1 0}$ | $1 ष$ |
| 20 | 4 |
| Pass |  |

That looks a little timid - West might easily have held the right cards to make $6 \checkmark$ cold.


This is not convincing - West did not have to own the $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \boldsymbol{J}$ - but it was playable.

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| M Pierce | C Pierce |
| 18 | 19 |
| 29 | 3 |
| 49 | 4NT* |
| 5** | 69 |
| Pass |  |

I refer the reader to my previous comment. However, I'm not sure East can do better.

|  | West | East |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Punch | Leslie |  |
|  | 1NT* | 2** |  |
|  | 39 | 4** | (Dble) |
|  | Pass* | 4** |  |
|  | 4 | 4NT* |  |
|  | 54* | 69 |  |
|  | Pass |  |  |
| 1NT | 14-16 |  |  |
| 2 | Transfer |  |  |
| 420 | Cue-bid |  |  |
| Pass | Cue-bid, denies first round club contro |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |
| 4 NT | RКСВ |  |  |
| 54 | 2 key cards + Q |  |  |

Recommended auction: This is a tough hand for East and the best approach is far from clear.

One question it poses is what happens when a cue-bid is doubled. Our Master Point Press Bidding Panel discuss this point in one of this month's problems. If West does not redouble it denies a first round control in the suit, but does an immediate bid suggest second round control? While you are pondering that, does East do best to introduce the diamonds or splinter in clubs?

As the cards lie $6 \vee$ depends on the spade finesse, but it might be better than that - give West a doubleton diamond for example, when a 2-2 trump break will probably see you home.

## Marks: 6『 10, 4『 5.

Running score: England 17 (24) Ireland 20 (15) CBAI 24 (9) N.Ireland 25 (28) Wales 30 (10) Scotland 30 (0)

Hand 4. Dealer North. Both Vul

| , K | N | ¢ AQ964 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - AK | N | - Q654 |
| - 1073 | W E | - K8 |
| \& AKQJ942 | S | ¢ 76 |


| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Joyce | Vaughan |
| - | $1 \mathbf{1}$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| $3 \dot{2}$ | $3 N T$ |
| $4 \dot{2}$ | 4 |
| $6 N T$ | Pass |

 took a trick.

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Brock | Cardiff |
| - | 1 L |
| 3\% | 34 |
| 4\% | 5\% |
| Pass |  |

When East could not bid 4 over $4 \boldsymbol{*}$ West let matters rest.

|  | West | East |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gilliland | Phelan |
|  | - | 14 |
|  | 230 | 2 |
|  | 4* | 4** |
|  | 4『* | 4** |
|  | 68 | Pass |
| 4 | Cue-bid |  |
| 4 | Cue-bid |  |
| $4{ }^{4}$ | Cue-bid |  |

I wonder why East did not rebid $2 \vee$.
6 was not bad, only mildly risky with North on lead (although the lack of a double over $4 \diamond$ was a factor). North led the $\downarrow$ A.

|  | West | East |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Irwin | Sharkey |
|  | - | 14 |
|  | 28 | 29 |
|  | 3** | 3NT |
|  | 4* | 4** |
|  | 49 | Pass |
| 3 | Fourth-suit forcing Cue-bid |  |
| 4 |  |  |

With no suit agreed North could not ask for key-cards. (Some partnerships play that in that situation 4NT asks for aces in the old-fashioned way.) One to discuss over the drawing-board. At least 4@ was a making contract.

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| McGowan | McQuaker |
| - | 19 |
| 3\% | 3 |
| 4\% | 4** |
| 4, | Pass |

West's cunning plan was one that Baldrick would have been proud of; after East bid 4 NT she could raise to 6 NT . This time declarer made 11 tricks.

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Clench | Ingham |
| - | 19 |
| 29 | 29 |
| 3** | (Dble) |
| 4\% | 44 |
| 6NT | Pass |

Once East had bid 3NT West was not going to stop short of 6NT.
Recommended auction: The first question is what should West bid on the first round - or 3\& If you start with the former and use the fourth suit to discover that South has a diamond stopper, then bidding 6NT looks reasonable. If you begin with $3 \boldsymbol{*}$ and then rebid $4 \boldsymbol{E}$ East should bid $4 \downarrow$. Then you need to be on firm ground about the meaning of $4 \boldsymbol{\downarrow} / 4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ - if you are not then a jump to 6 is probably in order.

## A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE - June 2019

Marks: 6NT/6e (E) 10, 6NT/6e (W) 9, 5\&/3NT 6, 44 4.
Running score: England 23 (24) Ireland 30 (28) CBAI 33 (22) N.Ireland 29 (28) Wales 40 (23) Scotland 34 (0)


South held 532 『J986 9 ) 10764 and led the $\downarrow 9$, declarer taking North's jack with the ace. Her next move was to test the trumps and North was kind enough to pitch a diamond on the second round (a club or heart is essential). Another diamond went on the third round of spades so declarer did not even need to finesse on the second round for +1430 .

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Kane | Symons |
| - | 14 |
| 3** | 3 |
| 4 | 4NT* |
| 5^* | 60* |
| Pass |  |

An identical sequence and an identical lead. Here too North pitched a diamond, followed by the $\boldsymbol{\$ 9}$. Having drawn trumps declarer took the diamond finesse to flatten the board.

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Friel | Sproule |
| - | $1 \Delta$ |
| $3 \star *$ | $4 N T^{*}$ |
| $5 \Delta^{*}$ | $6 \boldsymbol{a}$ |
| Pass |  |

South led the $\$ 9$ for the queen and ace and declarer took two rounds of trumps ending in dummy, North pitching the 9 . Declarer now tried a diamond to the king and South ruffed and exited with a club which meant two down.

|  | West | East |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Phelan | Gilliland |
|  | - | 14 |
|  | 34* | 3 |
|  | 49 | Pass |
| 38 | Spade support |  |
|  | West | East |
|  | Gross | Draper |
|  | - | 19 |
|  | 3* (3) | 49 |
|  | Pass |  |
|  | West | East |
|  | Rigney | Kenny |
|  | - | 19 |
|  | 34* | 3 |
|  | 4, | Pass |
| 32 | Bergen Ra |  |

Recommended auction: When I was a lad you responded 34 with the West hand, 9-11 with four-card support. In Bridge World Standard 1M-3M is still a limit raise. Some pairs now use $1 \mathrm{M}-3 \mathrm{M}$ to show a mixed raise, 7-9 or thereabouts and four-card support. If you don't like those ideas then you more or less have to use $3 \boldsymbol{\kappa} / 3\rangle$ to show this type of hand.
 small diamonds in partner's hand would be bad news a simple 4a might be in order.

Having said that 6 is not bad on this layout.

## Marks：4ヵ10，6＾ 7.

Running score：England 33 （24）Ireland 40 （28）CBAI 43 （35）N．Ireland 36 （28）Wales 47 （23）Scotland 41 （0）

## Hand 6．Dealer East．E／W Vul．

| － | N | $\stackrel{\mathrm{K}}{\wedge} 53$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| －K10754 | N | －AJ6 |
| －AJ5 | W E | － 874 |
| －KQ763 | S | －AJ52 |

South overcalls 1a and North raises to 3a

| est |  | Ea |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M Pierc |  | C Pi |
| － |  | 10 |
|  | （3¢） | Pass |
|  |  | Pas |

South led the $\downarrow$ K from $\uparrow$ AJ8742 $\vee$ Q3 $\downarrow$ KQ3 $\$ 104$ and in due course declarer lost a diamond and a heart．

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Cardiff | Brock |
| － | 1趐 |
| 24（24） | Pass |
| 6＊ | Pass |

（1－$)$

South led the $\varangle \mathrm{K}$ and declarer followed the natural line of playing North for the YQ －an unlucky one down．


2
South led the A and declarer ruffed and played a heart to the jack -+650 ．

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| O＇Connell | Burke－Moran |
| － | 120 |
| 34 | 4 |
| 4 ${ }^{*}$ | 5＊＊ |
| 5＊＊ | 5 |
| 69 | Pass |

（19）

Presumably $2 \checkmark$ would have been non－forcing．
A series of cue－bids saw E／W reach the heart slam．North led the 10 and declarer ruffed，cashed the V and continued with a heart to the jack－one down．

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Kelly－Rogers | Fitzpatrick |
| Double＊ | （3）Pass |
| Double | 4 |
| 4NT＊ | 5\％＊ |
| 69 | Pass |

South led the $\diamond$ K and declarer won with dummy＇s ace，played a heart to the ace and a heart－a useful＋1430．

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Sharkey | Friel |
| － | 120 |
| 27 （3） | Pass |
| 5\％ | Pass |

（14）

South led the $\boldsymbol{A}$ and declarer got the heart right for all the tricks．
Recommended auction：After 1e－（1ヵ）West must choose between $2 \boldsymbol{\sim}$ and a double．What to do after that is unclear－you must decide which approach you prefer－do you jump to $5 \boldsymbol{*}$ or $6 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ ？

Marks：6®10，6ヶ8，5『／5\＆ 7.
Running score：England 43 （24）Ireland 47 （28）CBAI 53 （35）N．Ireland 44 （41）Wales 54 （35）Scotland 48 （13）

## Hand 7. Dealer West. Both Vul.



3e. Puppet Stayman
3 At least one major
5* Cue-bid
North held $₫ \mathrm{~K} 105$ Q65 Q53 5962 and led the 2 . Declarer won with the king and ran the $\vee \mathrm{J}$. She followed that with a heart to the eight and two rounds of diamonds, South winning with the king and returning a club. Declarer could establish the diamonds, but not enjoy them-one down.

Suppose declarer takes the club lead in dummy and plays the $\downarrow$ J? If South wins and returns a club declarer wins in dummy, cashes the red aces, ruffs a spade and plays the $\uparrow$ J. With an extra entry to hand it will be possible to take advantage of the 3-3 diamond break.

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Cardiff | Brock |
| Pass | 2* |
| 2** | 2** |
| 24* | 2NT* |
| 3** | $3 * *$ |
| 34* | 4 |
| Pass |  |
| Forced |  |
|  |  |
| Balanced |  |
| Puppet Stayman |  |
| At least one major |  |
|  |  |

Under no pressure, declarer found a route to ten tricks.

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Punch | Leslie |
| Pass | 2e* |
| 2** | 2NT |
| 3** | 3** |
| 34* | 4 |
| Pass |  |

That is a sequence that you might see repeated.

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| O'Connell | Burke-Moran |
| Pass | 2** |
| 2** | 2NT |
| 3** | $3 * *$ |
| 34* | 4 |
| Pass |  |

Both declarers took eleven tricks.

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Kelly-Rogers | Fitzpatrick |
| Pass | 2** |
| 2** | 2NT |
| 3** | 3** |
| 30* | 4 |
| Pass |  |
| West | East |
| Sharkey | McDonagh |
| Pass | 2** |
| 2** | 2NT |
| 3\% | 39 |
| 4 | Pass |

I'm guessing $2 \diamond$ was a Multi that included the possibility of a strong balanced hand.

Northern Ireland's eleven tricks were worth an IMP.
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Marks：4『 10，6ヤ 5.
Running score：England 53 （36）Ireland 57 （28）CBAI 63 （35）N．Ireland 54 （42）Wales 59 （35）Scotland 58 （13）

## Hand 8．Dealer West．None Vul．




| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Cardiff | Brock |
| Pass | 1 |
| 3NT | Pass |

It appears that on the first round of the auction West＇s was AWOL． Although West realised a card was missing her initial Pass had to stand．

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Punch | Leslie |
| 1NT | 2＊＊ |
| 2＊＊ | 3\％ |
| 3 | 39 |
| 34 | 49 |
| 4 | 4 |
| 5\％ | 6\％ |

Another fine sequence from the Scottish pair．

## West <br> East

| O＇Connell | Burke－Moran |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathbf{2 0}$ | 18 |
| 20 | $2 N T$ |
| $3 \mathbf{2 N}$ | $3 N T$ |
| Pass |  |


| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Kelly－Rogers | Fitzpatrick |
| 1e | $1 \downarrow$ |
| 1NT | 4NT＊ |
| 6NT | Pass |
| 4 NT | Quantitative |

Bypassing diamonds on this type of hand is a matter for the partnership．

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Sharkey | McDonagh |
| $1 \&$ | $1 \$$ |
| 1NT | $2 \downarrow$ |
| 2NT | $3 N T$ |
| Pass |  |

Having gone down this route perhaps East might have tried 3e．If West then bids $3>$ East can keep the ball in play with 3 ．

Recommended auction：1－1－

## Marks：6 $\mathbf{~ / ~ / 6 N T ~ 1 0 , ~ 3 N T / 5 ~ 5 , ~ 7 \& / 7 N T ~} 3$.

Running score：England 58 （36）Ireland 62 （28）CBAI 68 （35）N．Ireland 64 （53）Wales 64 （35）Scotland 68 （23）
When you look at the final table you will appreciate that winning the bidding battles does not always translate into victory at the table：

| England | Q4s | 10.22 | 14.09 | 17.96 | 18.90 | 11.47 | 72.64 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scotland | 9.78 | PV『 | 12.60 | 10.00 | 13.12 | 19.68 | 65.18 |
| Ireland | 5.91 | 7.40 | －＊ | 6.06 | 12.24 | 16.12 | 47.73 |
| Wales | 2.04 | 10.00 | 13.94 | Q0\％ | 6.71 | 14.24 | 46.93 |
| N．Ireland | 1.10 | 6.88 | 7.76 | 13.29 | Qast | 4.90 | 33.93 |
| CBAI | 8.53 | 0.32 | 3.88 | 5.76 | 15.10 | ＊ | 33.59 |

You can play through the deals mentioned in this article.
Just follow the links:
Hands $1,2,3 \& 4$ here or https://tinyurl.com/yyb39auh and here or https://tinyurl.com/y64x7tfk and here or https://tinyurl.com/yxn39uvh

Hand 5 here or https://tinyurl.com/y2e88wc5 and here or https:// tinyurl.com/y3ugsync and here or https://tinyurl.com/y6t3ctmc

Hand $6,7 \& 8$ here or https://tinyurl.com/yyxth33s and here or https:// tinyurl.com/yxfz9kvk and here or https://tinyurl.com/y26v799h


## 2018 Book of the Year

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

It's magic how much they know when they finish without realizing just how much they learned."
Betty Starzec, ABTA President.
"If I could recommend just one book for beginning players it would be A Taste of Bridge."

## Barbara Seagram.

"I'm reviewing your book and I absolutely love it."
Chip Dombrowski, ACBL Bulletin editor.
"This is the only beginner book I know that begins by concentrating almost $100 \%$ on card play. I like this approach."

## Phillip Alder.

A Taste of Bridge is fun, but it is only half of the Honors Bridge Club beginner course. The amazing Israeli online teaching site, bestebridge.com, is the other half. Teacher and student notes, along with all the example hands your beginners will ever need, are included in the program. If you'll email me at honorsbridge@gmail.com, I'll send you a complimentary e-book, course materials, and two full-day free access to the Best e-Bridge website. If you've been unhappy with materials you've been using to reach your newest students, you owe it to them to give us a try.

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

## Jeff Bayone

Honors Bridge Club

## A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE - June 2019

## The Master point Press Bidding Battle set 17

There is another quite small panel this month. There were 29 different responses to the eight problems, which is also quite a low number, and six of the eight problems attracted a majority vote, with the lowest winning vote being seven out of 16 .

## PROBLEM 1

## IMPs. Dealer South. None Vul.

, -
K K865

- AKQ762

2 KQ4
$\begin{array}{cccc}\text { West } & \text { North } & \text { East } & \text { South } \\ - & - & - & 3 \varphi\end{array}$
$?$

| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 3NT | 9 | 10 |
| 4 | 4 | 8 |
| 5 | 3 | 7 |
| Dble | 0 | 2 |

I think we can all agree that there is no ideal action on this one. Let's start with a look at the majority. They go from:
Leufkens: 3NT. What else?
to:
Apteker: 3NT. I have too much not to act so it's either the higher scoring 3NT or wimpy $4 \uparrow$. Stabell: 3NT. Hamman's rule. Could be completely wrong, but requires the least from partner to make game ( $\mathbf{~}$ I10xx $\mathrm{Vxx}_{\mathrm{xx}}^{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{Axxx}$ )

## THE BIDS \& MARKS

Bid No. of Votes Marks Bid No. of Votes Marks

| 1. | 3NT | 9 | 10 | 5. | 4NT | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4 | 4 | 8 |  | 5\% | 4 | 6 |
|  | 5 | 3 | 7 |  | 5NT | 2 | 7 |
|  | Double | 0 | 2 |  | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| 2. | Pass | 7 | 10 |  | 5 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 44 | 6 | 9 | 6. | 3NT | 11 | 10 |
|  | 5 | 1 | 5 |  | 3 | 4 | 7 |
|  | 4NT | 1 | 3 |  | 4NT | 1 | 3 |
|  | 6 | 1 | 2 | 7. | Double | 8 | 10 |
| 3. | 1NT | 9 | 10 |  | Pass | 7 | 9 |
|  | 2 | 3 | 6 |  | 2¢ | 1 | 3 |
|  | Pass | 3 | 5 | 8. | Double | 13 | 10 |
|  | 20 | 1 | 3 |  | 44 | 2 | 4 |
| 4. | 4 | 12 | 10 |  | Pass | 1 | 3 |
|  | Pass | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6\% | 1 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4NT | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |



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

Green: 3NT. Tough problem. For me it's between 3NT and 4 (as we are not playing Non-Leaping Michaels) I have too much to pass and 5 is too rich for me. It's a bit scary bidding 3NT with a void, but I will hope that partner only has five spades and so passes 3NT.
Cannell: 3NT. Relying on partner to stop spades. Any diamond overcall is fraught with danger relating to level.

And there is no danger in bidding $3 N T$ ?
Kokish: 3NT. Many of us would risk 3NT at the table, so why lie about the beauty of $4 \star$, 5 or Double. Not that 3NT has to keep us out of spades or trouble, but the alternatives are not so hot either. Second choice $5 \downarrow$, which might occasionally catch a raise.
Lawrence: 3NT. Choices are 3 NT and $4 \diamond$.

Perhaps $5 \downarrow$. I'd consider 3NT rather strongly but given that 7 is possible, I hate to give up on $6 \downarrow$ ( $\downarrow 7653 \geqslant 2$ J83A763). Still, my guess is 3 NT with the intent of correcting 4 4 to $5 \downarrow$. Partner will have to make some lucky guesses.

Mike at least has a plan, though I suppose most of the others would also convert 4a to 5 .
Bird: 3NT. Give partner the club ace and some secondary values in spades and we should make $3 N T$. Even if 4 is played as natural (rather than non-leaping Michaels), it seems a poor sec-ond-best move.

This is actually covered in the system notes $4 \boldsymbol{s} /$ over 3 is natural. Barry would therefore seem to have lucked out by bidding on the assumption that he could not bid $4 \diamond$ on this hand so chose the most popular call instead.
Rigal: 3NT. Since for me $4 \diamond$ would be diamonds and spades I guess 3NT but I won't sit for it if doubled. If partner transfers to spades I will bid $5 \diamond$.

And another who prefers to play his own methods rather than those agreed for this feature:
Smith: $5 \uparrow$. Passing does not feel right, so it's a question of guessing the most likely right option. Since I play $4 \diamond$ as non-leaping Michaels (showing diamonds and spades), that's not an option, but even if it was it's not clear when partner will know to raise. That leaves a choice between 3 NT and $5 \diamond$ and either could be right. When you start constructing hands, though, it is not so easy to come up with one where 3NT is significantly the better game.

Have you actually done a computer simulation or is that just your opinion? It does seem that there must be quite a number of hands on which South
and the long hearts can be shut out of the play, making 3NT a good spot, and the better spot if it is partner who has a doubleton heart.
Alder: $5 \uparrow$. If South has seven hearts (admittedly not guaranteed these days), either West and North each have a singleton, or partner or West is void. Will the majority of the panel bid 3NT? Robson: $5 \downarrow$. I have absolutely no idea what to bid. I hate doubling with a void spade, so that's out. I could bid $4 \diamond$ but that's so feeble with such a mountain. I could bid 3NT and go down in game with a grand slam cold. $5 \diamond$ may work horribly but it will get us to some slams.

Nonetheless, four panellists were willing to make the 'feeble' $4 \diamond$ overcall:
Cope: $4 \star$. Too much upside potential not to bid, as we can make slam opposite the A*, a stiff heart and diamond support. True, 3NT may be the making game, but there are too many uncertainties about the spade suit - it could lead to our downfall in NT, or partner may feel entitled to bid a six-card suit.
Sime: $4 \diamond$. We seem to have a natural $4 \diamond$ available, so let's use it. Partner should raise with short hearts, some diamonds and an ace. Of course, 3NT might have been the winner. However, a spade lead or shift may have been embarrassing. Mould: $4 \star$. Ah, I know this hand as I held it (though on a slightly different auction). Four Diamonds is not very attractive but nothing is. I originally thought that 3 NT was the bid, but it has two major problems - one that you are going to get a spade lead almost for sure and unless pard has sufficient spade stops or one spade stop and the then it is good night, but the other problem is that pard needs to
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have not sufficient spades to bid them We all know to be circumspect here as a 3NT bidder can be off-shape, but is partner really supposed
 They may naively assume that spades plays bet ter. As for $4 \diamond$ rather than $5 \diamond$, I cannot see that I have the tricks for $5 \downarrow$. What am I going to do with all these heart losers if pard cannot raise? I cannot say that I am at all happy about this decision and I am glad I did not face this problem at the table. I shall be interested to see if the panel all just bid 3 NT , as I suspect they will, and maybe they are right.


Teramoto: $4 \downarrow$. Four-card hearts suggests that partner usually is short in hearts and has some diamonds. This is IMPs, and 3NT may be in danger with the void in spades.

I'm not sure that I have any great wisdom to impart on this one. I understand that $5 \checkmark$ might be hopeless, but I seem to have an awful lot to bid only $4 \diamond$, and I can see the problems with $3 N T$ also. However, I think I would opt for $3 N T$, intending to follow Mike's plan to convert to $5 \diamond$ if partner removes to 44. Of course, if he has such long spades, that reduces the chance that he will also hold diamond support, but what can you do?

## PROBLEM 2

IMPs. Dealer East. All Vul.

- AJ5
- AK6
- K732
- AJ8

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | Pass | $2 \downarrow$ |
| Double | Pass | $4 \varphi$ | Pass |


| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | 7 | 10 |
| 49 | 6 | 9 |
| 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 4NT | 1 | 3 |
| 6V | 1 | 2 |

We have 20 HCP and good controls, is that sufficient to justify a slam try facing a passed hand? No say:
Stabell: Pass. I must have had some reason for
not bidding 2NT last time - maybe I miscounted my hand? In any case, I can't shoot partner for
 10 tricks could easily be the limit.

I think you miscounted your hand now - most of us could not have as much 20 HCP for a 2NT overcall.
Apteker: Pass. Despite the big hand, opposite a passed hand, with poor shape, slam is unlikely. Teramoto: Pass. We may have slam, but I expect it is not very likely.

The next two both make the same point that partner is unlikely to hold six hearts:
Green: Pass. I don't think partner is likely to have six hearts (as no weak two) and he may have taken a shot with a decent five-bagger, something like xx Q $\mathrm{J} 10 \mathrm{xx} \geqslant \mathrm{xx} \mathrm{KQxx}$, where ten tricks are the limit. The five level could easily go down and slam, although possible, seems a long way off to me.
Smith: Pass. If partner were not a passed hand, this would perhaps be closer, but his failure to open with a weak two in first seat rules out hands such as $\vee$ QJxxxx and the $\uparrow A$ (and perhaps even $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{U}}$ Jxxxx and a black king too) This suggests that he has perhaps only a five-card suit. Even if you give him a 10 -count with ${ }^{\text {POJxxx, }}$ the $\forall$, and one of the black kings, you still have only 10 tricks and slam looks quite a way off..
Bird: Pass. If we are playing Lebensohl responses, $3 \bigcirc$ would show an $8-10$ hand. I am guessing what he can have for a $4 \vee$ response, when he failed to bid in first seat. Only because he is a passed hand, I will make no advance over $4 \vee$.
Robson: Pass. Clear. Why isn't partner, a passed hand of course, punting a bit with a shapely

## 5-4-3-1 seven-count?

In real life he, well, OK, I, was punting with a five-five six-count-probably not a compulsory action, to be fair. Good to know though that hopes for my world-beating partnership with Andrew are still alive.

The plurality may have voted to pass, but the majority voted to go on. That complicates the scoring a bit.

The simple approach:
Lawrence: 6ヶ. Ought to have a play. Glad East is a passed hand. Would still be wondering what to bid if he hadn't passed.

Pretty sure my world-beating partnership with Mike is dead in the water, however.

Or perhaps:
Cope: 4NT. Partner did not open (so we can rule out most six-card heart suits or 11-counts which are 5-4-3-1 in shape), yet felt it necessary to advance to $4 \checkmark$ with Leb (or non-Leb) available. So I expect some sort of hand such as $\boldsymbol{\$ x}$ Q10xxx Ax Kxxxx, which will give us play for slam. Keycard should determine if those top cards are held.

Well, it will no doubt sort out the $\checkmark A$ and $\vee \mathrm{O}$, but not sure that it will find the $K$ with any surety. Kokish: $5 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$. All the first-round controls and at least two trump honours. Page 214 at the end.

I never get to page 214, too short an attention span, but I like the bid. It allows partner to be involved in the decision making, unlike the previous two approaches. Of course, if partner thinks differently and interprets $5 \checkmark$ as asking for a spade control...
The most popular slam try was via a spade cue-bid. Leufkens: 44. A tough one. Do we have enough
for slam invitation? Assuming partner can bid differently with four hearts, still a slam is not sure at all. But I can't pass as there are too many possibilities with slam very good. So, how can I invite $6 \checkmark$ without asking for a spade cuebid? Just cue 49 and leave the final decision to partner.
Alder: 44. I have a sneaking suspicion that I should pass, but we might have a slam ... although perhaps not in hearts. Suppose partner holds something like: ©xx VOxx $\downarrow$ AQJx Then $6>$ is the spot, assuming trumps are 3-2. Sime: 44. What sort of passed hand can bid $4 \vee$ ? In my world, not a hand which didn't know how many hearts to open (see the previous set). Maybe a two-suiter? Perhaps we belong in 7 oppposite x Q J 10xx $\downarrow$ AQxxx xx . So let's try to find that one.
Cannell: 4 . Slam try for hearts. I think 4NT is too much. Leaving it up to partner to do the heavy lifting.
Mould: 4^. I have to confess opposite a passed partner I would have bid 3 NT over $2 \boldsymbol{4}$. After all, I will bid that over a Leb 2 NT and surely it is better I play it? Now, I think you just have to go
 presumably partner has some reason for leaping to game in what would appear to be only a five-card suit (usually anyway). Presumably either partner has close to an opening bid or is two-suited or both. I do not think I can commit with 4 NT so I will try and get an opinion with 44. Far be it from me to criticize teammates, but a constructive $3 \vee$ felt right to me on the other hand.
Rigal: 44. Not prepared to drive to slam but
surely worth an effort. Maybe partner can use keycard?

Partner held:
© 10x Qxxxx Axxxx *x
And $4 \curlyvee$ was the limit. As I said earlier, $4 \Upsilon$ was not a compulsory action. Though I like Eric's 5 raise, I would be concerned about partner misinterpreting my intentions, so if I went on I would choose $4 \boldsymbol{4}$. As for the question of whether or not to go on at all, that perhaps depends as much on who is partner as anything.


## PROBLEM 3

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

- A52
- AQ1064
- 7
\& 10853

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | 19** | 1 | Pass |
| 19 | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| ? |  |  |  |


| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1NT | 9 | 10 |
| 2ヵ | 3 | 6 |
| Pass | 3 | 5 |
| 2e | 1 | 3 |

We have a maximum for our initial pass but do we need to bid on in case there is a game available? No, say:
Smith: Pass. What game do we think we might be missing? Partner rates to be $4-2-5-2$ or4-$1-5-3$ or perhaps $4-1-6-2$. You might perhaps advance with 1 NT or $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$, but with what objective?
Bird: Pass. Even though South has passed a second time, he may still have a fair hand with diamonds. I don't see that I'm obliged to find a bid (1NT or $2 \boldsymbol{s}$ ) on these values with no fit.
Lawrence: Pass. Funny hand. If I had four spades and three clubs, I would bid $3 \boldsymbol{A}$. Such is the added value of a fourth trump.

Yes, a fourth trump would make a huge difference. The rest felt that they had just too much to pass.


Green: $2 \boldsymbol{\mu}$. Close between 1 NT and $2 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ as I feel I have slightly too much to pass. With a tenuous club stopper and a ruffing value I prefer $2 \boldsymbol{A}$.
Alder: $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$. And hope for the best.
Kokish: $2 \boldsymbol{A}$. For the record, I think 1NT is fine. And the majority preferred $1 N T$ to the threecard raise.
Mould: 1NT. One Heart was forcing in our methods, so partner has not shown any extras. This just looks normal.

Good point.
Teramoto: 1NT. I would like to continue to bid, because this is a good hand.
Cannell: 1NT. Just enough for one further move. Let's give partner another chance to describe
the hand.
Sime: 1NT. A balancing act between not giving up on game, but not bidding something which will lead to a minus score.
Leufkens: 1NT. Close again, but it can be 3NT (or even 4@ on a peculiar day) opposite many hands, so I can't pass.

A number of panellists see the possibility of spades playing better than no trump but bid $1 N T$ anyway as the best way to keep game in the picture without risking a silly four-three fit.
Robson: 1NT.Spades may play a tad better but there could still be a game. Would I have opened the bidding? Probably good I didn't.
Rigal: 1NT. It is tempting to play the $4-3$ spade fit but this looks more likely to be the normal contract if partner passes - and if he has short clubs won't he bid $2 \uparrow / 2 \diamond$ ?
Stabell: 1NT. I am a bit too good to call it a day on $1 \boldsymbol{A}$, even though I suspect that spades might play better than NT. Pass would be tempting in pairs, particularly since North might decide to balance.
Cope: 1NT. Possibly spades might play a trick better so a tougher problem at pairs, but here we can just make a simple value bid.

We might just try this one again at matchpoint scoring, now that you mention it.
Apteker: 2e. As a passed hand, easy to bid FSF as it is no longer GF and can hear more from partner.

Yes, 2early is not GF any longer. Would it show a misfitting five-five or more? Not for me. It shows the maximum pass, and denies an obvious descriptive bid - fair enough. The only downside is that it does eliminate the possibility of playing in

1NT. If partner does not have sufficient for game, we will likely have to play $2 \vee$ or $2 \uparrow$ on a seven-card fit. And what will partner do with a 4-1-5-3 hand short of the values for 2/3NT?

I have some sympathy with the passers, as 1 . will often be a safer spot than $1 N T$, but in practice I suspect that I would bid the latter.

## PROBLEM 4

## IMPs. Dealer North. All Vul.

$\wedge$ AQ6
$\bullet 75$

- Q84
- AQ1032

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 1 $^{*}$ | Double | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | 4 | Pass |

?
14. Five-plus spades or 15+ balanced with four spades

| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 4 $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ | 12 | 10 |
| Pass | 2 | 4 |
| 6 $\boldsymbol{e}$ | 1 | 5 |
| 4NT | 1 | 3 |

Kokish: Pass. Depends on what East believes his sequence shows. It's clearly NF or you'd have told us otherwise. If East has a big 1-6-3-3 we can miss an easy 6 and $6 \stackrel{y}{6}$ may well be playable. If 4 NT were NAT and extras, I could perhaps try that, but won't this dude think 4 NT is BW, else I'd pass 4V?

Well, I might just leave you to work out for yourself whether the bid was forcing or not.
Bird: Pass. It's all very well to say that partner's
double, followed by $4 \vee$, shows a great hand. North and East have only 26 points between them and North found a vulnerable opening bid. My hand is no better in support of hearts than partner will expect after my 3 NT bid. If we can make a slam, he should have bid more at his second turn. Even better, he should have overcalled $2 \downarrow$, like most people would have done on his hand!

Whether or not we will agree with the double when we see partner's actual hand, I don't think we will think that $2 \vee$ would have been adequate.
Sime: 4NT. Should be to play, doesn't like hearts. I described my hand with 3 NT , and it has deteriorated. The $\mathbf{Q} \mathrm{Q}$ will pull some weight in 4 NT . If partner's sequence is the modern-style strong and flexible, there will be another string to his bow. Clubs would be welcome, diamonds less so.

I agree that $4 N T$ should be to play, having jumped to $3 N T$ at our previous turn. However, like most of the panel, I don't agree with the bid.
Robson: 6\%.Partner has a good hand. We have a good hand. Thought of 5NT but our clubs can't be amazing given our earlier 3NT bid, and I am keen to declare (given my spade holding). If partner is weirdly shaped, e.g. 2-6-4-1 (and chosen, oddly, to double), they will remove.

Interesting idea and could certainly be the winner if partner has the big 1-6-3-3 type, with North a little light. And if partner has a massive heart suit, our two aces and two queens outside spades should not be a disappointment.

The majority went for the 'obvious' cue-bid.
Apteker: 44. I think that $4 \boldsymbol{V}$ is forcing for a round after this sequence. I am therefore going to show my first round spade control.

Should it be forcing? We all agree that partner's sequence shows a strong hand, but must we bid on with no aces?
Leufkens: 44. Partner should be very strong. I've got two-card support and not a bad hand for my bidding (except for Q ).
Stabell: 4 . I would be very surprised if North has $15+$ here. Sounds like 10-11 if partner is to be trusted. I intend to convert to 6NT if partner drives to $6 \vee$, but if he manages a 'pick a slam' 5 NT , I will suggest $6 \boldsymbol{2}$, which could easily be our best contract. I hope for something like xx $\checkmark$ AKQJxx $\diamond$ Kxx $\& x$ opposite, when 6 NT would be a huge favourite to make even on a passive heart lead - perhaps on a throw-in after three rounds of clubs (North showing out) and a diamond to the king...
Smith: 44. It is hard to imagine how partner can possibly have the hand he says he has. I have 14 HCP. Even give North just a 10 -count for his opening bid and that still only leaves 16 for partner, and hands with as few points as that and a six-card heart suit (eg $\boldsymbol{e x} \vee$ AQJxxx $\bullet$ Axx Kx ) would normally start with a $2 \vee$ overcall. It therefore sounds like partner has at least seven hearts and perhaps eight but, again, what would a vulnerable $4 \vee$ overcall look like if not that hand? Perhaps the only explanation is that North has psyched, as opposite partner's bidding I would expect us to be cold for at least 12 tricks. Very mysterious!
Alder: 44. There are lots of points in this pack, but I will assume partner has his calls.
Cannell: 4a. Similar to Problem 2 in many ways! Slam try for hearts.
Mould: 49. Ah this one. The player at the table

passed which I think is nuts given that partner has shown a hand too strong for a $2 \downarrow$ overcall (which in the modern style makes it a very, very good hand indeed). I think this is a slam drive. I do not think 4NT is Blackwood (though perhaps it should be as presumably I am balancedish and can just pass $4 \vee$ ) so I will troll on with 4 . Partner's hand will then Blackwood I assure you. Rigal: 4 $\boldsymbol{4}$.Enough to cue-bid $4 \boldsymbol{A}$ I think. Given my aces my lack of trumps shouldn't be a major handicap.
Lawrence: 49.I don't think I can pass. Six hearts to the AKQJ and the two minor-suit kings is enough for slam. There's a question of whether

4NT would be natural. So I choose 4a, unambiguously a try for slam. Maybe partner can bid 4 NT which would be for keycards.
Teramoto: 44.It is too good for Pass, but not sure about slam. $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ is a cue-bid and I hope partner asks with 4NT for keycards.
Yes, he will ask for keycards, I promise you.
Green: 4@. Partner has shown a strong hand and so it's hard to imagine North with a genuine 14 opener (it must be a super light distributional hand). Anyway, I think I have a fair hand with a potential source of tricks in clubs so slam could easily be making. I don't think I am worth a slam drive so I will cue-bid and see what partner does.
Cope: $4 \boldsymbol{4}$. The maths just does not add up - virtually a problem that is impossible, What could partner have bid over 14? They could have bid $4 \vee$ with a long string of hearts, or $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ with a two-suited hand, or just overcalled $2 \uparrow$ which would show a fair hand as a two-suited overcall. So, in terms of what is left, partner is saying that they had too good a hand to take any of the prior actions - so we should be looking at strength, length and good HCP. The fact that this would mean that North would not have an opening hand takes us back to the mathematical conundrum. We are too good with two bullets to pass, so we can start with a cue-bid and let partner either cue back or take control. This looks like it might be the companion hand to Problem 8 where possibly partner made a more sensible $4 \checkmark$ overcall, but we can hope that part-
 they were too good for $4 \vee$ immediately.
Tim is close, but a trick short. The actual hand was:

Should partner have started with a 3a cue-bid, asking for a spade stopper, intending to convert $3 N T$ to 4?? He is surely too good for any heart overcall.

## PROBLEM 5

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



| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 4NT | 9 | 10 |
| 5s | 4 | 6 |
| 5NT | 2 | 7 |
| 54 | 1 | 6 |
| 5 | 0 | 2 |

Partner's double is responsive, i.e. take-out, but he will be at least semi-balanced as a very shapely hand could have bid $4 N T$, two or more places to play, to avoid the risk of our leaving a double in if we are more balanced.
Lawrence: $5 \boldsymbol{e}$. The bidding is not over yet.
Green: $5 \boldsymbol{\$}$. Partner has asked me to bid if suitable and so I do. For me 4NT would show a stronger hand which I don't think I quite have (though it's close!). I can still get to hearts if
partner has the reds.
Kokish: $5 \boldsymbol{\$}$. Leaving room for $5 \vee$ over 5 if East has the red suits. No way to know whether slam has a good play, so I'm settling for going low. 4NT will leave me with the last guess if East replies 5 - cheapest four-card suit).
Stabell: 5\%. Could be a missed slam, but I don't intend to push on since 6 could be cheaper than our game anyway. I don't think partner will expect five-card clubs if I try 4NT. Will remove 5 to 5 『 .

I'm not very convinced by these arguments. How many red cards or, equally to the point, how few clubs, will partner need to hold to correct 5e to $5 \checkmark$ ? Remember, partner could have bid $4 N T$ instead of doubling if he held a shapely hand, so he may often be intending to pass whatever I bid.

By bidding 5*, I show long clubs - well, at least five - but surely my decision to bid a suit rather than $4 N T$, two or more places to play, implies that I have a significant preference for clubs over either red suit. Unlike Ben, I have never believed nor played that $4 N T$ was a stronger bid than $5 \mathbf{A}$, merely a different handtype - where I need more input from partner regarding what the trump suit should be. Nor do I understand Eric's assertion that 4NT leaves him with the last guess if partner shows four clubs - then we will play in clubs, at whatever level partner bids them if we have guessed to go low, as he suggests is his decision.

The rest of the panel was intent on getting partner to pick the trump suit.
Sime: 4NT. Two places to play. I would have bid 4 (clubs and hearts) on the first round. I have underbid by not showing the extra trump length.
5-5-3-0 is always tricky - is it a two- or a
three-suiter? No doubt there will be other players who would treat this hand as two-suited, but personally I would prefer the two suits to be a bit better before I would do that, just moving the high cards around, for example gives me a 4\& overcall:

-     - $\because$ AOJ 94 - 643 AK1096

Rigal: 4NT. Two-suited and way too shapely to pass here. My partner will assume the minors but I'll correct 5 to $5 \vee$.
Mould: 4NT. Sorry, do not see the problem. I am not driving this unilaterally to slam, so 4NT seems clear.
Cope: 4 NT . Two or more places to play - seems pretty obvious for now
Cannell: 4NT. Two places to play most of the time. I will, of course, pull 5 to $5 \vee$ to portray the rounded suits. I will pass either $5 \boldsymbol{*}$ or 5 as there are too many holes to fill the Albert Hall.

Shame I can't award an extra point for the Sgt. Pepper reference.
Bird: 4NT. Since I'm not good enough for a pick-a-slam 5NT, it's difficult to think what other action the Director had in mind.

Well, we got three different answers from at least one panellist, and some interesting discussion, so perhaps there is more than one way to look at the problem. As evidenced by the fact that a significant minority opt to drive to slam:
Smith: 4NT. Two Places to play. We may play in clubs rather than hearts - we may have two nine-card fits, as it seems unlikely that partner has more than two spades in a balanced hand too strong for a 2NT overcall. I plan to raise 5* and bid $6 \stackrel{\square}{ }$ over 5$\rangle$.
Alder: 4NT. Six or seven, here we come.
Teramoto: 4NT. Pick a suit and try to find a fit.

I would like to go to slam.
Leufkens: 5NT. Pick a slam. I'll correct 6 to $6 \vee$. Too much for 4NT.

I don't have a problem with bidding 5NT, but I don't quite see how we can have too much for $4 N T$ - can't we just raise a 5* or $5 \vee$ response to slam, or jump to $6 \vee$ over a $5 \checkmark$ response?
Robson: 5 NT . And pull $6 \checkmark$ to $6^{\circ}$ as I think if partner doesn't have four clubs, they'll have three hearts.
And if we are going to drive to slam anyway, how about showing the spade void along the way? Apteker: 54. Bidding slam while conveying first-round spade control to suggest the Grand.

That's OK as long as all it does is show the spade void, as opposed to also promising an allaround better hand. That would be a matter for partnership discussion and agreement, but if $5 \mathbf{1}$ does promise a better hand than 5NT, then I think it is too much - remember that half the panel is not even willing to commit to a small slam.

I have no problem with 5NT or 54, 5* simply isn't how I bid with two places to play, and I am happy to bid 5* then trust partner to decide on the level - my suits are a bit too broken for me to be happy to drive to slam.

One possibility which was not mentioned by anyone was 5 $\downarrow$, and rightly so. Partner could be, for example, 2-2-5-4. The responsive double does not promise hearts, and if we bid 5v we may be left to play there even when is making, as our bid in the highest ranking suit will look as though we have a long strong suit and are not looking for alternative trump suits.

## PROBLEM 6

## IMPs. Dealer West. All Vul.

- AKJ
- KQJ4
- AQJ52
- 7

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| $1 \downarrow$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{e}^{*}$ | Pass |

?
32 Natural and invitational

| Bid Votes |  | Marks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 3NT | 11 | 10 |
| 3 | 4 | 7 |
| 4NT | 1 | 3 |

Smith: 3NT. What a truly horrible method. I always thought the objective of a pre-empt was to inconvenience the opponents, so I fail to understand the idea behind pre-empting when it is partner who has announced a decent hand by opening with a 1 -bid. Every time I see this auction, opener is faced with a blind guess here I guess 3NT but we could easily be cold for $6 \star$ or $6 \uparrow$, or even $6 *$. Sometimes the old-fashioned methods are still the best, and doing away with strong jump shifts is like replacing a conventional round wheel with a square one and expecting to improve the ride.

Well, an invitational jump isn't intended to be a pre-empt, though I appreciate that it sometimes acts as one. I'm not a big fan of invitational jumps, partly because no-one seems to know what the continuations mean but, if you play two-over-one GF, how else do you handle a 10- or 11-count with a six-card suit in response to partner's opening
bid? One No Trump is hardly ideal either, is it?
Despite the 21 HCP, the lack of any sort of club fit turned most of the panel into pessimists.
Teramoto: 3NT. If he has one-loser clubs with the A , we have a good slam, but, this is not a very good chance.
Robson: 3NT. A bad good hand.
Alder: 3NT. Misfits are miserable.
Apteker: 3NT. Would need near perfect cards, probably including the $\diamond$ K, to make slam a good proposition. Given that it is difficult to find that out safely, I am going low.
Cannell: 3NT. Going low as a possible as a misfit looms. If I were secure that a jump to 4 NT would be quantitative I would try that.
Bird: 3NT. A slam is possible, but a $3 \vee$ rebid will not help me to discover if partner's cards are right for one. Anything but 3NT would be a gamble, and my wife doesn't approve of gambling.

Clear who wears the trousers in THAT household.
Leufkens: 3NT. Sure, can be slam, but too many options for two losers. I'm sure partner won't bid $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ with $\vee A$ and AO 10xx.

I agree. That hand should stretch just a touch and respond $2 \boldsymbol{*}, G F$.
Lawrence: 3NT. Not happily. My style for 3e is something like a maximum weak two bid and I can see that 5 may not fetch. 6NT is unlikely to fetch if clubs don't run.
Stabell: 3NT. Hamman's rule again. Not sure if I would have opened $1 \star$, but at least he didn't pass. I expect something like \&AKxxxxx and out, in which case 3NT looks as good as anything else. Must remember to discuss whether I should have expected another card as well.

Hamman's rule has stood the test of time, if
$3 N T$ is one among a range of plausible options it is probably the correct one. I doubt, however, that many people are so rigid in their requirements for the invitational jump-shift - perhaps they should be? For most I suspect that it is more likely to be around 10 or 11 HCP with a reasonable six-card suit, maybe seven. Alan knows the hand and will shortly tell us what partner actually held - was he wrong to respond 3\&? Would we prefer 1NT or 2\&? Not me, I think 3\& was the best of a bad lot, which perhaps backs up Marc's suggestion that the whole method is horrible..
Kokish: 3NT. As 3V will imply concern with spades, it won't accomplish much. Could make anything from 3NT to 6 so we have to decide whether to settle for 3NT or move forward, which opens cans of worms regardless. Even if 4NT were a NAT INV, there's no guarantee we can piece together even 10 tricks opposite mainly clubs.

Drew also mentioned a jump to 4NT. I'm happy enough to agree that it should be natural, but will partner ever know when to bid slam and when not - unless he holds solid clubs? Ben goes for the bid anyway.
Green: 4 NT . This should be quantitative as with a Blackwood bid I would start with $4 \boldsymbol{E}$ then bid 4 NT. $6 \diamond$ or even $6 *$ might make on a good day when partner has a diamond fit with me or super good clubs. Perhaps I should bid 3 instead of 4 NT but I feel this sends a simpler message to partner.
And finally, had partner responded at a lower level, we would all surely have shown our pattern, continuing with a heart bid.
Cope: $3 \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}$. My initial thought was to settle
for 3NT as the club bid, whilst showing values, made the hand a misfit so the conservative action held appeal. But it is still possible that partner may have subsidiary diamond support (say $\boldsymbol{\wedge} \mathrm{xx} \geqslant \mathrm{Ax} \geqslant \mathrm{xxx} \boldsymbol{\$} \mathrm{AQxxxx}$ or $\boldsymbol{\wedge} \mathrm{xx} \geqslant \mathrm{xx} \upharpoonright$ Kxx \&AQJxxx that would give a diamond slam fair play. If partner does not have diamond support they can still bid 34 asking us for a stopper, and we can get back to the conservative 3NT.
Sime: $3 \vee$. I am hoping for a diamond preference. If not, partner should only rebid his clubs if they are very good. And it is conceivable that our slam is $6 \vee$ opposite 3-3-1-6 or similar.
Mould: 3४. I know this one as well as John Holland held it opposite me. The hand is slightly wrong in that John did not have the $\$ \mathrm{~J}$, which I think makes a lot of difference. Without the $\downarrow \mathrm{J}$ I would bid 3NT. With it, there is such a good chance of a slam that I think you continue with $3 \vee$ and see what that brings. The hand opposite of $\uparrow \mathrm{xx} \geqslant \mathrm{Ax} \leqslant \mathrm{Kx} \mathrm{K} 10 \mathrm{xxxxx}$ would have made a good $6 \diamond$ slam, whereas with the actual hand without the $\downarrow$ J, $6 \star$ was awful. But who am I to argue with +1540 ...
Rigal: 3『. Will convert 3 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ to 4NT I suppose, natural and quantitative. I can't see how it could be Blackwood...hope partner agrees. If partner


I'm sure that $3 \vee$ followed by $4 N T$ over 3 ² should be natural - we could bid $4 \boldsymbol{i}$ at any stage to set trumps.

Iain only wants to see partner repeat the clubs if they are very good, and that seems right - the order of the suits is very convenient and he can just bid 34, FSF, with moderate clubs and no red-suit fit.

The problem for me with any slam try is that we
actually want partner to have bad clubs so that he has plenty of help in our long suits, and I'm not sure how easy it will be for him to work that out, while he will love strong clubs. Nonetheless, I don't see 3४ getting us into serious trouble, and if we don't want to give up on slam it is the best way forward.

## PROBLEM 7

## Pairs. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

\& K 1062

- KQ643
- AK8
- 8

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | $1 \mathrm{NT}^{*}$ | Pass | Pass |
| Double | Pass | Pass | $2 \dot{2}$ |
| Pass | Pass | Double $^{*}$ | 2 | ?

1NT 11-14
Double Penalty

| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Dble | 8 | 10 |
| Pass | 7 | 9 |
| $2 ゅ$ | 1 | 3 |

I don't play these methods so am not well-placed for me doubles should be for take-out as I believe that to be a more flexible approach. Hence, I would have had to double were I willing to defend 2s doubled. Anyway, I suppose my preferences are a bit irrelevant. Partner has doubled for penalty and South has run to $2 \star$. Presumably he does, however, actually have clubs as well as diamonds, as otherwise there is a shortage of clubs in the deck. If we are playing penalty doubles then:

Cannell: Double. Penalty.
Lawrence: Double. Odd sequence. South may be just scrambling with some 4-4-3-2 hand. Would be nice to know what South's pass meant. I note that East could have pulled my double in various ways if he had a weak hand.
Mould: Double. May not be optimal but could be a huge score. Seems normal to do this.
Rigal: Double. I've paused just long enough that my partner can pull and argue there was no break in tempo. PS that was a joke...I think. It's the way you tell 'em, Barry.
Green: Double. If it makes at least it's not game and it could be bloody for the opponents. I still have to work out what to lead mind you.
Alder: Double. I think my initial double was debatable (assuming I had some way to show both majors), but now I guess we should be going for the jugular.

You are not alone in thinking that 2 for the majors might have been a better start.

## Marc has a plan:

Smith: Double. And lead three rounds of trumps. If South is just messing around with long diamonds, we may be better off bidding our vulnerable game, However, one of the attractions of the weak no trump is that it so rarely gets punished even when the opponents have it on toast. If South has started guessing with some sort of balanced hand here, then let's hope he jumps again from the frying pan into the fire of a major next. The penalty from anything here could be four figures and I am prepared to risk a moderate loss for a shot at a big gain.

And I imagine that Alon's easy lead is following the same master plan.
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Apteker: Double. I have an easy lead and hope we can take this down for more than the vulnerable game. The best strain may not be easy to find if I choose not to double.

But there was also a big vote for the forcing pass. Kokish: Pass. Just a partnership thing re whether my double suggests three or at least four diamonds. Finding $5-3$ hearts or $4-4$ spades requires that West do something other than double. One could argue that this near-minimum double of 1 NT should try to defend if that is in the picture. Best for us will be if East reopens with a co-operative PEN DBL.

Enri answers that question, effectively saying that he likes double in our position to be based on four trumps.
Leufkens: Pass. Don't know what South is doing. But prefer penalty doubles in fourth hand with three cards.
Stabell: Pass. Close between this and double, but if partner decides to bid a major, I'm happy. If he doubles again, I have an easy pass.
Cope: Pass. Itching to double, but the forcing pass seems better as it allows partner to bid a four-card major if held, else double competitively.
Sime: Pass. It is better to be able to double $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ for take-out. Then I would be happier to pass $2 \star$, showing three of them, when the dog starts walking.

As I said at the start, I agree, but that apparently was not the agreement in place at the table. Bird: Pass. I have suggested 15 points already and have no special defence against diamonds. I don't like to double $2 \diamond$ on $\star A K x$ when we may have 620 available in one of the majors.

Robson: Pass. Don't want partner passing with a doubleton when we have game in a major. I would not have penalty doubled in the first place at these colours, preferring to show the majors, then patterning out with 3 §, perhaps.

All the above may still get to defend $2 \checkmark$ doubled. Tadashi prefers the more committal bid of $2 \vee$, giving up on the possible penalty because of the vulnerability and wanting to make sure that we find our major-suit contract. Note that the fact that we passed over 2end only bid hearts now implies that we have only a moderate heart suit.
Teramoto: $2 \boldsymbol{\vee}$. At this vulnerability, we should try to find a major-suit fit if we have one.

The panel thinks it is close, I think it is close. I think take-out doubles are better than penalty doubles when they run from our double of their 1NT opening.

## PROBLEM 8

## IMPs. Dealer West. All Vul.

A KJ10762
$\stackrel{-}{ }-$

- AKJ 10

2 J98

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | $4 \varphi$ | Pass | Pass |


| Bid | Votes | Marks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Dble | 13 | 10 |
| $4 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$ | 2 | 4 |
| Pass | 1 | 3 |

Double attracted the biggest vote of the set, meaning that any other action has to score poorly, I'm afraid.

Alder: Double. Into the Valley of Death ...
Green: Double. For me pass is out as we might have a big penalty against $4 \boldsymbol{V}$. We might also have a cheap save in $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ or in 5 m when partner bids over my double. Bidding 4 myself is too unilateral for me.
Rigal: Double. In for a penny in for a few hundred pounds. I'm hoping I'll catch a penalty pass. Cannell: Double. Cards - whatever that means. If there is a penalty to be had this is the only way. Leufkens: Double. Obviously, depends on style of direct double of $4 \uparrow$. But, assuming double wouldn't have been penalty, I can't bid 4@ unilaterally. Sure, this can backfire, but it gives a chance for two possibilities.
Kokish: Double. Either you believe in this approach or you choose between pass and 4 .

Then come the twin pessimists:
Stabell: Double. Since partner could not double $4 \vee$ for penalties, I have to keep it open even though it could mean having a choice between - 790 and - 800 (at best). Had a double from partner been a penalty double, I would have had a (relatively) easy pass now.
Sime: Double. May give partner a choice between minus 790 and minus 800 , or even worse. However, if you don't double, they will pre-empt with impunity.
Bird: Dble. I am somewhat light on defence, if partner chooses to pass. If instead he sees cause to bid, the double could be very productive indeed.

David puts his finger on a big part of the problem with the popular choice - we are very light on defence compared to what partner is likely to play us for. I can see him passing and conceding - 790
when our save would be cheaper.
Smith: Double. Partner didn't have an out-and-out penalty double available, so let's give him a chance to defend if that's what he wants to do. If he retreats to 4^, it may prove to be a good save even if it does go down, and even five of a minor may be an okay resting spot. Of the alternatives, Pass seems rather pessimistic and 4 rather too unilateral.

Marc is not the only one to describe bidding 4 as too unilateral.
Apteker: Double. 44 could be the winning action, but double keeps all options open and is more flexible.
Cope: Double. Even if this is the companion hand to Problem 4 (where they might make 6จ), we have to protect the fact that partner could not make a penalty double of $4 \vee$. Agreed, I am slightly on the weak side in HCP, but partner does not have to leave the double in. Bidding 4 is too unilateral for my liking

Yes, well-spotted, it is indeed the companion hand to Problem 4, as explained by Alan.
Mould: Double. It is hard to believe it, but this is the same hand as Problem 4! Yes, the opponents have just missed a slam, but in the modern style I think you just have to double. The scoring up of this hand was amusing since Brian thought John and I had bid the slam. No, 4 V doubled plus three scores 1390.

There were two panellists willing to make the unilateral decision:
Robson: 4a. I'm so sorry if you're salivating with a pure penalty double.
Teramoto: 4®.This hand is good for play. Pass by partner means he doesn't have many points.

I hope to make 4@ or have a good save against $4 \vee$ making.

They could easily be right, but another problem with bidding 4s is that it gives up on playing five of a minor. There is no reason at all why partner cannot be short in spades and have six cards in a minor. If we double, he may bid the minor and the save be far cheaper than that in 49.
Lawrence: Pass. If I knew East would lead a diamond, I might double.

If partner has a genuinely penalty double, he will pass and it will only be a matter of how many down the contract goes. If he passes simply because he has nowhere to go, we all know what
he is going to lead, and it isn't going to be a diamond. Minus 620 or 650 may very well be the best we can do on the inevitable spade lead.

I am not at all comfortable with doing so, but I think that double has more ways to gain than passing or bidding 4@, so that is where my vote goes. Partner has:

I think that, with three-card spade support and zero defence, he is meant to bid 44. What happens from there, who knows, but we ain't conceding-1390.

Congratulations to this month's top scorer, Drew Cannell, with 79 out of 80 .

## SET I7 -THE PANEL'S BIDS \& MARKS

|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Drew Cannell | Canada | 3NT | 49 | 1NT | 40 | 4NT | 3NT | Dble | Dble | 79 |
| Barry Rigal | USA | 3NT | 49 | 1NT | 40 | 4NT | 3 | Dble | Dble | 76 |
| Leif-Erik Stabell | Zimbabwe | 3NT | Pass | 1NT | 40 | 5\% | 3NT | Pass | Dble | 75 |
| Enri Leufkens | Netherlands | 3NT | 49 | 1NT | 40 | 5NT | 3NT | Pass | Dble | 75 |
| Alan Mould | England | 4* | 49 | 1NT | 40 | 4NT | 39 | Dble | Dble | 74 |
| Phillip Alder | USA | 5 | 49 | 24 | 49 | 4NT | 3NT | Dble | Dble | 72 |
| Marc Smith | England | 5 | Pass | Pass | 49 | 4NT | 3NT | Dble | Dble | 72 |
| Alon Apteker | South Africa | 3NT | Pass | 2\% | 40 | 5 | 3NT | Dble | Dble | 69 |
| David Bird | England | 3NT | Pass | Pass | Pass | 4NT | 3NT | Pass | Dble | 68 |
| Tim Cope | South Africa | 4 | 4NT | 1NT | 49 | 4NT | 3 | Pass | Dble | 67 |
| Iain Sime | Scotland | 4* | 49 | 1NT | 4NT | 4NT | 3 | Pass | Dble | 66 |
| Ben Green | England | 3NT | Pass | 24 | 4* | 5\% | 4NT | Dble | Dble | 65 |
| Tadashi Teramoto | Japan | 4* | Pass | 1 NT | 49 | 4NT | 3NT | $2 \vee$ | 49 | 65 |
| Andrew Robson | England | 5 | Pass | 1NT | 62 | 5NT | 3NT | Pass | 49 | 62 |
| Eric Kokish | Canada | 3NT | 5 | 24 | Pass | 5\% | 3NT | Pass | Dble | 60 |
| Mike Lawrence | USA | 3NT | 6 | Pass | 49 | 52 | 3NT | Dble | Pass | 56 |
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## A New Bridge Magarine Bidding System

## Attention!!!

The Bidding System will be modified - It will be updated next month as per Brian's comments in his recent moderations.

## 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 $1 \diamond$ 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 - $-2 N T / 3 \boldsymbol{c}$ are WNT/long
clubs minimum so NF, anything else is GF. Weak $2 \uparrow, 2 \downarrow$ and $2 \wedge$ ( $5-9$, six-card suit).
In response 2 NT is a relay asking for a highcard feature if not minimum with 3NT showing a good suit, non-minimum. $4 \boldsymbol{2}$ is RKCB. 2any 2new = NAT Constructive NF; 2any - 3new = NAT Forcing.
Three-level openings are natural and pre-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 $15-17,2 \boldsymbol{\omega}=$ Stayman, $2 \uparrow / 2 \boldsymbol{\top}=$ transfers, $2 \boldsymbol{s}=\mathrm{s}$ with $2 \mathrm{NT} / 3$ denying/showing a fit, $2 \mathrm{NT}=\star$ sith $3 \boldsymbol{s} / \star$ denying/showing a fit. After this new suits are splinters. 3 is 5 card Stayman, $3 \rightarrow$ is $5-5 \mathrm{~ms} \mathrm{FG}, 3>/$ 1-3-(4-5) / 3-1-(4-5) and FG. $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ is $5-5$ majors, game only, $4 \downarrow / \downarrow=\uparrow / \mathbf{~ s}$ (then $4 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{RKCB}$ and new suits are Exclusion).
1 NT rebid $=12-14$ with 2 a puppet to 2 to play in $2 \diamond$ or make an invitational bid, $2 \diamond$ is game forcing checkback, new suits at the 3 level are 5-5 FG and higher bids are auto-splinters.

Jump 2 NT rebid $=18-19$ with natural continuations.
After 2 over 1, 2NT is 12-14 balanced or 18-19 balanced and 3 NT is 15-17 range with a reason not to have opened 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 Smolen, $3 \uparrow / 3 \uparrow=$ transfers, $3 \boldsymbol{\infty}=$ slam try with both minors. Four level bids are as after 1NT opening. Reverse Kokish is played after 2 opening ( $2 \boldsymbol{2}-2-2-2 \mathrm{NT}$ is $23-24$ balanced, and 2 - 2 - NT is $25+$ balanced GF).

## Initial response:

Jump shifts are weak at the two-level and invitational at the three-level. Bidding and rebidding a suit is invitational, bidding and jump rebidding a suit is FG (eg $1 \downarrow, 2 \downarrow$ is weak, $1 \diamond, 1 \vee, 2 \downarrow$ is invitational; $1 \diamond, 1 \vee, 2 \boldsymbol{*}, 3 \vee$ is FG).
2 NT after $1 \boldsymbol{e} / 1$ is natural and invitational without 4M.
$2 N T$ after $1 \vee / 1 \boldsymbol{\perp}=$ game-forcing with $4+$ card support. Continuations in new suits are natural, 3 partner's suit extras with no singleton, 3NT
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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 (3NT 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 $1 \Upsilon / 1$. 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.
$1 \mathrm{NT}-2 \boldsymbol{\varphi}-3 \boldsymbol{\perp}$ is FG). Note that most relatively balanced hands with no stopper will start with a T/O double.
We open 1 NT and they overcall. Whatever its meaning, double of the overcall is T/O of the suit BID. Pass then double is also T/O and therefore implies length in the first opposing suit.
2 NT is rarely natural in competition (except as defined above). Possibilities include Lebensohl or scramble if game is not viable. Scramble will tend to apply in balancing situations, Lebensohl (Good/Bad) where game is still a live possibility. This includes the Good/Bad 2NT in situations where it is appropriate.
We double their Stayman or transfer over 1NT: if $1 \mathrm{NT}=14+$, double shows the suit doubled. If 1 NT is maximum 15 HCP , double is PEN of 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 $3 m$ P/C.

## Defences:

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

Over their 1 NT , Dble = pens, $2 \boldsymbol{2}=$ majors, $2 \checkmark=$ 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
June 2019 The uBid Auction Room

Bid these hands with those on the last 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. None Vul.

- AQ4
- AQ962
- Q52
- J10

North overcalls 2e
Hand 2. Dealer South. All Vul.

- A73
- Q72
- Q42
* A1094

Hand 3. Dealer West. None Vul.

- AJ87
- AQJ3
- 1065
- Q5

Hand 4. Dealer North. Both Vul

- K
- AK
- 1073
* AKQJ942

Hand 5. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

- AQ106
- A752
- 75
- 853

Hand 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

-     - 
- K10754
- AJ5
- KQ763

South overcalls 14 and North raises to 3a Hand 7. Dealer West. Both Vul.

-     - 
- J1094
- 87642
* K754

Hand 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

- Q9
- Q73
- K86
- AQ1095


## MASTER POINT BIDDING BATTLE

## Results - Set 16

This month's winner is a first-time entrant, Francesco Badolato, who scored 72, that's four more than Dominic Connolly and Bill March, who join Francesco in getting a book token. Both have already made it into the top three earlier in the year.

Olga Shadyro was drawn out of Herman's hat and also gets a book token.

## Other Good Scores

64 Brian McDowell, Todd Holes, Rodney Lighton
63 Mike Ralph
60 Alex Athansiadis
59 Olga Shadyro
58 Simon Hill, Colin Brown, James Carpenter

## The Yearly Standings:

Bill March (263) and Dominic Connolly (260) naturally also take the lead in the overall competition, ahead of Mark Bartusek (252) and Alex Athanasiadis and Mike Perkins (both 242). Todd Holes closes the top six of readers with over $60 \%$ (241, after a measly 39) but with eight months to go and only five scores to count, everything is yet to play for.


Brian Senior examines the responses of the readers and compares them against those of the panel.

| PROBLEM 1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PAIRS. Dealer North. All Vul. |  |  |  |
| - AK73 |  |  |  |
| - K86 |  |  |  |
| - 7 |  |  |  |
| - 107642 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| - | 28* | 3 | $3 \%$ |
| ? |  |  |  |
| 2 Weak |  |  |  |
| Bid | Votes | Marks | Readers |
| Pass | 10 | 10 | 3 |
| Double | 4 | 6 | 35 |
| 3NT | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 39 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

There was one reader vote for 34. This should surely promise a five-card suit and, with no semblance of a fit for partner as a get-out-of-jail card, is both dangerous and misleading. If we are going to bid then surely double, getting both black suits into the game, is superior to $3 \mathbf{4}$, so I am not inclined to award anything for 34 .
Meanwhile, $90 \%$ of our readers chose the same call, and yet it is not the experts' top choice! As I say, once we decide to bid something, double is surely the most flexible option and closest to describing what we hold, but this comment sums the situation up to me:
Robson: Pass. Most of the time a bid, either double or 3NT will turn plus into minus. And Pairs is all about "most of the time".
Exactly.

## PROBLEM 2.

| Bid | Votes | Marks |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Readers |  |  |  |
| $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ | 6 | 10 | 20 |
| $3 \boldsymbol{4}$ | 4 | 8 | 2 |
| $1 ヵ$ | 3 | 6 | 9 |
| Pass | 2 | 5 | 8 |


| PROBLEM 3. |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bid | Votes | Marks |  |
| Readers |  |  |  |
| 2 | 7 | 10 | 11 |
| 2NT | 4 | 7 | 21 |
| 1 | 3 | 6 | 6 |
| 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 |

## PROBLEM 4

## PAIRS. Dealer South. All Vul.

- 6
- KQ8
- KQ875
\& 10643

| West | North | East | South 14* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1{ }^{*}$ | Pass | 24* | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | 48 | Double |
| ? |  |  |  |
| 1e 2+ Clubs <br> 2 Fit, F1 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Bid | Votes | Marks | Readers |
| Pass | 12 | 10 | 14 |
| 4 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 4 | 1 | 4 | 8 |
| 5 | 0 | 3 | 7 |
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There was a significant minority vote amongst the readers for a bid of 5 . It is a matter of judgement as to how good this hand is and how enthusiastic we are about slam prospects, but we have already made one slightly discouraging call when we bid $3 \diamond$ over $2 \boldsymbol{A}$, so there is no need to feel ashamed of our hand. It is interesting that partner has made his try with $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ rather than bid out his pattern with $3 \vee$ - after which he might have been able to make a slam try, depending on what we did over that - so perhaps $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ is a very clear-cut slam try and he didn't want to risk our doing something which would leave him unable to clarify the message had he gone via $3 \vee$. Anyway, for those who read as a game try, or who simply don't like their hand, $5 \star$ is a plausible option, so I will award 3 points.

## PROBLEM 5

IMPs. Dealer East. None Vul.

- K103
- AKQ1075
- 

2. K1065

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | $1 \boldsymbol{~}$ | Pass |
| $1 \boldsymbol{w}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{i}$ | Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass |
| $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{i}$ | Pass |
| $?$ |  |  |  |


| Bid | Votes | Marks | Readers |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4e | 5 | 10 | 8 |
| $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | 4 | 6 | 12 |
| 5 | 3 | 6 | 4 |
| 4 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| 4NT | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 6* | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 5* | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 3NT | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 5NT | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Two reader votes that were not matched by the panel. There were several votes for signing off in 3 NT . I can understand that. If partner is just checking that we have a bit of help in spades then this may well be the way that he does it, and if he has a minimum opening then 3NT may be the place to play from his point of view. But I feel that game in either hearts or clubs should be at least as good as 3 NT , and that slam could still be on if partner does not have too much wasted in diamonds. So I'll make an award for 3NT, but only a modest one as it definitely goes against the general view of both the panel and my own feelings about the hand. The other reader vote was for 5 NT . I think this is premature, whether intended to be 'pick a slam' or a trump ask. We don't know why partner bid $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ and we should go more slowly to find out. I'm not sure that he will be in a position to make an intelligent decision over 5 NT , so no award, I'm afraid.
Martin Turner added that he changed his mind from 4 4 , which he thought was a bit puny, to $5 \boldsymbol{*}$. He should have stuck with his first idea.
I don't think that $4 \vee$ is puny. We have gone slowly enough and done a fair bit of exploration, so I think partner should realize that we have a decent hand and that $4 \checkmark$ is merely descriptive of better hearts than previously shown.

## PROBLEM 6

## IMPs. Dealer South. None Vul.

```
4 AKJ7542
\vee K7654
* -
& 7
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
- & - & - & Pass \\
19 & 30 & Double & Pass
\end{tabular}
```

| Bid | Votes | Marks | Readers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4* | 9 | 10 | 14 |
| 5 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| 5 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| 69 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 2 | 17 |
| 39 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 50 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

There was a significant reader vote for a bid of $3 \vee$, but that is totally at odds with the panel's view that this hand is not just worth a drive to game but worth a slam try on the way. Three Hearts is not forcing and is a gross underbid, so nothing for that I'm afraid.
One reader went for a jump to $5 \%$. That is closer to the panel's evaluation of the hand, but I think it should show a void as it takes up so much space so should be specific, with any lesser holding starting with $4 \boldsymbol{*}$, so again I'm not inclined to award anything for the bid.

| PROBLEM 7 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IMPs. Dealer North. None Vul. |  |  |  |
| ¢ A |  |  |  |
| - QJ1064 |  |  |  |
| - 87 |  |  |  |
| * AJ874 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| - | 34 | Pass | 44 |
| ? |  |  |  |
| Bid | Votes | Marks | Readers |
| 4NT | 6 | 10 | 11 |
| Pass | 6 | 9 | 18 |
| Double | 3 | 6 | 9 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

One reader voted for $5 \vee$. This surely cannot be right. We have two decisions to make, the first being whether or not to bid at all. The panel voted
nine to six in favour of action. OK, so the next question is what should we bid? To commit to one of our five-card suits makes no sense when we can either make a take-out double or overcall 4 NT to show a two-suiter. Partner may initially take 4 NT as being for the minors, but if he selects $5 \diamond$ and we convert to $5 \checkmark$ he will surely get the real picture.

## PROBLEM 8

## IMPs. Dealer South. None Vul.

- 1087
- J542
-KQ
* AJ109

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | Pass | Double | $2 \Phi$ |

?

| Bid | Votes | Marks | Readers |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Double | 8 | 10 | 10 |
| 3■ | 5 | 8 | 15 |
| 2NT | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| 3\& | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 3人 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 4 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| 4NT | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pass | 0 | 0 | 2 |

Four different calls overlooked by the panel garnered at least one vote from the readers.
I don't understand 4 NT at all. It is a wild overbid and not in the least bit descriptive of a balanced 11 -count. I suspect that it was intended as the answer to a different problem or was the result of misreading the question. Pass is at the other extreme and no panellists seriously considered it. Four Hearts is an overbid - it would be an overbid even facing a sec-ond-seat double, but at least it could be a winner, so I'll give it a couple of points, and $3 \boldsymbol{\perp}$ is also an overbid but a little more flexible than $4 \vee$, so is also worthy of a modest award.
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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 June 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. None Vul.

- 95

K107543

- A84
\& Q8
North overcalls 2
Hand 2. Dealer South. All Vul.
- KQ98
- AKJ43
- A
- Q87

Hand 3. Dealer West. None Vul.

- Q5
- K10976
- AKQJ4
- 8

Hand 4. Dealer North. Both Vul

- AQ964
- Q654
- K8
- 76

Hand 5. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

- KJ974
- K10
- AK1042
* K

Hand 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

- K53
- AJ6
- 874
\& AJ52
South overcalls $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ and North raises to $3 \boldsymbol{4}$ Hand 7. Dealer West. Both Vul.
- AJ62
- AK83
- AJ
- AQ8

Hand 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

- A10
- AJ106
- AQ52
- K76


## 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.

