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## Heroes of Istanbul

David Mossop's team (Alexander Hydes, Edward Jones, Thomas Paske, Justin Hackett \& Jason Hackett) swept to victory in the Open Teams Championship at the European Open Championships last month. Earlier in the year Jones \& Paske were also on the winning team in the Lederer, making a mockery of the decision of the EBU's selectors not to include them in recent trials. We will have a full report on the Championships next month.

## The Times They Are A-changin'

The Monaco Bridge Federation has issued the following communique:
"After nearly ten years of close partnership with the Monaco Bridge Fed (FMB), which have seen a lot of great successes and the creation of major events in Monaco, such as the Cavendish or the Winter Games, Pierre Zimmermann has chosen to play now for his birth country, Switzerland, as soon as the regulations of WBF and EBL will allow it.
"We fully respect his heart's choice, and wish to Pierre and his future teammates the greatest victories. We thank Pierre for what we've achieved together: this would not have been possible without the will of both sides, it allowed us to have a lot of great moments and the difficulties we faced together have created very strong links of friendship.
"It's clear that these links will not be broken by this decision, as Pierre will remain an active Partner of the FMB at the local level, as he will still support the events that we created together and of course he'll be an active player of these events.
"Through this partnership, based on the full respect of the WBF and EBL regulations, Pierre Zimmermann and the FMB have proposed a new route
 for the international bridge and opened new opportunities for professional top players: if some will probably welcome with pleasure the end of our atypical, or even controversial, project, some others will maybe take over, under same or different form. We want to encourage them, because bridge needs, at each level, active sponsors and innovative operators, as Pierre Zimmermann and FMB have been and will be."
For more on this topic go to: http://championships. eurobridge.org/EOC2019/bulletins/bul_16.pdf

## Well Equipped

From a seed planted in the early 1980s by Dimmie Fleming, the highly respected player and Former secretary of the English Bridge Union, grew the company A.L. Fleming, initially a specialist printing company producing a range of bridge related stationery. Under her guidance specialist products appeared, including the Fleming Board, which is still produced from the same moulds today. In 1987, the company was acquired by James Mulcahy who oversaw the growth of the company up until early this year, when health problems resulted in him deciding to retire, at the tender age of 80 .
The company has been taken over by the Collier family. Terry in comparison with James is a spring chick, who is trying to avoid the coming
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of age and whilst admitting to being 43, he has two sons that appear to be older than him, one of whom, Drew, is the company's Operation Director along with his mother Lesley the Company Secretary and holder of the purse strings. In taking over the company, their first task was to move it, lock, stock and barrel from Orpington to Takeley on the Herts/ Essex boarder, just 10 minutes away from Stansted Airport.
The web site is located at: https://alfleming.co.uk/

## The Way to the Stars

If you want to progress at bridge, reading is one of the best ways to do it. Mats Nilsland, author of a recently published book (5 Card Majors - The Scanian Way), and friends have recently sponsored 204 juniors with a free book!
These are the happy ones.
http://www.itbolaget.nu/bridge/register.asp

## About the book:

https://bridgewinners.com/article/view/5-card-majors-the-scanian-way-free-bridge-book-for-junior-players-courtesy-of-mats-nilsland/
The publisher is Svenska Bridgeförlaget (Sweden) and the book can be bought here:
https://www.bridgeforlaget.se/utlandsk-litteratur-1/n-1/nilsland-5-cards-major-the-scanian-way or by emailing order@bridgeforlaget.se

## Navigation

(A note from our layout editor)
Some subscribers are not fully aware of how one can navigate through the magazine. If you look in the bottom right-hand corner of this page you will see five icons. Clicking on these from right to left will move you 'Forward one page', 'End of Magazine', 'Beginning of Magazine', 'Back one page' and take you to the page with the index. Clicking on any item in the index will take you to that article.

If in an article there is 'See Page xxx' then clicking on that box will take you to that page. I hope this clarifies navigation for one and all.

## Card Game Books

Bridge books, ephemera, other card games and playing cards

> Gordon Bickley Card Game Books
> 208 Strines Road, Strines, Stockport Cheshire SK6 7GA Tel: 0161-427 4630 or 07530 553594 e-mail: gordonarf@aol.com
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## atasex FUNBRIDGE

## Test Your Technique

with Christophe Grosset
see Page 57
Dealer North. N/S Vul. Matchpoints

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AQ6 } \\ & \text { KJ97 } \\ & 6 \\ & \text { AJ872 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - K <br> - A10 <br> - AJ <br> \& KQ | $; 43$ |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| - | 1\% | Pass | 1 |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | 19* |
| Pass | 2NT* | Pass | 6NT | All Pass

1. Fourth suit forcing

2NT 17-18, singleton diamond
6\% was probably the safer contract, but playing match-points, South decided he had enough to try for 6 NT .
On the lead of the 2 (4th best), how do you plan the play?

## Spring is in the Alir

The Editor reports on the toughest event in the calendar, the Schapiro Spring Fours

64 teams gathered in Stratford-upon-Avon to contest the EBU's flagship event, the Schapiro Spring Fours. Here is how they lined up:

| 1 | Allfrey | Alexander Allfrey, Mike Bell, Tony Forrester, David Gold Graham Osborne \& Andrew Robson |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Milner | Sabine Auken, Hemant Lall, Zia Mahmood, Marion Michielsen, Reese Milner \& Roy Welland |
| 3 | Allerton | Jeffrey Allerton, Michael Byrne, Kieran Dyke \& Chris Jagger |
| 4 | Gillis | Diyan Danailov, Simon Gillis, Erik Saelensminde, Jerry Stamatov \& Odin Svendsen |
| 5 | Penfold | John Holland, Alan Mould, Sandra Penfold, Brian Sen ior \& Nevena Senior |
| 6 | De Botton | David Bakhshi, Thomas Charlsen, Thor Erik Hoftaniska Artur Malinowski, Dror Padon \& Janet de Botton |
| 7 | K1 | Viktor Aronov, Diana Damianova, Vladimir Mihov \& Ivan Nanev |
| 8 | Amalia | Kevin Castner, Paul Gruenke, Phil King \& Roland Rohowsky |
| 9 | Oldfield | Simon Cope, Peter Crouch, Geoff Oldfield, Mikael Rim stedt \& Ola Rimstedt |
| 10 | Ireland | John Carroll, Tommy Garvey, Tom Hanlon, Donal MacAonghusa, Krzysztof Martens \& Mark Moran |
| 11 | Black | Peter Bertheau, Dennis Bilde, Andrew Black, Gunnar Hallberg, Christian Lahrmann \& Derek Patterson |
| 12 | Brock | Sally Brock, Martin Jones, Barry Myers, Kay Preddy, Neil Rosen \& Norman Selway |
| 13 | Mossop | Jason Hackett, Justin Hackett, Alex Hydes, Ed Jones David Mossop \& Tom Paske |
| 14 | Gladpack | Kåre Bogø, Espen Fasting, Tor Eyvind Grude \& Lars Arthur Johansen |


| 15 | Dhondy | Brian Callaghan, Heather Dhondy, John Murdoch \& Iain <br> Sime |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 16 | Trevethin | Simon Ekenberg, Simon Hult, Oliver Lawrence \& Pat- <br> rick Lawrence |
| 17 | Samson | Diego Brenner, Dave Debbage, Paul Hackett \& John <br> Sansom |
| 18 | Phoenix | Ali Ahmed, Marusa Gold, Valio Isporski, James Thrower, <br> Todor Tiholov \& Rumen Trendafilov |
| 19 | Fawcett | Espen Erichsen, Joe Fawcett, Alastair Gidman \& Glyn <br> Liggins |
| 20 | Plackett | John Atthey, Richard Chamberlain, Paul Denning, Rich- <br> ard Plackett, Patrick Shields \& Garry Watson |
| 21 | B Green | Ben Green, Duncan Happer, Ankush Khandelwal \& Ben <br> Norton |
| 22 | Small | Jon Cooke, John Cox, Cameron Small \& Peter Taylor |
| 23 | Sushi | David Kendrick, Alan Mayo, Nick Sandqvist \& Nathalie <br> Shashou |
| 24 | Peterkin | Paula Leslie, Stephen Peterkin, Samantha Punch \& Derek <br> Sanders |
| 25 | Fegarty | Catherine Curtis, Richard Fedrick, Paul Fegarty \& Mike <br> Scoltock |
| 26 | Oxfjord | Finn Brandsnes, Roger Bryant, Erik Rynning \& Nick <br> Smith |
| 27 | Kane | Irving Gordon, Danny Kane, Helen Kane \& Anne Symons |
| 28 | Tanna | Ollie Burgess, Susanna Gross, Claire Robinson \& Neeraj <br> Tanna |
| 29 | Bowdery | Richard Bowdery, Richard Hillman, Petar Ivanov \& Ste- <br> fano Tommasini |
| 30 | Solomon | Harry Anoyrkatis, Tony McNiff, Dave Robinson \& Warner <br> Solomon |
|  | Para |  |


| 31 | Lasje | Lasse Aaseng, Tom Johansen, Sverre Johnsen \& Åsmund <br> Stokkeland |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 32 | Smith | Roy Bennett, Sandy Duncan, Jim Hay \& Harry Smith |
| 33 | Gipson | Sarah Bell, Alex Gipson, Paul Gipson \& Alex Roberts |
| 34 | Barnes | David Barnes, Nigel Guthrie, Barry Wennell \& Beth <br> Wennell |
| 35 | Dean | Richard Creamer, John Dean, Nick Dean \& John <br> Pemberton |
| 36 | Mcdif | Gwynn Davis, Cathy Ferguson, Sue Ingham \& Bob <br> McKinnon |
| 37 | Hackett | Bernard Goldenfield, Rhona Goldenfield, Mike Gold <br> smith, Barbara Hackett, Edward Levy \& Martin Taylor |
| 38 | M Green | Marcia Green, Waseem Naqvi, Graham Orsmond \& Tom <br> Townsend |
| 39 | U <br> Women | Olivia Bailey, Laura Covill, India Leeming, Siyu Ren, <br> Hanna Tuus \& Ewa Wieczorek |
| 40 | Stephens | Chris Cooper, Frazer Morgan, Philip Stephens \& Alan <br> Wilson |
| 41 | Taylor | Henry Bissell, Josh Clarke, Nicholas Greer \& Phillip <br> Taylor |
| 42 | Commins | Liz Commins, Paddy Murphy, Mark Roderick \& David <br> Stevenson |
| 43 | Nygren | David Burn, Margaret Nygren, Martin Nygren \& Laura <br> Woodruff |
| 44 | U21 Galpin |  <br> Edmund Lea |
| 45 | Shelley | Mike Huggins, Peter Shelley, Andrew Urbanski \& Tre- <br> vor Ward |
| 46 | Harris 1 | Jonathan Harris, Niall Igoe, Shahzaad Natt \& Steve Root |
| 47 | Five club <br> Partyband | Nadia Bekkouche, Lone Kiaer, Christina Klemmensen, <br>  <br> Maria Rahelt |
| 48 | U <br> Ronayne | William Clennell, David Fry, Imogen La Chapelle \& Jack <br> Ronayne |


| 49 | Pratt | Stanley Herman, Henryk Klocek, Maciej Pilecki \& Roger <br> Pratt |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 51 | Barton | Paul Barton, John Faben, Philip Morrison \& Jun <br> Nakamaru-Pinder |
| 54 | Harris 2 |  <br> Andrew Sobell |
| 55 | E ngland/ <br> S w e d e n <br> Juniors |  <br> Henry Rose |
| 57 | U26 Juniors | Jon Derrick, Ollie Powell, Ian Robson \& Eshan Singhal |
| 58 | U16 Juniors | James Cater, Dido Coley, Jamie Fegarty, Liam Fegarty, <br> Kim Hudson \& Theodore Sinclair |
| 59 | Stynes | Gad Chadha, Steve Lee, Debbie Sandford \& Kath Stynes |
| 60 | U21 Gahan | Sam Anoyrkatis, Theo Anoyrkatis, Andy Cope, Elizabeth <br> Gahan, Harry Madden \& Oscar Selby |
| 61 | Silverstone | Chris Dixon, David S Jones, Oliver Segal \& Victor <br> Silverstone |
| 62 | Turtles and <br> Crocs | Charles Bucknell, Stephen Kennedy, Will Roper, Louise <br> Selway \& Tony Ye |
| 63 | Miller | Daniel Baines, Ufuk Cotuk, Robert Miller \& Mark Tilley |
| 64 | Hecht-Jo <br> hansen | Dominic Connolly, Jackie Fairclough, Ingar Hansen, Gitte <br> Hecht-Johansen \& Szczepan Smoczynski |

At one time, this event was so popular that it had to be staged at three venues, but the steady decline in tournament bridge has seen it fall back to a single location. However, what it lacks in numbers is readily compensated for by the quality of the field. The generous sponsorship of Helen Schapiro enables the EBU to offer much better prizes than usual - but even the winning team will usually be struggling to cover their costs.

The latter stages of the event are covered on BBO and we join the action from a key match in the sixth round.

## Milner - Allfrey

By the time we reached Round 6 the two top seeds had both lost a life and found themselves in opposition, so it was a case of winner takes all.
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## Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

|  | KQ104 <br> - AJ2 <br> - K82 <br> - A96 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { J9762 } \\ & \text { 103 } \\ & \text { A1096 } \\ & 82 \end{aligned}$ |  | ค A83 <br> - Q <br> - Q75 <br> KQ10543 |  |
|  | $\rightarrow 5$$\begin{aligned} & \text { K987654 } \\ & \text { J43 } \\ & \text { J7 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bell | Milner | Gold | Lall |
| - | 1NT | Pass | 2** |
| Pass | 27 | 3\% | 3 |
| Pass | 4 | All Pass |  |
| 2* Transfer |  |  |  |

East led the K and declarer won with the ace and played the heart two, drawing trumps in two rounds and then exiting with a club. East won with the queen and switched to the $\leqslant 5$, West winning and returning the nine to ensure four tricks for the defence, -100 .

If declarer had played the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ at trick 4 the defenders would have had no resource.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Welland | Allfrey | Auken | Robson |
| - | $1 N T$ | Pass | 4 e* $^{*}$ |
| Pass | $4 \vee$ | All Pass |  |

East led the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$, West following with an upside-down two and declarer won, played a heart to the king and a spade for the ten and ace. Now East could play two rounds of clubs, promoting West's $\uparrow 10$ for a flat board.

Should we excuse declarer because East had never bid? Allfrey won a low scoring set 14-4.
You can replay the deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y2gbhdeg
The second session was much more exciting with a swing on every one of the eight deals. Milner scored 15-0 on the first four deals to lead 19-14.

Board 13. Dealer North. All Vul.
\& KJ 1054 - 5

- AJ1083
- 97


Open Room


North led the $\vee 5$ and declarer won with the king and ducked a club, South winning with the jack and switching to the $\$ 9$. That cooked declarer's goose and he was soon two down, -200 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Welland | Allfrey | Auken | Robson |
| - | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
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I would have been tempted to lead a diamond which would have given away the contract, but Auken unerringly led a $\uparrow$, West winning with the ace and returning the queen. Declarer won and played the $\vee 5$, East winning with the jack. She switched accurately to a club and West won with the ace. At this point returning either minor keeps the defenders one step ahead, but West tried to cash the $\geqslant \mathrm{K}$. Declarer ruffed, and could now establish dummy's hearts for +620 and 9 IMPs.

Board 15. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

- KQ1098
- 103
- Q1065
- $A Q$


North led the $₫ \mathrm{~K}$ and declarer ducked, South following with the seven. North switched to the $\vee 10$ and declarer won perforce with dummy's ace and played a diamond to the king followed by the 10 . North took the ace and exited with the queen, but declarer cashed all dummies clubs and then exited with the $\$ 7$. North won with the ten and returned the 46. Declarer played dummy's jack for a well-played +430 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Welland | Allfrey | Auken | Robson |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| 19 | 14 | 24* | Pass |
| 3\% | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

After a similar start, declarer played a low club from dummy at trick three and North won with the queen and found the killing switch to a diamond. Declarer won with the king and played a club but North won and played a second diamond. Declarer put in dummy's jack and cashed his minor suit winners, but the defenders took the rest for one down and 10 IMPs.

```
Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul.
4 J
* AK952
* J4
& KJ943
```



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Osborne | Michielsen | Forrester | Zia |
| $1 \downarrow$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | 2 |
| $2 \uparrow$ | Double* | Pass | 3 |
| $3 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |  |

$2 \star$ is a brave bid on such a moth-eaten suit.
South led the 8 and declarer took North's jack with the ace and ran the $\geqslant 8$ to North's nine. She returned the $\downarrow$ J and declarer won with dummy's
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ace，ruffed a heart and exited with a club，North winning with the king and exiting with a diamond．South took the queen and continued with the six． Declarer pitched a heart from dummy and North ruffed and played a heart， ruffed with the $\$ 8$ by declarer and overruffed by South who exited with a diamond，ensuring two down，-200 ．

| Closed Room |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | West | North | East | South |
|  |  | Welland | Allfrey | Auken | Robson |
|  |  | 19＊ | 18 | Double＊ | 2 |
|  |  | 24 | Double＊ | Pass | 2NT |
|  |  | Pass | 38 | Pass | 3 |
|  |  | Pass | 3NT | Pass | Pass |
|  |  | Double | All Pass |  |  |
|  | 1． | $2+$ may be any balanced hand including any other five－card suit， also 5422 |  |  |  |

West led the $\$ 6$ for the jack，queen and king and declarer played a diamond to the jack followed by one to the queen and ace．A low club now gives the defenders a shot at three down，but West returned the Q covered by the king and ducked by East，who took the club continuation with the ten and returned the $\$ 2$（the simplifies matters）for the five and seven．Now West needs to exit with a low heart，but for a second time he went with her majesty，exiting with the Q ．Declarer won with dummy＇s ace and now does best to come to hand with a heart，cash the $\checkmark K$ and then exit with a spade to endplay West and emerge with eight tricks．However，he played dummy＇s $\boldsymbol{j}$ and East won and played a spade for two down，－500 and 11 IMPs．

That concluded a great set for Milner，who now led 35－33． You can replay these deals here or https：／／tinyurl．com／yxwwku9u


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bell | Michielsen | Gold | Zia |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| 1 | $2 \boldsymbol{i}$ | Double＊$^{*}$ | 2NT＊ |
| Pass | $3 \dot{e}$ | 3NT | All Pass |
| 2NT | Clubs |  |  |

3NT was swiftly put to the sword，South lead the 10 and the defenders taking the first six tricks，+200 ．I wonder how the auction would have unfolded had East preferred $3 \vee$ ？

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Welland | Osborne | Auken | Forrester |
| - | - | - | $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ |
| 3 | $5 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Double | All Pass |

West led the $\downarrow \mathrm{K}$ and switched to the $\$ 3$ ．Declarer won with the ace and played the $\mathbf{J}$ ，East winning and returning a club．Declarer won with dum－ my＇s seven，ruffed a spade，ruffed a diamond，ruffed a spade and drew the outstanding trump．When he cashed his last trump，West，down to V J86 $\diamond 108$ should throw a heart，which will result in four down．When he pitched a diamond declarer could exit with a diamond，eventually scor－ ing a heart trick for＇only＇-500 ，still a loss of 12 IMPs．
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Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bell | Michielsen | Gold | Zia |
| - | - | 2** | 2V |
| Pass | 24 | 3 | Pass |
| 39 | Pass | 4* | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | 5NT* | Pass |
| 6\% | Double | Pass | Pass |
| 6 | Double | All Pass |  |

West's Pass was not alerted, so it is unclear what it meant. A method that is gaining in popularity is to treat Pass as neutral and game forcing, a new suit as five or more cards and game forcing and a double as the equivalent of a negative response, a scheme suggested by Jerry Helms in the ACBL Bulletin. As to the rest of the auction East would have done better to bid 3NT at some point.

South led the $\vee 9$ and North ruffed and returned the $\mathbf{~} 3$ to declarer's ace. The K lost to the ace and South ruffed the spade return and played a heart for North to ruff. Back came a spade and when declarer ruffed with the $\downarrow \mathrm{J}$ South overruffed and could have achieved five down by exiting with a trump. He tried for a trump promotion by playing the $\vee 2$, but that allowed declarer to pitch a losing club, so -1100 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Welland | Osborne | Auken | Forrester |
| - | - | 2** | Pass |
| 2** | 34 | 4* | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | 5\% | Pass |
| 5 | All Pass |  |  |
| 20-21 Balanced or any game forc A sign-off in hearts or waiting |  |  |  |

Facing a weak hand with hearts was East worth 5\%?(At double-dummy you can make 4 4 .)
$5 \checkmark$ finished two down, still worth 14 IMPs.

```
Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.
& AQ7
` J107
-K
* AJ8643
& J9642
* AKQ86
-10
* K9
```



```
- K103
- 98753
\(\stackrel{85}{ }\)
- 932
- AQJ642
- 72
```

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bell | Michielsen | Gold | Zia |
| - | - | - | 3 |
| $4 \star^{*}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\leftrightarrow}$ | Pass |
| Pass | Double | All Pass |  |

West held nothing back with his $4 \downarrow$. South led the $\boldsymbol{4}$ and North took the ace, cashed the $\boldsymbol{s} A$ and then played the $\diamond$ K. South overtook it and returned the $\downarrow 2$, North ruffing to put the contract down, -200 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Welland | Osborne | Auken | Forrester |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| 14 | 2 | 2 | 3 |

West cashed his top hearts, East discarding the $\$$. Had West now switched to the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ declarer would have been looking at only seven tricks, but he pre-
 ferred the $\$ 10$. Declarer took that in dummy and unwilling to give up on the possibility of making the contract played two rounds of clubs. West won and switched to the $\$ 2$ and when the finesse lost declarer was two down, -200 and another 9 IMPs had vanished, leaving Allfrey down 40-76. You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y49zqfa7 Milner added 5 IMPs over the first half of the final set, but Allfrey went down fighting:

Board 29. Dealer North. All Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bell | Michielsen | Gold | Zia |
| - | Pass | 180 | Pass |
| 1** | Pass | 10* | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 24* | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | 4 | Pass |
| 4『* | Pass | 5NT* | Pass |
| 6\% | Pass | 78 | All Pass |

## 1. Hearts

1『 Clubs and Diamonds
4 $\quad$ Cue-bid
5NT Pick a slam
At the state of the match, East had to press - and his partner delivered golden cards, +2140 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Welland | Allfrey | Auken | Robson |
| - | Pass | 1980 | Pass |
| $1{ }^{\text {d }}$ | 14 | 24* | Double |
| Pass | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | 4 | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | 6\% | All Pass |

12. $2+$ may be any balanced hand including any other five-card suit, also 5422
1* $4+$ -
One might have expected East to keep looking with 4d. If West then jumped to 6 East could have considered adding one for the road. However, although this cost 13 IMPs Allfrey could only add another 17 over the last three deals to go down 70-81.
You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y24bvr4a
On to the three quarter-finals, the undefeated team, KI having already secured their spot in the last four.

Penfold and de Botton was a terrific battle. At the halfway mark, de Botton led 28-14.
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\section*{Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul. <br> - A7 <br> - J762 <br> - 7654 <br> - 1053 <br> | - 654 <br> - AQ3 <br> - Q3 <br> ~ A9864 |  | ↔ KQJ1032 <br> - 94 <br> - K82 <br> $\because$ Q2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - 98 <br> - K1085 <br> - AJ 109 <br> - KJ7 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B Senior | Bakhshi | Senior | Padon |
| 1NT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{}^{*}$ | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ | All Pass |

On this layout there was no way to prevent ten tricks - declarer was allowed to set up the clubs, so did not need the heart king to be onside.


Here there was an excellent chance the $\vee \mathrm{K}$ would be favourably placed and that was enough for West to advance to the game that was unbeatable, giving de Botton 10 of the 15 IMPs they took in the set to lead 43-21.

You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y6syhjlt

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.


## Open Room



On this layout had no chance, declarer losing a heart, a club and a spade, -100 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Charlsen | Mould | Hoftaniska | Holland |
| - | - | - | 14 |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2} *$ | 2 | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | 4 | All Pass |  |

Here too declarer took ten tricks - an 11 IMP pick up.
Board 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B Senior | Bakhshi | Senior | Padon |
| Pass | $1 \mathbf{e}$ | $4 \varphi$ | Double |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

At the state of the match it would not have been a huge surprise had West chanced his arm with a redouble.

South led the $\star$ A and continued with the four, North winning and switching to the $\$$. Declarer ruffed, crossed to the A and played a heart to the ten. South won and tried a club, but declarer ruffed, went to dummy with a spade and repeated the heart finesse for ten tricks and +590 .

Having cashed a diamond South must switch to a spade. If declarer wins in dummy and takes a heart finesse South wins and plays a diamond,

North winning and returning a third diamond, South's ruff removing dummy's all important second trump.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Charlsen | Mould | Hoftaniska | Holland |
| Pass | $1 \mathbf{2 N}$ | $3 \%$ | Double* |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

By bidding 3NT North gave his team a shot at victory - if East leads a heart all declarer has to do is duck in both hands after which he has time to develop a ninth trick in spades. However, East had a second string to his bow and led the $\downarrow$ J. Now declarer was helpless and was soon two down, -200 - the 9 IMP pick up helping Penfold to win the set 26-0 and advance. You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y2nhjqzg

## Gipson v Amalia

Going into the last session Amalia led 36-32. After a couple of deals, the score had advanced to 41-39.

A A 7
-KQ7

- KQ3

Q Q9876


- KQ10963
$\checkmark 102$
- A97
\& AJ


## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rohowsky | Gipson | Gruenke | Gipson |
| - | - | - | 14 |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | 2 | Pass |
| Pass | Double | Pass | $3 \Downarrow$ |
| Pass | 4 | Pass | 4 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

4 $\boldsymbol{4}$ made in comfort.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roberts | King | Bell | Castner |
| - | - | - | $1 \mathbf{1}$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | Pass | $4 N T$ |
| Pass | $6 N T$ | All Pass |  |

On a good day you will take 12 tricks - but even when you can make it you might go wrong - for example after a diamond lead to the ace and a heart to the king, how do you continue?

East led the 4 and West won with the king and returned the $\$ 6$, a fast one down and a 10 IMPs that handed Gipson the lead, 49-41.

Board 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
© Q4

- K74
-K652
: KQJ3


## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Rohowsky | Gipson | Gruenke | Gipson |
| Pass | 1NT | 3 3 | Double* |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

East led the $\downarrow$ J and declarer won with dummy's ace and played the $\$ 3$, West winning with the king and returning the $\$ 6$ for the jack and queen. When declarer played a second spade West won and produced the $\$ 9$ so that was three down, -300 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Roberts | King | Bell | Castner |
| Pass | $1 ヵ$ | $2 N T *$ | Double |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \%$ | Double |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |
| 2NT |  |  |  |

East led the $\upharpoonright$ J and declarer put up dummy's queen (as the cards lie the winning move is to duck the trick). With little else to do declarer played five rounds of clubs pitching a diamond. East parted with the $\$ 3, \geqslant 2$ and 10 and then pitched the jack and ten of diamonds so declarer was home - or was he?

Not imagining that he could now take three diamond tricks declarer played a spade and West won with the king. Cashing the A and playing a heart is two down, but West returned the $>7$ and declarer won with dummy's ace and played a second diamond for nine tricks and a match winning 14 IMPs.
You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y4pnkvms
In the remaining match Mossop defeated Milner 73-49, despite losing 15 IMPs on Board 28 (see earlier) where they conceeded 600 in one room for 3NT and 630 in the other for $3 \vee$ doubled with an overtrick.

## Semi-finals

The matches between Penfold-Mossop and KI-Amallia proved to be one-sided:

## A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE - JuLy 2019

## Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul. <br> - J62 <br> - K73 <br> - AQ107 <br> - 762 <br> 

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mihov | King | Nanev | Castner |
| 1a | Pass | $2 \star^{*}$ | Double |
| Pass | $3 *$ | All Pass |  |
| 2* | Hearts |  |  |

Facing a Precision 14 East decided not to compete with $3 \boldsymbol{\vee}$. On this auction it would have been easy enough to hold declarer to eight tricks in hearts - a diamond to the ace is followed by a heart switch from North, South winning and returning a heart. East led the $\mathbf{~} \mathrm{K}$ and the contract was quickly two down, -200 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Rohowsky | Damianova | Gruenke | Aronov |
| $1 \mathbf{1}$ | Pass | $3 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| $4 \downarrow$ | All Pass |  |  |

South led the 10 so declarer was able to discard two diamonds on dummy's spades, an easy +620 and 9 IMPs, Amalia leading 28-1 at the end of the set. (Board 6 in the Closed Room is very strange - it's hard to believe the play record!)
You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/yy9yiqxy

## Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

$\rightarrow 3$

- Q975
- 874

2 J5432

| ^ AQ10962 <br> - K <br> - AK9 <br> - K76 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | - J87 |
|  | - AJ42 |
|  | - J652 |
|  | \& $A Q$ |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| King | Mihov | Castner | Nanev |
| - | Pass | Pass | 1 |
| Double | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | All Pass |  |  |

In a way this is an instructive deal - as East you must raise to $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ as you may have responded $1 \backsim$ with a worthless hand. With the onside there were ten tricks, +170 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aronov | Rohowsky | Damianova | Gruenke |
| - | Pass | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ |
| $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\imath}$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{i}$ | All Pass |  |  |

That gave K1 10 IMPs.

Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { AKQ93 } \\ & \text { AQ2 } \\ & \text { AQ432 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline N \\ W^{N} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | - 107 <br> - AKQ9753 <br> - K4 <br> e J 10 |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 862 \\ & 986 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |  |
|  | West | North | East | South |
|  | King | Mihov | Castner | Nanev |
|  | - | - | - | 2** |
|  | Double | 2** | Double | Pass |
|  | 3** | Pass | 3NT | Pass |
|  | 4『* | Pass | 4NT | Pass |
|  | 6\% | All Pass |  |  |
| 2 | Multi <br> Pass or correct |  |  |  |
| $2{ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |

I wonder if East was tempted to pass $4 \boldsymbol{\Downarrow}$ (it would be worth it to see the look on partner's face!).
North led a hopeful $\uparrow 4$ and declarer won with dummy's ace and ran the d. Although it lost he was not hard pressed to secure the rest of the tricks, +920 .
As declarer had telegraphed the fact that he held a heart void North should have looked elsewhere for his opening lead - a spade or a diamond ensure defeat (in the latter case if declarer wins in hand and tries a low club North can win or duck and win the next club and exit with a diamond).


Needing a fair amount of luck, declarer did not get any and finished three down, -150 resulting in the loss of 14 IMPs.

## Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul.

- 32
- J 10742
- 85
\& Q 10754

| ค AQJ74 <br> - K8 <br> - AJ32 <br> - A 9 |  | - 985 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | $\checkmark$ AQ5 |
|  | W E | - K76 |
|  | S | - K865 |
|  | 4 K106 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 963$ |  |
|  | - Q1094 |  |
|  | - J32 |  |

## A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE - July 2019



On the friendly layout declarer took all the tricks, +1010 .
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aronov | Rohowsky | Damianova | Gruenke |
| - | - | 18 | Pass |
| 18* | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 2** | Pass | 2** | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

## 1• Transfer <br> 20 Check back <br> 2 ${ }^{2}$ Minimum

No doubt there is some reason why East could not bid $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$, but preferring 3s to 3NT must be a better move. That gave Amalia another 11 IMPs and they led 59-11. They added another 9 in a low scoring third set and ran out easy winners, the final score being 108-29.
You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y445a3vw and here or https://tinyurl.com/y2tn62k7 and here or https://tinyurl.com/y4shwwpf

## Penfold - Mossop



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mould | Jones | Holland | Paske |
| - | $1 \mathbf{e}$ | Pass | 1 |
| Pass | $1 \mathbf{e}$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass

West led the $\vee 10$, reasonable enough, but not testing, and declarer won in hand. He took nine tricks, but the play record is missing. It looks like declarer played three rounds of clubs, East winning and returning a heart which declarer won to play a spade, +400 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ja Hackett | $N$ Senior | Hackett | Penfold |
| - | 1\% | Pass | $1 *$ |
| Pass | 19 | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 3\% | Pass | 4\% |

Declarer won the heart lead and played two rounds of clubs and then ducked a spade. East won with the nine, cashed the 0 and exited with a heart. In due course declarer had to lose two spades, -50 and a 10 IMP loss.

## A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE - JuLy 2019

## Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.

ค J62

- K73
- AQ107
- 762

```
& AQ8754
    ` 42
    - 3
    * AQJ8
```



```
- K
- QJ10986
- 965
- K43
- 1093
- A5
KJ842
- 1095
```

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mould | Jones | Holland | Paske |
| 14 | Pass | 1 NT | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | $2 \downarrow$ | All Pass |

South led the 10 so declarer took ten tricks, +170 .
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ja Hackett | N Senior | Hackett | Penfold |
| 1a | Pass | 1NT* | Pass |
| 2NT* | Pass | $4 \vee$ | All Pass |

1NT Forcing
2NT Game forcing, asks partner to bid without a major suit fit
When South led the same 10 declarer had ten tricks and the same number of IMPs.
Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

- 9765
- QJ 102
J J102
- 52
A A2
+ K9853
-863

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mould | Jones | Holland | Paske |
| - | - | - | $1 \mathbf{1}$ |
| 1 | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{N}^{*}$ | Pass |
| 5 | All Pass |  |  |
| Cue-bid |  |  |  |

South led the 8 and declarer won with the jack, crossed to dummy with a spade and played a diamond, putting up the king when North followed with the two. That was one down, -100 .

Of course, we can see that putting in the four is the winning play, but what if South started with $\$$ AJ or $\star$ A10? Then you have to hope that South started with no more than three clubs to the queen.

## A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE - July 2019

 South winning with the ace. When she played a second spade declarer was home, winning in dummy and clearing the diamonds.
It should not have been difficult for South to find the heart switch that would have flattened the board - as it was Mossop pocketed another 12 IMPs and led 34-7.

You can replay these deals at:
https://www.bridgebase.com/tools/handviewer.html?bbo=y\&linurl=https://www.bridgebase.com/tools/vugraph_linfetch.php?id=62960

## Board 9. Dealer North. EM Vul.



## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mould | Hydes | Holland | Mossop |
| - | Pass | Pass | 1 |
| Double | 3 | Pass | Pass |
| $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{a}$ | All Pass |

All roads should lead to $4 \boldsymbol{a}$ - but we have already seen that is not guaranteed. Here it was +620 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Paske | Penfold | Jones | B Senior |
| - | Pass | Pass | 1NT* |
| Double | Redouble* | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2 !}$ |
| $2 \mathbf{2 4}$ | All Pass |  |  |

1NT Good 11-14
Rdbl Asking partner to bid 2e
Missing the game cost 9 IMPs.
Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul.

```
ค J8652
\(-4\)
- 753
```

* K965



South led the 4 and declarer won in
dummy, came to hand with a diamond and cashed the top hearts. The $83.97 \%$ chance of losing only one trick failed to materialise, so an unlucky one down.


South picked an unfortunate moment to open $2 \downarrow$ which warned East off. He could have started with $2 \diamond$ (weak with diamonds) which would almost certainly have seen E/W go overboard.

Declarer won the heart lead with the king and ran the $\$ 10$, eventually making an overtrick when South pitched two hearts, +480 and 11 IMPs


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mould | Hydes | Holland | Mossop |
| - | - | 1\% | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 2** | Pass | 24* | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

## 2. Check back

2. Minimum with 3 spades

I don't see the rationale behind 3 - why not introduce your second suit with $3 \Downarrow$ ? If partner then bids $3 \vee$ you can choose between $3 \boldsymbol{\text { e }}$, hoping to see $4 \boldsymbol{e}$, or bid $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ yourself.
In the endgame declarer rejected the diamond finesse, so +490 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paske | Penfold | Jones | $B$ Senior |
| - | - | 189 | Pass |
| 19 | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 2** | Pass | 24* | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | 4** | Pass |
| 4NT* | Pass | 5** | Pass |
| 64 | All Pass |  |  |

## A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE - JuLy 2019

The same 3a bid, but here East cue-bid after which West asked for key cards. He took all the tricks, +1010 and 11 IMPs.
Two useful part-score swings on the last two deals saw Mossop's advantage increase to 75-10.
You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y2wpoxas
Penfold won the third session - but only 5-3 and a score change (the operator had missed a double on Board 15 from the previous set in the Open Room left Mossop ahead 85-16 at which point Penfold shook hands.
You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y399k8kk

## Final

```
Board 1. Dealer North. None Vul.
```



## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| King | JuHackett | Castner | Hackett |
| - | $1 \boldsymbol{2}$ | $1 \%$ | Double |
| 2\&* | $4 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass | $6 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

I don't see the point of overcalling $1 \vee-2 \vee$ makes more sense, but I doubt it would have stopped $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$ from reaching the excellent slam which rolled home, +920.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paske | Gruenke | Jones | Rohowski |
| - | $1 \mathbf{N}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| 3 | 4NT* | Pass | $5 \boldsymbol{\$}$ |

I don't care for $1 \boldsymbol{1}$, but when South responded $2 \boldsymbol{N}$ North asked for key cards (at least I assume he did). However, South appears to have shown only one (did he think spades was the suit partner was interested in?) It gave Mossop 11 IMPs.

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| King | Ju Hackett | Castner | Hackett |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| Pass | 120 | Double | $1 \stackrel{1}{ }$ |
| 14 | Double | 24 | 34* |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pas |  |

North was short on values for his double, but it may have simply shown four hearts.

East led the $¥ K$ and continued the suit, declarer taking the third round and cashing six diamonds - which were all the tricks he could muster, -200 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paske | Gruenke | Jones | Rohowski |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| 1a | Double | 2NT* | 4 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| 2NT | Spade support |  |  |

I'm not convinced by $4 \diamond$, partly because it goes beyond 3NT. West led the $\mathbf{~ J}$ and East took two tricks in the suit and had only to table a heart to ensure one down. When he exited with a trump declarer could eventually discard a heart on a club for +130 and 8 IMPs.

| Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { K973 } \\ & \text { QJ10743 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| - J64 <br> - K6 <br> -KQ106 <br> - 8752 | $W^{N}$ | - AQ1085 <br> - A <br> - A852 <br> * QJ6 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| King | Ju Hackett | Castner | Hackett |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | 39 | 34 | 59 |
| Pass | Pass | Double | All Pass |

You can see why South bid $5 \vee$ - he wanted to make E/W guess (for all he knew they might a slam available). However, had he contented himself with $4 \vee$ West would almost certainly have bid $4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ and then North might have speculated with a double after which South would not be
hard pressed to find a diamond lead.
East wisely cashed the $\vee$ A and then tried the $\forall A$. Declarer could ruff that, but had to go two down, -300 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Paske | Gruenke | Jones | Rohowski |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | $3 \vee$ | $3 \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ | $4 \uparrow$ |
| Double* | Pass | $4 N T^{*}$ | Pass |
| 5 $\boldsymbol{~}$ | Double | All Pass |  |
| Dble | Spade support |  |  |

There was some online debate about the meaning of West's double.
South led the $\checkmark 3$ and North ruffed and returned a club. The defenders took the first four tricks and with no entry to dummy declarer had to lose a trick to the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ for -800 and the loss of 14 IMPs.

```
Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.
4 5
    * AJ432
    - A3
    & QJ982
    & 1083 
    * }1065
```



```
- QJ94
- K865
- J62
- 73
( AK762
- Q97
- K95
* AK
```



East led the $\downarrow 6$ and declarer won with dummy’s king and played a heart to the ten, jack and king. He won the diamond return, played a heart to the nine, cashed the queen, unblocked the clubs ruffed a diamond and claimed, +1430 .

All Pass

The BBO operator noted that 'South is explaining the auction'. Unfortunately, he didn't add anything further. It looks as if was any game force but what happened after that is unclear.

Declarer's hopes must have soared for a moment when West's first heart was the ten (with $\uparrow$ K10 West should play the king on the first round) and East might have amused himself by withholding the king. Whatever, declarer was one down and 17 IMPs worse off.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| King | Ju Hackett | Castner | Hackett |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | 1 | 1 | Pass |
| Pass | 2 | All Pass |  |

East cashed his top hearts and switched to the $\downarrow 7$, declarer winning with dummy's ace and playing a spade for the king and ace. A spade back to the queen saw declarer continue with the king and queen of diamonds, the latter ruffed by dummy's $\boldsymbol{*} 10$. West discarded the $\geqslant 2$ and he pitched the $\geqslant 9$ when declarer continued with dummy's $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$, ruffing in hand. His next move was to pitch a heart on a diamond, but West ruffed and played the V , ensuring a one trick defeat, -100 .

Given enough entries, the best line in the trump suit is low to the ten, which offers a $56.23 \%$ chance of taking three tricks. As the cards lie declarer could have got home by playing the $\boldsymbol{\sim}$ at trick four, or by playing a club to the ace and a club.
 declarer got up to five tricks, -300 and 9 IMPs that saw Amalia edge the first set 32-30
You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y5r4gt44
Board 9. Dealer North. EN Vul.


East led the $\begin{aligned} & \text { A and when West encouraged with the ten he contin- }\end{aligned}$ ued with the two, West winning with the king and switching to the $>5$. Declarer won with the ace and played the $\$ 3$, East putting up the queen and returning the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$, ducked, followed by the $\vee \mathrm{J}$. Declarer covered this
with dummy's king and West, who had pitched a diamond on the previous round now fatally pitched a second diamond instead of ruffing. Declarer pitched a club, ran the $\$ 9$, discarded a club on the $\$$, ruffed a heart, crossed to the A and waited to score his for +110.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Paske | King | Jones | Castner |
| - | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{Q}$ | All Pass |  |

Rather than speculate with the $\downarrow$ East started with the $P$ and declarer won in dummy and played the 5 (the nine saves a trick) for the eight, ten and queen, East continuing with the $\vee 10$. West ruffed and switched to the $>5$, the defenders playing three rounds of the suit. Declarer pitched a club, East ruffed, exited with a club and declarer had only six tricks, -100 and the lead changed hands.

```
Board 13. Dealer North. All Vul.
    & K984
    * QJ76
    - }
& Q632
```


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gruenke | Hydes | Rohowsky | Mossop |
| - | Pass | 19* | 1* |
| Pass | 14 | 23 | All Pass |

## A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE - July 2019

South led the $\uparrow 9$ and declarer took North's jack with the ace, cashed the top clubs (South pitching the $\$ 8$ ) and played a spade to the eight followed by the $\vee 8$ for the queen and king. After cashing the $\vee 10$, declarer ruffed a heart, ruffed a spade and claimed nine tricks, +110 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Paske | King | Jones | Castner |
| - | Pass | 1\% | $1{ }^{1}$ |
| Pass | Pass | 19 | 14 |
| 23 | 24 | 3\% | All Pass |

South led the $\$$ A and switched to the 2 . Declarer won with dummy's ace and played a club to the ace. When South followed with the declarer could have abandoned the trump suit and played three rounds of hearts, after which he will be able to ruff a heart in dummy and make all the trumps in his hand. However, he cashed a second club and only then played three rounds of hearts. North won and cashed the O , the contract going two down, -200 and 7 IMPs that put Amalia back in front.

Eagle eyed readers will have spotted that an initial spade lead is best, as it preserves North's diamond and should ensure a one trick defeat.

Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul.

- K9864
- J104
- QJ9
$\div 42$
$-{ }^{-1} 22$
- AK875
- 93

- 10
- K653
- 106432

1086

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gruenke | Hydes | Rohowsky | Mossop |
| - | - | 19* | Pass |
| $1 *$ | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | 39 | Pass |
| 4** | Pass | 4** | Pass |
| 4NT* | Pass | 6\% | All Pass |


| 4e | Optional RKCB |
| :--- | :--- |
| $4 \uparrow$ | 3 key cards |
| 4 NT | \&Q? |

South led the unlucky $>3$ and a grateful declarer went up with dummy's queen, ruffed a diamond, drew trumps and claimed, +920 .


South led the 6 and declarer won with dummy's nine and played the 2 .
North went in with the king and played a second spade, -50 and 14 IMPs.

## Board 16. Dealer West. EM Vul.



West led the $\uparrow 6$ and declarer won with the ace and ran the 10 , East winning with the jack and switching to the $\$ 7$. Declarer's jack lost to the king and West played a second heart, East winning with the jack and returning the $\$ 3$. Declarer won with dummy's king and tried the $\mathbf{Q}$. West won that, cashed the $\upharpoonright 9$ and exited with a spade. Three rounds of the suit ensured a trick for the K and that was -150 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paske | King | Jones | Castner |
| $1+$ | Double | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

After the same opening lead declarer played a spade to the queen at trick two and was rewarded when East ducked. A diamond to the queen saw West win and play a second heart, declarer ducking, winning the third round and exiting with a heart. West won, cashed the $\boldsymbol{A}$ and exited with a club, but declarer put in dummy's queen and cashed the ace on which
a desperate West unblocked the king, giving declarer the rest, +150 and 7 IMPs, leaving Amalia ahead 61-35.
You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/y6gtdenk

```
Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.
* J
* 1094
- KQ1065
& 9732
```



```
Open Room
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
King & JuHackett & Castner & Hackett \\
\(1 母\) & Pass & \(2 \boldsymbol{\psi}\) & Pass \\
\(2 \boldsymbol{2 N}\) & Pass & \(2 \boldsymbol{y}\) & Pass \\
2NT & Pass & \(4 \boldsymbol{y}\) & All Pass
\end{tabular}
```

North led the $\mathbf{~} \boldsymbol{J}$ for the queen, king and ace and declarer ruffed a diamond and played a heart to the queen, continuing with the king when it held. South won, cashed the 10 and played a third spade, promoting North’s $\vee 10,+620$.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paske | Gruenke | Jones | Rohowski |
| 1NT | Pass | 2** | Pass |
| 29 | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| 37 | Pass | 4 | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | 69 | All Pass |
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When North led the $\varangle K$ declarer could ruff in dummy and play on trumps, quickly claiming, +1430 and 13 IMPs that might have gone the other way. Anyone for 6e?
Board 21. Dealer North. N/S Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| King | Ju Hackett | Castner | Hackett |
| - | Pass | 1\% | 14 |
| 2\% | 2* | 3* | Pass |
| Pass | 39 | Pass | 4 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

East led the 4 and West won with the ace and returned the 2 , Eat winning and playing a second diamond. Declarer won drew the outstanding trump and finished with ten tricks, +130 .


Unwilling to bid a red suit (West would have to lead a club to be sure of defeating $4 \curlyvee$ ) South relied on his spades. West led the 4 and declarer's task was hopeless. He finished with eight tricks, -200 and an 8 IMP loss.

Mossop won the set 24-0 to trail by 2 IMPs - hold on to your seats!
You can replay these deals here or https://tinyurl.com/yxkdw8qm


North led the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ and declarer won with the king, crossed to the $\boldsymbol{2} \mathrm{K}$, pitched a diamond on the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and played two rounds of spades. The defenders were helpless; declarer could establish a spade trick and one way or another was sure to come to eight tricks, +180 .

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ja Hackett | Gruenke | Hackett | Rohowski |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \mathbf{1 0}$ | Pass | $1 母$ | Pass |
| 10 | Pass | $1 N T$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2 e}$ | All Pass |  |  |

After the same lead declarer won，cashed the crossed to the king and pitched a diamond on the A ．He then played on spades and claimed eight tricks，+90 but a loss of 3 IMPs．

Board 27．Dealer South．None Vul．
－Q654
－K984
－AJ2
＊A5

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { A10972 } \\ & \text { Q76 } \\ & \text { 4 } \\ & \text { Q987 } \end{aligned}$ | $W^{N}$  <br>  $E$ | $8653$ | $32$ $1062$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Castner | Jones | King | Paske |
| － |  | King | $1{ }^{*}$ |
| 14 | Double＊ | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 24＊ | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

East stated with two rounds of spade and declarer claimed eleven tricks， +460 ．

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ja Hackett | Gruenke | Hackett | Rohowski |
| - | - | - | 1 |
| 1ヵ | Double＊$^{*}$ | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{a}^{\star}$ | Double | 3 |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | Pass | 5 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

South took a Pass card out of his bidding box after 3NT，but then changed his mind．West led the 8 and declarer won with dummy＇s ace，drew trumps ending in dummy and played a heart to the jack－two down and an 11 IMP loss that gave Mossop the lead．

Here＇s something to ponder－East was known to have an honour in both spades and clubs（and possibly two in the latter）．Is that enough for declarer to play a heart to the ace and then advance the jack，intending to run it if not covered，and take the ruffing heart finesse if it is？

```
Board 28．Dealer West．N／S Vul．
Q 104
\(\checkmark 1054\)
－AKJ8
－K105
\begin{tabular}{|ll|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\(N\) \\
\\
\\
\\
\\
\hline
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
－ 93
－AJ762
－Q3
－ 7532
－ 96
－K85
－KJ6
－ 1096
－Q742
```

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Castner | Jones | King | Paske |
| Pass | 1 | $1 \vee$ | 1NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
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West led the $\mathbb{Q}$ and declarer won with the king and played the $\downarrow 9$ for the jack and queen, East returning the $\geqslant 2$. Declarer won with dummy's ten, cashed two diamonds and exited with a heart. East cashed three tricks in the suit and declarer kept three spades and two clubs in hand and $\mathrm{Q} 10 \$ 8 \mathrm{~K} 10$ in dummy. West had pitched a club and East a spade, so declarer could claim
 when East exited with a spade, +90 .

Perhaps East's best chance is to keep all four clubs and hope declarer discards badly. In some situations, declarer may have to discard dummy's winning diamond!

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Ja Hackett | Gruenke | Hackett | Rohowski |
| Pass | 19 | $1 母$ | 1NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West led the 46 and declarer won with the king and ran the $\$ 10$, East winning and switching to the $\vee 2$. When declarer played low West could win and return a heart setting up seven tricks for the defence, +100 and 5 IMPs, Mossop ahead 75-64.

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Castner | Jones | King | Paske |
| - | $1 \boldsymbol{2 N}$ | Pass | $2 \mathbf{N}^{*}$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $3 \%$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

It is possible that N/S were at cross-purposes, South thinking that 2NT was weak, while North though that rebidding $2 \diamond$ would show that type. +690 was not much of a result.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ja Hackett | Gruenke | Hackett | Rohowski |
| - | 120 | Pass | 2** |
| Pass | 29 | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 4NT* | Pass | 54* |
| Double | Pass | Pass | 6NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

That was worth 13 IMPs, enough for the lead to change hands once more, but it was not an auction to stir the blood, with the excellent $7 \boldsymbol{〔}$ apparently never in the picture.

## Board 31. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

## - A95 <br> $\checkmark 1083$ <br> - A54 <br> 2 Q1043



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Castner | Jones | King | Paske |
| - | - | - | 1 |
| $3 \sum$ | 3NT | Pass | $4 N T$ |

All Pass
East led the to dummy's ace and declarer cashed the A and exited with the five, West winning and exiting with the 2 . Declarer won with the ace and played the Q , establishing a tenth trick. West does best to duck that, but he won and returned a club and declarer won, crossed to dummy with a spade and claimed the rest on a double squeeze - each defender would be forced down to a single diamond, +460 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Ja Hackett | Gruenke | Hackett | Rohowski |
| - | - | - | $1 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $2 \downarrow$ | Pass | $4 \vee$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West led his spade and declarer took East's eight with the king, cashed the $\vee \mathrm{A}$, played the $\uparrow 8$ to dummy's ace and ducked a heart to West's queen. A club went to dummy's ten, East's jack and declarer's ace, and
the outstanding trump was drawn. Declarer's next move was to play a spade to the ace -and with it went the contract. When West discarded declarer tried a diamond to the queen, but West won and exited with a diamond and declarer had only nine tricks.

Having drawn the last trump declarer must cash two more hearts, forcing West down to $\& \mathrm{~K} 98 \leqslant \mathrm{~K} 10$. Then cashing the Q and playing a spade to the ace squeezes West, who can be thrown in with whichever king he blanks.
The simplest line for declarer is to take two rounds of trumps, unblock the A and then play on spades, which is sure to deliver at least 10 tricks. However, perhaps the best line is to win the opening lead in dummy and run the $\geqslant 8$. West wins and does best to exit with a club, but declarer wins, cashes a top heart and then plays on spades. Even if West can ruff a spade he will be endplayed.

13 IMPs to Mossop suddenly ahead by 11.

```
Board32. Dealer West. E/W Vul.
& QJ872
` 732
* J9
* A72
```


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Castner | Jones | King | Paske |
| 19 | 14 | 2 | 24 |
| 3** | Pass | 39 | All Pass |
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North led the Q and declarer won in dummy and played a club for the queen and ace. North switched to the $\downarrow \mathrm{J}$ for the king and ace and South returned a trump, won the next club and played a second trump, ensuring one down, +100 .

## Closed Room

West North East South Ja HackettGruenke Hackett Rohowski

| $1 \%$ | 2 | DoublePass <br> $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

Considering the results at this table, I expected South to double 3NT. Although it would have been unlikely to affect the outcome there is a remote chance that declarer might attempt to make it, playing for spades to be 6-2, winning the spade lead and playing a club, with South failing to win and play a second spade and North failing to switch to the $\downarrow \mathrm{J}$. Then declarer can play a second club towards dummy and South will be caught in the endgame.

Whatever, declarer won the spade lead and cashed five hearts pitching diamonds, hoping for a miracle lie and a defensive error. Nothing doing so two down, but Mossop could afford the 3 IMP loss.
You can replay the deals here or https://tinyurl.com/yy6wwzq6
Yet another feather in the cap of Paske and Jones -the hottest pair in the country.

'Malahide regional bridge club has announced the revival of Malahide bridge congress. First organised in 1965 the congress was subsequently discontinued. The renewal of the festival will take place at the hom of the original event, Grand hotel over the weekend of March 6th to 8th, 2020.'

Irish Times Seamus Dowling Bridge Notes March $9^{\text {th }}$.

The Programme will have Gala Open Pairs, Mixed Pairs and Novice Pairs on its Opening night of Friday March $6^{\text {th }}$ Saturday is a Pairs day of 2 sessional Congress, Intermediate A and B categories and these categories will be repeated for 2 sessional Teams on Sunday $8^{\text {th }}$ finishing around 5.30 pm . These competitions are all pre entry and repeated for 2 sessional Teams on Sunday 8 finishing around $5.30 p m$. Th.

The Grand Hotel Malahide is an excellent Congress venue with superb facilities and it has much more to offer with its gorgeous view of Dublin bay and being situated in the historic and homely village of Malahide.
Visit http://www.visitmalahide.ie/ to know more about Malahide and all it has to offer from Medieval Castle to beaches with coastal walks and it is a 10-minute drive from Dublin Airport.
You might consider adding Malahide Bridge Congress to your diary for 2020!
For more information:
Malahide Regional Bridge Club email: malahidebridgecongress@mrbc.ie
Brochure will be found on
...when ready....
http://malahideregionalbridgeclub.com/
The Grand Hotel Malahide
email: info@the grand.ie
Quote Bridge Congress
Phone: +353 18450000
https://www.thegrand.ie/contact-us/
MALAHIDE BRIDGE CONGRESS March $6^{\text {th }}$ to $8^{\text {th }} 2020$ GRAND HOTEL MALAHIDE
will be run under the auspices of the Contract Bridge Association of Ireland (CBAI)

## Enterprising Bridge Tales: The Next Generation <br> By Marc Smith

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

Captain's log, stardate 21318.1. I am sad to record that only one of the two teams containing USS Competitor crew members survived the Round of 16, the team led by Chief Engineer O'Brain losing by just 6 UMPs to a strong Kazon team. By a quirk of fate, the winners of that match will now play the tournament favourites, whose number include our own Daniel Prussia and Lieutenant-Commander Dieter in today's quarter-finals. Good luck to them against last year's Delta Quadrant Championship finalists

All seats are taken and there are kibitzers standing five or six rows deep at all eight tables as the players arrive for the first stanza of the quarter-final matches. As he heads for his table, Daniel spots a couple of familiar faces across the room - not people he knows, but those he has seen pictured regularly in Universal Bridge Magazine since he first discovered the game. It occurs to him what a daunting task still awaits them if they are to win this event. Not only will he be sitting at the table with those legends from his magazine pages, but he will have somehow to defeat them in battle.

That is all for the future, though. First, they must make it through today's match, against a team whose reputation precedes them. Daniel fights his way through the throng of eager kibitzers to reach his seat. Already at the table are two huge humanoid creatures dressed in black leather, as if ready for hand-to-hand combat against Klingons. Thick, dark, unkempt hair frames faces that are made distinctive by wide, hooked noses and a prominent, bony ridge that runs from the top of the nose into the hairline. Smaller bony threads spread from the ridge, like the branches of a tree, across their forehead. Neither of them seems to have visited a dentist lately or, for that matter, a barber.
"We are Ogla," says the Kazon on Daniel's left.
"Daniel," responds Daniel, pointing to himself, "and Dieter."
"I don't think that Ogla is their name," interjects Dieter, quietly. "That is their tribe, the branch of the Kazon nation from which they come."
"The android is right," confirms the Kazon. "The Ogla and the Relora are the two most powerful of the original eight tribes of the Kazon nation. It has been only during the current generation that we have stopped fighting each other, and today we have a pair of Reloras at the other table. Our Ogla brothers will come in for the next set."

Further conversation is interrupted by the arrival of the boards, and the players draw their cards for the first deal.


Left Hand Kazon leads a low heart against what appears to be a routine game contract and Daniel studies dummy, unaware that the VuGraph
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commentators are already predicting that he is destined to flounder on the rocks of unfriendly distribution.

Daniel wins in hand with the $A \checkmark$ and immediately cashes a high spade, West's club discard revealing the bad news about the trump suit. Undeterred, he now plays a low club towards dummy. West plays low smoothly, but Daniel rises with dummy’s ${ }^{\mathrm{K}}$ and then continues with a second club to his ten and West's ace.

Daniel wins the heart continuation with the king and ruffs dummy's third heart. Next comes a low diamond, dummy's king winning. Daniel now ruffs a club in his hand to leave this ending:

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q105 } \\ & \frac{1}{62} \\ & - \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ - |  | ヘ J 987 |
| - Q10 |  | - - |
| - A10 | W E | - J |
| $\bigcirc 9$ | S | - - |
|  | , K |  |
|  | - - |  |
|  | - Q873 |  |
|  | - - |  |

Daniel now cashes the $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} \mathrm{K}$ and exits with a low diamond. The defenders can choose to win in either hand, but there is no way for East to avoid being endplayed in trumps, either now or after ruffing at trick eleven. Four side-suit winners and six trumps tricks add up to ten: $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}+420$ and some of the kibitzers crowded around the table show their appreciation with a smattering of applause as the players return their cards to the board.

That first deal produces the largest swing of the first set, when Daniel's Vulcans teammates escape for - 100 in Three Hearts Doubled. At that table, T'Grau overcalled South's One Diamond opening with an Unusual Two Notrumps, making it difficult for the Kazon North/South to find their spade fit. Whether that was a good thing or not, though, no one will ever know.

With 12 of the 48 boards played the favourites lead, but only by 11 UMPs (13-2). Daniel and Dieter sit out the second set and their teammates add another 2 UMPs to their advantage. The team completes the rotation
in the third set, with the Vulcans on the side-lines, but the Kazon team lives up to its advanced billing and proves to be unwilling to go quietly.

As a wild third set draws to a close, it is quite possible that either side could find themselves significantly ahead or behind. On the final deal of the stanza, the Romulans reach an ambitious Six Diamonds on these cards:

```
Dealer South. Both Vul
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
- \(A Q 10\) \\
- 752 \\
- KJ753 \\
- A9
\end{tabular} & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{8}{*}{\[
\]} & & - 975 \\
\hline & & - KJ96 \\
\hline & W E & -82 \\
\hline & S & ¢ J 1042 \\
\hline & - K62 & \\
\hline & - AQ83 & \\
\hline & - A964 & \\
\hline & 2 Q6 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & \begin{tabular}{c} 
North \\
Radwill
\end{tabular} & East & \begin{tabular}{c} 
South \\
Mickstorm
\end{tabular} \\
- & - & - & \(1 N T\) \\
Pass & \(2 N T\) & Pass & \(3 \$\) \\
Pass & \(3 \uparrow\) & Pass & \(4 \uparrow\) \\
Pass & \(6 \$\) & All Pass &
\end{tabular}
```

Eric Radwill's 2NT response is a transfer to diamonds and the Three Diamond bid confirms a fit. Radwill advances with a Three Spade cuebid, denying a heart control, so Mickstorm's return spade cue-bid denies a top club but promises a heart control. Radwill's jump to slam comes with no guarantees, but is in keeping with the frenzied action during this third stanza.

After considerable thought, West leads the $\vee 10$ around to Mickstorm's queen.
"Well, at least that's one finesse I don't have to worry about," thinks declarer, noting that there are still hurdles to overcome if he is to make
twelve tricks.
After winning trick one with the Q , his first move is to tackle the trump suit by leading low to dummy's king. The appearance of the $\$ 10$ from West gives declarer a choice, but Mickstorm accurately judges to rise with the ace on the second round of trumps, and down comes West's queen. Next comes a spade to dummy's ace and a heart to East's jack and declarer's ace.

Jeffrey Mickstorm sits back in his chair and contemplates the end position. If hearts were 3-3 to start with, he can simply concede a trick in that suit now, setting up a discard for his losing club. East's play is certainly consistent with a holding of $ఇ \mathrm{KJ} 6$.

West took a long time to lead the $\vee 10$, though.
"Would he have thought so long with 109x," muses declarer.
Eventually deciding that West must have held unattractive leads in all four suits, Mickstorm cashes his spades, eliminating that suit, and then plays a club to the ace and exits with a second round of clubs. Winning with the K , West has only black cards left and thus dummy's heart loser disappears on the enforced ruff-and-discard. An exciting +1370 !

The scoring of the third set is a rollercoaster of emotions, as first one side and then the other gains a major swing. When the dust settles, the Kazons have won the stanza by 38-33, reducing the deficit to just 8 UMPs with one 12 -board set remaining.

The Vulcans watched the third set on VuGraph, and the stress of doing so seems to have adversely affected Sartak. Looking decidedly green around the gills, he confesses that he is not feeling at his best and suggests that the team should continue as they were for the final stanza.
"I hope it wasn't that Klingon food we ate last night," comments Jeffrey Mickstorm, putting an arm around his ailing teammate's shoulder. "There's a highly-recommended Xindi place I've booked for us all this evening."

With that, the Romulans head off for their table as the Vulcans return to the VuGraph theatre. When Daniel and Dieter return to their seats, they find that they are pitted against the same Ogla Kazon pair against whom they began the match.
"Well that was exciting, wasn't it," comments the more gregarious of the warrior tribe. "Let battle begin."

The early boards of the final set suggest that the Great Dealer has
returned to his slumbers after the excursions of the pervious set. After lulling both players and kibitzers into a false sense of security, though, he suddenly throws a massive firework into the mix.

## Dealer East. Both Vul.

|  | ¢ AJ72 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $$ |  |
|  |  |  |
| - Q953 <br> - KQ1043 <br> - A <br> 2 QJ9 | N | - 864 |
|  |  | - AJ97652 |
|  | W E | - K3 |
|  | S | -7 |
|  | ( K10 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 8$ |  |
|  | - 1087652 |  |
|  | - K652 |  |


| West | North | East | South <br> Daniel |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | Dieter |  | $3 \downarrow$ |
| $4 \checkmark$ | - | Pass |  |
| Double | All Pass | Pass | 5 |

The auction starts in similar fashion at both tables. Whilst the Romulan West opts to save in Five Hearts, which costs -500, the Kazon takes the more aggressive stance and produces a red double card.

It is clear both to the players and massed crowds watching that the result on this deal could easily determine a match that has been nip-and-tuck throughout. Indeed, there are 18 UMPs in the balance, as Daniel can gain 6 UMPs by bringing home his doubled contract whereas failure will result in a 12 -UMP loss.

West opens the $¥$ K against Five Diamonds Doubled and, when dummy appears, it looks as though Daniel has three inescapable losers unless he can bring home the club suit for no loser. Either the suit could break 2-2, or he could find East with a singleton honour, so all is not lost. Those watching on VuGraph, who can see all four hands, can see that there is no winning line in the club suit, and the commentators are already
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commending the Kazon's brave decision to defend.
Daniel has an alternative idea, though. He ruffs the opening lead in dummy and immediately plays a trump. When West wins trick two with the $\boxtimes$ A he finds himself endplayed, but he keeps defensive chances alive by exiting with a low spade. Winning with the $\$ 10$, Daniel starts the process of stripping the side suits: he plays off the $₫ \mathrm{~K}$, crosses to dummy with the and cashes the discarding a club from his hand. He then ruffs dummy's last spade and lays down the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$.

Whether clubs break 2-2 or 3-1 makes no difference now. As it happens, East discards on this trick, but when Daniel then exits with a trump East has to win and surrender a ruff-and-discard. Away goes Daniel's last club loser and the doubled game has come home.

Play finishes and Daniel is fairly confident as he awaits the return of his teammates. Few UMPs change hands on the early deals and a win is just about assured by the time the team gain 6 UMPs on the final deal of the set. They win the stanza 17-7 and the match by 18 UMPs. They are into the semi-finals tomorrow, and at least one member of the team is looking forward to a glass or two or celebratory Romulan ale this evening.
"That's lucky," observes Mickstorm, studying the scorecard. "If you had gone down in Five Diamonds Doubled on the last deal, we would have missed our reservation time at the Xindi restaurant."
"We might also have lost the match in extra boards," points out Dieter.
"Ah, my android friend," laughs Mickstorm, putting an arm around Dieter's shoulder as the team head out of the playing area. "We really must educate you about priorities."
"Priorities," says Dieter, thoughtfully. "The plural or priority. An item's relative importance. The goal of a person or organization..."
"You really are a funny guy," says Mickstorm, smiling broadly.
"I am?" queries Dieter, clearly not understanding at all.

## New Honors Books from

 Master Point Press THE BRIDGE PUBLISHER

## Crocs on Squeeze Play Volume 1 \& 2

## Stephen Kennedy

From the mind of a junior bridge player comes two new books designed to challenge the norm and push squeeze play to its absolute limits. Well-known squeezes are thoroughly examined and dissected, and a variety of all-new squeezes are brought into the light of day.

## 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.
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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.
- 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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## FUNBRIDGE

## Out of Order

Playing in an early round of the Spingold I pick up what we call in my club a 'Marilyn' i.e., a shapely hand:

```
& }
* A10742
- 7
* AQ9762
```

With only the opponent's vulnerable my partner opens $1 \downarrow$. With a stronger hand I would start with $2 \boldsymbol{e}$, intending to bid hearts on the next round (and possibly the one after that) but here I content myself with $1 \vee$. When partner rebids 1 NT I continue with $2 *$ which we play as a relay. In reply partner bids $2 \downarrow$, promising three card heart support and, although I may not make it, I jump to $4 \boldsymbol{V}$.

This has been our moderately scientific auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | $1 \downarrow$ | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $1 N T$ | Pass | $2 \mathbf{N}^{*}$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\psi}$ | Pass | $4 \downarrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

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

```
& }1084
* K65
- AQ94
* K10
& }
` A10742
-7
* AQ9762
```

Many players would have rebid 1s with North's cards, but I have no objection to my partner's choice, which immediately limits his hand.

When East encourages spades by following with the two, West continues with the king and I ruff. As West did not overcall 14 I am inclined to place him with not more than four spades.

As far as I can see $4 \vee$ needs only reasonable breaks in hearts and clubs, so I continue with a heart to the king and heart to the ace. When East discards the seven of spades on this trick I get my first inkling that all in the garden may not be rosy.

When I continue with a low club West ruffs, cashes the queen of hearts and exits with a spade. I ruff and take a losing diamond finesse, finishing two down.

The full deal:


## Post mortem

On this deal the old advice of tacking the side suit first would have stood declarer in good stead. After ruffing the second spade a low club reveals the 5-0 split. It does West no good to ruff, so after the king of clubs holds declarer plays the ten. Again it does not help West to ruff, so declarer ruffs a spade and continues with the ace of clubs. If West ruffs in with the nine declarer overruffs with dummy's king, cashes the ace of diamonds, ruffs a diamond and plays the queen of clubs. West ruffs high, but declarer pitches a spade from dummy and must take three of the last four tricks.
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At the other table declarer did play a club at trick three and West discarded a diamond and did the same on the next round of clubs. Now declarer ruffed a spade and fatally played a diamond to the queen. East won with the king and played a spade and in due course West collected two trump tricks for one down.

## Grand Designs

Towards the end of a long knock out match, I pick up a fine hand:

```
\(\rightarrow\) A
- AQ10974
-KQ105
```

* K6

With only our side vulnerable I open $1 \mathbb{1}$ and partner responds $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ which we play as forcing to game. I am about to reach into my bidding box when East enters from the wings with 44. That's awkward, as although I have enough to contemplate a slam we have not yet established a fit. I wonder how partner would interpret a bid of 4 NT at this stage? Eventually I decide to take the bull by the horns and bid 5 . When partner continues with 5NT I interpret it as promising length in diamonds as well as clubs. Backing my judgement I bid 7 7 .

This has been our brief, but complex, auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | $1 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | $5 \boldsymbol{*}^{*}$ |
| Pass | $5 N T^{*}$ | Pass | $7 \downarrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West leads the ten of spades and I get only an average dummy:

```
& Q73
\bullet }
* A987
* AQ1085
A A
` AQ10974
* KQ105
* K6
```


## bid72 <br> 
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 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.
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## Deals that Caught My Eye

David Bird looks at the round-of-16 in the 2019 Open USBC

Plenty of big names from the USA bridge world played in the 2019 Open USBC (Bermuda Bowl trials), contested in Schaumburg, Illinois. We will look at some big swings, seeking to assign the blame/praise to one or more players, or to Lady Luck.

Our first deal, Donn faces Hill and East has a choice of opening leads against 3 NT :

Seg 1. Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cheek | Dwyer | Bertens | Huang |
| - | - | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | 2 | Double | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\beta}$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

What would you lead from the East hand? The choice is between a diamond, giving declarer a trick in that suit, or a major-suit lead in the hope that West can win and lead through declarer's diamonds.

Bertens led the $\$ 9$, Dwyer winning with the $\downarrow$ J. Since East had not opened the bidding, declarer placed the with West. Rather than
playing on clubs, he hoped for five spade tricks. He cashed the A and played a heart to the ace for a finesse of the $\boldsymbol{\perp}$. Bertens won with the queen and crossed to partner's for a diamond return. The game was two down.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bathurst | R.Lee | J.Lall | Korbel |
| - | - | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{*}$ |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{*}$ |
| Pass | $2 \star$ | Double | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

At this table Lall preferred to lead the $\vee 6$ and declarer was able to set up the club suit, making 3NT with two overtricks. The confident leap to 3NT perhaps suggested a chunky diamond stopper. In that case it might not be good enough to find partner with the $\vee$ A. One lead through declarer's diamonds would not suffice to beat the contract.

On the next board, declarer must aim to keep control against a hostile trump break.

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & \[
\] & \\
\hline - - & & - QJ102 \\
\hline - K873 & & - QJ2 \\
\hline -KQ108743 & W E & - A62 \\
\hline -84 & S & - QJ2 \\
\hline & - K873 & \\
\hline & \(\checkmark 4\) & \\
\hline & - 5 & \\
\hline & AK97653 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```
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| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Cheek | Dwyer | Bertens | Huang |
| - | - | - | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| 3 | Double | 4 | 4 |

How would you tackle the deal when West leads the $\$ K$ and a second diamond to partner's ace? Huang ruffed and turned immediately to his main
 side suit. The was followed by a club ruff with the 4 . All followed and the key moment had been reached. A low trump to the king, followed by good clubs, allows declarer to maintain control.
'Ace of trumps, please,' said Huang, and the game could no longer be made. He played the $\vee \mathrm{A}$, a heart ruff, the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ and the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$. A good club, ruffed by East, set up a trump winner for North but this was only a ninth trick.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bathurst | R.Lee | J.Lall | Korbel |
| - | - | - | $1 e$ |
| 4 | Double | Pass | 4 |

All Pass
The play started in the same way, but Korbel made no mistake after ruffing a club at trick 4 . He crossed to his $\Delta \mathrm{K}$ and played good clubs for a swing of 12 IMPs.

Next we will see the biggest swing in the match between Pratap and Lo.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wildavsky | B.Miller | Doub | Schermer |
| - | - | - | $1 \Delta$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2 e}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{a}$ | All Pass |  |

Nine tricks were made after the $\star$ A lead and a $\vee 10$ switch. No hint of a big swing was noted. Perhaps there would be more action at the other table. Let's see.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Koneru | $G u$ | Pratap | Robbins |
| - | - | - | $1 \Delta$ |
| 1 NT | Double | 2 | Pass |
| $2 \downarrow$ | Double | All Pass |  |

The meaning of East's 2 is not available. Whether it was a transfer bid or showed both red suits, North's penalty double of $2 \vee$ was surely a risky venture. His trumps have no texture and his four points in spades are likely to be wasted. The double of 1 NT , followed by a $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ bid, would have shown his hand well.

Gu led a trump to the ace and South switched to the 2 . Declarer finessed the successfully and played on trumps. North won the third round with the king and played a spade to the queen and ace. Koneru
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reached dummy with a spade ruff and drew North's last trump. He then led the 9 , covered by the king and ace. Declarer scored the rest of his club suit and the $\$$ A. He lost the final trick to South's $\$ 10$ but that was two overtricks and a bonanza of +1070 for a swing of 15 IMPs.
An important area of bidding involves judgement at the five-level when both sides have a good fit somewhere. Let's see what instruction we can draw from this board between Morris NPC and Kriegel:

Seg 3, Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- 972
- J954
- K 10
* 10432

| - 5 <br> - K3 <br> - A8542 <br> \& AJ975 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Passell | Platnik | Jacobus | Diamond |
| - | Pass | 14 | 2NT |
| 49 | 5\% | 54 | All Pass |

Let's accept the $1 \mathbf{~}-2 N T$ start, made at both tables. What should West bid then? Three actions might draw votes on an expert bidding panel: double, 3 (Unusual over unusual, to show a sound spade fit), and 4↔. Of these three, I like an immediate 4 ¢ least, since it does not describe the hand-type well.

North's 5\% was questionable and could prove expensive opposite some of the white-against-red 2NT bids that you see. Nor do I think highly of East's $5 \boldsymbol{4}$, with his $\boldsymbol{\$}$ K likely to be a dead duck under the UNT bidder. I dare say he might claim that partner's 40 had misled him. A trump was led and three tricks had to be lost for -100 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kriegel | Wold | Smith | Levine |
| - | Pass | $1 \mathbf{4}$ | $2 N T$ |
| 3 | $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ | $4 \boldsymbol{i}$ | $5 \boldsymbol{i}$ |
| Double | All Pass |  |  |

The first five bids look good to me. I'm a little surprised that Levine took a second bid on his hand, with no extra shape and good defence, but it was the right decision as the cards lay.

Wold won the diamond lead with the king and led the $\boldsymbol{\omega}$. Smith rose with the $\mathbf{Q} \mathrm{Q}$ (is it not better to play low, when you want a diamond ruff?) and switched to the $\vee 8$. Declarer can escape for one down if he rises with the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$. When he played low, West won with the queen and delivered a diamond ruff. The sacrifice was then three down for a loss of 500 and 12 IMPs away.

We continue with a cardplay problem in 3 NT :

```
Seg 3, Board 10. Dealer East Both Vul.
4 A42
* A1092
- A54
* AJ8
```

```
@ KJ873
```

@ KJ873
\bullet}
\bullet}

- Q982
- Q982
* Q92

|  | $N$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $W^{2}$ | $E$ |
|  | $S$ |

96

- KQJ875
- 107
4 Q 105
- 43
- KJ63
- K653

```

Open Room
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Zolotow & Kranyak & Eisenstein & Demuy \\
- & - & \(2 \boldsymbol{c}\) & Pass \\
Pass & \(2 N T\) & Pass & 3NT \\
All Pass & & &
\end{tabular}

Kranyak ducked the \(\vee Q\) lead and won the \(\triangle \mathrm{K}\) continuation. A diamond to the jack lost to the queen, and West's 2 continuation went to the 10 and king. A club to the jack was followed by a spade to the queen and king, West then clearing a diamond trick for himself. Declarer led the \(\vee 10\) to create an extra trick in his direction, and the 3-3 club break then gave him the contract for +600 .

\section*{Closed Room}
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Hinze & Tebha & Grainger & Warner \\
- & - & \(2 \downarrow\) & Pass \\
Pass & \(2 N T\) & Pass & \(3 N T\)
\end{tabular}
All Pass

At this table, declarer won the \(\bigvee \mathrm{K}\) lead, which reduced his chances of scoring a second heart trick. He continued with the \(\forall A\) and a diamond to the jack and queen, West returning the \(\downarrow 9\) to dummy's king. A finesse of the j was successful and all followed to the A .

If declarer places the \(\boldsymbol{\wedge} \mathrm{K}\) with West, he can succeed now by playing two more rounds of clubs and endplaying West with a diamond. The enforced spade exit would give declarer two spades, one heart, two diamonds and four clubs. Tebha preferred to play a spade to the 10. If this had forced the king, West then cashing his \(\uparrow 8\), declarer would have had nine tricks on the club break. He might succeed also if East held \(\uparrow \mathrm{Kx}\) and rose with the king. As it was, he lost 12 IMPs. We can say that there was a fair amount of luck involved in this swing. It does seem, though, that it is better to duck the \(\uparrow \mathrm{K}\) lead.

Are you up for an opening lead problem? The bidding is 14 (on your right) \(-2 \boldsymbol{4}-4\). What would you lead from this hand:
- A974 \(\vee\) KJ4 5 KJ1094


Open Room
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Passell & Smith & Jacobus & Kriegel \\
- & - & \(1 \uparrow\) & Pass \\
\(2 \boldsymbol{4}\) & Pass & \(4 \boldsymbol{4}\) & All Pass
\end{tabular}

Taf Anthias and I reached several general conclusions in our book 'Winning Suit Contract Leads', which used computer simulations to calculate the best leads. One of them was 'Singleton leads are gold dust'. Another was 'Leading from a king is often expensive and not to be recommended'.

Whether Oren Kriegel has read the book or not I couldn't say, but he did lead the \(\leqslant 5\), drawing the jack, queen and ace. When the \(\leqslant 3\) was played next, South discarded a club and North won with the king. Declarer discarded a club on the \(\$ 8\) return and South ruffed.

Continuing his accurate defence, Kriegel led back the \(\mathbf{\$ 7}\), won with dummy’s. A club finesse lost to the king and South played ace and another trump, clearing the dummy's trumps. Declarer had already lost four tricks. He could ditch one club on the \(\$ 9\) but still had to lose another club trick for two down.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Closed Room & & & \\
West & North & East & South \\
Platnik & J.Clerkin & Diamond & D.Clerkin \\
\(-\quad 1\) & - & Pass \\
2 & Pass & 4 & All Pass
\end{tabular}

The Clerkin brothers may have saved themselves a few dollars by not buying a certain erudite book, but it cost them 11 IMPs on this deal. Dennis Clerkin led the and declarer won with the queen. The was followed by a club ruff with the 8 ; North was unable to overruff. The \(\vee\) A and a heart ruff allowed declarer to ruff another club with the \(\boldsymbol{\$ 1 0}\). He then played a diamond to the ace and ruffed his last club with the \(\mathbf{Q}\). A second heart ruff gave declarer the first nine tricks and his \(\mathbf{\wedge} \mathrm{KJ}\) were worth a tenth trick.

The eventual winners of this trial would become the USA2 team in the Wuhan Bermuda Bowl.

\section*{ON THE OTHER HAND}


An Honors Book from Master Point Press

Master Point Press the bridge publisher

\section*{On The Other Hand:} Bridge cardplay explained
David Bird and Larry Cohen
In this unusual book, David Bird and Larry Cohen present cardplay instruction in a new way. 100 pairs of deals are shown, that look similar, but an entirely different line of play is necessary to make the contracts. Only by clearly understanding the techniques involved will you be able to tackle such deals at the table.

AVAILABLE FROM A BRIDGE RETAILER NEAR YOU
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\section*{Book Reviews}

\section*{Bridge Over the Rainbow : Sequel to 'If I Only Had a Heart' \\ Alex Adamson and Harry Smith \\ An Honors eBook from Master Point Press \\ 238pp. £12.95 US\$19.95}

Regular readers of New Bridge Magazine, or of its predecessor Bridge Magazine, will be familiar with these bridge tales from the land of Oz. For any readers not familiar, they are tales in the mould of David Bird's Abbot stories, or Mollo's Griffins. That is to say, a collection of interesting bridge hands set in a fictional narrative containing players with a range of human, and characteristically bridge, foibles.

It would be unreasonable to expect the humour to reach the standard of Mollo or Bird, but the authors make a good fist of it, and we can all recognise some of those annoying and (rather rarer) endearing charac-


Alex Adam.son \& Harry Smith ter types from our own bridge worlds.

The hands are well constructed, enjoyable, sometimes instructive, and the stories are entertaining but my preference would be for the balance to be weighted more towards the bridge hands and less to the tales of Oz. But that might in part reflect the fact that I have never been never a fan of the book or film.

Since I often in my reviews criticise books where proofing errors abound, it's nice to be able to say that they are almost non-existent in this one.

\section*{Getting to Good Slams: 30 Key Ideas \\ Terry Bossomaier}

An Honors e-Book from Master Point Press
199pp. US\$ 19.95 £12.95
Terry Bossomaier is an Australian Professor of Computer Science and Complex Systems, as well as a keen bridge player. In this book he explores the art - or science - of slam bidding, aiming to help average and aspiring players to bid a few more of them. While it is certainly true that many makeable slams are missed, at all levels of the game, it is also the case that many non-expert players lose more points by bidding failing slams, than they lose by bidding ones that they might (or might not) have made.

The author examines all the 100 hands from seven tournaments where 12 or 13 tricks were made. From these he has derived the " 30 key ideas" of the title. These thirty ideas are all, in their own way, useful, but there are both overlap and areas of contradiction between them. Perhaps more importantly thirty is simply too many 'key' ideas, as the author implicitly acknowledges by highlighting six of them in his concluding chapter.

The author's professorial background is reflected in his penchant for categorisation. Having noted that many slams can be made with fewer than the received wisdom figures of 33 points for a small or 37 for a grand slam, he proceeds to

identify them as 'skinny' if \(30 / 34\) points or fewer (small/grand), 'super skinny' if \(26 / 30\) or fewer, and 'seriously super skinny' if \(21 / 25\) or fewer. Whether this adds anything to our knowledge or learning is moot. Within his key ideas he classes slams as 'CR' where they make on a cross-ruff, or as 'LL' where there are two solid 5+ card suits and two outside tricks. I don't see how this helps much either, though it doesn't do any harm.

If the author's intention was for people to get better at bidding slams, particularly low point-count slams, by noting and using his key ideas, it might have been more intuitive and instructive to group the hands together to illustrate those ideas, rather than to present them in chronological order with the learning points scattered through the timeline.
I found the layout discomfiting. For each deal we see in the first instance only one of the hands, but the text then describes the bidding options as they relate to at least the partnership's and sometimes all four holdings. The full deal is laid out at the end of the section. This kind of thing is particularly awkward in an e-book, where scrolling back and forth is more cumbersome than with paper.

On the positive side, there is no doubt that many biddable slams are missed at the table, and study of these hands and the author's detailed and accurate analysis of what makes for an excess of tricks can only help pairs who want to improve their performance in this regard.

\section*{Kickback : Slam Bidding at Bridge. Second Edition}

\section*{Robert Munger}

An Honors eBook from Master Point Press
98pp. £8.95 US\$11.95
Some readers may not be familiar with the Kickback convention since, as the author says at the outset, "it has become popular in the expert community, but still isn't widely played among the rank and file of tournament players". In brief then, Kickback is an alternative to Roman Keycard Blackwood which uses (normally) the bid directly above the agreed trump suit as a keycard ask. It was created by Jeff Rubens in 1981, designed to create more space for exploration of partner's hand when clubs, diamonds or hearts are trumps.

Meunger's book is a comprehensive explanation of the convention, from its simplest elements to its most complex, including void showing responses, exclusion kickback, when to use 0314 responses and when 1430 , and third round control asks. Examples are plentiful, there is a
useful summary at the end of each chapter, and there are quizzes throughout. Anyone who wants to adopt Kickback will find all that they need in this book.

Having said that, they won't find it easy going. Of course any convention with many twists and variations takes hard work to learn - as Munger says near the end of the book, referring to an even fuller system set out elsewhere by Edwin Kantar "I can't remember the full-blown responses my brain is full". But even as someone who has played Kickback I found some parts of Munger's exposition hard to follow, so adopting the whole system is definitely not for the faint-hearted. It is of course possible to switch to Kickback without taking on all the more advanced elements.

As is to be expected, the author claims great advantages from the space-saving nature of Kickback, and those advantages certainly exist, although he fails to acknowledge that space is lost by 4NT having to be used as the cue-bid in place of the asking bid suit. Equally to be expected, he says rather less about the dangers of confusion when the bid that asks the Kickback question is in a suit that has already been bid naturally. Yes, he explains how you can deal with this, but that is where it gets complicated, and where there is complication there is the potential for confusion and misunderstandings. Nor is there any mention of the even more space-saving Minorwood, the convention where 4 of a minor suit is the keycard ask for that suit, so if maximum space saving is your objective, then Minorwood gains a step over Kickback. Then again, it too has its potential for misunderstandings.

I would in fact question Munger's claim that Kickback is "popular among the expert community". Some play it for sure, but a long way from a

ROBERT MUNGER

\section*{KICKBALK}

\section*{SLAM BIDDING AT BRIDGE}


SECOND EDITION

AN HONDRS BOLK FROM MASTER POINT PRESS
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majority do. I don't claim to know why, but suspect the danger of confusion is one significant reason. However, it is not for me to assess here the relative merits of any one system against any other. Readers can do that for themselves, and this book will give them all the material they could want to understand and judge Kickback, and to use it effectively if they decide they want to.

\section*{On The Other Hand - Bridge Cardplay Explained \\ David Bird and Larry Cohen \\ An Honors eBook from Master Point Press \\ 226pp. \$19.95 £14.95}

Bridge's most prolific author and arguably its best teacher have collaborated for the first time, and the outcome is a very readable and highly instructive book for improving players.

The basic principle is simple: each of the eleven themed chapters has a series of paired deals, one from each author - 200 deals in total. The deals in each pair are similar, sometimes almost identical, but the correct play is different, sometimes markedly so. What this does is make it very clear that while you can learn all the essential techniques to fulfil your con-


An Honors Book from Master Point Press tracts, you also need to know which one to apply when, and that in turn means not just recognising what you think is a familiar situation or pattern from a book or a lesson, and automatically applying the approach advocated there.

The interplay between the authors adds a human element which makes the reading more enjoyable, and that helps the learning process. If you're feeling lazy you can simply read the hands and explanations, but of course you will get more from the book if you use it quiz-style, trying to solve the hand before reading the text.

Also helpful for the learner are the 'Understand Why' box after each hand and the 'Points To Remember' section at the end of each chapter. None of the hands are terribly advanced, but they do get somewhat more so in the course of the book, with the themes moving from 'draw trumps or not', 'finesse or not' in the first two chapters, through to 'reading the cards' and 'arranging an endplay' in the final two.

\section*{Preempts}

\author{
Warren Watson \\ An Honors eBook from Master Point Press 2018 \\ 198pp. £12.95 US\$19.95 CD\$ 23.95
}

I'm sorry, but I wasn't impressed by this book. It claims to be targeted at intermediate players, but to me it is more suited to beginners. And it isn't well suited to beginners.

The author's approach to preempting is very much rule-based and rule-bound. For example 'never preempt with a side four-card major, or with a void'. Certainly not in keeping with the way most expert players preempt nowadays. A rule-based approach is fine for beginners, but the number of rules needs to be limited, and preferably not mutually contradictory. When every hand is headed by a nostrum, you end up with more advice, not to say instructions, than is helpful.

Speaking of hands, there is certainly no shortage of them, many from real life (including many from BBO Speedball tournaments), but a significant number of others apparently specially created to illustrate a point. It is to be expected that the latter fit the case perfectly, but I was also left with a strong impression that the real life hands were carefully selected, and that it wouldn't be hard to find other hands that point in exactly the opposite direction.

I was surprised to see the author include chapters on simple overcalls and third-hand openings. Not that these can't be preemptive, but then so is a mini no-trump opening. It's just that these are huge and different subjects.
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\section*{A grand slam \\ of pleasures}

Since the seeds of tourism were sown in the early 19th century, Madeira has grown famous as a holiday destination. The temperate climate, the natural beauty of the island and the lush landscapes ... combine these with Madeira's cosmopolitan and welcoming people and it's an unforgettable experience for visitors. It is in this wonderful setting that the Madeira Bridge Association is hosting the 22nd Madeira International Bridge Open, in partnership with the VidaMar Resort Hotel Madeira and Intertours

\section*{Do you love playing against good opponents?}

Then today's your lucky day: some top players will once again be in Funchal for the 22nd Madeira International Bridge Open. Come and enjoy good bridge in a hotel that measures up to the occasion. VIDAMAR's rooms all have sea views. Natural daylight floods the public areas and the playing-rooms. The VidaMar Resort Hotel Madeira offers many leisure and sports facilities, including restaurants and bars, indoor and outdoor swimming pools, a sauna, a whirlpool and a fitness centre. It is also home to the sensational Thalasso Sea Spa

Bridge package includes: - 7 nights' stay including buffet breakfast Entry fees for both main events (Pairs and Teams) Airport transfers Welcome cocktail party
Prize-giving and gala dinner Light lunch on Saturday 9th November Multi-trip Travel Insurance (1)
(1) Travel insurance includes cover for personal a ccidents, travel assistance, cancellation cover up to \(£ 2000\), natural disasters up to \(€ 2000\), post-departure assistance (accommodation expenses up to \(€ 100\) per night).
Further details and table of benefits at
https://www.travel-to-madeira.com
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
PRICES \\
VIDAMAR RESORT 5*
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { DOUBLE(2) } \\
& \text { ROOM B\&B }
\end{aligned}
\] & SINGLE
ROOM B\&B & \begin{tabular}{l}
PRICES \({ }^{(1)}\) \\
OTHER HOTELS
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { DOUBLE (2) } \\
& \text { ROOM } \boldsymbol{B} \& \mathrm{~B}
\end{aligned}
\] & SINGLE
ROOM B\&B \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Early booking (1) \\
( by \(31{ }^{\text {stt }}\) July )
\end{tabular} & € 666.36 & € 962.52 & Price per person for 7-night package & € 465.20 & € 605.20 \\
\hline Extra nights (per person per night) & \(€ 53.10\) & € 96.30 & & & \\
\hline Standard bridge rate (1) (bookings from \({ }^{\text {st }}\) August) & € 740.40 & € 1069.47 & \begin{tabular}{l}
(1) Package price pe \\
(2) Minimum occupa
\end{tabular} & n, 7 nights persons & \\
\hline Extra nights (per person per night) & € 59.00 & € 107.00 & For other accomm please contact Int & on options rs. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

For more information and FAQs visit www.bridge-madeira.com Please check the tournament website for changes to the programme.


NTERTOURS: RESERVATION
Tánia Cruz or Rosana Pereira
Tel.: ( + 351) 291208903 (direct) or +351) 291208900 Fax: (+351) 291225020 E-mail: groups@intertours.com.pt Website: www.travel-to-madeira.com

Pre- and post-tournament side events \(31^{\text {st }}\) Oct - 8.30pm | National Simultaneous Pairs \(01^{\text {st }}-02^{\text {nd }}\) Nov-4.00pm | IMP Pairs \(03^{\text {rd }}\) Nov - 4.00pm | Charity Tournament \(04^{\text {th }}\) Nov - 8.30 pm | Warm-up Pairs \(11^{\text {th }}\) Nov-8.30pm | Cool- down Pairs

Main tournament programme 04 \({ }^{\text {th }}\) Nov -6.00 pm | Welcome Cocktail \(05^{\text {th }}-06^{\text {th }}-07^{\text {th }}\) Nov -4.00 pm | Open Pairs \(08^{\text {th }}\) Nov-8.30pm | Open Teams \(09^{\text {th }}\) Nov-11.00am - 2.30pm| Open Teams \(10^{\text {th }}\) Nov-2.30pm | Open Teams

BRIDGE MADEIRA CONTACTS
Miguel Teixeira
Tel.: (+351 ) 965477574 | E-mail: migtei@netmadeira.com Carlos Luíz
Tel.: (+351 ) 914440580 | E-mail: cluiz57@gmail.com José Júlio Curado
Tel.: ( +351 ) 937951515 | E-mail: j.curado@yahoo.com Website: www.bridge-madeira.com

VidaMar Resort Hotel Madeira
Estrada Monumental 175-177 9000-100 Funchal - Madeira Tel: (+351 ) 291768447 | Fax: (+351 ) 291768449 E-mail: sales@madeira.vdm.pt Website: www.vidamarresorts.com
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\section*{Bridge} Educational Software

\author{
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. You are South with: AJ98764 MKQ10 - \(\mathbf{\$ 8 6 4}\)

\section*{IMPs. West Dealer. Both Vul.}
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
& Pass & 1४ & 2NT*
\end{tabular} \begin{tabular}{c} 
You \\
2NT \\
2N minors
\end{tabular}

Your bid please.
Sally Brock (European and World Champion)
3\%. Everyone has their own style in this situation so not sure it is a fair problem. For me \(3 \boldsymbol{E}\) is forcing with spades and next I intend to bid \(4 \vee\) in most scenarios.
Tim Verbeek (European and Junior World Champion)
\(4 \downarrow\). Horrible. When I start bidding spades and lefty makes a high level bid in diamonds partner has no clue about fit, my Diamond shortness or lack of controls in Clubs.
David Bakhshi (multiple Gold Cup winner and winner of several North American Bridge)

3ヶ. It is a good idea to have agreements about the meaning of \(3 \%\) and \(3 *\) in this situation. I tend to play that \(3 *\) shows hearts (INV+), and 3 shows spades (FG), while \(3 \vee\) and 3 s would both be competitive bids. Though I'm a little concerned that West will preempt in diamonds, I am
prepared to bid to the five-level, so I would start with \(3 \downarrow\), then bid 5 xH if necessary.
Mark Horton (Editor A New Bridge Magazine and prolific author)
\(3 \downarrow\). The simplest (but not necessarily the best) way to show a decent hand with spades.

\section*{Simon de Wijs (European Champion and Bermuda Bowl Winner)}

3NT. 'Unusual versus unusual'. Showing \(5+\) and \(3+\mathbb{C}\). I expect further competition and want to give partner as much info about my hand as possible.
Marshall Lewis (represented Croatia internationally, as a player and as a coach)
\(3 \star\). In my book 3 is invitational plus with Spades. I almost never suppress support at my first turn, but here I am ready to bid \(5 \vee\) over \(5 \downarrow\), a sequence that puts my Major lengths in accurate perspective. Meanwhile it may also be essential to get any Spade contract declared from partner's side.
Jan van Cleeff (multiple National Champion and co-founder bid72)
3\%. I cover David's reasoning though I reversed the meaning of 3e and \(3 \uparrow\).

\section*{Post Mortem}

Sally is absolutely right: everyone has their own style in this situation. Therefore we feel it interesting to show this to the audience. By the way this was the North hand: ©KQ 『AJ943 -J742 \&A3

So, knowing about long and good Spades and solid Heart support, North, with his fillings in Spades and his two Aces, might press on to the Grand.
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\section*{FUNBRIDGE}

\section*{Highlights and New Features}

\section*{Discover the Funbridge Monthly Challenge}

As you may know, Funbridge has the privilege of having many national bridge federations - including the EBU - as partners and as such hosts bridge tournaments awarding participants with official federation points (Masterpoints, Expert Points, Experience Points, etc.).
On top of playing this type of tournaments in their bridge clubs, club members can thus move up their national rankings directly on Funbridge. Every month we draw up a ranking list for each federation according to the number of official points earned by the participants over the month. This same list will be used as a basis for the next Funbridge Monthly Challenge. Get ready to be spoilt! 区


\section*{WHAT IS THE FUNBRIDGE MONTHLY CHALLENGE?}

Thanks to the Monthly Challenge, your results and participations in federation tournaments will soon be rewarded!
Indeed, with this new competition, the top 3 players of the month will receive prizes!
But there is more to it... Every month 5 players will be randomly selected and will get presents too! In other words, everyone can win \(\because\)
To access federation tournaments rankings, go to Play a tournament > Federations Tournaments > Rankings.

\section*{WHAT ARE THE RULES TO PARTICIPATE?}

To take part in the Funbridge Monthly Challenge and have a chance to win one of the prizes, you must play at least 1 tournament (all the deals) for one of the federations involved.

\section*{WHICH TOURNAMENTS ARE INCLUDED IN THE FUNBRIDGE MONTHLY CHALLENGE?}

Funbridge Points tournaments: 2 daily tournaments
EBU tournaments: 1 daily tournament
ACBL tournaments: 2 daily tournaments
FFB tournaments: Daily tournaments
NBF tournaments: 1 daily tournament
As federation tournaments are open to all (there is no need to be a member of one of the federations mentioned above to participate), you can play 5 Funbridge Monthly Challenges every month, optimising your chances to win a prize.

\section*{WHAT ARE THE PRIZES?}

At the end of each month, the top 3 players will receive:
1st: 5 credits for federation tournaments
2nd: 3 credits for federation tournaments
3rd: 2 credits for federation tournaments
The 5 players chosen by lot will receive 1 credit.
All of them will also get 1 credit for Funbridge Points tournaments and... Funbridge collector's mug with a new design every month!
Gotta collect them all! ;-)
You will be informed as soon as the Monthly Challenge starts. In the meantime, you can practise on Funbridge!
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Each deck includes 48 deals. The accompanying booklet has recommended bidding, opening leads and suggestions about the play for each deal.
A convenient score card is located on the back page of the booklet.
Previous tournament results will determine your score!
We have 13 volumes available!
Each deck including booklet are SEK 100.

\section*{Here are the details:}

Playing duplicate bridge at home has these advantages:
- Eliminate the luck of the deal - what matters is how you and your partner bid and play with the same cards as everyone else who has played the same deal.
- Compare scores with players of all levels who have played the same deal.
- Score your game using matchpoints, and get your score immediately after each deal.
- Read the commentary on each deal and compare your own bidding and play.
- Play as many or as few deals as you want at your own pace.

You'll find it quick and easy to set up your home game with the coded cards. Play a real bridge competition in the comfort of your own home.

The suggested auctions are according to Standard American, SAYC (five-card major suit openings, 1NT 15-17 HCP, 2C artificial and forcing, and weak two-bids in spades, hearts and diamonds) or ACOL, i.e. weak notrump, four-card majors and strong two-bids. Choose the booklet you prefer.

Improve your game with Svenska Bridgeförlaget.
We have Scandinavia's largest selection of bridge books and supplies.
We have all English-language bridge books and over 2.000 items in stock.
Welcome to place your order at www.bridgeforlaget.se.
WEB www.bridgeforlaget.se PHONE +46 720564000 MAIL order@bridgeforlaget.se
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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 SEK/team, if pre-paid 2400. Fixed prizes with 50000 SEK to the winning team 2nd to 6th get \(25000,15000,10000,7500\) and 7500 .

Masterpoints in all tournamaments in three categories: bronze, silver and goldpoints.
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\section*{DREPETD WIT JTUIAN P 1 Tix}


You lead the queen of diamonds, won by the ace. Declarer leads a trump to the ace, cashes the king of diamonds and leads a second trump, partner playing the ten on the second round. How should you continue?


You lead the queen of clubs, which holds. Declarer ruffs the second club and leads the king of spades. What are your plans?
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\section*{\(0008 x\) FUNBRIDGE}

\section*{Test Your Technique}

Dealer North．N／S Vul．Matchpoints


1．Fourth suit forcing
2NT 17－18，singleton diamond
62 was probably the safer contract，but playing matchpoints，South decided he had enough to try for 6NT．

On the lead of the 2 （ \(4^{\text {th }}\) best），how do you plan the play？

\section*{Answer}

The good news is the lead，because after this you will always make 6NT and probably get a decent score event if you lose a heart．This is no rea－ son not to try to make all 13 tricks．

The first indication is that the spades are divided \(5-4\) with 4 in the East hand．This makes the percentage for the long hearts to be with him a bit higher．You could get more of an indication about the distribution by cashing some clubs，but you need to keep an entry to hand after cash－ ing the hearts．It looks much safer to play West for the queen of hearts．

There is something you could try，cashing the 2 KQ ．If West follows twice and you have seen the 10 or the 9 appear at any point，you can safely overtake the Q in dummy to play the hearts the other way． Also，if after playing 2 rounds of clubs you feel（or know）that East is also shorter than West in clubs，he will become a clear favourite to be longer in hearts．

When you cash the K ，you see the 9 from East．You now overtake the 2 Q in dummy and see East discard，run the jack of hearts，play a heart to


Aunty Em had her head in her hands. How had it come to this? She took it for granted, through long experience and force of personality, that her plans would come to fruition, and, moreover, would work. But this was a disaster. And of her own making!

How could it have happened? How was it possible that a social event for the students in the club's classes had ended like this? An emergency meeting of the laws and ethics committee, no less!

Where had it started to go wrong? In the lead up to her election as club president she had made it clear that the classes were going to be her priority. With so many aging members, she could see that the club had to do better at bringing new players through. In her first week in office she had convened a meeting with all of the teachers, setting out the way forward. They had gathered in the magenta room - a place used for committee meetings as well as teaching. No-one disagreed with her central point that they needed to attract and retain more students, and to bring more of them through to the main club nights. It was the changes that she wanted to make that were more delicate.

Firstly, there was the beginners' class.
'Lion,' she began in a voice which clearly would not look kindly on dissent, 'I know that you have been teaching this class for a number of years. I have a more important role for you that I think you'll find well suited to your clear, logical thinking.' En route to getting her own way, she had found over the years that a bit of flattery went a long way.
'But they have to learn to bid soundly!' the Lion protested. 'Good bidding is the foundation of the game!' Many of the Lion's adoring Munchkin fans had first come to know him through attendance at these classes and he was loathe to give up the role.
'What you teach them is more like passing unsoundly,' quipped the Tin Man. 'If they don't bid then they will never have to play.'
'I object to that,' muttered the Lion.
'Object if you wish. What about the class I saw you teach on Weak

Twos? Following your guidance, the students passed out all but one of the example hands. And that was one that you had accidentally kept in from the class on Two Club openers! Strongest Weak Two I've ever seen!'
'I still say it shouldn't have been in the Two Club lesson,' protested the Lion. 'Game was no certainty on bad breaks.'
'Anyway,' Aunty Em broke in. She had no intention of allowing a little dissent to get in her way. 'I have asked the Mayor of Munchkinland to take on the role. He can carry on your good work, Lion, in being a friendly, welcoming face for the newcomers. I'm sure you will agree that he is an excellent choice.'

The Lion could only nod.
'Next we have the intermediate class. Due to my duties as President, I'm going to step back a little from this one. I'm going to share the duties with Dorothy.'

Dorothy nodded, trying to remember how she had allowed herself to be persuaded to accept. Subsequent discussions with her aunt had suggested that the word 'share' might be a euphemism.

Moving quickly on, Aunty Em continued. 'I've decided to split the advanced class into two parts and because this is our biggest group it will need two people. Up to Christmas I want the Tin Man to teach advanced bidding, assisted by the Lion. After Christmas, the Lion will teach advanced play, assisted by the Tin Man.'
'Assist HIM!' they protested in unison. The Tin Man drew breath first. 'How can you expect me to stand by and listen to him rotting their minds with mundane technique? When I teach that class I open up their minds to the beauties of the game!'

Aunty Em had known that this was going to be tricky one. She had to avoid the truth, which was that after a few lessons on card play from the Tin Man most students gave up all hope of ever mastering the game and left the club. He was reckoned to be the greatest recruiter for the Happy Friends club on the other side of town.
'Absolutely,' said Em, looking him straight in the eye. 'Your lessons are wasted on them. The Lion, however, has a great grasp of how to communicate the key elements of card play to inexperienced players. And I mean that, Lion, as a compliment. We are all far better players than the advanced class so that doesn't come into this.' The Lion smiled and puffed out his chest.

Aunty Em now turned to the more difficult part of this issue. 'Of course we don't want to lose what you bring on the subject, Tin Man. I want you to produce a regular column for the club newsletter in which you can, what was it you said? Open up the minds of the club members to the beauties of the game. That's a guaranteed two hundred and fifty words every quarter. Meanwhile, you will be passing on your wisdom on bidding to your class.' Aunty Em knew that the Tin Man played a more sophisticated bidding system than she favoured, but many of the students tended to like to learn new conventions, even if, almost especially if, they didn't really know how and when to use them.
'Finally, I have decided to introduce something new. I want to help increase the number of people who move from the advanced class into the club nights. We are going to start a competition on a Tuesday evening for people who have finished the classes but are not yet ready for the Wednesday night. It will be a gentle, friendly, and easy going event that will get people used to playing duplicate, and to run this I could think of no better person than Glin...' The door of the Magenta Room burst open and a cloud of green smoke filled the room.
'I do hope I'm not too late,' the Wicked Witch grinned at the surprised faces. 'It's about the Tuesday evening tournament. I've been talking to Glinda about it. She tells me that she doesn't feel up to doing it alone, and has asked me if I would take it on. As someone who always has the best interests of the club at heart I have agreed. Goodbye.'

She turned and swept out of the room. 'I told her not to smoke in the club,' was all Aunty Em could muster. 'And I'm sure she chooses that brand just for effect.
\[
* * * * *
\]

The Chairman of the Lollipop Guild called the meeting to order. 'We have, indeed we have, some very difficult, yes very difficult, issues to consider today,' he announced ponderously. Aunty Em could hear the embarrassment in his voice. As President she was, ex officio, a member
of the Laws and Ethics Committee. She looked at her other fellow members, Cissie, Zeke and Munchkin Bob. Even Munchkin Bob, she reflected, wouldn't be able to find anything funny in this. They were used to the witches being called before the committee. Indeed, hearing complaints about them seemed to be the main function of the committee. But this now involved learners, members of the classes she was so proud of, it had seemed that the perfect way to start the new regime. What could be better than an open night, inviting past and current students, and curious non-members to come to the club and play a friendly session. She had arranged for club members to come along to partner the least confident beginners. And she and the Mayor of Munchkinland would be on hand to offer advice as required.

Through her tireless efforts, she had managed to drum up considerable interest. But even she was taken aback when she found that she had fifteen full tables. The Wicked Witch of the West had also been busy, it seemed. Even though the classes had not yet begun, she had gone out of her way to meet, and apparently charm, many of the prospective Tuesday night players, encouraging them to come to the open night. When Aunty Em arrived, Wicked was laying out the table numbers and putting out the boards, with the help of her partner for the evening - Mr Yoop. A tall, thickset man, Mr Yoop was considered reasonably promising, if unimaginative. Munchkin Meg was to partner the wispy Mrs Yoop. Even at that early stage Aunty Em had smelt a rat.

Dorothy was playing with a very keen but inexperienced player, Tony Tobias, usually shortened to Toto. Small of stature and hairy of face, Toto's determination to master the game had given him a reputation of being something of a terrier in all senses of the word.

The Lion and his partner had the first shot at this hand:

Dealer North. E/W Vul


The Lion opened Three Spades. As he explained to his partner later, 'I don't rate stray queens and jacks.' West doubled, and North raised to Four Spades, ending the auction.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Lion
\end{tabular}

West began the defence with the top two diamonds, then switched to the \(\geqslant\) K. The Lion won the ace, and drew trumps, ending in hand and noting the void in the West hand. He could see that his problem was to avoid losing two club tricks. With the high cards marked in the West hand it was likely that the king was there, and unless the take out double had been made on a hand that had eleven red cards then playing to the ace of clubs and ducking one was not going to work. Was there any real chance? Ah ha! If East had a singleton \(\mathbf{~ J}\) or 10 then he could restrict the opposition to one club by running the queen and pinning East's card. He pulled the slowly from his hand and put it on the table. It all went well when the king appeared, but when East followed low, the Lion shrugged and conceded one down.
'Was that a Chinese finesse?' his partner asked him in a state of great excitement. 'I've read about them, but never seen one at the table.' The Lion smiled, and shook his head and mane. 'I'll explain later. It was a master play, but the contract had no hope on the actual lie of the cards.' Dorothy and Toto had got off to a good start, but in the third round
they played this hand against the Wicked Witch and Mr Yoop. Again the contract was Four Spades, although on a different auction.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Toto & Wicked & Dorothy & Mr Yoop \\
- & Pass & Pass & 14 \\
\(2 \downarrow\) & \(4 \uparrow\) & All Pass &
\end{tabular}

Again, West kicked off with the top two diamonds and then the \(\uparrow \mathrm{K} . \mathrm{Mr}\) Yoop began to open his mouth when Wicked held up a hand to silence him. 'Partner, at this point you should be making your plan.' Mr Yoop nodded. 'Do you know how many tricks you need to take?' Mr Yoop nodded again. 'Excellent. And how many sure tricks do you have?'

Her partner looked at his hand with its seven trump tricks, and added on dummy's two aces. 'Nine,' he responded
'Oh partner!' Wicked looked horrified. 'You have called for a card so I am going to have to play it!' She swiftly grabbed the \(>9\) and turned to Dorothy. 'So important to ensure that they understand table etiquette, don't you think? You to play.'

Confused, and very suspicious, Dorothy played low and Toto remained on lead. He fingered one card then another as it slowly dawned on him that he was endplayed. A club would run to the queen, a heart would give declarer a chance to finesse and allow him to discard two clubs. A diamond looked like it was going to give a ruff and discard but he could see nothing better. Sure enough, declarer ruffed in the dummy, discarding a club, and, after trumps were pulled, a second club followed on the \(\vee\) A.

Sitting in the Magenta Room, Aunty Em sat stony faced as Dorothy related the events at the table to the members of the Laws and Ethics Committee.
'Nobody else, I assume nobody else made it,' said the Chairman.
'Only one other,' Cissie looked pained. 'Munchkin Meg, when she was playing against Ada and me.'

She told the group their auction.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Ada & Meg & Cissie & Mrs Yoop \\
- & 1 NT & Pass & \(2 \downarrow\) \\
\(2 \boldsymbol{a}\) & \(3 \boldsymbol{a}\) & Pass & \(4 \boldsymbol{a}\) \\
Double & All Pass & &
\end{tabular}
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'Meg opened a weak no-trump and Mrs Yoop transferred. Ada's Two Spade bid showed a big hand, two or three suited, but I couldn't say anything at the four-level,' Cissie explained. 'Hoping to set up tricks in partner's hand, or get a ruff I tried a club lead.'
'That seems good,' said the Chairman of the Lollipop Guild. 'It establishes two club tricks for the defence.'
'You might think so,' Cissie sighed. 'Meg played low from the dummy and won in hand with the ace. She smiled at her partner and asked, 'Playing in a trump contract what should my priority be?'

Mrs Yoop's face reddened. She wasn't used to being asked her opinion by such an expert player. Indeed she wasn't used to being asked her opinion ever. 'I've been taught to take out all the trumps,' she whispered.

Meg tittered. 'Since you say so partner, that's what I'll do!'
Cissie took the hand diagram, and stroked off the cards until the South hand had one trump remaining. At that point the players held:

'You can see the problem poor Ada faced. What can West discard on that last spade?' Cissie asked.

Munchkin Bob leaned forward. 'A club is no good because declarer can then give one up, establishing the queen. A heart is no good because that sets up the jack. It has to be a diamond.'

Aunty Em had worked it all out. 'I see it,' she said. 'Declarer's next move is to throw West in with a diamond.'

Cissie was determined to finish the story. 'Yes, that's what happened. Ada tried a heart, but Meg won the ace and put Ada back in again with the queen of hearts. Now she was forced to give up a trick to the queen
of clubs.'
'Well played, partner. West has such a good hand, it's surprising that game made.' Mrs Yoop was confused but delighted.
'To an experienced player, West's bid had made the hand practically double dummy,' Munchkin Meg explained with a benevolent smile. 'I'm sure that with good coaching one day you will be able to play hands just as well.'
'That's the thing with Meg,' Aunty Em looked grim. 'She always has an answer. Anyway, if you think what Wicked and Meg did on that one was pretty bad then the second one was worse. Dorothy, as you leave, could you send Glinda in please?'

Once again the finger of suspicion was pointed at Munchkin Meg. The hand in question had defeated the best efforts of players, experienced or not, around the room.

\section*{Dealer East. N/S Vul.}
```

Q Q753

- Q874
- Q4
- A109
, K62
- AK 1053
- 2
* K754

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline - J8 & & - A1094 \\
\hline - 962 & N & \(\checkmark\) J \\
\hline - K1093 & W E & - AJ8765 \\
\hline - J832 & S & \& Q6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

After a One Diamond opening from East, a One Heart overcall from South and a constructive raise from North, most South's declared Four Hearts.

The defence started with two rounds of diamonds. Declarer ruffed the second round in hand, drew trumps and tried the black suits. Those who were not given any help by the defence were unable to avoid losing a club and two spade tricks to go one down. All, that is, apart from Mrs Yoop.

Playing Glinda and a beginner, she received the standard defence of two rounds of diamonds, ruffing in hand. Munchkin Meg smiled at her partner. 'Now remember to draw trumps. If you have five then you are
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going to need two rounds.' Mrs Yoop dutifully played the \(\vee\) A followed by the \(\bigvee K\), paying little attention to the cards played by her opponents.
'If the trumps are gone then you need to start work on your side suits,' Meg continued. Mrs Yoop cashed her K then played a low one towards the dummy. Meg jumped in. 'How many tricks do you need?'
'Ten,' said Mrs Yoop.
'Oh my goodness. You were not supposed to answer out loud! Well you have called for the ten so that's that.' Meg gave her partner a look of resigned frustration.

And so it was that Glinda won an unexpected trick with the \(\mathbf{2} \mathrm{Q}\) leaving these cards:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Q753 } \\
& \text { Q8 } \\
& \frac{1}{2}
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline ¢ J8 & & ( A1094 \\
\hline \(\checkmark 9\) & & - - \\
\hline - 109 & W E & - J76 \\
\hline - J8 & S & 2- \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { A K62 } \\
& \vee 105
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline & - - & \\
\hline & ¢ 75 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

It was diabolical! She was forced either to open up spades or give declarer a ruff and discard. Either way the defence would only take one more trick.

Glinda was almost in tears as she described the hand. Aunty Em looked at the rest of the committee. 'Uncannily similar to the stunt that Wicked pulled against Dorothy, wouldn't you say? The chances of falling into a partial elimination like this by accident must be millions to one.'

The Chairman sat back in his chair. 'You have, yes indeed you have, presented strong evidence here, Em. But I am not sure what we can do. This was not a competition event. Indeed, being open to all it was not even, strictly speaking, a club event.'
'I know,' Em spat back. 'But we cannot allow behaviour of this kind to flourish. It seemed too good to be true when I saw the two of them putting out the boards. I strongly suspect that they took a look at the hand records as well. I am inclined to think that the Yoops are innocent dupes
in all of this. Wicked has always been trouble but matters have deteriorated since Meg arrived. It seems ridiculous to say that she is bringing out the worst in Wicked but I think it is true. As you know, I had strong suspicions about them misbehaving in the Ozian Cup match against Henry. Now this! Ban the pair of them, I say! At the least, a stern warning.'
'Indeed, indeed,' the Chairman nodded. 'There is no doubt that we have to monitor this situation, but we are a long way from any action of that nature. If we are to challenge them then we will need a cast-iron case, and we are going to need help gathering the evidence. These are slippery customers. I would ask you all to keep the contents of this meeting to yourselves and to consider who can be trusted to help.'
Aunty Em was fuming as she left the club. Unusually, she had not got what she wanted. But she was determined that battle had only just begun. Let the Wicked Witch and Munchkin Meg enjoy their petty triumph for now - the soul of the club was at stake here. She wasn't going to let the next generation of members be corrupted! She might have to bide her time, but in the end she was going to win.


\section*{Master Point Press} THE BRIDGE PUBLISHER

\section*{Transfer Responses to One Club with Relays}
Lyle Poe

This 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.

\section*{Answers to "Defend With Julian Pottage"}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{( KJ52} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{- J87} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{A5} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{2. AJ6} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{¢ 1064 N AQ93} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline - 1043 & S & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{- 87} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{- A9652} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{- K9} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{- K975} \\
\hline WEST N & NORTH & EAST & SOUTH \\
\hline - & - & - & Pass \\
\hline Pass & 19* & Pass & 2\%* \\
\hline Pass & 4 & All Pass & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

2

```

    - K8
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline - AQ6 & N & - 3 \\
\hline \(\checkmark\) K109 & & \(\checkmark 54\) \\
\hline -K3 & W E & - 97642 \\
\hline \& QJ972 & S & \& A10653 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\]} & \\
\hline & WEST & NORTH & EAST & SOUTH \\
\hline & 1NT* & 2** & Pass & 44* \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{All Pass} \\
\hline 1 NT & 15-17 & & & \\
\hline 2 & One m & & & \\
\hline 4. & To play & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

You lead the queen of clubs, which holds. Declarer ruffs the second club and leads the king of spades. What are your plans?
You can see two trump tricks in your hand to go with the ace of clubs you have already made. There can be no advantage in ducking the first spade and there could be a disadvantage if partner has a doubleton trump. If, as is actually the case, declarer has eight trumps, the ace of diamonds and the queen of hearts, you could have a rough ride ahead.

Suppose you win the trumps when you get the chance and exit safely with clubs each time. On the run of the trumps, you will be unable to keep three hearts and two diamonds. With dummy all set to discard after you, declarer will have an answer whatever you do.

Having foreseen the squeeze, what can you do about it? You need to attack dummy's heart entries. Starting with a low heart will get you nowhere because declarer runs it to the queen and picks up the whole suit without needing a squeeze. You should lead the king of hearts first and then another when in with the queen of spades.
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\section*{10 CHESS \& BRIDEE \(\triangle\)-8 \\ BRIDGE SHOP.com London Bridge Centre}

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


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

\section*{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

66 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

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

COI 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. 98

Andrew Robson,
English Bridge Player

BE THE DIFFERENCE

\section*{FUNBRIDGE}

\section*{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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\section*{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

\section*{\(01083 x\)} 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.

\section*{He Wouldn't Dare}

In the round of 16 in the trials, you must decide whether to downgrade a flat hand.

Dealer South. E/W Vul:
As West, you hold
```

\& Q32
\K62
A1043
\& KQ2

```

Your opening 1 NT range here is \(14-16.1 \diamond\) followed by 1 NT is \(11-13\). Your call?

You are 4-3-3-3, which definitely deserves a downgrade. 4-3-3-3 hands are bad for many reasons. The lack of a second suit means you don't have a source of tricks, and the lack of any doubletons means you have to worry about the third round of every side suit if you wind up in a suit contract.

Other than that, there is nothing wrong with this hand. You have an ace and only 2 queens/jacks, which is par for the course. Also, and very important, you have a 10 in your 4 -card suit. That 10 could easily be worth a trick. Without that 10 it might be right to downgrade, since the hand would look more like a weak notrump than a strong notrump. With the 10 , it doesn't seem right to downgrade.
You open 1NT. The bidding concludes:
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
- & - & - & Pass \\
1 NT & \(2 \star^{*}\) & \(2 \mathrm{NT}^{*}\) & \(3 \downarrow\) \\
Pass & \(4 \vee\) & All Pass &
\end{tabular}

Diamonds and a major, either suit could be longer
\(3 \vee\)
Lebensohl, likely a long club suit and no game interest
Pass or correct

Your lead. Standard honour leads, 3rd and 5th spot cards.
The enemy bidding along with partner's silence makes it clear that partner's 2NT bid is based on a long club suit. North has a good hand with both red suits. South must have both majors to justify his pass or correct call.
The club lead looks natural and safe. But how is the hand likely to be played? North has both red suits. South has both majors, but hopefully only 4 hearts. South is likely to be relatively short in diamonds. It seems like declarer's plan will be to ruff diamonds in his hand. You have a good secondary holding in diamonds with your 10 of diamonds, but that won't be of value if declarer can ruff it out.

The right lead appears to be a trump. With any luck, you will be able to draw 3 rounds of trumps before declarer can ruff two diamonds in his hand. Your queen of spades is decent protection against declarer being able to establish his spade suit.

Can the club lead be necessary? Only if you need to establish club tricks quickly before club losers are discarded. You have both diamonds and spades under reasonable control, but it doesn't look like you can cash four quick winners. Your tricks figure to be slow tricks, and a trump lead may be necessary to protect these slow tricks.

You choose to lead the king of clubs.


Dummy wins the ace of clubs. Partner plays the 5 , and declarer the 3 . You play suit-preference at trick 1.10, 9, 8 are suit-preference high. 2, 3, 4 are suit-preference low. 6, 5, 7 are encouraging.

At trick 2, declarer leads the \(\downarrow\) from dummy. Partner plays the 5 , and
declarer the 6. You are playing upside-down count and attitude. How do you defend?
\& 9
- Q32
\(\checkmark\) K62
- A1043
\& Q2


What is going on? Clearly declarer is trying to find a way to his hand in order to take a heart finesse.

What is happening in the black suits? Partner must have the ace of spades. If declarer has it, he wouldn't have to lead diamonds from dummy, and the defence wouldn't have a chance anyway. For the club suit, it appears that partner has six clubs and declarer a doubleton. If declarer had a singleton club, he could just ruff a club to his hand. If declarer had a tripleton club partner would have only five clubs, and would not have bid 2NT.

On these assumptions, the defence always has 1 club trick, 1 diamond trick, and 1 spade trick. If partner has the jack of spades or even the 10 of spades, the defence can come to 2 spade tricks. The danger is that declarer has J10 of spades and guesses the spades right. If that is the hand, the defence will need to find another trick.

What is going on in the diamond suit? You can't be sure. Partner's 5 of diamonds would be consistent with either K52 or 65 doubleton.

If partner has 65 doubleton of diamonds, you can defeat the contract by ducking. Declarer is stuck in dummy, and there is nothing he can do. If he continues diamonds, you can give partner a diamond ruff. If he plays on trumps, you get a heart trick. However, if you win the ace of diamonds the contract may make. Whatever you do, declarer can get to his hand with the king of diamonds, put the jack of hearts through, draw trumps, and ruff the fourth diamond in his hand in order to make a spade play. If declarer has J10 of spades and guesses the spades right, he makes.

If partner has K52 of diamonds, obviously you can defeat the contract by winning the trick. What happens if you duck? Declarer can play another diamond, and eventually ruff a diamond in his hand. He can
then take a heart finesse, cash a second round of hearts, ruff dummy's fourth diamond, and make a winning spade guess to make.

This is scary. If partner has \(\$ \mathrm{~K} 52\) declarer's hand would be \(\$ \mathrm{~J} 10 \mathrm{xxx}\) VJ10xx xx exx. If partner has 65 doubleton of diamonds, declarer's hand would be \(\$ 10 \mathrm{xx} \geqslant \mathrm{J}\) 10xx \(\leqslant \mathrm{Kxx} \mathrm{exx}\). Declarer would have a reasonable \(3 \vee\) call with either hand, although it would be more attractive holding the king of diamonds fitting his partner's diamond suit. He would play it the same way with either hand. He expects you to have the ace of diamonds if he has Kxx, so his best chance is that you make a mistake and win the ace. If anything, the evidence on declarer's hand makes it more likely that partner has 65 doubleton of diamonds.

Let's look at partner's hand. Partner holds either \(\uparrow \mathrm{Axx} \mathrm{Vx}_{\mathrm{x}} \downarrow \mathrm{Kxx}\)
 2NT on the second hand. With the first hand partner might have bid more aggressively, but it would be quite reasonable for partner to take the low road and just compete to \(3 \boldsymbol{\&}\). So far, nothing conclusive. What about the play? If partner has the king of diamonds, he might have gone up king. Thus partner's actions would have been forced if he doesn't have the king of diamonds, but he might have taken a different action if he has the king of diamonds.

You can't be sure, but it looks more likely that partner has 65 doubleton of diamonds than K52. The best play appears to be to duck the ace of diamonds.

You choose to win the ace of diamonds. What do you play now?


Whatever else is going on, it must be right to cash the queen of clubs. If you don't cash it and declarer has Kxx of diamonds, he will be able to draw trumps and pitch his losing club on the diamond if he guesses the diamond position.

You cash the queen of clubs. Partner plays the 4 , and declarer the 6 .

Partner's play is defined as standard current count, so it is consistent with an initial 6-card club suit.

What do you lead now? If declarer has the king of diamonds, the contract may depend upon the spade suit. If partner has the jack of spades you will always defeat \(4 \vee\), so you can assume declarer has that card. The mystery card is the 10 of spades. If partner has it, you can exit with a diamond and wait for your two spade tricks, covering the jack of spades if declarer leads it. If declarer has it, he will be on a guess unless you cover the jack of spades.

Might it be right to put it to declarer now and lead a small spade? This is a tricky question. If declarer has the 10 of spades, this defence is fine, but if partner has the 10 of spades, you might be giving away the contract by breaking the spade suit if declarer gets it right.

Will declarer have enough information about your hand to guess the spades right? He will know you have KQ , king of hearts, and ace of diamonds. That's 12 HCP. The queen of spades gives you 14 , and the ace of spades gives you 16. Both holdings are within your notrump range, so it looks like declarer is going to be on a guess. This is important for you to know. For example, if you would have shown up with 13 HCP instead of 12 , you would know that declarer wouldn't play you for the ace of spades. Therefore your correct defence would be to exit safely with a diamond, planning on covering the jack of spades if declarer leads it, so he won't sneak through an unmakeable contract.

Suppose you lead a small spade and declarer doesn't have the 10. This gives him a chance to make. But would he ever get it right? He wouldn't dare duck. Left to his own devices he would lead a spade to the king, and he knows that you know it. You would always lead a low spade if you had A10, since you would know that it is your only chance. Even if you don't have the \(\$ 10\) you would know that it is safe to lead a low spade, and that it might be your only chance. If you have the queen, however, he won't think you would lead a spade since that might risk blowing the contract. He might be suspicious when you lead a spade, but is hard to imagine that he would find the duck. He just couldn't stand going down when the contract is cold by playing you for giving him a chance to make, when you are simply taking your only chance to give him a losing option.

Suppose declarer does have the 10 . When you shift to a small spade, his thinking is likely to be the same. He knows that he has the \(\mathbf{1} 10\), but
he also knows that you don't know where the 10 is. Would you dare underlead the queen of spades and risk giving away the contract? He is likely to decide that you wouldn't take the risk, and if he comes to that conclusion, he will get it wrong.

Obviously there is a lot of psychology involved. However, I believe that if declarer has the \(\mathbf{\$ 1 0}\) he is more likely to get it wrong if you lead a spade than if you wait, and that there is virtually no chance declarer will get it right if he doesn't have the \(\mathbf{~} 10\).

You choose to exit safely with a diamond. The \(\uparrow 9\) is played from dummy, and partner wins the king. Partner plays a third round of diamonds. Declarer ruffs with the 4 of hearts, and leads the jack of hearts. Do you cover?
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { K4 } \\
& \text { AQ87! } \\
& \text { J - }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline ( Q32 & \\
\hline - K62 & N \\
\hline - 10 & W E \\
\hline - 2 & S \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

It won't matter if declarer has his expected 4-card heart suit, since he will certainly let the jack of hearts ride. But just in case declarer has bid a 3-card heart suit, you should duck. You can cover the next heart, and declarer will be unable to return to his hand for a spade play.

You choose to cover. Declarer draws trumps ending in his hand, partner having a singleton heart. Then, to nobody's surprise, declarer leads the jack of spades. You have had the entire hand to get ready for this, so by now you should have made up your mind what to do. Are you ready?
- K4
- Q8
- J
- -
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \(\pm\) Q32 & N \\
\hline - - & W E \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{r}
10 \\
\& \quad 2
\end{array}
\] & \({ }^{\text {W }}\) S \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

If you have to stop and think about it, you might as well cover. Declarer
will know that you wouldn't have a problem if you have the ace of spades, so by thinking, you are showing him the queen. A good declarer will lead the jack whether he has the 10 or not. Of course if he doesn't have the 10 he will be planning on going up king all other things being equal, but he might get a read on you and let the jack ride if he has the confidence to back his judgment. It can't hurt him to lead the jack.

If you are prepared to play quickly, you should certainly duck. If declarer doesn't have the \(\$ 10\), there is no way he won't go up king unless you somehow gave the show away. He doesn't know where the \(\$ 10\) is, and if you have \(\mathbf{Q}\) Q10 of course you will cover, so even if he knows you won't cover from queen-empty, going up king is by far the percentage play. If declarer does have the 10 , obviously you do better by ducking. This illustrates why it was important for you to work out in advance that declarer didn't have the point count information to know whether you have the queen or the ace.

You play small without giving the show away. Declarer thinks about it for a while, but finally get it right and calls low from dummy, so he is down 1. The full hand is:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
\& K4 \\
- AQ875 \\
- QJ98 \\
- A9
\end{tabular} & \\
\hline , Q32 & N & ¢ A87 \\
\hline - K62 & & - 3 \\
\hline - A1043 & W E & - K52 \\
\hline \& KQ2 & S & \& J 108754 \\
\hline & ¢ J 10965 & \\
\hline & - J 1094 & \\
\hline & - 76 & \\
\hline & - 63 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Why do you suppose declarer got the spades right?
There are several possibilities. He might have picked up something from you or your partner - good declarers are able to do that even when it isn't obvious that you have given anything away. He might have decided that you could have the jack of clubs, in which case you couldn't have the ace of spades. He might have just flipped a mental coin. Or, and most likely, he might have worked out that if you had the ace of spades you
would have been inclined to underlead it when you were in with the ace of diamonds.

Should East have defended differently?
East's play of the 5 at trick 1, encouraging, was okay. He wouldn't mind if you cashed another club, and he didn't particularly want any shift.

When the queen of diamonds was led off dummy, East could have spared West the problem that he faced by covering with the king. Normally this would be a bad combination to cover an honour with an honour, since declarer might have \(\downarrow A x x\), and be able to then finesse the 10 and run 4 tricks in the suit without loss. On this hand, East can work out that West must have the ace of diamonds. East is looking at 24 HCP between his hand and dummy, and West opened a 14-16 1NT. It is impossible for declarer to have the ace of diamonds. If East had been focusing on the hand, he would have known to rise king of diamonds, cash the jack of clubs, and exit with a diamond. This will always defeat the contract when it can be defeated, and there will be no risk of an accident. As the play went, West probably should have ducked the ace of diamonds, and if West ducks the trick declarer can make if he gets the spades right.

\section*{Should East have bid differently?}

East has a difficult decision over \(2 \uparrow\). 3 by him would be a natural game-force, so he doesn't have a convenient invite available. He can only either force to game, or Lebensohl his way to 3e. Taking the low road looks reasonable. His side has a maximum of 24 HCP , and the \(2 \downarrow\) call indicates that suits might not be splitting. On the actual hand he was certainly right to not force to game.

East doesn't really think that \(4 \vee\) will make on a combined 18 -count at the most, but he doesn't know what kind of distribution he is up against. He has decided that there is no game, and while he would have competed to \(4 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\) over \(3 \bullet\), he couldn't be confident of making. \(N / S\) bid \(4 \vee\) with their eyes open. They knew they were up against a lot of high cards, and could easily have the distribution to make \(4 \boldsymbol{\vee}\). The odds on doubling \(4 \vee\) simply weren't good enough.

\section*{Bridge with Larry Cohen}

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

\section*{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).

\section*{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.
Last month, we looked at Our opening bid, response and opener's rebid. In this article, we address:
The fourth bid and beyond of our auction (with no interference)
Again, we assume no interference and that we are not in a \(2 / 1\) GF auction (where obviously we are forced until game is reached). Let's start with auctions where our response is 1 -of-a-suit.

\section*{Opener Rebids on the \(\mathbf{1}\) level in a new suit:}

After 1 of a suit- 1 of a suit, what if opener bids a 3rd suit? Let's start where the third bid is still on the 1 -level. So, we are looking at these auc-
 of the 4 th suit is forcing. So, in the auctions above, it would be \(1 \boldsymbol{\wedge}, 2 \boldsymbol{}\) and \(2 \boldsymbol{e}\) respectively (though not all partnerships agree on \(1 \boldsymbol{\infty}-1 \boldsymbol{- 1}\) ).

If responder bids anything but the 4th suit, it is not forcing. His bids of \(1 \mathrm{NT}, 2 \mathrm{NT}\) or 3 NT can end the auction. If he repeats his suit or raises opener's suit (on any level) it can end the auction.

\section*{Opener Rebids on the \(\mathbf{2}\) level in a suit:}

What if opener's rebid was a new suit on the two-level? If opener reverses or jumpshifts, that is forcing (other than a jump rebid of 2NT which is 18-19 balanced). Any other new suit bid on the two-level by opener is NF
 if responder bids over any of these NF rebids? If he repeats his own suit, it is weak, NF. If he jump rebids his suit to the 3-level, it is invitational (NF). If he jump rebids to game, that is also NF. If he raises opener's suit to the 3-level it is NF. If he bids 2 NT it is invitational (NF). Jumping to 3NT is obviously NF. Really, the only way for responder to force is to use 4th suit forcing.

What if opener's rebid is 2 of his own suit? If opener rebids his suit on the two-level (after a one-level response), that shows a 6-card (almost always) suit and is surely NF. So, we are talking about these starts: ,
 those rebids, responder has to bid a new suit to force. Anything else by responder (notrump, repeating his suit, or raising opener's suit) is NF.

Note: If the auction begins 1 any-1NT-2 of a suit, there isn't really any forcing bid the responder can make. If he bids a new suit, it is NF. If he raises either of opener's suits, it is NF. If he bids notrump, it is NF. The only forcing bid is "the impossible 2a." What is this? It starts 1 any-1NT-2-any- \(2 \boldsymbol{\bullet}\). Responder can't have 4 spades (since he didn't bid 14), so \(2 \boldsymbol{c}\) is forcing. Typically it is some maximum with support for opener's second suit.

\section*{Opener Rebids on the \(\mathbf{3}\) level in a suit:}

What if opener's rebid was on the three-level? Again, opener's jumpshift is \(F\) (GF). Opener's jump rebid ( \(1 \uparrow-1 \phi-3 \star\), for example) is NF. Opener's jump raise ( \(1 \uparrow-1 \mathbf{~}-3\), for example) is also NF. What if responder bids
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again after one of those NF rebids? Anything responder does is GF! So, for example, \(1-1-3-3\) is forcing.

\section*{Opener Rebids No-trump:}

What about if the auction starts 1 of a suit- 1 of a suit-1NT? These are the auctions: 1-1NT, 1-1MAJ-1NT, 1-1MAJ-1NT, 1-1NT. In all cases, opener is showing 12-14 balanced.
Raises of no-trump (even 4NT) are natural and not forcing. Repeating a previously bid suit (even jumping) is not forcing. What about bidding a new suit? Now we get into PA. A lot depends on whether or not the partnership uses new-minor forcing. So, \(1 \uparrow-1 \mathrm{NT}-2 \boldsymbol{w}\) would not be forcing if new-minor forcing were available. Furthermore, jumps in new suits ( \(1-1\) NT- might be played as weak (since with a decent hand, responder would start with new-minor forcing). This complex area is all a matter of PA.
If opener rebids 2 NT , new-minor is also a possibility. Unless using a special convention (such as Wolff signoff), any suit bid on the three level by responder should be forcing (for example, 1-1 1-2NT-3४).

\section*{Opener's Rebid is none of the above:}

If opener jumpshifts, the partnership is forced to game (so anything by responder below game is forcing).
If opener reverses, it is not GF, but is forcing one round. Now, we are back to PA and you can read more about reverses in the April 2019 issue.

\section*{Responder's second bid:}

If opener has rebid 1 NT , responder's new suit (unless conventional) would be NF. Example: \(1-1 \mathbf{1}-1 \mathrm{NT}-2 \boldsymbol{V}=\mathrm{NF}\)
If responder's first bid was 1 NT , his next bid (unless conventional) won't be forcing. Example: 1 \(1 \mathbf{-}-1 \mathrm{NT}-2 \mathrm{~V}-3 \mathbf{N}=\mathrm{NF}\)
If responder bids the 4th suit, it is artificial and GF. Example:

\section*{\(1-1\) - \(2 \boldsymbol{2}-2 \boldsymbol{2}\)}

If responder bids a new suit (and his original response was not 1 NT ), it is forcing: Example: \(1 \boldsymbol{- 1 \vee}-2 \boldsymbol{-}\)

I did warn you that this F or NF topic is not easy.
In the next article, we explore auctions with overcalls.

\section*{QUIZ}

Is the last bid in this auction F or NF (no interference)?
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Opener & Responder & Op. Rebid & Resp. Rebid \\
\hline A & 1 & 14 & 2 & 2 V \\
\hline B & 18 & 19 & 14 & 34 \\
\hline C & 19 & 14 & 29 & 39 \\
\hline D & 1 & 19 & 19 & 29 \\
\hline E & 120 & 14 & 1NT & 38 \\
\hline F & 19 & 1NT & 2 & 29 \\
\hline G & 1\% & 1 & 14 & 3 \\
\hline H & 1 & 19 & 14 & 2NT \\
\hline I & 1\% & 14 & 2* & 34 \\
\hline J & 19 & 14 & 2NT & 39 \\
\hline K & 1 & 19 & 1NT & 4 \\
\hline L & 18 & 14 & 3\% & 3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Each answer can be explained by carefully looking at the detail above.
A: F
B: NF
C: NF
D: F
E: NF
F: NF
G: NF
H: NF
I: NF
J: F
K: NF
L: F
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\section*{GOBBBRDGEGO}

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フ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

\section*{ this month's Master Point Press Bidding Battle book prize}

\section*{Translated by Maurizio De Sacco and edited by Mark Horton}

\section*{Chapter XV}

\section*{1964: NEW YORK: FINALLY WE WIN THE OLYMPIAD}

And so, for 1964 we organise a trial.
Which determines Belladonna-Avarelli (because Walterino has returned to bridge competitions, to the great joy of the whole team), and Pabis Ticci-D'Alelio as the first ranked pairs.

The team was completed on my decision, with Forquet-Garozzo, who finished fifth.

Eugenio Chiaradia could not take part in the trials, and I was deeply saddened by this: since 1948 Chiaradia had been the original and true catalyst of our competitive bridge. An Italian team without Chiaradia? But what could I have done? This was one of the most melancholic moments of my career as Head Coach, because Chiaradia's non inclusion in the team, also meant the break-up of friendship of sixteen years, though never forgetting what Italian bridge owed to Eugenio.

Here is what I wrote in 1965:

\section*{A CIASCUNO IL SUO}

Someone who holds a representative office in Italian bridge was often asked the following question the day after a world championship: "Well, you say that the Italian Bridge Federation only counts on around four thousand members, and despite this, has for a decade dominated countries who count on tens or hundreds of thousands of members playing competitive bridge; ours are amateurs, others, often, professionals... Would you like to explain the reasons for the Italian supremacy?"

Usually the answer is inspired either by the rhetoric of ancestral genius, or the presumed, though non existent training methods, or by the unalterable compactness of the team, or the pathetic legendary spirit, or discipline... and so forth.

I don't deny that the aforementioned have their value: some even vital
importance. But I don't understand why we forget about the school from which these members of the Blue Team come, almost in their totality and about the superiority of Neapolitan and Roman, the two fundamental systems, so undisputed that, by now, there are countless fakes around.

Avarelli and Belladonna play the Roman Club, which had many fathers: further than Giorgio and Walter, Manca Giorgio and Giancarlo, Bianchi Roberto, Iozia, Dussoni, Cavani.

D'Alelio, Forquet, Garozzo, Neapolitans, were born and raised, from a bridge point of view, under the shadow of one teacher only: Eugenio Chiaradia.

From the 'professor's' school graduated: D'Alelio, Farina, Forquet, Garozzo, Luciani, Montuori, Ricci, Sabetti, Siniscalco, Zeuli and... this looks enough to me.

I believe I must, at this point, take a few lines to relate some homeland history to the youngsters, and remind the old ones.

The development of competitive bridge, in Europe and Italy in the post-war era, started in 1948. But Italy was not admitted to the European championship until 1949.

An Italian bridge representative went, in person, to the 1949 European Championship. The English won, and the Italians were fifth. In the team, with Dussoni and Mazzitelli there were four Neapolitans, Chiaradia, Siniscalco, Ricci and Zeuli, who were a kind of attraction, because they played a bidding system which was rather odd and new in those times: the 'trefle sciaradià', as the French called it. That 'trefle sciaradià' was none other than the Neapolitan Club created by Chiaradia.

Nowadays, in America they write that Chiaradia drew the original idea from the Vanderbilt Club and in Belgium they say that the Neapolitan Club derives from an old local system, but it is a fact that, in 1949, nobody was contesting Chiaradia's, 'the professor', fatherhood of the newborn. He had had the idea back in 1944, and dedicated himself to making it real: found some intelligent and passionate bridge 'guaglione', at the Canottieri Savoia, and made up the first nucleus of the Blue Team.
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Giesù, Giesù, che ffatica, neh, che ffatica!"
Io dico...tu tieni...cheddici?"
Noi stiamo in zona, l'avversario in prima...cheffai?"
No money games. To try cute intuitive plays, which would have demonstrated the brilliance of the maker, was not allowed: you had to stay focused on the system, and the whole training consisted in bidding the hand without playing it, and the 'two' and the 'three' were pulled out to make the bidding more interesting. Go on, go on: 'io dico, e voi che dicite?'

They were now coming back from Paris.
Proud, haughty? Not even close: at the Canottieri Savoia, Eugenio Chiaradia was carrying on with his lessons and his training, as if they were still beginners and not Italian Azures.

In 1950 Zeuli and Siniscalco went to Brighton, to the European Championship, in the Italian team. We could have won, but the last match, against Belgium, cost us everything and we finished third.

Patience, we had made a step forward.
And the year after, in Venice...
The year after in Venice, with the Milanese parachutists Baroni and Franco, the Neapolitans gave us two pairs: Chiaradia-Ricci and Sinis-calco-Forquet. This last one was the last chick of the laying, a boy who I had put in the team not without attracting critics and gloomy predictions, while Chiaradia guaranteed that he was the best of the most recent disciples.

Italy won its first European championship.
And so the history of the Blue Team started.
Listen to how many Neapolitan presences our national team had at the European championships, after 1951:

1952: Chiaradia, Siniscalco, Zeuli; 1953: Chiaradia, Forquet, Luciani, Ricci, Siniscalco, Zeuli; 1954: Chiaradia-Forquet; 1955: Chiaradia, D’Alelio, Ricci, Sabetti; 1956-'57-'58: Chiaradia, D'Alelio, Forquet, Siniscalco; 1959: Chiaradia, Forquet. And at the world championships? Chiaradia counts on eight presences (1951, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963), D'Alelio eight (1957, 1958, 1959, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965), Forquet ten ((1951, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965), Garozzo five (1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965), Ricci one (1951) and Siniscalco four (1951, 1957, 1958, 1959).

It is true that it would not have been possible to get such a necklace of wins without the contribution of other circumstances, but what is certain is that the pedestal for it all must be sought in the professor's school. It is this mildness, patience, and above all his indescribable and superhuman passion, which allow him to tolerate the unevenness of others' temperaments, to 'teach', in the most literal sense of the word, how to behave in a team's match.

This is the way we succeeded in the European championships, and after the bitter delusionment of 1951 (how to forget the melancholy of Hotel Vesuvio, when the Americans portrayed us as antediluvian monsters, lunar... and one day, we would read in their big newspapers that we were from Mars!) started the series which allowed Italy to be proclaimed, and proclaimed again, ad nauseam, world champions.

So many years went by.
The men who were 'guaglioni' are now President of a Tribunal, University Professors, Directors of a bank, and so on.

The last one of the laying, Garozzo, is defined as 'el mas grande carteador do mundo' . The Neapolitan school doesn't exist anymore: the professor, the only one who remained equal to himself and who would still have had sufficient passion to start again with 'io licito...tu tieni... cheddici?', went to Brazil.

Too many things changed, even inside us.
Winning, for example, no longer gives us the same feeling as the first time in Venice. 1951, when, at the prizegiving ceremony, I wanted that the first person to receive the cup from De Nexon's hands was he, Sciaradà; nor I can forget New York 1957, when Chiaradia asked me, as a favour, to let Avarelli-Belladonna, Siniscalco-Forquet play, sacrificing his pair to the altar of the team's victory, so generating Fort Apache's legend.

The inevitable progression of time and the seasons brings with it bitter fruits as well, and so it happens, that he who bears the responsibility for forming a team that looks sentenced to win, at some point deems that some pair has become such a perfect and inseparable unit that it should not be touched any more, for any reason, not even for romantic loyalty to the Maestro.

Consequently, since no other pair (already experimented or ex novo ) gave reasonable hope for favourable results, it was precisely the oldest
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technician, the flag bearer for the Blue Team, and perhaps still better equipped technically, who was sacrificed.

So for this reason it is comprehensible that you could believe that the old friendship, grown up through twelve years of battles fought together, is extinguished, that you'd hold a grudge so that, when you meet for example, you'd turn your head, for the fear that looking into each other's eyes would bring so many memories to the surface that you would feel compelled to hug.
***
From time to time, to have to cancel a name from the list of those who love me, which is getting smaller every day, to feel more lonely every day, is the price I have paid and that - with God's permission - I'm available to keep paying, in order for the Blue Team to continue winning.
***
But the truth is stronger than these fogs.
If they ask me, today, when the Blue Team's wins are countless, what originally created the possibility of winning always, I answer: The Neapolitan and the Roman Club.

And if they still ask me today, when praising dribbles coming from Indonesia and Czechoslovakia, San Francisco and New Delhi, and somebody might think that together with my belly, my presumption grew as well, who is the one who deserves the merit for our chain of wins, I don't hesitate to do my duty and tell the truth: Eugenio Chiaradia.

So, first news, Chiaradia is missing.
Second news, I'm not the captain any more. I appointed Osella.
The Olympiad will develop in three phases: an eliminatory Round Robin, the semifinals with four teams, and a final with two.

I said and wrote that I will not go to New York, even if in my heart I predict that it will be quite difficult, especially if things do not go too well there, to stay here among robbers and assassins, to wait for Sergio's phone call from the Sheraton hotel every night.

However, my intention is to stay home.
***
So (my decisions are always irrevocable!) the day before the eve of the semifinals I arrived in New York. In the qualification England was first,
we were second, third and fourth USA and Canada.
According to the regulations, England should have faced Canada and we should have met the United States.

But at the last moment, nobody knows why, there was a change: draw.
According to which Canada will meet the United States and we the English.
***
About these Olympiads I transcribe a Firpo article, Captain Sergio Osella's diary, a few asterisks of my own, and the technical exposition of all hands from the Italy-Great Britain semifinal and the Italy-USA final, made by some Taddeo, a not very well hidden pseudonym for a Tuscan member of the national team.

It is known that many of these deals passed into the history of bridge as classics.

I also add the translation of an article of mine (published in 'Bridge Writers Choice' 1968) which, for heaven's sake, is not a technical comment, but just a dreamlike note about the last deal of the semifinal Italy-Great Britain.

\section*{THE LAST LAUREL}
by Luigi Firpo
"With the Olympic title, bravely conquered by the Azures in New York last May, the last laurel still missing in their crown was added to their incredible record: five European championships and six world championships consecutively.

Anyone who knows a bit about competitive bridge, who knows how tiny are the differences between one or other champion on the strictly technical level, and how big, despite everything else, the weight of whimsical luck still is, knows why I'm writing 'incredible'. It is a series of successes which go beyond human possibilities and the calculation of probabilities, to something prodigious.

\section*{***}

To explain the miracle, to accept it, many said in the past that Italy had been the first to take the road of scientific bridge, that it won because it was rushing with a Ferrari while the others were using an Isetta , that it had distorted the healthy, honest, simple bridge of the old times, to
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turn it into an anguished sixth degree training, good only for a dozen professionals.
***
As time passed, this explanation crumbled in the hands of its own town crier: all, one way or another, tried to build their own Ferrari (calling it, perhaps, Monaco, Little Major, and so forth), but kept losing.

Now the international field is split into two tendencies: those who look at Italy as a forestalling guide, that you ought to imitate and emulate, and those who are still ranting and raving about absurd prohibitions of bidding systems and the return to something which never existed, an imaginary 'natural' bridge.
But the secret of the wins seems to remain inscrutable, and not because it is a jealously defended secret, but only because it is of a different nature to pure play technique.

It looks as though it was understood by the captain of a very strong team, who for some time only knows humiliating defeats, a sincere friend of Italy like Baron De Nexon who, in a recent article, acknowledges that the lack of his pupils lies in indiscipline, insolence, neurosis, intolerance toward partner: ie, not a technical deficiency, but a morale one.
***
We don't need to repeat what the Italian team represents in that regard: a fused block, disciplined, with steady nerves, cemented, galvanised, led with steady hand by an enlightened and respected coach such as Carl'Alberto Perroux. The Azures themselves are the first to acknowledge that the number one protagonist for so many wins is precisely he, the non playing captain, the one who was capable of making a team out of six champions.
***
Unbeatable over long runs, where its endurance and incomparable experience can act as a steamroller, this team had disappointed in Turin, during the first Olympiad: they said that in short matches, in the disjointed cosmopolitan round of all play all, Italy could not perform at its best. Now, in New York, even this diagnosis was contradicted.

Greeting the Azures, just returning from a victorious competition, with the warmest and most affectionate 'Hurray!', Italian bridge thanks
them for this last, shining trophy, and applauds in them its standard bearers, who - only a few days ago were writing 'La Stampa' - despite being only a few, and with little means, without overlooking their job's commitments, knew how to impose on themselves an iron discipline, suffocate any rebellion and polemic, toughen the nerves to make them impervious and find that union of souls which gives the serious connotation of a moral victory to their successes."

Carl'Alberto Perroux Translated by Maurizio Di Sacco Edited by Mark Horton

\section*{THE BLUE TEAM}

IN THE HISTORY OF BRIDGE


An Honors Book from Master Point Press

\section*{The Abbot's Farewell}

The Abbot had enjoyed his stay with the monks of St Geofric's. Trying to teach talentless students was an exhausting experience, though. If truth be told, he had noticed little improvement in their bidding and play. Still, he'd done his best and he had certainly enjoyed the high-quality dinners presented every evening.

The Abbot took a piece of home-made bread and mopped up the last traces of the wine-laden gravy that had accompanied the noisettes of venison. Error-strewn as the bridge had been, he certainly couldn't fault the St Geofric's chef. Father Samuel was a short, light-weight man, not the picture-book image of a chef at all. Just imagine how much more enjoyable life would be, back at St. Titus, if each day ended with a magnificent meal such as he had just enjoyed.

Dom Francis inspected the Abbot's plate. ‘Good gracious!' he exclaimed. 'Anyone would think you'd licked the plate clean.'
'Of course not,' replied the Abbot. 'No respectable gourmet in France would leave any sauce on his plate. That's one of the purposes of having bread with a meal.'
'I wondered if we might make a small change to the system before our last session together,' suggested Dom Francis. 'You remember when we got too high on that heart hand last time? It could all have been avoided with a convention I was reading about yesterday afternoon. Are you familiar with Rolling Gerber?'
'By very good fortune, I have no familiarity with it whatsoever,' replied the Abbot. 'Gerber is a convention for beginners who have no idea how to use Blackwood properly.'
'That's not how Rhoda Lederer's book describes it,' said Dom Francis. 'Gerber allows you to avoid bad slams by keeping low.'
'My conscience would not allow me to put it on the convention card,' persisted the Abbot, 'not even for just one session.'

The St Geofric's chapel clock had just chimed seven times as play began in the evening duplicate. This was an early board.

\section*{Dealer South. None Vul.}


The Abbot led the \(\uparrow\) J and dummy went down with a king, as promised by his response to the 5 Gerber king-ask.

Dom Francis looked across the table, pointing at dummy's king. 'You see how well Gerber works, Abbot? If you use old-fashioned Blackwood, asking for kings with 5 NT would carry you too high when partner had no king.'
'Small, please,' said the declarer.
'When you go back to Hampshire tomorrow, I'll give you a copy of Rhoda Lederer's book as a going-away present,' continued Dom Francis. 'You'll find an explanation of Gerber in the chapter on slam bidding.'
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The Abbot nodded politely. If such a gift were indeed forthcoming, it would be dispensed through his car window at the first opportunity. It was well-known that Gerber was a method favoured by those who would completely misuse the Blackwood convention - players who wouldn't recognise a control-showing cue-bid if it rose up and bit them. It was inconceivable that any established Bermuda Bowl player, such as himself, would adopt a method specifically aimed at hopeless beginners.

Father Willis won with the \(\uparrow \mathrm{K}\) and saw that he had potential losers in trumps, hearts and diamonds. The heart loser could be ruffed in the dummy. How could he avoid a diamond loser? Ah, maybe he could discard it on the K ? What a play that would be! The Abbot would be able to tell everyone about it when he returned to the St Titus monastery.

Father Willis cashed the ace and queen of clubs, seemingly taking no notice of the ominous 9 and 10 that fell from East. He continued with the \(\vee A\) and ruffed his remaining heart in the dummy. He looked round at the other players, to check that they were all appreciating his line of play. ‘King of clubs, please,' he said.

Dom Francis ruffed in the East seat and the contract could no longer be made. Declarer overruffed and played the ace of trumps. He eventually had to lose a trick to the king of trumps and a diamond trick.

Father Haynes, who had been looking around the room during the play, leaned forward. 'Could you have drawn trumps before taking your discard?' he enquired. 'The king of clubs wouldn't get ruffed then.'

Father Willis looked back blankly. 'You may be right,' he replied. 'If the \(\$ \mathrm{~K}\) wasn't ruffed, though, I was going to take a trump finesse then.'

Since the slam had been bid with the aid of the G-convention that no respectable player would name in public, the Abbot had no intention of telling them how it could have been made. Declarer could have improved his chance of discarding the diamond loser by drawing precisely two rounds of trumps before crossing to dummy to play the \(\boldsymbol{\$} \mathrm{K}\). This would be possible only if he led the \(\mathbf{Q}\) from his hand on the first round. To play the ace and queen instead would allow West to win and draw a third round, preventing a heart ruff.
'I expect there was a way to make it,' continued Father Haynes. 'I'll look in Rhoda's book afterwards to see if there's anything about deals like that.'

Shortly afterwards, it was the Abbot's cardplay that was tested:

\section*{Dealer South. E/W Vul.}


The Abbot paused for thought after his partner's raise to 4a. Was there any law against him holding the \(\downarrow\), perhaps even accompanied by three trumps to the queen? It was true that he was wearing a very sour expression, almost as if he were praying that the Abbot wouldn't bid any further. Not that an ethical player such as himself would make any allowance for that. If anything, he would be more inclined to make another bid.

There was no further bidding and Father Godwin led the drawing the 5, 2 and 10. The Abbot ruffed the club continuation and played the ace of trumps, not in the least displeased to see West show out. Most of the other tables would be in a slam. It was typical of bad players to overbid good hands and underbid poor ones. Mind you, it might prove tricky even to make game.

The Abbot played his three top hearts, pleased to see East follow all the way. When he continued with ace, king and another diamond, Father Benjamin won in the East seat. These cards were still in play:


When East exited with the 8 , the Abbot ruffed low in his hand and overruffed in the dummy. 'Play the \(\mathbf{~} 8\),' he said.

Father Benjamin played the \(\boldsymbol{\$}\) J and the Abbot followed blithely with the 5 . When East returned the 9 , he finessed the 10 and claimed the contract.
'We should have beaten that,' Father Godwin declared. 'Your club lead at the end gave him a ruff-and-discard. Did you realize that?'
'It made no difference,' said the Abbot. 'If he plays the queen of trumps instead, I duck that and he has to play a club or a trump.'
'That may be true, for all I know,' persisted Father Godwin, 'but you won't ever find me giving a ruff-and-discard.'

For a moment the Abbot was tempted to point out that he would have gone down if West hadn't favoured him with a second round of clubs at the start. This would have left the defenders with a safe club return when they took the third round of diamonds. He was feeling rather tired, though, perhaps as a result of his second portion of the excellent venison dish. Explaining the simplest bridge situation to players at this level was a tiresome business. They rarely seemed to appreciate such assistance anyway.

A round or two later, the Abbot had this deal to play:

Dealer South. N/S Vul.


The 80 -year-old Father Norris placed the 9 on the table.
'I had a very awkward hand to bid,' declared Dom Francis, as he laid out his dummy. 'If you had just 20 points, we wouldn't have enough for game. With any more, we should have enough.'
'Small, please,' said the Abbot.
'There didn't seem to be any way I could make a game try,' continued Dom Francis. 'It's easier when partner opens 1 NT because then you can use 2 NT as a game try.'
'Small, please,' repeated the Abbot. 'Play the four of clubs.'
Dom Francis reached, somewhat reluctantly, for the requested card. Was there something wrong with the Abbot's hearing? He didn't seem to have heard the query about the bidding.

East won with the and the Abbot unblocked the When the two top diamonds dropped the queen from declarer, East switched back to clubs. The Abbot won with dummy's \(\boldsymbol{\mu} \mathrm{J}\) and ran the \(\because \mathrm{Q}\) successfully. He picked up the trumps for no losers and claimed the contract.
'We're learning such a lot from you, Abbot,' declared Dom Francis.
'Maybe Norris and Gavin missed the point of this deal, but the winning play was to lead the Q from the dummy.'
'Yes, but I needed an entry to dummy to make that play,' replied the Abbot. He turned towards Father Gavin in the East seat. 'You shouldn't have played your ace of clubs on the first trick.'
'I was in the third seat,' Father Gavin replied. 'Rhoda Lederer is quite insistent on playing high in the third seat. It's different in the second seat, I grant you.'
The Abbot laid out the club holding of the four players on the table, looking up to see if he had their attention. 'The 9 is led and dummy plays low. You must play one of your spot-cards, keeping the ace over the jack. Then I can't reach dummy for a trump finesse.'

Father Gavin shook his head at this suggestion. He pointed at his club holding. 'My other clubs were the 6,3 and 2 , he replied. 'We play that any card lower than the 7 is a discouraging signal. Even if I don't play my ace, contrary to what Rhoda Lederer recommends, I can hardly give partner the wrong signal.'
The Abbot gathered up the club cards and returned them to their respective pockets. He was largely wasting his time, trying to instruct players with not one ounce of natural ability at the game. He would venture one more sentence before moving to the next board. 'You know from the 9 lead that if you don't hold up the ace I will cross to the club jack and you won't score a trump trick. That's all there is to it.'

The other three players showed no signs of understanding this analysis, but anyway it was very kind of the Abbot to give up his time. For a player of his supposed experience, it was rather a mystery that he hadn't read Rhoda Lederer's book.

Time passed tolerably quickly and the Abbot could see an end to his labours when there were just two rounds left to be played. He picked up the South cards on this board:

\section*{Dealer South. Both Vul.}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
- AQ93 \\
- 10 \\
- 873 \\
-KQ1083
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { \& } 854 \\
& \vee 10752 \\
& 1054 \\
& -62
\end{aligned}
\]} & \\
\hline & \[
\begin{array}{|lll|}
\hline & \mathrm{N} & \\
\mathrm{~W} & & E \\
& \mathrm{~S} & \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\[
\]} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
, K76 \\
- K86 \\
- AKQJ2 \\
- A7
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline West & North & East & South \\
\hline Father & Dom & Father & The \\
\hline Lexus & Francis & Jodrun & Abbot \\
\hline - & - & - & 2NT \\
\hline Pass & 3 & Pass & 39 \\
\hline Pass & 3NT & Pass & 49 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{All Pass} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Father Lexus, whose red-veined nose suggested he was not averse to the odd glass of alcohol, led the \&K against the heart game. The Abbot held up the and won the club continuation. Although they were playing matchpoints, he saw the chance for a safety play in hearts. Yes, that would serve as one last glistening piece of instruction for the other players to remember. He crossed to the \(\$ 10\) and called for a low heart.

When East followed with the \(\geqslant 3\), the Abbot played the \(\geqslant\). Father Lexus won with the \(\vee 10\) and could not play spades successfully from his side of the table. The Abbot ruffed the E return in dummy and discarded a spade from his hand. He then drew trumps, delighted to see a 4-1 break in the suit. He scored his remaining diamond tricks and recorded a satisfactory +620 .
'It was lucky you played it from the South hand,' observed Father Jodrun. If Dom Francis plays the contract, I would lead the \(\boldsymbol{\$}\). We would score three spades a heart and a club.'

Father Lexus screwed up his eyes, as if performing some complex
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calculation. 'That would be two down,' he said.
The Abbot suddenly felt rather tired, after immersing himself in such a poor standard of bridge for nearly two weeks. No-one had even noticed his masterly play of the \(\vee 8\), or stirred themselves to think why declarer should make such a play. Should he explain that East could have beaten the contract by rising with the jack on the first round of trumps? There was no percentage in it. No-one would follow his explanation. Worse than that, he would have to endure further mention of Rhoda Lederer's wonderful book and its fervent advocation of 'second-hand low'.

Tomorrow he would have an arduous four-hour drive back to the monastery. Two weeks of rich food was enough for anyone, despite the high quality of Father Samuel's game dishes. Back at St Titus, he would be amongst players who, by and large, understood something about the game. Yes, it would be good to be home again.
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\section*{Bridge Over the Rainbow}

Alex Adamson \& Harry Smith

Alex Adam.son \&. Harry Smilh


\section*{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."

\section*{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.

\section*{Jeff Bayone \\ Honors Bridge Club}

AVAILABLE FROM A BRIDGE RETAILER NEAR YOU

\section*{The ubid Auction Room}

Marc Smith follows the battle to represent USA at the 2019 Bermuda Bowl

\section*{THE 2019 Open USBC:}

Held in the Chicago suburbs over 10 days during May, the Open USBC decided which team would join the Meckwell sextet to represent the USA at the 2019 Bermuda Bowl in China. After six days of play, just four teams remained. In one semi-final, WOLFSON saw off the original top seeds, ROSENTHAL, by a comfortable 216-118.

We start with action from the other semi, between FLEISHER (Martin Fleisher, Chip Martel, Eric Greco, Geoff Hampson, Joe Grue and Brad Moss) and KRIEGEL (Oren Kriegel, Ron Smith, John Diamond and Brian Platnick).

Readers can bid the deals with their regular partner (using the bidding slips provided elsewhere in the magazine) and then compare their contracts with those reached at the table by the team that will line up as USA2 in China in September.
KRIEGEL found a rather unusual way of losing 13 IMPs on our first deal:

\section*{Hand 1. ENW Game. Dealer East}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline ¢ AK4 & & 4 Q2 \\
\hline \(\checkmark\) K104 & \({ }^{\mathrm{N}}\) & \(\checkmark 85\) \\
\hline -KJ107 & W E & - Q62 \\
\hline - Q92 & S & \& KJ7653 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

North doubles if West opens with a 15-17 1NT. If a redouble is passed back to North, he retreats to Two Spades
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Grue & Platnick & Moss & Diamond \\
- & - & Pass & Pass \\
1NT & Double & 3NT & All Pass
\end{tabular}

Platnick's double is not alerted or annotated in the hand records and, indeed, his 6-3-3-1 15-count is not inconsistent with a penalty double. Undeterred, Brad Moss showed full appreciation for the value of a
vulnerable game and raised to the optimal contract.
North led a spade around to declarer's king, won trick two with his singleton and continued spades to dummy queen. A diamond went to North's ace and the spade continuation meant 11 tricks for declarer: a routine \(\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}+660\) ?

At the other table, the KRIEGEL East/West pair also got to 3NT, but a funny thing happened on the way to the forum:
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Kriegel & Fleisher & Smith & Martel \\
- & - & Pass & Pass \\
1NT & Pass & \(3 N T\) & Pass \\
Pass & Double & \(4 \boldsymbol{2}\) & All Pass
\end{tabular}

Here, Martin Fleisher did not double the opening 1NT. When East's raise to game came back to him, though, he now produced a red card. This development encouraged Ron Smith to rethink his position, and he retreated to Four Clubs.

Chip Martel did not find the heart lead, but when declarer immediately tried to cash three rounds of spades for a heart discard, Martel scored a ruff to go with his partner's three aces: E/W -100 and 13 IMPs to FLEISHER.

Curiously, this deal also produced a double-digit swing in the other semi-final. In that match, Zia-Rosenberg found their way to 3NT after West had effectively overcalled in spades over the opening 1NT. At the other table, though:
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Wooldridge & & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Hurd \\
Hass
\end{tabular} & Pass \\
1NT & - & Double & Pass \\
Pass & \(3 \downarrow\) & All Pass & \(2 \downarrow\)
\end{tabular}

East remained ominously silent as \(\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}\) climbed to the 3-level in their 5-3 fit. The defence managed to collect five tricks, but +50 was small compensation for the -660 lost at the other table.

Recommended auction: Geoff Hampson's decision is admirable, and well done if you replicated that auction. Another option seems to be a penalty redouble from North (people other than us old foggies do still play those, don't they?). If East then continues with Three Clubs when North retreats to Two Spades, then 3NT seems like the obvious destination. If East passes to give his partner a choice of penalizing Two Spades, though, then you will go plus, but only just and +100 will cost you 11 IMPs.
MARKS: 3NT 10, Three Clubs 4, Two Spades-Doubled (by North) 3
Running Score: 2019 USA2 10
After three of the eight 15 -board stanzas, FLEISHER had built a substantial but not insurmountable lead, 116-71. Over the next three sets, though, the worm turned and KRIEGEL fought back. Our next deal certainly helped their cause:

Hand 2. Both Vul. Dealer East
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline ¢ J8765 & N & - A432 \\
\hline - 10753 & & - K84 \\
\hline -K6 & W E & - AJ105 \\
\hline - 54 & S & * AQ \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

North overcalls \(1 \vee\) or \(2 \vee\) if able to do so
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Kriegel & Hampson & Smith & Greco \\
- & - & 1 & Pass \\
\(1 \boldsymbol{1}\) & \(2 \boldsymbol{v}\) & \(3 \uparrow\) & All Pass
\end{tabular}

This seems like an eminently sensible auction. North not unreasonably led his singleton diamond, so declarer was able to dispose of his club loser and eventually lost two tricks in each major: E/W +140.

In the other semi-final, the deal was flat at \(\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}-100\), one in 44 and the other in 34 when declarer mistimed the play after the same opening lead.

The excitement was at the second table in our match, though:
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Grue & Platnick & Moss & Diamond \\
- & - & 1 & Pass \\
2 & Pass & \(4 \boldsymbol{a}\) & Pass \\
Pass & Double & Redbl & All Pass
\end{tabular}

Joe Grue’s jump to Two Hearts showed five spades, four hearts and what are described as non-invitational values, and who can argue with that description of this West hand. Brad Moss clearly expected a little more, though, as he not only jumped all the way to game but also redoubled when North expressed doubt about the contract's viability.

Here, with South on lead, the defence was deadly accurate: South led his singleton heart and ruffed declarer’s \(\geqslant \mathrm{K}\) at trick two with his singleton \(₫ \mathrm{Q}\). So, the defence here scored two hearts and three spades for an even E/W - 1000 and 15 IMPs to KRIEGEL
Recommended auction: Stopping in Two Spades is perhaps too difficult, unless West passes his partner's opening One Diamond bid, and who does that on this sort of hand these days? You may think that stopping to double North in Two Hearts might be a good idea, but that's not such an easy contract to defeat as the cards lie. The Kriegel/Smith auction above looks quite reasonable.

MARKS: Two Spades 10, Three Spades 9, Two Hearts (by North) 7, Four Spades 5, Two Hearts-Doubled (by North) 2
Running Score: 2019 USA2 10
After six of the eight sets KRIEGEL had reduced the deficit to a mere 8 IMPs (194-202) with 30 deals remaining. This deal was key in a tight finish:

Hand 3. E/W Game. Dealer North
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
© QJ 1043 \\
- AQ862 \\
-A4 \\
\(\because 2\)
\end{tabular} &  & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\]} \\
\hline West & North & East & South \\
\hline Diamond & Greco & Platnick & Hampson \\
\hline - & 1NT & Pass & Pass \\
\hline Double & Pass & 2\% & 2 \\
\hline 29 & 2NT & Pass & 3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

All Pass
North opens a 15-17 1NT. South passes but competes to \(2 \diamond\) or \(3 \diamond\) if able at a later turn
John Diamond's double showed either a minor-suit single-suiter or both
majors. East's relayed with Two Clubs to ask which, giving South the chance to introduce his diamonds cheaply. West's Two Hearts now showed both majors and Greco showed a good diamond raise with 2NT. Hampson retreated to Three Diamonds and there matters rested.

West led the \(\mathbf{Q}\) to the king and ace and defence now found both of their heart ruffs to hold declarer to seven tricks. \(\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}+100\).

After the same start Joe Grue liked his hand much more than John Diamond had done at the first table:
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Grue & Kriegel & Moss & Smith \\
- & 1 NT & Pass & Pass \\
Double & Pass & \(2 \boldsymbol{~}\) & \(2 \downarrow\) \\
3 & Pass & 4 & All Pass
\end{tabular}

Whereas Diamond had just shown his majors at the two-level, Grue suggested a much better hand via a Three Diamond cue-bid. Brad Moss thought he had enough to bid game now, and right he was. There was only one lead to beat the game, an unlikely 2 from 9-2 doubleton.

On the club lead, declarer ruffed two hearts, bringing down North's king, and lost just two minor-suit tricks plus the king of trumps. E/W +620 and 11 IMPs to FLEISHER.

Recommended auction: Exactly how you bid this hand will depend on your methods against a strong no-trump, although I strongly recommend the 'Meckwell' method employed by both pairs in our featured match. Thereafter, it is all a matter of valuation: just how good do you think this West hand is, sitting under a strong no-trump?
MARKS: Four Spades 10, Three Diamonds-Doubled (by South) 6, Three Spades 4, Three Diamonds (by South) 3

Running Score: 2019 USA2 20
FLEISHER gained 8 IMPs and 2 IMPs on the last two, low-scoring sets to advance to the final with a 255-237 win. There they would meet WOLFSON (Jeffrey Wolfson, Steve Garner, Joel Wooldridge, John Hurd, Zia Mahmood and Michael Rosenberg). This bidding challenge arose in the first stanza:

Hand 4. E/W Game. Dealer East
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \(\wedge\) AQ & & ( K9863 \\
\hline \(\checkmark 1065\) & N & - 8 \\
\hline -106 & W E & - AK98 \\
\hline \& Q87532 & S & * AKJ \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
(North bids \(3 \vee\) and South raises to \(4 \vee\) )
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline West & North & East & South \\
\hline Wolfson & Grue & Garner & Moss \\
\hline - & - & 14 & Pass \\
\hline 1NT & 29 & Double & \(3 \%\) \\
\hline 3a & Pass & 44 & All Pas \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

At this table, North overcalled only Two Hearts and South raised just to the 3-level. Even so, East/West never found their club fit and the excellent slam was missed. With spades breaking 3-3, there were 12 tricks in that denomination too: \(\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}+680\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline West & North & East & South \\
\hline Greco & Rosenberg & Hampson & Zia \\
\hline - & - & 18* & Pass \\
\hline 17* & 39 & Double & 4 \\
\hline 5\% & Pass & 63 & All Pas \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Here, East/West had to cope with higher pre-emption, but they still found the top spot. Geoff Hampson opened with a Strong Club and the One Heart response was a semi-positive without three controls (ace=2, king=1). The bidding was at the 4 -level by the time Eric Greco next got to speak, but undeterred he introduced his motley 6 -card suit. Hampson's hand was eminently suitable, so he raised to the excellent slam. E/W +1370 and a well-deserved 12 IMPs to FLEISHER, who led 48-0 after just seven deals of the final.

Recommended auction: The key to reaching the top spot in a natural auction is West's decision after 14-(Pass)-1NT-(3४)-Dbl-(4४)-?

Whilst Jeffrey Wolfson might have bid his clubs en route to Four Spades in the first auction above, the extra level of pre-emption makes things very difficult for West and I would expect most experts to settle for Four Spades rather than risking Five Clubs. Kudos to Michael Rosenberg, even though his aggressive action did not bear fruit at the table in Chicago.

MARKS: Six Clubs 10, Four Hearts-Doubled (by North) 7, Four Spades/ Five Clubs 6, Six Spades 2

Running Score: 2019 USA2 30
Hand 5. E/W Game. Dealer West
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline ¢ 75 & & - KQ8 \\
\hline \(\checkmark 1072\) & N & \(\checkmark \mathrm{K} 9\) \\
\hline -KQ1042 & W E & - AJ875 \\
\hline \& J109 & S & - A 73 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

North opens 1s and South raises to 2 as
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Hurd & Hampson & Wooldridge & Greco \\
Pass & 14 & \(1 N T\) & All Pass
\end{tabular}

At this table, Eric Greco did not raise spades. When John Hurd also chose to pass that was the end of matters. Greco led a spade and declarer was soon claiming ten tricks: E/W +180.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Martel & Rosenberg & Fleisher & Zia \\
Pass & \(1 \uparrow\) & \(1 N T\) & \(2 \boldsymbol{1}\) \\
2NT & Pass & \(3 \boldsymbol{\varkappa}\) & Pass \\
\(3 \$\) & Pass & 3NT & Double \\
All Pass & & &
\end{tabular}

After Zia's competitive Two Spade bid, Chip Martel maneuvered his side to diamonds via Lebensohl. Martin Fleisher now liked his hand sufficiently to take a shot at game and Zia expressed his doubt about that decision in the traditional manner.

At this table, Zia managed at least to keep the defence in the ballgame by leading the \(\mathbb{Q}\), but the contract was surely always destined to make in reality. Would you have found the winning defence from Michael Rosenberg's hand? Holding AJ10xx \(\vee\) Axxx \(\uparrow \mathrm{x}\) Qxx, he needed to win the heart lead with the ace and switch to a club. Declarer cannot afford to rise with the A , so Zia would win with the K and then revert to hearts whilst the defence still holds the A.

That proved to be too difficult even for one of the world's greatest card players. Winning the first trick with the \(\uparrow \mathrm{K}\), declarer lost just three hearts and the A for E/W +750 and another 11 IMPs to FLEISHER.

Recommended auction: Once South raises to Two Spades, it is surely right for West to compete to Three Diamonds via Lebensohl. Whether you decide to take a shot at game on the East hand is, of course, less clearcut. With ten tricks the limit in diamonds, there are also no marbles available for trying game in your 10-card fit.

MARKS: 3NT 10, Three Diamonds 6, Four Diamonds 5, Two Spades-Doubled (by North) 4, Two Spades (by North) 2

Running Score: 2019 USA2 40
As they had in the semi-final, the FLEISHER team got off to a flyer. This time, they led by 102-30 after two sets. There were still 90 boards left, though, so plenty of time for a recovery by WOLFSON.

Hand 6. Both Vul. Dealer South


North opens 1 . South bids 3 if possible and North bids 5
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Grue & Garner & Moss & Wolfson \\
- & - & - & Pass \\
Pass & 1 & \(2 \boldsymbol{~}\) & 3 \\
\(4 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}\) & 5 & Pass & Pass \\
Double & All Pass & &
\end{tabular}

With such extreme shape, Brad Moss was perhaps tempted to break discipline after pre-empting. After all, two black aces opposite might mean that not only is Five Spades making, but Five Diamonds too. Perhaps a fit-showing Three Heart or Four Heart bid from Grue would have ensured that his partner did not do the wrong thing. Moss was up to the task anyway, and his singleton heart lead ensured that the defence found its three tricks easily enough: \(\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}+200\).
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Hurd & Fleisher & Wooldridge & Martel \\
- & - & - & Pass \\
Pass & 1 & \(1 \uparrow\) & 2 \\
2NT & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
Double & Pass & 5 & Double \\
All Pass & & &
\end{tabular}

At this table, Joel Wooldridge started with a One Spade overcall. Chip Martel showed a sound diamond raise via a \(2 \boldsymbol{c}\) cue-bid and John Hurd showed an invitational or better 4 -card spade raise with 2 NT . Fleisher showed his hearts and extra values and now Wooldridge jumped to game. When his partner doubled Five Diamonds now, though, things were perhaps less clear: with North having bid hearts naturally, the chance of both sides having a double fit was surely much higher here. Once again, perhaps North could have assisted in the decision-making process by preferring a fit bid rather than a general raise, although admittedly the heart suit does not have the ideal texture to suggest that option.

Although Martel led a heart, declarer won the \(\vee\) A and played a club to his king and West's ace. Now a diamond to East and the \(\boldsymbol{\$}\), overtaken, and a third round of clubs, forced declarer to guess the trump position. When he elected to ruff with the \(\uparrow 10\), East overruffed with the bare \(\uparrow \mathbf{Q}\) to defeat the contract by two tricks. E/W -500 and 12 IMPs to FLEISHER.

Recommended auction: I cannot argue much with the Grue/Moss auction above.
MARKS: Five Diamonds-Doubled (by North) 10, Five Diamonds (by North) 8, Five Spades 3

Running Score: 2019 USA2 50
Hand 7. Both Vul. Dealer North
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline - KQ2 & & - AJ764 \\
\hline \(\checkmark\) AK642 & N & - Q9 \\
\hline - 95 & & - AQ2 \\
\hline \% 1052 & S & 2 AK8 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

North doubles a diamond transfer bid
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline West & North & East & South \\
\hline Wooldridge & & Hurd & \\
\hline - & Pass & 2NT & Pass \\
\hline 3 & Double & 39 & Pass \\
\hline 4 & Pass & 49 & Pass \\
\hline 5 & Pass & 54 & Pass \\
\hline 5NT & Pass & 6\% & Pass \\
\hline 69 & All Pass & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

The subsequent auction suggests to me that Wooldridge expected at least 3 -card heart support opposite and, indeed, for my money Three Hearts does indeed confirm that. (Pass usually shows only a doubleton heart and, indeed, you might use redouble to show two hearts and five spades.)

It's strange how the Great Dealer sometimes has a habit of making you pay heavily for every slight transgression when things are going poorly, and yet fails to punish complete howlers when you are in what Zia used to call 'Heat One'. Six Hearts is not such a bad contract here, particularly with the \(\diamond \mathrm{K}\) marked onside. The 5-1 trump break put paid to any hopes declarer might have had, though: E/W -100.

By contrast, the FLEISHER East/West pair made this layout look like child's play:
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Fleisher & & Martel & \\
- & Pass & \(2 N T\) & Pass \\
3 & Double & Pass & Pass \\
\(5 N T\) & Pass & 6 & All Pass
\end{tabular}

Here Chip Martel did pass the double, showing a doubleton heart. Martin Fleisher knew he wanted to play slam and asked his partner to suggest a strain. When Martel bid Six Spades, Fleisher had hit the jackpot. Declarer won the diamond lead, took a diamond ruff in dummy, drew trumps, and claimed an easy 13 tricks: E/W +1460 and 17 IMPs to FLEISHER.

Recommended auction: The Fleisher/Martel seems imminently reasonable, and this deal just goes to show that simply getting to the right small slam can pay a handsome dividend. With the diamond finesse marked on the auction, though, Seven Spades is an excellent proposition. Bidding it, though, is a completely different kettle of fish and I cannot see a sensible auction to the top spot.

MARKS: Seven Spades 10, Six Spades/6NT 7, Six Hearts 5, Seven Hearts/7NT 2, Games 1

Running Score: 2019 USA2 57
FLEISHER continued to pile up the IMPs and at the halfway point led 179-68 and had one foot firmly on the plane to China. But then began the WOLFSON comeback: they won the fifth stanza 52-14 to reduce the deficit to 73 with 45 deals remaining.

Hand 8. E/W Game. Dealer North
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
ค - \\
- K52 \\
- J976 \\
\& AJ9876
\end{tabular} &  & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Q10762 } \\
& \text { A87 } \\
& \text { AQ104 } \\
& \leqslant K
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline West & North & East & South \\
\hline Wolfson & Martel & Garner & Fleisher \\
\hline - & Pass & 1NT & 2** \\
\hline 320 & All Pass & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Perhaps due to the score, Garner began with an off-shape 1NT opening. Fleisher entered with a Two Club bid showing both majors and Wolfson bid an apparently non-forcing Three Clubs (although their convention card does say they play Lebensohl), which ended matters.

Although the clubs were 5-1 and the diamond finesse offside, the singleton trump was the queen. Declarer was able to scramble two hearts, one diamond, three spade ruffs and three trumps for nine tricks: \(\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}+110\).

At the other table, Joe Grue and Brad Moss demonstrated why it is their team that deserves to be on the way to China later in the year:
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
Grue & Rosenberg & Moss & Zia \\
- & Pass & \(1 \boldsymbol{1}\) & Pass \\
1NT & Pass & 2 & Pass \\
\(2 \downarrow^{*}\) & Pass & \(2 \boldsymbol{a}\) & Pass \\
3 & Pass & 5 & All Pass
\end{tabular}

After a semi-forcing 1 NT response and thus a Two Diamond rebid promising at least a 4 -card suit, Two Hearts was a puppet showing either a weak hand with a doubleton spade or a strong raise in diamonds. (A direct

Three Diamonds would be weaker and semi-pre-emptive.)
Moss completed the relay to Two Spades, prepared to play there if his partner held the weak hand. When Grue showed the invitational nature of his hand, Moss was happy to accept, and jumped to the minor-suit game.

Zia led his singleton 8 Q and declarer won in hand perforce and led a low trump towards dummy. Zia hopped up with the king and switched to hearts, but declarer was in control. He won in hand, drew trumps ending dummy, and had the \(\star\) A left in hand in order to take the marked ruffing finesse against West's \(\mathbf{1 0}\). Declarer lost a heart at the end, but that was still E/W +600 and 10 IMPs to FLEISHER.
Recommended auction: Without some clever tool such as the Two Heart relay used by Grue/Moss on this deal, this is a tricky combination as \(1-1\) NT- \(2-3\) is, by definition, fairly wide-ranging. The void in partner's first suit notwithstanding, this West hand is still a huge maximum, and you would certainly raise to Three Diamonds on less-suitable hands. MARKS: Five Diamonds 10, Three Diamonds 6, Three Clubs 5, 3NT 4

Final Score: 2019 USA2 67
FLEISHER gained a further 31 IMPs over sets six and seven to lead by 261157. With only 15 deals remaining, WOLFSON conceded and FLEISHER officially joined the Meckwell team as the USA's representatives in China in September.

There were a wealth of interesting bidding hands in the 240 boards that the FLEISHER team played in the semi-final and final. That they scored 67/80 on the eight deals is a testament to how well they played in these matches and we wish them well (unless they meet England, of course) in China. Mark Horton will be back in this chair next month, but I will return in the September issue with another set of challenging deals harvested from a major event somewhere in the world.
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\section*{The Master point Press Bidding Battle set 18}

One or two fairly straightforward problems this month, with big majority votes, but those are more than made up for with one or two others which are truly horrible decisions - we should all be grateful that we only face them on paper.

\section*{PROBLEM 1}

\section*{IMPs. Dealer North. None Vul.}

ค -
V K865
- AKQ762
\& KQ4
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
- & \(3 \eta\) & Pass & Pass
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Bid & Votes & Marks \\
3NT & 16 & 10 \\
4 & 4 & 7 \\
4NT & 1 & 2 \\
5 & 0 & 2
\end{tabular}

You may remember we held this same hand last month but with the difference that it was South who opened 3 vin front of us. Then the voting went nine for \(3 N T\), four for \(4 \diamond\), three for \(5 \star\), and none for either double or 4NT. From a narrow majority in favour of bidding 3NT, we now have a big majority in favour of the same call. Let's see if the panel can explain why?
Rigal: 3NT. Still 3NT as in last month. Or did I miss something?

\section*{THE BIDS \& MARKS}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Bid & No. of Votes & Marks & & Bid & No. of Votes & Mark \\
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{1.} & 3NT & 16 & 10 & 5. & Pass & 18 & 10 \\
\hline & 4 & 4 & 7 & & 3 & 1 & 3 \\
\hline & 4NT & 1 & 2 & & 4 & 0 & 3 \\
\hline & 5 & 0 & 2 & & 3NT & 1 & 2 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{2.} & Pass & 8 & 10 & & 5 & 1 & 2 \\
\hline & 2. & 8 & 10 & 6. & 5 & 9 & 10 \\
\hline & 2NT & 5 & 8 & & 4NT & 5 & 8 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{3.} & 6 & 10 & 10 & & Dble & 4 & 6 \\
\hline & 7 & 8 & 9 & & Pass & 2 & 2 \\
\hline & 4. & 3 & 6 & & 5 & 1 & 2 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{4.} & 3 & 14 & 10 & 7. & Dble & 10 & 10 \\
\hline & 4 & 3 & 7 & & 3. & 6 & 8 \\
\hline & 4. & 3 & 5 & & Pass & 3 & 5 \\
\hline & 3. & 1 & 3 & & 2NT & 2 & 5 \\
\hline & & & & 8. & B & 10 & 10 \\
\hline & & & & & C & 4 & 9 \\
\hline & & & & & A & 4 & 7 \\
\hline & & & & & D & 2 & 5 \\
\hline & & & & & E & 1 & 2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


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

Well, perhaps you missed that it was a different opponent who opened \(3 \mathbb{\vee}\) ?
Sver: 3NT.
Leufkens: 3NT. Still, what else?
Rosen: 3NT. Wouldn't we all?
Stabell: 3NT. Will remove partner's 4a to 5 and pray.
Byrne: 3NT. Any decent partner will have a spade stop, and I can't think of anything better Smith: 3NT. When the Three Heart opening was on our right, it seemed we had a choice between punting 3 NT or heading somehow to a diamond game. With the opening over us, a diamond contract seems a less attractive proposition, and thus the realistic choices are 3 NT or pass.
Green: 3NT. Horrible problem. If partner bids

4 then I will have to try \(5 \uparrow\). I suppose pass could be right, or \(4 \diamond\) (which is natural according to the system) it's a bit of a guess.
Cope: 3NT-anything could be right (passing might even be our last chance at a positive score). We may have to play 4 NT if partner pulls to spades, but for the time being we have a source of tricks, and a stopper so we fall back on bidding old faithful.
Mould: 3NT. I held this and that is what I bid, which shows I learn nothing! Yes you are going to get a spade lead, but if you play in diamonds where are all your hearts going? The answer is on partner's \&J10xx (he held \(\uparrow\) Kxx \(\vee \mathrm{xx} \downarrow \mathrm{J} 10 \mathrm{x}\) \&AJ10xx). Mind you, I did get a heart lead so that was +490 . In the other room John Holland led a spade and that was - 200.
Bird: 3NT. I certainly don't want to play in diamonds with the pre-empt now on my left; South would be able to over-ruff hearts. 3NT is also somewhat less attractive than previously, but I will still bid it. Why? Because I am averaging only about 5.3 marks every time I put Pass as my answer.
Robson: 3NT. Nightmare problem but 11 tricks may be hard to accrue with the hearts sitting over me, so I prefer to try for the nine-trick game, gambling out the spades.
Kokish: 3NT. \(4 \diamond\) or \(5 \diamond\) could fail on a defensive cross-ruff with 3NT the only make. Or we could lose the first 9 or 10 tricks in 3NT with lots of diamonds available. 3NT might be carrying Hamman's Rule a tad too far, but a Canadian's gotta do what a Canadian's gotta do.
Apteker: 3NT. While partner is probably short in hearts and therefore unlikely to have 13+ HCP
given partner's failure to have acted initially, passing is still too conservative and negative a position to take. This needs little from partner to make game.
Alder: 3NT. Should I bid 3NT, 5 or \(6 \star\) ? Your guess is probably better than mine!

Well, nobody bid either \(5 \star\) or \(6 \uparrow\), and your guess is in line with the majority.
Carruthers: 3NT. What an unpleasant problem. And it may become more so if I see Pass - 4 \(\boldsymbol{\wedge}\) Pass back to me.
Teramoto: \(4 \star\). 3 NT may be in danger on the expected spades lead. \(4 \diamond\) or \(5 \diamond\) may be not bad, as partner often has short hearts with some diamonds.
Sandsmark: 4 . I only have three losers, and have to say something, to avoid being called a coward. Pass is not in my vocabulary on this hand and a double will no doubt result in 4 from partner, and then I'm stuck with my whole foot in the salad. Even if I then take-out in 5 he will believe that I have some tolerance for spades. If, on the other hand, I say \(4 \diamond\), partner is still likely to bid 4ヵ, but when I rebid \(5 \star\), he will probably understand that my hand is unsuitable for any spade contract.
Sime: \(4 \uparrow\). Looks familiar? Nothing I gleaned from comments by my learned fellow panellists in last month's version (South opened \(3 \vee\) ) has persuaded me to change my vote. In fact, the case for \(4 \diamond\) is even stronger. The heart king is now badly placed, a heart lead is less likely and partner did not squeak despite having short hearts. I am even more pessimistic about 3NT and \(5 \checkmark\). In fact 3 NT might be down a lot.
Cannell: \(4 \uparrow\). - I want to bid 3NT but fear the
spade suit, and whether or not the diamonds will provide six tricks. Non-vul at IMPs so will go low.

And out on his own:
Zia: 4 NT. 1t's 2 to 1 that he has a good ace.
Well, if he has an ace at all. And I suspect that the odds are not quite that good as North is definitely favourite to hold the \(\vee\) A.

As various panellists say, it's a horrible decision. I guess that I would go with the majority as we have heard from Alan - even when a spade lead would destroy the contract, they won't always lead one. But I also have a lot of sympathy for the pessimists who bid only 4 *.

\section*{PROBLEM 2}

\section*{IMPs. Dealer North. E/W Vul.}
, A8753
- -
- 104
- A108652
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
- & - & \(1 \downarrow\) & Pass \\
19 & Pass & 2 & Pass \\
\(?\) & & & \\
id & Votes & Marks & \\
ass & 8 & 10 & \\
NT & 8 & 10 & \\
N & 5 & 8
\end{tabular}

This one split the panel three ways, though everyone agreed on one thing:
Rosen: Pass. Horrible problem, second choice 2a, 3rd choice 2NT.

It surely is a horrible problem, Neil.

Stabell: 2 \(\mathbf{2}\). Might be a silly contract if he passes, but we should be able to get to a club contract or possibly even 3NT if he bids 2NT or 3*. Will pass 3 or \(3 \vee\).
Smith: Pass. Sure, we could be cold for Six Clubs. More likely, though, the objective is to end the auction before someone thinks of doubling.
Byrne: 2 . The hardest problem of the set. \(2 *\) might well make since partner can probably scramble one ruff and two aces even on a trump lead, but if he is \(1-5-4-3\) it could be a ridiculous spot. Game is unlikely but theoretically possible, so I shall try \(2 \boldsymbol{4}\) and hope to emerge alive. 2 shows constructive values but I lack a sixth spade, hopefully it won't matter if partner bids on to somewhere else.
Cope: Pass. Any bid we make elevates the auction on a probable misfit. True, partner can have three clubs (that makes 3NT a possibility) and they may even have three spades and a hand too good to raise to \(2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}\) immediately (which brings \(4 \uparrow\) into the picture. Those are possibilities, but the probability is none of the above, so let's go quietly on this misfit.
Zia: \(2 \boldsymbol{4}\). He may have two and maybe it would be better to bid \(3 \stackrel{\circ}{ }\) and pass the \(4 \dot{\aleph}\) cue-bid, but getting too old for those manoeuvres.

Almost worth trying just for the look on his face, but a bit wild, alas.
Alder: Pass. Come back strong club or Gazzilli, all is forgiven. Presumably at the table this went down with \(6 \boldsymbol{e}\) cold.
Carruthers: 24. Did I say Problem 1 was unpleasant? I take it back - this one is more so. We can easily have missed our 9 -card fit by the simple expedient of never bidding the suit.

Sandsmark: Pass. We probably have no fit anywhere, and since partner's rebid is non-forcing, this is a good place to lower the sails. If I bid one more time on this hand, we are bound to get too high and a double is lurking somewhere. Apart from that, no bid can describe my actual hand after this sequence!
Leufkens: \(2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}\). Invitational if I read the system well. Not ideal for sure, but it might improve the contract (even a 5-1 fit might be good with aces and many ruffs), or it might be a good way forward to game.

Also pointing out that 2 would be invitational but coming to a different conclusion is:
Sime: Pass. Not a great advert for Weak Jump Shifts, since the alternative of \(2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}\) is 'invitational.' That's what the system says, although it is debatable whether that treatment is best. Do I really have to make a WJS with \(10 \mathrm{xxxxx}(\mathrm{x})\) ? Serves me right if \(2 \diamond\) goes down with \(6 *\) cold!

I'm not going to swear that the treatment is best, but it is surely the most popular one when playing WJSs, maybe because it helps on more deals than it causes a problem?
Mould: 2^. Marvellous!! But what else?
Sver: Pass. I am aware I can miss some 5e, but I'm not sure how I could reach them apart from bidding 3 e game forcing and be very lucky. Huge minus score looks more probable on such a board and with these aces and a void I hope to make \(2 \checkmark\) even in a possible \(4-2\) fit and not perfect defence.
Teramoto: 24. \(3 \boldsymbol{2}\) is 4th Suit GF, so \(2 \boldsymbol{4}\) looks the only choice. 2 is usually a \(4-2\) fit, 2 NT is an overbid.
Bird: Pass. Even if partner has only four
diamonds, this may be the best spot available. To bid \(2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}, 2 \boldsymbol{\sim}\) or 2 NT instead should trigger an immediate phone-call to the men in white coats. Cannell: 24. Hate it. 2NT is second choice. Flaws everywhere - i.e. a good problem!

Well, did either of those two groups convince you? I'm not sure who had the better of the argument - stop now before we get too high or doubled, or bid again because something good may happen. There was a significant vote for a third option:
Green: 2NT. Are you a man or a mouse? Do you go high or low? Low would be passing which could end up in a silly \(4-2\) fit when game in

spades ( \(\boldsymbol{\wedge}\) Kxx \(\vee\) AKxxx AKxx \(\boldsymbol{*}\) ) or even slam in clubs ( x x AKxxx AKxx \({ }^{\boldsymbol{s}} \mathrm{Kxx}\) when partner would bid a natural 3e over 2NT and then I can advance with \(4 \boldsymbol{4}\) as a cue-bid) could be cold, I agree that these examples are at the top end but we are vulnerable at teams and passing is so horrible that I can't stomach it. I don't like \(2 \boldsymbol{A}\) as partner will assume that we have six and therefore a raise to 3 a would only promise a doubleton.
Kokish: 2NT. Perfect! At the table I might have responded 1NT to allow me to bid 3* after \(1 \diamond-1\) NT; \(2 \downarrow\); or I might have offered preference to \(2 \vee\) in tempo, the actual scenario not unexpected. Passing \(2 \diamond\), though possibly the winner, is not the way I like to approach the game. If East raises to 3 NT , we might be in a good contract.
Apteker: 2NT. A horrible least of evils call. I have a potential source of tricks for NT and it keeps open the small possibility of reaching game in either of the black suits if partner has three of either. The only real alternative for me is to pass.
Robson: 2NT. Horrid problem but I refuse to pass, essentially accepting defeat, when we could be cold for \(7 \boldsymbol{2}\), and I really don't see \(2 \boldsymbol{~}\) solving anything.
Rigal: 2NT. Yes I'm clearly not worth it but if partner bids again I hope we can find a better spot!

That has to be the hope, that another bid from partner gets us to a black-suit contract which has reasonable play. I would hate the big overbid were it not for the lack of anything that is much better. As it is, at least 2NT has the merit of sometimes
working really well, while passing only avoids a penalty and 2 misdescribes our hand just as much as does 2NT, just in a different way. Just as we started out, the only certainty is that this is a horrible problem.

For what it's worth, partner's hand was:

A diamond lead round to your king allows 3NT home as clubs are three-two and you can overtake the \(\boldsymbol{\Delta} K\) to get to dummy - if played by East. Played by West, 3NT should be beaten, while the assorted suit part-scores scramble home.

PROBLEM 3

\section*{IMPs. Dealer North. E/W Vul.}
- A9
- A85
- A
- A1098642
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
- & \(2 i\) & Double & \(3 \Phi\)
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Bid & Votes & Marks \\
6\% & 10 & 10 \\
\(7 \boldsymbol{2}\) & 8 & 9 \\
\(4 \boldsymbol{4}\) & 3 & 6
\end{tabular}

Optimism, pessimism, or science? Let's start with the pessimists.
Rosen: 6e. (I'm sure this was a better problem without the 3 bid as a good test of methods). Stabell: 6e. I want to play in clubs opposite the expected 1-4-5-3 hand, but if I mess around with a double or a forcing bid, he might get the idea that I am giving him a choice. So I just
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bid what I expect to make in order to avoid an accident. 4NT should be asking for aces since I could have doubled with both minors, but I can't afford to continue with 5NT since that will bypass our most likely slam. With a singleton spade and KQ in all other suits, he will probably wonder what I could have for my \(6 \boldsymbol{*}\) bid and perhaps come up with the right answer. Green: 6e. Another tough problem (and one that my team mate held recently, he bid 7e and went down), I can construct hands where grand is good and also hands where it is poor, since I have to guess I will go low as there is a chance that the auction is different at the other table and bidding and making Six may be enough to gain on the board. Holding all of the aces I cannot imagine that partner will ever co-operate (he may also hold two small spades or even worse \(\vee\) ) so I will just bid what I think I can make.
Apteker: 6e. Practical as near impossible to set clubs as trumps and start asking for keycards to investigate the Grand given the pre-empt.
Byrne: 6*. The practical shot. Any attempts to invite Seven will simply confuse partner as to strain, and I don't want to have to correct diamonds to no trumps because partner thought I was inviting a choice of trump suit.
Zia: 62. A pathetic if practical underbid
Sandsmark: 6\%. We have no chance of finding out exactly what is in the cards here, since the enemy have been so active. About everything I bid on this hand can be wrong. It must definitely be wrong to bid \(4 \boldsymbol{\mu}\), since this is no GF. All I know is that we should be in the area for a slam, so I think I have to make partner aware
of that. If he pulls in \(6 \uparrow\), I will say 6 NT , but I will pass \(6 \checkmark\) (if he pulls in \(6 \vee\), he must have at least five hearts). If we should have any business at the 7 level, this will be almost impossible to find out.
Robson: 6飞. I just don't see how we can intelligently explore for a grand here. Both Double and 4 a will only serve to confuse.
Kokish: 6\%. Or 4e, with 6\% coming next. We'd like to have discussed the nature of that sequence, though, to avoid having East correct 6 to a red suit under the impression I have a second suit. Worrying about East's possible offshape take-out double is counter-productive. With no aces, it is even more unlikely that East has such a hand.
Mould: 6\%. No idea and I cannot see me ever getting the info to find out. Where will 49 get me? Second choice \(7 \boldsymbol{e}\)

A number of panellists would like to explore Seven but don't see how to do so, and some fear a misunderstanding as to what we are about if we do try to be scientific. The group above have gone low, the group below guess high:

\section*{Sver: 78.}

Smith: 7\%. There seems no sensible way to investigate, so I bid what I think I can make. Partner surely doesn't have a 20+ balanced hand for his original take-out double, so he should have enough in clubs that we won't have a trump loser.
Cope: 7\%. An outright gamble with a good chance of success if partner has the \(\$ \mathrm{~K}\). They have a pretty lousy take-out double, and maybe even a doubleton spade since the raise was only to 3 . Opposite a sub-minimum such as: \(\mathbf{4} \mathrm{xx}\)
\(\checkmark\) Kxxx \(\diamond\) KQxx 2 Kxx, we would be happy to be in \(7 \boldsymbol{2}\), or am I just trying to convince myself that it is an educated gamble rather than a punt on Foinavon.

For the uninitiated, Foinavon was a horse which won the Grand National steeplechase around 50 years ago at odds of 100 to 1 . There was a huge pile-up of falling horses at a fence and Foinavon came from way, way behind, its jockey carefully picking his way through the chaos, and a 200metre deficit turned into an insurmountable lead. Carruthers: 7e. Really? Is there a way to bid this hand intelligently? Even if I wanted to make a strong invitation to \(\mathbf{7 \boldsymbol { e }}\), is there any way Partner can ever accept an invitation with no aces and possibly 2 spade losers? Nope. I don't think I'm violating Robert's Rule \#2 ("Do not play me for the perfect hand - I NEVER have it.") What do I need? Decent trumps and a couple of kings and a queen. Jack to four trumps may be enough, but jack to three may require a cover of the jack by South with a doubleton honour. Then we'd have a story. I bid \(7 \boldsymbol{2}\) rather than 7 NT in order not to go down six if I'm wrong. Another point is that if I bid 4 4 .4 NT or 5 NT , Partner will think I have another place to play.
Rigal: 7e. You only live once (unless you count this as being in your dreams. I guess I must be licensed to kill partner by giving him a heart attack) 6 will always be passed out so I have to bid what I think we can make unilateral as it might \(t\) be. We are all paper tigers.
Sime: 7\&. I cannot think of a slow route to \(7 \boldsymbol{2}\) which doesn't involve ambiguity about strain. I do not want to have to bid 7 NT when the thirteenth trick in clubs might be a spade ruff.
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Alder：7e．After being cowardly on Problem 1， I will catch up here．I expect most of the panel will cue－bid 4a，but how will that help？Partner is unlikely to guess that I have all four aces．So， it is either the 6 low road or the \(7 \%\) moon shot
Bird：7e The main risk of a loser lies in the trump suit．Still，suppose you bid 4a instead and then \(6 \boldsymbol{*}\) ．Partner will never raise to seven， even when he has enough to make this cold．

That would be my fear．Firstly，that if we have not come across this auction before partner might believe that 4a followed by offered a choice of trump suits，and secondly that he will never bid 7 even when it is cold．Still，if we are confident that we have had sufficient discussion that there should be no misunderstanding，then it can＇t hurt to bid 4a then 6＊，can it？
Leufkens：4 \(\mathbf{4} .6\) is lazy，and I don＇t think 4 4 promises two suits．I don＇t think we can involve partner unless he bids clubs himself；then I＇ll bid 7e．
Cannell：44．Then 6\％．At least that shows more oomph than a leap to \(6 \boldsymbol{2}\) immediately．I doubt I can scientifically find \(7 \boldsymbol{2}\) on some other route． Teramoto：4a．I am planning to bid 6\％at my next turn．This should be better than a direct \(6 \boldsymbol{e}\) ．

I have a slight feeling towards the pessimists＇ 6＾，but in a very regular partnership maybe 4＠ followed by 6 is OK－partner might work it out if looking at all the king－queens．

Partner held：

\section*{}

The K was offside．
I＇ve split the tie in favour of because I believe that the 4a bidders would have bid \(6 \boldsymbol{e}\) rather than \(7 \boldsymbol{e}\) ifforced to a decision．

\section*{PROBLEM 4}

IMPs．Dealer South．N／S Vul．
－J54
－ 10753
－KQ1092
－ 5
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
- & - & - & Pass \\
Pass & \(1 e\) & \(2 \boldsymbol{e}\) & Double \\
\(?\) & &
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Bid & Votes & Marks \\
3 & 14 & 10 \\
4 & 3 & 7 \\
\(4 \uparrow\) & 3 & 5 \\
\(3 \boldsymbol{4}\) & 1 & 3
\end{tabular}

Everyone agrees that we must support partner＇s spades，the only question being how we should go about doing so．The simple fit－non－jump is the popular choice．Of course， \(3 \diamond\) must show spades as we failed to open so can hardly have only diamonds．
Rosen：3४．Wouldn＇t we all？
Cannell： \(3 \downarrow\) ．Lead directing．Fit．
Byrne：3 \(\downarrow\) ．Simple lead－directing bid to show a fit and attract the right lead．If nothing else it will slow the opponents down．
Smith：3 \({ }^{*}\) ．Having failed to open the obvi－ ous Two Diamonds，this three－level action by a passed hand must be some sort of fit－non－ jump，showing a spade raise with diamond val－ ues／length．The main question for me is whether this is enough，and perhaps I should jump to \(4 \star\) ，although perhaps that should show 4 －card spade support？


Much as I love opening 2 2 ，I don＇t think that second－in－hand with a five－card suit and support for both majors is the ideal time．Switch around clubs and hearts and you might persuade me．
Green： \(3 \uparrow\) ．A bit of a style question，if partner can be depended on to hold a decent six－card suit then one might try \(4 \diamond\) as a fit jump but that would tend to promise four card spade support，opposite a more adventurous partner （who might hold a five－bagger） \(3 \diamond\)（as a passed hand）should show three－card spade support with good diamonds and should allow partner to go on to \(4 \uparrow\) with a hand that fits well．

The point about style is important．While
five-card weak two openings have been around for a very long time, it is only in recent years that many people have begun to make weak jump overcalls with only five cards, and it certainly makes a difference to how aggressive partner can afford to be.
Carruthers: \(3 \uparrow\). As I'm worth just 3A anyway, let's see if this elicits a raise. If not, I probably want a diamond lead.
Cope: \(3 \star\). Might as well take up some bidding space and get partner off to the right lead. Lacks the fourth spade for a \(4 \diamond\) bid despite the vulnerability.
Sime: \(3 \uparrow\). I am a passed hand so can make a Fit-Non-Jump. If this prompts partner to bid 4a, I would be inclined to bid a fifth if they bid on. We may need to secure a diamond lead or switch if we wind up defending.

I'm not convinced that we should bid a fifth once we have shown our hand pretty well with the \(3>\) bid, but if you feel good about an action at the table, then go with it.
Rigal: 3ヶ. Fit non-jump. We might buy it cheaper or we might need to bid \(4 \diamond\) to get partner involved. But I'm giving pard some latitude and hoping he can work out when to do more.
Teramoto: \(3 \downarrow\). I want to show diamonds for defense This must have some spades and we can even be allowed to play 34 .
Sver: 3 Pity to miss showing such a nice lead-directing hand.
Leufkens: \(3 \uparrow\). Sure, partner has bid \(2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}\), so probably only has five. And I've got hearts and a good diamond suit, but still, I have to make it more difficult for them. Especially as I can bid \(3 \diamond\) to show my suit plus support (at least some),
as \(3 \diamond\) doesn't make it easier for them than \(3 \boldsymbol{s}\).
Well, I would say that \(3>\) does make it a little easier for them than does 3 - it allows a \(3 \vee\) bid for one thing.
Bird: \(3 \uparrow\). This may help us in the bidding, or in our subsequent defence.
Kokish: \(3 \star\). Or transfer to \(3 \star\). Doing more: \(4 \star\) or \(4 \boldsymbol{4}\) assumes East does not have one of the imaginative hands we all might have for a WJO at this vulnerability. A simple 3a might be more effective than showing the diamonds, and it's an issue worthy of partnership strategizing IMO.

And we do indeed have a vote for a simple 3a bid.
Apteker: 3s. I want to make life more difficult for the opponents to reach their best contract rather than help partner get off to the best lead with \(3 \downarrow .4\) \& or a \(4 \diamond\) fit is possible at these colours but \(3 \boldsymbol{1}\) often does the job when \(4 \vee\) is unlikely a spot for the opponents.

Or we can go for the maximum pre-emption and bid 4a:
Sandsmark: 44. What else? There is no reason for letting the opponents share much info. By pre-empting 4a you leave them guessing where they are going. My alternative would be \(5 \mathbf{A}\), but that may be just a little too much cod-liver-oil for these cards.
I fear that that particular quaint Norwegian expression loses a little something in the translation. As for 54, I agree that this is just too much particularly if, as believed by some of the panel, partner may hold only five spades.
Alder: 4@. A tad aggressive, and if they double and lead trumps, it could be expensive. However, 3 d does not rate to do much - but would
be best in the unlikely event that our opponents cannot make a game.
Mould: 49. Now this is another problem that is entirely dependent on who you are sitting opposite. If B. Senior I pass, if J. Holland I bid 44. That probably suggests I should actually bid 3 a.

Now then Alan, even facing me you wouldn't really pass. Don't be naughty.

Direct spade raises take away more space than do fit-showing diamond bids, but how about a four-level diamond bid?
Stabell: \(4 \diamond\). With four-card hearts, \(4 \diamond\) is almost as good a pre-empt as 49, attracts a diamond lead and allows partner to make the last mistake at the five-level. Yes, we might be too high already, but North doesn't know that. \(3>\) or 3 \& are possibilities since partner's range is wide opposite a passed hand, but it makes it a bit too easy for North to bid 3NT.
Zia: \(4 \star\). Unless partner is Robson then \(3 \star\).
Robson and I appear to share some very bad press regarding the quality of our weak jump overcalls. The man himself makes the same bid, however:
Robson: \(4 \star\). Want to bid to the four-level and want to show my diamond values. So here we are. I seem to recall co-writing a book about this over a quarter-century ago (mind you, there was another section that told me not to take partner's pressure bids too seriously).

I think \(4 \diamond\) should work out OK, unless partner assumes us to have a fourth spade and competes too far on that basis. Overall, however, I do think that we should show the diamonds. This can help in both the auction and defence, and if we are not going to make a fit-showing bid on this hand then

I feel we are being far too restrictive in insisting on holding four-card support for partner.
Partner held:
- AQ10976 62 * 73 * 732

44 would have been down three, while the opposition were making or 6 .

\section*{PROBLEM 5}

IMPs. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
- KQ9
\(\checkmark 6\)
- KJ9864
- K72
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
1 & \(1 \stackrel{1}{2}\) & Double & \(2 \downarrow\) \\
Pass & Pass & \(3 \&\) & Pass
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Bid & Votes & Marks \\
\hline Pass & 18 & 10 \\
\hline 3 & 1 & 3 \\
\hline 49 & 0 & 3 \\
\hline 3NT & 1 & 2 \\
\hline 5\% & 1 & 2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

The panel didn't waste much time on this one.
Rosen: Pass. Wouldn't we all? (Lol)
Stabell: Pass. Cannot punish partner for competing against \(2 \boldsymbol{4}\). Yes, 3NT might make on a very good day opposite the ideal hand, but I could have been a lot stronger than this without being able to bid over \(2 \boldsymbol{4}\). If I bid on and go minus, we will concede - 110 in nest time this hand comes up, with 3\& making our way. Zia: Pass. This is competitive bid. Robson: Pass. I have a good fit but partner rates
to be 2-4-1-6 and we may easily be missing all four aces.
Rigal: Pass. I expect 8-10 and 4-6 pattern and to be in our last making contract.
Green: Pass. Not close for me. Partner can have quite a weak 4-6 hand and is just competing the part score and when non vulnerable I don't think it's worth shooting for game (although it could be making). The opponents are bidding vulnerable and they usually have something. If we were vulnerable it would be a much closer decision but I would still pass. Also sometimes partner can be \(4 / 5\) shape some of the time I don't think 3e guarantees six and opposite a five-bagger game is miles off.
Sime: Pass. Partner is typically 4-6 in the rounded suits with less than an opener. Three Clubs may be our last making contract.
Cannell: Pass. Content. 3 is not forcing.
Mould: Pass. Entirely a methods question. For me this shows \(4 V\) and \(5 / 6\) s and is NF. Yes, I have good support, but I lack aces and may well have only one spade stop. Can we blame partner for bidding this way on \(\uparrow x \vee K \mathrm{xx} \geqslant \mathrm{x}\) Qxxxxx? Byrne: Pass. Did I forget to bid \(3>\) on the previous round? This seems to have worked well as partner has now shown \(6 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\) and \(4 \boldsymbol{v}\), the sequence is not traditionally played as forcing although I await education if it is. The spade holding is not ideal facing a probably singleton (the opponents are at red) but even if partner does have two spades he will have a singleton diamond and the hand will not play well. Facing \(\uparrow \times x \geqslant K Q x x\) - \(\boldsymbol{c}^{\text {AJIxxx, for example, game is a long way off. }}\) Leufkens: Pass. Would 3\& 1st round be fit-jump, as I read in system-notes? Anyway, bidding on
is too much, even more so as it's non-vul. Partner can have very little in my book.

Yes, 3\& on the first round would have been a fit-jump.
Kokish: Pass. We might have a play for game opposite a good mesh of high cards in East's decent but non-forcing \(4 / 6\) hand, but it's not always bad to put down a respectable dummy in a partscore.
Apteker: Pass. Partner's sequence is non forcing otherwise partner would have bid 2 first. I would consider 3NT if my honours in \(\downarrow\) 's were swopped for the Ace.
Carruthers: Pass. If East wanted me to bid, he'd have started with \(2 \boldsymbol{e}\). In my book, this shows
 the like. With another ace, say, he starts with \(2 \boldsymbol{e}\). Making \(3 \boldsymbol{\&}\) forcing puts too much weight on the Double and reduces flexibility with hands worth a second bid such as the one I suggested. Smith: Pass. Is this really a problem? Partner does not have a good enough hand for Two Clubs (forcing for one round) at his previous turn, which is what he would have done with, say, 4-5 or 4-6 and an 11-12 count (the values for 2 NT ), so he has that same sort of shape with less than game-try values. Three Clubs looks like an excellent spot if the opponents let us play here.
Bird: Pass. If partner gives me a strange look when dummy goes down, I will tell him he should have responded \(2 \boldsymbol{e}\) instead of doubling.. Alder: Pass. I doubt I will have much (any?) company on the panel, but partner should have a limited \(4=6\) ( or \(4=5\) ) in the rounded suits. Perhaps \(\mathrm{x} \vee \mathrm{KJxx}\) x x xxxx. With game-going

\section*{A NEW BRIDGE MAGAZINE - July 2019}
values he should respond \(2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}\), not make a negative double. Give me the ace of diamonds instead of the king-jack and I would try 3NT.
Teramoto: Pass I think that 3 is NF with like \(4-6\). If GF hand, he bids 2irst.

I am confident that the above group have the 'normal' understanding about the meaning of partner's sequence. There are just three panellists who vote for action:
Sver: \(3 \uparrow\). I have quite a good diamond holding and I want to give him a chance to ask about 3NT if not too weak (couldn't find the system at the moment, but so far I remember it could be weak with clubs, right?)
Yes, it could indeed be quite weak with clubs. I guess that, as we failed to bid \(3>\) at our previous turn, partner should work out that we have come back to life because of a club fit, not just a massive diamond suit.
Cope: 42. We could have done with some system advice here. Is \(3 \in \mathrm{~F} 1\), INV or to play? I play it as forcing so 4e is an encouraging noise with a fit. If it is only INV but NF then I will change my vote to 5 .
Well, at least in the circles where I move your interpretation of the bid is unusual. As explained by a number of panellists, if partner had a GF hand he would have started with and got hearts into the game at a later point in the auction. Obviously, you like an immediate to deny hearts, and if all hands containing four hearts start with a double at least you will never get pre-empted out of your heart fit.
Sandsmark: 3NT. This is an obvious bid, since partner has made a GF (new suit at the Threelevel) and is bound to have some values in
hearts (his initial negative double). I will be very surprised if the majority vote is anything else than 3NT.

Well done Tommy - a perfect zero for that prediction - and you can see above why the panel disagree with you.
Partner held:

4e was the limit, with only seven tricks available in a no-trump contract.

\section*{PROBLEM 6}

\section*{IMPs. Dealer West. All Vul.}

\section*{- 3}
- AKJ8
- K1074
\& AJ62
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{West} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{North Pass} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { East } \\
2 \star^{*}
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{South 49} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline ? & & & \\
\hline 2 & 11+, 4+ diam & & \\
\hline Bid & Votes & Marks & \\
\hline 5\% & 9 & 10 & \\
\hline 4NT & 5 & 8 & \\
\hline Dble & 4 & 6 & \\
\hline Pass & 2 & 2 & \\
\hline 5 & 1 & 2 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Rigal: Pass. If forcing Pass makes the most sense. Partner will remove to 4 NT with a slammish hand for diamonds and 5 without, unless he wants to defend, when I will lead a trump and hope he can get in to play another.

Ifforcing, no doubt many would agree with you, and you do have one fellow panellist who considers pass to be forcing:


Cope: Pass. Forcing, and then pull the double to 5e as a slam try or if partner pulls instead of doubling bid the slam myself. If partner doubles and then rejects the slam try will respect the decision to play 5 .

But most who comment believe that, as \(2 \diamond\) was not GF, pass is NF.
Zia: 5*. Pass is not forcing or I would do that.
Smith: 5\%. Unfortunately, a forcing pass is not an option as partner's \(2 \checkmark\) did not establish a game force. I held the hand at the table and bid a rather feeble \(5 \star\), and there we played with 12 tricks easy. We are surely worth a slam try on such a suitable hand, and \(5 \boldsymbol{2}\) seems far more descriptive than the only other alternative available, 4NT.
Stabell: 5e. Partner might expect more
diamonds for this, but I'll take my chances in
 might think of passing out 40 if I pass. With more (king of clubs, queen of hearts or ace of spades) he might be thinking of slam. With the minimum hand above and wasted queen of spades, he would of course sign off in 5\(\rangle\).
Kokish: 5\%. Despite the footnote, we don't have the agreement that pass would be forcing, especially in an age when everyone borrows a king or so to open or respond positively. Apart from a Blackwood 4NT, 5e is the only slam try available. Hard to picture a hand for \(5 \boldsymbol{*}\) that includes two spade losers, so this is the best we can do. Apteker: 5e. Pass should not be forcing so that leaves either doubling, which I would do with a balanced type hand, or a move towards slam. Given the spade shortage, controls and extras I prefer the latter and choose to involve partner in the decision rather than taking over with 4NT. If partner has a doubleton spade and extras, I hope he is on the same wavelength and trusts that I am short in spades and does not merely bid \(5 \uparrow\).
Byrne: 5\%. Given that they are vulnerable the 4 bidder surely has a solid suit, which means chances of a slam are rising. Pass would not be forcing and 5 lazy, so I shall make a small try and see what partner can do.
Teramoto: 5\%. This is a Slam try and forcing. It usually needs a sound hand with a good five cards in diamonds.
Carruthers: 5\%. Willing to make a try and subside if he bids \(5 \star\). The problem is I have controls in all suits. Hopefully, with good trumps and good clubs, he'll realise that I must have
the other suits controlled to make such a try.
Bird: 5 . We could easily have enough for \(6>\), so Ladbroke's are currently offering '4-to-1 on' that I will be awarded 10 points for this thoughtful cue-bid. Mind you, maybe they haven't been informed that we now have a new director.

4-to-1 on? Well, the favourite does indeed win on this occasion - a bad day for the bookies.

Others agree that pass would be NF but come up with a different solution:
Rosen: 4NT. Pass would be non-forcing, I assume double would suggest defending rather more than I wish to, seems to be a choice between this and 5 .
Alder: 4NT. I hope he assumes that this is Roman Key Card Blackwood.
Sandsmark: 4NT. RKCB with diamonds. This may very well be enough for a diamond slam, and it cannot hurt to investigate the key-cards. With only one key-card partner will say \(5 \boldsymbol{*}\), and I will stop in \(5 \uparrow\). If he has both, I will go for 6*. Yes, I know it's a little hard, but you must know by now that my glass is always half full, not half empty. Always look on the bright side of life, Brian!
Sime: 4NT. RKCB, prepared to risk slam over one key card. I don't think that we are in a Forcing Pass situation, since \(2 \star\) was not FG. Double will be 800 at best, so I must make a slam try now. Five Clubs will not rock partner's boat if he has \(\mathrm{xx}, \mathrm{xx}\) in the majors, which is just what we want for slam.
Cannell: 4NT. My hand has improved enormously. I will check on the RKCB quality.

I prefer the 5* cue-bid as it is less committal than taking control with RKCB, but at least the
\(4 N T\) bidders are pointing in the right direction. This next effort is just wet, in my not-at-all-humble opinion.
Mould: \(5 \downarrow\). No idea if our pass is forcing or not. Don't really care. No idea what we or they can make, but assuming the vulnerable South has most of the spade honours it looks like we can make this. Maybe I should bid \(5 *\) but I have so many holes in my hand.

How can it hurt to make a slam try on the way to game when you have 16 working points and a singleton in the opponents' suit?

Mind you, Ben is happy to collect a penalty: Green: Double. I wish pass were forcing here but I don't play it that way opposite a limit raise (there is a case for playing \(2 \checkmark\) as GF to cope with auctions such as this), if it were forcing then I would have an easy pass, as it is I have to bid or double. I can construct hands where partner has Qxxx or Axxx in diamonds and with trumps probably splitting poorly I don't think \(5 \checkmark\) is always going to be the right spot and sometimes I may get doubled. Not that playing 4a doubled is always right either but it rates to go down and I am interested in going plus.

There are other doublers on the panel, but they play it as more extra values than penalty. Well, even though we have an agreed trump suit, it is hard to imagine how we can have a trump stack unless South has had a drink or three on his way to the bridge.
Sver: Double. I believe we are not in a strictly forcing pass position here so I want to show extras and I won't be unhappy if it stays. If I were sure we are, I'd bid pass.
Leufkens: Double. Partner should assume I
won't have a pure penalty double. I thought long about 5 , assuming partner has long diamonds, but that's up to him to decide. Pass isn't forcing as 2 wasn't FG.
Robson: Double. Assume pass is non-forcing, in which case double merely shows a good hand, not 4 KQ10x.

Even so, is it right to double when short in the opponents'suit? Partner would be more likely to expect a semi-balanced hand with honour to two or three spades, I would have thought?
Anyway, put me with the 5idders. Partner held:

South would just have got his seven spade tricks, while we are making slam in comfort.


\section*{PROBLEM 7}

\section*{IMPs. Dealer West. None Vul.}
- 42
- A4
- AQJ7
\& AQ763
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
- & - & - & \(1 \mathrm{NT}^{*}\) \\
Double & \(2 \downarrow\) & Pass* \(^{*}\) & Pass
\end{tabular} ?
1NT 10-12
Pass NF
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Bid & Votes & Marks \\
Dble & 10 & 10 \\
3\& & 6 & 8 \\
Pass & 3 & 5 \\
2NT & 2 & 5
\end{tabular}

Should we bid again and, if so, what?
Smith: Pass. Clearly double is out, whether it is penalties or inviting partner to compete in spades, and 2NT would be natural and stronger than this. I already showed \(15 / 16+\) with my penalty double (even against a mini no-trump, penalty doubles should be kept up to strength), so I have a minimum. Partner had various options open to him and chose to pass, so I see no reason to wade back in here on this very moderate club suit at the three-level.
Bird: Pass. 2NT would not be Unusual, and 3e looks too risky on what appears to be a partscore deal.
I agree, 2NT would not be Unusual, it would be natural, and we are not strong enough for that. Mould: Pass. If pard cannot bid spades, or make
a take-out double or bid anything, I cannot see what we can make.

I would have thought that partner's potential lack of spade length was good news, as it would improve our chances of finding a minor-suit fit.

Despite my views expressed a moment ago, there were two panellists who opted for 2NT.
Carruthers: 2NT. Dangerous, but so is Pass or any other bid.
Sandsmark: 2NT. Denotes a strong hand with the minors, which is exactly what you hold. If you throw in your towel at this point holding the best hand in the deck, you really deserve whatever is coming your way: "Nothing, my Lord" (Act 1, scene III in Shakespeare's KING LEAR). Lear's youngest and prettiest daughter Cordelia's reply to how much she loved her father. The king, who was blind when he could see, but only saw things clearly when he went blind, replied: "Nothing shall come from nothing!" And then he spit his kingdom between the two false sisters Reagan and Goneril, who had assured him of their love, lying their teeth off This is also the case here. If you pass here, you are likely to get zero points! Nothing! Nada!

Whilst being very impressed with the cultural aspect of Tommy's response - who doesn't appreciate a Shakespearean reference? - I can't agree that \(2 N T\) is both minors. For me, and for those panellists who comment on the matter, it is just strong and balanced.

Then there were the 3idders.
Robson: 3\&. Unsound, of course, but the colours are so good for bidding.
Rigal: 3\&. No reason to do anything but bid what is in front of me, showing extras in playing
strength or HCP．
Stabell：3e．Partner could still have enough for game without anywhere to go over \(2 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}\) ．For 3\＆ to be odds－on，I only need to find 4－3－3－3 with a minor－suit King opposite．Will pass 3 if that is what he bids，since he can＇t have much when he couldn＇t bid \(2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}\) over \(2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}\) ．
Zia：3＊．Reluctantly．
Alder：3＊．I have a strong suspicion that Pass is the winning call．I do not like to double with only two spades，and 2NT would be natural，not both minors．At other tables，if South is pass－ ing，some might open my hand 1NT，perhaps reaching an inferior spot；or open 1\＆，planning to reverse（or maybe jump to 2 NT over 1s）．It is unclear where they will end up．
Leufkens：3๕．Pass is surely an option as part－ ner would usually bid with 8 HCP．But why can＇t it be \(3 \boldsymbol{e}\) versus \(2 \vee\) ？Not strong enough for 2NT．

Indeed，he might well call with somewhat less than 8 HCP－unless he has heart length，of course，when a take－out double would not be a very descriptive effort．And if he holds heart length he might appreciate it if we：
Green：Double．It would be helpful to know what double from partner would have been．If take－out then there is a case for doubling as partner may be passing，if double would be pen－ alty then I think it is much closer between pass， 2 NT and \(3 \boldsymbol{e}\) ．If partner pulls my double to \(2 \boldsymbol{a}\) （he can＇t really have five on the auction）then I will try 3 （and we might still get to 3 ）．I am about a king heavier than I might be for an ini－ tial penalty double here and so I feel I should do something，I could try 2NT but that gives up on a penalty and we may be in the wrong spot．

I don＇t think that partner＇s double is defined in the system，but it is very popular to play double as take－out here，whether or not pass would be forcing．For what it＇s worth，I play that pass over two－of－a－minor is forcing but pass is NF over two－ of－a－major，with double take－out in both cases． The main thing is to have an agreement，of course， but I＇m convinced that T／O is more flexible than penalty．
Kokish：Double．Extra values，co－operative take－out，planning to convert \(2 \boldsymbol{4}\) to a hopeful 3e．Second choice a NAT overbid of 2NT．
Rosen：Double．Assuming take－out．I can then remove 2 to 3 ．If double is penalty put me down for a wimpish pass．
Teramoto：Dble．I think that it is T／O and my hand is too good to Pass．Partner will bid 2a usually and I will then bid \(3 \boldsymbol{2}\) ．

They all have a plan．
Cope：Double．Should probably pass but Dylan Thomas is ringing in my ears（Do not go qui－ etly into that good night）．I hope partner has a minor and whilst I expect a \(2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}\) response to my double，I can then bid 3\＆to suggest the minors as a direct 3\＆bid would be a good hand single suited．＂As the years advance，I must Rage．Rage against the dying of the light＂．
A plan AND a bit of culture．Very good．
Byrne：Double．For take－out，first plan is to make them pay and take a penalty．If partner bids spades I can retreat to no trumps．
Sver：Double．I hope it might be the final con－ tract，if I hear \(2 \boldsymbol{A}\) ，I bid 2NT，which should imply some minors．
Sime：Double．I am assuming that 2NT would be a balanced 19－22 or so，and that double would
be penalty，as it was in the previous set．Most experts in the UK，where the weak 1NT opener is prevalent，will attest that the second double is for take－out from either side is superior．So I will pass in a huff，and request that my vote be changed if double is take－out or 2 NT is minors．

Your vote got changed．I think the footnote in the previous set was because I thought double for penalty to be unusual．
Apteker：Double．As pass by partner is NF，dou－ ble by partner should best be played as take－ out．Partner may therefore be able to pass the double and could not penalize first time round． If partner bids \(2 \boldsymbol{a}\) ．I will convert to \(\mathbf{3 e}\) which should imply diamonds as well．


Cannell: Double. A tad too much to go quietly. If partner bids Two Spades I will try Three Clubs and hope for the best. Not sure what the difference is for 2NT after Two Hearts, or double and then 2NT if partner bids Two Spades. Brian - please discuss.

Sorry Drew, but nobody has really talked about the difference between \(2 N T\) over \(2 \checkmark\) and double then \(2 N T\) over \(2 \boldsymbol{a}\). The two sequences could be used to show different strengths of hand. If so, I'd vote for the slower approach being the stronger hand. But if we are to collect our penalties when we should be doing so we need to double a lot with doubleton hearts, whether we have 17 HCP or 22 HCP. I think that an immediate 2NT implies too much heart length to expect partner to be passing a T/O double, while a delayed 2NT implies shorter hearts. Either way, you rate to have some minor-suit length.
I'm a doubler, converting 2 to 3\&. Partner held:

ゅ763 Q QJ7 \$ 109832 85
If you do something, you will get to 3 , which should be successful. If you pass, they may make \(2 \%\).

PROBLEM 8
IMPs. Dealer North. N/S Vul.
- KQJ2
- 10
- 94
* AQ9865
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
- & \(1 N T^{*}\) & Pass & \(4 \Downarrow^{*}\) \\
\(?\) & & &
\end{tabular}

\section*{1NT 15-17 \\ 4* Hearts}

What is your plan?
(a) Pass then pass again when \(4 \square\) comes around
(b) Pass then double 49
(c) Pass but then bid over \(4 \vee\) - if so, what?
(d) Double 4
(e) Bid immediately - if so, what?
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Bid & Votes & Marks \\
B & 10 & 10 \\
C & 4 & 9 \\
A & 4 & 7 \\
D & 2 & 5 \\
E & 1 & 2
\end{tabular}

Without special understandings, there is no ideal way to deal with this hand - but, of course, that is why it is here as a problem. Some therefore pass throughout:
Byrne: A. I want to try and get us to 4d but I have no idea how to do that, I shall just trust partner to make a sensible black-suit lead and hope he has something in hearts.
Sandsmark: A. A hand from Hell, obviously. You have no guarantee of any fit here, and risk to lose 5-800 over maybe nothing if you bid! I know this makes me a coward, but in this case you should have good reasons to go for A.
Cannell: A. Going with A. If the low club was a low spade I would bid an immediate Four Hearts as Michaels - spades and a minor. I think Pass and then double is a three-suited take-out. I think double of Four Diamonds = diamonds. A direct bid of an off suit is natural and single-suited. Pass and then Four Spades
(if discussed) might be the above hand - four spades and a longer minor.
Stabell: A. Pass then Pass. Without any specific agreements, I would take the middle-of-theroad action. But it makes sense to play pass then double as spades with longer clubs, in which case that would be a very attractive alternative. With diamonds, I would double 4ヶ, with \(5 / 5\) in spades and a minor, I would (could) bid \(4 \checkmark\) over \(4 \diamond\), but the question is what to do with a decent 5-4-4-0 hand. I would have thought that pass then double would show something like that, although this hand-type is perhaps more frequent.

Both Drew and Leif-Erik touch on how to show a hand with spades and longer clubs/minor, and we will look at that in more detail shortly.

\section*{Rosen: B.}

Alder: B. And hope for the best.
Rigal: B, Pass then double. Hoping something good happens. An immediate \(4 \checkmark\) is too rich for me (4-2 spade fit not 6-4 clubs for example).
Green: B. I would pass and then double for take-out. Of course, passing throughout could be right but at favourable vulnerability it is very tempting to act. Passing first and then bidding is out for me as what would I bid (I can't imagine)? Doubling \(4 \diamond\) would show diamonds for me and so that's out. Bidding immediately seems extremely aggressive, a cue-bid of 4 would show spades and a minor with at least five spades and bidding five clubs on my own would give up on defending \(4 \checkmark\) doubled and is awfully high!
Leufkens: B. It's between A and B. The rest is extreme (and double would be diamonds for
me). As I didn't double \(4 \diamond\) and then \(4 \vee\), I hope partner can deduce I don't have diamonds, but I doubt I would have risked this in real life.

I think he will expect you to be three-suited. You wouldn't double the first time if that showed diamonds, as you wouldn't want to stress that suit over the others.
Robson: B. At these colours, I think I'm strongly suggesting take-out, with my failure to double \(4 \diamond\) (lead-directing), orienting my hand to the black suits.
Cope: B. A day for gambling - the vulnerability is right and we hope that partner has four spades rather than six diamonds, Pass and pass is the second choice, as to unilaterally bid clubs looks very dangerous, and an immediate double of \(4 \diamond\) with me shows a strong, but mainly balanced hand. My decision between A) and B) might depend on how the match was going up till then.
Sime: B (Pass and Double 4४). On grounds of frequency, Double of \(4 \diamond\) ought to be "lead a diamond." Four Hearts ought to be Michaels type, which wouldn't be outrageous with this hand at favourable, but rules out Four Hearts doubled as the contract. Otherwise, it looks like a choice between A and B. It is conceivable that both sides can make game, or that partner has a couple of heart tricks, so I will risk a double. Carruthers: B. Following the adage that it's the hand with shortage that must take action. However, I do so with eyes wide open, swallowing a bad or a good result with equal aplomb. I think Double followed by Double should show a hand like this with the minor suits reversed. Bird: B. The most likely game is \(4 \boldsymbol{4}\), so I discount
the last three options. My delayed double, rather than 4 NT , shows spades and one of the minors. I would bid \(4 \Upsilon\) immediately with a three-suiter.

Bidding 4ワ immediately with a three-suiter would put you in a very small minority, I fear. The one thing that everyone seems happy about is that the immediate cue-bid should be Michaels-style. Smith: C. Probably when \(4 \vee\) comes back to me. I bid \(5 *\) immediately at the table, as I recall. The advantage of bidding immediately is that it may makes things more difficult for the opponents, either because opener feels he has to bid on to show a fit or because responder plans on making a slam try over Four Hearts. Passing and bidding may stop partner raising when he shouldn't, but also makes it easier for them to double you when it's right for them to do so. Perhaps the conductor should have offered us a sixth option: isn't bidding Four Hearts immediately an option? Would this show spades and a minor, whereas a double of Four Diamonds is either diamonds or just strong balanced?

I think you'll find that your sixth option is actually covered by option (e).
Kokish: C. Pass, then 4@, indicating a black two-suiter without five spades (else \(4 \bigvee\) over \(4 \diamond\) to show five spades and one of the minors). With a second suit of diamonds, I would pass and double \(4 \checkmark\) for take-out, intending to convert \(5 *\) to \(5 \uparrow\). I believe this would be a popular plan for somewhat casual partnerships, but a personal preference is to double \(4 \diamond\) as takeout of hearts, including four spades and longer diamonds, and to treat pass-then-double as a strong no-trump with good overall defense rather than a trump stack.

Zia: C. Pass then 4a. I never thought about it but I think in future it should show four spades and a longer minor - but better discuss with partner, and for now run if doubled.
Teramoto: C. Pass then bid 4^, which I hope should be like \(4-6\) with Spades and Clubs. Because if I have Diamonds I double first. If \(5-5\) with Spades I bid \(4 \vee\) Michaels first. Also, with only Spades I bid 49 first.

That is very persuasive.
Mould: D. In my methods this is take-out of hearts. I appreciate that is not universal, but then this is presumably a question about methods.
Sver: D, Double \(4 \downarrow\). Because I think this should be a free opportunity to show such a weaker take-out double. If I double \(4 \checkmark\) again it would be stronger. And if I pass and then double, now I believe it should be for penalty. All of this in case I don't play double over \(4 \diamond\) as some diamond showing suggesting sacrifice, which I'm sure some people might do.

That completes the set regarding an immediate double - shows diamonds for the majority who commented, but Tim says strong balanced, and Niki a light T/O double.

And there was one vote for an immediate bid: Apteker: E. \(4 \vee\). Tough problem made even tougher with unclear agreements. I choose to show spades and another, notwithstanding the lack of a fifth spade.

Pass then double for take-out is the most popular option, with roughly half the panel choosing that route. However, not all were very confident about their choice. There were two votes for doubling \(4 \diamond\) to show a T/O of hearts, but for most this
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would have shown diamonds. Getting in a cheap T/O double would be useful when that was what we held. More or less useful than being able to show diamonds? I don't know the answer to that.

What is very compelling is the argument for what pass followed by 49 over 4V should show. As Tadashi says, all the hands containing five or more spades should have bid at their first turn,
so it pretty much has to be a four-card spade suit plus longer minor. And if a double of \(4 \diamond\) would have shown diamonds, then the main suit has to be clubs. This option seems to get us to our correct spot whenever we have a correct spot. It is committal, of course, sometimes losing out to those who pass throughout, and it gives up on the
possibility of defending \(4 \checkmark\) doubled.
This was partner's hand:
-10xx \(x_{x x x} \diamond K J x x x \geqslant J\)
Four Hearts would have been down one.
Congratulations to Neil Rosen, this month's winner with 78, just a point ahead of Eric Kokish and Michael Byrne.


SET I8 - THE PANEL'S BIDS \& MARKS
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & Total \\
\hline Neil Rosen & England & 3NT & Pass & 6\% & 3 & Pass & 4NT & Dble & B & 78 \\
\hline Eric Kokish & Canada & 3NT & 2NT & 6\% & 3 & Pass & 5\% & Dble & C & 77 \\
\hline Michael Byrne & England & 3NT & 2, & 6\% & 3 & Pass & 5\% & Dble & A & 77 \\
\hline David Bird & England & 3NT & Pass & 79 & 3 & Pass & 5\% & Pass & B & 74 \\
\hline Iohn Carruthers & Canada & 3NT & 2 & 7\% & 3 & Pass & 5\% & 2NT & B & 74 \\
\hline Ben Green & England & 3NT & 2NT & 6\% & 3 & Pass & Dble & Dble & B & 74 \\
\hline Marc Smith & England & 3NT & Pass & 79 & 3 & Pass & 5\% & Pass & C & 73 \\
\hline Tadashi Teramoto & Japan & 4 & 2 \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & 4, & 3 & Pass & 5\% & Dble & C & 72 \\
\hline Leif-Erik Stabell & Zimbabwe & 3NT & 2 & 6\% & 4* & Pass & 5\% & 3\% & A & 72 \\
\hline Iain Sime & Scotland & 4 & Pass & 7\% & 3 & Pass & 4NT & Dble & B & 72 \\
\hline Enri Leufkens & Netherlands & 3NT & 2 \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & 49 & 3 & Pass & Dble & 3\% & B & 70 \\
\hline Phillip Alder & USA & 3NT & Pass & 79 & 49 & Pass & 4NT & 30 & B & 70 \\
\hline Andrew Robson & England & 3NT & 2NT & 6\% & 4* & Pass & Dble & 30 & B & 69 \\
\hline Drew Cannell & Canada & 4 & 2 & 49 & 3 & Pass & 4NT & Dble & A & 68 \\
\hline Barry Rigal & USA & 3NT & 2NT & 79 & 3 & Pass & Pass & 30 & B & 67 \\
\hline Zia Mahmood & USA & 4NT & 2 & 6\% & 4 & Pass & 5\% & 3\% & C & 64 \\
\hline Alon Apteker & South Africa & 3NT & 2NT & 6\% & 34 & Pass & 5\% & Dble & E & 63 \\
\hline Nikica Sver & Croatia & 3NT & Pass & 79 & 3 & 3 & Dble & Dble & D & 63 \\
\hline Tim Cope & South Africa & 3NT & Pass & 79 & 3 & 5\% & Pass & Dble & B & 63 \\
\hline Alan Mould & England & 3NT & 24 & 6\% & 49 & Pass & 5 & Pass & D & 57 \\
\hline Tommy Sandsmark & Norway & 4* & Pass & 6\% & 44 & 3NT & 4NT & 2NT & A & 54 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\section*{A New Bridge Magazine Bidding System}

\section*{Attention！！！}

The Bidding System will be modified－It will be updated next month as per Brian＇s comments in his recent moderations．

\section*{Basic Method}

\section*{Natural}

\section*{Five－card majors}

Minors are three cards in length minimum． Always open \(1 \stackrel{\text { sith }}{ } 3-3\) but \(1 \diamond\) with \(4-4\) ，so \(1 *\) is 3 cards only if precisely 4－4－3－2 shape．
15－17 no－trump in all positions and vulnerabilities．
Two over one is game forcing in all uncontested auctions．
A 1 NT response is up to a non－game force but it is not forcing．However，the only hands that pass are weak no－trump types．
Jumps at the two－level are weak（eg， \(1 \downarrow-2 \boldsymbol{\perp}\) ）and at the three－level are invitational（eg 1『－3\＆）． \(1 \mathrm{M}-3 \mathrm{M}\) is a limit raise．
Inverted minors are played． \(1 \mathrm{~m}-2 \mathrm{~m}\) is F2NT and \(1 \mathrm{~m}-3 \mathrm{~m}\) is pre－emptive．
Over \(1 \mathrm{~m}-2 \mathrm{~m}\) ，next step is a WNT and 2 NT is GF with the next step suit； 3 m is unbalanced and non－forcing．All other bids are at least qua－ si－natural and FG．
After，say，1e－2－\(-2 N T / 3 \boldsymbol{c}\) 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 high－ card 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．

\section*{No－trump bidding：}

After 1NT \(15-17,2 \boldsymbol{\omega}=\) Stayman， \(2 \uparrow / 2 \boldsymbol{\top}=\) trans－ fers， \(2 \boldsymbol{s}=\mathrm{s}\) 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 e is 5 card Stay－ man， \(3 \rightarrow\) is \(5-5 \mathrm{~ms} \mathrm{FG}, 3>/\) 1－3－（4－5）／3－1－（4－5） and FG． \(4 \boldsymbol{e}\) is \(5-5\) majors，game only， \(4 \downarrow / \downarrow=\uparrow / \mathbf{~ s}\) （then \(4 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{RKCB}\) and new suits are Exclusion）．
1 NT rebid \(=12-14\) with 2 a puppet to 2 to play in \(2 \diamond\) or make an invitational bid， \(2 \diamond\) is game forcing checkback，new suits at the 3 level are 5－5 FG and higher bids are auto－splinters．

Jump 2 NT rebid \(=18-19\) with natural continuations．
After 2 over 1，2NT is 12－14 balanced or 18－19 balanced and 3 NT is 15－17 range with a reason not to have opened 1 NT ．
3NT rebid after a one－level response in a suit shows a good suit and a good hand．Where the response was 1 NT ， 3 NT may be a flat 19 －count．
After 2NT，20－22，3e＝Stayman with Smo－ len， \(3 \uparrow / 3 \uparrow=\) transfers， \(3 \boldsymbol{Q}=\) slam try with both minors．Four level bids are as after 1NT opening． Reverse Kokish is played after opening （ \(2 \boldsymbol{2}-2-2-2 \mathrm{NT}\) is \(23-24\) balanced，and 2 － 2 － NT is \(25+\) balanced GF）．

\section*{Initial response：}

Jump shifts are weak at the two－level and invita－ tional at the three－level．Bidding and rebidding a suit is invitational，bidding and jump rebidding a suit is FG（eg \(1 \downarrow, 2 \downarrow\) is weak， \(1 \diamond, 1 \vee, 2 \downarrow\) is invitational； \(1 \diamond, 1 \vee, 2 \boldsymbol{*}, 3 \vee\) is FG）．
2 NT after \(1 \boldsymbol{e} / 1\) is natural and invitational with－ out 4M．
\(2 N T\) after \(1 \vee / 1 \boldsymbol{\perp}=\) game－forcing with \(4+\) card support．Continuations in new suits are natural， 3 partner＇s suit extras with no singleton，3NT
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\(=18-19\) balanced, 4 of new suits are splinters but deny a second suit. 4 of partner's major shows a bad opening. Such as \(1 \mathrm{M}-2 \mathrm{NT}-3 \vee-3 \mathrm{M}-4 \boldsymbol{*}=\) splinter (3NT is \(5 \mathrm{M}-4 \diamond-2-2\) ).

\section*{Continuations:}
\(1 \mathrm{x}-1 \mathrm{M}-2 \mathrm{M}\) promises four-card support or three-card support and an unbalanced hand. Balanced hands with three-card support rebid1NT.
Reverses are forcing for one round after a one level response. The lower of 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.

\section*{Slam bidding:}

Roman Key Card Blackwood (1 or 4, 0 or 3, 2, 2 + trump Q).
Exclusion Blackwood only in clear circumstances including a jump to the five-level in a new suit and after \(1 \mathrm{NT}-4 \diamond / \downarrow\). Responses are \(0,1,2.4 \mathrm{NT}\) followed by 5 NT is for specific kings.
Cue-bids are Italian style, that is the lowest control is shown regardless of whether it is first or second round or a positive or negative control and skipping a suit normally denies a control in that suit, except that a player may revert to traditional cue-bidding, e'g. spades are trumps, cue-bidding \(4 \diamond\) then \(5 \boldsymbol{*}\) with 1 st-round , 2nd-round if he feels that to be appropriate and he is happy to commit to the five level.
Exception: a shortage control in partner's suit is not shown immediately.
The default for 5NT is "pick a slam" unless following on from 4 NT by the same player.

\section*{Competition:}

Responsive and competitive doubles through 4 - 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 3a (eg

\section*{How to Enter}

Send your chosen bid in each of the eight problems, by email to biddingbattle@newbridgemag.com or enter via the website www.newbridgemag.com. Entries must be received before the end of the month. Include your name, email address and number of the set which you are entering.
\(1 \mathrm{NT}-2 \boldsymbol{\varphi}-3 \boldsymbol{\perp}\) is FG). Note that most relatively balanced hands with no stopper will start with a T/O double.
We open 1NT and they overcall. Whatever its meaning, double of the overcall is T/O of the suit BID. Pass then double is also T/O and therefore implies length in the first opposing suit.
2 NT is rarely natural in competition (except as defined above). Possibilities include Lebensohl or scramble if game is not viable. Scramble will tend to apply in balancing situations, Lebensohl (Good/Bad) where game is still a live possibility. This includes the Good/Bad 2NT in situations where it is appropriate.
We double their Stayman or transfer over 1NT: if \(1 \mathrm{NT}=14+\), double shows the suit doubled. If 1 NT is maximum 15 HCP , double is PEN of 1 NT .

\section*{Our Overcalls:}

After a 1 M overcall, 2 NT = four-card limit raise or better and a cue-bid is a three-card limit raise or better, raises are pre-emptive, change of suit forcing one round. Fit single-jumps, splinter double-jumps. Jump cue is a mixed raise (about 6-9 and four trumps).
After a minor suit overcall, 2NT is natural and invitational and the cue-bid is a limit raise or better, raises are pre-emptive. Fit jumps, jump cue is a mixed raise (about 6-9 and four trumps) Weak jump overcalls, intermediate in 4th.
Michaels cue-bids. \(1 \mathrm{~m}-2 \mathrm{~m}=\mathrm{Ms}, 1 \mathrm{M}-2 \mathrm{M}=\mathrm{oM}\) and \(m\) with \(2 N T\) asking for the \(m\), inv+ and 3 m P/C.

\section*{Defences:}

Against all pre-empts, take-out doubles with Lebensohl responses against two-level openings - same structure as above.
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



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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\section*{WEST}

\section*{Hands for the}

July 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
1. E/W Game. Dealer East
- AK4
- K104
- KJ107
* Q92
(North doubles if West opens with a 15-17 1NT. If a redouble is passed back to North, he retreats to Two Spades)
2. Both Vul. Dealer East
- J8765
- 10753
- K6
- 54
(North overcalls \(1 \vee\) or \(2 \boldsymbol{~ i f ~ a b l e ~ t o ~ d o ~ s o ) ~}\)
3. E/W Game. Dealer North
- QJ1043
- AQ862
- A4
- 2
(North opens a 15-17 1NT. South passes but competes to 2 or 3 if able at a later turn)
4. E/W Game. Dealer East
- \(A Q\)
- 1065
- 106
- Q87532
(North bids \(3 \vee\) and South raises to 4 )
5. E/W Game. Dealer West
- 75
- 1072
- KQ1042
- J109
(North opens 1s and South raises to \(2 \boldsymbol{\text { s }}\) )
6. Both Vul. Dealer South
- A1073
- A1098 6
- 65
- 104
(North opens \(1 \$\). South bids 3 if possible and North bids 5 )
7. Both Vul. Dealer North
- KQ2
- AK642
- 95
- 1052
(North doubles a diamond transfer bid)
8. E/W Game. Dealer North
-
- K52
- J976
* AJ9876

\section*{MASTER POINT BIDDING BATTLE}

\section*{Results - Set 17}

Mike Perkins won this month with a resounding 78 out of \(80 . \mathrm{He}\) would have come second of the experts' panel as well!

Rodney Lighton and Colin Brown both scored 73, and also receive a book token.

Meic Goodyear was drawn out of the proverbial hat to receive the fourth prize.

\section*{Other Good Scores}

72 Mike Ralph
69 Bill Linton, Bill March
68 Dean Pokorny
64 Olga Shadyro
63 Mark Bartusek
62 Steve Handley

\section*{The Yearly Standings:}

Bill March 332
Mike Perkins 320
Dominic Connolly 320
Mark Bartusek 315
Rodney Lighton 307
Mike Ralph 305
David Barnes 299
Alex Athanasiadis 298
Brian McDowell 296
Bazil Caygill 296

\section*{Gomments on Bidding Bartle Set 17}

Brian Senior examines the responses of the readers and compares them against those of the panel.

\section*{PROBLEM 1}

\section*{IMPs. Dealer South. None Vul.}
```

@ -

* K865
* AKQ762
* KQ4

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $?_{-}$ | - | - | $3 \downarrow$ |


| Bid | Votes | Marks |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | Readers

```

Bill March called this one a horrible problem, even harder when playing Leaping Michaels. His choice of \(5 \diamond\) at least shows a strong hand and gives a possibility of partner raising, while the best contract might well be defending \(3^{\bullet}\).
Tony Burt also bid \(5 \downarrow\), wondering about 3NT, but realizing that if 3NT makes, so will \(5 \downarrow\), and partner will hopefully bid 6 with
John Pouget (the sole 4NT bidder) commented that his 4NT was "pick a minor"

Martin Turner decided on 3NT, having chosen \(4 \diamond\) first but deciding not to give up on 3NT with such a good minor. Partner is likely able to stop the spade suit and I can stop hearts?
Well, I think we can all agree that it is a horrible problem. The three actions chosen by various of the panel all make sense and could be the
winning calls. Of the three other actions selected by at least one reader, I had already awarded 2 points for a double, though I don't like the call at all and can imagine partner insisting on spades whatever we do from there on in. I'm pleased to see that only three readers went for the double. Pass, could be the only way to go plus, I suppose, but is so far removed from the sentiments of the panel that I cannot bring myself to give it an award.
That leaves 4 NT . The reader who opted for this call said that he knew perfectly well that it asked for partner's better minor, yet he chose it anyway. I'm going to assume that the master plan is to bid 4NT then convert partner's likely \(5 \boldsymbol{*}\) response to 5 as a mild slam try - stronger than an immediate 5 - and so I'll award 2 points because slam is certainly possible and partner will find it easier to go on after this auction than over a direct 5 .

\section*{PROBLEM 2}

IMPs. Dealer East. All Vul.
A AJ5
- AK6
-K732
\& AJ8
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
- & - & Pass & \(2 \boldsymbol{1}\) \\
Double & Pass & \(4 \downarrow\) & Pass
\end{tabular}
?
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Bid & Votes & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Marks }
\end{tabular} Readers

Martin Turner (4ゆ) has more than shown an excellent fit so he would make a slam try. With a suitable hand partner may be able to use Blackwood or bid a control.
Nothing to add to Martin's comment on this one. A significant minority of the panel agreed with him and made the same call.

\section*{PROBLEM 3}

\section*{IMPs. Dealer West. N/S Vul.}
- A52
- AQ1064
- 7
\& 10853
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline West & North & East & South \\
\hline Pass & 19* & 1* & Pass \\
\hline 19 & Pass & 14 & Pass \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
?
1* Three or more clubs
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Bid & Votes & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Marks }
\end{tabular} Readers

John Pouget chose \(2 \checkmark\) showing 3 heart honours.
Martin Turner also chose \(2 \boldsymbol{\vee}\), no fit in partner's suit but a decent 5-card major not fully shown.
OK, I don't agree with \(2 \checkmark\) as I think the suit is not worth repeating, but when nothing is ideal it is hard to say that \(2 \checkmark\) is a terrible call, so I think we can give it 2 points. Partner knows we are a passed hand and could have passed \(1 \vee\) with three hearts or a strong doubleton. Would he bid \(1 \boldsymbol{s}\) with four spades and two low hearts? Yes, he might, and when he does so \(2 \boldsymbol{V}\) and \(1 \boldsymbol{\sim}\) may be about equally likely to be the best spot. The problem with bidding \(2 \downarrow\) comes, of course, when partner holds a singleton.

\section*{PROBLEM 4}

IMPs. Dealer North. All Vul.
- AQ6
- 75
- Q84
* AQ1032
\begin{tabular}{cccr} 
West & North & East & South \\
- & \(1 \Phi^{*}\) & Double & Pass \\
3NT & Pass & \(4 \vee\) & Pass
\end{tabular}
?
14. Five-plus spades or \(15+\) balanced with four spades
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Bid & Votes & Marks & Readers \\
4s & 12 & 10 & 9 \\
Pass & 2 & 4 & 22 \\
6e & 1 & 5 & 0 \\
4NT & 1 & 3 & 2 \\
5e & 0 & 0 & 5
\end{tabular}

Bill March chose to pass - if partner was too strong to overcall \(2 \vee\) in the modern style then LHO has psyched, but that still doesn't underwrite a slam our way. It may be that partner is assuming I'll only pass if my 3NT was based on a long minor. Bill thinks this could be a partnership ender. John Pouget believes East doesn't trust partner's bidding.
Martin Turner passed. Partner may be showing a big hand with a strong suit but slam seems poor with a likely spade lead.
Well, those who say that slam is guaranteed are quite correct - it isn't but a 4 a cue-bid does not commit us to slam, only to the five level. If we are going down in \(5 \checkmark\) partner has almost certainly misbid. He has shown a strong hand with long and strong hearts and we have two aces and a side-suit which offers great potential as a source of extra tricks.
North may or may not have psyched, but our job is to trust partner, not the opposition.
Five readers chose to bid \(5 \boldsymbol{\%}\). This is clearly not intended as a slam try, as \(4 \boldsymbol{4}\) is the only rational cue-bid we could make with this hand. So they presumably bid \(5{ }^{2}\) as a correction of contract, but that suggests that they do not understand, or are used to unusual agreements, how strong partner's sequence is.

\section*{PROBLEM 5}

IMPs. Dealer South. E/W Vul.


Dudley Leigh called his choice of 5NT (as well as his 3NT on problem 1), a tactical choice, maximising pressure on opponents who may choose to "save"
John Pouget, again with a solo choice of \(6 \boldsymbol{}\), says East has a good hand and no direction.
Martin Turner explained his \(5 \vee\) : partner is showing some good cards and with shapely hands and good controls I think we are better declaring. I am showing a decent 5-card major.
I am sure that we are better declaring, the twin questions being at what level and in which suit. I would have thought that either 4 NT or 5 NT answered the latter question nicely, hence those two actions score more heavily than any of the more unilateral actions chosen by a minority of panellists and readers. Level is tougher to decide. Partner may take the fact that we bid at all over his double as suggestive of a good hand, and so find a raise to slam, but I think he will often find it too difficult to do so - our
distribution is very powerful, or at least potentially so. I suspect that, in practice, we will often have to make the decision on level ourselves. Five or Six? The panel was generally not willing to commit to Six, so I think that \(5 \geqslant\) has to score higher than \(6 \%\) or \(6 \vee\), and have increased the award for \(5 \vee\) accordingly to 4 points from the original 2 . However, either of the slam bids could be a winner and neither is ridiculous, so both get a small award of 2 points.

\section*{PROBLEM 6}


John Pouget (5NT - pick a slam) - says East has to be solid at the top of the club suit or has one honour missing but an entry elsewhere for 6NT. Martin Turner called this a difficult problem. He was assuming 3\& does not show a fit, so he bid out his shape hoping that \(3 \vee\) is forcing. We may be heading for 6 NT ?
Martin is correct that does not show a fit. Indeed, for most pairs it would definitely deny one. John is optimistic in assuming that the clubs must be solid or semi-solid. This is not one of the better areas of two-overone, and for most it just shows a reasonable six-card suit and invitational values. On the actual deal, the clubs were quite weak, which meant that there were more fitting cards for our suits than we would normally have
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expected, and this made slam better than would often have been the case. The better are the clubs, the less likely are we to have a good slam on this deal because of the gaps that leaves elsewhere. Facing six solid clubs, we are likely to require a finesse to make slam most of the time.
The sentiment of the panel was to go cautiously, with the majority opting for a sequence-ending 3 NT , and most of the rest an exploratory \(3 \vee\). I think both 5 NT and 6 NT are simply overbids and have little to commend them.

\section*{PROBLEM 7}

Pairs. Dealer North. E/W Vul.
- K1062
- KQ643
- AK8

98
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
- & \(1 \mathrm{NT}^{*}\) & Pass & Pass \\
Double & Pass & Pass & \(2 \boldsymbol{2}\) \\
Pass & Pass & Double* & 2
\end{tabular}
?

\section*{1NT \({ }^{11-14} \quad\) Penalty
Double}
\begin{tabular}{lccc} 
Bid & Votes & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Marks } \\
Readers \\
Double & 8 & 10 & 10 \\
Pass & 7 & 9 & 11 \\
2 & 1 & 3 & 0 \\
2NT & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
3 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{tabular}

Martin Turner doubled, thinking partner was showing a flattish hand which is maximum for the original pass of 1 NT. I am good for my first double so should I bid 3NT or look for a penalty?
Bazil Caygill added that his pass was forcing.
I think the panel covered this one quite well. Either we make a forcing pass - once we start to double their run-outs into a suit we can't then let them play undoubled in their next attempt at finding a safe haven - or
we double for penalty ourselves. Bazil is correct in believing his pass to be forcing, while Martin is likely to prove correct in thinking that partner is fairly balanced. He does not, however, have to be anywhere near to holding a maximum for his previous pass - he would quite happily double \(2 \boldsymbol{2}\) with six or seven points and some club length, while he might have passed previously with twice that strength.
A penalty double means we are happy to defend, while a pass is the most flexible option. I don't see that 2NT has anything going for it, while the 3 cue-bid is simply an overbid facing what may, as I say, be no more than a six- or seven-count. Consider also that, were we to find a majorsuit contract, we might be disappointed to find that partner's values were largely in clubs, while North was sitting over us with major-suit honours.

\section*{PROBLEM 8}

\section*{IMPs. Dealer West. All Vul.}
\& KJ10762
- -
- AKJ 10
~ J98
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
West & North & East & South \\
14 & \(4 \downarrow\) & Pass & Pass
\end{tabular}
?
\begin{tabular}{lccc} 
Bid & Votes & Marks & Readers \\
Double & 13 & 10 & 19 \\
4@ & 2 & 4 & 7 \\
Pass & 1 & 3 & 11
\end{tabular}

Martin Turner doubled, asking partner to do something intelligent.
Tina Jay asked if it was needed to comment that some problems were 'difficult'.
Most of us keep asking partner for that, Martin, but some of us have to wait a long time between instances where he delivers.
Some problems are difficult. Some are next to impossible. Some appeal to your bdsm side. They tie you up in knots, dominate you, and satisfy your masochistic tendencies. Enjoy.
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\section*{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.
\begin{tabular}{|c|l|c|l|l|l|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ Friday } & \multicolumn{2}{c|}{ Saturday } & \multicolumn{2}{c|}{ Sunday } \\
\hline 14:00 & Play through the ages & \(10: 45\) & Swiss Pairs session 1 & \multirow{2}{*}{\(13: 40\)} & \multirow{2}{*}{ Swiss Teams session 2 } \\
\hline 19:45 & Swiss Teams session 1 & \(15: 00\) & Swiss Pairs session 2 & & \\
\hline \multirow{2}{*}{\(23: 00\)} & \multirow{2}{*}{ Nightcap with the experts } & \(18: 45\) & Gala Dinner & \multirow{2}{*}{ Swiss Teams session 3 } \\
\cline { 3 - 4 } & \(22: 00\) & Speedball pairs & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Join us in marking the end of an era and saying goodbye in style.}

See over for costs and entry details.
Congress fees:
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|}
\hline Full congress (includes Friday afternoon and the speedball) & \(£ 75\) \\
\hline Congress Swiss Teams only (three sessions) & \(£ 45\) \\
\hline Congress Swiss Pairs only (two sessions) & \(£ 30\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{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
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Accommodation } & Three nights (Friday lunch to Monday breakfast) \\
\hline Single room & \(£ 340 \mathrm{pp}\) \\
\hline Double room used as a single & \(£ 395 \mathrm{pp}\) \\
\hline Double room & \(£ 315 \mathrm{pp}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

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.

\section*{Entries:}

Visit www.sbu.org.uk or contact Hasan or Julie at sbucongressdesk@gmail.com or on 01313433838.
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\section*{EAST}

Hands for the
July 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

\section*{1. E/W Game. Dealer East}
- Q2
- 85
- Q62
- KJ7653
(North doubles if West opens with a 15-17 1 NT . If a redouble is passed back to North, he retreats to Two Spades)
2. Both Vul. Dealer East
- A 432
- K84
- AJ 105
- \(A Q\)
(North overcalls \(1 \vee\) or \(2 \boldsymbol{~ i f ~ a b l e ~ t o ~ d o ~ s o ) ~}\)
3. E/W Game. Dealer North
- A86
- 9
- 962
* QJ9853
(North opens a 15-17 1NT. South passes but competes to \(2 *\) or \(3 *\) if able at a later turn)
4. E/W Game. Dealer East
- K9863
- 8
- AK98
- AKJ
(North bids \(3 \vee\) and South raises to 4ソ)
5. E/W Game. Dealer West
- KQ8
- K9
- AJ875
- A73
(North opens 1 1 and South raises to \(2 \boldsymbol{~}\) )
6. Both Vul. Dealer South
- KJ9865
- 5
- 3
- K9765
(North opens 1 . South bids 3 if possible and North bids 5 )
7. Both Vul. Dealer North
- AJ764
- Q9
- AQ2
- AK8
(North doubles a diamond transfer bid)
8. E/W Game. Dealer North
- Q10762
- A87
- AQ104
* K

\section*{Running Costs}

In order to meet our production costs we are relying on sponsorship, advertising revenue and donations.

Sponsorship can come in many forms - one that is proving popular is the sponsorship of a particular column - as you will see from the association of FunBridge with 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.```

