

May I again remind people that we try to start the Monday session at 2.00 p.m. sharp. This means that people should be sitting at the table opposite their partner before 2.00 p.m. My general policy is that I will always try to obtain suitable partners for people without one. This is extremely difficult if people arrive at 2.00 p.m. exactly and without a partner. So, in future, I will only 'guarantee' a partner for people if they arrive well beforehand (say at least 10 mins). Now I wrote the last paragraph before I was made aware of the exact circumstances last Monday. Everything above is still absolutely valid, but I do apologise to Pierre in that I was unaware that he had arrived very early, dealt some boards, and then left (to appear just before 2.00 p.m.). It was very unfortunate, but I was unaware that he was available (I, myself arrive at about 12.45 and am always very busy setting everything up and may not notice everybody around). Basically, I again apologise to Pierre, but it really does make life much easier for me if everybody is seated (opposite their partner) by 1.50 p.m.

### **Welcome Back Chuck**

I'm sure that everybody was pleased to see the return of Chuck. The club is not the same without him. He was kind enough to read all of the news sheets and give comments. Basically he agreed with just about everything I said but queried my 'persistent' knocking of America(ns). I agree. It really is uncalled for. After all, Elvis was American and they also invented 2/1 and the forcing NT. So no more US bashing (for a while).

Basically, there are very few nations which I have any tolerance for. I gave up French wine and brandy when they decided to blow up a Pacific island as a 'nuclear test' a few years ago. As far as I am concerned, anybody is free to have a go at the Brits and Tony's 'sucking up' to mr bush – it won't bother me at all. And if these guys do start a war, then Thailand is where I want to be.

## Too Subtle?

Now I thought that I had been fairly clear in the last few news sheets, but it appears not. A phrase like 'a loud mouthed Norwegian' is ambiguous?? So, I will clarify the situation and mention names from now on (please don't sue me – it's not worth while). First, let's cover the 'on notice' people from news sheet 2. Let's be explicit about the Belgian, American and Australian. Now it appears that I was not too subtle here; and Geoff, Chuck and Ian all got the message. Geoff usually appears (just about) on time, has a nice new shirt and has learnt not to criticize Chuck or other players. Chuck is well mannered and relatively quiet (for an American) – sorry, scrub that last bit. He has even been known to be very polite to less experienced opponents, realizing that this is not a stratified event; and he has not walked out again. Ian has not called anybody else a rude pig (Tholief has gone now) and no longer tries to sneak in a fag behind by back at the Amari. I now consider these three to be back to 'normal' status (but keep it up and don't push it, guys). Did I really mean to say that?

## Thorlief!

Now I did not elaborate in News sheet 5 as to why Thorlief was banned – I thought it was obvious; and the least said the better. It appears, however, that I need to justify it. Apparently Alex thought it harsh (John had provoked Thorlief) and Thorlief did not realize that he was 'on notice'?? I shall just summarize a few items from news-sheets 2-4:

'Cards (and bidding cards) should be placed on the table and not slapped down in an apparent show of anger. This is cheating (when showing displeasure at some action of partner's). If *two* opponents had asked you not to do this the previous week, then I can only assume that the offender is stupid or wants to cause problems. If his English is not up to reading this note then perhaps Alex will translate.'

'One such individual has been involved in a loud argument *three weeks running* (with 3 different opponents!)' – Thorlief had loud arguments with John, Chuck and Ian three weeks in succession. The very next week he even managed to get Bill to raise his voice.

'I can psyche as often and whenever I like' – sorry Thorlief, not repeatedly at our club.

'one particular member continually wishes to argue with me (and everybody else)'.

' – do these people realise that they are within 5mm of being thrown out? I really don't care who is to blame. This is the **LAST** warning. I will not risk the club's standing because of one loud mouthed Norwegian. It is simply more than pathetic.'

So what happened? The very next Monday, Thorlief got involved in a punch-up at the Monday club! Nothing like going out in style! Did he not have enough warnings? I think that I have to re-phrase what I said in news-sheet 2. If he did not realise that all of the above referred to him, then he is stupid *and* wants to cause problems. He should be aware that threatening somebody's life is a criminal offence in Thailand; and in front of numerous witnesses, could easily result in a jail sentence! Actually punching somebody in a Bridge club is way over the top. Needless to say, I feel that I was perhaps a bit too lenient earlier, but he is now certainly banned from the club.

Just to repeat a line from the news sheet issued on the day that he was requested to leave: –

‘I really don’t care who is to blame -This is the **LAST** warning.’ The bold capitals and underline were in the original. Most normal people would not take this to be a mild reprimand.

Incidentally, I believe that one other prominent club member (Martin) had approached Alex and cautioned him about his partner’s behaviour.

Now I fully realise that John may well have provoked Thorlief in the last ‘incident’, but I think that I had made it fairly plain that I just needed the slightest excuse to throw him (Thorlief) out. John presumably realised this and simply expedited the inevitable. As far as I am concerned, this is the end of the matter. I shall make it clear and totally unambiguous: - Thorlief is not welcome at either the Monday or Friday club ever again.

Virtually every member present congratulated me on the outcome and my swift reaction. I do not believe in parole and light sentences. If the prisons become overcrowded, – then hang ‘em all!

Just a friendly word to Alex: - Thorlief is a lost cause. You will not make many friends at the Bridge club by continuing to defend him or by suggesting that others have behaved anywhere near so badly. He has upset just about everybody at the club and been involved in every argument that I can remember. People must learn to be accountable for their own actions.

So, how about a little Bridge? .... Just room for a quickie.

### **Transfers over 1NT**

Most people play transfers these days, so it is worthwhile mastering them. Let’s say you have Hand A and partner opens 1NT (strong 15-17). You transfer with 2♥ and partner obediently bids 2♠.

What now? You clearly want to be in game but a 4♠ bid is incorrect. Bid 3NT and give partner the choice (he knows that you have 5 ♠’s).

Hand A	Hand B	How do you bid Hand B? This is similar to a hand from last week that went wrong. The simplest way to bid the hand is to transfer initially (bid 2♥) and then bid 3♥ (natural and game forcing) over partner’s expected 2♠ response. If partner then bids 3NT, you bid 4♥, indicating at least 5-5 in the majors. Before the days of transfers (remember Elvis, the Beatles etc ?) this hand would have been bid using extended Stayman (after 1NT - 2♣ - 2♦, a 3♣ bid was used to ask for 3 card majors), but the transfer sequence is to be preferred these days. Now said ‘the simplest way to bid ....’, in actual fact modern bidding theory is that these hand types are bid via Stayman.
♠ AQ982	♠ AQ982	
♥ A62	♥ AJ862	
♦ 94	♦ 6	
♣ J53	♣ 87	

Editor’s note: this is fully described in news-sheet 33 and in the NT book.