

**Club News Sheet – No. 116**

21/1/2005



	N-S winners		E-W winners	
Mon 17/1/05	1 st Jim/Austin	64 %	1 st Bob/Dave	66 %
	2 nd Phil/Mike(Can)	59 %	2 nd Gerard/Derek	61
Wed 19/1/05	1 st Chuck/Austin	60 %	1 st Clive/Terry	60 %
	2 nd Larse/Arne	59 %	2 nd Bjorn/Kees	59 %
Fri 21/1/05	1 st David/Ursula	60 %	1 st Mr & Mrs Braggio	67 %
	2 nd Jan/Mike(Can)	59 %	2 nd Lis/Finn	52 %

We had a 'simultaneous' on Monday and so where I refer to the 'booklet' it's the booklet of Monday hands that was distributed at the end of the session.

And we now have a 'club champion', details overleaf.

Bidding Quiz**Standard American is assumed unless otherwise stated.**

Hand A	Hand B	With Hand A RHO opens 1♠, what do you do?
♠ Q1054	♠ Q	With Hand B partner opens 1♠ and you respond 1NT. Partner then bids 2NT, what do you do?
♥ K9642	♥ K982	
♦ A3	♦ 10852	
♣ Q4	♣ Q1053	
Hand C	Hand D	With Hand C partner opens 1♦ and RHO overcalls 1♠, what do you bid?
♠ K5	♠ K8752	With Hand D you open 1♠ and partner responds 1NT, what do you do?
♥ K84	♥ QJ	
♦ A108	♦ AKJ9	
♣ AQ432	♣ K4	
Hand E	Hand F	What do you open with Hand E?
♠ AJ5	♠ 4	With Hand F LHO opens 1♠ and partner bids 1NT. (a) what do you bid? (b) suppose you choose a 2♦ transfer and partner bids 2♥, what do you do now?
♥ 976	♥ KJ653	
♦ KQ9	♦ A1082	
♣ AJ42	♣ 742	

Editorial

When we have 7 or more tables I generally play a Mitchell movement (N-S stationary), this is the first time that we've had a Mitchell on all three days! The numbers are certainly picking up now for all three days.

Can I again remind people to count their cards. We had yet another incident when dummy had 12 cards on Friday. Chuck informed me that dummy is everybody's responsibility and they should all be penalised according to the rules – you won't become club champion if you get zeros on boards like this! I was in a good mood and gave them all an average.

Actually, the reason for this fouled board was that a card had dropped out of the wallet. The wallets have expanded as the cards get older, I have introduced some new decks and they 'flop about' in their pockets. Hopefully Gerry will arrive soon with the new set of boards and cards that I have ordered.

I introduced a timer on Friday. I believe that the vast majority approved of this and it certainly cut down on the chatter between boards. Mike(Can) was not happy – he maintains that now that we start at 1.00 there is plenty of time. That is not the point! The point is that people do not like twiddling their thumbs for 5 (even 8) minutes while slow players are finishing (or even just starting!) their last hand. Let me know what you think.

Club Champion? After discussion with a number of members we have decided to have a club championship. For 2004 we decided that all days should be counted. What we did was take all results above 53% for any individual and total up the best 15 and then get the average of these best 15. I excluded myself from these calculations and that left 14 players with 15 or more results above 53%. Obviously the more times you play, the better your chances; but you can still get a good result if you had high scores (e.g Tonni, Hans and Chuck), a couple of 70%'s really help. The final results are below and anybody is welcome to check my mathematics if they suspect that I might have made an error.

As we now have meaningful numbers on all three days, we will probably have three separate championships this (2005) year. This is much fairer as some members do not play on Mondays, some not on Fridays etc. Let me know what you think.

Club Championship results for 2004

Position		%	No of results above 53%	
1	Dave	64.09	43	Congrats Dave.
2	Chuck	63.28	23	
3	Clive	61.06	29	
4	Kenneth	60.95	29	
5	Jeff	60.68	25	
6	Hans	60.66	18	
7	Bob	60.62	27	
8	Tomas	60.50	17	
9	Alex	60.29	22	
10	Tonni	58.93	15	
11	David (Swe)	56.96	15	
12	Jan	56.85	17	
13	Ian	56.78	15	
14	Mike(Can)	56.30	15	

So pretty close from 3rd – 9th. No other players got more than 15 results above 53%.

Alex answers back

Alex did not like my article last week where I suggested that Alex/Jeff were cheating. He and Jeff decided not to play on Monday and Alex spent ½ an hour writing up a note to me. Here it is: -

♠ xx *Terry: The grapes certainly are sour, for you of all people should know that these hands with an awkward distribution need a need a careful approach in bidding. Further, considering Clive for an opinion is totally ridiculous, he a leading player?? I said it could mean points or penalty, and I took my time thinking how much down you'd go, suppose Jeff had this hand.*
 ♥ AKxx
 ♦ Qxx
 ♣ Axx

What a load of twaddle! To start with, of course, South's proposed new hand has only 12 cards, so let's add a small ♣. We'll adjust West's hand to accommodate Alex's proposed new South hand and the lay-out would be something like this below. With the ♠K onside N-S do indeed make 7 tricks so it's down 3. But that's little compensation for the small slam (6♥) that N-S can make. Of course you could adjust the hand so that 6♥ does not make, but then 3♦ is just two down and is poor compensation for the easy 4♥ + 1 available to N-S.

Dealer:	♠ AQJ763	West	North	East	South
North	♥ 9754	(Lars)	(Alex)	(me)	(Jeff)
Love all	♦ -	-	pass (1)	3♦	dbl (2)
	♣ K95	pass	pass (3)	pass (4)	

♠ K52	N	♠ 104
♥ J106	W E	♥ Q2
♦ KJ5	S	♦ A1087643
♣ QJ42		♣ 108
	♠ 98	
	♥ AK83	
	♦ Q92	
	♣ A763	

← This is Alex's propose new lay-out (the West and South hands are altered from the actual deal).

Applying the Law

Now then, Alex, you tried to say something about the Law of total tricks in the last news-sheet and I indicated that you simply did not understand it; certainly not well enough to write to me about it. In this new layout of yours you have conveniently given South just two ♠'s and have the ♠K onside (so you set 3♦ by 3 tricks) but let's see what the Law says. N-S have 8 ♥'s (or 8 ♠'s, doesn't matter), E-W have 10 ♦'s, that's 18 trumps in all. You want to construct a deal so that 3♦ goes down 3 when partner has a hand that remotely resembles a reasonable take-out double, fine. So E-W make 6 tricks in this lay-out of yours. The total number of trumps is 18 and 18 - 6 = 12. You have a small slam your way!! It does not matter if you construct the deal so that N-S have 8 ♥'s or 8 ♠'s, whatever you do if you construct it so that 3♦ goes minus 3 when E-W have 10+ decent ♦'s (as implied by your partner's take-out double) then you usually have a slam your way. I suggest that you read up on the 'Law' before you try to lecture me.

But this is, of course, purely academic as double is a poor bid even with this new 'Jeff hand'. Has Alex not taught Jeff that a take-out double should be short in the suit bid? And I certainly would not double with just two small ♠'s.

- ♠ K98 So what happens if you give Jeff a more typical take-out double hand?
- ♥ AK83 6♥ is lay-down, add the ♥Q to this hand and 7♥ is there. 3♦ doubled
- ♦ 92 is always a terrible score (just 300 here) if Jeff has anything remotely
- ♣ A763 resembling a normal double.

Is your bidding a '*careful approach*'? Let's come on to what Jeff said to me on Monday:

What Jeff said

- ♠ 982 So we're reverting to Jeff's actual hand. Jeff told me that as Alex was a passed
 - ♥ 32 hand he thought that game their way was remote and that 3♦ would probably
 - ♦ KQ92 go 3 down, so he doubled. What he did not tell me was how he conveyed the
 - ♣ Q763 message to partner that this was a penalty double. Further 'interrogation' of
- Jeff revealed that he considers all doubles of 3-level bids as penalty. Alex did not appreciate this and is currently discussing what they do with a normal take-out hand. You cannot have a bid that is either penalty or take out – you are leaving yourself open to accusations of 'cheating' when partner 'guesses' it correctly.

Who's a 'Leading' player?

As I said, I consulted several 'leading' players – they all said much the same as Clive did. So what's with this Clive-knocking (Alex gave me three more anti-Clive sheets, I probably won't reproduce them - take it from me that his facts were incorrect and his logic faulty). Clive is most certainly one of the club's leading players, obtaining consistently good results (just this last week -115- we have 1st on Monday, 1st on Wednesday, 2nd on Friday) and this is certainly without having to resort to possibly dubious tactics. I have just finished calculating the 'Player of the year' results. Clive came third (Alex was ninth), so how high up do you have to finish to be considered as one of the club's 'leading players' then Alex?

Sour Grapes?

Alex chose to pass initially, fine. If Jeff had simply passed the 3♦ bid and Alex then made a take-out double which Jeff would then pass for penalties then this would be sensible bidding and there would be have been absolutely no problem. The problem is that the N-S hands were the opposite of what they should have been according to the bidding! Is this the '*careful approach*' ?

And it made no difference to me and my partner if we got 68% or 70 % for the session. The point is that you have been clearly told to behave and warned about any incidents like this. In news sheet 110, I said '*this is the last warning*' and '*take my warnings seriously*'. In news-sheet 112, I said that you two '*will be closely monitored*'. And Jeff was further warned in news-sheet 115 that he would be suspended if he psyched yet again. You both chose to ignore these repeated warnings, up to you. Have a nice day.

Anyway, Alex, you two are not actually suspended yet (but most certainly 'on notice'). I will happily reproduce any contribution to the new-sheet that you care to give me, but be prepared to come off 2nd best when you try to have a go at me or Clive or whoever. You may agree with Chuck on one point (kangaroos) but I believe that even Chuck would agree that my Bridge knowledge is far superior to yours.

Is that double of 3♦ for penalty?

Board 24 from Wednesday 19th

No controversy this deal – I didn't even bother to say anything! :-

Dealer: ♠ 6542
West ♥ 84
Love all ♦ AKQ2
♣ J102

♠ A7 N ♠ QJ82
♥ 97 W E ♥ QJ105
♦ J1098763 S ♦ -
♣ K8 ♣ Q9643
♠ K109
♥ AK632
♦ 53
♣ A75

Table A

West	North	East	South
3♦ (1)	pass	pass	dbl (2)
pass	3♠ (3)	pass	4♠
all pass			

Table B

West	North	East	South
	(Alex)	(me)	(Magnus)
pass (1)	pass	pass	1♥ (1)
3♦ (4)	dbl (5)	3♠ (6)	pass
pass	pass		

Table A: (1) So would you open this West hand with 2♦, 3♦ or pass? Non-vulnerable it is probably a matter of style. Some players would like more points in the suit but it has excellent body and I would not argue if you chose any of these three bids.
(2) Now this is what a double of 3♦ should be! I will ensure that Alex/Jeff read this page. 3♥ is a very reasonable, perhaps preferable, alternative
(3) South's double is for take-out and this hand has a 4 card ♠ suit and so bid it, fine. But with these ♦'s a pass of the take-out double would be perfectly reasonable. Alex please note; as you said, you can convert partner's double into penalties if you wish and this ♦ holding is typical to do just that, a void in ♦'s is not!! Anyway, North decided to bid his ♠'s and South (unwisely) raised to game.

Table B: So let's see what happened at Alex's table this time!

- (1) West passed, fine. So obviously did North and East and South opened 1♥.
- (4) West now decided to enter the lists with 3♦. This is of course terrible, partner has passed and RHO has shown his hand; a pre-empt thus has less effect and is much more likely to get clobbered than when an opening bid.
- (5) Alex slapped the double card down in a manner such that even the next table knew that it was a penalty double.
- (6) Many people play negative doubles (up to say 3♦ or 3♠) but I (East) did not even bother to ask, the gestures made it clear that it was penalty. But actually I had no problem: partner did not open with a pre-empt and only did so later when South had bid ♥'s. The only logical explanation for this is that he has 4 ♠'s, so 3♠ at (6) is 'obvious'.

And what happened? 4♠ by North went two down for a bottom. The defence was not razor sharp against my 3♠ in a 4-2 fit and it went just three down for an average. At other tables 3♦ and 4♦ were doubled for the N-S top scores and one North went one down in 3NT.

The bottom lines: -

- If you have a doubtful pre-empt, then don't come in later when partner has passed!
- If you pass and then later pre-empt, that implies that you did not initially pre-empt because you had a 4 card major.
- A take-out double of an opening 3♦ is short in ♦'s, generally playable in the other 3 suits

Don't double with length in the suit openedBoard 11 from Friday 14th

Dealer:	♠ J3		<u>Table A</u>			
South	♥ AQ108753		West (A)	North	East	South
Love all	♦ K		-	-	-	1♠
	♣ AJ9		2♥ (1)	dbl (2)	pass	3♣ (3)
			pass	3NT	all pass	
♠ Q1054	N	♠ 72	<u>Table B</u>			
♥ K9642	W E	♥ J	West	North	East	South
♦ A3	S	♦ Q98752	-	-	-	1♠
♣ Q4		♣ 10632	-	-	-	1♠
	♠ AK986		dbl (1)	redbl (4)	2♦	dbl
	♥ -		2♥ (5)	dbl	3♣ (6)	dbl
	♦ J1064		3NT (7)	dbl	all pass	
	♣ K875					

Table A: (1) What did you bid with this West hand A in this week's quiz? Pass or 2♥ I hope. Pass is best but 2♥ is reasonable, double is a terrible bid.

(2) This N-S pair played natural methods and so double here was penalties; playing negative doubles you have to pass and hope that partner re-opens with a double as he normally would.

(3) With a ♥ void and a minimum opener I don't blame South for not passing here.

Table B: (1) This West chose to double here – I simply cannot see the point, if you want to bid then overcall with 2♥.

(4) Redouble here shows 9+ points and generally a mis-fit for partner and a desire to defend a doubled contract.

(5) And here we see just one of the problems caused by the initial double – N-S are now in doubling mode and there is no escape for E-W.

(6) I would pass here, let partner stew in the pot of his own making. Anyway, for partner to double and then bid a suit should show a hand that was too strong for a simple overcall (this West hand is nowhere near of course).

(7) It's in last week's news-sheet - when you are being bombarded by penalty doubles, never bid NT!

And what happened? 2♥ doubled by West would have got a poor score for E-W, 3NT doubled by West went for 1100. This hand is a mis-fit and whichever side declared went down. Popular contracts were 3NT and 4♥ by N-S and even 6♥ by North!

The bottom lines: -

- It's usually best to defend with mis-fits.
- Re-double shows 9+ points and usually a mis-fit with a desire to defend
- A two level overcall should be close to an opening hand, this West hand is very marginal.
- A double should show shortage in the suit opened and invites partner to bid any of the other three suits.
- If you double and then remove partner's choice of suit then that shows a hand that was too strong to simply overcall initially (so about 16 + points).

A much more sensible double

Board 2 from Friday 14th

Dealer:	♠ K2					
East	♥ Q1062		West	North	East	South
N-S vul	♦ A985		-	-	1♥	dbl (1)
	♣ J102		pass (2)	1NT (3)	dbl (4)	2♣ (5)
			2♥ (6)	2NT (7)	3♥ (8)	pass
			pass	dbl (9)	all pass	
♠ J753	N	♠ A98				
♥ 9743	W E	♥ AKJ85				
♦ K10	S	♦ 764				
♣ 854		♣ A3				
	♠ Q1064					
	♥ -					
	♦ QJ32					
	♣ KQ976					

- (1) Now this is much more like it – a take-out double should be short in the suit bid and playable in any of the other 3 suits. As I have said before, a double does not necessarily quite guarantee opening values and obviously Austin (South here) agrees with me.
- (2) Now many players agree that a 2♥ (or 3♥) bid here is weak, but without that agreement pass is obviously fine.
- (3) On the border between 1NT and 2NT. I would also bid 1NT.
- (4) Now this shows a good hand, I would like a stronger hand than this when partner has promised nothing and both opponents have shown values.
- (5) But with his minimal double South obviously does not relish 1NT doubled.
- (6) And this 2♥ bid is very sensible, the previous pass showed very limited values and this 2♥ bid just shows ♥ support.
- (7) Quite why North decided that his hand is now worth 2NT when partner ran from 1NT and West has shown a little something is a mystery to me.
- (8) But it obviously worked out OK with East bidding like this. East has already overbid his hand and a pass is now called for, 3♥ will not make.
- (9) This means ‘3♥ will not make’.

And what happened? 3♥ doubled went for –800. Most E-W pairs were in ♥ partscores going down undoubled. One North was in 3NT going minus two, so I guess that a pass of North’s unwise 2NT would have given East a good score instead of an absolute bottom.

The bottom lines: -

- Listen to partner; if he says that he has no points then he has no points.
- Listen to partner; if partner does not like 1NT then he will not like 2NT.

Who overbid?

Board 21 from Friday 14th

3NT went two down here, anyone to blame or just unlucky?

Dealer:	♠ Q				
North	♥ K982	West	North(B)	East	South(D)
N-S vul	♦ 10852	-	pass	pass	1♠ (1)
	♣ Q1053	pass	1NT	pass	2NT (2)
		pass	3NT (3)	all pass	
♠ J964	N	♠ A103			
♥ A753	W E	♥ 1064			
♦ 43	S	♦ Q76			
♣ J82		♣ A976			
	♠ K8752				
	♥ QJ				
	♦ AKJ9				
	♣ K4				

To answer the question, North overbid
(and South had nothing to spare).

- (1) 1NT is a reasonable alternative.
- (2) What did you bid with this South hand E in this week's quiz? This bid should show about 17 – poor 18 points (with 18-19 bid 3NT). Now I was sitting behind Austin when he made this bid and he asked me if I would bid the same. I replied that it was marginal. It's 17 points but QJ doubleton is poor and the 5 card suit is poor (partner is known not to have ♠ support), I would probably bid 2♦ or pass. Anyway, looking at the traveller nobody played in 1NT and so I guess that most bid like Austin.
- (3) What did you bid with this North hand B in this week's quiz? Now South's bid was marginal, but this bid is not. You need about 8-10 to accept the invitation. This is 7 but the two 10's and decent intermediates bring it up to 8; but a singleton Q in partner's suit is miserable and pass is best.

And what happened? 3NT went two down for a clear zero. The most popular contract was 2NT by North (usually just making) so I guess that most auctions were like this except that North wisely passed at (3). Just one pair found the ♦ fit (playing in 3♦) for a good score.

The bottom lines: -

- A singleton (even a queen) in partner's 5 card suit is a miserable holding.

3NT is usually better than 5 of a minor

Board 22 from Friday 14th

Dealer: ♠ K5
East ♥ K84
E-W vul ♦ A108
♣ AQ432

♠ AJ1072 N ♠ 9643
♥ 62 W E ♥ Q1053
♦ 754 S ♦ 93
♣ K95 ♣ J86

♠ Q8
♥ AJ97
♦ KQJ62
♣ 107

Table A

West	North(C)	East	South
-	-	pass	1♦
1♠	2♠ (1)	pass	3♦ (2)
pass	5♦ (3)	all pass	

Table B

West	North (C)	East	South
-	-	pass	1♦
1♠	2♠ (1)	pass	2NT
pass	3NT	all pass	

Table A: (1) What did you bid with this North hand C in this week's quiz? You can bid 2♠ to ask for a stop (or ½ stop – depending upon partnership agreement) but I don't really see the point, with a ♠ stop I would bid 3NT – if partner does not have a ♠ stop also then he probably has sufficient high cards to run 9 tricks. You know me by now – if 3NT is a viable option, then bid it.

Anyway, this N-S pair play that 2♠ asks for a ♠ stop.

(2) And South denied having one.

(3) And so North bid 5♦.

Table B: (1) This N-S pair play that 2♠ asks for a ½ stop or better.

(2) And South has a ½ stop.

And what happened? 3NT made comfortably, usually with overtricks. 5♦ scored a deserved joint zero.

Now it may not surprise you to learn that this North is the same North who tried to convince me that 5♣ was a good bid last week (when I bid 3NT). He was wrong then and he's wrong again here.

The bottom lines: -

- 3NT is usually a better contract than 5 of a minor, think I've said that before.
- If one stop in the enemy suit is probably enough and you have one, then don't bother to ask partner if he too has a stop.

An amusing remark

Chuck has been partnering Austin recently (a match made in heaven?) and I overheard the following: -

Chuck: *'Gee, Austin, you're sure hard on your partners'*.

Anybody who has ever partnered Chuck will appreciate the humour here. In the past (before they met) I had frequently described Austin to Chuck as his twin brother, perhaps older brother is more apt?

How to stop short of an unmakeable game? – part 1

Board 2 from Monday 17th

The commentary in the booklet was that ‘the problem for N-S is to stop short of an unmakeable game’ and ‘if you play transfers in this sequence then you are better equipped’. This prophecy was totally born out at our club. Let’s have a look: -

Dealer:	♠ 4		<u>Table A</u>			
East	♥ KJ653		West	North(F)	East	South
N-S vul	♦ A1082		-	-	1♠	1NT
	♣ 742		pass	3♥ (1)	pass	3NT
			all pass			
♠ 108	N	♠ KQ9752				
♥ Q942	W E	♥ 107	<u>Table B</u>			
♦ 9743	S	♦ K5	West	North (F)	East	South
♣ 953		♣ AK6	-	-	1♠	1NT
	♠ AJ63		pass	2♦ (1)	pass (2)	2♥
	♥ A8		pass	2NT (3)	all pass	
	♦ QJ6					
	♣ QJ108					

Table A: What did you bid at (1) with this North hand F(a) in this week’s quiz? You have to make a 2♦ transfer. This pair do not play transfers in this situation – why not? Here we have the classic situation where it is unbiddable without transfers - 2♥ would be weak and 3♥ is forcing – so how do you bid an invitational hand? It’s impossible without transfers.

Table B: This is how N-S should bid the hand. A 2♠ bid at (2) by East is possibly unwise when West has shown nothing and South has shown a big hand with values in ♠’s. And what did you bid with this North hand F(b) at (3) in this week’s quiz? The North hand is not worth a natural 3♦ game force and so an invitational 2NT is best. As partner is known to hold ♠ values and did not super-accept then pass may be an even better bid.

And what happened? 2NT made at one table and went down at another table. Most other pairs got too high (3NT and 4♥). East tried 2♠ twice and was doubled once, these were good scores for N-S.

The bottom lines: -

- Play ‘Systems on’ after a 1NT overcall.
- Be wary about bidding again when LHO has overcalled 1NT – he has a strong hand with values in your suit.

How to stop short of an unmakeable game? – part 2

Board 11 from Monday 17th

The commentary in the booklet was that ‘some N-S pairs will find it hard to stop short of this rather poor game’ Let’s have a look: -

Dealer:	♠ AJ5			<u>Table A</u>
South	♥ 976			West North(E) East South
Love all	♦ KQ9			- - - pass
	♣ AJ42			pass 1NT (1) pass 2♥
				pass 2♠ pass 3♦ (2)
				pass 3NT all pass
♠ 92	N	♠ 1974		
♥ A43	W E	♥ QJ102		
♦ 863	S	♦ A75		<u>Table B</u>
♣ KQ765		♣ 1093		West North (E) East South
	♠ KQ863			- - - pass
	♥ K85			pass 1♣ (1) pass 1♠
	♦ J1042			pass 1NT (3) all pass
	♣ 8			

Table A: What did you open at (1) with this North hand E in this week’s quiz? I guess that many will simply open 1NT without thinking? The rest of the auction is then automatic. 3♦ at (2) is game forcing and is probably better than 3NT as North may have nothing in ♣’s.

Table B: But Jim was North at this table. I was kibitzing and Jim said to me that he reads the news-sheets as he placed the 1♣ card on the table for his opening bid. Did you open 1♣ or 1NT with this North hand E in this week’s quiz? If you heed what I say about 4333 type shape then 1♣ (with a 1NT rebid to show 12-14) is clear. (3) Actually, North now has a choice of winning options after he has made the correct opening bid. Pass, 2♠ and 1NT are all very sensible.

And what happened? As it turns out, South has 5 ♠’s and so a ♠ partscore is better than 1NT. But 1NT still scores a near top, only being beaten by two pairs (1♠ and 2♠). All the other N-S pairs got too high (3NT and 4♠) and all deservedly went down.

The bottom line: -

- Deduct a point for 4333 type shape.
- Heed what I say?

How to stop short of an unmakeable game? – part 3

Board 1 from Monday 17th

The commentary in the booklet was that ‘the auction should go no further than 3♠’. It was different at a few of our tables, let’s have a look: -

Dealer:	♠ 10962		<u>Table A</u>			
North	♥ K5432		West	North	East	South
Love all	♦ AJ		-	pass	pass	1♠
	♣ 96		pass	2♥ (1)	pass	3♥
			pass	3♠	pass	4♠
			all pass			
♠ K3	N	♠ Q4				
♥ J8	W E	♥ Q76				
♦ K9532	S	♦ 1074	<u>Table B</u>			
♣ A1052		♣ KJ743	West	North	East	South
	♠ AJ875					(Austin)
	♥ A109		-	pass	pass	1♠
	♦ Q86		2♦	2♠	3♣	pass
	♣ Q8		pass	3♠	4♣	dbl
			pass	pass	4♦	4♠
			all pass			

Table A: (1) Now I don’t like this 2♥ bid for a number of reasons. First of all, it is not forcing after an initial pass and you may be left to play in 2♥. But secondly, if you bid 2♥ here and then support ♠’s at the 3 level then this implies just 3♠’s. The correct bid at (1) is either 2♠ or 3♠ (or 2♦ if you play 2-way reverse Drury).

Table B: Now it would appear that Austin too overbid. I would not like to be in 4♠, but then I am not Austin.

And what happened? 4♠ was bid three times and only Austin made it. There would appear to be 4 losers (2♣’s, 1♥ and 1♠). The opposition cashed two♣’s and switched to♦’s but Austin finessed, cleared the♦’s before pulling trumps and West was then end-played when in with the♠K. All the other pairs were in ‘sensible’ contracts of 2♠ or 3♠.

The bottom lines: -

- If you initially pass, then a simple change of suit over partner’s opening is no longer forcing. So North cannot bid 2♥ at (1)

A Free Drink?

Board 5 from Monday 17th

The commentary in the booklet offered a free drink for any pair who can make a good logical case for the sequence that got them to 6♦ on these cards. Clive had a pretty good shot at the table but I think that I can possibly improve on his fine effort having seen both hands.

Dealer:	♠ 104		<u>Table A</u>			
North	♥ K7		West	North	East	South
N-S vul	♦ 109752		-	pass	pass	1♦ (1)
	♣ K642		pass	2♦ (2)	2♥	2♠ (3)
			pass	3♦ (4)	pass	5♦ (5)
			all pass			
♠ 865	N	♠ KJ72				
♥ J1096	W E	♥ A8432				
♦ 3	S	♦ 84	<u>Table B</u>			
♣ QJ1095		♣ 87	West	North	East	South
	♠ AQ93		-	pass	pass	2♣ (1)
	♥ Q5		pass	2♦	pass	3♦
	♦ AKQJ6		pass	4NT (6)	pass	etc to 6♦
	♣ A3					

Table A: (1) This South opened 1♦ and I agree with the bid. 2NT is reasonable but not that attractive with two doubletons. 2♣ is a bit of an overbid as it's only about 8 or 8½ playing tricks.

(2) 2♦ is probably right here, I prefer it to 1NT.

(3) A reverse, and forcing.

(4) With a ♥ stop I would bid 2NT.

(5) South told me that he could think of no other bid. Now you all know me, I will not bid 5♣/♦ if 3NT is a viable option; I would bid 3♥, asking North for a ♥ stop. Presumably South did not do this because he thought that 3♦ at (4) denied a ♥ stop? Still, it does no harm to try again, and many players would play that 3♥ here only asks for ½ a ♥ stop (Jxx would be enough) if the 3♦ bid denied a full stop.

Table B: (1) This South chose a rather optimistic 2♣ opener.

(6) And North (Clive) launched into slam mode when the ♦ fit was uncovered. Now this is very reasonable but it is not recommended to bid Blackwood with a weak doubleton (if one ace is missing there may be an AK off the top). I would simply bid 4♦ at (6) and then this South would show slam interest with a cue bid of 4♠, showing the ♠A and denying the ♥A. It's now safe for North to bid (Roman Key card) Blackwood, especially as he will be declarer and the ♥K is protected from the opening lead if partner does not hold the ♥Q.

And what happened? 6♦ made for the top. 3NT contracts scored well. 5♦ scored above average as it made an overtrick and beat the people who made 3NT just exactly and those that did not even bid game. The bottom lines: -

- It's best not to bid Blackwood with a weak doubleton when you do not know if partner has a top card in that suit.
- You can always take it slowly after partner has initiated a game forcing sequence (2♣ - 2♦ - 3♦ is game forcing) and so there's no need to leap into Blackwood.
- If you want to know if partner has a stop in the enemy suit, then ask him.
- Clive is still waiting for his free drink.

Bidding Quiz Answers

- Hand A: Pass. 2♥ is a not-too-bad alternative. Double is terrible, a double should be short in the suit bid and playable in the other three suits. If you double and then pull a 2♣ or 2♦ response from partner to 2♥ then that shows a hand that was too strong to overcall 1♥ initially.
- Hand B: Pass. You need about 8-10 points to accept partner's invitation. The singleton Q in partner's 5 card suit is an ill-omen and you should pass.
- Hand C: 3NT. You all know me by now, if 3NT is a reasonable option then
You could ask partner for a ♠ stop (by bidding 2♠) but what's the point?
- Hand D: 2♦ (or pass) or 2NT. It's borderline, 2NT here shows a good 17 or 18 points and this poor ♠ suit means it's a poor 17 in my opinion and I would bid 2♦.
- Hand E: 1♣ of course. You all know how many times I say to knock off a point for the 4333 type shape – so it's not worth 1NT. Jim got this spot on and deservedly got the resultant near top.
- Hand F: 2NT or pass. The hand is not worth a game force (3♦). The 'value' bid is an invitational 2NT but as partner is known to hold 'useless' ♠ values and did not super-accept then I think that pass is also a good bid.