

		<u>Winner</u>			<u>Runner-up</u>		
Mon 28 th	N-S	1 st Kenneth/David	61%	2 nd Thorlief/Tom	57%		
	E-W	1 st Gerald/Derek	63%	2 nd Richard/Gene	59%		
Wed 30 th		1 st Bill/Mike	66%	2 nd Jim(Sco)/Dave	62%		
Fri 2 nd	N-S	1 st Chuck/Paul K	75%	2 nd Bill/Ian	56%		
	E-W	1 st Dave/Marg	61%	2 nd Tomas/Phil	58%		

I'm afraid that the news-sheet is a bit short this week. My heart was not in it due to some happenings which are fully detailed on the next page.

The Gold Cup competition is getting very interesting. Dave overtook Chuck for the lead on Wednesday. But Chuck then came right back with a 75% game on Friday. That meant a 14 point jump for Chuck and he now leads Dave by 9 points. However, it's the 30 best results that count and if they both continue to get equally good results then Dave may well win as his 'poor' scores (so the ones that drop off) are worse than Chuck's. Currently we have: -

1st Chuck 1898.2% **2nd Dave** 1889.0% **3rd Bob** 1856.6% **4th Clive** 1799.3%

in the Silver Plate competition (best 10) we have 1st Ken Judson 2nd Clive
and in the Bronze Medal competition (best 5) we have 1st Gerald/Derek 2nd Paul K

Bidding Quiz

Standard American is assumed unless otherwise stated

Hand A	Hand B	With Hand A partner opens 1♠, what do you bid?
♠ K986	♠ K108	With Hand B partner opens 1♦. (a) what do you bid?
♥ -	♥ AKQ974	Suppose you choose 1♥ then what if: -
♦ 7	♦ A654	(b) partner bids 2♣, what do you do?
♣ AK987532	♣ -	(c) partner bids 2♦, what do you do?
Hand C	Hand D	(a) What do you open with Hand C? Suppose you open 1♦ and partner responds 1♥, then (b) what do you bid?
♠ Q5	♠ K3	With Hand D RHO opens 1♣ and you overcall 1NT. Partner bids 2♠, natural and weak. (a) what do you do?
♥ A92	♥ AJ7	(b) What would you do if partner had given an explanation that your 1NT bid was 12-14?
♦ AKJ763	♦ AK96	
♣ K10	♣ J1083	

What's your lead?

♥ 9642 You are on lead against a NT contract and elect to lead this suit, which card do you lead?

What is 3♣?

1NT - 2♦ - 3♣?

I understand that this sequence (no interference) occurred in the ASEAN teams (see next page). The 2♦ bidder was asked what 3♣ meant and replied 'no idea'. You can be sure that Chuck and I know **exactly** what this means, but then we were not playing.

The Teams Sham

In last week's news-sheet I wrote an article about rudeness at this club. In particular, I mentioned one visitor who had upset **a number** of people. I did not name him (it was Henrik) but said that he would be warned.

However, this was overtaken by events: -

Last week the ASEAN bridge games were held in Pattaya. Dave and I had decided to enter a team which would be sponsored (by as much as the club could afford) by the club funds. It's a long story, with people saying that they would play and then dropping out etc. but eventually the team of 6 was Me/Chuck, Dave/Hans and Alan/Gerry (the Acol pair).

About a week before the event Alan said that Henrik wanted to join our team or else Alan would withdraw and play with Henrik in another team. As the Monday club is now very busy (and because I did not want the team breaking up yet again) I said that I would stand down and just play on the Tuesday if 7 players were allowed.

We had a 'team' meeting and I made it very clear that the partnerships were set (Henrik to play with Chuck) and that any messing about with the pairings would not be a good idea. I also made it **very** clear that if possible I wanted to play on Tuesday with Chuck. Henrik also made it very clear that that would not be possible as we could only have 6 people on the team.

And then what happened? The first day (Monday) did not go well. **Henrik** did not get on well with Chuck. **Henrik** decided to split up the established Dave/Hans partnership. **Henrik** then decided that on the Tuesday he wanted to play with Paul (a visitor) and so invited in a 7th player anyway, in the **full knowledge** I wanted to play with Chuck if possible. **Nobody** even bothered to get in touch with me although **everybody** knew that I really wanted to play (and the team was being subsidised by money that **Dave and myself** had accumulated).

Obviously things just went from bad to worse. At the end of the Tuesday both Chuck and Dave were thoroughly fed up and neither played on the Wednesday.

Anyway, it was Henrik who I mentioned last week who's rudeness and supercilious attitude had upset a number of players in the club (quite an amazing feat, to upset at least 6 people in just 4 appearances at the club). I was going to warn him but after I learnt of his incredible selfish and arrogant behaviour in the teams I decided that he should simply be thrown out of the club for ever. We most certainly can do without people like him. The vast majority of the club have expressed their sympathy at the way I was treated and said that Henrik's behaviour was appalling and that he should most certainly be thrown out for good.

I had been looking forward to playing in this event for months and am still very upset that I let this ignorant individual spoil it for me. Gerry and Dave both subsequently apologised to me for letting it get out of control. I do not expect any other members of the team to even think of apologising – that is just the way they are.

The bottom lines: Dave and I subsidised the event. I did not get to play but an uninvited visitor got to play instead. Dave got to play with his partner on just one day. Chuck was upset. Dave was very upset. Words cannot express how upset I was (and still am). Henrik got to play throughout but will **never** play (and annoy people) at this club ever again.

I don't suppose that I will ever get a chance to play in a big tournament like this again.

The jump rebid is not forcing

Board 23 from Monday 28th

Dealer: ♠ K108
South ♥ AKQ974
Both vul ♦ A654
♣ -

♠ QJ642	N	♠ 953
♥ 82	W E	♥ J103
♦ 103	S	♦ J2
♣ Q864		♣ A7542
	♠ A7	
	♥ 65	
	♦ KQ987	
	♣ KJ93	

West	North(B)	East	South
-	-	-	1♦
pass	1♥ (1)	pass	2♣
pass	3♥ (2)	pass	pass (3)
pass			

- (1) What did you bid with this North hand B(a) in this week's quiz? 2♥ is best - provided that you pay it as strong which is 'standard'. Bid 2♥ here and you have no problem later in the auction.
- (2) What did you bid with this North hand B(b) in this week's quiz? The problem here is that 3♥ is not forcing and this is why 2♥ at (1) is simplest. The best bid now is 2♠, 4th suit forcing. I think it's best to play it as game forcing and then a subsequent ♥ bid would be forcing.
- (3) With two small ♥'s, a pass of the 3♥ jump is very reasonable.

And what happened? The results were all over the place, but two pairs did bid 6♥ making 13 tricks. The bottom lines.

- A jump in a new suit over partner's opening shows a very strong hand/suit unless you have an agreement to the contrary.
- In most sequences, a jump rebid (by either opener or responder) is highly invitational but not forcing.
- To make the sequence forcing there are usually options; including 4th suit forcing, a reverse, or a new suit at the 3 level.

Which card do you play?

♥ J83 ← DUMMY

N	YOU ↓
W E	♥ AQ105
S	

DECLARER

Those present may recall that there were a number of noisy exchanges between John Gavens and Emil on Monday.

Emil did not turn up on Wednesday and so I had the undoubted pleasure of partnering John and he told me about his partner's 'terrible' play on this deal. You (John G) are East and partner leads the ♥2 against 3NT. Which card do you play when dummy plays low? Answer next page.

Which card do you play? – answer

DUMMY→ ♥ J83 YOU ↓
 N
♥ 9642 W E ♥ AQ105
 S
 ♥ K7

You are East, defending 3NT; which card did you play when partner led the ♥2 and dummy played low? ‘Obviously’ you should play the ♥10. Partner’s ♥2 is 4th best so he has exactly four ♥’s which may, or may not, include the ♥K. Playing the ♥10 cannot lose, going up with the ♥A loses in the actual position. John Gavens went to great lengths to explain to me how his play of the ♥A was correct and how his partner’s lead was the problem. I’m with Emil here.

A Jump Rebid?

Board 24 from Wednesday 2nd

Dealer: ♠ 10742
West ♥ K10865
Love all ♦ 2
 ♣ AJ2

♠ A96 N ♠ KJ83
♥ 43 W E ♥ QJ7
♦ 10954 S ♦ Q8
♣ Q865 ♣ 9743

♠ Q5
♥ A92
♦ AKJ763
♣ K10

Table A

West	North	East	South(C)
pass	pass	pass	1♦ (1)
pass	1♥	pass	2♦ (2)
pass	pass (3)	pass	

Table B

West	North	East	South(C)
pass	pass	pass	1NT (1)
pass	2♦	pass	2♥
pass	2♠ (2)	pass	4♥ (3)
all pass			

- Table A: (1) What did you open with this South hand C(a) in this week’s quiz? I think that 1♦ is indeed best.
(2) What did you bid with this South hand C(b) in this week’s quiz? This hand is far too good for a miserable 2♦. With decent 3 card support, 2♥ is possible but I think that a jump to 2NT or else 3♦ are better.
(3) With a presumed mis-fit, North reasonably passed.
- Table B: (1) This South decided to open 1NT. Now I have no problem opening 1NT with a 6 card minor suit as long as both doubletons are reasonable (Qx or better) and I will not argue too much with this 1NT opening. However, I would not personally open 1NT as I think it’s too good! AKJxxx is worth far more than 8 points. I would open 1♦ and then jump to 2NT over a 1♥/♠ response although 3♦ would also be reasonable.
(2) Game forcing, showing 5 ♥’s and 4 ♠’s in their methods.
(3) With decent ♥’s and two doubletons this must be the best bid (rather than 3NT).

And what happened? 4♥ was the top spot. The computer says that South should make 10 tricks, Chuck made 12 (don’t ask me how) on his way to that 75% result.

The bottom line.

- A super dooper 17 count is far too good for 1♦ followed by 2♦.
- And it’s also a bit too good for a 1NT opener in my opinion.

John Gavens has asked me to include his name whenever I write up an incident involving him. This is presumably because he is always right and I will look foolish if I criticise him. So here's my 2nd effort at looking foolish under these 'new guidelines': -

Dealer:	♠ K3				
South	♥ AJ7	West	North(D)	East	South
Both vul	♦ AK96	-	-	-	pass
	♣ J1083	1♣	1NT (1)	pass (2)	2♠ (3)
		pass	2NT (4)	all pass	

♠ A	N	♠ Q942
♥ Q102	W E	♥ 9843
♦ Q1032	S	♦ J54
♣ AKQ65		♣ 92

♠ J108765
♥ K65
♦ 87
♣ 74

- (1) Generally played as 15-18
- (2) East asked what range 1NT was and received the (incorrect) reply of 12-14.
- (3) With no agreement to the contrary, this bid is weak and to play.
- (4) Absurd.

Now I just happened to witness this auction. And before the opening lead I informed John (North) that it was his duty to tell the opponents if there had been an incorrect explanation. John stated that his bid showed 15-16, fine.

But what was this absurd 2NT bid at (4) when partner had taken out 1NT?. I did not ask, but North has shown his hand with his 1NT overcall and South is the 'captain' – North should most certainly pass. Did he bid 2NT because he knew that his partner thought that he had 12-14 points? If so that is against the rules – you are not allowed to act upon information that partner has given the opponents. Either way, 2NT was ridiculous.

And what happened? 2NT was two down for a poor score. 2♠ making would have been a good score. The bottom lines.

- Once you have opened or overcalled 1NT then partner is the 'captain'.
- To bid 2NT over partner's weak take out of 1NT is 'absurd'.
- You are not allowed to let partner's explanation of your bid affect your bidding or play.

What is a psyche?

There's an interesting opinion about a bid being a psyche on the next page. Here's a definition from the Official Bridge Encyclopedia: -

'Psyche - Generally meaning bluffing calls to create the illusion of strength or length in a particular suit in order to conceal weakness.'

Was it a Psyche?

♠ AQ Remember this hand from last week's news-sheet? Chuck opened 1♥ and
♥ AJ1084 got a conventional 2NT (Jacoby) response. He replied 3♣, showing ♣
♦ 7 shortage. Now I wrote up the hand, congratulating Chuck on his very
♣ AKQ97 devious bid.

But Ian saw it another way – he said it was a psyche! And since I have made my zero tolerance policy on psyches very clear then Chuck should be

Is Ian right? Well I suppose he has a point. If partner had responded 1♠ and this hand bid 2♦ then that is certainly a psyche. In this case Chuck did not lie about his minor suit distribution in order to stop the opponents from finding a possible ♦ fit/contract and since Chuck's bid did not conceal weakness (see previous definition) as he said nothing about the ♦'s I think it's OK. But I also accept that Ian has a very good point. What do you think?

Know your splinters, cue bids etc.– part 1

Board 24 from Monday 28th

Dealer:	♠ QJ	West	North	East(A)	South
West	♥ QJ92	1♠	pass	3♥ (1)	pass
Love all	♦ 98532	4♥	pass	???	
	♣ J10				

♠ A10742	N	♠ K986
♥ 7653	W E	♥ -
♦ AK4	S	♦ 7
♣ Q		♣ AK987532
	♠ 53	
	♥ AK1084	
	♦ QJ106	
	♣ 64	

Unfortunately this E-W pair ran out of time and the board was averaged, so we'll never know if they would have recovered from this misunderstanding. So what is 3♥ at (1)? And what did you bid at (1) with this East hand A in this week's quiz?

In standard, it's much the same as the jump to 2♥ that I recommended a couple of pages back – strong and natural. However, I don't really like it here as it takes up so much room (and I prefer to play 2/1 anyway when a simple 2♥ is game forcing).

So given that you play standard methods, what should East bid at (1)? I would not bother with a splinter but bid a natural 2♣. The auction could develop in any number of ways but it would be child's play playing 2/1 as then a subsequent ♠ bid by East would set ♠'s as trumps and be game forcing. If not playing 2/1 then I guess that East would have to jump at some stage or introduce some sort of artificial bid and it may be awkward after N-S ♥ interference. Life really is easy playing 2/1.

And what happened? 5 pairs bid 6♠, one pair bid 6♣.

The bottom lines: -

- Go for the major suit 5-4 fit game/slam rather than a long ♣ suit.
- Don't splinter if it takes up too much room.
- Learn 2/1 – it really makes life easier as you do not have to make artificial 4th suit bids or whatever to set up a game force after a two level response.

Know your splinters, cue bids etc.– part 2

Board 27 from Monday 28th

Dealer: ♠ A1054
South ♥ 53
Love all ♦ AJ1075
♣ 76

West	North	East	South
-	-	-	1♥
pass	1♠	pass	4♣ (1)
pass	4♠ (2)	pass	pass (3)
pass			

♠ J762	N	♠ 2
♥ Q984	W E	♥ J7
♦ K8	S	♦ 97432
♣ J104		♣ KQ985
	♠ KQ98	
	♥ AK1062	
	♦ Q	
	♣ A32	

- (1) South did not know what to bid here, he eventually chose 4♣ in the belief that it agreed ♠'s and showed the ♣A. Actually, it is best played as a splinter, showing ♣ shortage.
- (2) Whatever 4♣ was meant to mean, I would cue bid with 4♦ here.

And what happened? 4♠ was bid at all but one table and made 10 or 11 tricks. 6♣ was bid once and went one down. One pair managed to stop in 2♠(!) but they made 12 tricks!

It looks like 6♠ should make even with the bad break (and that's what the computer says).

The bottom lines: -

- When partner bids a major, then an unnecessary jump is a splinter.
- Cue bids are never jumps

Bidding Quiz Answers

- Hand A: 2♣. Now you have excellent ♠ support and are obviously going to game or slam; you could splinter (3♥) but that takes up an awful lot of bidding space so I prefer 2♣. This would be a great hand for 2/1 as you don't have to do anything other than support ♠'s at the lowest level next go when playing 2/1.
- Hand B: (a) 2♥. Unless you have an agreement to the contrary, a jump shift like this is strong. In a major it shows a virtually self-sufficient suit; at least 5 cards, usually 6; and is game forcing and slam seeking.
(b) 2♠. 4th suit forcing. A subsequent ♥ bid would then be game forcing. A direct 3♥ bid over 2♦ is strong but not forcing (it's highly invitational).
(c) 2♠. A reverse. Partner has denied 4 ♠'s and so this 'lie' is relatively safe. The point is that 3♥ is not forcing.
- Hand C: (a) 1♦. 1NT is reasonable but I think it's a bit too good (that ♦AKJxxx is huge).
(b) 2NT or 3♦. The hand is far too good for a simple 2♦.
- Hand D: (a) Pass. You have said you hand and partner wants to play in 2♠.
(b) Pass. You are not allowed partner's explanation to affect your bid.

What's your lead - answer?

From ♥ 9642 I would lead the ♥2 against a NT contract, although I would not criticise another card. Against a suit contract I would lead the ♥6 (followed by the ♥9 next go – MUD) as I like to play that a low card promises an honour against a suit contract. Against NT I lead 4th best and that does not necessarily promise an honour. I don't mind if you disagree, but I don't think that anybody should criticise the ♥2 lead against NT.