

CONTRACT BRIDGE JOURNAL

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE ENGLISH BRIDGE UNION

At North-South, Game ; East-West,
West, Love ; South deals and holds

♠ 9 7 2
♥ A K J 8 3
♦ A 8 2
♣ K Q

He bids a Heart ; West overbids with
Two Clubs ; North Doubles ; and
East bids Two Spades. What should
South say now ?

This problem is fully discussed on
Page 7.

**THIS MONTH'S
PROBLEM**

CHAS. BRADBURY LIMITED

26 SACKVILLE ST., PICCADILLY
LONDON, W1.

Phone Reg. 3123-3995

LOANS ARRANGED
With or without Security.

WANBOROUGH MANOR COUNTRY CLUB

(Incorporated with the West Surrey Bridge Club)

Residential Club with Billiards, cardrooms,
swimming pool, lovely gardens and dancing
every Saturday night.

Illustrated Brochure on application to The
Secretary, Wanborough Manor, near Guildford.
Telephone Puttenham 351.

The copyright of this magazine is
vested in Priestley Studios Ltd.

It is published under the authority
of the English Bridge Union.

The Editorial Board is composed of,
and the Editor is appointed by, the
English Bridge Union.



ACHILLE SERRE

*Quality Cleaning
and
Dyeing
plus Retex*

will give holiday,
week-end and sports
clothes a new lease
of life

K 23
BRANCHES AND AGENTS IN PRINCIPAL CENTRES

RIVIERA HOTEL

CANFORD CLIFFS

BOURNEMOUTH

FACES CHINE AND SEA AMID GLORIOUS SURROUNDINGS

Quality fare prepared by first class chefs

Perfectly appointed bedrooms and suites

Cocktail Lounge—Tennis—Golf

Telephone: Canford Cliffs 285

Brochure on Request

- You can always rely on a good game of Bridge at
The Ralph Evans's Hotel

CONTRACT BRIDGE JOURNAL

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE ENGLISH BRIDGE UNION

VOLUME 3

JULY, 1949

NUMBER 9

• CONTENTS •

	<i>Page</i>
EDITORIAL	2
GOLD CUP CEIMAX	
"Alibi"	3
HORNS OF THE DILEMMA	
The Editor	7
CAMROSE FINAL	
Noel Byrne	10
ON SELECTION AND	
SELECTORS	12
HANDS FROM PLAY ..	14
ASSOCIATION HISTORY. I...	19
DOUBLE-TAKE	
Gordon Hammond ..	20
BRIDGE ON THE SCREEN	
"Guinea Pig"	21
SIGNALITIS	
C. E. Dickel	22
TORTUOSITY TRIUMPHANT	
(For the Opposition) ..	24
A QUESTION OF TACTICS	
G. A. Miller	28
JULY COMPETITION ..	29
ANSWERS TO JUNE	
COMPETITION	30

* * *

*All Bridge Correspondence to the
Editor :*

GUY RAMSEY,
13, Cannon Place,
London, N.W.3.

*All Correspondence on
Subscriptions or Advertising to
Publishers :*

PRIESTLEY STUDIOS LTD.,
Commercial Road,
Gloucester.

NOTES

The exigencies of the Press—the fact that the *Contract Bridge Journal* must leave the Editor's hands some appreciable time before it reaches the reader—have compelled this issue to be out-dated before publication.

The news from Paris is already known. The British team has, for the second year in succession, borne away the blue riband of Europe. The Ladies came joint third. In the August number, M. Harrison-Gray, the British Captain, will write extensively of the whole event. In the meantime, we offer to our team our official—as they have already received the heartfelt unofficial—congratulations of all players.

Many readers have written to point out various defences to the Problem on the Cover of the June issue ; some with alternative solutions. The Editor congratulates those who found lacunae which escaped Robert Darvas and the late Dr. Paul Stern, and promises to scrutinise, with even greater care, any future teaser.

On this occasion he—in common with Homer, Davas and his old friend, Stern, nodded.

EDITORIAL

THERE are two methods of training for a major event: the one, more conventional, to undergo a rigorous course of practice right up to the last minute; the other, to fling away all normal routine and plunge into experiment. Each has its risk: the former incurs the hazard of staleness; the latter, the lessening of concentration.

Britain's two teams, proceeding to Paris by train and plane as these lines are written, have split the systems between them. *Place aux dames*, the Ladies played the Iceland team, which paid a fleeting, and very welcome, visit to London late in June, and only ceased fire 14 hours before explaining for the Capital of Light and Love . . . and Bridge! In a tense, close match, during which they led by anything from 3 to 2 International Match points for the bulk of the hands, they ended up just 2 points down, ranked as a draw.

The Men, on the other hand—at least in some cases—embarked on a series of experimental bids, psychic bids, three-card bids. These (as might have been expected against such good opposition as the Reykjavik team, with its super-complicated system: a compound of Vienna, the Two-Club, Lederer and Culbertson) did not meet with great success; and the Londoners went down by 46 I.M.P.

This reverse followed a defeat in the 90-board Melville Smith Cup and the not overwhelming victory in the Gold Cup Final, recorded in this issue. And there have not been few who, scanning the auguries, foretold, Cassandra-like, doom in Paris.

It is our conviction, however, that the British team, under its Gibraltar-like pivot and Captain, M. Harrison-Gray, not only possesses the cool judgment and technical ability to carry again the blue riband of the International, but the even more important capacity to pull out its best efforts when these are most required.

Last year, the Gray team was seven strong—the “spare” being found of great value in the strenuous programme. This year, with an even heavier fixture list, it has been thought advisable to co-opt a seventh player to reinforce the Gray-Konstam, Reese-Shapiro, Dodds-Rayne partnerships. After careful consideration, Adam Meredith, tall, slim, idol of Lederer's, was the fortunate player to be invited. Meredith, whose performance in three matches impressed the Americans profoundly, thus gains his first International Cap. He will abandon the Baron he has played of late for Acol to conform to the element in the team with which he will be partnered. We beg to offer the newcomer our hearty congratulations and our equally hearty good wishes.

The Ladies will have the benefit of that young veteran, Mr. Graham Mathieson, as their non-playing Captain. Since they have no seventh team-member to provide relief to the three pairs, Fleming-Gordon, Rhodes-Litante, Lester-Williams, Mrs. Fleming will be freed from the cares of Captaincy: no inconsiderable strain on any player. Mathieson, himself an expert, and himself widely and deeply experienced in both strategy

and tactics—above all, himself a popular personality and a fighter who does not recognise defeat (witness his performance in the second half of the Crowninshield Cup) should prove a tower of strength.

Whatever the outcome—and we feel the chances of a British

“double” are excellent—it is certain that both teams will enhance Britain's already high prestige, both as players and as individuals who possess the charm and sportsmanship which makes the game a field of honour as well as a field of battle.

GOLD CUP CLIMAX

by “Alibi”

THE Gold Cup Tournament, always referred to as the “Blue Riband of British Bridge,” has many points in common with the F. A. Cup. The luck of the draw plays no inconsiderable part; and the quality of the play in the final is apt to be affected by the importance of the occasion and the magnitude of the prize. It is therefore pleasant to record the final stages of the 1949 contest, which departed from the stereotyped pattern in more than one respect.

In the semi-finals Len Shenkin's Glasgow team opposed those experienced campaigners, Don McAllister's Bridgend team, while two famous London combinations contested the other tie. The Shenkin team, who once won the Cheltenham Rose Bowl “international” competition, were soon 2,000 points in arrears, but thereafter played with such skill and resolution that they eventually won the 64-board match by a comfortable margin. History was thus made, for they became the first Scottish team to reach the final of the British teams of four championship although other players from North of the Tweed

have at various times figured in the semi-final round.

The other clash was between the holders, Pedro Juan (captain), Dr. Sidney Lee, Terence Reese, Boris Shapiro, Adam Meredith, Dr. Hans Leist (only the last four played) and Graham Mathieson (captain), Jordanis Pavlides, Leslie Dodds, Eddie Rayne, Kenneth Konstam and M. Harrison-Gray, all of whom took an active part in this match, also of 64 boards.

As was to be expected, this battle of giants aroused enormous interest in London circles, and speculation was rife as to the result. The play, however, was disappointing, for whereas Mathieson's team were very much on their toes Juan's players never showed the intensive will to win of which they are capable. Swings were few and far between, yet Mathieson always appeared to have an edge; the first session of 32 boards saw him leading by 1,220 points.

On the resumption Mathieson suffered a terrible setback that might well have decided the fate of the match. Both sides reached a vulnerable contract of Six Clubs; owing to the luck of the lead Juan's player made twelve tricks, his

CONTRACT BRIDGE JOURNAL

vis-à-vis made eleven only, representing a swing of 1,470. Some other minor reverses found Mathieson 980 in arrears.

The match temperament of his team now asserted itself; the deficit was gradually reduced, until out of the blue 980 points were suddenly handed to them on a platter. Mathieson and Pavlides bid and made 4 ♥ in Room 1; on the same hand, at Game All, Gray in the other room was doubled in 1 ♠ and made an overtrick.

The following hand shows the closeness of the exchanges:

♠ —	
♥ A 8 3	
♦ K 9 8 6 4 2	
♣ J 7 4 3	
♠ 10 8 5 3 2	♠ A 9 7 6 4
♥ 4	♥ Q 6 2
♦ A 7	♦ Q J 10
♣ 10 9 8 6 2	♣ K Q
♠ K Q J	
♥ K J 10 9 7 5	
♦ 5 3	
♣ A 5	

Dealer, East. East-West Game.

In Room 1 Dodds and Rayne (East-West) bid up to 4 ♠ after Reese and Shapiro had reached 4 ♥; South doubled, and with the bad break in trumps and the Diamond finesse wrong East lost 500 points. In the other room Meredith (East) opened 1 ♠, Gray (South) overcalled with 2 ♥, Leist bid 4 ♠ and Konstam, with a non-vulnerable minor suit save in mind, made the fine bid of 4 NT. East doubled, South bid 5 ♥ and East again doubled. West led ♦ A and shifted to ♣ 10.

When dummy played low East, rather misguided, false-carded with

♣ K, and this confirmed Gray's impression that West had started with a singleton trump. Once this view is taken, the contract is easily made; ♦ K was followed by a third round of Diamonds, ruffed with ♥ 9, and ♥ 10 was led to dummy's ♥ A. An established Diamond was now played; East did not trump, so South shed his losing Club. It only remained to pick up East's ♥ Q and one further trick only was conceded to ♠ A.

Finally a storming session by Konstam and Gray on the last 8 boards put Mathieson well ahead, and only a last-minute effort by Meredith — a beautifully-played vulnerable 3 NT — kept the margin down to a figure of 1,200.

The 100-board final was played in Glasgow at the Central Hotel — in every sense a successful innovation. The match was perfectly staged by the Scottish Bridge Union, with their popular Chairman, J. P. Edmond, in the part of match manager. The rooms were packed with more than four hundred spectators, and the players fought out the issue in a real Gold Cup atmosphere.

The Scottish team consisted of Len Shenkin (captain), his brother Louis Shenkin, S. Stein, A. Winetrobe, L. Rose and H. Cohen. They formed a remarkable combination.

Many times in the past crack London pairs have been held for long periods, notably in Camrose Cup matches, by national or provincial teams, a sensational beginning but a stereotyped ending; for invariably the Londoners have found their opponents wilting or going berserk in the last few boards, with the final margin in their

favour a decisive one. But a very different story was to be told in Glasgow.

No-one was seriously perturbed when the Scottish players jumped into an early lead which they increased to 2,140 at Board 13. This sort of thing had happened before ; the Londoners presumably would soon exact a dire retribution.

They did not get going to the extent of reducing the deficit ; but up it went again, and it was not till the 54th board that at long last Mathieson got his nose in front. Four consecutive swings, on Boards 61-64, saw him leading by 1,980 ; soon afterwards an unbroken run of gains, large and small, pushed the lead up to 3,600 with three-quarters of the match completed. During this period, incidentally, no-one could suggest that the London players had been unlucky !

And now Scottish supporters feared the inevitable landslide. It never materialised. On the contrary, it was a London pair who ventured an unspeakable vulnerable 3 NT—smartly doubled for a penalty of 1,100 ; as a form of repercussion from this disaster, two vulnerable 3 NT contracts, both ice-cold, were played in part scores, while the Scots bid both in their stride. And so the score hovered around the 2,000 mark until the final margin of 2,520, which, if anything, tended to flatter the winners.

The play of the cards by both teams was uniformly excellent ; the following is one of the rare

examples of faulty play by declarer :

WEST	EAST
♠ 4	♠ A Q 9 8 3 2
♥ 2	♥ K Q 7
♦ A 8 3	♦ K Q 4 2
♣ A K 10 8 7 4 3 2	♣ —

Both sides reached 5 ♣, and the first four tricks were the same in both rooms : ♥ J led by North, South covering ♥ Q with ♥ A ; low Heart returned, ruffed by West ; ♣ K, on which North dropped ♣ J and South ♣ 5 ; ♣ A, North showing out. It is now impossible for West to shorten his Clubs for a trump coup against South, who eventually has to make two further tricks from his original holding of Q 9 6 5.

In fact the contract becomes a virtual certainty as soon as North produces ♣ J, for declarer can plan his play to cope with four trumps in the South hand. The sequence is the following : Trick 4, ♠ A ; Trick 5, Spade ruff ; Trick 6, ♦ Q ; Trick 7, Spade ruff ; Trick 8, ♦ K ; Trick 9, ♥ K, *South discarding* ♦ A ; Trick 10, Spade or Diamond ruff. West's Clubs are now reduced to K 10 8, and at Trick 11 he exits with ♣ 8. If North holds ♣ Q, he is welcome to make it ; but if South, as in practice, holds Q 9 6, he has to win and lead back into West's tenace.

Mathieson gained a big swing on the following hand, which brings up the time-honoured question of the advisability of rescuing partner :

♠ A K J 8 7	♠ 5 3
♥ 6 2	♥ A 9 8 5 3
♦ K 4 2	♦ Q 9
♣ J 9 3	♣ K 8 7 2
♠ Q 10 9 6 4	
♥ J	
♦ 10 8 7 5	
♣ A 5 4	

Dealer, West. North-South Game.

The bidding started the same way in both rooms: West, 1 ♠; North, 2 ♥; East, double. In Room 1 the Scottish South rescued into 2 NT, and no doubt felt relieved when everyone passed; the contract was set one trick, albeit with some difficulty. Note the restraint of Pavlides (East) in not doubling 2 NT; he reasoned that Mathieson (West) had failed to do so while he had the chance, and that it might well be too close a thing.

In Room 2 Rayne did not hesitate to pass with the South cards. East's double looks reasonable enough, yet with Dodds (North) at the wheel the contract was made, and Mathieson gained a swing of 770.

The play went as follows: ♠ 5 led by East, ♥ 6 returned by West. East ducked, ♥ J won the trick, and ♦ 10 was led from dummy. From this point, with the Diamond suit played correctly, the defence is powerless. The same effect results if East wins with ♥ A and exits with ♥ 8; sooner or later he is forced to lead a Club, and the defence can only win one Spade, two Hearts, one Diamond and one Club—a disappointing result for East.

While there were few examples of brilliance in this match, one thing can safely be said: it is unlikely that such steady and accurate bridge has been seen before in a Gold Cup final. There were only fifteen swings of more than 400 throughout the 100 boards; six of these went to Shenkin, nine to Mathieson. The Londoners did not obtain their first sizeable gain (560) until Board 22; on the other hand, apart from a loss of 620 when the Shenkin brothers made 4 ♥ after a light opening bid while the hand was thrown in in Room 2, they incurred no adverse swing greater than 350 on Boards 11 to 80 inclusive. The Londoners gained points on 47 boards, the Scots on 31.

The honours of the match undoubtedly must go to the Scottish players. They looked like a sextet of cheerful sinners; their cheerfulness persisted and they were obviously out to enjoy the party; but they steadfastly refused to commit the "horrors" that most London teams have come to expect as their rightful due. Those followers of the game who fell back on the old *cliché*, that the Gold Cup final proper had been fought out when Mathieson met Juan in the semi-final, were destined to receive a resounding shock.

Finally, in these days when there is much whispering in dark corners about intonations, hesitations and other reprehensible practices, particularly during the stress of a needle match, it is pleasant to record that Shenkin's players provided an object lesson of the spirit in which the game should be played. They were charming as well as dangerous opponents.

HORNS OF THE DILEMMA

by The Editor

THE Universities in the Middle Ages spent a good deal of their time in posing—and striving to answer such questions of purely academic interest as:

Can an omnipotent God make a weight so great that He Himself cannot lift it? or the traditional chestnut of the Schoolmen, How many angels can dance upon the point of a needle?

It is, therefore, no surprise when from one of the Senior Universities, a query is posed to tax the intellectual resources of the bridge-playing world; for, in these material days, when Karl (not Jack, nor Alf nor even Harpo) Marx has infected all thought, problems of abstract philosophy give place, perhaps too readily, to those of concrete advantage.

From King's College, Cambridge, comes a note signed by D. E. Young, setting this riddle: At Game to you, against Non-Vulnerable opponents, you deal yourself: ♠ 9 x x, ♥ A K J x x, ♦ A x x, ♣ K Q and bid an impeccable Heart. Next player butts-in with Two Clubs which your partner Doubles. While you are planning just how you will dispose of your profits, however, the Double is removed by Fourth-hand to Two Spades—and Mr. Young enquires artlessly, "What do you do with your hand now? Double? Bid Two No Trumps? Bid Three Diamonds? Bid Three Clubs? Or What?"

This is no poser dreamed (or nightmared) up in the silent watches of the night, nor the fruit

of scholiast discussion over the port which the University still drinks of an evening. It cropped up in the Oxford-Cambridge match of 1949. True to the traditions of University ethic in discussion, Mr. Young carefully refrained from sending the other hands, lest knowledge influence the decision (or the opinion) given by any authority presented with the case.

Quot homines (or feminae !), tot sententiae with a vengeance.

Mr. Horace H. Renshaw, probably the finest player at the Portland Club, regretted that one could not invent the bid "Forcing Pass"—but even the new Laws do not sanction this emendation. For, if a Pass in this position could be inevitably construed as forcing, it would, unquestionably, be the ideal solution.

Unhappily, it might easily give the impression: "I hold a minimum Opener; I cannot Double Spades: proceed as you think best." It will, almost certainly, not convey the idea of a 17-point holding.

To Two No Trumps, the twin objection lies (a) that it postulates a Spade guard, on the presumption of which partner may predicate a future sequence of bidding ending in disaster; and (b) it may very easily steer a No Trump contract into the wrong hand.

A Double of Two Spades is open to the twin disadvantages that (a) there is no certainty that it will not turn out to be a makable contract; and (b) that *at the score*, you may gain a mere 100 or 300, with 600 for a Vulnerable Game on ice.

Three Diamonds, is, admittedly, "fancy," giving the impression that you are 4-4, 5-4, 5-5, or even more unbalanced in the red suits, even shorter in the blacks; and the subsequent question arise, what the devil do you do if Partner bids Four Diamonds? After all, you do not relish a Five Diamond contract with three in your hand, four in partner's, and a Spade coming through your partner's guard (if any). A rescue to Four Hearts is, obviously, "out" since the Double of Two Clubs postulates shortage in partner's hand for your announced suit. It is, by the way, for this reason that Three Hearts is barely considered in theory (and was not considered by a single expert consulted in practice) as a possible answer to the original question.

Three Clubs, likewise, has a double objection to it: it may be read as offering Clubs as a possible contract and, thereby, falsely implying that the butt-in was an out-and-out Psyche; or it may be construed as showing a Club void with, in consequence, a 4-5-4-0 hand: and there is nothing to tell the wretched North which of the two it is (plus the fact that it is, actually, neither!) Such a shape should, unquestionably, Double Two Spades, anyway.

I have thus, at length, itemised the lions in every path and signposted the multitude of horns adorning the head of this dilemma, for I now propose to allow the canvassed experts to speak for themselves:—

Mr. M. Harrison Gray, run to earth (as expected) in his bath—anyone who had telephoned to him in the morning will recognise the situation—made his conventional

comment: "Horrible!" He then settled down to work out "What the man has got." He came to the conclusion that it was 60 on Double to 40 on Pass. "But I wouldn't Double in a close match, d'you follow?"

Mr. Terence Reese, wrenching himself from his television screen, Doubled without such protracted consideration. "Partner ought to have four Spades to the Queen or be able to find another bid; Diamonds at the three level on three cards is pretty dubious."

Mr. Gray's partner, Mr. Kenneth Konstam, however, disagreed with Mr. Gray. Wolfing chicken at the Crockford's bar, "Connie" took one look at the hand and passed instantly. "There's nothing useful I can bid," he remarked with that rapidity of decision that makes him so difficult to play against, and reverted to the serious business of lunch.

Mr. Reese's partner, Mr. Boris Shapiro, was induced to stop discussing the other sex for five minutes. He found three answers, in order of preference: No Bid, Double, or *Three* No Trumps. He then reverted to his perennial topic.

Mr. J. C. H. Marx remarked, in Lancashire vernacular, making microscopic doodles on a score-pad, "Oooh, I think I Dooble if I'm feeling in form. After all, they oughtn't to get to eight tricks; and Heaven knows where *they're* going, or *we're* going, for the matter of that." Subsequently, however, he Passed, on reflection. "Your 5 points in Clubs will be useless with Spades as trumps."

Mr. Lewis Ellison plumped solidly for Three Clubs; to Pass

was not to be thought of on 17 points—"considering the muck we're all apt to open on. Partner must take some action, and I can take my view after he has told me a little more about the hand."

Mr. Karel Stepanek, fresh from negotiating by telephone a personal appearance, also found Three Clubs. And Mrs. A. L. Fleming, Captain of the England Ladies, endorsed this.

The Double, however, found great support from Mr. Colin Harding; while the Pass was the choice of Mr. E. Leigh-Howard, Mr. "Bass" Worthington (a notorious and dangerous "lurker") and Mrs. Renshaw, also a traditionally conservative player. Among the Passers, unexpectedly, was Miss Dorothy Pearson, whose Acol is of the forward type.

Mr. Algernon de Horsey, limp with the heat and engrossed in a rubber, commented, with the propounder, "Stinker"—and demanded time for consideration. Twenty-four hours later, he suggested—unusually—2 No Trumps.

Mr. C. M. Raphael, who is usually to be relied upon to find something unexpected, disappointed: he ranged himself with the Three Clubbers. Secretary of the B.B.L., George Gray, allied himself to the Cautious Lurkers.

The most protracted telephonic analysis came from (as expected) Mr. Leo Baron. He demanded what system he was playing, and we gave him a free hand, so he chose Baron. He asked who his partner was, and we told him his favourite. His first comment was: "Somebody is not playing Baron here!" Before he knew he was playing Baron, he asked if a Three

Diamond bid was 100 per cent forcing—as, on his own system, of course, it is. However, he threw this possibility away; and declined to make the bid anyway.

"If I can rely on my partner, he hasn't Doubled Two Clubs merely on Clubs: he has seven or eight points in his hand. A Three Club bid by me would be showing up a psyche since no suit has been agreed: it cannot be a cue-bid, since I should, presumably, then have four Spades and would Double the Spades. I am inclined to Double, with a favourite partner; for he will realise that, having opened One Heart, I am unlikely to have four Spades; and if his outside stuff is in Diamonds, he may remove the Double (though this is unlikely). If I beat Two Spades by one or two, with a Game on for us, unlucky; if I beat it by three, I couldn't care less; while if they make it—which is admittedly a possibility—I can rely upon my favourite partner not to be unduly distressed: something I could not rely upon in ordinary rubber-bridge play—*where I should not Double.*

"So I Double, but I do not immediately lead Spade. The Club caller may have three Hearts to the Queen, in which case, I want Partner to ruff it. I lead the King of Hearts and look."

Mrs. Rixi Markus, with the reputation of a thruster, surprised by Passing "in sleep." "But," she added promptly, "I don't expect Partner to Pass. My Pass tells him I haven't got four Spades; and he should have foreseen the possibility of this "rescue" before Doubling Two Clubs. If Partner has not foreseen this, everything is

a guess. "If he has foreseen it, he will make some other bid." In other words, Mr. Renshaw's Forcing Pass—but not so uttered!

Mrs. Madeline Lester, without hesitation, found the same answer: "Partner *must* take action; a Pass would be unthinkable from a good player."

Commander Borrett was the sole advocate, among those questioned, of a Three Diamond bid, although Baron toyed with the idea, providing it was 100 per cent forcing: the theory being that partner, if he had a Spade stop, should bid No Trumps. Just what Dealer would bid if the Diamonds were raised—as well they might be—was left as a hurdle to be negotiated subsequently.

It is at moments like this, especially, that one misses the ironical, profound, and idiosyncratic comments of S. J. Simon; and the forthright, vigorous and often scathing opinion of Dr. Paul Stern. But Mrs. Simon, extricated from solving two anagrams in Ximenes at once, said instantly: "Double and lead Spade," while Mrs. Stern Passed: "Playing with Paul, I shouldn't dream of doing anything else, because I can't

Double: only if my hand was a two-suiter should I bid in this position." Mrs. Stern saw no point in bidding Three Clubs: "Partner has a tongue of his own; why, then, try to "elicit" a bid from him and prevent him from Doubling Two Spades if he wants to?"

Further enquiries found Mr. Pedro Juan, proceeding by a "logical series of elimination" finding Three Clubs the least disadvantageous bid; Mr. Pearlstone ranging himself on the side of the Pass. Mr. Leslie Dodds announced himself as a "conservative player" (1) and also Passed.

Ending, as we began, with Mr. Renshaw, he decided, failing the right to make the bid "Forcing Pass," to "choose the least objectionable bid available "with Three Clubs.

One view I could not obtain—that of Ewart Kempson. But I know well enough what he would say: "I should never be in that position; and anyone who played Common Sense instead of Slow Approach would never get in that position, because the hand is a Two Heart bid!"

CAMROSE FINAL

by Noel Byrne

IRELAND entered on the match with England with the exciting prospect of gaining possession of the Camrose Trophy for the first time—if we could win by 2,500 to 3,000.

We never looked like achieving this, but it did look, at Board 96, as if we might gain a narrow victory and have the honour of

sharing the Championship points. England's lead of 2,000 odd had been whittled down to a mere 590 and our Star was definitely in the ascendant, when Harold Franklin produced a master to lead against a 3 NT. contract which burst it wide open; as the contract was made in Room Two, the hand put paid to our hopes. Here it is.

CONTRACT BRIDGE JOURNAL

Game All, Dealer South.

♠ A 8 7 3	
♥ A 8 7 6	
♦ K 9 6	
♣ J 10	
♠ Q J 10 5 4	♠ K 6
♥ Q 5 4 3 2	♥ 10 9
♦ 4	♦ A Q J 7 3
♣ A K	♣ Q 8 7 2
	♠ 9 2
	♥ K J
	♦ 10 8 5 2
	♣ 9 6 5 4 3

The bidding was identical in each room, North-South were silent and the auction proceeded—*West*, One Spade, *East*, Two Diamonds, *West*, Two Hearts, *East*, Three No Trumps.

Franklin led the Heart Knave, followed by the King, and then a Club. Declarer played Spades, North winning the second round and throwing back a Diamond. East finessed but is now helpless—he can only cash Dummy's winning Spades and Club Ace and has then to lead away from the Queen 5 of Hearts. Preston, in Room Two, had an easier passage. A small Club was led and though the subsequent play went as in Room One, Declarer exited from Dummy with a small Heart—South is thrown in and the defence cannot avoid giving Declarer his ninth trick.

A GIFT SUGGESTION

Complete sets of Volume II can now be supplied bound in blue Rexine and lettered in gold to match Volume I at a cost of 42/-

Please send orders to
PRIESTLEY STUDIOS Ltd.
Commercial Rd., Gloucester

He had a big slice of luck on Board 83. Dealer North. East-West Vulnerable.

♠ J	
♥ 10 8 5	
♦ 10 9 8 7 6 5 3	
♣ Q 8	
♠ Q 10 8 7 3	♠ A K 9 4 2
♥ —	♥ A 4 2
♦ K 2	♦ Q
♣ A J 9 7 3 2	♣ K 10 5 4
	♠ 6 5
	♥ K Q J 9 7 6 3
	♦ A J 4
	♣ 6

Tarlo (*North*) bid Three Diamonds, *East*, Three Spades, *South*, Four Hearts, *West*, Six Spades, *North*, Pass, *East*, Pass, *South*, Seven Diamonds, *West*, Seven Spades (end).

South led the Heart King and the party was over—an outrageous fluke but a great thrill for the biggest ever "gallery" seen in Dublin.

England won by 840 points, thus retaining possession of the Championship and the Camrose Trophy and we say—Well Done England.

Teams :

ENGLAND: T. Tarlo, H. Franklin, R. Preston, R. Swimer, J. S. Parminter, Mrs. A. Hurner.

EIRE: Dr. P. P. Donovan, J. Harold, J. Kelly, Mr. & Mrs. J. M. O'Sullivan, D. Rivlin, (non-playing Captain, Mrs. R. McConkey).

ON SELECTION AND SELECTORS

This Memorandum to the British Bridge League has come to the Contract Bridge Journal by the hand of a distinguished official of the English Bridge Union. The author demands that his anonymity be preserved even from the Editor; but so unchallengeable is the source through which it came; so important is the subject of the article; and so—in our view—fundamentally sound are many of the suggestions made, that we print it without comment, and with gratitude.

THE sounds and furies of the eliminating trials are now over. The two teams are chosen, and everyone wishes them every success in Paris. We have now to face, and face at the earliest possible moment, the methods of selection of the teams for 1950.

The methods adopted this year by the B.B.L. have aroused, and rightly so, vast criticism. The Selection Committee of the B.B.L., which included in its composition the Chairman of the E.B.U., and one of the E.B.U. Selectors, decided to over-ride the E.B.U. proposals. The resulting trials—and, even more, tribulations—shocked the bridge-playing public of London. The howls of protest are hardly stilled even now.

What were the results, apart from general dissatisfaction?

The men's team, winners at Copenhagen, are so completely outstanding that they played badly (admitted by them) in their trial, and even then made their opponents appear palookas. Had they been at their best, as four of them were later against the Americans, the result of the final trial would have been ludicrous.

The women's team, chosen after extensive, expensive and exhaustive trials, is still by no means the best

in the country,* and controversy rages around the choice of two of the six players.

What can be done to amend matters in 1950? Firstly, the new E.B.U. Selection Committee is even stronger than last year's; secondly, the E.B.U. delegates to the B.B.L. have been changed (with the exception of the Chairman of the E.B.U.). This may lead to both better representation and better administration.

In 1949 the E.B.U. favoured a method of team selection by:

- (a) open competition;
- (b) knock-out matches of 100 boards;
- (c) seeding teams of repute and performance to the quarter finals;
- (d) 200 board final;
- (e) consulation, after the final, between the B.B.L. and the Captain of the winning team to discover if the winning team can, by mutual agreement, be strengthened before it competes in the European Championship;
- (f) any team winning the European Championship,

* *The author's personal opinion.—*
EDITOR.

and of the same constitution, to be "put in the box."

Will the E.B.U. reiterate their proposals this year? And, if so, will the B.B.L. accept them?

This method would relieve the B.B.L. from the odium it incurred this year, but would it produce the best team? Perhaps the answer to that is to view the Gold Cup: open to all, forty-eight board matches, and a hundred board final: and yet it is common knowledge that you can pick each year only two of three teams of the entire entry out of which the winners will be found.

Should the B.B.L. *not* accept the E.B.U. suggestions, it might well be that the E.B.U. itself could produce an "English Men's team" and an "English Ladies' team" to challenge the B.B.L.'s. final selections.

Whatever methods are adopted, it is essential that a firm line should be taken in two directions.

Firstly, the B.B.L. should agree to accept no entry from any person thought unfit to represent Great Britain. It is common knowledge that among our leading players there are individuals, who, on account of their unfortunate temperament, should never be allowed to represent the Country, lest their table-manners shame both them and us. The B.B.L. should announce that it arrogates to itself the right to refuse any entry *without explanation*. In this it should receive the full support of the E.B.U., and the E.B.U. should receive similar support from its constituent bodies.

Secondly, efforts should be made to reduce the costs to the player of entering for these competitions. Times are hard, and purses empty. The Ladies had to play a trial and then three matches; each with its cost of table money, meals, transport and accommodation: this on top of their original heavy entry fees. These trials, which should be open to all, should also be within reach of everyone's purse.

These few lines, penned by one who has no hope of ever reaching the dizzy heights of European championships, are written with the hope that in 1950 a more satisfactory solution may be reached and that the B.B.L. will regain its lost prestige—a prestige that is essential to the game of Duplicate Bridge.

ORDER OF MERIT

The monthly prize of Two Guineas for the best set of solutions to the May Competition is awarded to L. C. Payman, 45 Waterpark Road, Salford, 7, who scored 81 points out of a possible 100.

Runners-up: Miss W. Jewson (Pevensey) 72, E. H. Potter (Hounslow) and A. F. Wallis (Maidstone) 69, P. A. Bainbridge (Norwich) 68, J. E. Gordon (Bromborough) 61.

Leading Scores in Six-Monthly Competition: C. E. Dickel (Glasgow) 293, A. F. Wallis, 271, L. C. Payman 268, E. H. Potter 264, C. Vickerman (Huddersfield) 245.

An annual subscription (30/-) forwarded to the Publishers will ensure regular monthly delivery of the *Contract Bridge Journal*.

HANDS FROM PLAY

A further selection appears below:—

From Mr. P. A. Bainbridge, of Coltishall, near Norwich, comes this teaser:—

♠ 10 9 8 3	♠ K J 7 2
♥ Q 8 6 2	♥ J 9 7 3
♦ A 8 6 2	♦ K Q J 10 7
♣ 6	♣ Void
	♠ A Q 5 4
	♥ 4
	♦ 4 3
	♣ A 9 7 4 3 2
	♠ 6
	♥ A K 10 5
	♦ 9 5
	♣ K Q J 10 8 5

At Love All, a lively auction resulted in South playing Four Hearts, doubled by West, who led the Ten of Spades. This was covered and won by East who returned his winning Spade honour, ruffed by South who laid down his Ace and King of trumps. To the Nine of Diamonds, West played low; North covered and led a Spade, ruffed with the last Southern trump. West won the second Diamond and led the single Club, won by East.

One Down—can YOU do better?

E. L. Glass, of Paignton, submits this:—

♠ 10 3 2	♠ J 9 8 7 6 4
♥ Q J 10	♥ 5 4
♦ J 8 3	♦ K 10 6 2
♣ Q 8 6 2	♣ A
	♠ A Q 5
	♥ 9 8 7 3 2
	♦ 9 5
	♣ J 7 5
	♠ K
	♥ A K 6
	♦ A Q 7 4
	♣ K 10 9 4 3

At Love All, Dealer South opened a Club and reversed with 2 ♦ over North's Spade response; a Diamond raise encouraged South to cue-bid the Hearts and North reverted to Diamonds. Blackwood operated and, on the showing of One Ace, South bid the Diamond small slam.

On the lead of the Heart Queen, South made contract by leading the blank Spade King at trick 2 and ruffing the Spades good, trumping the third round with ♦ Q, cashing the ♦ Ace and finessing the ♦ 10.

West hesitated long before his opening lead: he said he was toying with a Club.

Try to make contract on *that* initial lead!

S. Josephs, writing from the R. A. C. Country Club, Epsom, submits a rarity—a grand slam that might well have been passed out. Consider:—

♠ K 8	♠ A J 9 7 3
♥ 5 4	♥ 10 6
♦ J 10 9 8 7 6	♦ 5 4 3
♣ 10 9 8	♣ A 3 2
	♠ 5 3
	♥ K 9 8 7
	♦ A K Q 2
	♣ K Q J
	♠ Q 10 6 4 2
	♥ A Q J 3 2
	♦ Void
	♣ 6 5 4

South, who dealt, elected to pass (we prefer One Spade on a major two-suiter, irrespective of the result), as did West and North; East—to his subsequent sorrow—opened One Heart; South, One Spade; West, Two Diamonds; East, Three Spades; and East

Four Diamonds. South bid 4 ♠ and, over East's reluctant 5 ♦, North bid a (defensive) 5 ♠. Seven was cold on the two finesses in the majors.

His second offering is this: With ♠ Void; ♥ A K Q J 10 6; ♦ 4 3; ♣ A J 9 7, South hears his partner open with Two Spades! (System: Two Clubs and Blackwood). To Three Hearts, North replies with Four Clubs; to 4 NT, with 5 ♥; to 5 NT with 6 ♥. Puzzle (no prize): What should South bid? Our own vote goes to 7 NT: there MUST be a play for it.

Mr. Attwood, of West Hagley, Worcs., offers for consideration this poser:—

♠ 6 5 2	♠ Q
♥ J 7 6 3	♥ A 10 8 5
♦ A 8 7 6	♦ K J 10 5 4 3
♣ K 4	♣ 7 2

♠ 10 9 8 4 3
♥ 4 2
♦ Q 9 2
♣ 9 8 5

West dealt in a Duplicate match, with North-South Game Up, in the semi-final of the Piddock Teams of Four. In one room, North opened Two Clubs and East intervened with Two Diamonds, raised to three (wisely) by West. North found the intelligent bid of 4 ♦—a fine cue—and South muttered that his longest suit was Spades. Four was the bid, but Seven was the make.

In the other room, North elected to open a Vienna One Club (the system played here was the One Club—à la Stern—the Two Club

and Acol Two-bids—wow!). East psyched a Spade and West said One No Trump. North's Three Clubs was passed out, and Five were made.

Questions for consideration were:

1. Should a slam be bid since a losing finesse puts "paid" to the contract? Our answer is No—for you want a Spade drop-or-finesse as well as the Club King right.

2. Should Two, or One, Club be opened at Acol (played in Room 1)? Our answer: Two—the hand is only 4½ Q T but (*vide* S. J. Simon's last book, "Design for Bidding") you *have* to "cheat" on Quick Tricks when the trump suit is Clubs.

3. Having opened One Club, can the Psyche in Room II be exposed? The answer is that North should, we think, shoot 5 ♣. It is true that he could Double, but on the lead of ♣ Q, 1 NT is a make with an over-trick; and a red-suit reply cannot help North's subsequent bidding.

C. O. F. Carpenter writes from Bedford Park, W.4., of a hand played at a tennis club where the bridge is "social." At Love All, West distributed the tickets thus:—

♠ J x x	♠ Q 9 x x
♥ x	♥ x x x
♦ A K	♦ x x
♣ Q J x x x x x	♣ A 10 x x

♠ x	♠ A K 10 8 x
♥ J x x	♥ A K Q 10 x x
♦ Q J x x x x x x	♦ x
♣ x	♣ K

West's opening One Club elicited a direct Blackwood from East: ill-judged since the Blackwoodist could not possibly know, yet, where to play the hand. South, Mr. Carpenter, interposed 5 $\diamond$, hoping both to bother West (if he happened to have but one Ace) and generally make himself a nuisance. This West Doubled: about the best thing he could do—except Pass—on his horror. East, however, assumed West had a whale, and shot into Seven Hearts, which North, on the strength of the Club Ace (but, at a social club, not, presumably, for a Club lead!) elected to crack. East, spurning the Spades went to Grand Slam in NT and this North doubled “in sleep.”

South, hating every moment, led his singleton Spade: the only card to give East the chance to make his contract; it was covered by the J, Q and Ace. A Diamond followed, and East shed his Club on the second $\diamond$ top in the West hand. But now East went wrong: *because* North had doubled Hearts, he led Dummy's singleton and finessed! South cashed 6 Diamonds, the Knave of Hearts and gave North his singleton Club to score the Ace. Eight off—ugh!

The next comes from Ash Wheatcroft, of London, W.8., playing for Percy Charters in the Gold Cup—a match lost by the fantastic total of 10 points (hard luck, Sir). Yes, 10 aggregate—not match—points.

WEST	EAST
$\spadesuit$ A 9 x	$\spadesuit$ K Q 10 8 x
$\heartsuit$ x x x	$\heartsuit$ A x x x
$\diamond$ x x x x	$\diamond$ A
$\clubsuit$ J x x	$\clubsuit$ A K x

At Love All, West passed; North bid Three Diamonds; East

went Four Diamonds; and West, after a prolonged trance, tried Four Hearts—possibly Herbert, possibly not.

North, Percy Charters, held: $\spadesuit$ Void; $\heartsuit$ Q x; $\diamond$ Q J 10 x x x; $\clubsuit$ Q 10 x x x; and our correspondent, who was South, regarded: $\spadesuit$ J x x x x; $\heartsuit$ K J 9 x; $\diamond$ K x; $\clubsuit$ x x. Wheatcroft decided not to double in case (a) they found a better 'ole; (b) it revealed his trump holding; and (c) because an Acol Three-bid may be disastrous in defence (as this one was).

Charters opened the Queen of Diamonds on which South correctly un-blocked with the King. The Dummy led a low Heart, held by the Nine. A Spade breaks contract at this point, but a Club—the actual choice—is the more normal shot. The J, Q and K are played. Declarer cashes Heart Ace and then the Spade King in Dummy and then finesses the Nine, following with Ace. A Club puts Dummy in. The $\spadesuit$ 10 is covered by J and ruffed; a Diamond is led and ruffed in Dummy and South has to follow to the good fifth Spade!

Fine play by the winning Old-school Team; in the other room, East-West bid 4 $\spadesuit$ and North-South sacrificed in 5 $\diamond$ —300 down against a 420 gain.

Wheatcroft asks:

Should he have bid 5 $\diamond$? Our answer—No.

Should he have led a Spade at Trick 3? Our answer—now we know—obviously!

Competition Editor C. E. Phillips sends a quartette from the Northern Trials in which he and

his partner, C. Q. Henriques, Mr. and Mrs. Kremer came fourth to B. Franks and S. Blaser (North Western), H. Esther and J. Rhodes (North Eastern), John Brown and Mrs. Smith (Lincoln).

The winning pair alone bid this hand to slam in the contest :—

♠ A K Q x x	♠ x x
♥ x x	♥ A Q J x
♦ x x	♦ K J
♣ A x x x	♣ K Q J 10 x

West opened a Spade and East forced at once ; West re-bid the Spades and East showed the Hearts ; West Four No Trumped and, over the Culbertson encouragement of Five Hearts, went to Six Clubs. Franks (West) agreed that 4 NT on his cards was an overbid, but since the 3 NT level had been passed, they were booked for a certain bad result unless the slam happened to be a make : good tactical judgment.

When the cards fell thus,

♠ J x x	♠ K Q 10 x
♥ x x x	♥ 10 x
♦ Q x x	♦ K 10 x
♣ A K 10 x	♣ J x x x

♠ A x x x x	♠ K Q 10 x
♥ A K x x x	♥ 10 x
♦ x	♦ K 10 x
♣ Q x	♣ J x x x

♠ x	
♥ Q J x	
♦ A J x x x x	
♣ x x x	

and East dealt, and passed, Franklin and Fell were South-North. South opened Three Diamonds and West intervened with Three Spades. North, presumably preparing the way for a defence to a major-suit game, bid 4 ♣ and East gave the natural Spade raise. South went to Five Clubs—doubled by West—

who also popped the rescue to 5 ♦ by North. As the score was Love All, the 500 which resulted was much better than any East-West game.

Phillips also submits two problems of play :—

♠ x x	♠ x x
♥ Q J x x	♥ A 9 8 x x
♦ Q x	♦ J x x
♣ A J 9 8 x	♣ Q 10 x

♠ A K J x x	♠ x x
♥ x x	♥ A 9 8 x x
♦ x x	♦ J x x
♣ K x x x	♣ Q 10 x

♠ Q 10 x x	
♥ K x	
♦ A K 10 x x x	
♣ x	

South bid a Diamond and North, Two Clubs ; a re-bid of Diamonds was followed by a tentative Two Hearts, to which South replied 2 NT and all passed. West led his Spade King and switched to the Clubs ; the ♣ 9 losing to the ♣ 10. The puzzle is : find East's next lead ! To defeat the 8-trick contract, a Club must be returned at once ! The return of the Spade at this point sets up the Queen for Declarer's eighth trick.

Finally,

♠ A J x	♠ Q x x x
♥ Q 10 x x	♥ A J 9 x x
♦ K x	♦ 10
♣ x x x x	♣ K x x

♠ x x x	♠ Q x x x
♥ x	♥ A J 9 x x
♦ J 9 x x x	♦ 10
♣ Q 10 x	♣ K x x

♠ K x x	
♥ K 8 7	
♦ A Q x x	
♣ A J x	

The Daily Telegraph

BRIDGE ARTICLE APPEARS

EVERY FRIDAY

together with a

WEEKLY PROBLEM

East bid a Heart and South overbid One No Trump, raised to Three by North ; and West led a Diamond, won by Declarer. A low Heart went to Queen and Ace, and a low Club came back, won by the Queen over Knave. A second Diamond was led to the Dummy, and a Heart allowed Declarer to finesse the ♥ 8. South cashed all red winners and contract is now cold (as it happens) if East be thrown in to lead the Spades. Declarer, however, placed East with four Clubs, in which case he (East) is now down to a doubleton Spade. But the black suits were 3-3 in the East hand, and the play to drop the Spade Queen failed. A close hand.

From W. Geoffrey Attwood, of Cradley Heath, Staffs., comes a fine example of the Trump Coup en passant which occurred during play at the Stourbridge Golf Club.

The bidding was over-optimistic—hence the necessity for making the play.

The hand also exemplifies the reluctance of some players to lead up to a tenace position to reduce ruffers or to trump with a winning trump for a similar position, also to visualise how the timing of the play of a hand can be broken by the taking of an entry out of the requisite hand at the appropriate moment.

♠	K x x x	♠	Q x
♥	A J 8	♥	K Q 7 4
♦	A Q 9 x x	♦	x x x
♣	9	♣	Q 10 x x
♠	A 10 x x x	♠	J x
♥	9	♥	10 6 5 3 2
♦	K J x x	♦	10
♣	K J 8	♣	A x x x x

CONTRACT BRIDGE JOURNAL

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
No bid	1 ♠	Dbl.	Re-dbl
2 ♥	No bid	3 ♥	No bid
4 ♥	No bid	No bid	No bid

West led the 8 of Clubs and the play was as follows:—

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
♣ 8	♣ 9	♣ Q	♣ A
♦ x	♦ Q	♦ x	♦ 10
♦ x	♦ A	♦ x	♣ x
♦ J	♦ x	♦ x	♥ 2
♠ A	♠ x	♠ x	♠ x
♥ 9	♥ 8	♥ K	♥ 3
♠ x	♠ K	♠ Q	♠ J
♠ x	♠ x	♣ x	♥ 5

♣ J	♥ J	♣ x	♣ x
♠ x	♠ x	♣ 10	♥ 6
♣ K	♥ A	♥ 4	♣ x
♦ K	♦ x	♥ Q	♣ x
♠ 10	♦ 9	♥ 7	♥ 10

It will, of course, be noticed that East had an opportunity to return a trump early on, or to trump with the Queen and return a trump: either of which would have broken the contract; and that the lead of ♠ Q at the 7th trick is the only lead which enables the entry position to be regulated for the coup at the 12th trick.

ASSOCIATION HISTORY I

(NORTH-WESTERN)

CAPTAIN E. Bruce Parker, now a stalwart of Kent, was responsible for the formation of N.W.C.B.A. He became its first Chairman. However, he did not hold the position for long—because he lived in Yorkshire! He was gracefully deposed.

Bridge enthusiasts in the North-West (which comprises Lancashire, Cheshire, Cumberland, Westmorland and North Wales) will ever be grateful to him because, as a result of his initiative, a powerful, well-managed Governing Body exists to-day. Parker was succeeded by Colonel P. L. Coates, a great worker, a fine organiser, and an excellent Chairman. His enthusiasm had no limits, and it was not surprising that he was chosen as the first provisional Chairman of the E.B.U. in 1938.

Coates held office in the North-West until June, 1947, when he was succeeded by A. C. Douglass, a keen player and a hard-working member of the Council.

His most onerous job was Chairman of the Selection Committee for about 10 years. Needless to say, he got plenty of criticism—which had little effect on this slim asthmatic.

Perhaps the greatest thanks of all in the North-West are due to W. H. Preece, who acted as Hon. Secretary from practically the start until July, 1948. He was a business man and he did the organisation work of the Association in a business-like way. That is the reason why, to-day, the Association is financially strong and has been able to run many successful Congresses and several annual

events for members which are always well supported. In fact, at one recent N.W. Congress the financial results were a record.

The N.W.C.B.A. is different from most other associations affiliated to the E.B.U., for membership is by Clubs: not by individuals.

The Association is divided into local areas each with a Chairman, Secretary and Committee, and they run their own local events. What is even more valuable, these in the main are financially self-supporting.

* * *

DOUBLE-TAKE

by Gordon H. Hammond

IT WAS in the summer of 1940 that I first caught the germ. I had played auction bridge (in a manner of speaking) in my schooldays and in the years that followed I enjoyed odd rubbers without any craving for more knowledge. It was, of course, Hitler's fault that I was exposed to contamination. Somebody decided that Weston-super-Mare would be a good spot to build a new factory and I was despatched to see that all the bits were put together in the right way and on the right piece of ground.

In a thoughtless moment of chatty gossip with a local gent., I let slip that my wife and I played an occasional game of bridge. Later that evening, I had the sticky job of breaking the news to my wife that she was due to play partnership the next evening at the local club with a total stranger, while I paired up with his wife. Modestly, I pointed out that we were better than most of the people we had met in our own circle, and there was no reason to suppose that a small provincial club would produce a terrifyingly high standard of play.

The next evening we crept nervously into the club and were escorted by our respective partners into the card room, where innumerable people appeared to be sorting themselves out into pairs and fours. We joined in the general scramble and I soon found myself the subject of a pincer movement by two very serious looking types.

My partner and I decided to play Culbertson, but, future events seemed to suggest that either we had studied different editions of the Gold Book or there was some variation in our respective interpretations of the Great Master.

The gent. on my left said "Acol" in a firm voice.

As the steward was hovering around at that time, I assumed that he was ordering a local beverage, but later discovered my mistake. At the finish of each rubber, I called "Table up" plaintively, but nobody seemed interested and for the entire session I was squeezed, stripped, thrown in and subjected to every legitimate indignity that can befall one at the card table.

Meanwhile, I was aware that my wife, seated a few tables away, did not seem to be enjoying herself particularly, and her lot was slightly complicated by having what appeared to be the same man on each side of her. At last with sickly smiles and polite offers of thanks, we left our partners and crawled home. My wife's experience had been similar to mine, and we agreed that "something would have to be done," for it seemed obvious that the local club standard was away above us.

As a first step in our search for knowledge, I acquired a couple of bridge books, *Endplays* and *The Acol System*.

After a month's swatting, I had completely succumbed to the bridge bug and my wife's infection was far advanced, and we could not resist the temptation to have another try at the club. This time it was a "cut in" session and to my surprise, neither my partners nor my opponents seemed in the least formidable, with the exception of a Mr. Hare, who had been one of my opponents on the previous occasion. Had I improved so much? Or was I wrong about the standard of play?

I found the answer later. My wife's adversaries that fateful evening were the Sharples Twins, and my other opponent—guess who! Terence Reese!

BRIDGE ON THE SCREEN

by "Guinea Pig"

TO TELEWISE is something of an adventure. To be asked to televise is something of a compliment. To have televised is something of an achievement.

You catch a bus just after 5 p.m. from Broadcasting House and arrive at Ally Pally about half-an-hour later. In summer, you enjoy the view over London; in winter, the night-sky with its glimmering, twinkling lights. You then have a run through (without cards) to get the timing right and give the Producer the chance to see where he (or she) will switch from one camera (focussing on the cards, the players or the commentator) to another.

You then hang about (talking bridge) until 7 o'clock (as advertised)

when you have a rehearsal (*with cards*). This actually occurs at about 7.30. A film studio has nothing on Television for delay. You do well on the rehearsal hand and think "this is a 'pip' or a 'piece of cake.'"

You descend to the canteen and consume whatever the other performers have seen fit to leave for you. If you want a drink to give you a spot of Dutch, you plunge 100 yards (even in freezing rain) over to The Dive and imbibe: the canteen, apart from producing not very good food, is lamentably (but intelligibly) dry.

You get made-up—a dusting of dark powder over the bald patch and the expanse of face—at 8.30, and you hang about until a quarter to ten when you are "on."

You then march into a (gratefully sweltering—on a winter night) hot studio beneath the glare of arcs. You take your seat and, because the lights genuinely fog your mental processes, you almost forget to follow instructions and say "Good evening" to the camera when you are introduced. You are allowed (thank Heaven) to smoke ; and you pick up your cards.

You behold—trust the commentator to set a stinker!—
 ♠AKQxx ♥Void ♦10xx ♣AKQJx
 You are alleged to be playing Culbertson (1949 vintage) and you wonder.

One Spade or Two—that is the question. More Honour Tricks than Losers. O.K. Two Spades. Partner (you knew it !), Three Hearts. Oh well, Four Clubs.

Partner, with
 ♠xxxx ♥AKQ10 ♦Kxx ♣xx
 huddles. What a whale over a Forcing Two: four trumps, a solid suit, an outside King: Coo ! Six Spades, quotha.

You regard the Diamond suit and come to the conclusion he cannot have the Ace of Diamonds or he would bid Seven. You Pass and get 3 out of 5 marks.

You swear (inaudibly, dear Auntie B.B.C.) and crime yourself for opening Two, for you (knowing

the form) realise that 6 NT played by partner is top.

You are allowed (on the last hand) to watch your hated rivals (playing the Acol you prefer) coping with the brute. You rehearse the bidding in your mind as YOU would have made it (had you only known !:)

2 ♠ - 3 ♥ - 4 ♣ - 5 ♠ - 6 ♣ - 6 NT

You feel you have let down Ely and, on reflection, you wonder whether you should blame yourself for your 2 ♠ opening, or partner for not bidding 5 ♠ or (Goren) a natural 5 NT.

You hear the Acolyte on your cards open with . . . 1 ♣ ! Echo still echoes: Why ?

The bidding proceeds with the natural 1 ♥ and a secondary force of 2 ♠. The next hand bids 4 ♠—full value but uninspired—and this is passed out ! Coo, again: you have won the contest.

You subsequently de-powder yourself with cream and a piece of mutton-cloth (the sort of stuff you see encasing the joints you have not enough ration-books to buy) and take the bus back to the Big City . . . convinced that Television is still a piece of cake.

Until the next time (if ever !) the lights glaze your vision and cloud your judgment.

SIGNALITIS

by C. E. Dickel

UP NORTH in my experience I find that very little discretion is used in the matter of signals in play. Signals are made automatically and without thought. Believe it or not, I have witnessed a player make an honest signal when defending a grand

slam ! Clearly if partner ever gets in, the contract has thereby been set.*

The same position, however, arises if you are defending "Two Spades" and have already collected
 * *Might the signal not be, Protect Spades ; I guard Hearts ?*—ED.

five tricks. Unless, in this position, you are anticipating a juicy penalty, any signal made when discarding only tends to show declarer the straight road home.

Point No. 1 therefore is—when you require only one trick to down declarer, signals should cease; an occasional false card might not be out of place.

Next, we have the confirmed signaller who in the course of discarding shows an "honour" and ruins the defence.

The contract is 3 NT, for example. You have made up your mind to try Hearts, on which you have four to the King, Knave, when next on lead. Partner has to make a discard and throws a high Diamond. You duly get in and, being afraid to ignore the signal, you lead a Diamond through the Ace in dummy.

Dear partner makes his King but declarer has now sufficient tricks and gains the tempo. Partner also had ♥ Q—but no right to dictate that salvation lay in the Diamond suit.

Assuming, of course, that you are not simply trying to locate the setting trick, my second point is that a signal made when discarding should mean that you really have something.

My third point mostly concerns the player in the West position when South is declarer. Partner's leads will come through declarer and up to the exposed dummy. Often it is clear from the bidding and the nature of the dummy that East's natural play will be in a certain suit, e.g., Dummy is left with

♠ Qx(trumps) ♥ Kxx ♦ xx ♣ —

Declarer leads a trump and West has to find a discard. There is no necessity for him to signal good Diamonds as this suit would be partner's "natural" return. It is far better for partners to have confidence in each other's ability to judge each situation on its merits and to restrict signalling to desperate situations or to situations where it is clear that partner is not in a position to make the correct deduction.

You will have gathered that I am advocating moderation in the use of signals but contrariwise I am now submitting for your consideration what is, so far as I am aware, a new signal. Take the following position (Spades trumps).

♠ J 10 x
♥ K x x
♦ x x

♠ Void	♠ Q
♥ A Q 10	♥ x x x x
♦ K 10 x x x	♦ x x x
♠ 9 x	
♥ J x x	
♦ A Q J	

South leads ♠ 9. West follows with a small Diamond hoping against hope that partner will give him back a Heart although he realises that partner will almost certainly make his "natural" play of a Diamond.

Remember our tenet—"It is unnecessary to signal partner to make his natural play." It follows, therefore, that if one partner signals in the suit which is the others' natural play he is warning *against* the natural play.

In our example West would discard a high Diamond and East would return a Heart enabling the

defence to bag two tricks in Hearts and one in Diamonds. Be sure, however, that there is obviously only one natural play open to partner and if you should have a spare high card in the suit you want led, simply make the normal signal.

Mutual partnership understanding of the principles of defence, of the implications of the bidding and the plays already made should serve in many cases instead of signals which, too often, only assist the declarer.

* * *

TORTUOSITY TRIUMPHANT

... FOR THE OPPOSITION!

I HAVE said it before ; I am saying it now ; and I shall, as a matter of cast-iron certainty, say it again : the greatest gift a bridge-player can possess is clarity of mind.

(Not only a bridge-player, incidentally : even Cyril "It-depends-what-you-mean-by—" Joad admits he is, as a philosopher, pre-eminent as a logician ; he counts lucidity of mind above all other gifts).

It is quite horrifying, irrespective of the class of bridge frequented, to perceive how the Modern Mind, the Modern Methods, the Streamlined, Prepared, Anticipatory, Reversing, Inferential style of our game today has compelled us to empty the Baby of the Obvious out with the (admittedly dirty) Bath-water of the embryo practice we "made do" with when the game was in its infancy.

It is my conviction that, however far we have "progressed" beyond Dick Lederer and Walter Buller, it is only the rarest phenomena who have not regressed equally ; the only British writer-players of front-rank I except from this charge are Ewart Kempson (who

holds to Directness) ; Harrison-Gray (who still follows his own motto : "Bid what you think you can make") and the late Skid Simon whose posthumous work "Design for Bidding" is a passionate appeal for common sense. I would not know about the non-British players.

The occasion—though not the cause—for this arraignment is two-fold : a hand of which I have been told, which taxed the assembled Master Pairs at the Berners Hotel ; and one encountered in ordinary rubber bridge with a player of, admittedly, second or even third rank, who still plays daily at appreciable stakes.

To deal first with the Hand That Baffled The Masters : You hold :

♠7xxx ♥AJx ♦xx ♣KJ10x

and after a Pass from Dealer on your right, you also Pass ; a third No Bid is followed by One Heart from Partner, ~ fourth-in-hand. Dealer Passes again and it is up to you. What do you bid ?

Should my good colleague Edmund Phillips have set this as one of his Competition items, I

should have been tempted to return it to him as "unworthy" or "too easy." I should have been wrong.

For behold: what do you think the massed talent of Britain's bridge found? Take what is generally assumed to be our No. 1 ranking pair, Reese and Shapiro: they evolved the sequence 1♥ - 1♠ (!) - 1 NT—Two Down!

Take another pair of eminence: Phyllis Williams and "Honest Joe" Pearlstone. They bid the hand 1♥ - 1♠ (!) - No Bid! Also Two Down!

Certain players elected to show that they were "better than a mere One-over-one response" by bidding Two Clubs; one or two (with nine points and a fit) potted Two No Trumps; they all went down.

In order to gain 19 match-points out of a possible 20 in this formidable field, you had to find... the Palooka bid of Two Hearts! You make an inescapable Three Hearts and no other contract is within two tricks of being a make.

If you ask me *why* but one pair found this glaringly obvious, sticking-out-like-a-sore-thumb bid, I cannot tell you. The hand, to my view, cannot find another bid—unless, having passed, you find Three Hearts (baddish with only three trumps and no singleton); but even this is not fatal as it happens, for Partner has opened a minimum and, with a passing partner, will not re-bid.

Two influences, in my view, are responsible: the cult, beloved of Baron abetted by "Streamline" Mollo, for opening ludicrous

Prepared bids: One Spade on ♠5432♥AKQx♦KJx♣xx, for example (on which Pearlstone-Mrs. Williams bid—at Acol!—One Club); and the precise voice of Col. Walshe inveighing with the persistence of water drop-on a stone against Jump bids and exalting single "exploratory" suit-bids.

The "suit-over-suit *forcing*" theory, which from time to time, raises its head—A. Wolfers was its first notable apostle in this country—cannot, repeat CANNOT, hold good when there has been an inaugural Pass. The theory of exploring is predicated upon the certainty that the bidding will be kept alive. But if Third—or Fourth-hand opens a minimum (as usually he should, and must in Duplicate), how can he know whether partner is exploring or running? The answer is: He can't.

Believe me—believe, rather, the naked logic of the situation: If you have passed, the best possible bid you can make is to raise Partner's Major as high as your cards warrant.

The second hand was held by one Mr. X (no names, no pack-drill). It was

♠J109xx♥AK♦KQ10x♣Ax.
He opened One Spade: impeccable. Partner essayed One No Trump.

Mr. X must now take a view: he has a choice of three reasonable bids. He can Pass—cowardly but, with a "forward" partner, defensible; he can bid Two Diamonds—in the hope partner will give him Spade preference, a Diamond raise, or (unlikely) can re-bid No

Trumps ; or he can pot Two No Trumps. Any of these has a chance of working out well.

Mr. X—who will, perhaps, forgive me if I disclose the fact that he is not averse from playing the Dummy (especially when he holds 100 Honours—which seem often to come his way) elected to make the two-way bid of Two Diamonds. Partner bid Two Hearts.

This bid (made by a good player) says, as clearly as if written in capital letters "I bid One No Trump because I was not good enough to bid Two Hearts over One Spade ; I have, therefore, fewer than nine, possibly fewer than eight, points. I do not care for Spades ; I am not interested in Diamonds : in fact, I am (possibly) allergic to both. I have a minimum of five cards in Hearts but I can, if pushed, stand Two Spades as easily as Two Diamonds : in fact, I must be about the same in Spades and Diamonds or, on my avowedly weak cards, I should pass Two Diamonds. I have, probably, a weak Doubleton in both." With a Tripleton in both X's suits, Partner, of course, bids 2 ♠ and does not show the Hearts ; with a Doubleton and a Tripleton, he passes the Diamond bid or reverts to Spades.

A little—a very little—mental arithmetic now puts Partner inevitably with five Hearts, a couple each in Spades and Diamonds and—marvellous, Holmes !—four Clubs : presumably to an honour. Write off as unlikely the first round suppression of a 6-card Heart suit and, consequently only three Clubs.

Now, Mr. X must again take a view : he can Pass Two Hearts ; he can bid Two No Trumps or, encouraged by his Hearts, he can "shoot" Three No Trumps. He cannot, obviously raise Hearts or he would be marked 5-4-3-1 or (Baron) 5-4-4-0.

Mr. X did neither : he bid . . . Two Spades ! This was passed and went (as expected, for the hand was not well played) One Down.

In the post-mortem it appeared he bid Two Spades in the hope the miserable Partner would *now* (!) find the strength to go Two No Trumps ! If ever a player had said "I can't stand No Trumps at any price : I am 5-4-3-1 with my singleton in Hearts," Mr. X had said it.

"I was terribly good," he wailed (17 points !). "I hoped you could make an effort," he whined. (On ♠xx ♥QJ9xx ♦xx ♣K10xx !)

"We could make Three No Trumps," he analysed (a dubious analysis).

"I couldn't imagine you had the King of Clubs," he excused himself. "With that card, couldn't you have gone Two No Trumps ? I would have given you Three !"

What matters is not the result but Mr. X's change of plan. If he wants to go for game, he must bid an immediate Two No Trumps. If he is frightened, he must Pass One No Trump. If he wants (as he can) to have his cake and eat it, he must bid Two Diamonds. So he takes the (in my view defensible) course of the second suit-bid.

But when he hears Two Hearts, he must now make one of two Calls: Pass or Two No Trumps: the Heart bid having improved his hand and holding a Club stop to enable partner to re-enter and cash all long Hearts. He cannot—repeat **CANNOT**—bid Two Spades as *encouragement*. In fact, on the hand he held, he cannot bid it at all.

To make a purely protective sequence sound (when you want it to) like a spur, involves conditioning your mind to accepting the Party Line of Moscow not as a dazzling zig-zag of pragmatic inconsistency but, as a “loyal” Communist, as the Euclidean “shortest distance between two points.”

Which is absurd.

OBITUARY

IT is with a sense of profound regret that we must chronicle the death—as sudden as that which took “Skid” Simon—of his widow, Carmel. She survived him for barely a year. She was only 40 years old.

Mrs. Simon was a player and a person equally admired, commanding equal affection, as her husband; and the game, as well as all her wide circle of friends, and even acquaintances, will be the poorer for her loss: the richer for knowing her.

Carmel — “Caramel” to everyone—Simon had many talents. She took a Master’s degree at Oxford; wrote (as Kathleen Mary Carmel) two excellent thrillers; and ranked among the finest women bridge-players in Britain. She was “capped” in 1948, when our Ladies came second in all Europe; she reached the quarter-final of the Gold Cup in the same year; and only the shattering

death of her husband induced her not to compete in this year’s Trials.

During the war, Mrs. Simon performed a valuable, onerous and taxing task in one of the most hush-hush Departments; handling with her genius for codes and ciphers (which was manifest in the contemptuous skill with which she dismissed, almost at sight, every Crossword) the many Top Secret messages on which our ultimate victory depended.

It is at this moment at once a pride and a tragedy of remembrance that the writer of this brief memorial recalls that he was for long her partner and her friend—G.R.

LET US HELP YOU.

Our staff of experts will be pleased to advise you on all problematic points in bidding or play. A prompt reply to all your queries is guaranteed. Write the Editor: 13, Cannon Place, London, N.W.3.

A QUESTION OF TACTICS

The Editor,

Contract Bridge Journal.

SIR,

Tactics in Competitive Bridge seem to be a subject that one only learns by experience, for very little has been written on this very fascinating aspect of the game. Here is our experience in the Third Round of our Sydney Woodward Cup match against Mr. Burley's Westminster Hospital Medical School team.

At the half-way stage we were leading by some 800 points, so Mr. Burley's team decided to push their bidding for the second half, whilst we made the error of playing safe to conserve our lead.

Inspired bidding with some luck (if Mr. Burley will allow this) swung the match round to a handsome win for the Medical School. The following hand is a typical example of such bidding.

		NORTH	
		♠	A x
		♥	x x x
		♦	J x x
		♣	A Q x x
WEST	EAST		
♠ Q x	♠ x x		
♥ J x x x x	♥ A K Q x		
♦ K x x x	♦ A Q x x		
♣ K	♣ x x x x		
		SOUTH	
		♠	K J x x x x x
		♥	x
		♦	x x
		♣	J x x

Table 1. We were North-South. North dealt at Game All.

N. No bid.

E. One Heart.

S. One Spade (should have said nothing or bid Three Spades).

W. Three Hearts.

N. No bid. (With only two spades and six losers in the red suits, 3 ♠ did not seem justified. A Double might have been tried when South would have called four Spades.)

E. Four Hearts.

Game and 620 to Mr. Burley's team.

Table 2. Mr. Burley's team sitting North-South.

N. One Club (opening light).

E. One Heart.

S. Four Spades (a splendid bid in line with their tactics).

Game and 620 to Burley.

Net Result :—

1240 to Mr. Burley's team. (Game bid and made in both rooms.)

I think that the great majority of average duplicate players would appreciate comment and informative articles on match-play tactics ; also the differences in bidding for aggregate scoring and match pointing, and some light on I.M. Pointing which appears to require a balance of the methods demanded by the other two.*

Yours, etc.,

G. A. MILLER.

* *An excellent suggestion which we shall follow up as soon as possible—*
EDITOR.

This month's Competition

by Edmund Phillips

The CONTRACT BRIDGE JOURNAL offers a prize of TWO GUINEAS for the best set of solutions to the following problems. In the event of two or more sets of solutions being of equal merit, the monthly prize will be divided.

Answers to EDMUND PHILLIPS, Esq., Competition Editor, *Contract Bridge Journal*, 172 Chester Road, Northwich, Cheshire, not later than Aug. 7th, 1949. Solutions and names of prize winners in the June Competition will appear next month.

PROBLEM No. 1 (28 points)

Game All. What do you, South, bid?

- (a) as dealer ;
 (b) as third hand after two passes, on :—
 (i) ♠ A 10 6 4 ♥ K 9 7 4 ♦ K 6
 ♣ A 5 3
 (ii) ♠ J 5 3 ♥ Q 2 ♦ K Q J 5
 ♣ K J 8 2

PROBLEM No. 2 (12 points)

Game All. You, South, hold :
 ♠ A K ♥ A 8 6 5 3 ♦ J ♣ A K 9 8 7
 East, the dealer, opens Three Spades. What do you bid? (You are playing optional doubles, but no other special conventions against opposing three bids.)

PROBLEM No. 3 (12 points)

Game All. You, South, hold :

♠ K Q J 10 9 7 ♥ J 8 3 ♦ A 10 ♣ 10 2

The bidding proceeds :

SOUTH	NORTH
1 ♠	2 ♥
2 ♣	3 ♣
?	

What do you bid ?

PROBLEM No. 4 (12 points)

East-West Game. You, South, hold:
 ♠ K J 9 6 3 ♥ A 10 8 7 3 ♦ Q 2 ♣ K

The bidding proceeds :

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
1 ♠	Dble.	2 ♦	No bid
2 ♥	No bid	2 ♣	3 ♣

What do you bid ?

PROBLEM No. 5 (12 points)

Love All. You, South, hold :

♠ A J 9 7 6 5 ♥ A Q 8 ♦ Q 4 ♣ Q 10

The bidding proceeds :

NORTH	SOUTH
1 ♣	1 ♠
2 ♣	?

What do you bid ?

PROBLEM No. 6 (24 points)

WEST	EAST
♠ A K Q 7 4	♠ 6
♥ K 6	♥ A 8 3 2
♦ K J 9 8 7 4	♦ A Q
♣ —	♣ A Q 10 6 5 3

You, West, are playing Seven Diamonds. North leads the 3 of Diamonds, and South plays the 2. What two main lines of play has West, and which, if either, has the distinct advantage ?

HARROGATE AUTUMN BRIDGE CONGRESS

September 30th—October 3rd
1949, at the

HARROGATE HYDRO

Licensed by the E. B. U.

- * Harrogate Gold Cup.
- * Y.E. News Pairs Championship Trophy.
- * Johnnies Cup.
- * Eight Pairs Tournaments.
- * Golf Competition.
- * Dance.
- * All Events Open.

Programmes on and after 20th August from the Congress Secretary, Harrogate Hydro, or The Stray Bridge Club, 11 South Park Road.

Answers to June Competition

PROBLEM No. 1 (12 points).

Love All. You, South, hold :

♠ J7 ♥ A5 ♦ AKQ109 ♣ A1063

The bidding proceeds :

SOUTH	NORTH
1 ♦	2 ♣
?	

What do you bid ?

ANSWER.

1. Three Spades—12 points. Four No Trumps—8 points. Five Clubs—6 points. Four Clubs or Three Diamonds—4 points. In our view, this is the most open problem so far set : we started to conduct a "poll of the masters" on it, but the bids recommended were so variegated that we have had to fall back on our own judgment. The difficulty is of course to find a bid which invites a slam, without jeopardizing what seems to be a certain game. The most satisfactory solution is a completely unorthodox Three Spades, which is best calculated to arouse partner's enthusiasm if he holds the vital Ace or King in that suit : if he raises, you have sufficient in hand to return to Clubs one step higher. (North's actual hand was :

♠ K10x ♥ K ♦ Jxxx ♣ KQxxx;
he bid 5 ♦ and South 6 ♣).

Of the alternatives, Four Clubs or Three Diamonds are not forcing on the recognised systems and, though we are willing to take a slight risk of missing a game in the larger hope of reaching a slam, there is no certainty at all that these bids will get us the information we require. Two Hearts, suggested by the well-known analyst, is horrible : when you subsequently jump-raise Clubs, partner is sure to place you with a singleton Spade and the sequence of bidding will be an open invitation to opponents to lead that suit.

PROBLEM No. 2 (12 points).

East-West Game. You, South, hold :

♠ 64 ♥ Q ♦ KJ1074 ♣ J9743

The bidding proceeds :

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
1 ♥	2 ♣	2 ♠	?

What do you bid ?

ANSWER.

2. Five Clubs—12 points. Three Spades—6 points. It is obvious that opponents have game, possibly slam, in a major suit. Since you will have to sacrifice eventually, you may as well do so at once and so deny them two possibly useful rounds of exploratory bidding. The only alternative is a psychic inhibitory cue-bid, but this is rather a well-worn device against experts.

PROBLEM No. 3 (12 points)

Love All. You, South, hold :

♠ KQJ52 ♥ 8 ♦ Q5 ♣ QJ1083

The bidding proceeds :

NORTH	SOUTH
1 ♦	1 ♠
3 N.T.	4 ♣
4 ♦	?

What do you bid ?

ANSWER.

3. Five Diamonds—12 points. Six Clubs—9 points. The decision between these bids is close. However, since there is the possibility that partner's 3 N.T. was based largely on a long diamond suit, the more cautious alternative is preferable ; your sequence of bidding, of course, strongly invites a slam, which partner can be relied on to bid if his hand justifies. The chief objection to raising Diamonds is that the hand may well play better in Clubs : in Diamonds there may be a shortage of entries for setting up your suits.

PROBLEM No. 4 (12 points).

Game All. You, South, hold :

♠ AKQ743 ♥ Q95 ♦ Q6 ♣ 102

The bidding proceeds :

SOUTH	NORTH
1 ♠	2 ♦
2 ♣	2 N.T.
?	

What do you bid ?

ANSWER.

4. Three No Trumps—12 points. This at least is an incontrovertible answer. Palookas may be frightened by their absence of a Club stop, but on partner's bidding there should be an excellent chance of nine tricks on top : whereas there might well be four

CONTRACT BRIDGE JOURNAL

quick losers in a Four Spade contract. North's hand could be, for example:
 ♠xx ♥Jxxx ♦AKxx ♣QJx.

PROBLEM No. 5 (12 points).

North-South Game. You, South, hold:

♠J6 ♥A105 ♦KJ1073 ♣Q103

The bidding proceeds:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
No bid	3 ♣	4 ♣	No bid.
4 ♦	No bid	4 ♠	No bid.
?			

What do you bid?

ANSWER.

5. Four No Trumps—12 points. Five Clubs—5 points. Six Diamonds—3 points. Four No Trumps opposite an original game force is not conventional. It is a mark-time slam invitation which allows partner to rebid Spades, show a Heart suit or support your Diamonds. You can then bid Six in whichever denomination he selects. Five Clubs is a reasonably intelligent alternative, but might be wrongly interpreted either as showing a definite first round control or as confirming Spades for trumps.

PROBLEM No. 6 (12 points).

East-West Game. You, South, hold:

♠98 ♥J987 ♦AKQ ♣7532

The bidding proceeds:

EAST	SOUTH	WEST	NORTH
1 ♣	No bid	1 ♠	2 ♥
3 ♣	?		

What do you bid?

ANSWER.

6. Four Diamonds—12 points. Four Hearts—3 points. It seems likely that opponents are proceeding to Four Spades, and the Four Diamond bid is desirable to indicate the most probable lead to defeat the contract. If partner has length in Diamonds and raises, you will translate to Five Hearts which should then be a sound sacrifice.

PROBLEM No. 7 (12 points).

North-South Game. You, South, hold:

♠J ♥K1086 ♦AQ1052 ♣K72

The bidding proceeds:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
1 ♦	1 ♥	1 N.T.	No bid
2 ♦	No bid	2 N.T.	No bid
?			

What do you bid?

ANSWER.

7. Three Hearts—12 points. Three Diamonds—4 points. South should view this hand with the utmost suspicion. Where is the Spade suit? What are the chances that West has a sound over-call when you have four Hearts to the K 10 and partner a double stopper? The odds are that West's bid is a psychic, which only you can expose. North, in addition to the Hearts which you now expect him to hold, should have a Diamond fit to explain his second No Trump bid and the fact that he did not double the original Heart call. This reasoning may seem far-fetched to some readers, but the hand is taken from play and South correctly made the bid indicated, though he had never played against the opponents before and had, therefore, no special reason to expect tricks. At the same time, if South is wrong, the Three Heart bid can go badly astray and some credit is, therefore, given to a wooden Three Diamond rebid.

PROBLEM No. 8 (16 points).

WEST	EAST
♠A6	♠K84
♥A74	♥K93
♦J5	♦AQ8642
♣AKQ1053	♣6

Contract, 6 N.T. by West. North leads the Ten of Spades. How do you play the hand?

ANSWER.

8. West should win with the Ace, and lead the Jack of Diamonds. If Diamonds break, twelve tricks are easy. The lead of the Jack is the correct safety play in case South has the singleton ten, nine or seven; if North covers the Jack, dummy wins, the closed hand is re-entered and another Diamond lead to the Q 8; however North plays, he is held to one trick in the suit. The alternative line of laying down Ace of Diamonds is a safety play only against the singleton King.

If it becomes apparent that two Diamond tricks would have to be lost, West must try the Club suit, playing to drop the Jack rather than to catch it by a finesse.

ENGLISH BRIDGE UNION

LIST OF SECRETARIES

BRITISH BRIDGE LEAGUE—Major George Gray, 23 Clydesdale Gardens, Richmond, Surrey.

ENGLISH BRIDGE UNION—*Secretary*: Mrs. Stern, 7 Abbey Road, London, N.W. 8.
Tournament Secretary: Major G. Fell, Craven Lead Works, Skipton, Yorkshire.
Registrar: H. Collins, Esq., 30 Budge Row, London, E.C. 4.

ESSEX CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—F. M. Fletcher, Esq., 22 Fontayne Avenue, Chigwell, Essex.

DERBYSHIRE CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—W. Burnstone, Esq., c/o Town Clerk's Office, Market Place, Derby.

DEVON CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—G. Graham Wilson, Esq., "Hampton," St. Katharines Road, Torquay.

GLOUCESTERSHIRE CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—S. E. Franklin, Esq., Belmont Avenue, Hucclecote, Glos.

HERTFORDSHIRE CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—W. H. Weightman, Four Winds, St. Andrews Avenue, Harpenden, Herts.

KENT CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—Mrs. Harvey, Manor House, Tunbridge Wells.

LEICESTERSHIRE CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—P. de R. Pearse, Esq., 152, Upper New Walk, Leicester.

LINCOLNSHIRE CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—Mrs. Turner and Mrs. Brumpton, 51 Signhills Avenue, Cleethorpes.

LONDON CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—P. R. G. Charters, Esq., 16 Carlton House Terrace, S.W.1.

MIDDLESEX CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—Mrs. H. Freeman, The Nook, Lyndhurst Terrace, London, N.W.3.

NOTTINGHAM CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—Mrs. Bull, 28 Addison Street, Nottingham.

NORTH EASTERN CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—G. I. Rhodes, 5 Woodbine Avenue, Gosforth, Newcastle-on-Tyne, 3.

NORTH WESTERN CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—F. Farrington, Esq., Moor Edge, Chapeltown Road, Turton, Nr. Bolton.

OXFORDSHIRE CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—Capt. F. W. Taylor, 433 Banbury Road, Oxford.

SOMERSET CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—O. H. Dolley, Esq., Kellsall Lodge, Staplegrave, Taunton, Somerset.

SOUTHERN COUNTIES CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—Mrs. W. J. Davy, "Culford," West Overcliff Drive, Bournemouth. Tel. Westbourne 64406.

STAFFORDSHIRE CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—W. R. Cato, Esq., 204 Thornhill Rd., Streetly, Sutton Coldfield.

SURREY CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—R. F. R. Phillips, 110 Banstead Rd. South, Sutton, Surrey.

WARWICKSHIRE CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—Mrs. M. Knott, 9 Calthorpe Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham, 15.

WORCESTERSHIRE CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—R. D. Allen, Esq., 28 Britannia Square, Worcester.

YORKSHIRE CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION—R. H. Chope, Esq., 26 Riverdale Road, Sheffield, 10.

CONTRACT BRIDGE JOURNAL

Regional Editors—

Eire Scotland Wales North Eastern	NOEL BYRNE H. KERSHAW H. J. GOULD EWART KEMPSON	North Western Yorkshire London	A. C. DOUGLASS MRS. L. L. BEDFORD "ALIBI"
--	--	--	---

Competition Editor—EDMUND PHILLIPS

The **CONTRACT BRIDGE JOURNAL** is
the official organ of the English Bridge Union.

Publishers—PRIESTLEY STUDIOS, LTD., **Phone**—
COMMERCIAL ROAD, GLOUCESTER. Gloucester 22281/3

All Bridge Correspondence to—

EDITOR, **CONTRACT BRIDGE JOURNAL**, 13, CANNON PLACE, LONDON, N.W.3

BRIDGE INDEX

CLASSIFIED LIST OF HOTELS AND CLUBS

HARROW

HARROW BRIDGE CLUB—16, Northwick Park Road, HARROW, Middx. Tel. Harrow 3908. Good standard Bridge in enjoyable atmosphere. Sessions twice daily. Partnerships and Duplicate.

LONDON

CROCKFORD'S—16 Carlton House Terrace, London, S.W.1. Tel. No. Whitehall, 1131. 5/- Partnership, Tuesday Evenings. 2/- Partnership, Wednesday and Friday evenings. Duplicate Pairs under the direction of Mr. Harrison-Gray every Thursday evening at 7-30 p.m. R. PROVOST, Managing Director. A. J. HORSNELL, Secretary.

GLENALVON BRIDGE CLUB—22 Netherhall Gardens, N.W.3. Play Bridge under ideal conditions. :: Regular Partnership. Visitors welcomed. Secretary...HAM. 7414.

DORSET CLUB—3-5 Glentworth Street, Baker Street, N.W.1. Tel. Welbeck 1039. Regular partnership and duplicate. Stakes 1/-, 2/6 and 10/-.

LYNDHURST CLUB—36 Finchley Road, N.W.3. Stakes 6d., 1/-, 2/6, 5/- and 10/-. Duplicate Pairs every Monday 8-15. Restaurant, First-class cuisine. Fully Licensed. Further details apply Secretary. Telephones PRI. 5858 and 3435.

LONDON

PARK LANE BRIDGE CLUB, 28 Curzon Street, W.1. Tel. Grosvenor 1469. Stakes 6d., 1/-, 2/6 and 10/-. Partnerships at 6d. and 1/- on Monday and Wednesday afternoons and Tuesday and Friday evenings. Duplicate 1st Wednesday in every month. T. V. M. Cotter, Secretary.

NOTTINGHAM

CRANTOCK BRIDGE CLUB—480 Mansfield Road, Nottingham. Tel. No. Nottingham 65921. Proprietress: MRS. D. M. HOPEWELL. Hon. Secretary: N. R. C. FRITH. Visitors welcomed. Excellent venue for matches in Midlands.

PARIS

LA BARONNE DE LATOUR, ACADEMIE DE BRIDGE—11 Rue Berlioz, Paris 16me. Tel. Pas. 35-01.

WORTHING

MIRABELLE Residential Bridge Club, Sea Front, Heene Terrace, Worthing. Daily Sessions 2-30 & 8 p.m. Licensed Restaurant. Visitors Welcomed. :: Telephone 6431/2. Particulars from Secretary.

CUT

E. B. U.

**All who desire to further the
development of Contract Bridge
as a Game should be members
of, and support the**

ENGLISH BRIDGE UNION

E.



E.

Membership of the Union may be
obtained by:

- (a) Direct application to
LEAVER COLE & CO.,
30 Budge Row, LONDON, E.C.4,
Registrars,

or

- (b) Through Appropriate Affiliated
County Associations.

B.

B.

U.

U.