

CONTRACT BRIDGE JOURNAL

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE ENGLISH BRIDGE UNION

♠ K Q 5
♥ Q 9 5
♦ 4 3
♣ A 8 6 5 3

♠ A J 9 8 2
♥ K 3
♦ A K 7
♣ K 7 2

Bad bidding has achieved a contract of Six Spades. Postulating a game in which the defence can slip as near-fatally as the bidding, what is your best chance to get home against the lead of the Queen of Diamonds?

See page 16.

THIS MONTH'S
PROBLEM

CHAS. BRADBURY

LIMITED

26 SACKVILLE ST., PICCADILLY
LONDON, W.I.

Phone REG: 3123-3995

LOANS ARRANGED
With or without Security

TO CLUB SECRETARIES.

Spread the news of your activities. Write and tell us of your special events. Items of general interest are always welcome.

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

Still the
SAME
1941
PRICES!



Normal Coats, Costumes,
Day Frocks, Men's Suits

Quality Cleaning **STILL** 4/6
plus *Retex (Optional) 2/-

* RETEX is exclusive to Achille Serre

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 4

NOVEMBER, 1949

NUMBER 1

• CONTENTS •

	<i>Page</i>
EDITORIAL	2
SOME ASPECTS OF THE SQUEEZE	
<i>John Brown</i>	4
ORDER OF MERIT	9
PACHABO CUP ANALYSIS	
<i>Geoffrey L. Butler</i>	10
LAST RUBBER	
<i>Jonnie Johnson</i>	12
SWEDISH TOURNAMENT	13
ELEMENTARY, MY DEAR WATSON—BUT VITAL	
<i>The Editor</i>	15
AS OTHERS SEE US	
<i>Eric Jannersten</i>	24
THIS MONTHS COMPETITION	29
ANSWERS TO OCTOBER 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.

IRISH HONOUR

WHEN Ewart Kempson took a team to Dublin, our game received an accolade never before accorded to it. Mr. J. Costello, the Prime Minister of Eire, attended the match and the official dinner—the first occasion a Premier has attended such a function.

Kempson, with his team consisting of Mrs. Kempson, Colonel G. G. J. Walshe, J. Pavlides and Dr. J. Hurley just succeeded in struggling to victory by 570 points against Mr. J. O'Neill, Mrs. Macmenamin, Noel Byrne, L. Bastow, Des Purcell, Dr. R. Belton and Dermot Egan.

A considerable achievement by a "scratch" side; something of yet another triumph for E.K. and his "Direct" system—Mrs. Kempson and Dr. Hurley are both Kempson-ites—but, above all, a great thing—and a great honour—for the game.

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.

EDITORIAL

THE Contract Bridge Journal hopes, in all events and at all times, to be fair: fair to its readers, fair to its sponsors, the E.B.U., fair to all bridge-players who have a view to propound, a grievance to air, a complaint to make.

The Probable Teams nominated by the British Bridge League have, as previously announced, aroused a storm of discussion; and it had been our intention to throw open this, the November issue, to the controversy.

We are, however, postponing the publication of the several suggestions and the various criticisms that the B.B.L. has provoked: (a) by its new *method* of selection and (b) by some (by no means all) of the selections themselves.

This deferment, by a month, does not mean that the Journal proposes to allow the matter to be "talked out"; we are not the Circumlocution Office even though our trade is words. But we have deemed it more just to give to the supporters of the B.B.L. and its methods and choices the opportunity to consider, and the time to answer, the several charges made; and to print the answer simultaneously with the attacks.

The Journal is in a peculiar position. It is at once an organ of free speech (which means that it is as free to the "Government" as to the "Opposition") and an official publication. To hold a due balance between allowing to dissidents the right to propagate their views—naturally subversive

in the opinion of the ruling bodies—and thereby running the risk of losing much that has been gained by these bodies (such as the universal bridge law, membership of International organisations, and—possibly—the staging of *World Championships*), and becoming a mere Pangloss, blandly convinced that "All is for the best in the best of all possible worlds" is no easy task.

Moreover, there is a vast number of bridge-players who care nothing for what may be called the "politics" of bridge—and for these, too, the Journal is proud to cater.

To the cobbler, there is nothing like leather; and to the bridge politician, whether Mrs. X or Mrs. Y is chosen to play for Britain; whether Mr. A or Mr. B is a Delegate from E.B.U. to B.B.L.; whether Method P or Method Q is adopted for any given purpose are matters of paramount interest and concern.

The Dissidents are always—inevitably—more vocal than the Supporters. We have been inundated with demands for space to voice the views of the Dissidents. We grant them the space gladly, for we hold that it is our function to do so; we hold, too, that all players ought to take a vital interest in bridge politics, since that is the essence of a democracy.

We are deferring the discussion, however, until December; when both *con* and *pro* may meet in open and simultaneous debate, rather than print an attack in one

issue and the reply (by which time many points will have been forgotten and the whole controversy may well have grown stale) four weeks later.

Despite Devaluation and the (now almost permanent) Crisis, Britain is staging the Internationals in June; and the British Bridge League requires £3,000 to do it adequately.

With the importunity of the widow, we re-iterate our appeal to all card-players and all club members to subscribe, either direct or through their clubs, to this national cause.

The Contract Bridge Journal extends a cordial welcome to a new Contemporary: the European Bridge Review.

This Magazine makes its appearance officially, in 1950; but

a single issue found its way to us a week or so ago.

The E.B.R. owes its creation and its extraordinarily high level to the enterprise of Eric Jannersten a distinguished Swedish writer, player and editor. It is printed in the international language of bridge—English (and, for all that many of the contributors are Continentals, very good English too). It numbers on its Editorial Board notables of many nations. Our own representative is M. Harrison-Gray.

It says much for the virility of our game that it sustains so many publications; all of them (if we may say so) of a remarkably high technical standard. And we believe that the more periodicals which concern themselves with bridge, the better for the players, the better for the game.

A Christmas GIFT SUGGESTION

Have you a Bridge-playing friend who has not seen the Contract Bridge Journal?

If so, a subscription to the Journal would be a very pleasant surprise.

The cost for One Year, post free, is 30/-. Or a special Two-year subscription 50/-.

Such a gift should be especially acceptable to a friend living abroad. It would relieve your friend of exchange complications, and help to spread the good news about **your** Journal.

Please send enquiries, orders and cheques to the Publishers:—

PRIESTLEY STUDIOS LTD.

COMMERCIAL ROAD, GLOUCESTER, ENGLAND

SOME ASPECTS OF THE SQUEEZE

by John Brown

John Brown, the king-pin of Lincolnshire Bridge and the author of one of the best books on the game—"Winning Tricks"—contributes a thought-provocative article on play.

THE squeeze is, I believe, a much neglected play. Some squeezes are obvious enough, and a veritable tyro can sometimes stumble across and execute such; but other squeezes are hidden and obscure, and only a good knowledge of the game, a plan, and, in some deals, the help of the defenders can bring them to light.

Some players, in many respects very good, appear so to play their hands as if they had never heard of a hidden squeeze; they give very good attention to positional and tempo plays, yet seem to be entirely unsuspecting of any squeeze position that may underlie the structure of the hand.

The first hand occurred in a pairs competition:

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

At one table, the only one I believe where an attempt was made to exploit the squeeze, the bidding went (North opening and E-W not bidding), 1 ♠-2 ♣-2 ♠-2 N.T.-3 ♣-3 N.T.

The ♦ 6 was led, and when East played his Queen, South could not afford to hold off and so won with the King. As soon as South gives up the lead in any suit—and this he must soon do should he develop his own suits—East or West will get in and the Diamonds will be run. So why not let West make his Diamonds at once? It is possible that by so doing he might squeeze his partner. In point of fact he did, for East alone held the stoppers to the other three suits.

At Trick 2 South led back a Diamond and allowed West to make his four winners. A Club, two Hearts, and a Spade were discarded from dummy and East threw a Heart and then unguarded his Spade stopper.

The fourth Spade will squeeze East again. If, for instance, West now leads a Spade or Club, South wins in North's hand and then cashes his ♥ A—the Vienna Coup. The North hand is entered again and the Spades are run, squeezing East in Hearts and Clubs.

But what if a more thoughtful West had won trick 2 with the ♦ 9 and switched to Hearts? After all, why did South, who was not reputed to be a philanthropist, return the Diamonds?

The hands to follow were played at rubber bridge. We were playing

the Vienna system, which in spite of all that is said about it, has some very good points. It is excellent for slam bidding and it is the best system I know for getting in a four-four suit contract. Its Herbert convention after an Informatory Double is, I think, its worst feature; and, in my circle, we have long since discarded it in favour of more natural responses.* Why use a bid to announce weakness and then be obliged to look for a truer bid at a higher level?

I have heard the Vienna system criticized because it gives so much information to the opponents. But this is a recommendation. For how can one give any information to one's partner without disclosing it to the adversaries, if both sides understand the system played?

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

South, 1 ♣; North, 1 ♥; East, 1 ♠; South, 2 N.T.; North, 3 N.T.

West led the ♦ 4. South read this as from a four-card suit. It looked, therefore, as if West held one Spade and three four-card suits. If so, the only hope of setting up a long Heart or Club will lie in a squeeze.

It is necessary to reduce the position, if possible, to what

* So has—now—official Vienna.

—EDITOR

Culbertson mathematically describes as $n-1$, this standing for the desired number of winners in a hand of N cards: the unavoidable losers must be lost early in the play. South, therefore, won East's Queen with the King and returned the 10.

West appeared a bit suspicious, for, when it is in South's interest to lose Diamonds, can it ever be in West's interest to win them? Somebody must be wrong; but West found the diamonds broke evenly and cashed the long card. North threw a Club and East a come-on Spade.

South can discard a Spade or even a Club, but not a Heart; for he may want to lead once from dummy before the squeeze position has matured.

When West switched to his Spade, North's Queen was played. It was covered by East's King and South must refuse to win! Not because he couldn't develop another Spade trick if he did so: he could—by entering dummy and leading up to his ♠ 10; but because he could not be sure of creating $n-1$ if he won the first round of Spades, since East could refuse to win the second round. After winning the first Spade trick with his King, East returned a Club, won by South, who entered dummy with a Heart, leading the 8, and the position became:

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

CONTRACT BRIDGE JOURNAL

The Spade was led from the North hand and the finesse taken. West discarded a Club. But South's Spade Ace squeezed West.

What if, at trick 3, West, visualising the possibility of South's resort to squeeze play, refuses to cash his two Diamond winners and returns, say, a Club or a Heart? South would win and return a Diamond, and the battle for $n-1$ would begin in earnest. The remarkable dumping play would occur as South attempted to force West to win tricks when West would rather not. If West, still loath to win tricks, returns a second round of Clubs, South wins. And now since he is unable to do any more effective trick-losing in the West direction, he turns his eyes Eastward.

East has already been stripped of Clubs. He must next be stripped of Hearts by playing two rounds of the suit. A lead is then made to the $\spadesuit Q$ and a game of see-saw ensues. East wins, and, with Hobson's choice, returns the suit. South's $\spadesuit 10$ wins, and then the low Spade* is played to force East to win yet another trick. This losing trick takes the place of that which would have occurred had West obliged by cashing his last Diamond.

As before, the Spade Ace will squeeze West.

There are other possibilities in this hand, and readers may like to investigate what happens if West, when thrown back, with a Diamond, on either the first or second occasion, leads a Spade.

* The Ace also at this point would effectively squeeze West. A trick is then lost after the squeeze—AUTHOR.

\spadesuit A J 9 2
 \heartsuit A 5 3
 \diamondsuit A K 8
 \clubsuit J 6 4

\spadesuit K Q 8 7 6 4 3 \spadesuit 10
 \heartsuit Q 10 7 \heartsuit J 6 4
 \diamondsuit 2 \diamondsuit 5 4 3
 \clubsuit 3 2 \clubsuit A K Q 10 8 7

\spadesuit 5
 \heartsuit K 9 8 2
 \diamondsuit Q J 10 9 7 6
 \clubsuit 9 5

North, 1 N.T. (Vienna); East, 2 \clubsuit ; South, 2 \diamondsuit ; West, 2 \spadesuit ; North, 3 \diamondsuit ; South, 3 \heartsuit ; North, 4 \diamondsuit ; South, 5 \diamondsuit .

The hand was played as follows:

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
\spadesuit K*	\spadesuit A	\spadesuit 10	\spadesuit 5
\diamondsuit 2	\diamondsuit K	\diamondsuit 3	\diamondsuit 6
\spadesuit 3	\diamondsuit A	\diamondsuit 4	\diamondsuit 9
\spadesuit 4	\diamondsuit 8	\diamondsuit 5	\diamondsuit 7
\spadesuit Q	\spadesuit J	\clubsuit 7	\clubsuit 5†

If the lead of dummy's $\spadesuit J$ is made before trumps are drawn, the contract can be defeated by East's ruffing. This would not prevent the discard of South's club, but dummy's $\spadesuit 9$ would not be promoted to a winner.

* A club lead would defeat the contract, for then three rounds of clubs could be played and dummy's Knave of Clubs could not feature as a menace card.

† This play has a threefold purpose:

(i) It prevents Dummy's $\clubsuit J$, required as a menace card, from being extracted.

(ii) It sets up the $\spadesuit 9$ as a winner.

(iii) It is a step—a double one in fact—towards $n-1$.

CONTRACT BRIDGE JOURNAL

♣ 3 ♣ 4 ♣ 10 ♣ 9
 ♣ 2 ♣ 6 ♣ K† ♦ 10
 ♠ 6 ♥ 3 ♣ 8 ♦ J

The position became :

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

When the Queen of Diamonds was led, West was obliged to throw a Heart. The ♠ 2 was thrown in Dummy, having fulfilled its purpose as a menace to West. The ♥ A was next made, but the ♠ 9 squeezed East.

The next hand, played in the same circle as, and somewhat similar to, the previous hand, had an amusing feature. South, not vulnerable with East-West game, made two bids in which he could not have gathered a single trick had he been left in. Rightly or wrongly, he thought it was important to disguise the shape of his hand, and he knew the opponents well enough to regard their interference as highly probable. East was a conservative caller and some with her holding would have jumped to Three, or even Four Spades on the first round.

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

Bidding : (Vienna) West dealt and bid 1 ♣. North, No ; East, 1 ♠ ; South, 1 N.T. ; West, 2 ♣, North, No ; East, 2 ♠ ; South, 2 N.T. ; West, Double ; North, No ; East, No ; South, 3 ♥ ; West, 4 ♣ ; North, Double ; East, No ; South, 4 ♥ ; East, Double and all passed.

The play went :

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
♣ K	♣ 4	♣ 2	♣ 7
♣ Q	♣ 6	♣ 9	♠ 5*
♣ J	♣ 8	♠ 7	♥ 2
♥ 10	♥ 8	♥ 3	♥ A
♥ J	♥ 9	♥ 5	♥ K
♣ 3	♦ 3	♠ 3	♥ Q
♠ 2	♠ 4	♠ 10	♠ 8†

* South wanted, his Queen of Spades to feature as a menace card in a possible double squeeze position. After this play it cannot be extracted.

† South loses a trick to create the right timing for a squeeze.

♣ 5 ♠ 9 ♠ K ♥ 4
 ♦ 5 ♦ 4 ♠ 6 ♥ 6

And the position became :

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

And South had a simple squeeze on West.

Suppose, however, the original distribution were such that both opponents could hold the Dia-

† A Heart lead would have broken the contract, for it attacks a vital entry. For should South win in the North hand, his Spade and Club could not feature as menace cards ; if in the South hand, there is no entry to the Heart threat.

monds (Exchange West's \diamond 5 for East's \spadesuit 3). In that case South would have had, as in the previous example, a squeeze on both defenders, unless East had, when in with the Spade, switched to a Diamond, thereby extracting an important entry whether won in the North or the South hand.

As the cards actually were, East's switch to a Diamond would not have broken the contract provided South won in his own hand and allowed North's third Diamond to feature as a menace to West.

The final hand is unusual in that the squeeze is applied by a throw-in card:—

\spadesuit A J 9 6	
\heartsuit 7	
\diamond 9 7 6 2	
\clubsuit A K Q 5	
\spadesuit Q 10 4 2	\spadesuit 8 7 5 3
\heartsuit J 8 4	\heartsuit 10 6 5 2
\diamond K Q 10 8	\diamond J
\clubsuit 6 2	\clubsuit 9 7 4 3
\spadesuit K	
\heartsuit A K Q 9 3	
\diamond A 5 4 3	
\clubsuit J 10 8	

Here is a misfit and it was fortunate for North and South that they did not choose to play the hand in a high Diamond contract, the only suit in which they have a fit, such as it is. East has virtually a Yarborough, yet he holds a card which, with West's co-operation, can defeat the contract in the line of play South pursued.

The card is the Deuce of Hearts.

North, playing Vienna, opened 1 \clubsuit ; South, 1 N.T.; North, 2 \spadesuit ; South, 3 \heartsuit ; North, 3 N.T.; South, 4 N.T. (Norman); North, 5 \spadesuit ; South, 6 N.T.

The King of Diamonds was opened. East dropped the Knave and South won with the ace. The prospect did not look rosy; even if South could keep West out and find the Hearts no worse than 3-4, there are only eleven tricks in sight.

Apart from the chance of being able to drop the Heart or Spade honours in opponents' hands, there was nothing for it but to attempt a squeeze. A squeeze position will mature if East's Diamond was a singleton and West holds both the Queen and Ten of Spades, and if, in addition, East can be thrown in with a Heart when he has nothing but Spades to lead. With this end in view, South took the second trick with his King of Spades, won four rounds of Clubs, discarding a Diamond in his own hand. Then three rounds of Hearts were played and the position was:

	\spadesuit A J 9
\diamond 9	
\spadesuit Q 10 4	\spadesuit 8 7 5
\diamond Q	\heartsuit 10
	\heartsuit 9 3
	\diamond 5 4

The lead of South's losing Heart then squeezed West. As the hand was played, the contract could have been defeated by East's refusal to part with his Heart Deuce and by West's keeping two Diamonds.

An alternative play, not so spectacular but just as effective, is possible when West bares his Queen of Diamonds. Two Diamonds are kept in Dummy, a Spade being discarded in place of the Diamond. West is then thrown in to lead a Spade and the finesse is taken.

But South had a play against which there was no defence. If South should choose to win his three top Hearts immediately after winning the first trick, East's decision as to whether to unblock or not must be made at once. If East refuses to unblock, the hand

is played as before, South entering his own hand by the King of Spades after he has made North's Clubs. Should East throw his high Hearts, or should Declarer find he can drop the Knave and Ten and the Hearts break without loss, twelve tricks can be counted.

ORDER OF MERIT

The monthly prize of Two Guineas for the best set of solutions to the September Competition is awarded to G. F. H. Mence, Bolton House, Dyke Road Avenue, Hove 4, who scored 70 points out of a possible 100.

Runners-up: E. H. Potter (Hounslow) 67, J. A. Gould (Surrey) 66, D. M. da Costa (Brighton), Dr. R. McMahon (Essex) and A. F. Wallis (Maidstone) 63, L. C. Payman (Stockton-on-Tees) 62.

PROBLEM NO. 1.

There is some merit in Trial Bids of Three Hearts or Four Clubs, and 9 points have been awarded to each of these.

PROBLEM NO. 8.

Due credit has been given to alternative lines of play which seek to guard against a bad trump break by stripping the hand and forcing opponent to ruff a loser and then lead away from the guarded trump king.

INNOVATION

It has been decided to do away with the Six-Monthly Competition after the present period (August-January) and substitute instead a Ladder Competition. The three leading aggregate scorers each month from February onwards will receive a prize of half a guinea and automatically fall to the bottom of the ladder, starting again at zero.

It is hoped in this way to encourage the not-so-expert competitors who in the fullness of time are bound to win a prize. The experts equally will have an incentive—to get from the bottom to the top of the ladder again as quickly as possible.

Present Leading Scorers:

J. A. Gould 147, Dr. R. McMahon 133, E. H. Potter 128, J. W. Gerber (Renfrewshire) 124, C. E. Dickel (Glasgow) 122.

NOT A RECORD

The Editor,

"The Contract Bridge Journal"

Sir:—

The members of the Junior Carlton Club who, in drawing for partners each drew an Ace, have not established a record.

In the Auction Bridge Magazine for August, 1927, a correspondent

writing from Kenya recalled that in 1911 he sat down to a rubber in a friend's house; the three other players all drew Aces, "so, not to be out-done, I cut the remaining Ace."

The Research Editor of the Auction Bridge Magazine estimated the odds at 270,724 against.

Yours etc.,

GEORGE F. HERVEY,
(Cards Editor of "The Field.")

PACHABO CUP ANALYSIS

by GEOFFREY L. BUTLER

(Chairman of the English Bridge Union)

PERFECT organisation and perfect weather graced the first of the season's contests, the Pachabo Cup, which was won by Mr. Arnold Elliott's Middlesex team (with L. Ellison, A. Bendix, and R. Preston) with 16 Victory Points in a close finish with Mrs. Fleming's Kent team (A. L. Fleming, E. Harvey and E. Bruce Parker) 1 Victory Point behind.

As part of the English Bridge Union's policy to avoid duplication of events, the Pachabo Cup is now contested over one week-end by those teams which have won their individual team-of-four County Championship.

Twelve teams took part at the Welcomb Hotel, Stratford-on-Avon, each playing each of the others in an 8-board contest conducted in a most admirable fashion by Mr. Maurice Porter (who gained his first Camrose Cap in the 1948/49 series).

In order to keep in line with the practice adopted by the European Bridge League, it was decided by the Tournament Committee to decide each match by awarding 2 Victory Points to Nill if a match was won by 3 or more International Match Points, and to divide the Victory Points 1-1 for any closer margin.

The number of close finishes was remarkable, 13 of the 66 matches resulting in draws (Yorkshire had no less than 4 draws out of their 11 matches) while another 14 matches were

only just won by a margin of either 3 or 4 match points.

The object of reducing wins to Victory Points is not always understood. In multiple team matches where the standard varies, a first-class team (call it A), may meet a very weak team and the hands may be such as to permit A to win by a very large margin—30 or 40 match-points over 8 boards. Another good team quite as good as team A. might then have to meet the weak team over a series of hands in which large gains were impossible. Although playing par bridge, their win might be only 3 or 4 points, which gives Team A the chance of winning the whole contest on the result of one match.

Alternative ways of scoring have been used by the E.B.U. and a comparison of three methods is instructive. Under the scale used (2-0, for a win of 3 or more M.Ps.) the finishing order was as follows (after the splitting of ties). The number in brackets shows Victory Points.

- | | |
|------------------|------|
| 1. Middlesex | (16) |
| 2. Kent | (15) |
| 3. Yorks | (14) |
| 4. Leicester | (12) |
| 5. North Western | (12) |
| 6. Derby | (12) |
| 7. Staffs | (11) |
| 8. Gloucester | (10) |
| 9. Essex | (9) |
| 10. Warks | (8) |
| 11. Herts | (7) |
| 12. Oxford | (6) |

CONTRACT BRIDGE JOURNAL

Had the scoring been on total aggregate Net International Match Points, the finishing order would have been

1. Kent	(66)
2. Middlesex	(45)
3. Yorks	(28)
4. Leicester	(27)
5. North Western	(19)
6. Staffs	(-6)
7. Derby	(-12)
8. Gloucester	(-12)
9. Warks	(-24)
10. Essex	(-30)
11. Oxford	(-45)
12. Herts	(-56)

There now remains a third comparison, with the sliding scale of Victory Points according to the margin of a win.

The scale for an 8-board match is :

Difference in Match Points	Victory Points
0—2	3—3
3—6	3½—2½
7—11	4—2
12—16	5—1
17 and over	6—0

The use of this scale would have produced the following order (the ties having been split on the net aggregate Match Points) :

1. Kent	42½
2. Middlesex	38
3. Yorkshire	38
4. North Western	36
5. Leicester	36
6. Staffs	33
7. Derby	31
8. Gloucester	30½
9. Warks	30
10. Essex	28
11. Oxford	27½
12. Herts	25½

It will be seen that, with the notable exception of places 1 and 2 and a few minor changes, the three systems produce the same results. Middlesex did not win any match by a larger margin than 16 I.M.P.'s. and did not build up a big I.M.P. total, whereas Kent had big wins of 19 against Essex, 19 against Gloucester, and 25 against Derby.

The finish was extraordinary exciting. Kent on the last round needed to beat Staffs 2—0 to have a chance of catching Middlesex. Middlesex needed a draw against Leicester to keep ahead.

On the last board but one Leicester were in a 4 ♠ contract which, if successful, would have defeated Middlesex and have allowed Kent to slip through their lee into first place ; but a deceptive defence by the Middlesex captain, Arnold Elliott, defeated the contract and allowed Middlesex to draw their match and pass the post first.

On the face of it, Kent seem to have suffered by the system adopted, but it must be remembered that tactics are regulated according to the objective. Had big accumulations of Match Points been required, it is reasonable to suppose that Middlesex would have striven for larger margins in their matches.

Great credit is due to Oxford who, unperturbed by their lowly position, trounced the winners in the penultimate round.

LAST RUBBER

by JONNIE JOHNSON

A distinguished member of the Big Game at the Hamilton Club tells a true story.

IT was 6.45 p.m. on Tuesday, October 11th, 1949. I was playing bridge at a famous West-End Club—a rubber had just been finished. We were all keen players and we all wanted to play another; but the only lady at the table, an American, said: "I can only play for a quarter of an hour."

We all agreed to add up after fifteen minutes, cut for partners—the stakes were high—and I drew the lady; to my left sat a Hungarian Baron, to my right a Member of Parliament.

The first hand is played and we go down 50; the second hand is thrown in; and on the third, the M.P. bids a Club, the Baron Two Hearts, the American lady Three Diamonds; Four Clubs comes from the M.P., Four No Trumps from the Baron, Five Hearts from the M.P. and the Baron shoots Seven Hearts which is made. It can, however, be defeated on a Spade lead. The hands:—

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

Another hand is played and the Baron and the M.P. go down Two

in a part score, losing 200 points. And my partner announces that the next hand must be her last. The M.P. turns to me and comments: "You can kiss your side-bet goodbye!"—we have a fairly substantial wager on the rubber.

I said to my partner: "We need a grand slam to get square." Whereupon she opens her hand and bids Two Clubs (we are playing CAB) and I respond Two Diamonds. Two No Trumps is followed by my Three Clubs; whereupon Partner Blackwoods and I say Five Diamonds, to show one King. Six Clubs carols my partner—and I am convinced she must have all the Aces to open Two Clubs. So I bid Seven Clubs.

The M.P. Doubles but I have not the confidence to Redouble, for I feel we *may* be missing an Ace. The M.P. leads, and I table the Dummy. My partner tables *her* cards; we add the score, and we win the "rubber" (one game each way) by a single point. The last hand fell as follows:—

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

SWEDISH TOURNAMENT

THE Lyndhurst Club experimented in October with a new form of Duplicate: a variety of Mitchell Movement—the one where the North-Souths all sit and the East Wests all move.

The main differences between this and the ordinary variety are two:

(i) The whole room plays the same board at the same time;

(ii) A running score is kept and written up after every one, two, or three boards, for the whole room to see.

The advantages in favour of the Swedish method are that one can instantly compare one's results with those against whom one plays subsequently—so that, as one pair comes to a new table, one is *not* fined for saying: "What did you do on the Grand Slam hand?"—and one knows, precisely, where one lies at any given stage.

The disadvantages are that, in the close quarters which obtain in every Duplicate, it is extremely difficult not to overhear the bidding at nearby tables—which, since all hands are identical, is apt to put a premium on the long ear, and makes it very difficult for those players hard of hearing to catch the bidding necessarily and properly made in a low voice; and, secondly, the running score is apt to induce players in a dangerous position to "shoot" for impossible results or, conversely, to induce those in the running to sit on the splice: even though the former are requested not to do so.

Another disadvantage, from the organisers' point of view; is the enormous amount of work to be done before the event is even started. The Lyndhurst's *début* consisted of ten tables each playing 20 hands. This involved the use of 200 packs of cards; the tenfold duplicating of each hand; the insertion of each individual hand into an envelope marked (in pencil) Hand 15 W or Hand 19 N: the distribution after every hand of the new set of four envelopes to every table, each with its rubber band and a fifth rubber band to hold the set of four hands together; and the collection of every played hand (in a waste-paper basket).

It is unfair to comment on the slowness the procedure involves if one bases one's conclusions merely on the initial effort: any innovation will inevitably have its "growing pains." But in fact the evening, billed to start at 8 p.m. did not properly get under weigh until 8.45;* and the final score was not computed until well past midnight.

It must be, in justice, frankly stated that the organisers—Mr. J. Pressburger, who did the match-pointing as the results came in, actually in the room; Mrs. Nesta Lyon, who announced the vulnerability and the dealer for every hand and acted as M.C.; and Mrs. Shammun, who indefatigably collected the old, and distributed the new, packets of cards—worked like Trojans.

* This was due to the late arrival of certain participants.

Players were especially asked—repeatedly entreated—to keep down their voices; and errors in the scoring were—after the first three or four hands—very few.

If the critic may hazard a possibly constructive suggestion for future events of the same kind, it would be that the envelopes should be previously marked with the vulnerability situation and the dealer, so that players could "get on with it" without waiting for a verbal announcement, too often and too easily forgotten; and that the match-pointer should have an office *outside* the room of play where he could make his calculations in greater peace—with, therefore, less chance of error and greater speed*

A hand from the *premiere* posed this problem in defence:

♠ K 8 4 2
♥ K J 3
♦ A K 10 7 3
♣ Q

♠ A 7 5
♥ A 8 7 6 5 4
♦ 8
♣ A 6 3

North (the ultimate Dummy) bid a Diamond; East intervened with a Heart; South bid a Spade, raised to Three and re-bid by South to Four. West led the Heart Queen and East was in with the Ace.

Puzzle: What should East do? There are three lines open:

*. *We are told these suggestions which occurred spontaneously to the organisers, have already been translated into fact.*

(i) return the Hearts, trusting (a) that West is singleton or doubleton and can either ruff immediately or over-ruff subsequently—the second a poor chance since West seems marked with only a singleton trump;

(ii) cash three Aces and exit, hoping West will make a Diamond;

(iii) play Diamond at Trick 2; win the first Spade; and under-lead the Club in the hope of a ruff; or, better, win the *second* Spade in the hope of receiving a high Club from West.

We must tender our congratulations to the Lyndhurst upon their enterprise and industry, as on the distinguished gathering which graced the event, to which Mrs. Gordon, Dr. Lee, Standish Booker, Dr. Wood-Hill, Dr. Rockfelt, Mrs. Markus, Mrs. MacDonnell, Mrs. Gardener, Mrs. Alder, Mr. Konstam and Mr. Hirsch were among those who accepted invitations.

The winners were (N-S) Mrs. Markus and Mr. Harold Lever, with a monumental total and (E-W) Mr. Taylor and Mr. Ecker who nosed out on the last two boards in a close struggle.

COMMITTEE CUP

The Final for the Committee Cup—played in October—was won by the Civil Service C.B.A.—R. E. Clark (Capt.), J. A. Boatman, Dr. R. Varley, C. J. Stokes, Miss D. Coen and Miss P. Nye.

They defeated by 1080 (aggregate) points the team captained by Mr. Pennant Jones.

ELEMENTARY, MY DEAR WATSON—BUT VITAL

by The Editor

FROM Thundersley, Essex, comes the wail: Please comment on the following bidding:—

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

West opened a Heart; opponents did not intervene, and the sequence proceeded in the following quite unbelievable manner:—

1 ♥	2 ♦
3 N.T.	4 ♠
4 N.T.	5 ♦
5 ♠	No Bid!

At sight, any rational system should get to Six Spades "in sleep," as Skid Simon was wont to say. But, since the East player defends his handling of the problems posed by his cards, it might be well to analyse the sequence bid by bid.

West's choice of opening—One Heart—seems to us impeccable. The available alternatives are One (Strong) No Trump—for which, holding 19 points, it is too strong;* and One (Baronial) Spade. On such a holding as this with no difficulty in finding a re-bid, we can see no earthly point in initiating a Queen-Nine-high suit instead of an Ace-Queen-high suit. On such a hand, No Trumps is the

logical destination if Partner does not either support Hearts, bid Spades himself, or show passionate interest in a minor.

We wish to make it clear at the outset that we are *not* proposing to display our power by Reversing into Spades. We hold the view that the Reverse only incidentally shows power but primarily shows shape; to bid suits upside-down, unless playing Canapé, which makes the bidding of a short suit before a long one integral to the system, (or unless ill-advised enough to play one or two of the "freak" systems locally current in Britain, such as Nightingale, the Taylor and the Basic advocated by Mr. Scarfi and now accepted as "standard" in Newport, Mon., its author's own stamping ground): to bid suits upside down, we say, purely to show strength in the hand as a whole is, *pace* Colonel G. G. J. Walshe, a method with which the *Journal*, in common with the bulk of expert players in Britain, has no patience whatsoever.

* The Strong No Trump should neither drop below 16 nor exceed 18 points, Tens counting at $\frac{1}{2}$ point.

It is true that a circle of experts would *open* with a Spade, because the system they play would never otherwise be enabled to show that the hand contained four cards in the black major and *only* four cards in the red one, if the initial bid was a Heart and Spades were subsequently supported: Baron requiring a major 4-4 to be opened, irrespective of the value

Continued on page 17

LOST IN THE SCHWARTZWALD

Of many Blackwood tragedies and anomalies reported to us from time to time, the most amusing is a sublime effort by a casual partner at Crockford's of International Ladies' Captain, Mrs. A. L. Fleming, invited and agreeing, to play CAB.

Defying the rigid rule of that rigid, Dodds-beloved system, which enjoins that a Two Club opening must be predicated upon a minimum of two Aces, Mrs. Fleming's partner opened Two Clubs.

Mrs. Fleming perceived in her hand no fewer than three bullets. She gave the "impossible," but

accurate, response of 4 N.T. (3 N.T. announces 2 Aces, therefore, holding 3 Aces the range must be raised by one level).

Opener now shot to Six Hearts, which was passed (!). Thirteen tricks were inescapable.

Post Mortem :

Opener : (*reproachfully*) Couldn't you have gone to Seven, Partner?

Dimmie : (*with bland serenity*) Didn't you know I had three Aces by my response?

Opener : (*with melancholy pride*) Yes—but, you see, I knew your Ace of Diamonds was no good to me! (*accusingly*) Anyway, couldn't you have gone more slowly?

(Collapse of slim party)

COVER PROBLEM SOLUTION

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

Bad bidding has achieved a contract of Six Spades. Postulating a game in which the defence can slip as near-fatal as the bidding, what is your best chance to get home against the lead of the Queen of Diamonds?

The bidding sequence which achieved the Six Spades contract was :

1 ♠	2 ♠
3 ♠	4 NT (Blackwood)
5 ♦	6 ♠

Granting the weak opening, which has something to recommend it, some sign-off should have been made. Either a bid of 2 NT over the force (even Scientist Norman Squire sanctions 2 NT as a sign-off after a One Club opening) ; or a Blackwood "cheating" response of Five Clubs.

However, you are in Six Spades. The alternatives open to you—apart from immediately conceding One Down!—are : win the Diamond with the Ace and immediately ducking a Club to East. If your Diamond false-card is believed, and a Diamond is returned, and the Clubs break, you are home.

This will not solve, even against bad defenders ; for East will know he does not hold the Diamond King ; and he will know enough to recognise that West would scarcely lead Queen from King-Queen.

Secondly, it is even money who holds the Ace of Hearts. If West, you are going to lose the Heart King anyway. If East, he may come up with it on a low Heart lead from Dummy, fearing you hold a singleton King.

If this does not materialise, you must immediately cash the Queen of Hearts ; ruff your losing Diamond ; and run your trumps, in the hope that the hand with J 10 of Hearts also holds Q J 10 of Clubs.

(In practice, East obligingly played Ace on a low Heart from Dummy).

Continued from page 15

of the cards held, with the Spades.

This is, in our own view, pushing to the extreme of lunatic logic the valuable contribution to necessary Preparedness on weaker hands which Baron has made to bridge.

Over One Heart, which we approve, East prefers to bid Two Diamonds on Knave-Ten to five—a minor suit—than One Spade on Ace-King to five—a major! Unless he is one who Reverses purely to show strength—an "Unfrosted Expert," to quote Victor Mollo—there can be even less reason than rhyme to this effort. Spades are a better suit than Diamonds: it takes fewer tricks to reach Game in Spades; they have a greater pre-emptive value; and it is more economical to bid One than Two. Also the Spades held are better than the Diamonds. We have no hesitation in condemning unreservedly the Two Diamond effort because it gains nothing and can lose a lot.

West now bids the full value of his hand: Three No Trumps, which his cards are worth had East replied with a mere One-bid. The fact that East is good enough to bid Two-over-One and thus must have some 8-plus points and a fair shape, but bids in a suit which West does not fit, compels West not to get excited.

East, having stymied himself with his first effort, now shows the Spades. He is now definitely marked as a 5-4, but never as a 5-5. He might, it is true, be a 6-5, a 6-4, but a 5-5 is the one thing he *cannot* be. He is also marked as a singleton-holder, or he would not disturb a No Trump

Game unless he had hopes of Slam; which he—on the bidding so far—and on a 5-4 which he has announced, need not necessarily expect.

With the Spade suit marked as four in Partner's hand, West's cards rocket into the stratosphere. Here is the 4-4 fit which may easily produce the extra trick. Quite correctly, he bids 4 N.T. West responds Five Diamonds.

EAST

If this be Culbertson, it is a dead sign-off, and shows such a hand as

♠KJxx ♥x ♦KJxxx ♣Jxx

although it is doubtful whether this should disturb 3 N.T. since Partner has bid the singleton-suit.

If it be a Blackwood response, East is branded as lacking in imagination, for here is, assuredly, a case for jumping direct to a Six in view of the key-card of the King of Hearts in the hand actually held, plus the tops in Spades and the singleton in the un-bid suit.

It is true that East has scuppered himself: he dare not bid Six Diamonds for the suit he elected to show first is a bad one; nor dare he go to Six Spades at once, for this, if Partner prefers the Diamonds, will involve a Seven; while Five Hearts cannot be taken as showing the King for certain, but may induce Opener to envisage a 5-4-3-1 with K x x in Hearts (since Partner is virtually marked with three Aces on the bidding, unless he holds 5 points in Diamonds missing the Ace). This might induce Partner to contract for a Heart slam, if he held five cards in his opening suit but chose 3 N.T. rather than the might-be-passed Three Hearts.

Five Hearts might also be construed to mean two Aces, and a Grand bid with the Diamond Ace missing.

West now "corrects" to Five Spades: he can do no more—and East caps a monumental performance of ineptitude by Passing. Surely the conventional Four No Trumps after the limit-bid of Three can be due only to a startling improvement in the West hand after East's Spade-bid: either because the Spades suit West (more probable) or because there is a chance of a Diamond slam.

In any event, and whatever the misconstruction of the original response to the Four No Trump effort, the bid of Five Spades should have been made by *East*: it is certain, playing Blackwood, from West's point of view, that Five Spades must be a lie! No Four No Trumpist could possibly have but *One Ace* after a 3 N.T. bid and a *subsequent* burst into Blackwood.

Granting the whole horror of the sequence, East has still a chance to get out of the several pits he has dug for himself by the simple bid of Six Spades: his Spade Honours; his Heart King doubleton; his Club singleton should compel the bid: even his 5-card length in Spades should induce him to "shoot."

So much for comment—destructive. Now for comment—constructive.

We have already endorsed the opening of One Heart. To this, East cannot improve upon the simple and correct bid of One Spade. To this, West should find Three Clubs: he is now too good

for 3 N.T. or 4 Spades; and, again, East has only to bid naturally to find the "Master-bid": Three Diamonds.

West, delighted, now bids 4 N.T. (of whatever variety) and to a Culbertson, West bids Five Hearts (which must postulate an Ace and shows a key feature of the King which may induce West to bid the Grand if he have the cards to justify it). To this, West should bid Six Clubs, showing the King and still angling for the Grand. But East is now through. He bids Six Spades: a Six Diamond bid would announce the Diamond King and induce West quite correctly to shoot the Seven.

If Blackwood is the order of the day, West bids Five Diamonds—*now* he can afford to tell the truth, and should do so; and West bids Six Clubs! East, slightly baffled, lest his partner has merely a gigantic two-suiter, corrects to Six Hearts and West, indulging in his antics purely because the ultimate contract is in a higher suit, bids Six Spades.

Simpler bidding might suggest a direct Six Spade bid over Five Diamonds.

Oh, all ye Easts, striving for esoteric excellence, puzzling your heads with undigested smatterings of ill-considered theory, take note of these maxims:—

The simplest bid is the right bid;
The natural bid is the simplest bid;

Make it.

Reversing shows shape, not—
except indirectly—strength.

Do not—save when compelled to
by an awkward holding—bid
bad suits ahead of good ones, or

bid Prepared Clubs when you can open naturally.

Lay these precepts to your heart and act on them.

For of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.

Now for a tale of tragedy : also of an argument. You shall be judge and jury both.

A certain player dealt himself, in the middle of, a run of bad cards, the following hand and his hopes rode high :—

♠x ♥AKx ♦AKxx ♣QJ98x

He was a good player and opened One Club.

The rude fellow on his left—also a good player—intervened with a Spade ; and Fourth hand—a third good player—made things as difficult as possible with a Two Spade effort over a Pass.

Dealer cursed silently, but Doubled. This, by all the laws of normal bidding, is Informatory ; it is, also, by all the laws of logic, informatory. It is manifestly unlikely that Dealer, opening a mere one Bid, wants to play against a *voluntarily-assumed* contract of Two Spades by the enemy. If Second hand has psyched and Dealer holds the Spades, the Double with a Passing partner is lunatic tactics ; a psyche in Spades—the highest of the suits—is also improbable ; and there is little to suggest that anyone is playing funny business at all.

Intervener Passed the Double automatically ; and Dealer's Partner also passed on a 4-3-3-3 hand with three cards to the Ace in Clubs, and no other card of value.

Dealer contended that on the hand in question, a Three Club bid was obligatory, imperative and, in fact, the only possible call to make : the bid, at the 3-level, of Hearts was far too ambitious even after a Pass. Only if the Three Clubs elicited a Three Diamond or Three Heart bid from the Opener should the Hearts be mentioned, either a raise to 4 over a bid of Hearts or at the level of 3 over the Diamond suit.

This, Dealer claims, is simple and straightforward, saying in capital letters ; I have a bad hand, by my Pass ; I have normal Club support, by my belated raise—and I have nothing worth mentioning ; but I have four cards in Hearts now that you show yourself to hold a 4-4-4-1 or 5-4-4-0 whale.

As it was, Dealer would have made no effort and the hand would have been played peacefully in Three Clubs.

However, Dealer's partner Passed and the hand was played in Two Spades Doubled. Dealer's partner elected to open the Eight from the Ten-Eight-Three of Diamonds. Dummy went down with Queen-Seven to four and the fat was in the fire.

For Dealer won with the King and cashed the Ace on which Declarer dropped the Knave and Leader played the Three. A third Diamond (Dealer trusting the lead to be, as anyone would suppose from the fall of the cards, the leave-in of the Double, *and* the non-lead of the Club—the King of which was on the Table), put the fat well in the fire when the Ten, instead of lurking, badly concealed by the "childish"

play of the Knave, in Declarer's hand, appeared in the Leader's.

After which, Two Spades were comfortably made, with Game, rubber, bonus, cigars and nuts.

Dealer's pained eyebrows induced his Partner to exonerate himself for the leave-in of the Double. Taking this point first, his argument was: "Why could you not bid Three Clubs and let me know it was a real suit? A One Club opening is not a real suit—it is merely an 'opening gambit' "

The partnership had decided to play the Strong No Trump—when a Club is often opened on a hand which must bid the Short Club in order to cater for a re-bid; so the argument is not lightly to be disregarded.

But the Negative Double in this position *must* be predicated upon at least a 4-card Club suit, or the wretched Partner can have nowhere whither to retreat if he hold a balanced blizzard. On this bidding, if Partner hold no suit, he must be able to bid Three Clubs in confidence: in fact, Opener is (or should be) prepared for this weakness rescue and will welcome it as a playable contract, if he do not greet it with acclaim as an incitement to Game.

Such a hand as :—

♠xx ♡AQxx ♦KJ10x ♣AKx
is *not* opened a "Short" Club but as a (natural) Heart. Such a hand as

♠Q10xx ♡KQxx ♦xx ♣AKx
should be opened a Spade, not a Short Club since it has 14 points and can re-bid Two Hearts; but

if the system require a Club opening, is *not* able negatively to Double an intervening Diamond bid, when this has been raised to the 2-level primarily because it is not strong enough. Should the part-score situation be acute and the gambling propensities of the player dictate action, he still should not Double, because it cannot stand a Three Club take-out. If you want to gamble on this, toss-up between the Majors or bid the Hearts with a potential retreat to Spades.

You may behold here the difference between the Dealer's orthodox thought and the Partner's mental processes, affected as they have been by regarding One Club as merely an opening gambit and not a suit in its own right.

Now, for the lead. The "middle of three" was the lead evolved by the almost-good players who found (at Auction) the dilemma of differentiating between the Top of Nothing and a Doubleton, one hard to solve. The "middle-of-three" is, when the top-card in the suit is an Honour, one hundred per cent. bad: the Ten is a respectable card which should be either conserved or used to promote partner's holding. In any event, if the middle-of-three is selected for deception, it is mandatory that the higher card shall be played to the second trick.

So much for the card chosen; now, for the suit: Partner has bid Clubs in which you hold A x x. Why not lead the Ace? It will elicit either a card of encouragement or discouragement from

Partner; may pave the way to immediately forcing Declarer; will enable you to see Dummy and, because Partner has bid it, may well be a constructive lead rather than a mere beating of empty air: the valid objection to the *blind* lead of an Ace.

Finally: why experiment with a 3-card unbid suit? Leader could have chosen the lowest of a 4-card Heart suit, where Partner, by inference, was strong; a Club—the Ace—where Partner by announcement, both explicit by his bid and implicit by his Double, was strong; or—perhaps best of all, since the raise might, on the bidding, be predicated upon ruffing-values—a trump. Why the Eight from 10-8-3 of *Diamonds*?

The selection of this suit reminds us of a player who once said to us: "You may think you are a good player; but I would have you know I have every reason to believe I am a good player too." The occasion of this egotistical utterance was the following:—

We had bid a Heart and the opposition had contracted somewhat gingerly for Three No Trumps. The self-styled good player had a balanced blizzard, including three Hearts to the Ten. He elected to lead a small Diamond from four to the Knave! He then proceeded to justify the lead on the ground that they had our Hearts sewn up evidently, so why not try the Diamonds?

As it was, a Heart lead gets the contract down two; while the Diamond (which happened to strike our singleton and enabled partner's Knave to be caught

which it would not normally have been, the Dummy holding K Q x) gave them eleven tricks.

If the readers of the Contract Bridge Journal complain that this excursus is too elementary for them, We offer no apology but this explanation:—

The Leader in the last hand is a well-known County player who is to be seen constantly in the medium-priced room of London's leading bridge club: no Palooka he. The East in the first hand has County ambitions.

In fact, it is the fair player who, today, is far more likely to get abysmal results than the out-and-out beginner, whose natural card sense and common sense have not been vitiated by a welter of fallacious, though plausible, theory masquerading as science.

Now for a more advanced piece of "murder" with the technique not of the blunt instrument nor the ounce of arsenic; but the fine Italian hand of someone who once spent a week-end in Bordighera—or possibly had a friend who did.

This player had the good fortune to face Algernon de Horsey and, the second stroke of luck to pick up:

♠AKQxxxx ♥x ♦Qxx ♣Ax

The third "horseshoe" was to hear de Horsey open One Diamond! Visions of re-valuing the Pound must have flitted across the player's mind.

There was a butt-in of One Heart—and thence was initiated the crime. For the holder of this magnificent collection found himself anxious to do a lot of

things at once: to announce his whale; to proclaim his suit; to indicate support for his partner; to speak of slams; to state shortness in the intervening suit: all items of information it was desirable to impart.

The sensible way to do this is to make a forcing-bid and then allow the bidding to develop naturally; specifically, to bid Two Spades, and be guided by Opener's action what you do. This gives you as much time to tell as much of your story as the range between Two Spades and Seven No Trumps will allow—minus, of course, any bids that the Opposition consume. This is, also, the very basis of Approach bidding, and its real *raison d'être*: even Old Man Ewart ("Direct") Kempson Approaches on big hands.

The player who held this hand, however, elected to cue-bid Hearts!

Now, this cue-bid made immediately over an intervention, is a valuable weapon *on the right hand*. It should have at least 4-card support, preferably with a couple of high Honours, for Opener's suit; it should affirm, instantly, that the hand will be played in Opener's suit: that is its prime function. Here, *one* of the last things anticipated was to play in Diamonds, which *might* be no better than King to four opposite Queen to three. Moreover, the Two Heart bid was, in these circumstances, a *black* lie as opposed to the white lie of a cue-bid on a singleton justified by some other holding.

De Horsey immediately bid Four No Trumps (Culbertson)—

the partnership was titularly playing Acol—and the next player bid Five Clubs. To this intervention, there was no earthly reason why the Partner should not give the conventional response of Five No Trumps—since he held more than the technical qualifications: viz, two Aces.

His main reason was that he had told a lie with his cue-bid in Hearts. He had also not yet (at the 5-level!) mentioned, even by implication, his Spade holding. It was not borne in upon him that the dreaded Heart singleton was "covered" by de Horsey's *announced* Ace: for the beauty of the 4/5 is the number of inferences it offers to those of its adherents capable of drawing them.

In point of fact, the Partner found the "Master Bid" of . . . Seven Spades! This was passed "in sleep" by Fourth-hand; passed doubtfully by de Horsey; and Doubled (pretty obviously, on the two-suit showing) for a Diamond lead by the gallant intervener.

When the bidding came round to de Horsey, he was fully aware of the danger of the ruff; but he—a genuine expert, alert to every inference of the system and conventions he was playing—did NOT remove to Seven No Trumps. The bidding, so far, proclaimed in capital letters that the Ace of Clubs was missing! The partner, if his bidding meant anything, had *two* voids: Club and Heart; with, perhaps, nine Spades and four Diamonds; ten and three; or, possibly, eight and five. There was a genuine risk of losing at No Trumps the first six or seven

The Daily Telegraph

BRIDGE ARTICLE

APPEARS

EVERY FRIDAY

together with a

WEEKLY PROBLEM

tricks in Clubs. Better, by far, risk a one-trick defeat in Spades—with the chance that the Double was “on principle,” *plus* the chance that a Diamond would not be led—than an ignominious rout in No Trumps.

De Horsey's hand was :—

♠J ♥AQx ♦AKJ10xxxx ♣x
and, although Seven Diamonds was unbeatable, that bid had been passed, like a ship in the night : gone, gone beyond recall ; and, although Seven No Trumps was “stiff” de Horsey was right not to bid it.

Now, mark the additional horse-shoes the partner of the miserable Algy carried in his hip-pocket. Not only did he hold so superb a hand; which he had

maltreated, even to distortion by rack and thumbscrew, in the bidding, but he did not get a Diamond lead ! Add to this, that the Dummy held the key card of the Knave of Spades, while leader held four to the ten.

Grant that it would be “rotten luck, pard,” to go down owing to a mere J x x x when you held seven to A K Q : what luck is it that a bad contract—nay, a shocking contract—should make owing to the fortuitous trump holding (impossible of discovery) of the partner plus the bad-defence of the opponents : and this when two contracts of virtually equal numerary worth and overwhelming technical superiority had been, the one by-passed and the other never considered.

The worst of the story is yet to come. The mercifully un-named criminal in these annals is still convinced that he bid the hand immaculately!

For the record, the sequence should be:—

1 \diamond	1 \heartsuit	2 \spadesuit	No
4 \diamond^*	5 \clubsuit (?)	6 \clubsuit	No
7 \diamond	No	7 NT	

How simple; how effective; how classic; how successful—and (important at match-points) ten points better in the final result.

* *An eight-card suit to A K J 10 may be considered solid and thus justify the jump-over-a-force to show, normally A K Q J to six or A K Q to seven.*—EDITOR.

AS OTHERS SEE US

A SCANDINAVIAN IMPRESSION OF BRITISH BIDDING

by ERIC JANNERSTEN (Stockholm)

Editor's note—

At a time when British bidding methods are beginning to make a marked impression on the Continent, it is of interest to publish in the Journal the views of a well-known Scandinavian authority. Mr. Jannersten is the distinguished Editor of the Swedish Bridge Tidningen, the Scandinavian Nordsk Bridge Revy, and the new English language European Bridge Review. We have asked Mr. Jannersten to write this article and to hit as hard as he likes.

WHEN we renewed acquaintance, for the first time since the war, with English bidding technique at Copenhagen in 1948, we formed the impression that your systems were somewhat improvised and not built up on a sound foundation. We decided that Great Britain had won the Championship, not through any bidding superiority, but because their play of the cards, particularly in defence, was outstandingly good.

Before the 1949 Championships in Paris, we thought that we could beat the British. It seemed impossible that you could continue to skate over thin ice in the bidding—in the long run your methods must surely let you down. We were confident that our own bidding style was far more efficient. It is based on vintage Culbertson incorporating a number of our own ideas.

We use, for instance, the strong No-Trump (4-5 honour

tricks), a bid of a new suit at the Three level as forcing for one round, and our own version of Asking bids, developed to such an extent that Mr. Culbertson himself would not find the right answer without several hours' study. In theory these and other ingredients should show far more precise results than the British home-baked bidding cake.

But the British team of 1949 gave us something to think about. We had to concede that your bidding was not a mere matter of improvisation, but that you used a genuine system which yet left room for flexibility in certain situations. It was clear that it was based on sheer logic with plenty of scope for the player's judgment. This individual judgment is the most important factor in any system—it is not the system itself, but the commonsense of the man using it, that decides the day.

There is little point in writing an article in fulsome praise of English bidding. Your own experts can probably do it much better. So I will content myself by saying that I see plenty of advantages, but also some disadvantages.

The first thing that strikes me when I consider the English systems (in this connection I can see no great difference between Acol and CAB) is the great difficulty that they present to the average player. Is he not given too much rope with which to hang himself? Does not the system make too great a demand on the player's commonsense? Commonsense is invaluable, but the less you know about the game, the more need you have for hard and

fast rules. Will not the average player come to grief when he has to rely too much on his individual judgment?

From time to time we hear complaints of poor entries for competitions in Great Britain. We are told that the same names appear year after year in the prize lists. And after the Copenhagen tournament last year, the English bridge columnists emphasised the comparative youth of the Scandinavian players. It was suggested that Britain would find it difficult to maintain her position in the future when the younger Scandinavian players were more experienced and the British stars were approaching the veteran stage.

It seems to me that the system may have something to do with this state of affairs. Is it not possible that our systems, which aim at giving every bid a precise meaning, are better devised to guide inexperienced players along the right track than the British systems? Do you not postulate too great an understanding of the game, a knowledge properly restricted to the small army of experts?

The difference between the British and the Scandinavian top-ranker can perhaps be summed up like this: the British use a system that permits unlimited liberty for the individual, while the Scandinavians take the same liberties *outside the system*.

An English player may be faced with a choice of three different bids in a certain situation where the Scandinavian has only one. The English expert makes the right choice and gets a brilliant result. But the English average

player? He has to take a decision—for him, a very difficult decision.

The average Scandinavian player has no problem. The bid recommended by the system is not necessarily perfect, but it will not get him into serious trouble. And the Scandinavian expert? If he is not satisfied with the bid laid down by the system, he takes the liberty of stepping out of his straight jacket. He might easily find the same bid as the English expert.

Let us examine some simple examples. The first only applies to our beginners:

♠9754 ♥8 ♦AQ864 ♣952.
This is South's hand. His partner deals and opens with One Spade. What should South bid?

We can ignore the raise to Three Spades, which is forcing in our system and cannot therefore be considered if we are to have a true comparison.

Probably most English experts would bid Three Spades, but if this be ruled out, it is clear that Two Diamonds is the best alternative. Both English and Scandinavian experts would agree on that point.

But in our system you are not allowed to bid Two Diamonds as the hand lacks the requisite two honour tricks. The expert is not concerned whether it contains two honour tricks or fewer—he bids Two Diamonds anyway. He knows that the four-card support for Spades and the singleton Heart more than compensate for the sub-minimum honour strength.

The beginner must not reckon that way. It is not so easy for him to differentiate between the first hand and this one:

♠Q75 ♥84 ♦AJ864 ♣952.
Both have the same honour

strength. The English point count even gives the second hand an extra pip. Both hands contain normal trump support. But—on the second hand Two Spades must be the best response, because it is not strong enough for more than one voluntary bid.

The beginner may get confused if we tell him to bid Two Diamonds in the first case and Two Spades in the second. Therefore the system lays down that you must bid Two Spades on both these hands. Maybe it is not the best bid on the first, but it is at least a step in the right direction. And Two Spades on the first hand will do less harm than Two Diamonds on the second.

As the beginner acquires more knowledge and experience, so he will learn that Hand 1 constitutes an exceptional case. From then on he will bid Two Diamonds with fewer than two honour tricks but compensating values.

We now go a step further and quote an example given by an English expert, S. J. Simon. Your partner opens One Spade and you hold:

♠873 ♥9 ♦A9853 ♣10984.

Mr. Simon considered that Two Spades was the only correct bid if you decided not to pass, and so far we agree. But he went on to say that the accepted requirements for trump support were too high, and here we differ.

We hold that normally you should have at least three to the Queen or four small before supporting partner's suit. But we permit our more experienced players to break the rule and bid Two Spades on this hand, because it is obvious that this is the only good bid.

Those of our players who are not in the master class are better advised to pass. This is far better than responding One No-Trump or Two Diamonds or getting into the habit of bidding Two Spades on something like this :

♠753 ♥Q84 ♦KJ92 ♣1043.

A good player sees the difference between these two hands. The average player does not.

This may well be the reason why we breed in Scandinavia so many more promising young players than you do in Great Britain. We use systems with rigid rules which in time we learn to break, but the British players have too much liberty from the outset. It is like a child that has to be led by its parents until it grows up to be responsible for its actions. The more it grows in stature, the more freedom it is allowed.

And now for your slam conventions. We all use Asking bids and most of us play Blackwood. Most English experts seem to prefer cue-bids and the Culbertson Four-Five No-Trump convention. Both can have their advantages. But I do not think that English players have a thorough grasp of Asking bids, any more than we understand cue-bidding.

To make proper use of Asking bids, one should "Ask" only when there is really something you want to know. This means putting a question to your partner when you are interested in controls in one or more suits. Furthermore, you should have beforehand some idea of your partner's general strength. For example :

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

It is not so easy to find this lay-down grand slam without the use of Asking bids. But with them it is very, very easy. The bidding goes : 1 ♠-3 ♠*; 4 ♣-? 4 ♦; 5 ♣-? 5 ♦; 5 N.T.-6 ♥; 7 ♠.

Three Spades is forcing to game and West starts investigating slam possibilities. Four Clubs is an Asking bid, and Four Diamonds shows that East has second-round control in Clubs and first-round control in Diamonds; at the same time he denies holding another Ace. Five Clubs is a fresh Asking bid, enquiring for third-round control in Clubs. The reply shows that control, and as East has already shown his Diamond Ace, he now shows the King of that suit with his response of Five Diamonds. West can now account for all possible losers in the side suits, and the grand slam will depend on East holding the King of Spades. Five No-Trumps is the "big" grand slam force, and East's Six Hearts shows the King of trumps, West can now bid Seven Spades, knowing that the chances of making it are about a hundred to one on.

This does not mean that you should always Ask about controls. One reason why Asking bids have got such a bad name is because they are often used at the wrong time. An English expert once said that it was impossible to reach this small slam with the aid of Asking bids :

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

* Forcing inevitable when Asking Bids are being played—EDITOR.

It is quite true that Asking bids will not help you on this hand, but a good pair who normally use them instead of cue-bids could reach the slam like this:

1 ♠-2 ♦; 3 ♣-4 ♠; 5 ♠-6 ♠.

Three Clubs in this situation is forcing for one round. When East jumps to Four Spades, West becomes slam-minded. But he has nothing in particular to ask about. Of course the grand slam might be on if East's hand fits like a glove, but West is too old a hand to believe in fairy tales. As he himself has control in each suit, East's values are welcome wherever they may happen to be. He makes a slam try with Five Spades which means, when asking bids are normally used, that West is interested in undisclosed values. East will take note of his Queen of Clubs which may well be a key card; the doubleton Heart may also be useful, so he raises to Six.

Another objection raised against Asking bids is that they tell the opponents too much about your strength and distribution. True, as long as you only use "honest" Asking bids. But is there anything to prevent you Asking in a false suit, where you have *no* losers, to create the impression that this is your vulnerable point? Here is one of many examples that might be quoted of this form of psychic:

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

The actual bidding was
1 ♠-2 ♠; 4 ♥?-4 ♠. West, of

course, had not the slightest hope of a slam. But could it do any harm to give the impression that he was so strong that a slam might be possible if the gaps in a somewhat weak Heart holding could be filled in? The risk of getting a positive response, when he himself had the Ace and King but three Hearts only, was infinitesimal. North was duly fooled. Hearts ought to be the best suit to attack, so he led a small one from four to the Queen. As the Ace of Clubs was held by South, this was the only lead to give declarer his contract.

These small objections of mine are really only a matter of taste. I am prepared to believe that the British experts miss very few makable slams. There are undoubtedly some that the Scandinavian expert will bid but which cannot be found with the British slam-bidding technique. It is not impossible to construct examples to show the opposite.

It is not here that we really fail to see eye to eye, but in the fact that the British bidding methods appear to us too difficult for the ordinary player.

You have only to study what Scandinavian bridge has achieved. At Copenhagen last year Scandinavian nations got the second and third place; this year in Paris we came second, third and fourth. Our three countries together comprise some 15 million inhabitants. How is it that these small nations can enter such strong teams and keep up a continuous recruiting campaign? Do you not think that bidding systems may have something to do with it?

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 Dec. 7th, 1949. Solutions and names of prize winners in the October Competition will appear next month.

PROBLEM No. 1 (12 points)

East-West Game. You, South, hold :
 ♠ J 5 ♥ K Q 10 7 4 ♦ A 6 4 ♣ Q 10 2

The bidding proceeds :

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

What do you bid ?

PROBLEM No. 2 (12 points)

North-South Game. You, South, hold :

♠ J 5 3 ♥ Q 7 ♦ A K J ♣ Q 6 5 4 2

The bidding proceeds :

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

What do you bid ?

PROBLEM No. 3 (12 points)

Love All. You, South, hold :

♠ 7 ♥ K 10 8 5 4 2 ♦ K J 9 ♣ 10 5 2

The bidding proceeds :

NORTH	SOUTH
1 ♠	2 ♥
3 ♦	3 ♥
3 ♠	?

What do you bid ?

PROBLEM No. 4 (12 points)

Love All. You, South, hold :

♠ A J ♥ A 10 ♦ Q 5 2 ♣ K Q 10 8 5 3

The bidding proceeds :

SOUTH	NORTH
1 ♣	1 ♦
?	

What do you bid ?

PROBLEM No. 5 (12 points)

North-South Game. You, South, hold :

♠ Q J 6 ♥ Q 8 4 ♦ 9 8 7 2 ♣ 6 5 2

The bidding proceeds :

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
No bid	1 ♥	Double	No bid
?			

What do you bid ?

PROBLEM No. 6 (28 points)

WEST

♠ A 9 5 2
 ♥ A 7 6
 ♦ A 8 6 3
 ♣ 5 4

EAST

♠ K 10 8 7
 ♥ K 9 5 3 2
 ♦ -
 ♣ A K Q 9

West deals at Love All. Bid the two hands.

PROBLEM No. 7 (12 points)

East-West Game. You, South, hold :

♠ K 9 4 ♥ A Q 8 6 3 ♦ A 5 ♣ 7 5 2

The bidding proceeds :

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
1 ♥	2 ♣	No bid	2 NT
No bid	3 ♦	No bid	3 NT
All Pass			

What do you lead ?

Answers to October Competition

PROBLEM No. 1 (12 points).

Game All. You, South, hold :
 ♠ 7. ♢ Q 10 7 5 ♠ 10 6 4 3 2 ♣ Q 8 3
 The bidding (playing Forcing Two)

proceeds :

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
No bid	2 ♢	5 ♠	?

What do you bid ?

ANSWER

1. No Bid—12 points. Double—8 points. Five Hearts—5 points.

With North short of Diamonds, the hands should fit to produce an easy Five Hearts. However, if this bid is made at once, North is hardly likely to visualise a hand with no Ace or King and may proceed to a losing slam. A Double looks promising, since you have a Trump trick that East cannot be expecting to lose; but this call is, again, somewhat misleading and may mean that a slam is missed.

Best of all is a Pass—forcing, because North, by his opener, guarantees to overbid, or Double, any intervening call. If North finds Five Hearts, you can safely raise to Six. If North Doubles, you can still take your view whether to leave it or to bid Five Hearts.

PROBLEM No. 2 (12 points)

North-South Game. You, South, hold :

♠ K J 10 9 7 4 ♢ A ♠ Q 4 ♣ A K 5 3

The bidding proceeds :

EAST	SOUTH	WEST	NORTH
1 ♠	Double	No bid	2 ♠

No bid

What do you bid ?

ANSWER

2. Four Spades—12 points. Three Spades—6 points.

Partner's conventional Two Spade response shows a good all-round hand and is forcing to game. In the circumstances, you should be reasonably confident about a game in Spades, despite East's opener in that suit. A bid of Three Spades only might be wrongly interpreted as passing the buck back, and you have no wish for Partner to go experimenting in a red suit.

PROBLEM No. 3 (12 points).

Love All. You, South, hold :
 ♠ J 9 8 7 ♢ 10 2 ♠ K 10 9 ♣ Q 6 5 3
 The bidding proceeds :

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

What do you bid ?

ANSWER

3. No Bid—12 points.

You decided, rightly, that you had no free raise on the first round, and should not now trap Partner by producing a belated effort on the second. If he had hopes above mere competition for the part-score, he would have produced a stronger bid, such as an (informatory) Double.

PROBLEM No. 4 (12 points)

Love All. You, South, hold :

♠ K J 6 3 ♢ 4 ♠ A K 10 9 5 ♣ 8 7 2

The bidding proceeds :

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
1 ♠	Double	Red	1 ♢
No bid	2 ♢	2 ♠	No bid

?

What do you bid ?

ANSWER

4. Four Spades—12 points.

We regard this as an easy one, but there may be some competitors who are scared by their Honour-Trick weakness into bidding only Three Spades. The point is that Partner's Redouble guarantees a goodish hand, and your excellent shape makes up for the lack of points. There will be a play for Game if Partner has no more than five Spades to the Ace-Queen and the King of Clubs; and, having already Redoubled and, then bid his suit, he should not be expected to make a further effort.

PROBLEM No. 5 (12 points)

Love All. You, South, hold :

♠ A J 8 7 ♢ Q 5 ♠ 10 9 7 2 ♣ A 10 4

The bidding proceeds :

NORTH	SOUTH
1 ♢	1 ♠
3 ♣	3 ♢
3 NT	?

What do you bid ?

ANSWER

5. Four No Trumps—12 points. No Bid—9 points.

There can still be a slam, despite the absence of a suit fit, if Partner has a maximum of 22-23 points. Four No Trumps should here be interpreted as non-conventional since, with good Heart support and the conventional requirements, you could have bid

CONTRACT BRIDGE JOURNAL

Four No Trumps on the previous round. At the same time, it must be recognised that the slam is odds-against; and, since there is a possibility that even an expert Partner might misinterpret your bid, high marks are also given to a Pass. The other conceivable alternative—Four Clubs—is hardly likely to be helpful to Partner in choosing his next bid.

PROBLEM No. 6 (12 points) -

Game All. You, South, hold :

♠ K 7 ♥ Q 10 9 6 3 ♦ K 9 4 ♣ A Q 8

The bidding proceeds :

NORTH	SOUTH
No bid	1 ♥
2 ♣	?

What do you bid ?

ANSWER

6. Two No Trumps—12 points.
No Bid—5 points. Three Clubs—2 points.

This problem is admittedly directed against timid members of the "But, Partner, you'd Passed" brigade. It is the very fact of Partner's Pass that forms the principal justification for your bid, despite the absence of the usual 15 or 16 points. For, now, you can virtually rely on Partner's holding a five-card Club suit, for which you have an excellent fit. You want to be in Game if Partner is as good as :
♠ xxx ♥ x ♦ A Q x x ♣ K x x x x—
and he may well be better.

We must—reluctantly—give some credit to the Pass, however, since Game is bound to be speculative, and the Pass is so much better than Two Hearts which merely exchanges a good part-score for a bad one. Three Clubs should be safe, but may lead to a No Trump contract played by the wrong hand.

PROBLEM No. 7 (12 points)

Game all. You, South, hold :

♠ A 10 5 2 ♥ A J 6 ♦ K Q 9 ♣ A 8 3

The bidding proceeds :

SOUTH	NORTH
1 NT	3 ♠

What do you bid ?

ANSWER

7. Four Clubs—12 points. Four Hearts or Four Diamonds—7 points. Four Spades—5 points.

A player who has opened with a limit No Trump bid has no business to go beyond Game on his own initiative. However, with four supporting Trumps, three Aces and an

18-count, there is some danger that slam may be missed if only a routine Four Spades is bid.

There can be no ambiguity about a bid of Four in a lower-ranking suit, since, without good Spade support, you would have bid an automatic Three No Trumps. Four Clubs is best because it is your lowest-ranking Ace and because Clubs is the suit in which you would most like to stop a lead.

PROBLEM No. 8 (16 points)

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

Game All. The bidding proceeds :

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
1 ♥	3 ♣	No bid	No bid
3 ♥	3 ♠	4 ♥	All Pass

North starts with three top Clubs, on the last of which South throws a small Spade and West ruffs. A Spade is led to the Queen, Ace and a small one; and then a small Heart is led for the finesse. On this North discards a small Spade. Plan Declarer's play from now on :—

ANSWER

8. Trial will quickly show that any attempt to discard the losing Spade on the fourth Diamond is fruitless. In any case, on the bidding, North probably has five Spades and, therefore, only two Diamonds. The problem is, therefore, to avoid the loss of a Trump trick. Two leads-through are necessary to capture South's King, but only one entry is apparent. The other must be manufactured by throwing North in.

So—a Diamond is led to the Queen for another Trump finesse, and the Ace of Diamonds is cashed to strip North of the suit. Now, a Spade is led, which North wins. If he continues Spades, the Knave wins, the King of Diamonds is thrown and now a third Trump finesse can be taken. North's best defence, therefore, is to lead a Club. This is ruffed with the Eight of Hearts in the Dummy and Declarer, to reduce his own Trump length, must under-ruff with the Seven. The Knave of Spades permits a Diamond discard as before and, at Trick 12, South's Trumps are inescapably coupé.

If, at any stage of the end-play, South ruffs, Declarer can over-ruff and claim the rest in his own hand.

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., Flat 2, 'Kincora,' Higher Warberry 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**—L. G. Cayless, "Farm Edge" Leicester Road, Thurcaston, near Leicester.
- LINCOLNSHIRE CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION**—Mrs. Turner and Mrs. Brumpton 51 Signhills Avenue, Cleethorpes.
- LONDON CONTRACT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION**—Mrs. B. Tarlo, 97 Cholmley Gardens, London, N.W.6.
- 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, Chapelton Road, Tipton, 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**—F. O. Bingham, Esq., 64a Greenhill Road, Moseley, Birmingham.
- 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 NOEL BYRNE	North Western	A. C. DOUGLASS
Scotland H. KERSHAW	Yorkshire	MRS. L. L. BEDFORD
Wales H. J. GOULD	London "ALIBI"
North Eastern		EWART KEPMSON		

Competition Editor—EDMUND PHILLIPS

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

Publishers—PRIESTLEY STUDIOS LTD.,
COMMERCIAL ROAD, GLOUCESTER.

Phone—
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 every Thursday evening at 7.30 p.m. R. PROVOST, Managing Director. A. J. HORSNELL, Secretary.

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

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.

A GIFT SUGGESTION

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

Please send order to
PRIESTLEY STUDIOS LTD.
Commercial Rd., Gloucester

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.

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.

E.

B.