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A TRI-ANGULAR contest of 96 Boards was staged at the London Club in which four pairs of Nominated and Potential Lady Internationals for 1950 permuted.

In the first, the Nominateds—Mrs. Gordon and Mrs. Renshaw, Mrs. Williams and Mrs. Evans—defeated the Potentials—Mrs. Fleming and Miss Pearson, Lady Rhodes and Mrs. Markus—by 17 I.M.P.

When Mrs. Gordon and Mrs. Renshaw played with Mrs. Fleming and Miss Pearson, they defeated the other quartette by 29 I.M.P. And when Mrs. Williams and Mrs. Evans played with Mrs. Fleming and Miss Pearson, they nosed out in a match of fascinating hands and violent swings by 4 I.M.P.

The hands, which were recorded are being subjected to analysis and will, it is hoped, prove helpful to the B.B.L. Selectors.

OUR congratulations go to North Western for holding the biggest ever Congress at Blackpool. The numbers were impressive; the organisation was impressive; and the success of the local teams against strong invading competition was . . . impressive.
EDITORIAL

As forecast last month, this issue of the *Journal* contains the criticisms of the British Bridge League’s arrangements for the 1950 Internationals; the suggestions; the defence.

The bulk of the controversy centred round the selection (for nomination only) of the Ladies’ Team; and our sympathy was freely extended to the B.B.L. in a delicate and difficult task.

In selecting, there are, inevitably, many “imponderables” which must yet be weighed by the Selectors. It is as fatuous to field two players, each excellent, who are out of sympathy both personally and in style of play, as it would be to put two Singles Champions into the tennis court as a Doubles pair. The B.B.L. is, further, wise to reserve to itself the selection not only of the actual performers, but the picking of Selectees; for match temperament, social polish, suavity at the table, as well as ethical conduct must come under consideration as well as technical ability.

There is yet another imponderable, brought out clearly in the letter from Mrs. Markus: viz., that the pairs must not only be happy intra-pair but inter-pairs. We have, before now, seen one pair in a team rejoicing that another pair has experienced a bad session—and that makes for a losing team.

All things considered, the B.B.L.’s performance cannot be justly condemned, save by the most passionately partisan critic. The performance of the “Nominateds” when played against a quartette of Lady Rhodes, Mrs. Markus, Mrs. Fleming and Miss Pearson—a powerful team by any standard—was impressive. The victory—by 17 I.M.P. over 32 Boards—commands respect.

If it be felt that a 32-Board Match is, really, “no test,” it must be recognised that this is the “distance” over which our teams will be required to play at Brighton.

Further “invitation matches” are to be staged—in one of which certain Scottish Ladies will be in the field. This is all to the good. Practice makes perfect; and the more the practice (so long as the Nominateds and their potential accretions do not go stale) the nearer perfection will our representatives be in June.

We have the authority of the B.B.L. to state that any suggestion for the selection of the teams for 1950 will be carefully considered; and the *Journal* will gladly print them.

But the 1950 controversy is now closed; and it is an editorial pleasure to be able, in very large measure, to endorse editorially the action so far taken.

If the additions to the Nominateds are as successful as the original nominations, Britain will go in at Brighton with the best chance ever of gaining the double laurel.

Lieut. Commander Nightingall (not “Nightingale” as he appeared by a slip of our typewriter last month) writes to decry our implicit condemnation of the system which bears his name and is the product of his brain by our characterising it as a “freak.”
system. "What," he enquires plaintively, "is a 'freak' system?"

Since its first number, the _Journal_ has striven to propagate the gospel of what might be called Standard Bidding: the sort of bidding when a preliminary question or two would enable two strangers to play with reasonable success together.

There is no inherent stigma in the word "freak" which has become a convenient and brief term to differentiate the systems which (more or less) say what they mean from those which abound in artificialities.

It is, of course, true that any Two Club system under this definition would be characterised as "freak"—so would Vienna or any One Club affair. But a single bid does not, as we see it, involve "freakness." It is when the whole range of bidding is artificial: when, say a mere Ace Doubleton is bid ahead of a six-card major to Ace King; or when One of a suit announces a specific high-card holding: it is then that the system turns "freak."

None can deny the occasional success of a "freak" system or a "freak" bid. But we still take the view that "freaks" are bad for the game as a whole.

**ENGLAND** decisively defeated Northern Ireland—too late for a report of the match to be included this year. In January, both this and the Invitation Ladies Match will be recorded.

In tendering our congratulations to the England team (M. Harrison-Gray, A. Meredith, L. Tarlo, N. Gardener, A. J. Smith and E. D. Teague) on their victory by 49 I.M.P., we must express our delight that this most equitable method of scoring so far devised has made its way into the Camrose series.

We should like to add a special word of fraternal felicitation to the Bridge Editor of the "Daily Telegraph" (and to his partner) on acquainting themselves so well when wearing their first "cap."

A HAPPY Christmas, a prosperous New Year and a successful season to all our readers.

**COVER PROBLEM SOLUTION**

```
   ♠ A K Q
   ♥ 9 x x
   ♦ x x x
   ♣ A Q x x

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

At Love All, South deals. How should the bidding proceed?

This hand, submitted by Mr. Cyril Dancey, Honorary Secretary of the Gloucester Bridge Club, Gloucester, where it occurred in play, taxed the assembled ingenuity of the players present.

The Contract Bridge Journal, in all diffidence, suggests that the sequence might well go:

```
  1 ♥
  3 ♥
  4 ♦
  6 ♥
```

A bid of 3 NT by North over the 1 ♥ opening might elicit a direct 6 NT.

If the slam is bid in NT, it must be played by North; and a 7 bid is not recommended, since the Heart suit may well be guarded by J x x x in one opponent's hand.

Readers may care to exercise their own ingenuity upon this, in our view, difficult problem-hand.
FIRST of all, who does select? (I am speaking of British teams in the international championships).

Answer is, the Council of the British Bridge League. This is composed of delegates from the Unions of the four countries. I think the proportion is: four from the E.B.U. and two each from Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. These delegates are appointed by the Unions for their administrative ability.

The members of the Council are likely, therefore, to be people who are trustworthy, respected, good organizers. The question is, do these qualities make them good selectors?

Can players who are not themselves in the top class judge other players? My answer, without any equivocation, is NO.

Bridge, as we all know, is a peculiar game. At every other sport or pastime it is possible, within limits, to assess the relative merits of performers, either by trial or by simple observation. At bridge it can't be done, except by a very expert judge who has played with, and against, the players concerned.

The fact is that only first-class players can judge one another. All first-class players agree on this. Unfortunately, the others don't. This is a field in which many rush in where experts fear to tread. I think it is extremely difficult to judge the performance and ability of players simply by watching them in a match. One must, for one thing, have a complete knowledge of the system they are playing. Even then I am hesitant to lay down the law, about responsibility—for a missed slam, for example,—until I have asked the players themselves about it. No such hesitation restrains less well qualified critics. Time and again, on such an occasion as the Women's Trials, I am called aside by some reverend senator, and this sort of conversation takes place:—

R.S. "I just saw some dreadful bidding by Mrs. So-and-So. Couldn't understand it at all. Finished up in Three No-trumps. Went two down. Ought to have been in Four Hearts. Or Four Spades. Might have made that."

T.R. "What was the hand?"

R.S. "Well, she had six Hearts headed by the Ace—I am not sure it wasn't A K—four Clubs, good ones, Ace and another Diamond and two small Spades. Her partner opened...

T.R. "Isn't that one card too many?"

R.S. "Is it? Well, perhaps it was a singleton Club and three Spades—no, she only had five Hearts, that was it. Anyway, her partner opened One Club, somebody bid Diamonds, and the point is that when her partner bid Two No-Trumps, she went Three. Went three down, too. Shocking bidding. I must make a note of that."

Equally free with their opinions, and still more dangerous, are the
somewhat better players who have their own ideas about the game and judge everyone from their own standpoint. I over-heard, at Paris, this pronouncement from one of the British entourage:—

"I've been watching so-and-so and so-and-so play. I tell you outright, they're not international class at all. What do you think of this . . . .?"

A clear account follows of a bidding sequence that is perfectly correct. You think; "shall I try to explain?" No, what's the use?

I am not saying that these samples of conversation present a fair or complete picture of the present selectors (certainly I have no individual in mind): only that there is a widespread tendency to form and express opinions on the part of people who may be sincere and impartial but just cannot judge. It may sound brutal, but to me the opinion of a second class player about the respective merits of two first class players is an opinion without the slightest value.

The B.B.L. naturally, and to somewhat extent, rightly, takes credit for the fact that two years running, whatever criticisms there have been, it has sent a winning team to the open championship. Yes, but let us look more closely into the performance of the selectors.

In 1948 the easy method was adopted of putting the Gold Cup winners (with certain adjustments in the team) on one side and letting the rest form their own teams and fight it out to challenge Gray's team. Kempson's team won through and it was only in the last 10 boards of a 400 board encounter that Gray won the challenge match. Had Kempson won, as he very easily might have done, he would have taken another pair from outside and that team would have gone to Copenhagen, with at most one player from our team as seventh man. Gray would have been left out, so would Shapiro and I as a partnership. The selectors were lucky. Gray won and strengthened his side with three players from the beaten team.

In 1949 a most elaborate system of trails was proposed. No advantage was given to the Copenhagen winners. It turned out, however, that the scheme was unworkable because there were not enough teams of anything approaching international class to carry out the various stages of the trials. In effect, Gray's team was again given a privileged position. The team chosen to play it was massacred. The seven scrutineers appointed by the E.B.U. to watch the play unanimously reported that no useful purpose would be served by further trials. The E.B.U. so reported to the B.B.L. The B.B.L. decided, however, that the letter of the original manifesto entitled the other trialists to another go and selected another team to play the final challenge match. If this team won, four of them, according to the aforesaid "letter," had to go. Gray's team, whose players had had an extremely successful season, had "other engagements" and declared themselves unable to play the final match. The B.B.L. called the match off, apologized to the challenging team, sent their money back and selected Gray's team.

Wot a performance!
And now, 1950. One great advance has been made. The system of _ad hoc_ trials, with choice of team depending on the result, a system which has been violently attacked over the last two years, has been abandoned. Four players have been nominated for both men’s and women’s events as the probable nucleus. The teams are to be completed after performance in this year’s competitions has been noted. The four men who have been nominated are:—

M. Harrison-Gray, A. Meredith, J. T. Reese, B. Shapiro.

I have no quarrel in principle with this idea of naming four players in advance. If the players are outstanding it is absurd to submit them to the hazard of trials.

The two women’s pairs who have been similarly nominated are:—

Mrs. F. Gordon and Mrs. H. Renshaw; Mrs. P. Williams and Mrs. H. R. Evans.

Here there are more grounds for criticism. In the first place, form among the women is very much more equal than among the men. There is therefore much less case for picking four so far in advance. The four named are all excellent players, but inevitably some injustice is done to others who are at least in the same class: Mrs. Fleming, for instance, who has three times done well in the Masters Pairs, and whose team has never been beaten in trials in this country.

And it is bound to be pointed out that Mrs. Williams and Mrs. Evans have never even played together in a big event. I admire them both; they may be an excellent pair; but on what grounds are they segregated in this fashion?

We _ought_ to win the women’s championship just as we have won the men’s. We just haven’t put our best foot forward. It is not easy to pick our best team, I agree. It has been done for the most part by the bad system of _ad hoc_ Trials.

Might not the selectors have been expected, if not to co-opt, at least to consult, people like Harrison-Gray and myself who have coached the leading women players, who have played with and against them for years, and who are reckoned to be fair judges? And yet, for all the endless talk there has been about the composition of these teams, I can say that I at least have never been asked, formally or informally, to give an opinion about the composition, training, or captaincy of the women’s teams.

To find the best team, practice matches are needed, in which teams of men would take part. This would both improve the women’s game and help the men to judge who were the strongest players. I would, like Cleon,* respond at any time to a challenge to choose and direct a women’s team that would walk the championship.

To return to the men. What should happen? First of all, the idea that a Council elected for

* For the benefit of readers who have forgotten their Greek history, Cleon was an Athenian demagogue of humble origin. Exasperated by his continual criticisms, during a war, of the city’s military leaders, the Athenians put him in command of their armies and invited him to do better. _He did._—EDITOR.
general reasons is qualified for the special task of selection should be forgotten. Two alternatives are possible; to some extent they can be combined. One method is for the B.B.L. to appoint a selection committee similar to the group of scrutineers who watched the final trial this year. They were:—Pavlides, Leist, Marx, Ellison, Merkin, Pearlstone, and J. Tarlo. All knowledgeable players who for one reason or another were not at the time in the running for a place in the team.

The other method is to select two or three players who are thought to be certainties for the team and let them choose the others.

The obvious objection to the last proposal is that the players would tend to select their own friends and team-mates. That is true, but no harm would be done to the efficiency of the team. The difference between one first-class player and another is generally slight, and much more important than a slight difference in individual talent is that the players should like and respect one another and that they should combine without any sense of rivalry.

It is worth remarking that in a game like cricket, in which individual form is easier to assess than in bridge, the selectors, although themselves former first class players, have not disdained to co-opt players like Hammond and Sutcliffe who were themselves certainties for the team.

Conclusion: Of Which it is Written, In Shallow Water, Dragons are the Laughing-stock of Shrimps.

To sum up, these are the points I have made:—

1. Only first class players can judge one another.

STREAMLINED BRIDGE

by

VICTOR MOLLO

Illustrations by ANTON

The Third Edition of this book is now available in convenient size.

9/6 net

The recommendation of The Times of 17th December 1947 still applies

"One of the most important problems at this season of the year is the selection of a Christmas present. If the recipient-to-be is a Bridge player there can be no happier choice than Streamlined Bridge."


2. The Council of the B.B.L. is not composed of first class players, and so prima facie should not undertake the task of selection.

3. That the country has been well represented the last two years has been despite, rather than thanks to, the B.B.L.'s conduct of affairs.

4. The B.B.L. should do one of two things: either appoint a selection committee of good players not contending for a place in the team: or let the foremost players build the team around themselves.

What could be more ludicrous than the present system whereby delegates travel down from Scotland to "select" players whom they do not know even by sight?

Must it go on that way?
WHO SHOULD SELECT?

A Reply by GEOFFREY L. BUTLER

(Chairman of the E.B.U. and Delegate to the B.B.L.)

Mr. Reese spoils his case by inaccuracies. Anyone can enjoy his witticisms at the expense of the Reverend Senator who exists only in Mr. Reese's imagination, but as he admits that the samples of conversation are not a fair picture, it seems pointless to include them in what is intended to be a responsible article. Incidentally, Mr. Reese was not among the Official Observers at the Women's Trials.

As far as the 1948 Copenhagen team is concerned, Mr. Reese says the Selectors were merely fortunate. He assumes that he knows what the B.B.L. would have decided if M. Harrison-Gray's team had lost the final trial. He says that he, Harrison-Gray and Shapiro would have been dropped. Since the team actually sent included seven out of the eight players in the last trial—four of the winners and three of the losers—it might have occurred to him that had the match gone the other way the Reverend Senators would still have found room for the three who, he says, were included only by good fortune.

Mr. Reese's third mis-statement is that the E.B.U. appointed the Official Observers for the 1949 Trials. In fact it was the B.B.L. Selection Committee that did so. Mr. Reese apparently does not know that the B.B.L. has always consulted the Captain of the winning team in the Trials, in making the final selection, and that both before Copenhagen and before Paris, M. Harrison-Gray in the Open Series and Mrs. Fleming in the Ladies have been consulted in picking their additional players from those competing.

Mr. Reese shifts his ground in his argument. He complains that for the 1949 Trials no advantage was to be given to the Copenhagen team. He has forgotten the meeting attended by his Captain and Vice-Captain when the team asked that no such advantage should be given.

In the event however they were the only team considered by the B.B.L. as worthy of exclusion from the Preliminary Contest. The B.B.L. did in fact, recognise their merit.

Mr. Reese has, in former pronouncements said that the duty of the B.B.L. selectors is to select. Now that they propose to do so without the Trials which caused so much ill-feeling in the last two years, and which were advocated by "the experts," he is perturbed that they have made the decision without consulting him.

Pre-war, of some twelve or fifteen countries in the European Bridge Championships, the British Team was in the habit of coming out fifth, seventh or eleventh. Post-war, the Men's Team has been first on each occasion and the Ladies Team second or third. Mr. Reese's proposal that some better plan must be found for selecting a suitable Team, and the experts called in for this purpose, seems to foreshadow a return to control by the experts.
Mr. Reese is not only an expert, but a professional player earning his living by teaching, writing or organizing Tournaments. I do not suggest for one moment he would favour "Clients" but the principle of selection by professionals is all wrong.

The B.B.L. has left the ultimate selection of Teams entirely open. Certain Pairs have been asked to practice together with "hopes." What method will be adopted for selecting the ultimate players has not yet been announced.

It would seem reasonable, having regard to past results, for the Bridge Players of Great Britain to have confidence in the duly elected representatives of the four countries which form the British Bridge League.

A CRITICISM

Mrs. McDougall, of the Gloucester Club—a near-successful contestant in last year's Ladies' Trials—has submitted to the British Bridge League a method of future selection which, she believes, will create less disagreement than those employed heretofore. These are:

1. Entries should be invited from Pairs, a suitable fee being charged.

2. A number (say, three) of Pairs Contests to be held in which each Pair plays under a code-number or letter; not by name. These code numbers or letters to be secret.

3. Two experts—her "obvious choice" would be M. Harrison-Gray and Terence Reese—to be appointed as official markers for these contests. Each hand would be marked for (a) bidding and (b) play.

4. At the conclusion of the contests, the four leading pairs to play a series of 100-board matches to eliminate any Pair who might be considered as failing in manners, ethics or physical endurance.

5. The four pairs thus chosen, if they passed all tests satisfactorily, should form the representative team.

6. If any of the four pairs has to be dropped for failure to satisfy the selectors in manners, ethics, or endurance, they should be informed of the reason in writing.

7. A vacancy so created, to be filled by the next-ranking pair from the initial contest.

8. A tie to be decided by the match-pointed results; recourse to match-points will not otherwise be utilised.

9. Markers and scorers to be compensated.

N.B. To make the marking simple, the Scorer will fill in bidding and leads in the normal way, but the Markers will have no clue to the identity of the players. No discussion of hands by the players to be permitted until after the tabulated results by the Markers have been posted. All results to be open to inspection.

Mrs. McDougall also writes to the Contract Bridge Journal:
I wish to put forward a suggestion concerning the selection of players for Masters events. These should, in my view, be based solely on performance in recognised National competition for which a scale of marks should be allotted.

Selection for certain Masters Events is now based on performance in certain Congresses, which should accept this position. In my view, she is so outstandingly suited for the Captaincy that no-one could replace her. So far as her qualities as a player go, I lament that she was unfortunately partnered in Paris, and, therefore, could not develop her natural skill and good performance at the game; but I certainly would not hesitate to place her (provided she is given the right partner) among the leading woman players of the country.

The same goes for Mrs. A. L. Fleming, who has more experience and knowledge of the game than most women players who may have been in better form recently. She has also (a most important factor) the best match-temperament. She is, moreover, always willing to learn, and is, therefore, improving all the time: another factor of cardinal importance. Beware the stars who think they can afford to stop learning because they know all that there is to know; such players will inevitably regress and slip down the perilous slope that leads to the Limbo of the Has Beens.

A SUGGESTION

The Editor
The Contract Bridge Journal.

Sir

I have always been deeply interested in women's bridge; and I have always been most anxious to discover and help to develop new talent. I therefore claim to be as fair and neutral a judge as is possible to humans with regard to the selection of the Ladies' Team for the Internationals at Brighton next year.

To begin with I accept the present selected nucleus as representative of all that is good and worthy in women's bridge; I am convinced the Selectors intended to do their best; and I well appreciate that their task was onerous. I want only to discuss three players who have been left out of the provisional Probable team.

I cannot understand—I speak personally—how any country in the world fortunate enough to "own" a Lady Rhodes could even hesitate to nominate her—and her alone—as the team Captain. As long as Lady Rhodes is available, no other woman some players worthy of representation have neither the time, the money nor the opportunity to attend.

The writer suggests the publication of an "Honours List" to assist in the invitation to Masters Events—a suggestion we commend to the consideration of both the B.B.L. and the E.B.U.
A third player who has been overlooked is Mrs. N. ("Pat") Gardiner, who assuredly deserves very careful consideration.

I do not believe that Great Britain lacks talent; but it needs a single individual who is willing to help the team to shape itself and "get together" in every sense. The material is there; but it requires the guidance of someone who is inspired and unselfish enough to work in the background with the single aim of making a coherent team-entity out of two or three pairs, or four or six players.

Pairs and players are useless until they have been moulded into one whole. They must play together, meet often, be friends and have much more in common than a system.

This creates the right spirit and enables them to win. And the British women should win at Brighton in 1950—and win in comfort.

Rixi Markus

Farewell to Acol?

by M. Harrison-Gray

The path of progress is sometimes hard to follow, in more senses that one.

Those who have helped in the development of Acol take special pride in the fact that the system has stood the test of time since the middle 'thirties without the necessity for a single change of any importance. In each edition of The Acol System of Contract Bridge the authors blandly assert "In fact, the system has not changed at all."

What a luxurious and unique reflection for any system enthusiast, and what a tribute to the late S. J. Simon J. C. H. Marx, and the inventors!

It is true that the poor old system has had to put up with quite a few insults and well-intentioned suggestions. It has been "improved" in various circles, by "streamlining," by the addition of the Prepared Club, the prohibition of opening bids on four-card majors, the substitution of Blackwood for the original

Four/Five (no objection to this, for those that like it—I don't). We are brutally put in our place from time to time, and learn to our chagrin in the pages of the Journal that "the scientists have match records better than anyone else."*

* See December, 1948, "Science for the Average Player," page 22.

I can't say that we have lost much sleep over this sort of worry. But—in the top circles at least—"science" is being pumped into Acol from a most insidious direction.

The surviving members of the original Acolytes—Marx, Macleod and the writer—have lately had some rude shocks to bear. As an example, let us study the pivot bid of the system in action:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West</th>
<th>East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♠ 9 6 2</td>
<td>♠ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♥ Q J 10 7 4 3</td>
<td>♥ A 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ 6</td>
<td>♦ A Q 10 9 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♣ 7 5 3</td>
<td>♣ A K Q 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dealer, West. North-South Game.
This hand occurred last April in the challenge match to decide the British team for the 1949 European Championship. It looks like a text-book example of how to reach game in the right suit following an Acol Two-bid.

East opens Two Diamonds and West gives the negative reply of Two No-Trumps. East in practice rebid Three Diamonds (some would prefer Three Clubs), and West is now free to bid his hand naturally—he tries Three Hearts. As it is improbable that East will have much in the way of Heart support, West obviously shows a long semi-solid suit without tops. East’s holding of Ace-Nine is more than adequate, so he gratefully bids Four Hearts and watches West display his skill in making 11 tricks.

This means a nice swing for their side, for in the other room East pushed his partner to Five Hearts which went one down.

Unfortunately the bidding didn’t go like that. Over Three Hearts East bid Four Clubs.

West, with a “sorry-I-spoke” expression, subsided. Four Clubs was three down.

And West (apparently) was to blame. His pass was “both in theory and in practice, wrong.” He should have bid Four Hearts!

He failed to realise (so he was told) that his bid of Three Hearts did not necessarily show a biddable suit—it might have been merely a Heart stopper to enable East to go Three No-Trumps.

We have earnestly studied the Acol book, which offers little enlightenment on this startling new suggestion.

Let us examine the rival theories from the angle of probabilities.

The first—where Three Hearts is taken to mean a long suit—is virtually foolproof. If opener has no Heart support and is unable to bid No-Trumps, he will obviously pass except in the most unusual circumstances, and Three Hearts will be the best spot. He can raise to Four Hearts on as little as the singleton King or a small doubleton. And experience shows that these situations crop up quite frequently.

The second theory—with Three Hearts merely indicating a Heart stopper—will work in one situation only. Opener must have one particular type of hand: a solid seven-card Diamond suit and the Aces of Spades and Clubs. A guarded King of Clubs instead of the Ace won’t help him much, for the defence won’t lead Clubs until it suits them—the automatic opening lead will be a Heart up to declarer’s avowed weakness. Unless responder happens to have the Ace of Hearts, opener’s hand must be something like this:

\[ \spadesuit A9 \heartsuit 62 \clubsuit AKQJ972 \diamondsuit A5 \]

Science has now steered the partnership into a cast-iron Three No-Trumps.

But would any other pair fail to reach the same contract with two bids less?

Surely, having opened Two Diamonds on such a hand, any bridge player will raise partner’s Two No-Trumps to Three? This is no time for science. If partner has nothing in Hearts, the opponents may still lead a Spade or a Club; and if they do lead Hearts, doesn’t declarer in practice invariably hold something like \( J10x \)? And if partner happens to have the King of Hearts, the hand is better played.
from his side of the table.

The next system "improvement" was seen in the match between Crockford's and the Americans:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♠ K 3</td>
<td>♠ A 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♥ J 8 3 2</td>
<td>♥ A 10 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ A Q J 9 6 4</td>
<td>♦ K 10 8 3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♣ 5</td>
<td>♣ K 5 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dealer, East. North-South Game.

Playing the Acol weak non-vulnerable No-Trump, the bidding went like this: 1 NT—3 ♦; 3 ♥—4 ♥; 6 ♦.

As North fortuitously held the King-Queen of Hearts, this contract only went one down, with nine tricks cold in No-Trumps on any lead.

Was West's bidding really necessary?

I wouldn't put it past him to construct a hand on which Five Diamonds or Four Hearts will make and Three No-Trumps will fail; but don't we all in practice shut our eyes to the singleton Club and the possibly perilous position of the King of Spades, and raise One No-Trump direct to Three? And aren't these contracts made nine times out of ten?

Three Diamonds, I admit, is the scientific bid. If East rebids Three No-Trumps, you pass and bask in a glow of virtue. Partner must now have a guard in every suit.

The trouble is that partner won't bid Three No-Trumps—for a very good reason.

Only an "old woman" will force with Three Diamonds when she (or he) wants the hand to be played in Three No-Trumps—"I bid Three Diamonds for you to go Three No-Trumps, partner!" Therefore East, unless he has a minimum No-Trump with no fit in Diamonds, will cast around for a more intelligent and constructive bid; for he knows that West's force either means slam aspiration or a hopelessly unbalanced hand.

But West has only a top-heavy 11 points opposite a weak No-Trump, and starts to shiver as soon as East leans forward.

The next example comes from our match against Sweden in Paris:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♠ A K 8 7</td>
<td>♠ Q J 9 5 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♥ K J 10 5 3</td>
<td>♥ . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ A 9</td>
<td>♦ K 10 7 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♣ 7 6</td>
<td>♣ A J 10 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dealer, West. East-West Game.

Our pair bid as follows:

1 ♠—3 ♠; 3 ♥—3 ♠; 4 ♦—4 ♠; 5 ♠—6 ♠.

This bidding doesn't exactly sound fluent, but they can't be blamed for reaching the slam which went one down in both rooms against bad distribution and good defence.

The point is—have Acol players really reached the period of enlightenment when they must open One Spade on the West hand? Does any bidding machinery exist for conveying to partner the fact that West has more Hearts than Spades, if he opens with the latter? Isn't the proud boast made again and again in their Bible that Acol players bid their cards naturally? Is it now a system crime for West to reverse for Two Spades after opening One Heart, if partner shows a goodish hand with a response of Two in a minor?
Finally, this hand appeared in the Press:

**West** | **East**
---|---
♠ K Q J 9 4  | ♠ A 10 8 6
♥ A Q 3  | ♥ 10 6 4
♦ K 6 2  | ♦ A
♣ A K  | ♣ J 9 5 4 3

Dealer, North. Love All.

**Bidding:**

| NORTH | EAST | SOUTH | WEST |
---|---|---|---|
No bid | No bid | 1 ♦ | Dble
1 ♣ | 2 ♠ | No bid | 4 ♠
No bid | 5 ♦ | No bid | 6 ♠

No comment on the bidding was made in the article, chief interest lying in East's correct line of play to make certain of 12 tricks. Before publication, however, the author expressed the following views in conversation:

(a) East's bid of Two Spades is unconditionally forcing.
(b) West's raise to Four Spades is a slam invitation.

It is difficult to reconcile these new theories with accepted Acol practice.

Firstly, the book states: "Acol players do not demand a very high degree of strength for take-out doubles, preferring a light double to a weak suit overall." We have all been doubting on 11 points and a bit of shape since the Acol Year One.

If a jump take-out by partner is to be considered forcing, either a colossal range must be given to the hands on which he makes a simple take-out, or the use of the "Lederer" double (an integral part of the system) is automatically ruled out. No longer can we contest the bidding over an opponent's One Diamond on something like this:

♠ K J 7 ♦ A Q 6 2 ♣ J 4 ♠ Q 10 8 6

The prospect of hearing partner force with Two Spades and having to see it through with this minimum is too horrifying.

Suppose you hold:

♠ K Q 9 3 ♥ A 10 4 2 ♦ 7 ♠ K 10 8 6

Right-hand opponent bids One Diamond and you double. One Heart on your left, and partner bids Two Spades. In the old days we used to raise him to Four Spades in spite of our poor point count. We had the shape and four good trumps. We didn't want partner to pass a simple raise to Three Spades, which might leave him worried about the length and quality of our trump support if he had bid on a weakish four-timer. But do you want partner to think that you have a slam in mind?

Let us take one more look at West's hand in the example on the previous page:

♠ K Q J 9 4 ♥ A Q 3 ♦ K 6 2 ♠ A K

He doubles South's One Diamond, North bids One Heart and from East comes the musical sound of Two Spades. The opponents' bidding can now be dismissed with contempt; obviously South's One Diamond was a pathetic third-hand semi-psychic. Must West really put the onus on East with a delicate, beautifully scientific slam invitation of Four Spades?

And must East accept the invitation if he happens to hold:

♠ A 10 8 6 3 ♥ 6 ♦ Q 10 3 ♠ Q J 9 5 ?

Do we really need all these contraptions of modern science to reach this slam? Can any bridge player, holding the West cards, fail to raise Two Spades direct to Six?

Two things strike a diehard Acolyte. East's Two Spades on the hand in question is normally treated as a limit bid. Whether or
not right-hand opponent has bid over the double, it is a convenient way of telling partner that your hand is a bit too good for a simple response of One Spade and that you have some hopes of game if his double happens to be better than a minimum.

But his hand is clearly limited. If he was set on reaching a game contract, even opposite a minimum double, he could have made a stronger call, such as a bid in one of the opponents’ suits. This theory is well covered in the book.

By the same token, West’s raise to Four Spades is another limit bid. He does not guarantee a game; but he does want to be in a game contract, possibly a sporting one, even allowing for the fact that East’s Two Spades might have been bid on minimum values.

To suggest, therefore, that East, having already limited his hand, should have to make a slam try over another limit bid (West’s Four Spades) would, in the old days, be complete anathema. It sounds like the very worst form of trap bidding.

And note: even though dummy goes down on the table with all of a 22 count, with five plus honour tricks, with enormous trump support and a providential holding in Clubs to fill in East’s losers— even then East has to play well to make the slam.

Is East really expected to picture this gigantic hand and make a slam try merely because West has jumped him to Four Spades?

I don’t like these new theories. They don’t seem to fit in with my pet slogan “Bid what you think you can make.”

They strike at the very roots of Acol philosophy.

SHARON IN DUTCH

Contract, Six Hearts by South; Lead, the King of Diamonds by West.

Mrs. Culbertson’s solution was to win the Diamond lead; draw trumps; play Ace of Spades and finesse the Ten and, subsequently to take a second finesse.

Sharon produced the superficially attractive method of winning the Diamond and ruffing a Diamond; crossing to the Ace of Trumps; and ruffing Dummy’s last Diamond. The King of Hearts clears all outstanding trumps (which break 2-2), and now the Ace King and a third Club put in one opposing hand with the unenviable task of
leading a Spade or conceding a ruff-discard which makes the Slam airtight.

In the problem, West held the Queen to four Spades and East the Knave doubleton. Mrs. Culbertson based her play on the theory that the outstanding Spades would be 4-2 rather than 3-3, and the Queen and Knave more probably split than in one hand. Sharon believed that so long as both Spade Honours were not opposite the hand which won the third round of Clubs, she was bound to gain: although she was willing to agree that some "stinkers" might false-lead the Knave from Queen Knave, or lead an Honour from nothing. The lead of a Spade Honour—inevitable in good play—puts one to a hideous guess.

Mr. A. R. Reid, who was one of the many to pin-point an error in Sharon's analysis, last Christmas, of the Bellanger Theory, writes as follows in defence of Mrs. Culbertson's line of play.

The Editor,
"The Contract Bridge Journal."

Sir:—

"C'est magnifique, mais ce n'est pas la guerre."

The article "Sharon and Josephine" published in your September issue made delightful reading, but, of course, it is built up on the same fundamental fallacy which I described in my Note in your March issue. You will no doubt recollect that in your May issue you published a most lucid letter from Mr. Hubert Phillips confirming my argument.

A correct application of the theory of probability shows that Mrs. Culbertson's is the better method of playing the hand. Admittedly it does not have a very great advantage over Sharon's—I calculate the odds in favour of Mrs. Culbertson at about 25 to 24—but this is a very different result from Sharon's claim that the odds in her favour are 3 to 2.

There must be many of your readers who, like Mr. Hubert Phillips, "do not like to see the theory of chances misrepresented" and I feel therefore that prominence should be given in the pages of the "Contract Bridge Journal" to the fact that the Sharon articles should be read entirely for their entertainment value. As such, they are superb.

Yours faithfully,

A. R. REID,
Edinburgh.

P.S. The article, of course, contains other fallacies (more easily detected and therefore less dangerous) in addition to the fundamental 'probability' fallacy: for example, it is not necessary for the missing honours to be divided in order that Mrs. Culbertson's play should succeed.

There is, however, a third method of tackling the hand; and while the Editor of the Journal is no mathematician, this appeals to him as a bridge player.

Win the Diamond and take two rounds of trumps. If they break—as they do—cash Ace and King of Spades. If an Honour drops on these two rounds, the hand is a pianola. If the Queen and Knave of Spades drop Doubleton, you make Seven. If neither comes down, you must play for a 3-3 split and, if that works, the hand is safe for Six.
The only distribution that kills this is Q J to four (or more) Spades in one hand. Whether this is a better percentage play than those advocated by Mrs. Culbertson or Mademoiselle Sharon, I wouldn’t know.

On reflection, however, I believe the best line of play is a combination of all:

Win Diamond and ruff Diamond; make Ace of Hearts, ruff Diamond and play King of Hearts; play Ace and King of Spades. If no Honour drops, play a third Spade, for a 3-3 break. If, however, either opponent shows out on the second Spade, the best shot is now to play Ace and King of Clubs! The third Club may put in the hand without the Spades and the ruff-discard is inescapable.

One thing my method avoids: the maddening feeling when East bobs up with Q J x of Spades and a Palooka makes the contract where the Expert fails.

One more point: the bidding was, with N-S Game, E-W Love, One Heart, Two No Trumps (fording-to-game), Five Hearts, Six Hearts. British bidding would go a little differently: North might bid 3 N.T. to One Heart, might show One Spade, might do a lot of things. But, whatever means was exploited to reach Six Hearts, the fact that West passed and led the King of Diamonds ought to give South pause in his play when the Hearts break evenly.

West has, presumably, at least four Diamonds, if not five; and two Hearts (shown). Without the former, the King of Diamonds would be a bad lead in expert play. It is probable, then, that West does not also hold much of a Spade suit, or—not Vulnerable against Vulnerable opponents—West might have taken some action: on ♠ Q J x x and ♥ K 10 x x, a butt-in might be found.

Therefore, my own preference would be to lead low from North rather than from South, playing East for at least one Spade Honour—if I did not play off the two Spade winners. This would, I know, involve taking, a finesse on the first round, merely because of the entry situation: I should be tempted to lead the Eight, ducking from South. As it happens, this line works where the finesse through West puts Declarer to a horrible guess.

There is one thing about Sharon: she may not be right in her “projects” for Miss Poindexter’s Academy, but by the Lord Harry, she gets the bridge-players thinking.

MR. REID’S POSTSCRIPT

I. The various distributions of the Spade suit with their respective probabilities are as shown on page 19.

II. Assuming that West is the player to whom the lead is thrown by the play of the Club suit, then:

Mrs. Culbertson’s plan succeeds in all cases except Nos. 12, 16, 19 and 20.

The Editor’s in all cases except Nos. 1, 2, 5 and 16,

and Sharon’s in all cases except Nos. 8, 12, 16, 17, 18, and 19.

Continued on page 19
BEATING THE COUNT

by EWART KEMPSON

In the days of my youth I indulged in the box-fight with great enthusiasm. Out of fifteen staged contests I drew three, won two and lost ten. As a protagonist of the box-fight I was not a success but I am inordinately proud of never having been knocked out.

In managing to beat the count, I moved quickly, guarded my points with great care, played foxy when in an extra tight corner, rested my 147 pounds for brief periods in a horizontal position.

All this came back to me as I looked at a hand from a recent match in which Colonel Walshe, Mr. Pavlides, Dr. Hurley, my wife and I struggled home by 570 points against Mr. J. O'Neill, Mrs. McMenamin, Mr. Des Purcell, Mr. L. Bastow, Mr. Dermot Egan, Mr. Noel Byrne and Dr. R. Belton in Dublin.

The hand was dealt by West with East-West vulnerable:—

- K J
- Q 10 6
- S 3 2
- A Q J 10 3
- A 4
- J 9 7 3
- A K J 10 6
- 7 5

In Room 2 the bidding was brief and uninspired:—

WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH
Mrs. McMenamin Hurley Bastow Kempson
1 ♠ 2 ♠ No bid 2 ♦
No bid No bid No bid

In the other room the bidding was:

Pavlides Belton Walshe Purcell
1 ♠ 2 ♠ No bid 2 ♦
No bid 3 ♠ No bid 3 ♦
No bid 4 ♦ No bid No bid No bid
No bid

Mr. Pavlides led the King, the Ace and the Four of Hearts. East ruffed with the Seven of Diamonds and led the Six of Spades. The declarer played the Ace of Spades and then led the Seven of Clubs, Dummy's Ten winning. A Diamond was led from the table, East played the Four, South the Ace and West the Five.

Mr. Purcell now led the Five of Clubs, West played the King and Dummy's Ace won. On the lead of a Diamond from the North hand, East played the Nine and this is where you take over the South hand. Do you finesse the Knave of Diamonds or do you play the King?

You know that West started with four Hearts because East held only two. You are practically sure that West started with five Spades because he bid the suit without the Ace, King or Knave. He has played one Diamond and two Clubs so his thirteenth card is the vital one.

What about East? He held two Hearts and he ruffed the third round with the Seven of Diamonds subsequently playing the Four. An echo in trumps is made when holding three cards, plus the ability to ruff something. At Trick
4 East led the Six of Spades (surely the lowest of four) in the hope that West held the Ace and would give him another ruff.

Surely East’s hand is easily counted: four Spades, two Hearts, three Diamonds and four Clubs. Surely West’s unknown card is the Queen of Diamonds.

Here is the deal in full:

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

By the clever play of ruffing the third Heart with the Seven of Diamonds, and by the equally brilliant defence of playing the King of Clubs on the second round, East and West could have forced South to play the King of Diamonds at Trick 8.

But as neither of these plays was really made, Mr. Purcell finessed the Knave of Diamonds and made ten tricks.

It should be noted that only the joint defence described above beats the count; one is useless without the other.

And in any case it doesn’t explain how I came to stop at Two Diamonds with Three No Trumps cold.

---

**Contract Bridge Journal**

Sharon in Dutch (continued from page 17)

III. Translated into probabilities, the foregoing means that the probability of play succeeding is:

- Mrs. Culbertson’s: 12,496/16,100
- Editor’s: 12,080/16,100
- Sharon’s: 11,966/16,100

IV. The probability of the Editor’s play succeeding is, however, almost certainly better than the figure shown because no account in the foregoing is taken of the fact that the player with the long spade suit will be less likely to be thrown into the lead by the Club play. If due regard is paid to this it seems that the Editor’s play will be the best of all.

---

**Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Number of times distribution may be expected to occur out of 16,100 deals.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>WEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>♦QJxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>♦QJxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>♦Qxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>♦Jxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>♦QJx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>♦Qxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>♦Jxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>♦xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>♦QJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>♦Qxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>♦Jxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>♦xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>♦Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>♦Qx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>♦Jx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>♦xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>♦Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>♦J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>♦x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>♦ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 16,100
PORTLAND CLUB DECISIONS

The Contract Bridge Journal is privileged to record the following decisions:

It was reported that the Secretary of the Cairo Committee of the Egyptian Bridge Federation had written as follows to the Chairman during August in connection with a Tournament played at one of the Cairo Clubs.

"Law 86. (Defender claiming or conceding tricks). Does the wording, 'A defender may show any or all of his remaining cards to declarer,' mean that he puts his cards down, or is the wording to be taken as meaning that he shows his cards secretly to declarer only? If this be the case and the defender shows his cards to the table can declarer claim a penalty and have these cards considered as exposed cards?"

The Chairman had replied, "Law 86 only permits a defender to show his cards to the declarer. If he makes a claim by announcing a card or cards that he holds he becomes liable to a penalty under Law 20 (b). If he exposes his hand the cards are exposed cards and subject to penalty. Declarer should not, however, take advantage of this to claim more tricks than he would normally and properly have made." Approved.

CANADA. A Canadian visitor to England asks:—

"Is it justifiable as a game to have on the table for reference a book issued by Culbertson giving the suggested bids and replies? Culbertson in his Preface or opening justifies the practice which to me seems absurd. If correct for one, all the players could do this and the game becomes the subject of long delays and loses the element of individual ability and memory."

It was resolved that this is a matter for the management of each Club and not a matter of Law. Few, if any, Clubs would be likely to permit the practice. In private houses the host stands in the same position as the Club Management Committee.

AMERICAN TEAM v. THE LYNDHURST CLUB. The Chairman reported a decision which he had been asked to make in a dispute during this Match. Declarer is playing a contract of Three No Trumps. There were five diamonds in dummy and one card of entry. Three rounds are played and there are left the 10 and 7 in dummy and the bare 8 in an opponent's hand. Declarer plays to the card of entry and says, "Play a Diamond." whereupon dummy played the 10. A defender protested and claimed that, as declarer had not named which diamond, they can make him play the 7. The Match Manager was called but said he could not give a ruling as no Duplicate Laws were available and nothing had been said as to which set of Duplicate Laws governed the Match. The Chairman of the Portland Club was rung up on the telephone and gave a decision that declarer had intended the diamonds to be played out in their natural order and that the play of the 10 could stand.

The Committee considered that the first question to be decided was as to what Laws operated in the Match.
The Americans might possibly have considered that the Match was being played under the new International Duplicate Laws which were then operative in America but not in England, or the 1943 American Duplicate Bridge Laws; with neither of which Sets of Laws were the English players familiar.

The current Set of Laws authorised by the English Bridge Union for use in England in Duplicate Matches were the Laws of Duplicate Contract Bridge 1935, (the 1943 American Duplicate Contract Bridge Laws never having been adopted in Great Britain.)

In issuing the 1948 International Laws of Rubber Bridge the Preface to the European Edition contained the following sentence:

"Until the new Edition of the Duplicate Bridge Laws is available, Duplicate Directors should follow the provisions in this book wherever they apply rather than any previous edition of Duplicate Bridge Laws."

The Committee decided that this proviso brought this particular dispute for decision under the 1948 Rubber Laws where the situation was covered by Law 20 (b). In the absence, therefore, of any evidence that a majority of the players had agreed that a play had been improperly suggested by dummy the Committee were unanimously of the opinion that the play of the 10 should stand.

The Committee felt that it would be useful, as the new International Duplicate Laws are about to come into operation in England, to give their decision had these new Laws been in operation.

Under the new Duplicate Laws the Director has to be called and "if dummy prematurely touches or indicates a card and the Director decides that such act was of assistance to declarer the Director may require or forbid declarer to play that card or its equivalent."

The Committee came to the conclusion by six votes for and three against, that having regard to the fact that both the declarer, by not naming the particular card, and the dummy, by not asking him which card he wanted, had committed offences, the Director would be justified in forbidding the play of the 10.

THE GLOUCESTER CLUB, LONDON, W. had asked for a ruling on the following point.

The cards were apparently correctly dealt and the bidding completed and the opening lead made. On the declarer's partner tabling her cards which included the Spade Ace, the leader also tabled her cards saying, "I also have an Ace of Spades." It was then discovered that the leader's Ace belonged to another pack and that apart from this all the hands were correct.

Perhaps you will say whether or not there should be a redeal. I would draw your attention to the fact that on this question Paras. 12 and 14 of the International Laws appear to be contradictory.

A reply had been sent to the Gloucester Club by the Secretary with the concurrence of two members of the Card Committee, informing them that there must be a redeal.

The Committee finally decided that it would seem probable
the leader had picked up the card from the other pack and the deal had, therefore, been correctly made. In that event the reply sent to the Gloucester Club would have to be withdrawn and the decision would be that the deal must stand with the consequent penalties in respect of the exposed hand.

The Committee felt that there was no contradiction between Paras. 12 and 14, the latter referring to cards from the pack in use and not to cards from other packs or games.

(Since the Committee's decision two new factors have been discovered. (1) The second Ace of Spades was of a different colour and, therefore, could not, as a separate card, have been included in the deal. (2) It had not come from the other pack of cards on the table which was complete with its own Ace of Spades. The only inference seems to be, therefore, that two cards were stuck together in the deal and that the additional Ace of Spades became unstuck in the leader's hand. In these circumstances the Chairman has decided to leave the original decision as it stands at any rate until the next meeting of the Card Committee.)

THE WESSEX CLUB OF BOURNEMOUTH asks for a ruling in the following circumstances:—

The contract was Three No Trumps by South and East led a small Spade out of turn as the initial lead before dummy had been exposed. The declarer pointed out the irregularity. "The question then arose whether Rule 54 or 55 applied. If 54 the procedure was quite clear, but if 55 the matter was in doubt. The declarer wished the lead to be treated as a correct lead but (1) does he decide this before dummy is exposed or after, and (2) must West lead a Spade and is the declarer the fourth or second player?"

The Committee decided that declarer may make his decision at any time before a card is played by declarer even if dummy has inadvertently exposed his hand before attention has been called to the incorrect lead. If declarer decides that the lead shall stand then he becomes the second player and play continues as though it were a correct lead. Dummy can be exposed before declarer plays from his own hand.

If the declarer wishes to have the lead from the correct hand Section 57 (b) applies.

There seems to be some confusion between Laws 54 and 55. Some players seem to think that a lead out of turn can be dealt with under either Law. This is not so. Section 54 applies as to the first part to an offence committed by a defender who exposes a card before play to the previous trick has been completed, and as to the second part where a player "plays out of rotation," i.e. where rotation has already started. It can never apply to an initial lead.

The Committee gave further consideration to the time at which an opponent can ask to have a Conventional Bid explained to him. It was finally decided to allow such a question to be put by a player at any time until the Auction is closed.
ONCE again Dun Laoghaire’s Congress provided the curtain-raiser for another season, a season which promises to be both the busiest and the most interesting we have experienced. Amongst the multitude which thronged the Town Hall (until yours truly was almost compelled to run an Open Pairs on the roof) we were delighted to renew many friendships from across the channel and still more pleased to greet new friends. Miracle of miracles, none of our Trophies left our shores, thanks mainly to a couple named Ruth Giddings and Dermot Egan. This pair accomplished the wonderful feat of winning both the Mixed Pairs Championship and the Congress Pairs Championship—a performance which I venture to prophesy will not easily be equalled. David Rivlin, P. P. Donovan, Mrs. E. McCarthy and P. McKenna retained possession of the Team-of-four Championship and Mrs. F. McMenamin’s team improved on their Runner-Up position of last year, by winning the Ladies Team-of-Four. The other members of her team were Mrs. R. McConkey, Mrs. V. Mahon and Mrs. J. J. O’Doherty.

There was unanimous agreement amongst our players that if we were to continue to compete in the European Championships and have any hope of making even a
good showing, we would have to get down to the task of team-building in real earnest. A scheme was finally approved, which provided for the selection of twelve men and the nomination of the six ladies who represented us in Paris, as provisional Panels, the players on which would undergo a course of intensive practice. Provision was made that either Panel could be challenged by a team and if such team were successful in winning, they would automatically be added to the Panel. Even if not successful, one or more of the players could be selected for further training, at the discretion of the Selectors. The twelve men selected are:—J. J. Bastow, E. O. Barry, P. P. Donovan, D. Egan, J. Harold, J. A. Kelly, R. Belton, F. W. O'Connell, J. M. O'Sullivan, N. Peart, T. D. Purcell, R. Sheehan. No challenge has been received by this Panel as yet, but the ladies have been called to battle by the \( Continued \ on \ page \ 31 \)

**Fifteen Years After**

**A Correction**

by LESLIE DODDS

TURN the page of Scrap-Book (Bridge variety) back to 1934. Ewart Kempson, Lion of the North, was playing in the Gold Cup with his favourite partner, Selby Wraith. The hands fell as follows and Wraith at South was in Seven Spades:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\spadesuit KQx \\
\heartsuit AK8xx \\
\diamondsuit Qx \\
\clubsuit K73 \\
\spadesuit 85 \\
\heartsuit J10942 \\
\diamondsuit ? \\
\spadesuit ? \\
\clubsuit AJ9xxx \\
\heartsuit Qx \\
\diamondsuit Ax \\
\spadesuit A8x \\
\end{array} \]

West opened his top Heart, won by the Queen; two rounds of trumps were all that were needed; and a second round of Hearts broke the bad news. Wraith now embarked on a Vienna Coup, played off the King of Hearts and Ace of Diamonds, following with four trumps. Now, if East had held the Diamond King, the Grand Slam would have been landed; but the Red Minor Monarch bobbed up in the West hand and the squeeze failed, together with the Kempsonian hopes for that year's Gold, since the small slam was bid next door and was a pianola for twelve tricks.

Now, fifteen years later, Mr. Leslie Dodds re-read on a sleepless night as a (much too exciting) soporific "Kempson on Contract" wherein the hand is recorded. He writes, with characteristic generosity to his old friend the author: "I found the hand played by Wraith where he failed to make Seven Spades, which was not surprising; but where you failed to detect the error, which is really quite amazing." Mr. Dodds goes
on to say he thought the readers of the Contract Bridge Journal would be interested; and suggested sending the following analysis to the Editor, if E.K. would give his permission. This was, equally characteristically, forthcoming.

Now, Leslie Dodds _loquitur:—_

"Let us do what Wraith should have done: consider what a simple hand this is if we refuse to be confused by the fact that North holds the Queen of Diamonds; let us consider the situation as if North's holding were merely two small Diamonds: for the Queen in question is a mirage.

"It now becomes obvious that the play of the King of Hearts at Trick 11 must infallibly squeeze West. The play is easy:—Trick 5, 6, 7 and 8 are won by South's four remaining trumps, North discarding a Heart, a Diamond and a Club; and at this stage, the only "view" to be taken is as to whether West has three Clubs with his two remaining Hearts, or has he some other holding? This should not be difficult, as there have been eight Club and Diamond discards from East and West, each one of which must have been informative.

"If West holds three Clubs, the play is: Trick 9, Ace of Diamonds; Trick 10, King of Clubs; Trick 11, King of Hearts, squeezing East. If West holds anything else, the sequence is altered to Trick 9, Ace of Clubs; Trick 10, King of Clubs; Trick 11, King of Hearts—still squeezing East.

"Yes," concludes Mr. Dodds, "the contract can always be made against any adverse distribution; and—but for that misleading Queen of Diamonds—Wraith would have found the answer!"

(Mr. Dodds, by the way, was surprised Mr. Kempson omitted to find this answer before he wrote up the hand; but it is only fair to E.K. to state that Mr. Dodds admits to having dipped 100 times into "Kempson on Contract" before writing—whenever he completed—this corrective analysis.)

NEW BOOKS

reviewed by M. HARRISON-GRAY

HOW'S YOUR BRIDGE

_by Florence Osborn_  
(Faber and Faber, 10/6)

However excellent the material and eminent the author, the text book on bridge can never benefit more than a small section of the community.

One reason, of course, is the appalling "unreadability" of most bridge writers, which reduces to sheer hard labour an appreciation of the points of value. Simon was quick to cash in on the partiality of the bridge public for bright and snappy writing with deft human touches.

But the keen enthusiast who decides to digest "Dixey on Strip-Play" for an hour in bed each night will merely drift into a stupor. Take the classic loser-on-loser example on page 473. If the reader were to lay out the cards and peg away until he had made Four Spades by his own unaided efforts, he might eventually develop into a better man; but why should he exert himself when he has only to read on to see how it is done; and anyway he is never likely to meet such a hand, so why should he bother to memorise the exotic technique? And so the value of
Mr. Dixey's teaching goes out of the window.

It seems to me, therefore, that the book in the form of a quiz is the answer to the bridge player's prayer. It has been tried before; it will be tried again; but a famous American teacher, Florence Osborn, Bridge Editor of the *New York Herald Tribune*, has hit the jackpot.

Her book is divided into 50 sections, each containing four problems on bidding and one on play; and believe it or not, they are the sort of problem that you and I are up against every day. Here is one taken at random:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>♠️ 7</th>
<th>♥️ A Q J 6 2</th>
<th>♦️ 7 5</th>
<th>♣️ A Q 10 5 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ♠️</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>1 ♠️</td>
<td>No bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ♠️</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>2 ♠️</td>
<td>No bid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You are South with the above cards. What call do you make now?

This is the answer: "South passes, as the hand has fizzled into a misfit. North has been unable to raise either of his partner's suits or to bid No-Trumps, so he must have a long Spade suit and not much else. With no hope of a game, South has no choice but to pass."

How many of us can bear to pass partner's second bid of Two Spades with this hand? But surely we recognise the lay-out. Wasn't it on just such a hand that we pressed on only the other day, to wind up with a toss for 800?

This is an American book, but the usual stumbling block for British readers has been cleverly avoided. In submitting our solutions, for instance, to *Bridge World* problems, we are often infuriated with the audacity of the Americans in daring to differ with us on points of bidding technique. I am assured that Mrs. Osborn has taken special pains to bring the bidding problems into line with current British practice, and I for one have no quarrel with her answers. This is a rare compliment to be paid by an American writer and, we might be permitted to hope, a sign of the times.

**THE SQUEEZE AT BRIDGE**

*by H. G. Frechill*

(Faber and Faber, 10/6)

It is many years since we have had a monograph on Squeeze play. This book is an attempt to cover the subject in all its aspects—a formidable task indeed, but in my opinion no one has done it better than this former Irish international.

Soon after I started playing bridge, I remember asking the self-appointed club expert for an explanation of squeeze play. "Nothing in it," he replied airily, "you just play off all your trumps and hope someone will discard the wrong thing." This book is for the seeker after perfection who realises that there is rather more in the subject than the above advice can cover.

As Guy Ramsey very properly points out in his preface, the cardinal requirement for execution is recognition. This is brought out in one of Frechill's museum pieces, an example of the rare double ruffing squeeze:

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

The Queen of Diamonds is led and South has to make Seven Hearts. As the lead marks West with the Knave and East with the Ace, the trained mind recognises that dummy's King-Ten of Diamonds is a double ruffing menace that offers a far better chance for the contract than the simple Spade finesse.

Dummy therefore plays low to the opening lead and South ruffs. After five rounds of Hearts, three Clubs and the King of Spades, this position is reached:

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

Now the play of the King of Clubs (note the lead is in dummy) squeezes
both East and West simultaneously. Work it out.

The book includes a remarkable series of example hands, each of which is preceded (an excellent feature, this) by a matrix showing the basic position. It is idle to suggest that a close study of

The Squeeze at Bridge will make you an expert practitioner in five minutes or even five weeks; but as nothing gives quite such a glow of satisfaction as a cleverly executed squeeze, it will presumably have been a worthwhile labour.

RESULTS

GOLD CUP

G. F. Mathieson beat
R. J. T. Gibson by 39 I.M.P.
Dr. Wood Hill beat
C. B. Landau by 3 I.M.P.
Guy Ramsey beat
Mrs. R. McDougall by 16 I.M.P.
A. Elliott beat
Mrs. P. M. Williams by 9 I.M.P.
Mrs. Harrison-Gray beat
Major F. North by 41 I.M.P.
G. C. H. Fox beat
E. W. Tuck by 67 I.M.P.
J. T. Reese beat
F. R. G. Charters by 41 I.M.P.
Mrs. C. H. Griffiths beat
J. Joseph by 5 I.M.P.
F. Farrington beat
R. Vincent by 56 I.M.P.
H. Franklin beat
G. L. Mitchieson by 69 I.M.P.
R. B. Everett beat
T. O. Penn by 25 I.M.P.
W. Morley Burry beat
Emlyn Lewis by 30 I.M.P.
Gordon D. Johnstone beat
T. M. Bone by 24 I.M.P.
Ralph Evans beat
Baroness Knoop by 43 I.M.P.

2nd Round (to be completed by December 11th)
Miss M. Jonas beat
R. Evans by 1 I.M.P.

Southern Area, 1st Round

Mrs. G. Barnett beat
G. G. Wilson by 12 I.M.P.
H. P. F. Swinnerton Dyer beat
Baroness Knoop by 1 I.M.P.
(2nd Round to be completed by December 18th).

Northern Area

H. Franklin beat
J. E. West by 35 I.M.P.
(2nd Round to be completed by December 18th)

WHITELAW CUP

Mrs. Fitzgibbon (Worthing) beat
Mrs. E. Morgan (Worthing) by 1540 pts.
Mrs. A. L. Fleming (Tunbridge Wells) beat
Mrs. S. Harrison-Gray (London) by 810 pts.
Mrs. A. Hurner (Middlesex) beat
Mrs. N. I. Parker (Kent) by 3820 pts.
Mrs. E. S. Holland (Nottingham) beat
Mrs. G. Tracey (Scunthorpe) by 7690 pts.
Mrs. R. Evans (Bournemouth) beat
Mrs. Flemmish by 190 pts.
(2nd Round to be completed by December 11th)

NATIONAL PAIRS

North of England Championship
Scunthorpe Heat

Mrs. Vickers and Mrs. Cartwright.
Mrs. G. Tracey and Mrs. D. Hatson.
Mrs. W. E. Vickers and Mrs. Brereton
MELVILLE SMITH TROPHY
R. T. Gibson beat
J. H. Hammond, by 180 pts.
J. Griffiths beat
C. E. Davis by 80 pts.
A. J. Smith beat
W. Carmichael Mason by 1780 pts.
M. Wolach beat
A. Elliott by 2950 pts.
Mrs. P. Williams beat
G. Ramsey by 3390 pts.
L. Tarlo beat
S. C. Kastell by 870 pts.
Mrs. R. McDougall beat
J. Nunes by 420 pts.
Dr. J. Whitby beat
R. Swingler by 6680 pts.
Mrs. Markus beat
Mr. H. Freeman by 1740 pts.

SIDNEY WOODWARD CUP
Mrs. Bill beat
Major F. North by 1140 pts.
A. J. R. Blok beat
Major W. E. L. Rees by 3750 pts.
W. S. Grimshaw beat
Miss Dransfield by 1710 pts.

DUVEEN SHIELD
Division I
A. S. Stockton beat
Miss H. Harris
Civil Service C.B.A.1 beat
G. B. Burrows
Civil Service C.B.A.1 draw
H. W. Haycocks
C. G. H. Fox beat
G. B. Burrows

Division II
Gloucester Club I beat
J. A. T. de Boer by 2360 pts.
R. F. R. Phillips beat
W. B. Softlaw by 1060 pts.
J. Lincoln beat
N. F. Wallis by 3520 pts.
G. A. Miller beat
Cdr. P. G. Richards by 2570 pts.

Division III
M. F. Saunders
Battersea Polytechnic beat
May and Baker II by 2070 pts.
P. C. Shepherd beat
Imperial College II by 830 pts.

LONDON FLITCH
G. Forbat, L. Bradley, R. H. Newman,
P. Gordon, J. Tarlo, P. Kuhn,
M. Fenton, A. L. Della-Porta, Trevor
Harris, L. Tarlo.

Surrey Heat
Mr. and Mrs. Blok. Mr. and Mrs. Burns.

PAIRS GOBLETs
Miss M. Hearn and J. H. Boatman.
L. J. Homan and K. Hacke.
W. Carmichael-Mason and A. Stein.
Mrs. D. K. Gill and Mrs. Funnell.
A. Lederer and W. Langert.
Baroness Knoop and Mrs. N. Kahn.
L. Wolfers and A. Igel.
Mr. and Mrs. F. W. Collins.
Mrs. P. M. Williams and F. Emmet.
I. P. Gibb and G. G. Robson.
G. D. Sharpe and E. G. Broadbent.
Mr. and Mrs. A. E. Cole.
Mr. and Mrs. H. Freeman.
W. S. Grimshaw and Dr. P. A. Browne.

The players in the London Masters’ Individual are:—
L. Baron
S. Bendix
S. Booker
L. W. Dodds
L. Ellison
N. Gardener
M. Harrison-Gray
K. W. Konstam
Dr. H. Leist
Dr. S. Lee
Mrs. R. Markus
J. C. H. Marx
L. Tarlo

G. Mathieson
J. Pavlides
J. Pearstone
R. Preston
E. Rayne
J. T. Reese
Dr. M. Rockfelt
A. Rose
B. Shapiro
N. Squire
R. Swimer
J. Tarlo

Three sessions will be played, each
at 8 p.m., at the London Club,
16 Berkeley Street, W.1. Spectators
will be welcomed—\textit{with no charge for admission}.

ORDER OF MERIT

The monthly prize of Two Guineas
for the best set of solutions to the
October Competition is awarded to
E. F. Habben, 15 Poplar Walk,
Herne Hill, S.E.24, who scored 74
points out of a possible 100. G. L. H.
Mence (Hove) scored 81, but as a
previous prize-winner in the current
six-monthly period is not eligible.

\textit{Runners-up:} Miss W. Jewson
(Pevensky) 72, J. D. L. Harmer
(London, W.C.2.) 66, M. Hayes
(Bridgend) 64, E. H. Lewis-Dale
(London, N.W.2.) 63, T. S. MacCarrick
(Co. Clare) 60.

\textit{Leading Scorers in Six-Monthly Competition:} G. L. H. Mence, 200,
J. A. Gould (Surrey) 193, Dr. R.
McMahon (Essex) 188, E. F. Habben
175, J. W. Gerber (Renfrewshire) 172.
This month's Competition

by Edmund Phillips

The CONTR A CT BR IDGE 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 Jan. 7th, 1950. Solutions and names of prize winners in the November Competition will appear next month.

PROBLEM No. 1 (12 points).
East-West Game. You, South hold:

\[ \spadesuit 7 2 \heartsuit Q 10 8 3 \diamondsuit A 5 \clubsuit 10 9 8 7 6 \]

The bidding proceeds:

West North East South

1 \spadesuit 3 \heartsuit 4 \diamondsuit ?

What do you bid?

PROBLEM No. 2 (12 points).

Love All. You, South hold:

\[ \spadesuit J 8 7 5 \heartsuit 6 \diamondsuit A 5 \clubsuit J 10 7 6 4 2 \]

North, the dealer, opens One Heart and East Passes. What do you bid?

PROBLEM No. 3 (12 points).

Love All. You, South, hold:

\[ \spadesuit K 6 \heartsuit A J 10 9 7 5 \diamondsuit K 10 4 \clubsuit 4 3 \]

The bidding proceeds:

South North

1 \heartsuit 2 \spadesuit

3 \diamondsuit 4 \flush

What do you bid?

PROBLEM No. 4 (12 points)

East-West Game, You, South, hold:

\[ \spadesuit A K J 8 \heartsuit 2 \diamondsuit J 10 7 6 4 \clubsuit K 9 3 \]

The bidding proceeds:

East South West North

1 \heartsuit Double No bid 1 NT

2 \spadesuit ?

What do you bid?

PROBLEM No. 5 (12 points).

North-South Game. You South hold:

\[ \spadesuit K Q 9 6 5 3 \heartsuit J 9 8 \diamondsuit 7 \clubsuit A J 10 \]

The bidding proceeds:

North East South West

1 \spadesuit 1 \heartsuit 1 \spadesuit No bid

2 \spadesuit No bid

What do you bid?

PROBLEM No. 6 (12 points)

East-West Game. You, South, hold:

\[ \spadesuit A K J 9 2 \heartsuit 10 3 2 \diamondsuit K 9 8 7 \clubsuit 4 \]

The bidding proceeds:

South West North East

1 \spadesuit No bid 2 \heartsuit 3 \spadesuit ?

What do you bid?

PROBLEM No. 7 (12 points)

Game All. North-South 20. You, South, hold:

\[ \spadesuit A 9 3 \heartsuit A J 7 5 \diamondsuit J 9 2 \clubsuit 7 6 4 \]

The bidding proceeds:

North East South West

1 \spadesuit 2 \heartsuit 2 \spadesuit 3 \spadesuit

No bid No bid ?

What do you bid?

PROBLEM No. 8 (16 points)

West East

\[ \spadesuit A K 4 \spadesuit 8 3 2 \]

\[ \heartsuit K 10 2 \heartsuit Q 5 \]

\[ \diamondsuit A Q 6 \diamondsuit J 7 4 2 \]

\[ \clubsuit A Q 5 3 \clubsuit K J 9 6 \]

Contract, Three No Trumps by West. North leads the Queen of Spades. Plan the play.

The Seasons Gift . . .

... for your Friends

A set of Bridge Ash Trays (4 pieces: 1 \spadesuit; 1 \heartsuit; 1 \diamondsuit; 1 \clubsuit) made from Cristall Glass . . . . 5/6 per set.

Also very attractive for Bridge Clubs 60/- per dozen sets.

GEORGE EAMES LTD.
26 Daleham Gnns, London, N.W.3
**Answers to November Competition**

**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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ♠</td>
<td>2 ♥</td>
<td>3 ♦</td>
<td>Double</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do you bid?

**Answer.**

1. Four Hearts—12 points. The bidding sequence has been peculiar, to say the least, and it is non-vulnerable partner rather than vulnerable opponents who should be suspect. If opponents' bidding is genuine, it is impossible, in view of your honour strength and two trumps, for partner to have a double. The only explanation is that he has unbalanced heart support, hopes for a cheap 'sacrifice and expects you to read the situation.

**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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOUTH</th>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ♠</td>
<td>1 ♠</td>
<td>2 ♥</td>
<td>No bid ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do you bid?

**Answer.**

2. Two No Trumps—12 points. Three Hearts—3 points. Partner's bid is of course forcing but you have opened on the weakest of balanced hands and should do your utmost to discourage. It is time you have no spade stopper, but partner will realize you are rebidding at an unexpectedly high level and will not go on in no-trumps unless he has something in spades himself.

**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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ♠</td>
<td>2 ♥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ♦</td>
<td>3 ♥</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do you bid?

**Answer.**

3. No bid—12 points. Four Spades—8 points. This is a fairly close decision. Partner has shown 6-4 distribution and sufficient honour strength to justify the forcing rebid of Three Diamonds despite the lack of fit for your suit. A typical hand would be:

| ♠ A K Q x x x ♥ x ♦ A Q x x ♠ x x ; opposite such a holding, ten tricks will depend on a three-three break in spades, odds which are just not quite good enough for a non-vulnerable game.

A "preference" bid in diamonds would of course be futile: you have no reason to expect Four Diamonds to be an easier contract than Three Spades.

**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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOUTH</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ♠</td>
<td>1 ♦</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do you bid?

**Answer.**

4. Two No Trumps—12 points. Three Clubs—6 points. With a count of 16, a six card suit and a fit for partner, you should want to make a strong rebid. Two No Trumps is better than Three Clubs because three to a low honour in either major suit will give you a certain double stopper only if the lead comes up to your hand.

**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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOUTH</th>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>1 ♥</td>
<td>Double</td>
<td>No bid ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do you bid?

**Answer.**

5. One Spade—12 points. Two Diamonds—5 points. One No Trump—2 points. Partner, having doubled hearts, probably has four spades, and with your weak hand you should not neglect a possible opportunity to sell out at the one level. Of the alternatives, the orthodox Two Diamonds is better
than One No Trump, since the latter bid normally indicates a minimum of one plus honour trick and is likely to encourage partner to continue.

**Problem No. 6 (28 points)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West</th>
<th>East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♠ A 9 5 2</td>
<td>♠ K 10 8 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♥ A 7 6</td>
<td>♥ K 9 5 3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ A 8 6 3</td>
<td>♦ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♣ 5 4</td>
<td>♣ A K Q 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

West deals at Love All. Bid the two hands.

**Answer.**

1. **Western**
   - No bid

2. **East**
   - 1 ♠
   - 3 ♠
   - 4 ♣
   - 4 NT
   - 5 ♦
   - 6 ♠

No bid

1. **A maximum pass.**

2. **A one-over-one bid in this situation is so rarely passed that it is better to make the exploratory approach than to jump to Three Hearts with only three card trump support.**

3. **East surely wants to be in game, and there is still the faint possibility of a slam.**

4. **No need to hurry. West will of course make a slam invitation later.**

5. **Completing the picture of his distribution.**

6. **The Culbertson convention.**

7. **East has the requirements for 5 NT, but must sign off! Partner has shown three aces but, having passed originally, can have no other pictures. Also, by his preference bid, he has shown three cards in hearts. A loser in each major seems inevitable.**

8. **Completing his picture of distribution.**

9. **The Five Diamond bid can only be indicating a four card suit, hence a doubleton club. A discard for the losing heart is therefore available, making the slam just worth bidding.**

**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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ♦</td>
<td>2 ♠</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>2 NT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>3 ♦</td>
<td>No bid</td>
<td>3 NT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Pass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do you lead?

**Answer.**

The King of Spades—12 points. 

East's confident no-trump bidding surely shows a double stopper in hearts, hence a lead in that suit is likely to waste a tempo. The best chance seems to be to find partner with a spade suit. The king should be chosen because there may be a singleton queen on the table, and because you wish to force early entry into partner's hand.

Continued from page 24

Mrs. J. O'Neill, Mrs. J. J. O'Doherty, Mrs. V. Mahon, Mrs. R. Giddings, Mrs. F. V. Fowler and Mrs. N. Byrne.

The teams, ladies and mens, to compete at Brighton will be selected early in March and will then have a further period of training.
### ENGLISH BRIDGE UNION

**LIST OF SECRETARIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>British Bridge League</th>
<th>Major George Gray, 23 Clydesdale Gardens, Richmond, Surrey.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Bridge Union</td>
<td>Mrs. Stern, 7 Abbey Road, London, N.W.8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament Secretary</td>
<td>Major G. Fell, Craven Lead Works, Skipton, Yorkshire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Contract Bridge Association</td>
<td>F. M. Fletcher, Esq., 22 Fontayne Avenue, Chigwell, Essex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire Contract Bridge Association</td>
<td>W. Burnstone, c/o Town Clerk's Office, Market Place, Derby.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon Contract Bridge Association</td>
<td>G. Graham Wilson, Esq., Flat 2, 'Kincora,' Higher Warberry Road, Torquay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucestershire Contract Bridge Association</td>
<td>S. E. Franklin, Esq., Belmont Avenue, Hucclecote, Glos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire Contract Bridge Association</td>
<td>G. Weightman, Four Winds, St. Andrews Avenue, Harpenden, Herts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Contract Bridge Association</td>
<td>Mrs. Harvey, Manor House, Tunbridge Wells.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire Contract Bridge Association</td>
<td>L. G. Cayless, &quot;Farm Edge&quot; Leicester Road, Thurmaston, near Leicester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire Contract Bridge Association</td>
<td>Mrs. Turner and Mrs. Brumpton 81 Signhills Avenue, Cleethorpes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham Contract Bridge Association</td>
<td>Mrs. Bull, 28 Addison Street, Nottingham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Eastern Contract Bridge Association</td>
<td>G. I. Rhodes, 5 Woodbine Avenue, Gosforth, Newcastle-on-Tyne, 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Western Contract Bridge Association</td>
<td>F. Farrington, Esq., Moor Edge, Chapelstown Road, Turton, Nr. Bolton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire Contract Bridge Association</td>
<td>Capt. F. W. Taylor, 433 Banbury Road, Oxford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset Contract Bridge Association</td>
<td>O. H. Dolley, Esq., Kelsall Lodge, Staplegrove, Taunton, Somerset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Counties Contract Bridge Association</td>
<td>Mrs. W. J. Davy, &quot;Culford,&quot; West Overcliff Drive, Bournemouth Tel. Westbourne 6406.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire Contract Bridge Association</td>
<td>F. O. Bingham, Esq., 64a Greenhill Road, Moseley, Birmingham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire Contract Bridge Association</td>
<td>R. H. Chope, Esq., 26 Riverdale Road, Sheffield, 10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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. R. Provost, Managing Director. A. J. Hornsby, 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/-.

Lyndhurst Club—36 Finchley Rd., N.W.8. 'Phones PRose 5858 and 3432. Shilling Partnership every afternoon. Duplicate pairs every Monday fortnight at 8 p.m. Fully licensed restaurant. For full details apply Secretary.

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

SIDMOUTH
Bridge & Social Club, Esplanade, Sidmouth Devon—Open daily 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. Sundays from 2.30 p.m. Periodicals in Lounge. Visitors are welcome.
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All who desire to further the development of Contract Bridge as a Game should be members of, and support the
ENGLISH BRIDGE UNION

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.

The Subscription to the Union is only 5/- per annum and entitles you to:

(a) All Literature.
(b) Entry to all National Competitions.
(c) A voice in the management of the game.