

# The British Bridge World

Editorial Board

BERNARD WESTALL (CHAIRMAN)

GEOFFREY BUTLER

KENNETH KONSTAM

TERENCE REESE

ALBERT DORMER (EDITOR)

---

VOL. 15, NO. 7

## CONTENTS

JULY, 1964

	Page
Editorial ... ..	5-6
The Philadelphians, by Albert Dormer ... ..	7-13
Annals of Ruff's Club, by Terence Reese ... ..	14-15
The New York Olympiad (3), by Harold Franklin ... ..	17-31
The Watcher ... ..	32-34
One Hundred Up: New Problems ... ..	35
The Informatory Pass, by C. Ellwood Holmes ... ..	37-38
One Hundred Up, conducted by Alan Hiron ... ..	41-50
Bridge Academy, conducted by G. C. H. Fox ... ..	51-61

---

ADVERTISING: All enquiries should be addressed to the:  
ADVERTISING MANAGER, THOMAS DE LA RUE & CO. LTD.  
Bunhill Row, E.C.1.

---

ALL OTHER CORRESPONDENCE, INCLUDING SUBSCRIPTIONS, TO THE PUBLISHERS,  
ANDREWS & WARBURG, LTD., 35 DOVER STREET, LONDON, W.1.  
Tel: MAYfair 8997

Annual Subscription 35/-

*Published by Andrews & Warburg, Ltd., 35 Dover Street, London, W.1 and printed by G. F. Tomkes Ltd.,  
501-9 Grove Green Road, London E.11, on behalf of the proprietors, Thomas De La Rue & Co. Ltd.*

In the centre pages of last month's *British Bridge World*, Terence Reese replied to recent criticism of the way in which our international teams are chosen. He suggested that pressure for the introduction of a method based directly on results comes from a "fringe" of "interested parties."

Reese was answering Frank Farrington, Edmund Phillips, Harry Ingram and me, none of whom aspires to play in the British open team. However, I am glad that Reese has made himself the spokesman of those who oppose selection by results, since he, in my view, is the one player whose place in the team is not at issue. If selection by results were introduced, it could well be limited to four places, leaving the selectors free to offer the remaining two places to Reese and his partner, or to any other pair who happened, at a particular time, to be truly outstanding. This is the method followed by the Italians.

Since Reese's own position, therefore, is not at stake, discussion can proceed without personal involvement.

### The case for trials

Tournament bridge itself presupposes that competitions *can* be made to show which pairs are

better than others at a particular time. It is generally accepted that such tournaments as the Pairs Olympiad, the Masters Pairs, the *Sunday Times* Pairs, and so on, are won mostly (it doesn't have to be always) by the best pairs. In playing tournament bridge at all, we are committed to this belief, and it is nonsense to pretend that one cannot devise a reasonably accurate pairs trial.

It is true that, in theory, good judges might select better pairs, but it is not certain. Selection committees can be influenced by professional ties, family relationships, personal friendships, and the like. I believe that they *are* so influenced, at all levels, from Clubs through Counties and upwards. To imagine that bridge players can hold the balance evenly between close friends of many years standing, or relatives, on the one hand, and unfashionable or unliked players on the other hand, is unworldly. I believe that even the charitably-minded see some force in this argument.

However, not all bridge players *are* charitably-minded, and among the more cynical the belief may exist that a minority with special interests are influencing team selection to suit themselves. If this belief gains ground, the harm done is very much more serious

than the harm (illusory, some say) which might accrue if a well-conceived trial happened to produce a surprise result once in a while.

### The "Butler" method

The "Butler" method of conducting pairs trials was devised in Britain in 1961 after lengthy consultation with a large number of players and is now widely used throughout the world. In Britain, it was used to determine the teams for the 1961 and 1962 European Championships, but then it was dropped without explanation. Let us review the two years in which it was used and see whether anything happened to discredit the method.

In 1961 the winners (Reese did not take part) were Gardener and Rose, Priday and Truscott, Konstam and Rodrigue. I heard no one say at the time that these had not played the best bridge. They went on to take the European Championship very easily; admittedly in a sub-standard field, but no more so than Baden Baden last year. Nothing happened in 1961 to invalidate the "Butler" method.

In 1962, Reese still not taking part, similar trials were convincingly won by a newly-formed partnership, Swinnerton-Dyer and Barbour, with Swimer, Flint,

Konstam and J. Tarlo some way behind. Now, the three last-named played with Reese in the New York Olympiad, for which there was no trial at all, so I cannot see that the fact that in 1962 they *won* their places reflects any discredit on the "Butler" method as compared with the alternatives. As for Swimer, Reese himself said, after the 1960 Olympiad, that he had struck up a partnership of world class with Flint; so, presumably, Swimer's success in the 1962 trials, playing with Flint, did nothing to lessen faith in the "Butler" method.

We are left with the 1962 trials winners, Swinnerton-Dyer and Barbour. Had their subsequent record been one of failure, their easy success in the trial might have raised doubts, but the opposite proved true. From then until Barbour went to America, they were the most successful British pair, frequently asserting their superiority over the other pairs in the trials. The fact that the "Butler" method allowed them to get into the European Championship team, where they belonged, was greatly to its credit. It was something that could have been achieved only by an effective trial—not by the judgment of observers with preconceived notions.

*(Continued on page 39.)*



# THE PHILADELPHIANS

*Albert Dormer reports on a leading American partnership which has not yet been seen in action in Britain.*

Can an electric light bulb glow with personality? Perhaps I'm over-imaginative.

The Bridge-O-Rama "fishbowl" has gone out of fashion. Difficult to soundproof; it presented little theatrical advantage; to some it was a distraction even. Current fashion is to ensconce the 'Rama players far from the madding throng, where cheers and hisses can't be heard.

That's what they did at the New York Olympiad, but sometimes the personalities still came through. Especially when the players included Robert Jordan and Arthur Robinson of Philadelphia, mainstay of the U.S. team.

Watching a tricky defence on 'Rama, the audience generally jitters. Watching Jordan and Robinson, it's usually safe to relax. They'll find the right path most of the time.

They stride towards the 'Rama room, cigars clenched, menacing, leaning forward slightly from the

hips. They settle at the table, look at the opponents, size them up. It doesn't make the opponents any happier if they know Jordan's profession: he's a cemetery sales manager.

The pair seem to match paces in bidding and defence but Jordan, 36, may be a more positive force in dummy play. He is fearless, at times brilliant. Some claim that Robinson, only 27 and a bridge teacher, could be or could become, a better technician even than Jordan. Anyway, both are good enough for *my* money.

Jordan and Robinson carried the brunt of battle in the world championship in St. Vincent last year. Then, according to American critics, the United States lost the 144-board match against Italy only because John Gerber attempted a captaincy stroke which turned out disastrously. With 32 boards to play, the Americans were 21 points in the lead. Keeping Jordan and Robinson



as his anchor, Gerber split the other two partnerships and paired the renowned Howard Schenken with Bobbie Nail of Texas. Result: Italy scored 44 to 5 on the next 16 boards. For the remaining 16, Schenken resumed his partnership with Peter Leventritt and the score hardly moved, Italy winning the whole match by 19 points.

If Jordan and Robinson knocked at the door at St. Vincent, they hammered harder in the recent Olympiad. Next to Forquet and Garozzo of Italy, they probably played as well as any other pair. Barring the unexpected, they seem set to figure in world bridge for years to come.

An index of Jordan's standing is that the audience sighed heavily when he "misdefended" this deal:

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

Jordan and Robinson don't open four-card majors, so Jordan bid One Diamond on the North hand. The final contract was 3NT, played by the Swiss *maestro* Jean Besse. Jordan led Ace and another spade. The contract is easily made if declarer plays on diamonds, but it was not to be expected that he would do so after North's One Diamond opening. Instead, Besse came to the Queen of clubs and ran the 9 of hearts to South's Jack. Robinson played back a spade and the position, with North on lead, was:

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

There are times when only a good player sees that there is something to trance about. Jordan huddled for long, long minutes, and one felt that it was even money that he'd find the winning play—a *small* diamond instead

**300 KEY HANDS**  
from the  
**2<sup>nd</sup> WORLD BRIDGE**  
**OLYMPIAD**  
*Official Handbook*

**OUT JULY 25th 192 PAGES**

**\$2** postpaid in U.S. or Canada  
(elsewhere, \$2.50 postpaid)

**NEW:** For the first time, a special group of 50 dramatic deals with full commentary on the bidding and play!

Selection includes hands from the round robin, showing every country in action. Full coverage of U.S.-Britain and U.S.-Italy round robin matches.

**FULL COVERAGE OF the 60-deal U.S.-ITALY FINAL.**

Ample selection of hands from: GREAT BRITAIN-ITALY semi-final; U.S.-Canada semi-final; GREAT BRITAIN-CANADA play-off.

The swing hands from the Women's Title event.

Order direct from:

**AMERICAN CONTRACT BRIDGE LEAGUE**  
**33 WEST 60TH STREET**  
**NEW YORK, 10023**

of cashing the Queen of spades. He didn't make it, and the audience, long since alerted by the high-powered panel of commentators, groaned.

When people are disappointed because you miss a play like *that*, they think highly of you.

If, in the diagram position, North scores the spade and exits, he is pulped when dummy plays clubs. That is what happened.

If, instead of cashing the spade, North plays a club, dummy scores another club and North has to discard his spade. Now declarer plays to the diamond King, finesses hearts, concedes a heart and takes the rest.

If (still in the diagram position) North plays a high diamond, dummy wins and plays clubs, forcing a spade discard from North. Now a small heart from the table puts North in and declarer harvests whichever suit he returns.

Only a small diamond from North will do.

The Jordan-Robinson escutcheon emerged unsullied from that encounter but was nearly blotted on a deal from the semi-final against Canada.

West dealt with East-West vulnerable.

#### NORTH

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

#### WEST

♠ Q 10 2  
♥ A Q 2  
♦ Q J 9 6  
♣ J 6 4

#### EAST

♠ J 9 7 3  
♥ J 5  
♦ 8 3  
♣ A 10 8 5 2

#### SOUTH

♠ A 6  
♥ K 8 6 3  
♦ A 10 7 5  
♣ K 7 3



Jordan (left) and Robinson (right) watch on 'Rama a board which they have already played in the closed room. Centre is the American captain, Frank T. Westcott.

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
Robin-son	Howell	Jordan	Forbes

	No	No	No
1♦	No	1♥	No
2♥	No	No	2♠
No	No	Dble	All pass

Jordan's double, with a poor holding in the suit which was likely to be led and no shortage in his partner's diamonds, was distinctly adventurous. True, the Canadians trailed by 47 at this point, but Jordan, a man of wrath, is not the sort to relax until the last card is played.

South led the 3 of hearts, declarer won with the Jack and took the return finesse. He threw a diamond on the Ace of hearts and led the Jack of clubs, which was covered by Queen and Ace. Declarer led the 10 of clubs and Robinson ducked. The King of clubs won the next trick and Robinson played ace and another trump, dummy putting in the Queen the second time.

North ducked the second trump and the position, with declarer needing two more tricks, was:

(next column)

Dummy played the Queen of diamonds, Jordan put on the King and cashed the King of trumps. Jordan played red cards and the declarer could make only his master trump.

NORTH  
 ♠ K 8  
 ♥ 10  
 ♦ K 2  
 ♣ —

WEST	EAST
♠ 10	♠ J 9
♥ —	♥ —
♦ Q J 9 6	♦ 8
♣ —	♣ 8 5

SOUTH  
 ♠ —  
 ♥ K  
 ♦ A 10 7 5  
 ♣ —

If Jordan releases the King of trumps too early, declarer sails home. The diagram position is the same, except that *North* is on lead with two *small* spades and the declarer needs *three* of the last five tricks. North's best play is King and another diamond, but declarer throws a club. If South returns a heart, declarer makes the last three tricks with high trumps; if a diamond, North has to ruff and declarer overruffs and draws the last trump.

It avails declarer naught to play low from dummy on the second trump lead, with the idea of winning in hand and ruffing a club in dummy. This time North scores the King and puts dummy in with a spade. Declarer makes only his master trump.

Winning play for declarer is to



throw dummy's trump Queen under South's Ace. Then he can either ruff a club with dummy's 10 of spades or score the good clubs.

The final hand features another difficult defence which would be academically remote for many pairs. It came up in the Olympiad final.

NORTH

♠ 8 7 4 2

♥ K 3

♦ A K 8 4

♣ A 8 2

WEST

♠ A 5 3

♥ 10 7 5

♦ J 9 7 3 2

♣ Q 3

EAST

♠ K 6

♥ Q 6 4

♦ Q 10 6 5

♣ K 10 6 4

SOUTH

♠ Q J 10 9

♥ A J 9 8 2

♦ —

♣ J 9 7 5

SOUTH

Garozzo Robin-  
son

WEST

No

NORTH EAST

Forquet Jordan

1♠

No

2♣

No

2♥

No

3♦

No

3NT

No

4♠

All pass

In the Neapolitan system, the Two Club response need not be a genuine suit, but the rest of the bidding was natural. Since South's first two bids were in the canapé style and he had thus shown five-card hearts, he bid 3NT over

*There is still time to  
enjoy bridge in  
YUGOSLAVIA*

**POREC**

**23-27 SEPTEMBER**

Three Diamonds rather than rebid hearts.

Robinson led the Queen of clubs, Garozzo put on the Ace and threw two clubs on the top diamonds. Three rounds of hearts followed, dummy ruffing with the 8. Then came a trump lead in this position:

NORTH

♠ 7 4 2

♥ —

♦ 8 4

♣ 8 2

WEST

♠ A 5 3

♥ —

♦ J 9 7

♣ 3

EAST

♠ K 6

♥ —

♦ Q 10

♣ K 10 4

SOUTH

♠ Q J 10 9

♥ J 9

♦ —

♣ 5

Dummy's 2 of spades went to West's Ace. West returned a club, East won and played another club, declarer ruffing. South needed three tricks from this ending:

NORTH

♠ 7 4

♥ —

♦ 8 4

♣ —

WEST

♠ 5 3

♥ —

♦ J 9

♣ —

EAST

♠ K

♥ —

♦ Q 10

♣ 4

SOUTH

♠ Q 9

♥ J 9

♦ —

♣ —

Garozzo led a good heart and, when West discarded, passed it in dummy and made the contract. (It is true that, as the cards lay, Garozzo could also have succeeded by playing a heart and ruffing in dummy, this loses if West has all the outstanding trumps.)

The main interest lies in the

defence. Going back to the middle diagram, if, on the lead of the 2 of spades from dummy, East puts on the King and plays King and another club, the contract can be beaten. South ruffs and plays a trump, but West wins and returns a diamond. South ruffs again and has only hearts to lead. West ruffs at trick twelve, dummy overruffs but is left with a losing diamond. The defence is difficult but well within the compass of this pair.

At the other table the contract and the first three tricks were the same. Declarer then led a trump from dummy, not having touched hearts. East, Pabis Ticci, put up the King and cashed a club, but then the defenders played declarer's game by taking a second and third round of trumps. Declarer now set up the hearts and made his contract.

---

## LONDON CONGRESS RESULTS

### *Mixed Pairs:*

Mrs. Garfield and Saunders, Mrs. Williams and Langiert, Mr. and Mrs. Hiron (flicht).

### *Westminster Pairs:*

Vaz and Cundy, Ellison and Mrs. Ashcroft, Mrs. Shammon and Mrs. Sopp.

### *London Cup:*

Beach, Senk, Adler, Hoffman; Mrs. Cooper, James, Gerrard, Pates.

### *London Pairs:*

Group A: Crowhurst and Wardman, Mrs. Hartil and Mrs. Hiron, Mrs. Sinclair and Dr. Sinclair. Group B: Davis and Jackson, Hoffman and Adler, Kaye and Brunskill.

### *Piccadilly Cup:*

Mrs. Gatti and T. Lederer, Dr. and Mrs. Sinclair, Mr. and Mrs. Lamport, Mrs. Kell and J. Westlake.

# Annals of Ruff's Club

"Great Was The Fall."

An episode in Terence Reese's famous series,

Hearing loud cries of laughter from the card room, among which he thought he detected his wife's girlish tones, Sir Yoicks Harkaway finished off his drink in the bar and with a word to William, the club steward, strode off to investigate. He found his wife Mabel and Janet Sloe in play against Mr. Playbetter and Pamela Deuceace.

"I say, old girl, what's the racket about?" he asked, bringing a chorus of sh . . . s from the other tables, who had already been sufficiently disturbed. "What's this?" he went on more quietly, looking at Mabel's score-sheet. "You got the *maestro* 800 down?"

"Yes," said Mabel, as she and Pamela went off again into peals of merriment. "And it wasn't even doubled!"

"If the others don't mind, I'll show you the hand," said Playbetter. "See what you would have done. We were vulnerable and Janet dealt." (*next column*)

"Just look at our hands for a moment," Playbetter went on. "Janet dealt and passed. Pam and I play a no-trump of 15 to 17

NORTH

Pamela

♠ 8 3

♥ 7 5 4

♦ A J 5 3 2

♣ K Q 3

WEST

Lady Harkaway

♠ A 10 6

♥ K Q 10 8 6 3 2

♦ 10

♣ J 4

EAST

Miss Sloe

♠ Q J 7 5 4 2

♥ 9

♦ K 7 4

♣ 10 9 6

SOUTH

Playbetter

♠ K 9

♥ A J

♦ Q 9 8 6

♣ A 8 7 5 2

points in theory, but this time I decided to owe myself a point, as most of my strength was in the minors and I had a five-card suit. So I opened 1NT. Mabel overcalled with Three Hearts and now Pamela gave me 3NT."

"I expect that was a shocker," said Pamela, who was a comparative novice. "I thought you'd probably hold the hearts, as you did, and that with my 10 points and five-card suit you might be able to run nine tricks."

"It was a bright bid and I don't see what else you could have done on your hand," said Playbetter handsomely. "3NT was passed out and Mabel led the King of hearts. I won the second round, Miss Sloe discarding a spade. What would you have done now?"

Sir Yoicks was looking at the North-South cards only. "I would have played off a couple of high clubs for a start," he said. "And if everyone followed I'd have made five tricks there and perhaps got some clue about the diamond finesse."

"You would have done a great deal better than I did," said Playbetter. "I took the diamond finesse at once and never made another trick. When the girls have stopped giggling I'll show you why I played it that way." (Miss Sloe was actually suffering agonies of embarrassment over the whole affair.) "I pictured the hand more like this:

NORTH

♠ 8 3

♥ 7 5 4

♦ A J 5 3 2

♣ K Q 3

WEST

♠ A x x

♥ K Q 10 x x x x

♦ K x

♣ x

EAST

♠ Q J x x x x

♥ 9

♦ 10 x

♣ J 10 9 x

SOUTH

♠ K 9

♥ A J

♦ Q 9 8 6

♣ A 8 7 5 2

"Now you see what happens if I play on clubs first? I make three clubs and finesse the Jack of diamonds successfully, but then the diamonds are blocked. I am a trick short, whereas if I finesse the diamond at once I still have dummy's clubs for entry."

"Yes, I see," said Sir Yoicks. "Sometimes it helps to have been born without any brains, like me."

## THE ENGLISH BRIDGE UNION

### The Governing Body for England

All who desire to further the development of Contract Bridge should be members.

For full details of membership write to the Secretary:

Mrs. A. L. Fleming,  
12 Frant Road, Tunbridge Wells, Kent.  
Phone: Tunbridge Wells 30612



Try your hand at the June problems before reading how the experts voted.

**Problem No. 1 (10 points)**

Match-point pairs, North-South vulnerable, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
1♥	Dble	1♠	No
?			

South holds:

♠10 ♥AK873 ♦KJ82 ♣K104

What should South bid?

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
		1♥	No
2♣	3♦	No	No
?			

(West's 3♦ bid is strong, but not forcing.)

South holds:

♠K1087 ♥J6 ♦A5 ♣A10972

What should South bid?

**Problem No. 2 (20 points)**

Love all, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
1♥	No	1♠	No
?			

South holds:

♠5 ♥AQJ1064 ♦KQ97 ♣96

What should South bid:

(a) At match-point pairs?

(b) At I.m.p. scoring?

**Problem No. 6 (10 points)**

I.m.p. scoring, love all, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
		1♣	No
1♥	No	3NT	No
?			

South holds:

♠1043 ♥KQ976 ♦874 ♣AQ

What should South bid?

**Problem No. 3 (10 points)**

I.m.p. scoring, love all, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
	1♥	Dble	Redble
?			

South holds:

♠10972 ♥1084 ♦74 ♣J832

What should South bid?

**Problem No. 7 (20 points)**

Match-point pairs, East-West vulnerable, the bidding has gone:

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

South holds:

♠AKJ42 ♥AK9 ♦10832 ♣10

(a) What should South bid?

(b) What should South bid if East had passed?

**Problem No. 4 (10 points)**

Rubber bridge, East-West vulnerable, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
		2♠	No
?			

South holds:

♠93 ♥J1096 ♦Q975 ♣AK4

What should South bid?

**Problem No. 8 (10 points)**

I.m.p. scoring, love all, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
			1♥
No	3♥	No	4♥
No	No	No	
?			

South holds:

♠K842 ♥J5 ♦A742 ♣1083

What should South lead?

**Problem No. 5 (10 points)**

Rubber bridge, North-South vulnerable, the bidding has gone:



# THE NEW YORK OLYMPIADS (3)

*Harold Franklin concludes his Olympiad Diary.*

## Tenth day

Pride of place today must go to the British Women's team. Mexico gave them a chance to clinch matters by taking their match against U.S.A. 5-2. Our team needed no further encouragement. A smashing 7-0 victory against France was followed by the second half of the Argentine match in which we added a further 34 points to score a maximum win and make sure of the Championship with a full two days' play still to come. In thirteen completed rounds we had taken 89 points from a possible 91, beating Mexico and U.S.A. 6-1 and taking full points from every other opponent.

Mrs. Markus and Mrs. Gordon were in their most devastating mood against France and demoralised their opponents when they made three early slams, profiting by clever play from opponents' errors on each occasion. East dealt with neither side vulnerable:

### NORTH

♠ Q 9 6 2

♥ K 9

♦ 10 6 2

♣ J 9 6 2

### WEST

♠ A J 8 7

♥ J 8 5

♦ A K 7

♣ K 8 3

### EAST

♠ K 3

♥ A 10 6 4

♦ Q J 4

♣ A Q 10 5

### SOUTH

♠ 10 5 4

♥ Q 7 3 2

♦ 9 8 5 3

♣ 7 4

Mrs. Gordon opened 1NT with the East hand—Mrs. Markus tried Two Clubs, and having elicited the information that partner held a four-card heart suit, was encouraged to bid 6NT. South led the 5 of spades, dummy played the 7 and after considerable thought North played the Queen, though it is difficult to fathom the thought processes that led to this conclusion. Mrs. Gordon played a second spade to the Jack and continued with

three rounds of clubs. When the suit failed to break she was in some trouble, but was aided by South's helpful discard of the 7 of hearts. She crossed to dummy with a diamond and led the Jack of hearts for the King and Ace. Though she would have liked to lead another heart from the table, it was too early to take her third spade trick. Mrs. Gordon, therefore, realising that her best chance was to pin the 9 of hearts, boldly laid down the 10 and was richly rewarded.

Having tasted blood, Mrs. Markus wanted more on this hand. South dealt with East-West vulnerable:

NORTH

♠ Q 4 2

♥ J 6 5 3 2

♦ 8 3

♣ 9 7 4

WEST

♠ A 10 5

♥ K

♦ A 10 9 7 2

♣ A J 6 3

EAST

♠ J 9 7

♥ 9 8 7

♦ K Q 6

♣ K Q 10 5

SOUTH

♠ K 8 6 3

♥ A Q 10 4

♦ J 5 4

♣ 8 2

For France, East performed in perplexing manner. Over her partner's opening bid of One Diamond she responded 1NT,

conservative to say the least, and when partner removed to Two Clubs she still showed no excitement about her holding in partner's two suits and marked time with a false preference to Two Diamonds. But time had run out and her partner did no more.

It might have been a small consolation to know that 3NT was capable of being defeated. Mrs. Markus obviously also realised this, for when her partner responded 2NT to an opening bid of One Diamond, she eschewed the obvious raise to 3NT in favour of a bid of Three Clubs. East raised to Four Clubs, Mrs. Markus cue-bid the Ace of spades and when her partner bid Five Diamonds she went on to Six Clubs. After a heart lead she had time to develop twelve tricks with the help of two heart ruffs.

In full cry, Mrs. Markus and Mrs. Gordon continued with this third slam in the first six boards. East dealt, East-West vulnerable:

*(See next page.)*

Mrs. Gordon opened One Heart with the East hand, clearly with the intention of rebidding No Trumps after the expected spade response. Partner duly responded Two Spades and she bid 2NT. Over Three Diamonds she persevered with 3NT and when partner went on with Four Hearts,

## NORTH

♠ Q 8 6 5

♥ 8 6

♦ J 8 7

♣ 7 6 4 3

## WEST

♠ A J 10 7 4

♥ K Q 5

♦ A 10 5 2

♣ K

## EAST

♠ K

♥ A 10 3 2

♦ Q 9 3

♣ A J 10 9 2

## SOUTH

♠ 9 3 2

♥ J 9 7 4

♦ K 6 4

♣ Q 8 5

she thought it safe to introduce her club suit. This encouraged West to bid Six Hearts, the final contract.

South led the 5 of clubs. This was won in dummy and dummy's high trumps were cashed before crossing to hand with the King of spades. The 9 of clubs was led and allowed to run, note being taken of South's eight-spot. The Ace of hearts left South with a trump trick and was followed by the Ace and Jack of clubs, dummy discarding a second diamond and a spade. South ruffed the fourth round of clubs, and that was a mistake, for it meant that she either had to lead a diamond away from the King, or give the declarer a free spade finesse and the certainty of two tricks in the suit. If South declines

to ruff the fourth club, dummy is squeezed into abandoning the threat in one or other suit.

Meanwhile the men, beating Bermuda 7-0 and Germany 4-3 before going down 5-2 to U.A.R. completed a British double by heading the qualifying Pool, of which the final table read:

Britain	160
Italy	153
U.S.A.	147
Canada	145
Switzerland	140
Australia	125
Belgium	124
France	123
Argentina	122
Venezuela	121
Brazil	117
Spain	114
Sweden	114
Philippines	113
Israel	112
Poland	105
Thailand	102
S. Africa	99
Rep. of China	93
Holland	90
U.A.R.	89
Ireland	84
Germany	77
Bermuda	76
Jamaica	74
Mexico	71
Lebanon	68
Chile	59
Netherlands Antilles	22

The climax of the evening was



the draw for the semi-final. The original intention had been that the first team would meet the fourth, but this had been since abandoned in favour of an open draw. The three big guns waited hopefully to draw Canada and the plum went to U.S.A., who had lost 6-1 to them in the final round to enable their neighbours to take fourth place. With an eye to the morrow the Americans had taken the opportunity to give some of their front line a rest, a decision for which none could blame them. Italy and Britain had to meet therefore in a match which many would have liked to have seen as the final.

### Eleventh day

The match between Britain and Italy lived up to the highest expectations. In the first session the Vu-Graph audience saw Reese and Schapiro and Forquet and Garozzo give a display which confirmed the widely held view that these were the two greatest pairs in the world. If anything, Reese and Schapiro had the better of things, but luck was not on their side. They lost 11 points on board 2, where they might have hoped to gain. East dealt with North-South vulnerable:

(Next column).

Gray opened One Club on the West hand in third position.

NORTH

♠ A K 9 8 7 6

♥ 4 3 2

♦ A J

♣ K 5

WEST

♠ Q 3 2

♥ A 10 6 5

♦ 5 4

♣ A J 9 3

EAST

♠ J 10 5 4

♥ K Q 8 7

♦ 9 8

♣ Q 8 2

SOUTH

♠ —

♥ J 9

♦ K Q 10 7 6 3 2

♣ 10 7 6 4

Belladonna doubled, Konstam redoubled, Avarelli bid Three Diamonds and Belladonna closed the auction with 3NT. East led the 2 of clubs: since North's club holding was identifiable and his diamond fit marked there was a chance that West might look elsewhere for the setting tricks. However, he judged it safer to rely on East for the Ace of spades to give three club tricks and two Aces. Winning the first club with the Ace, he returned the 3 of clubs and that saw the declarer safely home with a trick to spare. In the other room, after a full auction, Reese and Schapiro settled in Four Diamonds and made eleven tricks. Over the next few boards the British team, and notably Reese and Schapiro,

fought desperately to recover the eleven points in swings of one, two and three. This was one hand where both East-West pairs misjudged a competitive auction to settle in Four Spades.

# NORTH

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

# WEST

♠ A 10 6 4 3 2  
♥ 4  
♦ A 10 9 2  
♣ 8 4

# EAST

♠ K 7  
♥ Q 5 2  
♦ K Q J  
♣ Q J 9 3 2

# SOUTH

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

# WEST

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

# WEST

*Reese*

1♠

2♥

4♥

No

# EAST

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

# EAST

*Schapiro*

INT

3♥

5♦

One Spade shows a minor suit opening and the response of INT merely invites partner to identify his hand. Two Hearts shows specifically a hand with six clubs and four diamonds, and clearly good enough to play at the Three level. So far as West is concerned the Three Heart bid may be a No Trump probe or may be a good heart suit. West has already identified himself as 6-4-2-1 so he raises hearts, since he cannot possibly hold more than a doubleton. Partner now knows his precise shape.

The final decision now rested with East who gave the matter long and tortured thought. It was to his advantage to know that partner held a singleton spade since that meant that the defence could not establish a quick trick in a side suit. It was conceivable that partner's diamonds were no better than Q10xx, and although that might make the hand difficult to play against

When Gray was declarer hearts were led and continued and he lost a heart, two clubs and one spade. At the other table Reese led the Jack of hearts, the declarer played low, but Schapiro overtook and switched to the King and another club. Reese played a third club and Schapiro trumped with the Queen: declarer overruffed and led a low spade to the King, leaving Reese with two trump tricks and a valuable 2 i.m.p.s.

No sooner had we fought our way back to parity than we suffered another reverse:

a 4-1 trump break, if the diamonds were no stronger than that, there should be compensation in the solidity of the club suit and, possibly, an outside King. Had West held ♠x ♥xx ♦Q10xx ♣AKJxxx his proper course would have been to have bid Two Clubs over 1NT since he lacked the playing strength for the shape-showing bid of Two Hearts.

Six Diamonds from the East hand, protected against the opening lead of a heart, would have

been an excellent contract. Six Diamonds by West, as played by Avarelli and Belladonna, was substantially worse, but happily for declarer the cards were well placed and the Italians were back in front.

Reese, whose game was both accurate and imaginative, quickly recovered a small swing, which was almost a large one. The Little Majors had made provision for a psychic opening bid of One Heart, the same bid as they use for very powerful hands,



*Our victorious women's team, with Mrs. Charles Solomon at left, Carl Alberto Perroux at right, and Baron de Nexon at centre.*

the difference of course being that the psychic opener will pass partner's response. Reese tested Forquet and Garozzo with this application:

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

Reese opened One Heart with the West hand and when his partner responded One Spade, he passed. Garozzo, on Reese's left, who held twelve points, now had to balance with a double, persuaded that Reese's opening was psychic. Reese was pushed to Three Spades, ready to punish one more bid by the Italians, but Forquet and Garozzo, sure-footed as ever, stopped in time. Nine tricks were made for a useful swing, the hand having been played in Four Spades, one down, in the other room. After another small swing to Britain the Italians scored heavily with another aggressive move. After Gray had made a normal opening bid of One weak No Trump in third hand, followed by two passes, Avarelli re-opened with a double on: ♠KQ982 ♥K76 ♦98 ♣Q52. He was fortunate enough to find partner with twelve points and that cost Britain 500.

We almost recovered the deficit

on board 17, but fine defence by Garozzo persuaded Reese to a wrong line of play.

NORTH

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

WEST

EAST

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

SOUTH

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

Four Spades had already failed in the Closed Room when the board came on the Vu-Graph screen. Reese played the same contract from the North hand and prospects were bright after an opening lead of the 9 of diamonds. Reese won in dummy, discarding a club from hand and led a spade to the Jack. But Garozzo had already seen the possibilities and with no more than normal hesitation he played low. Perhaps Reese ought to have considered the likelihood of East holding up the Ace: if the Ace wins the declarer must make the contract unless he decided to finesse the heart, and there is no good reason for doing that. Once the Ace was held up



an alternative, if remote, line was open to the declarer. If in fact West held ♠AQx, if the hearts were 3-3 and if the Ace of clubs were doubleton, declarer could make by taking three rounds of hearts and playing a second spade from dummy, and that is what he tried to do. The result was two down and the Italians ended the first session of twenty boards with a lead of 17 i.m.p., and the audience satisfied that they had watched bridge of a quality that matched the occasion.

In the second session Reese and Schapiro were opposed to Belladonna and Avarelli while Forquet and Garozzo moved into the Closed Room where they opposed Gray and Flint. Italy had the first major success, and were not unlucky in the manner of it. North dealt with East-West vulnerable:

*(Next Column).*

In the Closed Room Garozzo opened Two Spades with the South hand. Gray overcalled Four Hearts and Forquet sacrificed in Four Spades. This went back to Gray who made the obvious double—it was cruel luck to find that there was no way to a fourth trick.

At the other table Schapiro made a semi-psychic opening of One Diamond on the South hand.

NORTH

♠ K J 9 4

♥ K 9 5

♦ J 7 3

♣ K 7 5

WEST

♠ A 8

♥ A Q 10 8 7 2

♦ A 9 6

♣ A 9

EAST

♠ 6 5

♥ J 6 4 3

♦ 10 5 4

♣ Q J 6 4

SOUTH

♠ Q 10 7 3 2

♥ —

♦ K Q 8 2

♣ 10 8 3 2

Avarelli overcalled 1NT and Reese made the conservative bid of Two Spades. This was passed round to Avarelli, who bid Three Hearts, Reese competed with Three Spades, and there the auction ended.

Just when we seemed to need it most we had our first lucky break. East dealt with both sides vulnerable: *(Next page).*

In the Closed Room Flint opened Two No Trumps with the East hand. Gray launched into Gerber and quickly settled in 7NT. On the 'Rama, Belladonna opened the East hand One Club and Schapiro overcalled One Spade. Avarelli bid Three Clubs and Belladonna Four Diamonds and they were now firmly on the way to the grand slam. Once he had been able

## NORTH

♠ —

♥ 10 9 8 6 4 3

♦ 10 9 8

♣ 10 7 4 3

## WEST

♠ A 10 3

♥ 2

♦ K 3

♣ K Q J 9 8 6 5

## EAST

♠ Q J 7

♥ A J 7

♦ A Q J 7 6 2

♣ A

## SOUTH

♠ K 9 8 6 5 4 2

♥ K Q 5

♦ 5 4

♣ 2

---

 to locate the diamond King with

partner it seemed safer to Belladonna to play in the suit contract since he calculated that it might be necessary to develop the club suit by ruffing. West, Avarelli, however, knew that this was not so and might therefore have converted to No Trumps. But Schapiro still had to lead—after some thought he decided that the opponents clearly had their thirteen tricks and that a first round ruff was the one hope. He led a spade and Britain recovered 20 i.m.p. Two boards later they were in the lead for the first time, but the Italians



*Criminal Lawyer Perroux was professionally engaged, could come only for semi-finals and final. Mme Alexandre is at left, Mrs. Alvin Landy standing, Mrs. Geoffrey Butler at right.*

pressed home with two thin games to take up the running again.

The Italian lead went back into the twenties on a board which could easily have levelled matters. North dealt with North-South vulnerable:

NORTH

♠ A J 6 5 2

♥ 4

◇ 9 7 4

♣ A K Q 2

WEST

♠ K Q 10 7 4

♥ A 10 8 6 5

◇ 6 3 2

♣ —

EAST

♠ —

♥ J 9 7 3

◇ K J

♣ J 9 8 6 5 4 3

SOUTH

♠ 9 8 3

♥ K Q 2

◇ A Q 10 8 5

♣ 10 7

In the Closed Room the auction was:

NORTH	EAST	SOUTH	WEST
<i>Forquet</i>	<i>Flint</i>	<i>Garozzo</i>	<i>Gray</i>
1♠	2♣	2◇	2♥
2♠	No	3♠	No
4♠	5♥	Dble	No
No	No		

It may be open to question whether West should enter the auction with a void in partner's suit and his main strength in the opponents'. From the nature of the bidding and from his own hand East might have considered the possibility of his partner

having very good defence. The loss of 300 need not have proved fatal.

In the other room Reese opened One Diamond with the North hand and Schapiro bid Two Diamonds. Avarelli entered the auction with Two Hearts, Reese bid Three Clubs, East, Belladonna, raised to Three Hearts, Schapiro bid Three Spades and Reese went on to game. After two passes Avarelli doubled and his partner led a heart out of turn.

This opened up interesting possibilities and the position did not deteriorate when Schapiro prohibited a heart lead and West selected the 6 of diamonds. The King lost to the Ace and the 8 of spades was led, covered by the Queen which was allowed to hold. West now switched to the Ace and another heart: at this stage Schapiro knew West to be 5-5 in the majors and might have realised that since he needed entries back to his own hand he would have to rely on West holding a second diamond. In fact he became obsessed with the idea that the lead was a singleton, and discarded two diamonds from dummy on the good hearts. All would still have been well had he now played off the Ace of diamonds, for he would then have been able to continue the suit when the Jack fell. West

would trump the fourth round and dummy would over-ruff. A low spade to the 9 would then put West in difficulties from which there would be no escape. After taking two diamond discards on the heart Schapiro led the 3 of spades for the 7 and Jack. He then tried to cash the Ace of clubs: West ruffed and the contract was two down.

Gray and Flint took a good penalty on the penultimate board for a double swing and Britain ended the session trailing 88-73—close enough for continued hope. Konstam replaced Flint for the only change in the line-up and Schapiro took a quick chance to get back into the match when he took a calculated risk with a doubtful grand slam.

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

WEST	EAST
<i>Schapiro</i>	<i>Reese</i>
	1♦
2♦	3♥
4♥	4NT
5♦	6♣
7♥	

Schapiro appreciated that he needed a heart picture to justify accepting the grand slam invitation, but judging the slam to depend on no more than a good

trump break, he wisely felt that this kind of risk was necessary. Forquet and Garozzo played in Six Hearts and the scores were almost level.

Italy had slightly the better of the hard-fought exchanges that followed, and came to the very last board with an advantage of 10 i.m.p. West dealt with North-South vulnerable:

NORTH

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

WEST

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

EAST

♠ J 10 9 7 2  
♥ K Q  
♦ 9  
♣ K 7 5 3 2

SOUTH

♠ A K 8 6 5 4  
♥ 8  
♦ A Q 5 4 3  
♣ A

This was what happened in the 'Rama room:

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
<i>Schapiro</i>	<i>Bella-donna</i>	<i>Reese</i>	<i>Avarelli</i>
No	No	No	1♣
1♥	No	2♥	3♦
No	4♣	No	4♠
No	5♦	No	6♦
No	No	No	

The Three Diamond bid asked North about his diamond holding and the response showed the





*The Executive Committee of the W.B.F.*

*Back row: Leo Seewald, Johannes Hammerich (Venezuela), David Pigot, Carlos Cabanne (Argentina), Ralph Mizroch (South Africa), Tim Seres (Australia), S. A. Tuason (Philippines).*

*Front row: Waldemar von Zedtwitz, Baron de Nexon, Charles Solomon, Alvin Landy, Geoffrey Butler.*

King; the Four Spade bid asked about the spade holding and the Five Diamond response showed a singleton spade. Perhaps Avarelli felt that this was a slam his opponents would have to look for on the last board. The defence opened with the Ace and another heart: declarer ruffed the second round and played dummy's two top diamonds. Thereafter the hand collapsed and he was three down. A plus score in the other room would have done it,

but the result in the other room was already on view.

The Italians had made a weak opening of Two Hearts in first hand. After two passes Gray forced with Three Hearts and Konstam jumped to Five Clubs. Gray corrected to Five Spades, but this turned out to be just one too high. Konstam's was not a bid of which he could feel proud, for partners have often been known to make forcing bids on two-suited hands. But the pres-



sure was considerable and he felt that if there was the chance of a slam he had to find it.

Though Reese especially and Schapiro were outstanding for Britain and Forquet especially, and Garozzo for Italy, both teams had given a display that was in every respect worthy of a World Championship. And though our team might have won on the last board, it is fair to say that the edge was always slightly with the Italians. Were this not so we must surely have won a match in which two grand slam swings went in our favour.

Meanwhile the U.S.A. had made sure of their place in the finals, defeating the Canadians 133-117. They took a commanding lead early on and the gap was only narrowed when they judged it safe to introduce their young and comparatively inexperienced pair, Hamman and Krauss. And the British ladies continued on their winning way by defeating the last Olympic champions U.A.R. 6-1.

### The Final day

It seemed that anything would be in the nature of an anti-climax



*At the victory banquet: Charles Solomon (left), Walter Avarelli, Camillo Pabis Ticci, Giorgio Belladonna, Benito Garozzo, Mimmo D'Alelio, Sergio Osella (Capt.), General Alfred Gruenther (Hon. President of the W.B.F.) and Pietro Forquet.*

after the excitements of the previous day, but the Americans rose to their full height to produce a final almost as stimulating as the semi-final. It would not have been kind or practical to pitch their young pair into such a man's game, but the alternative meant imposing a very considerable strain on Jordan - Robinson, Stayman-Mitchell, all four of whom had been carrying a considerable burden for a long time. The Italians had relied on Forquet-Garozzo, Belladonna-Avarelli for the whole of the semi-final and continued to do so for the first forty boards of the final. When they felt one pair might be tiring they had no hesitation in introducing d'Alelio and Pabis Ticci for the final twenty boards, and they in turn played with uncanny accuracy.

Italy led by 21 i.m.p. when the final session began and Jordan and Robinson brought U.S.A. back into the picture with an early grand slam on a hand on which the Italians had stayed in Six. The Italians recovered their initial advantage with a series of small swings and led by 25 when American hopes were buoyed on this hand. East dealt with North-South vulnerable: (*Next column*).

In the Closed Room Stayman had opened 1NT with the South hand and d'Alelio had overcalled

NORTH

♠ 9

♥ A

♦ 10 8 7 2

♣ K Q J 10 6 3 2

WEST

♠ A K 10 8 4 2

♥ 9 8 5

♦ Q 9

♣ 9 5

EAST

♠ Q 7 6 5

♥ Q 10 6 4 3

♦ 6 5 3

♣ 4

SOUTH

♠ J 3

♥ K J 7 2

♦ A K J 4

♣ A 8 7

Two Spades. Mitchell bid 3NT, a contract which clearly would not have been disturbed by his partner. Pabis Ticci removed to Four Spades, and when Mitchell in turn bid Five Clubs, that was removed to Five Spades. He went on to Six Clubs and opponents sacrificed in Six Spades and were doubled for a loss of 900. The commentators explained that Six Clubs would probably have failed since the natural way to play the diamond suit was to play for the finesse—but more of that anon.

On the 'Rama Garozzo opened the South hand with the big bid of One Club. West, Robinson, overcalled with Two Spades, Forquet made a forcing bid of Three Spades and Jordan kept up the good work with an anticipatory sacrifice of Six Spades. This was

doubled for an even board. It seemed at the time that Five Spades might have been better judged, deferring a decision as to whether to bid Six Spades until the need arose.

The commentators who decided that Six Clubs would probably fail had not the opportunity to give as much thought to the hand as the declarer would inevitably have done. After a spade lead declarer draws trumps and must first of all attempt to bring down the heart Queen in three rounds. When this fails, he runs his club suit, keeping the fourth heart as a menace in dummy. On the last trump East is forced to discard a diamond and it would not be beyond the wit of declarer to consider that he held the good heart and that the diamonds had been 3-2.

The U.S.A. had no further chance, and although Stayman bid a hopeful slam on the very last board, judging that this might just turn the match, the Italians had been so accurate that the match was already settled, the

final margin being 158-112. If there had previously been any doubts as to the ability of Jordan and Robinson, they have taken the opportunity to establish the fact that they rank with the leading British and Italian players as one of the world's great pairs.

Britain defeated Canada 108-97 to take third place, and the British ladies finally lowered their flag to Sweden, their first defeat in thirty successive rounds at Baden-Baden and New York. This was the final table in the Ladies' Championship.

Gt. Britain	95
U.S.A.	85
France	72
U.A.R.	69
Denmark	67
Sweden	67
S. Africa	65
Ireland	61
Belgium	51
Mexico	44
Venezuela	42
Canada	41
Argentina	37
Bermuda	24
Chile	14

## WRITE TO THE WATCHER


ON ANY TOPIC CONNECTED WITH BRIDGE



# THE WATCHER

*Unbridled banter from our Special Commissioner on the inside of big bridge.*

*This month his correspondents touch on some delicate topics.*



I was in France during the last week of the Olympiad, and in *Le Bridgeur* of May 15th I read a complimentary account of the performance of the British team, including a reference to "deux lutteurs de 70 ans." One of the players concerned was said, in a television interview during the tournament at Oslo six years ago, to be then in his middle seventies. Isn't it nice to think that our representatives are growing younger?

Senex, Brighton.

*And prettier.*

\* \* \*

I have been left a small legacy by an aunt, and friends advise me that the safest way to invest the money is to back the under-forties in the proposed challenge match against the over-fifties (see March editorial).

When is the match, or series, to take place, and where can I get some action?

Bonanza, Streatham.

*Let's start picking teams. The over-fifties could begin with five players from the Olympic team, with others like Swimer, Gardener and Rose as alternatives. The under-forties could select Flint, Rodrigue, Hiron, Crown, Swinner-ton-Dyer. Bit thin after that. Writing as a between-forty-and-fifty neutral, I say, keep your money in your piggy-bank, Bonanza.*

\* \* \*

The British are supposed to be famous for understatement.

You could have fooled me. A British magazine published a fanciful story that Waldemar von Zedtwitz tore down a soft-drink advertisement at the New York Olympiads, supposedly paying the bridge authorities 1,000 dollars to compensate for the lost revenue.

In fact, what von Zedtwitz objected to was a 25-cent price tag at a coffee counter in the closed room.

That reads to me like a 4,000%

exaggeration. And in the same publication I see that someone I've never heard of is the *best* tournament director in the *world*. That doesn't seem like understatement either.

Who's the genius who knows so much about all the tournament directors in the world?

Disillusioned, *New York*.

*This throwing around of superlatives is one of the less attractive journalistic habits, I agree. Honi so it, and all that, but I sometimes suspect that part of the intention is to pique others who have some reputation in the same line. Had the writer said that Heredia was the best smoker of Russian cigarettes among tournament directors, no one would have argued!*

\* \* \*

Reports have reached the provinces that all three partnerships in the women's team that won the Olympiad are breaking up. What would have happened if they had lost?

F.R.L., *Nottingham*.

*I had heard this about two of the pairs, it is true. Of course, it has happened before. Broken hearts are often mended before the tapes go up.*

\* \* \*

Is the "Prepared Club" a System?

I thought it was just a bid. But at the Scarborough Congress a

number of players simply wrote the words "Prepared Club" on their card, and if asked for details replied with vague generalities and sometimes impatience.

Yet it was played with both strong and weak no trumps, variable diamond responses, and jump responses that were sometimes strong, sometimes preemptive. Two-bids also varied. To any query the stock answer was "Prepared Club."

For me, the Congress, enjoyable as it was from the social angle, was a complete write-off from the bridge point of view. One doesn't expect people at Congresses to come with rules of their own about which they are prepared to be aggressive, quoting some "expert" from Grimsby as their authority.

I am not sure what Tournament Directors can do, as matters stand. What can the E.B.U. do about it?

Exiled Tyke, *Worcester*.

*Don't quite see what you are complaining about. If players want to bid One Club when they have no five-card major, and are vague about the rest of their methods, how is that worse than facing the rigid and highly artificial systems?*

*Ten boards, I wager,*

*Of the Little Major,*

*Would send this Tyke*

*Home to Heckmondwike.*



I was interested in the suggestion reported by Mr. R. Franks ("You Say," May issue) that in the interest of natural bidding the auction should be limited to two rounds: opening bid, first response, rebid by opener, and second response. Finish!

I have been devising a method to meet this ruling. Any response of a major over a minor should

show in the first place four cards of the intervening suit, or, if they are touching, the lower valued suit. A jump preference in a minor has the sense of a delayed game raise, with Texas operating in all sequences where . . . .

Little Minor, Harrow.

Stop, L.M.! We take your point.

## VISIT THE EASTBOURNE CONGRESS

**9th-12th OCTOBER**

*CAPACITY TO BE ENLARGED THIS YEAR*

## One Hundred Up

Conducted by ALAN HIRON

### July Competition

A panel of experts will answer the questions and the marking of the competition will be determined by, though not necessarily in strict proportion to, the votes of the panel.

#### FIRST PRIZE

Two Guineas.

#### SECOND AND THIRD PRIZES

One Guinea.

*Please read these rules carefully.* No competitor may send in more than one entry. Only annual subscribers are eligible.

Answers should be sent to One Hundred Up, British Bridge World, 35 Dover Street, London, W.1, to arrive not later than first post on August 1. Some latitude will be given to overseas competitors.

**Problem No. 1 (10 points)**

Match-point pairs, love all, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
	1♠	Dble	2♠

?

South holds:

♠AK5 ♥Q943 ♦Q7 ♣QJ82

What should South bid?

**Problem No. 2 (20 points)**

I.m.p. scoring, love all, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
	1♠	2♣	3♦
4♣	No	5♣	5♦

?

South holds:

♠J10532 ♥A7 ♦QJ ♣QJ86

(a) Do you agree with South's bid of Four Clubs? If not, what alternative do you prefer?

(b) What should South bid now?

**Problem No. 3 (10 points)**

I.m.p. scoring, North-South vulnerable, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
		1NT	2♠

?

(North's bid of 1NT shows 12-14 points.)

South holds:

♠AJ4 ♥J7642 ♦5 ♣AJ72

What should South bid?

**Problem No. 4 (10 points)**

Match-point pairs, North-South vulnerable, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
	1NT	No	No

?

South holds:

♠— ♥K9632 ♦AQ87 ♣AK84

What should South bid?

**Problem No. 5 (10 points)**

Rubber bridge, love all, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
1♦	1♥	2♣	No
3♣	No	3♥	No
3NT	No	4♠	No

?

South holds:

♠J8 ♥K10 ♦QJ732 ♣AQ107

What should South bid?

**Problem No. 6 (10 points)**

Rubber bridge, love all, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
		1♦	No
1♥	No	3NT	No

?

South holds:

♠K76 ♥AJ9864 ♦K9 ♣108

What should South bid?

**Problem No. 7 (20 points)**

I.m.p. scoring, love all, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
1♠	No	2♦	No
3♠	No	4♣	No
5♠	No	5♠	No

?

South holds:

♠KQJ985 ♥AK ♦4 ♣Q832

(a) Do you agree with South's bid of Four Clubs? If not, what alternative do you prefer?

(b) What should South bid now?

**Problem No. 8 (10 points)**

Rubber bridge, love all, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
		No	1NT
No	2♣	No	2♦
No	3♥	No	3NT
No	6NT	All pass	

South holds:

♠K10842 ♥864 ♦872 ♣83

What should South lead?

# Directory of E.B.U. Affiliated Clubs

## BERKSHIRE

**READING BRIDGE CLUB**, 35 Jesse Terrace, Reading. Tel. Reading 52136. Hon. Sec. C. T. Holloway. Hours of play: 2 p.m. to 6 p.m. and 7 p.m. to 11 p.m. Duplicate alternate Mondays. Cut-in (3d.): 2nd., 4th and 5th Tuesday afternoons, every Tuesday evening and every Thursday afternoon. Partnership (3d.) 1st. and 3rd. Tuesday afternoons, every Thursday and Saturday evening. Partnership (6d.) every Tuesday evening.

## HANTS

**BOURNEMOUTH, GROVE ROAD BRIDGE CLUB**—East Cliff Cottage, 57 Grove Road, Bournemouth 24311. Hon. Sec., Mrs. Moss. Stakes 3d. Partnership, Thurs. and Sat. aft., Sun. evening. Duplicate, 1st Wed., 3rd Fri.

**SOUTHAMPTON, SUTHERLAND BRIDGE CLUB**—2 Rockstone Place. Tel.: 25291 or 73656. Hon. Sec., Mrs. Cahalan. Stakes 2d. Partnership: Tues. eve. and Wed. aft. Cut-in: Mon. and Fri. aft., Thurs. and Sat. eve. Duplicate: 3rd Mon. eve. (Sept. to May).

**WISSEX CLUB**, Lindsay Manor, Lindsay Road, Bournemouth. Westbourne 64034. Hon. Sec., The Secretary. 6d. Partnership Mon. aft., Wed. evening. 2d. Partnership Tues. aft. and Fri. aft. Duplicate 1st, 2nd and 4th Friday evening each month and 3rd Thursday afternoon. 6d. cut-in every night except Partnership and Duplicate days. 2d. or 6d. cut-in every afternoon. Visitors welcome.

## ISLE OF WIGHT

**SHANKLIN, CRAIGMORE BRIDGE CLUB**—Howard Road, Shanklin, I.W. Shanklin 2940. Hon. Sec., J. S. Danby. Stakes 2d. Duplicate Mon. (Oct. to May). Partnership, Tues.

## KENT

**WEST KENT CLUB**—12 Boyne Park, Tunbridge Wells, Kent. Tunbridge Wells 21513. Hon. Sec., R. H. Corbett. Stakes 3d. and 6d. Partnership, Mon. and Wed. 6d., Wed. and Fri. 3d. Duplicate, 1st and 3rd Sat. (2.15).

**SIDCUP**—Sidcup Bridge Club, Sidcup Golf Club, Hurst Road, Sidcup. Hon. Sec., Mrs. W. Davis, 24 Carlton Road, Sidcup. Telephone: FOO 1868. Stakes 3d. Partnerships Mon., Wed., Fri. Duplicate Mon., Wed.

## LANCS

**LIVERPOOL**—Liverpool Bridge Club, 22 Upper Duke Street, Liverpool. Tel.: Royal 8180. Hon. Sec., Mrs. H. T. Halewood. Partnerships Tue., Fri. afternoon. Duplicate Mon. evening.

## LONDON

**MAYFAIR BRIDGE STUDIO**—110 Mount Street, W1. (2nd floor). GRO 2844. Hon. Sec., Mrs. H. Ponting. Stakes 1/- and 6d. Partnership Sun. Wed. evenings 6d., Mon. afternoon 6d. Duplicate pairs 1st and 3rd Thursday evenings 7.30. 2nd and 4th Sun. afternoons, teams 2nd and 4th Sat. evenings. Tuition by G. C. H. Fox.

## MIDDLESEX

**HIGHGATE BRIDGE CLUB**—80 Highgate West Hill, N.6. MOU 3423. Hon. Sec., Mrs. Osborn. Stakes 2d. Partnership Wed. afternoons, Friday and Saturday evenings.

## NOTTINGHAM

**NOTTINGHAM BRIDGE CLUB**—401 Mansfield Road, Nottingham 65995. (Mr. and Mrs. Jack Hammond.) Half-way house for Sunday matches. Duplicate Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Saturday 7 p.m.

## SURREY

**EPSOM, MAYFIELD BRIDGE CLUB**—2a St. Martins Avenue, Epsom 4938. Hon. Secs. H. G. & O. M. Biggs. Stakes, 3d. (except Wed. & Fri. aft. 6d.) Partnership, Mon., Wed., aft. Wed., Fri., eve. Closed Sunday.

**HEATH BRIDGE CLUB**—The Heath, Weybridge. Weybridge 43620. Hon. Sec., C. G. Ainger. Always open. Visitors welcome. Stakes 3d. Partnership Tues. aft., Fri. aft. Duplicate Mon. and Thurs. eve. Tuition available.

## SUSSEX

**HORSHAM BRIDGE CLUB**—Secretary, Mrs. M. E. Binney. Horsham 4921 or 2078. Partnership Wed. and Fri. afternoons, Sun. evenings Cut-in Mon., Thurs., Sat. afternoons. Duplicate Tues. evenings, Chess Club Mon. evenings. Stakes 3d.

**BOGNOR CLUB**—2 Sudley Road, Bognor Regis. (Bridge section). Cut in, Mon., Tues., Thurs., Fri. and Sat. afternoons, Fri. evening. Partnership Wed. afternoon and Tues. evening. Duplicate, the first Tues. afternoon in each month. Stakes 3d.

**WHITEHALL RESIDENTIAL BRIDGE CLUB**—11/12 Howard Square, Eastbourne. Eastbourne 4544. Sec., Miss J. Fidler. Stakes 2d. and 3d. Partnership, Tues. and Fri. aft., Wed. and Sat. evening. Duplicate Sunday.

## WARWICKSHIRE

**HEATHERCROFT BRIDGE CLUB**—2 Pebble Mill Road, Birmingham 5. SELly Oak 0448. Stakes 3d. to 1/- . Cut-in or Partnership every aft. and eve. Duplicate Sun. eve., Mon. aft., and as desired by Members. Visitors welcome.

Would you like particulars of your club (address, telephone, hon. sec., stakes, partnership days, duplicate days) to be listed in this Directory every month? If so, please write to our Advertisement Manager (see address on page 4) for very reasonable terms.



# THE INFORMATORY PASS

*C. Ellwood Holmes of Newcastle discusses action by third-hand after a takeout double has been made.*

The same bid in the same circumstances cannot have two different meanings, and this should also apply to a pass. Suppose West holds:

(i) ♠J632 ♥32 ♦1097 ♣K654

If East deals and bids One Club which South doubles, West is not scared of the possibility of North passing for penalties. There certainly will not be a heavy loss. But if West holds instead:

(ii) ♠Q642 ♥9532 ♦10987 ♣2

Now One Club doubled may cost the earth. In fact, *in a Camrose match* it cost 800. In my view it is foolish to pass in that sort of situation. After all, partner has promised a rebid and in most cases this will not be Two Clubs. A "free bid" in these circumstances should *not* show strength; with a strong hand one can redouble or make a jump shift. A pass should show a hand like (i). That is what I

mean by the expression, *Informatory Pass*.

Players who say that a "free bid" shows strength argue that if opener does not fancy playing in One Club doubled he can redouble for a rescue. But he may see no reason to call out the lifeboat.

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

If these are the partnership cards in Example (ii), East is certainly not going to redouble, yet a contract of One Diamond will be far better than One Club doubled.

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

On the other hand, if this is the situation in Example (i), and East redoubles, no contract which may



then be reached shows any advantage over One Club doubled. Playing the Informatory Pass East would stand the double, knowing that West had bits and pieces in clubs.

The Informatory Pass can also be used when *partner* has made the takeout double and next hand has redoubled. Suppose North opens One Spade, East doubles and South redoubles. West holds:

♠832 ♥98 ♦764 ♣87652

One school says, "I have a worthless hand so I shall pass. The redouble lets me out. Partner can get himself out of the mess."

One fallacy in this argument is that it is not partner's mess but a *partnership* mess, and therefore it is not clever to curl up under the redouble. By doubling partner has asked for information: the redouble makes it all the more imperative to answer without delay. In any case, if we pass the above how is wretched partner to know we are not passing on, say:

♠QJ10942 ♥6 ♦9874 ♣K9

Once again a pass should not be made on two entirely different distributions.

A different doubling situation often makes difficulties for even experienced players. East bids One Spade, next hand butts in

## The Acol System today

by **TERENCE REESE** and  
**ALBERT DORMER**

'At long last there is a genuine classic on the Acol System . . . A really outstanding book.'

*Sunday Telegraph*

'The best exposition of good bidding ever to appear in a book.'

*Hy Lavinthal*

18s. net

**Edward Arnold**

41, Maddox Street, London, W.1

with Two Diamonds, and West holds:

♠9 ♥98 ♦KJ9876 ♣A1098

If he is wise, West refrains from doubling because he knows partner will be unable to stand the double in 99 cases out of 100. So West takes the penalty undoubled. You say that East may have a doubleton and therefore could stand the double? Granted, but then the other opponent won't. My own rule for sticking low-level doubles as opener in situations like this is to add my quick tricks to my trumps and to remove the double if "quickies" and trumps don't total 4½—5.

Should we not be pleased that pairs trials can turn up occasional winners like Swinnerton-Dyer and Barbour, rather than wring our hands at the possibility—yet to eventuate—that occasional duds might get into the team?

Clearly there was nothing in the 1962 trials to lessen confidence in the "Butler" method. And, remember that these were early days for the method; there was every reason to hope that experience would suggest ways of improving it. Yet, the following year the British Bridge League abandoned the "Butler" method. No explanation was given at the time and none has been given since, but there were signs of behind-the-scenes pressure.

For the European Championships at Baden Baden in 1963, the B.B.L. reverted to the method of which Reese approves—a team trial from which the players were to be selected, not on the basis of results but on form displayed. This time Reese agreed to play and, after a series of closely-contested matches, the selectors chose Reese and Schapiro, Konstantin and J. Tarlo, taking two individuals to complete the team—Flint and Harrison-Gray. It was generally felt at the time that the team was thus composed in order to facilitate the debut of the Little Major system. (Flint

had played a part in the invention of the system, and if he were to be selected the addition of another single player was a necessary consequence. Later, in New York, this team structure resulted in British players, alone of the leading countries, playing different systems with different partners.)

Whether or not the theory that the team was thus composed in order to accommodate the Little Major is true, the fact is that Swinnerton-Dyer and Barbour, who since winning the 1962 trials had continued in fine form, were passed over. One would have thought that, if the decision were at all close, they should have been given preference on grounds of looking to the future, for in all conscience our veterans have had a long enough innings, and every game needs the revitalising influence of new blood from time to time.

History shows that these troublesome episodes are concomitants of selection methods which are not based directly on results. A further example was seen before the New York Olympiads. After announcing their intention of holding trials, the selectors did not do so. There were "difficulties." Probably the members of the Baden Baden team did their best to co-operate, but at all events the outcome was that

they went to the Olympiad *en bloc* without trials.

### The way ahead

Returning to Terence Reese's letter in last month's *British Bridge World*, he proposes an illusory hypothesis designed to find out what any selection committee might do if offered a large financial reward. But, what people will do if you reward them handsomely is different from what they will do if you don't. That was long ago found true of judges, and bridge players are not of lesser partiality.

Referring to the fact that the expenses of British teams are paid, in one way or another, by the rank and file, Reese asks, "What do they want for their money?" I believe they want an official news medium, better prizes, more Bridge-O-Rama, a permanent headquarters and shopwindow, a better-publicised master-point system. So far as team expenses are concerned, the rank and file would probably be just as happy if players paid their own expenses (discreet provision being made for those who could not easily afford to do so); at any rate until the real priorities in the promotion of the game are met.

Reese adds, "Many countries

recently have followed divided policies, with the result that France took the field without Ghestem, Jais, or Trezel, America without Mathe and one or two others who would have strengthened their team."

What were these "divided policies"? France, U.S.A. and Italy, followed a uniform policy: they determined their teams by means of long pairs trials. Ghestem did not play with his regular partner, Bacherich, but he came a good fourth; the latter *did* win his place. Jais and Trezel did not enter for the trials. As for Lew Mathe, he is considered by many to be the best single American player. He did in fact come a very good fourth in the American trials (the top three qualifying) and he and his partner were reserves for the Olympiad.

It is human and understandable, in the artificial atmosphere of big bridge, if players over-estimate their importance to the game. The way for the season ticket-holders to guard against that danger is to co-operate in the building of a long-lasting trials scheme, integrated with the annual competition programme, giving everyone a fair chance of securing recognition at the various representative levels, and bringing added zest to the game instead of disillusionment.



# ONE HUNDRED UP

Conducted by ALAN HIRON

**June solutions:** If you did not enter for the June competition, try your hand at the problems on page 16 before reading how the experts voted.

The panel for the June competition consisted of the following seventeen experts: Mrs. R. Markus, M. Buckley, E. Crowhurst, R. Crown, G. C. H. Fox, J. Nunes, T. Reese, D. Rimington, C. Rodrigue, J. Sharples and N. Smart, all of London and the Home Counties; C. E. Phillips of Cheshire; H. Filarski of Amsterdam; J. Besse of Geneva; J. le Dentu of Paris; K. Barbour of Massachusetts; and J. Vanden Borre of Ghent.

## Problem No. 1 (10 points)

Match-point pairs, North-South vulnerable, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
1♥	Dble	1♠	No

?

South holds:

♠10 ♥AK873 ♦KJ82 ♣K104

What should South bid?

**Answer:** No Bid, 10; 1NT, 5; Two Diamonds, 2.

**The panel's vote:** 11 for No Bid; 4 for 1NT (Mrs. Markus, Sharples, Rimington and Phillips); 2 for Two Diamonds (Besse and Vanden Borre).

If he is bidding in accordance with standard methods, North's One Spade bid shows a five or six card spade suit, not enough points to redouble, and possibly a dislike of our hearts. This being so, it seems unlikely that we can

improve upon a contract of One Spade, for 1NT will not be a happy spot if the hands fit badly. Why then, you may ask, was the question posed? Well, because I thought that it would catch a fair number of *competitors*. To my intense surprise, some of the panelists were out of phase:

**BESSE:** "Two Diamonds. I see no reason to suppress my natural rebid, just because West has inserted a double."

**SHARPLES:** "1NT. I think that it is wrong to pass on the assumption that partner has a particular type of hand. We are shortweight for our bid, but even if partner has no second suit to show there is no reason to suppose that 1NT will be an inferior contract to One Spade."

I regard it as a valuable principle, as suggested by a previous conductor, that no-trump rebids after partner has bid a suit over an opposing double should be a level lower than those made over a genuine unopposed response. In other words, a rebid of 1NT here would show the values for a 2NT rebid if West had remained silent. This is in contradiction to Phillips' suggestion:

**PHILLIPS:** "1NT. Since partner's response is non-forcing, he should recognise 1NT as a denial bid and not be tempted mulishly to repeat his suit."



However, the majority of the panel followed the normal course:

REESE: "No Bid. More valuable material for Bridge Academy."

BUCKLEY: "No Bid. What else? INT would show a better hand, even supposing that you wanted to bid it."

LE DENTU: "No Bid. After all I have got the ten of spades, and with any luck the opponents won't let us stop in One Spade."

FILARSKI: "No Bid. There was no reason for partner to show us a bad spade suit, and we have no excuse for making another bid."

### Problem No. 2 (20 points)

Love all, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
1♥	No	1♠	No
?			

South holds:

♠5 ♥AQJ1064 ♦KQ97 ♣96

What should South bid:

(a) At match-point pairs?

(b) At I.m.p. scoring?

*Answer to (a):* Two Hearts, 10; Two Diamonds, 3; Three Hearts, 3; Four Hearts, 3.

*The panel's vote:* 14 for Two Hearts; 1 for Two Diamonds (Smart); 1 for Three Hearts (Rimington); 1 for Four Hearts (Mrs. Markus).

Another tempting one (or so I fondly imagined) for the competitors. While it is perfectly possible to construct hands for North which will quite properly pass a simple rebid of Two Hearts by South and yet offer an excellent play for Four Hearts or even Five Diamonds, they will be outnumbered by hands on which a more aggressive move by South will lead to a negative score: and at pairs scoring it is not the *magnitude* of your successes and disasters that influences your score but their *frequency*. It is this very

factor which makes the neutral rebid of Two Diamonds on the present hand as unsatisfactory as a jump rebid in hearts. South's heart suit is self-sufficient, requiring no support from partner, and will produce a better match-point score than diamonds even if North can support them. Even supposing that North does not pass Two Diamonds, it will be difficult subsequently to insist upon hearts without taking the bidding too high.

NUNES: "Two Hearts. I don't want to play in diamonds whatever partner's red suit holdings are."

REESE: "Two Hearts. I am aware that the hand is worth more in terms of playing trick strength, but I think that Three Hearts should be reserved for hands with more in high cards. As you have only twelve points, there is little danger of Two Hearts being passed out."

Yes, this is a very good point which should allay any qualms South may have about making an under bid.

RODRIGUE: "Two Hearts. A suit worth emphasising. Partner will have to bid again before we get anywhere. and I should hate to be left in Two Diamonds."

Aware of the history of this offering:

CROWHURST: "Two Hearts. The trouble with playing with the conductor is that one's bidding errors subsequently get recorded for posterity. It must be admitted, however, that Two Diamonds is (and was) a clear error at match-points: if partner passes there is no reason to suppose that I can make the necessary extra trick or two in diamonds with our hearts as good as this."

No reason at all—you will remember that I watched you try? About two tricks *less* than the heart rebidders did.

*Answer to (b):* Two Hearts, 10; Two

Diamonds, 8; Three Hearts, 4; Four Hearts, 4.

*The panel's vote:* 10 for Two Hearts; 5 for Two Diamonds (Sharples, Crowhurst, Fox, Smart and Rimington); 1 for Three Hearts (Buckley); 1 for Four Hearts (Mrs. Markus).

At i.m.p. scoring our concern about playing in a slightly inferior part-score vanishes, but our fear of missing a thin game is greatly increased. The point made by Reese in (a) about a Three Heart rebid showing more high-card strength is still valid, but many of the objections to the Two Diamond rebid now lose force. Every so often North will hold some hand such as ♠Axxx ♥x ♦Axxxx ♣xxx; Two Hearts would close the auction, and yet we would not have minded having a flutter at Five Diamonds. Nevertheless, the majority of the panel still plumped for the super-sound Two Heart rebid and refused to annotate their choice afresh.

To Mrs. Markus both parts of the question were clearly rhetorical:

MRS. MARKUS: "Four Hearts. As I would have opened the bidding with Four Hearts at any form of scoring I cannot afford to bid less now."

SHARPLES: "Two Diamonds. I think that the hand is fractionally too good to suppress the good four-card suit."

FOX: "Two Diamonds. Game may be even with very little in the North hand if he has the right cards. Probably it is better for us to hold back a little and see if partner can bid again, but Two Diamonds might sound more encouraging to North than Two Hearts."

BUCKLEY: "Three Hearts. I know that many distinguished operators hold that hands worth a jump rebid in playing tricks but short of points should just make a simple rebid. But you score for bidding and making *games*, not for

holding points; and it is not true that 'someone will surely find a bid.' Partner may well pass a respectable ten points with nothing much in hearts if you only rebid Two Hearts and you need much less than that."

Besse makes a point, rarely aired in these exalted pages, that this would be a good hand for Roman or Canapé methods. By opening One Diamond and rebidding Two Hearts over a response of One Spade, South would show at least five hearts and four diamonds without reversing values. Two Hearts would be non-forcing and South's problems would be over, whatever the form of scoring.

### Problem No. 3 (10 points)

I.m.p. scoring, love all, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
	1♥	Dble	Redble

?

South holds:

♠10972 ♥1084 ♦74 ♣J832

What should South bid?

*Answer:* One Spade, 10; No Bid, 3.

*The panel's vote:* 14 for One Spade; 3 for No Bid (Le Dentu, Smart and Vanden Borre).

Theory has gone through several stages of metamorphosis regarding problems of this type. Originally a pass by South in this position would have been taken as showing a willingness to defend against One Heart redoubled, but the great rarity of hands of this type caused this idea to die a natural death. Next came the Culbertson viewpoint, namely that any bid by South in this position showed *some* values and probably a five-card suit. Finally came the modern idea, followed by practically all the panel, that a bid of the cheapest available suit in which partner had expressed an interest (in

*The new, true classic of bridge*

*(Guy Ramsey in the Daily Telegraph)*

## THE EXPERT GAME

by Terence Reese

Edward Arnold Ltd.

12s. 6d.

this case spades) shows absolutely nothing except four cards in the suit named. The idea behind this is, of course, that no bidding room has been taken up. Partner can pass with some measure of security should he have the suit with us; and should he have made a double with little support for our suit, we have done nothing to prevent him rescuing himself at the same level that he would have done had we passed. Note that, had the bidding proceeded, say, *One Club—Double—Redouble*, then South would have no reason for showing his spade suit in case partner had a respectable five-card heart suit into which he wished to rescue himself. A bid of *One Spade* by South after this sequence would suggest the values shown by the Culbertson scheme. Of course a pass would not show the old-fashioned "willingness to defend," but merely nothing constructive to say, and very probably denying four cards in the cheapest available suit.

REESE: "One Spade. Never a sign of strength but simply a measure to prevent partner with three spades and five diamonds from bidding at the Two level."

PHILLIPS: "One Spade. In this situation I play the pass as denying four-card length in the cheapest suit."

BESSE: "One Spade. In my view it is very important for the doubler's partner to show a four-card suit at the cheapest

level; all the more so if he is very weak. I would also bid *One Spade* if my spades were only as strong as 6-5-3-2."

What the cognoscenti call a "Fox-suit," for of all the panel, Foxy is the most liable to introduce a suit of this calibre, even when not under pressure.

FILARSKI: "One Spade. The psychological disadvantage of passing the redouble is that opponents will double any further bids by our side and we will not know where to park."

### Problem No. 4 (10 points)

Rubber bridge, East-West vulnerable, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
		2♠	No

?

South holds:

♠93 ♥J1096 ♦Q975 ♣AK4

What should South bid?

Answer: Three Clubs, 10; 3NT, 7; 2NT, 5.

*The panel's vote:* 9 for Three Clubs; 6 for 3NT (Nunes, Buckley, Vanden Borre, Besse, Crown and Rodrigue); 2 for 2NT (Filarski and Smart).

Here my brief honeymoon with the panel must come to an end. While I am not entranced by the majority suggestion of Three Clubs, the second ranked alternative of 3NT fills me with horror. I'll make my points first and then the panelists can take over. Firstly in responding Three Clubs to the opening bid, there is a very grave danger that partner will greatly over-value a holding such as Qx or QJx in clubs and fondly imagine that South's supposed club suit will furnish several discards.

I am reminded irresistibly of a celebrated disaster from the 1960 National Pairs Final when the editor, playing with Harrison-Gray, reached a grand slam on a three-three fit—admittedly they didn't actually *play* there, but their



subsequent final contract was not a success. In the second place, I feel that a jump to 3NT is unnecessarily cramping and obstructive and that if the bid *exists*, it should be restricted to 4-3-3-3 hands with no Aces. I'm all for Filarski's ideas here:

FILARSKI: "2NT. If partner can show a second suit, then we are well placed. If he continues with Three Spades, South can make a try with Four Clubs (which I do *not* play as showing a long and broken club suit). A bid of 3NT tells only a story about points—but nothing about fits. It is a sound principle, that a response of 2NT need not always show a weak hand."

And all the rest were out of step . . .

RIMINGTON: "Three Clubs. Any other bid, except possibly 3NT is unthinkable."

RODRIGUE: "3NT. Just about ideal—10-11 points with a doubleton in partner's suit and no attractive suit of our own."

BESSE: "3NT. I don't see any less misleading action."

FOX: "Three Clubs. The hand is worth a positive reply and it is best to bid the suit with tops."

REESE: "Three Clubs. Best, on the whole, to show where the tricks are."

I would be the last to dispute the fact that, if you must bid a *suit*, then clubs are best.

#### Problem No. 5 (10 points)

Rubber bridge, North-South vulnerable, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
		1♥	No
2♣	3♦	No	No
?			

(West's 3♦ bid is strong, but not forcing.)

South holds:

♠K1087 ♥J6 ♦A5 ♣A10972

What should South bid?

Answer: Double, 10; Three Spades, 6; Three Hearts, 4.

The panel's vote: 9 for Double; 6 for Three Spades (Nunes, Barbour, Vanden Borre, Crowhurst, Crown and Fox); 2 for Three Hearts (Buckley and Phillips).

They're back in step again! Certainly the case for the double seems very strong. Partner cannot read it as showing a powerful holding in diamonds in view of the bidding, therefore it must just show satisfactory values all round. Both of the alternative suggestions; although possessing their good points, seem a little pawky. Three Hearts suggests a slightly poorer hand with another heart—perhaps merely competitive; whereas Three Spades must be effectively forcing unequivocally to game. After all if partner simply gives you a preference to Four Clubs, you will feel bound to try Four Hearts in case you are missing an easy game.

REESE: "Double. Whatever you tell me, West's Three Diamond call is probably based on about seven playing tricks. You must take some action and partner will realise that the double is to some extent co-operative."

RIMINGTON: "Double. Difficult, but if partner decides to pass the double we have probably done the right thing."

SHARPLES: "Double. Had we foreseen developments, it might have worked out better to have responded with One Spade to the opening bid, but one cannot cavil at the Two Club response. As it is we are left with no choice but to double. We cannot commit our side to the Four level, nor can we support partner with only a doubleton. The decision to stand the double rests with partner for it obviously cannot be based on trump tricks."



However, Three Spades had its advocates:

NUNLS: "Three Spades. I can't afford to miss a game. Partner can have four spades with me or on the other hand he may have a good heart suit. I can't see us going more than one off in Four Hearts and I may hit the jackpot."

FOX: "Three Spades. North may have four spades which he was unable to bid over Three Diamonds. If he converts to Four Clubs it will be all right. I would prefer better trumps for a double."

VANDEN BORRE: "Three Spades. I know partner may be weak, but I have twelve beautiful points. There may well be a problem for us on the next round, but we'll worry about that later."

According to the doublers, better trumps are the one thing that you cannot have. And the last idea:

PHILLIPS: "Three Hearts. This is a classic problem situation—the inference is that partner's hearts are good, else what was he intending to rebid had our response been in diamonds? Indeed a jump all the way to Four Hearts could not be strongly criticised."

Perhaps this reasoning is not as watertight as you make it sound. Partner could have been moodily regarding a poor opening with five indifferent to middling hearts and perhaps three card support for your minor suit and wondering whether to rebid his hearts or take the bidding to the three level with a poor hand. He would have been overjoyed to hear West's intervention, relieving him of a difficult choice—especially as the butt-in would have required him to bid at a higher level.

#### Problem No. 6 (10 points)

l.m.p. scoring, love all, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
-------	------	-------	------

		1♣	No
1♥	No	3NT	No

?

South holds:

♠1043 ♥KQ976 ♦874 ♣AQ

What should South bid?

Answer: No Bid, 10; Four Clubs, 8; 4NT, 3.

The panel's vote: 9 for No Bid; 7 for Four Clubs (Filarski, Buckley, Vanden Borre, Phillips, Le Dentu, Crowhurst and Reese); 1 for 4NT (Mrs. Markus).

The Ace and Queen of partner's first bid suit are vitally important cards, worth far more than their nominal six points. For slam purposes on this hand, an equally important feature will be the degree of partner's fit with South's hearts; and if North has the required measure of fit, then Six can be a lay-down with perhaps only 30 points instead of the traditional 33-34 necessary for a small slam. Suppose, for example, that North holds ♠AKx ♥Axx ♦Axx ♣KJxx—a perfectly ordinary nineteen count without a long suit—then twelve tricks will be there for the taking, provided that the hearts divide amenably. This is the type of slam that is repeatedly missed by point-count operators, and about half of the panel thought that the South hand warranted an effort.

LE DENTU: "Four Clubs. I am not coward enough to pass, but after this I am going to use all my brakes!"

CROWHURST: "Four Clubs. We ought to be investigating slam prospects here and this seems the bid best designed to help partner. The only alternative is a quantitative bid of 4NT but Nothing Bids of this kind often leave partner in the dark as to what is required of him."

PHILLIPS: "Four Clubs. The object

is to coax a Four Heart preference—a slam is likely to depend upon whether we can bring in our heart suit. At all events, 4NT should be safe."

MRS. MARKUS: "4NT. Quantitative and natural. Partner must realise that a fit in hearts is essential before going on."

RODRIGUE: "No Bid. Quo vadis? Partner hasn't opened 2NT, so my expectation is of nineteen points with something in hearts to twenty-one points with nothing (say xx) in my suit."

I don't think that a small doubleton will deter many of our panelists from opening 2NT—you should see some of the distributions for 2NT bids they have been endorsing in recent months. And for slam purposes we would prefer nineteen points with something in hearts rather than twenty-one without—which is why Mrs. Markus's 4NT does not receive my accolade for she is likely to end in the wrong slam.

RIMINGTON: "No Bid. Partner cannot have enough unless the hands are a perfect fit. A quantitative 4NT could still get partner bounding into Six with a maximum but leaving the opponents with two Aces to cash."

With which comment you strike an inadvertent blow in favour of Four Clubs. After a try in a suit partner is less likely to go leaping into a slam *with only one Ace in his hand*.

SMART: "No Bid. Partners who bid like this always turn up with 3-2-2-5 distributions and the heart tricks are there if only we could get at them."

The Ace and Queen of Clubs might prove of assistance. . . .

**Problem No. 7 (20 points)**

Match-point pairs, East-West vulnerable, the bidding has gone:

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

South holds:

♠AKJ42 ♥AK9 ♦10832 ♣10

(a) What should South bid?

(b) What should South bid if East had passed?

*Answer to (a):* Two Diamonds, 10; No Bid, 6; Double, 5; Two Spades, 4; Two Hearts, 4.

*The panel's vote:* 8 for Two Diamonds; 4 for No Bid (Filarski, Buckley, Crown and Crowhurst); 2 for Double (Mrs. Markus and Barbour); 2 for Two Spades (Reese and Vanden Borre); 1 for Two Hearts (Smart).

There was plenty of choice for South's optimum bid here, but the majority settled for showing South's second suit although it was only headed by the ten. It would be nice, they said, to pass and see if partner wanted to double Two Clubs, for to collect 200 at this vulnerability would be a pleasure. Unfortunately partner might only have a minimum response and be unable either to double or introduce a four card suit into the auction and so action of some kind was called for. Two Diamonds has the edge over a rebid of South's spade suit for it might find partner with four or even five diamonds and still leaves him with the option of returning to Two Spades if he does not hold four or more diamonds.

NUNES: "Two Diamonds. I cannot take the risk of partner passing. He must have at least three of one of my biddable suits. If Two Clubs was going off—well, it's unlucky."

LE DENTU: "Two Diamonds. Let's try something modern! If the diamond suit looks too ugly we shall have to close our eyes."

FOX: "Two Diamonds. Partner will convert to Two Spades if it is at all possible; he knows that we are playing match-point pairs."

RODRIGUE: "Two Diamonds. This

offers our best chance of competing."

SHARPLES: "Two Diamonds. Partner is likely to hold length in one of the red suits so this is a must. Before giving preference on a doubleton spade he should of course make the 'cost nothing' bid of Two Hearts if he happens to hold a five-card suit. Of course, the ideal bid would be a take-out double!"

There's many a true word. . . .

BARBOUR: "Double. A double which partner is expected to leave in with *either* long clubs (when I will hold a hand such as this) *or* with short clubs (when I will have them.) Here I can provide a full quota of defensive tricks and will welcome any alternative contract if partner has to take out."

Mrs. Markus has the same idea, and you must admit that it seems a useful weapon to have up your sleeve to cope with this awkward type of holding. I have an earlier conductor, Alan Truscott, to thank for this stratagem which I had hoped more panelists might stumble upon.

CROWHURST: "No Bid. But only at this vulnerability and at this form of scoring. If partner is looking forward to doubling, I should hate to get in his way. Even if he is unable to double he may be able to compete with Two Diamonds, Two Hearts or Two Spades. Of course, I shall help him by thinking for a minute or two before passing."

Not in my columns you won't! We don't play that sort of music round here.

Even without the trance, the pass is likely to work well and received a certain amount of support.

The dull and unimaginative Two Spades had its fans:

REESE: "Two Spades. It would be nice if partner could double Two Clubs but you cannot rely on it. You must be able to make 110 or 140 playing in spades."

"... improves on Dr. Johnson. It gives the bridge player both argument and understanding."

(*Manchester Guardian*)

## THE BRIDGE PLAYER'S DICTIONARY

by TERENCE REESE

*Mayflower*

21s.

VANDEN BORRE: "Two Spades. Reluctantly, but what else?"

There was yet another idea:

SMART: "Two Hearts. An obvious bid. Two Diamonds is too misleading."

While, as usual, I suspect that you have your tongue in your cheek by the time you get to Problem 7, I must admit that this solution *could* work well. But I feel that it could hardly work *better* than Two Diamonds which allows partner even more elbow room.

*Answer to (b):* No Bid, 10; Two Diamonds, 8; Two Spades, 5.

*The panel's vote:* They didn't. By some mischance I omitted to include (b) on the panelists' questionnaires. However, the editor has told me that no expense is to be spared, and so I rapidly polled a typical cross-section of panel by telephone with the results indicated above.

Technically speaking, South should remove from the contract of INT for he has an unbalanced hand. However, the match-point factor reared its ugly head in no mean fashion:

REESE: "No Bid. When in doubt, always play INT in match-point pairs!"

BUCKLEY: "No Bid. The hand *may*



play better in any one of three suits; but when the situation is as nebulous as this it is better to play in a seven trick contract."

I must say that I would always toil on with Two Diamonds in a situation like this—not so much in the hope of ever playing in a diamond contract, but in the expectation of being returned to my spades. Two Diamonds is certain to show a five-card spade suit so at match-point pairs I expect to be put back if partner holds two spades and three diamonds. Two Diamonds is likely to be a winning bid if partner has three spades and no full stopper in clubs and will only be demonstrably worse than the suggested pass if partner has been compelled to respond 1NT with a singleton spade and only three diamonds. Then, I freely concede, I will be in a silly contract and those playing in 1NT will be in the money.

#### Problem No. 8 (10 points)

I.m.p. scoring, love all, the bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
			1♥
No	3♥	No	4♥
No	No	No	
?			

South holds:

♠K842 ♥J5 ♦A742 ♣1083

What should South lead?

*Answer:* Two of Spades, 10; Any Club, 8; Five of Hearts, 4; Jack of Hearts, 4.

*The panel's vote:* 7 for Two of Spades; 5 for the Three of Clubs (Mrs. Markus, Sharples, Phillips, Crowhurst and Fox);

1 for Eight of Clubs (Rimington); 1 for Ten of Clubs (Barbour); 2 for Jack of Hearts (Vanden Borre and Le Dentu); 1 for Five of Hearts (Buckley).

Another problem offering plenty of choice. With no well-defined lead, South's aim is to select the lead that is least likely to do his side any harm. Quite a few panelists observed that they would like to lead a trump on this bidding but that the holding of Jack and another was a very unfavourable one to broach. The lead away from the King of Spades collected the most support: as Reese observes:

REESE: "Two of Spades. Many players do not realise that a lead from a King is less likely to give up a trick than from any other high card. If you can find partner with the Queen or the Ace then you have not done much harm, and if the Ace is on your right then you may still enjoy the King."

Others were not quite so convincing with their motives:

BESSE: "Two of Spades. I am quite willing to admit that *any* other lead might work better!"

SMART: "Two of Spades. Another triumph for the psychic thumb."

Others felt that one of South's nondescript clubs might be less likely to prove disastrous:

PHILLIPS: "Three of Clubs. The least unattractive choice. A trump lead from this holding invariably costs me a trick, partner turning up with Kx or Qxx."

RIMINGTON: "Eight of Clubs. I should really know the day of the week

**A FRIEND OVERSEAS WOULD APPRECIATE  
A SUBSCRIPTION TO  
THE BRITISH BRIDGE WORLD**



before I take a guess on this one. If you twist my arm, then I'll do something I've wanted to try for a long while and make a MUD lead."

(Master MUD Crowhurst has disappointed me this month with the lead problem.)

BARBOUR: "Ten of Clubs. The normal lead would be the card nearest the thumb when in doubt. However, the way I'm holding the hand, that is the Three of Clubs and if I led that partner might eventually return the suit and expect me to take some tricks."

And the final few decided that they could face partner's accusing stare if he happened to hold a high trump honour:

LE DENTU: "Jack of Hearts. Even if the worst happens and partner holds the protected Queen of Hearts there is always the chance that declarer might think that I am trying to pull one across him with a lead of ♡J from QJ bare."

BUCKLEY: "Five of Hearts. Any lead is likely to give a trick away, and there seems no reason why any of our other suits should be led, so I'll take my chance with this."

## G. C. H. FOX (continued)

cases. Sometimes, owing to a perverse lie of the cards it is impossible to make more than seven tricks. Pairs who have opened with a suit will find it difficult to stop below 2NT with a combined 24 count. The opening of 1NT ensures a plus score.

6. Frequency. There are more hands containing 12-14 points than those with 16-18 points.

The weak no trump also obviates certain rebid problems and makes it unnecessary to indulge in "prepared club" bids.

Having listed the numerous advantages you may wonder why anybody should ever consider playing a strong no trump, but the weak variety has its snags and these will be examined next month.

### RESULT OF JUNE COMPETITION

A very fine score by the winner, and extremely hard luck on the runner-up, whose score of 96 could normally be expected to win. Problems 1 and 3 had a lot in common this month; they were both dismissed as "routine" by the panel and yet competitors found the top-scoring solutions difficult.

**Winner:** C. LEIGHTON, Ibis, 78 Glenwood Gardens, Gants Hill, Ilford, Essex Max. 100

**Second:** MISS J. KERBY, 3/146 Great Portland Street, London, W.1 98

**Equal third:** J. T. NAYLOR, A10 Blenheim Drive, Allestree, Derby 96

J. HIBBERT, 15 Camellia Place, Twickenham, Middlesex 96

**Other leading scores:** D. J. DAY, D. J. WHEELER, 85; G. D. SHARPE, 84; J. T. CHAPMAN, 82; CIRCOLO DEL BRIDGE (Trieste), MRS. N. H. COATES, 81; A. A. WRIGHT, 88

J. W. FIELD, J. E. TAYLOR, 80; J. K. KROES (Holland), H. S. ROBINSON, M. D. 88

TEDD, 79; J. K. PATES, 78; MISS P. RHODES, 77; R. WADHAM, I. FOGG, A. A. PISCOTT- 88

DAY, 76. 88

Some further good scores in the May competitions were:

**Equal second:** CIRCOLO DEL BRIDGE, Trieste, via F. Filzi 14 90

A. A. PISCOTT-DAY, E. H. NUNN. 81



# BRIDGE ACADEMY

Conducted by G. C. H. FOX

*The noted bridge teacher and columnist continues his advice on tactics and scoring in match-point pairs contests.*

What type of no trump do you favour—weak or strong? Match point pairs contests probably provide the best conditions for the use of the weak (12–14) no trump, irrespective of vulnerability.

The advantages can be summarised as follows:

1. The pre-emptive value of the bid often enables partnerships to make a part score when a suit opening would have permitted the opponents to enter the bidding.

2. The part score being in no trumps will usually provide a higher score and consequently a better match point result.

3. The fact that the partner can safely pass the opening bid with as many as ten points creates a difficult situation for the opponents who cannot afford to be shut out. Suppose 1NT is followed by two passes and the last player has 12 or 13 points. He can estimate about 25 points on his corner, leaving 15 points

outstanding. If his partner holds his share of these or a trifle more it will pay him to compete, either by bidding or doubling. If it transpires that most of the missing strength is with the opener's partner he will do better to remain silent. In other words he has to guess what to do and no one can guess right all the time.

4. The opening weak no trump has a psychological effect on many players, inducing them to bid or double on unsound values. An example was given last month of an unsound double of a no trump resulting in a lucrative double by the opener's partner.

5. The knowledge that the opening bid cannot exceed 14 points often enables the hand to be played in the only makeable contract. For example, partner passes 1NT holding ten points. His side holds at most 24 points insufficient for game in most  
(Continued on page 50).



# PLAYING WISE

Dan Burgess develops your card-play with lessons designed especially for the improver.

*This month he continues his advice on ruffing.*

"But," she said "if I trump it, declarer will only over-trump me." Now, it is true that one doesn't normally sacrifice small trumps needlessly when declarer leads a card and you know he can ruff over you—but circumstances alter cases. You will meet many hands where declarer will want to lead master cards from one hand to discard losers from the other. Sometimes, the nature of the hand will compel him to do this before he draws trumps and, if you are able to ruff the suit easily, you will foil his plan. Take the following example: (*Next column*)

South is in Four Spades and your partner leads a heart won by declarer's ♥A. He now plays ♠A and leads a small spade to the Ace. Since he has no other entry to dummy he must play his clubs now in the hope of making two more tricks in the suit while discarding two losing hearts. When my lady pupil was defending and the third

NORTH	
♠	A x
♥	x x x
♦	x x x
♣	K Q J 10 x
WEST	
♠	J
♥	K x x
♦	Q J x x
♣	x x x x x
EAST	
♠	9 x x x
♥	Q J x x
♦	K x x
♣	x x
SOUTH	
♠	K Q 10 x x
♥	A x x
♦	A x x x
♣	A

club was led from dummy she wasn't going to sacrifice any trumps and discard—and she did the same when declarer continued with the Jack and 10 of Clubs. Now declarer made five club tricks, five spades and two Aces—twelve tricks in all. The crucial point is when declarer leads ♠Q. The defence must trump now or it is too late—once



declarer has three club tricks he has his contract. This is perhaps the simplest way of understanding the principle involved; if declarer leads a card which is a trick in its own right, it can rarely help him if you force him to trump his own winner.

The only exception would be when you see that your trump holding will, or may, provide the only hope for the setting trick. Take for example:

NORTH

♠ A x x

♥ Q x x

♦ x x x

♣ K Q J 10

WEST

♠ x

♥ A K x x

♦ A x x

♣ x x x x x

EAST

♠ J 10 x x

♥ x x x

♦ x x x x

♣ x x

SOUTH

♠ K Q 9 x x

♥ x x x

♦ K Q x

♣ A x

Again the contract is Four Spades and your partner has cashed his Ace and King of hearts and Ace of diamonds before switching to a club. Declarer overtakes the ♣10 with ♣A and continues with ♣K and Q. You, however, recall that you need only one trick to defeat

## AUTUMN CONGRESS

PORTHCAWL, SEPT. 24th-27th

Brochures from:

MRS. A. COPE,  
199 City Road, Cardiff.

the contract and think your best hope is to come to a trick in spades. You decide, therefore, that the best way to be sure of this is to discard a heart on the third club and a diamond if a fourth club is led.

The above two cases are fairly extreme examples of this situation in high-level contracts but you will meet many examples of it in contracts at the level of One-Two or Three. Don't be one of those people who "see no point in ruffing"—always ruff a winner unless you have a special reason not to.

Very often when ruffing in these situations you may be able to strike a useful blow for your side in your selection of the card to ruff with. Supposing dummy holds 10 3 of trumps and you have 9 8 2. Now, if you trump in front of declarer and use the 8 or 9, you are going to force him to use a pretty high card for an over-ruff and this may set up an extra trick for your partner. No harm in trying anyway.





# THE MOST DIFFICULT BID IN BRIDGE

*The first of an instructive series by Arturo Jaques, Argentinean international and magazine editor, in which he explores the highways and by-ways.*

Although the tired businessman, at the club for the evening game, claims he is there only for some quiet relaxation, we all know what his true intentions are. To let off steam, to Bid! And should an irate partner attempt to admonish him after an 1,100 bump, his curt reply comes quickly: "I came here to BID, not to Pass." This, of course, is a rather far-fetched example, but the fact is that it is more difficult to make a good Pass than a good Bid.

The Bridge Player is a man of action, a rugged individualist at heart. He is inclined to put more faith in his own decisions than those of partner. Thus, in a doubtful situation he is tempted to *bid* rather than *pass* and confide in his partner's judgment. Although he realises that bridge is a partnership game and that both partners should share in the joint responsibility of developing the bidding, sometimes it's just *too* difficult to keep quiet.

Bidding is like conversation; there is a time to speak and a time to listen. As we shall see in the examples that follow, tactical considerations frequently make a well-timed Pass more appropriate than an inopportune Bid.

## Individual decisions to Pass

All bids, whether constructive or competitive, are informative to a degree, but the recipients of this information are opponents as well as partner. Therefore, unless the defenders have a reasonable chance of competing for the final contract, or of suggesting a line of defence, or perhaps pushing the opponents out of their depth, it is often wise to stay out of the auction completely and give no information away.

An example: With nobody vulnerable, the bidding has gone One Spade—Pass—Three Hearts. In fourth position you hold: ♠x ♥x ♦QJxxx ♣Q10xxx and decide to brandish your newest convention as: you bid Three

*Unusual No Trumps.* Now what have you gained? Certainly you cannot talk the opponents out of their slam, as they have already determined their combined strength fairly accurately, and in any case, are halfway there already. But the unbalanced distribution of the defenders' hands is likely to make the play difficult. If declarer is forewarned as to the lie of the cards, he will be able to shape his plans accordingly. **DON'T HELP HIM, PASS!**

Another example, this time with East-West vulnerable:

NORTH

♠ x x

♥ A x x x

♦ K Q 10 x x

♣ Q x

WEST

♠ A J x x x

♥ K J x

♦ x x x

♣ A x

EAST

♠ Q 10 x x

♥ Q x x x

♦ x

♣ K x x x

SOUTH

♠ K x

♥ x x

♦ A J x x

♣ J x x x x

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
1♠	2♦	2♠	?

Obviously you have the material for a raise to Three Diamonds. But stop to consider what could happen if you pass. On the actual deal, the bidding will probably

die right there. Since West's opening is only a shade better than minimum and he cannot judge the diamond shortage unless the suit is supported by you, he must pass. If, instead, you bid Three Diamonds West can now comfortably rebid Three Spades and his partner will surely carry him to Four.

Thus a Tactical Pass should pay handsome dividends on this particular hand, but if the unexpected happens and the opponents still reach their game, there is nothing to stop you taking a profitable save in Five Diamonds.

### Partnership decisions to Pass

A somewhat different approach presents itself on other hands, where you must co-operate with partner and enable *him* to take the final decision. In this connection, I should like to borrow an excellent example from Reese's *Develop your Bidding Judgment*, which shows why you should respect partner's high-level double in a competitive auction.

The bidding has gone:

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
1♥	1♠	3♥	3♠
4♣	4♠	Dble	No
?			

South holds: ♠x ♥KQJxxx  
♦xx ♣AQJx

Reese points out that South's

problem really arises at his first rebid. In deciding to show his second suit instead of bidding Four Hearts, he prepares the ground for partner to take intelligent action on the following round when (as can be foreseen) opponents bid Four Spades.

Having shown his distributional two-suiter, South is in a position to relax and pass when partner doubles, whereas if he had gone straight to Four Hearts, withholding information, he would not have felt so confident in passing.

On the next deal you are sitting South against vulnerable opponents, when One Spade is opened on your right. You bid Two Clubs, West forces with Three Diamonds and partner produces an obviously defensive raise when he jumps to Five Clubs. Opener, unassisted by Blackwood, bids Six Diamonds directly, so the bidding has been:

EAST	SOUTH	WEST	NORTH
1♠	2♣	3♦	5♣
6♦	?		

Now, what would you do on each of the following hands?

(a) ♠Jxxx ♥x ♦xx ♣AQJ10xx

(b) ♠Axx ♥xx ♦QJ9 ♣QJ10  
9xx

(c) ♠Axx ♥xx ♦xx ♣KQJ10  
xx

But first let us agree on the meaning of North's bid. It seems safe to assume a strong distributional hand with no more than one defensive trick, if that. Now we can work out the correct action on the above hands:

(a) *Bid Seven Clubs.* One of the opponents, probably East, will be void in clubs, so you cannot reasonably hope to defeat the contract.

(b) *Double.* You are lucky to have been dealt the three outstanding trumps and this time you have the right Ace (spades).

(c) *Pass.* Leave the decision to partner. If you are willing to defend in spite of the favourable vulnerability, there is a strong inference that you hold a defensive trick. If partner also holds a trick, he can double or pass.

These examples merely scratch the surface of this difficult subject. But at least they offer food for thought and an opportunity to cultivate the habit of considering a PASS in many situations where perhaps it is instinctive to take direct action. But no system can help you all the way; you must learn to help yourself.

**BIDDING WISE**

*will be resumed next month*





# MY FIRST DUPLICATE PAIRS

*One of the fastest and best card players in British bridge, Michael Wolach, recalls his initiation.*

In 1939, at the outbreak of war, I lived in Poland and my experience of bridge was very small. I knew only Polish Bridge, which has been described by Norman Squire as "a combination of higher mathematics and murder."

But the end of the war found my bridge or at any rate my card-play somewhat improved. You cannot play bridge in various Polish Army units through Russia, Persia, the Near East and Italy, without learning how to handle cards. By the time I had arrived in England I was ready for my first duplicate.

The late 1940's were years of austerity for Britain in some ways, but not in bridge. Kosky, Simon, Meredith, Squire, Baron and many others were habitués of the old Lederer's Club in Mayfair. There it was that three other Poles dragged me for my baptism in a duplicate pairs; their names won't interest you, but their nick-names (really) were Messer-

schmitt, Electricflare and Sauerkraut. They were hardened tournament players; while I for my part was thought to have some flair for cardplay, but to know little about bidding and nothing about duplicate procedure. Believe it or not, sitting opposite Messerschmitt, this was my very first hand at duplicate bridge:

NORTH

♠ A K x x x  
♥ —  
♦ A K x x x  
♣ x x x

WEST

♠ Q x x x  
♥ Q x x  
♦ x x  
♣ K x x x

EAST

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

SOUTH

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

My partner, North, opened One Spade and I made the obvious



response (obvious in the Polish Army, that is)—Two Diamonds. I envisaged 3NT on the next round and wanted to stop the diamond lead.

Now there was no holding my partner. FOUR CLUBS came next, an "Asking Bid" (devised by Ely Culbertson but little played nowadays). I was terrified. I should — I think — have responded Five Clubs, showing first-round control of the "asked" suit but no other control. Naturally I did no such thing.

I only wanted to sign off and cool my partner down, so I responded Four Diamonds on my Jxx. (I hated bidding diamonds again, but you must remember that I could not make a natural bid of Four Spades, since this too would have been taken as a conventional response to the Asking Bid.) Partner's next bid was SIX DIAMONDS. West led the Ace of hearts and there I was.

One thing you learn in Polish bridge which is useful at all times: *play bad hands quickly and confidently*. Don't grumble and groan and tell everyone you are in trouble. In no time at all I ruffed the opening lead, cashed  $\diamond A$ , finessed a club, crossed to  $\diamond K$ , finessed a second club and cashed  $\clubsuit A$ , leaving this position:

## Learn Bridge with Reese

The principles of bidding and play are explained in an uncomplicated way that will be illuminating not only to learners but also to people who play a certain amount without always being too sure what they are doing or why.

Writing for beginners, Terence Reese displays the same brilliant quality of exposition as in his famous books on advanced play.

*Faber & Faber 15s.*

NORTH		
$\spadesuit$	A K x x x	
$\heartsuit$	—	
$\diamondsuit$	x x	
$\clubsuit$	—	
WEST		EAST
$\spadesuit$	Q x x x	$\spadesuit$ 10
$\heartsuit$	Q x	$\heartsuit$ x x x x x
$\diamondsuit$	—	$\diamondsuit$ Q
$\clubsuit$	K	$\clubsuit$ —
SOUTH		
$\spadesuit$	J x x	
$\heartsuit$	K J 10	
$\diamondsuit$	J	
$\clubsuit$	—	

I played dummy's Ace and King of spades, and when West showed out my heart sang. I put  
(Continued on page 61.)



# HOW TO PLAY NO-TRUMP CONTRACTS (2)

*The American authors, G. R. Nail (pictured left) and John B. Hathorn, conclude last-month's treatise on card play for the more advanced student.*

In the next deal, declarer adhered to the correct principles of no-trump play. It is a deal worth studying:

NORTH

♠ A Q 4 2

♥ 8 6 4

♦ A J 2

♣ J 10 2

WEST

♠ J 10 8

♥ K 10 5 2

♦ Q 5 3

♣ 9 6 3

EAST

♠ K 9 7 5 3

♥ J 9 7

♦ 7 6

♣ A 7 5

SOUTH

♠ 6

♥ A Q 3

♦ K 10 9 8 4

♣ K Q 8 4

West led the 2 of hearts, and East's Jack went to South's Queen. Following correct dummy procedure, declarer led a club to the Jack in order to drive out the club Ace before tackling diamonds. East went in with the Ace immediately and led the 9 of

hearts. Declarer ducked so that after one more heart lead he would know which way to take the diamond finesse.

West overtook the 9 of hearts with the 10 and shifted to the Jack of spades. But it was too late—declarer now had the contract well under control.

Declarer won dummy's Ace of spades, came to his hand with a club, and led the 10 of diamonds. West covered and declarer made the rest of the tricks.

Note that the Queen of spades should not be played on the Jack. If the spade finesse loses and East continued spades to drive out the Ace, a losing diamond finesse would defeat the contract. By playing the Ace of spades, declarer can finesse diamonds into East in perfect safety.

Take a look at this next pair of hands. The contract is 3NT as usual and West is the declarer.

(Next page.)

WEST

♠ J 9

♥ A K 4 2

♦ 7 5 3

♣ A J 8 5

EAST

♠ A 10 8

♥ 5

♦ K J 8 4 2

♣ K 7 6 2

North leads the 2 of spades and South's Queen holds the trick. A spade is continued to the Jack, King and Ace. What do you lead from the dummy at trick 3?

Unless you said a small diamond, you haven't been studying your lessons. Even if the clubs were tackled successfully, a diamond trick must be made to find nine tricks. This means declarer must assume some sort of a favourable diamond holding. If this is the case, then perhaps *three* diamond tricks may be taken, in which event the club finesse need never be taken at all. After ducking the diamond, win the spade return, lead a heart to the Ace, and play another diamond. If North produces the Queen or the Ace, it is all over. Usually the position will have clarified itself after the initial play. The point is, the club finesse should be avoided; a losing club finesse wrecks the hand. You can also be in trouble if you enter the West hand at trick 3 with a high heart or the club Ace.

The final deal is another example of how adherence to basic

principles pays off in fulfilled contracts. When the deal was played everyone at the table thought it was unmakeable. Actually, it was merely another case of "declarer error."

NORTH

♠ 9 2

♥ K 9 6 3

♦ A 9 8 6

♣ K Q 3

WEST

♠ 5 4 3

♥ 8 5 4

♦ 7 3

♣ J 10 9 8 6

EAST

♠ K Q 10 7 6

♥ A J 10

♦ Q J 10 4

♣ 7

SOUTH

♠ A J 8

♥ Q 7 2

♦ K 5 2

♣ A 5 4 2

After an opening bid of One Spade by East, South became declarer at 3NT. West opened the 5 of spades and East played the Queen. Declarer allowed this to hold and won the continuation with the Jack. Declarer now ducked a diamond to East, who knocked out the spade Ace. Diamonds didn't break and declarer ended up losing three spades, a diamond, and a heart.

If declarer plays in the proper sequence, he lands his contract. After winning the Jack of spades, cross to the King of clubs and lead a heart. If East goes up with



the Ace, this gives declarer nine tricks, so East must duck. After taking the Queen of hearts, a diamond is ducked into East, who exits with a spade. South now cashes three rounds of clubs and East will find it impossible to discard. If he throws two spades, declarer plays three rounds of diamonds and East is endplayed. If East throws the Jack of hearts and a spade, South simply ducks a heart and drops the Ace. If East throws a diamond and a heart, the diamonds run.

The difference between the de-

clarer's actual play and the recommended line is simply that in the latter declarer first goes for the suit in which opponents hold an Ace. That should nearly always be declarer's primary line of attack.

In conclusion, we would like to make this vital point. The only real "secret" to successful play, both dummy play and defence, is *careful and continuous counting*. To attempt to play or defend without counting down every hand is a losing habit. Counting will make up for many deficiencies in a player's technical skills.

---

## MICHAEL WOLACH—*continued*

West in with  $\diamond Q$  and he had to lead a heart. The Queen came up on my right and dummy's three spade losers went away on my  $\heartsuit KJ10$ . I had made an "impossible" slam in my first duplicate.

All evening, players came up to me to ask, "How did *South* come to be declarer in *Six Diamonds*?" I was so excited, I could only reply, "I couldn't sign off!" To my amazement we won the pairs tournament by a mile.

Another memory of those days. On our way to Lederer's I had heard the other Poles say that 1NT in response to One Club is forcing to game (I didn't realise it, but they were talking about

the *Vienna System*, where this is indeed true.) On an early hand my partner opened One Club and I had 17 points. Displaying my profound knowledge of bidding, I "forced" with 1NT, but to my horror he passed. I made eleven tricks in an electric silence.

It turned out to be quite a good result since half the room went down in slams.

You may ask: "What have these two hands to do with *Bridge Academy*?" The lesson is this: You should never give up hope just because you are in a bad contract. When the bidding is over, save your regrets until after the hand; meanwhile, get every ounce out of the cards.



# CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

5/- per line. Special terms for a series

## BRIDGE CLUBS AND HOTELS

### BOURNEMOUTH, BRANKSOME PARK

WISSEX CLUB. Tel.: Westbourne 64034. Residential Bridge Club in own beautiful grounds. 16 Bedrooms, Club Bar. Excellent food. Resident Proprietor. Bridge every afternoon and evening throughout year. Visitors welcome.

### BOURNEMOUTH, CANFORD CLIFFS

RIVIERA HOTEL. Tel.: Canford Cliffs 77345. Faces Chine and sea, licenced, 35 rooms, Cordon Bleu table, excellent cellar. A good cut in game is available to resident visitors, in our bridge room, throughout the year.

### HARROW

HARROW BRIDGE CLUB—16 Northwick Park Road, Harrow, Middx. Tel.: Harrow 3908. Good standard Bridge in enjoyable atmosphere. Sessions twice daily. Partnership and Duplicate. Open teams of four every Saturday evening.

### LONDON

GRAND SLAM BRIDGE CLUB—21 Craven Hill, W.2. Tel.: PAD 6842. Stakes 1/- and 2-6, 5/- and 10/-. Partnership evenings Mondays and Thursdays. Visitors welcome. Duplicate Pairs (Bounty £25) Tuesday weekly. 'Rummy' all night games.

## MISCELLANEOUS

### BRIDGE REQUISITES

Personal Score Cards, Travelling Score Slips, Result Charts, Hand Record (Curtain) Cards, "Silent Bidders," etc. MOVEMENT CARDS for Individuals, Pairs and Teams-of-four, etc.

WALLETS—better than boards at less than half the cost.

CARDBOARD £3 3s. 0d. per set of 32  
LEATHERETTE £4 14s. 6d. per set of 32

### WRITE FOR SAMPLES:

W. B. Tatlow, 2 Roseberry Court, LLANDUDNO

We supply famous Open Danish Sandwiches artistically decorated for all parties and occasions. Daily London deliveries. Scandinavian Specialities. Tel.: BIS 5682.

## TUITION

NICO GARDENER guarantees to improve your game. Tuition, practice classes and lectures all under personal supervision; also postal course. The London School of Bridge, 38 King's Road, London, S.W.3. Tel.: KENSington 7201.

PERFECT YOUR BRIDGE under championship guidance. Private or Group Tuition. Practice classes. Duplicate coaching. Master Points contests. Lectures. Folder free from the Mayfair Bridge Studio (Dept. 5), 110 Mount Street, London, W.1, or 'phone GRO 2844.

# Diary of Events

## 1964

July	24-31	DEAUVILLE BRIDGE FESTIVAL	..	Deauville
September	7-18	LEBANESE BRIDGE FESTIVAL	..	Beirut
	23-27	YUGOSLAV BRIDGE FESTIVAL	..	Porec
October	4-6	N.E.B.A. CONGRESS	.. ..	Saltburn
	9-12	E.B.U. AUTUMN CONGRESS	.. ..	Eastbourne
	16-18	WEST OF ENGLAND CONGRESS	.. ..	Weston
	23-25	ST. DUNSTONS CONGRESS	.. ..	Ilkley
Sept. 30-Nov. 1		SUNDAY TIMES CUP	.. ..	London
November	6-8	N.W.C.B.A. CONGRESS	.. ..	Blackpool

## 1965

March	18	CHARITY CHALLENGE CUP	.. ..	Worldwide
-------	----	-----------------------	-------	-----------