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## 56th SUMMER MEETING Winter Gardens, Eastbourne 11th = 14tth August 2022

## Join us in Eastbourne for our flagship event!

Modern Facilities Close to Hotels and Beach Play in Person
The 2022 programme will be shorter than previous years, but still packed with events - there's something for everyone. Join us at the newly refurbished Floral Hall of the Winter Gardens

Thursday 11th
Mixed/Open Pairs

Friday 12th
Swiss Teams

PLUS...

## SATURDAY AND SUNDAY WILL BE THE MAIN SWISS PAIRS

## One-day Swiss Pairs Lite on Saturday \& Sunday Serious Fast Pairs on Friday \& Saturday evenings (subject to demand)

For full congress information visit www.ebu.co.uk/competitions/summer-meeting
Please enter via 01296317 203, comps@ebu.co.uk, or the online members area at: www.ebu.co.uk/members

## ACOLytes - Common Problems



# When Stayman, and when transfers? 

How does one know when to use Stayman and when to use transfers when partner opens 1NT?
People often get a bit stuck if they hold both majors and partner opens 1NT. What are you supposed to do? Which major do you show first? Do you transfer or bid Stayman? The answer is, of course, 'it depends'. Specifically, it depends on how strong your hand is and what the length of your suits is. I'm going to split my answer to this question into sections according to strength because I think that's a good way to approach auctions in general: to start by thinking, 'Do I want to play in partscore? Game? Slam?! Am I sure which of those is most appropriate or do I need to consult my partner?'

## Weak Hand - partscore

```
& QJ954
*K732
-6
$864
```

Let's imagine that partner opens 1NT and you hold this hand. What are you supposed to do? You could transfer to spades, but partner might hold a doubleton spade and as many as five hearts. With a weak hand and 5-4 or 5-5 in the majors, bid Stayman. What is the worst that can happen? If partner responds by bidding a four card major you pass - you have found a fit and improved the contract. Yes, if partner has four cards in both hearts and spades you will play in an eight-card heart fit instead of a nine-card spade fit but this is both rare and not a great disaster as bidding disasters go.

The least helpful response that partner can give you is $2 \downarrow$, saying 'I do not have a four-card major'. What now? Bid 24, saying 'partner, I have 5+ spades and four hearts and a bad hand'. Partner should pass this no matter what they hold. This results in the same contract as if you had just transferred, but with the bonus that you find a $4-4$ heart fit along the way if one exists.

```
&K732
    \bulletQJ954
    - }
& 8 64
```

What if your majors were the other way around, and you held this hand? Is it the same? Yes! You can still bid Stayman and if partner bids $2 \checkmark$ you bid $2 \boldsymbol{*}$, saying 'I have $5+$ hearts and $4+$ spades and a bad hand'.

Advanced: You might have noticed that there is a subtle difference between the descriptions of the $2 \boldsymbol{s}$ bid and the $2 \boldsymbol{V}$ bid: the $2 \boldsymbol{L}$ bid promises $5+$ spades and exactly four hearts, where the $2 \vee$ bid promises $5+$ hearts and $4+$ spades. In other words, with a weak hand with 5-5 in the majors, you start with Stayman and then bid $2 \boldsymbol{V}$. If your partner just passes $2 \boldsymbol{v}$ with any hand that won't be the end of the world but advanced players might note that this means that it's often a good idea to correct to $2 \boldsymbol{\Delta}$ with 3-2 in the majors, in case responder has a fifth spade. Here's an example:


| West | East |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1NT | $2 \%$ |
| 2 | $2 \downarrow$ |
| $?$ |  |

Partner has said 'I have a bad hand with five hearts and four plus spades'. You can now bid $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ to say 'OK, given that information, I'd like to play here'. If partner has the East hand above this will turn out to be a good idea. It does, however, come at some cost: if partner holds exactly $4 \boldsymbol{~ a n d} 5$ you have moved from a 5-2 fit into a 4-3 fit. This probably isn't the end of the world (and you can potentially ruff a heart in the hand with three spades!) but I'd usually prefer the 5-2 fit. Overall, I feel it's worth it to cater to those 5-5 hands.

What about if you are 6-4 in the majors? I'd just transfer to my six-card major and forget about looking for a $4-4$ fit. You already know that you have at least a $6-2$ fit. A good rule for bidding is that if you have no interest in game and know about a fit you should play in that suit at the lowest level that you can. Don't overcomplicate things - they are complicated enough already!

## Strong hand - game

If you have enough to go to game facing partner's 12-14 points you should bid Stayman if your longer major is four cards and transfer if your longer major is five cards. If you transfer to a suit and then bid another suit at the three level, you are showing at least 5-4 in those suits and a game-forcing hand. This should never be a jump bid.

| West | East | - AQ 732 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1NT | 2 | $\checkmark$ AK94 |
| 24 | 3 | $$ |

This sequence says 'partner, I have at least five spades and four hearts, and I would like to play in game. Please tell me where we belong'. Your partner can bid 34 if they have a spade fit for you (no need to jump to $4 \boldsymbol{~}$ - you might still want to look for slam on some hands), or they could bid $4 \boldsymbol{V}$ if they have four hearts with you, or 3NT if they don't have either of those things.

## MiddLing hand - Invitational

Sometimes you hit hands that don't fall nicely into either of the categories above - let's say you have 11 points, like this hand. I said earlier that

- KQJ 2
- AJ 943
- 864
$\rightarrow 7$ transferring to a suit and then bidding a new suit at the three-level (not a jump) is game-forcing. There is exactly one auction where you can transfer and bid a new suit at the two level, which is forcing but only for one round. With the hand above you can have this auction:

| West | East |
| :--- | :--- |
| $1 N T$ | 2 |
| 2 | 2 |



Partner can support you in spades or hearts if your side has a fit and now responder should bid game - the shape makes it worth it. If opener doesn't have a fit for responder, they bid 2NT with a minimum or 3NT with a maximum. Responder can pass 2NT with this hand or keep bidding if they had a game-forcing hand all along. If responder bids something else over opener's 2 NT that is game forcing - so there is no need to jump to $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ instead of bidding $2 \boldsymbol{w}$ with a good hand.

This won't work if you have five spades and four hearts. With that shape you simply need to decide whether you are treating it as a weak hand and bidding Stayman, or as a game-forcing hand and using a transfer.

## Test yourself with Sarah's Quiz, online page 67


$75 \%$ of New -toTournament players would play in another similar event.

## Traps for the Unwary

## Strong Rebids Part III - Reverse Bidding

The reverse bid is one that is shrouded in mystery and confusion, upon which I can hopefully throw some light. The name reverse comes from the fact that you bid your lower ranking suit first, and then rebid the higher ranking, effectively 'reversing' the order that suits were bid back in antediluvian times.

If you (conveniently) hold a five-card major and a four-card lower-ranked suit, you can easily open the major and then show the minor on the next round irrespective of what partner does. If you (inconveniently) hold a five-card lower-ranked suit and a four-card major, you may not have enough bidding space to get both suits in.

Let's see a simple example of where you can and can't bid both suits.

| Hand A | Hand B |
| :---: | :---: |
| - AQ 42 | - 2 |
| $\checkmark 4$ | - A Q 42 |
| - J65 | - J65 |
| 2 AJ976 | AJ976 |

Hand A opens 1 and if partner responds 1 expected, since you hold a singleton) then you rebid $1 \mathbf{1}$, showing five plus clubs and four spades, and normally opening strength points (up to about 18 . With more you would jump to 2 as we discussed in February).
Hand B is more unwieldy. If you open 1 and get a 1 response, you simply can't rebid $2 \boldsymbol{V}$, as this will take the bidding too high, and go past the safety net of We call this bid a 'reverse' and it shows (not only) five plus clubs and four hearts, but also extra values - typically $16+$ points.
Although I have used the example of hearts and clubs here, a reverse applies if your five-card suit is hearts and your four-card suit is spades, or if your five-card suit is clubs and your four-card suit is diamonds (where partner has responded a major).

The key thing is that the second suit is higher ranking and can't be shown at the one level.The simple reason why you need a good hand is because if partner has a minimum response with only five or six points then you will need all your extra values to make a three-level contract, which is where you will end up, even if partner puts you back to your first suit.

There are a few important things to mention about a reverse bid before we look at some example hands.

The first (and one I must stress) is that a reverse bid is never a jump bid, and a jump bid is never a reverse.

If your second suit is higher ranking than your first, and to show it would take you past two of your original suit (called 'the barrier'), then you are in a reversing situation. If you bid the second suit it will show $16+$, so you can't show your second suit for hands of 11-15 points.

You can never choose between doing a reverse or an opener's strong jump shift, because that is determined for you by the rank of your suits. They exist in separate universes and are never alternatives.

Another widely held misconception is that your opening bid changes depending on whether you hold enough points to reverse or not - it doesn't. When you are 5-4 or 6-4 you always open your longer suit, and when you are 5-5 you always open your higher ranking suit. It is never correct to reverse when you are 5-5, all it does is mislead partner as to the lengths you hold.

The other thing to note is that there is no such thing as a 'jump reverse'. If a reverse is possible then do that with a good hand. The point range 16+ does indeed mean 16 or more than 16 ; it is openended and covers much stronger hands as well.
(A jump bid in a situation where bidding the suit at a lower level would be a reverse is generally played as a splinter bid, for example $1 \boldsymbol{1}-3 \boldsymbol{*}$ )

The good news is that a reverse bid is forcing for one round so there is no danger partner will pass.

Let's look at some hands and see what action you take on the second round after opening with a bid of $1 \mathbb{C}$ and hearing partner respond $1 \mathbf{V}$ :


| Hand 1 | Hand 2 | Hand 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\triangle \mathrm{AQ} 3$ | - K 982 | - 5 |
| $\checkmark 3$ | $\checkmark 5$ | - K 76 |
| -K654 | - J32 | - AQ64 |
| - Q 532 | A Q J 76 | \& AQJ96 |


| Hand 4 | Hand 5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| - 5 | ¢ KJ8 |
| - A 2 | $\checkmark$ - |
| - AKJ 5 | - A Q 87 |
| \& AKJ 1084 | \% KQJ 754 |

Hand 1 lacks the values to reverse into 2 so must content itself with a rebid of $2 \mathbf{~}$. This is not ideal with a poor five-card suit, but there simply isn't an alternative.

Hand 2 can rebid 14. Although the second suit (spades) is higher ranking than the first (clubs) this is not a reverse bid as it doesn't go past the barrier of (two of the original suit).
Hand 3 can reverse into 2 showing $16+$ points and at least five clubs and just four diamonds. The support for hearts will come later, 'patterning out', which will help find the best game.
Hand 4 is super strong and has more than enough for game, but it still only rebids $2 \star$, a reverse bid showing $16+$ points ( 20 does fall into the range ' $16+$ ' remember). Whatever partner says you can take the hand to game whether it be in no trumps, club or diamonds.

Hand 5 is perfect for a jump rebid of $3 \mathbf{2}$, but also fulfils the requirements for a reverse into $2-$ which should we choose? The answer is simple, if

we rebid we tell partner about six of our cards, if we rebid 2 we tell partner about nine of our cards (five clubs and four diamonds). $2 \star$ is more helpful to partner so we bid that. On the next round we can bid 3 and show our 6-4 shape, so there is nothing lost at all.

## The Dos and Don'ts of Reverses

Do carefully check whether your bid is a reverse by asking yourself if your second bid will take you past the barrier, two of your original suit.

Do make sure there isn't a better and more descriptive call you can make that accurately shows your shape and point count.

Don't ever jump if you can make a reverse bid, as a reverse is both strong and forcing, and a jump bid will consume too much space.
Don't change what suit you open because of the strength of your hand. If you are 5-5 always open the higher-ranking irrespective of your point count.

Try Michael's Quiz, page 68
 $100 \%$ of those playing in a congress for the first lime would like to play in a similar event again.

## Heffilump Traps

In each of the following hands you are sitting South. You are playing in a teams match with IMPs scoring. You should make a plan to give yourself the best chance of making your contract, even if that means giving up on the possibility of making overtricks.

| Hand 1 |
| :---: |
| - QJ 74 |
| - AQ 6 |
| - A 8 |
| - AQ 83 |
| $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathrm{N}}$ |
| - 85 |
| - KJ 5 |
| - J 92 |
| +K9754 |



You are in 3NT. West leads the 10 . Plan your play.

You are in 6 $\mathbf{V}$. West leads the K . Plan your play.

| Hand 3 |
| :---: |
| ¢ A 73 |
| - Q 1062 |
| - A 4 |
| -8653 |
|  |
| - K 8 |
| - A5 |
| - QJ7652 |
| - AJ 4 |

You are in 3 NT . West leads the 4 . Plan your play.

You are in 64. West leads the 4 . Plan your play. answers on page 28

## CLUB PLAYER゚S BIDDING OUIZ

You are sitting West. What should you bid with each hand below on the given auction at matchpoint pairs? Assume love all except where indicated.

| Hand 1 | W | N | E | S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ KQJ 87 | 14 | Pass | $4{ }^{\text {a }}$ | Pass |
| - KQ9 7 | ? |  |  |  |
| - K Q 10 |  |  |  |  |
| -1 |  |  |  |  |



| Hand 3 |
| :--- |
| LKQ103 |
| AQ 97 |
| 4 |
| 4Q643 |


| W | $\mathrm{N} \quad \mathrm{E}$ | S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $?$ |  |  |




| Hand 6 | W | N | E | S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \& 109852 |  |  | 18 | 1V |
| - 3 | ? |  |  |  |
| - K Q 7 |  |  |  |  |
| +1074 |  |  |  |  |

Julian Pottage gives his answers on page 62

# merciantravel 

Join Mercian Travel for

## Bridge and Bowling

 at Sol Don Pablo by Meliá, Torremolinos Twin Room Discount $£ 30$ pp off per week* Full benefits of our Mercian package include:Welcome Cocktail Party • Half board included • EBU Licensed daily Bridge \& Masterpoints Awarded - Optional Social Bowling 6 Days a Week • Qualified Bridge \& Bowling Directors • Farewell Drinks

30th October 22 - 5th December 22
8th January 23-27th March 23
7 Nights from £539pp 14 Nights from $£ 1,078 p p$
£200pp deposit to secure your place
Choose the number of nights you wish to stay and create the perfect holiday.

Very limited availability, on a first come first served basis!
*TRC's Apply. These offers cannot be combined or taken in conjunction with any other offers. Book by Friclay 26 th August 2022.


## LICENSED BRIDGE

WHEN you see the 'LB' sign in an advertisement in the magazine, it means that:

- The organisers of the holiday have applied for, and received, a licence from the EBU.
- They may choose to give Master Points in accordance with EBU scales.
- These Master Points will be accepted and added to player records.
- The bridge will be played in line with EBU regulations and bye-laws, thus affording all players the protection of playing within the jurisdiction of the EBU.

All county events advertised have an EBU licence.
NOTE: Members playing in events licensed by another National Bridge Organisation will not be able to have Master Points credited to their records save for events in Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, Republic of Ireland, New Zealand and Australia. The conversion of Green Points to Gold Points will only happen at English events, the BGB Gold Cup and Home Internationals.

## Blockages 2



This article looks at how declarer may overcome blockages that occur naturally in a hand. Take this suit layout, for example:


A casual glance would suggest that there are five club tricks available on any normal 2-2 or 3-1 split. Many declarers would give this combination little thought and would lead the to the and, observing that both opponents follow, would assume the suit was there for the taking.

However, what if one opponent started with $\boldsymbol{\&}_{\mathrm{Jx}}^{\mathrm{Jx}}$ ? After cashing the AKQ you'd have the master 10 in hand and the suit would have blocked itself. If the North hand had no outside entry, the last club would wither on the vine.

The solution to this problem is to lead a 'high' club from the South hand on the first round and to ditch the 1098 on the allowing the 7 to overplay the six on the fourth trick so the North hand retains the lead. That way the last, baby club could be cashed for the fifth trick.

Sometimes, such unblocking plays are not available. As South, you bid 1NT - 3NT and West leads the $\star$ K. How should you play the hand?

Hand 1
South plays in 3NT. West leads the $\$ K$.

- 642
- 86
- A 74
- AKQ 32


Your initial Count and Plan reveals nine top tricks, assuming clubs are not 4-0 (you have one spade, two hearts, one diamond and five clubs), so this one's a cakewalk, no? Actually, no. Were you to take the $A$ and attempt to run the clubs you'd come unstuck if the deal were something like this:


After cashing three rounds of clubs, the master club would be in the South hand and there'd be no way of unblocking the suit. The correct way to play the hand is to duck two rounds of diamonds and to throw a club on the $A$. Now you could run off five rounds of clubs without interruption and claim your game.
Now to another deal that needs another thoughtful play on avoiding roadblocks. You bid to 3NT after opening 2. West, surprisingly, leads a low diamond on which East plays the A . What is your best play on the hand overleaf?

Have you got it? Paul's quiz is online p69

## Hand 2

South plays in 3NT. West leads the $\downarrow 2$ and East plays the $\rightarrow$ A.

- 85
- J 3
- 10865
\& QJ 1075

- AJ 92
- AK 10
- K Q 43
- AK

Your initial Count and Plan reveals that you can see only seven top tricks (one spade, two hearts, two diamonds and two clubs) as diamonds are surely $4-1$ and the clubs are blocked. Is there any way of overcoming the club blockage and accessing the dummy?

The answer becomes clear if you realise that you have a second inescapable diamond loser; it cannot cost to pitch a high diamond on East's A at trick one. Now you can win the next trick (a heart switch), cash the two top clubs and get over to dummy by playing off the $\leqslant \mathrm{K}$ and another diamond. Here's the full deal:

## CLUB DIRECTOR COURSES

EBED is offering training courses to help you become a club tournament director, with new events in several locations.
Check our course calendar for details: https://www.ebedcio.org.uk/td-course-calendar

## Any questions?

mark@ebedcio.org.uk or call 01296317218

PETER CRAWLEY, who created the Master Bridge Series (MBS), has died at the age of 98. The list was started in 1975 and MBS continued to publish new titles until just before he died. Most of the early books are still in print from authors such as Hugh Kelsey, Ron Klinger, Terence Reece and David Bird, and - since 2000 - Julian Pottage and Marc Smith.

South plays 3 NT. West leads the $\downarrow 2$

- 85
- 13
- 10865
- QJ1075
- K76
- Q 62
- 1972
- 963


Were you to play low at trick one (the reflex play, perhaps) you'd make only seven top tricks. By unblocking the Q you can gain access to dummy with the 10 . Note that this play doesn’t even cost you a trick in the suit; you had to lose two tricks in diamonds in any case.

87.5\% of New Players enjoyed the Congress, with $62.5 \%$ enjoying it very much.

## $B^{*}$ <br> BriAnMAS

B
'It's like being in charge of a bank!'

Take your club cashless with confidence: BriAnMAS player accounts \& payments system

## To find out more visit

www.brianmas.net
Or contact Victor Lesk by Email: brianplaysbridge@gmail.com


# When to Cover with an Honour 



YOou may have heard the phrase: 'Cover an honour with an honour'. It has existed almost longer than bridge itself. And for good reason.

The idea is simple. When declarer (or dummy) plays an honour, you should play a higher honour on top of it if you can. Don't believe me?
Let's say declarer has Q76 in dummy and you have K54. Declarer calls for the queen, and you have a choice of playing low or covering with your honour (the king). Obviously, it doesn't really matter what we do if declarer has something like J10xx, so let's assume he has the ace:


In the first example, it is pretty clear what will happen if you fail to cover. The queen will run round to partner, and he will be unable to beat it. The king is the only card that can beat the queen, so you have to be the one to play it. Of course, declarer is unlikely to run the queen with only the ace in hand. He is far more likely to play towards the queen, winning when West has the king.

Declarer has a stronger suit in the second example, but it is still just as right to cover. If you don't cover, declarer will play a spade to the jack on the second round, finessing your king and leaving you without a trick. But if you cover with the king, declarer will take the ace and may still try a later finesse with a spade to the nine, but partner's ten will be good enough.

Something similar happens in the third example. But this time, partner will score two tricks when declarer tries a finesse.

Clearly, covering the queen is correct, and you may think that this only works because the king is a single rank higher than the queen. But I can assure you that it is equally right to cover when declarer plays a lower honour:


The first example is practically the same as one of the ones from earlier. And so is the second one but with a different coat of paint. If you fail to cover in the second example, partner will score the queen, but your king will fall to a finesse the next time declarer gets in. If you cover, partner's queen and nine will hang over declarer's ten and eight.

Those who follow my series may recall that I once wrote an article on Second Hand Low. In that article I advised playing low when you are second to play. This is because you want to save your high cards for when it matters.

However, covering an honour with an honour is exactly that. You aren't wasting your high cards if you're using them to beat your opponent's cards and you would be wasting them if they simply get lost in finesses a couple of tricks later.

Does this mean it's always right to cover? Well. This is the game of bridge we're talking about. . .


If you cover the jack, bad things will happen. Declarer will beat your king with the ace and then take a finesse against the queen by leading a low spade towards the ten remaining in dummy. Partner can take their queen, but that will be the only trick for the defence.

Consider what will happen if you refuse to cover. Declarer will have no choice but to play low and partner will score the queen. And then what will declarer do? Your king hangs over dummy's ten, and partner's nine does the same for declarer's eight. There is no longer a winning finesse for declarer to take, and the defence will come to two tricks in the suit.

Something similar will happen if you cover the queen in the second example. Declarer will beat your king with the ace, and a finesse against partner's ten will appear.

## So what's the difference?

The difference is that in this case, declarer has not led an honour from the dummy. He has led the first of touching honours. This may seem insignificant, but it makes all the difference. If you cover too quickly, you may open your partner up to a finesse.

## TO SUMMARISE

- Always cover an honour with an honour. Unless it is the first of touching honours, in which case cover the last honour.

Catchy right? Obviously, you'll never forget it. That being said, it may be difficult to implement at the table:


A simple auction calls for a simple lead. Declarer takes your 5 J lead in hand with the ace and immediately places the $\vee$ on the table.

Suddenly, things are not so simple.
We just spent an entire article figuring out when to cover, and now we're back in the dark. Since declarer's hand is hidden, we don't know if this is the first of touching honours or if it is unsupported.

But we do know something else: we know how many honours there are in the dummy. And this is useful because it allows us to place the cards in declarer's hand.

Since there is only one honour in dummy, does it make sense for declarer to lead an unsupported honour out of hand? The answer is no. If declarer has Jxx, there is no advantage to starting with the jack. The same is true with Qxx. Declarer would play a low heart towards the queen and not risk a cover. So, if declarer leads an honour from hand, you should look at the number of honours in the dummy.
\% If there is only one honour in dummy: do not cover.
\% If there are two honours in dummy: cover.
If you follow these rules, you will defend accurately in more cases than not, and as it happens, you will defend accurately on this hand as well. Here's the full deal:


Of course, this will not always be correct. But that is what future articles are for.

Opening leads are often subjective and virtually any opening lead can be successful some of the time. However, bridge is in many ways a game of percentages and therefore certain leads will gain more often than others. In each issue you will be given three hands and the bidding on each, and you are asked to choose your opening leads in both teams and pairs from those proposed by our Quizmaster. Answers will be in the next issue. In each problem you are on lead as West.


## NEW COMPUTER LEADS

Alan Mould has teamed up with Nathan Piper to get computer-generated simulations to provide best lead scenarios. More details with February's answers on p48.

A twin-pack of Piatnik playing cards is the prize on offer. For information on Piatnik cards visit www.gibsonsgames.co.uk/collections/all-cards
There are TWO categories in our competition: up to and including Master, and those with higher ranking. Please indicate the category for which you are entering with your answers. In the event of a tie, the winner from each category will be randomly selected. The editor's decision is final.

Entries to the Editor, Leads Quiz,
Raggett House, Bowdens, Langport, Somerset, TA10 0DD
or e-mail lou@ebu.co.uk
by 30 June 2022.
Please make sure you include your full postal address AND rank even if entering by e-mail

ANSWERS TO FEBRUARY'S QUIZ: Page 48

## TW0 answers - Teams \& Pairs

Hand 1
+1972
Q19

- 85
$-\quad 11065$

| South | West | North | East |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 *$ | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{v}$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | Pass |
| 6 | All Pass |  |  |

I think we can assume South has a nice hand! Choose from: (a) 2; (b) Q (c) 8; (d) J

夫太 $\star \star \star$

```
Hand 2
4 J952
* K 5 2
- J10853
& A
```

| South | West | North | East |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | $4{ }^{1}$ | Pass |
| $6{ }^{2}$ | All Pas |  |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ cuebid, ${ }^{2}$ Suggestion to play (accepted!) |  |  |  |

Choose from: (a) 2; (b) 2; (c) I; (d) A
$\star \star \star \star \star$
Hand 3

- 652
- AQJ 6
- KJ5 2
+64

| South | West | North | East |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{~}$ | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 4 | All Pass |  |  |

This was an Acol style auction so was natural and $9+$ and 34 was not forcing. Choose from: (a) a spade; (b) A; (c) 2; (d) 6

## Beat Today's Experts

These hands are all from modern events and David Bird points to some useful lessons to be learned from them. Bid them with your partner and then see how your efforts compare with the experts' bidding.

## MAY 2022 WEST HANDS

(IMP scoring on every deal)

1. Game All

- 1086

Dealer South

- 64
- A 986
(Berger)
\& K 1043
* South opens 18, North responds 14.

2. Game All

Dealer East
(Brown)

* South overcalls 24

3. E/W Game

Dealer East
(Marker)
4. E/W Game

- AK 9

Dealer East

- AK 7
- AKJ876
(VillaReal)
- 7

5. Love All

- K 10

Dealer West
(Dutt)

- A
- KQJ9642
- A5 3
* North overcalls 14, South bids 24

6. Game All

- 107

Dealer North
(Garafulic)

- K 10
- K 9763
- 1653
* North opens 14 and rebids $2 \Delta$ if possible


## Beat Today's Experts

These hands are all from modern events and David Bird points to some useful lessons to be learned from them. Bid them with your partner and then see how your efforts compare with the experts' bidding.

## MAY 2022 EAST HANDS

(IMP scoring on every deal)
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { 1. Game All } & \text { AJ952 } \\ \text { Dealer South } & \text { KQJ92 } \\ & 5 \\ \text { (Yaimat) } & \text { Q } 9\end{array}$

* South opens 1\&, North responds 14.

2. Game All

Dealer East
(Buchen)

* South overcalls 24

| 3. E/W Game <br> Dealer East | - K 8 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | - KQ6 3 |
|  | - AK7 |
| (Tutty) | - AQ 75 |
| 4. E/W Game | - J 10 |
| Dealer East | - 643 |
|  | - Q 2 |
| (Varela) | + AJ9543 |

5. Love All
. 642
Dealer West
(Chakrabarty)
. -

- AK 54
- Q 1032
- AKQ10 9
*North overcalls 1ヵ, South bids 2a

6. Game All
Dealer North
(Ravenna)

- Q 8
- AQ9854
- AQJ4
\& Q
* North opens $1 \Delta$ and rebids $2 \Delta$ if possible

$£ 6.50$ for $\mathbf{2}$ decks

Jannersten 100\% Plastic LARGE FIGURE CARDS Price is for 2 decks ( 1 Red/1 Blue) Postage not included

3-8 Table Howell Movement Cards Free to print out via email Contact sue@ebu.co.uk


## CLUB TABLES TWIN PACK ONLY $£ 75.00$ ( $£ 37.50$ EACH) POSTAGE $£ 7.50$ PER PACK SINGLES AVAILABLE AT £45 EACH SEE WEBSITE FOR DETAILS

Order online via our website www.bridge-warehouse.co.uk
Please email with queries: bridge.warehouse@ebu.co.uk

## 2022 Overseas Bridge in Malta

The San Antonio hotel in Qawra (pronounced with a silent 'q'), Malta was the venue for the 2022 Winter Overseas Congress. Originally planned for February 2021, this was the first one organised by First for Bridge. Although numbers were small, it was great to be back playing face-toface and enjoying the social side of bridge.

The hotel, located in the heart of Qawra and only a short walk from the sea-front, was an excellent venue and the all-inclusive tariff was generally welcomed by the players. Since we were in Qawra just as Malta was beginning to reopen, the hotel was only at about $25 \%$ occupancy, with just two floors of guest rooms open. Masks were obligatory indoors and outdoors, although this requirement was relaxed when eating and in the playing room.

The hotel had clear guidelines on protection, including the use of disposable plastic gloves when serving food at the buffet. It all made one feel very safe. Just outside the spacious and well-lit playing room was a refreshment area with plentiful supplies of water, tea and coffee as well as wine and beer on tap throughout the playing sessions. And then, in the middle of the afternoon sessions, cakes and sandwiches were supplied - just in case anyone was hungry.

There were two sightseeing trips included in the package for the players - an all-day visit to Valletta on Saturday and a half-day trip to Mosta and Mdina on Monday. Not everyone went on these trips,
but those who did thoroughly enjoyed them and were very impressed by the local guide. Qawra has excellent public transport links connecting it to the main sights in the island, so many of us were able to travel independently and explore further, including visiting the neighbouring island of Gozo.

Four Polish players (Janusz Gawecki, Stanislaw Pajak, Piotr Walczak and Andrzej Iwanski) joined the Congress and won most of the events. Excellent players, their experience was too much for the rest of the field. They were a pleasure to play against accurate in bidding and play and courteous as opponents. Embarrassed by their success, they offered to split up for the final Swiss Teams, which was won by Maria and Simon Budd, playing with Jackie Pye and John Holland. Maria and Simon had also won the Butler Pairs to challenge the Polish domination. All the results may be found at https://www.ebu.co.uk/results/863.

We are looking forward to the next overseas events: there's a fabulous river cruise including a visit to Floriade in June and the autumn overseas congress in Side, Turkey in October. We hope to see you there.

www.ebu.co.uk

## Bridge Fiction

## Bertie Bellis's Instruction



The Headmaster had rarely finished higher than fourth in the school duplicate, when partnering the Reverend Benson. Much to his surprise, last week, he and his wife Norma had finished a close second to Bertie Bellis and Percy Cutforth.
'I don't see why they should win most of the time,' Norma Doulton declared. 'Percy was very lucky to make four spades on the line he took.'

The Thursday duplicate was into its fourth round when the Doultons took their seats against the Matron and Stefan Götel, who taught German to the lower classes. This was the first board they played:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Stefan | The | The | Norma |
| Götel | Headmaster | Matron | Doulton |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ | Dble | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{Q}$ |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\imath}$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ |
| Pass | $4 \downarrow$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{Q}$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Stefan Götel led the queen of hearts and the Headmaster peered at his wife. 'I have a good hand here,' he informed her. 'We may have missed a slam.'
'Just put the dummy down,' Norma Doulton replied.

The Headmaster laid out his cards and looked up once more. 'Ace, please,' his wife said. The ace of trumps was played, and West showed out. Norma Doulton could see the risk of playing another trump next. If West held the ace of diamonds, she would go one down. Maybe two down if West persisted with hearts on winning the first round of diamonds. 'Play the ace of clubs, Alfred,' she said.

Everyone followed to three rounds of clubs and she discarded one of her diamond losers. These cards remained in play:


The Headmaster moved his hand towards dummy's trump holding. What was Norma thinking about? Surely, she should revert to the trump suit after discarding her diamond loser?

The Headmaster's wife was aware that the contract was not yet secure. On a trump continuation, East might win with the king and
switch to a diamond. If West held the ace, a return of the jack of hearts would allow East to ruff dummy's king. She would then lose a trump, a diamond, a heart ruff and an eventual heart trick.
'Play the last club,' said Norma Doulton, nodding happily when the jack appeared from the Matron. She discarded the king of diamonds and ten tricks were then assured. With his diamond entry destroyed by the Scissors Coup, West would not be able to lead the jack of hearts through dummy's VK8. Declarer would lose just one trump, one club and a heart.

The Matron was looking somewhat puzzled. 'I didn't have to make that club trick, did I?' she queried. 'You could have ruffed.'

Stefan Götel leaned forward. 'Norma played it well', he informed his partner. 'If she ruffs the jack of clubs, she goes down.'

The Matron's memory of the deal was beginning to fade. Whether Stefan was right or not, it still seemed a strange way to play the hand. Why give away a trick that she could easily have won?

A few rounds later, fifth formers Hutson and Phillips faced the top pair in the room:


John Hutson led a low heart and the senior maths master won with dummy's ace. 'Ace of trumps, please,' he said. 'And the king of trumps.'

Trumps broke 2-2 and Bertie Bellis then called for the two of diamonds, playing the eight from his hand. Hutson won with the ten, cashed the queen of hearts and switched to the nine of clubs. Declarer ducked the first round and won the club continuation with dummy's ace. When he played the six of diamonds, the jack appeared from East and he won with the ace.

With no pause for thought, Bertie Bellis finessed dummy's nine of diamonds and discarded his last club on the diamond king. The game was his.
John Hutson sighed as he returned his cards to the wallet. 'You read the diamonds well,' he said.
'There was no guess, really', Bellis replied. 'If your partner had started with QJx, he would have split his honours on the first round.'
'Yes, I see,' said Hutson. 'Still, I don't expect many declarers will make it. We'll end up with a bottom, even though there was nothing we could do about it.'
'It's not easy to see,' continued Bertie Bellis, in the tone he used when coaxing the mathematics sixth through some difficult problem on the blackboard, 'but who did you think would hold the jack of diamonds?'

Hutson considered the matter. 'I suppose if you held the ace-jack, you would have finessed the jack,' he replied.
Bellis nodded. 'Exactly right', he said. 'And how might that help you in defence?'

Hutson paused once more. 'Do you mean that I should have won the first diamond with the queen instead of the ten?' he asked.
'Well done, you've seen it,' Bertie Bellis replied. 'Yes, then I may place your partner with J10x and play for the drop on the third round.'
'I'll never be able to make plays like that,' said Hutson.
Bertie Bellis smiled at his young opponent. 'Of course you will,' he replied.


## Clever play



Playing pairs, your partner, North, opens 14 and you respond $2 \downarrow$. Your partner raises to $3 \downarrow$. What call do you make?

## Love All. Dealer North

- KQJ92
- Q87
- KQ 72
\& 10

-     - 
- AK 10
- AJ943
* AQ 874

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 1 | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | 4 | Pass | 4 NT |
| Pass | 5 | Pass | 6 NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

You will have a slam in mind, so proceed slowly and see what you can discover. You continue with $3 \boldsymbol{\square}$, and your partner now bids $3 \boldsymbol{1}$, stressing the quality of the suit (and probably denying a club stopper). You continue with $4 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$, a cue bid, and partner bids $4 \downarrow$. It's decision time and as it's pairs, you may be considering 6NT.

At the table, South bid keycard, and decided to have a go at 6 NT when partner showed one keycard.

The lead is the $\mathbf{6}$. How do you plan the play?

Once the ace of spades is gone, you have eleven tricks, and the twelfth may come from a club finesse, the ten of spades falling in three rounds, or a squeeze.

In order to keep the squeeze chances in play, you must win the heart in hand, preserving the queen as an entry for later. The reason why you need the heart as an entry is that you will need to finish up in dummy once all the red suit cards have been cashed. You can't achieve that in diamonds as South's diamonds are longer, so your final red card cashed will be the Q .

Now cross to a diamond (East discards a club) and drive out the ace of spades, discarding a club from hand. West wins and continues with a heart, again won in hand, and East discards a spade.
This is where you have got to:


Cash all the diamonds, discarding a spade from dummy. West discards a heart, and East one spade and three clubs. Now cross to dummy with a heart on which East discards a club, and cash the top spades, West discarding a heart on the third round,
and there is no ten falling. Have you been counting?
West still has a heart, and East the ten of spades. Therefore they have one club each. Drop the singleton king to land the contract. This was the full deal:


Perhaps, you can see, South should have been thinking more about playing in 7 than 6 NT . 6NT will get them the lion's share of the matchpoints, but despite the bad distribution of the opponent's cards, 7 is still making.

## Heather's Hints

* When planning the play, try to keep all your options open for as long as possible. In order to keep the squeeze chances alive on this hand, it was important to work out where to win the first and second heart tricks.
*It is frequently important, when playing pairs, to consider playing in no trumps rather than a suit contract, whether at game or slam level. This is especially true if your suit fit is in a minor, but can also apply with a major suit fit if the same number of tricks are available in both contracts.


## SIMON ASKS

Simon Cochemé has polled 14 experts with a few hands. You can read the answers in his column on p24. Why not have a look yourself and see what you would have bid:

1


Would you open 1 or 2e?

2


First in hand, Love All. Would you call 2 or Pass?

3

| KJ 53 |
| :--- |
| AJ 873 |
| 7 |
| A 83 |

RHO opens $1 \star$. Would you double or bid 1 ?

4

| KQ 86 |
| :--- |
| K K 4 |
| KJ2 |
| Q Q 93 |

Partner opens 1NT
(12-14). Would you bid $2 \mathbf{2}$ or 3 NT?

## EXPERT ANSWERS overleaf

## PREMIER GRAND MASTERS

Congratulations to
Jackie Davies, Hertfordshire
Raymond Semp, Manchester on becoming
Premier Grand Masters the English Bridge Union's highest rank, requiring a minimum 1,500 Green Points


Swiss events are designed to be self-levelling and a chance to
meet players of a similar standard to you from all over the county or country.

## Bridge with a Twist

## Ask Simon 2022



JAMES S (Apt, France) asks if we will ever see bridge on the television again.

It's been quite a while since the excellent Sky Arts programme Celebrity Grand Slam, but I have some good news for you. The BBC has just recorded a pilot of a radio show about bridge called I'm Sorry, I haven't a Cue.

In the first round, the contestants give us extracts from the new Aylesbury Dictionary of Bridge Terms, including:
\% Finesse - a female bridge player from Finland;
$\%$ King for Count - an abdicating monarch settles for lesser title;
\% Trial bid - plea bargain.
If you have some new definitions for the Dictionary, please email them to lou@ebu.co.uk

The second round is called Microsoft Weird, where Microsoft has suggested some not-veryhelpful corrections to text typed in by bridge writers. See if you can spot the changes that have been made in these phrases:
\% a week two opener;
$\%$ in the North Sea;
$\%$ responder's rabid;
\% the director chose a Bowel movement.
(Sorry about that last one; I couldn't resist it. All the others are genuine.)

Then comes a round where the contestants suggest titles for the bridge players' Film Club:
\% $\quad$ I'll pay your losses if they make it Double Indemnity;
\% $\quad$ Running a very (very) long suit Diamonds are Forever;
\% South can make 4 $\mathbf{~}$, but North can't South Specific.

The last round is based on the game 'One song to the tune of another'. Who can ever forget Sandi Toksvig's inharmonious attempt to sing the words of Elvis Presley's 'It's Now or Never' to the tune of the classic Italian ballad 'O Sole Mio'. The bridge version is called 'One bid with the meaning of another', and here is the example used in the programme:



DAVID H (Hereford) wants to know if I have seen the World Bridge Federation survey that says the number of World Championship pairs playing two-over-one has doubled from 2000 to 2018.

Doubled? Looks more like a $1 \%$ increase to me.

CLIVE D (Leamington Spa) asks whether PDI is worth playing.

If by PDI you mean Pass/Double Inversion, then the answer is yes, in agreed situations. The idea is that you swap the meanings of Pass and Double, to take away a round of bidding from the opponents. In the following sequence

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \downarrow$ | $1 \Phi$ | 2 | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{~}$ | $?$ |  |  |

opener has bid $2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ as some sort of Unassuming Cue Bid in support of partner's diamonds, perhaps looking for a stop in spades. A PDI pass by the $1 \mathbf{1}$ overcaller would show a desire for their suit to be led. This is the position where most people would double to confirm a liking for their suit, giving the opposition more opportunity to describe their hands. For instance, either opponent could redouble with a half-stop in spades. If the overcaller has bid $1 \boldsymbol{d}$ with a poor suit, then the opponents are more likely to have a spade stop anyway, and a double of the 2 doesn't give the opponents extra useful bidding space.

PDI is certainly very popular at the Young Chelsea Bridge Club where they recently had the auction Double - Double - Pass - Repass. West led the $4 \boldsymbol{V}$ and the contract went two off.

TONY T (Macclesfield) writes to tell me he thinks the EBU did an excellent job during lockdown.

It's not exactly a question, Tony, but I certainly agree with you. Their provision of an essential service to needy folk who didn't want to leave their homes, has led to the EBU's on-line bridge offering being known as deals-on-wheels.

## SIMON ASKS (from p23)

I am sometimes asked a question about a bid and, when I have given my opinion, I am asked what an expert would do. So I decided to find out and emailed 14 of England's finest. They were asked to give 10 points to their first choice, and between 0 and nine for the other bid on offer. They weren't asked for comments, but some gave a few anyway.

```
\Delta-
    -AKJ83
    *AKJ863
&K5
```

Eleven of the experts voted for $1 \downarrow$, and expressed their disapproval of opening by giving it an average score of 2.2.

2


First in hand, Love All. Would you Would you call 2 or Pass?

All the experts gave 10 points to $2 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$, with Pass (boosted by one expert who also gave it 10 points) getting an average of 4.1. Three of the experts commented that they would prefer to open $3 \boldsymbol{V}$. Passing was described by one as 'very last century'.

## 3

AKJ53 RHO opens $1 *$.
-AJ873
Would you double or

- 7
bid 1 $\boldsymbol{*}$ ?
- A 83

A 10-3 majority in favour of 1 (one expert gave them both 10). iv averaged 9.5, Double averaged 6.8 .
4

$$
\begin{array}{l|l}
\hline \text { K K Q } 86 & \text { Partner opens 1NT } \\
\text { K K } 4 & \text { (12-14). Would you } \\
\text { KJ2 } & \text { bid 2 or 3NT? } \\
\text { Q Q } 93 &
\end{array}
$$

The experts went back to expressing a strong opinion. Thirteen of them went for 3NT, with a dismissive average of 2.3 for Stayman. The one who voted for gave 3 NT an 8 .

This one surprised me. Just because you are balanced, and can't get any useful ruffs, doesn't mean the 1 NT opener is balanced too. The chance of two hands having mirror-image 4.3.3.3 distributions is $2.6 \%$. But, as one of the experts pointed out, 'bidding 3NT tells them nothing'. I am so last century.

## Trouble at the table



Geoff Blackman asked on the subject of an opening 2 bid, 'In a hand shown recently in the column of a national newspaper, South opened the 2 conventional bid holding 12 points but with only one ace and two kings (four controls, therefore). I understood that to open a conventional bid with less than 16 points it was necessary to hold five controls. Is this rule no longer in force?'
'The hand was played at an EBU International Trial - perhaps there are different rules in place at such an event?'

At Level 4, the hand you describe is not 'strong' according to the regulation. It would nevertheless be possible to agree to open if the agreement was (for instance) 'strong, or intermediate with a long major'. It is possible to mix strong and nonstrong meanings as long as the non-strong meanings do not include the suit opened (that is, clubs).

The international trials are played under Level 5, which allows 2 bids which are not WBF 'Brown Sticker'. This means that any bid which only shows average-or-better ( $10+$ HCP) hands, with any shape, is allowed.

Aplayer at an EBU affiliated club wrote, 'I asked an opponent to please leave her bidding cards on the table until the opening lead was faced. Yesterday it happened again. I called the director who said I was correct but did I really need to ask.
'Am I wrong to expect an EBU affiliated club to uphold the rules to ensure a level playing ground?'

The rules on bidding boxes and bidding are EBU regulations (in the Blue Book), not law. Affiliated clubs are recommended to follow these regulations but they are not required to.

The club can establish its own procedures for such things, depending on how it wants the game played. I would discuss your concerns with the TD or with someone on the club committee, explaining why you want the procedures for bidding to be kept visible to be followed.

The laws do allow for a review of the bidding before you play to trick one - so you can ask, even if the bidding cards have been picked up.

Iwas asked: Is it the decision of the host club, or the director appointed, to decide what movement and the number of boards to be played, on any given session?

This was in the context of a director wanting to use one-winner movements with short rounds and longer sessions, while the committee wanted to ensure better compliance with Covid restrictions.

The tournament organiser (the club) is responsible for the event and appoints the tournament director who is answerable to the tournament organiser. The tournament director is responsible for the technical management of the event, but the tournament organiser can constrain the tournament director as to how the event is managed (number of boards, type of movement, method of scoring). This is enshrined in bridge through Law 81.
(The rest is contractual arrangements between the club and the tournament director but for those purposes - 'I am not a lawyer.')

For the purposes of face-to-face bridge in the presence of Covid restrictions, considerations such as playing the 'best' movement are surely secondary to creating a playing environment so that players are prepared to come and play. The club must be able to instruct the tournament director what to do.

Peter Cotes asks how many times can you revoke with the same card?
'At a recent face-to-face session, declarer led the ace of spades from dummy followed by the king, discarding diamonds on both. Getting to hand later, he led the singleton three of spades. One could argue that he revoked twice as he failed twice to follow suit but as he only had a single spade he could only follow once and should discard once. I ruled that it was one revoke and one trick be transferred. The defence were more than content as they got a top. Was that correct?'

I think this is two revokes because both times a spade was played, there was a spade in the other hand which could have been played to the trick.
But in terms of revoke penalties, the second revoke does not matter: Law 64B.
'There is no automatic trick adjustment following an established revoke ...
2. ... it is a subsequent revoke in the same suit by the same player ...'

So only one trick is transferred.
It is just possible that a second revoke in the same suit by the same player requires a different adjustment under Law 64C, but this is very unlikely when the card that should have been played never wins a trick.

Amember was asked to rule whether it is acceptable for a player to hold the card in their hand rather than place it on the table.

The law says a card is played by facing it on the table. Once a card is detached from the hand, it should be placed face up on the table (except for the opening lead).

It is acceptable to keep hold of a played card, if the card is face up, touching the table, and clearly visible. As an opponent, you can ask the player to release the card if you want to think about the played cards, before playing.

In our club, boards are made up by members shuffling and dealing before we start play.

A passed-out deal on the first round should not be reshuffled and redealt. That is how we operate. However another local club appears to allow reshuffling. Please could you clarify this matter?

Law 22B: The auction ends when: ... all four players pass (but see Law 25). The hands are returned to the board without play.

## There shall not be a redeal.

Much has been written about over-prescriptive laws and regulations, but the EBU position is that the law is the law and clubs should follow the laws of the game.

Quick question: how frequently are individual NGS grades updated?

All new and corrected sessions are reprocessed between 2 am and 4 am every night, barring technical problems.

The processing updates all the records relating to NGS, including players' records on MyEBU and the rankings on the public website.

Another NGS query - why on 'My EBU' are there no details of NGS for sessions I play at club A and there are no entries at all for sessions at club B?

All online sessions at club A (since April 2020) are marked as 'Mentor sessions'. These sessions are charged at full rate (as they are not 'novice sessions'), but are not included in the NGS. Some clubs have chosen to mark all their online sessions in this way, because players do not want the online sessions to count for NGS.
Club B is not affiliated to the EBU - it was not affiliated face-to-face, so the same applies to the online games. Sessions played on club B online will show on their website but are not uploaded to the EBU and do not count for master points and NGS.

Robin Barker is the EBU's Deputy Chief Tournament Director. He is editor of the White Book and looks forward to answering your questions. Please email him - robin@ebu.co.uk.

# Answers from page 10 



## 3NT. West leads the $\mathbf{V 1 0}$.

You have seven top tricks, and you expect to make two more tricks through length in clubs.This will be easy if the four clubs that you are missing split 2-2
or 3-1, but will take a little more care if the opposing clubs split $4-0$, so you should seek to guard against this possibility.

Since you are missing the you will need to have two higher cards to beat them if you are going to win a total of five club tricks. You should therefore plan to win the on the first round, hoping that if clubs are 4-0 that West has $\mathbf{~ J 1 0 6 2}$. When East discards, you plan to lead towards dummy's AQ8. West will insert the 10 , and you will need to win the Q , cross back to hand to finesse clubs a second time, then get back to hand one more time to cash your fifth club. Do you have enough entries to your hand to achieve this?

The key is to preserve two heart entries by winning trick one with the A . You lead to the at trick two, then play the to the 10 and . You now lead dummy's to your J, and play the 5 to West's 6 and dumy's before cashing the A. Having preserved the K as an entry, you now lead the Q to the K and play the 9 to make your game.


## 6V. West leads the $\mathbf{~ K}$ K.

You have nine top tricks, and can win two extra tricks by force in spades. Your remaining trick will have to come via dummy's long diamond suit, but with
few entries to the dummy, timing may be a crucial factor.
If diamonds split 3-3, you will only need one outside entry to the dummy, but if they split 4-2 then you will need two entries (if they are 5-1 or 6-0 then it will not be possible to make a length winner). Since dummy's only entries are in the trump suit, it will be necessary to start establishing diamonds before drawing trumps.

You win the $A$ at trick one, then play the $\checkmark$ followed by the $\uparrow$ to dummy's A. When both opponents follow, you are well on your way to creating a diamond winner, so you now lead dummy's 4 . When East follows, you should trump high just in case West has no more diamonds. Say you trump with the 10 , you now lead the $\mathbf{V}$ to the $\vee$, then trump the $\downarrow 6$ with the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ to establish dummy's $\$ 7$.

With two trumps still outstanding, you should take care to win the next round of trumps in hand $(\uparrow K)$, then cross to dummy's $\$$ on the third round. You can now cash dummy's $\$ 7$, throwing J, then lead a spade, and force out the to make your slam.

| Hand 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | - A 73 |
|  | - Q 1062 |
|  | - A 4 |
|  | -8653 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q9642 } \\ & 84 \\ & 10983 \\ & \text { Q2 } \end{aligned}$ | - J105 |
|  | N VKJ973 |
|  | W E K |
|  | K1097 |
|  | - K 8 |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 5 |
|  | -QJ7652 |
|  | - AJ4 |

## 3NT. West leads the 4.

You have reached a game that is likely to be duplicated at the other table, so making your contract should ensure that you at least break even, and could even lead to a positive swing.

You have five top tricks, and hope to make four extra tricks in diamonds.


## 64. West leads the 4 .

You have taken a shot at bidding a slam that may well be bid at the other table too so, as always, making your contract should be your first priority.
You have 10 top tricks, and can make an extra trick in hearts, either through length or by trumping in the dummy. To make another trick though, you will need to score a trick in diamonds

This should be easy enough if diamonds split 3-2, but what if they split 4-1 (or 5-0)?

If they are 5-0, you will be in trouble, but if they are 4-1, then you may need to lose the lead twice in which case a club switch after the defenders have established spades may also prove too hard to overcome. Could it be possible to have only one diamond loser if they split 4-1, and how would this impact on the way that you tackle the suit?

If either defender has a four card holding including the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$, then you will have to lose two diamond tricks. However, if the $\star \mathrm{K}$ is singleton then you will be able to lose just one trick in the process of establishing the suit. However, with no significant back-up cards below the QJ it will not help if you have to play the $\star$ on top of the Q or the $\downarrow$.
Since you cannot afford to have your $\downarrow Q$ or $\downarrow J$ beaten by a singleton $\downarrow \mathrm{K}$, you can win the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ at trick one, then lead the $\$ 2$ to the A. If both opponents played a low diamond you would lead the $\$ 4$ hoping for a 3-2 split. However, when East follows with the $\downarrow$, you can win the QJ then give up a trick to West's 10 . You can now win any return, and if necessary, cross to the A or the to cash your remaining diamond winners, giving you the nine winners that you need to make your contract.
without losing two tricks in the process.
This will not be too challenging if East has the $\downarrow K$, so you should work on the basis that West has the $\diamond K$ and look for ways to succeed given that assumption.
West's low club lead suggests that he has led from a club honour, so you try the from the dummy, and trump when East plays the You now draw trumps in two rounds (good technique means keeping a high trump in the dummy in case you need a late entry). It then costs nothing to trump the 5 before testing hearts. If they split 3-3, you would discard the $\$ 3$ from the dummy on the fourth round of hearts, then try leading towards the $Q$ in the hope of an overtrick.

When West discards on the third round, you trump the 8 in the dummy, and again have a free shot of trying the $\boldsymbol{Q}$. If East played the K , you would have to fall back on the diamond finesse, but when East plays low, you can guarantee your contract.
Can you see how?
You can simply discard the $\$$. West wins the K , but will now be forced to concede a ruff-and-discard, or lead a diamond into your AQ. Either way, you will be certain to make your slam despite West holding the $\downarrow \mathrm{K}$.


The Lederer Memorial Trophy, one of the most prestigious events on the English bridge calendar, was won by team Harris (pictured, from left: Ola Rimstedt, Mikael Rimstedt, Jonathan Harris, Steve Root, Dennis Bilde and Zia Mahmood). The invitation event is organised by the London Metropolitan Bridge Association, and was played in late February.

## HARROGATE SPRING CONGRESS

The Harrogate Spring Congress took place in mid-February on RealBridge and BBO. The Swiss Pairs event was won by Paddy Murphy \& Mark Roderick. Second place went to Steve Root \& Stefano Tommasini.
The main Swiss Teams event was won by the team of Jacek Pszczola, Martin Seligman, Michal Kwiecien \& Wlodzimierz Starkowski, with the team of Catherine Draper, Gillian Fawcett, John Hassett \& Andrew Woodcock taking second place.

In the 9 High Improvers Pairs, North/South was won by Patsi Barnes \& Joan Watson, ahead of second-placed Maresa Cook \& Philip Goldenberg. Sitting East/West the winning pair was Jane Silverwood \& Jonathan Osbourne, with Ken Goddard \& Sue Goddard in second place.

## SILVER PLATE

The Silver Plate, the consolation event for the Gold Cup, has been won by the Mitchell team.
The Silver Plate is for English or Welsh teams defeated in either the first or second round of the Gold Cup. Scotland has a separate consolation event, the winners of which drop into the Silver Plate at the quarter-final stage.

The 2022 Silver Plate involved 52 teams. The final, played in late March, was between the Mitchell team and the Kemp team. Playing for the Mitchell team were Peter Clinch, Julian Mitchell, Ian Lancaster, Andrew Southwell, Christine Jepson \& Neil Watts. The Kemp team comprised Christopher Kemp, Charlie Bucknell, Oliver Powell \& Stephen Kennedy.

## TOLLEMACHE CUP

Gloucestershire won the Tollemache Cup - the inter-county teams of eight championship claiming the trophy for the second time. They last won the event in 2007. The event took place on RealBridge in February.
The Gloucestershire team finished ahead of Herts, with Berks \& Bucks finishing just behind.

## PORTLAND BOWL

Oxford A beat Cambridge B by 25 IMPs in the final of the university teams challenge. Oxford's Lawrence Wang, Yining Yang, Ewa Wieczorek \& Sam Anoyrkatis won the event for the second consecutive year. The tournament is sponsored by the Portland Club which hosted the final in late April. Chairman Christopher Kemp presented the cup.

## INTERNATIONAL TRIAL WINNERS FOR EUROPEAN CHAMPIONSHIPS

Open
Ben Handley-Pritchard \& Tom Townsend Ben Green \& Stefano Tommasini Ben Norton \& Mike Bell

Womens
Anne Rosen \&
Nevena Senior Ewa Wieczorek \& Ewa Kater Catherine Seale \& Catherine Draper

Mixed
Frances Hinden \&
Graham Osborne
Michael Byrne \&
Sarah Bell
Tom Paske \&
Diana Nettleton

Seniors
Barry Myers \&
Sally Brock
Gunnar Hallberg \&
David Mossop
Chris Dixon \&
Taf Anthias

English Bridge apologises for naming the wrong team to play in the Lady Milne in the February 2022 issue. The correct players were Catherine Curtis \& Lizzie Godfrey, Sally Brock \& Gilly Cardiff and Helen Erichsen \& Fiona Brown. England lost to Scotland in a very tight finish, just 0.46 VPs behind the victors, with 72.47 VPs.

## NATIONAL POINT-A-BOARD

The National Point-a-Board Teams was won by the team of Espen Erichsen, Richard Plackett, Simon Cope \& Peter Crouch. They finished five points ahead of Neil Rosen, John Atthey, Ben Green \& Stefano Tommasini, with Trevor Ward, Rob Cliffe, Graham Orsmond \& David Muller in third.


Imogen La Chapelle \& Stefano Tommasini (pictured) won the Portland Pairs in early April. The Mixed Pairs took place on RealBridge. Imogen is one of the younger winners of the competition and a member of the U21 Youth Squad.

Tom Furness \& Charlotte Bedford, also members of the Youth Squad (U16s), were second and Nichola Cockerill-Smith \& Ivan Leung finished third.

## RANKED MASTERS PAIRS

## Premier Grand Masters Pairs

Harry Anoyrkatis \& Stefan Lindfors
Grand Masters Pairs
Diana Nettleton \& Oliver Burgess
Premier Life Masters Pairs
Giles Ip \& Gabriel Ip
Life Masters Pairs
Szczepan Smoczynski \& Franklin To
National Masters Pairs
Jonathan Lillycrop \& Dan Cardnell
Regional Masters Pairs
Oliver Tiemann \& Alan Woof

## MASTERS PAIRS

Clair Sirkis \& Marc Rivoira

## THE 2021 MASTERPOINT ANNUAL COMPETITIONS

THE NATIONAL LEADER BOARD


Congratulations to Ron Davis who has won the Sunday Telegraph Salver for the most Master Points earned in the calendar year for the second year in a row. He scored 33,236 points in 2021. Jackie Davies was second with just over 25,292, and Tracy Sherman third with 24,965 .

## HIGHEST SCORING JUNIOR

For the fourth year in a row, the highest scoring Junior was Ben Norton $(14,049)$. In second place was Charlie Bucknell $(11,482)$ and Jamie Fegarty came third with 8,254.

## GOLD POINT RANKING

Michael Byrne ended the year on top with 59.49 gold points, followed by Mike Bell (last year's leader), with 56.46 and Tom Townsend in third place with 52.72 .

## ALL TIME LEADERBOARD

Derek Oram remains on top with 901,377 points. John Holland is second with 886,142 .

## CLUB CHAMPIONS

The highest earners of Master Points in each club are entered into a draw. This year's winners were Ann Lake \& Brian Lake of St John Acolites Bridge Club who won $£ 400$. Sue Oliver of Newbury Bridge Club was drawn second and wins $£ 200$, and Richard Macclesfield of Naphill Bridge Club wins $£ 100$ for third.

The Master Point lists for 2020, including a breakdown by county and rank, can be accessed on: www.ebu.co.uk/masterpoint-reports/2021

## COMPETITION NEWS

## SUMMER MEETING 2022

We are delighted to announce that the flagship of English bridge, the Eastbourne Summer Meeting, will return to Eastbourne and the grandeur of the newly refurbished Floral Hall of the Winter Gardens.

There will be a reduced four-day Summer Meeting from the evening of Thursday 11th to Sunday 14th August.
There will be Mixed and Open Pairs on Thursday evening, a Swiss Teams event on Friday, and the main Swiss Pairs event will run over Saturday and Sunday.

To book your accommodation please go to the Visit Eastbourne website, www.VisitEastbourne.com.

Our affiliated Eastbourne clubs are also welcoming visitors on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday prior to the Summer Meeting start.

Find out more at www.ebu.co.uk/competitions/summermeeting

## SUMMER MEETING SPECIAL OFFER!

EARLY BIRDS get $£ 10$ off. Book before the end of June.

## OVERSEAS CRUISE CONGRESS



## SCARBOROUGH SUMMER CONGRESS

For the first time since 2019 the Scarborough Summer Congress with be held live and in Scarborough. Taking place 20th -24 th July, join us for a relaxed holiday in the wonderful seaside town, ideal for players new to bridge competitions.

## CALENDAR OF EVENTS

## Red - Anticipated F2F Events

## MAY 2022

9-12 EBED Spring Sim Pairs, various clubs
14-15 National Swiss Teams, RealBridge
20-22 Teltscher Trophy, Northern Ireland
21 Northamptonshire GP Swiss Pairs, RealBridge
22 Kent GP Swiss Teams, RealBridge
22 Merseyside \& Cheshire GP Swiss Pairs
21-22 East Anglia Bridge Weekend, RealBridge
28-29 Corwen Trophy, RealBridge
29-4 Overseas Cruise Congress, Holland \& Belgium
JUNE 2022
3-5 Spring Bank Holiday Congress, online
11-12 Pachabo Cup, RealBridge
11-12 Yorkshire Congress, Harrogate
12-22 European National Team Championships, Madeira
18 Garden Cities final, venue tbc
18, Oxfordshire/Berks \& Bucks GP Swiss Pairs, RealBridge
26 Oxfordshire/Berks \& Bucks GP Swiss Teams, Windsor

- JULY 2022

1-3 English Riviera Congress, RealBridge
16-17 London Congress, YCBC
21-24 Scarborough Summer Congress
23-24 Glos \& Herefordshire GP Congress, Ross-on-Wye
30-31 Herts/Essex GP Weekend, Ware
31 Manchester GP Swiss Teams, Altrincham

- AUGUST 2022

11-14 Summer Meeting, Eastbourne
19-3 World Bridge Series, Poland (subject to circumstances)
23-25 Northern Midweek Congress, venue tbc
SEPTEMBER 2022
3 Bedfordshire GP Swiss Pairs, RealBridge
3-4 Crockfords final,
9-11 Isle of Man GP Congress, Douglas
10-11 Premier League, 1st weekend
12-18 Guernsey Congress
17-18 Herts \& Essex GP Congress, RealBridge
24 Cumbria GP Swiss Teams, RealBridge
24-25 Surrey GP Swiss weekend, RealBridge \& Richmond BC
25 Westmorland GP Swiss Pairs, RealBridge

- OCTOBER 2022

1-2 Suffolk GP Congress, Felixstowe
29-30 Kent \& Sussex GP Congress, venue tbc

# EBU CONGRESSES AND COMPETITIONS 

## All events are Green Pointed unless stated

Spring Bank Holiday Congress

3 - 5 June
Online


Championship Pairs with A \& B Pairs Finals (qualifying round - BP) Swiss Pairs Stratified Swiss Teams

## English Riviera Congress 1 - 3 July Online



One-day Swiss Teams Two-day Stratified Swiss Pairs

Scarborough Summer Congress 21 - 24 July The Spa, Scarborough


Championship Pairs Qualifier - BP with A \& B finals One-day Swiss Pairs One-day Swiss Teams Seniors Pairs

Summer Meeting
11-14 August Welcome Building, Eastbourne


Mixed \& Open Pairs Swiss Pairs \& Swiss Teams

## Northern Midweek <br> Congress <br> 23 - 25 August <br> Venue tbc <br> Stratified Championship Pairs Stratified Swiss Teams

## World Championships 2021

## Face-to-face combat returns, but Covid proves a setback

The World Championships for the Open, Women's, Senior and Mixed teams were due to be held in September 2021 in the Italian spa town of Salsomaggiore Terme, about 100 kilometres south of Milan. As with many sporting events originally planned for 2020 and 2021, the dates were changed but the title of the event and the venue remained the same.

And so it was that the England Open, Women's and Senior teams went to Italy in late March to contest, respectively, the Bermuda Bowl, the Venice Cup and the d'Orsi Senior Trophy. The three teams had all played in the online qualifying event back in September and had had very different experiences getting to the Championships.

In the last round, the Open team were one position behind the eight qualifying teams, 8.5 VPs behind Bulgaria and 10.5 VPs behind Hungary. They were well adrift with one board to go, but there was drama to come. First, England picked up 17 IMPs for bidding and making 6 while their German opponents went one down in a no-play $7 \boldsymbol{7}$. Then came the news that Hungary had lost 14 IMPs on the board, with the result that England qualified by less than one VP.

Playing for the Open team were Tom Townsend \& David Bakhshi, Ben Norton \& Mike Bell, Michael Byrne \& Kieran Dyke, NPC: Paul Barden, Coach: Claire Robinson. Bakhshi (three times) and Townsend (twice) were the only players in the team with previous experience of the Bermuda Bowl.

The Women started the online event in their usual, I am told, lethargic fashion, and half-way through the event were lying in 13th place out of 19 , with the top eight to qualify. They then moved up a gear or two, and seven wins and a draw in their last ten matches saw them qualify with relative ease.

The Women's team comprised Heather Dhondy (last minute!) \& Nevena Senior, Catherine Draper \& Gillian Fawcett, Sally Brock \& Fiona Brown, NPC: David Burn.

This was Dhondy's 12th Venice Cup, Brock's 9th, Senior's 7th, Brown's 5th Draper's 3rd, and Fawcett's 2nd. Brock has won the trophy twice, in 1981 and 1985.

The Seniors took a more scenic route. After lying in a comfortable qualifying position for two-thirds of the online event, they lost four of their last six matches and slumped to 10th place. But all was not lost - they were the third reserves. Various teams withdrew at the end of January and the England team was invited to play. The last time they qualified as reserves, in 2009, they went to Brazil and won the event!

Playing for the Senior team were Gunnar Hallberg \& David Mossop, Brian Senior \& Paul Hackett, John Hassett \& John Holland, NPC: Simon Cochemé, Coach: Alan Mould. Hackett, Hallberg and Holland have played for the d'Orsi Senior Trophy twice previously, winning in 2009. Mossop has played for the trophy once.

The championships started with the 24 teams in each category playing a complete Round Robin of 16-board matches. Players had their temperatures taken as they entered the playing venue, and had to wear masks throughout. The top eight teams then played a knock-out in the second week. You can read about how they fared on the following pages.
The first week went smoothly, but problems began on the second Monday. Teams started withdrawing from the consolation event. Play for the day in all events was cancelled on Tuesday, and players had to have a Covid test before playing on Wednesday. This meant there would be four stanzas a day, instead of three, to finish on time. Among those who tested positive was our very own Gordon Rainsford, working as a WBF Director, who was confined to his hotel room for a week.

The most contentious element was the allowing of substitute players - handy for locals - Italy replaced two players. In one team, rumour has it, the NPC bravely stepped in. Luckily David Burn wasn't called upon to play for the Women's team.

## BERMUDA BOWL - OPEN TEAMS By NPC Paul Barden

Bridge players from around Europe and the world descended on the fading spa town of Salsomaggiore Terme for the 45th World Championships; two weeks of intense competition in unfamiliar conditions - no vugraph theatre, no spectators at the tables, masks to be worn in the bridge venue, and everyone having to show a 'super green pass' confirming their Covid vaccination status.

The England Bermuda Bowl team arrived with a full day to spare, giving the coach vital time to scout out the gelaterie and pizzerie. The first seven days of competition would comprise a full Round Robin of 16 -board matches, three or four a day scored in IMPs converted to Victory Points, with the leading eight teams qualifying for the knock-out stages. We started well, winning nine of our first ten matches to top the table after three days. We were happy to have the VPs, but that did have the disadvantage that teams with a weaker third pair would sit them out against us, making the event all the more challenging.

A loss to USA2 on day four knocked us back, and we were in fifth place before the last match on day five, against table-topping Switzerland. We lost 12 IMPs on the fifth board when Tom Townsend's two-suited 2 opening steered opponents away from hearts, breaking 5-0, and into 3NT. Switzerland retained an 11 IMP lead going into the last board, which turned out to be a tricky slam hand:


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bakhshi | Drijver | Townsend | Brink |
| Pass | 20a | Pass | $2 \vee$ |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | $4{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Pass | 4NT ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Pass | $5{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Pass | $5{ }^{\text {A }}$ | Pass | $5 \mathrm{NT}^{\text {A }}$ |
| Pass | $6{ }^{\text {A }}$ | Pass | 7 |
| Pass | 7NT | All Pass |  |

Sjoert Brink responded to the opening with a natural positive $2 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$. When Bas Drijver raised, Brink's was supposed to show diamond shortage - he made a mistake. The result was the partnership disagreed about the meaning of $6 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$, and reached a poor grand slam. In the grand, declarer needed to run the spade suit, and soon took the finesse, to the relief of England supporters watching online.

| West Klukowski | North Norton | East Gawrys | South Bell |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $2{ }^{1}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | Pass | $2{ }^{\text {A }}$ |
| Pass | $2{ }^{\text {A }}$ | Pass | $2{ }^{\text {A }}$ |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | $3{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Dble | Redble | Pass | $3 \vee$ |
| Pass | 40 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Pass | $4 \mathrm{NT}^{\text {a }}$ |
| Pass | $5{ }^{\text {A }}$ | Pass | $5 \mathrm{NT}^{\text {A }}$ |
| Pass | 6\% ${ }^{\text {A }}$ | Pass | 6 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

In the replay, Ben Norton also opened 2\%, but Mike Bell responded $2 \downarrow$, letting Norton show his hand type. The auction continued $2 \boldsymbol{}$ (hearts or balanced), $2 \perp$ by South (relay), 2NT ( $24+$ balanced) by North, then 3 (Stayman) by South, which Michał Klukowski, West, elected to double. North redoubled to show club control, and South introduced his five-card heart suit, implying spades also or he would have transferred to hearts earlier.

Now North cued clubs, and South used keycard to check for aces and kings. North's showed either the king of clubs or the kings of spades and diamonds. South had done enough and signed off in $6 \boldsymbol{V}$. North gave this some thought, but passed, picturing a hand like

## 

where $6 \boldsymbol{}$ could sometimes be made on a $4-1$ heart break with 6 NT failing, by playing to ruff the fourth spade. So N/S played in the third-best slam.

Cont/. . .

The BBO commentators were berating Norton's failure to correct to 6 NT , but he was concentrating on the play. He won the club lead with the queen, got the bad news in hearts, and ducked the third round. He won the spade exit and ruffed a club to hand, arriving in this position:


Now he drew the last trump, discarding a spade from dummy, abandoning the finesse. He had counted West for four hearts and five clubs, so East would have eight cards in spades and diamonds. If they were 3-5 or 4-4 between the two suits, East would be squeezed. And if, unexpectedly, East had only two spades, perhaps one of them would be the queen.

Norton carried out his plan by crossing to the king of spades, intending to cash the ace of clubs next. When the queen of spades dropped, he could claim his contract, and the match, bringing England up to fourth place in the table.

The sixth day, Saturday, was another four-match day. We won the first two, then lost to Bulgaria to drop back to fifth place. The final match of the day was against Israel. We jumped into a handy lead with aggressive bidding in both rooms on the hand shown in the next column.

David Bakhshi doesn't make game tries when he can think of a reason to bid game, so the auction was soon over. Amir Levin led the eight of diamonds, and declarer made his plan. He would need to play spades for one loser, and they'd need to be 2-2 so that he could take a heart ruff in dummy. He'd then need the king of clubs onside, and a bit of luck in the heart suit. He's been in worse games than that. He took the ace of diamonds and led a trump

off dummy, planning to play East, who had overcalled, for the ace of spades. Josef Roll chose to win the first round, and could have beaten the contract by switching to king and another heart, overruffing dummy on the third round. But he knew little about the hand, and instead continued diamonds. Bakhshi ruffed, drew trumps with the king of spades, and led the queen of hearts. He was later able to take a ruffing finesse in hearts against West, followed by a club finesse for 10 tricks.

| West | North <br> Bell | East <br> Birman | South <br> Padon |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | 1NT | 2 | 1 |
| 2 | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

Alon Birman's 1 NT response gave us room to explore, which Bell and Norton used to good effect. Dror Padon led the Q against 3NT, so Norton was able to take a heart finesse for his contract. Even an impossible diamond lead and spade switch would not have been effective, since South's hand is crushed on the run of the diamonds.

On the last day of the Round Robin, we lost to the Netherlands, beat India, and pipped Australia by picking up IMPs at the end of a high-scoring match. That gave us some hope of fourth place, but alas the usually world-class Piotr Gawrys, playing for

Switzerland, had thrown 31 IMPs against Hungary in the last two boards, so Hungary were fourth and we were fifth.

The draw for the quarter-finals was selected by the first, second, and third teams picking their opponents from the fifth to eight teams. Since the teams immediately below us were Italy, Norway, and USA1, all quite recent Bermuda Bowl winners, we rather expected to be chosen as a relatively desirable opponent. As it happened, Switzerland took us with the very first pick.

But we were optimistic, we'd beaten them in the head-to-head, and they would be playing their third pair for some of the match rather than their hired guns from The Netherlands and Poland.

Indeed, Pierre Zimmermann, the property magnate who sponsors the team, and his partner Fernando Piedra, a Uruguayan-Swiss expert, were in the line-up for the first set of the 96 -board quarter-final. They're no mugs, but this was the time to pick up IMPs. Kieran Dyke and Michael Byrne seemed to have taken this theory too far on board 10 :


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dyke | Zimmermann | Byrne | Piedra |
|  |  | Pass | 1 1- |
| 14 | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

Byrne ventured 1NT somewhat light of the usual requirement, and Dyke showed again that game tries are not popular among top-level players. Piedra, with no obvious lead, tried the two of hearts, which went to the queen, eight, and four.

Byrne played a spade to the nine, jack and king, and Piedra laid down the king of hearts, getting the ten, in tempo, from declarer. Piedra gave this a long look - could Zimmermann really have played 8-6 from 8763 ? Evidently he thought the answer might be yes, because South continued hearts, bringing declarer's long suit to life. Byrne cashed the hearts, discarding a club, a diamond, and then, judging that the suit was not breaking, a spade from dummy, leading to this position with five more tricks required:


Now a diamond to the king followed by three rounds of spades endplayed South to lead away from the king of clubs.

At the other table, Drijver passed his partner's overcall, so Brink became declarer in 1 . Townsend's heart lead went to Bakhshi's king, declarer won the heart return with the queen and tried a spade to the jack and king. Now Bakhshi was able to give Townsend a heart ruff and the contract went one off.

After 16 boards, we were 29 IMPs ahead. Unfortunately for us, that meant that Zimmermann-Piedra handed over the rest of the match to the pros.

They clawed back some points over the next two sets, and at the end of the day we were six IMPs ahead. We were still optimistic - there had been nothing to suggest we couldn't match these guys.

And then the next day's play didn't happen. Reportedly there had been several positive Covid tests, including two from the Italian Bermuda Bowl team who were actually unwell. The WBF declared a rest day, and all players had to be tested. Substitutes were allowed in the case of positive tests
which was of most use to the Italians, who had time and geographical proximity on their side. Obeying orders, we trooped to the pharmacy to be tested: Bakhshi was positive. He had been running five miles a day, and looked the healthiest of us all, but there was the red line.

The next day the tournament restarted, with both sides now playing four-handed. Our remaining pairs played exceptionally well, but so did our opponents and luck was slightly against us, so that with three boards to play we were 12 IMPs behind. Rightly judging that we needed to catch up, we tried some mildly off-centre actions, and lost another 31 IMPs.

It was not to be this time, but England can be proud of their performance, losing a close match to the best players money can buy. All six players showed that they have what it takes to compete at this level. What's more, they played in the proper spirit of bridge, showing respect to their teammates, their opponents, and even their captain. With the experience we have gained, and with the right backing in future, there is every prospect that England can go from strength to strength in years to come.

BERMUDA BOWL RESULTS



## VENICE CUP - WOMEN'S TEAMS By NPC David Burn

The England team for the Venice Cup suffered a devastating blow when, a week or so before it left for Italy, Nicola Smith tested positive for Covid. By great good fortune Heather Dhondy could make herself available to renew her partnership with Nevena Senior - one of the most super subs since David Fairclough played for Nicola's beloved Liverpool a while ago.

England's progress through qualifying Round Robins is not always serene - the phrase 'last gasp' appears often in reports of such events - so the omens were not good when we drew Sweden in the first round. We had failed to score a Victory Point against them in the European qualifying round, and been severely drubbed by them in the semi-finals of the last Venice Cup, so it was something of a relief to beat them by a narrow margin on this occasion. From that point England progressed in untroubled fashion to second place - there were to be eight qualifiers - and stayed there for the last ten matches of the Round Robin.
You, West, hold an unpromising hand:

```
& 10982
\vee 6543
-762
&86
```

and hear this bidding:


What is your opening lead?
Fiona Brown reasoned that since South had spades, North had hearts and partner had not doubled the Stayman enquiry, her best bet was a diamond. She was right about that:


In the 24 -team field 6 NT was reached on 22 occasions, one of them being at the other table where it was doubled. But the lead there was a heart, so England scored 1680 in one room and 100 in the other for a gain of 18 IMPs , our largest of the Championships. The deal is a striking example of the dangers of leaking information, for which Puppet Stayman is notoriously terrible.
Poland had dominated the Round Robin to the extent that when we faced them in the last round they were certain to finish first and England to finish second. My opposite number in the Polish ensemble was rather late submitting his line-up because he was engaged in the noble task of trying to persuade the directors that we needn't bother to play. They weren't buying this, but the 16 -board match took rather less than the scheduled two and a quarter hours. At the end of it Poland chose Denmark as their quarter-final opponents, while I chose France and Sweden chose Italy, leaving USA2 to confront Turkey.

Often in the course of these affairs the team that selects its opponents comes to rue its choice. Poland trailed Denmark by 26 IMPs with a set to play and won by 33 , a staggering effort over the last 16 boards. Sweden was never headed by Italy, but the host nation had its chances until the end. USA2 was mangled by Turkey, but they had been thrown together by Fate and one of the Americans had tested positive for Covid. England trailed France at half time, but the longbows were deployed in the fourth segment and the winning margin was comfortable in the end. This next deal saw the turn of the tide.

Cont/. . .


England reached 4 by North, while France were in 5 . The latter contract was completely hopeless, and declarer dropped a trick to finish down three. The former contract also looked to be without any chance at all, and East began with two top hearts. Ruffing the second, North (Brown) led a low spade, but East avoided the bêtise of going up with $₫ \mathrm{~K}$ and West won with $\$ 10$. She continued with a third round of hearts, ruffed by declarer who cashed A . North started on the clubs, and East ruffed the
second round to play... a heart, so dummy's four diamonds disappeared on declarer's remaining club winners and a trump remained on the table for the tenth trick.

Bridge Base Online is a wonderful device for watching bridge. Unfortunately some of the watchers from time to time demonstrate why they are watching and not playing - for some hours after the completion of this deal I, who was commentating, was informed by sundry kibitzers that board 20 must have been mis-scored. It hadn't, and the 14 IMPs put England on course for victory.
Poland had chosen to play the winner of Sweden against Italy in the semi-final, which left England against Turkey. The first of those semi-finals was desperately close, Sweden emerging as winners by 2 IMPs. The second was not, for the Turkish women played with controlled aggression and great skill that the English simply could not match. Even when it appeared that the Turks had over-reached, fortune would lend them a hand.

The auctions at both tables confronted North with the same decision When England were NorthSouth on the next deal:



| West | North | East | South 181 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 | Dble ${ }^{2}$ | 37 | Pass |
| Pass | Dble ${ }^{3}$ | Pass | 34 |
| Pass | ? |  |  |
| 1 Natural or balanced, 2+ clubs; |  |  |  |
| 2 Take-out - fewer than four spades |  |  |  |
| 3 Take-out |  |  |  |

In the other room:


The English North bid 54, the Turkish North 6e. As a partial spectator, whose decision would you cheer?

This partial spectator is careful always to look for the disaster potential behind every apparently successful decision. At first it seemed that unless West led $\uparrow$ A six clubs was destined to lose a trick in each red suit. But closer examination showed that West was in fact the victim of one of the game's rarer coups - the Trick Zero Morton's Fork. If she led her ace, two of dummy's diamond losers would go on South's $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ and long spade, while if (as actually happened) West led $\uparrow K$, dummy's heart would go on the spade and there would be just a diamond to lose.

Plus 620 for England, and +1370 and 13 IMPs for Turkey. As they say in more serious professions, it's not the despair that kills you. It's the hope.

England and Poland were due to fight for bronze, but further 'sanitary considerations' as the organisers put it led to the abandonment of this match without a card being played. Both teams were awarded the medals - the same medals in our case, for the Poles were photographed in theirs and then generously gave them to us since there was only one set. Meanwhile the magnificent Turkish team found that it had come to the end of the road Sweden, who had held the Venice Cup since 2019 in Wuhan, were not minded to let it go.

| VENICE CUP RESULTS |  |  | D'ORSI TROPHY RESULTS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gold | Sweden |  | Gold | Poland |  |
| Silver | Turkey |  | Silver | India | $\bigcirc$ |
| Bronze | England |  | Bronze | Denmark |  |
| Bronze | Poland |  | Bronze | France |  |

# D'ORSI TROPHY - SENIORS TEAMS By NPC Simon Cochemé 

TThe Palazzo dei Congressi is a fine building, and the Open and Women's teams played in spacious brightly-decorated rooms. The Seniors went in via the tradesmen's entrance and played in the basement; dungeon would perhaps be a little too harsh as a description.

They started well and oscillated between 4th and 6th place for most of the first five days. Here is a board from our seventh round match against Pakistan.


John Hassett overcalled the opening $1 \star$ bid with his four-card spade suit. John Holland's 3 was a fit jump, showing four spades and five hearts.

West led the 9 and Hassett went up with the ace, throwing a club from hand. He played a club off the dummy, and West overtook his partner's 10 with the jack to lead a second heart. Declarer ruffed East's 10 in hand and played a club to East's king. East certainly didn't want to play a spade or a heart, so switched to a small diamond. Hassett took the ace-king of diamonds and ruffed a third round, discovering the suit was 3-3.

This is the deductive bit: Hassett knew that West held the ace or king of clubs (if East had had both,
he would surely have played one of them on the first round of clubs) and so East had to have the K for his opening bid. Hassett also knew that East must have started with 4-4-3-2 shape; with 3-3 in the minors, he would have opened $1 \%$. Hassett now led the Q from dummy, in case West's singleton was the 10 . East covered the queen and declarer won with ace. He ruffed his last club with dummy's 7 . East overruffed, but that was the last trick for the defence.

The Pakistani East went two down in $2 \boldsymbol{V}$ in the other room and England picked up 9 IMPs, on their way to a good win, by 15 VPs to 5 . Most of the Norths who played in 4 $\mathbf{4}$, had the friendly lead of the $\geqslant$ J or $\geqslant 10$. Only two Souths, out of eight, made ten tricks in spades.
What happened here against Eygpt?


North alerted 2NT to East as hearts and clubs, so Gunnar Hallberg's 3 was natural.

South did not alert the 2NT bid to David Mossop, sitting West. Mossop assumed it showed the minors. He queried it with a mouthed question and got a nod in return. For West, therefore, East's 3 showed a sound raise in spades. Mossop's 4NT was Keycard, with spades as the trump suit, and the 5 , reply showed the black aces and the queen of spades. Hallberg, East, thought that diamonds was the agreed suit, and his 5 response to RKCB showed the A and the K -Q. (This is a variation
on the bidding misunderstanding I describe on page 24.) North led a top club and 74 was one down. East-West called the director over South's failure to alert . . .


Small wireless cameras recorded the proceedings at every table, and proved very useful in many contentious situations. Was there a hesitation and, if so, was it five seconds or 25 seconds? Was the final contract doubled? Was a card, withdrawn from a player's hand, near enough to the table for it be considered as played? I am told that the videos - perfect for resolving disputed facts - were checked over a hundred times.

On the board, the video made it clear that South had not alerted the 2 NT bid, and the directors had to consider how to adjust the score. They looked at the contracts reached at the other tables, including the six who had bid and made 64,
the thirteen who had played in 4 or 5 , and the three who had made $6 \boldsymbol{V}$ doubled the other way. They decided that East-West should get a weighted score of +630 . Now, how to tell the scoring program to give East-West 630? Three no trumps plus one, perhaps? Alas no, East-West were not vulnerable. You or I would have to check the scoring tables, but expert directors know the answer is $1 \boldsymbol{\mathcal { L }}$, redoubled, with two overtricks! It was deemed to have been played by East; bridge historians writing Gunnar Hallberg's biography some time in the future will scratch their heads over this one. The Egyptian East-West had made $5+1$, so that was 4 IMPs in for England, instead of 11 IMPs out. England won the match 16-4.

With two days to go, England were in seventh place, but still had to play four of the teams in the top five. A series of flat boards against Guadeloupe, resulting in a small victory for England, made the task harder. We (I could have written 'they', but a proper NPC goes down with his ship) drifted down the table and finished in a disappointing 13th place.
Poland beat India in the final to win the d'Orsi Trophy. And who gave Poland their biggest defeat (2.69 - 17.31) in the Round Robin? England! I'm off to arrange a rematch.


## Everything a Bridge Player or Club needs and more



We will always match prices where possible

Any surplus from sales in The Bridge Warehouse is reinyested by the EBU in activities and services for its members and affiliated clubs.

Support bridge in England - shop at The Bridge Warehouse

Order online via our website www.bridge-warehouse.co.uk
Please email with queries:bridge.warehouse@ebu.co.uk

## Beat Today＇s Experts



## 1．Game AII．Dealer South

| $\begin{aligned} & 1086 \\ & \text { \& } 64 \\ & \text { A } 986 \\ & +1043 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 1075 \\ & \text { QJ1042 } \\ & \text { AJ65 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { KQ } 74 \\ & \text { A83 } \\ & \text { K } 73 \\ & 872 \end{aligned}$ |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Berger | Francesco | Yaimat | Leonardo <br>  <br> Pass |
| $1 \downarrow$ | $4{ }^{\mathrm{A}}$ | Pass |  |
| Pass | Dble | 4 | Dble |
| $4 \boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

We start at the Champions Cup，with Spelonga facing Geneva．The points are divided 20－20，and it is（or should have been）a gentle partscore deal．What do you make of East＇s $4 \downarrow$ ，showing the majors？It is entirely unjustified on those values．Why West passed，we will never know．North was also at fault．Would you not lick your lips at the thought of defending 4 undoubled，vulnerable？For all he knows，E／W can do very well in spades．Anyway，44 doubled went 500 down．

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alra＇deh | Nikitine | Farah | Andersson |
|  |  |  | 1\％ |
| Pass | 1＊ | $1{ }^{14}$ | 1NT |
| Pass | Pass | 27 | Pass |
| 24 | All Pass |  |  |

This is how the deal should be bid．Excellent！+140 and a gain of 12 IMPs．
Awards：2皿（10），3中（6），4中 doubled（1）．

2．Game All．Dealer East

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } 1074 \\ & 102 \\ & 86 \\ & 1843 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| －A9 2 <br> －Q 10873 <br> －AK 4 <br> － 76 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { KJ8653 } \\ & 6 \\ & 1975 \\ & 52 \end{aligned}$ |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brown | Marker | Buchen | Tutty |
|  |  | 1\％ | 24 |
| 37 | Pass | $4{ }^{\text {A }}$ | Pass |
| $5{ }^{\text {A }}$ | Pass | $5 \stackrel{1}{4}^{\text {a }}$ | Pass |
| $6{ }^{\text {A }}$ | Pass | $7 \times$ | All Pass |

This deal is from the final of the Interstate Seniors in Australia．Peter Buchen＇s 4 was RKCB（not ideal with a void in the hand）．Terry Brown showed two keycards and the trump queen．East＇s 5 announced＇all six keycards present＇and asked for side－suit kings．When West showed the K ，it was easy to bid the grand．

As you see，the A was not required．Many pairs would use 4s as Exclusion RKCB（asking for keycards outside spades）．The grand slam could then be reached even when West did not hold the $\boldsymbol{A}$ ．They stopped in $6 \boldsymbol{V}$ at the other table．

Awards：7｀（10），7NT（7），6NT／6｀（4），games（1）．

## 3. E/W Game. Dealer East



East opened with a Polish Club (usually 12-14 balanced or any $18+$ hand). The 2 NT rebid showed 21-22 balanced. $4 N T$ was RKCB and $5 \square$ asked for the trump queen. 64 said 'Yes, but no side-suit king. Mindful of a possible heart ruff, Bill Tutty adjusted 6 to 6 NT . This is a good contract, requiring three heart tricks or the club finesse.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lavings | P. Crichton | Krochmalik | R. Crichton |
|  |  | 2NT | Pass |
| $3{ }^{\text {A }}$ | Pass | 34 | Pass |
| $4{ }^{\text {A }}$ | Pass | $4{ }^{\text {A }}$ | Pass |
| 44 | Pass | $4 \mathrm{NT}^{\text {A }}$ | Pass |
| $5{ }^{\text {A }}$ | Pass | $5{ }^{\text {A }}$ | Pass |
| 64 | All Pass |  |  |

Here East played 64 after a transfer response, and a heart lead would have beaten it. The club sequence drew South's fingers towards the J and the slam was made.
Awards: 6NT (10), 6¢ (8), games (4).

## 4. E/W Game. Dealer East



| West | East <br> Varela |
| :--- | :--- |
| VillaReal | Pass |
| 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 4 |
| 4 | $5 \vdots$ |
| $5 \vdots$ | 6 |
| All Pass |  |

Trinidad/Tobago, Guadeloupe, Costa Rica, Panama, Barbados and Guatemala contested an Open Teams. I was impressed when four pairs out of six reached 6 deal. The key bid here was Claudio Varela's immediate diamond raise. West's $3 \downarrow$ rebid is space-consuming and shows a good suit. Three control bids followed, and twelve tricks were easily made, including a spade ruff.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rechtman | Pelletier | Lynch | Gerin |
|  |  | Pass | $2 \vee$ |
| Dble | Pass | $3{ }^{\text {A }}$ | Pass |
| 37 | Pass | 4\% | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | 5 | Pass |
| 6 | All Pass |  |  |

Life was more difficult here. East's Lebensohl response suggested 8-11 points. West might then have bid $3>$ (forcing). The actual auction was a bit of a guess, since East's one keycard in clubs might have been the king.

Awards: 6 (10), games (6), 7ヶ/6NT (5).

## 5. Love All. Dealer West



This deal comes from the Sanjay Damle Indian Super League. Sourendra Dutt leapt past the cold contract of 3NT, fearing that the ace of diamonds might be missing. Yes, but then East would need some particular cards for 5 to be a success. North led a heart to the ace, and the queen and ace of trumps were played. Declarer threw two clubs on the $\vee \mathrm{KQ}$, but North was able to ruff and exit with the king of clubs. Declarer then lost two spade tricks for one down.

At three tables 5 was allowed to make. North twice led a spade, and once switched to the after ruffing the third heart. At three tables West rebid 3NT instead of $5 \downarrow .12$ or 13 tricks were made.

Awards: 5/4/3NT (10), 5〉 (7), 6> (5).

## 6. Game All. Dealer North



| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Garafulic | Molina | Ravenna | Jack |
|  | $1 \uparrow$ | 2 | Pass |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | 3 | Pass |
| 4 | All Pass |  |  |

We end at the South American Mixed Championships. Diana Molina cannot be faulted for protecting with 2 . (Indeed, $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ plays well.) What should Sandra Garafulic (West) say at her second turn?
Bravo for her leap to $4 \boldsymbol{\cup}$ ! At the other table West chose to raise 3 to 5 . The defenders cashed their three blacksuit winners, and 12 IMPs were lost.
Awards: $4 \curlyvee$ (10), partscores (5), $5 \checkmark$ (3).

Many thanks to the RealBridge archive for providing comprehensive records of bridge played around the world. Our stars collect a satisfactory $48 / 60$ at the tables that I featured. Did you come close, or even beat them? Let's look for some tips.

## Tips to Remember

* Everyone knows how splendid Roman Keycard Blackwood is. So is Exclusion RKCB! Many slam hands are unbiddable without this aid.
* Think carefully before bidding 5 or when you have a stopper in the opponents' suit. 3 NT will not always be there, it's true, but eleven tricks may be too many in the minor.


# Answers to February's Problems 

TThe first hand was sent to me by David Hull, for which many thanks to him, the remaining two are my own.


| South | West | North | East |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 N T^{1}$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |
| ${ }^{1} 12-14$ |  |  |  |

A nice straightforward auction.
Choose from: (a) J; (b) Q ; (c) 4; (d) 3

A simple sequence by the opposition in which dummy has shown no interest in the majors, but declarer may have either or both. Also the expert tendency is increasingly not to bother with Stayman even with a major if the hand is very balanced. Should any of this sway us?
(a) J: $\mathbf{8}$ marks. It could easily be right (and was at the table) and if the contract is close it is not very likely to blow a trick.
(b) $\vee$ Q: 10 marks. Using the accepted principle of playing for the least in partner's hand to beat the contract, this is what I would lead as I need fewer honours in partner's hand for it to be right. It is more likely to blow a trick though.
(c) 4:3 marks. I really cannot see how this has got much going for it. It is quite likely you are simply playing the suit declarer would play!
(d) 3: 2 marks. My regular reader will know I am a big fan of leading 4th highest against NTs (more so than most experts these days I think) but there are limits even for me and this is well past it. Even if you set the suit up (or rather partner sets it up),
how are you going to get in to cash it? It could be right but partner will almost certainly need at least four of them as well and maybe five, which is hugely against the odds.
Pairs Bonus: $\mathbf{~} \mathbf{J}: \mathbf{5}$ marks. The major suit leads are close, but given that the is more likely to give a trick away I would go for the J at pairs.

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|clll|}\hline \text { South } & \text { West } & \begin{array}{l}\text { North } \\
\text { 4@ }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { East } \\
\text { All Pass }\end{array}
$$ <br>

Pass \& \& \& Dble^{1}\end{array}\right]\)| Passtake out |
| :--- |

Double was for takeout, but with this balanced rubbish you pass as always as it is a lot easier to take four tricks than 11.
Choose from: (a) a spade; (b) A; (c) 10; (d) 2

We have sensibly passed partner's takeout double. Now what?
(a) a spade: 1 mark. This is hugely unlikely to be right. It needs declarer to require ruffs on the dummy which means dummy needs a few trumps and a shortage and opposite declarer's length. This just hands the initiative to declarer. Defending contracts with high level pre-empts are often about cashing out before declarer can take discards.
(b) A: 10 marks. Not even close in my view. This allows you (hopefully!) to look at dummy, see partner's signal (which ought to be attitude) and decide what to do. There may be a ruff available (there was) or you may know what to switch to.

In this case dummy had AKQ and three low clubs.
Guess what was right?
(c) 10: $\mathbf{4}$ marks. Well I suppose if I was not going to lead the A I would lead this, but really it is not close.
(d) 2: 3 marks. The same arguments apply.

Pairs Bonus: VA: 5 marks. You get no matchpoints for -590/-790 so the same lead for me.
Hand 3
KQ1063
AQ872
4
Q6

| South | West | North | East |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 1 | Pass | 2 |
| 3 | $3 \vee$ | 5 | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| weak |  |  |  |

Choose from: (a) $\uparrow$; (b) A; (c) 4; (d) Q

It looks like the opponents are sacrificing. What is best? The lead is again clear in my view.
(a) ¢K: 5 marks. A highly seductive lead and I suppose my second choice, but it is wrong.
(b) A: 1 mark. Why? Where do you think this is going? There is no hurry to cash it and it could simply blow a trick. People lead aces against

## CONGRATULATIONS TO FEBRUARY'S WINNERS:

Master: Robin Prestwich, Wetherby
Open: Mike Tyas, Torquay


Platnilk
sacrifices far too often when they should be leading...
(c) 4: $\mathbf{1 0}$ marks. Trumps! It has long been my contention that many players' results would improve if they always led trumps against sacrifices and never otherwise, whereas my experience is that a lot of players do it the other way round! Here we have both majors and partner has clubs. Where are their tricks coming from if not from trumps? Get them out as soon as possible. At the table our failure to lead a trump cost one trick and partner's failure to switch to one cost another trick. Declarer was able to get two more ruffs than they were entitled to.
(d) $\mathbf{Q}: \mathbf{3}$ marks. Certainly better than the A but really again it is a trump that cries out.
Pairs Bonus: $\$ 4$ : 5 marks. The same lead for the same reasons. A trump was 500 against 420 for a top. Anything else was at most 300 for a bottom.

## COMPUTER-SIMULATED LEADS

Prompted by a couple of letters in February's issue about computer analysis of leads, Alan has teamed up with tech wizard Nathan Piper who has kindly agreed to generate the 'best' lead through a computer simulation of the hand. The computer is given the initial hand, and generates 10,000 hands which match the bidding,

From the next issue onwards we will award a bonus five marks if your answer matches the computer when it differs from Alan's preferred lead.
An appendix detailing the methodology for the simulation can be found online, on page 74 , along with some of the reasons unusual leads come up with good (and bad) results which might reflect what happens at the table. The computer's answers for the problems above are:

1. $\vee \mathrm{Q}, 2 . \vee \mathrm{A}, 3 . \geqslant 4$ (well done Alan - $100 \%$ )

These are based on the highest chance of beating the contract and the highest average tricks that can be taken which happen to match here. The results of all other available leads are online from page 76

## SEND IN YOUR LEAD PROBLEMS

Email the editor, lou@ebu.co.uk. Alan will be delighted to use them if suitable.

## Camrose Trophy

## England holds on to the Trophy

TThe 2022 Home International Championship for the Camrose Trophy was held over two weekends in January and March on RealBridge. As hosts of the second weekend, Scotland fielded a second team, SBU, to even up the numbers.

The first weekend was hosted by England, and the home team was Janet de Botton \& Artur Malinowski, David Bakhshi \& Tom Townsend, Espen Erichsen \& Glyn Liggins, NPC Peter Hasenson.

This board was played in $4 \boldsymbol{V}$ at all tables except one - where England faced Wales:


Paul Lamford led the $\$ 6$, the queen winning in dummy. A heart was led to the queen and king and back came another diamond. Townsend now played a club to the king and a club to the jack, playing Lamford for four spades and short cubs following his failure to open with a diamond pre-empt. He
cashed the ace of clubs, followed by the ace of hearts and ruffed a heart in dummy. His hand was now high +1370 and 12 well-earned IMPs.

The first weekend ended with England in first place on 68.51 VPs , Ireland second on 55.57 and Wales third on 51.37.

The second weekend was held in early March and the England team was Andrew Black \& David Gold, Simon Cope \& Peter Crouch, Andrew McIntosh \& Tom Paske, NPC Peter Hasenson.

Against the SBU team you pick up

```
&A74 `AKQ82 J3 $1096
```

What would you say if I told you that you will be the first member of your partnership to call trumps as diamonds and it will be at the seven level? Here's the deal:


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paske | Marshall | McIntosh | Bouverie |
|  | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 30 | Pass |
| 34 | Dble | 4 | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | 5 | Pass |
| 5NT | Pass | 7 | All Pass |

Let's make some sense of the bidding sequence. The 1 NT was $15-17$, and the 2 NT showed diamonds. 3* denied three diamonds to an honour. $3 \boldsymbol{4}$ was a cuebid while $4 \boldsymbol{V}$ showed a good heart suit. 4 NT was slam-going and $5 \boldsymbol{V}$ promised a really good heart suit. 5 NT was a grand slam try while 7 accepted and promised a little something in diamonds.

Following the 6 lead, McIntosh drew trumps and swiftly claimed 13 tricks and +11 IMPs when McGowan and Matheson only called the small slam. Two other pairs also called 6 with the last two pairs playing in game.
'Always cash a singleton ace of trumps when on lead' came true on board seven of the deciding match against Ireland when Andrew Black showed the way in 4 .


| West <br> Garvey | North <br> Gold | East <br> Hanlon | South <br> Black <br> $2 \boldsymbol{a}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{Q}$ | All Pass |  |

Tommy Garvey led the $\mathbf{5}$ to the ace and a club came back. Reading the position accurately, Black won the A , ruffed his diamond loser and cashed his heart winners, eliminating the red suits, before exiting with a trump. Garvey, with his singleton A, was endplayed to give the contract. Four other declarers went down in $4 \boldsymbol{\Delta}$ and the sixth contract was 5 doubled minus two.

Going into the last set of 16 boards, England could afford to lose 53 IMPs to their second placed opponents Ireland, and still win the trophy.

Ireland rallied strongly in the second half of the match to win the final weekend, but England were just too far in front overall to be caught and so completed a hat trick of victories, after winning in 2020 and 2021. Here are the final scores:

|  |  | Team | VP total |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 1 |  | ENGLAND | 135.96 |
| 2 |  | IRELAND | 130.74 |
| 3 | WALES | 92.13 |  |
| 4 | SBU |  | 90.63 |
| 5 | - | N IRELAND | 80.22 |
| 6 |  | SCOTLAND | 69.32 |

Simon Cope and Peter Crouch led the cross-IMPs with an impressive 1.28, 0.47 clear of the field.
At the Zoom presentation ceremony, Anne Perkins from the hosts, Scotland, congratulated England on their well-deserved victory and hoped, like many others, for a return to F2F action next year.

## CAMROSE QUIZ

```
4AJ862
\bulletAQJ5
* -
<K1065
```

| $\mathbf{W}$ | N | E | $\mathbf{S}$ |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $1 \mathrm{NT}^{1}$ | 5 | $?$ |
| $115-17$ |  |  |  |

It is Game All and your partner opens 1NT (1517). Your right hand opponent calls $5 \downarrow$. What is your call with the hand above. Choose from:
a) Double; b) 5NT; c) 64; d) 6NT

ANSWERS ON PAGE 70

# Junior Camrose \& Peggy Bayer 

## An English victory at every level

The Junior Camrose (JC) and Peggy Bayer (PB) took place on RealBridge in midFebruary. The tournament was hosted and run by Ireland, headed by Fearghal O'Boyle and Dermot O'Brien. The JC (U26) and PB (U21) are annual home international competitions between the junior teams from Scotland, Ireland, Northern Ireland, England and Wales. It usually has a fun social element as well as providing a good competition for up-and-coming juniors to prove themselves.

This year England were invited to send three teams, one for the Peggy Bayer and two for the Junior Camrose, so both the U26 (England) and U21 (EBU) teams took part in the Junior Camrose and the U16 team played in the Peggy Bayer.

## Peggy Bayer

The U16 team, captained by Giorgio Provenza, proved their mettle by dominating the competition. An excellent performance from an outstanding team proved that England has great players coming up through the Junior Squad system.

Lucy Norman \& Tom Furness displayed their talent well in this competitive deal against Scotland:


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ren | Furness | Day | Norman |
| 2 |  | $1 \downarrow$ | 2 |
|  |  | All Pass |  |

Lucy overcalled 2 to get her good suit in the auction and show some strength, and after West raised their partner to the two level, Tom competed to the level of the fit, buying the hand for Lucy to play.

After winning the $\quad$ lead in hand with the queen, Lucy set about drawing trumps with the $\checkmark$ K, getting the bad news instantly. East won and switched to a spade, and now Lucy needed to figure out how to safely draw the remaining trumps. She made the excellent decision to ruff the winning $\mathbf{K}$ ! This allowed her to get to the dummy in order to take the diamond finesse. She finished drawing the trumps with the marked hook before exiting with a heart and ruffing the heart return. Now to solve the clubs. With the 10 where it is, the only line of play in the suit is to play East for the so Lucy played a club to the king. East was thrown in as Lucy had eliminated the hand (although a ruff and discard can't cost here, it may have done if clubs were 4-1 with AJxx in one hand). East tried the as the only legitimate chance and Lucy claimed a well played 10 tricks to score up with teammates, Venetia Anoyrkatis \& Charlotte Bedford, who had managed to buy the hand in 24, to win 7 IMPs.

## Junior Camrose

The Junior Camrose was a close competition and couldn't be called even in the last round. The England (U26) team, led by NPC Nick 'Squid Leader' Sandqvist managed to maintain their narrow lead and the EBU (U21) team, led by NPC Nick Smith, could not quite overtake them at the last hurdle.

Typically, junior competitions tend to provide plenty of hands of interest, and this was no different with lots of swings available in each match.

In the second England match against Northern Ireland, Jonathan Clark \& Kripa Panchagnula showed good discipline to stay in a making part score of 2 (making +2 ) whereas their teammates had to find the defence to defeat 4 $\mathbf{~ : ~}$


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| O'Kane | Winter | Todd | S. Anoyrkatis |
|  |  |  | $1 \vee$ |
| 14 | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| Pass | 3\% | 34 | Pass |
| 44 | All Pass |  |  |

After Daniel Winter competed the part score with a balancing bid, he found himself defending 4 . With Sam Anoyrkatis having opened $1 \mathbf{V}$, Daniel chose to lead his partner's suit with the 8 - $2-10$ and ace. Declarer now tried a spade to the ace and one back which Sam took with the king. Given it was likely that declarer did not have the $\mathbf{~ J}$ as they would have taken a finesse in the suit, Sam could deduce that partner must surely have it so cashed his two heart winners before playing a third! Whilst this gives declarer a ruff and discard, there is no suit that declarer has only one loser in, so this did not give away a trick - in fact it promoted partner's $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \boldsymbol{J}$ and declarer was left helpless to go off for minus 2 . Note that this would be the only winning defence when the minor suit kings are swapped giving partner $\boldsymbol{\$}_{\mathrm{Jxx}} \boldsymbol{Y}_{\mathrm{xx}}$ xx KQJxxx. A good defence from Sam and Daniel was rewarded with 9 IMPs.

In one of the crunch matches in the event, England vs EBU, Jonathan Clark managed to find the winning action on this next board.

The 1 opening tends to show an unbalanced hand, 14 promises at least five spades and the double of 4 just shows a strong hand instead of specifically being for penalty - the idea that you have the opponents beaten in the trump suit when they have shown at least 10 (usually) is quite rare, so


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Panchangnula | Selby | Clark | Madden |
|  | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| 1* | 17 | 14 | 4 |
| Dble | Pass | 4NT | Pass |
| 5\% | All Pass |  |  |

it is much more useful to be able to show a good hand that can stand partner competing. Jonathan has a difficult decision now, should he return to his partner's diamond suit, or perhaps try $4 \boldsymbol{\$}$ or risk 5e? None of these seem perfect solutions as they could all be missing the best fit. Jonathan had already shown five spades so he did not need to tell partner about those again, but he could offer a choice of the minor suits with his 4NT bid. This isn't Blackwood (as no suit has been set yet) but offers a choice of suits. Here he managed to find partner with four clubs and they settled for an excellent contract in $5 \boldsymbol{1}$, losing a club and a spade (with the clubs falling 3-1 - the standard club play is to cash the king and play low towards the ace, or vice versa, but not to take the finesse!) when the diamond finesse was right.

In the other room, the E/W pair opted to take the money by defending $4 \boldsymbol{~ w h i c h ~ w e n t ~ o n e ~ o f f ~ f o r ~}$ -200 resulting in a 6 IMP swing in for England.

One of the most exciting aspects of the game by far must be slam bidding. As you might imagine, juniors being juniors, tend to be rather... enthusiastic when they even whiff a slam - it's a red rag to a bull. It can be tricky to maintain accuracy when the adrenaline kicks in but the English pair held their nerve on the following board against Scotland (overleaf).


Ewa Wieczorek and Charlie Bucknell play a Variable No Trump which means that North can't open the usual 15-17 1NT, hence the choice to open 1 which worked out favourably, allowing them to sniff out the heart fit and have a chance to explore slam. Ewa made a good raise to $3 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$, having a source of tricks (AKxxx is always nice) and a very sharp hand (aces and kings and the queen in the trump suit). After South showed slam interest, North bid Blackwood. They discovered they had all the keycards and considered a grand slam - opposite something like this

$$
\stackrel{\Delta}{\Delta} \mathrm{Ax} \text { AKxx } \diamond \mathrm{Kxx}^{\boldsymbol{A x x}}
$$

you'd quite fancy your chances. South, with a minimum hand and no kings, signed off.

Ronan Valentine, the Scottish player in the West seat, made an excellent deceptive lead of the $\boldsymbol{\$ 1 0}$. Now declarer has a few options. They can either ruff a diamond in dummy or try to set up the spades. Whenever trumps are $2-2$, ruffing a diamond is $100 \%$ and when trumps are 3-1 declarer can still ruff a diamond so long as it isn't overruffed before continuing to draw trumps. The risk is that spades are $5-1$ and that whichever hand is on lead can provide their partner with the spade ruff, which is why starting with trumps is a good idea! However, if you try to draw two rounds and they prove 3-1, the hand that wins the diamond can knock out your
final trump and you might now need to fall back on spades being 4-2 or 3-3. Declarer chose to cash one round of trumps before playing on diamonds and emerged safely with 12 tricks. As the only pair in the competition to bid the slam, making it was enough to win 10 IMPs for England.

Congratulations to the England team for winning the event. The players were Charlie Bucknell \& Ewa Wieczorek, Daniel Winter \& Sam Anoyrkatis, and Jonathan Clark \& Kripa Panchagnula. The EBU team surpassed itself coming second among players qualifying as U26. The team was Oscar Selby \& Harry Madden, Jamie Fegarty \& Liam Fegarty, and Thomas Gardner \& Andy Cope.
The Peggy Bayer team, which stormed to victory in the U21 competition despite all being U16 players, comprised Lucy Norman \& Tom Furness, Charlotte Bedford \& Venetia Anoyrkatis, and Raphaela Sinclair \& Rufus Barnett.

Peggy Bayer results

|  |  | Team | VP total |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | $\square$ | ENGLAND | 166.71 |
| 2 |  | $\underline{\text { IRELAND }}$ | 113.19 |
| 3 |  | $\underline{\text { SCOTLAND }}$ | 73.82 |
| 4 | - | $\underline{\text { N. IRELAND }}$ | 6.28 |

Junior Camrose results

|  |  | Team | VP total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | ENGLAND | 160.87 |
| 2 | orag | EBU | 152.40 |
| 3 |  | SCOTLAND | 99.51 |
| 4 | $1 \square$ | N. IRELAND | 73.83 |
| 5 | 214 | WALES | 63.12 |
| 6 |  | IRELAND | 50.27 |

More Junior reports online, p72

## Youth Challenge and Schools Cup

by Stuart Haring

With the lack of certainty about face-toface events when it was arranged, this year's Schools Cup and Youth Challenge took place online. After the advent of the interschools online league, this has become quite normal for many of the students and 22 teams participated, amongst the highest numbers in recent years.

In the qualifiers, Loughborough A dominated proceedings, achieving 77 VPs out of a maximum of 80. In their wake, Haberdashers' Aske's A (Habs) and Eton, last year's finalists, also qualified for the semi-final, where they were joined by a surprise as Westminster C had an excellent session.

Habs beat Westminster comfortably as each Habs pair bid and made a slam not bid at the other table. Loughborough held off the challenge from Eton, beating two part-scores by a single trick - each being enough to take them through.

The final was a re-match of a meeting in the qualifier, which Loughborough won by 28 IMPs over five boards. The final seemed to be going the same way when they took five IMPs on the first board. However, Habs, represented by James Cater, Rufus Barnett, Marco Vann and Zack Saurymper, made three game swings in the next four boards to take an unassailable lead. Meanwhile, Eton won the third-place play-off.

The most interesting board was the last one:


In the third-place play-off both Wests decided to open a weak $2 \boldsymbol{V}$, which East raised to game. South had to make a call about whether this was preemptive or a genuine bid for game. One South came in with 4 and was doubled. 4 is an easy make and 4 doubled made on a heart lead when the defence tried to cash a heart winner when back in with the A .

In the final, both Wests passed and East opened $1 \downarrow$, overcalled $1 \uparrow$ by South. One West decided it was worth a $2 \downarrow$ bid, while the other showed his spade stop with 1NT. Over 1NT, the Habs North judged his distribution worth a bid of 4@, which East doubled. At the other table, North bid only 24, allowing East an easy raise to $4 \boldsymbol{V}$.

Against 4 doubled, the Loughborough West made the lead of the $\$$. East found the play of overtaking with the Q and giving a ruff, hoping to win a heart trick and partner's trump stop to beat the contract. Unfortunately, with no heart trick coming, the contract made. The defence to beat it is to cash the $A$, then give the ruff. Whatever declarer does, West now makes two trump tricks via a trump promotion. The double-game swing confirmed the win for Habs.

There is a play for 5 by West but no West chose to compete over $4 \boldsymbol{4}$. On a spade lead, West must discard a club and ruff a spade high to eliminate them before playing a high trump. As long as there is no club void, South is endplayed holding a bare trump ace, letting declarer avoid a club guess.

The remaining teams continued the Swiss event from the qualifier. The leading school team wins the Schools Plate. This came down to the last board, but the late run from Westminster B was not enough to catch the High School of Glasgow, represented by Michael Kennedy, Kevin Ren, Alexander Duncan and Harry Stuart.

The leading team where players are not all from the same school wins the Harry Scully Trophy. The team of Lucy Norman, Charlotte Bedford, Tom Furness and Thomas Bradkin was 23 VPs clear at the top of the Swiss and won in style.

Imust confess I love my daily Wordle. It's a very simple puzzle and, if I apply basic methods and logic, I can solve it swiftly. Of course, my real gaming addiction is bridge, and sadly the same rules do not apply. This presents a dilemma to those teaching bridge to beginners. How do we keep it simple enough to engage our students whilst preparing them for the complexities of the game?

The challenge I have found

- both as student and teacher - is that standard teaching methods too often demand the Wordle approach. With practice hands, for example, you apply the right method and it works. This doesn't help much at the bridge table when hands repeatedly fail to conform neatly to the rules.

One useful approach is to consider that one aspect of the bridge teacher's job is to actively teach students to know what to do when they don't know what to do. The buzzword in schools for this is 'resilience'. It means more than not sobbing into your coffee because of a bottom but creating tools to work things out for yourself. Mixing up the teaching hands is a good place to start - including a hand from the previous week's lesson breaks the habit of students knowing what to look out for. Stretch the teaching hands so take-out double practice deals are not all $4 \cdot 4 \cdot 4 \cdot 1$ but shift to $5 \cdot 3 \cdot 3 \cdot 2$ and $4 \cdot 4 \cdot 3 \cdot 2$ to allow pupils to do more questioning for themselves.

One way to develop resilience is to explicitly teach concepts that can be applied in a variety of situations, such as all bids are either forcing, invitational or shut-up. One method is to include in the bidding box three pieces of card in traffic light colours. The partner of the bidder uses these to indicate what kind of bid his partner has made in the same way that you use an alert card. So, when for example North opens 1NT, South uses the orange card and when South bids 2 North uses the green card. Not only does this help embed a concept by connecting it to an image (always helpful . . .) but it enables the teacher to know if the students have understood or just hit lucky. Once these principles are embedded, new bids fit into a known framework.

## What is your first Question?

One of a teacher's most powerful tools is questioning. We must have all heard 'What should I bid with this?' a fair few times. It's a useful rule to counter a question with a question, 'Is that a balanced hand?' Or even better, 'What is your first question?' prompting them to develop their own working-it-out tools.

Building resilience in students is time-consuming in the classroom as you need to allow them thinking time but the benefits of building good habits early are worth every second.

If you have teaching ideas or tips to share please contact marysharp@btinternet.com

## Member Suspended

An EBU Disciplinary Committee considered the following charges against Alexander Hydes (BBO playing account names: itsgrim, itsgrim2 and killjoys2) at a hearing in December 2021:
$\because$ That when he played in some online games on the Bridgebase Online (BBO) platform between April and August 2020, he had prior knowledge of the layout of the hands obtained by self-kibitzing;
\%This information enabled him to make calls and plays which he might not have made had he not known the layout of the hands.
The defendant denied the charges, and a disciplinary hearing was held. The Disciplinary Committee found the charges proved to their comfortable satisfaction, and that the defendant's conduct constituted an offence under paragraphs 3.2(iii) and 3.2(iv) of the EBU Disciplinary Rules, being a breach of the Laws of Duplicate Contract Bridge and unfair or dishonest play.
The Committee imposed a sanction of a ban on becoming a player member of the EBU for a period of four years and six months and a tenyear ban from playing for England in any representative event.

The defendant appealed and the Appeal Committee upheld the decision of the Disciplinary Committee.


York Bridge Club have completed their purposebuilt new premises, built during the lockdown years. The club reopened its doors in early April and is now running several weekly sessions.

## Conviction Overturned

At a rehearing in early February, a verdict of dishonest and unfair play against Soheila Munro was overturned by the Disciplinary Committee. Mrs Munro was found not guilty, and the previous levied sanction was withdrawn.

We encourage all our club players to consider Tournament play. It's enjoyable, a great chance to improve your bridge and meet likeminded individuals.


King's Park Conference Centre Northampton
Join us for a weekend of bridge teaching, competition and, most importantly, fun! All levels catered for - beginner to junior international

A fantastic location, in picturesque woodland but with great transport links
More competitions and more prizes!
A range of other activities alongside the bridge Special Early Bird booking price of $\mathfrak{£ 1 3 0}$ if you book before 29th May
For more information, including how to book, please contact EBED:
lisa@ebedcio.org.uk or call 01296317228


## ACROSS

1 English cow leading and still over the moon (8)
9 Aspect of honour in confrontation (10)
10, 19d British verge on fierce attack..
(9)
11. ... well, that started quarrel (4)

13 Appeared to be praying to make a comeback when starting to limp in long distance race (5)
14 Draws off ships on exercise (7)
16 Floors with tales being told (7)
18 Branch that's almost snapped up (5)
20 Examination of immorality (4)
21 With birds finding a way North (5)
22 All the cards on the shelf, including the fourth joker, have a hand-made look (10)
23 Enthusiasm with reorganisation Ken's seen (8)

## DOWN

2 They happily slid away and carved sirloins with abandon (10)

3 Highlander perhaps missing start of course (4)
4 Deliver lesson to terrible cheat (5)
5 Hair-do that's a great result for granny, perhaps (7)
6 Chef uses this criminal activity (5)
7 Sudden attack by sporting partners secured 100 imps (10)
8 Throw out of plane - it's no problem (8)
10 One meddling with public transport organisation? Yes, having been recruited (8)
12 Spooner's sexy European makes driving potentially dangerous (7)
15 Good card's one treated poorly (5)
17 Short route into one of the armed forces for black, 21 (5) 19 See 10a.

## COMPETITION



Send your entries for the cartoon above to lou@ebu.co.uk or Editor, Raggett House, Langport, Somerset, TA10 0DD by 30th June.
Thank you for all the captions I received for the one below. Congratulations to naughty Peter Sturton for my favourite, shown below the picture. Other close contenders were Kevin Sullivan's ' . . . the Queen . . . World Peace . . . and that Betty forgets I didn't return her suit'; and William Parker's 'Dear Lord, may I never double my wife again.


From the bubbles in the duvet Brian could see his partner was getting her trumps out early

Our sponsor Fortnum \& Mason will be rewarding the winner with some wonderful Handmade English Chocolates. Created entirely by hand by Fortnum's master confectioners, these chocolates are made to a unique recipe, unchanged since the 1920s.

## FORTNUM \& MASON

EST 1707


# LETTERS TO THE EDITOR 

## ONLINE GP EVENTS

Counties are now restricted to just one online GP event a year, with a surcharge in EBU fees. Why? Online events eliminate travel and accommodation costs, important at a time of rising inflation and living costs. They also equalise opportunities for players from remote counties with fewer neighbours, and spare counties the costs of venue hire and TD travel and accommodation. Why not allow counties to make their own decisions about running online or F2F events, with equal EBU fees regardless? Enable players to play as many events as they choose without the needless expense of travel and accommodation. Peter Griffin

Online events differ from live ones because their catchment area becomes national, even global. This means there would be more undesirable clashes if counties were free to run all their one-day events online. We are trying to find a balance and ensure there is provision for those of our members who don't want to play online. There will be no shortage of online games for members. This was discussed and agreed at the last AGM, which is where Shareholders, who are the counties' representatives, vote on matters concerning the direction of the $E B U$.

## Gordon Rainsford EBU CEO

## SUBBING ONLINE

I have been subbing online on BBO and sometimes find myself playing in EBU tournaments and subsequently graded for NGS
after playing with a complete stranger and no time to discuss our system. How can I opt out?

## Dr Susan Parkins

Most directors will be grateful to find an English player. If you let them know as soon as you arrive that you want to be treated as a 'guest' you will not be graded, nor awarded Master Points, but your partner will still get any points.Ed

## LONGEST COMPETITION

My team just played the final of the Hubert Phillips plate for 2019-20, more than 2.5 years after the competition started.

Dave Robinson

## TWO TYPES OF CLUB

The editorial in February resonated. I play at two bridge clubs: one is friendly and relaxed, the other is regimented and I have even been shouted at! I would not attend the latter were it not for my lovely partner. Clubs definitely need to be more welcoming to attract and retain members.

Elaine Colin

## RETURNING TO F2F

It has been nearly six months since local clubs returned to face-to-face bridge, and I think they are, at best, achieving $60-$ $70 \%$ of the pre-lockdown attendance. My impression is that observance of bridge regulations has lapsed during the interval, especially in areas of the game where the computer prevents non-observance. As others have written, use of the STOP card is variable. Others are putting their calls away before the lead is made. As numbers are
low and clubs can't afford to lose members, the days when a club could threaten ill-behaved members with expulsion seem like another, not necessarily a nicer, era. Since returning to F2F I have not heard a single player either reserving their rights or accusing someone else of conveying unauthorised information. I sense we have all mellowed a little, and even those who have undergone director training are a little less legalistic. Scores seem less important than simply getting out and meeting people at the bridge table. We have perhaps got a better perspective of the importance of the game.

Gavin Wilson

## A TOM JONES

I enjoyed Simon Cochemé's article on how some conventions got their names. A couple he missed are the Unusual No Trump and a Tom Jones.

The first is a 2 NT bid after opps have opened one of a major, showing 5-5 or better in the minor suits. Many pairs also use it over one of a minor to show the other minor and an unspecified major.

The exception is a 2 NT bid in the protective seat after LHO opens and partner and RHO both pass. This shows a strong balanced hand. Its known as a Tom Jones because 'Its Not Unusual'. Duncan Jones
Duncan contributed another convention, sadly too rude to mention - but if you know him ask him about 'Ghislaine’! Ed


John will be known to many for his decades of loyal service to bridge administration, particularly to Warwickshire CBA, Coventry Bridge Club, and in his role as a National Tournament Director for the English Bridge Union.
As well as being a keen player and tournament director, John also led TD training courses locally and for the EBU. Many directors in the area have benefited from John's tuition, guidance, patience and support over the years. Until his recent move to Norfolk, John was an active member of both Warwickshire Executive Committee and the committee of Coventry Bridge Club.
He leaves his wife Maggie who is also a County Tournament Director, as well as many friends and bridge partners.

Anne provided a wealth of expertise and enthusiasm for both Cheltenham Bridge Club and the Gloucestershire CBA, for which she received a Dimmie Fleming Award in 2010.
Despite being the county's first woman to become a Grand Master, she was supportive of new and inexperienced players and happy to give her time and help to encourage them, and much enjoyed helping with the Youth Bridge Weekend.

Anne was described as 'always smiling and a real pocket dynamo, and loving her bridge.'


DAVID PRICE 1949-2022
David was a most respected and delightful international bridge player. Born in Kent, he took up bridge while at school and fell in love with the game. Upon his graduation he embarked on a successful career in the insurance industry, and played bridge part-time.

He married a bridge player, Helen Burton, in 1979 and took up bridge full-time. He went on to become one of the great rubber bridge players, playing at TGRs near Marble Arch, a club run by Irving Rose. David went on to play duplicate bridge, winning many of the national tournaments including the Crockfords Cup, the Spring Foursomes and the Tollemache Cup - all multiple times.

Internationally David played in the European Championships seven times, winning the seniors tournament in 2014. He also played in the Bermuda Bowl and was part of England's winning World Seniors team in 2009. David also captained many Camrose teams as well as European teams. He was awarded the EBU's Diamond Award for sustained excellence representing England.

David played with many top-class partners, including Christopher Duckworth, David Burn, Peter Czerniewski, Lionel Wright and Tom Townsend. His most successful partnership, however, was with the late Colin Simpson.

In 1995 David joined with Godfrey King, a great friend, to run the King of Trumps bridge club. After his marriage to Helen ended, he met Jenny Bishop, a pupil at the club, who became his wife.
David was known as one of the great gentlemen of bridge - polite, friendly and honest. He was a generous advocate for the game and will be missed by Jenny, his many friends, partners and by his opponents, myself included.

Godfrey King

| Congratulations to the newly promoted |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Premier Grand Masters: |  |
|  | Jackie Davies, Hertfordshire |  |
|  | Raymond Semp, Manchester |  |
|  | Grand Masters: |  |
|  | Gabriel Ip, Norfolk |  |
|  | Giles Ip, Norfolk |  |

Avon
Master
Stephen Powell
Philip Seymour Elaine Turner
Bedfordshire
Life Master
Peter Coles
Brian Leach
Berks \& Bucks
Regional Master
Marc Rivoira
Master
Amanda Abecasis
Sue Cunningham Alba Goss
Nick Green Jack Lawrence Grace Samuels Jacqui Watterton Jim Wright Tina Wright
Cambs \& Hunts
Master
David Jones Fred Peirce Corinne Walsham
Channel Islands
Master
Susan Childs
Cornwall

Paul Rundle
Cumbria
Master
June Ivison
Carol Nichol
Derbyshire
Master
Michael Lathbury
Devon
Life Master

Regional Master
Paul Hide

| Lincolnshire | Oxfordshire | Sussex |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Master | Life Master | Life Master |
| Louise Lewis | Peter Litchfield | Andy Ryder |
| David Lucas | Regional Master | Master |
| Maria Vietri-Nelson | Andrew Hones | Raquel Berdichevsky |
| Dee de Wit | Master | Neil Chisman |
| London | Mary Bennett | Carolyn Cox |
| Master | Finlay Gemmell | Cuckoo Healey |
| Mark Alcock | Patty Greaves | Hilary Levett |
| James Cater | Roberta Jefferies | Penny Mitchell |
| Sylvia Finnimore | Christopher Moxon | Nick Newell |
| Rex Goad | David Rushton | Mary Sharp |
| Alex Hannon | Chris Stafford-Darrall | Solvi Stafford |
| Mary Woodhead Manchester | Somerset | Warwickshire |
| Premier Grand | Master | Regional Master |
| Master | John Moore | Peter Abbott |
| Raymond Semp | Bob Williams | Peter Johnson |
| Regional Master | Staffs \& | Master |
| David Fussell | Shropshire | Richard Holland |
| Master | Regional Master | Shirley Jobson |
| Ash Shah | Michael McCartney | Jane Lee |
| Rhona Solomon | Master | Phil Shorey |
| Middiesex | Peter Goram | Alex Smith |
| Master | Pauline Jones | Westmorland |
| Stuart Montlake | John Sanders | Life Master |
| Ros Newby | Suffolk | Jill Rushton |
| Norfolk | Life Master | Wiltshire |
| Grand Master | Chris Green | Life Master |
| Gabriel Ip | Master | Susie Gall |
| Giles Ip | Brian Dean | Trevor Purches |
| Regional Master | Janette Mace | Regional Master |
| Penelope Stroud | T Sharp | Chaz Cross |
| Master <br> William Rouse | Surrey | Lucy Cross |
| North East | Regional Master | Master |
| Regional Master | Alick Fraser | Amanda Cooper |
| Steve Kitching | Inu Kassam | John Luck |
| Master | Fionn O'Leary | Worcestershire |
| Dee Milburn | Cecilia Rossiter | Regional Master |
| Catherine Norton | Master | Robert Chilimonczyk |
| Northampton- | Lis Bell | Steve Simmons |
| shire | David Blomfield | Master |
| Master | Mike Chevreau |  |
| Michael Dawe | Parri Datta | Chris Flood |
| Anne Jackson | Mary Dibbs | Stuart Smith |
| Richard Spratt | Nigel Fishwick | Yorkshire |
| Notting- | Keith Flower | Regional Master |
| hamshire | Roberta Linehan | Sarah Brown |
| Regional Master | Ruth Marie Lister | Alan Harte |
| Patrick Gaudart | Julie Minards | Master |
| June Evans | Angela O'Donovan | Colin Cheshire |
| David Heard | Jitendra Shah | Danny Parsonson |
| Jane Holdrick | Pankaj Shah | Peter Rawlins |
| David King | Naina Pradeep Shah | James Scarr |
| Ron Miller | Roger Smee | George Southern |



# Julian's answers to questions from page 10 



Pass. Partner's raise is pre-emptive and shows a limited number of high cards. A hand with three aces should be taking some other action - a Jacoby 2 NT raise if you play that or a splinter or an oldfashioned delayed game raise. It is far likelier that partner has one ace (when 54 is going down) than three aces (needed to make 6 $\mathbf{~}$ ).


Double. You could have had fewer high cards and a less perfect shape for your original double. The opponents are likely to have a nine-card fit and you do not want to let them play quietly in $3 \boldsymbol{2}$.

```
Hand 3
& KQ103
\vee AQ9 7
-4
* Q64 
```

1\%. When opening one of a suit, you need to have a rebid prepared. You achieve this here by opening the suit below the singleton, leaving yourself a convenient $1 \downarrow$ rebid over a $1 \downarrow$ response. If you open $1 \checkmark$ or $1 \boldsymbol{4}$, a suit rebid over 2 would lie about your major-suit length while a no trump rebid would overstate your values.


1 ${ }^{\text {. With }}$ such excellent playing strength and 15 HCP, you can afford to show your longest suit first, planning to reverse later. If you get to bid $1 \leqslant$ and then bid hearts twice, you will paint a perfect picture of six diamonds and five hearts.

| Hand 5 | W | N | E | S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ J 96 |  |  | 1 * | Pass |
| -KQ 92 | ? |  |  |  |
| - - |  |  |  |  |
| +197432 |  |  |  |  |

17. A response at the two level would show a better hand than this and would be all too likely to result in a poor contract of 2 - with most minimum opening hands, partner would have to rebid $2 \downarrow$ over a $2 \boldsymbol{\text { responsen }}$. Partner might still rebid 2 over but at least you will know it is a six-card suit.

18. Since you can show your suit at the one level, bidding 1 does not show any more strength than a 14 response in an uncontested sequence. The free bid of 14 does, for most pairs, show a five-card (or longer) spade suit, which you have.

HOLLYWOOD \& PACIFIC RIVIERA LOS ANGELES ROUNDTRIP Oct. 25 - Nov. 3. 2022 9 Nights

Regent Seven Seas Mariner



NORWEGIAN FJORDS \& GLACIERS STOCKHOLM TO COPENHAGEN July 10-24. 202316 Nights Regents Seven Seas Splendor


ICELAND \& NORTHERN LIGHTS REYKJAVIK ROUNDTRIP
Aug 17-27. 202310 Nights
Silversea Moon

All-Inclusive Fares include:
All Transfers Between Airport and Ship. Included Shore Excursions. Unlimited Beverages Including Fine Wines and Premium Spirits. Open Bars and Lounges Plus In-Suite Mini-Bar Replenished Daily. Pre-Paid Gratuities. Unlimited WiFi
Book before May 30 for a bonus shipboard credit!

## ALSO INCLUDED:

Bridge Program with Silvana and Rich Morici

- Daily ACBL SILVER MASTERPOINT duplicate
- Daily Bridge Lessons



## UK ESCAPES

We're delighted to be running our British
Bridge holidays again and have a fantastic selection of escapes coming up for 2022. Here's just a taste of what to expect.

$\sqrt{ }$ TOURSINCLUDED 12 September 2022 5 days from $£ 525$ pp

$\sqrt{ }$ FULL DAY ISLAND TOUR 20 September 2022 8 days from £950pp


8 June 2022 7 days from £629pp


LOOKING TO TRAVEL FURTHER AFIELD? TAKE A LOOK AT OUR OVERSEAS ESCAPES!

$\sqrt{\text { FULLY INCLUSIVE }}$ 30 September 2022 8 or 15 days from $£ 875$ pp


7 October 2022
8 or 15 days from $£ 899$ pp

$\sqrt{ }$ ULTRA INCLUSIVE
5 November 2022
8 or 15 days from $£ 699$ pp

$\sqrt{\text { TOURS INCLUDED }}$
21 \& 28 December 2022
8 or 15 days from $£ 895$ pp

## WINTER SUN ESCAPES TO THE CANARIES

 Long stay options available. Stay for 2,3 or 4 weeks on multi centre options.

5 January 2023
8 or 15 days from $£ 779$ pp


19 January 2023 8 days from $£ 750$ pp


26 January 2023 8 days from $£ 975$ pp

WANT TO TRY SOMETHING DIFFERENT? JOIN US ON A BRIDGE RIVER CRUISE

$\sqrt{ }$ WITH EXCURSIONS 29 May 2022
7 days from $£ 1,150$ pp


1) FLIGHTS INCLUDED 17 July 2022
13 days from $£ 2,395$ pp

$\rightarrow$ FLIGHTS INCLUDED 3 August 2022 8 days from $£ 1,549$ pp

## Bridge Club Live

## A disappearing defensive trick



Bidding and making 4 was worth eight IMPs in a recent IMPs Pairs movement. It appears that the defence have two spades and two minor aces to take.


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | 1 |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | 4 | All Pass |  |

West led a diamond and declarer ruffed the diamond return at trick two. Declarer then took two rounds of trumps finishing in hand. He ran the (1) to East's. East led the and declarer played
low, taking West's 10 with We were here:


Declarer now played out the K and the throwing the 6 , and then played the When East followed with 10 , declarer threw the 8 . East had only diamonds left so had to allow declarer to throw the Q on the return and ruff in dummy.

Declarer would also have prevailed if he had finessed earlier in the play, but the auction and early play suggested that East would have the longer clubs for the endplay to work. If West had been able to take A, the endplay still becomes available.

## Bridge Club Live offers

```
Fast, fun & friendly bridge;
Use of Audio and Video chat;
Dedication to Best Behaviour
at Bridge and to fair play;
Drop-in Drop-out Match
Point Pairs and social games;
Private social tables;
Individual, Improvers and
IMP Pairs Tournaments, and
Teams events;
Fast, fun \& friendly bridge ; Use of Audio and Video chat; Dedication to Best Behaviour at Bridge and to fair play;
Drop-in Drop-out Match
Point Pairs and social games;
Private social tables;
Individual, Improvers and IMP Pairs Tournaments, and Teams events;
```

Full programme of special competitions (Swiss Pairs, Leagues, KOs);

- Full bidding and play records;
- System cards;
- Forums \& reunions;
- Free coaching by senior members;
Free dedicated teaching area for teachers and students;

Free participation in dedicated sessions for your F2F club;
Clear graphics;
Daily personal results;
Messaging facility;
Spectating and kibitzing;
Grading scheme;
25 years of experience
providing support to members.

## Funbridge Competitions

## Can't See the Forest for the Trees

Some hands are annoyingly simple, once you have seen the solution. On this deal from the Funbridge Team Game, there are no endplays, no complex squeezes and not even any tricky suit combinations to be handled carefully. Yet, when I give this hand to my students, many of them go down, so perhaps it is more difficult than I first thought.


A simple auction carries you to $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ and West leads the $\$ 9$. How would you play?

This is a hand that requires you to do nothing more than count your tricks, and yet if the deal occurred in a large field I guarantee that many players would go down. The main problem is that most of them would fail before even thinking about how to play the hand: they would see dummy and automatically cover the diamond lead with an
honour. Unless you are playing against a rank beginner who would contribute the $\checkmark \mathrm{K}$ to this trick, you can now make only nine tricks.

Let's stop for one moment to count our tricks. Looking at our high-card resources, there seems to be no reason why we should not make six spades, three diamonds and one club. That adds up to ten, so what goes wrong?

The problem is that if you win the opening lead with, say, the $Q$, you can then score only two diamond tricks. You will win the second round of diamonds with the ace and you could use your only entry (the $\mathbf{~} \mathrm{K}$ ) to play a third round of diamonds, covered by East and ruffed. However, there is no way back to dummy to cash a third winner in the suit. You eventually have to resort to leading a heart towards your king and, when West shows up with the A , down you go.

It may be counter-intuitive, but playing dummy's low diamond and winning with the ace at trick one guarantees your contract. You can draw trumps with the ace and queen, then play your remaining diamond. East wins an unexpected trick with the $\star \mathrm{K}$ and plays a heart through your king, enabling the defenders to take two tricks in that suit. However, you will then win the club switch with the ace, cross to dummy in trumps, and dispose of your two club losers on dummy's winning diamonds. Ten tricks!

Bridge really is a simple game, but no one ever says it's easy.

# Sarah's Stayman \& Transfer Quiz from page 6 

 artner opens 1 NT . What is your plan on these hands?| Hand 1 | Hand 2 | Hand 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ K 10864 | ¢K8643 | - AKJ64 |
| - 8743 | 『J7432 | - Q 1086 |
| - Q 5 | - 4 | - 5 |
| -15 | \% 73 | \% $K 87$ |
| Hand 4 | Hand 5 | Hand 6 |
| Q Q 965 | - J 43 | - A 1095 |
| -QJ8642 | - Q 852 | - KQ864 |
| - 74 | - J8753 | - 8 |
| \% 3 | -9 | Q Q 95 |

Hand 1 - Bid Stayman and pass if partner bids a major. If partner bids $2 \downarrow$, you can now bid $2 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ to show a weak hand with four hearts and five spades. Partner should always pass this. This is better than just transferring to spades because partner might have something like

## 

where you'd expect your heart fit to play much better than a 5-2 spade fit.

Hand 2 - Bid Stayman and pass if partner bids a major (yay!). If partner bids $2 \downarrow$, you should bid $2 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$, not $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$, although this is an advanced point. This shows five hearts and at least four spades, so partner can pull to 2 with 3-2 in the majors and you find your fit.
Hand 3 - You are worth game facing a 1NT opening so you should transfer to spades and then bid $3 \boldsymbol{\square}$, showing a game-forcing hand with $5+$ spades and $4+$ hearts. Partner will bid spades if they have a spade fit for you; $4 \boldsymbol{V}$ if they have four hearts; and 3NT otherwise.

Hand 4 - You have a weak hand with a six-card major so you should just transfer to hearts and play there. If you bid Stayman and then $2 \boldsymbol{o v e r}$ partner's 2 response you run the risk of partner pulling that to 2 holding three spades and two hearts. It's also not clear that you even want to
play in a 4-4 spade fit when one exists - what is wrong with your 6-2 or 6-3 heart fit?

Hand 5 - Bid Stayman and pass whatever partner bids. This was a hand type that I discussed when I first wrote about Stayman. The idea here is that you don't think that you are making 1 NT , and LHO might be about to double it. If you bid Stayman, three things can happen:

1 Partner bids 24. Partner can ruff clubs in our hand, so the $4-3$ fit might well play a lot better than 1NT. It also might be harder for oppo to double than 1NT.

2 Partner bids $2 \mathbb{V}$. Hooray!
3 Partner bids $2 \downarrow$. Partner doesn't have a four-card major but might still have only two diamonds, if they are 3325. This would be unlucky, though, and it's pretty likely that we have a diamond fit. A $5-2$ fit is no great disaster anyway - we play in them all the time when we transfer to a major with a weak hand and then pass.

Hand 6 - Transfer to hearts and then bid 21. If partner supports your hearts or spades you are worth game. If partner bids 2NT, showing a minimum with no fit, you can pass this. If partner has a maximum with no fit they should bid 3NT instead of 2 NT .

## Michael Byrne's Quiz from page 8



Hand 1 just rebids $2 \downarrow$, as a bid of 2 would be a reverse. It may seem cruel to have to rebid a jackhigh suit instead of showing where all your goodies are, but if you bid 2 you are showing $16+$ as you are going through the barrier of $2 \downarrow$. It is possible that partner will have five spades and four hearts, but with such a hand and $10+$ points they are likely to show hearts next. With fewer points they may pass, but game won't be missed.
Hand 2 can rebid 2 and reverse, despite only having 15 points. The extra shape (6-4 not 5-4) and powerful top cards means that your hand is well worth a reverse. If instead you rebid 2 partner will pass holding
A6542, Q973, 6, J85
and a playable game will be missed).
Note that it would be wrong to rebid 3 as this would deny a four-card heart suit.
Hand 3 should rebid 2NT (18-19) as this shows the texture of the hand better, and will right-side a final contract of 3 NT . There is no danger of missing a 4-4 heart fit, since partner responded 14, so if he has four hearts he will be 5-4 and will have a nice easy 3 bid available to show his shape.
It wouldn't be wrong to bid $2 \boldsymbol{\vee}$, but with so much strength in your short suits this hand feels like a 2NT bid.

Hand 4 should rebid 2. When your second suit is lower ranking you can't reverse, so the choice is between rebidding 2 (weak 11-14 or medium 15-18) and rebidding 3 (19+ and gameforcing). Even those with the most optimistic of arithmetic will not have trouble working out that this hand is far short of the values for a jump to 3k!

| CROSSWORD NO 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Compiled by MERMAN |  |  |  |  |  | Answers from p 58 |  |  |  |
| E | C | ${ }^{3}$ | ${ }^{4} \mathrm{~T}$ | A | T | I | C | S | J |
| ${ }^{9} \mathrm{~F}$ | A | C | E | T | 0 | F | A | C | E |
| ${ }^{10} \mathrm{~B}$ | R | O | A | D | P | S | P | A | T |
| U | N | T | C | 2 | $\stackrel{13}{13} \mathrm{~K}$ | N | E | L | T |
| $\stackrel{14}{14}$ | 1 | P | H | 0 | N | S | R | L | I |
| Y | V | ${ }^{15}$ | $\stackrel{16}{16} \mathrm{~S}$ | T | 0 | R | E | Y | S |
| ${ }^{18}$ | 0 | U | G | H | T | A | 19 | E | N |
| ${ }^{20} \mathrm{O}$ | R | A | L | 0 | ${ }^{21}$ | V | I | A | N |
| $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ \mathrm{D} \end{gathered}$ | E | C | K | L | E | E | D | G | E |
| Y | S | ${ }^{23} \mathrm{~K}$ | E | E | N | N | E | S | S |

## Paul Bowyer's Quiz from p12



Your Count and Plan reveals plenty of winners (one spade, two hearts, five diamonds and two clubs). Can you get the diamonds established and run, however?


Your Count and Plan reveals ten top tricks (five spades and five diamonds) so this looks to be an easy one. The defence start by leading a heart to the $\geqslant A$ and playing a second heart. On the second round of trumps, East shows out. If you draw all the trumps, the diamonds are blocked. What now?

## ANSWERS

After the $\$ 8$ lead (surely the second-highest from a poor suit) you must resist the temptation to play the $\geqslant \mathrm{J}$ or $\vee$ from dummy. Indeed, even if West had led the $\mathbf{~}$, it still would be wrong to play a high heart from dummy as you need the Q J to provide a later entry to the table.

You must take trick one with the A, overtake the K K with dummy's A and set up the diamonds. Then, in the fullness of time, you can access dummy with a heart and run off the diamonds.

Note that if you were to play a high heart from the table at trick one, a canny East would hold back his king, denying you later access to the table.


After spades turn out to be 4-1, you have to rely on diamonds being 3-2. After ruffing the second heart and cashing two rounds of spades you must cash exactly two rounds of diamonds before playing off two more rounds of spades.

On the last trump you have to discard dummy's blocking diamond honour, allowing you to cash the - J109 for your ten tricks. Here's the full deal:


## CAMROSE QUIZ ANSWER (p51)

```
4 AJ862
\veeAQJ5
* -
K 1065
```

| $\mathbf{W}$ | N | E | $\mathbf{S}$ |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $1 \mathrm{NT}^{1}$ | 5 | $?$ |
| ${ }^{1} 15-17$ |  |  |  |

A small panel of world class players have reviewed the problem and given marks for different answers:

Double. 3 marks. Essentially for takeout but partner will most likely pass with her balanced hand, for an insufficient penalty.

5NT. 10 marks. The expert choice. Partner, pick a small slam in any of the other suits.
$6 \uparrow .6$ marks. A Grand Slam Try. Partner can bid 7e with four or more clubs. Very tempting but a little too much risk if partner has values in diamonds, or no four card major, or if suits are breaking badly. But if it works ...

6NT. 1 mark. Unlikely to make when partner has too many values in diamonds, or too few values in diamonds!

Here is the full deal:


The most successful score was achieved following the simplest of auctions as above. The lead was the $\$$. Thirteen tricks were made for +1390 . The other five results were making (twice), $3 \mathrm{NT}+1,6 \boldsymbol{-}-1$ and finally $6 \boldsymbol{-}-2$.

Marietta was born in Sri Lanka but arrived in England aged just six. After school she worked at United Biscuits, retiring early to pursue bridge.

Marietta decided to become the best player in the world, but this was put on hold when she decided she wanted to run a bridge club and bring new people into the game. She ran Richmond BC (19 years), Wimbledon BC (seven years) and Walton \& Hersham BC with all three increasing membership and daily table numbers and putting on stomping good social occasions, as well as improving the biscuits!

Some people, when first meeting Marietta, could feel a touch intimidated, but in truth she was a loving, caring, sincere and loyal person with a mischievous sense of humour. On top of all the hard work running three clubs she still found time to take on a mentoring role teaching all she knew bridge-wise to several people she thought showed promise.
Marietta continued to enjoy playing bridge herself, achieving many highs, of which playing for England's EBU team with her partner Janet Cahm in the Lady Milne home international would likely rank as her proudest moment.

$£ 6.50$ for $\mathbf{2}$ decks

Jannersten $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ Plastic LARGE FIGURE CARDS Price is for 2 decks (1 Red/1 Blue) Postage not included

3-8 Table Howell Movement Cards Free to print out via email Contact sue@ebu.co.uk


CLUB TABLES
ONLY $£ 75.00$
( $£ 37.50$ EACH)
POSTAGE $£ 7.50$ PER PACK
SINGLES AVAILABLE AT £45 EACH
SEE WEBSITE FOR DETAILS

Order online via our website
www.bridge-warehouse.co.uk
Please email with queries: bridge.warehouse@ebu.co.uk

## CHANNEL TROPHY SUCCESS

The Channel Trophy took place face-to-face in March after being delayed from its usual December date. The junior event pits teams from France, Belgium, England and the Netherlands, and took place at the Pieterman Bridge Club in Leuven, Belgium.
Congratulations to our England Junior teams who took part in the event. The U26 and U21 teams finished in first place, with the U26 Womens team finishing third in their respective categories.


U26 Team, from left: Jonathan Clark, Aaron Hutton, Kripa Panchagnula, Oliver Powell, Stephen Kennedy (Coach), Nick Sandqvist (NPC), Charles Bucknell, Eva Wieczorek


U26 Womens team, from left: Nathalie Shashou (Chaperone), Neeraj Tanna (NPC), Dido Coley, Kim Hudson, Lucy Norman, Charlotte Bedford, Lily Kearney, Bethany Madden


U21 Team, from left: Giorgio Provenza (NPC), Liam Fegarty, Henry Rose, Imogen La Chapelle, Jamie Fegarty, Oscar Selby, Harry Madden

## BGB JUNIOR PAIRS

Ten pairs competed for the BGB Junior Pairs in March. Congratulations to William Clennell \& Dominic Cooke who won with a handsome +64.50 IMPs, while Kim Hudson \& Dido Coley were the best Under 21 pairs with +46.00 IMPs. They win the Liz McGowan Trophy and the Paul Porteous Trophy respectively.

## SURREY SCHOOLS CUP



After a postponement in 2021, Surrey Schools Cup welcomed several schools back in early February.

The Schools Cup was won by a combined team from Harrodian, St Paul's Girls \& Westminster William \& Edward Battersby, Thomas Bradkin and Raphaela Sinclair. The Haberdashers' Aske's A team were the runners up - James Cater, Zack Saurymper, Rufus Barnett and Marco Vann.

The Salver was won by Westminster B team James Berry, Daniel Yap, Aditya Gupta \& Ryaan Sultan. The St Paul's Boys B team were runners up - Nicholas Dyer, Elliot Gaudaire, Adavya Goyal \& Anango Prabhat.

The mini-bridge for the David Garfit Clowes trophy was won by a pair from Epsom College, Leo Skingley \& James Lau. The King's College pair of Nikhil Dalton \& Blake Haden came a very close second.

Owing to last minute Covid concerns the minibridge tournament was played as a simultaneous pairs with the missing teams from Tormead able to play from their school.

The event took place at Wimbledon Bridge Club with kind members volunteering to help out. Some 76 students attended the club and eight played in the minibridge from their school. Putney High School and Lady Eleanor Holles School played for the first time. Richard Banbury took on the challenge of running the three events at once.
more photos overleaf

## SURREY SCHOOL CUP



## Appendix 1 - Methodology \& Results

## Methodology

The computer is given the hand in question, the contract and everything known about the opposing hands based on the auction (such as declarer has five plus spades, at most two hearts, between 12 and 15 HCP etc). It then generates random hands and checks them vs these criteria. For any matches it calculates the double-dummy results of leading each of the 13 possible cards. After 10,000 matching hands have been analysed the results are presented as follows:
> \% Percentages given are the chance of defeating the contract on the given lead. This is used as a proxy for being the best lead at teams;
> $\because$ The trick numbers that follow are the average number of tricks that follow from the lead. This is used as a proxy for being the best lead at pairs;

$\because$ Results are ranked by the percentages;
\% The best pairs lead has an asterisk after it for clarity in case it is not the same as the best teams lead;
$\because$ For ease of use the best lead in each suit is at the top. Where this is not the standard lead in the suit I've also included the standard lead in that section.

## Caveats

Because we have to interpret the auction for the computer, the highest confidence results are when the auction is relatively simple and unambiguous. Most practical opening lead problems lend themselves well to simulation but often the best puzzle hands don't fit the bill at all.

For example, the Leads Quiz sometimes features interesting and unusual slam auctions. These are problematic for simulation because:
$\because$ The main difficulty of these problems is working out what people have got from the auction which the simulator can't help with. Often if we correctly work out the situation then we already
know the best lead. By contrast in an auction like 1NT-3NT the problem is much more about how likely each lead is to work - ie how frequently are the cards laid out in certain ways - which is ideal for simulation.
$\because$ If an important inference is missed it might be that we are including or excluding a large number of hands in the results which will have a considerable impact on the output. So, bad input leads to bad output. In complex or unusual auctions it is quite likely that we are overlooking something and, if so, it is quite likely that it is material on the results. In a simple auction we can have high confidence that we aren't missing anything. Furthermore in simple auctions tweaking the assumptions usually doesn't change the results much. For instance in the auction

## 1NT-2-2 - 3 NT

allowing declarer to have an 11 count or a $5 \cdot 4 \cdot 2 \cdot 2$ hand doesn't make any significant difference to the results. Surprisingly even the inference that partner doesn't have a strong five-card club suit makes no significant difference to our choice of minor suit lead - unless our holdings are identical.
\& There is a difference between what a player 'should' have and what they actually might have in practice. Real-life opponents can bid quite strangely sometimes but it's very difficult to factor this into the simulation.

The other main contentious area is around the use of double-dummy analysis. A lot of people react quite strongly to that. There are indeed some important caveats with it but it's far more reliable that many people seem to think. David Bird and Taf Anthias dealt with this topic very well in their books on computer-simulated leads - Winning No Trump Leads and Winning Suit Contract Leads - Here is a précis:
\%One criticism is that double-dummy play isn't realistic so the leads may not represent what
works in real life. Actually the double-dummy number of tricks in a given contract and the actual number of tricks taken by real-life declarers agree very strongly - and this is all that needs to be the case to generate results (the intervening play isn't important).

This agreement occurs because:
\% On a majority of hands the best single-dummy declarer-play/defence is one of the working double-dummy lines.
¿In simulation both declarer and defenders benefit from double-dummy play whereas in real life neither side does. Often these effects cancel each other out because, for instance, one side gives the other a chance that can't reasonably be taken advantage of.
※While on any single deal double-dummy play may give one side an advantage over the other, the simulator is examining a large number of deals. There is no reason to suppose that one side is systematically advantaged over the other by double-dummy analysis. Even if this were the case, we are primarily interested in comparing the efficacy of different leads rather than evaluating how efficacious they are. Even if the defenders are more advantaged by double-dummy play that would tend to increase the efficacy of all leads but not to change their relative efficacy (see later caveats for special cases).

## SAVING DECLARER A GUESS

There are a number of layouts where leading a suit will apparently solve declarer's problem by saving a guess. The simulator doesn't factor that in because it knows the declarer is playing doubledummy and so always guesses right.

It turns out that this fear, while reasonable, is largely unfounded. The relevant holdings are actually quite rare and, when they do occur, declarer would have got them right at least half the time anyway. If this is really a concern of course the simulations help rather than hinder us because they can evaluate exactly how likely all the relevant layouts are and the results can then be adjusted accordingly.

## Misleading Partner

Now and again the lead with the best chance of working is a non-standard lead. Most commonly in my experience the simulation will sometimes lead, for instance, the nine from Q9x. While this might be
theoretically best it assumes that partner can read the lead. In practice the small card will probably work out better depending on who your partner is. This isn't usually a problem because normally the machine selects a standard lead.

## Ace leads

The simulator loves ace leads and surprisingly often will lead unsupported aces. The reason for this is that these leads back two horses. The lead may work of its own utility, or, if it hasn't already butchered the hand, it retains control allowing for a killing switch. Because the simulator runs doubledummy it always finds the best switch and so ace leads work a lot of the time.

While computer defenders benefit slightly more from these leads than human ones do, it is also of very great benefit to human declarers to see the dummy, partner's signal and declarer's initial card. Of course humans won't always do the right thing next - but that can be said for any lead that a human makes. It could be claimed that ace leads aren't really a special case and that simulators lead them more often simply because they are better leads, and it must be acknowledged that, following an ace lead, the critical decisions for the defence come earlier than, say, leading another suit, declarer wins, draws trumps and then forces your ace out. A human has less information at trick two and so is at more of a disadvantage to a computer at that stage. Therefore we can conclude that these leads aren't quite as good as the computers think they are.

However, we can also conclude that these leads don't give tricks/contracts away anything like as much as many experts think and that we humans should lead unsupported aces a lot more than we usually dare to.

## Singleton kings

This is a clear case where the computers are significantly out. The double-dummy analyser is expecting declarer to know to drop our king offside whereas in real life we win a finesse a lot of the time. These leads are far from hopeless because it's not always declarer who has the ace and even if so it may not have cost a trick or we may get the trick back by getting a ruff. It's difficult to evaluate how frequently we cost a trick by leading a singleton king but it seems safe to say we should significantly downgrade these leads.

Results from February Leads Quiz overleaf

|  | Hand 1 <br> - J 10 <br> - QJ <br> - 10 <br> - Q 8 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| South | West | North | East |
| $1 \mathrm{NT}^{1}$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |
| ${ }^{1}$ 12-14 |  |  |  |

A nice straightforward auction.
Choose from: (a) $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$; (b) Q ; (c) 4; (d) 3

## Assumptions

South has a balanced hand (any 5.3.3.2 but not $5 \cdot 4 \cdot 2 \cdot 2 / 6 \cdot 3 \cdot 2 \cdot 2$ ) and $12-14$ HCP.
North has 12-16 HCP (or 10+ with a six-card minor), two or three cards in each major, and does not have a $14+$ HCP hand with a long minor or a shortage.

In the following results the \% is the frequency with which the contract will fail on a given lead (used as a proxy for teams), while the tricks is the average number of tricks $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ will win on a given lead (used as a proxy for pairs play).

## Best lead in each suit:

PQ 14.6\%, 3.12 tricks *

- $\mathbf{J} 11.7 \%, 2.98$ tricks
- $4.4 \%$, 2.81 tricks
\& $37.2 \%$, 2.80 tricks
Other leads:
マJ 14.6\%, 3.12 tricks *
© 10 11.7\%, 2.98 tricks
7 9.0\%, 2.77 tricks
\$2 8.7\%, 2.85 tricks
-67.4\%, 2.81 tricks
- 10 7.2\%, 2.79 tricks
57.1\%, 2.80 tricks

By Nathan Piper

8 $8.5 \%, 2.76$ tricks
Q Q 3.6\%, 2.46 tricks

## Comments:

This is an ideal scenario for computer analysis so there is a very high level of confidence in the output.
For context the difference of 0.14 tricks between the best two pairs leads (highest number of tricks) may not sound a lot but it is. An extra trick once every seven boards would conservatively be worth around $4 \%$ extra on your session score. Very much worth having.

Following Alan Mould's suggestion that expert practice is changing to not bid Stayman with very balanced hands the simulation was re-run to allow dummy to have $4 \cdot 3 \cdot 3 \cdot 3$ with a four-card major. The results were then as below:

## Best lead in each suit:

PQ 14.1\%, 3.13 tricks *
¢ J 12.9\%, 3.07 tricks
4 9.1\%, 2.94 tricks
28.3\%, 2.91 tricks

## Other leads:

## マJ 14.1\%, 3.13 tricks *

—10 12.9\%, 3.07 tricks
Q 2 10.0\%, 2.97 tricks

- $6.1 \%$, 2.94 tricks
- 10 9.1\%, 2.92 tricks

7 9.0\%, 2.81 tricks
58.3\%, 2.91 tricks
87.6\%, 2.87 tricks

Q $4.2 \%, 2.59$ tricks
Nothing has changed too much but the minor suit leads have improved a bit because of the slightly greater average number of minor suit cards in partner's hand makes those leads a bit less bad than they were before.
I then reran allowing dummy to additionally have a $4 \cdot 4 \cdot 3 \cdot 2$ hand with a 4 card major and a strong
doubleton ( Qx or better). I still excluded hands with 44 in the majors as I think (perhaps wrongly) that everyone would bid Stayman with them. The results were as below:

## Best lead in each suit:

PQ 12.8\%, 3.06 tricks *
© $11.2 \%, 3.04$ tricks

- $4.6 \%, 2.95$ tricks
23.6\%, 2.95 tricks

Other leads:
『J 12.8\%, 3.06 tricks *
\$10 11.2\%, 3.04 tricks

- $6.6 \%, 2.95$ tricks
- 10 9.3\%, 2.93 tricks
\$2 8.8\%, 2.94 tricks
5 8.6\%, 2.95 tricks
१78.3\%, 2.77 tricks
$87.9 \%, 2.90$ tricks
(Q 4.7\%, 2.63 tricks
The differences between leads have narrowed but the relative ranking is mostly preserved.

```
Hand 2
- 652
\vee A5
- 10973
+ J542
```

| South | West | North <br> $4 \Phi$ | East <br> All Pass |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | Pass | Dble $^{1}$ |  |

Double was for takeout, but with this balanced rubbish you pass as always as it is a lot easier to take four tricks than 11.
Choose from: (a) a spade; (b) A; (c) 10; (d) 2

## Assumptions

South has between four and 10 high card points with either at least eight spades including at least three of the top six and at least one of the top three or, at least seven spades and at least two of the top four along with a four-card side suit.
North cannot have four plus spades with a
singleton and $0-10$ points, nor $2+$ spades, $16+$ points and $2+$ keycards in spades.
East has 3-5 hearts, 3-6 clubs/diamonds, and is not $5-5$ shape or more. East has either 0 spades and $12+$ points, one spade and $14+$ points, two spades and $16+$ points, three spades and $18+$ points.

## Best lead in each suit:

- A 63.9\%, 3.94 tricks *
- $959.2 \%$, 3.82 tricks
259.2\%, 3.83 tricks
- $258.4 \%, 3.81$ tricks


## Other leads:

5 60.4\%, 3.78 tricks
559.2\%, 3.83 tricks
259.2\%, 3.83 tricks

- 10 59.2\%, 3.82 tricks
- 7 58.5\%, 3.80 tricks
- $38.5 \%, 3.80$ tricks
© 58.4\%, 3.81 tricks
458.4\%, 3.81 tricks
\% $56.0 \%, 3.72$ tricks


## Comments:

This is a much harder hand to assess what the unseen hands are likely to have.

When I see a hand with seven spades I can quickly decide whether to open $1 \mathbf{~}, 3 \boldsymbol{4}$ or $4 \boldsymbol{\Delta}$ but it's much less easy to formulate when each action should be taken or to be sure that other people would bid the same way. The assumptions about partner's double in the balancing seat are equally crude but being the odd high card point or two out won't affect the results very much - and certainly not the ranking of the results.

Overall I have high confidence in the winner thanks in no small part to the large margin of victory.

The two minor suit leads were very close when I first ran it so I decided to rerun using 100,000 hands. As you can see it's still too close to call. Since there is symmetry between them in the auction and the holdings are the same length I have confidence that they would still be very close whatever tweaks I made to the assumptions about the opening lead. I can't say that of a trump lead though. I'm not
surprised a trump is last but, on the basis of the simulation alone, given how close behind it is, I'd also not be surprised if changing the assumptions about declarer's or partner's hand moved it up to second place.
Hand 3

- KQ1063
-AQ872
- 4
- Q 6

| South | West | North | East |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 14 | Pass | 2\% |
| $3{ }^{1}$ | 3 | 5 | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ weak |  |  |  |

Choose from: (a) K ; (b) A; (c) 4; (d) Q

## Assumptions

South has at least seven diamonds including at least two of the top four, with 4-11 HCP.

North has either four plus diamonds along with a side-suit doubleton, or at least three diamonds along with a side-suit singleton. North has fewer than 11 points with the shape for a take-out double, or fewer than 12 points and a five-card suit with at least two of the top four honours, nor does North have a $5-5$ shape (outside spades) with at least four of the top six in each suit.
East has at most three spades and at most four hearts and at least four clubs or a 3433 pattern. East doesn't have a void diamond with three spades or four hearts and doesn't have 16 points along with three spades, four hearts or seven plus clubs with three of the top four honours.

## Best lead in each suit:

- $487.8 \%, 3.79$ tricks *
- $\mathrm{K} 85.7 \%, 3.72$ tricks
\& 8 84.5\%, 3.69 tricks
- A 84.2\%, 3.62 tricks

Other leads:
Q Q 85.7\%, 3.72 tricks
6 84.4\%, 3.68 tricks
—378.2\%, 3.51 tricks
478.2\%, 3.50 tricks
⑩77.7\%, 3.49 tricks
2 76.7\%, 3.40 tricks
8 76.7\%, 3.40 tricks
7 76.7\%, 3.40 tricks
Q 75.8\%, 3.37 tricks

## Comments:

A reasonably easy hand to simulate. The hardest part to formulate is when partner would have bid on rather than doubled. I've crudely assumed a fit and some shape is required. I'm not too concerned about the exact requirements because I think partner will double most of the time and if partner has a hand good enough to bid on then 5 is very likely going off whatever we lead.
Since this is a sacrifice we are hoping for more than one off so the average number of tricks might be a better guide than the percentage that beats the contract score. Happily they agree so that is an academic point only.

