

bridge *Canada*

IN THIS ISSUE

Great Canadian Bidding Contest

Congratulations Sheldon Spier

All the Spots

New Player, Intermediate, Expert

Food for Thought

Lemony Mustard Dressing



THE CANADIAN BRIDGE FEDERATION

The mission of the Canadian Bridge Federation is to promote bridge within Canada and protect and advance the national interests of Canadian bridge, including the selection and support of Canadian bridge teams and players for international bridge competition.

IN THIS ISSUE

- 03. Editors Message
- 05. The Great Canadian Bidding Contest
- 18. TGCBC June Problems
- 19. The New Player Spot
Bidding Bad Hads
- 23. Bridge Basics
- 25. The Intermediate Spot:
Defensive Strategies
- 27. Mollo on play
- 28. The Expert Spot:
What Went Wrong
- 31. Food for Thought
- 33. IBPA - Shining Defenses
- 36. Upcoming Events



MEMBERSHIP

Bridge Canada is available to members only.

If you know of anyone who wishes to become a member of the Canadian Bridge Federation please share with them these options:

1. Be sure to include CBF dues with your ACBL dues.
2. Visit cbf.ca and click **Join The CBF**.
3. Email info@cbf.ca for more information.

NOTE: Membership dues are waived for Canadian players under 25 years of age. Junior players can join the CBF by sending their information to info@cbf.ca.

Stay **CONNECTED**



[Canadian.Bridge.Federation](https://www.facebook.com/CanadianBridgeFederation)



ina@cbf.ca (CBF Executive Director)



1 416 706 8550



www.cbf.ca



Neil Kimelman
Bridge Canada Managing Editor

EDITOR'S MESSAGE

Congratulations!

Sheldon Spier topped the readers in April with a fine score of 56. The \$100 and \$50 cash prizes for the combined February and April scores go to Ashot Harutyunyan with 103 and Donald Jobin with 94. The expert panel scores were topped with four panelists scoring 58: Martin Kirr, Danny Miles, Gerry McCully and Zygmunt Marcinski.

2020 CBCs and Covid 19

The CBF Board has decided to postpone the decision as whether to cancel this year's CBC until mid April, when we will be able to make a more informed decision. We will put the health of our members first. We will not proceed unless it is clearly safe to do so.

Please check our website (www.cbf.ca), or contact any board member, to get the latest update. For teams withdrawing, or in the event the CBCs will not be held in May, all entry fees will be refunded.

The Best of the Best Recognition!

Every year the Canadian Bridge Championships highlight the superior skill demonstrated by Canada's elite players. Starting in 2020 (hopefully!) we will ask participants to nominate the best examples they come across. It could be by themselves, a teammate or an opponent. Or a hand given to them in the hospitality room!

The best declarer play, defensive play and bidding sequence will be recognized. Besides the accolades of your peers, an article will be written about these gems, and published in bridge publications, such as Bridge Canada, ACBL Bulletin, The International Bridge Press Association (IBPA) newsletter and Funbridge website.

Food for Thought

I am running out of recipes to use – please help by sending me a favourite of yours!



(L to R) Ina Demme, Huges Boisvert, Neil Kimelman, Angela Fenton
Nader Hanna, Cathy Walsh, Wade Short, Jerry Mamer

CANADIAN BRIDGE FEDERATION *Board of Directors*

Zone I

Wade Short zone1@cbf.ca
8 Hemlock Rd,
Pointe du chene, NB 506-530-5612

Zone II

Huges Boisvert zone2@cbf.ca
1206-4239 Jean-Talon Quest
Montreal, QC H4P 0A5 514-889-9514

Zone III & CBF President

Nader Hanna zone3@cbf.ca
53 York Road
Toronto, ON M2L 1H7 416-756-9065

Zone IV & CBF Vice President

Neil Kimelman zone4@cbf.ca
110 260 Fairhaven Road
Winnipeg, MB R3P 1C9 204-487-2390

Zone V

Jerry Mamer zone5@cbf.ca
151 Nordstrom Road
Saskatoon, SK S7K 6P9 306-668-3951

Zone VI

Angela Fenton zone6@cbf.ca
601-1395 Beach Ave.
Vancouver, BC V6E 1V7 778-386-4343

bridge *Canada*

APRIL 2020 • VOL. 50 NO.2

BRIDGE CANADA MANAGING EDITOR
Neil Kimelman editor@cbf.ca

BRIDGE CANADA FRENCH EDITOR
Francine Cimon wirek@videotron.ca

PRODUCTION EDITOR
Jude Goodwin jude@cbf.ca

CBF EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT
Ina Demme ina@cbf.ca
99 Ellis Avenue, Nobleton, Ontario L0G 1N0

ACCOUNTING & FINANCE MANAGER
Cathy Walsh accounting@cbf.ca

WEB ADMINISTRATION
Louise Mascolo webmaster@cbf.ca

CBF HOTLINE
416 706 8550
FAX: 905 832 7184

CBF CHARITABLE FOUNDATION
Gim Ong charity@cbf.ca
32 Sandusky Drive, Winnipeg, MB R3T 5W4
204-775-5114

MAGAZINE AD RATES

Full page \$ 250 | Half page \$ 150
Quarter page \$ 87.50 | Business Card \$ 50
10% DISCOUNT if 3 issues paid in advance.

PUBLISHED 6 TIMES A YEAR



April 2020

Host: Andy Stark

For Panelists, see page 17

Editor's note: Welcome readers to the April edition of TGCBC. It's my pleasure to have Ontario expert Andy Stark as the host for this contest. Andy is well known for his interest in bidding theory and has brought us some worthy hands. Let's take a look....

1} Imps. None vul., you, South, hold:

♠ A K Q 9 8 4
♥ A K Q 7 6 3
♦ A
♣ –

West	North	East	South
			2♣
Pass	2♦	2NT*	?

*Both minors

Action	Votes	Score
Double	4	10
3♣	5	10
4♣	2	10
4♦	1	10
3♠	17	7

This hand was dealt out at a Sectional Swiss in Oshawa, ON. I was the beneficiary of that "balanced" major-suit hand and bid 3♠ planning to jump to 7♥ for my mundane rebid. However, like some of our panelists,

I didn't realize at the time that there was a real problem until it was too late. The key is to get the correct approach right here, right now.

Todd: 3♠. This seems to be a silly problem. Isn't everyone going to bid 3♠ now and 7♥ next?

No, Bob; not everyone...

Dalton: 3♠. Planning to rebid 6♥.

Roy would go plus on this hand if he stops at the 6-level, but surely there's a grand slam to be bid with just a modicum of friendly breaks. That's what a few of the other panelists thought, too.

Oddy: 3♠. Then 7♥ unless partner supports spades.

Grainger: 3♠. Over anything that happens, 7♥. Easy. If LHO has both majors stacked, unlucky. Partner has 13 cards too.

Bart: 3♠. The plan is to bid 7♥ on the next turn, hoping to catch a minimal fit with partner. Not sure why this is a problem.

Making the case for the KISS method:

Rayner (echoed by Cooper): 3♠. Then 7♥ at my second turn. I don't want any confusion by making what I know are "cue bids," but might be unclear to partner. It doesn't come with a guarantee if the distribution is really crazy.

Blond: 3♠. Then 7♥ at my next turn. While I considered wild bids like 7♦ to force partner to bid his best major immediately, I worry about potential misunderstandings, having seen a similar auction go awry at a recent CNTC.

Smith: 3♠. There is literally no hurry here. Yes, it would be dramatic to bid 7♣ or 7♦, but going slow loses nothing. The next bid I make will be 7♥.

Oh, how I wish the Jeffs bid 7♦ (or 7♣ like Fred Lerner). What a cool bid. On the right track:

Lindop: 3♠ (Then 7♦). If I were sure partner would

take 7♦ as “pick a major,” I would bid it. It would be best to have the contract played by partner so East can’t double with a void in the other major. However, partner may assume a jump in a suit – even one supposedly shown by the opponents – is natural. So, I’ll make the straightforward bid of 3♠, intending to follow up with 7♥, giving partner a choice of grand slams in the majors. If West holds Jxxx in both majors, too bad. Otherwise, we should be in a playable contract.

So often in bridge, and especially in the post-mortem, we wish there was a little genie who would sit on our shoulder and ring a bell, or whisper in our ear, “Take your time; your next decision will decide the fate of this board.” As it turns out West held J10xx in spades and East held a spade void, so if you, South, declare 7♥ or 7♠ you’re going down. 7♥ might even end up doubled by East in order to get a spade ruff. But if North declares a heart contract, 13 tricks are icy.

Do we know bad breaks are to be the case? Of course not. But East has helped us a bit by indicating 5-5 or even 6-5 in the minors. If one of our opponents holds a void in one of the majors, we want that player on lead. Therefore, how do we get partner on play? How do we steer partner into bidding their longest major? Let us count the ways...

Kuz: Double. I will start here. Next, I will probably bid 7 of whatever suit my opponents bid. Getting to 7 of a major eventually. No guarantee of a make though.

Kimelman: Double. I am heading for 7 of a major, but want to play it from partner’s side, in case East has a major suit void. The best way to do this is to double 2NT, and then cuebid the minor which the opponents bid.

Bishop: Double. Let’s start with this; then we will have an easy Q-bid which no-one can get wrong. Let’s leave the smallest amount of room for a major accident (pun intended).

The Cardinal’s bid (and pun) would make the Pope proud. Now for the 3♣ bidders...

Miles: 3♣. Stayman. The first order of business is to see if partner can volunteer a major, over which of course I will bid 7. I’ll keep cue bidding over interference to the 6-level to get partner to choose a major.

Mackay: 3♣. Yes, I realize I may be exposing myself to a very uncomfortable barrage from West but I’m OK with that.

Thorpe: 3♣. I plan to start here and bid a minor whatever the level until pard makes a choice.

Cimon: 3♣. A cue-bid for majors.

Going further with the clubs...

Jacob: 4♣. Should ask for the better/longer major. If partner bids a major then I’ll take it from there; if instead partner punts with 4♦, 5NT should ask again.

Marcinski: 4♣. First order of business: describe a major 2-suiter, at least 55, in order to solicit a preference (a goof agreement is for partner’s 4♦ to suggest equal length)

No worries, Ziggy; you’ve already won the board. Going one step further...

Hornby: 4♦. Asking partner to pick their longer major.

Most days the grand in either spades or hearts will make—as long as there isn’t extreme distribution. But on this day in Oshawa the only making grand was 7♥ by North. If ever there was a time to eschew simplicity for just a wee bit of complexity, this was it. Yes, we do have to trust that our minor bid right now, (or after marking time with a Double), will be understood by partner. Why shouldn’t it be? Plus, we have to teach East not to show their 6-5 in the minors.

Saying it all in six words or less:

Kirr: Double. Want to get East on lead.

The full deal:

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

2} Imp pairs, E-W vul., you, South, hold:

♠ A 9 8 4
♥ A 4 3
♦ 9 7 6 5 4
♣ 8

West	North	East	South
1NT ¹	Double ²	2♥ ³	?

1. 12-14
2. Penalty oriented; shows a good 14+ HCP
3. Both majors (Guoba rescue, wanting to play at the 2-level)

Action	Votes	Score
Double	24	10
Pass	4	7
2NT	1	6
3♦	1	6

The traditional way to play a Double right here right now is penalty. Partner, North, has shown a good 14+ point hand, so if they run and we double, it's for blood.

However, most expert partnerships nowadays play Forcing Passes. This means that a double in this situation by South is takeout. It would show values and shortness in hearts. North, with four hearts, would pass the double, and NS would probably go +200 or +500 or +800 or +1100.

Continuing, a pass here by South would be forcing. That is, it would show values, but deny shortness in hearts. Perhaps South has length in the runout suit, here hearts. South knows that partner will re-open with a double (if North has shortness in the runout suit) and that South can convert to a penalty pass. Or, if neither North nor South has a trump stack, they hopefully land in their best minor fit. (Or 2♠ if that is viable.)

The problem is that South has three hearts: not short enough to make a textbook modern double, not long enough to make a textbook modern forcing pass. Come to think of it, I have yet to even see the textbook on this topic. So how do our experts handle this conundrum? Some play old-fashioned and some play modern. As always discussion with partner will be crucial. First, the doubler, whatever the meaning, and their comments:

Hanna: Double. I play this double as penalty and I have good defense against 2♥.

Cimon: Double. I play a double of a Guoba rescue as penalty.

Kimelman: Double. My original thought was pass. But on reflection my stiff and two major aces and length auger for an aggressive double. Even opposite a minimum this could go for a big number. It leaves partner 14 HCPs, but is +800 territory:

♠ Kxx	♠ Qxxx
♥ Qxx	♥ Kxxx
♦ AJxx	♦ xx
♣ Kxx	♣ xxx

Thurston (echoed by Jacob): Double. A bit of a grope but the best way to show some values - 2 aces are not exactly chopped liver and I wouldn't expect this to be a

"pure" penalty double.

Marcinski (echoed by Smith): Double. The interpretation of this double is very much an area requiring partnership discussion and agreement. Absent discussion, and lest Pass not be assuredly forcing, I must double however it gets interpreted.

Grainger: Double. There's no mention of agreements here, some play double penalty, some takeout, some play pass forcing, some don't. We probably want to defend 2♥ doubled, and pass may be right if it's clearly forcing and double is takeout, but you don't always get your takeout double with Axx either. If partner pulls to 3♣, bid 3N.

Willis: Double. A heart short and the 5-card diamond suit is a bit concerning but need to show some values and not sure what is better.

Miles: Double. Of course, the auction will be different at other tables; to win IMP pairs, you need to roll the dice a few times. Who knows what double means? If partner passes, I'm happy and will lead my singleton. (If declarer needs to ruff a spade in dummy, partner may be able to overruff.) If partner bids, I'll bid diamonds or notrump.

Bishop: Double. I'm going to be on lead against this contract and can start my try for club ruffs (and we can easily handle the 'run' to spades). The only other choice seems to be a namby-pamby pass.

Thorpe: Double. Guessing we are forced (if we have that agreement) only as far as 2♥. They are red so hopefully we have a useful penalty.

Lebi: Double. If double is penalty, let the doubling begin. I play that pass is forcing thru 2♥ and that double is takeout, so I would not be able to make a penalty double yet and would be forced to pass.

Katie and Robert bring up the point about how high we play the forcing pass. Usually it is through 2♥ but it's up to each partnership (some play through 2♦ or even 2♠). This means that Advancer can pass any bid at or under 2♥ knowing partner is not going to pass out that contract. That is, one of two possibilities will occur: 1) your side is forced to compete over 2♥; or 2) the final contract will be their runout suit (2♣, 2♦, or 2♥) doubled.

Balcombe: Double. I am not sure this is for penalty, but it probably is. Not sure if we will beat it, but a trump lead and continuation will help.

Mr. B. not only makes good leads, he's humble. I recall years ago Keith was my teammate in a KO event. He won us 13 imps when he found the winning opening lead against a slam. I said, "Wow, great lead, Keith!" He responded, "Closest to my thumb." Now for the passers, and whatever their reasons...

Kuz: Pass. Not enough to double. Wait to hear more from partner.

Rayner: Pass. My first thought was to double for penalty, and it is possible that we might collect a juicy number. But this is IMPs and there are many layouts where we will not be able to defeat 2♥. Call me a coward. I am not happy with whatever I do. At matchpoints I would double.

Fun fact: the last time I heard someone say, "Call me a coward" at the bridge table it was Bob Hamman in 1997. He then went on to make the correct decision.

Mackay: Pass. If I were to double now (second double), it would be take-out. If I were to pass, my pass could be a "trap pass." Playing this method, I will pass. If partner doubles (take-out), I think we will be OK; I suppose I will bid 4♦. If he bids 3♣, I will try 3♦.

And finally, the Lebensohlers...sorry, Lebensohler, singular.

Cooper: 2NT. Lebensohl to try to get to play in 3♦. Do

we play that? Not penalty double at IMPs where they may have 8 trumps and close to half the deck. Double is good if it is a responsive type, allowing partner to pass with the right hand, correcting North's possible 3♣ to 3♦. But what is our agreement?

In 1996, when Al Roth posed this as a problem in Bridge Today, there were a lot of votes for Double. And, as it turns out, that was the winning call. Down two on a club lead. But in playing bridge today, (2020, the year of Clear Vision) if you play newer methods such as the Forcing Pass, who will double and who will leave it in?

The full deal:

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

Final word: Regarding that 1NT opener...I don't know who West was and I don't want to know.

3} Imps. N-S vul., you, South hold:

	♠ A K 6 4		
	♥ A 8 5 2		
	♦ K J 10 8		
	♣ 8		
West	North	East	South
2♥	Pass	3♥	?

Action	Votes	Score
Double	12	10
Pass	10	8
3♠	7	8

As Grainger says, "this one's ugly." It's a great problem because there are three decent solutions, as shown by the distribution of votes.

Balcombe (echoed by Kuz): Double. What else can you do? Cannot allow yourselves to be robbed blind.

Bishop: Double. Passing doesn't look like an option since we can't really expect partner to back in at the 4-level if my hand doesn't act over 3♥.

Thorpe. Double. Ugh. Here we likely have a fit, but can we rely on partner to balance with the known shortness?

Marty Kirr doubles and, like his partner Katie, also uses the word, 'Ugh.'

Lindop: Double. Risky to pass since partner won't balance with the ♠Q and ♦Q, which could easily be enough for game.

Miles: Double. Too strong to pass. Sneaking admiration for 3♠.

Speaking of 3♠. Here they are, the Marshall (& Danny?) Miles Fan Club:

Rayner (echoed by Duquette and Cooper): 3♠. Can't bring myself to pass with this promising hand knowing that partner is very short in hearts.

Thurston (echoed by Todd): 3♠. Trading on partner's known heart shortage seems the safest and most likely route to a possible game. Sorry if I just buried your 6-card diamond suit partner!

Bart: 3♠. I predict the panel will choose double, but I wonder what they plan to do when partner bids the not unexpected 4♣.

Answering...

Grainger: Double. Partner will bid spades most of the time. I will bid diamonds if he bids 4♣ and hope to survive. If he bids 5♣, he'll have 6+, so pass and hope for the best. This one's ugly. Jacob and Lindop also planned 4♦ over partner's possible 4♣ bid.

Summing up the passers:

Dalton: Pass. I can always count on Vince to balance.

Marcinski: Pass. I intensely dislike the risk/reward of acting here, and the auction isn't over. There's a chance my expert-aggressive partner will balance with double or 3♠ or 3NT (for a choice of minors).

Kimelman: Toughest problem for me. I might miss the occasional game but too small a target at these colours. Pass.

Smith: Pass. Clear as partner could not scrape up a double with shortness in hearts. Therefore, pard has 9 or fewer HCPs as I would expect a double with most 10-counts.

Mackay: Pass. And hope partner balances with a double. I expect little company.

That "little company" also includes Willis, Cimon, Blond, Hanna, & Hornby. So, Steve, you're not in little, you're in good company.

It's a toughie to be sure, and anything can be right. Flashback to my bridge youth—I can hear the Piglet (Mike Roche), "It's a bidders' game." Unfortunately, the full deal has been lost to the sands of time. Fortunately, everyone can now go on with their bridge career thinking their call is the correct one.

4} Imps., Both vul., you, South, hold:

♠ A K 5 3
♥ K 9 6 4
♦ 6 5 3
♣ 10 2

West	North	East	South
	1♦	Pass	1♥
Pass	3♠*	Pass	?

*Shortness in spades, GF heart raise

Action	Votes	Score
3NT	11	10
4♠	2	9
5♥	1	8
4♥	15	7

This hand arose in a recent Sectional Swiss and one of our esteemed panelists was the 3♠ bidder. Will he recognize the hand? Stay tuned.

The main choices are to "signoff" in 4♥ or show a control in spades by bypassing 4♥ and bidding 4♠. Or, as many panelists have shown, there is a third option: 3NT. What could 3NT mean? Stay really tuned.

As for 4NT. You can think it, but don't bid it. Why not RKC? I can't believe you're asking! Okay if you insist: South cannot responsibly launch into a keycard auction looking at two quick losers in each minor. North might show two keycards and the trump queen, and you still won't know what level you belong. Let's start with those who are not enamoured with their A-K of spades:

Lindop: 4♥. Might be cold for slam, but there is no easy way to investigate without risking getting too high. Partner could have a very good hand, such as ♠4 ♥A853 ♦AK984 ♣AK8, and we would have no play for slam.

Dalton (and Oddy): 4♥. Not interested in slam with that spade holding opposite shortness and no minor suit cards.

Cooper (echoed by Jacob): 4♥. This is why we play splinters. My ♠K is wasted, providing what is likely a useless discard. My hearts are short and lack the jack or ten.

Bishop: 4♥. A quick look at potential hands for partner that give us reasonable slam chances sees that opener has to have a veritable mountain with solid diamonds. Our three little diamonds hint at a distant problem. Our spades are somewhat of a mirage.

I wonder if some of the 4♥ bidders would change their call if the king of spades was the queen of hearts. If so, what would they change their call to? **Editor's note:** *On behalf of the 4♥ bidders, yes! To 4♠.*

There are some hands where the king of spades, while seemingly useless, provides a pitch for one of dummy's losers. But as Bishop and Thorpe indicated in their responses, we probably need a mountain from partner with a concentration of diamond cards in order to be in a good slam.

Those in the minority are the 4♠ bidders. South has a decent hand but cannot cuebid a minor. If you had a singleton club, say, you could cuebid 4♣ which is first or second round control and interest in a heart slam. So, if you wish to express interest in a slam you have to go beyond 4♥ and cuebid 4♠. You risk the safety of the 4-level but know that you can probably get out at the 5-level if partner cannot take it further.

Hanna: Despite the fact that my ♠K appears to be wasted, I do not have a totally useless hand and I need to show some life and make "one" try. Partner can have a hand such as ♠x ♥AQxx ♦AKJxx ♣KQx and 6♥ is a very good contract. **Editor's note:** *Needing hearts 3-2 and the ♦Q onside is less than 50%.*

Kuz: 4♠. It feels like I should make one move, at least.

That's what I thought as I, too, was a 4♠ bidder. Partner launched into RKC and we got to 6♠. There was a little something to the play but 6♠ rolled for a push board against our competent opponents. Incidentally, the North at the other table opened 2♣ so they had a different, yet slightly more comfortable auction. I mention all this because it might be necessary to bid smoothly in this situation. If you hesitate and then emerge with 4♥, partner is pretty well barred from the auction. Say you make a noticeable break in tempo—partner is not allowed to infer from your hesitation that you are close to making a slam try. So best not to hesitate at all. If you do hesitate, here's a thoughtful bid:

Thurston: 3NT. Would need a perfecto for slam but as slam is possible, I've too much to quit in game. 3NT seems to indicate spade values and might mobilize partner when he has ♠x ♥AQxx ♦AKQxx ♣Axx.

Miles: 3NT. Do I play any of the gadgets from other problems like serious/non-serious 3NT? Can't imagine why not; we're in a game-force with an 8+ major suit fit. I'll bid 3NT "non-serious" then 4♥ over 4♣ or 4♦. I'm certainly worth a try in case partner has a strong diamond suit such as ♠x ♥AQxx ♦AKQxx ♣Axx. But just one try; 5 minor suit losers (the ♠K may not be pulling full weight) and weakish trumps argue for caution. Some play 3NT here would be a spade cue-bid.

Blond: 3NT. To show spade values and a better than minimum hand (else I'd bid 4♥). Yes, my ♠K looks wasted, but considering I could have had ♠KQxx ♥Jxxx ♦xxx ♣xx, the fact that I have two key cards suggests I need to cooperate with partner at least once.

Grainger: 3NT. Shows some slam interest here regardless of agreements. Will bid 4♥ next unless partner asks for keycards.

Lebi: 3NT. Choice of contracts. ¾ of my hand is in spades.

Marcinski: 3NT. Despite the absence of a fifth trump and the fact that the ♠K is very likely not pulling full weight, slam remains entirely conceivable. So, I

need to make a “noise” other than 4♥, ideally without committing our side to the 5-level. Could partner interpret 3N as an offer to play? This is a matter of partnership agreement (I prefer to play that 3♠ commits us to 4♥), but if partner passes 3NT I won’t be unhappy.

The full deal:

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

While the non 3NT and 4♠ bidders were right, that slam was conceivably in the cards, South needed pretty well all of North’s 23 HCPs. The 4♥ bidders will survive if North, (who chose not to open with 2♣), makes another call over 4♥, but is that clear?

Mackay: 3NT. I have no idea how partner will take this bid. If nothing else, it sounds more encouraging than 4♥.

Since North was you, he will have an idea. You will get to 6♥ opposite not only yourself but yours truly.

5} Matchpoints, E-W Vul., you, South, hold:

♠ 2
♥ A J 9 8 7 6 2
♦ A K 10 4
♣ 6

West	North	East	South
		1♣	1♥
1♠	Pass	2♣	?

Action	Votes	Score
2♥	14	10
Double	6	9
2♦	2	9
3♦	0	9
3♣	1	8
3♥	5	7

This deal, from a 1988 issue of Bridge Today, is a problem setter’s delight and a tactician’s dream. The opponents are vul. and you are not. What’s your fancy? Some number of diamonds? Some greater number of hearts? Or the space saving takeout double? Buckle your seatbelts. Here we go. From the lowest to the highest...

Jacob: Double. The heart suit is not good enough for a 3♥ bid. I would be thrilled with a 3NT bid by partner.

Thorpe: Double. Will bid hearts again next time unless partner volunteers diamonds.

Lebi: Double. Takeout. Extras. What could be more descriptive?

Blond: 2♦. I think we need to introduce diamonds as quickly as possible. Give partner as little as ♠ xxxx ♥ x ♦ QJxxx ♣ xxx and we have a terrific play for 5♦. Can always repeat hearts at my next turn if no diamond fit is found.

Foreshadowing: Al Roth always was a fan of blonds. Jeff picked off North’s exact shape and point count. Just not the exact location of the quack.

Miles: 2♥. Go slow, get info, walk the dog, whatever you want to call it. Perhaps I will get another opportunity (over 2♠ or 3♣) to introduce diamonds. If double is the winner, that’s too difficult for me.

Grainger: 2♥. For now. Will bid again if partner does or if I can bid 3♦. West may jump to 4♠, but we will beat

that quite often.

Marcinski: 2♥. An interesting tactical problem. West may jump to 4♠, but we will beat that quite often. My plan is to underbid in the hope of saving subsequent bidding space allowing me to volunteer diamonds. I wouldn't double as the hand is too skewed towards offence.

Bishop: 3♣. Focusing our intentions just on hearts may leave a playable diamond contract out in the cold. A simple rebid of 2♦ seems insufficient (as we might lose hearts) and we aren't enough "equal red" to jump to 3♦ here. A jump to 3♥ would show the invitational nature of our hand but wouldn't tell advancer where his card(s) will be of most use. Surely no-one will take the cuebid as 'game-forcing' when we entered proceedings with just a simple overcall.

Todd: 3♥. The two choices are 3♥ and 2♦. The latter may be the winner if I catch a big fit with partner, but I don't need much from partner to make 4♥.

Thurston: 3♥. Double would risk a leave-in that I might not be happy about even though I have the extras. RHO did not raise spades so a misfit might be looming.

Hanna: 3♥. I need to take away some of their bidding space and in the meantime encourage partner to raise with a doubleton if he has a little something. 2♦ could be a winner if I hit a big diamond fit but that is a narrow target and I may not get another chance to show my extra heart length.

Cimon: 3♥. Pard is marked with spades. 3♥ should be invitational and if the bidding stops here, there's a good chance the opponents have no fit indicating that we have no fit.

Same hand, same start to the auction, five different calls. Ain't life grand? But wait, here's a 6th different call:

Balcombe: 4♥. What else?

That's what the real life at-the-table player did—he bid 4♥.

Before getting to the hand in real life, first a preamble. TGCBC you are reading is modeled after the Master Solvers Club (MSC), one of the longest running features to appear in the Bridge World, a magazine that has been around since 1929. The ACBL Bulletin has a similar feature and years ago, when it existed, so did Bridge Today.

The BT version was run by Al Roth. He called it the At the Table Master Solvers Club (ATMSC). As a regular contributor on the BW panel he was continually irked at not knowing what the real-life result was. Roth felt the MSC was too theoretical, and that some of the hands seemed too problematic—he complained frequently that they just were not real-life hands that were dealt out at the table. So, his ATMSC was an effort to reward panelists for the call that would have best worked at the table, not the call that might be best in theory. Points were rewarded solely on that basis, not by being in the majority with like-minded panelists as in the MSC. To be sure, I like reading panelist's comments for what they have to say: to hear their rationale. I'm in both camps: I like reading the theory and knowing what would have been successful.

On this problem, 2♥ scored the highest as it received the most votes. But compare with problem 1. That top score went to the non-3♠ bidders even though 3♠ received the most votes. Getting partner to bid a major first on problem 1 was not only right at the table, but in theory as well.

Back to problem 5: This was presented by Roth over 30 years ago. He argued vehemently for a 2♦ call as shown with his extreme score allocation. A vote of 2♦ scored 10/10 while all other votes scored 0/10! That feels harsh, but that's the way he rolled.

The full deal:

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

West	North	East	South
		1♣	1♥
1♠	Pass	2♣	4♥
4♠	Double	All pass	

Roth felt that with good hands one should always bid the second suit. He wrote that if you get your diamond bid in now, and if West bounces to 4♠, then partner will come alive with a bid of 5♦. It might even be doubled. But watch how cold 5♦ is.

After the normal club lead, it will go club-club and South can ruff with a small diamond in hand. South then cashes the ♦A and ♥A, and then ruffs a heart in dummy. South will finesse East out of their ♦J, ruff another heart in dummy, and return to hand with a trump, in the process drawing East's last trump for +400 or +550 if doubled.

The question that should have been posed to the solvers is this: How high are you willing to compete at your next turn? Eg., if you double the 2♣ bid, (or bid a quiet 2♥) and it comes back to you at the four level, do you take another call? Partner is going to double 4♠ and yes, you'll beat it, but only one trick. Chance are that not many of us would pull partner's double of 4♠ and the diamond suit would go unmentioned. Hence this problem's inclusion in Roth's ATMSC.

As Ben Yue of Winnipeg wrote in 1988: "2♦, good second suit." For an analogous situation, assume you, South, are the dealer with the same hand. You make the obvious 1♥ opening bid. What is your plan if partner responds 1♠? Do you rebid 2♥ or 3♥ or 2♦? There would be a lot of votes for 2♦. It's kind of the same principle. When you bid hearts at your third turn you imply a stronger hand than if you were to rebid 2♥ at your second turn and 3♦ at your third turn. To help visualize, here are the two auctions. They show roughly the same shape (6-4 in the reds). In the first one you tend to show a better hand than in the second one:

You	Partner	You	Partner
1♥	1♠	1♥	1♠
2♦	2NT	2♥	2NT
3♥		3♦	

Although Roth's hand shows that getting in the 2♦ bid early is best, I'm still a fan of double. Leaning towards the theoretical here.

6} Imps, E-W vul., you, South, hold:

♠ A Q J 5 3 2
♥ 3
♦ Q 6
♣ A 9 3 2

West	North	East	South
			1♠
Pass	2♦	Pass	3♣
Pass	3♠	Pass	3NT*
Pass	4♦	Pass	4♥
Pass	4NT	Pass	5♠
Pass	5NT	Pass	?

*Non-serious slam try

1] Do you agree with South's call of 3♣ or do you prefer 2♠?

2] Do you agree with South's call of 3NT or do you prefer something else?

2♠ or 3♣?

Action	Votes	Score /3
Prefer 2♠	26	3
Ok with 3♣	3	2

The 3NT call...

Action	Votes	Score /2
3NT OK	15	2
Not OK	14	2

South's call

Action	Votes	Score /5
7♠	9	5
6♦	6	5
6♥	1	4
6♠	13	3

This problem reminds me of the Eddie Kantar Classic. He sets up a problem but there's a narrative involved because he knows you might not agree with any previous calls.

"You are kibitzing a national pairs event. You were all set to play in the event, but your partner took ill at the last minute. The junior you decide to kibitz suddenly excuses himself from the table because he, too, is feeling ill. You are asked to fill in after partner's 5NT bid confirming the partnership has all the keycards and the queen of spades. What is your call?"

Starting with the junior's decision to bid 3♣ and not 2♠, some panelists felt stronger than others:

Balcombe (echoed by Grainger): Not Ok with 3♣. It takes away a forcing 2NT, implies extra values that are very marginal, etc.

Lebi, Miles, and Jacob all make the point that 3♣ shows extra values; Jacob mentioning that it often shows 5-5 in the blacks.

Bishop, who prefers 2♠, points out early that the ♦Q helps make the hand better. Kimelman, also prefers 2♠ because he likes a rebid of a major in a 2/1 auction to guarantee 6+ in the major.

As for the 3NT mild slam try, we have a split vote. Half the panel is okay with it, half are not okay with it. Of those not okay with it, 11 panelists offered up a specific cuebid instead: 8 for 4♣, 3 for 4♦.

As for what to bid after partner's 5NT bid, the majority of the panel either bid the grand in spades or they make a bid towards getting to the grand. 13 panelists are done and bid 6♠.

Many panelists (Miles, Bart, Kirr, and Thorpe) are done because they reason that if partner wanted to know about the ♦Q there was another way to ask for it such as bidding 6♦ instead of 5NT.

A few other panelists sign off in 6♠ because they don't have any side kings to show. Most experts play specific kings in this situation, not number of kings.

Only two panelists (Lebi and Cimon) mentioned that 5NT showed ownership of all the keycards. Isn't this significant? It means, yes, South is allowed to sign off at the 6-level but the 5NT bid acts as an invitation to bid 7 if South can find some redeeming quality in their hand. What is that redeeming quality? The ♦Q!

Duquette: 6♦. I think the rose-coloured glasses that South has been wearing would allow for this bid.

Lebi: 6♦. Trying to show the ♦Q. I assume my expert partner will realize that if I had the ♦K, I would have bid 7 directly.

Grainger: Put myself in a box showing a weaker hand, no sixth spade and letting partner ask, so I can't sign off (partner has shown serious interest with weak trumps, no club control and not solid diamonds). We'll both know the ♣K is missing at this point, so they can't bid 7 expecting diamonds to be ruffed out (unless they have seven of them; unlikely as this would give him a stiff ace in the blacks.

of hearts), only if he's looking at the king and works out you've got his filler. Will signoff over 6♥. Good hearts don't help me.

The other 6♦ bidders are Smith, Dalton and Jacob. As for 6♥, also an attempt to get to 7, Mackay mentions it as something he might try depending on his partner.

Blond: 6♥. I think I'm too good to just bid 6♠ here, so I'd try 6♥ to show the one second-round control I have and that I'm still interested in 7.

Thorpe mentions bidding the grand depending on the state of the match. Don't bet against Katie when it comes to knowing the state of the match late in the game. She and partner Kirr won a Canadian Senior KO on the last board when they bid a grand slam on a 4-3 fit—it was the only grand that had a chance to make. (A better lead would have defeated it, but still...c'mon, what a story!) Figuring it all out...

Hanna: 7♠. The ♦Q is a big card. Partner denied a club control and does not have great spades but yet he drove to slam opposite my non-serious interest. So, it is not unreasonable to expect a hand with good diamonds or extra useful values, e.g. ♠ Kxx ♥ Ax ♦ AKxxxx ♣ Qx or ♠ Kxx ♥ AQx ♦ AKJxx ♣ Jx.

Fun fact: The South cards were held by an up-and-coming Canadian junior in the CBF's Online Championship. Nader is a frequent mentor to him and other juniors.

Marcinski: 7♠. As I would have shown a serious slam try. Yet partner is inviting a grand while promising ♠K ♥A ♦A and not the ♣K. I can't imagine the grand slam not being at least odds-on if not cold. More importantly, all "waffling" possibilities are mis-directed so I've got to take the bull by the horns here and now.

Rayner: 7♠. If we are on the same wavelength regarding the 4♦ cue bid (denying a club control), I believe we are a favourite to make the grand.

Oddy: 7♠. The ♦Q must be what partner needs.


Bishop (echoed by Willis): 7♠. I don't think I've ever shown the 6th spade and I'm fortified by the diamond queen. Let's play partner for ♠ Kx ♥ AJxx ♦ AK10xx ♣ xx or some such holding. I could have more in clubs and not the key ♦Q. Can't see partner taking over control without the ♦K since he hasn't (from the bidding) shown anything in clubs.

Cimon: For me 5NT confirms all the controls and it is an invitation to 7. I already said I have a weak hand with 3 NT non-serious. My ♦Q is a gold card so I just bid 7♠.

Eddie Kantar continues... "You decide to bid the grand because isn't that what a junior would do?"

The full deal:

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





PANEL'S ANSWERS

Panelists	Hand 1		Hand 2		Hand 3		Hand 4		Hand 5		Hand 6		Total
	Bid	Score	Bid	Score	Bid	Score	Bid	Score	Bid	Score	Bid	Score	
Balcombe, Keith	3♠	6	Dbl	10	Dbl	10	4♥	8	4♥	7	6♠	8	49
Bart, Brad	3♠	6	Pass	7	3♠	7	4♥	8	2♥	10	6♠	8	46
Bishop, Ron	Dbl	10	Dbl	10	Dbl	10	4♥	8	3♣	8	7♠	10	56
Blond, Jeff	3♠	6	Dbl	10	Pass	8	3NT	10	2♦	9	6♥	8	51
Cimon, Francine	3♣	10	Dbl	10	Pass	8	4♥	8	3♥	7	7♠	10	53
Cooper, Stephen	3♠	6	2NT	6	3♠	7	4♥	8	2♥	10	6♠	8	45
Dalton, Roy	3♠	6	Dbl	10	Pass	8	4♥	8	2♥	10	6♦	9	51
Duquette, John	3♠	6	3♦	6	3♠	7	4♥	8	2♦	9	6♦	10	46
Grainger, David	3♠	6	Dbl	10	Dbl	10	3NT	10	2♥	10	6♦	10	56
Hanna, Nader	3♠	6	Dbl	10	Pass	8	4♠	9	3♥	7	7♠	10	50
Hornby, Ray	4♦	10	Dbl	10	Pass	8	3NT	10	2♥	10	6♠	8	56
Jacob, Dan	4♣	10	Dbl	10	Dbl	10	4♥	8	Dbl	9	6♦	10	57
Kimelman, Neil	Dbl	10	Dbl	10	Pass	8	4♥	8	3♥	7	7♠	10	53
Kirr, Martin	Dbl 10		Dbl 10		Dbl 10		3NT 10		2♥ 10		6♠ 8		58
Kuz, Bob	Dbl	10	Pass	7	Dbl	10	4♠	9	Dbl	9	7♠	9	54
Lebi, Robert	3♠	6	Dbl	10	Dbl	10	3NT	10	Dbl	9	6♦	10	55
Lindop, David	3♠	6	Dbl	10	Dbl	10	4♥	8	2♥	10	6♠	8	52
Mackay, Steve	3♣	10	Pass	7	Pass	8	3NT	10	2♥	10	6♠	8	53
Marcinski, Zygmunt	4♣ 10		Dbl 10		Pass 8		3NT 10		2♥ 10		7♠ 10		58
McCully, Gerry	3♣ 10		Dbl 10		Dbl 10		3NT 10		2♥ 10		6♠ 8		58
Miles, Danny	3♣ 10		Dbl 10		Dbl 10		3NT* 10		2♥ 10		6♠ 8		58
Oddy, Vince	3♠	6	Dbl	10	Dbl	10	4♥	8	2♥	10	7♠	10	54
Rayner, John	3♠	6	Pass	7	3♠	7	4♥	8	2♥	10	7♠	10	48
Smith, Jeff	3♠	6	Dbl	10	Pass	8	4♥	8	2♥	10	6♦	10	52
Thorpe, Katie	3♣	10	Dbl	10	Dbl	10	4♥	8	Dbl	9	6♠	7	54
Thurston, Paul	3♠	6	Dbl	10	3♠	7	3NT	10	Dbl	9	6♠	8	50
Todd, Bob	3♠	6	Dbl	10	3♠	7	4♥	8	3♥	7	6♠	8	46
Treble, Bill	3♠	6	Dbl	10	3♠	7	5♥	7	Dbl	9	6♠	8	47
Willis, David	3♠	6	Dbl	10	Pass	8	3NT	10	3♥	7	7♠	10	51

June 2020 Problems

Host: Ray Hornby

1) IMPs. Neither vul. As South you hold:

♠ K 9 8
♥ Q
♦ K Q 3 2
♣ A 5 4 3 2

West	North	East	South
Pass	Pass	1♦	Pass
Pass	Dble	Pass	?

2) IMPs. Both vulnerable. As South you hold:

♠ Q 10 8 2
♥ A Q J 4
♦ J 5 3
♣ K 8

West	North	East	South
1♦	2♣	Pass	?

3) IMPs. E-W vul. As South you hold:

♠
♥ 7 6 4
♦ A Q 5 4
♣ A K 10 7 3 2

West	North	East	South
-	-	Pass	1♣
1♠	Pass	3♥*	?

*Fit jump raise of spades (4+spades and 5+hearts)

4) IMPs., NS vul. As South you hold:

♠ K J 10 9 5 2
♥ A
♦
♣ A Q 10 8 6 2

West	North	East	South
1♦	2♥ ¹	3♦	?

1. Pre-emptive overcall

5) Matchpoints, Neither vulnerable.

As South you hold:

♠ A
♥ A J 10
♦ J 10 3
♣ A Q 8 6 4 3

West	North	East	South
-	-	-	1♣
2♠ ¹	Double	3♠	?


1. Pre-emptive overcall

6) Matchpoints, E-W vulnerable. As South you hold:

♠ 9 8
♥ A 7 5 4
♦ A 10 9 7 5 2
♣ 10

West	North	East	South
-	-	-	Pass
Pass	1♣	1♦	1♥ ¹
1NT	Pass	Pass	?

- 1) Do you agree with South's call of 1♥?
- 2) If no, what would you have bid?
- 3) What do you bid?



BIDDING *With Bad Hands*

by Andy Stark

Reason #58 (thousand!?) our game is so fascinating is that we sometimes decide the fate of a board even though we are dealt a really bad hand. Take for example this 3-count:

♠ K 3 2
♥ 6 4 3 2
♦ 9 7 4 2
♣ 8 5

As soon as you pick up a gem like this you think to yourself, "Yawn. Nothing to do with this hand but pass throughout and follow suit on defense." And yet you might have a crucial decision to make. Imagine you are defending against 6♣. Your partner leads a spade and the ace comes down in dummy. Declarer plays low from dummy so your king wins. Now what? You can continue spades or shift to any of the other three suits. It is conceivable that the hand will be decided right here and now. Make the correct play: down one. Make some hazily focused, my-play-can't-possibly-matter decision and 6♣ makes.

THE
NEW PLAYER
Spot

BIDDING WITH BAD HANDS ... CONTINUED

Bridge teaches us time and again that in order to play our best we have to be alert at every moment: during the auction and during the play—trick one through trick twelve. (You can relax at trick thirteen.) As we learn to bid, one of the toughest hurdles for newcomers is to appreciate their bad hands. So often I have seen newer players miss a chance to get to a great contract because they were too eager to pass. Let's look at another 3-count. This time you hold:

♠ 8 5
♥ 6 4 3 2
♦ 9 7 4 2
♣ K 3 2

Hmm, looks familiar. Say your partner opens 2♣. You bid an easy 2♦, waiting. Partner rebids 2♥. I have seen newbies reach for the pass card, not knowing that 2♥ is forcing for at least another round. However, the real question is this: Should one raise to 3♥ or 4♥ with this hand? Experience tells us that this hand is not only worth going to game, but that it can even cooperate in a slam investigation. For example, if the king of clubs were the jack that would be a 4♥ bid due to the four-card trump support (gold for partner) and the doubleton club. The rest is basura, yes, but four-card trump support? Partners swoon when they see that in dummy. So, if we raise to game without the club king, with the club king we have to go a little slower. The Principle of Fast Arrival states the faster we arrive at a contract the weaker we are.

We don't know partner's hand, but we do want to show our game-going values and our second-round control in clubs. The auction should go like this:

Partner	You
2♣	2♦ ¹
2♥	3♥ ²
3♠	4♣ ³

1. Waiting
2. Game-forcing
3. 1st or 2nd round control in clubs

Taking stock for a moment: you have been dealt a 3-count and you are cooperating in a slam auction. Partner's 3♠ bid told you that partner has a spade control, either first or second-round control. This means hearts are trumps and you will play in at least game, but maybe a small slam or grand slam is biddable. Your 4♣ bid says, "I have 1st or 2nd round control in clubs. Oh, and I don't promise you a rose garden. I'm only bidding this for you in case it matters to you."

The hard part is visualizing what partner has over there. You cannot have the attitude, "I only have 3 points. If there's a slam it's up to partner to bid it, not me." As always, bridge is a partnership game; maybe the good trump support and club king is all partner needs to know about. Maybe 6♥ is near laydown with these combined hands:

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

If you adopt the attitude that every bad bridge hand you ever pick up is like a hot potato and you just want to drop it, get it over with as soon as possible by passing, then you'll miss out on some good contracts. So, strive to describe your hand, especially when partner has a good hand.

Another situation that frequently occurs is when partner opens 1NT and you pick up a shapely Yarborough (or the like):

♠ 10 9 7 5 4 3
♥ 8 3
♦ 10 7 5
♣ 3 2

Remember when you were a beginner and wanted to pass 1NT and pray partner made it? However most duplicate players with any experience at all know that the hand will usually play better in spades. The main

BIDDING WITH BAD HANDS ... CONTINUED

reason is because in notrump partner cannot get to your hand. Partner would need three or four spades in order to gain entry. Ex, ♠AKx or ♠AQxx. Mind you, those cards will also help in a contract of 2♠. Also, in notrump your hand can't stop any of the other suits from running. If spades are trump your little spades come into play and become tricks. The combined hands might be:

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

In 1NT there are nine losers. Partner will probably score one spade, one heart, and two diamonds for down three. In 2♠ there are six losers for down one. If the jack of spades comes down on the first or second spade play, then 2♠ is a make! Meanwhile in 1NT, the jack of spades is irrelevant—no matter when it falls partner will still be down three. Steering the contract to 2♠ is the right thing to do. Leaving partner to flounder in 1NT is reminiscent of what the hillbilly said to the lost traveller, "You can't get there from here."

Years ago, I was playing in the Sheardown KOs, a prestigious team event held annually at the Toronto Easter Regional. The event is named after Canadian Hall of Famer Percy Sheardown. (Fun fact: my grandmother and Percy were classmates while growing up together in Goderich, Ontario, in the 1920s.)

I remember a hand I picked up. Well, vaguely; all I remember is that I held two red queens and not much else. And I complemented those two red queens with green cards at every turn. That I remember vividly, yet sadly.

♠ 5 4
♥ Q 7
♦ Q 8 4
♣ 10 8 7 4 3 2

Here was the auction:

LHO	Partner	RHO	Me
1♠	2♠	3♠	Pass
4♠	5♦	Pass	Pass
5♠	Double	All pass	

What I failed to appreciate was how appreciative partner would be if he knew I held the two queens in his two long suits. We were cold for 6♦ or 6♥. 5♠ went down one, maybe two, and we lost imps on this board. Partner was 5-6 in the reds with suits headed by the A-K. He also held the ♣A and a spade void. Since his 2♠ bid showed hearts and a minor, and since the diamond bid came freely at the 5-level, (implying a 6+ diamond suit), surely the two queens in partner's suits must be worth more than the two points each I stubbornly gave them throughout the auction. Instead, what I needed to do was reach deep into the bid box and pull out a bid with a 6 on it—either at my second or third turn to bid. Fortunately, I learned a valuable lesson from that hand; unfortunately, that hand has not been dealt out again since.

But there have been and will be many more hands like the Hand with Two Red Queens. Here's one from a recent club game at Lee's in Toronto. All vulnerable, you pick up:

♠ K 7
♥ 5 4 2
♦ Q 9 7 6
♣ 10 8 7 6

LHO	Partner	RHO	Me
	Pass	1♥	Pass
2♥	3♥	4♥	?

Would you bid here? I think you should bid 4NT. The meaning of this bid is, "Partner, let's play in your minor." Partner is a passed hand so must have some extreme distribution to be entering the auction at the 3-level, especially vulnerable. They must have at least six spades and at least five of a minor. By bidding

BIDDING WITH BAD HANDS ... CONTINUED


4NT you show good support for either minor. You also show something redeeming about your hand. Here the ♠K is gold. Maybe you will make, or maybe your side will bid on to a profitable sacrifice.

As it turns out, partner is cold for 5♣. The opponents can make 5♥, so if you keep your partner informed maybe they will make the great bid of 6♣ for down one and a top board, your -200 (5♣ doubled down one) beating all the other minus 650s (5♥ making). Partner held 6-6 in the blacks and a heart void. The only losers were a diamond and the club ace.

To sum up, keep the brain cells burning even when you pick up dreck. You never know when a bid or play by you will be the key play that turns a so-so result into a good one.

Question: What do you call
an eight card suit?

Answer: Trump.



KAPLANISM 16 *(Quotes attributed to Edgar Kaplan)*

Editor's note: This is the sixteenth in a series of quotes attributed to Edgar Kaplan, one of the game's greatest. He was a bridge writer, teacher, administrator, commentator, coach, journalist, player and lawmaker.

"The four-spade contract at Table 1 was no thing of beauty, butimps, not esthetics were at stake. (...) Plus 650, a result that would win any beauty contest –and which won 10 imps for CHICAGO."

"Grand National", TBW 12/78, p. 18

RHO opens 1♥ and you hold: ♠Q ♥A83 ♦AKQ9732 ♣K9

"Russell chose to begin the auction with a two-diamond overcall; alas, that ended the auction as well."

"Playoff Semi-final", TBW 3/79, p. 10

"On the seventh deal [of the segment] Morehead rested, but they had scored 64 imps without reply." Ibid, p. 14



DECLARER PLAY 11

This is the eleventh article in a New Player Bridge Canada series. Some of these concepts may be a review for you, but this series will also cover more advanced techniques and ideas.

In the first article of this series (Aug 2018) a Declarer Play Checklist was introduced as a methodology intended to improve your play of the hand.

DECEPTIVE PLAYS BY DECLARER TO IMPEDE THE OPPONENTS TO FIND THEIR BEST DEFENCE - PART 2

There are many things that as declarer, you can do to make the opponents defend less than optimally. Last issue we briefly examined *Mask your hand type and holdings by deceptive bidding* and *Force the defenders to make critical decisions early in the play*.

We will continue examining what techniques declarer can use to make it tough on the defence.

FALSE CARDING 101

False carding is easier when declarer, as there is no partner you are misleading, as can happen when defending. To be successful in this area is a two-stage process:

- ✓ Know how a particular play will affect the opponents, and
- ✓ Determine what message you want the opponent to receive.

Choosing the card from dummy

You may ask how this can be deceptive when the defenders can see what card you are playing. Choosing a specific card from dummy can give the opponents the wrong picture of your hand, causing misdefence. We already saw in Bridge Basics 10 the lead of the ♦J from J10987, facing stiff queen in declarer's hand, hoping that RHO will assume a finesse is being taken, and duck. This would be equally effective if declarer's singleton was the king. Playing a high spot from dummy will often lead RHO to assume a finesse is being taken. Of course the other important reason for leading a high spot is to keep RHO off the lead. The corollary is that the lead of a small spot will once in a while induce RHO to rise with an ace, if they hold one.

Here is a classic problem to illustrate another effective time to play a card from dummy that will give the defence a wrong impression:

BRIDGE BASICS ... CONTINUED

Ex 1: You are in 6♠ on the ♦J lead. Plan your play.

♠ Q 8 5 3 2
♥ 10 4
♦ Q 7 2
♣ J 10 2

♠ A J 10 9 4
♥ K 5
♦ A
♣ A K Q 6 3

You get to a good slam. All you need is the trump finesse to make it. But there is a way to improve your chances when the finesse is doomed to fail. Even if it loses, the defence must cash the ♥A right away, otherwise you can discard your two small hearts in dummy on your long clubs. To give the defence a losing option play the ♦Q at trick one! You know it is irrelevant, but not so the defence. The full deal:

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

East will innocently cover. For all West knows you could just as easily hold ♠ AJ1094 ♥ A ♦ A4 ♣ AKQ63, and play a 2nd diamond at trick three.

Choosing the card with which you win the trick

This is a common strategy. Third hand high will play their highest card to try and promote tricks for the defence, but will play the lowest of touching honours.

Let's say West leads the ♥2. Dummy has three small and East puts up the ♥Q. If declarer decides to win, holding both the ace and king of hearts, they can cause uncertainty of who has the ♥K by winning the trick with the ace.

To win the highest card from touching honours is a well-known stratagem. But what about this holding.

Ex 2: Lead: ♥2 against 3NT. East plays the ten.

Declarer	Dummy
AKQx	xxx

Winning the ace is wrong here. West will usually know what is happening because of 3rd hand high, but all East know is partner led from a long suit. To mask your holding, the king is a reasonable choice, as you would play that card from KQx. The queen can be just as good, feigning a holding of AQx. Here is a more complicated scenario that is often used in intermediate books.

Ex 3: The contract is 3NT, playing teams. After the ♥3 lead, East plays the jack.

♠ K J 8 3
♥ 10 4
♦ 9 8 7
♣ J 10 9 2

♠ A Q 4
♥ A Q 5
♦ Q 5
♣ A Q 6 5 3

If the club king is onside you have 11 easy tricks. But what if it is with West? If you win the first trick with ♥Q West will know you have the ace as well, and will desperately shift to diamonds in hope of finding partner with enough stuff there to beat the contract. Success! But if you win the first heart with the ace West will logically assume it is partner with the ♥Q, and lead a small heart after winning the ♣K, expecting to take 3 hearts, along with the ♦A and ♣K, defeating the contract. Wrong! If the ♣K was onside all along, all you have given up is an overtrick. The full deal:

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

Next issue: We continue to delve into deceptive declarer techniques by further examining specific card selection when winning a trick and false carding by declarer.

The Intermediate Series **DEFENSIVE PLAY** **20: DEFENSIVE** **STRATEGIES**

By Neil Kimelman

This is the last in a series on Defensive Strategies. I hope this series has been helpful.

GIVING DECLARER A LOSING OPTION II

Here is an ending that occurred in a recent CBF Online Championship match. Declarer had to hold his club losers to one. Dummy held ♣ K932 and declarer ♣ J4. LHO led a small club, what club should declarer play from dummy?

In order to solve this problem there are a few more questions that need to be answered: Could West have switched to a different suit? Does the bidding or play give you any clues? Assuming you have no other info, and West had a safe card they could have played, put up the king! Why? If you had to lead the suit yourself, the only hope was the ace in front of the king. West defended well by giving declarer a losing option, hoping declarer would play him for the queen. Try this one:



THE
INTERMEDIATE
Spot

THE INTERMEDIATE SERIES ... CONTINUED

EXAMPLE 2

Defending against a suit contract, declarer has enough trumps to set up the heart suit by ruffing the 3rd round. Can you do anything?

	Dummy	
	♥ A K 10 9 3	
Partner		You
♥ 8 7 6		♥ Q J 2
	Declarer	
	♥ 5 4	

It's a longshot, but you could play the jack or the queen on the 1st round of hearts. Declarer may play you for a true card and take a finesse on the 2nd round of the suit.

EXAMPLE 3

Defending against a notrump contract, declarer needs six heart tricks to make. Can you do anything?

	Dummy	
	♥ A K J 9 7 3	
Partner		You
♥ 8 6 2		♥ Q 10
	Declarer	
	♥ 5 4	

Declarer is likely going to play for ♥ Qxx on side. However they will cash off the ace first, in case East has a stiff queen, in which case they can finesse against the 10 on the 2nd round of the suit. If you woodenly follow with the 10 on the first round, they have no chance for six heart tricks unless you hold Q10 doubleton. Smoothly play the queen on the 1st round and declarer will finesse the 9 on the 2nd round and you will score your ten.

EXAMPLE 4

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

West	North	East	South
2♦	Pass	Pass	4♠
All Pass			

West leads the ♥10. East wins the ace and shifts to the ♦K. West overtakes, cashes the ♦Q, and returns the ♥9. Plan the play.

Despite dummy's lack of high cards you can make your contract by picking up spades. The finesse is the standard option missing the king, but it is wrong here. Why? Because of the defence. Why didn't West just continue with the ♦J? Why did they give you a sure entry, considering there is a good chance your ♥K was a singleton? The reason: West wanted you to take the spade finesse. The full deal:

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

So on defence you want to be aware of the opportunity to 'come bearing gifts' that may cause declarer to go wrong, when they were bound to succeed otherwise. One last example:

THE INTERMEDIATE SERIES ... CONTINUED

EXAMPLE 5

You are West. What do you lead from
 ♠1054 ♥AQ ♦Q10987 ♣42?

West	North	East	South
-	-	-	1♠
Pass	1NT	Pass	3♦
Pass	3♥	Pass	4♦
Pass	4♠	All Pass	

The normal strategy when sitting with good cards in declarers 2nd suit is to lead trumps. However this defence is dangerous. Why? You are concerned about the favourable layout of the hearts, North's suit. If declarer is given no chance of ruffing diamonds, they will try to set up the hearts, which you know will work. Best lead is a club, letting declarer try to ruff a diamond, which will fail, and allow partner to hopefully overruff dummy. The full deal:

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

On a club lead declarer will likely win, play ♦A ruff a diamond, club to their hand and a 3rd round of diamonds. If diamonds split declarer is in great shape. After ruffing a 2nd diamond, they can throw a heart on the ♣A, ruff a heart and play the ♠K, making 10 tricks.

On a trump lead and continuation declarer is desperate. They will pull trump and then play a heart. Surprise!! The favourable heart situation now leads to an effortless 11 tricks!



QUIZ

MOLLO ON PLAY VIII

ANSWER PAGE 32

Editor's note: Victor Mollo treated us to some great characters such as the Hideous Hog and Rueful Rabbit. In addition, he shared with us some great declarer play problems. Here is the last instalment of Mollo on Play.

CONTRACT: 6♠ AT IMPs

LEAD: ♥ J PLAN THE PLAY

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



I favor light opening bids.
 When you're my age, you
 can never be sure that
 the bidding will get back
 around to you again.

Oswald Jacoby
 at age 77.

WHAT WENT WRONG?

By Paul Thurston

Errors in play usually thought to be the sole province of defenders can also bedevil declarers on occasion.

Hand 1 DLR: North. VUL: N-S

♠ A 4 3 2
♥ 10 9
♦ A Q 9 8 7 4
♣ 9

♠ Q 9 8 6 5
♥ 6 5 4
♦ 6
♣ A 10 5 2

♠ 10
♥ Q J 8 3 2
♦ K 10 5 2
♣ 7 6 4

♠ K J 7
♥ A K 7
♦ J 3
♣ K Q J 8 3

West	North	East	South
	1♦	1♥	2♣
2♥	Pass	Pass	Dbl
Pass	2♠	Pass	3NT
All Pass			

Lead: ♥6

In the modern style, every player had something to contribute to the bidding with South's second round double used to show a good hand with no clear direction. The doubler had perhaps been hoping for a belated show of club support for a possible slam and, when that wasn't forthcoming, he closed up shop with the three notrump call he might have used a round earlier.

West's top heart lead went to the nine and Jack and South ducked. Back came the heart Queen that

THE
EXPERT
Spot

WHAT WENT WRONG ... CONTINUED

South won to set about the diamond suit. When the Jack ran around to East's King and the third round of hearts forced out South's last stopper, declarer wasn't particularly concerned as he anticipated the fun of running lots of diamond tricks.

At least until West showed out on the second round of diamonds. "No problem" thought declarer. "I'll win the diamond and work on clubs for more tricks". Looking at the entire diagram, we can see that attacking clubs after learning of the diamond split would work just fine. But he didn't do that because he couldn't! So WHAT WENT WRONG?

In a moment totally lacking in forward-thinking, South had made a fatal discard from dummy on the third round of hearts: he had called for the apparently "useless" nine of clubs! Faulty discards are more often made by defenders as a result of being able to see only half of their side's assets but declarers aren't immune to that kind of error – apparently! As it was, South then needed to play on spades for two hand entries but when a spade to the Jack brought the ten from his right and the Queen from his left, the contract was well and truly sunk.

Hey, South has represented his country in several International events so if it could happen to him, there's hope for all of us!

Hand 2 : DLR: South VUL: None

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

West	North	East	South
	1 ♠	Pass	3 ♣*
Pass	4 ♠	Pass	

Lead: ♣ J

Bidding errors usually get punished if the cards aren't totally favourable and the defense is adequate but "usually" doesn't mean "always" when only one of those necessary conditions obtains.

A poor contract lacking in total assets and with only a moderate fit in the side suits so WHAT WENT WRONG? In the bidding?

Seems North-South, a partnership with two expert players but hampered by a bit of rust and a recent conversion to Bergen Raises, weren't on the same page with North's three-club response. North intended his call to be Baby Bergen showing four-card support and 7-10 High-card points the original version also known as a "Four-Card Constructive" raise. A reasonably accurate description of what North actually held but South was expecting a full-blooded Bergen Limit Raise with 10-11 high-card points, the updated "Reverse Bergen" model.

Now we might argue with South's leap to game opposite what he expected he'd find in dummy (I'd recommend bidding game opposite a limit raise but not opposite the weaker Bergen variety) but the cold reality was four spades appears doomed for the loss of two hearts, one diamond and one club – and that's with the diamond ace onside. But South will keep the IMPs he "earned" by making four spades so WHAT WENT WRONG?

Brief interlude: just in passing (as West did!), do you agree with that player's decision not to overcall? Note that a two-club overcall might lead East-West to five clubs against which a spade lead to South for an immediate diamond shift is required for three defensive winners! Meanwhile back at the ranch, the opening lead was covered by the King for East to win and try to cash a second club. Not this time as South ruffed and drew three rounds of trumps with his

WHAT WENT WRONG ... CONTINUED

hand's high spades. To continue with a diamond that West won with the ace to ponder his next move. Not a successful pondering as laying down the other red ace was just the right move – for South!

In the aftermath, West suggested that a heart shift at trick two might have been in order and East allowed that, yes that would have worked – this time. But what would also have worked was a bit of counting by West after winning the diamond ace. No matter how South's red cards were distributed, dummy's diamond suit was never going to provide enough discards for sufficient hearts to disappear from the closed hand for four spades to be made – if there was any way it might be defeated without tabling the heart ace at the crucial juncture.

In a private post-match conversation, South allowed as how he was getting to like Bergen Raises.

Hand 3 DLR: West VUL: East-West

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

Opening lead: ♠ K

West	North	East	South
Pass	Pass	1 ♥	Pass
1 ♠	DbI	4 ♠	5 ♦
DbI	All Pass		

AS long as you weren't South (or, to a lesser extent, North), you'd really have to chuckle at WHAT WENT WRONG when this deal came up during an all-Experts match on BBO).

I'm sure we'd all find lots to fault in the auction starting with North's undernourished (even for a passed hand) takeout double and East's ultra-aggressive raise to game. Just before his five diamond call, South gave a surreptitious glance to his left, right and centre to make sure all hands came from the same deck – they did so on he went.

Declarer won his spade ace and decided he needed to loosen up his side suit before tackling trumps so he tabled the club King for East to win and return a low heart, South won the King and played a diamond to the King. Finish the trumps and claim his contract, yes?

Well, no! South paused to consider West's double of the final contract (actually intended to slow down East!) and thought it very likely that the double had been based on some prospects of a trump trick, maybe ♦ J852? Fitting action to his analysis, South attempted to reach his hand to finesse West for that hypothetical (and guarded) diamond Jack. But his chosen method of re-entry was a club from dummy. OUCH! East could ruff and cash the heart ace and another "cold" contract would be consigned to the ashes. But that didn't happen and yet the contract still went down. WHAT WENT WRONG?

Seems that when that club came from dummy, East was in some somnambulistic state of his own and he pitched a small spade! "Ah" thought South "I sure picked this hand correctly. Now a diamond to the nine, cash the Queen, ruff a spade, draw the last trump and claim with good clubs". But East spoiled that plan in a most unexpected fashion and South became the victim of a nasty "Grosvenor Gambit" of the first order. Check out the Bridge World magazine of the early 70's for Frederick Turner's introduction of the Gambit.

And despite all appearances from East's failure to ruff the second club, South might still have survived by trying to form a mental picture of the defender's distribution: if he really had two minor-suit singletons, what distribution of his major suits would be consistent with the bidding and the early defense?

Food for Thought

This is a new series featuring recipes from fellow CBF members. We all have our favourites – why not share!

Lemony Mustard Dressing

BY CATHY WALSH


INGREDIENTS

- 1 large lemon
- 2/3 cup olive oil
- 2 teaspoons grated lemon peel
- 2 teaspoons sugar
- ¾ teaspoon salt
- 1 teaspoon dry mustard
- ¼ teaspoon cracked pepper
- 1/2 cup freshly grated parmesan

TO MAKE

1. Grate 2 teaspoons of peel from the lemon. Microwave the lemon for 15 seconds on high. (More juice will come out of the lemon this way.) Squeeze juice from lemon to make ¼ cup. (More is also fine.)
2. In a small container whisk lemon peel, lemon juice, oil, sugar, salt, pepper and dry mustard.
3. Toss with lettuce and cucumber.
4. Sprinkle with grated parmesan.

Serves 8-10



Serve With

Romaine Lettuce

Sliced cucumbers

You can toss in anything else from the fridge, but it works well with just lettuce and cucumbers.



MOLLO On Play

Solution - Mollo on Play VIII

CONTRACT: 6 ♠ AT IMPs

LEAD: ♥ J PLAN THE PLAY

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

You could win the ♥A, pitching a diamond, and take the diamond finesse. This may fail when spades are 4-1 and the ♦Q is offside, or spades are 3-2 but west has ♦Qxxx, and can give his partner a ruff at trick three.

A better line is to ruff the heart and pull trumps. If trump are 3-2 then you will try and drop the ♦Q for an overtrick. If spades are 5-0, hope the opponents are in the same slam. However things get interesting if trumps are 4-1. If West has the length then you are cold, as long as he has at least one club. Cash three high trumps and the ♣AK. Now exit with a trump. West must win and is end-played. If East has the four trump, then cash the club ♣AK as before, but now cash the two high diamonds and get out a trump. You are home when East does not have the long diamond.



greatbridgelinks.com

Linking you to Bridge on the Net
News • Tournaments • Links

Gifts & Bridge Supplies
giftsforcardplayers.com

ONLINE SINCE 1995



Question: Do you know the difference between a serial killer and a bridge partner?

Answer: You can reason with the serial killer.



THE IBPA FILES

The International Bridge Press Association (IBPA) is a world-wide bridge organization of more than 300 members in all corners of the world. Its main objective is to assist bridge journalists in their bridge related professional activities. The IBPA publishes a monthly online Bulletin, which consists of interesting deals involving some of the best players of the world, competing in key international tournaments.



THE 2019 CHINESE PREMIER LEAGUE, SHINING DEFENCES

Jerry Li, Beijing

The 2019 Premier League Tournament's Second Leg was held at Jiangshan, Zhejiang Province, China, from July 5th to July 11th. Here are two brilliant deals from the tournament highlighting excellent defence:

Round 10. Board 1. DLR: North. VUL: NONE



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

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Di Franco</i>	<i>Li</i>	<i>Manno</i>	<i>Hou</i>
—	Pass	1♥	2♣
2♥	2♠	4♥	4♠
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Manno led the ten of clubs. Li played the jack from dummy (South), Franco covered with the queen, and Li won with the king. Li played the six of spades, Manno won with the ace, and Franco followed with the five. What do you do now?

If partner has the ace of hearts, the contract is going down for sure: the defence has three aces and a club ruff. But if partner doesn't have the ace of hearts, can the contract be beaten? You'd need partner to have started with queen-nine-third of clubs to make a club trick, and the king of diamonds so that Partner can shift to a heart before the clubs are set up.

Which key card does partner have? The ace of hearts or the king of diamonds (with the nine of clubs)? You need help from Partner's signal. Declarer played the jack of clubs and Partner covered;



THE 2019 CHINESE PREMIER LEAGUE, SHINING DEFENCES

Partner also played the five of spades, trump suit preference perhaps. Since you are missing the queen, jack, four, three, two of spades, perhaps Partner's five is a signal, welcoming hearts? Maybe yes, maybe no.

You need to think further. Why did declarer play the six of spades? If declarer held the ace of diamonds and no ace of hearts, he would have hidden his high spades and played a lower one than the six. Partner covered the jack of clubs with the queen an inference that he holds the nine. If you trust declarer's play, he was trying break your signal system, and you should shift to a low diamond.

A low diamond has an extra chance: if Partner has the ace of hearts but no king of diamonds, but he has the nine of clubs to stop declarer running the clubs, you can still get two heart tricks, one club and one spade. This was the full deal:

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

The young Italian star, Andrea Manno, thought for about five minutes, then played a low diamond to Di Franco's king! Franco shifted to a heart to defeat the contract. Wonderful! This last board was the most-beautiful deal of the tournament:

Round 6. Board 7. Dealer South. Both Vul.

West	East
♠ A K 7	♠ Q J 10 9 6
♥ Q 8 7 6	♥ A 9 4 3
♦ K 9 8 4	♦ 6
♣ J 7	♣ A 9 6

West	North	East	South
Dai	Bessis	Yang	Moss
—	—	—	Pass
1♦ ¹	Pass	1♠	Pass
1NT	Pass	2♣ ²	Pass
2♦ ³	Pass	2♥ ⁴	Pass
4♥	Pass	Pass	Pass

1. Precision: 11-15 HCP, 2+ diamonds
2. Puppet to 2♦
3. Forced
4. Invitational with five spades and four hearts


The opening lead is the queen of clubs (standard leads). You win with the ace, cash the ace of hearts, upon which South drops the king. What do you do now?

From declarer's point of view, with trumps 4-1, he has two heart tricks, one diamond trick and one club trick to lose, so the only hope is for North to have three or more spades for a club pitch. When Yang played spades, Bessis trumped the second spade,. Was Yang unlucky? No! This was the full deal:

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

When declarer played the ace of hearts, Brad Moss dropped his king! What a beautiful, imaginative play! Can we assure him candidacy for the IBPA's best defence of the year?

New from Master Point Press



PLANNING THE DEFENSE: THE NEXT LEVEL

Barbara Seagram and David Bird

Following on from their earlier book, *Planning the Defense*, Seagram & Bird move on to more sophisticated aspects of defensive cardplay for advancing players. Using the same step-by-step approach, the authors guide the reader through the issues involved in communications, deception, trump promotions, discarding and avoiding the embarrassment of being endplayed.

PLANNING THE DEFENSE


Barbara Seagram and David Bird

Ten years after their award-winning *Planning the Play of a Bridge Hand*, Seagram & Bird tackle the hardest part of the game: defense. Using the same step-by-step approach, they guide the reader through the minefield of signaling, making a defensive plan and, above all, counting – points, tricks and distribution.



AVAILABLE FROM A BRIDGE RETAILER NEAR YOU

WWW.MASTERPOINTPRESS.COM | WWW.EBOOKSBRIDGE.COM



CALENDAR *of* EVENTS

2020

9 June Canada Wide Olympiad Game Afternoon

17-24 June Day of Bridge benefiting Alzheimer Societies

ALERT:

Due to the current Covid-19 Pandemic, all upcoming bridge events are tentative. Check the website for updated information.

www.cbf.ca

LOOKING AHEAD @ TBA

2020 Canadian Bridge Championships

27 May - 7 June Niagara Falls, ON www.cbf.ca

2020 ACBL Summer NABC

16-26 Jul Montréal, PQ www.acbl.org

2020 International Fund Regional

15-20 Sept St. Catharines, ON www.cbf.ca



INTERNATIONAL

Jul 31-Aug 9 18th World Youth Championships
Salsomaggiore Terme, Italy

Aug 21 – Sept 4 World Bridge Championships
Salsomaggiore Terme, Italy.