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## The Good, The Neutral, and The Donkeys <br> by Andy Hung, Brisbane/ Perth

We all know that bridge can be a very unforgiving game. One wrong bid (or pass!) or one wrong lead can spell the defeat of a hand. However, the one time it works, is the rush that we all come back for over and over.

Come inside my mind and witness the highs and lows from the Weekend Swiss Pairs.

You hold:
Ⓠ3, 『AQJ983, ---, \&KQ832, $2^{\text {nd }}$ seat not vulnerable versus. vulnerable.

You hear pass on your right, you open 1४, LHO doubles, partner redoubles (showing 10+ HCP) and RHO passes.

You have a very distributional hand and expect the opponents to run to diamonds, but your agreement is if you bid now, that would imply a distributional and a minimum hand (picture xx , PKQJTx, x , KQxxx, an offensive minimum).

As expected, your LHO runs to $2 \star$ and this is passed back to you. What do you do? (If you double, or had partner doubled, this would be for penalties.)


Whilst now would imply an OK hand, it doesn't really describe this hand to the extent of a " $6-5$ with a void" type of hand.

I thought about bidding 3 (cuebid) followed by 4*, which would describe a good hand, but after a bit of consideration, I chose a jump to 4\&. My partner, appearing to be on the same train as me, comes back with $5 \vee$ !

What does that mean or ask for, you might ask? I'm not sure either, but I would kick partner off my train if he intended it as a heart void with support for clubs (Exclusion Key Card Blackwood)!

For a moment, you might flirt with a potential grand slam with a $6>$ bid (first round control with grand slam interest), but if partner had something like $\uparrow$ AKxx, $\because K x x$, Qxxx, Ax, grand slam would be a good shot, though a bad break or two can spell defeat.

However, that would not leave many high cards for the opponent who made a takeout double, so partner will have a little less, thus you settle for 6 .

The full deal:
Board 32, West deals, EW vulnerable

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Q Q } 3 \\
& \text { A Q J } 93 \\
& \text {--- }
\end{aligned}
$$

| -964 |  | -10872 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 72$ | $w^{N}{ }_{\text {E }}$ | - K 6 |
| -10862 | s | - AKJ97 |
| + 10964 |  | + J 5 |
|  | A AKJ5 |  |
|  | -1054 |  |
|  | - Q 543 |  |
|  | - A 7 |  |

Partner visualised our hand to be at least a 6-5 shape and most likely a diamond singleton or a void, and intended $5 \stackrel{\square}{ }$ as slam invitational. Put this in the good book.

Try this next hand, a declarer play problem:
North deals, nil vulnerable

| - Q J 109 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -KQ5 2 |  |  |
| -64 |  |  |
| - A 43 |  |  |
| $w^{N}{ }_{S} E$ |  |  |
| - 86 |  |  |
| - J 74 |  |  |
| - AK 2 |  |  |
| * K J 1096 |  |  |
| North | East | South |
| $1{ }^{1}$ | $1 \checkmark$ | 20 |
| 2NT | pass | 3NT |

1. Precision, 2+ diamonds, 10-15

Playing in 3NT by North, East leads $\$ 7$ (fourth best, or second highest from bad suits).

What do you do?
This hand is obviously all about the clubs. In a vacuum with no other information to go by, the percentage play in the club suit is to cash A first, then low to the jack, repeating the finesse if nec-

essary. However, the auction and the lead can sometimes contain a lot of information.

Here, East has 5-6 hearts (probably five). $>7$ could be fourth best from Q1087, or if it's from a bad suit, maybe from a four-card suit like $\leqslant 97 x x$ (from a three-card suit is possible too, but it would be highly unlikely).

Given that West didn't bid 24, East is also likely to hold 2-3 spades (probably not four, else East may have tried a spade lead).

Adding all that up, West appears to be the one with the club length, and whoever has length is the one that's likely to hold any missing honour(s) there. Playing K then finesse with J would gain if East has a singleton queen, but running J first is necessary if clubs are $4-1$. If clubs are $3-2$, then both plays are equal.

Going with the percentage line, I tried running 2 J :

```
4QJ109
`KQ52
* 64
*A43
```

| ¢ 7532 |  | - AK 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - ${ }^{\text {Q }}$ | ${ }^{\text {N }}$ | -109863 |
| -Q J 108 | $\mathrm{w}^{\text {c }}$ E | -9753 |
| -8752 |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{Q}$ |
|  | - 86 |  |
|  | - J 74 |  |
|  | - AK 2 |  |
|  | - KJ 1096 |  |



I was right that clubs were indeed 4-1, but I received -8 IMPs (instead of +5 , a difference of 13) for my efforts. Was I unlucky, or a donkey?

I certainly felt like both!
Try this next hand.
You hold AJ75, PK852, AK64, 10, second seat all vulnerable, RHO opens 1н.

You make the obvious double, your LHO bids $1 \vee$, partner $2 \star$, and RHO makes a support double showing three-card heart support. What now? I thought my hand was too good for a competitive raise to $3 \star$, and wanting to keep 3NT in the picture (partner may have $\boldsymbol{\$ K x x}, \geqslant x x$, Qxxxx, \&KQx ... I can dream!), I redoubled to show a good hand.

LHO bids $2 \boldsymbol{}$, and partner unexpectedly bids $2 \boldsymbol{1}$, passed to you. What do you do?

This was the full hand:
Board 36, West deals, all vulnerable

\[

\]

a K Q 6
$ヤ 743$

- 82
- A Q 532
- 92
- AQJ96
-9 3
+9764
- 10843
- 10
- Q J 1075
\& K J 8

Thinking partner was showing a three-card spade suit to try to get to a 4-3 Moysian game (since he didn't bid spades the first time around), I went back to diamonds and eventually settled in $5 \diamond$, which was not a success.

I will let you decide who the donkey is on this hand, but rest assured the donkeys have agreed on what to do next time if this comes up again!

Here is one final tester hand. You are East, defending $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ on an auction where South opens 1NT (15-17) and North transfers to spades:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 1NT |
| pass | $2 \square^{1}$ | pass | 24 |
| all pass |  |  |  |

## SOLUTION to Tim Bourke's Test Your Play

While it may be difficult to see, there is a simple plan to make 10 tricks - provided West has $\boldsymbol{\wedge}!$. Suppose the full deal is similar to this.

```
    @ Q J 2
    \vee764
    Q | 8
    * 9654
&K1076
    & 98543
\vee10953 『2
*432 -1075
* * AQJ10
    A
    * AKQJ8
    * AK9
    &K872
```

After winning $\upharpoonright J$ at trick three, draw West's remaining trumps with $\geqslant \mathrm{A}$ and $¥ K$. Next, cash $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$ then play $\diamond$ A followed by $\geqslant 9$ to dummy's $\diamond$ J. Now comes the clever part of the plan: lead $\boldsymbol{~} \mathrm{J}$ from dummy and jettison $>K$ from your hand. On this layout West can do no better than win $\mathbf{~ K}$ and put you back in dummy with either a spade or diamond, thereby allowing you to discard your two losing clubs on dummy's $\uparrow Q$ and $\downarrow$.

You note that it will not help West to duck $\stackrel{Q}{ }$ for that will be your sixth trick and then $\downarrow$ plus your three remaining trumps will bring your contract home.

Board 7, South deals, all vulnerable

- J 96543
- 642
- Q 105
- 8

| Q Q 72 |  | - A 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Q 5 | N | -KJ97 |
| - 7632 | $\mathrm{w}^{\text {s }}$ | - A 9 |
| - K J 104 |  | \& 97652 |
|  | - K 10 |  |
|  | - A 1083 |  |
|  | -KJ84 |  |
|  | \& A Q 3 |  |

Partner leads $\vee \mathrm{Q}: \vee 2, \vee 7, \vee 3$ (you play low encourage). Trick 2: $\uparrow 5, \vee 4, ~ \uparrow J, ~ \vee A$, Trick 3: $\uparrow 4$, $2,10, \mathrm{~A}$.

What now? And what's your plan?
Playing IMPs scoring, the first assumption you must make is that the contract can be beaten. On this hand, you must try to find six tricks if possible. You have two heart tricks, one diamond, one spade that you can see so far.

Partner's big gamble on 『Qx lead into the 1NT opener suggests that he should have a highish spade given he should have around 8-10 HCP. Putting everything together, you can now visualise a very pleasurable defence.

This was the full hand:

```
@ J96543
\vee442
-Q 105
* 8
```

- Q 72
- Q 5
- 7632
*K J 104

- A 8
- KJ 97
- A 9
- 97652
- K 10
- A 1083
- KJ 84
* A Q 3

I returned a diamond won by dummy, and when declarer called for a spade, I rose $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$. Instead of cashing $¥ K$, I returned $¥ 9$, forcing partner to ruff, then he gave me a diamond ruff, and a fourth heart promoted his $\uparrow Q$ as the setting trick. This is the reason we keep coming back to the game we all love and hate.

Ed: You will note that Andy writes Brisbane/Perth as his place of residence. He rotates between the two cities. In Perth he is giving lessons at WABC, where he advocates beginners learn in four distinct stages: Beginner, Advanced Beginner, Rookies and Advanced Rookies.

Ed: For more interesting problems, look out for Andy's "Free Bridge Quiz" booklet to take at the front desk. Andy will be giving out two different sets of booklets throughout the week, so grab one while you can!

## RonKlingerBridge.com

| How would you defend? |
| :---: |
| Problem 7 |
| South deals, NS vulnerable |
| - 853 |
| - K 53 |
| - A 73 |
| - A 10 |

- A Q 942
-104
- J 1096
- K 3

| West | North | East | South <br> $1 N T$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2 \boldsymbol{s}^{2}$ | 3NT |  | all pass |

West leads $\mathbf{~} 2$ (attitude leads, low-like): three - ten - jack. South continues with e2: three - ace - four, followed by $\mathbf{\$ 1 0}$ : five - six - king. What would you play as West at trick 4? Will it help if you and partner are playing 'Reverse Smith Peters'.


## First match overenthusiasm

The SWPT leads to the NOT after 12 rounds of rigorous play, and the first round contained a variety of hands, and some high-scoring matches. To bid a slam, let alone a grand slam in the first round requires a near certain expectation of success.

Board 6 brought some pairs down to earth, including some of the top teams. Only three pairs succeeded in 6४ NS on this deal:

Board 6, East deals, EW vulnerable

| , | \& J 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | -K1074 |  |
|  | -KQ63 |  |
|  | - AK 9 |  |
| - 10853 |  | @ K Q 7 |
| $\checkmark 986$ | $w^{N} E$ | $\checkmark 52$ |
| - --- | s | - J 10974 |
| * Q 108542 |  | * J 72 |
|  | - A962 |  |
|  | - A Q J 3 |  |
|  | - A 852 |  |
|  | - 6 |  |

Ron Klinger, declarer from the North seat received $₫ K$ opening lead. The slam is a good one, superficially requiring diamonds to break and a club ruff in the South hand.

Ron won $\uparrow A$ and played a second spade. This play often persuades defenders to switch to trumps, and that's what happened here.

Ron took the trump return in dummy, ruffed a spade, crossed to hand with a trump and ruffed dummy's last spade. The dummy reversal meant that Ron scored four trumps in dummy, A and two spade ruffs, three diamonds and two clubs, 12 tricks.

Is there an advantage in ducking $\uparrow A$ at trick one, intending to win the second spade and go about the same exercise in play?


## RonKlingerBridge.com

## How would you defend?

Problem 7 solution
This deal arose in the 2011 Coffs Coast Swiss Pairs:

|  | - 853 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | -K53 |  |
|  | - A 732 |  |
|  | +A109 |  |
| - A Q 942 |  | - 1076 |
| - 104 | $w^{N} E$ | - QJ 976 |
| - J 1096 | s | - Q 8 |
| -K3 |  | - J 54 |
|  | @ K J |  |
|  | - A 82 |  |
|  | - 54 |  |
|  | \& Q 8762 |  |

After the auction given, West led a low spade against 3NT. South captured East's ten and played a club to the ace and ran 10 to West's K. To defeat 3NT West has to play A, dropping K and collecting four spade tricks. How can West tell what to do?

One approach is 'Reverse Smith Peters'. When declarer tackles a new suit, East plays the lowest card to encourage a continuation of the suit led. Here declarer tackled clubs at trick 2. East played $\$ 4$ and then 5 , lowest each time. To discourage spades, East would play high-low in clubs. As West is known to have five spades, East should encourage spades by playing 4 , then 5 . If West is paying attention, West will play next.

## THE BRIDGE SHOP

## Solution to double dummy problem 5

South plays 2 to the ace, but what does East discard ? If a diamond, declarer plays $\downarrow Q$ and East once again has no idle card. If a heart, then declarer cashes $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and East faces the same problem.

Here, a duck might allow West to discourage heavily in spades, desperately trying to get partner to shift. West perhaps missed an opportunity against Ron, as 10 was not the card contributed at trick one or trick two.

As you can see, Ron's line of play meant he could cope with diamonds not breaking-a farsighted line, and the swing was well-deserved.

There were 12 pairs at the seven-level, four in a hopeless 7NT. 40 were in the heart slam, some doubled, while 17 pairs were in game.

FREQUENCIES FOR BOARD 6

| Contract | Result | Score | Frequency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 67 by NS | $=$ | 980 | 1 |
| $6{ }^{\circ}$ by NS | $=$ | 980 | 2 |
| $5{ }^{\circ}$ by NS | $=$ | 450 | 1 |
| 4『 by NS | +1 | 450 | 1 |
| $4 \checkmark$ by NS | +1 | 450 | 14 |
| 3NT by NS | +1 | 430 | 1 |
| 7V by NS | -1 | -50 | 1 |
| $6 \vee$ by NS | -1 | -50 | 4 |
| $6 \vee$ by NS | -1 | -50 | 23 |
| 7NT by NS | -2 | -100 | 1 |
| $6 \vee$ by NS | -2 | -100 | 1 |
| $7{ }^{7}$ by NS | -2 | -100 | 4 |
| 6 by NS | -2 | -100 | 2 |
| $6 \vee \times$ by NS | -1 | -100 | 11 |
| 7NT by NS | -3 | -150 | 1 |
| 7NT by NS | -3 | -150 | 2 |
| $6 \checkmark$ b ${ }^{\text {b }}$ NS | -2 | $-300$ | 1 |
| 7VX by NS | -2 | -300 | 1 |
| 7-x by NS | -3 | -500 | 1 |
| 7NTX by NS | -3 | -500 | 1 |

## At my grandmother's knee

Andy Braithwaite showed me a deal from the Seniors in which he found a great lead.

Today he had a companion hand to go with it.

```
You hold $105, MJ762, 1083, &A1073
```

You are on lead against 4『, with very little information at your fingertips. North has opened 1\%, you pass, South bids $2 \boldsymbol{\top}$, and with no opposition from partner, North rebids $4 \vee$.

You have a choice of unappetising leads. Let's go through them. A trump lead looks to give up a trick immediately. A spade lead (unsupported 10) could easily blow a trick there, while a club lead, either from an unsupported ace, or underleading an ace has been drummed into you as a no-no since you were a boy.


Round 3, Board 15, South deals, NS vulnerable

$$
\text { \& K } 43
$$

- AQ1094
- AQ 52
\& K


This was spectacularly unsuccessful. Declarer put in $\uparrow 9$ and Andy had eliminated declarer's problems in that suit.

Brooding about this hand, Andy berated himself for failing to lead A, the only lead to give declarer problems. Hadn't he also been taught to lead from length holding length in trumps?

The next match also gave Andy a headache about his opening salvo. This time he held 872 , - A10432, AQ6, 63

North had opened a $2+$ club in fourth seat. Andy overcalled $1 \uparrow$, and LHO bid $2 \uparrow$, a limit raise in clubs.

This time Andy reasoned: "There are six clubs on my left (for the limit raise of a 2+ club opening) and partner has not doubled $2 \boldsymbol{\psi}$ to encourage a heart lead. A spade lead looks futile, so l'm going with a diamond. I didn't lead A last time I was in this predicament (the aforementioned hand), so l'm going to lay down $\downarrow$ A."

Round 4, Board 10, East deals, all vulnerable


The defence took the first eight tricks, +400 . At scoreup, Andy's teammates said "You've got the wrong vulnerability, it's -600.
"No", said Andy and Arjuna, "it's plus 400, down four in 3NT".


VISIT PAUL or HELEN AT THE STALL

## 100\% CASHMERE SHAWLS

Don't pay hundreds of dollars for your cashmere shawl.
Only \$55.00. 3 designs, smart and attractive, luxurious feel.


Paul 0408888085 Helen 0418144534 paul@bridgegear.com WEBSITES www.bridgegear.com OR giftware at 6 nt.com.au

What would You Open? by Joan Butts

From the ABF
Mixed Team
Playoff,
December 2022


## Problem 4.

Set 4 quarter finals
Board 19, South deals, EW vulnerable

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 10963 \\
& 8 \\
& 10 \\
& \text { AK Q } 8652
\end{aligned}
$$

What's the best opening bid? is wimpy, 3NT better, and $4 \boldsymbol{*}$ or seem best.

What happened?
The full hand:

- K 72
- 963
- 8542
- 943


As you can see, $7 \diamond$ and 6 are possible.
The playoff results were:
$6 \uparrow$ (E) - 1430
$67(\mathrm{E})-1430$
5ex (S) -300
4『 (W) - 680
My view: I think 5 is the best opening. West will probably double for takeout, and East will bid $6 \vee$. At our table, I'm embarrassed to say I chose the worst (wimpy) opening of $3 *$ and then broke a cardinal rule of preemptive bidding by coming in with

5d over the opponents' 4 . Strangely enough I was left there doubled! (a totally undeserved good result).

Please send your opinion and a suggested bidding sequence to me (Joan Butts) via Stephen at sleksix@gmail.com


## TASMANIAN FESTIVAL of BRIDGE



## MyState Bank Arena, Glenorchy

## Thu 23 ${ }^{\text {rd }}-$ Sun $\mathbf{2 6}^{\text {th }}$ March 2023

## Thursday/Friday

TFoB Restricted Swiss Pairs
Australian Mixed Swiss Pairs - PQP event
Roger Penny Senior Swiss Pairs
Saturday/Sunday
TBIB Australian Swiss Pairs - PQP event
Sunday
NEW
TFoB Rookie Swiss Pairs for players with < 25 MPs

Saturday Evening Dinner
NEW
Bookings by $20^{\text {th }}$ March essential

## Entries now open on myabf.com.au

or for entries and other enquiries contact
Entries Co-ordinator: hugh.grosvenor@gmail.com 0447044141
or Event Organiser
Katherine Marsden kmarsden26@gmail.com 0418135618

Tasmanian Bridge Association www.tasbridge.com.au

PLAY YOUR CARDS RIGHT

[^0]
## Club vs club: the 2022 Final

The Inaugural Final of the Australia Wide Teams Club Knockout was held on RealBridge Tuesday 6 December 2022 at 7:30pm AEDT. Kibitzing was available for all divisions via My ABF - Congress View. The finalists were:

Open: Nedlands Bridge Club vs Moonee Valley Bridge Club


Vinod Nasta, Jonathan Free, Mimi Packer, Cynthia Belonogoff


George Lovrecz, Leo Saoud, TP Ranasinghe, Gordon McRobert Under 750: Canberra Bridge Club vs Mollymook Bridge Club


Elizabeth Yoo, Liz Shonk, Jo Thomas, A DeLorenzo, Helen Little Under 100: Brisbane Bridge Centre vs South Canberra Bridge Club


M Corney, Vanessa Brewis, J McGowan, Lilly Jia, Martin Wu


Paul Appelby, Kevin Caruana, Martha Griffiths, Brenda Watts

Under 50: Waverley Bridge Club vs Wagga Wagga Bridge Club


Kevin Gu, Nitin Joglekar, Ann Zhu, Marg Ferguson


Marie Gin, Henry McMahon, Kyle Giggacher, Paul Gianniotis Thirty teams kicked off the inaugural annual club knockout in September 2022 culminating in the final 6 December. Organiser Rob Ward said, "Special thank you to all Clubs and players who participated in this new event. Getting up and going had its challenges but we did and look forward to 2023 and beyond with enhancements that will make this event a highlight of the ABF Calendar."

[^1]20 December 2022

## TEAMS KNOCKOUT

## 2023 AUSTRALIA WIDE TEAMS CLUB KNOCKOUT

When: Second Tuesday of each month, starting June, 7.30 pm Eastern Qualifying: June-August-September:
Knockout and Consolation: October-November-December:
Where: RealBridge
Format: Clubs (home and alternate members) can enter one team (total 4) in each division:
All Clubs' players < 50 masterpoints
Clubs < 100 members and players less than 100 masterpoints
Clubs > 100 members and players less than 100 masterpoints
All Clubs and players less than 750 masterpoints
All Clubs and no masterpoint limit ( ${ }^{*}$ Masterpoints and Club members at 31 March 2023)
" Unlimited substitutes and monthly format avoid any significant disruption to existing club programs and the second Tuesday avoids the Melbourne Cup." Dave Munro, South Perth Bridge Club

Cost: $\$ 240$ per team ( $\$ 10$ per player per round) with entry and payment via myABF covers 6 rounds for all teams. Teams not making the knockout stage join a three round Swiss consolation Prize money: $\$ 1000$ winner and $\$ 500$ runner up payable to Club (this prizemoney is payable to clubs in divisions with 16 entries. The organisers will scale prizemoney for divisions with fewer entries)
"This was a great competition particularly for

Gold Masterpoints at A2 level
Director: Matthew McManus Organiser: Rob Ward (SMS 0418611 908)

Tournament Regulations: can be found via myABF
the less experienced players who grew significantly during the event. Home and alternate club provisions broadened eligibility. "Sue Falkingham Tasmania BA and Liz Sylvester Mollymook. CON M,


[^0]:    abfendorsed insurance brokers

[^1]:    Australian Bridge Federation Ltd

