

EDITORIAL

AGM

The BBA held its AGM in May, and this fairly low key event saw the 2005-2006 county committee returned to power unopposed. Your reporter arrived 5 minutes after the meeting commenced, and found that nearly all the excitement (was there any?) was over. A successful year for chairman Ron Davis and committee.

Future of the Bulletin

The April bulletin introduced a new format, based on an A5 booklet. This is the second version of the new style paper bulletin. Those people that commented on the new format, (not many), were mainly complimentary, though one or two readers suggested that a larger font size would make the new format easier to read. Changes have been made for this edition of the bulletin, and I hope that all members will find this copy and future editions easier to read. Please let me know if you find that this version still causes you reading problems.

In the last bulletin I announced that I was planning to offer readers *the option* of a “paperless” bulletin, using internet technology.

I suggested that the following options could become available subject to demand:

Option 1. A paper based bulletin. (**This will always be the default option**).

Option 2. Via Email as an attachment.

Option 3. Notification via email that a new Bulletin is available via the county website.

Option 4. No notification via email, just posting the new bulletin on the website.

I asked for feedback from the readers, regarding these possible options. Readers interested in the electronic options were asked to send an email to: Louise Smith at

la.smith9@ntlworld.com, supplying their name, email address, and their preferred Bulletin Option (2, 3 or 4), plus any comments that they wished to make. (Louise will only use your address for BBA related emails.)

Louise received an absolute deluge of replies (heavy sarcasm), only 3 (or maybe 4) responses flooded in: one prefers option 4, another doesn't mind option 2,3 or 4, and the other has a slight preference for option 2. Due to this amazing show of interest, (ho! ho!) the full implementation of this project has been put on the back burner for a while. One or two bulletins will be sent out by email. Louise and I look forward to receiving your feedback following this bulletin.

Brian Keable – Editor

Membership News

Welcome to New Members:

Full Members: since the last bulletin: Elaine Miller from Sandy, Premshand Shah from Luton.

Dual Members: David Dodds from Clifton, Mick Barnett from Watton-at-Stone, and returning members Peter Dunn and Glenys Baron from Kettering.

Members transferring to other counties (Hertfordshire): Roger Edmonds - becoming a Dual Member, J H Gardiner, Derek Peers.

Correction to April 2006 Members/Telephone List

Omitted: Bernard Eddleston 01462 623447

Christopher Parkin, Treasurer and Membership Secretary



Web Site

www.bedfordshire-bridge-assoc.co.uk

Hands for the September Bidding Competition:

Hand 1: Dealer West NS Vul Pairs

West: ♠KT973♥-♦AT97653♣4

W N E S

? Do you open? What do you bid?

Hand 2: Dealer West NS Vul Pairs

West: ♠63♥QT♦KQ986543♣6

W N E S

? Do you open? What do you bid?

Letters & Emails to the Editor

Email from John Hurst

Brian - Copy of letter I sent to the EBU

I opened the June edition of English Bridge with a sinking feeling as I read the cover, and rapidly the sinking turned to despair and despondency, and I know from the reactions of some club members I am far from alone. Ever more rules to deal with ever more perceived problems. Some of the rules remind me of early "Cafe" Bridge at University: Pass = 0-6 No bid = 7-12, or "One strong no trump", partner

I have long regarded bridge as becoming over-complicated and over-regulated. I constantly hear folks moaning about governments introducing more and more red tape. Regrettably they reflect society. Look what we do left to our own devices, more and more rules and more and more complexity seem to be the order of the day.

I learned bridge in the sixties, from books by the early acolytes, such as Iain Macleod's "Bridge is an Easy Game", may he roll in his grave. There were no alerts, no stops, no bidding boxes. Despite that, there seemed to be far fewer disputes than there are these days in serious tournament bridge, or at club level. I have a deal of sympathy for the views expressed by Ken Latty of E Sussex else where in the June edition. More and more complications will drive more people away from EBU registered clubs, and hence from Bridge.

Here is a simple variation on bridge, which originally I used for amusement but now perhaps I might propose seriously, that would cut complexity "at a stroke" to coin a phrase. Just try the effect of this rule, "Redouble closes the auction." I suspect that would do away with a vast array of the proliferation of systemic arrangements that exist, to the betterment of the game for many "ordinary" players. Perhaps a club or two might like to try it at their Xmas Party. No doubt it wouldn't take long for someone to devise a new way round it, with yet more complications and more rules to deal with them!

My enjoyment of Bridge (add football and most other sports) forever wanes on the tide of regulation we seem determined to apply.

John Hurst

Editor's Comments:

I wonder what readers think of John's letter? What on earth is he ranting on about I can hear some of you say?

Well I'm pretty sure (I've talked to John) its about the new EBU rules for Alerting and Announcing published in the June edition of English Bridge. Also in the new version of the Orange Book (Handbook of EBU Directives and Permitted Agreements), which was sent to some EBU members (mostly tournament players). The new regulations will come into effect from August 1st, though the EBU says there will be a bedding down period of one year, before they are fully operational.

So what has changed and is there any need to get too uptight about things?

(A) Changes to Alerting.

(B) Introduction of Announcements.

(C) Introduction of a new Convention Card EBU 20B.

How these changes affect the players?

(a) Tournament Players. Players who regularly play in EBU (&WBU) events will find the new rules in force from August 1st.

Tournament level players will probably have little trouble getting used to the new ideas. They will have a copy of the Orange Book to study and analyse the changes.

(b) County standard players. Most (all?) counties will implement the new rules in all or some of their own competitions. These players should get by ok but there will be lots of hiccups as players and directors struggle to implement the new rules. Counties will have to give some thought, guidance and assistance to their players and officials (and clubs) on how to implement this new process smoothly. Have the BBA a plan for this? I understand that something is in the pipeline. We shall see.

(c) Club Players. Clubs I think will have the choice of whether they implement the new rules. I think the better clubs will go ahead, but initially I think John is right, there will be chaos at club level, with some players knowing the new rules, some players continuing with the old rules, those that have no idea about the old or new rules and others misinterpreting the changes. Non EBU members will be totally perplexed, as they will have had no real warning of what is to come. Clubs will need much guidance from the EBU and the county in order to implement the changes sensibly.

What will be the overall effect of the changes:
There are two possible scenarios:

Scenario 1 (virtual reality?)

The EBU, county associations and clubs do their homework well and prepare everyone for the changes.

The new rules work well, alerting is simplified, announcements help lead to greater understanding of the way players bid.

Introduction of a new convention card may see more and more players using convention cards.

Scenario 2 (reality?)

(a) A possible deepening of the divide between tournament players and ordinary players.

(b) The new regulations may cause fewer players to take up the game and play on the local scene.

(c) There may be a further split between clubs. There will be some clubs whose members and organisation cannot cope with the changes and never implement them. Will non EBU affiliated clubs apply the new changes?

Should the EBU be implementing these changes?

Yes, if they want to make things better for the tournament players, No, if they want to encourage current members to stay in the game and if they want new members to replace the old ones.

The EBU (and to a lesser extent the county associations) seem unable to cater for both the requirements of the enthusiastic dedicated intense minority and the broader requirements of the majority who play bridge for fun and as a social relaxation.

The above are my personal views (not those of the BBA – so far as I know). As a natural pessimist I fear this may not be a successful innovation, as there seems to have been little effort put in to make the average player fully aware of the changes. Why for example didn't the EBU give every member a copy of the new Orange Book? (Cost I suppose, plus lack of appreciation of the need for education at grass roots level). However I hope I am wrong and that it does work.

Readers may agree/disagree with me. I would welcome further emails and letters on this topic in the coming weeks, as to how you see the new rules being implemented in the events that you play in. I'm sure at the very least it will generate

some funny stories as players grapple with the new rules.

Brian Keable (Editor)

View From The Spring Foursomes

By Alan Shillitoe

The Spring Foursomes is the toughest and most prestigious event on the calendar in this country. Of all the single-venue events, it is the only one to attract all the top players in this country, and some of the top foreign stars too including winners of Bermuda Bowls, Venice Cup and many other international champions and medallists. And Zia!

My team consisted of myself along with my former Essex partner Stuart Nelson and experienced Oxford pair Rob Procter and Mike Robinson. Naturally, we didn't trouble the seeding committee, being placed into the third-ranked group of teams.

The format of the event is double-elimination i.e. a team has to lose twice before it is knocked out of the main event. For those that do depart, the secondary events are also fantastically strong, including comfortably the strongest one-day Swiss Teams of the year. It is possible to turn up to enter just this event, but only a handful do now as they tend to get spanked around by quality units battle-hardened by knocking seven bells out of each other over the previous three days.

Our initial grouping saw us drawn against the reigning champions and second seeds (Brian Senior, Geoffrey Wolfarth, Sandra Penfold, Valio Kovachev, Vladi Isporski) and the 31st-seeded London-Suffolk combination of Jim Gobert, Chris Chambers, Richard Hillman and Jon Green – familiar faces to me. We lead both 32-board matches at halfway and still lead the group on total IMPs with one stanza to go in both matches. By this stage, the Bulgarians had got into full swing and we lost to the number two seeds but hung on to win the other match and claim second in the group. I was a little disappointed as winning the group would have won us a match against a team containing the great Norwegian Geir Helgemo, a man considered a few years ago to be the best player on the planet.

With only 44 teams entering the event, the vagaries of the movement put us into another threesome in the once-defeated knockout with two teams to stay in the event. This time we

started badly, but pulled back to top the group and eliminate the Teltscher team in the process. This should have won us a match against Zia, but his side were usurped by a London-New Zealand combination so another superstar showdown slipped away. We didn't go the same way and duly won comfortably only to come up against a Bulgarian international side (Julian Stefanov, Rosen Gunev, Ivan Naney and Ilya Valiev) in the 5th round – highly fancied by many to go all the way.

For me, one of the joys of playing against foreign opposition is countering each sides individual systemic variations and bidding philosophies. The Bulgarians were playing nearly identical methods to those we had fought for 32 boards against Kovachev and Isporski – Strong 1♣ with relay continuations, Multi 2♦, 2♥ weak 4-4 Majors (Norwegian Style), and many transfer pre-empts at the 2 and 3 level. As part of preparing for any good event, a pair should have defensive methods organised for a system they might come up against, and Stuart and I have a thorough list of treatments. Having already played against these methods previously we had also tweaked a few things after discussing our experiences. Our philosophy is to keep the methods as transferable as possible between analogous situations to reduce memory strain and thus avoid system errors.

The match itself started well. We began against Naney and Valiev and jumped out to a 17 IMP lead after the first stanza. Valiev misdefended a slam and then this board hit the table:

Dealer N, Love All

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| | ♠AQ87 | | |
| | ♥K1072 | | |
| | ♦KQ7 | | |
| | ♣92 | | |
| ♠J4 | | ♠ | |
| ♥A654 | | ♥QJ98 | |
| ♦J2 | | ♦A843 | |
| ♣108764 | | ♣AKJ53 | |
| | ♠K1096532 | | |
| | ♥3 | | |
| | ♦10965 | | |
| | ♣Q | | |
| West | North | East | South |
| <i>Shillitoe</i> | <i>Naney</i> | <i>Nelson</i> | <i>Valiev</i> |
| | 1NT ¹ | P | 2♥ ² |
| P | 3♠ ³ | X | 4♠ |
| ? | | | |

1 – 14-16 2 – Transfer to ♠

3 – Minimum with 4♠

My thought processes were such. Partner has a serious hand to double at the 3♠ level. We don't play an Astro variant so we can't show major/minor two suiters immediately. He is, after the double however, liable to be three-suited. This means that we have a double-fit and so therefore so do our opponents. Double-fits always play for more tricks than expected so I will save because I don't know who can make what. I bid 5♥ because partner was guaranteed to have a decent Heart holding on this auction. This isn't the best bid. That would be 4NT, inviting partner to bid their minors if any good and would get me to 5♣ on this deal. If partner bid 5♦, then I could convert to 5♥.

5♥ was doubled by North, and a Spade lead and ruffed. I was pretty certain trumps were going to be 4-1 offside, but ran the Queen anyway to remove South's trump and allow me to retain control when I decided to run the clubs. North switched to a diamond which I won and played a top club. When the Queen dropped, I could return to my hand with the 10, ruff a spade, draw two more rounds of trumps and play on clubs just conceding a diamond and one more trump for one off. In the other room, West was faced with a similar decision but opted to double 4♠ with his flattish hand and Ace. This duly made an easy 10 tricks for +590 to our team mates.

Despite the fact I didn't take the best removing action (to the cold 5♣), I had still won the board once I had elected to move. Although West in the other room has achieved far more in the game than myself, I still feel it was an error of judgement on his part not to save.

The Bulgarians showed their class by winning the second stanza by 23 IMPs to lead by 6 at half-time after some sloppy bridge by us. Partner got caught for a penalty after wandering in, and I miss-defended a thin vulnerable game. At this level mistakes get punished.

We needed something to change the momentum, and duly enough, this arrived on the first board after the break. For the squeamish a warning. Turn away. This is X-rated.

Dealer S, EW Vul

♠92
♥Q1072
♦9753
♣974

| | |
|---------|--------|
| ♠754 | ♠AK108 |
| ♥K3 | ♥A986 |
| ♦KQJ642 | ♦A |
| ♣106 | ♣AKJ8 |

| |
|-------|
| ♠QJ63 |
| ♥J54 |
| ♦108 |
| ♣Q532 |

| West | North | East | South |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <i>Stefanov</i> | <i>Shillitoe</i> | <i>Gunev</i> | <i>Nelson</i> |
| P | 2♦ ¹ | X | 2♥ ² |
| 3♦ ³ | P ⁴ | 4♦ ⁵ | P |
| 4♠ ⁶ | P | 6♠ ⁷ | P ⁸ |
| P | P | | |

- 1 – Weak 4+♦, 4+ Unspecified Major. 3rd Pos 0-almost anything
- 2 – Pass or Correct to 2♠
- 3 – Alerted by Gunev as general force, clearly a misunderstanding going on
- 4 – Glad to be out unscathed. My job is done.
- 5 – General force
- 6 – Bid almost resignedly. The only other ‘feature’ of the hand.
- 7 – Can’t do less than this looking at this monster
- 8 – Happy with this turn of events

Stuart and I have a gadget. A 2♦ gadget to be precise. Weak in diamonds with an unspecified major. We use it purely as a high-frequency destructive tool. It is a derivative of the aforementioned Norwegian 2♦/2♥ used as a balanced pre-empt in the majors. The theory behind it (as developed by Norwegian Bjorn-Olav Ekren) is that if you pre-empt in two suits at once, then you have a high chance of finding a fit in one. Once you find that fit, pre-empt to the limit and get out again. The advantage of using Diamonds and a major is that it is twice as frequent as majors alone, and because the Major is unspecified, the opponents only have one cue-bid to assist their competitive auctions. This is WMD at the bridge table. Sometimes it goes off in your face, but most top pairs have something

in their armoury – because it works far more often than not.

There was nothing to the play. Partner came to two trump tricks as it drifted one off. Teammates scored up +1370 in the other room without the disruption. Gunev and Stefanov hadn’t done all their homework properly and lost 16 IMPs as a penalty.

After this board momentum was with us and we eased away to win by 32. I even had time to open 2♦ in the final stanza. We scrambled to 2♠, and Stefanov decided he wanted some of the action this time. That resulted in +470 and 8 more IMPs.

Our reward for winning was a sixth round clash with Mossop’s Anglo-Swiss line up. Mindful of the fact that when we reached this stage two years ago we were thoroughly trounced by the Bermuda Bowl silver medallists from Norway, Stuart and I were anxious to make a better fight of it this time. There were never more than a handful of IMPs in it, and one humorous highlight was defeating a 6♥ slam bid by England regulars David Price and Colin Simpson. I was looking at six trumps when Simpson bounced to the final contract and I made a very quiet in-tempo pass to make sure he stayed there!

The match was all-square after 24 boards, but coming into the final deal I was mindful that Price/Simpson had played the previous seven hands of the stanza pretty much perfectly and thus we probably needed a good board. Accordingly I took a bounce to a slam which could have easily been cold on the auction but in reality was around 50-50. The lie was unfriendly and we lost 11 instead of gaining 11. The final margin was just 18 IMPs.

As always I will be back for more next year. It is simply the best event on the calendar.

Parkin Cup - Inter-county Invitation Teams of Eight

Report by Val Lawson

This new event was played for the first time on Sunday May 7 2006 at Wilstead. We welcomed teams from Hertfordshire and Berks & Bucks and they competed against four teams from Bedfordshire. Sadly, several members of the team from Norfolk were taken ill and they had to withdraw at short notice.

During an afternoon and evening session, each team played an eight board match against each of the others. Tea was provided at half-time, and the whole day was very pleasant, friendly but competitive. At the tea break, Berks & Bucks had a narrow lead from Hertfordshire. Of the home teams, Milton Keynes A was in third place. After the second session, final results were:

1st Hertfordshire

Ann Flockhart & Mike Hancock, Malcolm Harris & Maria Budd, Stan & Tara Harding, Bobby & Martin Rodney.

2nd Berks & Bucks (Players not known)

3rd Bedfordshire (Actually a Bedford team reinforced with a couple of outsiders)

4th Milton Keynes A

5th Milton Keynes B

6th Wardown

County Chairman Ron Davis announced the results and handed over to Chris Parkin who presented the Parkin Cup to the winning captain Ann Flockhart. A prize was given to each of the winning team.

Looking at the score records Alan Oddie & Iain Roberts were the only pair to bid the heart slam on board 20 in the first session. There were a few more slams bid and made in session 2, but some didn't get there on board 2. On board 9 two slams look possible but only one makes; while on 13 the defence have to be quick to take their tricks.

Hand details are below - would you reach the right contract with your partner? :

Session 1, Board 20 Both Vulnerable Dealer West

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>♠Q43 ♥- ♦T4 ♣AKJ87653</p> | | <p>♠AK95 ♥KJ52 ♦AQ6 ♣QT</p> | |
| ♠JT62 | | ♠AK95 | |
| ♥AQT987 | | ♥KJ52 | |
| ♦K5 | | ♦AQ6 | |
| ♣4 | | ♣QT | |
| <p>♠87 ♥643 ♦J98732 ♣92</p> | | | |

Possible auctions:

Against real living opponents, they are likely to make it tough for EW, with a pre-emptive jump to 4C.

| W | N | E | S |
|----|----|----|---|
| 1H | 4C | 5H | P |
| 6H | P | P | P |

The 5H bid by East, should ask opener to push on to 6H with second round club control, or cue bid 6C with first round club control.

If the opponents don't bid 4C but only bid 3C, it still won't be easy, and the best bid East can make is still probably 5H, asking for club control.

Session 2, Board 2 N-S Vulnerable Dealer East

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>♠- ♥QJ7 ♦T865 ♣JT7642</p> | | <p>♠AJT6 ♥KT32 ♦K32 ♣K3</p> | |
| ♠Q8753 | | ♠AJT6 | |
| ♥A5 | | ♥KT32 | |
| ♦AQ7 | | ♦K32 | |
| ♣A98 | | ♣K3 | |
| <p>♠K942 ♥9864 ♦J94 ♣Q5</p> | | | |

EW can make 6S, should they get there after a weak no trump opening by East. Here is one possible way.

| E | S | W | N |
|-----|---|----|---|
| 1NT | P | 2H | N |
| 2NT | P | 3H | P |
| 3S | P | 4D | P |
| 4NT | P | 5C | P |
| 6S | P | P | P |

2H is a transfer to spades, 2NT is a transfer break showing 4 spades and a four card heart suit, and a non minimum hand. 3H is a re-transfer (to 3S) so that opener plays the hand. 3S opener completes the retransfer. 4C is a cue for spades. 4D another cue, opener prepared to make one slam try below

game. 4NT Roman Key card Blackwood. 5C opener show one key card (Ace or King of spades). 6S, west takes a pot at slam.

Session 2, Board 9 E-W Vulnerable Dealer North

| | | |
|--------|---------|----------|
| ♠A53 | ♠872 | ♠J |
| ♥T92 | ♥5 | ♥KQJ8643 |
| ♦73 | ♦K8654 | ♦Q9 |
| ♣97542 | ♣AKQ6 | ♣JT8 |
| | ♠KQT964 | |
| | ♥A7 | |
| | ♦AJT2 | |
| | ♣3 | |

| | | | | |
|----|----|-----|---|--|
| N | E | S | W | |
| 1D | 3H | 3S | P | If North bids 4H to show a heart control, and a bit to spare for his support of spades, then South can be much more confident about launching slam |
| 4H | P | 4NT | P | wards. |
| 5C | P | 6S | P | |
| P | P | | | |

North South can make 6S, but it won't be easy if East pre-empt in hearts:

| | | | |
|----|----|----|---|
| N | E | S | W |
| 1D | 3H | 3S | P |
| 4S | P | ? | |

? what should South bid? 4NT works well because North has a single heart and there is no heart loser, but if North had a doubleton heart, and there was no quick way to get rid of a losing heart, 6S would fail. Perhaps North can make a better bid than 4S? Say the auction went as follows:

Session 2, Board 13 Both Vulnerable Dealer North

| | | |
|-------|--------|--------|
| ♠62 | ♠AQT | ♠8754 |
| ♥QT96 | ♥84 | ♥AKJ52 |
| ♦9652 | ♦KJ4 | ♦Q8 |
| ♣QT2 | ♣AKJ85 | ♣64 |
| | ♠KJ93 | |
| | ♥73 | |
| | ♦AT73 | |
| | ♣973 | |

North-South are missing two top hearts, but can make 12 tricks if South plays the final contract and West fails to lead a heart.

If North opens 1C, how many brave Easts would bid 1H (or a braver 2H's) to get the heart lead? Assuming that North opens 1C and East stays out of the auction, can any reader conjure up an auction whereby South can play in a slam, 6D, 6S or 6NT and make if West fails to lead a heart?

Editor:

I wrote the bidding sequences up for this article and I can't see any rational way for South to get to play any slam.

As to the event itself Val is right, it was a most enjoyable afternoon, but the format will need to change if it is to become a regular feature of the

bridge scene, with more external teams playing. Many good Bedfordshire players took part, but they were dispersed between four teams, and Bedfordshire did not have one team sufficiently strong to give the visitors Bucks & Berks, and Hertfordshire a tough game.

BBA/EBU Green Point Swiss Teams

Held at Stevenage on the 17th June 2006, a well organised/directed event, which the non-soccer watching players enjoyed. From the BBA point of view a good event, but with attendances down – only 41 teams - (the World Cup?)), little or no profit to be made for the county. Note (to Tony Blair) too much choice (bridge) is not always the best way of making things work.

| Pl | Teams | VP's | Wins | Best Bedfordshire team, Monica Lucy, Maggie Willis, Brian & Rita Keable 8 th equal. |
|----|---|------|------|--|
| 1 | Victor Savage, Bob Holder, Sandra Belcher, Phil Thornton | 107 | 6 | |
| 2= | Mandie Campbell, Antony Nash, Judi Berzins, Benji Hackenbroch | 94 | 5 | |
| 2= | Karima Basse, Tugrul Kaban, Maria Budd, Malcolm Harris | 94 | 5 | |
| 4 | Sheila Evans, Mike Wren, Bill Blackman, Richard Perryman | 93 | 5 | |
| 5 | Ed Scerri, Derek Oram, Celia Oram, Richard Palmer | 90 | 5 | |
| 6 | David Dickson, Anne Flockhart, Vernon Gaskell, David Walker | 88 | 5 | |

What would you bid? Answers to April Competition

The Panel

Many of the panel are missing. Roger Gibbons on an extended summer long holiday in the south of France. Maybe Jeremy Dhondy went to the world championships, and was too busy, or perhaps is just too busy. No news from Jerry Harouni, who is usually somewhere abroad. Derek Oram is always busy. Thanks to those who have taken part, including the competitors, that small band of enthusiasts.

Perhaps it is time to recruit some new panellists for future bulletins, or maybe give this feature a rest? Time to visit the job centre I guess. Any BBA experts like to have a go as a panellist?

Hand 1

Hand 1 Dealer South, EW Vul.

Teams

South: ♠A9♥A32♦K9♣AQJT92

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S | W | N | E |
|---|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|----|----|---|---|
| 1C | 4D | X | P |
|----|----|---|---|

| | | | |
|---|-----------------|--|--|
| ? | (X was takeout) | | |
|---|-----------------|--|--|

Keith Bennett: Pass

Pass: Very close to 6C, but the chance of a diamond ruff and bad breaks suggests taking the money would be better. Declarer is very unlikely to be able to get to dummy so holding them to 7 or 8 tricks seems likely.

Alan Kay: Pass

Pass. I think that 6c is likely to be a good contract if partner has his full values but he was under pressure and the vulnerability suggests that bad splits are likely. It should be possible to stop declarer from reaching dummy and therefore I should make my Kd so if 6c is on we should get 800 for only a small loss.

Peter Lee: 6C

6C. Although it may fail to Ace diamonds and a ruff I cannot bring myself to bid less. 6NT is an alternative which may work better - or worse.

Alan Shillitoe: Pass

Pass. EW are vulnerable and I have no guarantee of a fit and suits are breaking badly. If we are making game we are taking at least 500, and if we are making slam then we should get at worst 800 but without the risk of going off. I can control entry to dummy so that they won't be able to finesse my trump K. Partner is probably worth two tricks for his double so I think its dinner time.

Moderator:

Three of the panel take the money on offer, but at the table in a Division I match there was more on offer in 6C.

Hand 2

Hand 2 Dealer West, LA. Teams

South: ♠Q932♥J32♦QJx♣QJ2

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| W | N | E | S |
|---|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|----|---|---------|---|
| 1C | X | 3C(Pre) | P |
|----|---|---------|---|

| | | | |
|---|----|---|---|
| P | 3H | P | ? |
|---|----|---|---|

Keith Bennett: 4H

4H. Seems normal - enough in values and not enough in controls to do anything else. 3NT is not an option with 1 stop opposite likely shortage.

Alan Kay: 4H

4H. Partners sequence is showing a good hand although

he may not have been expecting to have to bid at the three level. I have a lot of probably wasted values but some must be of use to make game in hearts.

Peter Lee: 4H

4H. Partner should have a hand too strong to overcall 1 H with a good suit. My bits should prove enough for game. He may well not have 4 spades and bidding 3S would imply longer spades.

Alan Shillitoe: 4H

4H. In my style partner is strong and very single suited - with 5 hearts and a good hand (2/3suited type) one should overcall first, then re-open with a double. I opt for 4H as my tricks are slow and so

we may need trump control to establish them. With Axxx Jxx xxx QJx, I think 3NT is better as it is likely to be 9 tricks and run.

Moderator:

Why did I include this hand you may ask, the panel thought it was trivial raise to 4H. Well at the time my partner bid 3H, and I was heavily castigated for going on to 3NT which duly went off. 4H's didn't make either, and our best result was to defend 3C for one off. Needless to say I don't think partner had her bid, and he didn't think I had mine! (No, I haven't made a mistake).

Hand 3

Hand 3 Dealer North, EW, Teams

South: ♠AJ765♥A10♦KJ6♣A76

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| N | E | S | W |
|---|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|----|---|----|---|
| 1H | P | 1S | P |
|----|---|----|---|

| | | | |
|----|---|---|--|
| 2S | P | ? | |
|----|---|---|--|

As South how would you continue?

Keith Bennett: 3D

3D - initially a game try - will turn into a slam try.

Alan Kay: 6S

6S. A wild punt but it should have some play especially if I do not give the defence any help about my hand and 6S cannot be a contract we can reach with any certainty if I bid it more scientifically. The

worst hand partner can have is a minimum hand with 3 spades and a shortage in one of the minors in which case I will probably need some luck.

Peter Lee: 3D

3D. A good slam is probably unlikely, and very difficult to find out. I almost bid 4S. May pass 3NT now. 3C too seems reasonable.

Alan Shillitoe: 4C

4C. I know technically this is a splinter, but partner has promised a source of tricks (hearts), so now I want to start finding out what controls may be missing.

Moderator:

The panel seem to have mixed views on the possibilities for the hand, apart from Alan Kay who punted 6S, cos it might make. Perhaps his "bashing approach" has some merit.

Hand 4

Hand 4 Dealer E, EW, Teams

East: ♠1086532♥♦108♣AK1042

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| E | S | W | N |
|---|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| ? | Do you open? If so what do you bid? | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|

Keith Bennett: 1S

1S - 6 losers, 2 quick tricks. The risk is that partner will get carried away when we have a misfit, but I think the risks of passing and having to guess later, or the risk of pre-empting and missing a club fit are greater.

Alan Kay: Pass

Pass. I do not like a bid of 2S here but I am tempted to open 1S as this hand has a lot of potential if we can find a fit and depending how the bidding develops I will show a 2-suiter.

Peter Lee: Pass

Pass. Opening any number of spades is a total miss description. With 6 spades I am unlikely to be pre-empted out. E.g. After a raise of 1H to 3H I can back in with 3S implying a two suited hand.

Alan Shillitoe: 2S

2S. Even assuming I'm not playing a weak 2-suiter type. Not worth 3/4S 1st Vul. I know this is a distortion, but realistically a high frequency of pre-emption gives the opponents lots of opportunities to go wrong. I won't bid again of my own free will, but will react positively if partner should encourage. This would be an excellent hand for an action double later in such an auction.

Moderator:

Note that the two wise older panellists go for the down the middle "Pass", whilst the younger panellists go for the more avant garde approach of opening when its their turn. Will this approach be duplicated by the competitors?

| Panel | Hand 1 | Marks | Hand 2 | Marks | Hand 3 | Marks | Hand 4 | Marks | Score |
|----------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| Peter Lee | 6C | 8 | 4H | 10 | 3D | 10 | Pass | 10 | 38 |
| Alan Kay | Pass | 10 | 4H | 10 | 6S | 6 | Pass | 10 | 36 |
| Keith Bennett | Pass | 10 | 4H | 10 | 3D | 10 | 1S | 5 | 35 |
| Alan Shillitoe | Pass | 10 | 4H | 10 | 4C | 8 | 2S | 5 | 33 |

Competitors Comments

Hand 1

Dominic Connolly: 6C

6C. The only available options are pass, 4N, 5C, 5D and 6C. I wonder how many pairs have an agreement over what 4NT means? The hand appears to be unsuitable for a 5D bid and 5C doesn't get the job done. The quality of the club suit and protected DK justifies the slam bid, but I would not be surprised to find the contract struggling with some inevitable bad breaks. Pass is a possibility especially at this vulnerability but the Law is not on my side as I don't have enough diamonds to defend.

David Woulds: 6C

6C. It looks very tempting to pass and take the money, but it may not yield much if partner has diamond shortage giving opps a 10 or 11 card fit and on a bad day partner does not have a trump to lead and you're writing -810 instead of +920 or +1440.

Bryden Keenan: 4NT

4NT. Bidding 6C if partner gives me one key card and 7 if 2.

Terry Pearce: Pass

Pass. No guarantee 4H or 4S makes. Looks like 4D will go 1 or 2 off vulnerable. Expect club lead.

Val Lawson: 5H

5H. If we're going to play H I want to be declarer to protect KD & 4H will not show the values of my hand

Moderator: Our competitors are more enterprising than the panelists and three of go for all the money and either bid slam or going looking. Only Terry decides to wimp out.

Hand 2

Dominic Connolly: Pass

Pass. A point counter's delight, but a deceptive nine count and full of softs. 3NT could be the thinking man's choice and a very smart bid but I figure to lose the lead again before garnering 3NT on an initial club lead, even if partner has his strong single suited hand.

David Woulds: 4H

4H. I don't like the shape, but I have some useful cards which may just be enough for partner to make game.

Bryden Keenan: 3S

3S. Hoping partner won't assume I have 5 or that it is a weakness take-out. Partner might be 4441.

Terry Pearce: 4H

If North can bid 3H on his own, my hand must be worth 1 trick.

Val Lawson: 4H

Moderator:

Dominic goes quietly, unusual for him. What is Brydon "smoking". How can his partner be 4441?. Surely he would double again with that type of hand and non minimum values?

Hand 3

Dominic Connolly: 3C

3C. Showing the CA, spades agreed, there is a possible slam here.

David Woulds: 4NT

4NT. RKCB. If partner shows 1 or 2 key cards without the Q, I will bid 6, it's when he shows 2 +Q it gets interesting.

Bryden Keenan: 3C

3C. If partner bids 3D, I shall bid 3H and hope he fancies bidding Blackwood.

Terry Pearce: 4NT

4NT. RKCB with spades agreed trump suit.

Val Lawson: 4C

4C. Cuebid

Moderator:

The competitors all want to proceed slam wards, some with considerably less foreplay than others.

Hand 4**Dominic Connolly: Pass**

Pass. To open, first you need an opening hand. This isn't one. I often see bidders justify opening the bidding by saying they have a six loser hand. The Losing Trick Count can't be used until a fit has been established! You can't open because partner will rightly expect more - anyway the honours are not even in the right place. You may have an opportunity to come in later and leap around if a fit is established.

Moderator:

Some (the EBU Laws & Ethics committee for one) would say that as this hand meets the requirements for the Rule of 18 (used to be 19), it is an opening bid of one. E.g Add total points (7) to total number of cards in two longest suits (11), to make 18. It might be if the AK of clubs were in the spade suit. However if one looks at new Orange Book (page 42), this hand would not be allowed as an opening bid at Level 3, as the point count is less than 8. (Does this mean then that Bryden's bid of 1C – see below – is a psyche?)

David Woulds: Pass

Pass. The hand is potentially very offensive in 2 suits and holding the boss suit we can afford to await developments.

Bryden Keenan: 1C

1C. There is likely to be a lot of bidding and if I don't get in quickly I'll never be able to show both my suits, so 1C and then spades at least twice.

Terry Pearce: 2S

Shows 5-10 points, spades and a minor at least 5-5.

Val Lawson: 2S**Moderator:**

This time the younger competitors take the restrained standard approach of passing with their shapely seven count. Does Terry really play weak two suited Two bids, or is this a sudden show of bravery? Brydon takes another puff on his magic cigar, inhales deeply and sets off to make at least three bids on this mighty seven count.

| Competitors | Hand 1 | Marks | Hand 2 | Marks | Hand 3 | Marks | Hand 4 | Marks | Total |
|------------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| David Woulds | 6C | 8 | 4H | 10 | 4NT | 5 | Pass | 10 | 33 |
| Terry Pearce | Pass | 10 | 4H | 10 | 4NT | 5 | 2S | 5 | 30 |
| Dominic Connolly | 6C | 8 | Pass | 5 | 3C | 5 | Pass | 10 | 28 |
| Val Lawson | 5H | 5 | 4H | 10 | 4C | 8 | 2S | 5 | 28 |
| Bryden Keenan | 4NT | 8 | 3S | 5 | 3C | 5 | 1C | 4 | 23 |

National Results**Corwen Trophy (Inter-county Pairs championship)**

Bedfordshire were represented by Ron Davis & Alan Oddie 16th 54.55%, Dominic Connolly & David Woulds 58th 49.4%, Harry Cook & Howard Watson 66th 48.37%. Disappointing perhaps for Davis & Oddie who may have expected greater things, but good performances from the other pairs who did not let themselves down, in a strongish field of 103 pairs.

Pachabo (Inter-county Teams of 4)

Bedfordshire were represented by KO Cup winners, David Harris, Jon Williams, Ron Davis, Alan Oddie came 7th equal in this 30 team event. An excellent performance from our premier team, who proved once again that their skills work at national level as well as at the easier county level.

Garden Cities Trophy (Inter-county teams of 8)

Alas Bedfordshire were not represented in this years Garden Cities event. Wardown the club that won the Bedfordshire teams of 8, were unable to field a team for the semi-final.

Lambourne Congress

Good results for Brian & Maureen Stairs plus Alan Cooke & Maris Sheppard.

Brian & Maureen: 2nd Mixed Pairs, 2nd Senior Pairs. Alan & Maris: 6th Senior Pairs. As a team 5th Seniors Teams.

Welsh Seniors Congress

Welsh Seniors Pairs. 1st for the second year in succession, Brian & Rita Keable.

Editor: Baa!

Spring Bank Holiday Congress

Pairs A Final 10th Jon Williams & (David Stevenson), 28th Monica Lucy & Maggie Willis. Pairs B Final. = 13th Ron Davis & (Bill Taylor) Alan Shillitoe & (David Thornton). Swiss Teams 2nd David & Jane Jensen (+Chris & Cath Jagger).

Rivera Congress (Torquay)

Outstanding success for Monica Lucy plus Chris Cook of Hertfordshire, on their debut at pairs, who won the Swiss Pairs from a large field. Alas the trial run in the Swiss teams was less successful.

Berks and Bucks One Day Swiss Teams

Equal second place for Brian & Rita Keable plus Middlesex team mates Brenda & Geoff Foley.

Harrogate Seniors Congress

Monica Lucy & Alan Cooke second in the Swiss teams, 5th in the Pairs final

Editor: I'm sure we have missed someone out, but then life isn't fair is it?

Things that maybe you didn't know?

Useful Downloads

Orange Book 2006:

www.ebu.co.uk/laws_ethics/articles/orangebook/default

New EBU 20B Convention Cards:

www.ebu.co.uk/ecpubdefault.asp?page=Convention+Cards+and+Systems+information

Psyching

After August 1st 2006, the regulation in the last *Orange Book* that a player may not psyche a game-forcing or near game-forcing artificial opening bid no longer applies.

What nationality is a bridge hand with only clubs and spades?

A New Zealander.

What nationality is a bridge hand with only diamonds and hearts?

A (red) Indian.

Contributions to future Bulletins

The editor has been asked by several readers (well principally by Margaret Jones), to include more details of the play from county events. So the next time you go to a county event and see someone play a hand well or you have a play problem, why not write the details up and send them to the Bulletin Editor?

BBA Competitions

Restricted Pairs 2006

Thursday 8 June 06.

The event saw a host of invited pairs who had all done well in either a county event or in their club championships, coming together to play in the last event of the season. The event turned out to be a duck shoot for Wardown players, with the first four pairs being regular or semi-regular members of that club. Powerful winners were David Harris & Jon Williams with a big score, chased by Bill Stanley & Barry Parkins, followed by Richard & Angela Chester. For Jon Williams, no doubt intent on winning the Master Point race once more, a chance not to be missed to put 600 more “blackies” in the annual sack to be sent to the EBU. For the others a chance to win a bottle of scotch (or wine) – well done Bill – or have an evenings bridge amongst their peers. A good attendance from across the county. (Perhaps this explains why Wardown ducked out of the Garden Cities, they’re all pairs players?).

| Pos | Players | Score % | Pos | Players | Score % |
|-----|--|---------|-----|---------------------------------|---------|
| 1 | David Harris & Jon Williams | 66.16 | 16 | Anne & David Gilling | 48.68 |
| 2 | Bill Stanley & Barry Parkins | 62.57 | 17 | John Andrews & Bernard O'Connor | 47.92 |
| 3 | Angela & Richard Chester | 60.02 | 18 | David Woulds & Dominic Connolly | 47.31 |
| 4 | Alan & Saroj Ellis | 58.21 | 19 | Howard Watson & Harry Cook | 46.43 |
| 5 | Monica Lucy & Rita Keable | 57.95 | 20 | Michael Bale & John Neville | 45.28 |
| 6 | Niall Perry & Brian Keable | 57.73 | 21 | Jane & David Jensen | 43.94 |
| 7 | Roger Edmonds & Ron Davis | 57.40 | 22 | Padma Dalvi & Mary Rider | 43.46 |
| 8 | Bert Shiebert & Peter Scott | 55.28 | 23 | Linda Tigwell & Bill Marsden | 42.85 |
| 9 | Bernard & Margaret Eddleston | 54.54 | 24 | Mike Brooke & Ian Brydon | 41.44 |
| 10 | Terry Pearce & Les Calver | 53.68 | 25 | Tony Dyer & Eric Mason | 39.15 |
| 11 | Erika & Tim Sharrock | 53.67 | 26 | Mick Barnett & David Dodds | 31.84 |
| 12 | Glenys Baron & Peter Dunn | 52.13 | 27 | Sheila & Alan Caves | 31.74 |
| 13 | Maureen & Brian Stairs | 52.04 | | | |
| 14 | Alasdair Macrae & Harry Moore | 50.89 | | | |
| 15 | John Hulatt & Steve Gibbs | 48.96 | | | |

Hands for the September Bidding Competition

Hand 3 Dealer South NS Vul Pairs

North: ♠6♥J76♦AQT76♣AKQJ

| | | | |
|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| S | W | N | E |
| 1H | P | 2D | P |
| 2NT ¹ | P | 3C ² | P |
| 3D ³ | P | 3H ⁴ | P |
| 3S ⁵ | P | ? What do you bid now? | |

¹ Bal 15-18 ² 3C Enquiry ³ 15-16

⁴ 3 card heart support ⁵ 4 card spade suit

Hand 4 Dealer North LA Pairs

East: ♠T98♥-♦AKT97♣AK964

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|----|
| N | E | S | W |
| P | 1D | P | 2C |
| P | ? | (a) What do you bid now? | |
| (b) What would you bid playing teams? | | | |

Bedfordshire Teams-of Four League and KO Cup 2006/2007

Incomplete Teams

Any individual or pair who would like to play in the League or Knockout Cup but lacks team-mates can give their name(s) to Richard Chester (07775 716029, richard_chester@yahoo.com) who will put interested parties in touch with each other.

Smoking

The home team shall have the right to rule that there be no smoking inside their venue. At a venue where smoking is allowed there shall continue to be one non-smoking room, unless the away team agrees to waive this restriction.

Mementoes

Mementoes for Cup and League will be awarded to all members of a team who have played in at least four matches in the league and at least two matches in the Cup.

Knockout Cup Rules

Status of Dual Members

The Association Rules and Regulations state that a Dual Member cannot play in the Knockout Cup unless he or she was a full member in the previous season. Failure to adhere to this rule may result in a team being disqualified from the Knockout Cup.

Pachabo Cup Entry

The winning Knockout team will be invited to represent Bedfordshire in the Pachabo Cup, an inter-County multiple teams competition usually held in June. Any team wishing to play in the Pachabo Cup should ensure that all its players are nominated at the beginning of the season. It is not permitted to add players to a team after the end of the Knockout Cup. Should the winning team not be able to field four players for the Pachabo Cup owing to illness or unavailability, the prevailing EBU rules for adding players from the losing finalists will be implemented. The current rules permit the incomplete winners to add players from the losing finalists, to make up their team to four, five or six players.



Bedfordshire Teams-of Four League and KO Cup 2006/2007

League Entry

League Fee £20 per Team

| |
|---------------------|
| Captain |
| Address |
| |
| |
| Telephone No |
| Email Address |
| Player 2 |
| Player 3 |
| Player 4 |
| Player 5 |
| Player 6 |
| Team Name |
| Usual Home Venue(s) |

KO Cup Entry

KO Cup Fee £10 per Team

| |
|---------------------|
| Captain |
| Address |
| |
| |
| Telephone No |
| Email Address |
| Player 2 |
| Player 3 |
| Player 4 |
| Player 5 |
| Player 6 |
| Team Name |
| Usual Home Venue(s) |

Please send this form with the entry fee(s) to:

Richard Chester, 4 Dane Street Cottages, Nr Chiltern Green, LUTON, LU2 8PE

Tel: 01582 726310, 07775 716029 Email: richard_chester@yahoo.com

Cheques to be made payable to: 'Bedfordshire Bridge Association'

At least four and no more than six players must be nominated at the time of entry. Captains must ensure that all players have paid their BBA subscriptions before playing a match. Closing date for entries: 31st July 2006