

6 Duff Place, Deakin, ACT 2600 Tel: 02 6282 2382; Fax: 02 6282 2213 manager@canberrabridgeclub.com.au

President's Message

One of our members who plays regularly in the Wednesday night duplicate made a comment at the annual Teams of Three event held recently which gave me food for thought. She expressed her delight at discovering the joys and challenges of teams bridge.

Many bridge players choose to play a regular session because it is convenient in relation to other aspects of their lives. As a consequence, they are only exposed to the form of the game offered by that particular session.

On page 2 of this Bulletin our Tournament Secretary, Daniel Geromboux, outlines many forms of bridge as well as the diverse range of movements and scoring methods. This article will certainly whet your appetite for some different forms of this fascinating game.

I suggest that you look at the Club Calendar and talk to Sean or Judith to work out the best way to sample some of these formats.

Happy Bridging

Julia Hoffman

Thank You

The Youth Team thanks Club members for their generous support for its fundraising efforts July 2004 Editor: Earl Dudley dudleves@webone.com.au



At the CBC

Griffin Trophy

Commencing on 26 July and running for 4 consecutive Monday evenings

Play with a different partner each night with 3 out of 4 scores counting

Egon Larsen Pairs

Commencing on 23 August and running for 4 consecutive Monday evenings

Winter Butler Pairs

Commencing on 22 July and running for 3 consecutive Thursday evenings. Best two scores count.

Nationwide Pairs (as part of the usual walk-in)

Friday, 25 July 7.30 p.m - pre-dealt boards with hand records. Green masterpoints awarded on local results, with red points awarded on good results when combined with those of other clubs. Results can be viewed on-line. Table money for the evening is \$6 for all-comers.

Table Fee Change for Non-members.

For the sessions with a flat rate for table money (that is, Tuesday and Friday afternoons and Friday night) a surcharge of \$2 will be charged for non-Canberra Bridge Club members.

If you have a non-member friend who plays occasionally please tell them! Note that from July 1 the club subscription for the rest of 2004 is \$30.



Types of Bridge Movements

Daniel Geromboux

Matchpoint pairs: This is the style of bridge played in normal club sessions. Your score is compared with each other score obtained on a board and you get 2 points for each score you beat and 1 point for each score you tie. Your score is then converted to a percentage to make it easy to read.

<u>Teams</u>: This is a form of bridge where you play in a team of 4, 5 or 6. However, only 4 players participate in any one match.

Your NS pair plays on one table against an EW pair while your EW pair plays the same boards against the other team's NS pair. Your scores on each board are then compared and various forms of scoring can be used (see below):

- <u>IMP's:</u> This is the most common form of Teams scoring. The difference between the two scores is converted on the IMP scale. The scale is designed to reduce the impact of a large score achieved on a single board on the result of the match.
- **VP's:** This is a scale used to convert IMP results from a match. It is designed to reduce the impact of excessive results from a lucky/unlucky single match on the overall results of the whole event.
- **Board-a-Match (or Point-a-Board):** In this form of teams you get 2 points on each board if your score is better than the one your opponents holding your cards at the other table scored, 1 point for a flat board, and zero points for a worse score. Think of it as teams with pairs scoring.

Total Points: As the name implies, you just add up all your scores and the winner is the pair or team with the highest amount. This is virtually an obsolete form of scoring. It is hardly ever used anymore.

Butler: This is an IMPs form of scoring for pairs events, for which the strategy is the same as normal teams events. The scores are obtained across the room, including yours, with the top and bottom ones eliminated to reduce effects of silly results. The remaining scores are then averaged to produce a datum. You compare your score with this datum and convert to IMPs.

<u>Cross-imps</u>: This is another IMPs form of scoring for pairs events where you get an IMP score against every other score in the room.

Individual: In an individual you play a few boards with many different partners. It is a good way to play with players who you ordinarily wouldn't get a chance to partner. A sense of humour is important because differences in styles and systems tend to lead to disasters. It is usually scored similarly to matchpoint pairs.

Mitchell: A movement where NS stay seated, EW move up one table every round and boards move down one. It works only for odd numbers of tables.

Skip Mitchell: A modification of the Mitchell movement for an even number of tables. Halfway through the movement the EW pairs simply move an extra table.

<u>Relay Mitchell:</u> A different modification of a Mitchell movement for an even number of tables. Each round, one set of boards is out of play on a "relay" table. Meanwhile, two tables at the opposite end of the room share boards throughout each round of the session.

Howell: A movement where all pairs play against all other pairs and all boards. Only one pair remains stationary while the others all move. Used for smaller numbers of tables, or to have a shorter sit-out, or to provide a single winner.

<u>Swiss</u>: This is when a new draw is allocated every round based on the results so far. 1st plays against 2nd, 3rd plays 4th, etc. If however these people have played each other before then the draw is modified until no repeat matches occur. Swiss draws can operate for both teams and pairs.

<u>Round-Robin:</u> This is where each team will play against every other team.

Barometer: This is the term for a pairs movement where everyone plays the same boards at the same time. Scores are available shortly after the conclusion of each round.

<u>Medley:</u> This is a teams event where you partner all three of your team-mates, one third of the time each.



Barry Turner

RichardHills

Some of the more recent members of the Canberra Bridge Club may not know why the primary room of the club is named the Barry Turner Room and why one of the important club championships is the Barry Turner Teams.

Barry Turner served for many years as an indefatigable treasurer and volunteer for the ACT Bridge Association (as BFACT was then known). Unfortunately, while he was conducting maintenance on the roof of our club, he fell off, suffering severe injuries, and was invalided to his original home in Perth to live with his relatives.

After his death some years later, it was revealed that he had willed a substantial sum of money to the ACT Bridge Association, for the purpose of establishing a trust fund to assist official ACT representatives to compete in the annual Interstate Teams competitions.

Barry Turner was endearingly idiosyncratic and eccentric. Canberra Bridge Club stalwart Brian Thorp relates:

"Did I ever tell you my Barry Turner story? He and I were partners at one stage and on one occasion a board was passed in when we had game on. I asked Barry why he hadn't opened on his 16 HCP. "Oh, it was a terrible 16", he said.

Editor: Barry will be long remembered with a great deal of fondness. Not only did he serve with distinction as the Association treasurer for many years he worked tirelessly in a voluntary capacity to make improvements to the clubrooms for the benefits of all members.

He only played occasionally but was no mug with the cards despite some strange ideas on bidding that Brian discovered.

His devillish sense of humour is illustrated by the following bidding problems published in the December 1971 newsletter of the ACT Bridge Club. Question 1: What would you have done?

Your hand is:

▲KQ9854
♥A3
◆J2
◆532

Your partner opens 2 (Acol – strong). You bid 2 as you have enough for a positive response. Partner bids 3 (natural) and you bid 3 and partner bids 4. You now know that partner has a minor two suiter and doesn't like spades. If he has a void in spades you don't want to play in 4 nor 5, when 6 or 6may well be on. Certainly, if you now bid 4partner may not go on.

So you bid a Blackwood 4NT. You will bid $6 \clubsuit$ if partner has two aces. Partner oblingingly bids $5 \bigstar$. He has the $\bigstar A$. You bid 5NT and partner bids $6 \bigstar$. So you bid $7 \bigstar$ and make it since the $\bigstar J$ and the $\bigstar T$ are doubleton.

Question 2: What would you have bid?

Partner opens 1 ▲ and you hold:

λ ♥K AK9753 **AKT86**

What do you do? What slam is on? You want to know if partner has the ♥A and one of the minor suit queens. There could be 19 HCP missing.

For the moment, you bid $3 \blacklozenge$. Partner is obviously not impressed and rebids $3 \blacklozenge$. You bid $4 \clubsuit$ and partner, still not impressed, bids $4 \blacklozenge$.

So you are stumped. You can only rebid $6 \bigstar$ now. If that goes down and $6 \bigstar$ is a makeable contract, you can blame partner for failing to support you.

Partner's hand is of course the hand in question 1. At one table in the Association's Restricted Teams, the spade hand was passed by the second bidder and was opened at the other table. Which partner of the opening bidder had the harder task?



Trip to the VCC

David Wawn

Richard Brightling, Ian Thomson, David Hoffman and I decided to head to the Victor Champion Cup in Melbourne over the June long weekend to acclimatise to Melbourne conditions. Yes, it rained and squalled all weekend and so we're ready for the ANC.

Some lead problems from the VCC.

You hear 2 passes and so you open 3♣. LHO bids 3♥, RHO bids 3NT and partner doubles. What do you lead?

▲K98
♥ 3
♦ 42
♣JT87532

I went looking for partner's suit with the $\clubsuit 8$. Wrong! Declarer could continue spades and had the communication to end up with 3 spades, 3 hearts, a diamond and 2 clubs. If I lead the $\checkmark 3$, we get it off.

2004 VCC

Session: 8, Board: 19 EW Vulnerable, Dealer: South



(Editor: Maybe but not if declarer wins and plays a club at trick 2. Of course this requires a specific distribution of the club suit and for declarer to have an active imagination. If declarer tackles diamonds at trick 2, which is likely, the defence will succeed if North ducks the first spade.) Next hand: You are South and hold:

▲ K94
∀ J72
♦ 87654
₽ QT

Bidding

West	North	East	South
-	1 🛦	Х	2♥*
3+	4 🔶	4 🗸	Pass
Pass	4♠	Pass	Pass
5 🗸	Х	All Pass	

* 2 v shows 3 spades, 5-12 points.

Stylistically jumps to the 4 level are splinters.

What do you lead?

David Hoffman found the best lead of the \diamond 8. I ruffed and underled a spade to get another diamond ruff for two off. Results across the field varied with some teams suffering double game swings where $4 \checkmark$ and $4 \bigstar$ made each way.

2004 VCC Session: 9, Board: 13 All Vulnerable, Dealer: North



A Simple Quiz (answer on last page)

What would you call with the following hand (Nil vulnerable, IMPs)

(a) if it is your opening bid?

- (b) if the opponent on your right opens 1♣?
 ▲AQT752
 ♦AK8
 - ♦K5

A mid-game lead problem.

Your RHO opened 1NT in second seat, you doubled, and all passed (the opponents were not playing SWINE).

You lead the A and see

- **▲8**53
- **∀**T5
- ◆ T762
- **♣**T964
- ▲J2
 ♥K843
 ◆AQ8
 ◆AKJ3

Partner discourages, you switch to a heart and partner's \checkmark Q is taken by the \checkmark A. Declarer returns a heart which you duck to the \checkmark T. A low club is run to your \clubsuit J and you cash the \clubsuit K and partners signals for a diamond. How do you continue?

Partner continued $\diamond A$, $\diamond Q$ and I, sitting North, thought this play showed a doubleton. So I overtook and had to concede a diamond to dummy in the end game. My fear in overtaking was that I may not otherwise enjoy my diamonds. With my having signalled diamonds, I believe partner needs to play the $\diamond Q$, then the $\diamond A$ and then low. This way I can't go wrong.

2004 VCC Session: 13, Board: 7 All Vulnerable, Dealer: North



This board swung the final result. We had done badly in the third last match, lucked a weaker team in the second last match and scored a 21-9 win to draw leaders Klinger in the last round.

For some strange reason, the organisers decided that Klinger's yellow transfer opening system and our Polish Club would make more sense to Bridge Base's Vugraph audience than Acol and Standard at the other table.

The final was tight until this lead problem.

Klinger held:

★K986
♥Q864
◆T73
◆97

He heard $1 \clubsuit$ from his partner, $1 \blacklozenge$ from his RHO (Hoffman), $1 \bigstar$ from his LHO (me) and 3NT from his RHO to end the auction.

What did he lead? In their system 1 & was completely ambiguous. It could be any balanced weak hand, even if it had a 5 card major, or strong options.

Klinger led the **v**4 and this was a disaster.

2004 VCC Session: 10, Board: 25 EW Vulnerable. Dealer: North



Neil won the ♥A and switched to clubs, which David eventually won, came to the ♥K and ran diamonds. When they broke, he had his game. The same contract was two off on a club lead and 13 imps to us. There were some other interesting hands in the event.

I have never seen an auction with 2 splinters in it before.

2004 VCC

Session: 7, Board: 3 EW Vulnerable, Dealer: South



David opened $1 \blacklozenge$, I bid $2\clubsuit$, David rebid his diamonds and so I splintered with $3\heartsuit$. David then counter-splintered with $4\clubsuit$ and I bid $6\blacklozenge$.

A trump or heart lead or \bigstar A lead and diamond or heart continuation will take it off, but when David got \bigstar A lead and club switch, he was able to ruff out the clubs for 12 tricks.

Some good distributional hands emerged

2004 VCC Session: 8, Board: 28 NS Vulnerable, Dealer: West



I stuffed up and didn't show a big two suiter and so played in $6 \blacklozenge$ rather than $6 \blacklozenge$. How

would you bid this after a distributional weak opening from West?

How do you bid your 6/6 hands?

2004 VCC Session: 2, Board: 21 NS Vulnerable, Dealer: North



I opened $2 \clubsuit$, one option for which was a weak 4+/4+ in the majors. Partner bid $2 \blacklozenge$ showing equal length or one more spade than hearts. So I leapt to $4 \bigstar$. An obscure defence will beat it. On a trump lead, West must insert the $\bigstar J$ but it made normally.

Our 18-12 victory over Klinger in the last round drew us level with them and one other team in second place. Despite losing in the last round, the Kiwi team of Ware snuck through to win by a VP.

Results

State Open Pairs

FINAL: Arjuna Delivera – Ian Thomson PLATE: Karen Creet – Judith Tobin

Open Butler: Michael Cullen – Peter Kahler

Womens' Butler: Nola Church – Julia Hoffman

Matchpoint Pairs: Tony Kershaw – Paul Sullivan

Barry Turner Teams: David Vaughan, Roy Nixon, Steve Hurley, Richard Hills, Hashmat Ali

Von der Pahlen Mixed Butler Pairs: Anne Powell, Richard Brightling

Problem from Last Issue

2004 Open Trials Qualifying Session: 4; Board: 1 Nil Vulnerable; Dealer: North



The standard contract is 4. I challenged readers to test their skills on the following:

- On the lead of the *J, declarer drew trumps and tackled clubs. How can EW defeat the contract?
- On the lead of the *J, how can declarer make 4 on best defence?
- How can EW defeat 4 ▲ regardless of declarer's line of play?

The first question: East switched to a heart on winning the $\clubsuit Q$. Declarer won in dummy and now needed to get to his hand with a diamond in order to ruff a club to set up the 5th club for the 10th trick.

Declarer ran the \blacklozenge J and I fell from grace by winning the \blacklozenge A. If I had ducked, declarer would have been in trouble. Declarer can exit with the \blacklozenge K but I simply cash the \blacklozenge K and play a third heart (a "ruff and sluff") to triumph.

Declarer can succeed on the \clubsuit J lead by drawing only two rounds of trumps before tackling clubs. East cannot gain by playing the 4th club to promote a trump winner because declarer discards a heart loser. On winning the \checkmark A declarer can play a 3rd trump to return to hand, ruff a club and set up a diamond winner.

To defeat 4♠ regardless of declarer's line of play, West must lead a heart initially. Now declarer cannot delay drawing three rounds of trumps before tackling clubs.

Bridge Tip

Earl Dudley

Avoid Being too Sophisticated in Competitive Bidding

The following hand from Round 2 of the Knock-out Teams illustrates the dangers of excessive sophistication in the bidding of hands, particularly in contested auctions.

East- West held the following hands at unfavourable vulnerabilty:

▲ 954	▲ A3
♥KT4	♥ 982
♦JT	♦ AKQ962
♣AQJT6	* 75

Bidding

	-		
West	North	East	South
-	-	1 •	Pass
2*	Х	3 🔶	Pass
3 🗸	Pass	3♠	Х
Pass	Pass	4 🔶	All Pass

In theory, the East-West bidding cannot be criticised. The first two bids were standard and when North doubled to show both majors, East rebid 3 ◆ to suggest a hand with good playing strength but modest defensive values (or else East would have redoubled).

West's rebid of $3 \checkmark$ showed values in hearts and invited East to rebid 3NT with a spade stopper. East then rebid $3 \bigstar$ to show the $\bigstar A$ and suggest that West bid 3NT (this would have been particularly useful if West held the $\bigstar Q$).

South was itching to tell his partner which of her two four card majors to lead should West declare in 3NT. East's bid of 3 A presented the opportunity.

3NT fails on a spade lead since the club finesse loses but makes on a heart lead from North as it did at the other table. The $4 \bullet$ contract failed.

To avoid the disaster that befell EW, West must bid 3NT immediately in response to East's rebid of $3 \blacklozenge$. Sure – the spade suit could be wide open but the failure of NS to compete at favourable vulnerability suggests that they have a 4-4 or 4-3 fit. The point is that 3NT figures to be reasonable once East rebids $3 \blacklozenge$. Why not bid it as quickly as possible?

Bridge Survey

Thanks to the small number of readers who completed the survey of reader preferences that appeared in the March 2004 Bulletin. The results of the survey are summarised below:

Content of the Bulletin	Average Rating *	Proportion of Responses Nominating Item as No 1 (most desired)
Serious articles on hands played by Club members illustrating points of technique in bidding play or defence	1.8	62
Information pieces to help the average player	1.8	46
Bridge tips	1.8	38
Letters to the editor	2.0	38
Articles on recent hands played by Club members illustrating unusual happenings (large penalties etc)	2.0	31
Club news (forthcoming events, clubroom maintenance etc)	2.1	31
Articles dealing with issues relating to the conduct of bridge (eg, claims, rudeness at the table)	2.4	15
Interviews with bridge personalities (at all levels of bridge) with a focus on revealing aspects of life outside of bridge	2.4	15
Quizzes (eg, double dummy problems)	2.5	15
Photos	2.8	23
Humorous articles	2.9	15
Social news	3.1	8
Material appearing in other publications	3.2	8

* A rating of 1 = most desired, 5 = least desired

As a result of the survey, I will continue to ensure that your Bulletin will have a lot of original material on bridge played at the Club or by Club members, which illustrates points of technique in bidding play or defence. I will be happy to publish suitable letters to the editor if I receive any.

Answer to the Simple Quiz on Page 4:

You would call the director of course. You only have 12 cards!

Be Considerate!

All members are asked to show consideration for their fellow players and the Club's cards and table cloths if eating at the table. Commonsense should be used to ensure only appropriate foods are brought to the table.

Entertainment Books for June 2004 - June 2005.

Anne Pettigrew has again organised a supply of the popular Entertainment Books. There is now a sample copy in the foyer, for you to look at. Last year Anne raised \$400 for the Club through the sale of the books. It doesn't take long to recoup the \$50 cost of the book through the use of the discounts. Please see Anne or Judith to order your book.