



South African Mixed Trials

Bulletin: Number 11

AND THEN THERE WERE EIGHT!

Congratulations to all the pairs who made the top eight! Terry and Jan East are still in 1st position with a solid 138.25 VPs, while the other pairs who were in the top 4 have swapped around with Larry Chemaly and Sharon Lang in 2nd place with 132.47 VPs and Duncan Keet and Carol Stanton a very close 3rd with 131.64 VPs. Glen Holman and Michele Alexander with 123.82 VPs are 4th but we all know how quickly things can change! It is longer board matches in the final rounds but we all realise how expensive just one board can prove to be!

Commiserations to Lex van Vught and Rita Gawron, Jude Apteker and Zela Stern, Brian Pincus and Maureen Narunsky and Imtiaz Kaprey and Jill Rabie who missed the cut, and perhaps especially to Lex and Rita who just missed finishing 8th by the narrowest of margins (.43 VPs). They had a finishing total of 95.56 VPs behind Paul Reynolds and Erica Zimet with 95.99 VPs. Lucky Paul and Erica!

Everyone was very happy with Steve Bunker's slick organisation of the Qualifying Rounds and compliments on the SABF Mixed Trials WhatsApp group were plentiful and well deserved. Players were happy too with arrangements at both the Johannesburg and Cape Town centres and Thank You's were extended to the monitors and catering folk and all the helpers.

As always, I say Good Luck to all the Finalists!



Deirdre Ingersent



Just 3 JHB based players have survived through to the finals. The Links is about to get a lot bigger for those 3...

Behind the Scenes

Steve Bunker has done a remarkable job organising the SA trials. While many have expressed their appreciation, I don't believe they really understand what goes into organising an event such as this.

Below he shares with us his experience:

"It's all in the planning but mostly in the execution!" laughs the organiser out loud, an ardent believer in the 6 Ps rule.

Here's what the checklist looked like with one match to go in the MIXED Qualifiers:

														MIXED									
Date	Match	UK start time	SA start time	BOARDS & HAND RECORDS				Files				Tournaments			Tourney ended								
				Qty	BRD File	HR File	Dealt	Boards uploaded	Include List	Seating Plan	Results sheet	Created	Boards linked	Include list loaded	Seating uploaded	IMPS results saved	Converted to VPs	Penalties imposed	Results to Whatsapp	Results to web	HR to web	BBO Data Link added	
Sun 05-May	1	9:00 AM	10:00	12	BDMIXQ01	HR_MIXED_Q1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	n/a	Y	Y	Y	Y
	2	10:30 AM	11:30	12	BDMIXQ02	HR_MIXED_Q2	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	n/a	Y	Y	Y	Y
	3	1:30 PM	14:30	12	BDMIXQ03	HR_MIXED_Q3	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	n/a	Y	Y	Y	Y
	4	3:00 PM	16:00	12	BDMIXQ04	HR_MIXED_Q4	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	n/a	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mon 06-May	5	9:00 AM	10:00	12	BDMIXQ05	HR_MIXED_Q5	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	n/a	Y	Y	Y	Y
	6	10:30 AM	11:30	12	BDMIXQ06	HR_MIXED_Q6	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	n/a	Y	Y	Y	Y
	7	1:30 PM	14:30	12	BDMIXQ06	HR_MIXED_Q6	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	n/a	Y	Y	Y	Y
	8	3:00 PM	16:00	12	BDMIXQ07	HR_MIXED_Q7	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	n/a	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tue 07-May	9	9:00 AM	10:00	12	BDMIXQ08	HR_MIXED_Q8	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	n/a	Y	Y	Y	Y
	10	10:30 AM	11:30	12	BDMIXQ09	HR_MIXED_Q9	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	n/a	Y	Y	Y	Y
	11	1:30 PM	14:30	12	BDMIXQ11	HR_MIXED_Q11	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y										
Wed 08-May	1	9:00 AM	10:00	16	BDMIXF01	HR_MIXED_F1	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y										
	2	11:00 AM	12:00	16	BDMIXF02	HR_MIXED_F2	Y	Y				Y	Y										
	3	2:30 PM	15:30	16	BDMIXF03	HR_MIXED_F3	Y	Y				Y	Y										
Thu 09-May	4	9:00 AM	10:00	16	BDMIXF04	HR_MIXED_F4	Y	Y				Y	Y										
	5	11:00 AM	12:00	16	BDMIXF05	HR_MIXED_F5	Y	Y				Y	Y										
	6	2:30 PM	15:30	16	BDMIXF06	HR_MIXED_F6	Y	Y				Y	Y										
Fri 10-May	7	9:00 AM	10:00	16	BDMIXF07	HR_MIXED_F7	Y	Y				Y	Y										

When these trials are over, they will have comprised 54 individual BBO tournaments with a total of 488 pre-dealt boards. Using their BBO Names, players will have been pre-seated correctly no fewer than 1,040 times!

Prior Proper Planning Prevents Poor Performance.

I think this is remarkable.

- Bernard Donde

MIXED PAIRS QUALIFIERS – RESULTS BY ROUND

Players	Rank	TOTAL VPs	Round 1		Round 2		Round 3		Round 4		Round 5		Round 6		Round 7		Round 8		Round 9		Round 10		Round 11		Win	Draw	Lose
			IMPS	VPs	IMPS	VPs	IMPS	VPs	IMPS	VPs	IMPS	VPs	IMPS	VPs	IMPS	VPs	IMPS	VPs	IMPS	VPs	IMPS	VPs	IMPS	VPs			
Terry East & Jan East	1	138.25	4	11.38	3	11.05	9	12.90	0	10.00	20	15.58	19	15.37	16	14.70	0	10.00	-5	8.30	10	13.18	21	15.79	8	2	1
Larry Chemaly & Sharon Lang	2	132.47	33	17.86	29	17.24	16	14.70	-16	5.30	20	15.58	4	11.38	-16	5.30	-9	7.10	18	15.15	-16	5.30	31	17.56	7	0	4
Duncan Keet & Carol Stanton	3	131.64	28	17.08	-4	8.62	24	16.37	0	10.00	-20	4.42	23	16.18	-39	1.34	33	17.86	5	11.70	24	16.37	5	11.70	7	1	3
Glen Holman & Michele Alexander	4	123.82	6	12.01	26	16.73	39	18.66	2	10.71	-9	7.10	-19	4.63	39	18.66	-3	8.95	-18	4.85	9	12.90	-4	8.62	6	0	5
Phil King & Merle Bracher	5	117.07	10	13.18	-2	9.29	13	13.97	16	14.70	9	12.90	-16	5.30	-11	6.55	8	12.61	-5	8.30	-10	6.82	11	13.45	6	0	5
Peter Ward & Merle Modlin	6	110.29	-33	2.14	2	10.71	-24	3.63	-2	9.29	2	10.71	12	13.71	11	13.45	0	10.00	15	14.46	19	15.37	-10	6.82	6	1	4
Andre Van Niekerk & Rose Duff	7	105.97	25	16.55	4	11.38	-16	5.30	-1	9.64	-20	4.42	-3	8.95	1	10.36	-8	7.39	5	11.70	-9	7.10	10	13.18	5	0	6
Paul Reynolds & Erica Zimet	8	95.99	-25	3.45	-3	8.95	-39	1.34	-5	8.30	-2	9.29	-23	3.82	41	18.90	18	15.15	-15	5.54	16	14.70	-11	6.55	3	0	8
Lex Van Vught & Rita Gawron	9	95.56	-10	6.82	-29	2.76	-9	7.10	23	16.18	2	10.71	-12	6.29	-1	9.64	-33	2.14	18	15.15	-8	7.39	4	11.38	4	0	7
Jude Apteker & Zela Stern	10	93.84	-28	2.92	2	10.71	-9	7.10	5	11.70	-2	9.29	3	11.05	-26	3.27	3	11.05	5	11.70	8	12.61	-31	2.44	6	0	5
Brian Pincus & Maureen Narunsky	11	88.73	-4	8.62	-26	3.27	9	12.90	1	10.36	-9	7.10	16	14.70	-41	1.10	9	12.90	-18	4.85	-19	4.63	-5	8.30	4	0	7
Imtiaz Kaprey & Jill Rabie	12	86.37	-6	7.99	-2	9.29	-13	6.03	-23	3.82	9	12.90	-4	8.62	26	16.73	-18	4.85	-5	8.30	-24	3.63	-21	4.21	2	0	9

CARRY OVER & CALCULATIONS

Players	Rank	TOTAL VPs	Deduct VPs	Sub Total	Reduce by 25%	Carry over	New Rank
Terry East & Jan East	1	138.25	-48.37	89.88	-22.47	67.41	1
Larry Chemaly & Sharon Lang	2	132.47	-53.28	79.19	-19.80	59.39	2
Glen Holman & Michele Alexander	4	123.82	-46.31	77.51	-19.38	58.13	3
Phil King & Merle Bracher	5	117.07	-41.74	75.33	-18.83	56.50	4
Duncan Keet & Carol Stanton	3	131.64	-63.01	68.63	-17.16	51.47	5
Andre Van Niekerk & Rose Duff	7	105.97	-40.65	65.32	-16.33	48.99	6
Peter Ward & Merle Modlin	6	110.29	-50.50	59.79	-14.95	44.84	7
Paul Reynolds & Erica Zimet	8	95.99	-51.64	44.35	-11.09	33.26	8

DAY 3 – MATCH SCHEDULE

Wed 08-May 10:00	1	1	KEET, Duncan	STANTON, Carol	MODLIN, Merle	WARD, Peter
		2	EAST, Terry	EAST, Jan	ALEXANDER, Michele	HOLMAN, Glen
		3	KING, Phil	BRACHER, Merle	LANG, Sharon	CHEMALY, Larry
		4	VAN NIEKERK, Andre	DUFF, Rose	ZIMET, Erica	REYNOLDS, Paul

Wed 08-May 12:00	2	1	KEET, Duncan	STANTON, Carol	BRACHER, Merle	KING, Phil
		2	HOLMAN, Glen	ALEXANDER, Michele	ZIMET, Erica	REYNOLDS, Paul
		3	VAN NIEKERK, Andre	DUFF, Rose	EAST, Jan	EAST, Terry
		4	CHEMALY, Larry	LANG, Sharon	MODLIN, Merle	WARD, Peter

Wed 08-May 15:30	3	1	KEET, Duncan	STANTON, Carol	DUFF, Rose	VAN NIEKERK, Andre
		2	REYNOLDS, Paul	ZIMET, Erica	MODLIN, Merle	WARD, Peter
		3	CHEMALY, Larry	LANG, Sharon	ALEXANDER, Michele	HOLMAN, Glen
		4	EAST, Terry	EAST, Jan	BRACHER, Merle	KING, Phil

Points Schmoints

D	N	W	N	E	S
5	♠ KQ86 ♥ 42 ♦ KQJ1042 ♣ 8	♠ 103 ♥ K3 ♦ A63 ♣ KQJ1097	♠ 1♦ P 1♥ 2♣ 2♦ P P 3♣ P P P	♠ J94 ♥ Q10875 ♦ 75 ♣ A42	♠ A752 ♥ AJ96 ♦ 98 ♣ 653
		3♣ W		NS: 0 EW: 0	

3♦N+1	130	4.00
4♦N=	130	4.00
4♣W-1	50	1.60
5♠N-1	-100	-3.20
3♣W=	-110	-3.20
3♣W=	-110	-3.20

Looking at the recap sheet, 2 pairs allowed their opponents to play in 3♣. The North hand is minimum with only 11 HCP, but it is a hand with great trick taking potential. If partner only has the J♠, we are likely to take at least 7 tricks. The two Norths who passed 3♣ failed to recognize that despite having a bare minimum opening, the hand could take a lot of tricks. In addition, the hand is poor in trick taking ability if playing in clubs. Unfortunately, it is ingrained by most bridge teachers that point count should guide your bidding, when in reality it is trick taking ability that should be your beacon. Marty Bergen wrote a book, 'Points Schmoints!' that is worth reading, examining this topic.

33 HCP for Slam?

2	D	N impalaphil ♠ AJ10 ♥ KQ53 ♦ K93 ♣ AK5	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%;"></td> <td style="width: 10%; background-color: #ff0000; color: white; text-align: center;">N</td> <td style="width: 10%;"></td> <td style="width: 10%; background-color: #ff0000; color: white; text-align: center;">E</td> <td style="width: 10%;"></td> <td style="width: 10%; background-color: #ff0000; color: white; text-align: center;">S</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">1♣</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">P</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1♥</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">P</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">1NT</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">P</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6NT</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">P</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">P</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">P</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		N		E		S						1♣	P	1♥		P		1NT	P	6NT		P		P	P					
	N		E		S																												
					1♣																												
P	1♥		P		1NT																												
P	6NT		P		P																												
P																																	
W Dunx		♠ 986 ♥ J7 ♦ A10762 ♣ J106	E carol2007 ♠ 732 ♥ 10984 ♦ Q5 ♣ 9742																														
		S stacey31 ♠ KQ54 ♥ A62 ♦ J84 ♣ Q83	6NT S NS: 0 EW: 0																														

2nd hand out the box today demonstrated an important principle in bidding. North was faced with a decision when partner showed a balanced hand with 12-14 HCP. He knew his side had a minimum of 32 HCP. I clearly remember advice from a doyen of South African Bridge, Dougie Ettlinger. He said when both hands are balanced, you actually need 34 HCP to make a slam and this is borne out by this hand. To make 12 tricks, you need the A♦ onside and hearts breaking 3-3 – very poor odds. Sven Bjerregaard, a Swedish international who lived in Cape Town for some years, gave me another tip which I found interesting. He said there is no such thing as a quantitative raise inviting 7NT. 5NT is just a very strong invite to 6NT and may be passed. Maybe this is the right hand for that bid?

An interesting thing happened at the featured table. Duncan Keet led the 6♦ underleading the Ace! This is a very unusual play and it looks clear for declarer to duck and hope that the opening lead is from the queen. However, Merle Bracher, (Stacey31), has played against Duncan before and went up smartly with the King. Unfortunately, hearts did not break so she had to go 1 down.

Those pairs who appreciated the very balanced nature of the North hand were rewarded with 5.2 imps when they bid a disciplined 4NT on the same auction.

bkpsc	moremo	kimeden	lexvan	6NS=	1440	15.40
peter3202	merl66	rix181	horace1	4NS+1	660	5.20
imtiazi	JillyRabz	tarankaur	InTime	4NS+1	660	5.20
teeast	SweetieE	sternz	judeap	6NS-1	-100	-8.60
larryc777	sharrie	lady macb	glensa	6NS-1	-100	-8.60
impalaphil	stacey31	carol2007	Dunx	6NS-1	-100	-8.60

Imaginative Bidding

N larryc777

♠ A543
♥ AKJ7
♦ A4
♣ K42

After 3 passes Larry Chemaly opened 1♣ and heard partner respond 1♦. The next hand made a takeout double. Before reading on, decide what you would do with Larry's hand.

Most people play that redouble is a support double showing 3 card support for partner's suit so that was off the table. I believe that the majority of players would bid 2NT with the above hand without giving it much further thought, but Larry found a brilliant bid. He said **PASS** and look what happened next:

The defence to 1NTx was merciless and they beat the contract by 3 earning +800. Larry's reasoning was excellent. There is plenty of time to bid NT and he was rewarded when opponents bid 1NT (note if he can make 3NT, opponents will be at least 3 down in 1NT). On this hand the field got to 3NT and most went down. His imaginative pass earned him 12.2 imps.

<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;">6 D</div>		N larryc777 ♠ A543 ♥ AKJ7 ♦ A4 ♣ K42	W N E S P P P P P 1♣ P 1♦ X P 1NT P P X P P P
		W glensa ♠ KQ92 ♥ 10852 ♦ KQ3 ♣ 73	E lady macb ♠ J7 ♥ 64 ♦ 10752 ♣ QJ1085
		S sharrie ♠ 1086 ♥ Q93 ♦ J986 ♣ A96	1NTx E NS: 0 EW: 0

larryc777	sharrie	lady macb	glensa	1NxE-3	800	12.20
impalaphil	stacey31	carol2007	Dunx	3NN=	400	6.20
peter3202	merl66	rix181	horace1	3NN-1	-50	-4.60
teeast	SweetieE	sternz	judeap	3NN-1	-50	-4.60
bkpsc	moremo	kimeden	lexvan	3NN-1	-50	-4.60
imtiaz1	JillyRabz	tarankaur	InTime	3NN-1	-50	-4.60

As an aside, East should realise that 1NT will be hopeless with a maximum of 14-15 HCP between the 2 hands and should consider taking out to 2C. The East hand may make 3 tricks playing in clubs and may end up making zero tricks playing in NT.

4th Suit Forcing

The field did not manage to come to grips with the issues surrounding this hand. There are several points of interest:

1. How do we show 5-5 in the remaining suits forcing and non-forcing after partner shows the other 2 suits. A common agreement is that a jump in the second suit (i.e. 3♥) shows 5-5 invitational and repeat of the 4th suit shows 5-5 forcing. If that is your agreement, East should bid 4♣ as a cue bid agreeing hearts with slam interest and the excellent heart slam would be reached.

<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;">10^D</div>		N larryc777		W N E S			
		♠ 1064	♥ J94	♦ 1086	♣ Q1083	1♠ P	2♣ P
W judeap		E sternz					
♠ KJ732		♠ A					
♥ AKQ62		♥ 1073					
♦ J2		♦ KQ743					
♣ 7		♣ AK54					
		S sharrie					
		♠ Q985					
		♥ 85					
		♦ A95					
		♣ J962					
				3NT E		NS: 0 EW: 0	

2. How forcing is 4th suit forcing? I believe that

unless you are a very experienced partnership that discusses regularly, you should play 4th suit forcing to game. I have no doubt that whatever you decide, if partner rebids 2NT to a 4th suit forcing, this should be 100% forcing. You need to give partner room to describe why he has gone 4th suit. There are many hand types that go 4th suit. It could be a hand with long strong spades, game forcing hands with diamond or club support, a hand with a game forcing 5-5 shape or a hand just looking for some help in the heart suit. You need to give partner room to describe his hand and avoid jumping to 3NT just to show a few extra high card points. You must be allowed to show these hands below 3NT in order to decide on the best contract. Aiming to play in exactly 2NT is generally poor bridge. Who knows whether a hand will make exactly 8 tricks or 9 and the reward for making 9 is great.

3. How should East respond to 4th suit forcing with the example hand? Many years ago, I remember discussing a similar hand with Tim Cope, one of the best SA players who has played for SA internationally on numerous occasions. I remember he looked at me quizzically, and said 2NT, obviously. I was surprised as I thought this must show a stopper. His reasoning was that 2NT is the most descriptive bid and where else are we going to play if partner has no interest in the other 3 suits. On this particular hand it is highly unlikely that partner does not have some help in hearts. In addition, if he has 2-3 small hearts, opponents may be able to cash only 4 tricks (neither opponent has bid hearts). No other game may be possible (we may be losing the first 3 heart tricks in 5 of a minor). This all made perfect sense to me and I, therefore, believe it would be correct to bid a forcing 2NT on the example hand (I hope Tim hasn't changed his mind after all these years).

bkpsc	moremo	carol2007	Dunx	3NE+1	-630	2.00
glensa	lady macb	kimeden	lexvan	4♥W+2	-680	-0.40
larryc777	sharrie	sternz	judeap	3NE+3	-690	-0.40
InTime	tarankaur	merl66	peter3202	3NW+3	-690	-0.40
imtiazi	JillyRabz	SweetieE	teeast	3NW+3	-690	-0.40
horace1	rix181	stacey31	impalaphil	3NE+3	-690	-0.40

Novice & Advancing Players' Corner

Pyrrhic Victories

The definition of a Pyrrhic victory (as defined by Wikipedia) "is a victory that inflicts such a devastating toll on the victor that it is tantamount to defeat. Such a victory negates any true sense of achievement or damages long-term progress".

What is the aim when we are in a bridge contract? The aim is to make the contract. The aim is not to protect your honours or to make sure your queen is victorious. If you are a chess player this is instinctive as one is used to sacrificing bishops and knights for the ultimate victory. For some reason in Bridge, we are very reluctant to throw away our high cards even if it means the cost of the contract.

This is why it is very important to count our tricks and count our losers when the dummy comes down.

Let's have a look at a hand from today:

N Dunx	
♠ J109432	
♥ Q	
♦ KJ83	
♣ K7	
♥ J	
S carol2007	
♠ Q5	
♥ AK8	
♦ Q102	
♣ 85432	

North lands up in 3♠ after East opened 1♥ and West supported hearts. You get the Jack of hearts lead and most of us would be absolutely ecstatic at the lead. You may think "Great I get 3 heart tricks and then I can throw away clubs and draw trumps and and and...."

Now let's really analyse the situation and we start by counting our losers. When we count losers, we go suit by suit and work out what we are missing. Let's start with spade suit. How many losers do we have in spades? We are missing the AK. So we have 2 spade losers. How many heart losers do we have? None. We have AKQ between the two hands and only 1 ♥ in our hand. So, we actually get 2 extra heart tricks and no losers. How about ♦ losers? We have KQJT so we have 1 loser there. How about clubs? The problem is that with East being the opener there is a very good chance East is sitting with the Ace of clubs. We may very well have 2 losers in clubs. This brings **our loser count up to 5**. This means our contract may go down. Let's see what happens if we don't think and get so very excited about the lead and stop thinking....

You quickly win the Q of ♥. Now how do you get to dummy to get the AK ♥ and get rid of your losers? There is no clear entry so you try the diamond... let's see what happens....

N Dunx	
♠ J109432	
♥ Q	
♦ KJ83	
♣ K7	
♥ Q	
♥ 2 ♥ J	
♥ 8	
S carol2007	
♠ Q5	
♥ AK8	
♦ Q102	
♣ 85432	

You lead the 3♦ and West wins the Ace and comes a ♣ through. East wins the Jack of ♣ and cashes the Ace of ♣. Now you have lost 2 ♣ tricks and 1 ♦ trick and you are still going to lose 2 ♠ tricks (there is no way you are going to avoid this).

N Dunx	N Dunx	N Dunx
♠ J109432	♠ J109432	♠ J109432
♥ Q	♥ Q	♥ Q
♦ KJ83	♦ KJ83	♦ KJ83
♣ K7	♣ K7	♣ K7
♦3	♣7	♣K
♦A	♦4	♣10
	♣J	♣6
	♣A	
♦10	♣2	♣3
S carol2007	S carol2007	S carol2007
♠ Q5	♠ Q5	♠ Q5
♥ AK8	♥ AK8	♥ AK8
♦ Q102	♦ Q102	♦ Q102
♣ 85432	♣ 85432	♣ 85432

This is why we count our losers. We know we have 5 losers. Let's look at the whole hand and with the J♥ lead try to work out how we can guarantee making 9 tricks if we are in 3♠.

	N Dunx	W	N	E	S
	♠ J109432		P	1♥	P
	♥ Q	2♥	3♠	P	P
	♦ KJ83	P			
	♣ K7				
W		E			
♠ K86		♠ A7			
♥ 7542		♥ J10963			
♦ A96		♦ 754			
♣ 1096		♣ AQJ			
	S carol2007				
	♠ Q5				
	♥ AK8				
	♦ Q102				
	♣ 85432				
		3♠ N		NS: 0 EW: 0	

We can see the whole hand now and we can see that there are 2 ♣ losers, 2 ♠ losers and a ♦ loser. But on this lead, we can make the contract. We can make it by sacrificing the Q of ♥. If we play the A♥ and then the K♥ we can throw the club away and now we are down to 2 ♠ losers, 1 ♦ loser and 1 ♣ loser. We make the contract regardless of where the A♣ is.

Our aim is always to make the contract. That is the way we win Bridge. Do not win the Q♥ because it is so important to win a random Queen but if we can't get to dummy, winning the Queen may win the battle but costs us the war. The aim is straight up, every time, all the time to **MAKE YOUR CONTRACT**.

Submitted by Carol Stanton

BRIDGE ETIQUETTE!

Making the game more pleasant for all



Much of the popularity of contract bridge is attributed to the high standard of etiquette which is observed by the players. No other modern game leans so heavily on the expectation that participants conduct themselves in a highly civilised manner. The tenets of bridge etiquette are based on good common sense and should be implemented in a way that makes the game more satisfying. Understanding the rules is also an important facet of the game – players often do not know what the rules are and should ALWAYS call the Director to clarify them, rather than having an unpleasant dispute at the table. These rules were designed to ensure that no one is prejudiced by an infraction like a “lead out of turn” or a

“bid out of turn” or similar events. For example, when someone asks what a bid means when it is not their turn to bid, should you shout at them and say, “It is not your turn to ask”, or should you call the Director. The Director’s duty is to explain why “asking out of turn” may give your partner unauthorised information which may prejudice the opponents.

In these regular articles we will explain the basic rules and show how they can be applied in an agreeable way.

Courtesy

This is the Golden Rule — always be courteous at the bridge table.

This applies to how one relates to partner, the opponents, and the Director when s/he is called.

Carefully avoid any remark or action that might cause embarrassment to any other player – or which might interfere with his/her enjoyment of the game.

Start by greeting your new opponents at the table.

Wait until the game is over for post-mortems. Post-mortems at the end of a hand often do more harm than good, as they tend to “rattle” your partner who made a play based on their best judgement at the time. This could affect their bidding and play on the next hand to the partnership’s detriment. It is also irritating to the opponents who must listen to your comments (often hastily made).

When your partner does not drop the singleton king, but takes the losing finesse, do not start criticising their play which may have been the best percentage play anyway.

Not only could a post-mortem undermine partnership confidence, but it may communicate information to players who have not played the hand at other tables. Never try to teach or criticise a player at the table unless guidance is requested.

The Director should always be called to the table in a courteous manner. Using the word “please” assists in this courtesy. Being mindful of the “tone” in your voice when summoning the Director recognises that this official has an onerous task in providing a valued service to bridge players.

Submitted by Deirdre Ingersent