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## Words from the Editor

The LMBA AGM has previously been held in July, but from this year onwards it will be in September. This date works better with the new timing of the issues of MetroNews and our constitutional requirement to notify you of the meeting date several months beforehand and to distribute the agenda for the meeting three weeks before its scheduled date.
Every LMBA member has the right to ask for a resolution to be placed on the AGM agenda (though they need to do so at least 60 days before the date of the meeting). The 2011 agenda is detailed below and, unusually, you will see that it includes one such resolution. It comes from Richard Fleet, who has is a former LMBA Chairman and honorary life member of the Association. In putting this motion before the meeting he says: "I have in mind three facts:
1 Those "Pay to Play" members who do not satisfy an arbitrary playing condition do not receive English Bridge and the annual diary. If it is uneconomic to send magazines and diaries to these members, the solution is to redesign Pay to Play, not consign them to an inferior class of membership.
2 Those members who do not have access to the internet were unable to respond to the recent questionnaire. The draft minutes of the April shareholders meeting may give an unfortunate impression, but the General Manager appeared to think that saving money was more important than allowing people to participate: I do not imagine that it would have consumed much in the way of resources to send out printed questionnaires to those members - I suspect few in number - who might have contacted the EBU and asked to be sent one. Alternatively, if there were many such members, that is an indictment of their exclusion.
3 Those clubs which do not meet 'regularly' are unable to become members: regularly is not specifically defined but, per the website 'We would not expect any duplicate bridge club to meet less than once a fortnight on average'. Why should not a club that meets (say) once a month be unable to affiliate?"
The issues that Richard raises are interesting. I am not sure whether I, personally, agree with all the points that he makes but, in my role as a LMBA shareholder who attends the EBU shareholders' meetings on your behalf, I always try to represent the views of the majority of the membership. And I find that I don't know what your views are generally on these issues, nor how many of you may find yourselves disadvantaged as members under P2P.
If you asked me to guess, I would say:

- I suspect that there may be quite a few members in London who do not play in their affiliated clubs often enough to receive their magazines and diaries, but perhaps quite a number of these are happy to become direct, paying members of the EBU.
- I suspect very few of our members do not have access to the internet. Just over half of our members have registered their email addresses with us, but I am sure many more use email without updating the EBU or LMBA. And others have access to the net via libraries, family members' computers etc. So is there really a problem here?
- I am really not sure if there are clubs in London that meet less than once a fortnight that would like to affiliate but can't. Please let me know if you are there, such clubs!
Because I don't have all the answers, I do hope those of you who feel strongly about these issues will come along to the AGM - it should engender an interesting discussion! As an added incentive, there will be a free glass of wine and nibbles on offer for all attendees.

Chris Duckworth
MetroNews Editor 201 Greyhound Road London W14 9SD

chris.duckworth@lineone.net

## Annual General Meeting

The 2011 Annual General Meeting will be held at the Young Chelsea Bridge Club, 32 Barkston Gardens, SW5 (nearest tube station: Earls Court) on Thursday $\mathbf{8}^{\text {th }}$ September, starting at $\mathbf{7 . 0 0} \mathbf{~ p m}$. The Agenda for the meeting is shown below.

## Agenda

1 Registration of proxies \& apologies for absence
2 Minutes of the AGM of $15^{\text {th }}$ July 2010
(Note. These can be found at www.metrobridge.co.uk - the LMBA website - follow the link at the bottom of the home page)
3 Matters arising from these minutes.
4 Chairman's Report
5 Treasurer's Report
6 Adoption of accounts for 2010
7 Subscriptions (direct and Pay-to-Play) for 2012-2013
8 Elections to the Executive Committee
9 Appointment of honorary auditor
10 Member's resolution (see editorial above):
"The LMBA Shareholders should press the EBU to ensure that all members are treated equally and that all who wish to become members are allowed to".
11 EBU shareholders' Report
12 Any other business

## LMBA results this year

## Ian Gardiner Trophy

The lan Gardiner Trophy qualifier consists of a one-day multiple teams competition, from which the leading two teams qualify for a head-to-head final. Since the trophy winners go on to represent London in the Pachabo Cup, the same scoring method as is used in the Pachabo is applied to the qualifier. This is a hybrid method combining elements of both pairs and teams, based on a complicated formula that no-one quite understands, so the computer is needed to work out who has actually won!
This year fifteen teams competed in the qualifier and it was very tense as the results were calculated, with three teams in the running for the top spot. In the event only half a point separated the three, with Ken Barnett, Liz Clery, Ryan Stephenson and Paul Huggins emerging winners on 94 points, and two teams tying for second place with 93.5 points - John Pemberton, Steve Popham, Tim Gauld and Paul Martin along with Brian Callaghan, Chris Duckworth, Ian Payn and Rob Cliffe. But only two teams could make it to the final, so it was back to the computer to determine that the Pemberton team had won through and would play the final against the Barnett team.

The Pemberton team certainly justified their qualification by going on to win the head-to-head final by a comfortable margin. They duly represented London in the Pachabo, but did not have one of their better days and finished about haif-way down the field.

## London Championship Pairs

It was a somewhat disappointing total of 25 pairs who entered this event in February. The format was a qualifying stage, from which precisely 10 pairs went through to the final, whilst the remainder competed in a consolation event.
At the end of the qualifying stage the leaders were Mandie Campbell and Benji Hackenbrock, with Brian Ransley and Marc Smith second and last year's winner Steve Popham, playing this time with Malcolm Todd, in third place. In the final, Mandie and Benji fell back, but the others maintained their relative positions and Brian and Marc had a storming set, so that eventually the first four places were filled as follows:

1 Brian Ransley \& Marc Smith

199

2 Stephen Popham \& Malcolm Todd 175
3= Neil Rosen \& Alistair Kent 174
\& David Gold \& Susanna Gross
In the consolation event held alongside the final, the leading pairs were

| 1 | Roland Gronau \& David Wing | $58.91 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Brian McGuire \& Ned Paul | 58.81 |
| 3 | Paul Chapman \& Graham Pollack | 58.40 |

## Palmer Bayer Trophy

This "No Fear" Pairs is a very sociable event which has a loyal following amongst the participants, who enjoy the friendly atmosphere and the opportunity to discuss the hands over a glass of wine with an expert after play. This year we were very pleased to welcome David Burn as our expert and he kept everyone amused as well as being very instructive.
The winners this time were last year's runners up, Timothy Wilson \& Monica Marinescu, who scored a healthy $65.74 \%$. In second place were Sylvia Stock and Sue Grant on $61.34 \%$ while Nathalie Shashon \& Allison Green came third with $60.88 \%$. The picture shows David presenting the trophy
 to the proud winners.

## Green Pointed Swiss Weekend

The annual green-pointed weekend was held in a new venue this time - the Chadwick Street Sports Centre in Westminster. The turnout of 64 pairs for the Swiss Pairs on Saturday was a little down on previous years, but the quality of the field was high. The leading places were taken as follows:

## 1 Malcolm Harris \& Maria Budd 105

2 Ian Payn \& Brian Callaghan 104
3 David Pinder \& Colin Bailey 101


In the Swiss Teams the following day the entry was slightly up with 27 teams in the field. The leading positions were:
1 Paul Hackett, Roger O'Shea, Justin Hackett, Jason Hackett 100
2 Helen Beattie, Tricia Gilham, Brian Powell, Mike Scoltock 96
3 David Schiff, Anne Catchpole, Phil Mattacks, Ken Rolph 95
Tricia and Helen must have been very annoyed by the result, as they were runners-up last year as well and must have hoped to have gone one better this time, but the winners were happy enough to celebrate with a glass of bubbly, as you can see in the picture!
The new venue was very conveniently located with some good facilities, but unfortunately the centre closed shortly after the event, so we will be looking again for somewhere new to stage next year's competition!

## Garden Cities

Once again there was an entry of four teams, two each from the Young Chelsea BC and the Woodberry BC, competing in this year's Garden Cities heat, held to determine which club would represent London in the Regional Finals of the national Inter-Club Teams-of-Eight Championship. The leading teams were:
1 Young Chelsea A Paul Martin, Tim Gauld, Ryan Stephenson, Liz Clery, Chris Duckworth, Brian Callghan, Ian Payn, Rob Cliffe
2 Woodberry A Nigel Freake, Gill Hutchinson, Peter Rogers, Doug Dunn, Anne Catchpole, Paul Lamford, Ken Barnett, John Stimson
The same four pairs from the Young Chelsea competed in the Regional Final, where they qualified to the next stage by coming in second place. The first four players above were then joined in the final by Gordon Rainsford, Dom Goodwin, David Ewart and Gunnar Hallberg and went on to win the trophy - by just one VP, but that was enough! Many congratulations to all the players.


## London League

There was a three-way tie for second place in Division 1 of the League this year between two Young Chelsea teams, YC3 and YC5, and the London Duplicate BC team, all on 55 VPs. But the runaway winners with 79 VPs were Brian Callaghan's YC1 team.

Division 2 had clear-cut results for first and second places. The YC2 team captained by Simon Cearns won the division with 72 VPs ahead of the YC4 team on 63, well clear of the third-placed Punters team on just 50.
Division 3 featured another runaway win - this time by James Smith's Monday Club B team, who dropped only 5 VPs in their five matches to achieve a magnificent 95 VPs . In fact at the time of going to press one match was unplayed, but the team was still well-clear of the second-placed August Blue team who had 73 VPs from their 6 matches.

The Newcomers League proved popular enough this year to merit dividing into two. Newcomers Division A was won comfortably by The Slammers team, headed by Linda Parsonage who scored 81 VPs. The other teams in the division were
clustered together on scores in the lower 50s. In Newcomers Division B, Susan Behrmann's Hurlingham team won by a clear margin also - they were on 96 VPs with the second-placed LSE B team on 64.

## Home Counties League

In the Home Counties League, Simon Cochemé's London Red team recaptured the title, winning by a good margin. They scored 82 VPs, while the runners-up, Barry Stoker's Surrey Orange team, could only manage 53 VPs. The picture shows some of the winning team - all wearing red, though you can't tell that in this black and white photo! They were identified by their captain as follows:


L to R Back: Scarlet Pimpernel, Red Pepper, Red Baron, Cockney Red, Red Barrel. Front: Red Head, Simply Red. Absent members of the Red Army: Lady in Red, Miss Scarlet, Red Arrow, Red Devil, Red Herring.

## Café Bridge Drive

Following the successful introduction of café bridge last year, this event was again held in the Tonsleys in aid of Age Concern Wandsworth. We were lucky once again with the weather, which stayed dry and sunny, greatly enhancing the experience for everyone when walking between venues.
The capacity of the venues was also increased this time, with one new restaurant joining in and extra tables being sited in others, so an entry of 36 pairs was accommodated. Four pairs ended up with over 60\%, the leading players being:
1 Mary Anne St Clair-Ford \& Venetia Harper
65.31 \%

2 Sati McKenzie \& Simon Prager
64.90

3 Lyn Fry \& Bridget Wilson
62.10

4 Richard Turner \& Camilla Hull
61.65


The picture shows the winners being presented with their prizes by Rachel Corry, Age Concern Wandsworth's Chief Officer, who came along at the end to say a few words, draw the raffle and present the prizes.
The LMBA was very pleased to be able to present Age Concern with a cheque for $£ 550$, the proceeds from the event and the raffle.

## Fox Shammon Trophy

The entry for this event was a little down this year, perhaps because due to the late Easter this year several of the usual participants were not able to play.
This year's winners were LMBA President Bernard Teltscher, playing with Victor Silverstone, who last won this event in 2008. They scored $60.94 \%$, well clear of the second and third placed pairs, who were the same two pairs as came second and third last year, but in a different order! Second were Bryan and Sheila Peers on $56.92 \%$ and third were Malcolm Morris and Susi Berhmann on $55.80 \%$. In fourth place on $54.46 \%$ were the 2007 winners, James Smith and Simon Cochemé.

## London Trophy

The final stages of the London Trophy and Della-Porta Plate were held at the Royal Automobile Club in Pall Mall early in June. See Mike Hill's article on pages 10-13 for some of the more interesting hands that arose, and also the winning captain, Chris Dunabin's article on pages 9-10 on the crucial hand from the semifinals. The final results were:

## London Trophy

1 Reform Tuesday - Chris Dunabin, John Reid, Richard Pollitzer and Sos Green

2 Coombe Hill Golf Club - Leonard Marks, Pamela Marks, Gordon Fox, Sandra Fox

3 Royal Blue - Bob Bowman, Bernard Heilpern, Andrew Kisiel, Brigitte Kisiel
4 South Croydon Sports Club Stephen McNiell, Christine Meakin, Anita Zabllocka, Ann Tyler

## Della Porta Plate

1 Cheeky Chaps - John Cox, Riky Choudhuri, James Palmer, Simon Scanlan
2 Oxford \& St Georges - Myrna Woolf, Monty Krimgoltz, Alf Wilkins, Bernard Fox


Trophy Winners


Plate Winners

## London Trophy Pairs

The LT Pairs was held earlier in the year this time, providing an opportunity for pairs still in the main event to practice and improve, so perhaps go further in the main event itself! Or for those already knocked out, it was another chance to meet and play against like-minded opponents.
In the event, 21 pairs competed and it was tight at the top in the end. The winners were last year's winners, Bob Bowman and Arun Suri with $62.29 \%$, two points clear of the 2009 winners, Andrew Kisiel and David Glass. In third place on $59.86 \%$ were Steve Morley and Ken Kentea. For details of one of the more interesting hands from the event, see the article on pages 24-25.

## London Trophy semi-final

## by Chris Dunabin

One semi-final in the London Trophy was held between the Reform Tuesday v Royal Blue (RAC) teams on $23^{\text {rd }}$ May. Board 21 of the match was crucial in affecting the result. Not all of the pips were recorded, but all of the critical cards are shown in the diagram below

## NS Vul. Dealer North



At one table, with Royal Blue North South playing weak twos and with East West silent, the bidding went (North

As the cards lie, John Reid could have made almost certain of beating the contract by leading the diamond ace, but, understandably fearing that declarer was void, he led the jack of spades. If clubs broke 3-3 (as they did), declarer could now make his contract by discarding the diamond
loser on a spade, running the jack of hearts (covering if West covers) and giving up a heart; but he played for the rather better chance that clubs were 42 and hearts $3-2$, so he crossed to a top club and ruffed a club; he couldn't then avoid losing two hearts.
At the other table, Christopher Clarke and Richard Pollitzer, North South for Reform Tuesday, were playing strong twos, so the bidding went (North first) $2 \boldsymbol{- 3}-4 \star-4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}-5 \approx-6 N T$.
A spade lead would have made life very difficult by removing declarer's only entry to hand, but, with three small cards in each black suit, West unsurprisingly led a club, the suit bid by dummy. Richard tried leading dummy's diamond, in the hope that East might be panicked into going up with the ace. When this failed, and realising that there was no chance of playing hearts for no losers, he bet the farm on a 3-3 club break, first cashing two top hearts. On the fifth club, East had to discard from J10xx of spades
and A10 of diamonds. Probably he'd have done better to discard $\leqslant 10$, which might have been from AJ10, with West holding four spades; but in fact he threw a second spade. Richard read the position correctly, threw a diamond from hand, and made his twelfth trick with the two of spades.
If East had thrown the diamond, declarer (who knows from earlier play that East has no hearts and almost certainly has the diamond ace since West would have no reason to duck, so should realise East is protecting spades) must throw a spade, cross to hand with a spade, then play his low diamond to East's ace, forcing East to
put him back in hand to make two more spades and the diamond king.
It's hard to say whether 6- or 6NT is the better contract; but interesting to note that 6 v can't make if the ace of diamonds is cashed at trick 1, whereas in 6NT it's the one play that lets the contract make without the need for a squeeze.
The net score was +1540 to Reform Tuesday. If $6 \downarrow$ had made and 6NT gone one off, as was possible, instead of winning by 2190 overall, Reform Tuesday would have lost by 540 and Royal Blue would have gone through to the final.

## Puzzle Corner



All you have to do with this puzzle is place the numbers 1 to 8 in the circles so that no adjacent numbers (ie numbers that differ by 1 , such as 2 and 3 ) are in circles that are directly connected by a straight line.

For the solution, see page 13.


## London Trophy Finals

On $5^{\text {th }}$ June, the Royal Automobile Club once again generously provided a venue for the finals of the London Trophy, the LMBA competition originally limited to sports and social clubs but which now, in its $33^{\text {rd }}$ year, allows bridge clubs to enter teams. The traditional nature is maintained by continuing to restrict teams to no more than one player ranked at national master or higher. As usual, the final of the London Trophy itself, the play-off for third place between the losing semifinalists and the final of the Della-Porta Plate, the competition for first round losers in the London Trophy, were played simultaneously using the same boards.
The three matches were: -
London Trophy final:
London Trophy third place play-off: Della-Porta Plate final:

Coombe Hill GC vs. Reform Tuesday
South Croydon SC vs. Royal Blue Oxford \& St Georges vs. Cheeky Chaps

Anyone expecting a quiet start was disappointed as the very first board provided significant swings in all three matches.
Love all. Dealer North

|  | - KQ10754 <br> - A942 <br> - J5 <br> * 9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ^ AJ98632 |  | - - |
| - - |  | $\checkmark 10865$ |
| - K83 |  | - AQ1076 |
| - AQ7 |  | * 8632 |
|  | -- |  |
|  | - KQJ73 |  |
|  | - 942 |  |
|  | * KJ1054 |  |

In the main final, Reform Tuesday bid the north-south cards to $4 \checkmark$ and duly went one off but, at the other table, their east-west pair chose to sacrifice in 5 which was doubled and went four off - an overall swing of 850 to Coombe Hill GC. In the third place play-off, Royal Blue did exactly the same thing, except that the declarer play in 5 doubled was sharper and the contract went only two off giving an overall swing of 350 to South Croydon SC. There was almost another repeat performance in the Plate final, the only difference being that Oxford and St Georges chose to sacrifice in 4a rather than $5 \bullet$. That went two off but, as their north-south pair had contrived to go four off in $4 \mathbf{\downarrow}$, there was an overall swing of 700 to Cheeky Chaps.
The rest of the first half was relatively uneventful, except perhaps in the third place play-off where Bob Bowman and Arun Suri, playing east-west for Royal Blue, who had already shown some bidding aggression in the sacrifice on board 1 seemed determined to
continue in that style. They were the only ones to bid a poor, but making slam on board 2 and they then found another 5 sacrifice on Board 3, going for 800, albeit against a making game this time. They were also alone in bidding to slam on board 10, a contract which is off the ace of trumps and a cashing side ace. However, the aces were in different hands and the defence failed to cash the side ace when they had the chance, after which declarer could and did establish a twelfth trick.
At half-time, Coombe Hill GC had a narrow lead of 380 in the main final, Royal Blue were comfortably ahead by 1300 in the $3^{\text {rd }}$ place play-off and Oxford \& St. Georges were just 260 ahead in the plate. The odds were clearly on Royal Blue in the $3^{\text {rd }}$ place play-off but the other two matches were far too close to call.
The second half began fairly quietly (although Coombe Hill GC extended their lead on board 14 when they made a game that failed at the other table) but then this hand livened things up.

## Love all. Dealer North



At most tables, the north-south auction began $1 \vee-2 \star$, the exceptions being
one south who responded $4 \boldsymbol{\square}$ and one north who opened $2 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$. Thereafter, things diverged. Two norths rebid $3 \boldsymbol{v}$ and were raised pessimistically to $4 \mathbf{~}$, ending the auction. The other two norths reversed with $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ and this led to a final contract of $6 \boldsymbol{v}$ at both tables. That was also the contract at the other two tables so even the strong $2 \boldsymbol{}$ opening did not lead to the good grand slam. One pair forgot to ruff both losing spades before drawing trumps and so made only twelve tricks, but everyone else made thirteen. However, the two failures to bid even the small slam meant swings of 500 to Coombe Hill GC and 470 to South Croydon SC.
Coombe Hill GC and Royal Blue were consolidating their leads but the Plate match was still desperately close. Then board 19 provided some unexpected excitement.

## EW Vul. Dealer South

- 876
- 1096
- 9432
* AK 3
- 43
- 7543
- 8
^ QJ9742
- 10952
$\bullet$ AJ
-KJ76
- 1085
- AKQJ
- KQ82
- AQ105
* 6

Although both 6NT and 6a can be made as the cards lie, they are hardly with the odds and one would expect the contract at every table to be 3NT played by north, after an auction beginning 1-2. In fact, two norths chose to respond 1NT and one south chose to open a slightly eccentric 2NT. These should still lead to 3NT as the
final contract and the outcome should be the same, whichever hand plays it. However, there were two variations the Oxford and St. Georges south inexplicably passed the 2 bid to lose a swing of 360 whilst the Royal Blue south chose 5 , as the final contract and, after electing to finesse the $\diamond Q$ on the first round of trumps, found he had two trumps to lose as well as the $\vee \mathrm{A}$, for a swing out of 510 .
Curiously enough, these swings were more than reversed immediately (on board 20), another solid 3NT for northsouth. The two who had failed on board 19 showed they had learnt their lesson by bidding 3NT, but their opponents at the other table bid to the failing 5\% for swings of 800 and 700 respectively.
Board 23 was to decide both the main final and the Plate.

## Game all. Dealer South

|  | - 643 <br> - 109874 <br> - J6 <br> - AJ3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\wedge}{\vee} \text { AKQ62 }$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \qquad \text { A1082 } \\ & \checkmark 53 \end{aligned}$ |
| - AQ109742 <br> *K |  | $\begin{aligned} & \quad \text { K86 } \\ & * 10974 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A KQJ975 } \\ & \bullet J \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | - 3 |  |
|  | * Q8652 |  |

In the third place play-off, both teams had bid and made the diamond slam although the bidding was not the same. Both souths passed as dealer and one west, not unreasonably, thought his hand worth an Acol 2; opener. Although south backed in belatedly with 3a over east's 2NT response, that
was not going to keep west out of slam. The other west opened 1* and reversed into hearts after east responded 1a (the look on south's face on hearing east's bid was not recorded!). However, once he heard of diamond support this west wasn't to be kept out of slam either.
In the main final, both souths opened 14. The Coombe Hill GC west overcalled $2 \star$ not expecting that to end the auction - but there she played! The Reform Tuesday west doubled and heard 3* from partner after north raised spades. That encouraged him to bid 5 over south's jump to $4 a$ and to go on to 6 when south competed again with 5 ! ! Optimistic stuff, but one can't argue with success. Both declarers made twelve tricks but the 1200-point swing to Reform Tuesday was a killer.

## Results

Trophy: Reform Tuesday beat Coombe Hill GC by 520 points
Third place play-off: Royal Blue beat South Croydon SC by 3210 points
Plate: Cheeky Chaps beat Oxford \& St. Georges by 840 points
This was the most exciting ending to the event that I can remember. Both the London Trophy and the Della-Porta Plate were won by the teams trailing at half time - and in both cases the margin of victory was less than the swing they gained on board 23.

## Puzzle Solution

(See page 10)

In the Plate, the Oxford and St. Georges South opened a weak $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ and west doubled. East's response of 2NT seemed an overbid and west, probably expecting more, bid an immediate 6 - but fortunately, east's scant values were in the right place. At the other table, south passed and the Oxford \& St. Georges west opened 1*. After hearing a 1 a response, he rebid 3 v . Quite what this jump reverse meant is not recorded (extra distribution perhaps?) but it convinced east to raise to $4 \mathbf{4}$. The consequence was that, after a Blackwood enquiry, west chose the wrong slam. 6 had no play, even had the trumps broken 4-2, and west duly ended three off - a massive swing of 1670 to Cheeky Chaps.


Trophy Runners-up - Coombe Hill Golf Club

## London News

Some happy news to report this time, concerning the nuptials of some of London's best known players - which can be summed up as two weddings and an engagement.

David Ewart and Sarah Dunn were married at the beginning of July. Both are barristers and both are very keen tournament players who participate in most of the major events in this country. David was a member of our 2010 Tollemache team and is currently Chairman of the Young Chelsea Bridge Club. He and Sarah often play in the same team but usually not in the same partnership!


Earlier in the year - well actually at the end of last year, but they kept it quiet for a while - Gordon Rainsford married his long-term partner, Arnaud Pitois. Arnaud is a video director and editor who does not play bridge. Gordon is Manager at the Young Chelsea and of course is well known not only as a fine player but also as a top Tournament Director. He now also works part time for the EBU as Assistant Chief TD, taking some of the workload off the shoulders of Max Bavin.

And it must be something in the air at the Young Chelsea, as the engagement is between Ian Payn, former Chairman of the club and MetroNews columnist and his long-term partner, Anne Brewster. Anne was once a regular at the YC and was a member of its organising committee for many years, but she no longer finds time to play much bridge. lan's time for playing is also limited these days, as he is Operations Manager of a busy legal Chambers, is a member of the LMBA committee and has recently joined the Board of the EBU.


## Forthcoming competitions

This centre section may be separated from the rest of the magazine for reference purposes. Unless otherwise indicated in the competition detail, all competitions are played at the Young Chelsea Bridge Club, with permitted conventions at EBU Level 4. All competition organisers' contact details are at the end of this schedule.

## London League \& Newcomers League

## Entries close $1^{\text {st }}$ September 2011

Holders: Division 1 Young Chelsea 1 Division 2 Young Chelsea 2 Division 3 Monday Club B Newcomers A The Slammers Newcomers B Hurlingham

Capt: Brian Callaghan
Capt: Simon Cearns
Capt: James Smith
Capt: Linda Parsonage
Capt: Susan Bermann

These league competitions are for teams-of-four, although up to 8 people may play for any one team during the season. Matches are played in home or away venues, which may be homes, clubs or other suitable premises. There are currently three all-play-all divisions with end of season promotion and relegation plus the Newcomers League. The latter is designed particularly for those with little experience of competitive bridge. The winners of the Newcomers are eligible to be promoted to the London League, but may choose to compete again at the lower level.

In Division 1 only, any systems are permitted, provided reasonable notice is given. The lower divisions of the London League are played at Level 4, whilst In the Newcomers League EBU Level 3 systems and conventions only are permitted.
New teams are always welcome and will be considered for entry at any level, although it would be exceptional for a new team to enter Division 1 directly. All players in the London League must be EBU and LMBA members, but nonmembers are allowed in the Newcomers League. Teams in this league are restricted to only one player of National Master rank or above, however.
Entry fee: $£ 20.00$ per team in the London League, $£ 16$ per team in the Newcomers League. Entries and enquiries should be directed to Sati McKenzie.

## London Trophy \& Della-Porta Plate

Entries close $1^{\text {st }}$ September 2011
Holders: London Trophy: Reform Tuesday - Chris Dunabin, John Reid, Richard Pollitzer, Sos Green
Dell-Porta Plate: Cheeky Chaps - John Cox, Ricky Choudhuri, James Palmer, Simon Scanlan
The London Trophy is a knock-out teams of four competition for club teams, which has now been opened up to teams from all types of clubs, including both bridge and non-bridge clubs. Teams eliminated in the first match enter the secondary Della-Porta Plate competition, also run on a knock-out basis.

Matches are played in home or away venues, which may be homes, clubs or other suitable premises. Early rounds are regionalised to minimise travel. The final stages of both competitions will be held at the Royal Automobile Club in Pall Mall on $20^{\text {th }}$ May 2012. All participants are also eligible to play in the London Trophy Pairs, to be held this season on $25^{\text {th }}$ March 2012.

Simple systems only are allowed in this event - full details of what is permitted will be sent to all participants and may be found on the LMBA website at www.metrobridge.co.uk. No team may have more than one player of National Master or above and no pairs of regular high-level tournament players are allowed. Players need not be members of the EBU or LMBA.
Entry fee: £20 per team
Entries and enquiries should be directed to Chris Duckworth. Every effort will be made to accept late entries if necessary.

## Mixed Pairs Championship <br> Sunday 18 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ September 2011 starting at 1.00 pm <br> Holders: Ryan Stephenson \& Liz Clery <br> A single extended session, match-pointed, mixed pairs event. All players must be EBU members, but LMBA membership is not necessary.

Entry fee: £22.00 per pair.
Advance entry is not required but a phone call to the
 Young Chelsea guarantees your entry! Contact Nigel Freake or the Young Chelsea BC for further information.

## Home Counties League

Entries close ${ }^{1{ }^{\text {st }}}$ October 2011
Holders: London Red Capt: Simon Cochemé
This is an inter-county teams-of-eight competition for London and the Home Counties. It is aimed at county second team players who would not normally be expected to represent their counties in events such as the Tollemache Cup. Teams are allowed to field at most two Grand Masters in any one match. Matches are of 24 boards and are normally played at the YCBC on weekday evenings starting at 7.00 pm . Players must be members of the county that they represent but allegiance is not required. Green points are awarded.
Current participants are Middlesex, Surrey and London (each with two teams), so there is room for additional counties to join in - anyone interested should contact Sati McKenzie for more details. Players interested in representing London should contact Simon Cochemé (London Red) or Nicole Cook (London Blue) individuals may join a team at any stage during the season.
Entry fee: £16 per team.

## Champions Cup <br> Sunday 2nd October 2011 starting at 1.00pm

Holders: Berks \& Bucks - Mike Perkins, Ian Reissman, Chris Cooper, Ben Paske
This is a single session, multiple teams event for the 2010/2011 season winners of the highest divisions of leagues organised in London and the home counties. (Please note that this event is now just one session in length). New leagues are always welcome to apply - contact Sati McKenzie for further information. Anyone who is a bona fide member of the league that they represent, including non-EBU members, may play.
Entry fee: $£ 32.00$ per team.
Entries should be sent to Sati McKenzie to arrive no later than $25^{\text {th }}$ September.

## Lederer Memorial Trophy

## Saturday-Sunday $19^{\text {th }}-20^{\text {th }}$ November 2011

Holders: Gold Cup - David Bakhshi, Alexander Allfrey, Peter Crouch, Tony Forrester and Andrew Robson

This prestigious event for eight invited teams of international players provides a marvellous spectator event for anyone interested in seeing how the experts'
 minds work at the bridge table. You can rub shoulders with the top stars from this country and abroad as they compete for the trophy. Whilst this is a very hardfought competition it is always played in the best of spirits, so you will enjoy the great atmosphere. Check out the website at www.metrobridge.co.uk for the latest news on who will be playing this year. An event that is not to be missed!
Play starts at 1.00 pm each day. On Saturday there are four matches finishing at about 8.00 pm ; on Sunday there are three matches, followed by a wine reception
 for all present (players and spectators) at around 6.15 pm , immediately following which is the prize giving ceremony.
Entry fee: $£ 10$ for Saturday ( $£ 6.00$ after 4.30 pm ), £8 for Sunday, £16 for the whole event, payable on arrival. Free to YCBC members.
Contact Stefanie Rohan for more information.

[^0]
## Teltscher Cups - Lederer Satellite Pairs

## Saturday $19^{\text {th }}$ November 2011

## Holders:

NS: Shirin Moazed and Paul White EW: Pip Railing and Martin Jones
This is a parallel satellite event to the Lederer. Players at participating clubs play the same hands as are played in the Lederer itself on the Saturday afternoon, scoring up as team mates with the results achieved by two of the star pairs in the main event - one NS and one EW. The winners are invited to attend the Lederer on the Sunday to meet their team mates and be presented with the Teltscher Cups.


Paul White and Shirin Moazed from Hurlingham with Sally Brock and Nicola Smith, their pair in 'the other room'

Clubs that wish to hold heats should contact organiser Stefanie Rohan.
Entry Fee: £1 per player

## Junior Teams of Four Championship



Sunday 6 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ November 2011 starting at 1.00 pm
Holders: Not held in 2010
A single extended session teams-of-four competition for junior (Under 25) players - that is players who were born on or after $1^{\text {st }}$ January 1986. Players need not be members of the EBU or LMBA.
Entry Fee: £20.00 per team.
Entries and enquiries should be directed to Chris Duckworth.

## Under-19 Pairs Championship

Sunday $27^{7 \text { h }}$ November 2011 starting at $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ pm


Holders: Tommy Brass \& Asitha Nanayakkara
This single session match-pointed pairs competition for junior players born on or after $1^{\text {st }}$ January 1992 is also a qualifying heat for the national Under-19 Pairs Championship. Qualifying pairs will be eligible to compete in the national final to be held on Easter Saturday $7^{\text {th }}$ April 2012, and will also be offered free entry to the London Easter Festival of Bridge. Players need not be members of the EBU or LMBA.

Entry Fee: $£ 2.00$ per player.
Entries and enquiries should be directed to Chris Duckworth.

## Ian Gardiner Trophy

## Sunday $5^{\text {th }}$ February 2012 starting at 11.30am

Holders: John Pemberton, Steve Popham, Paul Martin, Tim Gauld

This is the major London Teams of Four Championship, which is played as a oneday two-session multiple teams event from which the leading two eligible teams qualify for a head-to-head 48 -board match to determine the winner of the lan Gardiner Trophy. Green-points will be awarded for both stages of the event, and the winners will be eligible to represent London in the Pachabo Cup, the national inter-county teams championship, on $9^{\text {th }}-10^{\text {th }}$ June 2012.
The qualifier is scored using the same method as the Pachabo - a combination of IMPs and point-a-board. Note the early start on $5^{\text {th }}$ February is combined with only a short break between sessions, allowing an early finish on Sunday evening.
Note also that all players must be LMBA members and, in order to be eligible to go through to the final, all players in a team must have London as their primary County of allegiance before playing in the event.
Entry Fee: £60.00 per team.
Entries should be sent to Sati McKenzie to arrive by 29 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ January 2012.

## Palmer Bayer Trophy

## Sunday $29^{\text {th }}$ January 2012 starting at 1.00 pm

## Holders: Timothy Wilson \& Monica Marinescu

This single extended session, match-pointed, 'No Fear' pairs competition is for those who like to play tournament bridge under more relaxed conditions than often apply, and for those who particularly
 want to enjoy a social atmosphere when playing. Improvers and tournament novices are most welcome and more experienced players may find this the ideal way to introduce family, friends and colleagues to organised bridge. Players need not be members of the EBU or LMBA.
The principal aim of this event is to have fun, so the pace of play is a little more leisurely than usual. Simple systems only are allowed, but including weak two opening bids and transfers in response to 1NT openings. (A full description of allowed systems and conventions can be found at www.metrobridge.co.uk and will be made available at the event.) A complimentary glass of wine awaits you at the end of the session to be enjoyed whilst discussing the hands that you have just played with an expert, who will be happy to answer any questions.
Entry fee: $£ 16.00$ per pair.
Advance entry is not required but a phone call to the Young Chelsea guarantees your entry! Contact Chris Duckworth or the YCBC for further information.

## London Championship Pairs

Sunday $\mathbf{2 6}^{\text {th }}$ February 2012 starting at 1.00 pm
Holders: Brian Ransley \& Marc Smith
As the major County pairs championship, this competition is green-pointed and is also the qualifying event for the Corwen Trophy, the national inter-county pairs championship. The competition comprises a one-day, two session, match-pointed pairs event. The top fourteen pairs
 from the first session will compete in an all-play-all final with carry-forward scores whilst the remainder of the field competes in a consolation final
All players must be LMBA members, but only the leading four pairs with London as their county of allegiance (before playing in the event) will be eligible to play in the Corwen Trophy on $26^{\text {th }}-27^{\text {th }}$ May 2012.
Entry fee: $£ 30.00$ per pair.
Advance entry is not required but a phone call to the Young Chelsea guarantees your entry! Contact Nigel Freake or the YCBC for further information.

## Advance notice

Full details of the following events will be included in the next issue of MetroNews, but you may wish to note the planned dates:

Green-Pointed Swiss Weekend Saturday-Sunday $10^{\text {th }}-11^{\text {th }}$ March 2012 Swiss Pairs on Saturday at 1.00 pm, Swiss Teams on Sunday at 11.30am. Venue to be announced.

London Trophy Pairs
Sunday $25^{\text {th }}$ March 2012 at 2.00 pm
Single-session pairs for participants in the London Trophy
Café Bridge in the Tonsleys Tuesday $17^{\text {th }}$ April 2012 at 10.30am In aid of Age UK, social bridge where you move from venue to venue.

## Garden Cities Heat

Thursday 19th April 2012 at 7.00 pm Inter-club teams-of-eight competition, qualifier for the national competition.

Fox Shammon Trophy
Seniors Pairs at the Queen's Club.
London Trophy Finals
Sunday $20^{\text {th }}$ May 2012 at 2.00 pm
London Trophy and Della-Porta Plate finals at RAC, with spectators invited.

## Tournament Organiser contacts

Sati McKenzie for Leagues, Champions Cup, Ian Gardiner Trophy sati.mckenzie@googlemail.com 02076270977
Flat 11, 31 Clapham Common Southside, SW4 9BW
Chris Duckworth for London Trophy, Palmer Bayer, Junior events chris.duckworth@lineone.net 02073853534 or 07768693168 201 Greyhound Road, W14 9SD

Stefanie Rohan for Lederer Memorial Trophy, Teltscher Cups stefanie@metrobridge.co.uk 02088883674 or 07891747273 9 Courcy Road, N8 0QH

Nigel Freake for Mixed Pairs, London Championship Pairs gelohnake@waitrose.com 02088012884

Simon Cochemé for London Red team in Home Counties League simonx@simonx.plus.com

Nicole Cook for London Blue team in Home Counties League nizx@yahoo.com 07944744899

## Competition venue

## Young Chelsea BC <br> 32 Barkston Gardens, Earls Court, SW5 0EN 02073731665 info@ycbc.co.uk

## How to get there:

By Tube: Take the Piccadilly Line or the District Line to Earls Court Station. Come out via the Earl's Court Rd exit, cross the road to the right, and turn left at the Blackbird Pub. It's about 3 minutes walk.

By Bus: The 74, 328, C1 \& C3 buses all stop at Earls Court Station.
By Car: Parking is possible with care. You may park on single yellow lines or metered bays after 6.30pm on Mondays to Saturdays, but you must not park in residents bays until after 10pm on weekday evenings. On Saturday afternoons (after 1.30pm) there is free parking on single yellow lines and in metered bays if you park one block or more east of the club (take care to check the signs). On Sundays there are no parking restrictions. Note that the club is no longer within the congestion zone.


## General Competition Information \& Regulations

Entries are generally accepted on the day where possible, but when needed in advance, as specified in the competition description, they may be made by post or email, or by phone if time is very limited. Payment on the day is generally acceptable, except for events played at non-central venues, such as Leagues and Knock-out competitions.
Payment on the day may be by cash, by EBU voucher, or by cheque made payable to LMBA. Electronic transfer of funds is also possible - please ask the event organiser for the LMBA account details - but debit and credit card payments are not accepted.

Membership requirements for each competition are specified in the competition description. All members of clubs affiliated to the EBU are automatically members of the EBU. If players are members of counties other than London, they can become LMBA "dual" members in order to comply with a requirement for LMBA membership, by the payment of our dual membership subscription, which is $£ 5$ per annum. If players are not EBU members by virtue of their club membership, they may become members of the EBU and LMBA by the payment of a direct membership subscription, which for the current season is $£ 29$ per annum.
Direct and dual membership subscriptions may be paid along with competition entry fees, making sure that full contact details for the individual are provided, including email address and existing EBU membership number if appropriate. Alternatively, they may be sent directly to the LMBA Membership Secretary, Roger Morton, at 43, Banstead Road South, Sutton, Surrey, SM2 5LG. He may also be contacted at rhl.morton@blueyonder.co.uk or 02086434930.
New members, defined as those joining the LMBA and the EBU for the first time, receive a $£ 5$ voucher which may be used for entry into any LMBA competition.

Seating policy. Players may be allocated a starting position by the TD on arrival at a venue, or may be required to draw a starting position or cut for North-South. Players who require a stationary position for medical or mobility reasons should if possible notify the organiser or venue in advance.

Competition regulations. The Laws of Duplicate Contract Bridge (2007) apply to all competitions. Where appropriate, the regulations and directives of the EBU Laws \& Ethics Committee also apply, as contained in the current Orange Book and other published documents.
Regulations for matches played privately can be found on our website www.metrobridge.co.uk. In such matches, reference may be made if necessary to an external referee. It is recommended that the Young Chelsea Bridge Club is contacted on 0207373 1665, where access is usually possible to a suitable person.
The decision of the LMBA Executive Committee in any dispute is binding and final.

## Inter-Club Teams

The Young Chelsea BC held an invitational Inter-Club event for teams representing bridge clubs in and around London one evening in June. This proved to be a popular idea and on the day 22 teams from 17 clubs came and played. There were so many teams that it was decided to split the field into two divisions, largely self-selected, so that everyone could play other of a similar standard. Everyone played 24 boards, with a break half-way through for sandwiches.
The first division was won by the London Duplicate, with Buttons A second and the Young Chelsea 1 team third. The picture shows the winners - Tony Clark (not pictured), Mike Fletcher, Andrew Thompson \& Nigel Bruce receiving the cup from Club Manager Gordon Rainsford.
The second division was won by the Stock Exchange team of Jimmy Strauss, Stuart Leigh,
 Chris Brewin \& Brian Kelly, with the Livesey team second and MCC third.
Mark Davies played for the YC Pink team in the first Division and has supplied details of a couple of hands that were of particular interest. The first was Board 9:
EW Vul. Dealer North

- 65
- J97643
- 642
* 43
$\rightarrow$ J4
$\bullet 2$
- AKJ85
* K9852
- AK10
- AKQ108
- Q73
- 107
- Q98732
$\checkmark 5$
- 109
* AQJ6

At Mark's table, the bidding went:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $2 \downarrow$ | $2 N T$ | Pass |
| $4 *$ | Pass | $4 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| $4 N T$ | Pass | $5 \uparrow$ | Dbl |
| $6 *$ | All pass |  |  |

On $\uparrow 6$ lead, won on table, declarer drew two rounds of trumps ending on table, noting 10 and 9 falling from South. She then led a club towards \&K and the ace popped up. A high club was continued and now Declarer has two ways of succeeding - ruffing a club with the high $\bullet 7$ on table or finding the $\checkmark$ J, likely to be with North on the bidding.

Ruffing the club holds some dangers can you be certain that North has a second spade so you can get back to your hand to draw the last trump? - so the best route is to draw the last trump and play a heart to the 10.
Without North's bold opener EW would not reach the slam and would not make it either.

The second hand was Board 18, where Mark was East and became declarer:

## NS Vul. Dealer East

- Q10953
- 52
- AJ1095
- K

| - J84 | - AK62 |
| :---: | :---: |
| - AQJ3 | - K974 |
| - Q7 | - K86 |
| * A862 | - 93 |

* A862
- 93
- 7
-1086
- 432
* QJ10754

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2*T | Pass | 2v | Pass |
| 4* | All pass |  |  |

On $\uparrow 7$ lead (to 8, 9 and A) declarer can see he will definitely lose a club, a
diamond and a spade and he still has to deal with his $4^{\text {th }}$ spade and $3^{\text {rd }}$ diamond, only one of which can be ruffed. But $\uparrow 6$ can be established by leading the $3^{\text {rd }}$ round of spades from dummy while East still has an entry. The biggest risk is a spade ruff in South to kill the contract.
Not thinking it through, Mark decided that he needed two of his top hearts as entries for the spade plays and drew two rounds of trumps and then led $\uparrow \mathrm{J}$ hoping for either 4-2 in spades or last trump with North - down one.

In practice, drawing a third round of trumps before making the spade play from dummy, followed by the lead of a diamond to $\bullet$ leaves North with no defence. He can attack either minor, but declarer can always establish his $\uparrow 6$ and get a diamond ruff.

All the teams seemed to enjoy themselves greatly and welcomed the opportunity to meet and play against new faces. The YC was happy to host this event, but would be delighted if another club would like to take a turn at doing so next time. Any club interested in hosting should contact Gordon Rainsford or any member of the LMBA Committee

## London Trophy Pairs - 2011

The Royal Automobile Club in Pall Mall was once again the venue for the London Trophy Pairs, which this year was held in February. The event is renowned for the wide variety of scores achieved on each board, and eleven of the thirty boards had at least six different scores in the eight times they were played.

Perhaps the most interesting hand of the day was board 22 (see top of next page). Apart from one table where South bought the contract in 4\% (undoubled), all the Easts played in the heart game and all failed. It's hard to see how this happened at every table. If South leads the likely $\& A$, then the $\leadsto K$ provides an immediate parking
place for a small diamond or spade and declarer runs the $\vee 10$, then $\vee 8$. He crosses to a top spade, plays trumps from the top, wins in hand whatever North returns when in with the $\vee \mathrm{K}$, draws the last trump and cashes his remaining winners to make ten tricks, conceding the last trick with whichever small card he has left.

EW Vul. Dealer East

|  | - 98 <br> - K7643 <br> - J <br> * Q10764 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - J1065 |  | - AK4 |
| - 108 |  | - AQJ952 |
| - A5432 |  | - K97 |
| - K8 |  | * 3 |
|  | - Q732 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ - |  |
|  | - Q1086 |  |
|  | * AJ932 |  |

If South instead leads a spade at trick 1, that provides a third spade trick and an early entry to dummy for declarer to draw trumps as above. Declarer still has the $\uparrow A$ as an entry to dummy, so should now make an overtrick by leading towards the \%K after drawing trumps.
The only defence that can make declarer's life difficult is if South finds the unlikely opening lead of a diamond. Declarer wins in dummy and starts on
trumps in the same way as before but now, when in with the $\vee K$, North can play a club to South's ace for another diamond lead. North can ruff (although he is ruffing a loser) and exit with a spade, leaving declarer with a spade loser at the end for one off.

However, declarer can counter this by cashing the $\uparrow A K$ before exiting to the vK. Now when North takes his diamond ruff, he has only clubs with which to exit, so providing declarer with access to his $\% \mathrm{~K}$ to discard his spade loser. But that's not the end of the story. North can thwart this line by declining to ruff the diamond. Declarer can win the $K$ and draw the last trump but is still left with a losing diamond and a losing spade. Did the play really go this way in practice? Somehow I doubt it.
When the dust cleared, Bob Bowman and Arun Suri, the holders of the Trophy emerged as winners again, albeit by a considerably smaller margin than last year.

## Slam Adventures

We pick up the following rather fine hand as South:

- AK5
- A97
- Q
* AQ10964

We open One Club; next hand overcalls One Spade, and partner doubles. Next hand raises to Two Spades. We have an awkward call now; Three No Trump is possible, but rather final. We decide on Three Spades, a cue-bid in the opponent's suit. It is a bit nebulous as to what this
shows, but we have a strong hand; perhaps we will survive. Partner jumps to Five Clubs. Well, we have good controls, and partner should have a few high cards, so we give it a sixth. That ends the auction.
The lead is the ace of diamonds and partner puts down:

- 7
- K8653
- 965
* KJ83

Prospects are not good; perhaps we have overbid. We play low from
dummy; four, queen. Surprisingly, West thinks for a while before continuing with the king of diamonds, on which East plays the two and we ruff.

We have eleven tricks; six trumps, two hearts, two spades, and a spade ruff in dummy. Where is the twelfth trick to come from? It looks impossible. Teammates are not going to be happy.
Still, there is no point in giving up just yet. We start by drawing trumps. These prove to be 2-1, with West having two and East a singleton. We take the aceking of spades and ruff a spade in dummy.
These cards are left and our heart loser is still leering at us:


These situations are quite simple, really. There is nothing we can do but run the trumps and hope for a defensive error. We don't expect this, as the defence can work out what we have: three spades (if we had a fourth spade we would have arranged to ruff it in the dummy), six clubs, one diamond (we ruffed the second); ergo, three hearts. With AQx in hearts we could have claimed. So the defence can happily discard spades and diamonds and wait for their heart trick.

Nothing for it; we play the jack of clubs and overtake with the queen. We have to make two discards from dummy,
and it is worthwhile taking a moment to work out what they are going to be. We could discard a low heart and the diamond, but that would leave us with just hearts in the two hands; we would be bound to lose a heart in the end. Although it surely cannot matter, we might as well leave the $\uparrow 9$ in the dummy, which means discarding two low hearts.
On the $\curvearrowleft Q$ West discards a spade and East the 4 . We lead the $\approx 10$, and West discards a diamond and East the $\bullet 10$. We now lead the $ヶ 9$, and much to our surprise East discards the $\vee 10$. We cross to dummy with the king of hearts and return to our ace; the $\vee 9$ takes the last trick.
What has happened? This was the position at the table when the $\approx 9$ was led:


East, who started with QUJ104 and -J1042, was squeezed.
Why was this allowed to happen?
This was the distribution of the diamond suit:

965
AK873
J1042
Q

West led the ace and got the four from East.

From West's point of view, the $\downarrow 2$ was missing. With the signalling methods in use, East would have played the four from original holdings of J42, and 1042. In these cases declarer would have played a false-card of the Queen from a holding of queen-other.
East should really have played the jack at trick one. With an honour sequence as top cards, East should have played the jack to (a) deny the queen (b) indicate holding the ten. West can then lead a low diamond at trick two. As before, declarer ruffs, but now West retains the king of diamonds to deal with dummy's nine, and East can hang on to the QJ10. Against this defence, declarer has no resource.

The full hand:

> \& 7
> $\bullet$ K8653
> $\bullet 965$
> $*$ KJ83

- QJ963
$\bullet 2$
- AK873
- 52
- 10842
- QJ104
- J1042
\& 7
- AK5
- A97
- Q
- AQ10964

So team-mates were happy with us after all, but as it happened bidding and making Five Clubs would have been enough. At the other table, after 1*-1a - double, our East jumped preemptively to Three Spades. South tried 3NT, but the defence took the first five diamond tricks.


It is not every day that we pick up a 25 count, so, when we do, we want to maximise its potential.

- AK
- AKJ52
- AQ
* A954

At one table in a pairs event South, the lady half of a married couple, opened this hand with One Heart. We shall come back to what happened to her later.
All the other South players opened Two Clubs. Amazingly, partner responded Three Clubs. Seven Clubs directly is a possibility, or 5NT as the Grand-Slam Force, asking partner to bid Seven with two out of the top three trump honours. At several tables South bid Three Hearts; North then bid Three Spades.
At this point a quiet Four Clubs is best, to agree the trump suit prior to any Blackwood manoeuvres. You don't want to mess around with Blackwood, particularly the popular Roman KeyCard variety, without knowing what trumps are. However, most South players launched into Blackwood (partner had no aces, funnily enough) and then more Blackwood (partner showed two kings). The final contract was mostly Six Hearts (you have to wonder why), with a few pairs in Six NoTrump, a solitary pair in Six Clubs, and an even more solitary pair at the Seven level - and they were in Seven NoTrump, perhaps wrongly imagining that every other pair would be in Seven Something as well and going for a matchpoint top (Seven NoTrump, bid and made, seldom produces a belowaverage pairs score). Nobody reached Seven Clubs.

- Q964
- 64
-KJ
* KQ1082
- AK
- AKJ52
- $A Q$
* A954

Let us imagine that we are in Seven NoTrump; West leads the three of diamonds.
Firstly, let us count our tricks. In clubs we have five. A 3-1 break, or 2-2 break, will not hurt us; and a 4-0 break can be catered for, as we are in the fortunate position of having both the ten and the nine between the two hands. A low club to dummy's king will show up a 4-0 break, and then the ten can be finessed if West has four (we return to the \&A), or the nine can be finessed if East has four.
If the club suit was:

- KQ1082
- A754
then we can only succeed against a 40 break if West holds all four. We can start with the ace or lead low to the king; if East shows out we can finesse the ten later.
However, if the club suit was:
* KQ982
* A754

Here we need to start with the ace, in case West holds J1063; an initial low club to the king would leave West with a fourth-round winner. If East holds all four clubs, there is nothing we can do.
Returning to the hand, diamonds are worth two tricks. Annoying, really; we
have the ace-king-queen-jack, but doubletons in each hand. A third diamond in either hand would give us thirteen tricks on top.
In spades we have three top tricks, and the nine may prove to be a useful card, as it will provide a thirteenth trick if either opponent holds J10x. That's ten; the ace-king of hearts is twelve. So, we need to find a thirteenth trick.
The heart finesse, if successful, will do, but if it loses we will be down immediately. It is rather depressing to go down in a grand slam early in the play, and we have plenty of winners to cash before making a decision as to whether the heart finesse will be necessary.


Entries are reasonably fluid, so we can take our winners easily enough. However, doubleton top honours (here, the ace-king of spades) can lead to blockages. So, we win the first diamond and play the ace-king of spades. One advantage here is that if an opponent has the magic J10x holding (giving us four spade tricks), the jack or ten will drop on the second round. Here, that doesn't happen - the opponents follow with low cards.
Before running the clubs, we take our second diamond trick and cash the ace of hearts. A 5-1 break with the queen being singleton is a low chance, but it is a chance nonetheless; not so on this occasion. West plays the three and East the eight.
Time to run the clubs. We follow to four rounds, watching for $\vee Q$ and $\uparrow J 10$. This is the position when the fifth club is led from dummy:

```
- Q9
- 6
- -
\(\because 2\)
A-
- KJ52
- -
\& -
```

On the $\& 2$ we discard the $\downarrow 2$. The queen of spades comes next, on which East plays the eight and West the jack; we discard the $\vee 5$. We have a new position:


The ten of spades is still out, and so is the queen of hearts; in fact, the opponents have a spade and three hearts between their two hands.
Let's see. If East has the ten of spades, he will have only one heart, and it will have to be the queen. If not, West has Qx left and there will be nothing that we can do. If West has the ten of spades then he will have only one heart left; East will have the other two. If East has Qx of hearts left, we will need to finesse the jack, but if he has two small hearts we will need to play the king and drop the nowsingleton queen.
Anyway, we have to play the six of hearts from dummy. East follows with the nine.

Well, one of our cases has gone; East does not hold the ten of spades and the queen of hearts.
East could have Q9 of hearts, of course; that would leave West with the ten of spades and a low heart. If East has the ten of spades and a low heart, we are dead, as West will have Q10 behind our KJ. The third case is when West has the ten of spades and the queen of hearts; in that case the last club will have squeezed him - he will have held $\uparrow 10$ and $\bullet$ Q10 and have had to make a discard.

Which to go for? We can play for a finesse or a squeeze. Well, if the finesse wins, so what? And the opposition will be sure to comment on our luck. But if the squeeze wins, we will be rather more pleased than if we had taken a simple finesse.
This was the full hand:

- Q964
- 64
-KJ
* KQ1082

| - J1073 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| - Q1073 |  |
| - 732 |  |
| - 73 |  |
|  | - AK |
|  | - AKJ52 |
|  | - AQ |
|  | * A954 |

West was indeed squeezed on the last club.

It is odd that in two cases out of three it was correct to play the king of hearts at trick twelve. This would be correct if either East had been squeezed ( $\boldsymbol{\sim} 10$ and Q9, a show-up squeeze) or if West had been squeezed ( 10 and $\bullet$ Q10). The finesse of the jack would
only gain in the case where East had $\checkmark$ Q9 remaining.
What of the lady who opened One Heart? Her husband gave her a terrible time in the post-mortem for opening at the one-level on a 25 -count (they ended in Four Hearts). He may have had to eat some humble pie later, for they scored well above average. The pair in Seven NoTrump went down (they took the heart finesse). Six NoTrump made either eleven tricks or
thirteen - some declarers played on hearts early and could not recover, and some simply cashed their winners and found the queen of hearts dropping in the endgame. Six Hearts (the majority contract) had two trump losers. Seven Clubs would have been laydown, as you can ruff the nine of spades in hand. Rather funny that reaching the best contract involves supporting partner's suit when you have A954 in it.

## Perfidy in Poznan

## by Brian Callaghan

In mid-June your editor and I played together in the $5^{\text {th }}$ European Open Championships. It is held every two years and this year it was in Poznan, Poland. The 'Open' means what it says. Any bridge player, European or not, in good standing with his national bridge organization can play. Being English we have an advantage over many of the other players. The reason is not because it is our birthright, but because the official language of the championships is English so that we do not have the added burden of explaining our bidding in a foreign tongue.

Some people remember great hands, but those must have been thin on the ground. What I remember most from the tournament was a ruling. This is the story of that ruling.
The first stage of the mixed teams consisted of a round robin. In round 4, playing against a pair whose first language was not English, sitting North as dealer I held the following hand
^ KQ83

- AKQ8532


## - -

- 72

I opened 1 $\mathbf{~}$, East on my left passed and we pushed the bidding tray beneath the screen to the other side.
I should explain about screens for those who have not played using them. A screen divides the table diagonally
so that North and East are screenmates on one side and South and West on the other. The idea is that during the auction no information should pass across the screen except for that contained in the bids themselves. Those bids are placed on a tray which is pushed back and forth beneath the screen as the auction progresses. In order to let your opponents know what your bidding means you explain all conventional calls made by your partnership to your screenmate. In mixed events the requirement is that a man and a woman are on each side of the screen, presumably to limit the number of testosterone fuelled arguments.
The tray came back shortly with $3 \mathbf{V}$ from partner and 4* from West. My screenmate asked me about the $3 \boldsymbol{v}$
call which I explained was natural and invitational - old-fashioned bidding. She then alerted her partner's 4 bid and, when I asked, confidently explained it as showing spades and diamonds. I thought this was plausible but I will do a quick digression into bidding theory to explain why.
When your opponent opens $1 \checkmark$ it is extremely common to use a $2 \downarrow$ bid as Michaels to show five spades and a five card minor. A $3 v$ bid instead usually show a solid minor and asks partner to bid 3NT with a heart stop. Suppose you opponent opens $2 \downarrow$ weak instead. You now have one fewer cue bid. As reaching 3NT is a prime objective, some keep the $3 \vee$ cue bid as a stopper ask and use what is known as leaping Michaels where a bid of 4 of a minor shows five cards in that minor and five in the unbid major. What if the opponents open $3 \downarrow$ ? Now some play non-leaping Michaels where 4 of a minor again shows that suit and the other major. I am not too keen on this last variant myself as it means that if you want to bid a minor naturally, you have to do it at the 5 -level.
Anyway, back to the auction where I bid 5 as an unambiguous slam try and East bid $6 \leqslant$. The tray went to the other side and re-emerged with a double from partner which concluded matters. I tried a top heart as my opening lead, not because I had great hope that it would win a trick but because I felt a top spade might be the only lead to let the slam make and that declarer would have difficulty disposing of all the losers in a five card spade suit. The lead was not a success as the full hand was:

- KQ83
- AKQ8532
-     - 
* 72

| - J 76 |  | - 54 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ - |  | $\bullet 96$ |
| - A10986432 | 6432 | - QJ7 |
| * J6 |  | * AK9843 |
|  | - A1092 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J1074 |  |
|  | - K5 |  |
|  | * Q105 |  |

Declarer ruffed, crossed to a top club to pick up the trumps, ruffed out the clubs and then discarded all three spades for an overtrick.
As you can imagine I was feeling, as the saying goes, stitched up like a kipper. Anyway step one was to ask Chris, my partner, "Did you have the same explanation as I did?" The answer was no. Screens are good at their job but work best when the partnerships know their systems well. They introduce a new source of problems when the explanations differ one side from the other. Step two was to try to find out what the opponent's system really was and if they could document it. As it happened they were able to point in their convention cards to where it said "Lipping." This is an English word that a spellchecker will not necessarily pick up. From the context I guessed that this meant leaping Michaels. The obvious thought occurred to me and I said "But it doesn't say non-Lipping and this wasn't a leap." East replied "Is Lipping." I felt this was a logically false statement but thought the opposition might not appreciate this nuanced an interpretation, so I did not pursue the matter.

West, the 4 bidder, told me in fluent English "I forgot my system. Our agreement is that it shows diamonds and spades." It was time for the director to whom we explained the facts. English was not his first language either and when we reached "Lipping" he said "I don't understand." I gave him my interpretation and added that I thought I would have led a spade, more successfully, if I had not been told that West had the suit.

I hoped that we might get some redress but in the event was surprised when the score was adjusted to down one. Every player polled on the lead, given that West had only shown diamonds, had chosen a top spade.

The directors must also have thought that the mere presence of "Lipping" on the convention card was not sufficient evidence that they were playing it in this position. I do not know for certain, but maybe I should have had had some explanation like "It shows spades and diamonds but my partner sometimes forgets." And finally Chris should also have had the explanation. Then she might not double on the grounds that I was unlikely to lead a spade.
The result at teammates' table was 6 down one so the ruling swung a large number of IMPs our way - a triumph for European justice.

Thus fortified, we went on to qualify for the knock-out stage, when we picked a team called Austria in the round of 32 . The reason we picked them was that we had not heard of any of their players and we duly beat them in a close match. Next we faced Russia. We had, unfortunately, heard of them and they proved too good for us. Ah well, we can try again in the next European Open in two year's time.

## Congratulations ....

to the following LMBA members who have done well in national and international events over the last few months.


London members seem to have travelled to all corners of the world with much success at the bridge table over the last few months.

Simon Gillis (left, holding cup) won the Iceland Express Teams in Reykjavik in January with a team of Norwegians.

David Gold and David Bakhshi (pictured centre, right) won the $16^{\text {th }}$ NEC Cup in Yokohama in February, in partnership with two Dutch stars.

Bernard Teltscher and David Gold won the Open Pairs at the St Moritz Bridge Festival in January.
Chris Duckworth and Brian Callaghan came second in the Mixed Teams at the Gold Coast Congress in Australia in February.

David Bakhshi (those David's certainly get around!) reached the finals of the Vanderbilt at the US Nationals in March in a multi-national team, losing a close final to the eventual American winners


Gunnar Hallberg (second from left) was a member of the Pharon team who were silver medallists in the Seniors Teams at the European Open Championships in Poznan in June.

Also in Poznan, Tom Townsend came $6^{\text {th }}$ in the A final of the Mixed Pairs and Brian Callaghan and Chris Duckworth came $5^{\text {th }}$ in the B final.

More international success, albeit a little nearer home, was achieved by Susanna Gross, who was a member of the English Lady Milne team that came equal first with the Scottish team, and by Michael Alishaw and Toby Nonnenmacher who were members of the winning English Peggy Bayer team.

At the Year End Congress in London, London the team of Nick Irens, Espen Erichsen, Zia Mahmood and David Bakhshi came second in the Swiss Teams and Graham Orsmond, Gad Chadha, Debbie Sandford and Jackie Fairclough came equal third. In the Swiss Pairs Tom Townsend and Mark Teltscher were third.
Liz Wright and Lorna Vestey won the Bridge England Sim Pairs in February with a massive 71\% score.
At the National Swiss Teams Congress in January the team of Sarah Dunn, David Gold, Gunnar Hallberg and Fredrik Bjornlund came third. In the Harrogate Spring Congress Rob Cliffe and Mike Vail were equal third in the Swiss Pairs.
Chris Duckworth and Brian Callaghan won the Portland Pairs in March, with Anouk Riviere coming second. Also in March, at the Ranked Masters Pairs, Tim Chanter and Helen Wildsmith were third in the Regional Masters.
At the Lambourne Jersey Festival Alan \& Olivia Woo and Alex Hydes won the Swiss Teams; David Wing and Roland Gronau were second in the Swiss Pairs.
At the Schapiro Spring Foursomes Martin and Margaret Nygren were second in the Hamilton Cup.
At the Spring Bank Holiday Congress Richard Johnson and Heather Bakhshi came third in the Pairs B final.

In the Easter Festival there were a number of successes. Alex Hydes (right, holding trophy) won the Championship Pairs whilst Arthur Wolstenholme and Angus Tayler (left) won the Under-19s Pairs.

## Chris Duckworth and Brian

Callaghan came
 second in the Swiss Pairs and Willie Whittaker was second and Helen and Espen Erichsen third in the Swiss Teams.

In the main Crockfords Cup finals Nick Irens, Espen Erichsen, David Bakhshi and Tom Townsend were second and Bernard Teltscher was a member of the third-placed team. In the Plate finals held alongside Richard Johnson was a member of the runners-up team.

In the June one-day events Lorna Vestey, Ned Paul, Dave Strawbridge and Martin Baker were equal second in the Berks \& Bucks Swiss Teams while Chantal Girardin, Bill Linton, Paul Lamford and Stefanie Rohan were equal third in the Bedfordshire Swiss Teams.

Joe \& Gillian Fawcett (right) won the Swiss Pairs at the Riviera Congress and came third in the Swiss Teams with Rob Cliffe. Nick Boss was third in the Swiss Pairs.


## The Terminal Cafe

I wouldn't normally use this space to write about a specific event - that's not my remit. There are times, however, when you just have to get something off your chest. Early July, on a rainy Saturday afternoon, those of us who are hardy of spirit and short of memory joined together to play in the eighth annual YC Individual, held in memory of Keith Loveys.

I'm in a reasonably good position to comment on why there is an individual at the YC (you don't see many of them about these days), because it was my damned fool idea in the first place. After Keith died at an absurdly young age, Warwick Pitch was determined to honour his old friend's memory in some way, and I suggested an individual, primarily because Keith, if he didn't have a partner lined up for the evening, would happily play with anyone who'd wandered in off the streets. So, what better than an event where you have 24 different partners? The winner gets their name engraved on a pewter tankard, and has the right to drink from it at the bar for a year. This right is often not claimed, mainly because The Loveys Cup (sorry) quite frequently goes missing for extended periods of time. It's
in situ at the moment, though, so for the next year...no, I'm getting ahead of myself.
Quite often, when writing about what happened at a bridge event you can get a feel for what happened at other tables, and give some sort of balance to that event. This isn't quite so easy in an Individual. Firstly, no-one can remember what happened. Secondly, if they can, by the time you get to them they're so drunk they're unintelligible. So, I can only tell you what happened at my table. And what happened at my table is this.
I went four off in a freely-bid Four Spades.
I let through Three No Trumps after a pathetic auction which should have stopped in Two. And gone off.
I came up with a brilliant lead against Four Hearts which misled partner to the extent that he then got the defence wrong. The prosaic lead would have trivially beaten the contract.
I sat as dummy watching declarer, doubled in Two Hearts and cold for an overtrick, spend rather a lot of time going one off.
I'm not particularly interested in what my partners did, though. It's not very polite to dwell on them, and after all, it's an individual, right? Rough with the smooth and all that. Mind you, there did seem to be an awful lot of rough knocking about.
To start with it might be as well to mention that although the event was open to all, there were a fair few good players scattered around (and if I miss you off, it's for space reasons or because I just forgot you were there. Or something. So no offense, right?). Previous winners Rob Cliffe, Paul Lamford, Stefanie Rohan and Lorna Vestey were joined by Brian Callaghan, Chris Duckworth, John Pettit (making his annual pilgrimage from Wales just to play in this event. Madman) and other luminaries too numerous to mention. Twenty-four boards sped by, and the event was played in good spirits, the only rulings called for being of a technical nature. All very lovely, but lovely butters no parsnips, to win an event like this you need to be tenacious, consistent, and above all, lucky. Which is why this year the winner was...ah, no. We'll get there in a minute.
I didn't do very well, but although I can moan about my luck as much as the next man I was more or less the architect of my own misfortune. The blame for the previously mentioned four down in four Spades can't be laid at anyone else's door. I also bid Three No Trumps precipitously with one partner rather than investigate a major-suit game, quite, quite wrongly. My partner might just have made game in a major, I had no chance in 3NT. I came, I operated, I lost. Or, as Julius Caesar might well have put it, veni, operati, downthekarsi.
But there was just one bright moment...
I was South, I hadn't met North before. East I knew but she played little part in proceedings. West I knew, a nice enough chap. Which is why what was about to happen to him was all the more regrettable...


I opened One No Trump (weak). West passed, North bid Stayman, and with East/West playing no part in the rest of the auction, I gave an honest answer and on the next round of the bidding found myself in Six No Trumps.
A small club was led and I looked at dummy. Things looked straightforward enough. A 3-3 Spade break, or QJ Doubleton in Hearts would see me home, or failing that, there are various squeeze possibilities. So, first things first, I ducked the lead to rectify the count. Except as we can see now, I didn't duck it, the Jack of Clubs held, presenting me with my twelfth trick. But, this being pairs, we played on and it turned out that although West might well have led KC instead of a small one, it didn't matter. He's got it all - all the club and heart honours and four small spades! So, on the run of the diamonds he was forced to surrender. +1020, and a good score for once.
"Were you happy with the bidding?" asked my partner. I replied that I was, although if he was just going to bid 6NT I didn't know why he'd bothered with Stayman. "Well," he replied, "I had four hearts, didn't I?" Bearing in mind that this was an individual, there's only one answer to that. "Quite so." I said.
So, who won? Okay, no more pussyfooting around, it was Callaghan, who like me, has played in this competition every year since it started, but unlike me has now won. Never mind, l'll be back next year. Maybe l'll break fifty per cent next time. But maybe, once again, I won't.

In my last column I mentioned that I had stepped down as Chairman of the Young Chelsea - which hasn't stopped me doling out a thousand words of free plug (see above). Earlier this year, I was a bit surprised to be asked to join the board of the EBU. I accepted, and hope to transfer my co-opted status to being an elected member come the AGM in October. The reason that I mention this is that l'd just like to announce my general accessibility. I'm not about to start holding surgeries, but if you have any issues either at national level or at county level (I'm still on the London Committee) then don't hesitate to get in touch. I'm not going to solve everyone's problems, and I'm not the correct entry point for most specific issues, but I can take note of what you say, point you in the right direction, and listen with a sympathetic ear. I'm famous for that, you know. E-Mail is best. Ian.Payn@CharterChambers.com will find me.
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[^0]:    Zia thinking hard in the 2010 Lederer

