

Last week's winners: Monday 7/6/03

Friday 11/7/03

1<sup>st</sup> Clive/Chuck 62 %  
2<sup>nd</sup> Bill/John(UK/Aus) 57 %

1<sup>st</sup> Hans/John Gavens 68 VPs  
2<sup>nd</sup> Chuck/Clive 45 VPs

### How Green is Your Garden?

I planted a number of Avacado seeds in pots a few months ago and I now have far more seedlings than I need. They are about ½ a metre tall now. If anybody wants some, then let me know (no charge). Now (the rainy season) is the time to plant.

### Welcome back Bob, Chuck

Bob and Chuck re-appeared on Monday, a welcome addition to our low-season numbers. Chuck was kind enough to scribble comments all over last weeks news sheet. I really welcome this, it is the kind of reaction that I like and I will print comments, whether I agree with them or not, from anybody. So, what does Chuck say?

### No Game when Responder has 14 Points? \_Part 2

Hand 10W Partner opens 1♠, the bidding goes: - 1♠ - 2♥ - 2♠ - 3♦ - 3♥ - 4♥ - pass

♠ K Remember this hand and bidding sequence from last week? Chuck simply  
♥ A10654 could not understand why I wrote it down. He agrees that 3♦ is 100%  
♦ AK764 forcing and that this hand must bid game, although he prefers a 3NT final  
♣ 83 bid. I'm not so sure. Chuck acknowledges that it is probably a 5-2 ♥ fit and  
so East must have ♣'s. Thus 3NT as East may have just xx in ♥'s. I feel  
that if 3NT is correct, partner needs something like ♣KJx (x) and he would have bid 3NT himself. With  
such a holding, 3NT is probably better played from the East hand. Anyway, I'm not particularly arguing (do  
I ever?). 3NT or 4♥, who cares? The point is that 3♦ is forcing and West must go to game.

I believe that Hans still maintains that West should pass 3♥. I would be more than pleased to print his reasoning in the news-sheet.

### Quotes

I quoted three books last week about the meaning of 4NT after partner has just bid 3NT (it is natural). Chuck says '*please don't find (by jumping from author to author) someone to agree with your position and quote him. Always use the same guru*'. I don't understand, so I simply repeated what Chuck wrote word for word. Maybe someone can explain it to me?

## Over the Top – One too many? Part 2

Remember this one? I went to 4♦, vulnerable and it was doubled.

Hand 2North

	West	North	East	South
♠ K8	-	-	1♣	1♥
♥ J3	1♠	2♦	2♠	3♦
♦ J106432	pass	pass	3♠	pass
♣ KJ4	pass	4♦	dbl	all pass

I think that Chuck slightly missed the point, or perhaps I did not make the point very clear. He said that 4♦ is a bad bid vulnerable as partner may have only 3♦'s, not 4. I know that. I bid 4♦ on the assumption that partner had just 3♦'s. Indeed, partner *did* have only 3♦'s. The whole point is that it is *teams* scoring. I expect 4♦ to go one down, I also expect 3♠ to make (so they score 140). If I go one down in 4♦ then that is 100 away. Now the Law of Total Total tricks is not exact; I may go two down, I may make. And on the + side, partner may just have 4♦'s. I would not make this 4♦ bid at pairs, opponents will double and the expected -200 is a bottom. Teams scoring is totally different, it is very dangerous to double opponents into game if the expectation is just a one trick set. This is the reason that I believe that the bid is sound, one down (even doubled) is no problem at teams and I estimated that the likelihood of making was just as good as the likelihood of going minus two, but the gain at teams is much greater if you are doubled and happen to make.

For some reason (I don't understand it), Chuck does not think that I should quote from books. Nether the less, here is a quote from The Official Encyclopaedia of Bridge. '*In almost all doubling situations at IMPs, the odds favour the coward, not the hero* (i.e. do not double)'. The book then goes on to say much the same as I have said.

## Bidding Opponent's Suit – Part 2

The last two pages of last week's news sheet were devoted to a bidding sequence involving a bid of opponent's suit. I made 13 comments on the bidding and said that a bid of opponents suit need not be alerted. Chuck's comment on the whole two pages –

*'I agree, I must be weakening. Partner should bid 4♠ over 3♥. No cue is alertable unless it has a very special meaning.'* I'm not sure why 4♠ when you can bid 3♠, no need to go to game yet? But this is a minor point.

---

Many thanks for the written input, Chuck. I believe that the last news-sheet that Chuck had was No. 30 (but I re-wrote the first two pages). Nos 30 and 31 contain some 'Chuck material', I look forward to printing his comments and also any contributions from anybody else.

A short report this week. I am trying a new approach – to let a few members 'approve' the news sheet before I print it. Hopefully this will avoid any animosity, future misunderstandings and cock-ups.