



Master Solvers Panel

(Continued from page 7)

No fit, so no safety to bid. 3♦ is forcing for us.

Jones: Pass. Don't you have any easy problems? I originally answered 3♦, but after considering all the ways I could be significantly overboard by making a forcing 3♦ bid, I will make a cowardly pass. It would be nice if 3♦ was non-forcing (not my methods). Better yet, 3♣ as a transfer to diamonds would be great (again, not my method). That's three consecutive hands where I've gone low. Would you like to see me do the Chicken Dance?

J.S.: I'll pass that one.

Hamilton: 3♦. Yes, we could be heading for trouble, but we also might be heading for game or even slam. I am such a strong believer in bidding my hand, not trying to guess what the final contract should be, that I feel 3♦ is clear-cut.

Gaer: 3♦. Non-forcing, but constructive. This is too good a hand to not try to improve the contract.

EOK: 3♦. This hand is much better suited for transfer advances where North gets to vote more easily than over this forcing 3♦. The nature of 3♦ makes pass more attractive. But as we could make 6♦ opposite the right mesh, I am not going to try to stop on a quarter (inflation) in 2♥.

Dunitz: 3♦. Depends on whether a new suit at the three-level is constructive but non-forcing, or forcing. I prefer the former, in which case I would bid 3♦. If 3♦ is forcing I'll go low. It is worth mentioning that I would always bid if I had two hearts and one spade as opposed to the hand you've given me.

Bell: Pass. 3♦ would be virtually game-forcing, so I'll await further developments ... or not.

Lawrence: Pass. Not in trouble yet, and no certain goal. Bidding 3♦ is an alternative unless it's forcing. And that is the rub.

Kantar: I don't know the system. If 3♦ is forcing, I pass; if it isn't, put me down for 3♦.

J.S.: As the panel indicates, this situation is close all the way around: Whether or not to use 3♦ as forcing and also whether or not to bid 3♦, even if it is forcing. The Cayne South bid a forcing 3♦, declared 4♦, judged poorly in the play, and was off one. The Rosenthal South passed 2♥, gaining 6 IMPs which started a rally, but was still 29 behind to start the second half of the match.

Problem 4.

Both sides vulnerable, IMP scoring. You are South holding:

♠76532 ♥AQJ98 ♦9 ♣98

South	West	North	East
?		1♦	Dbl

Lawrence: 1♠. The moderator likes this theme. Ever since his success in 1960 in (I believe) a trials hand, he bid 1♥ with this hand. Actually, that could be right. But I'm not fully convinced. I'll stick with tradition and bid 1♠. It isn't wonderful, but it surely feels right if partner rebids 1NT.

J.S.: In 1970 I guessed to open 1♥ holding five solid hearts and five spades to the ace nothing, which happened to work well. Using this hand as a problem 46 years later doesn't meet the qualification for a theme.

Gaer: 1♥. Lead directing. If we miss a spade fit, so be it.

EOK: 1♥, as if I were 4-5-2-2. I do not hate 1♠ as much as many will, and could bid 1♠ then 2♥ non-forcing if (say) West's 2♣ came back to me.

Hamilton: 1♥. Just looks right. I teach that it promises at least four decent hearts that can stand a three-card raise. Another avenue would be to pass and then bid 2♥ which shows five hearts and four or five spades, but will I get the chance?

Bell: 1♥. I'm not going to worry about missing a five-three spade fit when the suit rates to break unfavorably. I'd much rather steer my partner to the right lead if the contract is played by my LHO. Yes, I know partner *might* have four spades and be shut out with an intervening club bid, but I'll risk it.

Coopers: 1♥. What we want led, not good enough to redouble or to bid again. The singleton diamond is a negative. If we were going to bid twice, we would bid spades first.

Dunitz: Playing standard I would bid 1♥ for the lead and to show where my values are. But in my methods, I would bid 2♥ showing five spades and four (or five) hearts and less than invitational values.

J.S.: Partner, holding: ♠-- ♥87 ♦AKJ72 ♣KJ10542, would have an interesting decision after your conventional 2♥ bid.

Jones: Redouble. Finally, you gave me a hand where my methods work well. I will treat this hand as if it had four spades and five hearts. I will start with redouble, which in my methods shows hearts (same as a 1♥ bid in standard). If partner doesn't bid spades we won't play there. Missing a five-three fit with the five card suit being weak is frequently correct. I may rebid my hearts though.

Kantar: 1♠. Thanks for not giving me the ♠65432.

J.S.: In the Vanderbilt both South players bid 1♠, a call that seems to ignore that there was a vulnerable takeout double to your right. At one table North rebid 2♣ and played it there. The cards were so favorably located that 11 tricks were made. At the other table East-West seemed to ignore the 1♠ bid (and that they held no

long suit, no singleton or void, and only 20 HCP) and bid to 3♠. South kindly didn't double, so scored +300 rather than a possible +800. This was a small gain for Cayne, but the Rosenthal rally continued through the third quarter and into the fourth. They were within 2 IMPs when the following board was played.

Problem 5.

Both sides vulnerable, IMP scoring. You are South holding:

♠Q1086 ♥9862 ♦876 ♣54

South	West	North	East
Pass	1♥	2♥*	3♥
?			

*Michaels

Jones: 4♠. If I was willing to defend against 4♥ I would only bid 3♠ ... 4♥ by the opponents is probably coming. Thus, it is a sound tactic to assume they would bid 4♥ and take the 4♠ dive prematurely. We won't often make 4♠, but it's not impossible.

EOK: 4♠. Does not create a statement of "ownership," so no forcing passes. As they may not bid 5♥ with only eight (or even nine) trumps I expect to make this quite often.

Hamilton: 4♠. The possibilities are 3♠, and leave the rest up to partner, or 4♠, going right by their target game. I would choose 4♠ as that puts max pressure on opener. I do not think passing 3♥ is a real option. It is quite wrong to pass 3♥ and then save in 4♠ over presumed 4♥ bid by opener. 4♠ could go for one too many, they might have slam, they might push to 5♥ and go down, who knows? I might be convinced that 3♠ is enough if the panel is nearly unanimous.

J.S.: In my younger days (46 years ago) I would have bid 4♠ also, the idea being to give the opponents the maximum guess. But this ignores partner. His Michaels cue bid has a wide range. He may have more to say; he doesn't know that 4♠ is purely preemptive.

Lawrence: 3♠. Not 4♠. That's a bit much. This bid gives North some information in time for him to use it.

Coopers: 3♠. We have a good fit but no hand.

Gaer: 3♠. Again, lead directing. Our four hearts should annoy them if we can establish a forcing defense. This could also be our hand if partner elects to bid again.

Dunitz: I want to bid. I want to bid. I want to bid. But whenever I bid 3♠ with this hand, we somehow get too high. Is there any solution? Yes! as long as I'm willing to give up the penalty double of 3♥. One should play 3♠ as competitive and double is a game try in spades or a responsive double. It works as follows: I double, partner bids 3♠ with all minimum hands, and bids his minor with extras. After partner's 3♠ bid, I bid 3NT to find out which minor he has when I hold both minors.

J.S.: Using double as a game try is surely the best way to go. You will have to contend with numerous competitive decisions before holding cards which warrant a penalty double of 3♥. With this hand, of course, you bid 3♠ as a competitive call.

Bell: Pass. No reason to take action, particularly since the contract should be played from the strong hand if indeed it is our hand.

Kantar: Pass. If partner has extras I expect to hear another bid, probably double. 3♠ is a bit too rich for my blood. I wouldn't blame partner for playing me for more than this.

J.S.: You might hold another high card for 3♠, but four spades to the queen will be useful if declarer has a good hand and wishes to bid on, either planning to make a game or as a save. He indeed did hold a good hand: ♠KJ972 ♥-- ♦A52 ♣AKJ86. The Cayne South bid 3♠ and North eventually bid 5♠ over 5♥. The Rosenthal South jumped to 4♠. Partner, thinking this actually showed some values, bid 6♠. Both declarers ruffed the opening heart lead and made the mistake of leading a trump. As a result, when spades proved to be 4-0, 6♠ was down four for -1100; 5♠ was down only -800.

The seven IMPs to Cayne was followed by two other big swings from which Rosenthal could not recover. Happy Fathers Day!

THE CACTUS FLOWER

NON-LIFE MASTER REGIONAL

SEPTEMBER 22-25, 2016

TUCSON, AZ

Where the desert turns to GOLD!

Open Pairs
Trophies

Gold Rush Pairs
Giveaways

Sunday Swiss
Prizes

Compact Knockouts

EARN 25 PERCENT GOLD POINTS IN TWO-SESSION EVENTS EXCLUSIVELY FOR NON-LIFE MASTERS WITH LESS THAN 750 POINTS.

FREE lectures Thursday through Saturday. FREE coffee, tea, Danish, salmon, bagels and candy.

Director in Charge: ERIC BELL

Co-chairs: STEVE REYNOLDS, tvsl@cox.net and CINDY SHOEMAKER, cndyshoemaker@yahoo.com

Partnerships: RUDY MARTINEZ, 925-382-9454, partnerships@southernarizonabridge.com

Fees: \$12 per session for paid members; \$16 for all others.

The Hotel Tucson, 475 N. Granada Ave., Tucson, AZ 520-622-3000

Room rates: \$69/79 double or single. Includes breakfast and WiFi.
Rooms reserved until September 16, 2016. Booking code: NLM REGIONAL.

www.facebook.com/southernarizonabridge or www.southernarizonabridge.com