## 11. Goodbye, Columbus - Hello Bid72

## By Ron Klinger

Teams in the Columbus Alt on-line tournament in place of the Vanderbilt Knock-Out Teams:
Blass Josef Blass, Sjoert Brink, Bas Drijver, Jacek Kalita, Michael Nowosadski, Jacek Pszczola (Pepsi)
Spector Vincent Demuy, John Hurd, John Kranyak, Warren Spector, Gavin Wolpert, Joel Woolbridge
Moss Ishmael Del'Monte, Roger Lee, Eldad Ginossar, David Grainger, Brad Moss, Sylvia Moss
Upmark Peter Bertheau, Per Ola Cullin, Simon Hult, Marion Michielsen, Fredrik Nyström, Mikael Rimstedt, Ola Rimstedt, Johan Upmark
Tulin David Bakhshi, Alon Birman, Dror Padon, Ricco van Prooijen, Stan Tulin, Louk Verhees
Meltzer Billy Cohen, Nikolay Demirev, Rose Meltzer, Ron Smith
Lavazza Dennis Bilde, Norberto Bocchi, Philippe Cronier, Giorgio Duboin, Agustin Madala, Antonio Sementa
Street Thomas Bessis, Nic L'écuyer, Cédric Lorenzini, Hugh McGann, Tom Hanlon, Paul Street
After Day 1, the leaders were Lavazza 31.97 Victory Points, Street 25.44, Moss 23.53, Upmark 23.00.
After Day 2, the leaders were Tulin, 56.08 Victory Points, Lavazza 53.86, Blass 45.83, Moss 42.80 .
Day 3 results:
Round 5:
Lavazza 18.09 (+49 Imps) beat Moss 1.91
Spector $12.12(+9)$ beat Blass 7.88
Upmark 19.14 (+61) beat Meltzer 0.86
Street $10.50(+2)$ beat Tulin 9.50.
Round 6:
Lavazza 15.39 (+27) beat Tulin 4.61.
Upmark 19.65 (+68) beat Spector 0.35.
Moss 15.39 (+27) beat Street 4.61.
Blass 19.44 (+65) beat Meltzer 0.56.
Standings after Round 6:

| Team | Victory Points |
| :--- | :---: |
| Lavazza | 87.34 |
| Upmark | 76.05 |
| Blass | 73.15 |
| Tulin | 70.19 |
| Moss | 60.10 |
| Street | 57.40 |
| Spector | 46.08 |
| Meltzer | 9.69 |

The last round (see tomorrow) features LAVAZZA vs UPMARK, placed first and second with one round to go.
North dealer : Both vulnerable

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Pass | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{a}^{(1)}$ |
| Dble $^{(2)}$ | $?$ |  |  |

(1) Weak two
(2) For takeout

What would you do as North with:

- A102
- 3
- J107432
* KQ10

|  | North <br> - A102 <br> $\checkmark 3$ <br> - J107432 <br> * KQ10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West |  | East |
| - Q3 |  | - 75 |
| - QJ754 |  | $\checkmark$ A108 |
| - AQ8 |  | - K95 |
| * A76 |  | \& J9842 |
|  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A KJ9864 } \\ & \text { ๒ K962 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | $\text { - } 6$ |  |

After the auction above in LAVAZZA vs MOSS, both Norths bid 3^, all pass. LAVAZZA’s South made nine tricks, +140 , MOSS +170, +1 Imp. The swings were greater in the other three matches.

## BLASS vs SPECTOR

BLASS North-South:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $1 \star$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{}$ | Dble $^{(1)}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}^{(2)}$ | $3 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

(1) Shows three spades
(2) Good raise to $3 \downarrow$

West’s $\vee \mathrm{J}$ lead was taken by the ace. East shifted to the $\uparrow$. West won with $\uparrow$ Q and continued with the $\star$. South ruffed, cashed $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$, crossed to the $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$ and ruffed a diamond. South ruffed a low heart and pitched a heart loser and the two club losers on dummy's three diamond winners.

Note that South has seven losers and North has seven losers and North-South have a good trump-fit. $7+7=14$ and 24-14 = 10 tricks likely (see The Modern Losing Trick Count).

SPECTOR North-South:

| West | North <br> Kranyak | East | South <br> Demuy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dble | Pass | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{a}$ |
|  | $4!$ | Dble | All Pass |

West led the $\uparrow 3$. South won cheaply and played the $\downarrow 6$. West took the $\downarrow$ Q and switched to the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$. East won with the $\downarrow$ A. South's $\vee K$ won the heart return and shifted to the 3 . West rose with the ace. South could win any return, cash the A to draw trumps, ruff a heart and cash $=\mathrm{K}$, pitching the other heart. Ten tricks, +790 and +11 Imps.

In days gone by, one did not open a weak two with $4+$ cards in the other major. In the present, anything goes for many experts.

|  | North <br> - A102 <br> $\checkmark 3$ <br> - J107432 <br> * KQ10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West |  | East |
| - Q3 |  | - 75 |
| - QJ754 |  | - A108 |
| - AQ8 |  | - K95 |
| * A76 |  | \& J9842 |
|  | South |  |
|  | ^ KJ9864 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K962 |  |
|  | - 6 |  |
|  | - 53 |  |

## MELTZER vs UPMARK

MELTZER North-South had the Pass : Pass : 2^: Double, $3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$, all pass auction. South made ten tricks, +170 .

UPMARK North-South:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Pass | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}^{(1)}$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$ | Dble $^{(2)}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$ |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{a}$ | $4 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$ | Dble |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

(1) Weak two in hearts or in spades
(2) Pass or correct

East's actions were less than ideal. One should not sacrifice with a balanced hand. One should not compete to the 4level with part-score values. If you want to support partner, do it at once. East could/should have bid $3 \vee$ over North's double.

I have often thought that when partner does something like that to you, partner should be obliged to play the hand. North led the $\downarrow 7$. West won with the $\downarrow 8$ and played the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ : three - eight - king. South switched to the $\uparrow 9$, queen, ace, and North returned the J for South to ruff. South cashed the $₫ \mathrm{~K}$ and switched to the 2 . West took the and drew trumps. West lost two spades, two clubs, the $¥ \mathrm{~K}$ and a diamond ruff, three down, North-South +800 and +12 Imps.

## STREET vs TULIN

TULIN North-South had the Pass : Pass : 2 $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$ : Double, 3^, all pass auction. South made ten tricks, +170 .
STREET North-South had the Pass : Pass : 2^ : Double, 4^: Double, all pass, auction South also made ten tricks, +790 and +12 Imps.

With each new convention I scream,
Why can't bids say what they mean?
Then I'd understand
What was in partner's hand.
Alas, that is only a dream.
(ACBL Bulletin, March 2020)

