



# Margaret Bourke Invitational Online Teams & Ted Chadwick Cup ebulletin 3



Webpage: [Results](#)

## Farewell with thanks

Well, what a great experience this was, with the chance to experience good play and defence, and for me, meeting many of my New Zealand friends in matches was wonderful.

Congratulations to Ashton, who sailed through the last stages with ease.

Peter Newell, a member of Cornell had a family emergency and couldn't compete in the 3rd and 4th playoff - so both teams finish equal 3rd by captains agreement, winning \$450 prize money.

Semi finals						
Team #	Team	C/F	Set 1	Total	Set 2	Total
1	THOMPSON	0.1	36	36.1	34	70.1
2	NZ MIXED	0	55	55	28	83
Team #	Team	C/F	Set 1	Total	Set 2	Total
3	ASHTON	0.1	31	31.1	53	84.1
4	CORNELL	0	14	14	4	18
Final						
Team #	Team	C/F	Set 1	Total	Set 2	Total
1	ASHTON	0.1	24	24.1	35	59.1
2	NZ MIXED	0	6	0	12	18

## Proper form

Dear Editor,

In Daily Bulletin #2 you correctly refer to Furuta by his last name, but incorrectly refer to Tadashi, Hiroshi, and Hiroki, which are all first names rather than the respective family names, namely Teramoto, Kaku, and Yokoi. Any chance you can fix this? (*Ed: done*).



Traditionally Japanese wrote their names in English in western style (family names last), unlike Chinese or Koreans who write family names first in English. Family names precede given names in the Japanese language when written or spoken in Japanese.

*Robert Geller, Japanese Seniors' Team*

I asked many of the players I met whether they had been enjoying the event. Notwithstanding disappointing performances (always a worry to those of us who suffer at the hands of the cards), the answer was a resounding "yes".

I was for a long time reluctant to play online bridge, but now I'm not so sure . . .

## So happy to be here

Lynryung Hwang from KOREA BTS team, took the time to send this message:



"Dear Organisers,

I was happy to be able to participate in such a great tournament.

I would like to participate in any tournament next time, so please let me know if there are any.

## The rest of KOREA BTS



Myungkee Park



Chunkyung Kim



Yungyoon Park



Kyunghae Sung



Sungae Yang

## Well done Japan Open (4 of 6): Ted Chadwick Cup winners



Furuta Kazuo



Hiroshi Kaku



Masaaki Takayama



Kyoko Shimamura

### The Semi-Finals

by Bill Jacobs

Thompson (Ben Thompson – Renee Cooper, Joe Haffer – Phil Markey) were up against NZ Mixed (Jenny Millington – Barry Jones, Jo & Sam Simpson, Liz & Blair Fisher).

And Ashton (Sophie Ashton – Maurits van der Flugt, Sartaj Hans – Avi Kanetkar, Ellena Moskovski – David Wiltshire) faced off against Cornell (Mike Cornell – Ashley Bach, Martin Reid – Peter Newell).

Board 1 saw a delicate competitive decision. You hold:


♠ Q 9 8 7 4  
♥ Q 10 8 5  
♦ 6 3 2  
♣ 2

With no one vulnerable, LHO opens 1♣, partner over-calls 1♠ and the next hand bids 2♣ (natural and forcing). The Law would tell you to pump it up to 4♠ now, based on your 10-card fit, but I think David Wiltshire showed excellent judgment to content himself with 3♠:



Jo and Sam Simpson

Board 1, North deals, nil vulnerable

	Cornell		
	♠ A 3		
	♥ A 6 3		
	♦ Q J 8 4		
	♣ K 6 5 3		
Wiltshire		Moskovsky	
♠ Q 9 8 7 4		♠ K J 10 5 2	
♥ Q 1 0 8 5		♥ 9 7 2	
♦ 6 3 2		♦ A 5	
♣ 2		♣ 9 8 4	
	Bach		
	♠ 6		
	♥ K J 4		
	♦ K 10 9 7		
	♣ A Q J 10 7		

West	North	East	South
	1♣	1♠	2♣
3♠	pass	pass	dbl
pass	3NT	all pass	


This gave his opposition just enough rope to hang themselves, getting to 3NT (rather than bidding and making minor suit games). Declarer went two down when the heart finesse failed.

At the other table, Avi Kanetkar, South splintered with 3♠ over 1♠, to avoid the failing 3NT. West saved in 4♠, doubled and down two for a 9 IMP swing to Ashton.

In the other match, Barry Jones, West showed similar good judgment to compete only to the three-level in spades, again catching the opponents in 3NT.

Vast quantities of IMPs flew back and forth in the Thompson - NZ-Mixed match, whilst the other semi-final stayed quiet. Then came:

Board 8, West deals, nil vulnerable

	Cooper		
	♠ A 7 4		
	♥ 10 8 4 2		
	♦ 6 4		
	♣ A J 7 3		
Jones		Millington	
♠ K 9 6 3 2		♠ Q J 10 8	
♥ A 6		♥ 9	
♦ Q J 10 5		♦ A 9 8 7	
♣ 6 5		♣ K 10 8 4	
	Thompson		
	♠ 5		
	♥ K Q J 7 5 3		
	♦ K 3 2		
	♣ Q 9 2		

West	North	East	South
pass	pass	pass	2♥ <sup>1</sup>
2♠	4♥	4♠	pass
pass	dbl	all pass	
1 11-14, 6 hearts			

Fans of the Pearson Count (Rule of 15) would triumph here. After three passes, South's hand has 11 HCP plus one spade = 12, not enough to bid. Thus pass the hand out and beat par.

Of course, with Ben Thompson, that was never going to happen. The auction quickly reached 4♠, and it was hard to blame Cooper for doubling with two aces, against two passed hands. On a heart lead, that was -590.

At the other table:

West	North	East	South
Markey	Jo S	Haffer	Sam S
1♠	pass	4♥	dbl
pass	pass	4♠	pass
pass	5♥	pass	pass
dbl	all pass		

Haffer's 4♥ splinter was dangerous on two levels. First of all, you don't want to find yourself declaring 4♥ (I've seen it happen on more than one occasion, and that's just me.) That potential disaster was avoided, however, when Sam Simpson took the opportunity to double 4♥ and Jo then coolly went on to 5♥, doubled and only down one. 10 IMPs to NZ Mixed.

Both tables in the other match reached 4♠, but Michael Cornell, North found the challenging ♦6 lead. (South had overcalled in hearts, North had given a 7-10 point raise.) That left David Wiltshire, West, with a very tricky decision.

If the lead is a singleton, you must go up with ♦A, hoping North has two black aces, so there is no entry to the South hand for a ruff. North must have ♣A anyway, otherwise there's no hope for the contract, and if South has ♠A it seems you are always down. This then boiled down to a decision on whether North has led from a doubleton or a singleton. Wiltshire guessed wrong, going up ♦A at trick 1, giving the defence the communications for the vital ruff.

At the other table, North led a stodgy heart so there were no problems.

The next board saw another of these "double or overcall" decisions.

Board 9, North deals, E/W vulnerable

Jo  
 ♠ K Q J 4 2  
 ♥ Q  
 ♦ J 10 9 7 4 3  
 ♣ 4

Markey  
 ♠ A 7 5 3  
 ♥ A J 6 5 4  
 ♦ ---  
 ♣ A Q 10 8

Haffer  
 ♠ 10 8 6  
 ♥ 10 7 3  
 ♦ A K  
 ♣ J 9 7 5 2

Sam  
 ♠ 9  
 ♥ K 9 8 2  
 ♦ Q 8 6 5 2  
 ♣ K 6 3

West	North	East	South
	pass	pass	1♦ <sup>Precision</sup>
dbl	1♠	2♦	pass
3♣	4♣	pass	pass
4♥	pass	5♣	all pass

What should West do over the third seat 1♦: double or 1♥? I wish someone could definitively answer this question for me. For the record, of the three players who faced this decision, two doubled, one bid 1♥.

I don't mind the double at all, but perhaps Markey might have taken the opportunity to bid 2♥ on the next round (as the other doubler did). This meant that his late 4♥ wasn't fully trusted, and Haffer went back to 5♣, a most ugly contract that didn't enjoy trick 2 after the singleton spade lead.

Incredibly 4♥ makes, with an overtrick to boot. After winning ♠A at trick 1, declarer simply plays ace and another trump. South gets endplayed with a 4<sup>th</sup> round of trumps to hand dummy the lead.

At the other table, NS sensibly took the -500 point 5♦ sacrifice against 4♥, for 13 IMPs to NZ Mixed, now increasing its lead.

At the halfway point, NZ Mixed led Thompson by 19 IMPs, Ashton led Cornell by 17.

In the second half, Thompson recovered a little, but NZ Mixed held on to win by 13.

(One has to feel for Thompson, who utterly obliterated the field in the Swiss qualifying, winning every match for a net IMP score of +235 in a day: their reward was a 0.1 IMP carryover, not enough.)

The other match was all one-way traffic, Ashton winning by 66 to set up an NZ-Mixed versus Ashton final.



### Chadwick on leads

The following deal, reported in *The Australian* 20 April, 1996, features lead problems faced by top players in the 1996 Playoffs, including Ted Chadwick, who we honour in today's Ted Chadwick Cup.

If you wish to match opening leads with the best of them, cover all but the West cards in this deal from the playoff final.

East deals, nil vulnerable

♠ A K 9 7 2  
 ♥ A Q J 7 2  
 ♦ 6  
 ♣ Q 8

♠ 8 6 3  
 ♥ ---  
 ♦ A K Q 10 9 8  
 ♣ 9 7 6 4

♠ J  
 ♥ 9 8 5 4 3  
 ♦ J 7 5  
 ♣ A J 5 3

♠ Q 10 5 4  
 ♥ K 10 6  
 ♦ 4 3 2  
 ♣ K 10 2

West	North	East	South
		pass	pass
3♦	4♦	5♦	5♠
all pass			

1. Both majors

What lead would you choose as West?

In the Women's final, after two passes one West opened 4♦, North bid 4♠ and East competed to 5♦. South bid 5♠, ending the auction. East led ♦5 and 11 tricks were made.

At the other table, West opened 1♦, and North bid 2♦, Michaels, both majors. South jumped to 3♠,

North bid 4♠, and ♦A was led, South making 11 tricks, no swing.

In the Open Final, the auctions were identical up to 5♦, when South, John Roberts doubled 5♦, rather than competing to 5♠. North, Matthew Thomson led ♠A and shifted to a trump.

Declarer, Tim Seres won the trump shift in hand, ruffed a spade, ruffed a heart and ruffed his last spade. He had to ruff a heart to return to hand, and two rounds of trumps exhausting South of trumps left him with only one trump, meaning he could not score a second club trick. Two down, -300.

Single dummy, both 5♥ and 5♠ appear to be excellent contracts, and -300 stands to be a modest gain against -450.

Ted Chadwick – David Beauchamp demonstrated that even 4♠ was too high on the NS cards. At their table, Stephen Burgess, South, figured all his cards were working, and soldiered on to 5♠.

West, Ted Chadwick, led ♦9, and David Beauchamp, East did the right thing, third hand high!

When ♦J won the trick, Beauchamp was in no doubt as to why Chadwick had underled ♦AKQ.

### The Final: Ashton vs NZ-Mixed

Bill Jacobs

The match started quietly with a tempting game down 1, followed by another tempting game down 1. On board 3, Wiltshire held:

♠ A  
♥ A Q 10 5  
♦ K J 6 4  
♣ K Q 9 3

He opened 1♣ and LHO's 1♦ was passed back to him. He bid 1NT to show his strength, and perhaps should not have been surprised when partner took it out to 2♠, down two. The winning choices were to pass out 1♦ or bid 1♥. That was 6 IMPs to NZ Mixed, who defeated their opponents' diamond contract.

Board 4 was a tempting game down one, as was Board 5 at one table (down two actually). But on this deal, Hans bucked the trend with:

♠ 9 2  
♥ A J 10 9 6 4  
♦ Q 8  
♣ J 9 5

Partner opened 1♠, RHO bid 2♣. Sartaj made the technically correct but often uncomfortable negative double. It worked perfectly, partner bidding 2♦ and he 2♥ to show long hearts in a not very strong hand. Partner passed and for the first time in the match, a contract had made.

At the other table, Jones bid 2♥ with this hand and got too high.

Board 7, South deals, all vulnerable

	♠ K 8 7 5 4										
	♥ Q 9 6 2										
	♦ 4										
	♣ 10 6 2										
♠ A Q 3 ♥ 8 7 4 3 ♦ K 9 6 ♣ A J 5	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> <table style="border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center; width: 40px; height: 40px;"> <tr><td></td><td>N</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>W</td><td></td><td>E</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>S</td><td></td></tr> </table> </div>		N		W		E		S		♠ -- ♥ K J 10 ♦ J 5 3 2 ♣ K Q 9 8 7 3
	N										
W		E									
	S										
	♠ J 10 9 6 2										
	♥ A 5										
	♦ A Q 10 8 7										
	♣ 4										

West	North	East	South
David	Jenny	Ellena	Barry
			1♠
dbl	4♠	4NT	Pass
5♣	all pass		

I must admit I don't care for Ellena Moskovsky's "two places to play" 4NT. Doesn't she really have only one place to play? Not to worry, 5♣ was reached anyway, a good save against 4♠, which became even better when neither opponent was able to double. Down two in 5♣ for -200.

West	North	East	South
Liz	Avi	Blair	Sartaj
			1♠
dbl	4♠	6♣	dbl
all pass			

I also don't care for Blair Fisher's 6♣, at least I don't having seen all four hands. If West's ♠AQ had been elsewhere, 6♣ may have had chances, but partners rarely have what you want.

Against 6♣ doubled, Sartaj found the good lead of ♦A ... partner's ♦4 was unreadable. He tried ♥A next and Avi's ♥2 made it clear he didn't like it. So another diamond, and declarer misguessed, going up with ♦K. That was -800 for 12 IMPs to Ashton.

At the halfway mark, Ashton led 24 to 6.

In the second half, NZ Open picked up 7 IMPs for bidding and making a thin game, and then another 5 IMPs for not bidding another thin game that goes down. The match was becoming very tight.

But that was it for the Kiwis. They missed a good game, and a few more IMPs dribbled away in overtricks and undertricks. Then ...

What do you open this hand, in second seat?

♠ 8 7 3 2  
♥ A K 8 5  
♦ K Q 7 5  
♣ A

Avi Kanetkar did the honest thing and opened 1♦. What his planned rebid was after a 2♣ response is unclear, but the sky was unlikely to fall down whatever he chose. Sartaj Hans scraped up 1♠ in response with:

♠ J 10 9 6  
♥ 10 6 2  
♦ A 4  
♣ 10 9 7 3

1♠ was raised to 3♠, a contract that made easily.

In the other room, Jenny Millington opened a 15-17 1NT. I'm sure she'd have lots of company, but 1NT was not a happy contract. She took five of the available six tricks in the hope of finding a 7<sup>th</sup>, to lose 200 and 7 IMPs.



Dave Wiltshire and Sophie Ashton

Sunday, October 3

## The Silliest Board (or that hand again)

by Bill Jacobs

The Gods were clearly laughing when this board was 'dealt'. At all vulnerable, you pick up:

♠ K Q J 10 9 8 6 2  
♥ A K Q 3  
♦ J  
♣ --

Partner deals and passes, RHO opens 1♣, and you?

A curse on all those who bid 4♠: where's your spirit of adventure?

Tim Bourke was imbued with the spirit: he bid 6♠. Partner, David Smith, held:

♠ A 7  
♥ 8 5  
♦ 10 8 6 5 2  
♣ Q 10 9 6

and did not make the rookie error of bidding 7♠, based on his ♠A. He's playing with Tim before.

I like what John McMahon did: he bid 5♠. In the world of madcap pre-empts, this could be open to misinterpretation, but not here: partner Charles McMahon duly bid 6♠.

Peter Gill and Sophie Ashton doubled 1♣, and over partner's response, *now* they bid 5♠. This made it quite clear that their 5♠ bid was not a pre-empt but a slam try. The only risk in this approach is playing a contract of 1♣ doubled: unlikely but possible. Their partners duly bid 6♠.

They were the four success stories; let's close with a sad tale.

Brad Coles overcalled 1♠: I've heard of heavy overcalls but this seemed ridiculous. But he had a plan. It went pass on his left, pass by partner (omygod!), and double by opener (phew!) Now Brad bid 5♣, quite clearly in his view, Exclusion Key Card Blackwood. Absolutely bloody brilliant.

The final contract of 5♣ was not a success.

*Ed: I wonder whether we will see this problem featuring in Bidding Forum, Brad?*