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Future Master Leaders
7/3 - NLM NAPQ Game
$1^{\text {st }} \mathrm{OA}$ : Patrick Lammers \& Janet Hansen (65.0\%, 1.69 MP ½ Red/½Black.)
$2^{\text {nd }} \mathrm{OA}$ : Kateherine Meyer \& P Wintzinger
(58.8\%, 1.27 MP ½ Red/½Black.)
$3^{\text {rd }} \mathrm{OA}$ : Reeta Brendamour \& Annette Keriakes
(57.1\%, 1.28 MP $1 / 2$ Red $/ 1 ⁄ 2$ Black.)
$4^{\text {th }}$ OA: Sara Brown \& Judy Barron
(55.8\%, 1.05 MP ½ Red/½Black.)

7/7 - NLM STaC Game (9 Tables)
$1^{\text {st }}$ NS: Charlie Kobida \& Mike Burns
(55.3\%, 0.80 SILVER MP)
$2^{\text {nd }}$ NS: David Elliot \& Carla Runda
(55.4\%, 0.56 SILVER MP)
$1^{\text {st }}$ EW: Alex Grimm \& Patrick Lammers
(69.2\%, 0.80 SILVER MP)


2nd EW: Evelyn McCarthy \& Partner
(52.5\%, 0.56 SILVER MP)

Be sure to check for North American Pair Qualifier
Games. Extra red/Black Points. For more about the North American Pairs (NAP) go to:
http://www.district11bridge.com/District 11 NAP FAQ.html

## Upcoming Events

July 6-12 STaC District 11
July 25-26 NLM Sectional Lexington KY
July 31 - Aug 2 Summer Getaway Sectional Hebron KY

## NO Saturday Supervised Play

July 11 (STaC) \& August 1 (NKy Sectional).
Saturday Supervised Play resumes July 18.
Link to Volunteers \& Topics:
http://www.cincybridge.com/Saturday-Supervised-Play-Schedule.html

## Sectional Tournament at Club (STaC):

SILVER points at the CBC! Remaining games:

| CBC | $\mathbf{7 / 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 / 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 / 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 / 1 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10:00A | NLM | NLM | NLM | Swiss |
| $2: 30 P$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Teams |
| $7: 00 \mathrm{P}$ | 0 |  |  |  |

NLM=NLM \& Open. O=Open Only. NLM attendance permitting Swiss Teams are Stratified - Form a Team and play to win your strata! NLMs are welcome on Sunday!

## CBA Future Master Games

Mon 7 PM < 2500
Tue 7 PM NLM
Wed 11 AM NLM/Homestyle
Fri 11 AM 0-20/NLM + Lecture
Sat 9:30 AM Lecture/Supervised Play

## Tuesday Night NLM Section Underway !!!

Let's get more of our friends to join us! Contact Tom Mess (tmess7023@gmail.com) and Lou Temples (lew@powderalloy.com) with any questions. Don’t forget Let's Talk Bridge! at 6:30 PM.

## 10:30 Friday 2/1 Game Force Series

Phyllis Bishop's 10:30 2/1 seminar series continues: July 10: 4th Suit Forcing

## Learn to Play Bridge Software (Free)

PCs only - Not for Apple computers).
Basics: http://www.bridgebase.com/download/ltpb1setup.exe
Beyond: http://www.bridgebase.com/download/Itpb2setup.exe
Click to see the Newcomers Bridge Series

## Hand of the Week Steve Moese

Winning the Battle of the Partials
Any idea how often we play slams, games or partials? Larry Cohen published an analysis of 1 Million bridge hands. As you can see we play fewer partials than games! Winning the contest for partials is an

| 3 NT | $18.1 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| $4 \vee / \mathrm{a}$ | 24.9 |
| 5-level | 8.6 |
| Small | 5.7 |
| Grand | 0.5 |
| SubTot | $57.8 \%$ |
| Partials | $42.2 \%$ | important element in all forms of scoring.

You are North - East Deals and EW are Vulnerable. Your hand:

| NORTH |
| :--- |
| $\wedge$ Q1097 |
| $\bullet$ Q862 |
| $\bullet$ Q3 |
| J J62 |


| em to 11-12 | N | E | S | W |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P. West's $1^{\text {st }}$ |  | P | P | 1 |
| suss sugests | P | P | Dbl | P |
| , ${ }^{\text {exing }}$ ( Why | 14! | P | P | 2\% |
| es North bid 1 | 29 | P | 24 | AP |

instead of 1v? Don't we bid up the line with both 4card majors? Look what happened here - West rebid 2\&. If we'd bid 1 first, we'd have to bid 2 to show
our second suit. Bidding 1s with about 6-7 HCP gets both major suits in and keeps the auction at the 2Level. If North were a little stronger (add the 2 Q for example), then a $2 \%$ cue bid would be best! GAME FORCING you think? Not at all. A cue bid here is forcing until a fit is found, and implies interest in both majors. With A GF hand ( $12+\mathrm{SPs}$ ) advancer will keep bidding - you will know the difference!
BTW, North knows partner has support for the 3 unbid suits. How? With a balanced shape unsuitable for a balancing double, partner would bid 1NT. This is not a 15-18 hand with sound stoppers in their suit. A Balancing NT is 11-14 HCP and a shape unsuitable for take-out. A balancing 1NT doesn't promise a stopper! It simply shows a desire to compete. Since partner doubled, we know they hold no more than 2 \% cards.

The Play -


The Opening Lead: 25. Since people don't usually underlead Aces, playing small from dummy has much to recommend it. Declarer called for the K (an error) and West won the $A$. The $\downarrow K$ drew the $\downarrow 8$ from East (upside down signals, showing low interest in $a \diamond$ continuation). The $\forall A$ caught the $Q$ from North and the $\$ 4$ from East (even remaining number of cards). East won the small and promptly returned the $3^{\text {rd }} \star$. Dummy won the $\geqslant 10$, pitching a -. A small toward North (always lead through the person you think has the Ace) pulled the $\uparrow A$ from

West. A return put North to the guess. If West has the $\Delta J$, ruffing with the $\$ 10$ is sufficient. If East has the $\Delta$, then North must ruff with the $\boldsymbol{\wedge} \mathrm{K}$ and finesse the $\triangleq$ J. North chose to play West (the bidder) with the $\$ \mathrm{~J}$ and was over-ruffed by East. North could drew trumps, but there was the finesse for the 『K. Even if the finesse worked, it would require a doubleton $\vee K$ for North to escape with no $\vee$ losers. West won the vK for down 2 and -100.

## Post Mortem

Many would open South's hand 1*. West would have a maximum 1 N overcall of that bid. Now North is stuck - with no safe way to explore a Major suit partial. Strange how South's actions set EW up for their best or worst result.
North made 2 bad guesses out of 2 tries. Playing low on the opening lead should have been automatic. It cost NS an extra undertrick.

EW 2N; 2*; 2e; NS 2ヵ; 1v; Par-100: NS 3@×-1

| Contract |  | Score |  | MPs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N-S | E-W | N-S | E-W |
| 2 | S | 2110 |  | 5 | 0 |
| 3 | S | -2 | 100 | 3.5 | 1.5 |
| 2 | N | -2 | 100 | 3.5 | 1.5 |
| 1 NT | W | 2 | 120 | 2 | 3 |
| 1 NT | W | 3 | 150 | 0.5 | 4.5 |
| 1 NT | W | 3 | 150 | 0.5 | 4.5 |
| 2* | W | -1 100 |  | 5 | 0 |
| 2 | S | -1 | 50 | 3.5 | 1.5 |
| 2 | S | -1 | 50 | 3.5 | 1.5 |
| 2 | W | 2 | 90 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | N | -3 | 150 | 1 | 4 |
| 2 NTx | S | -4 | 800 | 0 | 5 |

-100 was worth 3.5 out of 5 MPs in the open game and only 2 of 5 in the NLM game. -50 would have been worth only 0.5 MP more in the open game but 1 more in the NLM game. North's bidding 14 not 1v allowed NS to stop at the 2level. West's decision not to rebid 1NT allowed NS to compete to a
better spot. Bid 'em if you got 'em!
NS benefitted by keeping EW out of their NT contract. Hmmm - there's a lesson here.

Mike Purcell will return to the Future Master Newsletter next week.

