

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 1A

1. This situation arose at my own club recently. South is declarer, but East out of turn makes a face down opening lead. South now starts to put her cards on the table as dummy! (It seems that South was a little stressed during the auction). How would you rule, and under what Laws?
2. You are running a full weekend congress of 24 tables, playing three 8 table sections. For the two qualifying sessions, you decide to play 32 boards for session 1, move the EWs across, then play 24 boards for session 2. Is there any factoring required to reach matchpoint aggregate totals for the two sessions for qualifying purposes?
3. Another ruling situation I met recently.

Board 18 NS Vul Dealer East

	♠4	
	♥K875	
	♦QJ9652	
	♣73	
♠A97		♠QJ853
♥A43		♥J10962
♦108		♦73
♣AK1094		♣5
	♠K1062	
	♥Q	
	♦AK4	
	♣QJ862	

Bidding:	W	N	E	S
			P	1♣
	1NT	2♦*	P	2♥
	P	3♦	3♠	All pass.

* Alerted by South and explained as transfer.

EW call you after the hand. How do you approach this situation?

A few things for you to get your teeth into. Comments follow in 1B

Reg.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 1B

I set this question in lesson 1A.

You are running a full weekend congress of 24 tables, playing three 8 table sections. For the two qualifying sessions, you decide to play 32 boards for session 1, move the EWs across, then play 24 boards for session 2. Is there any factoring required to reach matchpoint aggregate totals for the two sessions for qualifying purposes?

The answer is 'No'. Why? Because every player in this event has played a total of 56 boards, all with the same top of 14. So the same aggregate score is available to the whole field, and there is no need to factor.

Factoring is an area which many directors do not understand well. I'm going to devote all of this article to it. There are two possible reasons for factoring:

1. Where you are aggregating scores for more than one session and there are different tops available in the two sessions. Before aggregating, you must make the two lots of scores equivalent.
2. Where players whose scores are being compared (either within one section or between sections) where different numbers of boards have been played. So the total available matchpoints were not available to all players.

Can illustrate best by example.

#1. Simple 9 table Mitchell. 27 boards, 9 scores per board, top of 16. Every player NS and EW plays the same number of boards with the same top, so scores are comparable. If you wanted to give a prize for the best matchpoint score over the whole field, you could just select the highest matchpoint total in the whole field.

#2. 7 1/2 table with NS Rover. Playing 28 boards. There are 7 scores per board, top of 12. EWs all play 28 boards. The NSs play only 24 boards, except for pair 7 who does not sit out, and plays 28 boards. To make the NS scores all comparable within this NS section, all NSs except pair 7 must have their scores multiplied by 28 / 24, and you can now compare total matchpoints. For an overall prize, you could compare scores across the whole field, as now all scores are equivalent to 28 boards with a top of 12.

#3. A 9 table Mitchell playing two sessions. With two full movements you could just aggregate the two sessional matchpoints as all have played 54 boards with a top of 16. However, for session 2, one NS pair fails to appear, so we have 8 1/2 tables. Assume that the NS fields and EW fields stay in the same direction for session 2. There are only 8 scores on the TSC in session 2, so the top becomes 14. EW sit out one round in session 2. To tabulate:

	NS	EW
Session 1:	27 boards with a top of 16	27 boards with a top of 16
Session 2:	27 boards with a top of 14	24 boards with a top of 14.

All the boards for session 2 have a lower available top. Before you can aggregate the scores for the two sessions, you must make the session 2 scores equivalent to a top of 16 by multiplying session 2 scores by 16/14. So now the NSs would have been scored as a total of 54 boards with a top of 16. The EWs would have been scored as a total of 51 boards with a top of 16. The tops available on every board are now the same i.e. 16. If you need only to place NS and EW within their own sections, that is all the factoring you need to do.

However, what if you wish to give a prize for the best score over the whole field? Or what if you mixed up the field for session 2 so that many players were now sitting in a different direction, and you were awarding outright places on total matchpoints? Now those who sat EW in session 2 are disadvantaged because they played only 24 boards. So, to rectify this, you must, as before, factorise all scores by 16/14 to compensate for the difference in tops. but you must do a further factoring to bring the EW scores for session 2 up to the equivalent of the NS 27 boards. You would multiply then by a further 27/24. Now all raw matchpoint scores are equivalent to 54 boards with a top of 16.

Important note: When factorising for tops, the factor is Top/Top. When you factor for boards, the factor is No. of boards/No of boards.

#4. A little more complicated example. You are running a small 19 table congress with two qualifying sessions. You play as two Mitchells, swapping the sections after session 1. Places 1,2 and 3 in each section and direction will qualify for the final, and also the best 4th NS overall and the best 4th EW overall. So you are comparing scores not just within each section and direction, but across the two fields.

You play A section as 10 tables with a skip (9 scores per board) and B section as 9 tables (9 scores per board) for session one. So, for this session, all have played 27 boards with a top of 16. For session 2, A NS move to B EW and B EW move to A NS so that now we have two 9 1/2 table sections. We must now play 30 boards with a share and bye for both sections. Remember we need to compare across the original fields to find the best 4ths. So

	Original sections			
	A NS	A EW	B NS	B EW
Session 1	27 x 16	27 x 16	27 x 16	27 x 16
Session 2	27 x 16	27 x 16	30 x 16	30 x 16

Fortunately the tops are all the same. But, because you are looking for the best 4th NS, you must make the scores comparable by factoring the A NS by 30/27. Likewise the original A EW.

So whether you factor depends on:

- (a) Are there different tops where you are amalgamating scores for the group whose totals you are comparing?
- (b) Are there different total numbers of boards played by pairs within the group whose scores you are comparing?

Factoring in Barometer or Swiss pairs movements:

Occasionally, you may be unlucky enough to have to run a Swiss Pairs event with a half table. Or perhaps a Barometer movement with a half table where you have to curtail the movement. How do you cope with this? You need to know how your scoring program treats the sitout round, but most would probably award an average score for this round.

In a Swiss pairs of say 11 rounds, 11 players out of the field would sit out. Giving them an average will disadvantage them if they averaged, say, 58% on their other rounds. It is a simple process to give them the equivalent of their other round scores for their sitout round. Where the program awards an average, subtract this average from their total score to get their results for 10 rounds, then factor that result by 11/10. Use a similar procedure for a curtailed Barometer movement.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 1C

I presented this ruling problem in Lesson 1A. This is an excellent example for discussion purposes.

Boardd 18 NS Vul Dealer East

	♠4	
	♥K875	
	♦QJ9652	
	♣73	
♠A97		♠QJ853
♥A43		♥J10962
♦108		♦73
♣AK1094		♣5
	♠K1062	
	♥Q	
	♦AK4	
	♣QJ862	

Bidding:	W	N	E	S
			P	1♣
	1NT	2♦*	P	2♥
	P	3♦	3♦	All pass.

* Alerted by South and explained as transfer.

EW call you after the hand. How do you approach this situation?

Discussion:

In all situations where opponents claim misexplanation, your first task is to decide whether there actually was MI. Perhaps the information was correct and the bid was systemically incorrect. So your first task is to establish what the NS agreement was. But there is a further consideration you should always make.

Tip: Whenever misinformation (MI) or a misbid situation arises, there is in most cases also unauthorized information (UI), and this should also be considered in reaching a judgment. Remember also that MI includes such things as incorrect alerts and failure to alert.

In this case, North has heard South's alert, (whether it was incorrect or not), and subsequently must not take any action suggested over another by this UI.

First step: was there MI? You question both players as to their agreement, and if necessary check their system card. This is the sort of situation where the two players often have different ideas about their agreement (do transfers apply over a 1NT overcall?), and it may not be possible to establish what their agreement actually is. The footnote to Law 75 makes it clear that the Director is to assume misexplanation rather than misbid in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Assume we decide on MI. Next step: were the opponents damaged? In deciding on this, we proceed as follows. What would be the likely auction in the absence of the MI? Bear in mind that EW are entitled to know that the 2♦ bid was natural. They are not entitled to **know** that NS are

having a misunderstanding, but are entitled to draw that conclusion from South's alert, but at their own risk. North is not entitled to know that South has treated his 2♦ as a transfer, and South is not entitled to know that North's 2♦ bid was natural. North should treat South's 2♥ bid as natural, and should pass having found their best fit. There are all sorts of possible outcomes on this hand, but one likely scenario would be that East would pass, suspecting a misunderstanding between NS, and might then pass out 2♥ opting for a positive score.

One could make a case for South's 2♥ bid being forcing (a reverse), though the 1NT overall makes this less likely. Perhaps we should require North to treat this as forcing for one round and raise to 3♥? Whatever, the likely scenario in this hand is that, without the UI, NS will play in some number of hearts. East will not double. Game is unlikely for EW, and a double may allow NS to escape by legitimately alerting them to their misunderstanding.

In adjusting the score, Law 12C2 requires us to sometimes award non-balancing scores to NS and EW. Suppose we decide that the most likely result in 3♥ is NS -300, but that somewhat less than perfect play will produce a -400 result for NS. We shall award EW +300 and NS -400. We should specify which score is to be used for matchpointing in pairs. Better I think is to treat this sort of result as an average for comparison with the rest of the field, and adjust the NS and EW matchpoints manually.

Assume we decide that there was no MI, but that NS forgot the system. Is that the end of the matter? No adjustment? No, because now we must consider the UI involved. The same considerations apply, and we will make a similar adjustment.

By the way, suppose you meet a quite difficult situation where you find it very difficult to decide what might have happened on this hand without the infraction. Do you just throw your hands in the air and decide to award an Av+ and Av-? No. Read Law 12C1, which says you may award an artificial adjusted score only when no result can be obtained on the hand. When there has been a result, you must assign an assigned adjusted score i.e. an actual bridge score under Law 12C2. Admittedly, 12C2 does say that this score may be assigned in total points or matchpoints, but this refers to a situation where you work out the assigned score, and award the respective result in matchpoints to the two sides. In a very extreme case, it may be acceptable to award some sort of result in matchpoints (which may be the equivalent of 60% / 40%, but is not an artificial adjusted score)

During the course of these lessons, we'll come back often to this type of situation, because this is one of the most difficult area for congress directors. I urge all aspiring congress directors to join the ABDA and receive their quarterly bulletin, which is full of useful information and articles.

More soon.

Reg.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 1D

Question from Lesson 1A:

1. This situation arose at my own club recently. South is declarer, but East out of turn makes a face down opening lead. South now starts to put her cards on the table as dummy! (It seems that South was a little stressed during the auction). How would you rule, and under what Laws?

Law 54 cannot apply, since that Law applies only to a faced opening lead out of turn. So where do we go? Read Law 17E, which tells us that the auction period has not ended until the opening lead is faced. So clearly we are still in the auction period, even though technically the auction has finished. (It isn't unconditionally finished, because, if some MI comes to light, the TD could reopen the auction and allow East to change his final pass).

So the situation now is (a) East has a card face down on the table during the auction period, and (b) South has several cards face up on the table during the auction period. There is no penalty for (a), though it is a breach of procedure, and in this case, there is no penalty for (b). In the rare event that MI came to light and the TD re-opened the auction with East changing her pass to a call of some kind, then Law 24C would oblige North to pass!

So my answer to this problem: I would tell East to take back her face down card, West to make her opening lead, and South as declarer to pick up her cards. Any cards seen by EW would be authorized information to them.

Reg.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 2A

Following our previous discussions on UI and MI situations, here are a few more. I make no apology for hammering this area, because it can be quite difficult even for experienced directors, so the more practice and discussion the better. These are real life problems such as you will face every day at your own club. Make up your mind about your own decision and your reasons and I'll give my own views in Lesson 2B.

Ruling 1:

Board 8

Nil Vul

Dealer West

♠QT932

♥J4

♦J9865

♣J

♠754

♥KT7

♦AQ4

♣9864

♠8

♥A65

♦T732

♣AQT52

♠AKJ6

♥Q9832

♦K

♣K73

	W	N	E	S
The bidding:	P	P	P	1♣*
	P	1♦	P	1♥
	P	P	2♣	P
	P	2♥	P	P
	3♣	P**	P	3♥

All pass

* Precision

** Agreed hesitation

I'm not sure if the Director was called before the hand was played and EW reserved their rights (whatever that means)

However 3♥ was allowed to make. Director was called after the play of the hand and restored the contract to 3♣ making for EW and an equal top. Most of the field were in some number of spades NS.

Do you agree with the Director's ruling?

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

Ruling 2:

Board 2
NS Vul
Dealer East

	♠KQ65		
	♥J10842		
	♦AK		
	♣Q2		
♠10			♠A9842
♥Q			♥63
♦Q1082			♦7543
♣KJ87643			♣A9
	♠J72		
	♥AK975		
	♦J96		
	♣106		

	W	N	E	S
The Bidding	4♣*	P	4♠	P
	5♣	P	5♦	P
	6♣	All pass**		

*Alerted and described as Gerber.

** At the end of the auction, West informed NS of the mistaken explanation.

NS get a plus score, but claim that they would have doubled had they known the correct explanation.

How would you rule and why? As you can see, 4♥ can go off on not very brilliant defence.

Reg.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 2B

My comments on the rulings in Lesson 2A.

Reg.

Ruling 1:

Board 8

Nil Vul

Dealer West

♠QT932

♥J4

♦J9865

♣J

♠754

♥KT7

♦AQ4

♣9864

♠8

♥A65

♦T732

♣AQT52

♠AKJ6

♥Q9832

♦K

♣K73

	W	N	E	S
The bidding:	P	P	P	1♣*
	P	1♦	P	1♥
	P	P	2♣	P
	P	2♥	P	P
	3♣	P**	P	3♥

All pass

* Precision

** Agreed hesitation

I'm not sure if the Director was called before the hand was played and EW reserved their rights (whatever that means)

However 3♥ was allowed to make. Director was called after the play of the hand and restored the contract to 3♣ making for EW and an equal top. Most of the field were in some number of spades NS.

Do you agree with the Director's ruling?

Comment: Here we have a clear hesitation by North in a competitive auction. South is in possession of UI – that North was contemplating some action other than pass. What are his obligations? Look at law 73C: when a player has UI, he must **‘carefully avoid taking any**

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

advantage that might accrue to his side’. Or Law 16A: he may not choose from logical alternative actions one that could demonstrably be suggested over another by the extraneous information’.

Players used to be told that, when in possession of UI, they should ignore the UI and bid what they would normally bid. This is incorrect. There are more constraints than this. If their normal action is one that may have been suggested over another logical action by the UI, then by law they must not take that ‘normal’ action. The Laws don’t define a ‘logical alternative’. In Australia, the National Authority has given us guidelines: if the action taken is one that 75% of the players in this field would have taken without the UI, then there is no logical alternative. The corollary then is that a LA is one that 25% of players in this field may have taken. Implicit in this is the assumption that the other players would be playing a similar system with similar agreements. An example:

You open 1♣, LHO bids 2♠ (weak), partner thinks for some time and then passes. Round to you. You now double. If you can convince me that it is your partnership agreement that, because you play negative doubles in this situation, it is almost mandatory for you to reopen with a double with a reasonable hand short in spades, then I would have no difficulty in accepting this call. This, by the way, is why it is important that players have an adequate system card, because the Director can confirm this from your card. So partnership agreement may justify your action.

Partnership style is perhaps another matter. It’s harder to confirm from your system card, and, in any case, your individual or partnership style is now constrained, because you have UI and must conform with Laws 16 & 73.

On to our question. In assessing South’s action, try to ignore the other hands. Look at South’s hand and at the bidding, and treat it as a bidding problem. What action do you take, and importantly, what action would other players take when the bidding comes round to South?

South has three possible actions – pass, bid 3♥ or double. I myself would pass, as I believe would many players. This might be our last chance for a plus score – I have good defensive values and partner is weak. At pairs, I might even double. But I would not bid 3♥. So South has at least two LA’s. 3♥ is not a 75% action.

However, we don’t automatically disallow the 3♥ bid yet. We know have to decide whether the 4♥ bid was ‘demonstrably suggested’ by the UI. North’s options when he hesitated were pass, bid on, or double. South knows from his own holding that North was not contemplating a double of 3♣. So the 3♥ bid was demonstrably suggested by North’s hesitation. I would disallow the bid, and adjust the score to the result expected in 3♣ by East.

I see this situation as so clear cut that I would be tempted to apply a procedural penalty to South (if South was an experienced player) for a clear infraction of Law 16 and Law 73. Players who blatantly infringe the law should learn that an adjusted score is not the worst thing that can happen to them, and that sometimes a procedural penalty will also apply.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

To say this is not saying anything about South's ethics. South has shown insufficient regard for his obligations under the Laws, and so is subject to penalty.

If, instead of bidding 3♥, South had doubled (and it had worked), I would have had much more difficulty in reaching a decision. Double was not nearly so demonstrable by the UI. But, on balance, I think I would have disallowed it, because the knowledge that North may have some extra values makes the double more attractive than pass.

Let's go back to 'demonstrably' in Law 16. A little bit of history may help. This word appears for the first time in the 97 Laws. Pre 1997, there was an increasing tendency, especially in the ACBL, to apply a policy of 'If it hesitates, shoot it'. In other words, players who guessed right after partner's hesitation would have their good score taken from them, even though the hesitation may not have been informative. The classical situation:

Partner bids 1♠, you respond with 2♠, partner ponders for some time and then bids 3♠. Round to you. Obviously he has extra values. But what was his problem? He could have been thinking of passing 2♠, or he could have been thinking of bidding 4♠. In the bad old days, whether you passed or bid 4♠ and your decision was right, you were likely to lose your good score. Now we can say that North's hesitation didn't demonstrably suggest pass over 4♠, or suggest 4♠ over pass. Now you would be allowed to keep your score. Whilst partner's hesitation was UI, it didn't demonstrably suggest one action over another.

Another example. Partner opens 1♥, 1♠ from RHO, 4♥ from you and 4♠ from LHO. Long think from partner then pass. Many regular pairs have an agreement in this situation: we don't sell out to 4♠; either we bid on in hearts or double them in spades. So, after the 4♠ bid, a double from partner suggests defending the hand, and 5♥ wants to play 5♥. A pass says 'I'm not sure what to do. Partner, you make the decision'. In effect, partner's pass is forcing, and the long think doesn't provide any more info than does the pass. If the Director is satisfied that this is your agreement, he will have no problem in accepting your subsequent action.

But contrast this with the same situation, but partner after his long think now doubles. The double says 'I think we should defend this hand' but the long think adds 'But I'm not really sure about it'. Now you need to consider the Laws before taking your action. You would need to have a pretty defenseless hand to justify pulling the double.

Director's guidelines on doubles: if a player makes a fast double, he will be unhappy if partner pulls it. If a player makes a slow double, he won't be unhappy if partner pulls it.

Discussion of the second problem from Lesson 2A follows in Lesson 2C.

Reg.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 2C

I repeat here the second problem from Lesson 2A, and offer my comments.

Board 2

NS Vul

Dealer East

	♠KQ65		
	♥J10842		
	♦AK		
	♣Q2		
♠10			♠A9842
♥Q			♥63
♦Q1082			♦7543
♣KJ87643			♣A9
	♠J72		
	♥AK975		
	♦J96		
	♣106		

	W	N	E	S
The Bidding	4♣*	P	4♠	P
	5♣	P	5♦	P
	6♣	All pass**		

*Alerted and described as Gerber.

** At the end of the auction, West informed NS of the mistaken explanation.

NS get a plus score, but claim that they would have doubled had they known the correct explanation.

How would you rule and why? As you can see, 4♥ can go off on not very brilliant defence.

Comment: A very complex situation. Following our catechism, decide first of all: Was there MI? You need to question the EW players and check their system card. They were not a regular partnership, so it is likely that there was MI. Remember, where there is doubt, opt for MI rather than misbid. So assume for the moment that there was MI.

Remembering our earlier tip when there is MI, ask yourself also was there UI? Yes, West knows that East has interpreted her 4♣ as ace asking. She is not entitled to take any further action based on this knowledge.

Our next step is to decide whether EW were damaged, and, if so, what score to adjust to. This is another of those ‘what if’ situations – we have to decide what would probably have occurred without the infractions. This is sometimes easy, often difficult, and sometimes almost impossible. What we can’t do is accede to NS’s request to allow them to have doubled 5♣, as though they suddenly became aware of the situation near the end of the auction. We have to decide what may have happened had the correct info been available at the start of the auction.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

Tip: Directors and committees are sometimes disadvantaged by knowing all the hands and the likely results before making their judgments. In assessing what a particular player may do, ignore this info. Look only at the hand and the bidding to this point.

Tip: In assessing these what - if situations, always use the following little trick. Imagine that all four players are sitting at computers where, every time opponents make a call, the full meaning of this call comes up on the screen but of course not the opponents' screen. In this way, there is never any need to ask questions or receive explanations, so there is no UI and no MI. If the opponents have their wires crossed, they will carry on oblivious to the fact until, perhaps, at some stage the actual bidding may wake them up to their error.

So let's apply this trick to our current problem. West bids 4♣ (to play) and NS know this. But East thinks this is ace asking. North will take some action: with both majors double for takeout is probably best. East will obediently show her aces. It seems unlikely that EW have any sophisticated understanding such as ROPI in this situation, so East will probably bid 4♠. South's best action, with her flattish hand, would be double.

Round to West. What is her correct action? She has bid 4♣ to play, and has heard West suggest she wants to play in 4♠, despite North's takeout double. There is no reason why East could not have a spade suit as good or better than West's club suit. So West's correct action is to pass. Pass by North and back to East, no doubt very puzzled at this point. West has asked for aces, I've shown her two, and she is content to settle in 4♠ doubled! East is no doubt puzzled, but I'm not sure that there is sufficient information from the bidding to suggest strongly that EW have had a misunderstanding, and for East to run to 5♣.

So one (very generous) adjusted score could be NS + 800 (in 4♠ X). This is contingent on so many things happening when there are all sorts of other possibilities. Perhaps NS find their heart fit and go off in 4♥ or 5♥. However the TD in this sort of situation has to make his best judgment of what might have happened without the infractions. You might need to discuss with NS their methods over 4♣. If North says that she would have bid 4♥ over the 4♣, then you proceed on that assumption, in which case NS may finish in 5♥ going off, and their plus score means that they were not damaged.

We assumed at the start that there was MI. But suppose that 4♣ systemically was always for aces, so there was no MI but a misbid. Does this mean no adjustment? No, because there has been UI. East's explanation has woken West up to her misbid, and she must ignore this. Again she should pass 4♠ – as far as West is concerned, East has indicated that she wants to play in 4S.

Some might suggest that, in the actual auction, North should have realized before her final pass that there has been some misunderstanding between EW and should have doubled 6♣. This is true. But, after MI or UI, the non-offending side do not lose their rights to adjustment by subsequent poor bidding or play. It is only if their actions are wild, gambling or irrational that they lose such rights.

One further piece of advice: where possible, always consult in trying to reach such judgments. With fellow directors if available. But, if not, you could consult with experienced players as to might have happened in these what – if situations.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 3

We'll start this lesson with a summary written for a 1997 course for congress directors. Everything is still valid.

QBA Course for Congress Directors 1997.

GENERAL: Congress directors are required to be more deeply conversant with the Laws than are club directors, and must be able to cope with the more difficult areas such as unauthorised information, failure to alert etc. They must also be familiar with the QBA regulations, especially where they relate to red masterpoint congresses. Note that these regulations are the default regulations for QBA approved events unless the sponsoring organisation (SO) has exercised its options to vary them. They should also be equipped to manage events with multiple sections and multiple sessions.

Remember also that the congress Director is responsible for reporting results of red masterpoint congresses to the State Masterpoint Secretary. The QBA Regulations include guidelines for the details and format required for these results.

PRINCIPLES:

1. **Preparation:** You may have to assist the convenor with the planning, organisation and promotion of the event. Be aware of the QBA requirements for approved congresses. These are not bureaucratic red tape. They are designed to ensure that players know what type of event they are entering and the basic regulations, to minimise the possibility of player dissatisfaction, and to ensure that, whatever happens during a congress, there will be a regulation to refer to. So advise the convenor on what must appear on the entry form. Sort out also what help you will need during the event.

2. **Movements:** The first criterion should be the technical accuracy of the movement. However, this may need to be modified by various other factors: (a) the wishes of the SO (b) time constraints (c) amount of help available (d) the acceptability to players. The convenience of the TD or minimising his workload should **not** be a significant factor. Avoid any temptation to display your versatility by arranging complex movements. Players don't like them, and there is a large chance that they will go wrong. On this subject: it is good practice, even with simple Mitchell movements, to check after every move that the boards have moved to the correct table. Players have been known not to pass on the byestand boards, and have even passed on the boards they are due to play and proceed to re-play the boards they have just played!

Ideally movements should be complete. This is not always possible within the time constraints. Sometimes skip movements may have to be used in Mitchells, and barometer Howells may have to be shortened. It is highly desirable that all final sections should finish at the same time for presentations to proceed. Do not shorten movements in the higher sections of finals. If necessary, shorten movements in the lowest section(s).

Attention should be paid to seeding the field in qualifying, right down to last place as well as possible. In drawing up charts, if I am confident that there will be no skip or curtailed movements, I prefer to mix the players in each field. This saves pairs the embarrassment of seeing themselves seeded last. If you are seeding for a skip, leave the field in seeded order. This minimises the inequity of a skip movement. If using a curtailed movement e.g. 11 tables curtailed to 10 rounds, I prefer to offset the EW field so that EW1 starts at table 5 or 6. If you leave them in seeded order, you may get complaints that seed 1 NS did not meet seed 2 EW etc.

27 boards per session is about ideal, though you can manage 30 bds in Mitchell qualifying if you push players along. For barometer finals, 9 table (51 bds) or 7 table (52 bds) are ideal. 10 table (57 bds) or 8 table (60 bds) are too long. For barometer finals, work on about 8 bds per hour. You can manage a little faster with Mitchells.

Qld players have been somewhat indulged in contrast to their Southern counterparts. Pre-dealt boards with hand records and barometer pairs finals with virtually instant results are accepted as the norm (not necessarily so in other states).

Preliminary announcements: Again, check the QBA regulations about the standard preliminary announcements. Explain the movement, the qualification process, and any regulations re tiebreaks. Specify the systems permitted. Arrange with the convenor to organise an appeals committee of at least three, bearing in mind that it should include any members of the QBA Appeals Committee who are present.

During play: Carry your lawbook with you, and refer to it unless you are totally confident that you can rule from memory. If a player queries your ruling or even seems doubtful, find the Law and read it to the table. If you make decisions based on bridge judgment e.g. in unauthorised information situations, always inform the players of their right to appeal. If you are uncertain about the correctness of your judgment, you can even recommend that they appeal. Often when called to a table, you will find four players trying to talk at once. Ask who called you, and give them the floor first. Then hear the others. Dummy, unless the hand is finished, should take no part except to answer any questions of fact you may put to him.

In general, your priority is to make a ruling so that play can proceed. However, provided play can proceed, it is quite acceptable for you to withhold a decision and take time to consider the situation. Once your decision is made, convey it to both parties. Decisions by the appeals committee should be reported back to you for you to relay it to the parties concerned. Try to ensure that appeals forms are available, so that the appeal can be made in writing, and the decision and preferably reasons put in writing.

Checking scores: The Laws do not require the TD to check the accuracy of the scores, but in my view, especially with barometer scoring where nobody but the players and the scorer see the score, it is inviting trouble to fail to have some score checking mechanism. It is much easier (and less embarrassing) to change a score before entering it into the computer than to have the players find the error later and then have to rescore.

Recap sheets should always be available as far as possible so that players can exercise their right to check the scores. In a barometer movement where boards are flowing through the field, you will have to keep the recap sheets secure so that players may not see results of boards they are yet to play. But players should be allowed to check their own section's scores on request.

Computer scoring programs: The Director should be familiar with at least one computer scoring program. Scoring and score checking may be delegated, but the Director is responsible for the accuracy of the scoring.

Australian Bridge Directors' Association: All congress directors are required by QBA regulation to be members of this body. This is not based on some sort of trade union policy, but to ensure that directors are able to continue their ongoing education in directing matters through receipt of the *Directors' Bulletin* as a benefit of membership. The **1997 Laws** will be thoroughly covered in the current and forthcoming issues, so all directors are urged to join now if not already members.

To move on to another area – Swiss Teams events.

Running a Swiss Teams event.

Probably the most popular type of event in Qld, and one of the easiest for congress directors. Computer programs have made running these events a bit of a breeze. But it is still wise for directors to be able to do a draw manually, and maintain records manually.

The principle is that, after a set first round draw, each team is now playing against the team with the progressive score closest to their own, with the proviso that you don't meet the same team twice. (There is a modification of this called the Danish Teams, where you may meet a team twice if they are nearest to you in the progressive score).

Even and odd numbers. It is very desirable to have an even number of teams – not only for the Director (an odd number makes much more work), but also for the players. Teams in the whist movement tend to resent being 'outside the mainstream', even if it's only for two matches. So I always stress to the convenor the desirability of an even number. However, occasions will arise when you need to cope with an odd number of teams, when there is a last minute withdrawal or an unexpected arrival. So always be prepared to cope with an odd number. Because the triangle play two half matches, and can't score up until the rest of the field have played two matches, it may be necessary to keep the number of rounds to an even number, say 6 x 9 board matches rather than 7 x 8 boards.

Pre-dealt boards. These days, Qld players would be aghast if they didn't get duplicated boards and hand records at a congress. (I suspect that we may have led the world in this regard. In other states and overseas, boards are still often dealt at the table or at least duplicated by the players). I find that board sharing is very adequate if 4 tables share 8 bds. If you are playing a triangle, you desirably need an extra full set of boards to use in the triangle, and you also need some extra boards (dealt at the table) to start at the third table in the triangle.

It may be appropriate here to produce some material I published in *Directors' Bulletin* a few years ago. But let me apologise in advance for any formatting problems which may appear in your copy. Much of the material I am producing from the past was written in WordPerfect. I have copied this into Word 2000, and saved in Word 97 format so as to make it accessible to all. The major problems appear with tables and boxes, but I hope that this won't be so bad as to be unreadable.

Swiss Teams:

This is the most popular of all teams events with the average player. It can be legitimately run as a one day event of two sessions, though a one session teams event would be so short as to be meaningless.

Nowadays, these are almost always run by computer programs, but it is still important for directors to understand how to run such an event in the absence of a computer or computer failure.

The first round is pre-drawn. No universal method, but the most common is thus: for say 24 teams, 1 v 13, 2 v 14 3 v 15 etc. From then on, each team is drawn against the team closest to them in the current scores, with the proviso that you don't meet the same team twice. This means that the draw for the next round cannot be made until all scores are in for the current round. You can't afford to wait for persistently slow players, and it is wise to announce that, unless the last board has been started by a specified time, unplayed boards will be scrapped regardless of the results at the other table. (Some directors are doing the Swiss draw one round behind, to leave ample time for the draw. I find this approach very unsatisfactory).

To score manually, you need a score result card for each team, along these lines:

Team No. 1 Team Captain: SMITH

Round	Versus	IMPs	VPs	Total IMPs	Total VPs
1	13	24	23	24	23
2	3	5	18	29	41

and so on for all rounds.

IMPs and VPs columns are for the results of each match, and the Total IMPs & Total VPs columns for progressive totals.

As results come in, you update your totals, and put the cards in descending order of total VPs. When all results are in, find your matches, starting from the top. As play progresses and you get to the lower part of the field, you may find the last two teams have already played each other. In this case, you will have to start at the bottom and work a few places up.

How many rounds should you play? The minimum number, according to McKinnon:

No. Of Teams	Rounds
9 - 16	6
17 - 32	7
33 - 64	8
65 - 128	9

If you have too many rounds, you may not be able to find a valid draw. If this happens, you may have to re-match two of the lowest scoring teams. It is certainly possible to have too many rounds (i.e. to over-Swiss). You may not be able to get a valid draw, and you will find top teams, having played all contending teams, drawn to play a poor team. Don't exceed half the number of teams for your number of rounds.

The Triangle in Teams Events

Neither directors nor players enjoy having an odd number of teams necessitating a triangular match with three teams as part of a larger teams event. But the occasion does arise and we need to be able to handle it. Most directors are familiar with the method, but for new directors I'll briefly cover the standard approach. One problem with this method is seating rights. The second part of this article describes a method which gets round this by having each pair play each other pair in each team.

Standard movement: There are two types of movement you may use, a whist or a Mitchell. In the whist movement, the players move up two tables, dropping off the boards they have just played at the intermediate table. Assume 8 board matches. To start, sit the teams at table 1 (Bds 1-4), table 2 (5-8) and table 3 (9-12). Boards are dealt, then the EWs make their first move: 1 to 3, 2 to 1, 3 to 2. After playing 4 boards, the EW move up 2 tables with boards up one table. The draw with boards will have been:

Rd 1: 1 v 2 (9-12)	2 v 3 (1-4)	3 v 1 (5-8)
Rd.2: 1 v 3 (5-8)	2 v 1 (9-12)	3 v 2 (1-4)

Note that teams do not play the boards they dealt - a desirable feature. After this move, players return to their home table and score up their two half matches. Boards are now removed, and a new set of 13-24 is used and the process is repeated.

Mitchell: Again, sit players at their home table for dealing. If you wish to avoid teams playing the boards they dealt, then pass the dealt boards down one table before the first move (3 to 2, 2 to 1, 1 to 3). EW players move up one table, play 4 boards, then EW move up one table with the boards moving down as in a Mitchell. The draw and boards:

Rd 1: 1 v 3 (5-8)	2 v 1 (9-12)	3 v 2 (1-4)	
Rd 2: 1 v 2 (9-12)	2 v 3 (1-4)	3 v 1 (5-8).	Now score up and repeat with new boards.

See comments below if using duplicated boards for all matches.

Alternative method:

Assume 8 board matches.

Table 1	Table 2	Table 3
Boards 1-4	Boards 9-12	Boards 17-20
5-8	13-16	21-24

Each table has two sets of 4 boards. The boards stay at the same table, and one or other set is played in each of the four rounds. The draw for each round, and the boards played for a particular round are listed. Note that the first named pair in each draw sits NS. The

pairs in the draw are named by their original seating position, not necessarily their current one. To avoid confusion, you could name them differently e.g. team 1 NS as 1A and 1EW as 1B etc. At the end of 4 rounds, each team will have played 16 boards (2 matches) playing 4 boards against each other pair.

Round	TABLE 1 Boards	TABLE 2 Boards	TABLE 3 Boards
1	1NS v 2EW (1-4)	2NS v 3EW (9-12)	3NS v 1EW (17-20)
2	1NS v 2NS (5-8)	3NS v 2EW (9-12)	3EW v 1EW (21-24)
3	2NS v 1EW (1-4)	2EW v 3EW (13-16)	1NS v 3NS (21-24)
4	2EW v 1EW (5-8)	3NS v 2NS (13-16)	1NS v 3EW (17-20)

The Boards: If boards are dealt at the table, there is no problem. If the field are playing duplicated boards each of 8 matches, then boards 1-16 may be used from the duplicated boards (the rest of the field are playing these also in their two matches). However boards 17-24 will need to be dealt at the table, as the teams will be playing the duplicated 17-24 when they move out into the field for their next match.

Organisation: Of course, the teams in the triangle will not be teams 1, 2 and 3. I'd suggest that for movement purposes, number the tables 1-3 and teams take their temporary number from the table at which they are sitting (but make sure they don't hand in their results with those numbers!). Post a notice such as the above for the players to know where to go on each round, and take out insurance via a table card listing the rounds, the match and boards for each round. The board numbers will need to be modified for matches other than 8 boards. If you are playing with duplicated boards, then the boards for the next match will be 17-32, with a further 8 boards dealt at table 3.

Any questions or problems? Happy to publish questions and answers in the next lesson. Let me know if you find any of the material indecipherable.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 4A

CONDUCTING A SWISS PAIRS EVENT

To run a Swiss Pairs you will certainly need a computer program. You just can't do it by hand, and if you lose power for any reason all is lost.

This is an ideal movement for a 1 day pairs event. The following format is one that I have found very satisfactory, but you may wish to vary it. The one disadvantage of this sort of tournament is the large amount of pre-dealing and duplication of boards that is necessary, as the whole field is playing the same set of boards at the same time. This can be reduced by dividing the field into two sections, with boards flowing through from one to the other. But this will involve two lots of prize money. My suggested format:

5 board matches - about 35 mins per round. Set tables up into little clusters of 6 tables with a central table for boards. Two sets of boards 1-5 are placed on the central table, with players taking a board and returning it when played. With 18 tables, for example, you will need six sets of boards. The formula for boards: 2 sets per 6 tables or part thereof.

You will need special pickup slips for 5 board matches. I can provide a copy of the one we have devised¹. This can be photocopied and cut into strips. I suggest putting out a single strip on each round. They are collected and gummed in line onto a sheet of paper ready for entering into the computer. Remind players to enter their pair numbers, and always check that this has been done before accepting the pickup slip.

10 to 11 rounds constitutes a good one day event. The method of scoring is matchpointed pairs across the field. The scoring programs allow you to run two independent sections if you wish.

With a smallish field, five board matches may mean too many rounds. It's not a bad idea, in a small field of mixed quality, to have no more rounds than about a third of the number of pairs. You may have to use 6 board matches.

THE DRAW:

Unlike a Swiss teams, you don't have time to score round 1 in order to print the draw for round 2. So the draw operates one round in arrears i.e. the first two rounds are drawn in advance, and the draw for round 3 is based on the progressive positions after round 1. This provides you with the leisure to check scores and enter the results into the computer without undue pressure.

How you do the draw for the first two rounds is optional. I started originally using this method: roughly seed the field from top down into groups of 8 pairs. For the first draw, I would have 1v9, 2v10 etc to 8v16. Then 17v25 and so on. The draw for the lowest group would depend on the number of pairs in that group. For round 2, I would play 1v5, 2v6 and so on. In other words, for the first two rounds, all pairs are playing pairs roughly of their own calibre. However, I found that it took a long time for the seeded pairs to filter to the top and start meeting each other. Now I tend to draw as for a Swiss Teams i.e. with say 40 pairs, 1 v 21, 2 v 22 and so on. The recommended draw may have to be varied depending on the size and quality of the field, but is probably not all that important.

Supposing you are running a 24 table event. You have made up your seeded field of 48 pairs, and will now enter the starting positions for round 1 of all pairs in turn. Thus, if you were using the 1v9 draw suggested above, you would seat your pairs 1-16 as follows: 1 1NS, 2 2EW, 3 3EW, 4 4NS, 5 5NS,

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

6 6EW, 7 7EW, 8 8NS, 9 1EW, 10 2NS and so on. The NS and EW sequences used are to try to balance the field as much as possible.

A few comments: a half table is most undesirable. Who wants to sit out for 5 boards? So a standby pair is desirable. If you cannot fill a half table, you will have to proceed by entering averages for the sitout match. You may have to enter something like PHANTOM in your names file if the computer will expect full tables.

If you have a large field, it is best to paste your pickup slips on two separate pages.

¹. Webmasters Footnote. Score pickup slips can be downloaded from the Director area of the QBA website.

RULINGS:

Some more ruling problems. These are all problems that have actually occurred at the table in recent months, so they are not just theoretical problems. The bidding goes:

Problem 1:

N	E	S	W
2♣*	P	2♣!	

*Strong, game forcing.

You are called. How would you rule?

Problem 2:

At a small country congress recently, I had to rule in this situation. East, the offender, was a novice player not long out of classes.

South dealer, EW vul.

S	W	N	E
1♥	1♠	P	Dbl

I carefully explained the Law, and East changed her bid to 2H, doubled by South. result: EW +670 for a top board.

Here were the hands:

	♠10763	
	♥-	
	♦875	
	♣K107632	
♠KJ985		♠Q2
♥7		♥AJ109642
♦K104		♦Q93
♣A984		♣J
	♠A4	
	♥KQ853	
	♦AJ62	

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

♣Q5

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

How would you rule?

Problem 3:

The bidding goes (using written bidding):

N	S
1♣	1♥
2♣	2♠

At this stage, South quickly crosses out the 2S call and substitutes 3H. North, holding only a small doubleton in spades, now bids 3NT. This makes. Now, and not until now, you are called. North asks whether he was entitled to act on South's 2S bid. Was it authorised information or unauthorised?

Study your lawbooks and make up your minds on these three rulings. Discussion in next lesson.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 4B

Rulings:

Here are my comments on the ruling problems set in Lesson 4A

Problem 1:

N	E	S	W
2♣*	P	2♣!	

*Strong, game forcing.

You are called. How would you rule?

This is one of those situations where you can't really make a sensible decision without taking the offender away from the table, and asking what was in her mind. There are all sorts of possibilities.

1. Did she not see her partner's bid and thought she was making an opening 2♣ bid? This seems extremely unlikely. There can't be too many situations where both partners have a game forcing opening! But, if this was the case, then of course partner is barred.
2. Did she think partner had opened 1♣ and she was responding with 2♣? In this case, the bid is not conventional and can be corrected to 3♣ (with the proviso in Law 27).
3. A likely possibility. Did she mean to write 2♦, but somehow 'echoed' her partner's 2♣ bid by mistake? In this case, there may be a case for inadvertency. I don't believe that we should discount inadvertency because the player has not claimed it. Some players just don't know their rights under Law 25. She may have meant to write 2♦, accidentally wrote 2♣, realised her mistake, and just sat back waiting to take her medicine. If she makes a convincing case that to bid 2♣ was never in her mind, then I would allow inadvertency. This is the rare situation where I may look at her hand before making a ruling, to ensure that it was consistent with her claim. Normally it is bad practice to inspect a player's hand before making a ruling during the bidding, because your decision in itself may convey UI to the other players at the table. But to allow or disallow a claim for inadvertency would not be expected to give any such information.

Problem 2:

At a small country congress recently, I had to rule in this situation. East, the offender, was a novice player not long out of classes.

South dealer, EW vul.

S	W	N	E
1♥	1♠	P	Dbl

I carefully explained the Law, and East changed her bid to 2♥, doubled by South. result: EW +670 for a top board.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

Here were the hands:

	♠10763	
	♥-	
	♦875	
	♣K107632	
♠KJ985		♠Q2
♥7		♥AJ109642
♦K104		♦Q93
♣A984		♣J
	♠A4	
	♥KQ853	
	♦AJ62	
	♣Q5	

How would you rule?

Comment: East, by her infraction, has managed to play in 2♥, which she might have seen as the best possible partnership contract. To bid 2♥ (instead of her illegal double) would almost certainly not allow the partnership to rest in 2♥, as West would have taken this as some sort of cue bid, especially as East was an unpassed hand. But silencing West has allowed East to play in a contract not possible after a legal call. This is not to say that this was East's intention. East was no doubt quite innocent of any evil intentions. But we are considering the effect, not the intention.

Read Laws 23 and 72B1. These are laws which we should always think about when an infraction appears to have advantaged the offenders. We are required to award an adjusted score if the offenders gained an advantage through the irregularity *and the offender could have known, at the time of his irregularity that the irregularity would be likely to damage the non-offending side.*

Benefit for the offending side of course = damage to the non-offenders.

What does 'could have known' mean? The consensus amongst senior directors is that it is a sort of 'code phrase'. You need to know something of the history of the Laws to understand this. Years ago, the director had the right to award an adjusted score in this sort of situation, but the wording of the Law was such that, by so ruling, he was imputing dishonest intentions to the offender. In other words, it was almost an accusation of cheating. Whilst this may have passed muster 30 years ago, these days it would be an invitation to a lawsuit. So, in the last few versions of the Laws, the concept of 'could have known' was introduced. The Director, under this concept, is making a mechanical ruling rather than a judgment of the offender's intentions. What the Law requires us to do is to ignore the particular offending player. Picture a 'generic' bridge player, even one with less than scrupulous ethics. If such a player could have known that his infraction and subsequent barring of partner could benefit his side, then the TD will adjust, regardless of the person actually sitting there. Even if the particular player is famous for his high ethical standards, or even if it was unlikely that the player would have known the relevant Law, we would still adjust.

Let me give you an example of when a player 'could not have known'. South is dealer, but North makes an opening pass out of turn, not accepted. So the bidding reverts to South and North must pass at his first turn. South holds 17HCP, and knowing that North must pass, legitimately punts on 3NT. North hold only 5 HCP, but they are the right ones, and 3NT rolls home, with the rest of the field playing in a partial. NS get a top. No adjustment here. When North passed out of turn, there was no way he could have known that NS would get a good result.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

I had to rule on the above situation at a recent congress. East was a novice, playing in her first congress, and I felt sure she had no idea of the relevant Law or the effects of her infraction. So, against my better judgment, I ruled no adjustment. This I was entitled to do as the Law is written because I was sure she 'did not know'. But I suspect that my decision was contrary to the Law's intention. I submitted this ruling to BLML, which is a world wide tournament directors' discussion group on the Internet. Opinion was divided, but the majority felt I should have adjusted regardless of the offender's novice state. I think that justice was done, but perhaps the Law not properly enforced. The danger in making exceptions is that, when one doesn't make the exception, then there may be implications suggesting a player's dishonest intent.

Problem 3:

The bidding goes (using written bidding):

N	S
1♣	1♥
2♣	2♠

At this stage, South quickly crosses out the 2♠ call and substitutes 3♥. North, holding only a small doubleton in spades, now bids 3NT. This makes. Now, and not until now, you are called. North asks whether he was entitled to act on South's 2♠ bid. Was it authorised information or unauthorised?

Comment:

One's first reaction is to say 'The 2♠ bid was a withdrawn call, and therefore UI'. However, when you make any ruling, you should be prepared to back this up by reading the appropriate law to the player. Where is the appropriate law?

Law 16C covers information from withdrawn calls, and says that a withdrawn call is UI. But Law 16C starts thus: *A call or play may be withdrawn, and another substituted, either by a non-offending side after an opponent's infraction, or by an offending side to rectify an infraction.*

The 2♠ bid was not withdrawn to rectify an infraction, so this should not come within the ambit of 16C. And, if you look at 25B (delayed or purposeful correction), a substituted call may be accepted by LHO and the auction proceeds without penalty. This has effectively been the case here, though nobody bothered to call the TD at this stage.

So I can't find any Law that says that the 2♠ bid is UI, so will have reluctantly rule that it is not UI. I don't like it, but the opponents through their failure to call the TD have contributed to their bad result.

Could one penalize both pairs for failing to call the Director? Look at Law 9. Surprisingly, it doesn't require the Director to be called when an infraction occurs! It requires him to be called only immediately someone draws attention to the infraction. And in this case no one has called attention to any irregularity until the end of the auction.

One could penalize NS for a breach of correct procedure under Law 90. After all, crossing out a bid and replacing it without calling for the Director violates correct procedure. Apart from this, a good lecture to both pairs would be appropriate.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 5A

1. Here is a little poser that may have you scratching your head and searching the Lawbook.

South is declarer in 4S. There is one trump left in dummy. Declarer holds D AKxxx opposite dummy's D xx. He needs to bring the diamonds home to make his contract. As it happens, the diamonds break 3-3, so he can make his game easily. However, he plays DA, small from dummy. Then he plays the DK, but gets a trick ahead of himself and calls on dummy to ruff. Dummy says 'But there is still a diamond in dummy'. Now declarer retracts his call for a ruff, plays the second diamond, then ruffs out the suit to establish his long diamond winners and make his contract. EW call you and request an adjusted score. Their case: whilst dummy is entitled to prevent an infraction by declarer, once declarer calls for the ruff in dummy the infraction has already occurred, so he is now too late. Had declarer been allowed to ruff his DK, he would have been one down.

Your ruling, and under which Laws?

Another UI problem:

Vulnerability: Nil

Dealer: West

S- xx
H- KJ10xx
D- AQ108
C- xx

S- KQJxx	S- Axx
H- void	H- xxx
D- Kxxx	D- x
C- Axxx	C- KQ10xxx

S- xxx
H- AQxxx
D- Jxxx
C- J

The bidding:

West	North	East	South
1S	2H	3H *	4H
4S	P	P	5H
X **	P	5S	All pass

* Explained as a limit raise

** Break in tempo

Heart lead, making only five (declarer didn't realize she had to trump a diamond).

NS claim damage because of East's pull of the 5HX after West's slow double. How do you rule? Would you rule differently if West had thought for some time after the 5H bid and then passed, and then East had bid 5S?

2. Some more on UI:

Those who attended the seminar at Sunshine Coast will recognize this hand. However, I am reproducing it here because it is an excellent discussion example.

Bd 24 / Nil / W

A104
Q1085
AQ104
A2

8
AK964
1097
1098

J75
J2
KJ8
KQJ85

KQ9432
73
63
643

Bidding:

W	N	E	S
P	1NT(15-17)	P	2H (alerted)
P*	2S	3C	All pass

* long think

Result 3C one off for NS +50

NS call at the end of the hand and claim damage in that East's 3C bid was not a 75% action after West's hesitation.

West explained that he did stop and think about doubling 2H as a lead director but wondered if East would take this as having some other meaning. In most cases when you are called, the hesitator will endeavour to explain his reasons so that you don't often have to adjudicate on the fact of the hesitation. Where there is a dispute, you may be able to sort out the facts with some sort of question to the hesitator as 'Did you have a problem?' or 'What were you thinking about?'. In my experience there are very few players who call you for a non-existent hesitation, though there are a few who are a bit quick on the trigger.

We need to make some allowances for the fact that bridge players are not automatons and may need to think about their decisions, particularly in situations where the bidding is already at a high level before it gets back to you. For example

W	N	E	S
1H	X	3H	5C

Very few Wests could act in perfect tempo after this auction.

This leads to a further comment at this table. East said that West was always a slow bidder. Some players are persistently slow, and as directors we need to take cognizance of this. UI arises from a 'break in tempo'. What others would call a hesitation may not be a break in tempo for an habitually slow player. But we must counterbalance this with the observation that even the slowest bidders will not agonise over a Yarborough before passing.

At this table, East stated that she had formed the view that South's bid was for a weak takeout, and that she had better get a bid in now in case 2S was passed out. At this stage, South's hand was unlimited. I'm quite sure that East's view was not a conscious decision to take advantage of the UI. But subconsciously no doubt there was the thought that West must have some values, add those to her own values and NS do not have enough for game.

So what is our decision here? They don't come much simpler than this one.

Was there UI? Yes.

Did East have alternative LA's? Yes

Was East's 3C bid a 75% action? No. Many Easts would pass with this hand.

Could the 3C bid be indicated over the pass by the UI? Certainly.

Were NS damaged? Yes, they could have made 9 tricks in spades

What do we adjust to? The likely result was +140 for NS. Law 12C2 requires us sometimes to give a split score in this situation – to give NS the most favourable result that was likely and EW the most unfavourable result that was 'at all probable'

In other words, we give NS the likely result. For EW, we need to decide that, if perhaps their defence was poor and they may have allowed South to make 10 tricks (without drawing too long a bow), then we shall award them -170.

In deciding on the question of damage, we need to discuss the concepts of 'consequent damage' and 'subsequent damage'. In consequent damage, the damage results directly from the infraction. With subsequent damage, the damage results from some event after the infraction, but not caused by it. In other words, something has happened to break the nexus between the infraction and damage. Consider some possibilities in our present case.

(A) You may take the view that South's failure to compete to 3S was poor bridge (presuming the NS system allows her to do so competitively). I myself would have bid 3S on the South hand (provided it showed just a competitive hand). But subsequent poor bridge does not deprive NS of their rights to an adjustment.

South's failure to bid 3S was perhaps poor bridge, but doesn't lose her right to redress. Without the infraction, NS should have been playing in 2S.

(B) Suppose South had taken the push to 3S. North as declarer went one off because she drew three rounds of trumps therefore not getting her club ruff. Very poor bridge. Does that lose their right to adjustment. No, because they should have been playing in 2S, which they would have made. We adjust the score to NS +110.

Contrast the above with these situations:

(C) After the 3C bid, you are called to the table, explain the Law and instruct bidding to proceed. South now bids 4S, going off 1. Do you adjust? Not in this case. South's 4S bid is a wild, gambling bid. Perhaps South thought along these lines: 'I'll have a go at 4S. If it makes, well and good. If not, well the Director will probably adjust the score because of East's infraction. This sort of approach is called the 'double shot', which could be defined as a wild, gambling action taken on the expectation that if it fails you'll get your adjusted score anyway. This sort of action has broken the nexus between the infraction and the damage. In all these UI and MI situations, non-offenders are still expected to play normal bridge.

The WBF Laws Committee has issued an interpretation which is official: Players damaged will not lose their right to redress merely because of subsequent poor judgment or play, but only if subsequent actions are wild, gambling or irrational or in the nature of a double shot.

Consider the next variation:

(D) South accepts the push to 3S, which is easily made. But South manages to revoke, and the penalty costs a trick for one off. There are two schools of thought here. One says NS should have been in 2S and they made 8 tricks so they are entitled to +110. The other says NS were in a simple 3S. They went down not because of poor judgment or play but because of a revoke. The revoke breaks the nexus between infraction and damage. There is logic in both views. However the dominant view amongst senior world directors is that the revoke is classed as an irrational play, and does break the nexus. The same would apply where other infractions e.g. opening lead out of turn by defenders would lose their right to redress if the damage resulted solely from this.

This is not to say that we won't adjust the scores for the offending side. Even where we have denied redress to the non-offenders, we still apply law 12C2 to the offending side.

Another interesting ruling, also discussed at the seminar.

Hesitation Blackwood

10/E/All

74

3

KQ9

AKQ9754

AQ1032

KJ986

AKJ94		10762
7		A1042
102		---
	5	
	Q85	
	J8653	
	J863	

Bidding:

1S	(2C)	4S
4NT	P	5H
5S		??

4NT = RKCB 5H = 2/5 Aces, not SQ

What do you bid with the East hand? What do you bid if West had thought for some time before signing off in 5S?

This situation occurred recently in the UK at their major event in Brighton. East raised to 6S after a long pause for thought from West before bidding 5S. East claimed the raise to 6S was ‘automatic’. The TD ruled the score back to EW +680. This was appealed and the appeals committee supported the Director’s ruling.

Personally I feel that this was a pretty harsh decision. 6S must go close to being a 75% action (in the UK, it is actually a 70% rule). However, the interest here is in the comments of the committee chairman, which is something we should all remember as a principle in making these ‘hesitation Blackwood’ rulings.

Comments: (By AC Chairman): East has extra, undisclosed values. But the partner of a Blackwood bidder is normally expected to accept his partner’s decision, and when that decision is after a pause for thought, it is not permitted to continue except when partner ‘cannot’ have a hand on which slam will fail.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 5B

The problems set in Lesson 5A:

South is declarer in 4S. There is one trump left in dummy. Declarer holds D AKxxx opposite dummy's D xx. He needs to bring the diamonds home to make his contract. As it happens, the diamonds break 3-3, so he can make his game easily. However, he plays DA, small from dummy. Then he plays the DK, but gets a trick ahead of himself and calls on dummy to ruff. Dummy says 'But there is still a diamond in dummy'. Now declarer retracts his call for a ruff, plays the second diamond, then ruffs out the suit to establish his long diamond winners and make his contract. EW call you and request an adjusted score. Their case: whilst dummy is entitled to prevent an infraction by declarer, once declarer calls for the ruff in dummy the infraction has already occurred, so he is now too late. Had declarer been allowed to ruff his DK, he would have been one down.

Your ruling, and under which Laws?

Comment:

[Please note that after these answers were written the WBF Laws Commission made a ruling that, when declarer calls for a card from dummy that is a revoke card, dummy may enquire of declarer concerning his possible revoke under Law 42B1. Jan Peach]

I can't give you a generally agreed answer, because there isn't one! I have strong views on this, but many disagree. Let's look at the relevant Laws:

42B1. Dummy may ask declarer when he has failed to follow suit whether he has a card of the suit led. To me, this obviously refers to a situation where declarer has failed to follow suit in his own hand.

42B2: Dummy may try to prevent any irregularity by declarer. Law 45B says that declarer plays a card from dummy by naming it. Once he has done so, the card is legally played. It is now too late for dummy to *prevent* the irregularity because the irregularity has already occurred. Some would argue that dummy's intervention prevents the irregularity of *establishing* the revoke. I don't accept this. Establishment of a revoke is per se not an infraction – it is merely a part of the post revoke process that decides whether there is a penalty and what it is.

Law 43A1c. Dummy must not participate in the play, nor may he communicate anything about the play to declarer.

This to me is the clincher. Declarer was heading for disaster by ruffing his winning king until dummy woke him up. This clearly to my mind is participating in the play. The defenders have been damaged. Declarer, left to his own devices, would have gone down. I would adjust the score to one off.

Some of those who disagree quote Law 44C: *In playing to a trick, each player must follow suit if possible. This obligation takes precedence over all other requirements of these Laws.* However, as I see it, this is merely a statement of how the game is played. In soccer, there is a basic rule that players may not handle the ball. But sometimes they do, and the Laws of Soccer make provisions to cover this.

In most cases, a revoke by dummy is no big deal in that the director will adjust where damage has been done to defenders. But this is a special case where declarer, by revoking in dummy, would have advantaged the defenders, and dummy's intervention cost defenders that advantage.

Another UI problem:

Vulnerability: Nil
Dealer: West

S- xx
H- KJ10xx
D- AQ108
C- xx

S- KQJxx	S- Axx
H- void	H- xxx
D- Kxxx	D- x
C- Axxx	C- KQ10xxx

S- xxx
H- AQxxx
D- Jxxx
C- J

The bidding:

West	North	East	South
1S	2H	3H *	4H
4S	P	P	5H
X **	P	5S	All pass

* Explained as a limit raise

** Break in tempo

Heart lead, making only five (declarer didn't realize she had to trump a diamond).

NS claim damage because of East's pull of the 5HX after West's slow double. How do you rule? Would you rule differently if West had thought for some time after the 5H bid and then passed, and then East had bid 5S?

Comments:

This was a pairs event (in the USA, not local). Let's follow our catechism.

Was there UI? Yes, West's slow double.

Were there LAs for East? Yes, pass or 5S.

Was East's 5S a 75% action? I believe a significant number of players would pass in a smooth auction. So we'll say no.

Could East's 5S bid have been demonstrably influenced by the UI? This East claimed that, from the bidding, she 'knew' that West was void in hearts. This is a little self-serving. It's not obvious that West was void in hearts, but the diagnosis is much more likely after West's very slow double. Remember again the aphorism that, if partner makes a slow double, he won't be unhappy if you pull it. Whilst I have a little sympathy for East (I'd wonder how many defensive tricks my 6 card club suit will produce), I would adjust the score for the above reasons.

Now for the second question. Suppose West had thought for some time and then passed. Would you now accept a 5S bid by East?

Not quite so clear. It is obvious from the bidding that EW hold the balance of points in this hand. Many experienced partnerships have an understanding in this situation. If West doubles the 5H, he prefers to defend. If he bids an immediate 5S, his hand is much more suited to playing than defending. If he passes, this pass is forcing, and East must either double 5H or bid 5S. In other words, when West passes in this auction, he is saying to East 'I'm not sure whether to bid or double. I'm passing the decision to you, partner'. Now a slow pass by West is not conveying UI to East. His pass conveys exactly the same information as his hesitation – I'm not sure what to do. If EW can establish that they have this sort of understanding, then I would find no problem with East's 5S bid.

Supposing this same situation arose in a teams event. Now I would find a decision much more difficult. With the East hand, with my 6 card club suit and singleton diamond, I would be worrying about the double game swing, with us making game in a spade club fit and them in a heart diamond fit. (This is why at my first bid I would have bid 3C before supporting partner's spades. This gives partner a much better idea of how well the hands are fitting, and we may well have found a 6C spot.). I would find the 5S bid by East more acceptable on the basis of, when in doubt, bid one more rather than risk the double game swing.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 6A

PSYCHIC CALLS

In first seat, holding S x H xxxx D xxxx C xxxx, I open 1S. Is this a psyche? The answer is 'It depends'. Let's look at the relevant areas of the Laws.

From Definitions:

Psychic Call - A deliberate and gross misstatement of honour strength or suit length.

From the body of the Laws:

SECTION SIX

CONVENTIONS AND AGREEMENTS

LAW 40 - PARTNERSHIP UNDERSTANDINGS

A. Right to Choose Call or Play

A player may make any call or play (including an intentionally misleading call - such as a psychic bid - or a call or play that departs from commonly accepted, or previously announced, use of a convention), without prior announcement, provided that such call or play is not based on a partnership understanding.

B. Concealed Partnership Understandings Prohibited

A player may not make a call or play based on a special partnership understanding unless an opposing pair may reasonably be expected to understand its meaning, or unless his side discloses the use of such call or play in accordance with the regulations of the sponsoring organisation.

C. Director's Option

If the Director decides that a side has been damaged through its opponents' failure to explain the full meaning of a call or play, he may award an adjusted score.

D. Regulation of Conventions

The sponsoring organisation may regulate the use of bidding or play conventions. Zonal organisations may, in addition, regulate partnership understandings (even if not conventional) that permit the partnership's initial actions at the one level to be made with a hand of a King or more below average strength. Zonal organisations may delegate this responsibility.

To understand the definition fully, we must realize that the misstatement is in relation to our agreed and properly announced system. If it is part of our partnership agreement that I may sometimes open 1S with the above hand, then this is part of our systemic agreements, and therefore by definition cannot be a psyche. Thus the old Kaplan / Sheinwold system incorporated what they called a 'controlled psyche'. It was common to open 1S with something like S K10975 H xxx D xxx C xx, and the system incorporated a sequence to discover this psyche. The term 'controlled psyche' was a misnomer. The essence of a psyche is that it is a gross departure from one's announced system. A bid

incorporated into your system either by explicit agreement or based on partnership experience undisclosed to the opponents simply cannot be a psyche.

But our agreement to open 1S with my initial example hand is subject to regulation. In Australia for example, the rule of 18 Opening Points for an opening bid applies. So our agreement to open 1S now makes our system a YELLOW system, which would be illegal to play in events not allowing such systems.

Let's get this clear: a bid made in accordance with your partnership agreement can never be a psyche. So a psychic bid must deceive partner as much as it does the opponents. Note also that a psychic bid must contain an *intent* to deceive the opponents. A mistaken bid or a systemic error is not a psyche.

Systemic agreements may fall into two categories: explicit agreements which have been formalized after discussion and appear on your system card; and implicit agreements which may have never been formalized by agreement, but become known to each partner on the basis of partnership experience. Where psychic bids are used with reasonable frequency by a partnership, a degree of understanding develops in relation to when partner may be psyching and what sort of bids he may psyche. This understanding becomes part of your partnership agreement, and must be disclosed to the opponents. If it is not so disclosed, it becomes a concealed partnership understanding (CPU), and is a serious breach of Law 40B (V. above).

Take a common 'baby psyche' which may succeed against weak players but not against good players. Partner opens 1H and RHO doubles for takeout. Holding heart support and a singleton spade, you bid 1S. If partner knows from experience that you will sometimes make such a bid on such a hand, then the opponents are entitled to know this also. If he fails to alert and explain this possibility, you have a CPU, and are in breach of law. If partner fails to alert this, and subsequent bidding suggests that he has diagnosed your 'psyche' and acted accordingly, then the Director may be entitled to adjust the score on the basis that you have a CPU. For example, if partner holds a 4 card spade suit and fails to raise you, then there is strong evidence that he has acted on a CPU.

The QBA has a regulation requiring all psyches to be reported to the TD. There are several reasons for this regulation. One: it allows the TD to get a feeling for when a particular partnership may be in danger of reaching some sort of implicit agreement, and having a word to this particular pair to explain the situation. Two: the body of reported psyches forms a background for the TD to judge in a particular situation whether there is a possible CPU. Three: if he considers that there has been an illegal fielding of a psyche, then on his own initiative he is entitled to adjust the score on the basis of a CPU.

So in our example, the bidding has gone:

N	E	S
1H	Dbl	1S

What are North's obligations? If he alerts this as a possible tactical bid short in spades, he is now entitled to act on this basis, because opponents have been informed. If not, then he must act on the basis that South's 1S bid is genuine, and continue to do so unless it becomes clear from subsequent authorized information that South's 1S bid was not genuine. North in other words is allowed to diagnose partner's psyche on the basis of subsequent bidding and his own card holding. His prior experience with this partner is not authorized, because he has not revealed it. The QBA regulations, which follow the lines of the EBU regs, state that the discomfort of the opponents is of itself not sufficient to diagnose partner's psyche. There must be other supporting evidence. Thus if in this sequence South's bid of 1S had been doubled by West (showing spades) and North held a 4 card spade suit, then there is pretty strong evidence that South may have psyched and North is entitled to act on this diagnosis, because the psyche has been revealed by the legal auction.

Fielding a psyche:

When player A psyches and partner B fails to bid out his hand because he has diagnosed A's probable psyche, this is called 'fielding the psyche'. This is not in itself illegal, provided that the diagnosis of partner's psyche is based on AI. Our regulations make it clear that partnership experience (unless disclosed to opponents) is not AI. The discomfort of opponents in itself is not a sufficient diagnosis, but may be possible confirmatory evidence. And it must be clear that it is *partner* who has psyched, not one of the opponents.

There was a recent report in the QBA Bulletin of a hand from a recent congress. West opened a standard pre-empt of 3C. North passed, and East bid 3H (normally forcing). South asked about the 3H bid, agonized for some time before passing. West now decided, on the basis of South's obvious discomfort, that East may have psyched and opted to pass. This was passed out, and went off 6 tricks for a good score (NS can make 4H). East had psyched with a weak hand, club support and a 3 card heart suit.

I would have adjusted the score on this hand. East's psyche had been diagnosed solely on the basis of South's discomfort, and the Regulations state that such discomfort is not alone sufficient to diagnose partner's psyche.

Note, by the way, the difference between a psychic opening bid and a psychic bid elsewhere during the auction. The ABF System Regulations cover largely opening bids. You can't alert a psychic opening bid such as the hand at the start of this article because, if this is alerted, you are playing an illegal system. However, bids during the auction that may be deceptive to the opponents must be alerted if there is some partnership experience to suggest this. Previously I said that a bid which is a subject of partnership agreement (whether explicit or implicit, cannot be a true psychic bid. In this article, I have used the term 'psychic' (in quotes) to indicate bids which we normally think of as psychic in the sense that they intend to deceive the opponents, but which may be systemic in that there may be some partnership experience available to the psyching pair but not to the opponents.

Take another situation. Your partner will sometimes make a 'psychic' cue bid on the way to slam i.e. he may cue bid a control he does not have. If you have partnership experience of this, then you must alert the opponents, otherwise you are playing a CPU.

I'm often asked questions such as this: a player playing weak 2's showing systemically 6-10 HCP opens 2S with QJxxxx in spades and nothing else. Is this a psyche? Is this a gross misstatement of suit length or honour strength? Probably not. But, in any case, it doesn't matter. This sort of bid represents a departure from the agreed system, and the approach here is exactly the same as with psyches. If partnership history is such that you know that partner will sometimes bid with this sort of hand, then it must be announced to the opponents. If it is not, then any subsequent action which allows for the fact that partner may hold that hand will need to be justified by a legal diagnosis of the fact.

So the approach to departures from system is exactly the same as to psyches. Unjustified action which allows for the fact that partner may have such a hand is evidence of a CPU.

So let's try to summarise.

1. A psyche is a gross misstatement of your hand in length or strength within the context of your agreed and disclosed system. There is a gray area between psyches and departures from your disclosed system, but this is of no consequence. Fielding a departure from your disclosed system is treated in the same way as fielding a psyche.
2. For a bid to be a psyche, there must be an intention to deceive. And partner must be deceived equally with the opponents. Responder to a psyche is not entitled to field the psyche until the diagnosis has been made from AI.
3. The essential infraction in fielding a psyche is that of acting on the basis of a concealed partnership understanding. In other words, you know something about this auction which the opponents don't, and they are entitled to this knowledge.
4. When you are called to the table after a psyche, what is your procedure?
 - A: Examine responder's hand and decide whether his bidding is consistent with being deceived by the psyche. Has he bid his hand to the full on the assumption that partner's bid is normal? If not, he will be required to explain his actions and how he diagnosed the psyche by AI.
 - B: If he cannot so justify his action, then you are entitled (of your own initiative) to adjust the score. It does not require a claim of damage from the opponents.
 - C: There may be situations where it is not clear cut, where you feel that there may have been an element of fielding, but can't be sure. In this case, warn the pair concerned, and advise that any future similar incident will be treated as a fielded psyche.Remember that the Laws grant players the right to psyche, but provided such action is not protected by a partnership understanding.

Players who psyche frequently in a destructive manner with obvious disregard for their results on the hand may be seen to be in breach of Law 74. However, the best approach at the club level is simply to tell these players that they are not welcome if they continue this frivolous approach to the game.

Disputed claims:

A recent appeals committee decision at the EBL Championships in Teneriffe was interesting, in that it laid down a principle in considering disputed claims where there is a trump outstanding. Their statement was that, in such a situation where declarer thinks his hand is high, trumps will be deemed to be played last. This in effect is what we all do, but it is good to see this in print, and it will become part of EBL 'case law'.

Note that this decision was on a hand where declarer claimed when he had the master trump, but there was a lesser trump outstanding. But what if the outstanding trump was higher than declarer's? It may well be that declarer can be deemed to carelessly play his trump first, and then lose whatever further tricks opponents may be able to cash. Will keep you posted on this.

Another ruling for you.

Bd 19 Dlr S Vul EW

	K852		
	2		
	K74		
	KJ932		
A10943			Q76
Q874			KJ9653
95			Q63
A8			Q
	J		
	A10		
	AJ1082		
	107654		
W	N	E	S
			2NT#
P	4C	P*	P
4S	All pass		

Result: EW -300.

5 / 5 in minors, 6-10 HCP

*Asked about the 4C bid, told it was pre-emptive, thought for some time before passing.

At the end of the hand, North calls you to explain that South has misinformed opponents.
4C was not pre-emptive but constructive and invitational, which is correct systemically.

How do you rule?

Reg.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 6B

Here is the recent ruling problem I presented to you.

Bd 19 Dlr S Vul EW

		K852	
		2	
		K74	
		KJ932	
A10943			Q76
Q874			KJ9653
95			Q63
A8			Q
		J	
		A10	
		AJ1082	
		107654	
W	N	E	S
			2NT#
P	4C	P*	P
4S	All pass		

Result: EW –300.

5 / 5 in minors, 6-10 HCP

*Asked about the 4C bid, told it was pre-emptive, thought for some time before passing.

At the end of the hand, North calls you to explain that South has misinformed opponents. 4C was not pre-emptive but constructive and invitational, which is correct systemically.

How do you rule?

Comment:

Let's follow our usual formula.

1. Was there MI? Clearly there was in this case. NS agree that South's explanation was incorrect.

2. Were EW damaged? Obviously a score of –300 would be a probable bottom score.

3. Was the damage caused by the UI? It's true to say that, had EW been given the correct information, then they would probably have not got their bad score. However, this does

not yet prove cause and effect. East's question is UI to West. West's action in bidding 4S is a clear violation of Law 16. West's LAs were to pass, double or bid. His 4S action could demonstrably have been suggested by East's question. This becomes a situation where the EW damage was subsequent, but not consequent, to the MI. The EW damage was caused by their own infraction of Law 16, not as a direct result of the MI.

So EW keep their score. They have lost their right to redress. But what about NS? Law 12C2 explains how the TD will award an adjusted score after an irregularity. EW have lost their right to an adjustment, but NS are still subject to adjustment. In this case, I would adjust the NS score to +130, the probable result in 4C. So we are awarding a split score: NS +130, EW -300.

Incidentally, how do you cope with this in matchpoint pairs scoring? Which score do you use for matchpointing the whole field on this board? This is a decision for the TD, and he should inform the scorers what is to be done. In general, my preference is to enter an average for this board so that the result is not included in the matchpointing for the whole field. Then you will need to work out the matchpoints for NS with +130, and for EW with -300, and adjust accordingly. Where it is clear that one score rather than the other is a quite realistic one, you might include this score for matchpointing the whole field.

Two other points need to be made here. Remember our rule: when there is MI, there is usually also UI. Before making a final decision on this board, we should analyse the NS bidding to make sure there was no use of UI. North is in receipt of UI that his partner believes that his 4C bid was pre-emptive. Has he taken any action possibly influenced by this knowledge? He must act on the assumption that South knows that his 4C bid was invitational. South has declined the invitation, so North has acted quite properly in not bidding on.

What do you think of East's question and slow pass. This was extremely unwise, and illustrates what I am always preaching to players. East asked about the 4C bid and got the answer most favouring action by him. What possible point is there in asking this question when, no matter what answer you get, you intend to pass? All such questions achieve is to limit partner's options, and make it possible for uncharitable opponents to question one's reasons for asking the question.

Reg

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 7A

With the accreditation examination coming up soon, what I hope to find the time for is to reproduce some questions from previous congress accreditation examination papers and provide my own answers. I hope to organize this within a week or so. Meantime, a few things to be going on with.

1. South is dealer, but East out of turn makes an opening bid of 2H, which shows hearts and an unspecified minor. The out of turn bid is not accepted, so the bid is cancelled and West is barred for the auction. NS get to 4S with West to make the opening lead. What are the lead penalties?

2. Same situation, but this time East does get in a heart bid in the first round of the legal auction. What are the lead penalties on West?

3. Bd 18. N/S Dlr E

	AJ7		
	KJ82		
	875		
	875		
83		K10942	
10654		A	
AJ943		K106	
J3		10962	
	Q65		
	Q973		
	Q2		
	AKQ4		
W	N	E	S
		P	1NT (15-17)
P	2C	2S*	P
3H	P	3S	All pass

* Alerted by West and explained as showing spades and hearts. Explanation incorrect.

Result EW –100.

NS claim damage in that, without the misexplanation, they would have found their heart fit. How would you rule?

Reg.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 7B

With the accreditation examination coming up soon, what I hope to find the time for is to reproduce some questions from previous congress accreditation examination papers and provide my own answers. I hope to organize this within a week or so. Meantime, a few things to be going on with.

1. South is dealer, but East out of turn makes an opening bid of 2H, which shows hearts and an unspecified minor. The out of turn bid is not accepted, so the bid is cancelled and West is barred for the auction. NS get to 4S with West to make the opening lead. What are the lead penalties?

2. Same situation, but this time East does get in a heart bid in the first round of the legal auction. What are the lead penalties on West?

Law 26 covers this. You apply 26A when the withdrawn call related to a specific suit or suits, and 26B for all other withdrawn calls. But what about a call such as East's 2H which has one specified suit and one unspecified? There has been official clarification of this (as I recall, via an official interpretation by the WBF Laws Committee). Use 26A only when *all* suits are specified, otherwise use 26B.

Example 1: 2D Flannery (showing hearts and spades) is the withdrawn call. Apply 26A. Penalty: declarer may require offender's partner to lead a heart or not lead a heart; or he may require him to lead a spade or not lead a spade. (note that he can't forbid both a heart or a spade lead).

Example 2: 2H as above (showing hearts and an unspecified minor) is the withdrawn call. Apply 26B. Under 26B, declarer may not demand, merely prohibit. So he can prohibit the lead of any one suit which he specifies. Make this a little more complex. Suppose that the 2H bidder had later bid his heart suit during the auction, but not his minor. May declarer forbid a heart lead from West? I believe so because we are applying Law 26, which says nothing about suits being specified during the legal auction. Let's go even further. Suppose East had during the auction later bid his hearts and his minor club suit. May declarer forbid a heart lead or forbid a club lead? For the same reason, I believe so. Seems unfair. Another gap in the Laws?

3. Bd 18. N/S Dlr E Teams

AJ7
KJ82
875
875

10654	A
AJ943	K106
J3	10962

Q65
Q973
Q2
AKQ4

W	N	E	S
		P	1NT (15-17)
P	2C	2S*	P
3H	P	3S	All pass

* Alerted by West and explained as showing spades and hearts. Explanation incorrect.

Result EW –100.

NS claim damage in that, without the misexplanation, they would have found their heart fit. How would you rule?

Comment:

Follow our usual catechism.

Was there MI? Yes, obviously.

Was there also UI? Yes, East heard West's explanation that her bid shows hearts and spades. This UI East can't act on. If there had been no alert and explanation, a likely explanation of West's 3H bid would be a hand which can't tolerate spades but has a long heart suit. With the heart Ace, there is no reason for East to disturb 3H, even if it were doubled.

So here we have both MI and UI. Were NS damaged? If NS get to 4H, they are likely to go one off. With their methods, and given no MI, can South bid 3H over East's 2S. Will this propel them to 4H going off? If South passes over the 2S, remember that West will still bid 3H because of her misunderstanding. Would North now double? Possibly not given her failure to double 3H or 3S in the actual auction..

I felt that the likely result for NS would be +200 in defending 3H undoubled, and adjusted the score accordingly.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 8A

Here's a little gem of MI situation for you to get your teeth into whilst awaiting lesson 9. It was sent to me by Keith, and it happened at his club. How would you rule?

Bd 16 Dlr W Vul EW

		--	
		10 8642	
		Q6	
		AKJ864	
AK109742			Q865
Q95			J
AK9			J107543
---			93
		J3	
		AK75	
		82	
		Q10752	
W	N	E	S
1S	2S	#P	3C
4S	5C	P	P
5S	6C	P	P
Dbl	All pass		

Result: EW 300.

Asked about the 2S bid, told it was a spade suit.

At the end of the play, I was called to the table with West complaining that South had misinformed them, and North admitting wrong information by South (she said her bid was actually Michael's cue bid). East said she would have supported West's spades if she had known it was Michael's cue bid and West said she would have bid 6S. North then said she would have overcalled 7C, and West countered she would then have bid 7S!

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 8B

I presented this ruling problem to you in lesson 8.

Bd 16 Dlr W Vul EW

		--	
		10 8642	
		Q6	
		AKJ864	
AK109742			Q865
Q95			J
AK9			J107543
---			93
		J3	
		AK75	
		82	
		Q10752	
W	N	E	S
1S	2S	#P	3C
4S	5C	P	P
5S	6C	P	P
Dbl	All pass		

Result: EW 300.

Asked about the 2S bid, told it was a spade suit.

At the end of the play, I was called to the table with West complaining that South had misinformed them, and North admitting wrong information by South (she said her bid was actually Michael's cue bid). East said she would have supported West's spades if she had known it was Michael's cue bid and West said she would have bid 6S. North then said she would have overcalled 7C, and West countered she would then have bid 7S!

What did you decide?. Here are my comments:

I find this situation quite incredible! I would need to talk to the players but here are my thoughts.

Did East really believe South's explanation of the 2S bid? Does anyone in the world these days play this as natural? Presumably EW are playing 5 card majors, so East knows immediately that the explanation is wrong. She knows even more strongly when she hears West bid all the way up to 5S entirely on her own without a peep from East herself.

Did West really believe the explanation? If she did, then her subsequent bidding is consistent only with a sudden outburst of insanity. Who in their right mind, vul v not, would bid on their own to 5S knowing there are 5 or 6 spades to the probable QJ on her left, with partner possibly void! Whilst EW may be a pair whose policy is never to let yourself be outbid by the opponents, I have to assume sanity at the bridge table, so am forced to the conclusion that West knew that the info was wrong, and acted on that assumption.

Did South continue to believe her explanation correct after hearing West bid to the 5 level all on her own? If she became aware later in the auction of an error in her explanation, then she should have immediately called the Director.

Would EW realistically have got to 6S if given the correct info? Would West bid 6S, knowing that there may be two immediate losers in hearts, with the heart hand on lead? Would East have bid 6S looking at two or three possible losers? Remember that West did not open with a strong forcing bid; she opened only 1S.

All the EW comments are of course being wise after the event. Even if they did accept the push to 6S, would not West have at least contemplated the diamond finesse rather than count on the break (she has the entries for it)? On the bidding North could easily be 0-6-1-6 in distribution. And, had EW gone to 7S, then North would know that West was void in clubs, so would seek salvation elsewhere, and may try the heart suit for one off.

So, my summary:

Was there MI? Yes.

Were EW damaged? I think probably not. NS blundered into their best spot. I don't believe that EW were misled by the MI, and suspect that they both know the info was wrong. I don't believe any sensible EW pair would bid to 6S given the correct info, and even if they did they may well go off. Remember that I have to assume some sort of bridge sanity amongst the players.

It seems to me that EW have got a poor score because NS blundered into their best spot, and that EW are now asking the director to rescue them.

I would be inclined to let the score stand. If South indicated that she suspected a wrong explanation at some stage during the auction, I might apply a procedural penalty for failing to call the Director at that time.

Since I wrote the above, Keith checked the results at the other tables in this event. These are not really relevant, but are of interest. There were 7 tables:

Two tables (including the problem table) played in 6CX for 10 tricks

One table played in 4S making 10 tricks (how is it possible to make only 10 tricks? Was there a revoke?).

Three tables played in 5S making 13 tricks.

One table played in 6S making 12 tricks. Perhaps they accepted the push.

So, with one EW pair out of six getting to 6S, West's claim that she would have bid 6S given the correct info must be taken with a grain of salt.

Exam Papers:

Here is one exam paper from the two I sent in lesson 9, with my answers.

CONGRESS ACCREDITATION EXAMINATION 1995 - PAPER 2

Answers may be brief, but you should indicate the reasons for your answer, and show that you understand the applicable law(s).

Q 1. West is the dealer, but South opens 1C Precision out of turn. The bid is not accepted by West. What ruling do you make?

A: Law 31B. The bid is cancelled and North must pass throughout. South may bid at his turn as he likes.

Subsequently West bids 1S raised to 4S by East with no competitive bidding. North is on lead. What are the lead penalties, if any?

A: Law 26B. The 1C bid is an artificial bid which does not specify or relate to a specified suit. When North is first to lead, declarer may forbid the lead of any one suit which he may name. He can't demand a lead.

Q 2. North is dealer. South starts to bid out of turn, gets as far as writing '1' on the bidding slip when he is told that he is not dealer. You are called. How do you rule?

Definitions: a bid consists of an undertaking to win a number of tricks in a specified denomination. So '1' is not a bid. It is UI to North, and North may take no subsequent action influenced by his knowledge that South probably has a 1 level opening bid.

Q 3. South has made an Ace enquiry, and North systemically shows three aces. South knows that North has made a mistake, as he holds two Aces. East asks about North's bid. What explanation should South give?

A: South's obligation is to explain the meaning of North's bid under their partnership agreement. He should explain that the bid shows three aces even though he knows that the

bid is incorrect. He has no obligation to explain this error, because it would reveal knowledge which he has from his own card holding.

North subsequently realises that he has made a mistake in his Ace showing response. Is he obliged to alert the opponents to his error?

A: No. One must alert opponents to one's own side's misexplanation, but not to our misbids.

Q 4. The bidding goes:

W	N	E	S
1NT	P	2D	P
2H			

At this stage West remembers to alert the 2D bid as conventional, a transfer to hearts. You are called. South claims that he would have taken some action over the 2D bid had he known it was conventional. How do you rule?

A: Law 21B. Failure to alert = misinformation. South may retract his pass, and substitute another bid without penalty. Under 16C, his original pass is AI to North, but UI to EW. South's likely change of call is to double 2D. West may now change his call also. Perhaps West will now pass. His original 2H call (e.g. his failure to superaccept) is UI to East.

Would your ruling be any different if North had passed over West's 2H bid before West remembered to alert?

A: Yes. Under 21B, South may change his call only if partner has not subsequently called. It's now too late, but under 21B3, the director may adjust the score later if there has been damage. Technically, South's remark that he would have taken action if the 2D call had been alerted is UI to North (his probable action would have been to double), and North may not take action based on this. However, the Director will adjust the score if necessary if South's inability to double 2D damaged NS.

Q 5. The bidding goes:

W	N	E	S
1S	X	P	XX

You are called. How do you rule?

A: Law 36. An inadmissible double. Must be corrected, and partner must pass throughout.

What would be your ruling if the XX had been followed by three passes?

A: The inadmissible redouble has been 'condoned' by the opponents. But this is not condoning in the same sense as an insufficient bid or a call out of turn is condoned. In these cases, the illegal call stands and becomes a part of the legal auction. When an inadmissible double is condoned, the only result is the opponents have forfeited their rights to any penalty. The bidding reverts to the offender, who must replace his illegal call with a legal call, and there is no penalty on partner and no lead penalties.

Q 6. West is dealer and opens 2C Precision. North does not notice the opening bid, and makes a bid of 1NT. When this is pointed out as insufficient, he corrects his bid to 2D. At this stage you are called. What is your ruling?

A: Law 27. The 97 version of Law 97 is poorly drafted. The 87 Laws had specific provision for what happens after a premature attempt to correct an insufficient bid. Note that Law 25B does not apply here. (see 25B1). In other words, LHO does not have the option of accepting the substituted call of 3D. The WBF Laws Committee has clarified that we adopt the same approach as in the 87 Laws. This is that we cancel the premature correction to 3D. We revert to the insufficient bid of 1NT, and give give East his option to accept it. If he so chooses, bidding proceeds but with the 3D call being a withdrawn call. If he chooses not to accept it, then we apply law 27 in relation to the 1NT call.

North subsequently bids diamonds during the auction. EW are the declaring side in 3S. What are the lead penalties for NS, if any?

A: North has two withdrawn calls: 1NT and 3D. Under law 26A1, there is no lead penalty for the 3D call because he has later specified diamonds during the legal auction. However, his original 1NT withdrawn call remains subject to penalty under 26B. Declarer may forbid the lead of a specified suit by South. May he forbid for example a diamond lead? I believe so, under Law 26B.

Q 7. East makes his face down opening lead, and then calls you to ask may he change his lead. What is your answer?

A: Law 41A and 47E2. Under 41A he may not retract his card because of a change of mind, only after an irregularity. The irregularity may be that he should not have been on lead, and as long as the card is still face down one would allow the retraction. Otherwise he may retract his card only if misinformation comes to light after he has selected the card. Note that, under 47E2, he may retract his opening lead after MI comes to light even if his opening lead has been faced. But he may not do so if dummy has faced any card. However, his right to an adjusted score remains.

Q 8. South calls you to the table. He has looked at his cards, and then finds he has 14 cards. No other player has yet looked at his cards, but East has only 12 cards. The C2 is the card South holds belonging to the East hand. What do you do in this situation?

A: Law 13B1. If you decide that the C2 is an inconsequential card and that South's seeing this card will not affect subsequent bidding or play, you may restore the C2 to the correct hand and allow play to continue. But note that this must be with the concurrence of all players at the table.

Would your ruling be different if South had made an opening pass before discovering that he held 14 cards?

A: Law 13. A player with an incorrect hand (South) has made a call – pass. If you are satisfied that the hand can still be rescued without a change of call, you may again correct the hands and allow play to proceed. Again, you must have the concurrence of all four players.

Q 8. Explain the meaning and significance of the term 'self-alerting bid'. List those bids which are classed as self-alerting under QBA and ABF regulations.

A: Self-alerting calls are calls which have so many different meanings or treatments by various partnerships that there is no single meaning which can be regarded as standard. When such a call is made, it is treated as though it had been automatically alerted. Self-alerting calls include doubles and redoubles, bids above 3NT and cue bids. A cue bid for the purposes of the regulations is defined as a bid of the suit named by an opponent or of a suit indicated by an opponent's bid. For example, if a bid of 1D actually shows a 4 card spade suit, a bid of 1S or 2D would be a cue bid, and therefore not alertable.

Q 9. (a) West has the H2 on the table as a minor penalty card. South plays on spades (which are trumps) and West must discard on the third round of spades. You rule that West must play the H2. Right or wrong?

A: Wrong. Law 50C. The only restriction is that West may not play a non-honour card in hearts until he has first played the H2.

(b) Again, West has the H2 as a minor penalty card. A few tricks later, he accidentally drops the S5 on the table when playing to a trick. You rule that the H2 and the S5 are both minor penalty cards. Right or wrong?

A: Wrong. Law 50D. When a defender has two or more penalty cards, both become major penalty cards.

Q 10. Spades are trumps. South the declarer leads a heart from dummy which East ruffs. South plays a small heart, as does West. East now discovers that he does have a heart, so he replaces the spade with the H9.

South now asks may he withdraw his small heart and play a different one. Your ruling?

A: Yes, he may. Law 62C Note that under 16C, the original card played by South is UI to EW

West also asks may he change his card played. Your answer?

A: Yes. Law 62C2. But note that, if he does so, his originally played card becomes a major penalty card. Note also that his right to change his card applies only if South has chosen to change his.

Q 11. South is declarer. East looks as though he is about to make the opening lead out of turn, but North says 'It is not your lead'. Is there any problem with this?

A: Laws 17E and Laws 42, 43. The latter two Laws cover dummy's rights. Those rights extend to preventing an infraction by declarer, but not by defenders. To prevent an infraction by a defender could be seen as an infraction of Law 43C (participating in the play). However, look at Law 17E. The auction period has not ended until the opening lead is faced, so in this example we are still in the auction period. There is not yet a dummy, only a potential dummy. Under Law 9A1, any player may call attention to an irregularity during the auction, and I would see this right as extending to preventing a threatened irregularity.

Q 12. During a pairs event, a player comes to you and says 'In the first board of the previous round, I conceded the HJ at the end, thinking that the HQ was still not played. The opponents accepted the trick. I now realise that the HJ was high, and that I actually should have won that trick.' What action, if any, do you take?

A: Law 71A. This player has conceded a trick that he has in fact won. Provided you are still within the appeal time under 79C, you will give him his trick.

Also look at Law 72A2. If the opponents accepted the conceded trick knowing that it was not their trick, they have breached Law 72A2 and are subject to penalty.

Q 13. You are running a barometer Howell movement, with some tables slow to move. At one table the bidding has gone North 1NT East Pass South 2C. At this stage, another pair come to the table, and it is realised that EW are sitting at the wrong table. How do you handle this problem?

A: Law 15C. Cancel the auction. Seat the players correctly at the two tables affected, and allow the auction to re-start. Instruct the pair who previously played the board at this table that they must repeat the calls they had made in the auction to date. If any call differs in any way from the previous auction, cancel the board and award an artificial adjusted score.

Q 14. In a highly competitive auction, with NS bidding hearts and EW spades, the bidding has reached 6S by East, pass by South, pass by West. North has not yet bid when South makes the opening lead face up. You are called. How do you rule?

A: Law 24B. The card is prematurely lead. North must pass at his next turn (which is now). So the contract is 6S by East. However, we must now look at Law 23. South by his infraction has effectively prevented North from bidding, possibly a sacrifice in 7H, possibly even a double of 6S. If you deem that South could have known when he made his lead that barring partner might advantage his side, you may award an adjusted score. You don't have to impute impure motives to this particular South, merely decide that any South, perhaps one with less than pure motives, may have known that barring partner could be to their advantage. If, for example, 6S went one off and you considered it possible that South given the opportunity may have taken the phantom, then you may adjust to the result for 7HX going off whatever number of tricks.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 9A

As promised, I am sending you some samples from past examination papers. Do some work on these, and I'll try to provide my answers shortly.

I apologise for any formatting problems with the text. I've had to translate some of the material from quite old word processing files. I hope it will all be readable, if not perfect.

By the way, I have absolutely no idea of the contents of the examination paper for the exam coming up in October. Any similarity to any questions appearing in that paper will be quite coincidental. There are sure to be some similarities, because there are lots of standard questions for any accreditation paper.

Reg.

CONGRESS ACCREDITATION EXAMINATION 1995 - PAPER 2

Answers may be brief, but you should indicate the reasons for your answer, and show that you understand the applicable law(s).

Q 1. West is the dealer, but South opens 1C Precision out of turn. The bid is not accepted by West. What ruling do you make?

Subsequently West bids 1S raised to 4S by East with no competitive bidding. North is on lead. What are the lead penalties, if any?

Q 2. North is dealer. South starts to bid out of turn, gets as far as writing '1' on the bidding slip when he is told that he is not dealer. You are called. How do you rule?

Q 3. South has made an Ace enquiry, and North systemically shows three aces. South knows that North has made a mistake, as he holds two Aces. East asks about North's bid. What explanation should South give?

North subsequently realises that he has made a mistake in his Ace showing response. Is he obliged to alert the opponents to his error?

Q 4. The bidding goes:

W	N	E	S
1NT	P	2D	P
2H			

At this stage West remembers to alert the 2D bid as conventional, a transfer to hearts. You are called. South claims that he would have taken some action over the 2D bid had he known it was conventional. How do you rule?

Would your ruling be any different if North had passed over West's 2H bid before West remembered to alert?

Q 5. The bidding goes:

W	N	E	S
1S	X	P	XX

You are called. How do you rule?

What would be your ruling if the XX had been followed by three passes?

Q 6. West is dealer and opens 2C Precision. North does not notice the opening bid, and makes a bid of 1NT. When this is pointed out as insufficient, he corrects his bid to 2D. At this stage you are called. What is your ruling?

North subsequently bids diamonds during the auction. EW are the declaring side in 3S. What are the lead penalties for NS, if any?

Q 7. East makes his face down opening lead, and then calls you to ask may he change his lead. What is your answer?

Q 8. South calls you to the table. He has looked at his cards, and then finds he has 14 cards. No other player has yet looked at his cards, but East has only 12 cards. The C2 is the card South holds belonging to the East hand. What do you do in this situation?

Would your ruling be different if South had made an opening pass before discovering that he held 14 cards?

Q 8. Explain the meaning and significance of the term 'self-alerting bid'. List those bids which are classed as self-alerting under QBA and ABF regulations.

Q 9. (a) West has the H2 on the table as a minor penalty card. South plays on spades (which are trumps) and West must discard on the third round of spades. You rule that West must play the H2. Right or wrong?

(b) Again, West has the H2 as a minor penalty card. A few tricks later, he accidentally drops the S5 on the table when playing to a trick. You rule that the H2 and the S5 are both minor penalty cards. Right or wrong?

Q 10. Spades are trumps. South the declarer leads a heart from dummy which East ruffs. South plays a small heart, as does West. East now discovers that he does have a heart, so he replaces the spade with the H9.

South now asks may he withdraw his small heart and play a different one. Your ruling?

West also asks may he change his card played. Your answer?

Q 11. South is declarer. East looks as though he is about to make the opening lead out of turn, but North says 'It is not your lead'. Is there any problem with this?

Q 12. During a pairs event, a player comes to you and says 'In the first board of the previous round, I conceded the HJ at the end, thinking that the HQ was still not played. The opponents accepted the trick. I now realise that the HJ was high, and that I actually should have won that trick.' What action, if any, do you take?

Q 13. You are running a barometer Howell movement, with some tables slow to move. At one table the bidding has gone North 1NT East Pass South 2C. At this stage, another pair come to the table, and it is realised that EW are sitting at the wrong table. How do you handle this problem?

Q 14. In a highly competitive auction, with NS bidding hearts and EW spades, the bidding has reached 6S by East, pass by South, pass by West. North has not yet bid when South makes the opening lead face up. You are called. How do you rule?

1989 ACCREDITATION EXAMINATION - CONGRESS DIRECTOR

1. You are asked to run a country congress. List what announcements you should make, either in writing or verbally, before start of play.

2. The event is of four sessions, two qualifying and two final. What movements would you use for

- (a) 35 tables and
- (b) 23 tables.

3. What results would you need to collate for the state Masterpoint Secretary?

4. You finish with an entry of 23 1/2 tables, due to the non-arrival of a pair. You decide to have three qualifying sections, of 8, 8 and 7 1/2 tables, playing 4 boards per round. For qualification into the final, you need to find the best overall NS 3rd and EW 3rd., so you will need to factorise. Describe the factoring process for the 7 1/2 table section.

5. You are running a Swiss teams event. What would be the minimum number of rounds you would require for

- (a) 20 teams
- (b) 28 teams
- (c) 36 teams.

6. You are running a championship teams event, using a round robin. Draw up the table for a round robin of 12 teams.

7. Complete the table movement cards for a 5 table Howell using the movement specified in Appendix 3, filling in the appropriate data. (This page should be returned with your exam papers.

8. Describe briefly the Flower Howell. What are its advantages and disadvantages.

9. Matchpoint the travelling score card containing a fouled board in Appendix 2. (Note: sorry, but don't have this appendix). However, the answer will cover this type of problem..

10. You are running a Barometer Howell final. You have collected the result slips and are scoring them when two pairs who played against each other in the last round come to you. They had entered a score of 5H North for 9 tricks for -100. In actual fact, they now agree that North made 10 tricks, and that the score should have been -50. What do you do?

11. East is to make the opening lead. He places a card face down on the table, then calls you, saying that he has changed his mind, and wishes to change his lead. What do you rule?

12. In what situations would you allow the opening leader to retract his face down lead?

13. (a) With North as dealer, the bidding has gone 1NT - 2D - when it is discovered that the EW pair have gone to the wrong table. The Director cancels the auction and sends the EW pair to their correct table. When the correct EW pair arrive, you rule that any of the players may require that the board be cancelled. True or false?

(b) The bidding then proceeds 1NT - pass. At this point, you cancel the board, and award both pairs 60%. True or false?

14. Declarer is on lead. Dummy is high, but Declarer has no entry to dummy. Declarer leads incorrectly from dummy, covered by the defender next to play. You rule that because the incorrect play was condoned, the score must stand. True or false?

15. South as declarer claims at trick 11, saying "I'll give you a club". The score is entered. Immediately after the end of the session, South comes to you and says "I now realise that my club was the best". EW agree, but say "he conceded a club to us, so we took it". What action do you take, if any.

16. On the last round of a major pairs event, you decide to award a 60% score to NS at table 1 after a difficult decision. The EW pair accept your ruling. However, the 60% score allows NS to win the event by one matchpoint. The unlucky pair at table 6, who were thereby beaten into second place, advise that they wish to appeal against your ruling. Comment on this situation.

17.(a) South is declarer, West makes his opening lead face down, when suddenly South realises that he has given a wrong explanation of one of North's bids. You are called. What do you rule?

(b Would your decision be any different if the misexplanation had been brought to light by a question from East after the face down lead?

18.
Bd.6, Dlr E, EW vul.

	AKJ97		
	8		
	J2		
	Q10652		
Q8		106432	
KQ42		AJ	
K1087		6543	
A84		87	
	5		
	1097653		
	AQ9		
	KJ3		

W	N	E	S
		P	P
1H	2H(1)	P	2NT
P	3S(2)	P	3NT passed out.

- (1) Alerted by South as described as a forcing cue bid.
 - (2) After the 3S bid, South calls you, and explains that the first explanation was wrong. The 2H was a conventional bid showing at least 5-5 in spades and clubs.
- Result: 3NT making 9 tricks on a diamond lead. A top score.
Comment on this situation, and what you would rule.

19. What do you understand by the term "balance" in relation to pairs movements?

20. North
 S. 109632
 H. 2
 D. QJ432
 C. 32

 South
 S. AKJ74
 H. A5
 D. A75
 C. 754

The bidding:

W	N	E	S
		1H	1S
4H	4S	5H	X
P	?		

Whilst North is still contemplating his call, South leads the SK.

4H EW and 4S NS both make. 5H EW and 5S NS both go off one.

What is your ruling?

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 9B

My answers to the 1989 accreditation paper.

1989 ACCREDITATION EXAMINATION - CONGRESS DIRECTOR

1. You are asked to run a country congress. List what announcements you should make, either in writing or verbally, before start of play.

A: Depends a little on circumstances, but consider items such as: format, qualification, tiebreaking, appeals, alerting and systems, session times etc.

2. The event is of four sessions, two qualifying and two final. What movements would you use for

(a) 35 tables and

(b) 23 tables.

A: No "right" and "wrong" answers. General principles to follow: Minimum of 24 bds and maximum of 30 bds per session; preferable for all sections to finish close to the same time; play complete movements and avoid skips where time and size constraints allow; movements should be as close to perfectly balanced as possible; maximum of about 3 1/2 hrs per session; try to play different opponents in second qualifying. If comparing qualifying scores across fields, may need to factorise; players like at least three board rounds if possible; pleasing the players is perhaps more important than technically good but complex movements. Players like simple movements. Remember Murphy's law of bridge movements: if players can foul up a bridge movement, they will.

My preferences:

For 35 tables: 3 x 9 tables (27 bds) and 1 x 8 (28 bds with skip). Swap sections around for session 2: 2 x 9 and 2 x 8 1/2. Factoring necessary. For the finals: 3 x 9 Barometer Howells (3 bds per round) and 1 x 8 Barometer (4 bds per round stopping after 13 rds)

For 23 tables: 2 x 7 plus 1 x 9 would be nice, but that I think is too big a size difference. My preference: 2 x 8 plus 1 x 7 (28 bds) and for Q2 1 x 8 plus 2 x 7 1/2 (32 boards). Factoring needed.

3. What results would you need to collate for the state Masterpoint Secretary?

A: The top half of the field in each session and the top half of each final session. For outright final places, you should provide the full list of places in the championship as awards will probably go to all places. In other final sections, list the top half.

Rounding: in pairs events, round **down** where necessary. For example, for a 9 table Mitchell, awards go to the top 4 places NS and EW. Note that, in teams events, outright awards go only to the top third of the field, rounding **up** if necessary.

The MP sec. will also need to know details of the total entry and the type of movements. Details of all players' ABF numbers.

4. You finish with an entry of 23 1/2 tables, due to the non-arrival of a pair. You decide to have three qualifying sections, of 8, 8 and 7 1/2 tables, playing 4 boards per round. For qualification into the final, you need to find the best overall NS 3rd and EW 3rd., so you will need to factorise. Describe the factoring process for the 7 1/2 table section.

A: The 8 table sections play 32 bds with a top of 14. In the 7 1/2 section, NS play 32 bds with a top of 12 (only 7 scores per board). So that the NS will be factorised by 14/12. The EW's play 28 bds with a top of 12. As their scores are being compared with other EW's who played 32 bds with top of 14, then factorise by 14/12 x 32/28.

5. You are running a Swiss teams event. What would be the minimum number of rounds you would require for

- (a) 20 teams
- (b) 28 teams
- (c) 36 teams.

A: 7, 7, and 8. For the mathematicians, the formula for the minimum number of rounds is $\log_2 N + 2$ (rounded up).

6. You are running a championship teams event, using a round robin. Draw up the table for a round robin of 12 teams.

A: Essentially a Howell movement. Start your first round thus:

1 2 3 4 5 6

Then come back the other way:

12 v 1 11 v 2 10 v 3 9 v 4 8 v 5 7 v 6

Go down each column adding 1 to each team number, but omitting 12 which stays in the first column. After 11 rounds, you are finished, and the last figure should be one less than the top figure in the column.

12 v 1 11 v 2 10 v 3 9 v 4 8 v 5 7 v 6
 12 v 2 1 v 3 11 v 4 10 v 5 9 v 6 8 v 7

and so on.

7. Complete the table movement cards for a 5 table Howell using the movement specified in Appendix 3, filling in the appropriate data. (This page should be returned with your exam papers.)

A: Refer to standard references. Essentially, in Howell movements, players follow the pair numbered one below them (with the highest numbered pair stationary) and the boards move down one station towards table 1. You would fill out the starting pairs at each table, and then complete the rest of the rounds in the same way as you did the draw for the round robin in teams above. Boards are played in sequence at each table. On each round, the boards will move one station towards table 1 i.e. from table to table, or table to bystand, or bystand to table.

8. Describe briefly the Flower Howell. What are its advantages and disadvantages.

A: Players move in a circular fashion around the table. In e.g a 9 table Flower, pair 1 sit at EW1, 2 at EW2 etc down to EW9. Pair 18 sit at 1NS, 17 at 2NS and so on. Players as in all Howells follow the lower numbered pair. If not barometered, then the board movements are irregular and a lot more work for the Director (or the players can get their boards from a central table).

Other advantages: much simpler movement for the players, who merely move from one table to the next. Disadvantage: very unbalanced, unless you have arrowswitching of players or boards.

There are some Howell movements e.g. 10 tables, 14 tables where a modified type of Flower movement produces a properly balanced movement. Players move only to the next table, but will change direction.

9. Matchpoint the travelling score card containing a fouled board in Appendix 2. Return it with your paper. (TSC not available. But there were 5 scores in one group and 4 scores in the other).

A: The approved method is to separate for scoring purposes into two sections: one group where the board was played correctly and one where the board was played in the fouled state. Matchpoint each section separately. In this case, the five score section has a top of 8, and the four score section a top of 6. Then add to the scores in each section one matchpoint for each table in the other group. Thus, in the 4 table group, you would add 5 to each pair's matchpoints and to the 5 table group, add 4. Do this and you will find that your check total is correct (72). You will note that this result is similar to the one you would get by scoring each section separately and treating the scores in the other section as adjusted scores.

10. You are running a Barometer Howell final. You have collected the result slips and are scoring them when two pairs who played against each other in the last round

come to you. They had entered a score of 5H North for 9 tricks for -100. In actual fact, they now agree that North made 10 tricks, and that the score should have been -50. What do you do?

A: Read carefully Law 79. Tricks won must be agreed before the hands are returned to the board. Law 79B applies if you are asked to change the number of tricks after the round has ended. The 1987 Laws did not allow you to change the result to any side's advantage. So that you could not change the score to -50, because that would advantage NS. You would leave the score at -100 for NS, but could change it to 50 for EW because they are not being advantaged. That is, you would award a split score. The 1997 Laws have varied this to give you discretion i.e. you need not grant this increase in score. No guidelines are laid down and in Australia no guidelines have been suggested. But take this approach. The Law was designed to prevent players with much to gain from the score change e.g. prize money, placing etc cajoling, browbeating or perhaps even bribing a pair with nothing to lose into agreeing the change in score. The EBU have laid down guidelines: where one pair has much to gain and the other little to lose, then the TD will automatically disallow the change.

It is important to know what scores you may change legally. An error in calculating the score, such as an arithmetical error or a wrong vulnerability may be changed up to the expiry time, but an error such as agreeing an incorrect number of tricks can be changed only at the director's discretion.

11. East is to make the opening lead. He places a card face down on the table, then calls you, saying that he has changed his mind, and wishes to change his lead. What do you rule?

A: Covered in previous exam.

12. In what situations would you allow the opening leader to retract his face down lead?

A: Covered in previous exam.

13. Covered in previous exam.

14. Declarer is on lead. Dummy is high, but Declarer has no entry to dummy. Declarer leads incorrectly from dummy, covered by the defender next to play. You rule that because the incorrect play was condoned, the score must stand. True or false?

A: An interesting question! The laws do not specifically cover this situation, but there is a pervading principle of the laws that a player may not advantage his side by an infraction of the laws, if he could have known that such infraction might be to his advantage. See, for example, Law 23 and Law 72B. Read also Law 81C6 where the Director is charged with rectifying "any error or irregularity of which he becomes aware". As part of that rectification, he may (Law 82B1) award an adjusted score.

One can't know whether Declarer intentionally led from the wrong hand, and he is certainly not going to admit it! Clearly, he would have known that leading from the wrong hand (an infraction of Law 44G) would be to his advantage. The correct action here is to deprive declarer of his good score obtained by his infraction, and award an adjusted score according to the likely result without the infraction. However, defenders, who thoughtlessly played to the lead from the wrong hand, are not entitled to redress, so they should retain their poor score. Another situation for a split score.

15. Covered in previous exam.

16. On the last round of a major pairs event, you decide to award a 60% score to NS at table 1 after a difficult decision. The EW pair accept your ruling. However, the 60% score allows NS to win the event by one matchpoint.

The unlucky pair at table 6, who were thereby beaten into second place, advise that they wish to appeal against your ruling. Comment on this situation.

A: Law 92A allows a contestant to appeal against a ruling made at HIS OWN table. There is no provision for appealing against a decision at another table. Advise the unlucky pair that they have no right to appeal.

17.(a) South is declarer, West makes his opening lead face down, when suddenly South realises that he has given a wrong explanation of one of North's bids. You are called. What do you rule?

A: Law 75D1 obliges South to call the Director as soon as he realises that he has given a wrong explanation. (Interestingly, this is the only situation where the laws compel you to call attention to your own infraction). South will call you, and you will ask him to correct his explanation. Then you will give West the option of retracting his lead, and replacing it with another.

(b) Would your decision be any different if the misexplanation had been brought to light by a question from East after the face down lead?

A: Yes. Technically, whilst East has the right at this time to ask questions, there is no sound reason why he needs to, except perhaps for the benefit of West, which is improper. East's questions may well be unauthorised information to West, and his change of lead may be influenced by it. If there was misinformation EW are still protected. I would let the lead stand, but advise EW that they may be entitled still to an adjusted score if damaged.

18.

Bd.6, Dlr E, EW vul.

	AKJ97		
	8		
	J2		
	Q10652		
Q8		106432	
KQ42		AJ	
K1087		6543	
A84		87	
	5		
	1097653		
	AQ9		
	KJ3		

W	N	E	S
		P	P
1H	2H(1)	P	2NT
P	3S(2)	P	3NT passed out.

(1) Alerted by South as described as a forcing cue bid.

(2) After the 3S bid, South calls you, and explains that the first explanation was wrong. The 2H was a conventional bid showing at least 5-5 in spades and clubs.

Result: 3NT making 9 tricks on a diamond lead. A top score.

Comment on this situation, and what you would rule.

A: South's incorrect explanation of North's bid is unauthorised information to North. Assume that there had been no misexplanation. North bids 2H showing at least 5-5 in the black suits. Partner, knowing this, chooses to bid 2NT. What reason does North have to disturb that contract? He has no extra values, and the most minimal distribution for his bid. It seems probable that North in making his next bid, has acted because of having heard South's misexplanation.

I would adjust the score to NS +150 (the result of 2NT making 9 tricks).

19. What do you understand by the term "balance" in relation to pairs movements?

A: Essentially, a movement where each player in a field has his scores compared with each other player in that field the same number of times. For perfect balance, each player in a field should also meet the same opponents as the other players in that field. Thus a Mitchell movement is perfectly balanced. In say a 10T Mitchell (share and

byestand), each NS compares with every other NS nine times, and the same for EW. If you had a skip or curtailed movement, this would disturb the balance in one sense because not all pairs have played the same opponents. A Howell with even number of tables is balanced, but an odd number Howell is slightly unbalanced unless you arrowswitch at the stationary table. This would normally not be worth worrying about except in say Butler movements with long matches.

20. North
 S. 109632
 H. 2
 D. QJ432
 C. 32

 South
 S. AKJ74
 H. A5
 D. A75
 C. 754

The bidding:

W	N	E	S
		1H	1S
4H	4S	5H	X
P	?		

Whilst North is still contemplating his call, South leads the SK.

4H EW and 4S NS both make. 5H EW and 5S NS both go off one.

What is your ruling?

A: Discussed in previous exam, but worth returning to. Law 24. North must pass at his next turn. But there is much more than that. Read Law 23A. South's lead during the auction has effectively prevented North from making another bid, and he may well have gone on to make the "sacrifice" of 5S. South's action, intentional or not, has very likely damaged EW, and the Director should award an adjusted score of EW +100, the likely result in 5Sx by NS.

It is not necessary to decide that South knew his action could advantage their side, only that he COULD have known. One assumes that players have a general idea of the rules at least, and the sort of infractions that prevent partner from bidding.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 10A

Q. 1

West is the dealer and passes. While North is contemplating his bid, South passes out of turn. How do you rule?

Q. 2

Here is an instructive hand from a recent congress.

Bd 15 Dlr S Vul NS

76
J72
53
AQJ764

AK43
K10864
2.
10

10982
93
KJ987
82

QJ5
AQ5
AQ4
K953

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
				1C (1)
	1D (2)	2D (3)	5D	Dbl
	5H (4)	6C	All pass	

Result: NS -200.

1. Precision
2. For majors (not alerted)
3. Positive hand 8+ HCP
4. At this stage you are called by North. It transpires West's 1D bid was systemically correct, but East did not realize that NS were playing Precision. You offer South the option of retracting her double without penalty, which she declines. Bidding proceeds.

Do you adjust? If so, to what?

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 10B

Q. 1

West is the dealer and passes. While North is contemplating his bid, South passes out of turn. How do you rule?

A 1: As you may have guessed, a little trap in this one. Law 30 covers a pass out of rotation. Law 30A applies *before any player has bid*, and Law 30B *after any player has bid*. Which do you apply?

South has opened the auction with a pass. A pass is not a bid. If you look at Definitions (P.11), you will see the definitions. Distinguish between 'calls' and 'bids'. Calls include all bids, but also passes, doubles and redoubles. So in this situation you apply 30A (before any player has bid), and offender must merely pass at his first legal turn. If West had opened the bidding with say 1C and South had then passed, you would apply 30B2.

There are a few areas where you need to be alert to this difference.

Q 2

Bd 15 Dlr S Vul NS

76
J72
53
AQJ764

AK43	10982
K10864	93
2.	KJ987
10	82

QJ5
AQ5
AQ4
K953

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
				1C (1)
	1D (2)	2D (3)	5D	Dbl
	5H (4)	6C	All pass	

Result: NS -200.

1. Precision

2. For majors (not alerted)
3. Positive hand 8+ HCP
4. At this stage you are called by North. It transpires West's 1D bid was systemically correct, but East did not realize that NS were playing Precision. You offer South the option of retracting her double without penalty, which she declines. Bidding proceeds.

Do you adjust? If so, to what?

A 2:

As I think I've mentioned before, an excellent way of approaching these MI and UI situations is the one Kaplan recommended years ago. Picture a situation where each player has his own personal hand held computer, on which a full explanation of the opponents' calls comes up as each call is made (but not of course his own). So there is no need to alert, and no UI from a false alert or a failure to alert. So that in this auction, North and South immediately know what West's 1D bid means, but East's misunderstanding remains.

Let's look in sequence. The first infraction occurred when East failed to alert the conventional 1D overcall. This was an alertable call even though East did not register because he forgot that NS were playing Precision. Law 21B makes it clear that failure to alert represents misinformation, and the MI Laws apply.

South doubles the 5D bid, and West bids 5H. At this stage, you are called. How do you proceed? By this time, East has realized that he had got it wrong and had not alerted. Law 21B allows a player to change without penalty a call made after misinformation, but only provided his partner has not subsequently called. The wording of this law is not all that great. Does 'subsequently' mean after the MI (i.e. the failure to alert) or after the call that opponent may wish to change? The latter is the correct understanding. So how far back can you take the auction?. North bid 2D after the failure to alert, but South has since called with a double of 5D. So North can no longer change his 2D call. However South may change her 5DX call, because North has not yet bid subsequently. So you allow South to change her call, but she opts to leave it. Note that law 21B3 makes it clear that, when it is too late to change a call, the TD may still award an adjusted score in case of damage, and you advise the table thus. Bidding proceeds.

You are called back at the end of the hand. NS have a terrible score (6C for -200) and ask for an adjustment. You start by looking at any infraction. Failure to alert was one infraction. But there was another. I'll repeat what we discussed in the previous series of lessons.

When there is misinformation, there is often also unauthorized information.

Always remember this adage when making a ruling, and check it out. West, by East's failure to alert, suspects that East has forgotten that her 1D call was conventional. This is UI, and she may not take any action suggested over another by this UI. If I show a major

two suiter and believe that partner understands, and despite that partner jumps to 5D, I would be quite happy to pass 5D. I've got a great hand for partner with his presumed long diamond suit. Clearly, pass is one of West's options, and the 5H bid could have been based on UI.

So, in adjusting the score, we'll disallow the 5H bid. What would have been the likely outcome without these infractions? East would still have bid his 5D (having forgotten that NS were playing Precision) and South would have doubled. There is a good chance that North would have passed, and NS could get +800 with good defence. Do we give them this score?

Normally yes. But consider the issue of 'consequent damage' and subsequent damage'. 'Consequent' means damage resulting from the infraction. 'Subsequent' means damage arising after the infraction, but not arising directly from it. Take a situation where South has been pushed to 5S after EW have used UI to push to 5H. South plays rather poorly and makes only 10 tricks for -100. As South should never been playing in 5S except for the EW infraction, he will be given the score for 4S making i.e. +620. The WBF Laws Committee have made it clear that, in arriving at such adjusted scores, we do not take into account subsequent poor play or even poor bidding, where there has been damage. The only situation where the non-offenders may lose their right to an adjusted score is if they take action that is 'wild' gambling, or irrational'. This proviso is particularly aimed at the 'double shot'.

Take North's situation after the 5H bid. His options are to pass (leaving decision to partner) or double. Is 6C a realistic option? He has no reason to think this a winning option. I see the 6C bid as a double shot. The philosophy behind the double shot is 'I'll take this gamble, but if it doesn't come off, then the Director will adjust our score anyway because of the MI'. So I see the 6C bid as fitting the 'gambling' concept.

So I would allow NS to keep their score of -200. The 'double shot' has cut the nexus between infraction and damage. However, EW should not be allowed to advantage from their infraction, and I shall still adjust their score to -800. So we have a split score here.

Two of our panel wrote in with their answers, and both suggested adjusting to -500 representing three off in 5DX. Incidentally, this was a Butler Pairs, and -500 would still be a good result for EW, as the par result is NS 3NT for +600. Look at Law 12. It requires us to award the probable score to the non-offenders, but to award the offenders the worst score they may get without drawing too long a bow. I see a possible defence as CA, diamond switch, 3 rounds of diamonds. Provided South ducks the first heart to the king, and splits his honours (preferably with the queen) when the spades are led from East, dummy will have used his last trump to get back to hand to repeat the finesse. Will he so repeat (if it loses he will go -1400), or will he settle for -800? The latter is certainly a possibility. Perhaps my analysis is wrong, but that is what appeals committees are for.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 11A

A couple of further ruling problems for you. Both have arisen in recent play.

Question 1

E/W Vul
Dealer S

			N	
			3	
			7543	
			AQ876	
			632	
	8762			KQJ94
	98			AJ1062
	J102			93
	KQJ5			10
			A105	
			KQ	
			K54	
			A9874	
Bidding:	S	W	N	E
	1NT	P	P	2C
	X	P	2D	2S
	X	All pass		

Nothing alerted. 2 Clubs systemically was Landy (showing majors). E/W inexperienced players, N/S experienced. West forgot they were playing Landy.

Result: EW +670. NS claim damage because of failure to alert.

How would you rule?

Question 2.

Bd 14 Nil vul Dlr E.

		5	
		K65	
		QJ1084	
		J832	
AQ84			K1072
AQ42			J9
96			A73
A74			KQ106
		J963	
		10873	
		K52	
		95	
West	North	East	South
		1C	P
1H	P	1S	P
3S	P	4S	P
4NT(1)	P	5D(2)	P
5S	All pass.		

- (1) Simple Blackwood
- (2) One ace

Result: EW +450.

NS call you to the table at the end of the hand. They claim that East's 5D bid was significantly slow, and East's mannerisms suggested discomfort and disapproval of West's 4NT. West got the most favourable answer he could to his enquiry, yet he signed off in 5S. East admitted a hesitation, but said that they nearly always use 4C Gerber for aces, and she had to think a little before answering. West made a similar explanation – being used to Gerber, he made the mistake of thinking that 5D showed no aces. He wasn't aware of any mannerisms from partner.

How do you rule?

Review and Explanation of Calls (Law 20).

I have often been asked by directors about what they see as an apparent inconsistency in Law 20. Law 20 in its earlier part limits the right to a review of the auction up to the time when each player has played to trick 1. Yet 20F allows questions about bidding agreements during the play. There is no inconsistency. A review of the auction merely means a *restatement of the calls made during the auction to date*, and this includes any alerts. Requests for explanation of an opponent's call are not part of the review, but are covered by a specific law. It would have been better if this law had been perhaps two separate laws: one relating to a review of the auction, and one relating to requests for explanation of the meanings of calls.

These days we are so used to written bidding or to bidding boxes that we don't need to ask for a restatement of the auction: we can see that in front of us. But those using spoken bidding may occasionally need to exercise this right. Note that the right to a restatement of calls expires for each player as soon as he has played to the first trick (for declarer, as soon as he has played from dummy). Technically, to conform with this requirement, our written bidding regulations should require the bidding pad to be covered as soon as the hand on lead has made his lead, with declarer and third hand retaining the right to inspect it until he has played. This is a bit messy, so our regulations require the bidding pad to be covered by dummy as soon as third hand has played to trick 1.

Note Law 20B which says that, if a player is required by Law to pass at his turn, he is not permitted to ask for a restatement of calls. The Law does not forbid him to ask about the meaning of a call, but any such action would be suspect – his only reason for asking at that time could be to alert his partner to something about the opposition bidding, and this would be quite improper.

Reg Busch.

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 11B

Comments on the problems set in Lesson 11.

Question 1

E/W Vul
Dealer S

			N		
			3		
			7543		
			AQ876		
			632		
	8762				KQJ94
	98				AJ1062
	J102				93
	KQJ5				10
			A105		
			KQ		
			K54		
			A9874		
Bidding:	S	W	N	E	
	1NT	P	P	2C	
	X	P	2D	2S	
	X	All pass			

Nothing alerted. 2 Clubs systemically was Landy (showing majors). E/W inexperienced players, N/S experienced. West forgot they were playing Landy.

Result: EW +670. NS claim damage because of failure to alert.

How would you rule?

Answer:

Obviously one would need to have been at the table to clarify this situation. For example, does West's pass after the double of 2C mean anything systemically? Does it mean tolerance for 2C or does it mean 'no major preference? What does South's double of 2C mean? Penalty? Extra values?

So, whilst these examples all come from real life, any comments have to be related to a theoretical situation, making certain likely assumptions. Comments would in no way reflect on the specific players concerned at this particular table.

What infraction has occurred? West has failed to alert a conventional bid, the 2C bid showing majors. So failure to alert = MI. Remember, when there is MI there is also UI. East has the UI that partner failed to alert, so has possibly forgotten their agreement.

Have NS been damaged? Certainly, -670 will be an awful score whether in pairs or teams.

Was the damage consequent on the infraction (i.e. directly resulting from the infraction), or merely subsequent to (i.e. following but not resulting from the infraction). Remember the WBF's dictum that, where the non-offenders find themselves in a position they would not have been in without the infraction, they won't lose their right to redress purely because of subsequent poor bidding or poor play. They lose their right to redress only where their subsequent actions are wild, gambling or irrational, and specifically where the non-offenders have taken a 'double shot'.

Let's examine this situation more closely. What does South's double of 2C mean? I suspect penalties. He doesn't have any more values than he has advertised by his 1NT opening. Further, did South (an experienced player), with his holding in clubs, not wonder about the genuineness of East's 2C call? Did he not wonder again when East pulled the 2CX to 2S?

What about East's UI that partner has probably forgotten the system? I don't believe that any East would pass 2CX, even if West's pass meant a tolerance for clubs. I don't consider that East's 2S bid could have been at all influenced by his UI, and that his action to bid rather than stand the double was a 75% action.

What would be my decision here? I suspect that South has been having a double shot. It is likely that West has failed to alert because he has forgotten the system. Whilst South has reasonable grounds for thinking that 2C might fail, he has no reason to believe that 2S will not make. Partner has not shown any values. I suspect that South has sensed that MI is likely to have occurred, and is taking a gamble in the hope that it may come off, but, if it doesn't, the Director will come to his rescue and adjust the score on the basis of MI. Even if the possibility of a failure to alert had not occurred to South, I still see his double of 2S as wild and gambling.

I would leave NS with their table result. But EW may not be allowed to benefit from their infraction, and I would adjust their score to 2S undoubled making, on the basis that, had the bid been alerted, then South may not have doubled..

Question 2.

Bd 14 Nil vul Dlr E.

		5	
		K65	
		QJ1084	
		J832	
AQ84			K1072
AQ42			J9
96			A73
A74			KQ106
		J963	
		10873	
		K52	
		95	
West	North	East	South
		1C	P
1H	P	1S	P
3S	P	4S	P
4NT(1)	P	5D(2)	P
5S	All pass.		

- (1) Simple Blackwood
- (2) One ace

Result: EW +450.

NS call you to the table at the end of the hand. They claim that East's 5D bid was significantly slow, and East's mannerisms suggested discomfort and disapproval of West's 4NT. West got the most favourable answer he could to his enquiry, yet he signed off in 5S. East admitted a hesitation, but said that they nearly always use 4C Gerber for aces, and she had to think a little before answering. West made a similar explanation – being used to Gerber, he made the mistake of thinking that 5D showed no aces. He wasn't aware of any mannerisms from partner.

How do you rule?

Answer:

This is a common and typical directing problem. You are called to the table with one side alleging transmission of UI by facial expression or a break in tempo, the other

side denying it or at least minimizing it. Not that either side is consciously lying. It's just that we tend to believe what we want to believe, and one side perhaps maximizes the problem and the other side minimizes the problem. It's my experience that players rarely call me for UI when there has not been any. There may be a few players who are quick on the trigger to call for small changes in tempo, but one gets to know these and apply a little scepticism to their claims. In this case, EW admitted to some break in tempo, but no facial or bodily expressions. East and West gave what could have been a reasonable explanation for their actions. But one must realize that their explanations are what are called 'self-serving'. That is, their explanations, whilst explaining and perhaps justifying their actions, are not capable of objective corroboration. Whilst one must not ignore such self-serving explanations, one must approach them somewhat critically.

The Law says that, when a player has UI, he may not choose from among logical alternative actions one that could demonstratively been suggested over another by the extraneous information. If one accepts that West had UI, then his bid of 5S is one that could demonstratively been suggested by the UI. A player who uses Blackwood and finds the partnership with all four aces does not sign off at the 5 level.

Note that the Laws do not require me to decide that West's decision *was* influenced by the UI; only that it *could* have been. The only judgments I have to make are:

1. Was UI available to West (I don't have to decide that West even was aware of it), and
2. Was West's action one that could have been influenced by the UI.

So, in making a decision to adjust the score to the result in 6S off one, I am making a technical decision. I am in no way impugning the ethics of the EW players. Understand that, in all these judgment situations, the Laws never require the Director to make judgments about the ethics of the individual players concerned. These decisions are technical not personal, and we should always go to some trouble to make this point to players.

Reg.