



Cambs & Hunts Bridge



Newsletter Number 21

30 December 1998

Editors: **Chris Jagger**, 2 Wycliffe Road, Cambridge CB1 3JD, Tel: 01223-526586 and
Jonathan Mestel, 180 Queen's Gate, London SW7 2BZ, Tel: 01223-329671.

E-mail: ajm8@cam.ac.uk or cnj10@dpmmms.cam.ac.uk

Unofficial web page: <http://members.aol.com/gilescw/chcba.html>

The next newsletter is scheduled to appear on **30th April**. Please try to get copy to us no later than **15th April**. All contributions welcome!



Once more, the County has qualified for the final stages of the Tollemache Championship to be held in February.

Congratulations to David Kendrick who, with Brian Senior, will be representing England in the Camrose Series.

One of the editors and Catherine Ashment would be embarrassed if their engagement were to be mentioned on the front page of this Newsletter. Otherwise, I'm sure the County would have wished to congratulate them both warmly.



In this issue Paul Barden describes some hands from the Tolle qualifier, while Chris Jagger discusses the gambling 3NT. Victor Milman takes us through his team's triumph in the Newmarket Open Swiss Teams and there is the usual round-up of news and events.



Philip Cooper writes: The word 'fatuous' appears more in the Cambs and Hunts Newsletter than in real life, and as a consequence I thought of this limerick. It's a bit of fun and may raise a few smiles amongst your readers.

'Fatuous' is a bridge term so it seems,
'Fatuous' describes play whether in pairs or in teams,
First there's a 'fatuous' double,
Then a 'fatuous' lead into trouble,
Would someone please explain what this silly term
'fatuous' means. **Philip Cooper**

If it's something which can't ever gain,
And might easily cause you some pain,
Then 'fatuous' we name it,
And loudly proclaim "It
Won't ever, partner, happen again."
Anon

Tollemache Qualifier 98 by Paul Barden

We were in a group of 9 with a team of 8 (Warren & Kendrick, Wightwick & Woodruff, Barden & Mestel and Jagger & Young) plus Chris Larlham as npc. This worked well enough; we seemed to do less well at the end of each day, so perhaps tiredness was a factor, but the advantage of getting into rhythm by playing all the sets should not be underestimated.

The set against Lancashire was an early indication of the way I was playing:

Game All	♠ 10732	Dealer						
	♥ 1094	South						
	♦ 97							
	♣ 10865							
♠ AK654		♠ 8						
♥ 72	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td>W</td><td>N</td><td>E</td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td>S</td><td> </td></tr> </table>	W	N	E		S		♥ KQ65
W	N	E						
	S							
♦ AJ		♦ Q1063						
♣ AJ92		♣ Q743						
	♠ QJ9							
	♥ AJ83							
	♦ K8542							
	♣ K							

S	JM	N	PB
1♦	1♠	P	1NT
P	3NT	all	pass

At the other three tables, South led a diamond and 3NT made easily. But against us South led a heart, which went to the nine and king; this had the effect of removing an entry to East's hand. At trick two I led a club to the king and ace, then played on diamonds. South allowed the jack to hold, and when I cashed dummy's spade winners he alertly unblocked the queen and jack, leaving me without resource.

This was good defence, but soft play by me. I should have tried a small spade off dummy after the jack of diamonds held. No doubt North should rise with the ten; would you? Better still is to lead the DJ off table without unblocking the ♦A. South must duck this and then a small spade is led off table. If N wins this and puts a heart through he is squeezed in the black suits (or endplayed if only two hearts are cashed.)

However, we got all that back and more two boards later:

E-W game	♠ K5	Dealer						
	♥ 84	North						
	♦ 42							
	♣ AKQ10843							
♠ 943		♠ J1086						
♥ K5	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td>W</td><td>N</td><td>E</td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td>S</td><td> </td></tr> </table>	W	N	E		S		♥ AQJ10
W	N	E						
	S							
♦ J1098753		♦ AKQ						
♣ 6		♣ 95						
	♠ AQ72							
	♥ 97632							
	♦ 6							
	♣ J72							

N	PB	S	JM
3NT	X	all	pass

The 3NT opening was Acoll style, allegedly a solid suit with nothing outside. My double just showed a good hand; we play that 4♦ would be take-out of clubs, but this hand is too defensive. South seems to have had a brainstorm in passing the double. Jonathan bravely passed on the strength of his king of hearts. This was very right and we cashed the first eleven tricks in the red suits with the

help of suit preference on the second round of diamonds.

At other tables the hand was played in 5♣ by North or 5♦ by West. Against 5♦, North led a top club and then had to switch to spades; this looks like the right defence and was found by Chris Jagger. Against 5♣ East led a top diamond and then had to switch to hearts. This looks harder, and Fiske Warren (playing with David Kendrick) scored up +550. But West should surely give suit preference in this position, whereas against 5♦ South must give count.

My one good hand of the event came against Derbyshire:

N-S game	♠ AK8	Dealer
	♥ K5	East
	♦ AKQJ2	
	♣ 1094	
♠ 103		♠ Q762
♥ Q92		♥ 1043
♦ 10874		♦ 963
♣ QJ85		♣ K62
	♠ J954	
	♥ AJ876	
	♦ 5	
	♣ A73	

PB	S	JM	N
P	1♥	P	2♣
P	2♥	P	4NT*
p	5♥	P	6NT

The auction was quick, but North took longer over 2♣ than 4NT (asking for plain aces), and I smelt a rat. Reflecting that a lead from Kxx wasn't too likely to cost if I was wrong, I led a club. Lucky this time, and three off when declarer took the heart finesse. David

and Fiske played the same hand in 6♦, one off when East also led a club.

There was an echo later in the event, when we played the second half of the match against the same pair:

E-W game	♠ 1095	Dealer
	♥ 8754	West
	♦ AKQJ94	
	♣ -	
♠ 6		♠ Q7432
♥ QJ32		♥ 96
♦ 8762		♦ 1053
♣ QJ105		♣ 763
	♠ AKJ8	
	♥ AK10	
	♦ -	
	♣ AK9842	

JM	N	PB	S
P	1♦	P	3♣
P	3♦	P	3♠
P	3NT	P	6NT

No inspiration this time, and I led the seven of spades. North had a difficult decision to make, had I led from the queen of spades, or could West be induced to take the queen if the jack were played from dummy. He played the jack, and in due course drifted three off again. *[I like to think I might have managed to duck holding ♠Qxx as West, but we'll never know. However, one opposing declarer reached 7NT, and on a neutral heart lead, led the ♠J at trick 2! East stared at this, but then took the trick, as you don't expect to lose IMPS for setting a freely bid grand. However declarer was only one down as a result. Why declarer declined the reasonable shot of laying down ♠AK I cannot say. - JM]* David Kendrick made 6NT from the South hand by leading the jack of spades early in the play, inducing

an error from East, but no one in our match managed to bid 7♦ or even 6♦.

North on these two hands was Jim Tomlinson, who has sent me his write-up of them for the Derby Evening Telegraph. He was so charming that I made a horrible misbid in the first set to give most of the points back, and Jonathan joined in with a more understandable slip on this hand from the second set:

E-W game	♠ 832	Dealer
	♥ QJ5	South
	♦ J43	
	♣ Q865	
♠ KQ10964		♠ J5
♥ 7		♥ 10643
♦ Q85		♦ K962
♣ A94		♣ 1032
	♠ A7	
	♥ AK982	
	♦ A107	
	♣ KJ7	

S	JM	N	PB
2♥	2♠	P	P
2NT	P	3♥	P
4♥	P	P	P

Actually I've forgotten the auction, but it did start with an Acol 2♥ (not my choice). Jonathan led the ♠K and I unblocked the jack to clarify (?) the situation for him. Declarer won, played a heart to dummy, then a club to the king and ace. There was nothing in the play after this and ten tricks were made when the clubs broke 3-3.

I mention this hand because of the interesting play which results if Jonathan ducks the king of clubs. Declarer draws all my trumps, throwing a diamond from dummy, and West has to find three discards. The only winning

defence is to throw two spades and a diamond. If he throws three spades declarer can duck a spade, win West's club exit in dummy, ruff a spade, and exit in clubs to make two diamond tricks. A possible alternative is to cross to dummy with a second heart and lead the jack of diamonds. Looking at the diamond suit in isolation East should cover this, but on this hand that lets the contract make. Declarer wins and again draws trumps, and this time the squeeze on West works against any defence. But if East ducks the jack of diamonds, West wins and plays two rounds of spades, East pitching a club. Now if declarer draws trumps he's lost control, and if not West can give East a club ruff when he takes the ace. The eventual winners of our group were Berks & Bucks, with us quite comfortable in second place. This hand against them did not change that, but I was very angry about it:

N-S game	♠ 3	Dealer
	♥ KJ9853	North
	♦ 2	
	♣ AJ854	
♠ K1042		♠ AQ75
♥ Q4		♥ 1072
♦ AQ753		♦ KJ64
♣ 92		♣ 63
	♠ J986	
	♥ A6	
	♦ 1098	
	♣ KQ107	

N	PB	S	JM
1♥	P	1♠	2♦
2♥	2♠*	3♥	P
4♥	5♦	X	all pass

My 2♠ bid showed a sound diamond raise. For some reason, Jonathan failed to alert it.

AKQx and the bidding started identically at both tables: 1♦ by her partner, 2♠ weak jump overcall by nonvulnerable opponents. The difference, however, was that Eryl's 1♦ was precision, 11-15, while Giles's 1♦ was a normal unlimited Acoll bid. At this point Sally decided that the only chance of a slam was to find a heart fit with her partner; without a fit they were unlikely to have enough points and tricks for a slam. She then continued with a forcing bid of 3♥ and passed partner's 3NT response which denied fit. As it happens, 1♦ opener had a maximum, nice 15 count (Kxx QJ AKJxx Jxx), and 6NT depended on a heart finesse which was off. Eryl still managed to take 12 tricks in her vulnerable game, but then defence to a cold 3NT is an ungrateful task at IMPs. At our table events took a different turn when Steve Siklos decided to double for takeout with his strong hand. Now Giles jumped to 3NT, his partner very reasonably bid 6NT. On a heart lead with the spade return declarer lost the first two tricks: a very useful gain for our team.

Here is another hand from the same match where Eryl and Sally stayed in a partscore, with opponents bidding to a hopeless game. Sally (and Steve) both opened 1♠ in the third seat, and in both cases this showed a 5 card suit. Once again, Sally's bid was limited by 15 points, while Steve's wasn't. At our table Nadia bravely overcalled 1♠ with 3♥ – very weak, king to six and nothing else. Giles leapt to 4♠ on this hand: xx Axxx xxx AJxx. The contract had no play since trumps broke 4-2, not unexpectedly in view of the preempt, and the peaceful 2NT by our teammates brought another badly needed swing.

The only game (as far as I recollect) that our teammates missed still brought us one IMP, although on a rather unusual score comparison: 2♠+2 by our teammates, +170, and 6♣-

3, -150, by us! The full hand, rotated for convenience, was):

E-W Game	♠ Qx	Dealer S
	♥ 10xxx	
	♦ 10xx	
	♣ 10xxx	
♠ AJxxxx		♠ Kxxx
♥ Qxx		♥ AJxx
♦ Kxx		♦ Qx
♣ J		♣ Kxx
	♠ x	
	♥ Kx	
	♦ AJxxx	
	♣ AQxxx	

Our bidding went very high very quickly:

VM	West	NS	East
1♦	1♠	P	4♠
5♣	5♠	6♣	all pass.

In fairness to my partner, she missed an easy sacrifice in 5♦ a few boards earlier and had been mildly criticized for that. This time she was determined to sacrifice at as high a level as was needed – thus 6♣. The bidding was so confident that nobody could find an obvious double. I have sympathy with West, who probably expected 4♠ to be of a preemptive variety. On the other hand East was unhappy about doubling with weak and finessible holdings in both minors. As the cards are, 4♠ is the last making spot for E-W, so our 6♣ turned a plus into a minus – at least not a very big minus.

Teammates managed to stop in 2♠ after a scientific sequence:

SD	West	EH	East
1♦	1♠	P	2♦
P	2♠	all	pass.

2♦ here showed support for spades with at least invitational values; perhaps after 2♠ East has enough to either make another try or just blast 4♠ – it’s a vulnerable game at teams, after all, and partner’s minimum for a vulnerable overcall will probably offer some play for the contract. It’s hard work getting 1 IMP in...

Brilliant defence by Sally and Eryl earned us a game swing on the next hand.

	♠ AKxx	Dealer S
	♥ 10xx	
	♦ xx	
	♣ Axxx	
♠ Qxx		♠ Jxxx
♥ KJxx	W N	♥ Axx
♦ AQxxx	W S E	♦ xxx
♣ x		♣ xx
	♠ x	
	♥ Qxx	
	♦ KJx	
	♣ KQJ1098	

At our table the bidding was

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

and was pretty similar at the other table, probably with a negative double instead of the 1♠ bid. 2NT is a fairly aggressive enterprise on the South hand, but it seems that the club suit is good enough to justify the bid. I was lucky to get a diamond lead, so that nine top tricks were available, and at the end West was endplayed with a spade and conceded another diamond, +430 (it’s hard to keep everything on the run of clubs – are you tired of references to bad defence?). Sally

found an inspired lead of a small heart, and now declarer can only take his top eight tricks he started with. I think this defence illustrates a nice point. When you bid a suit, even with partner supporting it, and opposition bids confident no-trumps after that, it pays off to look for an alternative lead. Once in a while they will be bluffing, but in the long run their 2NT–3NT sequence shows that they do have the suit stopped. If anything, let partner lead towards your broken holding through the hand that announced the stopper first. Another case of leading your suit regardless of the bidding often occurs after a preempt. One can so frequently see the bidding go (2♥) - 2♠ - P - 2NT, P - 3NT or some such, and preemptor on lead still fishes out the fourth highest from a holding like K10xxxx with at most one outside entry. I’d suggest that having some respect for opponents’ bidding will save a few tricks on hands of this sort.

Back to the Newmarket competition. Nadia and myself specialized on the day in bidding and making pretty thin vulnerable games. The reasoning went as follows: we know pretty well that defence is difficult; it’s probably as difficult for our opponents as it is for us; the normal odds for bidding a vulnerable game at IMPs are at about 30%; let’s add a misdefence factor, and you have to bid 15-20% games... and so we did...

Here is one example. The hands were Q10xxx x AJ1098 xx opposite Kxxx Kxxxxx xx A, and the bidding was straightforwardish: 2♠–4♠. The 2♠ opening showed a weak 5-5 hand with spades and an unspecified suit; being vulnerable, partner was expected to have a reasonable hand as far as weak openings go. It seemed to me that 4♠ should have enough play opposite either minor. And indeed, diamonds were established for one loser on the lead, the ace of hearts was right although that

was irrelevant. All that was needed now was for Nadia to play trumps for one loser, which needs either spades breaking 2-2 or finding a singleton honour. Declarer thought that the best line would be a small spade from hand to the king, and she dutifully tried performing this at trick four, being in fact in dummy with the ace of clubs. She was not allowed to play from the wrong hand and decided to lead a small trump from the table instead which was luckily covered with a singleton ace. There did not seem to be much to choose between the two lines, but declarer would have gone down if allowed to play according to her original plan...

Another pushy vulnerable game was bid as follows: 1NT-2♥, 3♠-4♠, with the hands being Q9xx Kxx AKxx Ax opposite KJ10xx xxx x xxxx. 1NT promised 15-17 points, the transfer break showed four card support and 16-17 points. Now Nadia decided that her hand, however weak, had sufficient playing strength and went on to game. Note that this time we had more points, the whole 20 of them instead of 17 in the previous example. The ♥A lead on a not very informative auction solved all the problems. As it happens, this is a roughly 65% game which requires ♥A being onside or an original heart lead – see above about defensive contributions to the odds...

If you think that this was quite enough over-bidding for one afternoon, here is the hand from the final match: AJ10 Qx AQJxx KJx opposite xx J10xxxx Kx xxx. The bidding went 1♦-1♥, 2NT-4♥. The opening could in theory be on a three card suit, but the 2NT rebid (i) showed 17-18 points; (ii) denied four hearts; (iii) by inference promised at least a four-card diamond suit. This meant that the Kx diamond holding became nearly ideal, and another vulnerable game was bid. On a lead of a small spade the play was simple, and defence

not quite accurate: ace of spades, three rounds of diamonds discarding ♠x (the first hurdle – diamonds had to be 3-3). This was followed by declarer playing on trumps, and the defence on spades. After seeing my RHO turn up with king-queen of spades and ace-king of hearts it was easy at the end to play a club to the king to bring home a game and another 11 IMPs. Of course, a club switch at any time takes the contract down – but remember, misdefence has been factored in...

Our only disaster happened, not surprisingly, when it was our turn to defend.

Love all	♠ Kx	Dealer E
	♥ Qxx	
	♦ xx	
	♣ AQ9xxx	
♠ 10xx		♠ QJ
♥ x		♥ KJxxx
♦ A10xxx		♦ QJxx
♣ 10xxx		♣ KJ
	♠ Axxxxxx	
	♥ A10xx	
	♦ Kx	
	♣ x	

East	South	West	North
1♥	1♠	P	2♣
2♦	2♠	3♦	X

Perhaps the 2♠ bid was too aggressive, and partner expected more from my hand, but it's still hard to find the penalty double of a red two-suiter by North. I passed as South because of nice controls, hopefully a trump trick or a club ruff or two. Little did I know that partner would return a high club for me to ruff, asking for a spade, and then unblock the king of spades under the ace... There was no way of defeating the contract from there.

How do you respond to 3NT with the following hands? (solutions at the end):

1. QJx Ax xxxx xxxx
2. KQxx AKxx xx xxx
3. AKx Axxx xx Axxx
4. Axx AKQJxx x xxx
5. xxxx x xxxx xxxx

The crucial thing to remember if this convention comes up against you, is that you have got to try to cash your tricks before they cash theirs. With this in mind the normal advice is to cash an ace. This gives you a chance to look at dummy and plan how you are going to take five tricks.

One should always consider the drawbacks of a convention. The biggest weakness is that you wrong side the 3NT contract, and for this reason some people prefer to play 3♠ as a gambling 3NT opener. However that loses the vital natural preempt, and is also easier for opponents to come in over. Other people prefer to use 3NT as a preempt in four of a minor (not necessarily solid), freeing up four of a minor as a South African Texas bid showing a good major suit preempt. Or some people use it as showing a good preempt in a major. There are many possibilities. There are even people who use it to show 25-26 balanced, although most people would open 2♣ with this.

Finally, a little story from my days at the University Bridge Club. There was a time when the standard was lowering, and it seemed that you could get a good score whatever you did. With this in mind, Giles and I played a system where if you were first or second to bid, you had to open 3NT or 4 of a major. On the first hand, I opened 3NT, and a good score resulted from it. On the second hand, one of the opponents opened 3NT! My partner doubled, and everybody passed. Dummy commented "We usually play the Gambling 3NT opener,

but I guess he's just doing the same as you." We cashed the first twelve tricks, declarer having a gambling 3NT opener. It was the best result for our system all evening!

Solutions

1. Pass. You have no reason to believe that 3NT is going more off than four of a minor, and they probably have game on.
2. 4♣. You should make four of a minor, whilst 3NT rates to be one down.
3. 4NT. You can count eleven tricks. Ask partner if he has the twelfth.
4. 4♦. A strange hand. You want partner to have clubs or else a singleton club for slam. If he bids 5 of a minor, raise him. Otherwise bid 5♦ and let him convert to clubs if that is his suit.
5. Weak hands which will go a lot off in 3NT depend a lot on vulnerability. At favourable vulnerability one can often pass and hope that seven or eight off is not a bad score. On this hand you might be a little more inventive. Try inviting slam with 4NT – partner probably won't be accepting this one anyway!



Addendum by JM

So how do you respond to a gambling 3NT holding AKQx QJxx 10 AKQx? The scientific way, is to bid 4♦, asking for a singleton as suggested above. If partner bids 4♥ you bid 6♦; otherwise you try to sign off in 4NT. Unfortunately, you will need quite detailed agreements to sign off in 5NT as I don't think 3NT-4♦-5♦-5NT is to play. Thus you may end up in 5♦ and run the risk of a heart ruff if partner is say Jx xxx AKQJxxx x. It would be possible to have agreements which avoid this problem, but it's probably not worth worrying about. Perhaps we should just pass 3NT? Or perhaps we should just gamble with 6♦ or

6NT or even 7♦, and hope they don't find a heart lead?

The following hand came up in the 1955 England-USA World championship match.

N-S vul	♠ 9873	Dealer N
	♥ AK932	
	♦ 7	
	♣ 842	
♠ AQ62		♠ K104
♥ QJ85		♥ 6
♦ 10	W N S E	♦ AKQJ852
♣ AKQ7		♣ 95
	♠ J5	
	♥ 1074	
	♦ 9643	
	♣ J1063	

The Americans bid 3NT-6NT. The East hand does not qualify as a modern pure 3NT opener because of the ♠K, but imagine that West held that card. Meredith, as South, had an unenviable guess and eventually led ♠J.

What do we make of West's raise to 6NT? Clearly when East holds a stiff heart a simple 6♦ is better. Indeed, it is hard to construct a hand for West where 6♦ would not be a better contract unless both are very good. But suppose West is known to have the mechanism for enquiring for singletons; doesn't this rather imply that a direct 6NT would deny an AK off the top and so South should try a passive lead? This is bluff, double-bluff and gambling territory.

At the other table, Konstam opened 1♦ and Schapiro responded 2♥. Again the final contract was 6NT, but this time played by West. Unfortunately, North held the only heart combination for one without Barden-like powers (see page 3) to find the killing lead.

So, finally, suppose you hold Jx AK10xx 9xx J10x and the auction goes 3NT on your right, 6NT on your left. You know what to lead, but don't double, whatever you do!! LHO will then remove to 7♦ and partner will have to be on form ...



Results round-up

The County (Barden, Jagger, Kendrick, Mestel, Warren, Wightwick, Woodruff, Young) have again qualified for the **Tollemache** final, coming second in their group.

The latest results from the **ECL**: Norfolk 5-7, 6-6 (win), 12-0. Herts: 6-6 (loss), 7-5, 0-12.

Fourteen teams have entered the **County Knockout**. There are three first round results so far: WOODRUFF beat LARLHAM, KNIGHTS beat JACOBSBERG, LAST beat SHAW.

Cambs and Hunts Open Swiss Teams:	VPs
1 E. Howard, S. Dempster, V. Milman, N. Stelmashenko	100
2 G. Woodruff, S. Siklos, M. Atherton, A. Johannsson	99
3 R. Hair, S. Prince, A. Greenstein, Y. Dias	91
4 D. McFarlane, A. Brodie, P. Burrows, D. Kendrick	87
5 D. Harrison, A. Harrison, S. Parker, E. Manning	85

This year we were up to 31 teams, with the scores being out of a maximum of 140. Mr and Mrs Lockett, M. O'Reilly, J. Ede won the Ascendor's prize.

County Multiple Teams:	VPs
1 C. Larlham, R. Midgley, D. Nicholson, F. Warren	106
2 J. Caldwell, J. Jacobsberg, A. Curtin, J. Turner	80
3 O. Hodgson, J. Hodgson, J. Bissett, R. Bissett	72
4 G. Gittins, D. Carmichael, E. Howard, E. Campbell	68
5 A. Gerloch, S. Oram, K. Jackson, C. Fuller	65
6 N. Stelmashenko, V. Milman, G. Woodruff, J. Young	62
7 M. Jude, B. Penfold, P. Beavan, S. Hollingworth	54
8 E. Lancaster, S. Lancaster, P. Jones, B. Day	53

The Joe Ward trophy, for the leading team with no Regional Master or higher ranked player was awarded to Oliver Hodgson's team.

Other Results:

Cambridge C (Woodruff, Wightwick, Johannsson, Deacon) got to the final of last year's **National Inter-Club Knockout**, but were beaten by a team led by Collings. Giles Woodruff was also involved in the **Silver Plate** semifinal with Ashment, Young, Shaw, Johannsson, Siklos, but they lost to Draper, who went on to win the competition.

As far as we are aware, the best county result in the **Hubert Phillips Bowl** was Stelmashenko, Milman, Schechter and Woodruff, who progressed to the last 32 before going out to a Hertfordshire team.

Congratulations to David Kendrick, who came second in the **Camrose trial** with Brian Senior. They have been selected to play in the **England Camrose** team. Congratulations also to G. Hazel, J. Green, C. Ashment, L. Zivan, K.W. Fung and I. Greig, who make up the whole England U25 team for the **Channel Trophy**. Ashment/Zivan, along with Zalin/Birdsall, have also been selected for the **Hero** tournament in January.

Gareth Roberts narrowly failed to retain the **Great Northern Swiss Pairs**, coming third with John Young. Woodruff/Shaw (no stopping this Woodruff chap!) were 3rd in the A final at the **EBU Autumn Congress**, whilst Ashment/Jagger won the B final. Young partnered Fegarty, whilst Jagger took on Lamford, and won the **National Men's Teams**.

Around the Clubs:

Cambridge Club: T. Pal, H. Kaku, W. Tunstall-Pedoe, I. Watson won the May Pamplin Swiss Teams.

Dates for your diary:

7th March ECL v Essex (Trumpington)
 21st March ECL v Suffolk (Trumpington)
 16th May Swiss Teams Club Challenge (Harston)
 20th June Jubilee Pairs (Fenstanton)
 (The last two dates are provisional).