



Bidding Basics

BY LARRY COHEN larryco.com

Responding to 1♦

This is easier than last month's article (in which partner opened 1♣) because we don't have to consider a 1♦ response. Just about everything we discussed last month applies here.

Partner	Opponent	You
1♦	Pass	?

1 of a major response

A 1♥ or 1♠ response shows four or more cards in that suit and at least 6 points. As responder, you are unlimited in strength, so opener must bid again. With 4-4 in the majors, respond in hearts (even if the spades are better). With 5-5 in the majors, respond 1♠ (even if the hearts are better).

Respond 1♥ with:

♠A 10 7 6 ♥Q 7 6 5 ♦K 8 7 6 ♣2.

Respond 1♠ with:

♠K J 8 7 6 ♥K Q 10 9 8 ♦3 ♣K J.

1NT response

This shows 6-10 high-card points, balanced and no four-card major.

Respond 1NT to 1♦ with:

♠K J 7 ♥J 7 2 ♦A J 4 ♣10 8 7 6

♠A 9 7 ♥Q 7 6 ♦6 5 2 ♣8 7 6 2

2♣ response

This shows four or more clubs and ?? HCP. The ?? depends on whether you wish to play old-fashioned ("standard") where only 10 or 11 HCP are required. I strongly recommend the modern way where opening-bid strength is promised and the partnership is forced to game. If playing the latter way, you cer-

tainly can have a side four-card major. This way is called: "2/1 game forcing." Assuming that system, respond 2♣ with either hand below:

♠K Q 6 2 ♥A 2 ♦6 5 ♣A K 6 4 3

♠6 5 2 ♥4 ♦A 4 3 ♣A K Q J 9 2

2♦ response

This shows 6-10 points in support and at least four diamonds. The 1♦ opening almost always shows four or more diamonds, so raising on four is OK. The raise denies a four-card major. Respond 2♦ with either hand below:

♠A 2 ♥K J 2 ♦J 8 7 6 5 ♣4 3 2

♠6 5 ♥6 5 ♦K Q J 7 ♣J 8 7 6 5

2♥/2♠ response

Most players today use these jump bids as weak (old-fashioned would be very strong). Don't make such a bid if you aren't 100% sure your partner knows what it means. Assuming it is weak, it is very weak (approximately 2-6 HCP). Here are some examples of the weak jump-shift response to 1♦:

♠5 ♥K J 9 8 7 6 ♦5 4 3 2 ♣6 5

♠A 10 9 6 5 2 ♥3 2 ♦8 5 3 2 ♣3

2NT response

This shows a natural, balanced hand, typically with stoppers in the unbid suits. It denies a four-card major. Regarding high-card points, I recommend 11-12 (invitational). The opener can pass with a minimum. Make sure you and your partner agree on the range. Here are some examples:

♠Q J 6 ♥K Q 7 ♦Q 10 7 ♣Q 7 6 5

♠K 3 ♥Q J 3 ♦K J 6 5 ♣J 10 7 6

3♣ response

This can be played in many ways. It could be a natural bid (very strong or very weak). I recommend intermediate/invitational with a good six-card or longer suit. This is a matter of partnership agreement. If you aren't 100% sure that you and your partner know what the bid means, don't make it. If playing it as invitational, here are some examples:

♠7 6 ♥4 3 ♦K 6 5 ♣A Q J 10 8 7

♠4 ♥K 3 2 ♦K 2 ♣K J 10 8 7 6 5

3♦ raise

This is a limit raise (10-12 points in support) with at least four-card support. Opener can pass with a minimum. Here are some examples:

♠7 2 ♥A 6 ♦K J 7 6 4 ♣Q 10 3 2

♠4 3 2 ♥3 2 ♦A 10 5 4 2 ♣A Q 5

♠5 4 2 ♥3 ♦A Q J 9 ♣K 10 7 6 5

3♥/3♠ response

Same as 2♥/2♠, but with a seventh card in the suit. This is another bid you shouldn't make unless you are 100% sure your partner knows what it means.

3NT response

Assuming 2NT is 11-12 HCP, this has all the same qualifications, but with 13-15 HCP.

4 of a major response

This shows a very long suit without a lot of high-card points. It denies real slam interest. With a good hand with lots of high-card points, just respond one of the major and later drive to game or higher. Here are some examples:

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

Other responses

Any responses not listed above are impractical (likely to never occur and not worth the memory).

BIDDING BASICS QUIZ

What is your response to partner's 1♦ opening with each hand below?

1. ♠ J 5 4 ♥ 8 7 ♦ K 4 3 ♣ A 9 6 5 2
 2. ♠ 3 2 ♥ 3 ♦ K J 7 6 5 ♣ Q 6 5 4 3
 3. ♠ A Q 7 6 5 ♥ A 2 ♦ A 2 ♣ K J 5 4
 4. ♠ A Q 7 6 ♥ A 2 ♦ A 2 ♣ K J 5 4 3
 5. ♠ A 2 ♥ 10 7 6 5 ♦ K J 10 9 2 ♣ A Q
 6. ♠ K J 10 ♥ A J 9 ♦ J 4 3 ♣ K J 8 7
 7. ♠ A K Q J 10 7 6 ♥ K 3 2 ♦ 2 ♣ 3 2
 8. ♠ K 2 ♥ 3 2 ♦ A Q 8 7 6 ♣ J 10 7 3
-
1. 1NT. 6–10 HCP, balanced, and no four-card major. (Not enough for 2♣.)
 2. 2♦. 6–10 points in support and at least four diamonds.
 3. 1♠. To start.
 4. 2♣. With enough strength, bid the five-card suit first and look for spades later.
 5. 1♥. Have to get that four-card major in while the getting is good.
 6. 3NT. Presuming you agree it shows 13–15 HCP balanced with stoppers.
 7. 1♠. Way too strong for a jump to 4♠.
 8. 3♦. Limit raise values, no four-card major. ■



International Fund Game winners

A Chattanooga TN couple took the top score in the ACBL-wide International Fund Game held July 11. Ron and Linda Smith scored 71.80% playing at Chattanooga Bridge Club. There were 735 tables of play, and the game raised \$5402.25 to support ACBL teams in international competition.

1. Linda Smith – Ron Smith, Chattanooga TN	71.80%
2. Morton Case – James Knopf, Roslyn NY	71.14%
3. John Flynn, Canton MA; John McDermott, West Roxbury MA	70.45%
4. Charles Grimes, Midland TX; Robert Grimes, Yucca Valley CA	69.91%
5. Robert Gordon, Lexington MA; Neal Gore, Bedford MA	69.44%
6. Gregory Bardes – Adel Eryan, Tampa FL	67.95%
Kathy Hughes, Missouri City TX; Carol Irvin, Richmond TX	67.95%
8. Diane Redfield – William Redfield, Utica NY	67.36%
9. Allen Beroza, East Amherst NY; Elizabeth Clark, East Aurora NY	67.23%
10. Gail Davis – Geri Munson, Baton Rouge LA	67.13%

Top scores by district

1 Robert Colavecchia, Waverley NS; Ginny Saunders, Halifax NS	62.15%
3 Arthur Seelenfreund – Daniel Silver, Rye NY	66.98%
4 Diane Redfield – William Redfield, Utica NY	67.36%
5 Allen Beroza, East Amherst NY; Elizabeth Clark, East Aurora NY	67.23%
6 Bud Hampshire, Poquoson VA; Maria Mitchum, Hampton VA	66.00%
7 Linda Smith – Ron Smith, Chattanooga TN	71.80%
8 Ronald Emmett, Normal IL; Henry Hoffman, East Peoria IL	60.00%
9 Gregory Bardes – Adel Eryan, Tampa FL	67.95%
10 Gail Davis – Geri Munson, Baton Rouge LA	67.13%
12 Geoffrey Bull, Stuart FL; Allen Schwenk, Portage MI	66.10%
13 Dale Pinkert, Highland Park IL; H. Steans, Bannockburn IL	65.05%
14 Joseph Browan, Maplewood MN; William Voedisch, Marine MN	58.92%
16 Charles Grimes, Midland TX; Robert Grimes, Yucca Valley CA	69.91%
18 Melissa Martin – Linda Petersen, Whitefish MT	67.08%
19 Judith Dubester – Karen Hudesman, Seattle WA	65.43%
21 Edward Nagy, Danville CA; Gene Simpson, San Rafael CA	66.67%
24 Morton Case – James Knopf, Roslyn NY	71.14%
25 John Flynn, Canton MA; John McDermott, West Roxbury MA	70.45%

Charity Foundation Election Notice

ACBL members interested in running for the Board of Trustees of the ACBL Charity Foundation have until Oct. 15 to submit a written declaration of candidacy.

The ACBL Board of Directors will elect one of the Foundation's five-member board for a four-year term beginning Jan. 1, 2018, at the fall board meeting in San Diego. Trustees do not receive expense reimbursement.

Candidates should send name, address, player number and biographical information to ACBL Charity Foundation, P.O. Box 289, Horn Lake MS 38637-0289 or by email (with "Statement of Candidacy" in the subject line) to elections@acbl.org.