

methods when there is a choice between that and modern ways. (Bridge Buff scored 450 for all five problems, an excellent showing.)

Cohen summed up the case for double being a takeout bid.

"I double," he says. "I don't care if I get zero points if this is not part of 'ACBL Standard.' This, and all low-level doubles should be takeout, something that comes up much more often than penalty. My vote should call attention to this area of bidding.

"Eighty years ago, if your right-hand opponent opened 1♦ and you doubled, it was penalty. Sanity soon prevailed and the meaning of double became takeout. Soon, it will here, too. Think how much more likely this hand type is than having length in right-hand opponent's suit — especially when partner also tends to have some length when he responds 1NT."

If you held the hand shown in the problem, you'd like double to be takeout.

Suppose, however, you held:

♠A K 8 7 3 ♥K 10 7 ♦A 10 9 4 ♣5.

With this hand, you'd like to double for penalty.

You and your partner can decide the method you prefer. Which hand do you think would occur more frequently? What do you give up playing it one way or the other?

2. IMPs. N-S vulnerable.

♠5 2 ♥K 8 6 5 2 ♦K Q J 5 4 3 ♣ —

West	North	East	South
		3♣	?

Call	Votes	Award
3♦	14	100
Pass	4	70
3♥	1	20
Dbl	0	0

Bidding with distribution

Even though you only have 9 high-card points, the majority of the panel bids. You have a good suit and good distribution. Some are sure it's correct to bid.

"3♦. I need to get involved," says Meckstroth, "so I'm rolling right in with my best suit."

"3♦," agrees Walker. "Get in and get out."

Falk echoes 3♦. "I realize this is likely to lose the heart suit. We could have a slam if partner has:

♠K 8 6 3 ♥A 7 ♦A 10 8 2 ♣8 4."

Montin sums up the arguments for bidding 3♦. "I do not have my full values and I am not emphasizing the suit I would like to get into the picture (hearts), but I just can't bring myself to pass. If I don't bid now, I may never get to."

Others bid 3♦, but admit it's close.

"3♦," says Baze. "I don't have the values at this vulnerability, but I'm short in clubs, so I have to take the chance of getting our side into the auction. Pass is a close second choice."

The conservative group pass.

"Pass," says Lawrence. "No call comes close to describing these values. I would hate to bring back a minus 1100 score for comparison (with my teammates)."

"Pass," says Sanborn. "There will be more bidding, so I can come to life later. All other choices are flawed."

"Pass," agrees Soloway. "Just too rich for me to enter in the direct seat."

"We would hate to bid 3♦," say the Joyces, "and hear partner bid a forcing 3♠ or 3NT. We expect an immediate bid to get us too high at least some of the time."

Robinson was the only panelist who voted for 3♥. That bid has a high risk, but also has a high reward.

"Since I have the red suits," he says, "I might as well bid them in (the order of their) importance."

Even though the heart suit is poor, he is willing to bid it. If your side can make game, 4♥ is a likely candidate and if you don't bid the suit now, it may be lost in the auction. The panelists who bid 3♦ are opting for safety first and hope to get hearts into the picture later. Finding a heart fit later, however, may be too optimistic.

Whether you enter the bidding with a shapely hand such as this depends on your partnership style. You don't have a lot of high-card values, but it feels right to bid. One issue no one on the panel addressed: What do you do

if your LHO raises to 5♣ and p doubles?

3. IMPs. N-S vulnerable.

♠Q 9 7 6 ♥J 9 8 5 ♦A K 10 9

West	North	East	South
	1♣	Pass	1♥
Pass	1NT	Pass	Pass
2♣	Pass	Pass	?

Call	Votes	Award
Pass	8	100
Dbl	6	90
2♦	5	40

A classic problem

You have the values to bid, but h no convenient call. This hand is a classic for a bidding contest. It's no surprising that the panel is divided. Pass received the most votes. What are the arguments for that call?

"Pass," says Meckstroth. "I hate ting them have it, but it doesn't see like we have a fit."

Boehm agrees with Pass. "I'm guessing that we have no eight-card fit on the assumption that partner would open 1♦ with 4-4 in the minor. At IMPs, I'll hope for a small plus."

"Partner is most likely 3=3=3=4," says Walker, "which means they've

Panel's answers

	1	2
Grant Baze	Pass	3
August Boehm	Pass	3
Larry Cohen	Dbl	3
The Colchamiro	Dbl	3
Allan Falk	Dbl	3
Richard Freeman	Pass	3
Betty Ann Kennedy	Dbl	3
Mike Lawrence	Dbl	Pa
Jeff Meckstroth	Dbl	3
Jill Meyers	Pass	Pa
Randi Montin	Pass	3
Shawn Quinn	Pass	3
Barry Rigal	Dbl	3
Steve Robinson	Pass	3
Kerri Sanborn	Pass	Pa
Paul Soloway	Dbl	Pa
The Sutherlins	Dbl	3
Karen Walker	Pass	3
Bridge Buff	Dbl	3