

1997 original texts	2007 final Introduction
<p>[Deletions highlighted in yellow]</p> <p>Scope and Interpretation of the Laws</p> <p>The Laws are designed to define correct procedure, and to provide an adequate remedy when there is a departure from correct procedure. An offending player should be ready to pay any penalty graciously, or to accept any adjusted score awarded by the Tournament Director. The Laws are primarily designed not as punishment for irregularities, but rather as redress for damage.</p> <p>A great deal of effort has been expended to make these</p>	<p>[Additions and changes highlighted in yellow]</p> <p>INTRODUCTION TO THE 2007 LAWS OF DUPLICATE BRIDGE</p> <p>The Laws are designed to define correct procedure and to provide an adequate remedy when there is a departure from correct procedure. They are primarily designed not as punishment for irregularities but rather for the rectification of situations where non-offenders may otherwise be damaged. Players should be ready to accept gracefully any rectification or adjusted score awarded by the Director.</p> <p>There have been many developments in duplicate bridge over the last ten years and there are no signs that these changes have stopped. The task that confronted the Drafting Committee was to ensure the Laws were updated so as to cope with past changes and establish a framework that can cope with future developments.</p> <p>Directors have been given considerably more discretionary powers. There are fewer automatic penalties: they are replaced by the concept of rectification of a situation that unfortunately has arisen. Bridge is played in different ways in different countries so the Laws give more power to Regulating Authorities to make controlling regulations. This is particularly so in the area of Special Partnership Understandings, in itself a new concept. Artificial bidding is a fact of life so an attempt has been made to solve problems that arise when something goes wrong.</p> <p>We have tried to clarify the areas of responsibility of Regulating Authorities, Tournament Organizers and Directors and it is made clear that certain responsibilities may be either assigned or delegated.</p> <p>Many headings present in the 1997 Laws have been removed</p>

Laws easy to use. References from one Law to another have been made more explicit. The hundreds of headings and sub-headings can help a Director find the section of a Law that is applicable to the facts of a case (these headings are for convenience of reference only; headings are not considered to be part of the Laws).

Prior to the 1987 Laws words such as may, should, shall and must were used without much discrimination. In 1987 they were rationalised, and the practice is continued in the current Laws. When these Laws say that a player "may" do something ("any player may call attention to an irregularity during the auction"), the failure to do it is not wrong. A simple declaration that a player "does" something ("...dummy spreads his hand in front of him...") establishes correct procedure without any suggestion that a violation be penalised. When a player "should" do something ("a claim should be accompanied at once by a statement..."), his failure to do it is an infraction of Law, which will jeopardise his rights, but which will **seldom** incur a procedural penalty. In contrast, when these Laws say that a player "shall" do something ("No player shall take any action until the Director has explained..."), a violation will be penalised more often than not. The strongest word, "must" ("before making a call, he must inspect the face of his cards"), indicates that violation is **regarded as** serious. Note that "may" becomes very strong in the negative: "may not" is a stronger injunction than "shall not", just short of "must not."

in the interests of streamlining their appearance. Where headings remain they do not limit the application of any law, nor indeed does the omission of a cross-reference.

Established usage has been retained in regard to "may" do (failure to do it is not wrong), "does" (establishes correct procedure without suggesting that violation be penalized) "should" do (failure to do it is an infraction **jeopardizing the infractor's** rights but **not often** penalized), "shall" do (a violation will **incur a procedural penalty** more often than not), "must" do (the strongest word, a serious **matter indeed**). Again, "must not" is the strongest prohibition, "shall not" is strong but "may not" is stronger - just short of "must not".

For the avoidance of doubt, this Introduction and the Definitions that follow form part of the Laws. Finally, unless the context clearly dictates otherwise, the singular includes the plural and the masculine includes the feminine, and vice versa.