

## Unlucky West

by Harold Feldheim

There are occasions in bridge where good play must of necessity give way to better play. Sometimes, these situations can revolve around the smallest spot cards. The following hand from the French national championship of 1947 is one of my personal favorite examples of this principle. While the auction is primitive, the play and defense certainly exhibit the highest sophistication.

Dealer: North
Vulnerability: North-South

## NORTH

- 85
- J 107
- J 82

AK 853

| WEST | EAST |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4 1093 | ¢ |
| - Q 953 | - 842 |
| - 3 | - KQ109765 |
| C.J9642 | - Q 107 |

SOUTH
ค AKQJ 7642

- AK 6
- A 4
© - -

| North | East | South | West |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | 3 | $6 \mathbf{4}$ | All Pass |

The scene is the finals of the French national championship. Seated
South was European champion Boris Koychou**.

After East's rather inconvenient preempt, it was hard to come up with
any sort of scientific action. He thought of a cuebid followed by bidding spades, but how could partner ever know that a hand such as x QJxx xxx xxxxx would be enough for a grand slam? With this in mind, and only two possible losers in his hand, he decided on the practical jump to a small slam in spades. This was a risky bid for two reasons; first, partner may be of no help covering his two losers, and second, he may have missed an easy grand slam. As it turned out, he made the right decision, although it took a fair amount of acrobatics to bring home his contract.

West's opening lead was the 3 , clearly a singleton. Boris surveyed his chances which seemed none too bright. The tricks were there waiting for him in the dummy but unfortunately there was no easy way to get there. Winning the A at trick one, he cashed the ace of trumps noting the 10 from West and a diamond discard from East. He followed with the $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ K, West playing the nine in an effort to avoid the inevitable. Now Boris, fully
master of the situation, would not be denied and led the $\boldsymbol{2}$. West won this unlikely trick with the trey but could not avoid allowing declarer access to the dummy, allowing the two red suit losers to vanish.
"Just my luck," bemoaned the unfortunate West. "If I had the deuce and South held the trey, I would have been the brilliant defender by avoiding his being able to throw me in. But now," he continued dejectedly, "he gets to be the brilliant one."
"I've always been the luckier player," responded Koychou.
**Later, Boris Koychou emigrated to the United States and, partnered by such luminaries as Harold Ogust (of the 'Ogust' convention) and Boris Raymond, he became a mainstay teammate of the Kaplan-Sheinwald squad, helping to popularize weak no trumps and all the other "special" treatments that were so revolutionary at the time.默

## New CBA Web Site

During the fall of 2011 the communications committee of the Connecticut Bridge Association headed by Allan Clamage has been working to redesign the CBA web site. The goal has been to make the site your go-to place for information about tournaments, STaCs, standings, clubs, and whatever else you might want to find out about bridge in the state.

Hopefully, you will find the new design attractive and, most important, easy to use. If something is not there that you think is important, let David Keller, the CBA webmaster know. You will find a "contact us" link as well as links to all the board members and to regional and national information. Of course, Kibitzer in color is there as well as archived copies.

Check out www.ctbridge.org for the most up-do-date information about Sectionals including directions, times, and strats. The new site should be up and running by March. In the interim we will continue to maintain the information on the current site.

# Negative Inference (NI) 

In my opinion, "counting" is THE most important aspect to successful bridge. Regardless of a player's skill level, improving one's ability to count points, distribution and tricks - will lead to significantly better results.

There are three techniques to improve one's counting ability:

- First, thinking in "patterns."
- Second, precise defensive carding.
- Third, using "negative inference." This article will focus on NEGATIVE INFERENCE(NI).

Negative inference is the FAILURE of partner or the opponent(s) to make a certain bid or card play. We can then use this information to count down the hand. Let's start with a simple example. South opens the bidding with $1 \vee$. What are the negative inferences?

1. South FAILED to open (NI), so West is pretty sure South has less than 22 HCP .
2. South FAILED to open 1^(NI), so West is sure that South's spades are shorter than the hearts. More specifically, if South opened with five hearts, then South has at most four spades. If South were playing the Flannery convention, then South most probably has three or less spades.

West knows that South has less than 22 HCP and most probably fewer than five spades. (The probability that South has five spades and six hearts is very small.) West is now on the way to counting the South hand.

Let's look at another example: West is on lead against South's opening bid of 1NT and leads the Q from QJ109 (suit not relevant). North (dummy) has 752. On the 2 East plays the K and South plays the Ace. How many cards does East have in the suit?

West knows South has at least 2 cards in the suit because South opened 1NT, so East has at most four cards (4-3-42) in the suit. But with Kxx or Kxxx East's correct play would be a lower spot card. East's FAILURE to play a lower spot card means he has a singleton or doubleton (unblocking the suit).

So after the first trick West knows two things about the South hand:

1. South started with four or five cards in the suit led (4-3-2-4 or 4-3-1-5)
2. South has 11-13 HCP remaining in the hand. West is on the way to counting down declarer's hand.


QUIZ: West's opening lead is a fourth best deuce (suit not relevant) against South's opening bid of 1NT. What is the negative inference? What are West's possible distributions (patterns)?

Answer: see next quarter's article
NI: Sometimes it is more important to know what a player DID NOT bid or DID NOT play; then using that information to count down the hand.

TIP: When you are DUMMY, get in the habit of counting declarer's high card points and/or distribution. Write it on your score sheet and compare it to the hand record after the session.

## Milestones and Congratulations

## New Life Masters

Dorothy Carpenter Jill Fouad
Margaret Karbovanec
Bunny Lukas
Carmella Marcella
Helen McBrien
Elizabeth Snyder
Addie Specyalski
Joan Stroup
Ronald Talbot
Kerry Wiland

Gold Life Master (2500 MP's)

Kenneth Abelson
Kenneth Hirshon
Thomas Hyde

Silver Life Master (1000 MP's)

Susan Katz<br>Carmella Marcella

## Bronze Life Master <br> (500 MP's)

Muriel Brown Jill Fouad
Margot Hayward
Bunny Lukas
Carmella Marcella


## Can't Cost - Chapter 30

by John Stiefel

In this recent deal from a Regional Knockout Team event, both pairs went down in a slam that could (and should) have been made. At one table, South made no "can't cost" plays. At the other table, South made one but he still went down.

Dealer: West
Vulnerability: North-South

Opening Lead: ※ (opponents lead A from AK)

> NORTH
> NK 82
> K Q 10982
> A K 82
> $\ldots-$
> SOUTH
> A 109754
> A
> 54
> 8765

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | 1 | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{~}$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{~}$ | 2 | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{~}$ |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{~}$ | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | $6 \boldsymbol{~}$ | All Pass |  |

The bidding merits some discussion. Note that North contented himself with a simple 2 rebid. True, game is likely (and South could pass $2 \star$ ) if South has as little as AQxxx, x, xxxx, xxx; but more points are lost in the long run than won by playing partner for the "magic hand." Also note that South's life would have been more difficult if East had raised West's overcall to $3 \mathbf{\$}$. Finally, North's $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ bid showed slam interest and shortness in clubs (presumably a void in light of his minimum rebid at his last turn). With only game intentions, North would have simply raised to $4 \boldsymbol{4}$.

At Table 1, South ruffed the opening lead in dummy (East playing the 10, standard attitude) said "I'm good if I get a split in either major." Accordingly he lead a heart to his A and then played $\boldsymbol{A K}$, ending in dummy. Both followed to the $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ A but East showed out when the $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$ was played, discarding a high diamond. At trick 5, South played dummy's $\uparrow K$, discarding a club as West's Jack fell. "Maybe this is a false card," South said and led dummy's $\geqslant \mathrm{Q}$. It wasn't. West trumped trick 6 with the $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$ and led a club to his partner's Ace to trick 7 . Down 1.

At Table 2, South did better, but not good enough. After ruffling the opening lead in dummy, he played to his A at trick 2 and then ruffed another club at trick 3 . Now he played the $\boldsymbol{\$}$ of spades to trick 4. This left dummy without any trump, but South recognized that he could afford to lose one trump trick. Now played the $『 \mathrm{~K}$ to trick 5, West's Jack falling. Then he continued with the $>\mathrm{Q}$ to discard his last club at trick 6, West ruffling with the J . At this point, West, who had started with six clubs to the KQ, realized South had no more clubs, as the Ace was the only one left and partner had it. So he played a diamond at trick 7. South cashed dummy's AK at tricks 7 and 8 , but when he ruffed a diamond at trick 9 , West overruffed with the $\mathbf{Q}$. Down 1. West had started with 3-2-2-6 distribution.

Note that the Table 2 South would have made the contract while the Table 1 South would still have been down if East (instead of West) was the defender with QJx of spades and only two hearts. East would have ruffed the third round of hearts, but South would overruff with his Ace of trump, crossed to dummy's ace of diamonds and led another good heart to discard his last club while East ruffed in with his high trump.

Do you see how the Table 2 South could have made the contract?

If South had played dummy's AK to tricks 6 and 7 before leading dummy's
$\vee$ Q, he would have made the contract. ("Deep thought" players call this the "Dentist's Coup," as it involves "extracting" West's two exit cards in diamonds). West would have still ruffed trick 8 with one of his spade honors, but with nothing but black cards left in his hand he would have had to allow South to gain the lead at trick 9 and draw the last trump.

Did South at Table 2 misplay the hand? Probably, but he did have to guess West's distribution. If West started with 3-2-2-6 distribution, the "Dentist's Coup" was necessary (as shown above). But what if West had started with 3-3-1-6 distribution and made the "can't cost" false-card of the VJ? Then West would ruff the K and South would be down 2! (West would play a club to East's Ace and then score his $\mathbf{Q}$ via an uppercut in diamonds.)

While South at Table 2 actually had a close decision, there are two arguments for the "Dentist's Coup" play. First, there is "restricted choice"; i.e. West would always play the $\boldsymbol{V}$ Jif he started with Jx but might not play it if he started with Jxx. Second, a 5-2 diamond split is "a priori" much more likely than a $6-1$ diamond split and West doesn't need a singleton diamond for his passed-hand non-vulnerable 2 bid.

The entire hand was:

| NORTH |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| ¢ K82 |  |
| - KQ10982 |  |
| - AK 82 |  |
| 2-- |  |
| WEST | EAST |
| ¢ Q J 3 | - 6 |
| - J 3 | - 7654 |
| -109 | - Q J 763 |
| \% K Q J 9 54 | 2 A 103 |
| SOUTH |  |
| ¢ A 109754 |  |
| $\checkmark$ A |  |
| - 54 |  |
| 28762 |  |

# A Few Interesting Deals from Seattle 

by Brett Adler



Imanaged to make it to Seattle this year for the Fall Nationals, and had a great time playing bridge for eight days and taking a couple of days off for sightseeing. In eight days there are a lot of hands I got right, and too many hands I got wrong. For this article I included a few of the deals that I found interesting.
I was playing with some new partners for this tournament, and for the first deal I saw an "interesting" play from one of these players at tricks one and two, against a 2 NT contract by South (I've only shown the relevant suit).
NORTH
$\perp \mathrm{J} 84$

## WEST

EAST
ヘ KQ963
ค 1075

## SOUTH <br> - A 2

I was sitting West, and my partner and I were playing "attitude" leads against No Trump contracts, which means that rather than leading $4^{\text {th }}$ best, the lower the card you lead the more you like the suit. As a result I led the 3 and declarer played the $\$$. See if you can guess what my partner played at trick one, and when they won the trick, guess what they played at trick two?
My partner who is a very good player played the 5??? at trick one and this won the trick when declarer ducked. My partner then sat there for a long time not realizing that he had won the first trick. When finally he was made aware he had won the first trick, he played back a HEART??? I'm not sure what was going through his head but he got more hands right than wrong so I managed not to comment. I've given this to a few people so far and no one has matched my partner's actions.
The standard play from my partner should have been the $\boldsymbol{\Phi} 10$, and the $\boldsymbol{T}$ returned at trick two which would have beaten the contract by one trick (although dummy could have played the $\mathbf{~ J}$ at trick one which would have won the trick). At the time I thought this was a disaster, however most players with my
hand lead the $\mathbf{~ K}$ and now declarer won the Ace and still had a suit stopper with the Jack and also made eight tricks. So, at least we still had an average board.
In previous articles I have written about two suited freak hands, and there was another in Seattle.
My partner opened 2NT (20-21
balanced), and I held: KJ109865; $\boldsymbol{\bullet}$---; -AQJ1073; $\boldsymbol{\&}---$. How would you bid this hand?

> | NORTH |
| :--- |
| A 4 |
| A Q 85 |
| K 94 |
| AK 76 |

```
WEST EAST
@ 72
`K964
- 52
& J 105 32
    & Q 3
    `J10732
    -86
&Q984
SOUTH
@ KJ109865
\bullet ...
* A Q J 10 73
&-..
```

At our table the bidding went as follows:


I am not sure how to bid this hand, but we got to a great contract. In the end I blasted the Grand Slam and was rewarded when partner had the $\boldsymbol{A}$ and the -K. With diamonds breaking 2-2, I was able to claim my contract early. I can always make the contract irrespective of how the spades divide. If they break 2-2 the Queen will drop; if they break 3-1 a ruff in dummy is all the help I need; and if they break 4-0 I can start with A and either finesse East then ruff once if West shows out, or take a ruffing finesse against West if East shows out.

With spades 2-2 a few pairs played a nerve racking $7 \boldsymbol{4}$, but no-one played the match-point best contract of 7NT. A Grand Slam in diamonds was still an above average score.
For my third hand I'll take a $100 \%$ board against a world champion pair with a slew of Kibitzers every day of the week (even if it was because of an accident).
I held: \$Q632; A974; 82; 632 and heard the bidding go $1 \boldsymbol{\square}$ on my left from Ralph Katz; 2 $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ weak from my partner, and 3 from Nick Nickell on my right. There were a bunch of spectators traveling with these superstar opponents including Eric Kokish who was taking notes on every bid and play, so what bid would you make to secure all of the match-points?
I was concerned that the opponents could make a slam as I thought one of the opponents would have a spade void. Rather than bid some number of spades, I decided to feign strength and make a cue raise as if I had a good hand - I therefore bid $3 \checkmark$ which was followed by Katz bidding 3NT on my left which ended the auction.

Prior to the lead, my partner was asked what my $3 \checkmark$ bid meant and he replied that it was lead directing???
It is hard to argue with success as the full hand was:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { NORTH } \\
& \text { N J } \\
& \text { J 6 J 10 } 9643 \\
& \text { \& A K } 7
\end{aligned}
$$

| WEST | EAST |
| :---: | :---: |
| ค A 109875 | - Q 632 |
| - 32 | - A 974 |
| - 75 | -82 |
| -984 | -632 |



# Bridge at the Lunatic Fringe\#18: You Can't Make it if the Finesse is Winning! 

by Alan Wolf

Today's hand is a remarkable instance in which the contract can be made only if the one finesse available (but never taken) would lose. Start by looking only at the declarer and dummy hands:

## NORTH

(Professor)

- Q 73
- 8654
- A J 52
\& J 10

> SOUTH
> (Warren)
> K K 1084
> 2
> Q 4
> A K Q 95

In a contract of $4 \boldsymbol{Q}$, the road to making the contract at first glance seems easy enough. Four spade tricks, five clubs, and the A. Perhaps you'll even be able to take the diamond finesse for a possible overtrick.
However, as the play develops, the defense starts with two rounds of hearts; declarer ruffing the $2^{\text {nd }}$ round, and going after trumps. East ducks the first round of trumps, but wins the Ace on the second round as West shows out. So, East started with four trumps to the Ace.
East now leads a third round of hearts, continuing an effective "tapping"

## Interesting Details from previous page

I was able to win the $\vee$ A, and played back my $\uparrow$ Q so we cashed the first seven tricks (declarer was down 3 for a score of 300 to us). Most declarers made 12 tricks on a spade lead, and the only other East/West score in a large field was plus 100 as after West led the A against 6 NT , his partner played $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$ to request a heart switch and the hand was beaten one.

As the old adage goes, it is better to be lucky than good.

defense. When declarer trumps this round, East is left with one trump more than declarer, setting up a second trump trick for the defense. (If instead of trumping, declarer discards a diamond, the defense will continue with a fourth round of hearts.) Now what?
Well, the simple answer is: the legitimate way to make the contract is to take one more high trump (leaving East with the only remaining trump), and start on the clubs. The hope is that whenever East ruffs in, she will have no remaining hearts, and will have to lead a diamond away from the King. This will allow the diamond Queen to win, avoiding a diamond loser, and serving as an entry to Declarer's remaining good clubs. (If instead, the diamond finesse is winning, the Queen will be covered by the King, and declarer will be stuck in dummy with one or more red suit losers.) The full hands were as follows:

> NORTH
> (Professor)
> Q 73
> 8654
> A J 52
> J 10

WEST
(Minna)
4 6

- AKJ 97
- 1096

8 7632

## EAST

(Majorca)
ค A 952

- Q 103
- K873
- 84

SOUTH
(Warren)
, KJ1084

- 2
- Q 4
- AKQ 95

With both sides vulnerable, the bidding proceeded as follows:

| North | East | South | West |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Professor | Majorca | Warren | Minna |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{\bullet}!$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ | $3 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ | $4 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ | Pass |
| Pass | Pass |  |  |

The deal occurred when Minna was still a relative newcomer to the game, and while her 2 overcall was unsound, it had the effect of throwing Warren off base in the play.

The beginning play proceeded as outlined above...

A $\boldsymbol{\text { ® }}$ led.
Heart to the Queen, ruffed by Warren. @J, ducked by Majorca.
Spade to the Queen, taken by Majorca. Heart back from Majorca, ruffed by Warren.

At this point in the play, Warren felt sure that Minna had the $\leqslant$ to (maybe, just barely) justify her two-level vulnerable overcall. Therefore, in the heat of the contest, he did not play off his master trump first, but instead went after clubs immediately.
Majorca ruffed in, and exited with her last trump. Warren took his remaining club tricks, and tried the diamond finesse - down one.
Obviously, if Majorca did not have the
$\checkmark \mathrm{K}$, she could have exited a diamond at the critical juncture, stranding declarer in dummy with red suit losers. Would Majorca have been up to this play, giving declarer a free finesse? Probably yes, since the cards at this point of the hand were pretty much an open book.
In the post-mortem, there was some thought that a diamond shift at trick two could always defeat the contract. Not so. As long as declarer refuses the finesse, and takes the A immediately, he can make the contract, as the defense no longer has the timing for an effective "tap."

## Wee Burn News

The Wee Burn Fall Series ended December 1. The following pairs were winners:

1. Mary Richardson-Betty Hodgman
2. Linda Cleveland-Karen Barrett
3. Marilyn Tjader-Martha Hathaway
4. Joan Hoben-Susan Mayo
5. Brooke Megrue-Penny Glassmeyer
6. Betty Pascal-Mary Ellen Mcguire

Our two section Charity game was won by:

1. Mary Richardson-Betty Hodgman
2. Susan Kipp-Ann Piper
3. Audrey Bell-Jean Thoma

The semi-annual Swiss Team event had the following winners:

1. Joan Hoben, Susan Mayo, Brooke Megrue, Penny Glassmeyer
2. Mary Beach, Ann Towne, Thyra Elliott, Marty Molwitz
Congratulations to Penny Glassmeyer, our Player-of-the-Year for 2011.
Members of Woodway CC and CC of
Darien are welcome to join our games as drop-ins or for a complete series.

## Country Club of Darien

The winners of the fall series are: Carole Steckler - Jane Becker Donna Doyle - Carol Kesmodel Rhea Bischoff - Liliana Geldmacher

## Hartford <br> Bridge Club

Still exciting after 80 years of bridge!
The Hartford Bridge Club celebrated its $80^{\text {th }}$ Anniversary with a bang! As it turned out, the bang was a freak October nor'easter that left over 850,000 CT homes and businesses without power including the Hop Meadow Country Club scheduled to host our gala.

Over 200 people were scheduled to attend a day of celebration, official business and of course, bridge. The two week delay caused over 75 changes with equal numbers having to decline but with new signees, we ultimately returned to our original 200 attendees.

HBC holds the title of being the oldest bridge club in the United States with a current membership of over 500 with 14 active directors. The Club has a
very interesting history originating with 50 members in the Bond Hotel in 1931. We are now located at 19A Andover Street in West Hartford where we can accommodate thirty five tables of players. We currently have 169 life masters and the membership has earned over 330,000 master points. We have a very diversified membership including over 160 members with less then 100 master points.

HBC maintains a Pairer Player Program wherein members volunteer to be available at the Club on a daily basis in case a player arrives without a partner. We also inaugurated a Mentoring Program in January of 2011 to allow novices to study with advanced players to help improve the overall level of play at the Club. The program has over 60 participants and continues to provide a positive experience for both advanced and novice players.
There are thirteen games to choose from Monday through Saturday with three limited games; two capped at 750 master points and one at 100. In addition, we feature an instructional game where players are allowed to ask questions during the bidding and play. Classes are offered regularly for beginner and intermediate players. All other games are open to all levels of players with evening games on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday for those still in the work force.
We are justifiably proud of our Club and strive to ensure a positive experience for all who participate. We know how intimidating the game of bridge can be for beginners; the never ending rules, partnership agreements, and, of course, the opponents who always seem to know your hand as well as theirs. Won't you join us as we enter our ninth decade of continuous play?

## Bridge Forum (Hamden)

## Year End Results

## TUESDAY

Rita Brieger-Harold Miller ran away with Top Pair honors. Don Brueggemann-Esther Watstein also had a good autumn to finish a clear second, followed by a close battle for third-fifth between Jon Ingersoll-Bob Hawes, Hill Auerbach-Tracy Selmon and Howard Cohen-Pat Rogers. Jon Ingersoll and

Irene Kaplan were both part of two top ten partnerships.
For the individual Player-of-the-Year title, Rita did a little better with Aniko Richheimer than Harold did with Burt Saxon as they finished a dominant 1-2. Fredda Kelly, Billie Hecker and Louise Wood rounded out the top five.
Van Dyke Cup - After reaching the final week almost every year without winning, Jon Ingersoll finally came good this year, thanks to a successful new partnership with Shirley Fruchter in the final game. Louise Wood, Mary Connolly and Harold Miller were the other finalists. This was Jon's third cup win. He joined Billie Hecker, Louise Wood and Bob Hawes in winning both Tuesday-only cups in the same year.

## FRIDAY

Hill Auerbach-Larry Stern emerged as top pair again, although Lucy LacavaGeorge Levinson were still in contention at the start of the last game of the year. Carl Yohans was third with Janice Bruce and fourth with Arlene Leshine. Louise Wood was also in two of the top ten pairs.
The Friday Player-of-the-Year contest was much closer, a battle between Carl and Louise. Carl went ahead with two games remaining, but had two inconsistent closing games to drop to fourth behind Robert Klopp and Billie Hecker. Marge Simson and Louise's top partner Charles Heckman finished fifth and sixth.

Reynolds Cup - After Marge Simson and Larry Stern led for most of the competition, Carl and Louise fought it ought at the end. Carl had won this cup in 2005 , and began with a 2 -point carryover. Louise led by 1 point at the half, but needed to better Carl on both of the last two boards. On one, Louise's partner made an overtrick Carl had not. The other did not look good - Louise had made 5D instead of 4H. Carl and partner bid to 4 H , over which their opponents eventually bid 4 S . This was set four, but undoubled. Louise had gone exactly one year without holding a cup (she'd held at least one for eight years running). This was her seventh Reynolds Cup win and twenty-first overall.


# Bidding a Slam Without Blackwood 

by Gloria Sieron

| his hand came up in a recent club game. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dealer: West Vulnerability: Both |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| NORTH |  |  |  |
| ¢ Q J 1084 |  |  |  |
| -432 |  |  |  |
| - 964 |  |  |  |
| -75 |  |  |  |
| WEST |  | EAST |  |
| ¢ AK 7 |  | - 93 |  |
| - - - |  | - AK876 |  |
| - A Q 10 | 83 | -KJ52 |  |
| - A 10 |  | - Q 4 |  |
| SOUTH |  |  |  |
| - 52 |  |  |  |
| 『 Q J 1095 |  |  |  |
| - 7 |  |  |  |
| 2 K J 9 8 2 |  |  |  |
| North | East | South | West |
|  |  |  | 1 |
| Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | Pass | 2* |
| P | 3 | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | 6 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Losing Trick Count (LTC) really works. If you do not use this method of evaluating your holding, you should try it on a couple of deals.
For those not familiar with LTC, the ACBL Bridge Bulletin contained a twopart introduction in the November and December issues. I can also recommend Ron Klinger's book The Modern Losing Trick Count. The basic LTC count as described in this book is:

1. Count losers only in the first three cards in a suit.
2. With three or more cards in a suit, only the $A, K$ and $Q$ are counted as winners.
3. With two cards in a suit, only the $A$ and $K$ are counted as winners.
4. With one card in a suit only the $A$ is counted as a winner.

LTC should be used only after a trump fit is established. As with any method of hand evaluation, this is only a guide but has proven itself to be useful. Much like the Law of Total Tricks, there are always adjustments and modifications that can be made. Ed.

For instance, West has 17 HCP, with a losing trick count of four (one in spades, none in hearts, one in diamonds, and two in clubs). The average losing trick count for an opening hand is 7. After minimum bidding by West, East indicated a fit and game-going interest by jumping to 3 . West's bid of 3 encouraged East to bid 3NT. West assumed that East's bidding indicated an opening bid and therefore East had an LTC of seven. Since West had an LTC of four, the total was 11. LTC says that if you subtract your side's LTC from 24, the result should approximate the number of tricks you can take. So, West subtracted 11 from 24 and determined that LTC indicates his side can make 13 tricks in diamonds. Considering the possibility of a duplication of values (East's first bid suit (hearts) coincides with West's void) West decided on a 12 -trick contract. With careful play - trumping two spades in dummy - East/West scored 1320.

## Club News from previous page

## TUESDAY-FRIDAY COMBINED

 General Statistics: We had 54 grand slams bid and made. Lucy LacavaGeorge Levinson bid and made five, while no other pair had more than two. Individually, George finished with seven, Lucy with six and Fredda Kelly with five (each with a different partner). We also had 128 scores of passed out. Tracy Selmon, Louise Wood and Hill Auerbach were the passout leaders.Our slam success rate overall was very close to the chance of a 3-2 suit division, with 605 of 896 slams succeeding ( $67.52 \%$ ). 425 of 588 penalty doubles succeeded (72.28\%), as did 5 of 8 redoubles(62.50\%).

Our designated Complainer About Bad Cards for the year, Jean Pyne, held 8,372 HCP for 827 deals, averaging 10.12 HCP per hand. Due for counting next year is Bob Hawes.

We just missed an interesting possible record on December 23, when we were one trick away from a first place tie between Emma Q. Antonio-Lucy Lacava and Allison Hellman-Mike Hellman. Emma is almost exactly eighty years older than Allison.

Memory Bowl: In an interesting twist, no Life Master ever had the lead. Gert Pedersen was in front at the end of November. During the first half of

December, the leading score stayed where it was while Gert, Lucy Lacava and Jean Pyne took turns in front. Then Lucy surged forward, followed by Rita Brieger (who had an $84 \%$ score with Aniko Richheimer). In the end, Lucy managed to stay in front, the decisive hand coming when she made $7 \boldsymbol{\square}$ on a trump holding of AJ1074 opposite K2. When LHO did not lead a trump, Lucy ran the ten from her hand and found Qxx where she wanted it. Harold Miller, Billie Hecker, Pat Rooney and Muriel Romero finished $3^{\text {rd }}-6{ }^{\text {th }}$.

```
        UNIT-WIDE CHAMPIONSHIP
        Thursday AM, November 3,2011
FLIGHT A EVENT LEADERS
Betty Pascal - Mary Ellen McGuire
Marilyn Tjader - Martha Hathaway
3 Audrey Cadwallader - Belinda Metzger
Elaine McClure - William McClure
5 \text { Kathie Rowland - Janet Soskin}
6 Sarah Budds - Allan Clamage
FLIGHT B EVENT LEADERS
    Betty Pascal - Mary Ellen McGuire
    Marilyn Tjader - Martha Hathaway
    Audrey Cadwallader - Belinda Metzger
    Elaine McClure - William McClure
5 Kathie Rowland - Janet Soskin
Lois Berry - Betty Walsh
FLIGHT C EVENT LEADERS
Betty Pascal - Mary Ellen McGuire
Lois Berry - Betty Walsh
3 Mary Jane Vander Wiede -
    Robert Vander Wiede
4 \text { Brenda Greene - Donna Christensen}
5 \text { Ursula Forman - Ruth Johnson}
6 Susan Schroeder - Anne Gallagher
            UNIT-WIDE CHAMPIONSHIP
            Wednesday, December 7, 2011
FLIGHT A EVENT LEADERS
    Ruth Teitelman - Micki Schaffel
    Jatin Mehta - Om Chhabra
    Allan Clamage - Don Stiegler
    Mary Ellen McGuire - S Kipp
    Marsha Futterman - Judith Merrill
6 ~ S a r a h ~ C o r n i n g ~ - ~ D i a n n e ~ E l i e ~
FLIGHT B EVENT LEADERS
    Jatin Mehta - Om Chhabra
    Mary Ellen McGuire - S Kipp
    Woody Bliss - Leonard Messman
    Ursula Forman - Mary Beach
    Donna Doyle - Carol Kesmodel
6 Robert Lahey - J Michael Carmiggelt
FLIGHT C EVENT LEADERS
    Mary Ellen McGuire - S Kipp
    Woody Bliss - Leonard Messman
    Ursula Forman - Mary Beach
    Donna Doyle - Carol Kesmodel
    Peter Carroll - Mark Moskovitz
    Gene Coppa - Jo Sue Coppa
        JEFF FELDMAN TOURNAMENT
        JEFF FELDMAN TOURNAMENT
Friday AM Senior Pairs
1 Gloria Sieron -
    David Benjamin
2 Howard Lawrence -
            Michael Bolgar
Elizabeth Nagle -
            Susan Seckinger
4 Sarah Budds -
            Kathleen Frangione
5}1
6
    3 3 Mark Moskovitz - Mark Myers
    4 Brenda Harvey - V Wardlaw
    5 Ronnie Bershad Sachs -
        Barbara Thompson
    6 4 Robert Rubinstein - Seth Milliken
Friday AM Open Pairs
1 Allan Rothenberg -
Richard DeMartino
1 Shirley Derrah -
        Robert Derrah
2 Linda Green - David Blackburn
```



| JANUARY |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6-8 | Fri.-Sun. | New England Individual Regional Newton, MA |
| 10-16 | Tues.-Mon. | District 3 Tri-state Regional Rye Brook, NY |
| 19 | Thurs. | Evening Local (Split) Championship Local clubs |
| 20-22 | Fri.-Sun. | District 25 GNT Finals Sturbridge, MA |
| 23 | Mon. Daytime | Unit-wide Championship Local Clubs |
| 28 | Sat. Afternoon | ACBL Intsl Fund Game \#1 Local clubs |
| 31 | Tues. Daytime | Unit-wide Championship Local clubs |
| FEBRUARY |  |  |
| 2 | Thurs. | Daytime Local (Split) Championship Local clubs |
| 14-20 | Tues.-Mon. | New England KO Team Regional Cromwell, CT |
| 23-29 | Thurs.-Tues. | STaC with North Jersey (U106) Local Clubs |
| MA |  |  |
| 2-4 | Fri.-Sun. | Connecticut Winter Sectional Hamden, CT |
| 5 | Mon. Daytime | ACBL-wide Senior Game Local Clubs |
| 15-25 | Thurs.-3 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ Sun. | Spring Nationals Memphis, TN |
| 21 | Wed. Evening | ACBL-wide Charity Game \#1 Local Clubs |
| 26 | Mon. Evening | Local (Split) Championship Local clubs |
| 29 | Thurs. Evening | Local (Split) Championship Local clubs |
| APRIL |  |  |
| 9 | Mon. Evening | Local (Split) Championship Local Clubs |
| 13 | Fri. Daytime | Unit-wide Championship Local clubs |
| 25-29 | Wed-Sun. | New England Senior Regional Hyannis, MA |
| MAY |  |  |
| 7 | Mon. Daytime | Unit-wide Championship Local clubs |
| 10 | Thurs. Afternoon | ACBL Int'l Fund Game \#2 Local clubs |
| 18-20 | Fri.-Sun. | Connecticut Spring Sectional Hamden, CT |
| 23-28 | Wed.-Mon. | New York City Regional New York, NY |
| JUNE |  |  |
| 1 | Fri. Evening | Worldwide Bridge Contest \#1 Local clubs |
| 2 | Sat. Afternoon | Worldwide Bridge Contest \#2 Local clubs |
| 4-10 | Mon-Sun | STaC with North Jersey (U106) Local Clubs |
| 12 | Tues. Daytime | Unit-wide championship Local clubs |
| 15 | Fri. Daytime | Unit-wide Championship Local Clubs |
| 18-24 | Mon.-Sun. | New England Summer Regional Sturbridge, MA |


| 28 | Thurs. Evening | Local (Split) Championship Local clubs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JULY |  |  |
| 11 | Wed. Daytime | Unit-wide Championship Local clubs |
| 12-22 | Thurs. $-4^{\text {th }}$ Sun. | ACBL Summer Nationals Philadelphia, PA |
| 13 | Fri. Evening | ACBL Intıl Fund Game \#3 Local clubs |
| 31 | Tues. Daytime | Unit-wide Championship Local clubs |
| AUGUST |  |  |
| 6 | Mon. Evening | Local (Split) Championship Local clubs |
| 14 | Tues. Evening | Local (Split) Championship Local Clubs |
| 17-19 | Fri.-Sun. | Connecticut Summer Sectional Greenwich, CT |
| 21 | Tues. Daytime | Local (Split) Championship Local clubs |
| Aug.-Sept. |  |  |
| 27-3 | Mon.-Mon. | New England Fiesta Regional Warwick, RI |
| SEPTEMBER |  |  |
| 14 | Fri. Daytime | Unit-wide Championship Local Clubs |
| 19 | Wed. Daytime | Local (Split) Championship Local Clubs |
| 20 | Thurs. Daytime | Unit-wide Championship Local clubs |
| 22 | Sat. Daytime | Local (Split) Championship Local Clubs |
| OCTOBER |  |  |
| 4 | Thurs. Evening | ACBL-wide Instant Match Point Local clubs |
| 5-7 | Fri.-Sun. | Sid Cohen Sectional <br> Hartford, CT |
| 12-18 | Fri.-Thurs. | STaC with North Jersey (U106) Local Clubs |
| 20-21 | Sat.-Sun. | District 25 NAP Qualifying |
| 22-28 | Mon-Sun | District 3 Regional Danbury, CT |
| NOVEMBER |  |  |
| 1 | Thurs. Daytime | Unit-wide Championship Local clubs |
| 2-4 | Fri.-Sun. | Jeff Feldman Memorial Hamden, CT |
| 14-18 | Wed.-Sun. | New England Masters Regional Mansfield, MA |
| Nov.-Dec. |  |  |
| 22-2 | Thurs. $-1{ }^{\text {st }}$ Sun. | ACBL Fall Nationals <br> San Francisco, CA |
| 26 | Mon. Evening | ACBL-wide Charity Game \#2 Local clubs |
| DECEMBER |  |  |
| 5 | Wed. Daytime | Unit-wide Championship Local clubs |
| 10 | Mon. Daytime | Local (Split) Championship Local clubs |
| 11 | Tues. Evening | Local (Split) Championship Local Clubs |
| 14 | Fri. Daytime | Unit-wide Charity Local Clubs |

2010 winner Brenda Harvey selected Dee Altieri as the Champion's Honoree, having played with Dee occasionally on the first Friday of the month in 20078. Dee had been a long-time regular in the old Thursday evening game in North Branford, where she was usually the consistent partner of such players as Helen Kobernusz, Anne Spillane, Hildegarde Gilley and Sybil Blood, as well as with Ginny Anderson, Jean Shepler Miller and Rita Levine. Dee was often on call to partner Bill Sherry. In the Friday game, Dee won the Consistency category for Player-of-theYear in three separate years. Her most regular partnerships were with Sylvia Alpert and Emma Q. Antonio. Emma kindly obliged Dee once with a reopening double when Dee held AQ1094 behind an opponent who had made a two-level vulnerable overcall on 86532, resulting in a 1400 penalty. Dee's last game with Brenda was on 5 September 2008. We saw Dee last playing with Sylvia on 5 December 2008, less than two months before she died on 2 February 2009.
[Note: The following hand was actually played in 1991. The contract was 3 NT bid and made. One of the following lines of play is almost exactly what happened at the table. I have inserted Dee into the story, but Bill Sherry was actually at the table at the time.]
Board 8
Dealer: West
Vulnerability: None
NORTH
© J 105
-K10852

- A 2

Q 93

| WEST | EAST |
| :---: | :---: |
| ¢ A Q 6 | - 98 |
| - AQ 943 | - 7 |
| - Q | - J 108754 |
| 9 10865 | ¢ K J 42 |

SOUTH

- K 7432
- J 6
- K 963
\& 7

As Bill Sherry put down the dummy, Dee found herself unfortunately unsurprised by what she saw. Still, she thanked him with every sign of calm in her voice. Looking at his glass, she thought it just as well that she was the one declaring 3NT. And, with a bit of assistance from her opponents, she might not go down too much. And soon Dee found herself scoring up +400 and hearing Bill say that he'd known all along his dummy would be good enough. But where was Dee sitting? The reader is invited to choose his/her own adventure. Figures are supplied from a recent survey.
Dee sat West (21\%): Forgetting that they weren't playing weak jump shifts, Bill had jumped to 3 over Dee's 1 opening bid, and her 3NT had closed the auction. North chose to lead the 3 to South's Ace. Back came the heart Jack to Queen and King, followed by the heart ten to Dee's Ace. Dee led a club to dummy's Jack, then a diamond to the Queen, which North ducked. A club to dummy's King was followed by a successful finesse of the spade Queen. On Dee's last club, North discarded a spade. Dee then cashed the spade Ace and led the heart three. North had to take this with the five, then could only cash the diamond Ace and lead a heart from 82 into Dee's 94.

Dee sat South(23\%): West sorted a heart with the diamond Queen and opened $1 \boldsymbol{1}$. Over Bill's 1 ${ }^{\top}$, East made a weak jump shift of $3 \star$, which Dee doubled. When Bill pulled the double to $3 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$, Dee thought 3NT the least of evils. West led a heart to Dee's Jack, and ducked a second round, won by dummy's ten. Dee ran the spade Jack to West's Queen. West returned a low club instead of the eight, so that East had to play the Jack when dummy ducked, giving Dee a second stopper. Dee then had only to knock out the spade Ace, after which E/W could neither set up a fifth trick or prevent Dee setting up a second club trick to go
with two diamonds, two hearts and three spades.

Dee sat East( $25 \%$ ): Dee was reluctant to respond to $1 \boldsymbol{\vee}$, but bid 1 NT anyway. Then came 2 from South and 2NT from Bill. North raised to 34, but Bill could not be kept out of his favorite contract. South led a spade to North's Jack. Not liking to lead back into dummy's AQ, North tried Ace and another diamond next. South, taking the deuce as showing length, took Dee's Jack with the King and played a third diamond to Dee's eight, setting up four tricks for her. After a spade finesse, Dee led dummy's club ten to Queen, King and Ace. The heart Jack was taken in dummy and the club eight led. When North covered, Dee was able to take all the remaining tricks with winners in the minors.

Dee sat North(31\%): East passed West's opening bid of $1 \boldsymbol{V}$, and Bill reopened with a double. Over Dee's 1NT, East then came in with $2 *$. Bill bid $2 \boldsymbol{\sim}$ passed by West. Dee returned to 2NT, raised to game by Bill. East made the most favorable opening lead of the diamond Jack, crashing West's Queen as Dee took the Ace. Then Dee ran the spade Jack to West's queen. A low club went to Jack and Ace, followed by the heart Jack to Queen and King. The ten and another spade cleared the suit. West tried another low club, but Dee's nine forced the King. East stuck Dee in dummy with a diamond, but Dee just cashed the spades and led dummy's second heart; West had to let her in for the eighth and ninth tricks.
(What really happened in 1991: Mila Sherry, Bill's mother, sat East. When North passed 2NT, Mila tried to pull to 3D, but Bill returned her to 3 NT . The defenders took the first four tricks with the spade Jack, diamond Ace, club Ace and diamond King, which let Mila take the remainder.)

[^0]The Kibitzer welcomes comments, discussions, and other contributions from our readers. We retain the right to edit material for length or appropriateness. Submit to the editor at twproulx@optonline.net.

## Betty Loop

Over the years we form very close friendships with our partners and members of our bridge community. Each one of us has a list of favorite people. It is with great sadness I report that one of our most liked and respected members, Betty Loop, passed away on November 20, 2011. She was 90 years old. Betty will be missed by all.

Besides being a very fine bridge player, Betty was a delightful partner, who accumulated over 3211 masterpoints and was 38th on the list of top 200 masterpoint holders in Connecticut in her lifetime. Betty always had a twinkle in her eye, and always had humorous stories to tell about her family whom she loved very much, and the quirks of other bridge players.

Betty and I played bridge together over 15 years. I always get excited when a new bridge convention comes along, and so early on I "discovered" Drury and one day I suggested to Betty that we add Drury to our convention card. Now Betty, as you know, did not play what she thought were exotic or unnecessary conventions so she quietly insisted to me that Drury was not necessary. I must confess maybe she had a point. Over the years I would bring it up, however we never played Drury once in all the time I knew her.

But nonetheless, we did well at the bridge table. Betty played well with everyone. On behalf of all her friends in the Connecticut Bridge Community, I wish her family our deepest sympathy for their loss.

We love you, Betty Loop.

- Elliot Ranard

童

## James R. Greer



James R. Greer, 68, of New Canaan passed away peacefully at his home in the presence of his loving family on Thursday, November 10, 2011, after a brief illness.

He was born on February 2, 1943, in Glasgow, Scotland, the son of William and Margaret (Robertson) Greer. He came to Stamford, Connecticut in 1954. He attended Dartmouth College and Boston University, and received his Bachelor's Degree in Government from Boston University in 1966.
Jim retired after a successful career in Executive Search and Outplacement, during which he concentrated his talents on helping other people meet their career goals. He said that he preferred working on Outplacement because it gave him the opportunity to be of material help to people who had lost their jobs.

After retirement Jim was able to devote himself to his avocation as a duplicate bridge player. Before his final illness he was the $12^{\text {th }}$ ranked player in Connecticut and the $52^{\text {nd }}$ ranked in all of New England. He was on the bridge team which, in 2009, won the District 25 Championship Flight North American Teams title. His record of more than 6000 masterpoints put him in the top $1 \%$ of all duplicate bridge players in the country.

Jim met his beloved wife, Maeve, when he was asked to mentor her as a new bridge player. Together they loved to participate in bridge tournaments, attending virtually all Regionals in New England and New York and as many National tournaments as possible. Many of Jim's closest bridge friends referred to him always as "Rabbit" after the Victor Mollo character, based on a hand he declared in 4 S thinking he was in 3NT. Because he thought he was in 3NT, he chose the only winning line to make the hand.

Some of Jim's long-time partners included the late Monroe Magnus, Allan Clamage, and Art Crystal, and, of course, his wife, Maeve. Jim served on the Connecticut Bridge Association board from 1980 until 2001 and was a frequent alternate thereafter. He also often served on Conduct and Ethics and Appeals committees.

Jim taught bridge to beginner and intermediate players both in private lessons and in at several local senior centers. He loved helping other players improve their game, and he was always willing to give advice and share his extensive knowledge of the game. Jim was known to his many friends and to his family as a kind man with a penetrating mind and a dry sense of humor. He was a well-informed fan of many sports, always ready with unexpected insights on the teams he followed. He will be remembered for his keen wit and gentle smile as much as for his many achievements.

He is survived by his wife, Maeve Lucey; his nephew, Ronald Kennedy; several cousins; and by many, many bridge partners, bridge students, and friends. He was predeceased by his sister Catherine Kennedy.

An annual memorial game will be held in Jim's honor at the Wilton Bridge Studio in Norwalk, CT.

[^1]
# Winter in Connecticut 

When the weather outside is frightful,<br>Playing bridge is quite delightful<br>Hamden • March 2-4, 2012 • KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS HALL 2630 Whitney Avenue, Hamden

## SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

Friday, March 2
10:00 Stratified Open Pairs Stratified Senior Pairs
2:30 Stratified Open Pairs
Stratified Senior Pairs
Saturday, March 3
10:00 Stratiflighted Pairs
A/X, B/C
299er Pairs
2:30 Stratiflighted Pairs
A/X, B/C
299er Pairs
Sunday, March 4
10:30 Continental Breakfast
11:00 Stratiflighted AX/BC
Swiss Teams
Lunch is available for \$8

## Stratified Games:

A:2000+, B:500-2000, C: 0-500

## Stratiflighted Games:

Flight A:
$A: 3000+, X: 0-3000$,
B/C Pairs:
B:500-2000, C: 0-500
299er Pairs:
50/100/300

## Partnership:

John Farwell
203-401-1592
The break between sessions on
Friday and Saturday is short.
Plan to bring lunch and play both sessions

Events and stratifications may be modified at director's discretion as warranted by attendance.

## Barbara Shaw Trophy for player winning most points in the 299er games!

Entry Fee:
\$11 per person per session for paid ACBL members.
\$1 additional for non or unpaid ACBL members. Student discount
\$3/student/session
Check www.ctbridge.org for updates and results.

## THE KIBITZER

The Kibitzer is published quarterly by the Connecticut Bridge Association, Unit 126 of the American Contract Bridge League.
All comments, news, items related to the bridge world and of interest to our readers are welcome. Please send all items for the next Kibitzer by April 15, 2012.

Editor: Tom Proulx 34 Saint Mary's Lane Norwalk, CT 06851

Phone: 203-847-2426
Email: twproulx@optonline.net

## You can see The Kibitzer

 in blazing color at the CT bridge site: http://www.ctbridge.orgIf you would like to receive The Kibitzer via e-mail, let us know. Email Tom Proulx at twproulx@optonline.net

## Your CBA

| President | Phyllis Bausher | $203-389-5918$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Vice President | Sandy DeMartino | $203-637-2781$ |
| Secretary | Debbie Noack | $203-924-5624$ |
| Treasurer | Susan Seckinger | $860-513-1127$ |
| Past President | Burt Gischner | $860-691-1484$ |
| Tournament Coordinator | Susan Seckinger | $860-513-1127$ |
| Unit Coordinator | Don Stiegler | $203-929-6595$ |
| Recorder | Leonard Russman | $203-245-6850$ |

CBA Web site http://www.ctbridge.org

## Your Link to the Board

Central
Eastern
Fairfield
Hartford
Northwestern
Panhandle
Southern
Southwestern
Members-at-Large

| Kay Frangione | $860-621-7233$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Janet Gischner | $860-691-1484$ |
| Esther Watstein | $203-375-5489$ |
| Betty Nagle | $860-529-7667$ |
| Sonja Smith | $860-653-5798$ |
| Allan Clamage | $203-359-2609$ |
| Sarah Corning | $203-453-3933$ |
| Tom Proulx | $203-847-2426$ |
| Susan Rodricks |  |
| Judy Hess | $203-255-8790$ |
| Joyce Stiefel | $860-563-0722$ |
| Bill Watson | $860-521-5243$ |


[^0]:    - Rick Townsend

[^1]:    - Maeve Lucey

