
by Harold Feldheim

Of all the variants in the play of the cards, none is prettier than those that extract the best efforts of both declarer and defender. This hand is an excellent example of this theme.

Your problem: What are South's chances of making her contract? After $2 \boldsymbol{2}, 2$, (waiting), South, with only 24 HCP, used her excellent diamond suit as an excuse to bid 3NT. North felt his long clubs were also worth the leap to 6NT.

## North

© 64

- 65
- 109

A J 108765
South
ค A Q 8
-A Q 3
AK Q 65
\% K 4

Lead: 10 -

South surveyed her prospects. Entries to the club suit were a problem but, after counting her tricks, she hit upon an elegant solution. With six sure tricks outside of


Harold Feldheim clubs, (one spade, two
hearts, and three diamonds), only three of her seven clubs were needed to fulfill the contract.

With this thinking, she led the 4-spot and when West inserted the deuce, called the 10 from dummy. Of course, after East takes the queen, declarer can win any return, overtake her singleton king and claim the balance of the tricks.

But the 10 held the trick! Now what? If either side started with three clubs, the suit would remain blocked. After a little thought, she solved this conundrum by returning to the K and leading a
diamond towards the 10-9 in dummy. After this entry-forcing play, the defense had no chance.

The complete hands:


Give East full marks for his sharp defensive duck, but give declarer higher marks for solving this elegant defense with a delicate counter-measure. 薬

## New CBA Board Members <br> from President Ausra Geaski

Jay Stiefel and Geof Brod will not be continuing in their positions as Members-at-Large on the CBA Board. On behalf of the CBA I would like to thank both Jay and Geof for all of their past support as members of the Board and with helping in the decision-making for our Unit's activities.

I am pleased to welcome two new members as part of our CBA Board Judy Hess and Bill Watson. Both of these new board members represent different geographic sections of our Unit
and are frequent players at all of our Sectionals. Judy has served as co-chair for past Sectionals. Bill is a member of the Hartford Bridge Club Board and has worked this past year with some of the state colleges and universities to promote the game of bridge among the students.

On behalf of the CBA, I thank Judy and Bill for volunteering their time and efforts and we all look forward to working with them at our upcoming board meetings.

Sectional Tournament Sept. 28, 29, 20

Check the web site: Ctbridge.org, your club director, or Board representative for the location of this tournament.

See you in September!

by Jim Greer

Bridge is primarily a game of skill, not chance. But there is a luck factor that takes many forms. Sometimes a particular bidding method will work for one side or the other. And there are issues of style or temperament that come into play. Then there are hands like this one that defy all catagorizing another Senior Moment from Allan Clamage, my favorite seniors partner:

|  | North |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | -983 |
|  | - A J 96 |
|  | - A Q |
|  | A Q 42 |
| West | East |
| 4 A Q 52 | ¢ K J 1064 |
| $\checkmark 2$ | $\checkmark$ |
| -K1093 | $\checkmark 876$ |
| \% KJ 108 | 89763 |
|  | South |
|  | ¢ 7 |
|  | VK Q 108743 |
|  | - J 542 |
|  | - 5 |

Playing in a KO match against an expert pair, Allan opened $3^{\bullet}$. It went DBL, $4^{\wedge}$ by me, $4 \boldsymbol{\sim}$ by East. Allan now bid 5 !

I assumed he had a spade void or 8 hearts and bid $6 \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{ }$, reasoning that both minor suit finesses were working. All pass, making six.

I asked how he found the $5^{\circ}$ bid. He answered, "Well, I thought I had 8." Then why not bid $4 \boldsymbol{}$ originally?

"Because I counted the hand correctly the first time, then recounted and came up with 8!"
We lost the match anyway.

Jim Greer

# The Magic of Being There 

by Gloria Sieron

How can two hands with barely enough high-card points for game, produce a slam?
This hand came up at Lynn Condon's Thursday 11 a.m. game at the Scandanavian Club in Fairfield:
Dealer: North

## North

© AJ 98

- J 42
- Void

28 AJ 10987


East

- 32
- AQ 87
-10983
South
AKQ7654
-K5 3
A 765
2 Void
Auction:


The double of $5^{\boldsymbol{P}}$ assured South that his $K$ was a valuable asset and validated the 6 bid.
What do you think of North's opening bid?
At the Academy of Bridge Cheerleading, the saying: "Six/four bid some more" is very popular. Many players also use the "Rule of Twenty." When you add the number of cards in your two longest suits to your high card points and come up with twenty (or more), your hand should make an opening bid. Possession of two quick tricks plus strong spots in the black suits makes this "Rule of Twenty" opener a must.

Going back to basics: Add the total points in the North hand - eleven - plus the two extra clubs. You have the required thirteen points to open.

To justify the splinter bid (4): With evidence of a good spade fit, how do you evaluate the worth of the diamond void? The Papa Bear would give it ten points since you can trump all the diamond losers. The Baby Bear goes along with standard methods and adds just five points for the void.

The Mamma Bear thinks 7 1/2 points is just right. Now that I've convinced you that North should definitely open one club, have I further convinced you that North's rebid of the splinter, showing game-going values, is part of the magic of "being there?"

With any high-card point holding in diamonds other than the Ace, South would devalue his hand, sensing a duplication of values. Considering the prime value of the $A$, and the two extra spades, South initiated a Roman key-card Blackwood sequence. When East doubled $5^{\circ}$ which assured the value of the $K^{\bullet}$, South felt secure bidding the Slam.

After a heart lead and a heart return to South's King, twelve tricks were needed and available. Expecting a twenty-point, game-going splinter raise, South was a bit surprised by dummy's assets. South played only one round of trump, noting that the ten fell. All the rest of his trumps were high. Six trump tricks in South's hand, the two aces, the $\mathrm{K} \downarrow$, plus trumping three diamonds in dummy and South fulfilled the contract.

Making twelve tricks is not hard. The magic of getting to the contract or "being there" is the challenge.

嶅

# Can＇t Cost－Chapter 13 

by John Stiefel

An interesting variation on the＂can＇t cost＂theme occurred in this IMP match between two of New England＇s top teams． Vulnerability：N／S only
Dealer：South
South West North East
$2 \boldsymbol{L}-3 \checkmark-3 \boldsymbol{c}-$ All Pass
Opening Lead： K

Note－Advanced readers might want to study the 4－card ending later in this article before reading to the end．

| North |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| ¢ $\mathrm{Qxx}^{\text {x }}$ |  |
| $\geqslant$ AKx ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |  |
| $\checkmark$ Q x |  |
| ¢xxx |  |
| West | East |
| ${ }_{\underline{4} \mathrm{Ax}}$ | 旲 $\mathrm{x} \times$ |
| ${ }^{\text {J J x }}$ | $\uparrow$ Q 10 xx |
| －AKJ 10 xxx | $\checkmark \mathrm{xx}$ |
| Q Q $\mathrm{S}^{\text {a }}$ | 9 A J 109 x |

## South

企KJ 10 xxx
－ xxx
$\checkmark x$ x
K C
South＇s opening bid seems normal to me．Some would argue that $3 \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is indi－ cated at favorable vulnerability at IMPS， but this would likely force West to bid 3NT and leave North－South with the choice of－600 or -300 （in 4 doubled）．

West might have bid 3NT but chose 3 ，hoping East might have enough to act if game were cold．Here，though， East didn＇t have enough to act and North－South bought the hand at 30．

West cashed his two top diamonds （East playing high／low）and paused for thought．South＇s likely distribution was 6－3－2－2 or 6－2－3－3．If he was 6－2－3－3 with $\mathrm{Q}^{\boldsymbol{\vee}}$ ，a club shift was essential，so West played his Q to trick three．East won this with his As and continued the suit，hoping to give West a ruff，but South won his King and started on trump．West hopped the Ace and exited with his last trump．He feared being end－played if he ducked（South could win dummy＇s queen and cash dummy＇s $A \boldsymbol{} \quad$ and $K$ before exiting to East＇s

A ）．This left the following position after trick 6：


So far so good for East－West，right？ They had taken 4 tricks and East would eventually take the fifth．Wrong！（Some advanced readers might want to stop here and see how South took the rest of the tricks．）

South now played the King，Jack and another trump，leaving this ending with East still needing to play to trick 9.


What can East discard？If he throws a club，South will lead a heart to dummy， ruff a club and dummy will be good．A heart discard won＇t help either because South can then cash dummy＇s AK and his hand will be good．（This end position is called a＂trump squeeze．＂）

Well，East－West couldn＇t have done anything，right？Wrong again！BOTH West and East could have done better． First，it＂can＇t cost＂East to duck West＇s Qe lead to trick 3 （declarer can＇t have a


John Stiefel
stiff K as West wouldn＇t have led the Q from Q x x）．Also，West was correct to win the ace of trumps at trick 5，but it＂can＇t cost＂him to lead a low heart to trick 6．（The contract is cold if South has $Q 10 \times 7$ ．）Had either East or West made the indicated＂can＇t cost＂ play，the fragile position required for the trump squeeze would have been destroyed．（Try it．Dummy needs 2 clubs in the end－game and East could have prevented this is he had ducked West＇s Qearlier．Dummy also needs two top hearts for entries and West could have prevented this if he＇d led a heart after winning the trump Ace．）

In summary，it would have been very tough in the real world for East or West to foresee the threat of a trump squeeze． It would have been much easier for either of them to make the＂can＇t cost＂ play and watch declarer go down with－ out even thinking about a potential trump squeeze．

P．S．In the other room，West blasted out 3NT，North bid 4d East bid 4NT．（East figured that the vulnerable game must have a play if West could bid 3NT by himself．）4NT headed off one （high heart lead followed by a spade shift）．All that for a swing of one IMP！

## 2008 Boston Nationals Hosted by District 25 Volunteers Needed

In the fall of 2008, District 25 will once again play host to the ACBL Nationals which will be held in Boston, MA.
It has been 10 years since the last Boston Nationals and the anticipation of the National event coming to our Northeastern States again is high and enthusiastic. Although the tournament is over a year away, planning has been underway for more than a year within our District to select event chairpersons and to begin

this successful event.

Several of the co-chair positions have been filled by CBA volunteers, including:
Registration/Prizes: Susan Seckinger
Volunteers Hospitality Suite : Phyllis Bausher, Kay Frangione, and Betty Nagle

Each of these positions and many other committees that are necessary for the workings of the Nationals will require work from volunteers across

District 25. The games will be held in two adjoining host hotels - The Marriott and The Westin.

More information will be forthcoming on the District 25 website
(nebridge.org), in future Kibitzer issues, and at our Sectionals.

Save the dates! November 20-30in 2008 and think about volunteering some portion of your time to support our District as together we "Make History in Boston." Call Ausra Geaski at 203-533-7271 for more information and to offer some time to make Boston 2008 the best Nationals ever.

## Brod Team Wins Senior Swiss in Nashville

Connecticut's own Geof Brod captained a team with Rich DeMartino, Jay Stiefel, and Pat McDevitt (MA) to capture the Senior Swiss Truscott/USPC tourney at the summer Nationals in Nashville. The team posted a score of 132.81 to win the close, eight-match event. Three of this team won the same event last year. Second place winners included Connecticut players Steve Becker and Larry Bausher. Congratulations to all!憾


State Days Coordinator: Ausra Geaski.

## One for the Books

By Jim Greer

How often have you taken all the tricks on defense against a voluntarily bid game contract? Here's a hand I played with Maeve (Mahon) Lucey recently in a club game:

## North <br> $\underset{\sim}{\boldsymbol{*}} \mathrm{A}$ Q Jxxx <br> $\nabla^{\nu}$ <br> $\checkmark \mathrm{xx}$ <br> (xxxx



Maeve opened $2 \boldsymbol{L}$, after 3 on my right. I said $3^{\bullet}$. LHO bid 3 NT (?!?), all pass.

Maeve cleverly led the J and I overtook then cashed the next 6 heart tricks; LHO let a spade go, so now we cashed all the spades. Down 9.

A small doubleton is sometimes a stopper against me, but not when partner is on lead.

I gave this hand to three of my intermediate bridge classes recently. Several students wanted to know why I didn't double.

# Bridge at the Lunatic Fringe Second Hand Play, Part Three 

by Allan Wolf

Continuing with exceptions to the " 2 nd hand low" maxim, the most mundane reason for playing $2^{\text {nd }}$ hand high is that if you don't take the trick, you'll never get it. While this sometimes is the case, it also often happens that the lost trick in one suit comes back in another suit - sometimes with interest. A case in point:

```
        North (Prof. Lobochevski)
        $ K42
        `KQ 5
        * 974
        9532
```

| West (Minna) | East (Majorca) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Q J 109 | ¢ 76 |
| $\checkmark$ A J 104 | -87632 |
| - J 63 | - K Q 102 |
| \% K J 9 | -104 |

South (Warren)
A A Q 853
$\checkmark 9$
A 85
A A Q 76
Warren opened the bidding with one spade, and proceeded to game when the professor raised to 2 s. Warren's bid was marginal, a "help-suit game try." A bid of $3 \boldsymbol{3}$ or 3 would probably be better, and might keep the partnership out of a poor contract. But it's hard to argue with success.

Looking at all four hands, it's easy to see that a diamond lead would easily defeat the contract. But with no attractive plain suit lead, Minna led the J won by Warren in the closed hand.
Warren immediately led his singleton heart, and Minna, seeing the K and Q in dummy felt that a hold-up was pointless and that if she didn't take her Ace, she might never get it.

This in fact was true, but never-theless, rising with the Ace allowed Warren to make the contract, as the two heart winners now allowed him to get rid of both diamond losers. With the clubs breaking, he was now able to hold his losers to the A and two clubs.
 to lead hearts themselves, they will eventually make two diamonds and two clubs setting the contract by one trick. Ducking gives up one heart trick, but gains two diamond tricks.

Another example - one that many players go wrong on - occurs when a singleton is led from dummy. Especially if the suit led is known to be a critical side suit for declarer, it is usually right NOT to play the Ace in $2^{\text {nd }}$ hand (unless dummy has exceptionally long trumps).
On the very next hand, Majorca made this error, rising with the Ace in second hand, and Warren again made a contract that might have been defeated:


The bidding:
$\underset{\text { (Warren) }}{\mathbf{S}} \underset{\text { (Minna) }}{\text { (Professor) }}$ (Majorca)

| 15 | Pass | 1NT* | Pass |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 29 | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 31 | Pass | 4 | Pass |

Pass Pass

* Forcing

Minna led the $\mathrm{Q} \downarrow$, and Warren won in dummy in order to lead his singleton spade. Now Majorca went wrong by going up with the Ace. She continued with a trump in order to restrict spade ruffs in dummy.

But with the lucky spade position the Queen coming down on the third round, only one ruff was enough to establish the spade suit. Thus Warren made an overtrick, losing only one spade trick and one trump trick.

If Majorca ducks the spade lead (smoothly, of course), declarer may well go wrong and put in the Jack. Now the Ace and another trump restricts declarer to only one spade ruff, and the defense will make 3 spade tricks and a trump for down one.
Declarer of course can make the contract via a cross-ruff if he goes in with the King after Majorca has ducked. But as Warren privately confessed to the professor at the end of the round, "I would have played the Jack. I just didn't think that Majorca was up to ducking the Ace with a singleton in dummy. I guess I was right."

## Hartford Bridge Club

Life is good at the HBC! Our current membership is at an all-time high... 486 members, an increase over 2006 yearend figure of 480. Please note and respect the HBC dedicated bridge players. On Friday, July 13, the club had two sections in play, each with 13 tables. Who says "luck" is a big part of the game!

Bob Bencker's Wednesday night lessons for under 200 master point players is successfully continuing at 6:30 p.m. followed by bridge at 7 p.m. Cost is $\$ 5$ per person whether an HBC member or not. The beginner section has been melded into the regular group.
"Participation is beyond our wildest expectations," said Club Manager Donna Feir.

## Meriden Bridge Club in the News

Dan Nocera's morning games in Meriden on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday made a big spash in Meriden's newspaper, the Record-Journal. Featured on the front page of the "Look!" section, the article written by Bryan Koenig is complete with full color photos of the game in play and one of Phyllis Bausher. The article covers some history and general discussion of the game, using quotes from several players including Harold Feldheim, "anyone can beat anyone on any one hand...the game is heavily based on strategy and skill, rather than luck."
Phyllis has the last word. She talks about the ACBL being "heavily involved in attracting new, younger players with programs in schools across the country." She says, "bridge will always be here." Amen to that!

## Stamford

The Stamford BC has closed its doors. At the annual dinner and meeting in June, the club voted to cease its Friday night games. This appears to follow the general trend of poor attendance at night games, certainly and most especially for Friday night.

Most of our supplies have been given to bridge teachers in the area and our trophies have gone to those whose name was on them the most. Thanks to all who came and played on Friday nights to the end.

## Bridge Forum (Hamden)

## Tuesday

At the halfway point, Player of the Year is a tossup. This year we have the occasional presence of Harold Feldheim in the mix. Harold's lead in the Consistency category puts him a fairly close second to Louise Wood, with Jatin Mehta third. Muriel Romero, leading in Performance and Achievement, is fifth overall but can rise quickly with more even results in the second half of the year.

## The top pairs:

1. Harold Feldheim - Jean Orr
2. Al Guntermann - Carl Yohans
3. Tad Karnkowski - Bob Klopp
4. Billie Hecker - Muriel Romero
5. Hill Auerbach - Tracy Selmon
6. Brenda Harvey - Bob Klopp
7. Marge Simson - Marshall Weiss
8. Inge Bellis - Rosemarie Tilney
9. Jatin Mehta - Hasmukh Shah
10. Rita Levine - Tony Tusa.

Stein Cup Final Four(April):
This year featured the novelty of having two finalists with the same first name, but was also noteworthy for its display of nerves. The four finalists between them were unable to reach average in the first two weeks. Mary Connolly, looking for her first cup win, had the lead, but had to take the absentee score of $45 \%$ for the final week. It was likely that, assuming one of them beat the absentee score, it would be a battle between Bob Klopp and Bob Hawes (trying to hold both Tuesday-only cups simultaneously after surviving the maximum six elimination matches). Bob Hawes had the good fortune of securing 14-time cup winner Louise Wood as a partner, but in the end Bob Klopp managed the only average game of the final to take his first cup, with Mary second, Bob Hawes third, and Brenda Harvey fourth.

## Friday

Louise Wood, sitting third at the halfway point, has a good chance to be the first player to be Player of the Year for both Tuesday and Friday. The rest of the top five are all relatively new to competing for this distinction. Lois Flesche and Marge Simson are about even in first and second, with Larry Stern and Al guntermann rounding out the top five.

## Leading Pairs:

1. Muriel Romero - Florence Schannon
2. Brenda Harvey - Bob Klopp
3. Hill Auerbach - Larry Stern
4. Fredda Kelly - Louise Wood
5. Jinny Goggin - Al Guntermann
6. Carrie and Charlie Schnee
7. Billie Hecker - Muriel Romero
8. Oosman Bashir - Jonathan Bittner
9. Charles Heckman - Bob Klopp
10. Dee Altieri - Marge Simson

> MILESTONES and CONGRATULATIONS

## Silver Life Master

(1000 master points) Donald Brueggemann William Selden

Bronze Life Master<br>(500 master points)<br>Brett Adler<br>Joyce Calcagnini<br>John Carey<br>Bob Fishman<br>Patricia Flakos<br>Thomas Gerchman<br>David Katzman<br>Lois Patton<br>Libby Pearl<br>Stuart Reyman

## Life Masters

(300 master points)
Joyce Calcagnini
Lois Karcher
Susanne Redmond
Richard Olson
John O'Shea
Libby Pearl
Bernie Snyder
William Watston

## Claiborn Cup Final Four (April):

This contest featured much better results during the finals. Carl Yohans, looking for his second cup win, took the lead with a moderate $55 \%$ score in the first week, but Brenda Harvey posted $65 \%$ in week two to take a $9 \%$ lead. During the first half of the last game, Carl chipped away to within $4 \%$, but a strong second half for Brenda gave her the win, her second, and briefly made her the only player holding two cups at once. The sentimental favourite, Emma Q. Antonio, is still looking for her second cup win, more than ten years after her first. This was Emma's third time in the last five Claiborn Final Fours. Fivetime cup winner Fredda Kelly never got started and finished fourth.

## Tuesday/Friday Combined - <br> Helen Frank Cup (May/June):

This cup (the equivalent of an eighteensession Swiss event) was notorious for never seeing any sustained momentum. Tracy Selmon took the early lead. 2002 winner Jon Ingersoll went ahead and built a good lead early on, but didn't make any further progress. Bob Klopp and then Jatin Mehta joined Jon at the top, with the three of them exchanging the lead through about mid-June.
The last two winners, Helen Molloy and Brenda Harvey, moved into the top ten in late May and hung around. Carl Yohans got up to third with two weeks to go and looked a likely winner, while three-time winner Louise Wood made the top ten as well. Little happened until the last three sessions. Jatin opened up a fair lead, with his partner Joel Tames, off a successful new partnership, moving into second while the pack fell back. Then Joel took a lead of 2-3 top boards into the final game, for which he had no partner. This left five challengers with a chance to overtake Joel.
Jatin and Helen fell away in the first half. Carl had a bad round at the start of the second half. Bob and Louise both caught Joel in the end, with Louise edging Bob for her fourth Frank Cup win and fifteenth triumph overall.

## Hamden Sectional May 4, 5, 6, 2007

Winners of the Scott Loring trophy for the player(s) winning the most points in the under 2000 MP category are: Zachary Gidwitz and Alex Dezieck (college students).

## FRI. AFT. OPEN PAIRS

| $\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ 1 & \\ 2 & \\ 3 & 1 \\ 4 / 5 & 1 \\ 4 / 5 & \\ 6 & 2 \\ & 3 \\ & 4 \\ & 4 \\ & & 6 \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

F Blachowski - H Lawrence
D Stiegler - D Finn
1 P Lennon - E McClure
4/5 S Corning - R Blair
4/5 B Corbani - J Williams
21 A Dezieck - Z Gidwitz
E Nagle - B Kliman
A Ardolino - J Bramley
52 J Mehta-R Olson
63 P Olschefski-C Olschefski
FRI. AFT. SENIOR PAIRS
A B C
1 J Smith - J Gischner
J Noyes - C Graham
B Loop - M Fromm
T Hey - E Ranard
R Teitelman - M Schaffel
11 C Schneider - C Schneider
2/3 M Bolgar - E Hunt
2/3 O Bigelow, Jr - J Orr
42 S Swope - C Sommer
3 J Kerr - A Gordon
FRI. EVE. OPEN PAIRS
A B C
11 C Sommer - S Swope
K Hwang - L Lau
S Corning - R Blair
22 A Hamilton-E Taylor
B Gorsey - J Pearson
3 M Witt - J Farwell
4 E Misner - J Misner
5 E Nagle - B Kliman
3 W Watson - M Raider
4 V Labbadia - R Benedict
SAT. MORNING A/X PAIRS
A $\mathbf{X}$
1 A Clamage - J Greer
2 L Bausher - S Becker
3 D Blackburn - H Feldheim
41 S Smith - D Rock
B Gorsey - J Pearson
2 C Graham - A Hummel
3/4 S Rodricks - S Seckinger
3/4 J Force - J Jacobs

## SAT MORNING B/C/D PAIRS

## B C D

1 M Stasiewski - D Tracy
H Stasiewski - D Tracy
H Kobernusz - D Burnham
2 J Tames - D Keller
$\begin{array}{lll}4 & 3 & 1 \\ 5 & \text { S Swope - C Sommer }\end{array}$
54 L Flesche - S Fruchter
652 J Mehta - O Chhabra 6/73/4 P Tierney - P Tierney 6/73/4 C Schneider - C Schneider

```
SAT. MORNING 199ER PAIRS
A B C
\(\begin{array}{ll}1 & 1 \\ M\end{array}\)
22 D Storey - D Bauman
S Werkheiser - B Caraceni
3 S Anthony - J Bacon
43 C Wieder - S Petrie
```

| SAT. AFT. A/X PAIRS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 1 |  | L Meyers - J Lowe |
| 2 |  | B Adler - L Lau |
| 3 |  | L Bausher - S Becker |
| 4 |  | J Hess - N France |
| 5 |  | J Pearson - B Gorsey |
|  | 1 | A Geaski - R Wolak |
|  | 2 | J Bentivegna - A R Mulukutla |
|  | 3 | D Rock - T Gerchman |

SAT. AFT. B/C/D PAIRS
B C D
$\begin{array}{llll}1 & 1 & 1 & \text { C Pokorski - P Leighton }\end{array}$
222 A Dezieck - Z Gidwitz
33 M Meyers - R Pomerantz
4/5 4/5 M Stasiewski - D Tracy
4/5 4/5 P Kreger - R Sellew
663 M Huttner - A Lovejoy
SAT. AFT. 299ER PAIRS
A B C
$\begin{array}{lll}1 & 1 & M\end{array}$
2/3 R Gencarelli - S Schiffres
2/3 R Klopp - B Harvey
421 R Minniear - S Byron
2 C Wieder - S Petrie

## SUN. FLIGHT A SWISS TEAMS

$1 \quad V$ King - J Stiefel - R DeMartino -
L Bausher
J Greer - M Lucey - A Crystal -
$3 \quad \begin{aligned} & \text { D Benner } \\ & \text { H Lawrence - F Blachowski - }\end{aligned}$
W Fontaine - A Clamage
4 B Adler - L Lau -
J Segal - A Wolf
5 J Williams - L Condon -
H Feldheim - R Wieland

## SUN. B/C/D SWISS TEAMS

B C D
$1 \quad 1 \quad 1$ A Dezieck - Z Gidwitz -
J Parks - E Mayberger
2 F Gilbert - R Shapiro -
C Pokorski - J Hess
3 L Wood - A Leshine -
F Kelly - C Yohans Jr
42 G Pedersen - V Goggin -
S Fruchter - L Flesche
5/6 3/4 2/3 R Klopp - B Harvey -
C Heckman - A R Mulukutla
5/63/42/3 M Hovell - B Whiting B Metzger - A Cadwallader
5/6 4 J Mehta - H Shah -
R Olson - S Carlsen
5/6 D Brueggemann - W K Graebe -
M Meyers - E Watstein

# A Simple Hand? 

by Nick France

Below is a simple hand I have recently added to my collection of Defensive Par hands. It doesn't seem that special but after you solve it, look at the comments in the last paragraph.


| South | West | North <br> Pass | East <br> Pass |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 2 | 3 | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Opening Lead: K
How many losers do you have? Four; one spade, one heart, and two clubs.

What can you do about it? One way is to take a winning heart finesse.

Is there anything better? Yes if you can get them to lead a heart for you, you won't have to guess.

How do you do this?
If you ruff out dummy's diamonds then the opponents can take a trump and two clubs and will either have to lead a heart or give you a ruff and slough as long as you have a trump left in both hands.
So do you pull trump right away? No, if you do that, the opponents might be smart enough to win the second trump lead and return a club. Now your only entries to dummy are trump. In order to ruff two diamonds you will have to use
dummy's last two trumps. When the opponents get in they will not be forced to lead a heart (a club or diamond from East is perfectly safe). You have to guess the hearts for yourself.
So what's the plan? Win the A and ruff a diamond high immediately. Now you can get back to dummy to ruff the last diamond and still have a trump left in both dummy and your hand when you finally lose your two clubs and the Ace of trump, end-playing whichever opponent is then on lead.

So what's the catch? Well, this hand was played in the final round of a Blue Ribbons event (you would think only experts left to play) and followed by Larry Cohen for Bridge World. Four spades was played 10 times in one section with West making a diamond bid and then leading the $\mathrm{K} \leqslant$ : Only 5 of the 10 declaring 'experts' got the problem right.
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