

## Representing

by Harold Feldheim

In poker, a large bet on a mediocre-to-terrible hand is an attempt to frighten the opposition by representing a more powerful hand to the other players. Of course, the other players have to decide whether or not our hero has a powerful hand or is bluffing in an effort to frighten the opposition into folding.
As with many other pasteboard tactics, this bluffing attempt has found its way into bridge, sometimes at a very subtle level. First, consider a bid to direct the defense. Assume you sit South and hold:

```
@ AKQ 7654
` J 4
* --
& J 872
```

The bidding goes:

| South | West | North | East |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| - | $2 \boldsymbol{~}$ | Pass | 2 |
| 2 | 3 | $4 \boldsymbol{~}$ | 5 |
| $?$ |  |  |  |

What to do? In a European championship, South found the excellent lead directing bid of $6 \boldsymbol{*}$. Now, East-
West could no longer bid the grand slam because South has told the table he could trump the opening diamond lead.
This is wonderful strategy and one of our own District 25 players, Walter Fontaine of North Providence, Rhode Island, found a way to infuse tactical poetry into this strategic coup.

Dealer: South
Vulnerability: North-South

```
NORTH
& 3
`K1087
A A5 3
& AQ652
```

SOUTH
© AK 2
-AQ643

- K 7
K 43

| South | West | North | East |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \checkmark$ | 3 - | 40* | 6 6e! |
| 6 | Pass | Pass | 6 |
| ? |  |  |  |

And there we are - same situation from the other side. South knows there are enough cards to make a grand slam but the vagaries of the distribution were in the way. South thought for a while about 7 NT but couldn't see his way to 13 tricks. So, reluctantly, South doubled and collected a mere 1100, poor even against a small slam. But if the hand was entertaining, the post-mortem was terrific. The complete hands:

```
NORTH
& $
` K 10 87
* A5 }
&AQ652
```

| WEST | EAST |
| :---: | :---: |
| ¢ Q J 10954 | - K 87 |
| $\checkmark$ J | ヤ952 |
| - Q 102 | - J 9864 |
| ¢ J 87 | ¢ 109 |

SOUTH

- AK 2
-AQ643
- K 7

是K43

By infusing tactical thought into strategy, East (Walter) represented a club void and this competitive psyche was enough to keep North-South out of either seven hearts, or seven no trump. The analysis was fun to follow.
"What were you going to do if they bid seven hearts anyway?"
"I guess I'd bid seven spades. It's still a cheap sacrifice."
"And what if they bid seven no trump?"
There was a silence. Then, "I guess I'd say nice bid."
And there the analysis ended.
5

## Governor's Cup Winner for 2012

Marsha Futterman is this year's winner of the Governor's Cup awarded annually to the person who wins the most master points at the CT Fall Sectional.


## Can't Cost - Chapter 33

by John Stiefel

In this deal from a recent National Mixed Board-a-Match Team event, West made an unusual "can't cost" play to present declarer with a losing option which she elected.

Dealer: South
Vulnerability: East-West

| South | West | North | East |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathbf{N P}^{1}$ | Pass | $1{ }^{2}$ | Pass |
| $1{ }^{\text {c }}$ | Pass | $2{ }^{3}$ | Pass |
| 3\% | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

${ }^{1} 17+\mathrm{HCP}$
${ }^{2}$ 0-7 HCP
${ }^{3} 3$-card spade support
Opening Lead: ?
On lead vs. 3NT, reached via the auction above, West held the following:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { \& } 753 \\
& \text { KJ74 } \\
& \text { J } 72 \\
& 765
\end{aligned}
$$

He selected the 2 as his lead for the following reasons.

1. The form of scoring was Board-aMatch, so overtricks were important.
2. The auction was strong and West held xxx in both of declarer's suits. So, the defense's goal was more likely to be to hold down overtricks than to actually defeat the contract.
3. The auction suggested that both opponents held heart honors.
Dummy (North) hit with the following hand (displayed above the West hand).

> | NORTH |
| :--- |
| \& 862 |
| A 742 |
| 1053 |
| K 105 |

WEST
\& 753

- KJ74
- J 72
\& 765
Partner won the opening lead with the A, declarer's Q falling, and returned the 6 , declarer's K winning.

At trick 3, declarer cashed the A , dummy playing the 2 and East the 4. Then he cashed the at trick 4, dummy playing the 5 and partner the 8. Trick 5 was a club to the K, partner showing out and discarding the 2 .

Declarer now played a club to his Q to trick 6, partner discarding another diamond. Before playing his mandatory $\boldsymbol{\$} 7$ to complete trick 6, West paused to plan his defense. (This was a good time to break tempo - when there was no possibility of giving "unauthorized information" to partner.)
Declarer clearly held 4-1-2-6 distribution and her singleton heart might well be the Q. Also her spade holding was likely to be AKJx, as her A play to trick 2 was seemingly made in hopes of dropping a stiff Q. So West was going to have to find 3 discards. It seemed "obvious" to discard the 7 and then the $\geqslant 4$ (standard signals) to show partner a good heart holding. The problem with that, however, was that it could induce East to unguard hearts. Then West would have to discard a low spade to trick 9 to keep his guards in hearts and diamonds and that might induce declarer to finesse in spades to take the rest of the tricks.
West realized that partner could guard hearts - as long as she kept two. So he discarded the $\boldsymbol{\vee}$ to trick 7 and the $\boldsymbol{\nabla}$ to trick 8 noting that partner had only discarded one heart up to this point.
When declarer led her last club to trick 9 , West followed through with his plan to unguard hearts to suggest the he, rather than partner, had the $\$$ Q. He started to play the $\mathbf{V}$ when he thought "If I'm going to come down to only 1 heart, how can it cost to discard the King instead of the Jack?" So he discarded the ${ }^{\text {V }}$ K to trick 9. This forced partner to keep $\geqslant 10$, 9 hearts and discard all her diamonds.

This was the 4-card ending.

|  | NORTH <br> 8 <br> - A 7 <br> - 10 <br> © - . |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WEST |  | EAST |
| ¢ 75 |  | - Q 4 |
| - J |  | -109 |
| - J |  | $\checkmark$ |
| \% - - |  |  |

> SOUTH
> $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ K J 4
> $\downarrow$ Q
> ..-
> $\mathbf{9} \ldots-$

All of a sudden, South had two additional options beside the "normal" play of leading to $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ to the $\geqslant \mathrm{A}$ and taking the spade finesse. New option 1 was to overtake the $\geqslant \mathrm{Q}$ with the $\nabla \mathrm{A}$ and cash the $\downarrow 7$ if it was good (she had watched carefully for spade discards but hadn't seen the need to watch for heart discards). If the 7 won, then West, if he had $\uparrow \mathrm{Qx}$ and $\downarrow$, would have to make a fatal discard to trick 11 . New option 2 was to lead the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ and let it win and perhaps get the A later. After some thought, she concluded that West held the $₫ \mathrm{Q}$ to account for his unusual $\vee \mathrm{K}$ discard. So she selected New option 1.
East was happy to win trick 11 with her $\vee$ 10. She had to lead a spade to trick 12 , but South, still convinced that West had the Q, went up with the A and held herself to 10 tricks.

At the other table, the opening lead was a low heart won by declarer's Q. So declarer easily made 12 tricks with the aid of the spade finesse. So the "can't cost" discard of the $\checkmark \mathrm{K}$ helped win the board.


# Negative Inference (4) 

Definition: Negative inference is information deduced from a player's failure to take a specific or expected action in the auction or play (Bridgeguys.com).
Often by paying very close attention to the auction, and using all the negative inferences (NI) available, it is possible to visualize a player's pattern. This can often be accomplished without referring to your own hand. The following two problems are presented in such a manner.
(A). Maeve Lucey and I, playing in the Hamden Swiss, defended the following hand against John Steifel and Rich DeMartino.

The auction proceeded:

| JS | ML | RDM | LL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dbl | Pass | 2NT | All Pass |

What were Rich's probable distributions?
A solution often begins with a very simple question: what was Rich's 5-card suit? Upon reflection, it was highly likely that Rich did NOT have a 5 -card suit. If he had had five spades, he most probably would have passed 2 Dbl (NI). If he had five cards in any of the remaining three suits he might have bid that suit (NI).
If Rich did not have a 5 card suit, then his distribution was limited to the following three generic patterns: 4-3-3-3, 4-4-3-2, 4-4-4-1. (see the second article in this series).
As it happened, Rich's pattern was $4=1=4=4$.
(B). Faye Marino and I had the following auction:

| LL | West | FM | East |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | 1 | Pass |
| $1 \boldsymbol{~}$ | Pass | $2{ }^{1}$ | Dbl $^{2}$ |
| Rdbl $^{3}$ | All Pass |  |  |

${ }^{1} 2$ was alerted as $4^{\text {th }}$ suit forcing ${ }^{2} \mathrm{Dbl}$ was lead directing showing diamonds
${ }^{3}$ Rdbl expressed a strong desire to play $2 \checkmark$ Rdbl if Faye could cooperate
What was my EXACT distribution?
The first question to resolve was the length of my diamond holding. With East showing between four and six diamonds, I most probably had four+ diamonds. If I had held only three diamonds and a stopper, I might have made an easy 2 NT bid (NI). Else I could have passed (forcing) to let Faye further describe her hand (NI). So the desire to play 2 Rdbl strongly suggested a holding of at least four (good) diamonds.
But if I had held four diamonds, and four spades, then why did I open 1? The fact that I did NOT open $1 \checkmark$ with four diamonds means that my clubs had to be longer (NI). The only pattern consistent with the auction was: $4=0=4=5$. At this point in the auction, the three players should have known my exact pattern!
The previous articles in this series focused on NI during an auction. The following problem highlights NI on defense. It would have been a difficult problem for almost all of us; only a very few top players in the CBA would have solved it "at the table." Never the less, this problem is well worth the study.

by Larry Lau



Problem: Al Wolf and I defended the following hand at the Rye regional against a strong player.


Trick one: $\mathbf{2} 6,3,9$ A.
Trick two: $\vee \mathrm{A}, 2^{*}, 4,6$ (*encourages a club return - "reverse Smith echo").
Trick three: $\boldsymbol{\vee} 8,3,9, \mathrm{Q}$
Trick four: $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 .}$
Construct South's and East's exact distribution. Assume South had exactly four spades, and 1 NT was $15-17 \mathrm{HCP}$.

## Milestones and Congratulations

New Life Masters
Trudi Brown
Karen Emott
Karen Harrison
Luisa Kelso
Elizabeth Nuki Joel Tames
Robert Taylor
Thomas Thompson
Linda Wyse
Sandra Zieky

Gold Life Master (2500 MP's)
Natalie Cohen
Elliot Ranard
Silver Life Master (1000 MP's)
Patricia Dettmer
Fredda Kelly
James Macomber Jean Orr
Janet Soskin
Lee Wilcox

Bronze Life Master (500 MP's) Pat Brasher
Margaret Garilli
Richard Lebel
Peter Marcus
Elizabeth Nuki
Thomas Proulx
Joan Stroup
Joel Tames
Sandra Zieky

## A Coup in the Auction

by Geoff Brod

 Senior Trials. The winner gets to go to Lille, France in August 2012 to represent the ACBL in the equivalent of the Bermuda Bowl for the old folks.

Your first match of the event went OK. Fifteen teams were entered and you survived the first round with an exciting come from behind victory to advance to the quarterfinals. Here you encounter the number one seed, a team captained by Mike Passell. You expect to have your work cut out for you and that's what happens.

Almost from board one things go wrong in one manner or another. After the end of the first segment of fifteen boards you find yourself down 21 imps . That's hardly the match however. There are six segments in all, 90 boards in total but as you proceed it doesn't get better. In fact you have been unable to outscore your opponents in any one of the first five segments and going into the last 15 boards you find yourself down 66 .

My sense of how to proceed in a situation like this has always been that you continue to try to play sound bridge and hope for some good things to happen, like a two-way finesse that your side gets right and the opponents get wrong. In general, wild preempts and first or second position psychic bids are much more likely to lose than gain. So you really look to avoid off-the-wall actions. What you do look for are opportunities to create swings with actions that while they may be anti-percentage are only modestly so. You hope for a number of these and for the swings to go in your favor.

In this situation you like your partnership's methods. For openers you are playing a weak notrump (12-14) and your one club opening can be as few as two in a balanced hand outside of the range for a no trump opening. That one club opening can include a hand with 5 diamonds and 332 distribution in the other suits, 15-19 HCP. Additionally your two diamond opening is 11-15 with some 4441 distribution that always includes 4 diamonds. If you get a few cards you should be able to create auctions that will not be duplicated at the other table. That's what you want: differences in the hope that they will create swings.

Immediately things start to go better. You have several good results and you estimate that you have picked up 25-30 IMPs. Not bad but a far cry from the 67 you need to win. Finally you come to the $12^{\text {th }}$ board of the set. Just four more chances to beat the other team. You pick up:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { a } 1063 \\
& 108764 \\
& \text { S } 874
\end{aligned}
$$

That's a pretty dismal collection. Everybody's vulnerable and your partner opens 1NT. That's 12-14 remember. Remarkably it goes pass on your right. What are your thoughts?
Your first reaction should be that they have a minimum of 25 HCP and that it has to be close to $100 \%$ that they are cold for a game, most likely 3 NT but possibly 4 or even 5 . Second, there is a decent chance that whatever you do here they may be able to extract a large penalty or, barring that, bid to their most likely game, whatever that may be.
The normal action here would be to transfer to hearts and hope that they aren't able to penalize you and perhaps have some mix-up where they fail to bid their game. Actually you aren't too worried about being penalized in hearts, although it certainly could happen. So your thoughts turn to trying to do something to keep them out of game. A transfer to hearts isn't likely work too well. Almost all expert pairs play that a double of two diamonds shows a hand that would have doubled a weak no trump in the direct position. That's probably what would happen here.
You consider Stayman but almost instantly reject it. There are many problems with the continuations. You would have to bid $2 \downarrow$ over a 2 response and that would invite a correction to $2 \boldsymbol{s}$ by partner with three spades and only two hearts. Also, Stayman does not impede the opponents very much. Again, a double by your LHO would show not clubs but a hand that would double a weak NT in the direct position.
Finally it occurs to you to Texas into $4 \boldsymbol{V}$. Think about it. Usually this would show a hand with long hearts and some high cards that would hope to have a fair chance of making. One of its appeals is that it does not announce weakness. You can not unreasonably hope to catch the
opponents with two balanced hands in the neighborhood of 12-14 HCP where neither of them has any obvious action over the transfer.

So you do it. Your LHO hesitates briefly and passes. Partner dutifully takes the transfer, again it goes pass on your right, you put the green card on the table and hope for another green card on your left. You are hoping to go down 200 or 300 undoubled against +600 or +620 at the other table.
Alas, not unexpectedly, it goes double. Now think about that for a minute from the perspective of the opponents. Is this for penalty or takeout? Have they ever talked about it? I have to confess that I've never discussed it with any partner. It's not as if this comes up every other session in duplicate. In any event, there's a good chance for a misunderstanding. I of course am rooting for the takeout interpretation.
Partner passes of course and much to your delight, your RHO bids 4ヶ. You breathe a sigh of relief but that's shortlived as when it comes back to partner he puts the red card on the table. Oh well, if they don't score overtricks that's just - 790 compared to the -620 you were booked for.
Actually that's much too pessimistic an assessment. For a hand with just a jack, you have a lot of defensive potential. You have a singleton to lead and three trumps and it's even possible on some layouts that the 10 could be promoted into a trick. So you lead your diamond. Partner has the magic hand. Declarer wins the diamond but partner holds $\boldsymbol{A K}$ and the $\boldsymbol{A}$ and you are able to negotiate two diamond ruffs to achieve +500 , a tremendous result. The opponents were jockeyed into a 4-3 spade fit and were cold for 3 NT. You gain 12 IMPs on the board.
But it's not enough. While both you and your teammates have good cards you pick up just 43 IMPs and fall short by 23. Still it was a good run. How would 4 doubled have fared? I don't know. I'm afraid to compute the result.


# Bridge at the Lunatic Fringe\#20: 1NT - 2S Invitational 

by Alan Wolf

Starting with this article, I'll begin a series of articles on bidding gadgets, i.e., minor add-ons to your bidding arsenal that may prove effective.
This article deals with a change to the way of playing 4 -suit transfers over 1NT. With this gadget, the bid of $2 \boldsymbol{\sim}$ over 1 NT is NOT a transfer to clubs, but is instead an inquiry about the strength of the opening NT bidder's hand. With a minimum NT opening, opener rebids 2 NT, with a maximum, $3 \boldsymbol{2}$. These bids say nothing about opener's club holding.
Responder generally makes this 2 bid with one of two sorts of hands:
(a) A hand lacking a 4-card major, that is worthy of a NT invitation, i.e. about 9 HCP .
(b) A weak hand with long clubs, looking to play $3 \mathbf{2}$. Note: when the bidding starts 1NT-2 2NT, opener must pass a $3 \boldsymbol{c}$ bid by responder.
If responder's intent was the NT invitation, he will pass opener's 2NT rebid, and will bid 3 NT over opener's $3 \boldsymbol{2}$.
The main advantage of this gadget is that it avoids responder having to go through the Stayman convention in order to make a NT invitation, a standard practice when playing 4 -suit transfers. When responder does not have a 4-card major himself, the response to Stayman is of no interest to him, but may be helpful to the opponents. For example, after 1NT-2
$2-2 \mathrm{NT}$, the opening leader is on alert not to lead a heart, even though it might have been the normal lead were it not for the artificial 2 bid. 1NT-2 serves to conceal opener's major suit holding.
The disadvantage of this approach is that responder cannot find out about opener's club holding. Playing normal 4 -suit transfers, a system of either "preacceptance" or "acceptance" provides this information, which on rare occasions may get the partnership to a marginal NT game.
Occasionally, the 1 NT- 2 gadget may be used in lieu of a direct 4NT slam invitation, and allow opener to play in 3 NT when he would decline a slam invite. An example:

> NORTH
> (Minna)
> \& Q 73
> A 9
> A K Q 4
> s J 942
> SOUTH
> (Majorca)
> A J 52
> Q 8
> J 52
> A K 107

Playing in a team game, Majorca and Minna employed this gadget, bidding as follows:

| South | West | North | East |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1NT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

When Majorca as South showed a minimum for her opening NT bid, North settled for 3NT, which as it happened was not assured on the opening heart lead, even with a combined 31 HCP .
Majorca hopefully played low on the opening heart lead, and lost to the King. When a heart came back, she had only eight tricks on top, and needed to develop the ninth without giving up the lead. Either of the two black suit finesses was possible, but Majorca found the winning line by giving herself an extra chance. She cashed the A and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ K, hoping to drop the $\boldsymbol{\mathcal { L }} \mathrm{Q}$ (a $40 \%$ chance), planning to fall back on the spade finesse if the Q did not drop. As it happened, the Queen did drop, West having started with Queen doubleton, and Majorca now rolled home with an overtrick.

At the other table, the bidding was 1NT 4 NT , passed out. After the heart lead and continuation, declarer needed two additional tricks, and the club finesse offered by far the better chance for that. So declarer tried the club finesse, losing to the Q . This resulted in two down, and provided a big swing for the Minna/ Majorca team.

## 2012 CALENDAR

## NOVEMBER

1, Thurs. Daytime

2-4, Fri.-Sun.

14-18, Wed.-Sun.

Unit-wide
Championship, Local Clubs
Jeff Feldman Memorial, Hamden, CT
New England
Masters Regional,
Mansfield, MA

## DECEMBER

Nov. 22- Dec. $2 \quad$ ACBL Fall Nationals,
Thurs. $-1^{\text {st }}$ Sun. San Francisco, CA 26, Mon. Evening

| 5, Wed. Daytime | Unit-wide <br> Championship, <br> Local Clubs |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Local (Split) |  |
| Championship, Mon. Daytime | Local Clubs |
| 11, Tues. Evening | Local (Split) <br> Championship, |
| 14, Fri. Daytime | Local Clubs <br> Unit-wide Charity, <br> Local Clubs |

## Hartford Bridge Club News

In November of 2010 the Hartford Bridge Club initiated a $0-50$ master point game to complement our long standing Thursday afternoon instructional game. We opened with four tables, employed a supportive and understanding director and introduced "fledgling" players to a competitive yet friendly environment.
The game has grown to an average of fifteen tables and continues to expand from month to month. As players have accumulated master points and as word has spread, the Club has gradually raised the master point ceiling to a present limit of 199. Computer printouts of the day's hands are available at the close of the game and the director is available to answer questions and offer constructive advice.

If you are interested in improving your game and have fewer than 200 master points we would love to introduce you to our tables. For further information please call us at (860) 953-3177. Games are held weekly on Fridays from 1:30 to $4: 30$ p.m. Every effort is made to accommodate a player who arrives without a partner; a phone call in advance is advised.

## Wee Burn News

Throughout the fall and for the winter series all games will be held at the Main Club on Thursday at 12:45 PM.
Summer series winners were:

1. Linda Cleveland-Susan Mayo
2. Jean Thoma-Karen Barrett
3. Janet Soskin-Betty Hodgman
4. Joan Hoben-Carol Davidson
5. Brooke Megrue-Kathie Rowland
6. Lois Berry-Ann Fuller

Players with fewer than twenty master points are encouraged to join the newplicate group which meets at the same time as the regular game each week, but is of shorter duration.

## Bridge Forum (Hamden) <br> \section*{Third Quarter News}

## TUESDAY

Leading Pairs: Rita Brieger-Harold Miller continue to set a record-breaking pace. Brian Lewis-Bill Reich, after an absence of some months, began playing again towards the end of this quarter and regained second place. Howard Cohen-Pat Rogers, just behind Bill and Brian, have a modest cushion over the chasing pack. Jon Ingersoll is the only player with two partnerships in the top ten.
Player-of-the-Year: Thanks to an $80 \%$ score the week she played with Simon Rich, Rita will probably remain ahead of Harold. Riding a lengthy hot streak, however, Jon has nearly caught them both. Fredda Kelly and Don Stiegler round out the top five.
Van Dyke Cup Preliminaries: We appear headed towards our first finish in which all the finalists have won this cup before. Leaders Jon Ingersoll, Bob Hawes, Fredda Kelly and Louise Wood have won nine times between them, all in the last eleven years. Jon and Bob, who fortunately are due not to be partners in the final week, are significantly ahead.

## FRIDAY

Leading Pairs: While Tuesday has been no contest, Friday has been a whirlwind. Harold Miller-Burt Saxon were leading at the end of August, and have been in second place every week since. The lead has passed to Breta Adams-Karlene Wood, Hill Auerbach-Larry Stern, Norma and Stan Augenstein, and finally back to Hill and Larry.

Player-of-the-Year: Harold and Burt, would be the first pair to tie for Player- of-the-Year playing exclusively together. They just inched ahead of Stan (who played twice with Robert Klopp, preventing this being a two-pair contest) in the last game of the quarter. Arlene Leshine and Larry Stern are within reach of the lead with a consistent fourth quarter or inconsistency from the leaders.

Reynolds Cup Preliminaries: This competition is looking likely to finish with an all-male final, the winner joining Carl Yohans in 2005 and the late Morse Ginsberg in 2000 in keeping the women from a clean sweep. Seven men and only three women remain, with Larry Stern well in front and top woman Vera Wardlaw in seventh place. But seventime winner and defending champion Louise Wood has survived this far, and can never be counted out.

## TUESDAY/FRIDAY COMBINED

Overall Player-of-the-Year: The last game of September was very good to Harold Miller. Not only did he and Burt Saxon take the Friday lead after that game, he also inched back ahead of Rita Brieger for the Overall lead. Harold was the top player for the summer quarter, with Jon Ingersoll and Bernard Gee second and third. Overall, Harold and Rita would almost have to stop playing to give Louise Wood, Robert Klopp or Fredda Kelly in third through fifth places a chance to catch up. Last year, Fredda was almost exactly this far ahead in the middle of July when she had to miss several months, and her lead lasted until the end of September.


## IN MEMORIUM

Connecticut residents as listed in the ACBL Bridge Bulletin

Melvin L. Cantor<br>Lawrence A. Gochberg<br>Christopher E. Teehan



by Gloria Sieron

It's only the second round at a recent club game. On the first board you bid and make three hearts. When you open the traveler, you find that the previous North/South pair bid the game and made it defended by a very competent East/West pair. Here's the hand.

You should probably cover North, East and South hands before you go on.

> NORTH
> ↔ Q 3
> J 9753
> 83
> \& K 842

| WEST |  | EAST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ J 875 |  | ¢ 10962 |
| - K 4 |  | - 86 |
| - A J 32 |  | - KQ 65 |
| A93 |  | * 1075 |
|  | SOUTH |  |
|  | ¢ AK 4 |  |
|  | - A Q 102 |  |
|  | - 1097 |  |
|  | Q J 6 |  |

With North the dealer the bidding was simple: Pass, pass, one notrump, pass,
two diamonds (transfer), pass, three hearts, passed out. How the first pair got to game will be shrouded in mystery forever. How did the game make? Why that's easy. West must have led a spade. Declarer gets to throw off one of dummy's diamond losers on the spade winners. I asked several experienced East pairs if they had doubled North's transfer bid for a diamond lead. They each said they thought East's hand was too weak.

Barbara Kirtley sat West at my table. She said, "Would you like to know why I led the A ? Years ago I attended lessons given by Roy Erickson (a director and teacher in Western Connecticut). This is what I learned from Roy. I have a 13 HCP opening bid. The notrump bidder has an announced range of 16 to 18. Let's give him 17. 17 plus 13 equals 30. Therefore, there are 10 high card points distributed between dummy and my partner East. I wanted to get a look at the board so I could get a better idea of how to defend."

Sure enough, East could signal high perhaps even with the King. Two diamonds one club and the King of hearts held the contract to three.

Barbara added that her alternative lead would have been the A. Seeing the K in the dummy, she would shift to the A and receive the encouraging signal.
Absent the lead encouraging double of the transfer bid, were you able to analyze the opening lead in West's position? Or, did you choose to lead a spade as many West's did?



RESULTS

```
        UNIT-WIDE CHAMPIONSHIP
        Friday July 27, 2012
FLIGHT A EVENT LEADERS
    John Stiefel - Richard DeMartino
    Ed Rosenfield - Arthur Rosenfield M.D.
    Julius Fuster - Pete Amedeo
    Margaret Karbovanec - Diane Storey
    Paula Beauchamp - Dot Grogan
    Laurie Robbins - Rachel Brown
    Helen Walker - Doris Andrews
FLIGHT B EVENT LEADERS
1 Ed Rosenfield -
    Arthur Rosenfield M.D.
Julius Fuster - Pete Amedeo
3 Margaret Karbovanec - Diane Storey
4 \text { Helen Walker - Doris Andrews}
5 Judith Voss - Annet Bonfanti
6 Paul Grande - Howard Gelin
FLIGHT C EVENT LEADERS
1 Ed Rosenfield -
    Arthur Rosenfield M.D.
2 Judith Voss - Annet Bonfanti
3 Paul Grande - Howard Gelin
Marilyn Zolot - Vicki Rethy
5 Rebecca Jacobson - Susan Lewis
6 Jackie Del Negro - Bob Nardello
    UNIT-WIDE CHAMPIONSHIP
        Tuesday July 31, }201
FLIGHT A EVENT LEADERS
    Judith Hyde - Aldona Siuta
    Geoffrey Brod - Joel Krug
    Virginia Naugler - Bob Gruskay
    Judith Merrill - Lois Labins
    David Margolin - Larry Wallowitz
6 Susan Pflederer - Lesley Meyers
FLIGHT B EVENT LEADERS
    Judith Hyde - Aldona Siuta
    Judith Merrill - Lois Labins
3 Penny Skenderian - Mary Ann Downes
Carl Palmer - George Holland
5 Jerry Hirsch - JoAnn Scata
6 Fred Stein - Louis Brown
```


## FLIGHT C EVENT LEADERS

```
        Patricia Shimkus - Sandy DeGregorio
        Patricia Schackner - George Pollard
        Robert Neff - Bob Meisel
        Martin Arnold - Pam Blawie
        Richard Fronapfel - Bob Rowley
6 Barbara Falkin - Howard Falkin
        FRIDAY UNIT-WIDE SESSION
        September 14, }201
FLIGHT A EVENT LEADERS
1 Donna Lyons - J Sun-Ming Lee
2 Hillel Auerbach - Lawrence Stern
3/4 Norma Augenstein - Stanley Augenstein
3/4 Stan Gedansky - Bill Titley
5 Robert Klopp - V Wardlaw
6 Thomas Hey - Don Stiegler
Lea Selig - Helen Pawlowski
FLIGHT B EVENT LEADERS
    Donna Lyons - J Sun-Ming Lee
    Hillel Auerbach - Lawrence Stern
    Norma Augenstein - Stanley Augenstein
    Robert Klopp - V Wardlaw
    Mark Moskovitz - Peter Carroll
    Joan Stroup - Elizabeth Nuki
```


## FLIGHT C EVENT LEADERS

1 Donna Lyons - J Sun-Ming Lee
2 Mark Moskovitz - Peter Carroll
3 George Levinson - Lucy Lacava
4 Woody Bliss - Leonard Messman
5 Paul Grande - Howard Gelin
6 Monica Akelaitis - Marg Fiedler
UNIT-WIDE CHAMPIONSHIP
Thursday, September 20, 2012
FLIGHT A EVENT LEADERS
1 Thomas Lorch - Reginald Harvey
2 Ed Meyer - Peter Hussey
3 Nancy Bartone - Susan Seckinger
4 Robert Lahey - J Michael Carmiggelt
5 Margaret Mason - Constance Graham
$6 \quad$ Charles Halpin - Terry Fidler
7 Marilyn Goldberg - Dot Grogan
FLIGHT B EVENT LEADERS
1 Ed Meyer - Peter Hussey
2 Robert Lahey - J Michael Carmiggelt
3 Belinda Metzger - Mary Ellen McGuire
4 Duncan Rowland - Scott Hutchason
5 Rodney Aspinwall - Margot Hayward
6 David Mordy - Joe Holmes
FLIGHT C EVENT LEADERS
1 Ed Meyer - Peter Hussey
2 Duncan Rowland - Scott Hutchason
3 David Mordy - Joe Holmes
4 Lynn Reilly - Joan Bergen
5 Catherine Tomasello - Kathryn Ferguson
6 Elizabeth Stumpp - Ellen Beveridge
UNIT-WIDE CHAMPIONSHIP
September 25, 2012
FLIGHT A EVENT LEADERS
1 Richard Blair - Connie Graham
2 Robert Klopp - Barbara Henningson
3 Laurie Robbins - Reginald Harvey
4 Howard Zusman - Allan Wolf
5 Lesley Meyers - Susan Pflederer
6 Lee Getz - Nusrat Rizvi
7 Eric Vogel - Irene Rivers

## FLIGHT B EVENT LEADERS

1 Robert Klopp - Barbara Henningson
Lee Getz - Nusrat Rizvi
3 Eric Vogel - Irene Rivers
4 Richard Fronapfel - Susan Fronapfel
5 Roger Crean - Sandra Gould
6 Bob Meisel - Judy Williams

## FLIGHT C EVENT LEADERS

## Eric Vogel - Irene Rivers

2 Richard Fronapfel - Susan Fronapfel
3 Peter Carroll - Mark Moskovitz
4 Nancy Ramseyer - John O'Shea
5 Sherri Mehler-Carten - Diana Genung
6 Mary Murphy - Patricia Schackner

## SUMMER IN CONNECTICUT

Greenwich, August 17-19, 2012

## Friday AM Open Pairs

1 Richard DeMartino William Ehlers
$2 \begin{array}{lll}2 & 1 & 1\end{array}$ Thomas Proulx - Robert Hartman
2 Elise Luskin - Amy Frolick Robert Stayman - Ann Van Dyke
32 Bruce Adler - Richard Tisch Steven Lockwood - Jill Marshall

```
M Margery Binder - Jack Binder
5 George Trost - William Sigward
6 4 Barry Kaplan - Jay Kaplan
5 \text { Judith Lapolla - Douglas Dill}
6 \text { Peter Carroll - Mark Moskovitz}
```


## Friday AM Senior Pairs

## 1 Sallie Abelson -

``` Barbara Loprete
            Sharon Santow - Thomas Hey
    1 Donna Doyle - Carol Kesmodel
            Bobby Rose - Jane Finn
            Robert Zipf - Joan Carter
            Gloria Sieron - Jatin Mehta
    2 Barbara Dempsey - Carol Ducret
            Diane Storey - Marvin Lerman
3 Sandra Bandler - James Bandler
Diane Mott - Lynne Forrest
5 Betsey Relyea - Karen Harrison
```


## Friday PM Senior Pairs

```
11 Rebecca Margulies - Susan Fisher
Kenneth Hirshon - Kenneth Abelson
Sallie Abelson - Barbara Loprete
Jatin Mehta - Gloria Sieron
22 Margaret Karbovanec -
Rebecca Jacobson
Fred Hawa - Susan Pfeister
3 Mort Amstel - David Katzman
4 Luisa Kelso - Margaret Molwitz
5 Elaine Misner - James Misner
Robert Zipf - Joan Carter
3 Donna Doyle - Carol Kesmodel
4 Gordon Mackenzie Jr - Lola Meyers
5 Nancy Brookman - Marina Engel
```

Friday PM Open Pairs
1 Steven Lockwood -
Jill Marshall
2 Dean Montgomery -
Allan Clamage
$\begin{array}{lll}3 & 1 & 1\end{array}$ Thomas Proulx -
Robert Hartman
Casey Stern - Judy Gruenberger
Diana Wendy - Ellen Berger
Linda Green - David Blackburn
Fern Lindsay - John Farwell
2 Judith Lapolla - Douglas Dill
3 George Trost - William Sigward
4 Suzanne Curtis - Timothy Curtis
5 Deborah Kessler - Mary Case

## Saturday AM A/X Pairs

1 Bob Gwirtzman - Glenn Robbins
21 Jill Marshall - Bob Rebelein
3/4 Jiang Gu - Sharon Goldman
3/4 Lawrence Lau - Brett Adler
52 Jerome Miller - Bud Rottman
63 Paul Burnham - Farley Mawyer
4 Susan Seckinger - Susan Rodricks
5 Joan Martin - Lois Zeisler

## Saturday AM B/C Pairs

1 Hasida Korper - Dorothy Kaplan
Mary Sue Saltsman - Leia Berla
1 Daniel Fromm - Jake Neuthaler
2 Susan Fronapfel - Richard Fronapfel
Jeffrey Allen - Theo Allen
Diane Storey - Marvin Lerman
3 Dale Rowett - Cherry McLaughlin
4 Susan Schnur - Jean Frankel
5 Hazel Heggie - Dona Seutter

RESULTS continued


## Saturday PM B/C Pairs

1 Hazel Heggie - Mary Leinbach
Terry Lubman - Fern Lindsay
Thomas Hey - Katharine Goodman
Elaine Misner - James Misner
Leia Berla - Mary Sue Saltsman
1 Susan Fronapfel -
Richard Fronapfel
2 Jake Neuthaler - Daniel Fromm
3 Diane Mott - Lynne Forrest
4 Karen Harrison - Betsey Relyea

## Saturday PM 299er Pairs

Jan White - Lou Filippetti
1 Sharon Phillips - Cathy Dann Randi Margolin - Alan Margolin Ilene Mankoff - Harvey Skolnick Walt Rinehart - Jackie Scott
G Stephen Thoma - Ron Freres
21 Thomas Walker -
Scott Hutchason
3 Judy Helderman - Sherry Lieb
42 Karlene Wood - Breta Adams

## Sunday A/X Swiss

1 Melih Ozdil, Justine Cushing, Sharon Goldman, Jiang Gu
2 Glenn Robbins, Ira Ewen, Michael Rosen, Bob Gwirtzman
3 Lawrence Lau, Allan Wolf,
Frances Schneider,
Bernard Schneider
41 Gloria Sieron, Ann Cady, Jatin Mehta, Joan Martin
2/3 Lynn Condon, Sonja Smith,
David Rock, Solomon Field
2/3 Paul Burnham, Jason Rotenberg,
Farley Mawyer, Thomas Proulx

## B/C Swiss

1/2 Lu Ganley, Jane Finn,
Susan Klein, Robert Krissoff

| 1/2 |  | Robert Derr |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Susan Smith, Michael Smith |
| 3 |  | James Misner, Elaine Misner, |
| 4 |  | Vivian Wu, Victor Mazmanian, Terry Lubman, Linda Green |
| 1 |  | Deborah Noack, John Farwell, Jean Schiaroli, Robert Rising |
|  |  | Georgeann Kishner, Stanley Kishner, Richard Fronapfel, Susan Fronapfel |
|  | 2 | Susan Grosz, John Grosz, Karen Sanders, Jan White |
|  |  | CT AUTUMN SECTIONAL <br> Hartford, October 5-7, 2012 |

## Friday AM Open Pairs

Clayton Parker - Edith Parker
Larry Bausher -
Richard DeMartino
31 Beverly Saunders -
Vera Gerard
$\begin{array}{llll}4 & 2 & 1 & \text { Ronald Talbot - Lincoln May }\end{array}$ Tom Joyce - Marsha Futterman
6
Cynthia Michael -
Margaret Mason
32 Adish Jain - Asha Jain
4/5 Robert Gruskay - Selma Moffie
4/5 Linda Green - David Blackburn
$6 \quad 3$ Marge Pane - Irene Rivers
4 Michael Marcy - Shari Peters
Friday AM Senior Pairs
1 Lesley Meyers -
William Watson
Mary Petit - Elizabeth Nagle David Benjamin - Gloria Sieron
Marilyn Goldberg - Shirley Gerber
11 Phyllis Curcio - Carol Tellar Sarah Budds -
Kathleen Frangione
Richard Sieron - Laurel Koegel
2 Sarah Smedes - George Smedes Marie Abate - Betty Ustanowski Paul Miller - Katharine Goodman Lea Selig - Aldona Siuta
3 Donna Lyons - J Sun-Ming Lee
4 Betty Payton - Barbara Clark
Friday PM Senior Pairs
1 Paul Miller - Katharine Goodman Lesley Meyers - William Watson
21 Dinesh Gupta - Sidney Keller
32 Alan Godes - Karen Barnett
Marilyn Goldberg - Shirley Gerber
Mary Petit - Elizabeth Nagle
43 Phyllis Curcio - Carol Tellar
54 Carol Kirsheman -
William Kirsheman
Friday PM Open Pairs
1 Larry Bausher -
Richard DeMartino
2 Tom Joyce - Marsha Futterman
3 Constance Graham -
Richard Blair
41 Carolyn Joseph -
Judith Merrill
Judy Maravolo-Foote Donald Foote
$6 \quad$ Geoffrey Brod - Victor King

| 1 | Richard Roth - Liz Brian |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Beverly Saunders - Vera Gerard |
| 2 | Larry Levy - Loretta Levy |
| 3 | Betty Kerber - Donald Muller |
|  | Judith Hyde - Richard Benedict |
| 4/6 Roz Sternberg - Anant Patel |  |
| 4/6 Shari Peters - Michael Marcy |  |
| 4/6 Lincoln May - Ronald Talbot |  |

## Saturday AM A/X Pairs

1 Donald Foote -
Judy Maravolo-Foote
2 Douglas Doub - Carolyn Joseph
3 Larry Bausher - Phyllis Bausher
4/5 1/2 Constance Graham -
Alice Hummel
4/5 1/2 Edwin Lewis III - Thomas Hyde
$6 \quad 3$ William Titley - Richard Blair
4 Susan Seckinger - Susan Rodricks

## Saturday AM B/C Pairs

1 Shirley Derrah - Robert Derrah
Larry Wallowitz - Paula Beauchamp
1 Carol Hill - Lila Englehart
2 Allen Bast - Jacob Bast
Partab Makhijani - Dinesh Gupta
H Lane Jr - Arthur Giovannangeli
3 Sarah Smedes - Jacquelyn Del Negro
4 Margery Gussak - Norma Healy
Saturday AM 299er Pairs
11 Eric Vogel - Irene Rivers
22 Alan Godes - Karen Barnett
33 Janice Martinez - Lou Filippetti
Janet Bannister -
Suzanne McMullen
541 Bernd Selig -
David Brandwein
5 Mary Beth Murphy -
Patricia Shimkus
2 Haroula Dobyns - Judi Zucker
3 Georgeann Kishner Stanley Kishner

## Saturday PM B/C Pairs

1 Larry Wallowitz -
Paula Beauchamp
21 Sarah Smedes -
Jacquelyn Del Negro
Muriel Dane - Myrna Butler
Michael Wavada - Peter Katz
Marylin Noll - Lea Selig
Susan Smith - Michael Smith
2 Allen Bast - Jacob Bast
3 Richard Fronapfel - Susan Fronapfel
4 Stephen Shamroth -
Elizabeth Shamroth
5 Alan Berg - Jean Berg

## Saturday PM 299er Pairs

1 Jerry Hackman -
Joyce Handleman
1 Alan Godes - Karen Barnett
Sandra DeGregorio -
James Larson
Mary Whittemore -
Jesse Whittemore
Irene Rivers - Eric Vogel
$\begin{array}{lll}2 & & \text { Irene Rivers - Eric } \\ 3 & 1 & \text { Bonnie Murphy - }\end{array}$
Randall Murphy

42 Stanley Kishner Georgeann Kishner
53 Karlene Wood - Breta Adams
4 Judi Zucker - Haroula Dobyns

## Saturday PM A/X Pairs

1 Marsha Futterman Hilda Silverman
Allan Wolf - Russell Friedman
31 Susan Rodricks - Susan Seckinger
42 William Titley - Richard Blair
53 Ausra Geaski - Bunny Kliman
64 Elizabeth Lincoln - John Sedgwick
Sunday B/C Swiss Teams
1 Michael Smith, Susan Smith, Robert Derrah, Shirley Derrah
2 Paul Miller, Linda Green,
Fern Lindsay, Terry Lubman
31 Loretta Levy, Larry Levy, Dinesh Gupta, Eugene Coppa
4/5 2/3 Susan Fronapfel, Richard Fronapfel, Sandra Gould, Roger Crean
4/5 2/3 Michael Wavada, Michael Dworetsky, Jerry Hirsch, Kenneth Leopold
4 Norma Healy, Margery Gussak, Patricia Schackner, Mary Murphy

## Sunday A/X Swiss Teams

1 Franklin Merblum, Sheila Gabay, Victor King, Alan Applebaum
21 Burton Gischner, Janet Gischner, Thomas Proulx, Paul Burnham
3 Marsha Futterman, Hilda Silverman, Yeong-Long Shiue, Tom Joyce
4 Allan Wolf, Maeve Lucey, Lawrence Lau, John Segal
2 Zachary Grossack, Donald Caplin, Joyce Pearson, Jori Grossack
3/5 Bill Reich, Brian Lewis, Robert Hawes, Simon Rich
3/5 Deborah Noack, Gary Seckinger, Robert Rising, John Farwell
3/5 James Osofsky, Ausra Geaski, Michael Heider, Bunny Kliman

UNIT 126 199ER SECTIONAL
W. Hartford, October 14, 2012 Sunday AM 199er Pairs
$1 \quad$ Brian Fisher - Flo Fisher

21 Jonathan Clark -
Lillian Serrano
3 Maxine Cechvala - Marlene Myers
2 Bob Butterfoss - Judy Goff
5 John Dinius - Dennis Jacobs
63 Jan Rosow - Barbara Mindell
Wayne Sherman - Jim Eck
1 Edward Kwash Sharon Kwash
6 Maureen Mullane Barbara White
2 Carol Magowan - Ruth Adams
3 Kate Beatty - Ann Patton
4 Tony Mortimer -
Edward Vandeventer
5 Nancy Stangel -
Barbara Edelstein
Sunday PM 199er Pairs

| 1 |  |  | Judy Collins - Lise Dutil |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | 1 |  | Wayne Sherman - Jim Eck |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | John Calderbank - |
|  |  |  | Nancy Calderbank |
| $4 / 5$ | $3 / 4$ |  | Jonathan Clark - Lillian Serrano |
| $4 / 5$ | $3 / 4$ |  | Doug Vagts - Joyce Vagts |
| 6 | 5 | 2 | John Price - Kathleen Price |
|  | 6 | 3 | Mary Carsky - Jan Shapiro |
|  |  | $4 / 5$ | Kate Beatty - Ann Patton |
|  |  | $4 / 5$ Tony Mortimer - |  |
|  |  |  |  |


| 1 | 23370.65 | Richard DeMartino |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | 19057.58 | John Stiefel |
| 3 | 17796.90 | Harold Feldheim |
| 4 | 14660.91 | Douglas Doub |
| 5 | 10442.85 | Larry Bausher |
| 6 | 10309.82 | Victor King |
| 7 | 10297.93 | Geoffrey Brod |
| 8 | 8609.68 | Franklin Merblum |
| 9 | 7355.69 | Marvin Rosenblatt |
| 10 | 6697.32 | Steve Becker |
| 11 | 6448.65 | Lawrence Lau |
| 12 | 5977.79 | Hilda Silverman |
| 13 | 5708.13 | Allan Clamage |
| 14 | 5630.33 | Arthur Waldmann |
| 15 | 5138.53 | Marilyn Goldberg |
| 16 | 5043.55 | Franklin Silver |
| 17 | 4871.21 | Jane Smith |
| 18 | 4320.14 | Don Stiegler |
| 19 | 4290.70 | Allan Rothenberg |
| 20 | 4243.58 | Bernard Schneider |
| 21 | 4215.68 | Cynthia Michael |
| 22 | 4192.65 | Sandra DeMartino |
| 23 | 4160.54 | Sarah Budds |
| 24 | 4150.90 | Janet Gischner |
| 25 | 4149.34 | Stephen Earl |
| 26 | 3873.99 | Jeff Horowitz |
| 27 | 3850.33 | Joan Brod |
| 28 | 3830.69 | Frank Blachowski |
| 29 | 3808.89 |  |
| 30 | 3688.31 | Setty Jane Corbani |
| 31 | 3668.35 | Doris Greenman Goldman |
| 32 | 3622.45 | Pat Hartman |
| 33 | 3492.46 | Dot Grogan |
| 34 | 3492.37 | Allan Wolf |
| 35 | 3444.90 | David Ehler |
| 36 | 3434.67 | Richard Wieland |
| 37 | 3422.02 | Gloria Sieron |
| 38 | 3416.96 | Tom Joyce |
| 39 | 3392.37 | Frances Schneider |
| 40 | 3353.24 | Maeve Lucey |
| 41 | 3321.13 | Charles Halpin |
| 42 | 3314.27 | Lesley Meyers |
|  |  |  |



Tom Proulx with the B Winner trophy at the Greenwich Sectional

## Kibitzer Editor Wins Prize

Tom Proulx, editor of the CBA newsletter Kibizter, snagged the top honors at the recent CBA tournament held in Greenwich on August 17, 18,19 . Tom won the huge trophy, pictured, for capturing the most points for the tournament awarded to B players.
Tom scored above $60 \%$ at each session of the Friday game playing with Robert Hartman, CEO of the ACBL, who was visiting the Connecticut Sectional over the weekend. Robert played both sessions with Tom handily beating the field.
Robert didn't fare so well on either Saturday or in Sunday's Swiss. But Tom, playing on Sunday with longtime partner Jason Rotenberg teamed with Paul Burnham and Farley Mawyer to come in $2 / 3$ in the A/X game for another $4+$ master points giving him the weekend B category win. The Proulx team tied with another Connecticut four-some: Gloria Sieron, Ann Cady, Jatin Mehta, and Joan Martin.

Tom,

Burton Saxon's dismissal of the utility of the Flannery convention seems somewhat short-sighted to me. He wrote that "If your partner does not bid spades (after you bid 1『), you don't have a spade fit." The problem is that you often do not have a rebid either. If you are playing $2 / 1$ with a Flannery hand, you will probably be forced to bid a two-card minor if partner bids a forcing 1NT. Playing Standard American you might have no reasonable bid at all if responder bids two of a minor.
The other commonly occurring benefit of Flannery is that it allows responder to discriminate between hands with four spades and five. If partner opens $1 \boldsymbol{\top}$, responder does not need to show a four-card spade suit. If opener has four spades and a big hand, he will reverse into spades.
Flannery also has some subtle benefits. I sat West when we recently scored a top on the following layout:

```
NORTH
& 942
* AQ 85
* J 762
* }7
```

| WEST | EAST |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\triangle 5$ | ¢ AK 63 |
| - J 9 | -107432 |
| - KQ543 | - A 98 |
| 2 A J 62 | - 43 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Partner (East) opened 2 . I jumped to 3 NT and ended up taking eleven tricks when North was understandably reluctant to underlead the $\vee \mathrm{AQ}$. Her diamond lead made the contract very easy. If East had opened $1 \boldsymbol{*}$, he would have started a very uncomfortable auction. The most common contract was $3 *$.
On the other hand, playing Flannery often requires a sense of adventure. In the last sectional in Hamden I opened 2 with the following hand (both vulnerable):

```
@ Q 8 75
* Q983
-10
AK K
```

Partner alerted and explained the bid. LHO bid $3 \downarrow$. Partner had to figure out what to do with this hand:

```
& K432
`J1074
-6
& Q J 9 4
```

He chose to compete with $3 \vee$. RHO then bid $4 \boldsymbol{(}$ (!). He thought that his partner's bid was Michaels even though our bids had clearly shown eight hearts, and he was looking at two of them in his own hand. For all that I knew, however, he could have held nine spades. I passed and so did a puzzled LHO. My partner knew that $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ was going down a lot, but he decided not to double because he figured that the opponents might notice that they held eleven diamonds between them. So, he passed. We could have set 4 by eight (!) tricks, but only if we took out their trump starting at trick one. As
it was, our opponents got a very good board going down only four because nearly everyone in our direction made 4 •

Mike Wavada
Enfield, CT

## The author responds:

Mike Wavada's letter provides a strong defense of the Flannery convention. While it is important to present hands where Flannery, or any other convention, is successful, Mike's best observation is that Flannery often solves a rebid problem.
I still believe this is a bid that should only be used by experts. When the opposition bids a minor suit at the three or four level, the Flannery partnership needs to thoroughly understand a complex number of options. Interference thus often becomes an effective pressure bid. If the Flannery partnership guesses right, they receive an average board. If they guess wrong, they get a zero.
Experts moved away from the bid before average players began to abandon it. I would be most interested in finding out how many of Connecticut's expert players still use Flannery.
Burt Saxon
5

| Top 10 continued |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 43 | 3285.05 | Sarah Corning |
| 44 | 3251.60 | Margaret Mason |
| 45 | 3171.08 | Randolph Johnson |
| 46 | 3142.18 | Yeong-Long Shiue |
| 47 | 2982.90 | Mildred Fromm |
| 48 | 2963.08 | Lynn Condon |
| 49 | 2954.69 | Howard Lawrence |
| 50 | 2953.05 | Peter MacCuaig |
| 51 | 2942.76 | Marsha Futterman |
| 52 | 2929.71 | Ruth Teitelman |
| 53 | 2921.39 | Edwin Lewis III |
| 54 | 2902.69 | Sonja Smith |
| 55 | 2897.78 | Kenneth Hirshon |
| 56 | 2826.54 | Morris Feinson |
| 57 | 2820.55 | Joan Panico |
| 58 | 2816.38 | Ann Cady |
| 59 | 2812.89 | Lenny Russman |
| 60 | 2812.55 | Kenneth Abelson |


| 61 | 2809.63 | Jay Borker |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 62 | 2804.05 | Arthur Crystal |
| 63 | 2789.62 | Sallie Abelson |
| 64 | 2775.29 | William Wood |
| 65 | 2745.68 | Brett Adler |
| 66 | 2707.42 | Constance Graham |
| 67 | 2701.38 | Phyllis Bausher |
| 68 | 2699.08 | Howard Zusman |
| 69 | 2694.77 | Seth Cohen |
| 70 | 2691.03 | Thomas Hyde |
| 71 | 2660.27 | Sharon Santow |
| 72 | 2656.19 | Natalie Aronsohn |
| 73 | 2651.11 | Barb Shaw |
| 74 | 2606.49 | John Segal |
| 75 | 2563.83 | Natalie Cohen |
| 76 | 2563.20 | Barbara Kirtley |
| 77 | 2556.18 | Lois Zeisler |
| 78 | 2538.41 | Flora Bery |
| 79 | 2538.24 | Micki Schaffel |
| 80 | 2537.13 | Caryll Schenker |


| 81 | 2504.49 | Elliot Ranard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 82 | 2479.41 | Charlotte Zultowsky |
| 83 | 2478.37 | Vesna Hauptfeld |
| 84 | 2447.01 | Terry Brewster |
| 85 | 2434.23 | Susan Seckinger |
| 86 | 2426.12 | David Margolin |
| 87 | 2422.29 | Virginia Naugler |
| 88 | 2416.75 | David Benjamin |
| 89 | 2352.46 | Joel Wolfe |
| 90 | 2351.42 | Nancy Starr |
| 91 | 2338.74 | Jane Lowe |
| 92 | 2305.72 | Burton Gischner |
| 93 | 2301.60 | Jay Force |
| 94 | 2278.74 | Helen Kobernusz |
| 95 | 2260.46 | Susan Pflederer |
| 96 | 2257.18 | Aimee Housholder |
| 97 | 2254.10 | Gail Carroll |
| 98 | 2239.83 | Ausra Geaski |
| 99 | 2232.38 | John McGuire |
|  | 2228.20 | Amos Foster |

## 2012 Monroe Magnus Trophy

October 9, 2012, After our 4th Sectional: Hartford

| 1 | 77.62 | Richard DeMartino | 36 | 14.08 | Robert Rising | 71 | 9.25 | Franklin Merblum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 41.49 | Larry Bausher | 37 | 13.77 | Douglas Doub | 72 | 9.25 | Alan Applebaum |
| 3 | 41.26 | Lawrence Lau | 38 | 13.57 | Michael Wavada | 73 | 9.25 | Sheila Gabay |
| 4 | 40.50 | John Stiefel | 39 | 12.83 | Robert Hartman | 74 | 9.24 | Russell Friedman |
| 5 | 33.10 | Linda Green | 40 | 12.72 | Susan Fronapfel | 75 | 9.07 | Deborah Noack |
| 6 | 30.93 | Dean Montgomery | 41 | 12.72 | Richard Fronapfel | 76 | 8.61 | Jane Finn |
| 7 | 29.82 | Allan Wolf | 42 | 12.70 | Hilda Silverman | 77 | 8.58 | Esther Watstein |
| 8 | 29.32 | Michael Smith | 43 | 12.37 | Steve Becker | 78 | 8.49 | David Blackburn |
| 9 | 29.32 | Susan Smith | 44 | 12.06 | Tom Joyce | 79 | 8.45 | Ann Cady |
| 10 | 28.22 | Phyllis Bausher | 45 | 11.83 | Solomon Field | 80 | 8.43 | Margaret Molwitz |
| 11 | 28.11 | Robert Derrah | 46 | 11.78 | Harold Feldheim | 81 | 8.34 | Barbara Loprete |
| 12 | 28.11 | Shirley Derrah | 47 | 11.78 | Richard Blair | 82 | 8.32 | Bob Rebelein |
| 13 | 27.17 | Allan Clamage | 48 | 11.58 | John Farwell | 83 | 8.27 | Lou Filippetti |
| 14 | 26.05 | Cynthia Michael | 49 | 11.51 | Janet Gischner | 84 | 8.19 | Fern Lindsay |
| 15 | 25.45 | Jill Marshall | 50 | 11.51 | Burton Gischner | 85 | 8.09 | Linda Starr |
| 16 | 24.87 | Brett Adler | 51 | 11.38 | Gloria Sieron | 86 | 7.81 | Lincoln May |
| 17 | 23.17 | Thomas Proulx | 52 | 11.04 | Jatin Mehta | 87 | 7.81 | Ronald Talbot |
| 18 | 22.64 | David Rock | 53 | 10.97 | Sylwia McNamara | 88 | 7.79 | Irene Rivers |
| 19 | 20.27 | Constance Graham | 54 | 10.97 | Karen McCallum | 89 | 7.78 | Howard Zusman |
| 20 | 19.56 | Marsha Futterman | 55 | 10.56 | Maeve Lucey | 90 | 7.78 | Thomas Gerchman |
| 21 | 19.05 | Frances Schneider | 56 | 10.38 | Steven Lockwood | 91 | 7.70 | Katharine Goodman |
| 22 | 19.05 | Bernard Schneider | 57 | 10.13 | Carolyn Joseph | 92 | 7.50 | Brian Lewis |
| 23 | 18.96 | Sonja Smith | 58 | 10.04 | Farley Mawyer | 93 | 7.50 | Ira Ewen |
| 24 | 18.95 | Paul Miller | 59 | 10.00 | Justine Cushing |  | 7.50 | Bill Reich |
| 25 | 18.64 | Sandra DeMartino | 60 | 10.00 | Melih Ozdil | 95 | 7.50 | Michael Rosen |
| 26 | 18.32 | Terry Lubman | 61 | 9.85 | Joan Martin | 96 | 7.47 | Bruce Downing |
| 27 | 18.25 | Victor King | 62 | 9.76 | Susan Seckinger |  | 7.31 | Linda Otness |
| 28 | 17.77 | Paul Burnham | 63 | 9.76 | Susan Rodricks | 98 | 7.15 | Mildred Fromm |
| 29 | 17.50 | Glenn Robbins | 64 | 9.56 | James Misner |  | 7.14 | Sarah Smedes |
| 30 | 17.50 | Bob Gwirtzman | 65 | 9.56 | Elaine Misner | 100 | 7.14 | Tania Reyes Hiller |
| 31 | 17.26 | Margaret Mason | 66 | 9.50 | Donald Foote |  |  |  |
| 32 | 15.46 | William Titley | 67 | 9.50 | Judy Maravolo-Foote | Total Masterpoints reported: 1519.82 Players selected: 100 out of 836 |  |  |
| 33 | 15.35 | Jiang Gu | 68 | 9.33 | Lila Englehart |  |  |  |
| 34 | 15.35 | Sharon Goldman | 69 | 9.33 | Carol Hill |  |  | \% |
| 35 | 14.96 | Lynn Condon | 70 | 9.33 | William Ehlers |  |  |  |

## 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 January 15, 2013.

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.org

If 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 | $203-245-6850$ |

## Your Link to the Board

| Central | Kay Frangione | $860-621-7233$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Eastern | Janet Gischner | $860-691-1484$ |
| Fairfield | Esther Watstein | $203-375-5489$ |
| Hartford | Betty Nagle | $860-529-7667$ |
| Northwestern | Sonja Smith | $860-653-5798$ |
| Panhandle | Allan Clamage | $203-359-2609$ |
| Southern | Sarah Corning | $203-453-3933$ |
| Southwestern | Tom Proulx | $203-847-2426$ |
| Members-at-Large | Susan Rodricks | $203-521-2075$ |
|  | Judy Hess | $203-255-8790$ |
|  | Joyce Stiefel | $860-563-0722$ |
|  | Bill Watson | $860-521-5243$ |

