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## A Point of Luck

by Harold Feldheim

In the book 'Winning Swiss Team Tactics', I coined the word OPTIPISM. Simply stated, it means that when a contract seems iron-clad, look for some nasty distributional surprise and try to guard against bad luck. On the other side of the coin, when confronted by a poor contract, look for some slice of good luck that might salvage the situation.

It is not an exaggeration to say that the success or failure of many, if not most, bridge hands can be determined during the first several tricks. Thus when considering either the play or defense of any hand, the winning player analyzes the problems and pitfalls at the very start. This process is most effective when applied before trick one. In other words,

Paint as complete a picture possible before playing to trick one.

The following hand illustrates how recognizing a problem early on can turn a hard to see line of play into a reasonable attempt to obtain a not-so-obvious victory. Here, declarer combined a bit of optimism with a dollop of luck to score a pleasing success.

Dealer: South
Neither side vulnerable
South West North East
1S 2H dbl 3H
pass pass 3 S pass
4S all pass

NORTH

- K98
$\checkmark 95$
- QJ103
- A864

SOUTH
^A10654

- 107
- AK6
* Q105

The auction: North felt that two spades would be an underbid while a game force would be a serious overbid. He compromised with a negative double followed by support, intending to convey an invitational sequence. Although holding minimum values, South, possibly expecting a bit more, carried on to a very dicey game.

The play: West cashed the $\vee \mathrm{KQ}$ and switched to the $\uparrow 9$, won in hand by the A. Prospects looked bleak. Assuming normal breaks, South could count four spades, four diamonds and one club. Barring some distributional miracle, e.g. the doubleton $\uparrow \mathrm{QJ}$ or a singleton club honor, he was looking at two more losers, a club and a trump. In all such situations, optipism aided by careful analysis, should come into play. Examining the lead, South found out that EW led A from AK and, therefore, East held the $\vee$ A. The auction told him two important things: first, the remaining high cards lay with

West; and second, West held at least five hearts. Since success depended on being able to force a club lead from West, he set out to try for an endplay. The general plan was to strip away West's diamonds and throw him in with a trump.

Choosing to read West's diamond switch as a doubleton rather than a singleton (the more likely distribution), he cashed another diamond, led up to the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ and followed with a low spade. South played for a bit of luck by ducking the trick. West won the $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$ and, not having the third trump, and realizing that a heart would concede a ruff and sluff, tried a small club. South played low from dummy, realizing that West could hardly overcall at the two level with only 8 HCP , scoring the $\% \mathrm{Q}$ for his tenth trick.

The complete hand:

- K98
$\checkmark 95$
- QJ103
- A864

| ^ Q3 | A J 72 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ KQJ83 | - A642 |
| - 92 | - 8754 |
| * K932 | - J7 |

A A10654
$\checkmark 107$

- AK6
* Q105

Continued on page 6.

## From the President

Bridge players are basically nice people. Sometimes they may even be too nice. And those really good players that we deem not very nice because they seem so aloof and non-friendly may be the smartest (and most helpful) in the room. As with everything in bridge, we can learn from sitting at a table with top A players, even table demeanor.

Certainly being civil to partner and to opponents is expected. ACBL is focusing on "Playing Nice" and we should all work on that aspect of the game. First and foremost, playing the game, whether at the local club or Sectional, Regional or National tournaments should be a pleasant experience for everyone. Harsh language or downright rudeness has no place at the bridge table.

However, sometimes an offhand comment about a bid or your inadvertent gasp or nod or frown when partner's card hits the table can convey a ton of information about your hand. Alert opponents pick up on this and on every hesitation, shrug and facial expression you display (and it's legal for them to do so, but not your partner.) When a player is the declarer, placing the cards is essential to making a contract and winning. Your actions at the table should tell nothing that can help opponents analyze the situation and play the hand the only way it can make.

Serious gamblers look for "tells", which are those facial expressions, tics, small habits, etc. that give away information. At the table, during play, you should say nothing, except to ask partner if she is really out of the suit when she doesn't follow suit. You
should be quiet, look at your hand, and at the cards on the table. You don't want to be expressive or make faces like you-know-who during the first debate.

Which brings me back to the most serious offense of all in this regard. A properly filled-out convention card needs to be on the table, clearly visible at all times. Opponents have the right to pick it up (at their turn to take an action) and look at it to find the information they need about the conventions you play without having to ask you to explain the "Alert" (or lack thereof). This is an ACBL rule.

So, when an opponent bids $5 \star$ after a 4 NT bid by his partner, you need to be able to pick up opponent's nicely filled-out convention card and have all the information you need to know about what convention they are playing, and what 5 means. You do not want to ask, repeat, you do not want to ask because then opponent will say, out loud, for all to hear, what (he thinks) partner's bid means. Not only do you hear it, so does everyone at the table, including the bidder. Guess what? He didn't think they were playing that version of responses, or Meckwell vs. Cappelletti in a different bidding sequence. While not legal, he can adjust his bids to compensate for the obvious disagreement and potentially avoid a disaster (the director might disagree with his actions, but sometimes it's hard to prove.) You may have given the opponents an enormous advantage.

So be a really good card player during the play of the hand. Don't talk, don't apologize for a bad play, don't fling your cards on the table when you're discouraged. Play every hand
smoothly, in tempo, and quietly. And always have a filled-out convention card on the corner of your quarter of the table.

## Can You Defeat this Hand Part 1

by Burt Saxon

Defense is a very important yet neglected, aspect of bridge. This hand is tough. You should keep reading and then show Part 2 (page 5) to your partner, or have him reading Part 2 at the same time you're reading Part 1. You are sitting West with this hand:

```
^ AK7643
\bullet 10762
-7
* 32
```

NS vul, South opens $1 \star$. Despite your four hearts, you decide to overcall 1 A . North bids $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ to show a limit raise or better in opener's diamonds; your partner passes. South bids $3 *$ which ends the auction. Your partnership agreement is to lead king from either AK or KQ . You lead $\mathrm{K} \wedge$ and this dummy appears:

$$
\text { A } 1095
$$

- J4
- AQ1093
- K108

Now get partner's input on what he would do with this lead, looking at his hand in Part 2 and prepare for a lively discussion over Part 3 (page 11).


STRIP SQUEEZE<br>by Geof Brod

It's the morning duplicate. Halfway through the session you pick up the best hand you have been dealt so far: AA953 $\downarrow$ - KQ98 \&AQJ3. East on your right passes and you open one $1 \star$. Pass on your left and partner responds $1 \vee$. Another pass on your right and it's up to you. It's normal to bid $1 \boldsymbol{\sim}$. You, however, are playing a weak no trump opening. If they deal you a strong no trump you open in a minor and rebid no trump, at the lowest level. Here you have an option not available to the other pairs in the field. You can conceal your spade suit and rebid 1NT showing 15-17 balanced. There are two clear flaws: your hand is not balanced; and you may miss a spade fit.

Most of the time, however, you will not have an 8-card spade fit and by concealing the nature of your hand you may well gain on the lead and/ or subsequent play. Another way you might benefit is that no trump may play for just as many tricks as a 4-4 spade fit for a better matchpoint score. As against that, your hand is prime and looks better for play in a suit. If you score poorly because of an offbeat action, you will not be well placed in the post-mortem. Rightly or wrongly, you rebid 1NT.

LHO passes and partner starts to think. You decide that should she raise to 2NT you will accept. After all, you do have a good looking 16 HCP and your one jack is in a four card suit supported by higher honors. Sure enough, partner raises to 2 NT and you go on to game.

West, your LHO, considers at some length and finally emerges with the A J. You see:

```
Q842
K1095
|
& K864
A A953
v
    KQ98
* AQJ3
```

Perhaps this is the favorable lead you were hoping for. You cover with the $\wedge Q$, covered by East with the $\uparrow K$, which you take with you $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$ A. It seems normal to start diamonds now. You lead to the $\forall J$ in dummy and East gobbles it up with the $\bullet$ A. A low club comes back and you take the *A in hand. Time to see how many spade tricks you have. You lead low up to the $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} 8$ in dummy. West follow low and East wins the $\uparrow 10$. It appears that West has led from an original Jx as opposed to a long suit of his own. The immediate inference is that he has length in a red suit and not four clubs which might have been led otherwise. East returns another small club and again you arrange to win this in hand with an honor. West shows out, pitching a diamond. So West has ten red cards and was reluctant to lead either since we had bid both.

Your plan now is to cash your remaining black card winners (you have four of them) ending in hand. Yes, you could just simply lead up to the $\vee \mathrm{K}$ in dummy while you still have a black suit entry there, but were it to
lose to the $\vee$ the opponents would potentially be able to take five tricks whereas now you have nine to cash.

You take your winners leaving:

```
` K1095
*
&
A
\bullet }
* KQ9
&
```

On the run of the blacks, West has tossed three more diamonds and a heart. You are hopeful now that the diamond 10 might fall, but when you cash the $\uparrow$ K, remarkably East throws a heart. West started with seven diamonds (count 'em) and three hearts, and he's pitched two of those. He holds 10 and a diamond and a stiff heart. East has shown up with the $\bullet A$ and the $A K$. It is a totally safe play for an overtrick. Lead a heart. West will have to win with his likely $\vee A$ and be endplayed into leading a diamond into your remaining $\vee$ Q9. And so it proves. You end up with a gratifying overtrick.

When you cashed your last black suit winner, West had to reduce to four cards. He could choose to remain with the stiff $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and $\downarrow 10 \mathrm{xx}$ (as he did) or $\vee A x$ and $\vee 10 x$. With this holding his $\uparrow 10 \mathrm{x}$ would fall under your $\diamond K Q$, leaving your $\leqslant 9$ good. He knew that wasn't likely to work out for him. He just had to hope that you would get it wrong in the end game. He was strip squeezed.

# OUR HAT TRICK 

Larry Lau and I just completed our hat trick of hat tricks. We played in the von Zedwitz pairs at the Nationals, (a tough and grueling three-day event with a large proportion of the field eliminated each day), for the third time. We qualified for day three for the third time, and like Icarus flying too close to the Sun, we crashed and burned on the final day for the third time.
The field is tough and the slightest error you make always seems to be punished. Having said that, here is a hand from day two of the event, and I've rotated the hand to make myself South (I think I've said this before, but playing with Larry I'm only ever allowed to sit North or West).
Before I tell the story of what happened at our table, how would you play this hand in a contract of 4 by North after the lead of the top two clubs from West?

## NORTH

- KQ8752
- A109
- AJ8
* J


## SOUTH

- A10963
- K32
- 1043
- 82

In $4 \boldsymbol{A}$, there is a guaranteed line which is to ruff the club, pull the opponents trumps, so now two suits have been eliminated; then play the top two hearts followed by the third heart not caring who wins it. If either opponent wins
and plays back a non-diamond you get a ruff/sluff and only lose one diamond, and if either opponent plays on diamonds you are guaranteed two diamond tricks. If East wins the third heart, he has to lead into the AJ $\downarrow$, and if West wins and plays a low diamond through the AJ $\downarrow$, you just have to play low - the magic card in the South hand is the 10 .
Of course, there wouldn't be a story if our contract was 4a...
North (Larry) opened 1^, East doubled, and I bid 3NT??? Larry and I were playing a convention that over one of a major, a jump to four of that major by partner is a weak preempt, and a jump to 3 NT is also a preempt to four of the major, but shows some outside defense (such as my K $\downarrow$ ). We had never discussed whether this was still the case over the double, but I thought Larry would work it out as I hadn't redoubled to show 10+ high card points.
There was no alert, and after three passes I anxiously awaited the lead and a look at dummy. West led the Q४, and when I saw dummy I was immensely relieved that they hadn't led a club. Now I had to work out who had the JV so I could win three heart tricks.
In the end I decided that leading from the QJ $\downarrow$ combination was more likely so I won the $\mathrm{K} \upharpoonright$ and ran 5 rounds of spades ending in my hand. On the second round of spades, West had pitched the 10 to show his partner he had
nothing higher in clubs and by inference, that he also held the 9.. East was concerned that he would get end-played in clubs to lead into dummy's diamond holding, so he unblocked the A* and K during the run of the spades.
Now I finessed in hearts and cashed my last spade and heart winner. At this stage I probably had all the match points as I can cash the A for 10 tricks in NT beating all the pairs in $4 \boldsymbol{A}$, but I had seen an avalanche of club discards from the opponents and decided that the A * wasn't going away, so I exited dummy with the Je. East won the Q\&, and then exited his "preciously" retained 52 which I won with my 8 West had pitched all of his clubs by this point. 3NT making 11 tricks (+660) was, surprisingly, not a common result; all other N/S pairs were +620 for $4 \uparrow,+500$ for beating 5 dbld, or had a minus score for going down in a spade contract. The full hand was:
Dealer North: N/S Vul
NORTH

- KQ8752
- A109
- AJ8
* J

| WEST |
| :---: |
| - J |
| - QJ84 |
| - Q72 |
| - 109763 |
| SOUTH |
| - A10963 |
| - K32 |
| -1043 |
| - 82 |

My second hand is from a recent club game, and although declarer's bidding and play were less than optimal, I enjoyed the hand as Jeff Goldman and I were able to squeeze the declarer for an extra undertrick.

| Dealer |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North; | Vul: None |  |  |
| Me | North | East | South |
|  | P | $2{ }^{1}$ | P |
| P | dbl | P | 2 NT |

all pass
1 Weak

|  | NORTH |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | - Q532 |
|  | $\checkmark$ A42 |
|  | - 10 |
|  | - A10874 |
| WEST | EAST |
| - A84 | - K96 |
| $\checkmark$ KJ97 | $\checkmark 85$ |
| - 76 | - KQ9854 |
| - Q532 | - J9 |
|  | SOUTH |
|  | - J107 |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q1063 |
|  | - AJ32 |
|  | * K6 |

I like the takeout double by North as he's already a passed hand and his partner shouldn't get too excited. I'm not sure why South didn't bid $2 \vee$, but here we are defending 2 NT .

I led $\downarrow 7$ and declarer made the first mistake at trick one when he won the $\star$ A after East contributed the $\uparrow$ Q. I did preface this hand by saying declarer played the hand less than optimally, so he now played the K , and finessed the second round of clubs into East's eJ. East returned the $\mathbf{\vee}$ covered by the $\vee 10, ~ \vee J$, and won with the $\wedge$ A.

Now declarer got the bad news when he cashed the to discover that the clubs weren't breaking. Next declarer played the $\boldsymbol{~} 2$ to his $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ and both Jeff and I ducked this trick rectifying the count.

NORTH - Q53

- 42
- --
- 108

WEST
EAST

- A8
- K9
$\bullet$ K97
- 6
- Q
$\checkmark 5$
- K985


## * ---

SOUTH

- 107
- Q63
- J3
*     - 

South now led $\uparrow 10$ won by East with the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$, and East returned the $\vee 5$. I won the $\vee 7$, cashed the $\vee \mathrm{K}$, cashed the A , and South had to surrender when I played my $\&$. If he pitches his $\vee \mathrm{Q}$, my $\vee 9$ is a winner, and when he holds onto his $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ and pitches a diamond, I lead my $\downarrow 6$ to partner's $\downarrow \mathrm{K}$ and $\downarrow 9$. We therefore held declarer (or declarer held himself) to five tricks.

Editor's note: it is rare indeed that defenders can produce a squeeze against a declarer who generally has the upper hand in tempo and knowledge. Good defense is a beautiful thing when YOU do it...

## Can You Defeat this hand Part 2

\{see Part 1 on page 2 after you've decided on your action(s)\}.

You are East with this hand:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { a } & \text { void } \\
\vee & \text { KQ983 } \\
& \text { J82 } \\
\approx & \text { A9764 }
\end{array}
$$

NS vul, South deals and opens $1 \star$.
Your partner overcalls $1 \wedge$, North bids $2 \boldsymbol{A}$, indicating a limit plus hand. You pass and South bids $3 \uparrow$, ending the auction.

Your partnership agreement is to lead K from either AK or KQ . What card do you play when partner leads $\wedge \mathrm{K}$ and dummy plays $\boldsymbol{\wedge} 5$ ? Can you and your partner now figure out how to beat the hand? Make your play, along with a rationale as to why (editor's note: and another as to why it was right even if it didn't work out). Then both of you can turn to Part 3 (page 11) and discuss how and why you went wrong (if you did) and how you can improve your partnership's communications and chances of dealing with the next difficult defensive problem faced at the table.

## INTERMEDIATE BRIDGE

(finding the "Elusive Extra Trick")

You pick up ^KQJ97 ャK5 -K952 \&85. Partner opens $1 \&$; you bid a quiet $1 \wedge$, pretty sure there's a game somewhere. Opponents remain silent, as expected. Partner bids 2NT. Playing new minor forcing, you bid $3 \star$, and partner responds 3 A . If you had a singleton you'd think a lot about exploring for slam, but with no short suit on either side and a maximum of 31 HCP , you decide to settle for game, $4 \boldsymbol{\sim}$. Lefty leads \& J and you survey dummy:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sim \text { A83 } \\
& \vee \text { A73 } \\
& * \text { AJ6 } \\
& * \text { AQ64 } \\
& \sim \text { KQ597 } \\
& \vee \text { K5 } \\
& * \text { K952 } \\
& * 85
\end{aligned}
$$

1 club loser, possibly 2 diamond losers, easy 4; everybody's bidding it, maybe making 5 on a good day; some might have tried slam and need some good luck to make 5, but you need to make 5 to beat all your "real" opponents, those holding your cards at other tables. Even if both finesses lose (probability $=25 \%$, a really bad day), you can make 5 if the $\$$ break $3 / 3$ -
what's that probability? Less than $50 \%$, i.e. not good. How else can we take care of the fourth $\downarrow$ ? Well, how many of the AKQJ of $\uparrow$ do we need to draw trumps? Ah hah, Brett Adler told us just last issue the probablilty of a 3-2 break is $68 \%$ (better than $50 \%$ for sure), so we don't need the $\uparrow A$ to draw trumps; we can use it to trump a $\star$ (if the $\uparrow$ Q \& $\uparrow 10$ don’t show up early.)

So, thinking that the $\because \mathrm{J}$ is not likely to be from KJ10 (a notrump lead), we reject the finesse, taking the $\because \mathrm{A}$. We lead $a \wedge$ to the $\boldsymbol{\wedge} \mathrm{K}$ and a * to the $\diamond$ (It's unlikely that lefty has a singleton, he would have led it.) Not our day, it loses. Note that righty will give us the $\% \mathrm{Q}$ for a later pitch if he cashes the $\approx \mathrm{K}$ at this point; so he leads another $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$. We win in our hand, noting that the suit is breaking 3-2, preserving the $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$ in dummy. We lead to the $\star \mathrm{A}$ and the $\diamond 5$ back to the $\diamond \mathrm{K} 9$ and play the K . If the suit breaks 3-3, we went to a lot of planning and effort for nothing except insurance; if lefty has the last trump and a doubleton we make the same four as everybody else who just drew trumps and lost 2 -s. Here righty has four diamonds
and the third spade and we trump the - 9 with dummy's carefully preserved $\wedge$ A, claiming 5. Yes, we could have finessed the $\uparrow 9$, and the odds favor a $4-2$ break, but we'd look kinda silly if lefty showed up with the $\star 10$ and we've turned a sure 5 into just 4 .

How'd we do? One optimistic pair in 6 NT down 3; five pairs in $\uparrow 4$ making four (drew trumps and played for the 3-3 drop); three pairs in 3NT making 4 (same play); two pairs in 3NT making 5 (perhaps with helpful defense i.e. a - or lead); 9 of 11 matchpoints for us; rather than 4 for making just 4 . Not a bad payoff for cheap insurance.

The complete hand:

$$
\text { A! ! } 83
$$

$$
\bullet \text { A73 }
$$

AJ6

$$
\because \text { AQ64 }
$$

A 54
A 1062

- 98642 QJ10
- $73 \quad$ Q1084
* 85 \& K32

A KQJ97
-K5

- K952
* 85


## A Point of Luck

Continued from page 1

Final analysis: South had to play West for a specific distribution, that being 2-5-2-4. Notice that if West held the third trump, playing $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$, $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ and another spade, the sluff and ruff would no longer exist since,
with dummy having no trumps, West could exit a heart without harm. This partial endplay is a very satisfying technique, especially when it works. South played for the only possible distribution and Lady Luck rewarded his efforts.

Moral: When a contract looks terrible, take another look. Optipism oft works wonders.

# Achievements 

## MILESTONES

Emerald (7500)
Marvin Rosenblatt

Diamond (5000)
Betty Jane Corbani
Sapphire (3500)
Morris Feinson
Joel Krug
John Segal
Gold (2500)
Burt Gischner
Tom Hey
Michael Smith

Ruby (1500)<br>Sheila Katz<br>Aldona Siuta<br>Mike Wavada

Silver (1000)
Joan Brault
Joyce Calcagnini
David Keller
Marti Molwitz
Theresa Waltz
Vera Wardlaw

| Bronze (500) | Life Master |
| :---: | :---: |
| Larry Bowman | Mary-Jane Cross |
| Evan Dean | Georgeann Kishner |
| Karen Emott | Mary Ellen McGuire |
| Linda Kesselman | Leonard Messman |
| Ken Lem | David Waltz |
| Gordon Mackenzie | Theresa Waltz |
| Mary Ellen McGuire |  |
| Doris Nussbaum |  |
| Felix Springer |  |
| David Waltz |  |
| Elizabeth Wellington |  |
| Mary Whittemore |  |

2016 GOVERNOR'S
CUP
The Cup was won this year
by Faye Marino

1. 23.65 Faye Marino
2. 21.97 Doris Greenwald
3. 19.08 Rich DeMartino
4. 15.31 Terry Lubman
5. 14.49 Jeff Goldman
6. 13.19 Kevin Hart
7. 13.19 Jeff Horowitz
8. 12.02 Harold Feldheim
9. 12.02 Jill Fouad
10. 10.33 Russell Friedman
11. 9.34 Natalie Cohen
12. 9.05 Larry Lau

## LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENTS

(Top 200)
(published annually by the ACBL)

Rich DeMartino
Jay Steifel
Harold Feldheim
Doug Doub
CT has a number of players on this major achievement list, and a number who will probably appear in the next year or two.

All of these players are still very active and will probably move up significantly over their remaining competitive years.

## DISTRICT 25 <br> NAOP WINNERS

## FLIGHT A

\#1 Jay Steifel
\#2 Frank Merblum/Doug Doub

## FLIGHT C

\#1 Trevor Reeves

These players will represent D25 at the ACBL NAOP finals next Spring in Kansas City.

Wish them GOOD LUCK next time you see them.

## Achievements

## 2015 Masterpoint Race Winners \& 2016 Race Leaders

| Bracket | $\underline{2015}$ | $\underline{2016(a t ~ 11 / 6) ~}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ace of Clubs (local black points only) |  |  |
| 0-5 | Don Ernst 47.50 | Jonathan Jankus 54.77 |
| 5-20 | Brian Fielding 43.89 | Pam Lombardo 30.94 |
| 20-50 | Gordon Kreh 61.33 | Joseph Hochheiser 47.34 |
| 50-100 | Clifford Wald 100.12 (\#9 ACBL) | Lisette Voorhees 50.17 |
| 100-200 | Ru Cole 130.77 (\#10 ACBL) | Trevor Reeves 92.92 |
| 200-300 | Russ Sackowitz 113.59 | Cliff Wald 108.03 |
| 300-500 | Don Kimsey 101.30 | Russ Sackowitz 121.40 |
| 500-1000 | Shari Peters 152.75 | Gary Mirashiro 122.09 |
| 1000-1500 |  | Roger Crean 128.13 |
| 1000-2500 | Richard Fronapfel 210.36 |  |
| 1500-2500 |  | Richard Fronapfel 259.65 |
| 2500-3500 |  | Linda Green 181.77 |
| 3500-5000 | Doris Greenwald 278.66 | Betty Corbani 211.28 |
| 5000-7500 | Sandy DeMartino 218.63 | Sandy DeMartino 165.95 |
| 7500-10000 | Larry Lau 115.40 | Larry Lau 84.84 |
| >10000 | Geoff Brod 176.21 | Geoff Brod 170.91 |
| Mini-McKenney (includes all masterpoints won) |  |  |
| 0-5 | Don Ernst 58.59 | Jonathan Jankus 115.99 |
| 5-20 | Sylvia Szanto 63.61 | Pam Lombardo 41.47 |
| 20-50 | Gordon Kreh 102.33 | Kishor Lathi 72.86 |
| 50-100 | Cliff Wald 126.77 | Silvia Szanto 84.19 |
| 100-200 | Ru Cole 224.39 (\#16 ACBL) | Trevor Reeves 165.18 |
| 200-300 | Russ Sackowitz 166.71 | Cliff Wald 124.92 |
| 300-500 | Don Kimsey 123.50 | Felix Springer 228.94 |
| 500-1000 | Susan Smith 209.26 | Gary Mirashiro 150.90 |
| 1000-1500 |  | Susan Smith 266.60 |
| 1000-2500 | Jill Fouad 365.10 |  |
| 1500-2500 |  | Debbie Benner 397.41 |
| 2500-3500 |  | Art Crystal 471.02 |
| 2500-5000 | Randy Johnson 590.27(\#352 ACBL) | Randy Johnson 414.66 |
| 5000-7500 | Sandy DeMartino 466.38 | Sandy DeMartino 334.06 |
| 7500-10000 | Larry Lau 478.07 | Larry Lau 310.25 |
| >10000 | Rich DeMartino 967.32(\#108 ACBL) | Doug Doub 671.17 |

## Achievements

## Major Recent Tournament Wins

|  | Greenwich Sectional (8/26-8/28) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: |
| Jill Fouad/Harold Feldheim | Fri Open Pairs | 1A | 9.13 |
| Jeff Goldman/Rich Demartino | Sat AM AX Pairs | 1A | 9.85 |
| Terry Lubman/Doris Greenwald | Sat AX Aft Pairs | 1A | 10.31 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Warwick Regional (8/30-9/4) |  |  |
| Eleanor \& Barry Bragin | Wed AX Pairs | 4 AX | 14.58 |
| Tom Hyde/Ed Lewis | Thu Open Pairs | 1A | 15.31 |
| Felix Springer/Trevor Reeves | Thu Open Pairs | 2A1BC | 11.48 |
| Theresa \& David Waltz | Fri MidFlight Pairs | 2B1Y | 14.93 |
| Alan Rothenberg/Rich Demartino | Fri Open Pairs | 1A | 34.01 |
| Victor King/Doug Doub | Fri Swiss | 1 A | 11.55 |
| Alan Rothenberg/Rich Demartino | Sat Open KO | 1 | 28.53 |
| Doug Doub/Geoff Brod/Victor King | Sun Open Swiss | 1 | 27.43 |

Hauppauge Regional (9/14-9/18)

| Jill Fouad/Harold Feldheim | Fri Open Pairs | 1A | 26.69 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Harold Feldheim | Sat Round Robin Teams B1 | tie 1 | 14.37 |

Dave Ehler/Victor King
Victor King

Debbie Benner/Art Crystal
Debbie Benner/Art Crystal

Fri Open Pairs
Sat Round Robin Teams B1 tie 1

Rhode Island Sectional (9/24-9/25)
Sat Open Pairs 1A
22.75

Sun AX Swiss
$\quad$ Naples Regional
Tue/Wed KOs B1
Fri/Sat KOs B1

Watertown Sectional (10/8-10/9)
Jay Stiefel
Frank Merblum/Doug Doub
Dave Ehler/Victor King

D25 NAOP Flight A Final $1 \quad 36.00$
D25 NAOP Flight A Final 227.00
D25 NAOP Flight A Final 90.2910.29

Danbury Regional (10/17-10/23)

| Al Wolf/Russ Friedman | Wed ABC pairs | 2A | 21.98 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sandra Gould/Armanda Buscher | Golden Opportunity Pairs | 1A | 11.03 |
| Stiefel/Demartino/Brod/Ehlers | Fri Round Robin Teams | 3 | 13.64 |
| Susan \& Michael Smith | Sat ABC Pairs | 5 A1B | 12.11 |
| Victor King | Sat Round Robin Teams B1 | 1 | 25.72 |
| Victor King | Sun AX Teams | tie 2 | 19.84 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | October STaC |  |  |
| Phyllis \& Larry Bauscher | Wed AM Pairs | 1A | 11.06 |
| George Holland/Richard Fronapfel | Thu Aft Pairs | 1A | 13.47 |
| George Holland/Richard Fronapfel | Mon Aft Pairs | 1A | 15.87 |

## From the o e de e e e

## HARTFORD BRIDGE CLUB NEWS

"85 Came Alive" was a wonderful party. On Sunday, October 30 the Hartford Bridge Club celebrated its $85^{\text {th }}$ birthday with a gala, sold out luncheon at Maneeley's Banquet and Catering in South Windsor. Registration began at 11:30, followed by a wonderful buffet meal, business meeting and an afternoon bridge game with 57 tables. The luncheon was complimentary for all paid up members. A few former members came to reconnect with old friends and to participate in the celebration. One even flew in from California. Lunch selections included beef tenderloin, chicken marsala, fish, pasta, potatoes and salads as well as assorted breads and rolls. Dessert pastries were served mid afternoon. Complimentary coffee, tea and soft drinks were available throughout the event. There was also a cash bar. Thanks to donations from individual members, there were gift bags for all attendees and a beautiful floral arrangement at the registration desk. For one and a half hours during the registration period and luncheon, Paul Bisaccia, internationally acclaimed piano virtuoso of classical and Americana music, entertained the crowd. His appearance was made possible thanks to the generosity of the "Anonymous Music Lovers." Special guests were Mark Aquino, District 25 Director, and Esther Watstein, President of the Connecticut Bridge Association. Special thanks to Dave Metcalf who directed the game. It was a memorable afternoon, enjoyed by all.

## NEWTOWN BRIDGE CLUB

On Sunday and Monday, September 11 and 12, Larry Cohen presented "Top 5 Errors", "Slam Bidding", Defensive Strategy", and "Law of Total Tricks for Balancing" to 25 tables of enthusiastic players both days. Along with Larry's bridge lessons, everyone enjoyed a continental breakfast, lunch and home-baked cookies.
On Wednesday September 14, Harold Feldheim gave an informative talk on "Weak 2 Bids", prior to the morning game. His lecture was very well received and the 80 players who played that morning were able to put Harold's insights to use as there happened to be six hands that seemed tailor-made for a weak 2 opening.
Sixty-six teams participated in the
Swiss team games October 10-13
during the club's second annual Team Week.
Newtown Bridge Club plays Monday through Thursday at Edmond Town Hall, 45 Main Street, Newtown. Directions and information about games and lessons may be found on the club's website; www.newtownbridge.org

## WEE BURN NEWS

The Summer Series "at the beach" was most successful, especially for the following pairs who did well:

1. Penny Glassmeyer/Susan Mayo
2. Janet Soskin/Sue Kipp
3. Belinda Metzger/Mary Ellen McGuire
4. Kathie Rowland/Joan Hoben
5. Molly Johnson/Pat Brasher
6. Jean Thoma/Karen Barrett

And our CONGRATULATIONS
to Karen Barrett who just became a GOLD LIFE MASTER.

## WOODWAY COUNTRY CLUB

Winners of the summer series:

1. Susan Mayo/Karen Barrett
2. Betty Hodgman/Millie Fromm
3. Marilyn Tjader/Carole Davidson

Winners of our annual ACBL Charity game:

1. Susan Mayo/Karen Barrett
2. Katie Goodman/Tom Hey
3. Gloria and Bill Hayes

## Tournament Schedule

DECEMBER
1-4 Orlando Nationals

JANUARY
23-29 Tarrytown Regional

FEBRUARY
15-20 Cromwell Regional
MARCH
3-5 Guilford Sectional
8-19 Kansas City Nationals

## Bridge Forum Update

## Tuesday

Leading pairs - Kevin Hart-Jeff Horowitz have more than doubled the performance of any other pair. Rita Brieger-Harold Miller and Alan Milstone-Gernot Reiners have been trading second place, well ahead of Abhi Dutta-Paul Johnson in fourth. Player of the Year Leaders: The three leading pairs occupy the top six positions, with Jeff leading. Jon Ingersoll, Hank Banach, Bob Hawes and George Levinson round out the top ten.
Van Dyke Cup preliminaries:
Eliminated in the quarterfinals were Hill Auerbach, Tracy Selmon and Bob Hawes, and in the semifinals Alan Milstone, Gernot Reiners and Hank Banach. The four finalists were Kevin Hart, Jeff Horowitz, Harold Miller and Kay Howe, with Kevin having the highest carryover score.

## Friday

Leading Pairs: Erik Rosenthal-Jim Uebelacker have maintained a fair lead. Rita Brieger-Aniko Richheimer had a summer surge into seond, with Alan Milstone-Gernot Reiners third. Player of the year Leaders: 1 Rita Brieger; 2 Harold Miller; 3 Erik Rosenthal; 4 Gernot Reiners; 5 Alan Milstone; 6 Aniko Richheimer; 7 Norma Augenstein; 8 Louise Wood; 9 Jeff Horowitz; 10 Joe Pagerino. Reynolds Cup preliminaries: This cup was close for a while until Rita's late summer surge. Eliminated quarterfinalist were Erik, Jeff and Norma. Eliminated semifinalists were Alan, Kevin Hart and Joe. Well behind Rita entering the finals were Harold, Jim and Gernot.

## Tuesday/Friday Combined

Overall Player of the Year: The top three Tuesday pairs have locked up the six top spots, with Jeff narrowly
leading Kevin, and Alan momentarily ahead of Harold, Rita and Gernot in their constant reshuffle for third. Yearly Statistics: The Hart-Horowitz partnerships leads in getting the most tops, avoiding zeroes, $70 \%$ games and profitable penalty doubles (tied on the doubles with Erik.) Pat RogersPhyllis Haeckel are the only pair to have two games without no tops or bottoms. Breta Adams-Karlene Wood have bid and made 13 grand slams. Vicki Rethy, Ann Drabkin and Joyce Handleman are leading in passouts.風为

## The Seven NoTrump Bridge Club (NEW!)

In late October, the Seven No-Trump Bridge Club opened in Stamford CT. The owner, Joe Grill, is an ACBL Tournament Director who recently moved to the area from Charlotte NC. The club is located in the Annunciation Greek Orthodox Church on Newfield Ave, near the High Ridge Road exit off the Merritt. The facility features 25 tables with brand new equipment, comfortable chairs and Bridgemates. There's also PLENTY OF PARKING! A full schedule of professionally run games is offered during the week and the club is expanding its lesson offerings as well. For more information, visit www. 7 ntgames.com or contact Joe Grill: email: Joseph.Grill@7ntgames. com; cell-979-218-7428
Editor's note: Joe ran more than 7 games a week at the consolidated club in Charlotte, one of which is Jerry Helms' own local game. When I spoke to Jerry in Ottawa, he said that they all were very sorry to see Joe leave because he was so instrumental in their success. His rapid growth in this current location is testimony to his capabilities.

## Can You Beat this hand - Part 3

The Analysis: in order to beat the hand, EW need two spade tricks, one spade ruff, one heart and one club. There is only one way to do this: East does not want a late $\boldsymbol{A}$ ruff because he may not have time to develop his heart trick. He should give his partner as neutral a signal as is possible in their defensive carding system. The $\because 6$ is probably the best bet. One of my partners and I still play Lavinthal discards, so the $\vee 9$ would request another spade lead in our system. West, on winning the first trick, should realize that playing $\wedge \mathrm{A}$, ruff $\wedge$ will set up South's $\wedge Q$ for a pitch, and, therefore give partner an immediate ruff, retaining spade control. East ruffs and leads $\vee \mathrm{K}$ to set up his $\downarrow$ while still having C control. \& will win the A and draw trumps, but will eventually have to give East his $\& \mathrm{~A}$ and $\vee \mathrm{K}$ first and West his $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$ second or vice versa but wind up losing all three cards regardless. If you and your partner can find this defense after reading parts one and two, you are good defenders. If you and your partner found this defense at the table, you are expert defenders. If you found this defense at the table (or with Parts 1\&2 without peeking) within 10 seconds, you deserve the Bols Brilliancy prize. If you found this defense in less than five seconds, you could be accused of cheating. The whole hand:

- 1095
$\checkmark$ J4
- AQ1093
- K108

| ^ AK7643 | A void |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark 10762$ | $\checkmark$ KQ983 |
| +7$\times 1$ | - J82 |
|  | * A9764 |
| - QJ82 |  |
| $\checkmark$ A5 |  |
| - K654 |  |
| * QJ5 |  |

## Editor's Note:

## A note from Harold Feldheim

 Richard "Dick" Wieland and I met through bridge and became close friends. He was multi-faceted, with an insightful view of the world and, from him, I learned a great deal, especially in the areas of politics and economics and how things tick. He was a kind and generous friend. I mourn him. I will miss him.
## IN MEMORIAM

Connecticut residents as listed in the ACBL Bridge Bulletin

Billie Hecker
Mildred Helyer
Joan O'Connell
Judith Pinney

Dick died in late November, having moved from CT to Las Vegas in the last year. He was a significant force in CT bridge for more than 25 years, despite often being out of the state creating and selling businesses in Texas, Washington DC and other locations. I learned a lot of bridge from Dick (and Jim Greer and Mort Friedman and a lot of others at a local pub in the 90s following Roy Erickson's regular Tuesday night game in Ridgefield, long since defunct.) Dick was a staunch proponent of the quintessentially abstruse bid. I myself have been one of his victims more than once. Harold tells the story of Dick making a far-out-there bid, which made obvious sense to him, but Harold was unable to field it and they got a bad result. Dick, in the post-mortem, was sure his view would be held by $90 \%+$ of the field; to prove it, he went to Mike Cappelletti Sr., a
member of their swiss team, and asked for Mike's thought. Mike told him the same thing as Harold had. Dick said: "You're both idiots; you two play together and I'll play with Mike's client."
Thanks for the memories, Dick.

## 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, 2017.
Editor: Bill Wood
Phone: (203) 803-9566
Email: wawoo1@juno.com

## 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 Bill Wood at wawoo1@juno.com

## Your CBA Board

| Esther Watstein | President | (203) 375-5489 | ewatstein@optonline.net |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Susan Rodricks | Vice President | (203) 521-2075 | srodricks@optonline.net |
| Debbie Noack | Secretary | (203) 924-5624 | mainerinexile@comcast.net |
| Susan Seckinger | Treasurer |  |  |
|  | Tournament Coordinator | (860) 513-1127 | seseck@sbcglobal.net |
| Phyllis Bausher | Past President |  |  |
|  | Nominating Committee chair | (203) 389-5918 | pbbausher@comcast.net |
| Mark Aquino | District Director | (617) 522-8626 | maquino621@comcast.net |
| Connie Graham | Board of Directors--Central | (860) 505-7833 | cegraham38@aol.com |
| Allan Clamage | Board of Directors--Fairfield <br> Bylaws Committee chair <br> Electronic Coordinator | (203) 964-0194 | allanbc@optonline.net |
| Jan Rosow | Board of Directors--Hartford | (860) 508-4484 | jsrosow@gmail.com |
| Sonja Smith | Board of Directors--Northwest | (860) 653-5798 | sonja721@gmail.com |
| Frances Schneider | Board of Directors--Panhandle | (203) 542-0719 | frances77@gmail.com |
| Mike Wavada | Board of Directors--Eastern | (860) 763-3694 | mike@wavada.org |
| Sarah Corning | Board of Directors--Southern | (203) 453-3933 | sarah@corningfamily.org |
| Karen Barrett | Board of Directors--Southwest | (203) 286-7530 | kebob@optonline.net |
| Susan Fronapfel | Board of Directors--At Large | (203) 733-8525 | director@newtownbridge.org |
| Ausra Geaski | Board of Directors--At Large | (860) 533-7271 | ausrag@aol.com |
| Sandy DeMartino | Board of Directors--At Large | (203) 637-2781 | sdemar20@hotmail.com |
| Joyce Stiefel | Board of Directors--At Large | (860) 563-0722 | jamms14s@aol.com |
| Bill Wood | Kibitzer Editor | (860) 803-9566 | wawoo1@juno.com |
| Debbie Benner | List Manager | (203) 259-3665 | dlbfsa@optonline.net |
| David Metcalf | Tournament Director-in-Charge |  |  |
| Don Stiegler | Unit Coordinator StaC Coordinator | (203) 929-6585 | dwsteigler@comcast,net |
| Millie Fromm | Unit Recorder | (203) 259-6648 | millstantx@aol.com |
| David Keller | Webmaster | (203) 375-2840 | david.keller@janussystems.com |
| Donald Brueggemann | Communications Director | (203) 488-3220 | law-scribe@snet.net |

