# Southern California <br> Bridge 

## PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

by Robert Shore


## Expanding the Tournament Trail for Non-Life Masters

As some of you may know, our District is entitled to sanction as many as four regional tournaments in a year. For the last several years, we've held only one. Bridge Week, the Summer's Best Regional, consistently turns a profit at our Long Beach location. Our other efforts to hold regionals proved unable to attract sufficient local support to cover the costs requested by host hotels, and were running at a substantial loss.

Not one, but two of our Units have stepped up with an idea. They each would like to hold a Non-Life Master Regional, either as a stand-alone event or in conjunction with their local Sectional. Most importantly from my perspective, they are willing to make this attempt at no financial cost to the District. Even if both Units follow through with their plan, this still leaves us with another sanction available for the previously proposed regional shared between District 23 and our Southern California neighbors in District 22.

Both of our local groups are in contact with one another. I have asked them to "fully bake" their plans in time for the Board to vote to approve them at our next meeting, and both groups have advised me that they expect to be able to meet that deadline. So in my May column I hope and expect to be able to announce additional local gold-point opportunities for our Non-Life Masters who are still trying to climb that mountain.

## Auf Wiedersehen

The German farewell "auf wiedersehen" literally translates to "until we meet again." I have no idea what that may mean to our readers in their personal lives, but I can now report on what it means

PRESIDENT continued on page 2

## District Director Report

by Kevin Lane
"Bridge is a game and should be fun."


Board of Directors reorganization motion

The Board will meet in Columbus, where we will vote on a motion to reduce the size of the board from 25 to 13 . As I've written previously, I'm currently and tentatively planning to vote "yes" in Columbus. The motion itself will, on-balance, hurt ACBL's chances for sustaining long-term prosperity. But if, as I currently believe, passing this re-org motion is necessary to allow the board to focus on issues that do matter, then it will be worth it to pass this re-org motion. For four years, board re-organization discussions have consumed all the energy of the board.

The most positive element of this reorganization is that it it retains the current districts and district organizations. Certain neighboring districts are lumped together for purposes of electing a member of the national board of directors. Many districts throughout the ACBL favor retention of the current district model.

## Although I'm skeptical of the benefits of this <br> DIRECTOR continued on page 2
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in this corner of the bridge world. We will hold our next District Board meeting immediately following the April Pasadena-San Gabriel Unit Game, in San Marino, which I understand is scheduled for April 5. So I'll ask that Unit Presidents make sure they have provided to Tom Lill a list of their Unit Representatives and Alternates, and I hope to obtain more or less full attendance at this meeting. And perhaps we'll even do our hosts a solid by showing up beforehand to play the game.

## Revised Bridge Week Schedule

We are in the process of revising the flyer for Bridge Week and it will be out very shortly after this column goes to press. Most importantly from the players' perspective, we have changed the schedule to incorporate the Bracketed Swiss events that have proven so popular at other tournaments. We are eliminating the Thursday-Friday Knockout and the Saturday Compact Knockout. In their places, we are holding Bracketed Swiss events on both Thursday and Saturday. And before I receive a fistful of e-mails from the other pedants among us, we are aware that the events are actually full round robins (with the possible exception of the lowest bracket) rather than Swiss format. We're going with the term that people have come to understand through usage.

## Grand Slam Cup Progress

We are continuing to make progress in assembling the line-up for the inaugural Grand Slam Cup, which will make its debut at Bridge Week. I have contacted our neighbors to the north in District 21. No one has made any promises yet but District 21 has expressed tentative interest in participating in the series. Continue to stay tuned for further updates.

Something you want me to know? Contact me at Bob78164@yahoo.com.

## DIRECTOR continued from page 1

motion, I must also candidly admit the motion won't significantly harm the organization either. The primary downside is that the motion will make it harder to elect the qualified board members needed to achieve ACBL prosperity.

## Addressing the biggest problems first

A basic tenet of sound management is addressing the biggest problems first. A year or so ago the ACBL lost a couple million dollars stemming from the board's hiring and oversight of our CEO. Nothing
in this re-org motion addresses the root cause of that problem, although I submitted a motion last year - but deferred to Columbus - that partially addresses the issue. Other major issues confront the board that are independent of internal governance issues. Any perceived cost savings to the board reduction are mitigated by additional staff headquarters would need to hire.

## Goals

Sound business decisions originate with the question: "what is our goal?" I'm somewhat disheartened that this re-org motion isn't anchored in any tangible plan. Most notably, the reduction to thirteen board members is arbitrary until there's some agreement on the role of the board. I'm chairing a task force to move committee work off of the board. Typically, a business would decide the role of the board first and then its size. I'm reminded of a Dilbert cartoon where the boss says: "Dilbert, you start writing the software, while I go find out what the user wants."

## Putting the right people in the right chairs

For the ACBL to be successful, the board needs people who are qualified to carry out their role, assertive enough to tackle serious problems, and humble enough to cede decisions to management, board members, or committee members if an issue is outside the scope of one's role or expertise. Businesssavvy board members have noted for decades that this problem is much more critical to ensuring the ACBL's future than mere board size. The re-org plan pushes this issue down the road.

Still, it's an inherent challenge to conduct working sessions with twenty-five people. My hope is that if we can take the chronic "board-size" issue off the table, the board can focus on the issues that will determine the ACBL's future prosperity.

I welcome your input. klaned23@gmail.com

## 

So, you think you've had a great game $\ldots$ or a terrible one? An article in the July, 1993 ACBL Bulletin reports that in a $2 \frac{1}{2}$ table novice game, one pair scored a perfect $100 \%$ game. The last place finisher had $0 \%$.
$\bigcirc(\odot) \odot \odot \odot \odot \odot \odot \odot \odot \odot \odot \odot \odot \odot \odot \odot \odot \odot \odot$

# From the Director's Chair: by Brian Richardson 



## The PRINCIPLE of FULL DISCLOSURE

 (Part Two)Part Two deals with some issues that were not dealt with in Part One, or, perhaps, issues that needed further elaboration.

## DOUBLES \& REDOUBLES

Most Doubles do NOT require an Alert. Some, those which have an unusual or, probably, unexpected meaning, are required to be Alerted.
Some examples:

- A 3-level pre-emptive bid which is immediately doubled, or is doubled in the pass-out seat, requires an Alert if the system agreement is that it is for penalties, rather than takeout.
 Doubles are penalty or are lead-directing Doubles, an Alert is required.
- 1V - P - 4* (splinter bid) - X. An Alert is required if the double requests a lead of any suit other than the suit.
- 12-P-1v-X, XX. If the redouble shows 3card support for partner's $\boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ suit an Alert is required.
- $1 \uparrow-\mathrm{P}-1 \vee-2 \boldsymbol{2}$, X . If the Double is a Support Double showing 3-card support for partner's $\vee$, an Alert is required.
- $1 N T-2 \mu / \downarrow / \varphi$. . If the X is a stolen bid double, indicating that the bid made by RHO is the bid the Responder would have made, then the X requires an Alert.


## CUE-BIDS

A Cue-bid is defined as a bid of a suit already bid by the opponents, when the original bid was the bid of a natural suit. Under the Laws of bridge, natural is defined as the bid of a minor suit which shows at least 3 cards in the suit, or the bid of a major suit which shows at least 4 cards.

Paying attention to those definitions of natural bids it is clear that after a Precision $1 *$ bid an overcall
of $2 \boldsymbol{w}$ is a Cue-bid. If, by partnership agreement, the overcall does NOT show a suit, then it requires an Alert. In a similar fashion a conventional $2 \star$ bid, not showing a suit, can be followed by an overcall of $3 \star$. If that overcall shows a suit no Alert is required. Any other meaning of the requires an Alert.

Most Cue-bids do not require an Alert, however, as with many aspects of bridge, there are some exceptions.
Some examples:

- 1a-2. No Alert if it is for Takeout. Alert if it shows the suit.
- 1e (could be short) - 2e. If Takeout, no Alert. Alert if it shows a suit.
- 2 (Flannery, showing majors) - 2 . If Takeout, no Alert. Alert if it shows a suit.


## ANNOUNCEMENTS

Certain bids require an Announcement. On the ACBL Convention Card these bids appear in BLUE.

The common bids that are subject to an Announcement by the partner of the person who has made the bid are:

1NT - this opening bid requires partner to ANNOUNCE the strength of the bid, by saying 15-17, 12-14, or whatever the partnership agreement specifies. (Some Bridge Clubs, for Club events, have made the decision to not require this Announcement if the $1 N T$ range is 15-17.)
$1 N T / 2 N T-P-2 \star / \downarrow$ or $4 \diamond / \downarrow$. If these responses to the opening No Trump bid are Transfers, partner must announce "Transfer". (If Responder makes a bid that, systemically, is a Transfer to a minor suit, Opener is required to say "Alert". In other words, a Transfer to a major suit requires an Announcement while a Transfer to a minor suit requires an Alert.)

However, there's one oddity here. Some pairs use the sequence $1 \mathrm{NT}-2$ to show a long minor - either minor. Opener is expected to bid 3 ; if responder has clubs, he passes, or else corrects to $3 \downarrow$. This is not a transfer bid a transfer shows a known suit. The $2 \boldsymbol{a}$ bid is technically a relay (or a puppet, if you prefer), and requires an Alert.
$1 \vee / \Delta-P-1 N T$. Opener is required to Announce "Forcing" or "Semi-Forcing", if either of those descriptions apply.
$1 \curvearrowright / \downarrow$. When either of these opening bids may be made with fewer than 3 cards in the suit, then an Announcement of "could be short" is required to be made by partner. If I happened to be playing a system that permitted me to make a non-forcing opening bid with fewer than 2 cards in the bid suit, consistent with the Principle of Full Disclosure, I, personally, would make the Announcement that the bid may be made with fewer than 2 cards in the bid suit IF our partnership was using a bidding system which permitted that. (Those who play the Montreal bidding system may, in some situations, open $1 \&$, with a singleton in that suit.)

## ******

In last month's article I made a statement that needs some clarification. I stated that, in relation to Weak Two opening bids that "There are a number of bids which appear in red on the Convention Card which are often not Alerted, when indeed they require an alert." I went on to talk about opening a Weak Two bid with more than 11 points. On the Convention Card a "Natural Weak" bid appears in black and thus does not have to be alerted. I must admit to not knowing a bridge player who considers a hand with 12 or more High Card Points as 'Weak". A bid of a Weak Two which, systemically could be made with 12 High Card Points, is an Intermediate strength and that bid does appear in RED. Thus, if your agreement is that your partnership may open a $12 \mathrm{HCP} \star / \mathrm{\square}$ or $\downarrow$ hand at the 2 level, it does indeed require an Alert.

ENJOY OUR WONDERFUL GAME OF BRIDGE FOLKS AND REMEMBER TO CALL THE DIRECTOR IF AN I NFRACTION OCCURS.
 Submitted by John Jones:


## Play or Defend?

by John Jones

> North
> \& 742
> $\vee 87532$
> 87598
> $\& 1098$

| West |  | East |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - J 53 |  | - A Q 10 |
| - Q97653 |  | - J 42 |
| - AK Q J |  | -10964 |
| * void |  | +543 |
|  | South |  |
|  | -986 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A K 10 |  |
|  | - void |  |
|  | * A K Q 762 |  |
| Contract: | 5 |  |
| Opening lead |  |  |

OK, will you play or defend?
If you need a hint, turn to page 8 .
The solution is on page 14 .

## D23 Top MP Winners for 2019 by Mike Marcucci

Each year, the ACBL publishes lists of the top point winners for each category of the Master Point ladder. Here are the Top 10 in each category for District 23. Note that there are 2 colors to the listing numbers. Orange shows the national ranking (they list the top 500) and black shows the remainder of our top 10.

Mini-McKinney shows total points of all colors, while the Ace of Clubs is black point only totals.

Note also we have 2 National winners this year! Susan Morse-Lebow was tops in the nation in her category of the Mini-Mckinney and Ross Bengal was tops in the nation in his category of the Ace of Clubs. Nice going, folks!! In previous years, those winners got their pictures on the cover of the ACBL magazine. We don't know if they still do that, but hope so.

2019 D23 Mini-McKenney Final
$10000+$

## Ifti Baqai

Mitch Dunit
Alex Kolesn
Billy Cohen
Ellen Anten
Steve Gross
John Jones
Steve Mager
Aram Bedros
Bruce Horiguchi
7500-10000
Gil Stinebaugh
Sid Brownstein
43.84

Gene White 36.92
Andy Vinock 35.81
Rhoda Himmell 29.56
Steven Onderwyzer 6.19
5000-7500
John Ramos
Mike Mikyska
572.08
520.69

Joe Viola
493.59
462.34
424.62
376.08
265.68
230.39
223.88
221.22
566.31
473.81
443.33
427.24
345.12
273.95
245.95
234.84
218.02
217.22
280.71

Kay Tseng
250.12

Claude LeFeuvre 248.17
Jo Melis
232.99
206.35
197.81
195.96
194.77
184.70
176.14

2019 D23 Ace of Clubs Finals
$\underline{10000+}$
252.38
193.01
192.81
179.89
168.38
131.35
111.74
106.81
91.01
85.35
140.10
67.46
38.36
26.44
21.27
1.50
$\begin{array}{lll}241 & \text { Peter Knee } & 172.26 \\ 259 & \text { Viktor Anikovich } & 167.91\end{array}$
291 Frances Israel 157.51
299 Joe Viola 155.57
307 Herman Helber 154.75
361 Peter Szecsi 143.28
376 Raymond Mack 140.42
399 Danny Kleinman 137.89
406 Joan Rubin 136.41
10 Lulu Minter $\quad 115.77$
$\begin{array}{cll}7 & \text { John Melis } & 358.03 \\ 189 & \text { Jackie Hess } & 181.53\end{array}$
240 Robert Perlsweig 171.75
$\begin{array}{lll}246 & \text { John Petrie } & 170.89 \\ 265 & \text { Om Chokriwala } & 167.04\end{array}$
300 Dominique Moore 158.56
414 Bob Shore 141.33
$420 \quad$ Bill McClean $\quad 140.31$
9 Sankar Reddy $\quad 127.50$
10 Kim Wang 118.37

|  | 2500-3500 |  |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 57 | Kay Tseng | 219.53 |
| 121 | Jo Melis | 184.93 |
| 405 | Louis Papp | 133.71 |
| 4 | Steven Rowe | 124.85 |
| 5 | Leslie Swift Rawitt | 123.93 |
| 6 | Renee Hoffman | 118.34 |
| 7 | Claude LeFeuvre | 116.92 |
| 8 | Bud Bates | 105.75 |
| 9 | Richard Wasser | 103.29 |
| 10 | Wayne Otsuki | 102.78 |


|  | 1500-2500 |  |  | 1500-2500 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 97 | Dwight Hunt | 344.89 | 252 | Susan Raphael | 155.77 |
| 211 | Jim Perkins | 274.18 | 290 | Kiyo Nagaishi | 149.16 |
| 298 | Rick Turner | 246.81 | 304 | Dwight Hunt | 147.34 |
| 328 | Kiyo Nagaishi | 238.39 | 413 | Richard Plumer | 136.57 |
| 373 | Joyce Henderson | 229.66 | 417 | Judith Jones | 136.27 |
| 393 | Tom Reynolds | 226.74 | 422 | Rick Turner | 135.63 |
| 401 | Nancy Heck | 225.54 | 7 | Basant Shah | 132.85 |
| 491 | Stanley Greengard | 210.96 | 8 | Betty Witteried | 128.63 |
| 9 | Basant Shah | 205.59 | 9 | Vera Mandell | 124.42 |
| 10 | David Peim | 199.07 | 10 | Michael Klemens | 123.19 |
|  | 1000-1500 |  |  | 1000-1500 |  |
| 147 | Dalia Hernandez | 240.22 | 306 | Martin Hurwitz | 119.66 |
| 177 | Fredy Minter | 225.26 | 323 | Fredy Minter | 117.15 |
| 190 | Samantha Macdouglas | 221.41 | 374 | Dalia Hernandez | 111.76 |
| 269 | Paula Nataf | 198.18 | 4 | Robert Preece | 100.96 |
| 358 | Bert Stock | 181.92 | 5 | Bert Stock | 100.58 |
| 6 | Roy Ladd | 150.10 | 6 | Pamela Cole | 87.45 |
| 7 | Kiran Kumar | 147.50 | 7 | Roy Ladd | 84.98 |
| 8 | Robert Preece | 139.15 | 8 | Alan Golden | 82.38 |
| 9 | Martin Jurwitz | 134.91 | 9 | Sherry Troeger | 77.25 |
| 10 | Marion Tumen | 123.99 | 10 | Patricia Taylor | 76.43 |
|  | 500-1000 |  |  | 500-1000 |  |
| 32 | Alan Olschwang | 317.11 | 7 | Alan Olschwang | 209.82 |
| 124 | Jojo Sarkar | 222.91 | 95 | Raymond Primus | 136.71 |
| 150 | Laura Gastelum | 214.31 | 178 | Katherine Weisberg | 119.65 |
| 155 | Dawn Lee | 213.68 | 215 | Jojo Sarkar | 114.80 |
| 313 | Richard Bakovic | 175.21 | 258 | Richard Bakovic | 109.98 |
| 332 | Katherine Weisberg | 171.94 | 292 | Colleen Gardner | 106.67 |
| 448 | Raymond Primus | 158.14 | 7 | Mori Taylor | 90.88 |
| 8 | Elaine Godin | 152.42 | 8 | Jerry Goodman | 86.10 |
| 9 | Colleen Gardner | 150.73 | 9 | Robert Bakovic | 84.59 |
| 10 | Usha Bansai | 149.83 | 10 | Dawn Lee | 84.13 |
|  | 300-500 |  |  | 300-500 |  |
| 20 | Emma Kolesnik | 264.63 | 17 | Robert Johann | 160.07 |
| 22 | Alexander Wiles | 258.40 | 62 | Jill Thesman | 117.31 |
| 25 | Robert Johann | 249.06 | 145 | Brian Fielding | 96.31 |
| 75 | Jill Thesman | 195.48 | 183 | Sunny Lee | 91.26 |
| 218 | John Vacca | 148.50 | 262 | Ravnesh Amar | 84.22 |
| 262 | Brian Fielding | 140.01 | 275 | John Vacca | 83.01 |
| 278 | Virginia Brewer | 137.54 | 297 | Jerold Rose | 80.85 |
| 279 | Jerold Rose | 137.49 | 325 | Douglas Timmer | 78.55 |
| 302 | Lynn Edelson | 134.78 | 9 | Bruce Scheldon | 65.22 |
| 413 | John Hagman | 123.54 | 10 | Patricia Berg | 65.17 |
|  | 200-300 |  |  | 200-300 |  |
| 25 | Joan Oliver | 210.45 | 85 | Joan Oliver | 91.30 |
| 282 | Shoreh Toufanian | 113.92 | 225 | Bob Weingarten | 69.35 |
| 372 | Sharyn Miller | 103.13 | 265 | Katthy Soltwedell | 66.16 |
| 394 | Hanna Zhuang | 100.69 | 414 | Nancy Toussaint | 57.63 |
| 490 | Bob Weingarten | 92.25 | 5 | Richard Bratkovich | 57.07 |
| 6 | Katthy Soltwedell | 90.40 | 6 | Loretto Russell | 55.98 |
| 7 | Nancy Toussaint | 89.89 | 7 | Russell Gray | 54.40 |
| 8 | Loretto Russell | 79.34 | 8 | Irving Klasky | 52.83 |
| 9 | Ramesh Sawhney | 73.94 | 9 | Shoreh Toufanian | 49.05 |
| 10 | Tim Lee | 68.48 | 10 | Monica Fastovsky | 47.26 |


|  | 100-200 |  |  | 100-200 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | Mark Rappaport | 214.01 | 39 | Mark Rappaport | 105.44 |
| 15 | Larisa Rappaport | 213.55 | 31 | Larisa Rappaport | 104.98 |
| 76 | Lillian Slater | 150.35 | 202 | Linda Lin | 69.99 |
| 236 | Aton Arbisser | 109.38 | 203 | Lillian Slater | 69.96 |
| 340 | Jack Stewart | 98.15 | 317 | Frank Neiman | 62.67 |
| 374 | Linda Lin | 95.84 | 326 | E A Ruttenberg | 62.25 |
| 7 | Frank Neiman | 82.35 | 329 | Carol Decordova | 62.09 |
| 8 | Larry Feldman | 77.92 | 353 | Larry Feldman | 60.38 |
| 9 | Carol Decordova | 73.02 | 440 | Michael Connell | 55.98 |
| 10 | E A Ruttenberg | 72.52 | 10 | A D Shah | 55.33 |
|  | 50-100 |  |  | 50-100 |  |
| *1 | Susan Morse-Lebow | 258.69 | *1 | Ross Bengel | 141.20 |
| 3 | Ross Bengel | 225.96 | 56 | Patricia Sullivan 7 | 72.67 |
| 55 | Ardis Laine | 123.81 | 59 | Bob Becker | 71.42 |
| 121 | Charles Laine | 99.22 | 104 | Charles Laine | 61.97 |
| 139 | Patricia Sullivan | 95.95 | 136 | Bette Gordy | 57.44 |
| 159 | Bob Becker | 92.35 | 188 | Louis Simmons | 52.78 |
| 403 | Bette Gordy | 64.85 | 259 | Ardis Laine | 48.91 |
| 443 | Louis Simmons | 62.77 | 335 | Lindsay Gronich | 45.15 |
| 9 | I D Patel | 59.35 | 9 | Susan Morse-Lebow | 40.63 |
| 10 | Lindsay Gronich | 59.17 | 10 | Sri Nagesh | 39.14 |
|  | 20-50 |  |  | 20-50 |  |
| 107 | Sandra Schlosser | 80.76 | 60 | Carl Lundgren | 62.02 |
| 143 | Carl Lundgren | 73.56 | 106 | James Degner | 52.42 |
| 167 | Di Zheng | 70.39 | 141 | Sandra Schlosser | 48.92 |
| 197 | Tomoko Stock | 67.36 | 220 | Alan Nueman | 42.40 |
| 258 | James Degner | 61.12 | 363 | Nava Grutman | 36.67 |
| 304 | Nava Grutman | 55.64 | 6 | Naum Grutman | 34.17 |
| 342 | Naum Grutman | 53.14 | 7 | Jim Werner | 33.47 |
| 420 | Karmen Armoudjian | 49.86 | 8 | Carolyn Byrnes | 31.80 |
| 433 | Alan Nueman | 49.11 | 9 | Tomoko Stock | 29.14 |
| 480 | Shuai Lan | 47.44 | 10 | Karmen Armoudjian | 28.40 |
|  | 5-20 |  |  | 5-20 |  |
| 152 | Frances Gross | 49.56 | 75 | Harkirat Randhawa | 42.34 |
| 158 | Harkirat Randhawa | 49.05 | 108 | Frances Gross | 37.33 |
| 185 | Joef Wyrick | 46.2 | 176 | Phylly Yarnall | 31.29 |
| 191 | Raymond Boncato | 45.52 | 236 | Barry Sinsheimer | 28.68 |
| 205 | Danielle Dina | 44.24 | 244 | Danielle Dina | 28.30 |
| 267 | Barry Sinsheimer | 39.61 | 263 | Myrna Silton | 27.41 |
| 416 | Dingan Chen | 32.99 | 288 | Teresa Dubernet | 26.59 |
| 440 | Phylly Yarnall | 32.04 | 331 | Joef Wyrick | 25.27 |
| 500 | Myrna Silton | 30.35 | 9 | Raymond Boncato | 22.78 |
| 10 | Elaine Bock | 29.95 | 10 | John Walker | 20.71 |
|  | 0-5 |  |  | 0-5 |  |
| 295 | David Khalieque | 30.70 | 164 | Melanie Smothers | 26.44 |
| 306 | Mikie Alpert | 30.03 | 230 | Mikie Alpert | 23.44 |
| 314 | Melanie Smothers | 29.71 | 245 | David Khalieque | 22.71 |
| 414 | Priscilla Caillouette | 25.86 | 261 | Priscilla Caillouette | 22.04 |
| 472 | Angela Chen | 24.24 | 331 | Timothy Singer | 19.87 |
| 488 | Jeffrey Silver | 23.73 | 393 | Angela Chen | 18.34 |
| 7 | David Dai | 22.50 | 7 | Barbara Kaye | 15.76 |
| 8 | Barbara Kaye | 22.06 | 8 | Lawrence Mitchell | 14.77 |
| 9 | Timothy Singer | 21.41 | 9 | Rosalie Stern | 13.80 |
| 10 | Lawrence Mitchell | 19.93 | 10 | CC Pultzer-Lemann | 13.67 |


| District 23 Rank Changes January 2020 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Junior Master | Sectional Master | Bronze Life Master |
| David Adelstein | Mikie Alpert | Linda Nye |
| Stephanie Campbell | Margaret A. Bass | Joan C. Oliver |
| Ames C. Cushing | Bill Kessler | Patricia Shellogg-Seal |
| Herb Glazeroff | Diana Mitchell | Tien P. Zee |
| Velma M. Matteson | Myrna A. Silton |  |
| Edward J. Nowacki | Barry Sinsheimer | Silver Life Master |
| Elaine L. Porzucki |  | Laura L. Gastelum |
| Barbara Quinn | Regional Master | Jodie S. Rachmil |
| Joseph E. Roth | Jerry D. Reid |  |
| Sally A. Shannon | Jill Sattinger | Ruby Life Master |
| Dennis R. Welsh |  | Pamela K. Cole |
| Chia C. Yao | NABC Master | Kiran Kumar |
|  | Larry Feldman | Brian Reynolds |
| Club Master | Ardis K. Laine | Jo-Anne T. Waller |
| Estelle Byrnes | Glen Musicer |  |
| Patricia J. Donley | Janet Treisman | Sapphire Life Master |
| Linda Lessing | Denise I. Wreede | Claude Le Feuvre |
| Lawrence Mitchell Joanne L. Moser | Advanced NABC Master | Diamond Life Master |
| Freda H. Otto | Nancy A. Toussaint | Verna M. Baccus |
| C. C. Pulitzer-Lemann |  | Rae Murbach |
| Andrew D. Smith | Life Master |  |
| Rosalie Stern | Joyce Roberts | Platinum Life Master |
| John F. Tholen |  | Rhoda Himmell |
| Glenda Zelichov |  |  |

## Hint for "Play or Defend?

I have been known to call the 2 Stayman. Jeff Goldsmith calls the 22 Roberto, after Roberto Scaramuzzi who drew the card in a tie breaker. Others have different names for deuces, but regardless of what you call it take notice of the 2 . It is a very important card on the actual hand.


|  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Around the Units in District 23



Long Beach by Jon Yinger

www.acblunit557.org www.LongBeachBridge.com

January 26 Unit Game: Overall results: 1st in A Dominique and Arthur Moore, 2nd Kauy Tseng/Wayne Rapp, 3rd Mary Kiechle/Steve Sturm, 4th Verna Baccus/Jeanette Estill, 5th Bruce and Chiye Horiguchi, 6th Jackie Hess/John Melis. In the B flight overalls Lillian Slater/Bonnie Shok were 2nd, Milton Kalikman/Nancy Nakanis 3rd, Sherry Troeger/Gayle Grubb 4th, Margie Lee/Don Garner 5th, Hanefi Erton/Oliver Yildiz 6th. In the C flight overalls Mark Singer/Paul Chen were 3rd, Rosemary Ford/Lynn Johnson 4th, Rosalie Storc/Penny O'Toole 5th, John Tholen/Lynn Danielson 6th. And in the NLM game Jennifer Wellman/Gordon Hull were 1st, Dale Whitney/Porteneuve Aido tied with Larry Wisinski/Edward Von Leffern for 2nd. Congratulations to all!

70\% GAMES Jan 16 through Feb 15: In open games: Monday evening Jan 27 Sherry Troeger/Ilan Rothstein had $70.82 \%$, in the evening game Jan 29 Mary Singer/George Derevjanik had $70.82 \%$, in the afternoon game Jan 28 Alan Flower/Loren Hilf had 70\%, Feb 2 Akiko Murakami/Alfred Lee had 70.50\%. In NLM games Jan 17 Melanie Smothers/Ted Dowe had 70\%, Jan 30 Sylvia Kaprelyn/Henry Lee had $73.75 \%$. And in beginner games Jan 28 Herb Glazeroff/Carol Poto had 82\%, Feb 10 Gerri Landes/Leayn Johnson had 87.50\%. Congratulations to all eight pairs!

BIG MASTER POINT AWARDS Jan 16 through Feb 15: In the team game Jan 19 the team of Peggy Waite/Betty McClellan/Steve Rowe/John Crabtree came in 1 st each winning 1.30 mp . In the team game Feb 9 the team of Kay Tseng/Colleen Gardner/John Melis/Jane Reid came in 1st each winning 1.98 mp . In the Unit Game Jan 26 Dominique
and Arthur Moore won 5.40 mp for 1st, Kay Tseng/Wayne Rapp 4.05 mp for 2nd, Mary Kiechle/Steve Sturm 3.04mp for 3rd. In other open games Jan 17 Jo and John Melis won 4.67 mp for 1st, Toni Morford/John Crabtree 3.50mp for 2nd. Feb 3 Jackie Hess/Alan Flower won 3.79mp for 1st. Feb 4 John Backovic/Ralph Beazley won 4.23mp for 1st, Jackie Hess/Jon Yinger 3.17mp for 2nd. Feb 5 Bill Mclean/John Bakovic won 3.65mp for 1st. Feb 6 Gayle Grubb/Linda Renkus won 3.35mp for 1st. Feb 7 Bruce Horiguchi/Maya Ayala won 3.21mp for 1st. Feb 10 Thad Mikols.Ralph Beazley. Feb 11 Mark Tang/Bruce Horiguchi won 4.67 mp for 1sst, Gayle Grubb/Baum Harris won 3.65 mp for 2 nnd . Feb 12 Kiyo Nagaishi/Wayne Rapp won 3.79mp for 1st. Feb 13 Phil Schuster/Jon Yinger won 3.50mp for 1st. Feb 14 Joyce Henderson/Larry Slutsyky won 4.38 mp for 1st, AlanFlower/Verna Baccus won 3.29 mp for 2 nd . And Feb 15 John Jones/Jim Nicola won 3.35 mp for 1st. Congratulations to all!

NEW MEMBERS: Nancy Sheley, Peter Connor. Welcome to you both!

STATUS CHANGES: New Club Master: Rick Gonser. New Bronze Life Master: Judith Lorber. New Silver Life Master: William Smith. New Ruby Life Master: Sherry Troeger. Congratulations to you all!

CONDOLENCES to family and friends of Marcie Evans. She was a dear person and a great bridge player. She will be sorely missed.

GET WELL: Phyllis Parker

## UP-COMING EVENTS AT THE CLUB:

Mar 2-8 District 23 STaC sectional tournament Extra points, $\$ 11$ card fee
Mar 9 9:30-11:30 am Pro-Am game Ams \$5, Pros free

Mar 15 Swiss Teams
Mar 22 Unit Game 12:30pm 0-199pts \$2, others \$8 dessert served

Mar 31 ACBL-Wide International Fund Game Extra points $\$ 13$ card fee

## NEWS FROM LEISURE WORLD BRIDGE CLUBS <br> Judy Carter-Johnson

CLUB CHAMPIONSHIP: Clubhouse \#1January 25. Ellen Kice/Al Appel 1 in A. Sue Boswell/Ted Cooper 2 in A, 1 in B. Linda Nye/Joan Tschirki 3 in A. Sharon Beran/Bud Parish 4 in A, 2 in B.

CONGRATS TO: Howard Smith who attained rank of Silver Life Master. And to Sylvia Kaprelyan and Russ Gray who earned some points at the Costa Mesa Regional.

Any news for next month's column, please e mail me @ jcj90740@gmail.com results of all Leisure World games are posted on www.acblunit557.org


> Pomona Covina by Tom Lill www. acblunit551.org

Unit Game: Saturday March 21, 11:00 a.m., Glendora
Individual: Saturday, March 7, Chino
STaC Games: March 3, 5, 6, 7
That's right, both La Fetra and Bridge41 have signed up for the silver-point STaC games this month. Entry fee will be boosted to $\$ 8$ at La Fetra, and $\$ 4$ at Bridge41. Those STaC sanction fees are simply ruinous, don't you know?

Even better: after a l-o-o-o-n-g hiatus, Unit 551 is returning to the Sectional scene. It will be a joint effort with Unit 516. The dates are May 29-3031; the location, the Upland Women's Club in ... well, I don't have to spell it out, do I? The tournament flyer is available on the ACBL web site. Physical copies will be available soon at La Fetra, Bridge41, and the Knights of Columbus.

We will be presenting the annual Ace of Clubs and Mini-McKenney awards before the March Unit game. As in last year, we won't be mailing out awards (except in special circumstances), so if you can't make it to the game, you can pick up your award later at a club game. Or something.

In the sad news department, Clara Satterfield is leaving southern California at the end of this month, to be with her daughter in Louisiana. Please come join us at the game on Friday, March 20, to say "farewell" and scarf some cake-and-ice-cream.

Roger Boyar led the rest in the February Individual, with a score of $66.77 \%$. Al Lax was second, Art Weinstein third, and Yours Truly was fourth.

The February Unit game was won in a cakewalk by Amr Elghamry - Gerard Geremia, with a score of $69.05 \%$. They were more than 3 tops above the second place finishers, Steve Mancini and Your Correspondent. (To be fair, we did get some nice gifts, otherwise, meh, we'd have been down in the depths. After Amr and Gerard, the rest of the field was bunched up real closely.) Third place was taken by Vic Sartor - Bill Papa, and fourth by Claudia Cochran - Hanan Mogharbel.

February being a bit short, only 34 players won points, the total being 57.39 . And to top it off, there was a great disturbance in the Force. Doublecheck though I might, the top club point gatherer last month was ... Your Correspondent, with a whopping 6.72. (To be fair, a lot of the heavy hitters didn't play much in February; an humble thing, but mine own.) Second was Amr Elghamry (4.01); then Clint Lew (3.88); Hanan Mogharbel (2.99); and Steve Mancini (2.72).

The top game in February was a $67.84 \%$ game by Bill Papa - Vic Sartor. Bill and Vic also scored $67.13 \%$, with Kurt Triselmann - Yours Truly also topping $65 \%$ at $67.00 \%$. There were two other scores over the magic $65 \%$ mark, both in Individual games: $74.43 \%$, and $70.43 \%$, both by ... well, modesty forbids. (Ah, the old bromide: "If only I could partner myself ..." Ahem.)

Other winners: Hanan Mogharbel, Linda Stuart, Clint Lew, Joe Unis, Marjorie Preston, Clara Satterfield, David Ochroch, Fredy Minter, and Lulu Minter.

No promotions to report this month.
This time, we have a wild one for you in the Hand-of-the-Month department. I'll give it to you from South's perspective, for maximum impact. Partner (North) deals, and opens 14. The opponents are silent (more on this, later). You are holding this collection:

』 4 『 KQJ10 • K K875432.
Whether playing Standard or $2 / 1$, 2 seems indicated, no? Partner's rebid is $3 \vee$ ! Hmmm, must be some shape over there. You make the obvious 4NT call, and partner responds 5s, showing 2 key cards and the trump Queen (or extra length, of course). What? Partner jump-shifted and has only two Aces? Well, you are committed now (or perhaps one of both of you should be), so $6 \vee$ it is. The opening lead is the $\forall A$, and partner quickly proceeds to wrap up all 13 tricks. Partner's hand? Take a gander:

## ^ AKQ9875 © A98543 none none.

That's right, a 7-6 monster. Partner's bidding seems reasonable; so does yours; but how do you get to the cold grand? It would be easier playing $2 / 1$, but we were playing Standard. The hand also makes 7a, as the missing spades are 3-2. Yoiks! Note that with North void in both minors, this grand comes home on the lofty total of 19 working HCP. The power of shape

One puzzling thing: East held eight diamonds to the AQJ, yet failed to enter the auction. East was no palooka, either. No comprendo!

Quote for the month: "If you tell the truth you don't have to remember anything." (Mark Twain)


## Santa ClaritaAntelope Valley by Beth Morrin

This year's Magic Mountain Sectional will be held on October $3^{\text {rd }}$ and $4^{\text {th }}$ at the Friendly Valley Auditorium in Santa Clarita. For more information, contact tournament chair, Ruth Baker (rbaker1243@sbcglobal.net)

Unit 556 will honor the winners of the Helen Shanbrom Ace of Clubs and Mini-McKenney contests at our annual Unit Game and Awards Ceremony on Sunday, March $22^{\text {nd }}$ at the Joshua Tree Bridge Club in Lancaster. The luncheon will start at 11:30 AM and game at 12:30 PM.

Congratulations to the winners of the 2019 Helen Shanbrom Ace of Clubs Awards:

| $0-5$ | David Khalieque |
| :--- | :--- |
| $5-20$ | Harkirat Randhawa |
| $20-50$ | Alan Nueman |
| $50-100$ | May Ho |
| $100-200$ | Carol Reukauf |
| $200-300$ | Paul Reukauf |
| $300-500$ | Carol Provost |
| $500-1000$ | Ruth Baker |
| $1000-1500$ | Albert Stock |
| $1500-2500$ | Basant Shah |
| $2500-3500$ | Bill Brodek |
| $5000-7500$ | Paul Markarian |

Congratulations to the winners of the 2019 Mini-McKenney Awards:

| $0-5$ | David Khalieque |
| :--- | :--- |
| $5-20$ | Harkirat Randhawa |
| $20-50$ | Tomoko Stock |
| $50-100$ | Gay Gipson |
| $100-200$ | Carol Reukauf |
| $200-300$ | Paul Reukauf |
| $300-500$ | Carol Provost |
| $500-1000$ | Ruth Baker |
| $1000-1500$ | Albert Stock |
| $1500-2500$ | Basant Shah |
| $2500-3500$ | Lance Kerr |
| $5000-7500$ | Paul Markarian |

## Upcoming Events:

## District 22-23 STaC Games:

Tuesday, Mar. $3^{\text {rd }}$ at $5: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ at the Sports Complex in Castaic

Thursday, Mar. $5^{\text {th }}$ at 10:00 AM in at the Sports Complex in Castaic

Friday, Mar. $6^{\text {th }}$ at 12:30 at Joshua Tree Bridge Club in Lancaster

Sunday, Mar. $8^{\text {th }}$ at $12: 30$ at Joshua Tree Bridge Club in Lancaster

ACBL-wide Senior Pairs Game: Monday, Mar. $2^{\text {nd }}$ at 12:30 at the Senior Center in Santa Clarita. Please RSVP to Paula Olivares (paula@pacbell.net).

World-Wide Bridge Contest: Friday, June $5^{\text {th }}$ at 12:30 at Joshua Tree Bridge Club, 2747 W. Ave L, Lancaster.

Longest Day Games: Monday, June $15^{\text {th }}$ at the Senior Center in Santa Clarita and Friday, June $19^{\text {th }}$ at Joshua Tree in Lancaster.

Next Board meeting: TBA


## San Fernando Valley by Linda Silvey

[Editor's note: with great sadness, we bid farewell to Linda, who has given us the news from Unit 561 for the past five years. Linda has retired from her Unit board, and a replacement column-writer has not yet been located.

Sigh. Our District has 9 units, and of these nine, only five (sometimes four) are letting us know the latest news. We'd love to hear from the rest of the Units. Heck, most of us have friends in other Units, so we're not just interested in our own local news.

Anyone interested? The job doesn't pay very well (it's a volunteer job), but it's not all that burdensome. You can put in as much, or as little, effort as you please. So if you are interested, just talk to a member of your Unit's Board of Directors. It's easy, it can be fun.]

## Downey - Whittier by Linda Eagan and Liz Burrell

We hope you will join us on WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2020, at the Downey Bridge Club to help us celebrate the life of our late, great director for many years, Marcelita Landry-Evans. Marcie had many, many friends throughout the bridge world and elsewhere and we wish to honor her memory with a Charity Game and catered lunch.

The lunch will be hosted by Mary Kiechle, Marcie's long-time good friend and member of the Downey Bridge Club at 9813 Paramount Blvd, Downey, CA 90240. Reservations are a must since we can only accommodate a maximum of 11,12 or maybe 13 tables so be sure to call, text or email Liz Burrell (562-972-2913; lizburrell7@gmail.com) as soon as possible to make your reservation. We also need a count for the caterer.

We start our game at 10:00 a.m. but please arrive no later than 9:45 to register and pay your game fees (\$11). If anyone would like to share "Marcie Stories" that day, we would be happy to have you say a few words during our lunch. We look forward to
hearing from you soon and to a special day remembering Marcie.

## Since Dec 2019 these are our $\mathbf{6 0 \%}$ or better gamesCongrats to them!

| Ernest Wong - Larry Boles 01/29/20 | 69.19\% |
| :---: | :---: |
| Ernest Wong - Mark Tang 02/05/20 | 68.23\% |
| Gabrielle Sill - Kim Wang 01/08/20 | 66\% |
| Gabrielle Sill - Connie Kang 01/29/20 | 63.64\% |
| Linda Krause - Bob Krause 01/22/20 | 61.81\% |
| Mary Kiechle - Barbara Horn 02/12/20 | 61.48\% |
| Joyce Roberts -Tim Cole 12/04/19 | 60.71\% |
| Mary Kiechle - Barbara Horn 12/18/20 | 60.37\% |
| Gabrielle Sill - Larry Bolls 12/04/19 | 60.12\% |



# West Los Angeles by Elizabeth Ryan 

 eryan311@gmail.comThis column is really a way to celebrate our members, new and old. If you have some news to share please email it to me so we can all celebrate with you.

## Now to the West LA news.

There are new and transferring members to welcome to our district:

New members: Jonathon Eastman, David G. Gidlow, Michael C. Gordon, Meir Hasbani,Lauren Z. Hurwitz, Susan M. Miller and Feresheth Mobasheri.

Transfer from another unit: Loretta Kohn and Ray Kosarin.

There are some exciting level changes as well:
New Junior Masters: Raymond L Coen and Thomas E. Unterman

New Club Masters: Polly Bell, Charles L. Guinness and Denny's Purcell

New NABC Master: Tam Lachoff and Gabe Rosenberg

New LIFE Master: Barbara Wellisch
New BRONZE Life Master: Lidia Epelbaum
New RUBY Life Master: Colin D. Gordon
Congratulations to our Unit's Mini-McKenney winners for 2019 (masterpoints).

0-5 MP: Angela Chen (22.24)
5-20 MP: Danielle Dina (44.24)
20-50 MP: Di Zheng (70.39)
50-100 MP: Susan Morse-Lebow (258.40)
100-200 MP: Mark Rappaport (214.01) Larisa
Rappaport had 213.56!
200-300 MP: Joan Oliver (210.45)
300-500 MP: Alexander Wiles (258.40)
500-1000 MP: Dawn Lee (213.68)
1000-1500MP: Paula Nataf (198.18)
1500-2500 MP: James Perkins (274.18)
2500-3500 MP: Nelly Gordon (167.82)
3500-5000 MP: Robert Shore (566.31)
5000-7500 MP: John Ramos (572.08)
7500-10000 MP: Sidney Brownstein (230.93)
Over 10000 MP: Iftikhar Baqai (1434.44)

## Club news and 70\% Games

## Barrington Bridge Club:

1/24 Bryan Conley \& Basant Shah 71.11\%
1/27 Sheri Rivera \& Aram Bedros 70.91\%
2/19 Sally Aminoff \& Robert Levy 72.39\%

STAC week pair game on March 5th Thursday evening at $7 \mathbf{p m}$, Silver points! The Barrington bridge offers a team game on the first and third Thursday of each month, game time 7:00. There are no games this March but will start up again in April.

A celebration of Roger Clough's 80th birthday was held at the Barrington Bridge Club, bridge and dinner were served. A fun time was had by all. The winners were Pam Wittes \& Harvey Katz (N/S), Mike Mikyka \& Junko Hemus (E/W).

## Beverly Hills Bridge Club:

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { 1/23 Victor Anikovich \& Alan Schneider } & 74.54 \% \\ 1 / 30 \text { Steve Mager \& Pete Benjamin } & 74.76 \%\end{array}$
There are stratified open night games at the Beverly Hills Bridge Club. Monday and Wednesday and a novice game on Thursday night, game time 7:15.

Beverly Hills Bridge Club began its "Learn Bridge in a Day" program 5 years ago and are experiencing lots positive outcomes from its participants. Check out their website for more information.

CC Lehman-Pulitzer, a newer player, has been playing in the Open Games and has this experience to share about it: "We few baby guppies who have the nerve/courage to swim into the big shark-filled bridge room learn a lot and as long as we don't take too long, we can swim off with only a few-if any shark nibbles! 사)"

## Fun History Fact from West LA

Aram Bedros had a $70 \%$ as he did last month. As we will see in this month's fun fact, he has been scoring such games for at least 30 years!

The July 1989 ACBL Bulletin reported that Earl Ziskin racked up FIVE 70\% plus games in a six week period during April and May while playing at the Culver-Marina Bridge Club. Astonishingly, each was with a different partner! The partners were Aram Bedros ( $74.5 \%$ ), Leon Saizow ( $73.4 \%$ ), Lyle Peake (71.5\%), Art Peterson (70.0\%) and Bill Gavin(71.8\%).

## Solution to "Play or Defend?"

Answer: Choose to play. This is an Eddie Kantar hand. It can be found on Roy Wilson's double dummy problems on his website. Here is Eddie's analysis:

Ruff the diamond with the $\boldsymbol{A}$.
Lead the 6 to the dummy and ruff a diamond with the K.

Continue by leading the $\%$ as an entry to dummy.

Ruff a third diamond with the Q .
Play the $\vee A$ and $\vee K$, pitching a small spade.
Ruff the $\upharpoonright$ T with dummy's last trump.
Ruff a fourth diamond with your J .
Now your hand has the 2 and three small spades, while dummy has K74 of spades and a high diamond. East has the high trump, which is the 3, and the AQT of spades.

If you lead your 2 , East is endplayed and must give you the $\mathbf{\wedge}$ K and the last diamond. Pulling four rounds of trumps works similarly.

# Problem Solvers＇Panel 

Moderator：John Jones
Panelists are：Mark Bartusek，Jeff Goldsmith，Roger Lee，Rick Roeder， John Swanson，and Jon Wittes．

［The variety of hands that partner could have for opening 14 and then jumping to $4 \vee$ over the game forcing $2 / 1$ is troublesome for the panelists．Is his suit solid？Must he have an 8 bagger？Does he promise an outside ace？Is he warning he has short diamonds？ What＇s his maximum number of diamonds？Are we playing Namyats？Is partner a disciplined bidder？ Once we get past trying to figure out what partner has， we get to an age old question．Can I disregard the old adage of never putting an eight－card suit in the dummy？］

Wittes：Pass．If partner has a doubleton diamond， slam becomes a possibility．If partner has a stiff diamond，still a remote possibility．If partner has a void diamond［fairly likely if he thinks he is warning us against bidding a slam］， $4 \vee$ may very well be the limit．Give partner the worst possible hand $⿴ 囗 K x x$ YKQJxxxx＊oid＊Jxx，and game will probably rest on trumps behaving．I don＇t expect partner to jump to $4 \checkmark$ with a very good suit and a good control outside the suit and even a minimum diamond fit．

Bartusek：5४．Very tough！Let＇s give partner a choice in the matter since 4H encompasses such a large range．Of interest，would 5NT be pick a slam or clearly Josephine？［Josephine was the original name for Grand Slam Force．It was invented by Josephine Culbertson．I generally play the rule that if $5 N T$ could be pick a slam then then pick a slam it is．］

Roeder：Pass．I bet many partnerships have not discussed this sequence if playing 2 over 1 as I am assuming［2／l GF is always assumed for this column］． Logically，his hand is slam negative． $2=7=2=2$ with solid hearts is possible．［That hand has got too much slam potential to bid that way if $4 \checkmark$ is intended as doubtful for slam．］So is $3=7=0=3$ ．Is my hand good enough to override？No．You did not mention how trustworthy partner is．If I have pegged his hand right， I am going to teach him Namyats．
Swanson：6 6 ．The $4 \checkmark$ rebid says that partner has no interest in my suit．However，I retain some interest． The downside of 5 is that it is a cue bid for hearts， not diamonds．Partner can＇correct＇diamonds to hearts with solid hearts．The spade situation will just have to adjust to the auction．
［Look at the discrepancy in calls between the last two panelists．］

Lee：Pass，even thinking is an overbid．
Goldsmith：7『．N／S probably don＇t have an agreement about what $4 \vee$ shows，but in the old days of $2 / 1$ ，it showed solid hearts and exactly one outside ace． Versus Axx AKQJxxx $\uparrow x x$ ，there＇s a pretty good chance to make seven，so if I think partner knows what he＇s supposed to have，I＇ll try 7\％．［You＇ll need diamonds to break 2－2 if they lead a club．］Keycard won＇t work to find out if he＇s void in diamonds， because he shouldn＇t show that void．

If partner can have any random hand with a lot of hearts to bid this way，get a new partner．

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | $? ? ?$ |  |
| IMPs <br> Both Vul | What call do you make? |  |  |

[Last hand was much more a guessing game as to what partner might have than it was an evaluation problem. Here we have a problem that relies on style and evaluation. The six panelists form three groups. Two panelists pass and think it is close. Two panelists open and think it is close. Two panelists open and think it obvious. Notice that the only mention of a weak two bid is an admonition not to ]

Roeder: Pass. Reverse my majors and I would open 1*. Power of the spade suit again speaks!

Bartusek: Pass. It's very close between Pass and $1 \downarrow$, but also system dependent. It's obviously a clear-cut opening bid playing a strong club system, but in standard $2 / 1$ the spade shortness seems like the deciding factor to me (remember the various uses of the Pearson count / Rule of 15 / Cassino count / which utilizes your spade length in the calculation). [Those rules are generally used for deciding to open in fourth chair.] Admittedly you won't have any rebid problems, but an auction like $1-1-2$ might lose your heart fit if the partnership lacks game-going values. It's interesting that two common hand evaluators that people cite give the following results:

Kaplan \& Rubens $(\mathrm{K} \& R)=13.25$, Danny Kleinman $(D K)=10.0$. Surprising initially, but upon further examination DK doesn't measure shape, only HCPs. [Jeff also mentions the $K \& R$ hand evaluator. Both the $K \& R$ evaluator and the $D K$ evaluator are available on Jeff's website (jeff-goldsmith.org) What earthly good would an evaluation program that only counted HCP be? Danny is conservative bridge player. But he is an intelligent, astute player and theorist. He would never invent a hand evaluator that only counted HCP! The DK program has clearly whiffed on this problem! But it won't miss on every problem. The $K \& R$ evaluator, which likes aces in long suits (who doesn't?), is about right.]
[Two panelists open $1 \$$, but think it is close.]
Swanson: 1*. Pass is fine, but this hand is much too good in support of hearts for a weak two bid.
Wittes: 1 ${ }^{\text {. I }}$ I would open 1 with 2 bullets and that distribution, but wouldn't fault a pass.
[I am emphatically in agreement with the last two panelists that think this is a clear opening bid.]

Goldsmith: 1 4 . K\&R says 13.25. It thinks this is a sound opening without the es (13.05) [I Agree!]

Lee: $1 \downarrow$, no matter how conservative you are, this is a clear opening bid in any playable expert style.
[This hand comes from a BBO practice session. My partner passed this hand. Third chair stole the pot with an aggressive 3a preempt. We missed a good 4 game when I passed with a 5-3-3-2 12 HCP with 12 HCP. After he answered the original question, I told Roger the result. He doesn't like the initial pass, but he also disagrees with the final pass. Here is what he wrote:

I will also say that even if you wanted to pass on hand 2 as an opening bidder, passing in the balancing seat again is beyond bad, it is possibly the worst call I have seen in a year. To be clear I would call reopening double as an unpassed hand to be completely obvious, failing to double as a passed hand is criminal. It is rare for me to see a competitive bidding decision cost an average of about 5 IMPs per hand in the long run, but if you deal out 20 or 30 hands in a simulator I'm pretty sure you will see that's how absolutely terrible it is to fail to reopen with a double.

|  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $1 \vee$ |
|  | pass | 14 | pass | $2 \vee$ |
|  | pass | 3\% | pass | $3 \vee$ |
|  | pass | 4\% | pass | ??? |
| None Vul | You, | hold: | VQJ y you | $\text { Q3 } \mathrm{A} 42$ |

Goldsmith: 4 . Partner is yet again trying to be a pain in the neck. He either doesn.t have a diamond stopper or he has substantial extras. The over/under on his heart length is 0.5 . He could have $₫ K Q J_{x x} \vee_{x} \uparrow x x$ KQJxx, in which case, we are already too high. He could have AKJxxx void $*$ KQJxxx, and 6 excellent. If he has AKxxxx $\uparrow$ x ${ }^{2}$ KQxx, we want to be in 4 4 . The only bid I have that can elicit some sort of input from him is $4 \star$, though I suspect the main effect it will have is to give me a problem on the next round. My plan is to pass if he bids a game, and if he bids $5 \star$, to bid $6 \boldsymbol{}$.

Lee: 4母, though 5* could be right, my honors look wrong for that. Good advertisement for playing 2 over $2 \boldsymbol{v}$ as an artificial game force.

Roeder: 44. We might have same three losers in 5 . If diamonds are led at the first three tricks, I can take the tap in hand with short spades if partner is $5=0=2=6$, $5=1=2=5$ or $5=0=3=5$.

Swanson: 4 . This seems clear-cut to me.
Wittes: 4a. Likely to be right if partner is 6-5. Could even be right if partner is 5-5 and ten tricks is the limit of the hand.

Bartusek: 4ar . Partner is very likely to be 6-5 on this auction. If only $5-5$ then partner would have found another bid over $3 \boldsymbol{~}$ (unless 4 is very playable with my hand opposite a strong 5-card suit).

[This problem elicited five different answers. Pass, 3@, 3NT, 4\&, 44. Not bad variety with only six panelists.]
Bartusek: 34. Partner can be very light in balancing seat (especially NV), so let's just try to find the safest spot at the lowest level. My initial evaluation was an easy bid. Upon further reflection, West's pass implies that partner doesn't have diamond shortness! Thus, partner could easily be $5=4=2=2$ or $4=5=2=2$. In addition, if I end up playing a Moysian fit at the 3 or 4 level then I probably want to play in the stronger trump suit. Obviously. this will be a disaster if partner has a minimum with $3=4=2=4$ (but doesn't everyone need more practice playing those 3-3 fits at the 3-level?). Note that a 3 bid also allows us to play 3NT if partner is so inclined.

Goldsmith: 3NT. Someone has to bid it, [Why does someone have to bid 3NT? It looks as though we may not even have a stopper.] and if not me, then who? If not now, then when? I'm glad it is matchpoints.

Lee: 4*. It's ugly but has to be done. 4 could be right, but 5 is just an overbid.
Roeder: 4*. I could easily be convinced that Pass is the winner as suggested by "The Law." 4e could be right but I would hate for the gossip circle to say I was this wimpy. A Moysian could play well.

Swanson: Pass. I'm invoking the Law of Total Tricks for assistance on this one. If they have nine trumps and we have eight someone is not making at the threelevel. I hope it is they.

Wittes: 4e. Yes, I have a good hand on this auction, but other than having five clubs, my distribution couldn't be much worse. After all, partner is just balancing. Give partner an opening bid with $4=4=2=3$ distribution, and 4 is probably the limit of the hand at best. [4 looks much better as an answer when you look at all the other possibilities. It's wimpier than Popeye's friend who "Will gladly pay you Tuesday for a hamburger today," but it rates to be the most likely plus score.

| Matchpoints Both Vul. | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 18 | dbl |  |
|  | 32 | $3 \square$ | pass | 4* |  |
|  | pass | 4 | pass | ??? |  |
|  | You, South, hold: A1032 $\downarrow$ AQ AKQ9763 *void What call do you make? |  |  |  |  |

Bartusek: $6 \uparrow$. A choice between 6 and $5 N T$, but 6 seems much safer. Partner rates to be something like $3=5=1=4$ or $3=6=1=3$ (hopefully not $3=6=0=4$ ). I'm fearful that 5 NT will get us to hearts when partner's hearts aren't good enough to withstand the dummy being tapped at trick 1 (e.g. J86542, or even K86542 without enough quick pitches). This would have been easier if we were non-vul since partner's failure to open $2 \boldsymbol{\checkmark}$ in 2 nd seat would eliminate the possibility of slam-ready hearts. I'm fairly certain that partner won't have seven reasonable hearts since a $2 \downarrow$ opening bid would have been acceptable.

Goldsmith: Pass. Why didn't partner open a weak $2 \downarrow$ ? Probably his hearts are not good enough; maybe he has $\uparrow$ Kxx $\vee 10 x x x x \uparrow$ Qxx. Opposite that hand, $6 \boldsymbol{\psi}$ is touch and go. I could try for slam, but I don't see partner's being able to make a good decision, so I'll just pass. How's he supposed to know that the H9/8 are big cards? If he has one fewer club and one more diamond, slam isn't so good, and he'll like that hand more. Pass.

Lee: 6 . 5 seems overly scientific on an auction where partner is staring at no keycards for diamonds.

Roeder: 5as. Partner did not open a weak 2 s s I might be less than thrilled to have to trump trick one with a high heart honor. Shades of Problem \#1! If 5 and $4 \vee$ hearts both make, matchpoint considerations will tilt me to hearts. Partner has not guaranteed a 6bagger with this sequence. Yikes! Too tough! I simultaneously "punt" and cue bid with 5\%. 1965's "Help!" is ringing in my ears. Partner could have

could make six of either red suit. Other hands exist where the limit is $6 \downarrow, 5 \downarrow$ or $5 \downarrow$. Once partner freely bids 3 hearts, the five level will be safe most of the time if you are smart enough to figure out where. Since there is guesswork, passing is not unreasonable in hopes of either +620 or +650 versus +600 in a making $5 \star$ or getting too high. Last, the strength of the 1e opener is always a touch suspect when the opener is in $3^{\text {rd }}$ seat - that possibility augurs for optimism and is the deciding factor in ascending to the lofty heights of the 5 level.

Swanson: 52. Who knows what to do here? 4 was forcing; partner could hold a mediocre five-card heart suit. If he retreats to $5 \boldsymbol{\vee}$, I'll pass. If he finds a $5 \uparrow$ bid I'll venture $6 \star$.

Wittes: 5e. Best problem of this set. With KJ10xxx of hearts and an outside Q or K I would expect partner to open $2 \downarrow$, even vulnerable. However, to bid $3 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ freely over $3 \&$ and then $4 \vee$ over 4 , I would not expect partner to bid $4 \vee$ without $\vee K J 10 x x x$ or maybe even १KJxxxxx and out. If partner has one of those hands, will he bid a slam over my 5 \&id? I don't know, but I think my hand is worth one more try.
[This difficult but interesting hand was sent to me by my friend Charles Steinhardt, who is teaching at the University of Copenhagen. It is great to know your partner's weak two style. My preference here is to bid $5 N T$, pick a slam. Partner's actual hand was $₫ J x x$ -KJT8xx xxx $x$, so 7 makes on the actual hand. Many of the panelists would open $2 \checkmark$ on that hand, but the partnership style in Charles' partnership was to be disciplined vulnerable.]

