Bridge News

Volume 59, #7 July 2022 Published by ALACBU

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

by Robert Shore

It's Here!



At long last, for the first time in three years, Bridge Week has returned to Long Beach! We start as usual with on Monday Pro

Am, which falls on July 4 this year. Life Masters who are reading this (within or without the district) — we can use your help. We have a plethora of "ams" interested in playing the event, and we want to follow through on our advertising by giving them an experienced partner for the event. I've played this event and I found the experience quite rewarding. So please make an effort to show up and provide a fun experience to those who are still learning the game.

One other aspect of our schedule deserves special mention. Between sessions on Wednesday, July 6, we will take time to honor and remember Eddie Kantar, who passed away earlier this year. We have been very proud to count Eddie as one of the District's members all these years, so it is mete and fitting that we mark his passing by sharing anecdotes and memories about the beloved figure. Please make an effort to be there. You won't regret it.

We will be abiding by ACBL's COVID safety rules. We will require proof of vaccination. As I write this (it's subject to change, possibly in the middle of the tournament), masks are recommended but not required. We'll follow the lead of many other local tournaments by providing you with a fashionable bracelet to wear as proof that we've confirmed your vaccination status. As we hoped, many of our friends from around the country will be joining us, so we have hopes of a very healthy turnout. Don't miss this opportunity to compete for red and gold points, and to see long-missed friends.

PRESIDENT continued on page 2

Regional Director's Report

by David Lodge

A question I've had since before running to be on the national Board of Directors (BOD) has to do with the role of the board – namely the delicate balance between the concept of exercising oversight versus the issue of actually getting involved with the management of the organization. Several years ago, the ACBL tried to rewrite a significant piece of critical software. The effort was a failure and as a result thereof, the league wrote off in excess of \$2,000,000. I've thought about, had I been on the board at that time, notwithstanding that I have little IT knowledge, could I have made a difference in assisting in the management of the project. And every time I imagined a different outcome, it became clear that a different result could only have happened if the collective business experience and specific skill sets of the individual BOD members were utilized in more than just an oversight capacity

The ACBL realized very good financial operating results in 2020 and 2021. However, 2022 is expected to produce a large operating deficit (the budget put forward by management and acknowledged by the BOD showed an operating loss of close to \$900,000 in 2022). As the head of the Finance Committee, I, in concert with ACBL president Joann Glasson (also a CPA and prior chair of the finance committee) will be taking a more active role than

DIRECTOR continued on page 2

Inside This Issue
Director's Corner page 2
Rank Changes page 4
Puzzle Page page 5
Eddie Kantar Tribute page 6
Pro-Am Event page 7
North American Pairs page 8
Around the Units page 9
Problem Solvers' Panel page 13

PRESIDENT continued from page 1

North American Pairs

Qualifying for North American Pairs has started and will continue through the end of August. Make sure you find and compete in a qualifier before the end of August so that you can continue to participate in this year's event. As always, ACBL will subsidize the winner of each flight (to the tune of \$700 per person) to travel to the Spring Nationals, which will be in New Orleans this year. Particularly for our Flight B and C players, this is a great opportunity to get a taste of the tournament scene. Try it. You'll like it!

Upcoming Board Meeting

Our next Board meeting will take place in person. It will occur at Long Beach on July 9, 2022, after the conclusion of the afternoon session. Make your plans now. Please RSVP in response to our email so that we know how many people we'll need to feed at the meeting.

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

DIRECTOR continued from page 1

previously taken by BOD members. The question that we face is the organization "right sized". We acknowledge that all prior attempts to stop the erosion of our membership have been unsuccessful and that our ranks continue to decline. We also are realistic about the effects of COVID, one being that online bridge has become a major alternative to F2F play, both at clubs and at tournaments. While the major loss expected in 2022 is hopefully a "one-off", that's only the likely outcome if several things change: our marketing initiatives start to pay off and we stop the decline of memberships; tournament play starts to pick up; IT's efforts are successful and the large amount of money directed towards creating/repairing/improving critical software does not have to be expended in upcoming years; tournament operations are run in the most efficient possible way.

The summer NABC in Providence starts in a few weeks and the BOD meetings start on July 11. I'm looking forward to a productive meeting and reporting back with optimistic accomplishments and future plans.

I'm looking forward to seeing you in Long Beach.

Stay safe, stay healthy and enjoy our great game!

The Director's Corner by David White

Back on the Tournament Trail



I am called over to a table by a player who tells me she only has 12 cards. Sure enough, she is right. I look around and find the Ace of spades on the floor and give it to her. She was previously void in spades. Now she says to me: "You've ruined my entire

hand."

Since we are all gearing up for the first LA Regional in several years, I thought a refreasher course on what to expect at a tournament would be handy.

There have been many rule and procedure changes that didn't affect online bridge much, but could change your behavior F2F.

First, a word about masks. The tournament has NO say in the mask requirement. It is up to LA County and Long Beach City boards of heatlh. If the COVID condition is red you will wear a mask, covering BOTH nose and mouth at all times. If the condition is yellow or orange, wearing a mask is your choice.

The condition is set on Thursday and remains in effect for a week. Be safe, bring a mask, be safer, wear the thing.

AT THE PLAYING SITE

When you get to the tournament it will look the same. \$9.00 for parking still seems like too much, but it's either that or a 45 minute bus ride. Inside there will be a hospitality desk, partnership desk and the directors' selling table.

At the last two tournaments I attended, they did not have new stickers, rather they were gving away left-over stickers and section awards from the last ten years of local tournaments, a bit nostalgic.

The partnership desk will do their best for you, but I'm fairly sure neither Jeff Meckwell nor Larry Cohen will be available.

The biggest change will be buying your entry. If you purchased your entry online, there will be a list

of table assignments at the directors desk. This may be a typed list, on a larger screen monitor or projected on a wall. Details are still being finalized.

If you are going to buy your entry at the desk, you need to know the total masterpoints of your pair (or team).

Remember the player with the highest number of points determines in which EVENT you play. (Flight AX, or Flight BCD, or Gold rush.) The average number of points determine in which stratificaon you place in that event. Just tell the director "highest player xxxx points, and xxxx total points," most directors can divide by 2 or 4.

Lee Marvin said it's "dirty filthy cash," but Liza Minelli had the final right answer: "money makes the world go around." For those reasons, all tournaments now accept credit cards. It fact, plastic is preferred. Tap your credit card on the little white square and when the green light flashes, you're done. You do not have to sign anything and NO reciepts are issued. If you really need a reciept you will have to enter your email address as none are printed on-site.

(Note: Lee Marvin in "Paint Your Wagon,"1969 & Liza Minelli in "Cabaret," 1972.)

AFTER THE GAME

Do not expect printouts and summaries as quickly as in the past. The directors main efforts are in getting the results online, rather than hanging up. The fastest way to see your results is on the ACBL website. Sign in to myACBL and make sure your preferance is set to receive emailed results after every session or correction.

PLAYING THE GAME

Very little has changed in the mechanics of duplicate bridge. If you're sharp eyed you'll notice director using more complicated movements to ensure there are only 26 or 27 boards in play and everybody will play everybody else.

The HCP range of opening 1NT is still an annoucement. That has not changed, nobody is talking about changing it, and it does not matter what your club does. ALWAYS annouce the range of your partner's opening.

Opening 1NT with a small singleton is now illegal, not just improper. This does not apply to opening 2NT, or a NT rebid after opening a suit.

Transfers are now annouced with a single word; the suit being transferred to.

A 2 Diamond response to an opening 2 Club, is not alerted or announced if 2 Diamonds is negative, weak, a minimum response, or in anyway the lowest possible holding.

There are no alerts above 3NT until the auction is over.

Players are no longer REQUIRED to protect themselves from unalerted bids. So, if the auction goes $1NT-P-2\clubsuit$, you do not have to ask what $2\clubsuit$ is because it might not be Stayman. If it's an alertable call, and it is not alerted, and you are damaged, you will be protected.

When Eddie Kantar said "All hestitations are forcing," he was joking. He then related this story.

Alvin Roth, a very ethical player, is defending 7NT, vulnerable, in a money rubber bridge game where the declarer has reduced to a three card ending. Dummy has the Axx of spades and declarer the KJ10. The lead is in declarer's hand and he leads the \$\Delta J\$. Second hand has xxx and Roth Qxx. Second hand goes into an act trying to make declarer think he has the queen and finally plays low. Declarer, taken in by the hesitation, also plays low. Roth, holding the queen, also plays low allowing the jack to take the trick and the declarer to make 7NT. When Roth's partner asks him why he didn't take the SQ, Roth says: "You hestiated so long I thought you had it!"

Southern California Bridge News

Published monthly by ALACBU, Inc. 1800 Avenue of the Stars, 12th Floor,

Los Angeles, CA 90067

Phone: 310-440-4100

email newsletter@acblunit551.org

Editor/DesignerTom LillManaging EditorBob ShoreContributing EditorJohn Jones

Copy deadlines: the 23rd of the preceding month. Opinions expressed in the Southern California Bridge News are those of the authors and donot necessarily reflect those of ALACBU, Inc., The Bridge News or the Editor. The Bridge News reserves the right to reject material it considers to be in poor taste or deems otherwise unsuitable for publication.

District 23 Rank Changes May2022 **Junior Master Sectional Master** Silver Life Master Caren C. Cameron Janice A. Boehnlein Wenjia Yan Nanci Carr Noel F. Carmier **Regional Master Ruby Life Master** Tracy E. Boysr Jessie Ornelas Wendy S. Wilson Jacqueline Stultz **Club Master NABC Master** Susan E. Butler Rami Razouk **Gold Life Master** Katherine B. Jervik Gregory A. Tapia Pamela E. Sullivan **Bronze Life Master** Jeff Grotenhuis Lillian Slater

The Puzzle Page

Bridge Jeopardy by John Jones

Category: People Organizing the Long Beach Regional

And the answer is ...

\$100 –The Grand Life Master teaching the Monday class on defense.

\$200 – The person taking signups for the Monday class and the Monday Pro/Am.

\$300 – She is running the partnership desk.

\$400 – He is the Tournament Manager.

\$500 – He is hosting Youth Day on Friday.

Play or Defend? by John Jones

North

- ♠ A 10 2
- **♥** J 9 5
- **◆** 10 9 6 4
- ♣ A 10 9

<u>West</u> ♠ Q J 9 7 ▼ K 8 3 ♠ K J 8 7 ♣ 6 5

East ★ 8 4 ▼ Q 10 7 2 ◆ Q 3

♣ 8 7 4 3 2

South

- **★** K 6 5 3
- **♥** A 6 4
- ♦ A 5 2 ♣ K O J

Contract = 3NT

Opening Lead = $\triangle Q$

All players can see all the cards. Do you play or defend?

(Solutions to these puzzles are on page 7. No peeking!)

June Rebus

Well, can you figure out what this says?







It's a whole week of bridge at the Los Angeles Regional! I haven't been this excited since my telephone got stuck on vibrate.





Edwin B. Kantar

Please join us at a Tribute to one of our favorite bridge heroes - mentor - friend, husband.

JULY 6, 2022

2:15 – Pacific Room We would love anyone with a story or memory of our Hero, to please speak.

IF YOU HAVE ANY PHOTOS, PLEASE EMAIL THEM TO:

michelinonbridge@aol.com

Questions? Call Marjorie 310 422-9330



LONG BEACH REGIONAL JULY 4-10



FREE WORSHOP - JULY 4

"The Setting Trick"- Defensive Tips for Success!

10:30 -12:00 INCLUDES LUNCH

To register: email dalia.hernandez@gmail.com

By Marjorie Michelin - Grand Life Master



1:00 PRO-AM GAME PLAY WITH A PRO FOR ONLY \$15

To register or questions, Contact Dalia Hernandez 562-221-1398

dalia.hernandez@gmail.com

LONG BEACH HILTON ~701 WEST OCEAN BLVD. LONG BEACH, CA



Solution to "Play or Defend?"

Answer: Play. Win trick 1 with the ♠K in hand and cross to the ace of clubs. Lead the ◆10 off the dummy. East can either cover or duck, but the hand can be made regardless. If East chooses to cover, win the trick and continue diamonds. West will win and shift to hearts. Hold up until the third round of hearts. Play a third round of diamonds to set up the ◆9. The clubs will provide entries to your hand to finesse the spades. If East elected to duck the ◆10 off the dummy then West will win and again likely find the heart shift. You now cash the ◆A, felling the ◆Q and play a third diamond to set up the ◆9. Either variation allows you to score three spades, one heart, two diamonds and three clubs. This is another hand from Julian Pottage original book <u>Play or Defend</u>.

Bridge Jeopardy Questions

100 – Who is Margorie Michelin?

200 – Whois Dalia Hernandez?

300 – Whois Jan Wickersham?

400 – Whois Peter Benjamin?

500 – Whois John Jones?

Contact Dalia at <u>dalia.hernandez@gmail.com</u> 562.221.1398

Contact Jan at <u>wickershamjanet@gmail.com</u> 626.487.4014

Contact Peter at ahoneydo@aol.com 310.720.6050

Solution to "Rebus"

"Bridge World Standard"

Have a good bridge rebus? Send it to johndjones44@yahoo.com

NAP Qualifiers Continue

June, July and August are when clubs can hold qualifiers for the annual North American Pairs tournament.

This year, as last year, players can qualify either at face-to-face clubs or online VACB virtual clubs. Qualifying games are announced by club managers. Contact your club manager for dates and times. Only designated NAP Qualifier games will count for qualification to the district final.

Club qualifying games award extra masterpoints, half black, half red. ACBL charges a small additional sanction fee to raise money to send the district-level winners to compete against the other districts at the Spring NABC in New Orleans.

The North American Pairs is really three tournaments: Open (Flight A) includes all eligible ACBL members. Flight B includes players with fewer than 2,500 masterpoints. Flight C includes non-Life Masters with fewer than 500 masterpoints. Your masterpoint holding at the end of May, 2022 (reported on June 6 and the July Bulletin) determines your flight -- so even if you go over 2,500 or 500 after May 31, you remain eligible for Flight B or C throughout the tournament.

For each scheduled weekly game, clubs may hold two qualifying games each month.

The district final will qualify players to compete in New Orleans at the NABC in March, 2023. Date and location for the district final will be announced soon.

Please review the full Conditions of Contest at the ACBL web site: https://www.acbl.org/nap-qualifiers/. District 23 NAP director is Morris Jones. Email questions tonap@bridgemojo.com.

Around the Units in District 23



Long Beach by Lillian Slater

www.acblunit557.org www.LongBeachBridge.com

70's Club – Big Games



On June 7th, Long Beach Bridge held it first Pro-Am in three years! In a field of 11 tables, Leo Dittemore and Bob Bauman not only won but did so with an impressive 70.83% game! Congratulations!



At the June 26th Unit Game, Robert Shore and Mike Savage won in a field of nine tables, scoring 70.24%.



In the June 17th NLM game, Jenny Ernest and Jan Van Lierop scored a 70% game in a field of three tables



On June 18th, Cory Hand and Jackie Hess did it again a 72.18% game in a field of seven tables



Ed Piken and Steve Ramos had another great game on June 23rd, scoring 70.31% in a field of 5 tables.



Alan Olschwang and Linda Nye earned a 72.92% game in a field of 11 tables at our sister club, Leisure World..



Pomona – Covina by Tom Lill www.acblunit551.org

Individual: July: NO GAME this month August 6, 10 a.m., Ontario

Club Championships: July12 and 15, La Fetra **Unit Game**: Saturday July 16, 11:00 a.m., Glendora

STaC: July 26 and 29, 8:45, La Fetra

Unit Board Meeting: 10:15 a.m. before the game

The June Individual was another squeaker. Gary Atwell and Yours Truly tied for first at 63.54%. Ho Ming Yim was third, Don Logsdon fourth, and Roger Boyar tied with Susie Emminger for fifth.

In the June Unit game, Vic Sartor – Bill Papa outdistanced the rest with a 66.67% game. Yours Truly – Roger Boyar were second, Amr Elghamry–Lulu Minter third, and Susan Emminger– Gary Atwell rounded out the list of top scorers.

No rank advancements this month. No doubt we will see some action here after our upcoming Regional ... at which I hope to see *you*.

Topping the charts again this month are Fredy and Lulu Minter, at 69.44%. Others placing first were Bill Papa, Vic Sartor, Roger Boyar, Gary Atwell, and Stephen Andersen.

Some months I'm desperate for a good hand to share with you. But this past month, the dealing demons have run amok. I present to you THREE amusing hands. Two are amusing mainly for the *look* on partner's face as the bidding progressed (yes, I was the culprit on those two). The other one ... wait for it!

There were three – count 'em, THREE – 8-card suits dealt at our Unit game. If my calculations are correct, you would pick up such a suit about one time in 214 deals. So the odds of three popping up in a 27-board session are pretty low. Here's one of them. Partner opens 1♣, and you are looking at

♠ AKQ108654 ♥ A7 ♦6 ♣ 92.

Oh, how I long sometimes for the days when the old fashioned strong jump shift was in vogue. Oh well, 1♠ it is. Partner rebids 2♠, and with controls everywhere, I shot 4NT, RKC for *clubs*. 5♠ was the response, raised to 6♠, and partner's eyes popped! The opening lead was the ♠A, and dummy duly came down:

♦ 92 ♥ J986 ♦ K ♣ AKQ654.

12 tricks. If the opponents don't take their ◆A at trick 1, of course, it eventually will be discarded on a club (they were 3-2).

A couple of deals later, RHO opened 1♠, and I found myself looking at a fair hand:

♠ AK **♥** A **♦** J752 **♣** AKQ764.

I made the obvious double, and LHO bid 2♥. Hmmm. There seems to be a lot of points in this deck, but OK, there must be some shape. RHO raised the ante to 3♥. And I made the "obvious" 3NT bid. Well, it must have been obvious, because everyone was there except the unfortunate soul who played 3♣. Dummy held two absolutely golden cards:

Making 4. Again, the look on partner's face was delightful when I called 3NT, with him holding those tram tickets. The opponents – the same ones as on the first deal here – were not *quite* so amused.

And finally, we present the world's second shortest auction to a grand slam. Only the second shortest, because in David Bird's book "Famous Bridge Records," he presents the shortest possible such auction. Dealer opened 7NT! This deal reportedly occurred at the 1995 NABC in Atlanta. Declarer had a balanced 36-count (not a hand you will pick up every day – my math shows this will happen in about 1 of every $10\frac{1}{2}$ billion deals) and just shot the grand. Down one, but he was not alone.

Anyway, on our third deal, dealer (I'm innocent this time!) opened 1♣, promising 17+HCP, and his partner found himself holding

That looks like a 17 count to me, so perhaps 6NT would be enough. Maybe they could try for a heart grand? No, Our Hero must have added a point for the fifth heart, and another point or two for his superb dummy play, because he plopped the 7NT card on the table. He caught this dummy:

Grossly underbid, there are 14 top tricks.

Sheesh!

Quote for the month: "Methodology gives those with no ideas something to do. (Mason Cooley)

Downey – Whittier by Liz Burrell

After several weeks of preparation and anticipation, yesterday (June 22) was the first ever "Longest Day" game at the Downey-Whittier Bridge Club. As you know this is the ACBL-sponsored

fundraiser to benefit The Alzheimer's Association. Although we don't have the final, final count yet, our little club has raised over \$1,100 in cash and check donations to date. Not sure when we will find out how much ACBL will be donating per table in the United States and Canada but we're anxious to know the final accounting. Thank you members, family and friends who have helped us with this very worthwhile endeavor.

June has flown by and many of our regular members have been vacationing or absent for other reasons. Our typically sparse attendance (post-COVID) has been even lower, and for the first four weeks of June, we've averaged just $3\frac{1}{2}$ tables. Even so, there have been some good games. On June 1, Jon Yinger and Alan Flower scored 68% and earned 0.60 black points. John Petrie and Sankar Reddy were close behind with 66%, earning 0.42 black points. The next Wednesday, June 8, Nancy Toussaint and John Jones scored 61.46%, earning 0.70 black points. The formidable team of Al and Mary Kiechle were second with 58.33% which netted them 0.36 black points.

June 15 was our monthly Potluck lunch which probably accounts for the huge increase in attendance, 4 ½ tables! This time Petrie/Reddy were first with 61.31% and 1.40 black points, while Yinger/Flower were second with 54.17% and 1.05 black points. Yesterday, June 22, Steve and Linda Wood were first with 68.06% (this was also the high score so far in June) and 2.33 black points. Barbara Horn and Terry Binns were second with 64.06% and 1.75 black points. We were also treated to a delicious pizza lunch courtesy of our good friend and member, I D Patel. Plus we had a record high attendance for June of 51/2 tables! This was largely due to five of our friends from OLLI (the senior group at Cal State Fullerton) who made the trek from the Fullerton/Yorba Linda/Placentia area to help with our fundraiser. Hats off and thanks to all of them!

Please join us on June 29 for our last game of the month. If you need directions or other information, please call me at 562-972-2913. (There are only 184 days left until Christmas, in case you're interested!)

Thurs. May 26



Santa Clarita-Antelope Valley by Beth Morrin

The first board meeting of Unit 556 was held on May 31st. The board voted to postpone our yearly sectional until 2023. The board also discussed the need for face-to-face games in our area and we agreed to investigate two possible locations in the Canyon Country/Newhall area.

Virtual Game Schedule

Monday:	12:15 PM	Open game
Tuesday:	6:15 PM	Open game
Thursday:	10:15 AM	Open game
Friday:	12:15 PM	Open game
Sunday:	12:15 PM	749er game
	12:30 PM	Open game

Contact our club manager at paula@pacbell.net for reservations. Our games cost \$3 unless it is a special game series.

Winners in Unit 556+ Open MP games:

Mon. N	May 16				
N/S	Genise Hasan – Robot	65.05%			
E/W	Bill Brodek – Paula Olivares	65.90%			
Tues. N	May 17				
N/S	Ruth Baker – Roy Ladd	62.04%			
E/W	Amr Elghamry – Dominique Moore	64.81%			
Thurs.N	May 19				
N/S	Thomas Beggane – Robot	62.63%			
E/W	Rae Murbach –Diana Borgatti	71.72%			
Fri. Ma	y 20				
N/S	Kathy Flynn – Ruth Baker	58.84%			
E/W	David White – Bob McBroom	64.39%			
Sun. M	ay 22				
N/S	Amr Elghamry – Gerard Geremia	64.35%			
E/W	Kathy Swaine – Rand Pinsky	60.71%			
Mon. May 23					
N/S	Anita Walker – Robot	65.70%			
E/W	Bill Brodek – Paula Olivares	66.56%			
Tues. N	Лау 24				
N/S	TemoArjani – Khushroo Lakdawala	57.94%			
E/W	Ernest Wong – Lulu Minter	63.56%			

N/S E/W	Wiay 26 Gerard Geremia – Joseph Viola Kiran Kumar – RoshenHadulla	67.95% 60.04%
Fri. Ma N/S E/W	ay 27 Bud Kalafian- Stephen Licker Rae Murbach – Gerard Geremia	63.13% 60.86%
Sun.Ma N/S E/W	ay 29 Amr Elghamry – Gerard Geremia Kathy Swaine – Rand Pinsky	70.24% 60.71%
Mon. N N/S E/W	May 30 Carol Ashbacher – Robot Lynn Sager – Robot	59.19% 61.84%
Tues. N Rae Mu	May 31 urbach – Joseph Viola	67.22%
Thurs. N/S E/W	June 2 Gerard Geremia – Joseph Viola Diana Borgatti – Rae Murbach AviceOsmundson – Liane Walliser	56.48% 60.80% 60.80%
Fri. Jur N/S E/W	ne 3 Ramesh Sawhney – Robot Diana Borgatti – Cathryn Martin	66.05% 61.11%
Sun. Ju N/S E/W	ne 5 Kathy Swaine – Rand Pinsky Greg Vernon – Robot	70.10% 59.92%
Mon. J N/S E/W	une 6 Ramesh Sawhney – Robot Helen Wang – Robot	60.83% 62.50%
Tues. J N/S E/W	une 7 Kathy Swaine – Rand Pinsky Gerard Geremia – Joseph Viola	60.07% 64.93%
Thurs. N/S E/W	June 9 Roy Ladd – Robot Greg Vernon – Robot	61.66% 66.75%
Fri. Jur N/S E/W	ne 10 Pat Larin – Wayne Rapp Rae Murbach – Gerard Geremia	61.42% 70.06%
Sun. Ju N/S E/W	ne 12 RoshenHadulla – Bill Brodek XiaodongZhao – Robot	61.57% 63.43%
Mon. Jon N/S	une 13 Kathy Flynn – Bob McBroom Diana Borgatti – Carolyn Cohen Jeanette Deverian – Cathryn Martin	56.39% 56.39% 58.67%

July2022					
Tues. Ju N/S E/W	une 14 Lulu Minter – Ernest Wong Kathy Swaine – Rand Pinsky	61.77% 66.80%			
Thurs. J N/S E/W	June 16 TemoArjani – Bill Brodek Ramesh Sawhney – Robot	60.76% 70.81%			
	e 17 Dave White – Bob McBroom Carolyn Cohen – Bill Brodek	61.11% 66.36%			
Sun. Ju N/S E/W	ne 19 Amr Elghamry – Gerard Geremia Ann McClelland – Robot	65.28% 59.17%			
Winner	rs in Unit 556+ Limited MP games:				
Tues. M	_				
	Jerome Paul – Margaret Shifley	56.25%			
Wed. M	Iay 18 Glen Drogin – Robot	64.81%			
Sun. Ma	ay 22 Michael Perera – Robot	70.14%			
Tues. M	1ay 24 Anita Walker – Jackie Moore	59.44%			
Wed. M	Iay 25 Angela Peters – Robot	56.48%			
Sun. Ma	ay 29 Anita Walker – Robot	59.72%			
Tues. M	1ay 31 Donald Zachary – Robot	72.22%			
Wed. Ju	ıne 1 Julie Hanson – Angela Peters	62.50%			
Sun. Ju	ne 5 Steve Mancini – Michael Connell	62.04%			
Tues. Ju	une 7 Gary Trenda – Robot	68.98%			
Wed. Ju	nne 8 Thomas Beggane – Robot	58.75%			
Tues. Ju	une 14 John Tyner – Lora Smith	62.04%			

Wed. June 15
Angela Peters – Robot 59.26%

Sun. June 19
John Walker – Lisa Walker 56.94%

Next Board meeting: TBA, via Zoom.

Pasadena – San Gabriel by Morris "Mojo" Jones

bridgemojo.com



We're continuing to hold two great Unit Championship games (also known as a "unit game") every month on alternate Sundays.

The dates for this month will be **July 17 and 31**. Game time is 12:30, and we're finished by 4:00. Space is limited, so reservations are required! Call Miriam Harrington to reserve your seat at (626) 232-0558. The game will be seeded, as best we can, for a fair competition. North-South seats can not be reserved if your pair is able to move from table to table.

Winners from the June games: June 12, North-South **Peter Szecsi** and **Amr Elghamry**, East-West **Arthur Moore** and **Dominique Moore**. June 26, North-South **Fredy Minter** and **Lulu Minter**, East-West **Gregory Tapia** and **Hanna Zhuang**.

Congratulations to new Junior Master **Denise Botsford**, and new NABC Master **Janelle Morton**!

Looking forward to seeing you all at the Bridge Week regional in Long Beach! A fter that I'll be traveling to Providence, Rhode Island, for the American Bridge Teachers Association convention and the NABC.

Problem Solvers' Panel

Moderator: John Jones

Mark Bartusek, Angela Chen, Ed Davis, Gabe Foster, David Grainger, Daniel Korbel, Rick Roeder, Mike Shuster, Abdou Wafik and Jon Wittes are panelists.

For the July issue I frequently use youth panelists before Youth Day (Friday July 8) during the Long Beach Regional. Both Chen and Foster are recent college graduates that are up and coming players. The rest of the panel are among my regular group of experts who so wonderfully contribute to this column.

As always, panelists are playing 5-card majors, 15 - 17 NT, and 2/1 GF. Beyond that, except where indicated, panelists may use any reasonable methods.

	West	North	East	South	
1	pass	pass	3♣	???	
	You, Sou	th, hold: ♠ 9	2 ▼ AQJ8	♦ AKQ9	♣ J85
-		What call	do you ma	ke?	
IMPs					
BothVul					

We'll start with a hand from the recent South American championships. My partner, Valerie Gamio, held this hand and faced this difficult call. Note that pass, double, 3♠, 3♥ and 3NT are all possible calls. Any of them could be right on any given hand. Most panelists discussed alternatives to their selection. We'll start with those that agree with the 3♥ bid that Valerie made at the table.

Wittes: 3♥. Great problem to start with! I can't recall overcalling a 4-card suit at the 3 level, especially vulnerable, but my hand is too good not to bid, and I feel, if we have a game, 3♥ is most likely to get us there. An additional plus is since I have three clubs, partner is likely to be short in clubs. Double is too dangerous with two small spades. 3NT is not totally unreasonable, but right-hand opponent is likely to have a good suit for a vulnerable 3♣ call.

Bartusek: 3♥ (Shades of Marshall Miles - I've seen him do it. Zia has overcalled at the 3-level on a 4-bagger also). Seen Marshall do it? From a very close seat... as his regular partner! 3♥ is the least of evils.

A Moysian 4-3 heart fit should play decently (although 3♥ would be more enticing if the red suits were reversed). I certainly reject double since that will result in an intolerable 3♠ or 4♠ bid from partner. 3NT might work if partner has club help, but we can still reach it after a 3♥ overcall (perhaps even if partner has 3-card heart support with ♠Kx. Note that 3♠ could easily lose a 4-4 heart fit, and pass is likely to miss a vulnerable game.

Chen: 3♥. If we assume about 7-8 points for the 3♣ preempt, if the rest of the points are evenly divided then we have about enough for game. While 3♥ is lacking one card in hearts and double is lacking spades and 3NT lacking stoppers, 17 points still feels a little too much for passing. Partner, a passed hand, is not too likely to raise to 4♥ with only two hearts, and with a 4-3 fit, 4♥ can still be makeable.

Foster: $3 \checkmark$. Joylessly (brutal first problem, John!). If $4 \checkmark$ is right, we'll get there. If $4 \checkmark$ or $5 \checkmark$ is right, I'll hope partner can help get us there. If 3 NT makes with partner holding Q(x) of clubs, I'll tip my cap to RHO. I just can't bring myself to double and await the $4 \checkmark$

death-knell. Will some brave soul try pass? *Just wait and see all the passers!*

Now for those who selected the bid I would have made, 3NT.

Grainger: 3NT. Yuck. RHO rarely has a solid suit, and even if partner has $\Delta xx(x)$ clubs will sometimes block. Grainger again, after a follow-up email in which I told him that 3NT was my choice too, but on the actual hand it goes down four tricks. I've seen many hands in which the preempted suit ran against a partial stopper. I've even seen my partner double a Jxx 3NT overcall with AK tight in my suit versus Meckstroth. Meck ran, of course, but 5♦ was cold (and 3NT was cold for 5). I once held ♠AQ ♥QJ ♦AQTxx AK9xx, at both vul after pass-pass-(2 \checkmark). I tried 2NT, all pass; partner had ♠6432 ♥5432 ♦void ♣8xxxx. I took my two aces. I think 3♦ has more going for it than 3♥ on your hand should you pick a suit. Partner might bid 3NT or 3♥, while 3♥ might get raised on a doubleton, and even opposite three it could be ugly.

Korbel: 3NT. Wheeeeeeeeeee! *Is 3NT with a jack third stopper on Mr. Toad's Wild Ride, Danny?*

Abdou: 3NT. Close my eyes! Hamman's rule extrapolated.

Hamman's rule? Which rule? Hamman may have too many rules!

Roeder: Pass. Those who feel a need to take action will point out that Pard could have: ♠xxx ♥Kxxxx ♠Kx ♠Axx. True, but what about the other 1,000 possibilities? Best to follow one of Hamman's prime rules: "If you need me to have a specific hand, I don't have it". And NOT to despair: any partner, who is lucky enough (or rich enough) to play with Hamman, will grasp the concept of balancing actions.

Davis: Pass. Two small spades, no 5-card suit and no sure club stopper make double, 3♥ and 3NT all too risky IMO. Since I have no bid that adequately describes my hand, I'll pass and hope that partner can act if we have a game. (If partner bids 3♠, I'll risk a 3NT bid.)

Shuster: Pass. I suppose 3NT is the alternative and could work alright. Still, Vulnerable East probably has something. Note that even opposite our entire wish list: spade stopper, club help and the heart king: ♠QJxxx ♥Kxx ♠xxx ♠Ax, we'll need 3-3 diamonds to make 3NT from our side. Partner rates to have less. If partner reopens with a double, I'll try 4♥, otherwise we rate to go plus on defense.

Despite the fact that my first thought was to bid 3NT, I find the arguments made by the three previous panelists compelling and I have changed my mind. How tough of a problem is this? There is multiple support for three different calls and Valerie stated that her second choice was 3• (see Grainger's comment). Further, the consensus call among the better players in the Columbian tournament was generally in favor of doubling, despite only having two spades. We had dinner with Dutch star Tim Van De Paverd who said "I'd double. It's too good of a hand to do nothing." Isn't bridge an easy game? By the way, both Valerie and her husband Luis (who was at the other table) played quite well in Columbia and we got the silver medal in group play.

	South	West	North	East	
			1♦	pass	
L	1 ♥ ???	pass	3♦	pass	
Matchpoints E-W Vul	You, S	outh, hold: \Delta What c	104 ♥ A109 all do you ma		♣ Q763

We have too much not to bid game, and not enough for slam to be in the picture. Thus, the problem is which game to bid. Space is limited. Should 3\(\Delta\) ask for a spade stop or show a spade stop?

Chen: 3♠. 3♠ is not natural since partner is unlikely to have spades with the 3♠ bid. Since the opponents didn't interfere in the bidding, there's less of a need to ask for stopper here with 3♠, therefore it can be asking for 3 card heart support.

Korbel: 3♠. I think this is more useful as a 3NT grope rather than showing spade values.

Davis: 3♠. This denies a spade stopper the way I play. A 3NT bid by my hand would imply a spade stopper. (With the limited room available over 3♠, I play a rebid of my major invites a raise on an honor doubleton and I try not worry about a club stopper). Even if I did not have this agreement, I would bid 3♠ because I do not want to bypass 3NT and I do not want to play 3NT from my side. We have a lot of HCP between us so there is a good chance that partner has a spade card. 3NT from partner's side is likely to be best at matchpoints.

Bartusek: 3♠. I remember getting almost the exact problem from you years ago. I also answered then that spades should be the primary stopper concern, with 3NT guaranteeing a spade stopper and 3♠ denying one. You commented that you didn't think that this was the standard interpretation, although maybe I've convinced more people by now. Note that a 3♥ bid guarantees 6+ length (or at least 5 very good ones). I remember the hand and predicted you would bid 3♠ on this hand. No, I don't think 3♠ asking for a spade stop is standard. I don't believe it's Standard American, Bridge World Standard or even the standard expert treatment. If it was standard, this wouldn't be a good problem. However, I do think the treatment is worth considering in this column (we do allow discussion of panelists preferred treatments) and in serious

partnerships. One of the arguments in favor of 3\(\rightarrow\) asking for a stop includes thinking that the opening leader will select spades when all else is equal.

For those who play that $3 \spadesuit$ would show a stopper, bidding $3 \heartsuit$ was a popular alternative.

Grainger: 3♥. Partner shouldn't be striving to raise this on two without a side singleton. Better to have 3♠ actually show something in spades by us and be more of a punt by partner.

Wittes: 3♥. I'd like to bid 3NT, but if 3NT is right it's probably best to play from partner's side. Worst case scenario, partner will bid 4♥ with honor doubleton, but even that might be all right if partner doesn't have a spade stopper or even if he has a tenuous one like Qxx. Best case scenario, partner has honor-third in hearts.

Foster: 3♥. Forcing. If partner offers 3NT or 4♥, great, otherwise I'll aim for 5♦. Partner's failure to make (or fake) a spade bid discourages blasting to 3NT.

Abdou: $3\checkmark$. $3\checkmark$ for now and 4♦ over partner's 3♠, will give up over 3NT, slam would be a reach. Cue 5♦ over $4\checkmark$.

Shuster: 3♥. This doesn't promise much. I hope to hear 3NT next and I'll pass 4♥ if my guy bids it. This gives partner room to waffle with 3♠ (over which I'll try 3NT.)

One more country to be heard from:

Roeder: 4♦. This is a safer route to 4♥ as well as some number of diamonds (probably 5). Even by West Hollywood standards, bidding 3NT is somewhat perverted. I would like 4♦ better if this were an IMP event. Perhaps, I erred in not setting the conditions as IMPs.

Matchpoints E-WVul

South	West	North	East
		1NT	pass
2♠	pass	3♣	pass
???			
1NT = 15 - 17			
2♠ = Clubs			
3♣ = Good hand	d for clubs (2	2NT w/b poor	hand for clubs)
You, Sou	th, hold: ♠/	A3 ♥ Q62 ◆	3 ♣ 10975432

What call do you make?

2♠ showing clubs is now a popular treatment among experts. So those who don't play this treatment were likely familiar with it from having others play it. There are some major questions to be answered before we select our bid. How much club support did partner show? What are our follow-ups? How aggressive do we want to be? The follow-up question is fairly easy to answer. Assuming we don't wish to shoot out 3NT or 5♠, a 3♠ bid shows shortness and is game forcing. But do we have enough to move at all?

Foster: $3 \blacklozenge$. $3 \blacklozenge$ if it shows shortness (in BWS it does). If my new suits are natural, I'll hazard $3 \blacktriangledown$, and trust (hope) partner won't put me in a 3-3 fit.

Abdou: 3♦. This shows shortness. It's an overbid but will get us to the right strain. Shooting out 3NT like a MP pig maybe going down when slam is on.

Bartusek: 3♦. Three of any suit is now shortness and game-forcing for a lot of players (although some people might have to bid 4♦). This is a great hand opposite a club fit. There are a number of hands opposite that could make 6♣ (e.g. ♠Kxx ♥AKx ♦xxx ♣AKxx or ♠xxx ♥AK10x ♠Axx ♣AQxx), although 5♣ should be an easy make. The major question is whether we should play 3NT or 5♣/6♣ at matchpoints. Even if 6♣ is a heavy favorite, I'm not sure I want to be there. A significant portion of the field will be in a part score, and some will be in the wrong strain. There is far too much uncertainty for me to seriously consider 6♣.

Wittes: 3♦. With most of my partners I play a new suit shows shortness in that suit with at least some game interest. If partner bids 3NT over 3♦, I will sit.

Grainger: Pass. Not close at MP. Partner's "good hand for clubs" might only be honor doubleton.

Shuster: Pass. Clubs are probably blocked and a spade lead or shift will remove any hope of an entry or we could just be off the diamond suit. Probably worth a shot at 3NT if red at IMPs. With answers like this and a pass on board one, I'm going to get a reputation as Mealymouth the second, either earned or learned directly from the source.

Roeder: Pass. In matchpoints, plus scores are the elixir. Drink it up!!

Davis: 3♦. I don't play these methods. However, if I did, my 3♦ bid on this auction would show short diamonds so that is what I will bid here. I will pass partner's 3NT bid, bid 3NT over partner's 3♥ or 3♠ bid and raise partner's 4♠ bid to 5♠.

Well, if $3 \blacklozenge$ shows shortness and then following with $4 \clubsuit$ is slammish, what about a direct $4 \clubsuit$? Is that a game try (to get to $5 \clubsuit$) or a slam try with no shortness? Chen plays it as a game try. Korbel thinks slam try is more common.

Korbel: Pass. If 4♣ was NF I would try it, but I think it' commonly played as forcing.

Chen: 4♣. With a 7-3 club fit, 3NT may have enough tricks. However, if the spade ace gets knocked out early it may be hard to enter dummy to get the club tricks later. I would need partner to have ♣AKx if clubs break 2-1, or ♣AKx and the spade king if clubs break 3-0. While 5♣ may rely on not having HCP wasted in diamonds, if I start with 3♦ showing shortness and bid 4♣ after partner bid 3NT, it may not look like 4♣ is intended to play. And with 7 cards and just 6 points, 4♣ may be a more descriptive try for 5♣.

	South	West	North	East
1		1♣	dbl	1♥
4	1 ♠ ???	2♥	dbl	pass
Matchpoints	You, South, hold:	♦ J8732	▼ 10 ♦ AJ1	03 \$ 652
E-W Vul		What cal	ll do you mak	e?

The sixty-four dollar question on this one is "What does partner's second double show"? If it is penalty, we might well pass. If double shows three spades and a little bit extra we want to proceed with caution. If double shows significant extras then maybe game is on, but which game?

First, we'll hear from the panelists that think double is penalty and this is the time to commence the defense.

Foster: Pass. I'll take this action in the name of partnership trust. 1♠ promised four spades and an excuse, and I have more than that. Partner doubled her RHO, so she should mean business. I'll apologize if we score zero.

Chen: Pass. Partner can bid 3♥ with a strong hand and spade fit, or bid 3♦ with a diamond suit strong hand, so the second double seems likely a penalty, with a strong hand and some hearts - likely 4-card with some honors.

Grainger: Pass. Partner made a penalty double, the opponents are vul. at MP and I have an ace and a trump honor.

Next, we'll hear from those that drive to game.

Davis: 3♠. If I did not think this was forcing, I would bid 3♥. We are going to play game somewhere.

Shuster: 4♠. I would have bid 2♠ last round though. Partner's auction should deliver 3-card spade support and extra values. Since this doesn't rate to be a slam hand, I'm not going to try to bring diamonds into the picture.

Some think an invite is in order.

Korbel: 3♠. I think this is not pure penalty although some might disagree. I think 3♠ is almost forcing and if partner passes that's fine too.

Roeder: 3♠. Tough! I would like to bid diamonds but would worry that partner thinks I might be denying fivespades. When I freely bid 1♠, I showed something. So, let's give partner some rope (but not too much – I have been to West Hollywood before).

Some think this is a good time to get out of Dodge.

Abdou: 2♠. I presume the second double is a good hand with 3 spades.

Bartusek: 2♠. I don't think we need to get to 4♠ to score well at matchpoints. Partner rates to have some wasted heart honors opposite my shortness, so inviting with 3♠ seems like too much. Admittedly, passing partner's supposed penalty double might get the magic 200, but I'd rather play in our 8-card spade fit than take the risk of 2♥ making.

Wittes: 2♠. I would play partner for a good hand with three spades. I bid 1♠ freely over 1♥. I don't feel I have enough to bid more.

Part of my thinking is based on my style of takeout doubles. I double fairly aggressively at the one-level if I have good shape. Thus, I need my second double to be: "I have some extras and exactly three of your suit, so I need some help with getting this right.

5
IMPs Neither Vul.

South	West	North	East
	pass	1♣	dbl
1♥	pass	3♣	pass
777			

You, South, hold: ♠ A75 ♥ AQ9863 ♠ A93 ♣ 3

What call do you make?

First hand in a new partnership, but partner is known to be sound.

The panelist who best read my mind was Wittes. He is concerned about the effect of not redoubling. Yes, this may be a little old school, but I was worried. I was playing my first hand with my friend Rhoda Walsh. I tried $3 \spadesuit$ and over her $3 \spadesuit$ (whatever that means), I bid what I thought we could make, $6 \spadesuit$. Rhoda produced $\spadesuit T8 \heartsuit 74 \spadesuit J \spadesuit AKQJT976$, and played well to make six.

Wittes: 3♦. I object to this auction. I would have redoubled instead of bidding 1♥. After bidding 1♥ over 1♣ Double, I have no way to show this strength of hand with this good of a suit. On the given auction, 3♦ is at least forcing and would give partner a chance to bid 3♥ with a doubleton heart or bid 3NT from the right side. If we have a possible slam, I've put us in bad position after bidding 1♥ the first time.

Several panelists made a ho-hum $3 \checkmark$ bid. Without the double of $1 \clubsuit$, $3 \checkmark$ would be 100% forcing.

Roeder: 3♥. This would be forcing if my RHO had passed. The logic is that if I have a dog I should let partner play it in 3♣. Such logic is even more pervasive with the double since the doubler has announced something in hearts.

Shuster: 3♥. I'm not sure where we're going to wind up... I'd like partner to bid 3NT so I can raise to four.

Bartusek: 3♥. The standard expert interpretation is 6+ hearts in a game-forcing hand. I don't see another option (and I hope partner doesn't ignorantly pass).

Foster: 3♥. Still forcing. Slam remains plausible, so I'm not bidding 3NT yet. If pard continues 3♠, then I'll chicken out. These misfits often play quite badly.

Grainger: $3\blacktriangledown$. See what partner does. Slam interest in hearts if partner bids $4\blacktriangledown$ or $4\spadesuit$, pass 3NT and not clear what to do over $3\spadesuit$.

Korbel: 3♥. Let's see if we have a fit.

Abdou: 3♥. 3♥ is forcing; over 4♥ I will bid Blackwood, over 3NT will raise to 4♣!

Chen: 3♠. 6NT is not very likely to make if there is no heart or club fit. 6♥ will have a chance if there's a three-card heart fit. I'll bid 3♠ and if partner bids 3NT, rebid 4♥. If partner bids 4♥, I'll try for the heart slam; if partner bids 4♣, I can try for the club slam.

I've saved my favorite bid for last. Take it away Ed!

Davis: 4. A psychic splinter bid will probably not get much support in a bidding panel. Did you consult your buddy Nostradamus before making such a wild prediction? I will, of course, raise partner's expected 5♣ bid to 6♣ because I think that we are a favorite to make 6♣. I would like a trump lead against 6♣ and it might help to paint a deceptive picture for the opening leader as a thoughtful East might choose to lead a trump to cut down on the number of spade ruffs in dummy. As to the prospects of making 6♣, there are 25+ HCP between my hand and the East hand so partner's 34 bid is likely to be based on a long and very strong club suit and the heart finesse will be onside if necessary. Partner will also play the hand very well given the takeout double. If I did not choose to try the psychic 4♠ bid, I would just bid 6♣ since it is hard to see how we would benefit from a slower and more scientific auction even if we knew what we were

The psychic splinter is a great bid and certainly wins the award for the most creative bid of the month.

I think the panelists did a good job of handling some difficult hands. Chen and Foster held their own nicely with the experts. I hope to see many readers at the tournament. Friday July 8 is Youth Day: all young players play free that day, and there will be a youth get-together following the second session.