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## AT THE <br> Bethesda North Marriott Hotel \& Conference Center

5701 Marinelli Road, North Bethesda, MD • 301-822-9200

- GOLD POINTS GALORE
- Great new schedule with team events starting every day!
- Spacious hotel in convenient location
- LOTS of restaurants and shopping nearby

For hotel reservations call 1-800-228-9290 and mention Bridge and MABC Bridge for the special rate of $\$ 119$ (plus tax) — rate is good till June 11, 2012.

## The July 4th Regional features:

FAMOUS Mid-Atlantic hospitality!

- Hotel or in-suite hospitality every night!
- Special hospitality for daylight players

SPECTACULAR Intermediate/ Novice Program!

- Speakers at 12:45 \& 6:15 Tues - Sat
- 0-5s play FREE on Tues
- Special I/N receptions Thurs \& Sat at $4: 30$
- Bridge Boot Camp —Warm up your bridge muscles in the popular Advance Your Game class on Mon, July 2 from 1:30-4:30. The class will focus on playing card combinations and the fee is $\$ 30$. Contact Shawn Stringer to reserve a space. Join us in the hospitality suite after the class for refreshments and an opportunity to discuss bridge hands.

Tournament Chair: Shawn Stringer, 301-275-6363, bethesdabridge@gmail.com Fliers available at the WBL and NVBA Unit Games and at local sectionals. Schedules are also in the April/May and June/July District 6 TableTALK publication and on the web at www.mabcbridge.org.

Then, from AUGUST 2-5, 2012, it's the

## WASHINGTON BRIDGE LEAGUE'S

 67th Annual Potomac Valley Tournament at the Kensington Town Hall/ArmoryCome on out for Friday's IMP Pairs, Saturday's Trophy Pairs and Panel Show, Sunday's 1-Day Bridge Class, and lots more!

Do you have a suggestion that might help to increase membership or otherwise improve the Washington Bridge League? Give any and all ideas to Don Berman, 301-776-3581, don.berman@verizon.net, 13707 Engleman Dr., Laurel, MD 20708, or www.WashingtonBridgeLeague.org.

## WBL OMBUDSMAN

Any player with helpful director issues including criticism or praise of the directing staff may contact the Ombudsman, Adrienne Kuehneman and be assured that the source of the information will remain confidential. Information should be provided in writing and may be handed to her at any game, or mailed to her at 6333 Tone Dr., Bethesda, MD 20817-5811.

## DEADLINE: APRIL 27, 2012

to submit new articles to the editor for the May/June 2012 issue
Washington Bridge League BULLETIN (usps \#861-240)
Vol. 70, \#3-Subscription \$2 Per year for members of Unit \#147 (included in ACBL annual dues).
$\begin{aligned} & \text { Non-Menber subscription rate is \$21 For three years. Published bi-Monthly by the washington } \\ & \text { Bridge League at } 14517 \text { Perrywoon Drive, Burtonsvilue, MD } 20866 \text {. Perionicais postace paid at }\end{aligned}$
ACBL PO. Box 289, Horn Lake, MS 28637-0289. ALL EDITORIAL AND GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE
should be directed to the Editor at 901 Cliftonbrook LN., Silver Spring, MD 20905-3711.
Editor - Donna Rogall (301-421-9615), drogall@verizon.net
I/N Columnists - Shawn Stringer, shstringer@aol.com and Ron Zucker, ron@motherzucker.com
Columnists - Steve Robinson, Richard Colker, Don Berman, Chris Miller, Barry Bragin
The opinions expressed by our columnists do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the ACBL, the WBL, or even the editors of this publication. The WBL is not responsible for the claims of its advertisers.
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## PRESIDENT's LEETTER

by WBL President, Richard Ferrin

This is my first column as WBL President. As an initial matter, thank you for electing me. I intend to do everything I can to merit your trust. I would like to thank our past President, Don Berman and past Treasurer, Fred King, for their many years of service on the board, and their tireless work in helping bridge grow and prosper in the Washington and suburban Maryland area. The Board will sorely miss their experience and good judgment.

This year, we have several new board members, and several existing board members who are serving in new officer positions. The tournament chairs for both our sectional and regional tournaments are new as well (Ron Zucker and Shawn Stringer, respectively). They have bravely taken on the formidable task of filling the void left by our longtime sectional and regional tournament chair, Nadine Wood,

## Did You Know?

## Rockvilie Duplicate Bridge Club

has a game almost every day!
Join us often and spread the word!

| DAY | TIME | LOCATION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Monday | 11:15 AM | St James |
| Tuesday | 7:00 PM | Rockville <br> Senior Center |
| Thursday | 11:15 AM | St James |
| Friday | 11:15 AM | St James |
| Saturday | 1:00 PM | St James |

## www.rockvilledbc.com

Need a Partner? Call Mark Lavine: 301-503-3348

## Locations:

| St James Episcopal Church |
| :--- | :--- |
| 11815 Seven Locks Road |
| Potomac, MD | | Rockville Senior Center |
| :--- |
| 11500 Camation Dr |
| Rockville, MD |

who passed away last year. As all of us get our "sea legs" in our new positions, we hope to rely not only on the sage advice of those who came before us, but also on you, the members, to let us know what we are doing right, and what we can do to improve the game we all enjoy so much. Constructive criticism is welcome and indeed vital to increasing the bridge community in the Washington and improving the experience for those who are already members.

The single most important part of making both the Unit Game and the tournaments run smoothly is the help we get from volunteers. One of my top goals is to broaden the base of volunteers so that we do not rely too heavily on the Herculean efforts of a few. We especially welcome volunteers to help Kitty Gottfried with hospitality.

Our 4th of July regional is coming up soon, and it will be held this year at the North Bethesda Marriott. Although the tournament is run by the Mid Atlantic Bridge Conference and draws players from a large area, the success of the event depends primarily on WBL membership playing lots of bridge and volunteering when possible. It is a wonderful playing site, and we look forward to seeing you there, as well as our local WBL events.

## Opt OUT?

If you'd like to stop receiving the printed version of the WBL Bulletin, please send your e-mail address to Don Berman at:
don.berman@verizon.net
You will start receiving an e-mail link to the on-line version of the bulletin in lieu of your printed copy.


* Stratified Open Pairs (unlim/1500/500) .

HURSDAY, AUGUST 2
Rockville Duplicate Bridge Club, 301-503-3348 (Mark Lavine) N0 ENTRY St. James Episcopal Cburch, 11815 Seven Locks Rd., Rockville TILL 11AM

- Strataflighted Open Pairs (AX unlim/3000, B/C/D Separate 2000/1000/500) (both sites); Stratified NLM Pairs (NLM/100/50) \& 0-20 Pairs (Kensington Armory only; Stratified 199er Pairs (Beth El only)
Beth El Congregation, 3830 Seminary Rd, Alexandria
Kensington Town Hall/Armory

| S (Kensington | OURNAMEN |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | .7:00pm |
|  | .7:30pm |
| FRIDA | Y, AUCUST 3 |

## FRIDAY, AUGUST 3 <br> 10:00am, 2:00pm

* *StrataFlighted $A / X$ (unlim/3000) \& B/C/D Pairs (2000/1000/500)
- IMP Pairs AX (unlim/3000)
$7: 15 \mathrm{pm}<$ EARIER START
It's the Friday nigbt IMPs! With only one partner, it scores like a team game. To get your IMP score on
a board, we take your result and IMP it against each result at the other tables, then get the average.
- B/C/D Pairs (2000/1000/500)
$\frac{7: 15 \mathrm{pm}}{7: 15 \mathrm{pm}}$
- Intermediate/Novice Pairs (300/200/100/50/20) (single sessions)

10:00am, 2:00pm, 7:15pm (will run if we bave 3 or more tables)

SATURDAY, AUGUST 4

* 2th Annual: Washington Bridge League Trophy Pairs

11:00am \& 4:00pm Two session Open Pairs, qualifying and final. Single session entries available.

- Strataflighted B//DD Pairs (2000/1000/500) (single sessions)
.11:00am, 4:00pm
- StrataFlighted AX Pairs (unlim/3000)

4:00pm
A Intermediate/Novice Pairs (300/200/100) or Newcomer Pairs (50/20/5) (single sessions) 11:00am, 4:00pm ~Don't miss the between sessions Panel Show ~

SUNDAY, AUGUST 5

- 1-Day Bridge Class: Advance Your Game

10:30am

- AX Board-A-Match Teams, (unlim $/ 5000,2$ session playthru w/short break)
.11:00am \& TBA
- B/C/D Swiss Teams, VPs (2500/1000/500, 7 round playthru w/short break) 11:00am \& TBA
- 300/100/50 Swiss Teams, VPs (single sessions) 11:00am, 3:00pm
* Lots of Intermediate \& Novice Events with Silver Points! $\downarrow$

IN events: $0-5,20,50,100,200,300 ;$ Stratification at Director's Discretion.
Famous Washington Hospitality includes snacks, drinks, and Friday and Sunday lunch free of charge. Chair: Ron Zucker, 202-300-3443, ron@motherzucker.com. Volunteer Coordinator: Barbara Summers, 301-598-5838, imbarb1184@a0l.com Hospitality: Kitty Gottfried, 301-587-3981 kgotfried@hotmail.com Partnerships: Barbara Doran, 301-608-0347, SectionalPartner@DistrictSix.ors *StrataFlighted if attendance warrants-othervise combined into Stratified Pairs (unlim/2000/500) Directions to the Kensington Town Hall/Armory: 495 Beltway Exit 33, Connecticut Avenue North (Rt. 185 N -to Kensington). 1.5 miles, right at light-Knowles Ave. $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ right at stop-Armory Ave. $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ left at stop-to 3710 Mitchell St. \& parking lot on right. Additional parking in nearby lots-see website maps.


NEWPORT MILL MIDDLE SCHOOL<br>11311 Newport Mill Road

Kensington, MD 20895

Play for Silver<br>NLMs with fewer than 500 MPs

Maryland Hospitality<br>Lunch and refresbments included both days!

## Saturday, September 22

NLM Stratified Pairs (500/200/100 and 50/20/10) . . . . . . . . 11:00 am
NLM Stratified Pairs (500/200/100 and 50/20/10) . .......... 3:15 pm
Sunday, September 23 (All day playthrougb with lunch break)
Stratified Swiss Teams (500/200/100) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .11:00 am

## -Join US for a fun weekend!-

## TOURNAMENT CHAIR <br> Shawn Stringer <br> 301-275-6363

shstringer@aol.com
DIRECTIONS: From I-495 (Washington Beltway) take Exit 33 (Connecticut Ave/MD-185) North towards Kensington. Go 2 miles and keep Left as Connecticut Ave splits. After the split, take the third Right onto Lawrence Avenue. Take the first Left onto Newport Mill Road. The school is one-half mile on the Right.

## CALL FOR NOMINATIONS FOR

 THE MACHLIN TROPHYIn 2006, the WBL initiated a new annual award, the Machlin Trophy for Sportsmanship in honor of Jerry Machlin, whom many of you will remember as one of the greatest directors the game has ever known.

To date, the recipients of the award are: Dr. Charles Stenger, Peter Boyd, James Geist, Rose Berman, Barbara Doran, and Millard Nachtwey. Each year, a committee of the most recent five winners, (the longest standing to be the Machlin Committee Chair - Peter Boyd) is appointed to consider this year's nominees. The criteria for awarding the trophy are as follows:
"The candidate should (1) demonstrate strong ethical standards and a commitment to active ethics (i.e., full disclosure of systems and agreements to opponents, etc.); (2) behave graciously at the table after bad results or good results; (3) exhibit exemplary behavior at all times toward partner and opponents; (4) demonstrate an ability to get along with mul-
tiple partners; and (5) demonstrate a willingness to help mentor other players in the game. A player wouldn't necessarily have to satisfy all five, but these are the main the criteria that the selection committee will consider."

We welcome nominations from the membership of the WBL. Please send your suggested candidate to Richard Ferrin at rferrin@mac.com or in person at the unit game. It would be appreciated if you would indicate in two or three sentences why you think your nominee is a good candidate for the award. We would like to hear from you by Aug. 1 .

## Welcome to the

Washington Bridge League
The WBL welcomes the following new ACBL members: Mina P Coggeshall, Caitlyn Edgley, Fadi Eidi, Ms Doris Freedman, Ms Joan M King, Marilyn Lowen, David Matusow, Mrs Beverly M Rezneck, and Phillip S Shapiro.

In addition, we welcome the following transfers from other units: John W Locke,
...continued on p. 26, column 2


Great Game Products
7825 Tuckerman Lane, Suite 206, Potomac, MD 20854
1-800-GAMES-4-U or 301-299-9005
wuvwogreatgameproducts.com • sales@bridgebaron.com
(Shipping/handling not included $\bullet$ All prices in US dollars)


## Bridge Baron 22 \$64.95

Comprehensive, easiest to use bridge game available. Download and CD available
Bridge Baron 22 is now available for iPad, iPhone and Android devices. ** features may vary
Windows 2000 / XP / Vista / 7 (English, Francais, Deutsch)
Macintosh/IMac/Mac OS X 10.5 or later (English, Francais, Deutsch)

## Introduction to Bridge - Play \& Learn with Pat Harrington $\$ 34.95$

Available on CD-Rom for Windows 2000/XP/Vista/7 (English Only)

- Teaches both bidding and play $\bullet$ Paced appropriately for beginners - Lessons 1-3 teach the mechanics, trick taking, and provide the background for bidding • Lessons 4-6 teach opening bids and their responses • Quizzes to reinforce your understanding $\bullet$ Provides an extensive glossary and reference section - Includes 38 carefully crafted instructional deals, and 92 BONUS practice hands $\bullet$ Presented in an easy-to-use, interactive format


## Learn and Practice

## Bidding Conventions $\$ 29.95$

Available on CD-Rom for Windows 2000/XP/Vista/7 (English only)

- Learn Conventions allows you to practice each convention in Bridge Baron. LPBC teaches you six conventions in depth using the interactive Bridge Baron Teacher architecture, and allows you to practice these conventions as well. $\bullet$ LPBC teaches you and allows you to practice responses and rebids for conventions, while Learn Conventions does not offer practice of responses and rebids for conventions. - LPBC 2 and $\underline{\boldsymbol{3}}$ are also availabe. They each contain seven convtions.

Congratulations to Marvin Elster and Ron Zucker who tied for first with a score of 490 . They win a free entry to the Unit Game, and will be invited to be on a future panel. Tied for third were Pete Hughes, Barbara Barnes, Rick Eissenstat, Allen Veasey, Dalia Kende, James Key, JC Clement and Fred Gramlich with a score of 480 . Tied for eleventh were Lyle Poe, Noble Shore, Carl Gutschick, Sam Keiter, Jeffrey Klemm, Wes Goldberg and Mike Gill with a score of 470 .Tied for eighteenth were Paul McGowan, Vin Bartone,Sven Pride, Mark Cohen, Winnie Fratkin, Ronald Witt, Johnny Petersson, Tom Musso, Gene Fisher, Enid Asherman, Suzanne Abrams and Gerald Lerner with a score of 460 . Tied for thirtieth were Jeff Watson, Francesco Parisi-Presicce, Dick Robinson, Nigel Guthrie, Bob Pustilnik, Al Duncker, Manuel Paulo, Nikola Tcholakov, Paul Benedict, Bob Levey, Ram Sarangan, Pete Ekstrand, Jay Weinstein, Martin Personick, Kathy Loh, Dan Baker, John Merold, Michael Meyer, Jim Allen, Arnie Frankel and Walter Taschek with a score of 450 . The average score of the 200 solvers was 416 . The average score of the experts was 463.

All readers are encouraged to send answers and/or new problems to Steve Robinson, 2891 S. Abingdon St. \#A2 Arlington, VA, 222061329. In addition to the winner receiving a free play at the WBL Unit Game, Steve will play with anyone who gets a perfect score or who exactly matches all five of his answers. If you send a self-addressed stamped envelope to the above address along with your answers, I will send you a copy of the new problems to ensure that you can meet his next deadline. You can pick up a copy of the problems at the WBL Unit Game in Maryland, and can send answers or requests for problems to robinswr@erols.com. You can also see and answer the problems at the WBL web site. WBL Solvers Club uses Washington Standard as published July 1996. I accept only the first answer from each solver unless it is clear that the solver wants to correct his answer.

I personally score all the problems. If a majority of the solvers vote for an answer, and the answer is reasonable I will give that answer 100 points. I will not give 100 points to an answer that I consider bad no matter how many experts
vote for it. There are times when I want to make a point. I will give that answer 100 points and will therefore give the majority answer 90 points. For the other answers I consider how good the answer is and how many experts vote for it for its score. If you submitted an answer that got 20 points, that bid would get a bad score at the table. A good exercise would be to figure out why I gave your answer 20 points. You might have misread the problem.

The book Washington Standard second edition is out. If you are a serious bridge player, this book is a must. You can purchase a copy from Steve for $\$ 25.00$ whenever you see him or can send him a check for $\$ 30.15$ that includes $\$ 5.15$ for priority mail.

| 1) IMPs, None Vulnerable |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ^AQ 54*K76542*AK3 |  |  |  |
| SOUTH | WEST | NORTH | EAST |
| $1 *$ | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| Action | Score | Votes | Solvers |
| 2\% | 100 | 7 | 84 |
| 3 | 80 | 2 | 44 |
| 2 | 70 | 1 | 60 |
| 3\% | 40 | 0 | 6 |
| 2 | 40 | 0 | 1 |
| 2 NT | 40 | 0 | 1 |
| 1NT | 30 | 0 | 3 |
| $2 \wedge$ | 20 | 0 | 1 |

How do you show an intermediate hand with a bad six-card suit? With a good diamond suit and 16 HCP you could jump to $3 \downarrow$. If your diamonds were AQJ10xx, it would be clear to jump to $3 \star$. If partner passes $3 \star$ and he had a singleton or void, you would not have many trump losers. But try playing K76542 opposite a singleton or void. The modern way to go when you have a weak sixcard diamond suit is to bid $2 *$ first. If partner passes $2 *$, you could be in the best contract. If partner continues, you can show your extra strength and your extra diamond length. You can also do this with weak six-card major. Don't jump in a suit that looks like a five-card suit.

Six experts agree with me and try $2 \boldsymbol{*}$. If
partner has $\uparrow$ Axxxx $\vee \mathrm{Kxx} \bullet \mathrm{Jx} \& \mathrm{Jxx}_{\mathrm{x}}$, he'll bid 2 to keep the bidding open since opener could have a hand not quite worth a jump shift.

Parker: " 2 *-The classic modern bid hoping to get by this round and give partner a chance to clarify his hand. I will raise $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ and bid 2NT over $2 \vee$."

Landen: " 2 \&-Common problem, the usual solution. Invent a suit to keep ball rolling. As $2 \%$ could be very strong, partner will strain to keep the bidding alive."

King: "2*-If I get by this. Actually I would have opened 1NT and not had this problem."

It does make sense to open this hand 1NT to avoid rebid problems. When you open the bidding, you should be prepared for partner's worst response. If you're going to fudge, maybe it's better to fudge on your opening bid. That's why I open 1NT when I have 15-17 HCPs, a five-card major and a balanced hand. That's also why I very rarely open 1NT with a singleton king or queen.

Theurer: "2*-The diamond suit quality is too poor to rebid $3 \star$. Some might have opened 1NT to avoid this rebid problem, but that doesn't solve everything either. The hand has a lot of controls and potential playing strength partner could pass 1NT with many hands that offer good play for game. 2 is a significant underbid, again partner might pass on a lot of hands where game is good. $2 \%$ on the chunky three-card suit is less limited and partner will often give false preference to $2 \star$ even with two of that suit and three clubs, to keep the auction alive. over $2 \star$ or $3 \boldsymbol{\&}$, probably raise to $3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ over a $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ rebid and bid $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ over $2 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$."

Woolsey: "2\&-I hate it, but everything else looks worse. Surely South should have anticipated the likely rebid nightmare and opened 1NT.

Schwartz: "2\%-I have the points for $3 *$ but not the suit. 2 \& encompasses a hand this strong and if partner passes, might even be the right spot. Maybe it's right to open 1NT to avoid this problem."

Three experts rebid their diamonds. I hope their partner doesn't pass it.

Cappelletti: " $3 \star$ —Too good for 1NT or $2 *$. I would have opened 1NT."

Adams: " 3 - Tough to defend any response since I open 1NT to avoid this problem. I am simply too strong for a 1 NT or $2 \star$ rebid, and $2 \&$ with $6-3$ is for masterminds. Sorry suit not better, but point count right and we can still play other strains if partner does not pass."

The following expert will be a trick lower if partner passes.

Hopkins: "2 - I don't have a great source of tricks or a known fit with partner. I will go slowly and catch up if partner shows game or slam interest."

If you have a very bad six-card suit, it's often right to bid a lower suit rather than jump in your six-card suit.

## 2) IMPs, They're Vulnerable

AAQ3 42 AK54 AQ106

| SOUTH | WEST | NORTH | EAST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \leqslant$ | $3 \boldsymbol{A}$ | $4 \bullet$ | Pass |
| ???? |  |  |  |
| Action | Score | Votes | Solvers |
| Cue | 100 | 3 | 39 |
| RKC | 90 | 2 | 96 |
| 6NT | 90 | 4 | 15 |
| Pass | 70 | 1 | 25 |
| 6 | 70 | 0 | 9 |
| 5 | 70 | 0 | 3 |
| 5NT | 40 | 0 | 7 |
| $5 \%$ | 30 | 0 | 5 |
| 5 | 20 | 0 | 1 |

I assume that the solvers meant 4 NT as asking for aces and $4 \boldsymbol{A}$ as a cue bid. From the expert's comments, I could tell whether they were cuebidding or asking. I assume that a partnership would know what bid is ace asking and what bid is a cue bid.

You have $\boldsymbol{\wedge}_{\mathrm{x}} \vee \mathrm{KQJ} 10_{\mathrm{xxx}} \bullet \mathrm{Jxx}_{\mathrm{xx}}$ or $\boldsymbol{\uparrow}_{\mathrm{x}}$ $\checkmark$ AQ109xx xxx ${ }^{\circ} x x$. Your partner opens $1 \diamond$ and RHO overcalls $3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$. Wouldn't you bid $4 \bullet$ ? I would. Actually I'd bid $4 \bullet$ holding $\boldsymbol{\wedge}_{x}$ $\bullet A Q J_{x x} \bullet \mathrm{Qxx}_{\bullet} \bullet \mathrm{Kxx}$. When they have one major, we have the other. Do you really want to be in 6NT opposite the first two hands? This hand is worth a slam try, not a slam force. If you make a slam try such as $4 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ or 5 and partner rejects, how good can slam be?

Four experts bid 6NT. If partner has one of my example hands, you could easily be playing 6NT out of your hand. 6 NT is a non-thinking bid. If you're going to bid 6NT, why not ask for keycards first? If partner does not have solid hearts, he will need an entry in order to run the hearts. If partner has solid hearts, you might belong in seven.

Parker: "6NT—Science be damned. I want the lead to come up to my hand. If partner has something like seven solid hearts and a King he can bid the grand. I don't know if partner would think 4NT was to play or asking for keycards, so I bid what I think I can make."

The only time 4 NT is to play is if the last
bid by your side was a natural 3NT.
Cappelletti: " 6 NT —Admittedly gambling but will probably make a large percentage of the time."

King: "6NT—Partner thought (hoped?) he could take ten tricks opposite a minimum opener. I have two tricks more than that."

I think it's more likely that partner thought that he could make six tricks opposite a minimum opener.

Theurer: "6NT—The opponents preempt has done its job and significantly crowded our auction. LHO bid 3 at unfavorable on a broken suit so he probably has a card on the side and or extra shape.le partner doesn't need an awful lot to bid $4 \boldsymbol{\vee}$, but since slam is excellent opposite a minimum such as $\uparrow x$ KQJTxx xxx $\approx K J x$, I'm certainly way too good to make a pessimistic pass of 4 .ot and bid slam. In theory partner is unlimited and a grand is possible, but bad breaks are a good possibility given the preempt and I don't have the space and tools to find out everything I need. I would prefer to play the hand to protect my spade tenace so I'll take the reasonable shot at slam here. Would $4 \uparrow$ be a cuebid and guarantee a heart fit or Kickback for hearts here with 4 NT being a spade cuebid? Or could it just be a general strong hand with or without a heart fit?another reason to just shoot out slam to avoid confusion with those possible slam tries."

Wouldn't he bid 4• holding $\checkmark$ KQJTxx xxx ${ }^{2 x x}$ ? I would.

One expert asks for keycards
Woolsey:"4NT-Four notrump or 4^ if that is my RKC call. I'm going to have to drive this hand to slam, so I might as well find out how good partner's hearts are which will help me choose the right strain. If $4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ is my RKC call and I hope it is, then a follow-up 5NT will be pick-a-slam, so we can back into a $4-4$ minorsuit slam if partner's hearts aren't too strong."

Three experts agree with me and cue bid. Cue bidding allows you to bid 5 NT later as choice of slams.

Schwartz: "4NT—Spade cue bid playing kickback.ce to slam but too strong to pass 4 .'

Hopkins: " $4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$-Partner shouldn’t have a really bad hand with Heart length since I still have a chance to call if he passed. I'll make a try and see if I get cooperation. I would treat partner's 4NT as RKCB for Hearts.

One expert bids $4 \wedge$ no matter what it means. I'm sure he'd know what $4 \wedge$ means depending on whom he was playing with.

Adams: " $4 \wedge$-I usually play this as RKC
for Hearts. Playing kickback, 4 NT would be a cue bid with spades. Note that if not playing kickback, I would still bid $4 \wedge$. Why would I cue bid playing one method, and bid RKC playing the other? 1.4^ is cheaper. 2. Cue bid with 4NT leaves no RKC and no re-cue bid for partner. RKC 4NT is not good bridge as one without Queen gets us past 5 in search for the Queen. Back to my preferred method. If I use 4 as RKC, I can invite a grand opposite two with Queen, and I can give choice of slams (via 5NT) opposite two or one with Queen. Partner should respect that I do not have a lot of room, and that choice of slam means my hearts not great. Note I am not worried about wrong siding notrump. If partner has zero Keys, we will play 5 . Summary... Bid $4 \uparrow$ no matter which way you play it. It's more flexible than 4 NT ."

One expert thinks we're high enough. He thinks it's important to give partner room.

Landen: "Pass-This might end up missing a grand, if partner has extras, but it's more likely he stretched to bid $4 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$. Suits are breaking badly and so I'll try to go plus."

When an opponent preempts, you shouldn't hang partner when he could be making an overbid.

## 3) IMPs, None Vulnerable

^ 72 97*AKQJ9\&A1072

| SOUTH | WEST | NORTH | EAST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1\% | Pass |
| 2** | Pass | $3 * *$ | Pass |
| ??? * $10+$ | hort di | nds |  |


| Action | Score | Votes | Solvers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4* | 100 | 2 | 19 |
| 4* | 90 | 2 | 36 |
| 3NT | 90 | 4 | 111 |
| 5\% | 70 | 1 | 14 |
| $3 \vee$ | 70 | 0 | 5 |
| $3 \wedge$ | 70 | 0 | 2 |
| 4NT | 50 | 0 | 4 |
| 6\% | 50 | 0 | 2 |
| 6 | 40 | 0 | 1 |
| Pass | 20 | 0 | 4 |
| 5 | 20 | 0 | 2 |
| Abstain | -20 | 1 | 0 |

I've gotten complaints about the $2 *$ bid. In order to have a good constructive auction you have to set trumps ASAP. Suppose you respond $1 \star$ and opener rebids $1 \boldsymbol{A}$. In order to force you must bid $2 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$. You haven't shown your club support. Suppose partner is $4=3=1=5$ with three lit-
tle hearts. He bids $3 \checkmark$ and you still haven't shown your club support. Suppose over your $1 \star$ response LHO jumps to $3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$. Now what? Suppose your partner rebids 1 NT over your $1 \star$ response. Now you have to bid two-of-a-major in order to force. You haven't supported clubs yet. Now partner raises to three-of-the-major. In order to support clubs, you have to bid 4** and partner would be scratching his head trying to figure out what you have. I think it's so important to set trumps ASAP, that I will make an inverted minor with only four-card support. However, if I have a four-card major, I will show that first.

Partner has reduced your hand to an eight count. Usually when partner shows shortness you subtract any kings, queens and jacks in that suit. This hand is an exception. Here we have probably five tricks even opposite partner's shortness. The good news about this hand is that you're playing IMPs. If you're playing matchpoints, you wouldn't want to play in $5 \star$, cold for 11 tricks in notrump. Therefore, assuming that 5 would always make, there is little downside bidding above 3NT. At matchpoints it's either 3NT or a slam. Give partner $\uparrow A x x$ Axx $\lll \operatorname{Kxxxx}$ and you could easily make $7 \boldsymbol{\circ}$.

Five experts signoff in game. 3NT or $5 \%$ will end the auction so there very little chance of getting to a cold slam. They don't understand that not only does 3 show diamond shortness, it also shows extra values. $\rightarrow Q J_{x x} \bullet \mathrm{QJxx}_{\mathrm{x}} \bullet \mathrm{x} \bullet \mathrm{K} \mathrm{xx}$ is not good enough to splinter. Partner is very likely to have at least five clubs when he splinters.

Parker: "3NT-I DO have diamonds stopped and he should have the majors stopped since he can't have much in Clubs. Maybe he has something like $\uparrow K Q x$ AQxx $x \uparrow K x x x x$ or just change the heart Queen to the club Queen."

If partner happens to hold $\uparrow A x x x \vee K x$ - $\mathrm{x} \Leftarrow \mathrm{KQ}$ xxxx, would you really want to be in 3NT from your side? You go down in 3NT when you're cold for $6{ }^{\circ}$.

Adams: "3NT—Anything other than 3NT could be interpreted as lacking diamonds and get us too high, so I am end played into wrong siding this. $2 *$ was a silly call. $2 *$ should show a five-card suit, four only when I do not have an obvious alternative. This hand should respond $1 \star$. After $1 \star$, we would be able to have simple bidding, and get notrump played from partner's side. Imagine this auction: $1 \boldsymbol{*}-1$ - 1NT - 2 -2 any $-3 *$ where $2 *$ is game-forcing-checkback and $3 *$ shows diamonds and clubs. Now I have shown my hand and I can respect any-
thing partner does, and notrump is right sided."
It's nice if you're playing two-way-checkback and it's on after 1ヵ-1 - 1NT. However, most pairs do not play two-way checkback. Responding 1 could confuse the issue.

Hopkins: "3NT—Contract most likely to make. I presume we are adopting a Canape style of bidding?"

Schwartz: "3NT—Must admit I would start with $1 \star$, but with only four clubs and no control in the majors, can't drive past 3NT."

One expert makes a bid with no upside. Partner can't bid a slam

Cappelletti: " $5 *$ I would bid 3 NT at matchpoints but $5{ }^{\circ}$ is probably safer at IMPs."

Three experts join me and try for slam. Again most partnerships would know what $4 \star$ means. If you're playing Kickback, $4 \star$ would ask for keycards with clubs as trumps. That would be my preferred meaning. If you're not playing Kickback then 4 is a cue bid. I like 4*. If partner has a minimum hand, (but can't be that bad) he can bid $5 \star$. Since I didn’t bid 3NT, I probably don't have the wasted KQ of diamonds.

Theurer: "4*-For his splinter, partner has at least four clubs, frequently will have five clubs. $4=4=0=5,3=4=1=5$ or $4=3=1=5$ patterns are quite possible in addition to $4=4=1=4$. I don't have anything to cuebid in the majors but I do have extra values and want to make a forward going move to show slam-cooperative interest - a typical hand for partner, $\uparrow A x x>K Q x x-$ $\$ K Q x x x$, would be a fine hand for $6 \%$. I assume partner's splinter puts us in a game force, thus $5{ }^{\circ}$ by me here would be fast arrival showing the weakest possible hand, with no slam interest but not interested in playing 3NT. 3NT would be also discouraging with lots of diamond wastage, few or no extras, not interested in slam unless partner has a moose. $4 \boldsymbol{*}$ should be forcing and shows a slam-cooperative hand but with no appropriate hand to bid $3 \boldsymbol{v}$ or $3 \boldsymbol{A}$ which should be cuebids or at least value-showing bids. Some might play that they show shortness. What is $4 \star$ here? If it is a cuebid then that's probably the right bid. But many would play that it is Kickback and if so I don't think that bid is right here. Should I be taking control with no major suit controls here? Can't partner have $\uparrow Q J x x$ AKQx -\&KQxxx? He'd bid 5* showing two keys and the club queen in response to $4 \star$ kickback, and now l'd be guessing whether we're off AK of a major. Thus if $4 *$ is Kickback I will bid $4 \star$. If 4 is not Kickback then $4 \star$ would be a reasonable bid.tner can bid $4 \bullet$ Kickback. If partner can’t bid Kickback, he
may have two fast losers in a major and we do not want to be in slam. If he cuebids four-of-a-major then I will bid 4NT, which should be a hand better than bidding $5 \%$ but a hand that can't go past $5 \%^{\circ}$ because I don't have a control in the other major."

Woolsey: " $4 \star$-I hope I'm playing sensible methods where this is RKC. I'll risk being off a cashing AK in a major if we have the necessary keycards. If this isn't RKC I would make the same bid, hoping partner would drive to slam with KQ of clubs, a side ace, and a side king."

Landen: " 4 - $2 \star$ was a moronic bid. Why would anyone raise a possible threecard club suit in preference to bidding $1 \diamond$ ? Now, we're forced to guess between settling for 3NT and looking for 6*. Its IMPs, so at least $5 \star$ making will be a decent result."

The following expert gets the score he deserves. There are no easy problems in a master solvers contest and sometimes you just have to guess. Abstaining gets you a - 20 .

King: "Abstain-This is just a pure guess in my view. If partner has $\uparrow A K x x \bullet A J_{x x} \bullet x \oplus J_{x x x}$ we belong in 3 NT . If he holds $\uparrow \mathrm{xxx}$ AKJx -x॰KOJxx we had better get to $5 \%$. Personally 1 think $2 \propto$ was very misdirected and we should have started with $1 \star$. I think $3 \bullet$ or $3 \wedge$ by me right now should show values in that suit and ask for a stopper in the other one. I abstain."

I don't think it's right to splinter in this situation with xxx in a side suit.

There is nothing wrong with making an Inverted Minor with only four-card support.
4) IMPs, You're Vulnerable
^K K 854 KJ1064 - 1092
SOUTH WEST NORTH EAST
???

| Action | $\frac{\text { Score }}{}$ |  | Votes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 |  | $\frac{\text { Solvers }}{9}$ | 97 |
| Pass | 90 | 3 | 48 |
| Dbl | 70 | 1 | 38 |
| $3 \uparrow$ | 70 | 1 | 14 |
| $3 \downarrow$ | 70 | 0 | 1 |
| $4 \uparrow$ | 30 | 0 | 1 |
| $4 \downarrow$ | 30 | 0 | 1 |

This is a bidder's game. You have 5-5 in the majors which is what $4 \star$ shows. The only problem is that you're a little light in HCP. When the opponents preempt, you make gambling bids. If you had $\wedge \mathrm{Kx} \bullet \mathrm{KJ} \bullet K J x \bullet A Q x x x, 95$ \% of experts would overcall 3 NT . If you had
 would overcall $3 \boldsymbol{v}$. Is the problem hand that much weaker than my example hands. True, on bad days you might find LHO with $\uparrow$ AJIOx $\bullet A Q x x * K Q J x$ and you would go for a big number on my two examples as well as the problem hand. This doesn't happen in real life. If real life you catch partner with enough strength that you either make your contract or there's enough strength to go down one. When you are short in the opponent's suit, you should be aggressive. If your minors were reversed, then it makes more sense to pass.

Four experts join me and show both majors. Showing both majors is better than overcalling in one of your major. If partner is 4-2 in the majors, 4 gives you a $100 \%$ chance of playing in your nine-card fit.

Cappelletti: " 4 -Most likely to get to right spot although a bit light."

Theurer: " 4 -A tough decision. Usually the hand short in the opponent's suit is the one that needs to take action. Here, that's my hand. But there are issues. If I do bid, do I double, bid three-of-a-major, or bid 4 Michaels to get both suits into the picture? And, whatever I do bid, I'm bidding at unfavorable vulnerability and partner will likely take me for a better hand than I have, no matter what action I take. The problem with passing, though, is that it avoids one problem of what to bid and risks another partner may have too many diamonds and too few of one major or the other to balance, and a vulnerable game may be missed. Imagine him with $\boldsymbol{\wedge x} \bullet$ Q9xx $-K x x=A Q x$, for example. If I pass, will he balance over $3 \downarrow$ ? Nope. Yet $4 \downarrow$, even with his probably wasted diamond King, has reasonable play. It's a bidder's game, so I will hope for some working values and a major suit fit from partner, getting both suits in at the risk of going for a number or just getting too high. Another problem with passing is that LHO could extend the preempt via $4 \star$ or $5 \star$, potentially shutting us out even if partner has a decent hand with a fit for one or both majors."

Adams: " 4 -Hope partner can take a joke. Two decent suits are two chances to find a game. $4 *$ is not safe, but neither is pass. Assume partner has some diamond length and will not be able to bid. Clear danger that partner hangs me, but playing with Robinson, I usually get some slack for this sort of bid. After 3 - Pass - Pass, partner has a problem, after $3 \star-$ Pass $-4 \star$ we are toast, so I risk $4 \star$ now. $3 \star$ - Pass - 3NT and we are really ill, as 3 NT can be a semi-psyche. What
about Double? My experience to date doubling with five-card majors has been poor. Partner with $\uparrow A x x$ Axx $\mathrm{xxxx}^{\boldsymbol{*}}$ Axx will pass and we will be lucky if we set them, cold for four-of-a-major."

Hopkins: " 4 -The opponent's may have a huge Diamond fit and I want to get in early before the bidding skyrockets. They are very likely to sacrifice over our game or slam in this case, even if we can't make our contract. And if things are going bad, there is a reasonable likelihood we have some sort of fit."

Three experts pass.
Woolsey: "Pass—Just too weak to act. If I bid anything, partner will probably bid more than we can make."

Woolsey ignores his void rule. "When you have a void you overbid by a trick because it's very difficult to evaluate what the void is worth". This does not include a void in partner's suits.

Parker: "Pass—If they bid 3NT I will back in with $4 \star$. If I bid $4 \star$ or double now partner should assume I have much more. If it goes all pass then they will go down since partner has good diamonds. If he bids anything we will be in good shape, I can bid $4 *$ over 3 NT and raise any suit he bids."

But what if LHO bids 5 ? Partner would have to pass 5 with $\uparrow x$ Axxxx $\mathrm{xxx} \& A Q x x$ and you'd have good plays for slam.

King: "Pass-It is very tempting to bid $4 \star$, but will you be comfortable if it goes $5 \star$ double after that? "

I'd be more comfortable then if it goes 5 pass. If I bid $4 \star$ and partner doubles $5 \star$, he would have club values and I'd expect 5 doubled to be our best spot. We won't be cold for five-of-a-major and most of the time we'd beat $5 *$. And it they make it, it's not the end of the world.

One expert doubles. Double will get you to your nine-card major-suit fit but what about the eight-card fit?

Landen: "Double—This might turn out badly, but I think I have to act. The hand with shortness in the opponent's suit bids. Having decided to take action, I might as well try for the whole enchilada and hope partner has a diamond stack."

One expert overcalls $3 \boldsymbol{A}$. The big problem with bidding $3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ is that if you have a heart fit, you're unlikely to find it. You'd be playing in
 have the same problem if you overcalled $3 \boldsymbol{v}$.

Schwartz: " $3 \uparrow$ —Not enough to bid $4 \leqslant$ at this vulnerability and passing is too likely to
end the auction."
You can enter light when they preempt and you're short in their suit especially if you can make a descriptive bid. Partner should take your possible lightness into account.

## 5) IMPs, None Vulnerable

- 10 K K $* 1062 * A K Q J 532$
SOUTH $\frac{\text { WEST }}{1 \uparrow} \frac{\text { NORTH }}{\text { Pass }} \frac{\text { EAST }}{\text { Pass }}$
??

| Action | Score | Votes | Solvers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3 \wedge$ | 100 | 8 | 39 |
| 3* | 80 | 1 | 50 |
| 3NT | 70 | 1 | 15 |
| 2* | 70 | 0 | 62 |
| Double | 50 | 0 | 17 |
| 5\% | 50 | 0 | 7 |
| 4\% | 50 | 0 | 4 |
| 1 NT | 30 | 0 | 1 |
| Pass | 20 | 0 | 2 |
| 2 | 20 | 0 | 2 |
| $2 \wedge$ | 20 | 0 | 1 |

There are four ways to show a good hand with clubs. One way is to jump to $3 \boldsymbol{\%}$. $3 \boldsymbol{\%}$ shows a good six-card suit or longer with an opening hand. $\uparrow_{\mathrm{xx}} \boldsymbol{V}_{\mathrm{xx}} \bullet$ AJx AK $Q_{\mathrm{xxx}}$ would be a minimum $3{ }^{\circ}$ bid. The second way is to jump to $3 \boldsymbol{A} .3 \boldsymbol{A}$ asks partner to bid 3 NT with a spade stopper. If partner does not have a spade stopper, he's supposed to bid $4 \star$, unless he has a hand where he wants to be in game opposite a solid minor suit. He might not know which minor you have. The third way is to double and then bid clubs. You know what I think about doubling when you're short in an unbid major. The fourth way is to just bid 3NT.

I like $3 \boldsymbol{A}$. It gets you to 3 NT opposite a spade stopper. The bonus is that it stops LHO from bidding a red suit at the three-level. The only problem is that you still need two tricks to make 3NT.

Cappelletti: " $3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$-Western cue bid. My partner is likely to have some values.'
$3 \boldsymbol{A}$ is not a Western cue bid. $3 \boldsymbol{A}$ shows a solid minor. Opposite a solid minor, partner most logical continuation is to bid 3NT with a stopper. If partner happens to have $\uparrow A Q x x x \wedge A Q J \diamond Q * x x x$, he could probably bid 6 and expect to make it. Forget the term Western Cue bid. There are many cue bids which do not ask for a stopper.

King: " $3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$-If partner has a spade stop-
per, I want her to bid 3NT. "
Theurer: " $3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ —I have two basic choices $3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$, which will ask partner to bid 3 NT with spades stopped. This is a reasonable description of my hand though even if partner has a spade stopper, we don't have nine sure tricks even assuming clubs run. The other choice is $3 \boldsymbol{\%}$, which shows a good-but-not-necessarily-solid six-card or longer club suit and intermediate $13-16 \mathrm{HCP}$ values. This will keep the bidding lower if partner has a poor hand and if he has values he can still bid 3NT or $3 \boldsymbol{A}$ to ask if I have spades stopped or $3 \diamond$ or 3 which would show values there and try for $3 \mathrm{NT}, 5 *$ or a red suit contract. Partner would be limited by his failure to overcall 1^, but he can still have some hands with openingbid values but not enough for a two-level overcall. Both bids have their plusses and minuses. Because it's IMPs and because with a stiff club partner will not play me for solid clubs if I bid $3{ }^{*}$ and thus pass on some hands where 3 NT makes, I will make the aggressive call."

Woolsey: " $3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}-3$ ^ doesn’t do justice to this hand, since partner won't be expecting a solid club suit so he won't bid 3 NT with a single spade stopper and one or two small clubs."

Adams: " $3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$-Will infer that partner has some HCP from the auction, and that 3 NT will make more often than not when partner has a stopper. $3 \uparrow$ also preempts a heart rebid by opener. My second choice is 3 NT which is the right bid when partner has the spade stopper, might talk opener into a passive side suit lead when East has the missing spade card, or might convince the opponents that my hand type different. At the table, I might be bold enough to try it. I would definitely do it against known passive leaders, but not against players that consistently lead their best suit. Note that 3NT down one or
two can win IMPs. Third choice is $3 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$, right on values, but partner will not play me for seven solid and a side king. Last choice is to pass: Giving West a second chance at game can cost me six IMPs, but bidding rates to get me a swing my way. I gain eleven for game, six or seven for partscore swing, one thru three for us down a little, or at least five if they bid again and go down."
Hopkins: " $3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ - Please have a Spade stopper and a little bit on the outside, partner!" Good partner have at least two tricks.
Landen: " $3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ —Asking for spade stopper, just as $1 \boldsymbol{A}-3$ does. Second choice is 3 NT , which might be better."

One expert underbids. With only one spade stopper, partner will not play you for a solid suit and therefore would be reluctant to bid 3NT when it's right.

Parker: " 3 \&-Shows this type of hand, partner will stretch to bid 3 NT with a stopper. $3 \uparrow$ should ask for a stopper too, but we may get too high if he does not have one."

One expert knows where he belongs and gets there quickly. I can just see the opening bidder with AKQ10x of spades make a safe lead and you take the first nine. Of course he might just lead a high spade and laugh when he sees dummy. On the other hand, he might have AKQJx or $A K J_{x x}$ of diamonds. He'll know if there's another way to beat 3 NT .

Schwartz: "3NT—Must be some reason not to bid $3 \boldsymbol{A}$, here is mine. With only 13 HCP partner is odds on to have a spade stopper. If I bid $3 \uparrow$ LHO can direct partner not to lead a spade when its right and now might get a heart lead through my king. Thus I bid 3NT directly which is the most likely right spot."
$3 \boldsymbol{\sim}$ is not only a descriptive bid, it's also preemptive.

## Solvers' Scores

| John Adams | 3 | RKC | 3NT | 4 * | $3 \wedge$ | 460 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mike Cappelletti | 3 | 6NT | 5* | 4 | 34 | 440 |
| Robbie Hopkins | 2 | Q | 3NT | 4 * | 3 A | 460 |
| Fred King | $2 *$ | 6NT | ab | Pass | 34 | 360 |
| Steve Landen | 2* | Pass | 4 * | Dbl | $3 \wedge$ | 430 |
| Steve Parker | 2* | 6NT | 3NT | Pass | 3\% | 450 |
| Steve Robinson | 2* | Q | 4* | 4 * | 34 | 500 |
| Alan Schwartz | $2 \%$ | Q | 3NT | $3 \wedge$ | 3NT | 430 |
| Brad Theurer | 2* | 6NT | 4* | 4 | $3 \wedge$ | 490 |
| Kit Woolsey | 2* | RKC | 4* | Pass | $3 \wedge$ | 470 |
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The Lovenberg Race is open to all WBL members; the Izzy Cohen Race is open to all WBL members who started the calendar year with less than 1500 masterpoints; the Tubbs Race is open to all WBL members who started the calendar year as a Non-Life Master with less than 500 masterpoints; the Woolridge Race is open to all WBL members who started the calendar year with less than 20 masterpoints.

Winners in each category receive four sessions of free plays. Second place gets two and third place gets one.

This list is up to date through May 17, 2012, not including the Unit KO. All points are subject to audit by the WBL Director.

## Lovenberg

1148.94 John Adams

2 106.20 Steve Robinson
3 63.05 William Cole
4 62.94 James Geist
5 60.41 Brad Theurer
6 56.56 Alfred Steinberg
7 54.63 Michael Richey
852.31 Peter Boyd
$9 \quad 51.74$ Mark Shaw
$10 \quad 51.10$ Lloyd Rawley
51.10 Ellen Klosson
249.53 Donna Rogall

13 47.45 Jason Meyer
4 47.29 Clyde Kruskal
45.77 Leon Letwin

16 44.89 Donald Berman
7 44.73 Larry Kahn
18 42.28 David Ruderman
19 41.92 H John Edmonds
39.54 Robert Bell
38.41 Barry Falgout
2237.93 Richard Wegman

3 36.78 Steven Schatzow
36.58 Ronald Zucker
35.92 William Hacker

Lessons will cover slam bidding, weak twos, 3 level+ preempts, overcalls, takeout doubles, negative doubles, opening leads, and signaling. Each lesson will be tailored to the needs and interests of the players.

This is a great program for beginners as well as experienced social bridge players! Partners will be provided if needed. For more information, contact Bryan or Lois Geer at 301-236-0014 or by email at geerbridge@ verizon.net.


ALERT! The Unit Game is now played at Ohr Kodesh. NO OUTSIDE FOOD IS ALLOWED. Snacks and drinks
will be provided.

## WBL GUARANTEED <br> Partner Procram

You never need to miss the unit game because you don't have a partner at the last minute! The WBL has a guaranteed partner (GP) program for players who occasionally need a partner for the unit game. Here's how it works: we provide a standby partner, if an odd number of people in need of a partner arrive, we match the players as best we can, and the GP plays with the one who is left. (If there is an even number of players looking, the GP goes home). You can always get a game.

Players in search of partners should try to arrive between 7:00 and 7:15 (or call ahead). The partnership desk closes at 7:25. You can call the WBL cell phone (301)395-2760 at the last minute if are on your way and know you'll be at bit late.

To find a partner in the Open or $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{D}$ game at least a day in advance, contact Barbara Doran at UnitGamePartner@DistrictSix. org or barbd@star power.net, or call 301-608-0347 between 9 am and 10 pm . To find a partner for the NLM game, contact Shawn Stringer at 301-2756363 or ShStringer@aol.com .

You might want to volunteer for the GP program yourself. It's a great way to meet people. If you play on the night you're the GP, you play free. If you volunteer, you receive a free play for any future unit game whether or not you play that night.

Partnerships Close AT 7:25pm to start the game promptly at 7:30pm. Call if you're late, OR YOU MAY NOT BE ACCOMMODATED.


The Washington Bridge League could use a little of either! In order to keep events exciting and entry fees low, the WBL relies on the goodness of our members to volunteer for small jobs at the Unit Game and Sectional Tournaments. Some jobs require brains while others require muscle. We'll be happy to employ either.

From setting up and breaking down tables, to publicity and events development, a lit-
tle effort from you will make our bridge community even better. Busy schedule? No worries. Most volunteer assignments take only 15 minutes to 1 hour a month

## Here's how to help:

1. Reply by email, phone or in person if you are willing to help in any way.
2. Please indicate if you can offer any special skills (such as marketing or a strong back).
3. Someone will contact you shortly with a choice of assignments you can pick from.

Thank you in advance for any assistance you can provide.

Barbara Summers, Volunteer Coordinator, 301-5985838, jimbarb1184@aol.com,
by Rich Colker, rcolker@gmail.com

The ACBL Alert procedure requires players who "by experience or expertise, recognize that their opponents have neglected to Alert a special agreement" to protect themselves. The following deal, played by four expert players, from the second qualifying session of the Life Master Pairs at the 2011 Fall NABC in Seattle, may help to shed some light on the limits of that responsibility.
Bd: 17
Dlr: North
Vul: None

${ }^{(1)}$ Drury, not Alerted
North noted the failure to Alert before the opening lead and East called the Director, who he told privately that he would have doubled $2 \boldsymbol{*}^{\circ}$ had it been Alerted but felt he could not ask about a non- Alerted bid without risking passing unauthorized information (UI) to his partner, West. North had told E/W at the start of the round
that they played strong notrumps and a "rubber bridge" style, making it plausible that $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$ were not playing Drury. After the opening lead (the ه6) South made 12 tricks in $4 \uparrow$ for plus 480.

The Director, citing the section of the ACBL Alert Procedure quoted above and the part of the ACBL Club Director's Handbook which says "... an opponent who actually knows or suspects what is happening even though not properly informed may not be entitled to redress if he or she chooses to proceed without clarifying the situation," ruled that the table result would stand since a seeded pair such as $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ here should have the experience/expertise to protect themselves.

E/W appealed the Director's ruling. East said he paused for a few seconds after his RHO bid 2* to allow South time to Alert the bid. When no Alert was forthcoming, he judged that N/S were one of (in his opinion) many pairs who did not play Drury. He explained that asking about the bid would have barred his partner from leading a club if $2 *$ turned out not to be Drury. Furthermore, he believed that requiring him to ask about the bid would have put his side in an untenable position: if he was wrong and 2 * was not Drury his partner would not have been allowed to lead a club from, say, 109x.

The Committee decision described in some detail the dilemma experienced by players who find themselves in positions like the one East experienced here. (In what follows I liberally paraphrase the case write-up for brevity.) N/S's agreement was that $2 *$ was Drury. ACBL regulations require an Alert of Drury, so this was a failure to Alert and therefore constituted misinformation (MI). The non- offending side was clearly damaged by the MI. The Committee members reflected that at most tables at which Drury was played the 2*

Committee Action, cont. from p. 17...
bid was doubled, a club was led, and a heart shift was found. Therefore, assuming East was misinformed, reciprocal 450 s should be assigned since no other outcome is at all probable.

The difficult point was raised by the regulations cited by the Director, who ruled that Drury was common enough and East's hand suggestive enough of a failure to Alert that East needed to protect himself by asking about $2 *$. The Director pointed out that this regulation also applied to West. Once South bid 4^ West pretty much knew that $2 *$ had been Drury. He could have asked about the bid before acting in the passout seat. If it turned out that there had been a failure to Alert the Director could have backed up the auction, giving his partner a second chance to act. The Committee judged that this would not occur to even one player in 100 in West's position. Practically, requiring this sort of protection is not reasonable, so they judged that West did not have to protect the partnership. East, however, clearly strongly suspected that $2{ }^{\circ}$ was Drury before he acted.

Is "strongly suspected" enough to require protection? A case was recalled that occurred a few years ago in which a player held 22 HCP , heard a Flannery opening by an opponent, followed by a jump by the opener's partner described as "invitational." The Appeals Committee who heard the case decided that the player knew from his own hand and experience that the jump was intended as blocking, so he was on his own. That case was obvious: that player knew what was going on. A similar (made-up) example is one where a player holds 24 HCP and hears a 3 NT opening on his right, with no Alert. He knows there should have been one. If he doesn't ask to protect himself, he gets no protection.

So where is the line in the sand? Is "strongly suspects" a failure to Alert enough? What if East had held: $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} \boldsymbol{x}$ Qxxx xx AQJ109x? Now he is pretty certain - though perhaps not one-hundred percent - that $2 \boldsymbol{*}$ wasn't natural. Where are the spades? Is that sufficient to require that East protect himself?
...continued on p. 20

## 4. - 2011 WINNERSVINNERSNINNERSNINNERSNINNERSVINNERS ......May 17, $2012 . . . .$. Annual Meting \& घlactions Raporti......

## Minutes of the 2012 Washington Bridge League Annual Meeting

from Ellen A. Cherniavsky, Secretary
The 2012 WBL Annual Meeting was called to order by President, Don Berman at 7:15 PM.

The minutes of the previous year's annual meeting were approved without objection.

## Treasurer's Report

Treasurer, Fred King announced that losses this year totaled $\$ 4000$, down from an $\$ 8000$ loss the previous year. The biggest loss comes from the Bulletin at about - $\$ 11,400$ and the biggest money maker is the unit game at $+\$ 6500$. All other items are between $+\$ 1500$ and $-\$ 1900$. We are in good financial shape overall. The WBL received an anonymous gift of $\$ 25,000$ last year. The Treasurer's Report was accepted without objection.

Richard turned the meeting over to Jim Allen, Elections Chairman, who asked for nominations from the floor for officers for the fiscal year 2012. A slate of officers nominated through the petition process was available. No further nominations were made. Nominations were closed and the slate of: Richard Ferrin for President, Ellen Cherniavsky for Vice President, Linda Marshall for Secretary, Rose Berman for Treasurer, was elected unanimously.

For Directors, Jim Geist, Oliver Thomas and Norman Mitchell were elected. Hearing no further nominations, nominations were closed and the slate was elected unanimously.

Jim turned the meeting back to Don.

Don Berman presented the Ace-of-Clubs and Mini-McKenney awards.

The meeting was adjourned at $7: 22 \mathrm{pm}$.


2011 WBL PROFIT \& Loss Summary

| Item | Income | $\underline{y}$ Expenditure | $\underline{\text { Net }}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Admin. | $\$ 8,897.14$ | $\$ 7,433.72$ | $\$ 1,463.42$ |
| Sectionals | $\$ 68,116.14$ | $\$ 70,008.55$ | $-\$ 1,892.41$ |
| Unit Game | $\$ 65,248.25$ | $\$ 58,674.56$ | $\$ 6,573.69$ |
| Bulletin | $\$ 3,000.00$ | $\$ 14,410.61$ | $-\$ 11,410.61$ |
| RR \& KO | $\$ 1,698.92$ | $\$ 638.75$ | $\$ 1,060.17$ |
| Totals | $\$ 146,960.45$ | $\$ 151,166.19$ | $-\$ 4,205.74$ |



Committee Action, cont. from p. 18...

Finally, the Committee judged that "recognized" means "knows intuitively" as in "recognized at a glance" and not just "strongly suspects." Suppose, for example, an opponent opens 1 NT , his partner bids $2 \star$, and there is no announcement. Is that enough to assume $2 *$ was a transfer? The Committee thought not. But if opener then bids $2 \checkmark$ that should trigger the "Did you guys fail to announce 2 as a transfer?" question. In the present case the jump to $4 \uparrow$ makes it obvious that $2 *$ was Drury, but $2 *$ by itself was not enough to make it obvious.

All in all, this was a close case. On the one hand the offending side committed an infraction which damaged the non-offending side, who were unwilling to ask a "bad" question for fear of compromising their rights. On the other hand the regulations can be interpreted to require that East protect himself. Since most honest players would not ask about a non-Alerted call here the Committee judged that equity in this case was
reciprocal $450 \mathrm{~s}, 4$ a by South making five.
To my mind it violates the spirit of the game to hold players accountable for transmitting UI if they ask about a clearly suspect call, but to force them forfeit the opportunity to act in their best interest (by doubling $2 *$ in the present case) if they don't ask - especially when it was an opponent's infraction that caused the problem in the first place. (Catch-22. Damned if you, damned if you don't.) We don't want experienced players to seek out so-called "double shots" (not asking about a call they "knew" should have been Alerted to get to keep the table result if it turns out that no Alert was required but to then call the Director for a score adjustment if the call was Alertable just as they suspected). That's why the cited ACBL regulations were written. But special care needs to be taken to protect the "innocent" side in cases where it is less than perfectly clear (or "known intuitively" or "recognized at a glance") that an irregularity has occurred. Perhaps this is quite a fine line to walk, but it's one we must strive to navigate with discernment.

| Is your computer old? Sluggish? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brand new? Not connected? |
| Your computer Rx is herel |

## 66th AnNuAL WBL City of Washington Tournament

## April 12-15, 2012

Results


## Players with fewer than $\mathbf{5 0 0}$ masterpoints

| 1 | 11.02 | Ajit Thyagarajan |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 9.73 | Lawrence Heinen |
| 3 | 7.46 | Alexander Prairie |
| 4 | 6.49 | .John Gauss |
| 5 | 6.31 | .P Gould |
| 6 | 5.71 | .Margarett Whilden |
| 7 | 5.62 | .Bruce Steinwald |
| 8 | 5.61 | .Jim Walsh |
| 9 | 5.48 | .David Marshall |
| 10 | 5.37 | .Terence McCarthy |
|  | 5.37 | . .Anthony Hawks |
|  | ers with | 00 masterpoints |
| 1 | 5.61 | Jim Walsh |
| 2 | 4.55 | .Gerald McGowan |
| 3 | 3.44 | . . .Yasmin Jiwa |
|  | 3.44 | . .Jeanne Haji |
| 5 | 3.43 | Catherine Bardsley |
| 6 | 3.36 | .Tina Brinsfield |
|  | 3.36 | . .Cheri Hayes |
| 8 | 2.70 | .Johnny Marsh |
|  | 2.70 | .Jane Marsh |
| 10 | 2.12 | .David Penn |

THUR MORN OPEN PAIRS @ROCKVILLE

## Stratum A, 23.0 Tables

Ronald Steinberg - Barack Peled
2 Robert Levey - Warren Manison .
3 Diane Walker - Barry Falgout
4 Ann Ingram - Irving Lessin .67 .82

4 Ann Walk Hang Lessin . . . . . . . 66.20
5/6 Bruce Steinwald - P Gould . . . . . . . . . . 61.34
5/6 William Pettis - Robert Bumgardner . 60.19
Stratum B, 14.0 Tables
Ronald Steinberg - Barack Peled
2 Bruce Steinwald - P Gould
3 Bruce Steinwald - P Gould Chattopadhyay
Chatapadnyay .............. .58 .33
4 Lotta Brafman - Jesse Stern . . . . . . . . 57.18 5 Richard Ray - Barbara Sadick . . . . . . 56.02 $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 6/7 } & \text { Lester Slaback - John Jackson . . . . . . . } 53.01 \\ \text { 6/7 } & \text { Behnaz Fardshisheh - Pari Khoshkish 53.01 }\end{array}$ 6/7 Behnaz Fardshisheh - Pari Khoshkish 53.01
Stratum C, 7.0 Tables

Stratum C, 7.0 Tables
Bruce Steinwald - P Gould . . . . . . . . . 60.19
2 Annapurna Satpathy - Dev Chattopadhyay .58 .33
3 Lotta Brafman - Jesse Stern . . . . . . . . . 57.18
4 Lester Slaback - John Jackson . . . . . . . 53.01
5 Barbara Levine - Neil Crane .
Stratum A, 39.0 Tables / Based on 89 Tables


Ellen Klosson - Peter Boyd
. 66.49
Benjamin Brill - William Hacker
.66 .49
.62 .23
Benjamin Brill - William Hacker . . . . 62.23
Guilaume de Decker - Ajit Thyagarajan 60.96
4 John Glynn - Ellen Glynn . . . . . . . . . 60.88
5 James Summers Jr - Barbara Summers 60.24
6 John Glynn - Ronald Susi
$7 \quad$ Barry Falgout - Rusty Krauss . . . . . . . . 59.72
${ }_{9}$ Steve Robinson - John Adams . . . . . . 59.60
Sylvia Shi - Alexander Prairie
59.51

Stratum X, 19.5 Tables
Guillaume de Decker - Ajit Thyagarajan 60.96
John Glynn - Ellen Glynn . . . . . . . . 60.88
James Summers Jr - Barbara Summers 60.24
4 John Glynn - Ronald Susi . . . . . . . . . 60.14
5 Sylvia Shi - Alexander Prairie . . . . . . 59.51
6 Debnarayan Dhar - Dhirendra Ghosh .56.94

## THUR EVE FLT B/CDD PAIRS

Stratum B, 24.0 Tables
Gerald McGowan - John Adams . . . . . 63.39 Jim Walsh - David Marshall

3 Michelle Zygielbaum - Louis Coccodrilli 59.85 $4 / 5$ Leo Cardillo - Stephen Colevas . . . . . . 59.52 Eldon Compton - Gabriel Cornett .58 .90
Stratum C, 20.5 Tables Gerald McGowan - John Adams . . . . . 63.39 Jim Walsh - David Marshall .62 .31 Michelle Zygielbaum - Louis Coccodrilli 59.85 Paul Setzer - Kellen Leister . . . . . . . . 59.52
Eldon Compton - Gabriel Cornett
Eldon Compton - Gabriel Cornett . . . . 58.90
Stratum D, 15.0 Tables
Gerald McGowan - John Adams
.63 .39
Jim Walsh - David Marshall .62 .31
Michelle Zygielbaum - Louis Coccodrilli 59.85 Paul Setzer - Kellen Leister . . . . . . . 59.52 Eldon Compton - Gabriel Cornett . . . . 58.90 6 John Gauss - Carolyn Baird .

## THUR EVE NLM PRS @ WBL

Stratum A, 11.0 Tables


## David Penn - Maxine Penn (pic)

.61 .90 Susan Holbeck - Anne Menkens .61 .76 Tina Brinsfield - Cheri Hayes Hanna Wagner - Mark Feldman .60 .85 Margaret Cooke - Peter Isard .59 .82 Margarett Whilden - Edmund Gehan .54.80 Stratum B, 8.5 Tables David Penn - Maxine Penn Susan Holbeck - Anne Menkens
Tina Brinsfield - Cheri Hayes Hanna Wagner - Mark Feldman Margaret Cooke - Peter Isard .

Stratum C, 5.0 Tables Susan Holbeck - Anne Menkens Tina Brinsfield - Cheri Hayes Margaret Cooke - Peter Isard

## THUR EVE 199ER PRS @ NVBA

## Stratum A, 9.5 Tables

Wayne Bardsley - Catherine Bardsley 64.73 Rozelin Prochaska - Nancy Tarlano . .63.23 Kermit Quick - John Witherell . Brian Brunsvold - Katherine Culp Jon Guyton - Maura McGinn . 59.10 Joseph Din - . . . . . . 54.52

Stratum B, 6.5 Tables
Wayne Bardsley - Catherine Bardsley 64.73 Rozelin Prochaska - Nancy Tarlano . .63.23 Kermit Quick - John Witherell . . . . . . 62.93 Kermit Quick - John Witherell . . . . . . 62.93
Jon Guyton - Maura McGinn . . . . . 54.52 Joseph Drodge - Diana Jarrett

Stratum C, 3.0 Tables
Wayne Bardsley - Catherine Bardsley 64.73 Rozelin Prochaska - Nancy Tarlano . . 63.23

## THUR EVE NEWCOMER PR @WBL

## Stratum A, 6.0 Tables

Stratum B, 5.0 Tables

## Fleanor Sontag Lillian Cles

2 Patricia Welty - Patricia Price .66 .68
2 Patricia Welty - Patricia Price .
Helen Van Lowe - Natalie Brodsky . . 59.80 4 Roslyn Eisner - William Eisner .

Stratum C, 3.0 Tables
Eleanor Sontag - Lillian Glaser . .66 .68

## Helen Van Lowe - Natalie Brodsky 59.80

## FRI MORN FLT A/X PAIRS

Stratum A, 11.0 Tables / Based on 34 Tables
James Beller - Lawrence Heinen . . . . 62.80 2 Amy Bloom - James Stormes . . . . . . . 61.90 3 Mita Banerjee - Shou-Ling Wang 4 Edna Doigan - Forest Montgomery 5 Edna Doigan - Forest Montgomery . . .58.04 59.82 6 Alfred Steinberg - Andrew Gofreed . . 55.95 Stratum X, 5.5 Tables
1 James Beller - Lawrence Heinen 2 Amy Bloom-James Stormes .62 .80 4 David Loken - Kathrine Loh

## FRI MORN FLT B/C/D PAIRS

Stratum B, 14.0 Tables
Peter Gould - Bruce Steinwald
2 Thomas Reckford - Behnaz Fardshisheh56.82
3 Bernice Hacke - John Gauss .
55.30

4 Elaine Conway - Richard Bryan . . . . . 53.98
$\begin{aligned} 5 & \text { Anne Marie Hannon - William Hannon } 53.79 \\ \text { 6/7 } & \text { Dale Collinson - Susan Collinson . . . .53.60 }\end{aligned}$
6/7 Silas Wasserstrom - Michael Gottesman 53.60 Stratum C, 12.0 Tables
1 Peter Gould - Bruce Steinwald . 58.14
2 Thomas Reckford - Behnaz Fardshisheh 56.82
3 Anne Marie Hannon - William Hannon 53.79 4/5 Dale Collinson - Susan Collinson . . . .53.60 $\begin{array}{ll}4 / 5 & \text { Dale Collinson - Susan Collinson . . . . } 53.60 \\ \text { Silasserstrom - Michael Gottesman 53.60 }\end{array}$ 4/5 Silas Wasserstrom - Michael Gottesman 53.60 6/7 Honna Stoker - Edward Stoker . . . . . .53.22

Stratum D, 7.0 Tables
Peter Gould - Bruce Steinwald . . . . . . 58.14 2 Dale Collinson - Susan Collinson . . . . 53.60 3/4 Donna Stoker - Edward Stoker . . . . . . 53.22 3/4 Howard Stevens - Patricia Mozer . . . .53.22 5 Jenny Shaefer - Alexander Shafer . . . 52.65

## FRI MORN NLM PAIRS



1 Dev Chattopadhyay (pic) - Asim Mandal 63.39

Gail Harrison - Brian Brunsvold Yasmina Patel - Parviz Steeds Neil Singer - Michael Barth
Sheila Kaplan - Marie Saeger .
Stratum B, 7.5 Tables
Gail Harrison - Brian Brunsvold Neil Singer - Michael Barth Sheila Kaplan - Marie Saeger Sheila Kaplan - Marie Saege
Thayer Baine - Lindsay Eakin
Stratum C, 3.0 Tables
Neil Singer - Michael Barth
Heide Blaker - Lynne Battle

## FRI AFT FLT A/X PAIRS

Stratum A, 15.0 Tables / Based on 39 Tables


Mark Shaw - Leo LaSota
Cole... John Adams - William Cole . .
Steve Robinson - William Pettis Rammohan Sarangan - Hank Meyer Robin Taylor - Mickie Kivel . . .63 .07 .60 .00
.60 .04 .... . . 57.77 Stratum X, 6.0 Tables Lloyd Rawley - Kitty Gottfried Lloyd Rawley - Kitty Gottfried . .
James Beller - Lawrence Heinen Irv Kipnis - Margie Coccodrilli
Adrienne Kuehneman - Melanie Adrienne K
Manfield .
60.71 . 57.14 .55 .65
. 60.71 .57 .14 .55 .65 54.17
57.14
.57 .14

### 54.17

3 Jenny Shaefer - Alexander Shafer
55.68 4/5 Donna Stoker - Edward Stoker . . . . . . .55.49 4/5 Daniel Falk - Larry Wallace . 55.49

## FRI AFT NLM PAIRS

## Stratum A, 8.0 Tables

Susan Weiss - Bernice Felix
Margarett Whilden - Edmund Gehan . 63.10
Julie Thomas - Ollie Thomas
. 58.33
4 Donna Hankey-Woods - Douglas Woods 56.25
5/6 Prabhakar Tamboli - Albert Pike III . 52.98
5/6 Pat Kibler - Donald Smith
Stratum B, 6.0 Tables
Julie Thomas - Ollie Thomas
2/3 Prabhakar Tamboli - Albert Pike III . 52.98 $2 / 3$ Pat Kibler - Donald Smith . .52 .98
Reina Lerner - Sharona Sapoznikow $\quad 51.79$ Stratum C, 2.5 Tables
Pat Kibler - Donald Smith

## FRI EVE FLT A/X BAROMETER PRS

Stratum A, 15.0 Tables / Based on 24 Tables


1 John Adams - Steve Robinson
65.79

2 Donald Berman - Leon Letwin . . . . . . .63.04
3 Donna Rogall - David Ruderman . . . . 60.09
4 Johnny Marsh - Jane Marsh . . . . . . . . 59.04
$\begin{array}{ll}5 & \text { Benjamin Brill - Leo LaSota . . . . . . . . . } 59.01 \\ 6 & \text { Ronald Kral - Jim Dick . . . . . . . . } 56.39\end{array}$
Ronald Kral - Jim Dick
Stratum X, 7.5 Tables
Johnny Marsh - Jane Marsh

## FKI AFT FLT B/CD PAIRS

Stratum B, 16.0 Tables


Michael Gottesman - Silas Wasserstrom 64.77 Ernie Schuler - Robert Sturm .63 .07 Ernie Schuler - Robert Sturm 59.66 Annapurna Satpathy - Shyamalendu Pal 58.71 Annapurna Satpathy - Shyamalendu Pal 58.71
Anne Marie Hannon - William Hannon 58.52 Anne Marie Hannon - William Hannon 58.52
Larry Moran - Douglas Fox . . . . . . 56.06 Larry Moran - Douglas Fox … . . . . 56.06
Jane De Briyn - Dick Kreimborg . . . 56.06 Stratum C, 13.5 Tables
Silas Wasserstrom - Michael Gottesman 64.77 Ernie Schuler - Robert Sturm . . . . . . . 63.07 Annapurna Satpathy - Shyamalendu Pal 58.71 Anne Marie Hannon - William Hannon 58.52 Larry Moran - Douglas Fox . . 56.06 Jane De Briyn Diek Kreimborg ... 56.06

Stratum D, 8.0 Tables
Ernie Schuler - Robert Sturm .
Annapurna Satpathy - Shyamalendu Pal 58.71

## FRI EVE FLT B/C/D BAROMETER PRS

Stratum B, 9.0 Tables


1 Dale Sanders - David Williams

## Stratum C, 7.5 Tables

Dale Sanders - David Williams

Stratum D, 4.0 Tables
Jill Benson - David Benson .
Stratum C, 13.5 Tables Charles De fi Jith . ...... . 56.51 Jim Walsh Dearolf - Judith Dausch .... .54.17 $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 3/4 } & \text { Jim Walsh - Robert Maman ..........52.34 } \\ 3 / 4 & \text { Catherine Bardsley - Wayne Bardsley 52.34 }\end{array}$

## SAT COMPACT KO - BKT \#1

## 10 Tables

1 Stephen Rzewski - Rammohan Sarangan Hank Meyer - Michael Klein
2 Brad Theurer - Martin Graf - Mark Shaw Lyle Poe Jr
Gene Kuehneman - Robin Taylor - Mickie Kivel - Lou Reich
4 Adair Gellman - Vincent Bartone - Rusty Krauss - Stephen Drodge

## SAT COMPACT KO - BKT \#2

## 11 Tables

1 William Young - Deborah Hoveland - Mel Yudkin - John Christensen
2 Dennis Schwanz - Susan Miskura - Mike Frosch - Francesco Parisi-Presicce
3 Sylvia Shi - Hakan Berk - Murat Berk Alexander Prairie
4 Jesse Stern - Lotta Brafman - Eldon Compton Gabriel Cornett

SAT MORN FLT A/X PAIRS
Stratum A, 16.0 Tables / Based on 47 Tables


1 Fred King - Robert Bell .
.60 .04
Mark Lavine - Ronald Kral .59 .85 3 Donald Berman - Leon Letwin . . . . . . 59.66 5 Chrid Ruderman - Richard Wegman .59.09 6 Stan Schenker David Milton ...0.14
Sta
Stratum X, 6.0 Tables
1 Christopher Miller - James Stormes . .58.14 Renate Conlon - Ronald Conlon . James Geist - Richard Ferrin .
Roma Chandra - Leonid Fastovsky ... . 52.46
SAT MORN FLT B/C/D PAIRS
Stratum B, 16.0 Tables

homas Reckford - Behnaz Fardshisheh 60.04 John Gauss - Carolyn Baird . . . . . . . . 57.39 Joan Anania - Edward Anania . . . . . . 56.82 Alan Ferraro - Temma Kanowith . . . . 56.63 Suzanne Floyd - Forest Montgomery .56.44 James Gerding - Elizabeth Gerding . . 55.30

Stratum D, 6.0 Tables John Gauss - Carolyn Baird . . . . . . . . 57.39
Joan Anania - Edward Anania . . . . .56.82 Joan Anania - Edward Anania . . . . . . 56.82
James Gerding - Elizabeth Gerding . .55.30 Thomas Jennings - Albert Stolpe . . . .53.22

## SAT MORN NLM PAIRS

Stratum A, 15.0 Tables


Julie Thomas - Ollie Thomas
Tina Brinsfield - Cheri Hayes . Della Morris - Ruth Freedman . . . . . . 58.68 Maxine Penn - Barbara Levine Ronnie Loeser - Ruth Fu Reina Lerner - Sharona Sapoznikow . . . . . . 56.63 Stratum B, 13.0 Tables Julie Thomas - Ollie Thomas Tina Brinsfield - Cheri Hayes Reina Lerner - Sharona Sapoznikow .56.63 Maryellen Leister - Dottie Terrell . . . .54.61 Catherine Bardsley - Donna Setzer . . 54.42 Stratum C, 5.0 Tables
Tina Brinsfield - Cheri Hayes . . . . . . 58.78 Nancy Ferris - Judith Riggs . . . . . . . . 53.22 Steven Hundert - Elizabeth Hundert .51.89 Peter Pollak - Judy Ferraro . . . . . . . . 51.83

## SAT AFT FLT A/X PAIRS

Stratum A, 15.0 Tables / Based on 42 Tables

Helene Bauma Jim Wakefield
2/3 Stan Schenker - David Milton $2 / 3$ John Adams - William Cole . Richard Wegman - David Ruderman .58.81 Dhirendra Ghosh - Mark Cohen . . . . . 58.33 6/7 Steve Robinson - Peter Boyd

Stratum X, 5.0 Tables
Dhirendra Ghosh - Mark Cohen
Tanya Rodich - Barack Peled .
James Geist - Ajit Thyagarajan
Kevin O'Brien - Lynda Flanger
. 59.66 58.78 58.18 57.08 .59 .66 Maxine Penn - Barbara Levine . . . . . 58.78


Suzanne Dawson - Rochelle Hilton . . 61.18 Jeremy Billones - Kathleen La Marre . 58.71 Jern Schoen Kathleen Zellmer . 56.46 Jean Schoen - Kathleen Zelw . . . 56.46 Cynthia Harrison - Hanna Wagner . . . 56.33 Stratum B, 9.0 Tables
Suzanne Dawson - Rochelle Hilton . . 61.18 Jeremy Billones - Kathleen LaMarre .58.71 Jean Schoen - Kathleen Zellmer -...56.46
Cynthia Harrison - Hanna Wagner . . . 56.33
Thomas Pratt - Nathalie Kaye $\quad . \quad 55.44$
Stratum C, 4.0 Tables
Patsy Henderson-Earl Henderson . .53.15
Elizabeth Hundert - Steven Hundert .52.30
3 Alexander Gretsinger - Jane Dolkart .51.79

## SAT AFT FLT B/C/D PAIRS

## Stratum B, 17.5 Tables

Anthony Hawks - Terence McCarthy . 60.36 Thomas Reckford - Behnaz Fardshisheh 60.01 Dale Sanders - David Williams ..... . 58.97
Howard Levenson - Melany Levenson 58.59
Patrice Gordon - Arthur Olson . . . . . . 57.74
6 Gary Weinberg - Sarah Weinberg . . . . 57.49
Stratum C, 15.0 Tables
Anthony Hawks - Terence McCarthy . 60.36
Thomas Reckford - Behnaz Fardshisheh 60.01 Dale Sanders - David Williams ..... . 58.97 Howad Leven M 50.59 Patrice Gordon - Arthur Olson . . . . . 57.74 Patrice Gordon - Arthur Weison . . . . . . 57.74
Gary Weinberg - Sarah Weinberg . . . 57.49

Stratum D, 8.5 Tables
Anthony Hawks - Terence McCarthy . 60.36 Dale Sanders - David Williams ..... .58.97 Howard Levenson - Melany Levenson 58.59 Jim Walsh - David Marshall . . . . . 56.85

Lynne Groff - Alfred Groff .56 .85

SAT AFT NLM PAIRS
Stratum A, 9.0 Tables
 .66 .29 59.66 .59 .66 57.95
58.33
.57 .58
46.69


SUN FLT A/X SWISS
Stratum A, 18 Tables
/ Based on 49 1/2 Back row, left: Stephen Drodge - John Miller - Noble Shore Front row, left: Michael Gill, \& NPC, Robert Brady . . . . . . . 98.00 1/2 Back row, right: John Adams - Richard Wegman - Front row,
right: Donna Rogall Clyde Kruskal . . 98.00

3 Ann Lindley Ann Lindley - Kenneth Alfred Durid Milto - Willi Pe...... . 93.00 Stan Schenker ............. 8400
5 Steve Robinson - Peter Boyd - William Cole - Mark Shaw

Stratum X, 8 Tables
Stephen Drodge - John Miller - Noble Shore - Michael Gill . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 98.00 Jason Meyer - James Geist - Lloyd Rawley Michael Richey Rabenstein - Robert Henry . . . . . . . . 69.00

## SUN FLT B/C/D SWISS



Michael Girard - Witold Palosz - Barack Peled - Ronald Steinberg, \& NPC, Tanya
James Beller - Albert Lauber - Jay Cherlow Hadi Abushakra 99.00
Jerry Miller - Margie Coccodrilli - William Jerry Miner - Margie Coccodriti - William Marshall Kramer - Phyllis Sonen - Hilda Marshal Krane Floyd
4/5 Sylvia Shi - Matthew Lahut - Patrick Frye Alexander Prairie . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 85.00
6 Kevin O'Brien - Lynda Flanger - Francesco Parisi-Presicce - Mike Frosch . . . . . 83.00
7 Jeffrey Kosnett - Alice Wegman - John Glynn -Ronald Susi . . . . . . . . . . . .

Stratum C, 10 Tables
Sylvia Shi - Matthew Lahut - Patrick Frye Alexander Prairie . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 85.00

Klaber - Tobi Bear .......... . 77.00
3 Albert Stolpe - Thomas Jennings - Nancy Lea Ross - Andres Doernberg
4 Wayne Bardsley - Kellen Leister - Paul Setzer - William Glen
. 70.00
Stratum D, 4 Tables
Wayne Bardsley - Kellen Leister - Paul Setzer William Glen . . . . . .
SUN MORN NLM SWISS, Stratum A, 7 Tables
1 Rochelle Hilton - Jeanne Haji - Yasmin Jiwa Patricia Mitchell
2 Margarett Whilden - Thomas Grahame Hanna Wagner - Maree Webster . . . . . 52.00
3 Marge Amey - David Amey - Yuen De Anda Ron Sutter

Stratum B, 4 Tables
1 Margarett Whilden - Thomas Grahame Hanna Wagner - Maree Webster . . . . . 52.00
SUN AFT NLM SWISS, Stratum A, 7 Tables
1 Rochelle Hilton - Patricia Mitchell - Yasmin
Jiwa - Jeanne Haji ................. 63.00
2 Marge Amey - David Amey - Yuen De AndaRon Sutter . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 52.00
Margarett Whilden - Thomas Grahame Hanna Wagner - Cynthia Harrison . . . 42.00

Stratum B, 5 Tables
1 Marge Amey - David Amey - Yuen De Anda Ron Sutter
.52 .00
2 Margarett Whilden - Thomas Grahame Hanna Wagner - Cynthia Harrison . . . 42.00

Bits \& Pieces, cont. from p. 5.

Alexander C Prairie, and Mrs Rhona P Prensky.
Please join us at our weekly Unit Game on Thursday evenings and frequent the local bridge clubs in the area. Information can be found at www. WashingtonBridgeLeague.org.

## 2011-2012 WBL/NVBA PLAYER OF THE YEAR

To be eligible, a player: (1) Must be a member (or pending member) of either the NVBA or the WBL; (2) Must attend at least three WBL and three NVBA sectionals during the contest period (August, 2010 through June, 2011). Points won on Tournament Thursday evenings are included in the totals, but do not count towards eligibility; (3) Must be a member in good standing of the ACBL and a local affiliate throughout the contest period and remain so through the award presentation.

Awards: Two trophies will be awarded.


Satisfaction Guaranteed (Clients have said: "It changed their lives")

- Investment management by Nationally acclaimed Registered Investment Advisor
- Advice on how to pay NO current income tax when selling stocks, real estate, etc.
- Retirement planning-Both long and short term
- College Financial Aid-It's Surprising who may qualify, or obtain more aid
- Other techniques to help children/grandchildren reduce the high costs of college
- Estate \& Gift Planning-Saving taxes and protecting assets for your loved ones Free PowerPoint presentations to groups,
including Investment Training and Saving College Costs
Gene has been listed by Washingtonian Magazine as "1 of 156 People You Can Trust with Your Money" and by Marquis Who's Who In Finance \& Industry.
(P) 301-983-1357 * (F) 301-983-5502 * genefi@comcast.net

Standings: Here are the standings after seven of eight sectionals. The asterisk* indicates that the player has met eligibility requirements.

## Open Leaders

| Player | Points |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 John Adams | . 144.72 |
| 2 Leo LaSota | . 119.82 |
| 3 Steve Robinson | . 116.30 |
| 4 William Cole | .112.78 * |
| 5 Stephen Drodge | .112.35 * |
| 6 John Miller | . 98.98 * |
| 7 Mark Shaw | . 95.14 |
| 8 Kenneth Davis | . 85.87 * |
| 9 Peter Boyd | . 84.63 |
| 10 Helene Bauman | . 80.54 * |
| 11 David Milton | . 79.10 * |
| 12 Steven Schatzow | . 77.90 * |
| 13 Barry Falgout | .77.35 |
| 14 Stan Schenker | .75.28 * |
| 15 James Geist | . . 69.90 |
| 16 Donna Rogall | . 66.27 |
| 17 Clyde Kruskal | . 63.18 |
| 18 Robert Hopkins Jr | .58.90 * |
| 19 Andrew Gofreed | . 58.70 * |
| 20 Robert Bell | .56.38 |
| NonLM |  |
| Player | Points |


| 1 Thomas Jennings | $33 *$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 Larry Wallace | 12 * |
| 3 Alexander Prairie | 30.12 |
| 4 Daniel Falk | . 30.06 * |
| 5 Sylvia Shi | . 28.89 |
| 6 Yuen De Anda | 25.40 * |
| 7 Ron Sutter | . 25.40 * |
| 8 Phillip Tseng | . 23.58 * |
| 9 Ernie Schuler | . 23.45 |
| 10 Paul Setzer | .22.41 * |
| 11 Dottie Terrell | . 20.67 * |
| 12 John McCormick | . 20.52 * |
| 13 Wayne Bardsley | . 20.47 * |
| 14 Kellen Leister | .20.41 * |
| 15 Georgette Weiss | . 19.93 * |
| 16 John Gauss | . 19.87 |
| 17 David Montague | . 18.84 |
| 18 Carolyn Baird | .18.41 * |
| 19 Thomas Grahame | . 17.61 |
| 20 Glenn Terrell | .16.85 |

## SATURDAY <br> ONTLM GAME 8 MINHLESSON

Every Saturday, the Rockville Duplicate Bridge Club holds a 0 - Non Life Master game with a mini-lesson.
Mini-Lesson: Saturdays, 12:30 pm 0-NLM Game: $1: 00 \mathrm{pm}$

Cost: $\$ 6.00$
Location: St. James Episcopal Church 11815 Seven Locks Road
Directions: Take Rt 270 to Exit 4B (from either direction) Montrose Road. This will take you to Seven Locks Road. Left on Seven Locks Rd 3 blocks. St James Church is on the left (going south), between Post Oak and Gainsboro Rd. There are two buildings, the game and minilesson are in the building on the left facing the church. There is plenty of parking in the rear, and a rear entrance to the building ( 1 flight of stairs if you enter from the rear of the building).

For additional information, contact Mark Lavine, 301-503-3348 or mlavine@gcsii.com
Open Games: Sat.: 1 pm , Mon, Thurs \& Fri: 11:15am, Tue: 7 pm (Tue only at Rockville Senior Center-see www.rockvilledbc.com for directions.)

## THE WBL ONLINE

The Washington Bridge League is providing two new online services:

## 1. The WBL Online Bulletin Board

On an OPT IN basis only, this service will include an online directory of members. Send any of the following information that you're willing to have posted to the WBL webmaster, Don Berman, at don.berman@verizon.net or call him at 301-776-3581.

Name, Email Address, up to two Phone
Numbers, ACBL Number

## 2. The WBL Online Partnership Desk

Check it out at washingtonbridgeleague.org Contact Clyde Kruskal at cpkfam@gmail.com or 301-395-0480 with any questions.

## MAJOR SUIT RAISES:

 Competitive AuctionsLast month, we discussed the preemptive raise to 4 M to make it tough for the opponents to get into the bidding. We saw that it was relatively easy to develop guidelines to help decide whether or not to take the leap to the four level. It is more difficult to know if you should bid again when you are in a competitive auction at the two or three level. Your thought process should go like this: Are the opp's trying to "steal" our hand? Do we belong at the three level? Will they double us in $3 \downarrow$ ? Can we beat their part score? Can we beat them enough if, in fact, we can make 3?

One tool that is useful in fighting the part score battle is the Law of Total Tricks (sometimes simply called the "LAW".) The Law of Total Tricks was introduced in the 1950's and has been discussed and written about extensively. For a thorough study, pick up one of the popular books and read to your heart's content. Our goal, in this limited space, is to get you thinking about the relevant concepts and how they may help your competitive bidding.

In a nutshell, the LAW suggests that the total number of tricks possible in a given hand is roughly equal to the total number of trump held by both sides, each in its respective trump suit. So, if your side has 9 clubs and the opponents have 8 diamonds, then there should be 17 possible tricks in the hand when the hand is played once in clubs and once diamonds. Maybe you can take 9 tricks if you declare and the opponents can take eight if they declare. Or maybe you can take ten tricks and they can take only seven. Note that the LAW tells how many total tricks can be made, but does not guarantee how many
either side can make.
The most important follow-up concept that flows from the Law of Total Tricks is this: when you want to compete for a part score, you are safe at the level roughly equal to your side's number of trump. Does that mean that if you have nine trump you will always make your three level contract? Of course not. Nor does it mean that you cannot compete to a level higher than your number of trump. What it does mean - from a scoring perspective - is that you will be relatively safe at that level. It also means that if the opponents can make their two level contract, you should consider competing to the three level if you have a fit of your own. That is because your matchpoint loss is likely to be less than letting them make their contract.

Let's look at a bidding sequence that you probably encounter every time you play and see how our LAW concepts apply. South opens and the bidding goes:

| $\frac{\text { South }}{1 \vee}$ | $\frac{\text { East }}{\mathrm{P}}$ | $\frac{\text { North }}{2 \downarrow}$ | $\frac{\text { West }}{\mathrm{P}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P | ???? |  |  |

N-S are stopping in a part score. Should East pass or compete?

Here is how East should be thinking: N/S is in a known eight -card fit. We probably have a fit of our own. N/S have shown roughly half the deck, so we have roughly half the deck as well. If I pass, we will likely score - 110 or -140. If I compete, we may be -50 or -100 or we may even be +110 , all of which are winning strategies. We may also push them to 3 H which they cannot make, and we will be +50 or +100 . On the other hand, we may not have a fit. And we may get doubled and go for a minus bigger than their

## part score. So, what to do?

When you are at the table and are considering your options, here are some practical hints to guide your decision:

1. Watch the vulnerability - at Matchpoints, -200 is a terrible score. Non-vulnerable, -50 or even -100 is often the winning score.
2. Soft values in opponents' suit suggest passing. $\boxtimes K x$ or $\boxtimes$ Qxx usually take more tricks on defense than offense. On the other hand, having xx or xxx in their suit suggest making a balancing call.
3. The more distributional your hand, the safer it is to get into the auction. A six card suit is great. A singleton heart makes it almost mandatory that you bid or double.
4. It is easier to balance over their $2 \boldsymbol{v}$ if you have four or more spades. If they are bidding spades, getting into the auction is somewhat more risky because there is no suit you can play at the two level.

In summary, try not to let the opponents play at the two level. Use these guidelines and see if you can be more active in competing, either to win the contract or to push the opponents out of their comfort zone. You may get set, but in the long run, your strategy will pay off in spades.

Contact Ron or Shawn if you have any questions.

Next month, we'll start showing how the Law of Total Tricks guides bidding, and suggest a structure for major suit raises you can use!

## Stepping Up to New Heights: As of May 1, 2012

## Junior Masters: <br> 5 Masterpoints

Ms Ivy E Broder
Mr George Joseph
Marcia M Littlejohn
Carol L McGarry
Ms Joy I Oliver
Stanley B Rosen
Wilma F Bonner
Fadi Eidi
Mr Myron L Goldstein
Mr Christopher E
Goldthwait
Carl E Hunt Md
David Karsten
Stephanie Karsten
Mrs Jeanne Pejeau
Asefe B Rahnema
Clark Readler
Mr Jonathan Walters Barbara Yuravlivker Fran Zamore

## Club Masters: 20 MPs

Mrs Catherine S Bardsley
Mahmoud Katirai
Ms Karen K Salem
Mr F Scott Bush
Mr Richard J Kwan
Mrs Jane E Marsh
Mr Johnny M Marsh
Mrs Claudia Rathbone
Warren L Schaaf
Mr Neil M Singer

## Sectional Masters: 50 MPs

Lois J Garin
Mrs Sandra C Getler
Mr Terry M Klein
Mr Steven L Leifer Mr Jim J Walsh Sarah P Watson Mrs Rita Z Barr Mr Michael S Berens Cheri Hayes

Mr Lawrence D Hollman Ms Mary E Ourand
Mrs Sally Schlein
Ms Jo Turner

## Regional Masters 100 MPs

Mr Thomas J Grahame Ms Jo Anna Mencarelli Mrs Franny Van Dyke Mr Ted Van Dyke
Mrs Betty Ann
McGeehan
Dr Prabhakar Tamboli

## NABC Masters: 200 MPs

Lloyd Bowling
Ms Betsy Cox
Mr Alan J Ferraro
Mrs Jeanne E Ferraro
Ms Barbara S Sadick
Mr Bruce Steinwald
Mr Patrick M Frye

WBL Solyers' Club's New Problems

GIOG $2 v m \rho / K D_{W K}$
NEED A RIDE OR A ARTNER
FOR THE THURSDAY UNIT GAME?
Contact Barbara Doran UnitGamePartner@DistrictSix.org,
(301-608-0347 between 9am and 10pm) to find a partner in
advance. For a last minute partner, call the WBL cell phone (301-
395-2760).
Ron Zucker, Carpool Coordinator can be contacted at 202-986-
2166 or (ron@motherzucker.com) or log on to the On-Line Car-
pool Notices at www. WashingtonBridgeLeague.org.
Good luck! We look forward to seeing you on
Thursday evenings.


[^0]:    TO GET ON AN EMAIL LIST FOR BRIDGE NEWS \& BRIDGE PROBLEMS, SEND A NOTE TO STEVE ROBINSON AT ROBINSWR 1941 @GMAIL.COM REQUESTING SUCH.

