UPCOMING EVENTS

LANCASTER REGIONAL
Spooky Nook
October 30 – November 5

DAVE TREADWELL SECTIONAL
Wilmington
December 26 – December 31

UNIT 190 SECTIONAL
Wilmington
February 9 - 11

NABC - PHILADELPHIA
March 8 – March 18

DELAWARE’S FIRST STATE REGIONAL
April 30 – May 6

WEB PAGE 1

My partner and I often laugh about how competitive we are. But I laugh more.

DSBA PRESIDENT’S LETTER

Happy DSBA New Year!

The DSBA has a newly elected Board and is excited to be sponsoring, promoting, and helping with many bridge competitions in the following months.

• December 27-31, 2017 - Dave Treadwell Sectional at the Bridge Studio, DE
• February 9-11, 2018 - Blue Hen Sectional at the Bridge Studio, DE
• March 8-18, 2018 - Spring NABC in Philadelphia, PA – (Dave Treadwell Day March 15)
• April 30-May 6, 2018 - DE “First State” Regional at the Crowne Plaza, Claymont, DE

With opportunities to make new friends and share in fun adventures, these events also provide a variety of competitions, challenges, and potentially masterpoints. **YOU** come in as we need many volunteers to help.

Unit 190 provides volunteers for the Spring NABC on March 14th and 15th. Karen Pollak and Kim Holm are organizing. **Please volunteer.**

Email: Directly from the Unit web site [www.Unit190.org](http://www.Unit190.org)
Karen Pollak: karenfaithp@gmail.com
Kim Holm: kimrholm13@gmail.com

The DE “First State” Regional is being chaired by Bruce and Judy Gwaltney and co-chaired by Mark and Melody Henderson. If you see an email from them, please don’t delete it. Volunteering at a Regional is a fun way to work with fellow bridge players.

Another important way to support Unit 190 is to visit our website [www.Unit190.org](http://www.Unit190.org). The Member’s only tab has useful information. If you have a problem logging onto the Member’s only tab, please contact Mark Henderson (henderson.mm@gmail.com).

And, of course, the best way to support Unit 190 is to Play Bridge!
Meet the Woman who gives Bridge Tips to Warren Buffett and Bill Gates

By Thomas Heath Washington Post Reporter July 28

Bill Gates, left, accompanied by Sharon Osberg, is presented with a medal by the American Contract Bridge League. (Mat Hayward/Getty Images)

Most of the entrepreneurs I write about use business as a way to pursue their passions, whether it’s philanthropy, culture, sports or politics. Sharon Osberg is the other way around. Her passion is playing bridge, a card game for math whizzes that led her into a rarefied world most others would kill to be a part of.

Osberg parlayed a gift for the game into a series of business opportunities and high-powered “elephant bumping” that includes Warren Buffett and Bill Gates, billionaires whose net worth clock in at $74 billion and $90 billion, respectively. “Bridge is my world,” said Osberg, who lives in Marin County outside San Francisco. “Everything in my adult life is a result of bridge, one way or another.”

Investor Warren Buffett plays bridge with Berkshire Hathaway shareholders in Omaha, Neb. (Nati Harnik/AP)

Osberg even makes money from the game. She owns a piece of an online bridge company called Bridge Base that earns her a dividend and gives her a rooting interest in the game’s popularity. Indeed, she has been a bridge
teacher and partner to both billionaires. Recently, she partnered with Gates — the founder of Microsoft — at a Toronto bridge tournament where they took second and then relaxed over a glass of wine and chips.

“In photos of Bill and Warren playing bridge,” she said. “I am always the one whose back of the head is facing the camera.” She calls Gates and Buffett “solid” bridge players and plays with them regularly. “They are not in the upper echelon of national or world players,” she said. “They are very solid, everyday players.”

“I love the game, and I love my partner,” Buffett said. “She’s a fabulous teacher, extremely smart and very patient. They talk about bridge partners who were asked how they should have played their hand, and the partner says, ‘Under an assumed name.’ Sharon doesn’t do that.” Still, the way each tackles the game may offer a clue to how they do business. “There’s a big difference between Bill’s and Warren’s approach to learning the game,” Osberg said. “Bill is very scientific. He reads and studies on his own. Warren enjoys playing. Warren has good instincts.”

“When I first met Warren, his game was ragged around the edges,” she said. “We would play in the evening, and I would go through teaching points. He absorbed it like a sponge. Bill is the same way. Pretty big brain capacity.” No kidding.

Osberg has her own chops in business. She spent 18 years at Wells Fargo, the San Francisco bank that is one of Buffett’s biggest equity holdings. (She was at Wells Fargo before she knew Buffett.) I called Osberg while researching a story on a mutual fund I am writing about. Our conversation quickly turned toward bridge, Buffett and the interesting world she inhabits thanks to the game she loves. Some people have paid millions just to have lunch with the Oracle of Omaha. Osberg trades gossip with him on the phone and plays bridge remotely with him three to four times a week. She attends annual meetings in Omaha of Berkshire Hathaway, the sprawling conglomerate Buffett built. On Sundays, after the meeting winds down, Osberg will play bridge with shareholders as “part of the weekend experience. I play with everybody.”

Buffett recalled one hilarious moment in particular.

“I have a younger sister, Bertie, who likes to play bridge,” Buffett recalled. “She happened to be in [Omaha] with her husband for our annual Berkshire meeting. So, the four of us play. By some miracle, my sister and her husband beat me and Sharon. My sister reached for the score pad, so I tore the sheet off and ate it. Not that it is a competitive game or something.”

Osberg has also bumped with the swells in Buffett’s orbit: She was an occasional guest at the Georgetown home of Katharine Graham, then the owner of The Washington Post, when Osberg visited the city during the 1990s. This
actually has an investing component to it: The subculture of bridge goes beyond Forbes billionaires, reaching into executive suites and boardrooms. Hedge fund star David Einhorn is a tournament bridge player. Bear Stearns, the investment firm that failed in the 2008 crash, was known as “the bridge firm” because its top management and many of its quant geeks were players. “I just kissed [former Bear Stearns chief executive] Jimmy Cayne on the cheek last week,” Osberg said.

Famed value investor and Buffett mentor Ben Graham reportedly compared the strategy of bridge to the discipline of long-term investing. This is from a 2013 report in the Globe and Mail in Toronto:

“As Graham pointed out, playing your hand right — in bridge or in the stock market — generally leads to success in the long term. It doesn’t, however, guarantee you success right now. Sometimes, playing a hand the right way leads to failure; sometimes picking a stock for the right reasons results in a loss. Bridge can teach an investor the importance of sticking to a well-thought-out strategy.”

Osberg is a member of the elite echelon of world-class female players, but she said she is playing in what is widely considered a man’s game. Bridge has taken her to Tokyo, Athens, Chile, Australia, the island of Corsica, Verona, Paris, Montreal and virtually every major U.S. city. Bridge is not for the faint of heart.

“Everyone loses more than they win,” Osberg said. “Losing is much more common. You have to develop a thick skin. It’s not easy to sit down to play in a tournament,” she said. “The way you move your cards and how you do your bidding, it’s very difficult.”

She recalled Buffett’s first bridge tournament, held in Albuquerque. They made it to the finals after two grueling qualifying rounds. “That was miraculous,” she said. But Buffett, the steely capital allocator who moves world markets with mere utterances, had enough. Osberg recalls: “He said, ‘I can’t do it anymore.’ It was so stressful, he didn’t want to play in the finals.”

“I had no business being in it at all,” Buffett said. “We were playing people not as good as Sharon was, but a whole lot better than I was. I dropped out. I was on the board of USAir at the time, so I said I had to get back to a board meeting. This was not great behavior on my part. I love the game, but playing in tournaments is too many hours of concentration.”

At her peak, Osberg was one of the top players in the world. “I am no longer a serious player,” she said. “I used to play just to win. Now I play for the beauty of the game. It’s the same way mathematics can be beautiful. Your brain has to be nimble enough to recompute on the fly when information comes in.” Honestly, I have never
thought of math as beautiful. But then Buffett and Gates, not me, are the geniuses traveling in the Gulfstream jets with their bridge maven Osberg.

Osberg grew up near Philadelphia in an upper-middle-class family of Italian immigrants. Her father was a businessman who helped run a family meat business. She learned to play bridge at Dickinson College in Carlisle, Pa., where she graduated with a political science degree in the early 1970s. “Somebody a couple of doors down in the dorm said, ‘We need a fourth for bridge.’ I said, ‘I will do it.’ ” She was a natural. After graduation, Osberg moved to California and joined the large community of bridge players around the Bay Area. “Everyone knew each other,” she said.

A fellow bridge addict hooked her up with Bank of America, where she participated in a three-month technology training program that introduced her to a business that drew on the same skill-set that made her so successful at bridge. “I loved programming,” she said. “It's numbers, pattern recognition, problem-solving. It's just so cool. The same reason I love bridge.”

Osberg was in the right place at the right time. Bank of America was just beginning to pioneer technology that would lead to online banking. She eventually spent 18 years at Wells Fargo, where she rose to executive vice president for technology and retired in 2000. Her years running technology at Wells Fargo brought her into contact with Gates and other technology wheels. She remembers one meeting with entrepreneur Marc Andreessen, co-author of Mosaic, the first widely used Web browser.

The stiff bankers shed their jackets, dress shirts and ties to make their Silicon Valley guests comfortable, only to see Andreessen and company show up wearing suits.

She was invited to New York to play in a bridge tournament in the early 1990s and was partnered with Buffett confidant Carol Loomis, at the time a Fortune magazine writer. Buffett was playing, too, and invited her to stop in Omaha some time. “I said, ‘Where is Omaha?’ That was not the thing to say.” When she finally stopped in his hometown, they went to dinner, and Buffett pulled out a blank map of the United States and asked her to draw an X for Omaha.

They quickly became close friends. As her mentor educated her about business and managing people, Osberg bought her first shares in Berkshire Hathaway — at the then-soaring price of $16,050 — “a fortune to me.” (The stock today sells for around $259,600. Osberg owns a lot more of it.) “He opened up a world I never would have
been part of without him,” she said. “Once or twice a year, I get to sit back and just listen to Bill and Warren. They talk about companies. They talk about trends. Artificial intelligence. Nuclear proliferation. What the future might hold and the political implications in the business world. “I don’t know how I got that lucky.”

Just look for the one whose back is to the camera.

**Unit 190 299’er Sectional**

**DSBA TREASURER’S REPORT**

The Treasurer’s Report, which was postponed at the September 2017 DSBA Annual Meeting, can be found on the Unit 190 website. ([www.Unit190.org](http://www.Unit190.org)).

---

**Why don’t scientists trust atoms?** Because they make up everything.
ADVANCEMENT IN RANK

JUNIOR MASTER
Tom Bason
Harry Heath, Jr.

CLUB MASTER
Janet A. Blanchfield
Shirley B. Derrickson
Alan B. Palmer

SECTIONAL MASTER
Carol Bason
Patricia B. Modispaugh
Mary Kay Moriarty
Kathleen R. Sullivan

REGIONAL MASTER
Marilyn E. Haskins
Darlene E. Herring
Dolores I. O’Boyle
Kathy Wiblin

NABC MASTER
Lee B. Davis

ADVANCED NABC
Carol A. Niebler

SILVER LIFE MASTER
Francis A. Bizzocco
Kurt H. Engleman
Steve Herrmann
Audrey Hildebrand
Anne M. Morris
John B. Strange

RUBY LIFE MASTER
Nancy M. Steele

SAPPHIRE LIFE MASTER
Marie G. Anzilotti
Barbara Rhoades

Yesterday, I saw Richard Popper spill all of his Scrabble letters on the road. I asked him, “What’s the word on the street?”
BEATING THE BOTS

By Pieter Van Bennekom

Anyone playing bridge in South Florida beware: The St. Cat’s club in West Palm Beach has a couple of new players who always come in first. Not very sociable, B.B. O’ Saint and B.B. O’ Catherine are quiet, never smile or growl, and they don’t even partake of the quite decent lunch that Director Julie Jawor puts out every day.

That’s because BBOSaint and BBOCatherine aren’t human. They’re robots that fill in whenever there’s an odd number of pairs, so nobody will have to suffer through that dreaded sitout.

One Friday, when my partner Christine and I dropped in at the St. Cat’s club, the “bots” were needed because there was a half table. Since they’re robots and presumably don’t make mistakes – more on that later – they did come in first with a 62% game. Fortunately for those who are merely human, the bots were not eligible to earn masterpoints, leaving more for the rest of us. Christine and I had a decent 54% game in a strong field, but the day’s highlight was definitely the round when we had to play three boards against the “bots.”

There’s lot of buzz about bots these days. Their use as a remedy for sit outs, as was first reported in the ACBL Bulletin, began a few months ago at a Center City club in Philadelphia. Coincidentally, when we got home from our “bots” game in West Palm, the mail brought the Bulletin cover trumpeting, “Bring on the Bots!”

Here’s how it worked: Instead of twiddling our thumbs for half an hour when we arrived at the sitout table, we had to go to the front of the room, where Christine and I were placed on chairs some distance apart, with the director in the middle as a proctor. We were each given a small tablet and a felt-tipped pen, in order to make our bids and to choose the cards we wanted to play. We had one bad, one average, and one good board against the bots – the bad board was the first, when I was trying to familiarize myself with all the different buttons on the screen. With all of the excitement, I totally forgot to return my partner’s suit. The bots don’t groan, shake their heads, cough, or even place cards on the table at a certain angle, some of the shenanigans that have given rise to the recent cheating scandals.

If the robots always make the right decision and play perfectly, how can one get a better-than-average board against them? They’re programmed to make the best decision based on facts known to them from both the bidding and the leads, but they’re not clairvoyant. Sometimes, as we all know, an illogical lead or bid can cause unexpected results, both good and bad.

(Moreover, there are all kinds of “illogical” things about the bots. For example, the post-game statistics showed that BBO Saint’s declarer play was better, but BBO Catherine’s leads were better. I hope the two of them didn’t argue too much about that on the “hard” drive home.)

When we got a 71% score against them, my second bid was 2 NT, Christine raised me to 3 NT and I made an overtrick for a +630 score. The best North-South should be able to do on the hand is 4♥ or 4♠ for +620, so we should have had a top by 10 points – except for the fact that bad defense let a couple of people make an overtrick in 4 Spades. But, more amazingly, I should have been Down Two in 3 NT. The wrong opening lead by BBO Saint gave me three extra tricks. Yet, when you look at the hand, you can’t really fault the bot for picking the ♦J lead.

My feat of beating the bots by 3 tricks is definitely worth an entry on the Bridge Burglar blog. My column’s anti-hero, Flustered Flo, will play the role of another South Declarer who played the hands against human opponents and was very glad to have made her 4♠ Game. She will be chagrined to find out that her nemesis, Smug Sam, bested her by 10 points by making 4 NT against the supposedly “perfect” bots, no less.
South Dealer; both sides vulnerable

North
♠ K J 6
♥ A K 10 9 8 6
♦ 8 7
♣ 7 4

West
♠ A 5
♥ J 4 2
♦ J 10 5 4 2
♣ Q 10 3

East
♠ 10 9 4
♥ 7 5 3
♦ A Q
♣ K 8 6 5 2

South
♠ Q 8 7 3 2
♥ Q
♦ K 9 6 3
♣ A J 9

The bidding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ♠</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>2 ♥</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ♠</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>4 ♠</td>
<td>All pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opening lead: ♣3

Robots have entered the game of bridge in a big way and many clubs are experimenting with using robots to replace “phantom” pairs and prevent sit outs when an odd number of pairs shows up. Flustered Flo found out that a club near her home was using the bots for sit outs, so she drove over there out of curiosity to try it out. She was glad to see that her nemesis, Smug Sam, had also made the trip there. Since they always played perfectly, she hoped the bots would teach Sam a lesson – Sam wouldn’t be able to intimidate or bluff the robots, as he often did with human players.

On the diagrammed hand, which Flo played against human opponents, Flo sat South and landed in a makeable 4♠ contract when her North partner, Loyal Larry, raised her to Game after one round of bidding.

Her West opponent led the ♣3, the only unbid suit, to East’s ♣K and Flo’s Ace. She unblocked the dummy by cashing her Queen of Hearts and then led a small trump from her hand. West took the trump Ace right away, got to his East partner’s hand with the Ace of Diamonds and East dutifully returned a Club to West’s Queen. Flo had lost three tricks, a Spade, a Diamond and a Club, but she had the rest with trumps, good Hearts and the King of Diamonds.

“That was a pretty close Game with just 23 high-card points between us,” said Flo to her partner. “Thank you for putting me there. I guess you figured, correctly, that your Heart length ought to count for something extra. I think we’ll get a good score on the board, because not everyone will bid it, certainly at least a tie for a top.”

Flo was sorely disappointed to find out that her score was nowhere near a top. She was even more chagrined that her nemesis Sam, who had also been South, had beaten her by 10 points by bidding 3 NT and making his contract with an overtrick for +430, 10 points better than her +420.

“The hand records say you should have gone down,” Flo said, waving the paper in Sam’s face. “And I see that you played that board against the bots, who are supposed to play perfect defense. Why did you bid No-Trump, which is the wrong contract to be in, and how did you make FOUR?”
“After my partner responded 2♥ to my opening 1♠ bid, I didn’t bid 3♦, but 2 NT,” said Sam. “Then my partner raised me to 3 NT. The West robot led decided to lead the ♦J, from its longest suit. The lead of the ♦J, from ♦J10, although logical, turned out to be fatal.”

“How so?” Flo asked.

“The East robot took the opening ♦J lead with the ♦A and led back the ♦Q to my ♦K,” Sam explained. “I took the ♥Q and forced out West’s ♠A. Of course, the bot cashed his good ♠10, but when he led another Diamond, my ♦9 was high and I could get to the dummy to run the Hearts. That gave me six ♥ tricks, two ♦ tricks, one ♣ trick and a ♠ trick, for a total of ten.”

“What should he have done to put you down?” Flo asked.

“A Club lead will set the contract, too, but that would have been even more illogical. If he was going to lead a ♦, leading a fourth-best ♦4 sets the contract,” said Sam. “After forcing out my ♦K, West then still has his ♦J10 in the suit and runs it when he gets back in with the ♠A. They take five tricks, four Diamonds and the Spade Ace.”

“I thought robots were perfect,” said Flo. “How come they decided to give you a good board?”

“They’re programmed to make the best decisions based on their own hands and what they’ve learned from the bidding,” said Sam, smug as always. “They can’t see all four hands. And I try to give them as little information as I can from my bidding. That’s why I went to No-Trump right away. You can often steal a trick that way, keeping opponents in the dark on what to lead.”

“Even robots?” asked Flo, incredulously.

“Yes, Flo, especially robots.”

---

**A REMINDER CONCERNING**
**THE DSBA ONLINE MEMBERSHIP DIRECTORY**

Unit 190 Webmaster Mark Henderson

The online membership directory has been updated to include addresses for all members who have authorized use of their address through the ACBL. Updates are being made, as time permits. My intention is to have all information current so please, okay, pretty please, log in and verify your correct address. There was much copying and pasting, all of which hopefully landed in the right place. All errors are mine. Should you need assistance or have questions or concerns, please bring them to my attention at henderson.mm@gmail.com. Thank you.
UNIT 190’s FIRST STATE SOUTHERN SECTIONAL

July 27 – July 29

Top Masterpoint Winners

1 19.26 Robert Taylor, Newark DE
2 19.26 Anne Taylor, Newark DE
3 17.47 Eliezer Solomon, Ocean City MD
4 17.47 Andrew Stayton, Rehoboth Beach DE
5 13.46 Terry Patton, Selbyville DE
6 12.73 Nancy Steele, Rehoboth Beach DE
7 12.73 Jane Myers, Rehoboth Beach DE
8 12.65 Pat Tylander, Alexandria VA
9 11.94 Terry Dutton, Bivalve MD
10 11.71 Maxine Poulton, Maricopa AZ
11 11.71 Eugene Condon, Maricopa AZ
12 10.24 Francis Rode, Milton DE
13 9.92 Melody Henderson, Wilmington DE
14 9.92 Mark Henderson, Wilmington DE

DSBA SOUTH STATE PAIRS CHAMPIONS!

Eli Solomon (A); Mary Kay Reilly (C); Debbie Schell (B); Tina Brinsfield (B);
Andy Stayton (A); Rich Weissmann (C)
“Director Please!”

ACBL Tournament Director Sandy Cerato (stitchwitch@comcast.net)

CLAIMS – WHEN, WHY, and WHAT’S NEW

Today’s discussion is about claims—what they are, what they are not, and how they should be made. Also, I have noted the change in the law effective 9/25/17.

A claim is made when you:
1. Announce you will win a specific number of the remaining tricks;
2. Suggest that play be curtailed; or
3. Intentionally face your hand

When you make a claim, do not expose your hand until you’ve made a clear statement of the order of play of the cards. For a statement or action to constitute a claim or a concession of tricks, it must refer to tricks other than the one currently in progress.

Effective 9/25/17, the law on claims is that, at the request of the non-claiming or non-conceding side and, with the concurrence of all four players, play may continue without the need to summon the Director. (Previously, play was supposed to stop once a claim or concession was made.) If the players agree to play on, the table result achieved will stand. The claimer/conceder picks up her faced hand in such cases and play continues. Silence, in response to a request to play on, is deemed to be concurrence.

If someone does not agree, the Director is called. Once the Director is called, there is no second chance to play on. She arrives and will decide who wins the remaining tricks as equitably as possible to both sides, but any doubtful points will be resolved against the claimer. If any play occurred after the claim, however, the Director may take this as evidence of the plays probable from the claimer and from her opponents.

When a claim is made and there is an outstanding trump, the Director will award a trick(s) to the opponents when the following circumstances are present:

1. Claimer did not mention the trump(s) in her statement, and
2. There was a chance that the claimer did not realize a trump remained in an opponent’s hand, and
3. There is a normal line of play (which includes play that would be careless or inferior for the level of player involved, but not irrational) that would allow the claimer to lose a trick to that trump.
There is a difference between a poor claim and a poorly stated claim. In the first instance, the player has erred; the claim is likely to be faulty. In the second instance, the player has solved the bridge problem, though stating it poorly; the Director would allow the claim. Here are a few examples to help you understand how claims are dealt with at the table so you can make a good claim:

Example 1:

```
Dummy
♦ - - -
♥ 3 2
♦ 3 2
♣ 2

West
♦ 3
♥ 6 4
♦ 6 4
♣ - - -

East
♦ - - -
♥ A K
♦ Q J
♣ J

Declarer
♦ A K Q J 2
♥ - - -
♦ - - -
♣ - - -
```

Spades are trump, the lead is in dummy and declarer claims with no explanation. If, after questioning declarer, the Director feels there is a possibility that declarer was unaware of the outstanding trump, a trick would be awarded to the defense, because if declarer has forgotten about the trump, she may choose to ruff the ♣2 with the ♠2 and West could overruff with the ♠3.

Example 2:

On the deal from Example 1, spades are trump, but the lead is in declarer’s hand. Declarer claims with no explanation. The Director would allow the declarer to win all of the remaining trumps, presuming that trumps are played from the top down.
Example 3:

On the deal from Example 1, the East and West hands are reversed and the lead is in dummy. The claim would be allowed because it would be irrational for declarer to underruff with the ♠2, assuming that East ruffed the ♣2 with the ♠3.

Example 4:

```
Example 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dummy</th>
<th>East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♦ K Q 10 5 4 3 2</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West</th>
<th>East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♦ J 9 8 7</td>
<td>♦ - - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Declarer          |
| ♦ A 6          |
```

Declarer is on lead and claims seven diamond tricks. Since the East hand will fail to follow suit, declarer would be allowed to take the finesse and win all seven tricks.

Example 5:

```
Example 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dummy</th>
<th>East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♦ K Q 10 5 2</td>
<td>♦ J 6 4 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West</th>
<th>East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♦ - - -</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Declarer          |
| ♦ A 9 8 7      |
```

Declarer’s claim of five spade tricks would not be allowed because she might carelessly play first, or lead first, to the ♦A. But, if the East–West hands were reversed, the claim would be allowed. Whether or not dummy or declarer cashed an honor first, the suit is played for no losers.

If you have any director questions or ideas for future “Director Please” columns, contact me at: stitchwitch@comcast.net

Remember to make time for bridge every day
IN MEMORIAM

Let us remember Joan Donoho Hughes and Judith H. Hoopes, two of our bridge-playing friends who have recently passed. Also, if you learn of someone who has recently died and whose name and memory should be honored, please send an email to alabridge@gmail.com.

A note from the DUMMY Editor . . .

First off, check out those smiling faces on the pictures of those winners from the First State Southern Sectional! That highly successful well-run tourney is known for its fabulous first-rate Southern hospitality and, by all accounts, every single player had a great time.

The Dummy, this quarterly publication of Unit 190, is going the way of other newspapers, and will now only be published online. In a decision made by the Board of Directors, there will be no more hard copies printed for distribution. Unit 190 members who have signed up, will continue to receive notice of the publication by an individual email. For articles, letters to the editor, or possible subjects for inclusion, please email me at alabridge@gmail.com.
# 2017 Dave Treadwell Sectional

**December 27-31, 2017**

*Bridge Studio of Delaware*

| Wednesday 27th | Flight A/X - Two Session Swiss (Open/5000)  
Flight B/C/D - Two Session Swiss (2500/1250/500)  
Pizza will be provided between sessions |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10:00 am       | 2 sessions play-thru  
| 10:00 am       | Stratified Open Pairs (Open/2000/1000)  
Stratified NLM Pairs |
| 2:15 pm        | Flight A/X Pairs (Open/5000)  
Stratified B/C/D Pairs (2000/1500/750)  
Stratified NLM Pairs |
| Thursday 28th  | Stratified Open Pairs (Open/2000/1000)  
Stratified NLM Pairs |
| 10:00 am       | Flight A/X Pairs (Open/5000)  
Stratified B/C/D Pairs (2000/1500/750)  
Stratified NLM Pairs |
| 2:15 pm        | Stratified Open Pairs (Open/2000/1000)  
Stratified NLM Pairs |
| Friday 29th    | Stratified Open Pairs (Open/2000/1000)  
Stratified NLM Pairs |
| 10:00 am       | Flight A/X Pairs (Open/5000)  
Stratified B/C/D Pairs (2000/1500/750)  
Stratified NLM Pairs |
| 2:15 pm        | 2 abbreviated single-sessions  
Strat Pairs (Open/2000/1000)  
Stratified NLM Pairs  
*End of year mini-party between sessions* |
| Saturday 30th  | 10:00 am  
& TBA  
Stratified Open Pairs (Open/2000/1000)  
Stratified NLM Pairs |
| Sunday 31st    | 2:15 pm  
Flight A/X Pairs (Open/5000)  
Stratified B/C/D Pairs (2000/1500/750)  
Stratified NLM Pairs |
| 10:00 am  
& TBA | Events will be scored single session (more MPs) |