

UNIT 191 BRIGHT LEAF ALERT

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF UNIT 191

SEPTEMBER 2020

Greetings from my couch!

Hi all! Hope you are all keeping busy and active during these dog days of summer! The days are flying by. I never know what day of the week it is as they all seem alike. I appreciate playing bridge often on BBO with friends near and far while we wait to resume face-to-face games. In the meantime, our Unit Board of Directors is still active and planning activities and such for the future. This month we are running an experiment on our Unit webpage with regards to the coming election. Please read the notice from **Ed Fuller** and help us test the new system by following his instructions as we “practice” conducting our Unit Board of Director Elections in preparation for 2021. The real election will be held in November. Right now, you can help us find “bugs” in the system by trying out the online practice ballot. We appreciate your help. Also, our Mentorship Committee is busy planning for the future starting with a casual mentor/mentee game online if enough people are interested. Please email **Bev Craig** with your ideas and show your interest if you will. Meanwhile, we ask that you continue to support Triangle Bridge Club and The Bridge Academy by playing in their daily virtual games as we wait for normalcy to resume. Stay well! Exercise your minds by playing bridge! Take care!

Deanna Larus

Unit 191 President



Mock Board Directors Ballot –» We Want You To Vote!

Elections for Unit 191 Board Directors are coming soon. The slate of candidates from the unit's Nomination Committee is posted in this issue. Anticipating online voting Marc Goldberg and I are exploring the use of features of the unit's website for online balloting. We are asking your assistance in finding any glitches in the process. An online mock Board Director ballot is in the **Members Only** section of the unit website. Instructions for how to access the ballot and how to vote are appended below. ***Please VOTE!***

Ed Fuller

The National and local election are Tuesday, November 3rd.

Get out and VOTE in these elections as well!

Some "***Clues***" as how to vote in the Unit 191 Mock Board Directors election:

- Go to the unit website at <https://www.bridgewebs.com/unit191brightleaf/>
- Select **Members Only** from the tabs on the left-hand side of the home page.
- Enter your ACBL Number or Email or Name.
- Enter your password.

If this is the first time that you have used "Members Only", click [Set/Reset Password].

Note: After you click [Set/Reset Password], you will get a prompt to **Send Set Password Email**.

BridgeWebs will then send you an email with a link to reset your password. If you do not see the email in your Inbox, check your Spam folder.

Note: This is a *unique personal password* that you create just for the Unit 191 website. It is *not* your ACBL password for MyACBL on acbl.org.

- Across the top of the **Members Only** page you will see a number of tabs.
[For instance, the **Member List** tab is the current Unit 191 online directory.]
- Select the **Unit 191 Director Ballot** tab (currently on the far right).
- Vote for your candidates from the mock ballot.
- Click **Send Message** at the bottom of the ballot to cast your vote.
- You're done. Thank you!

We would appreciate any comments and suggestions on this trial balloting procedure.

Send to: Ed Fuller <edwin.fuller@gmail.com> and Marc Goldberg <goldberg73@gmail.com>

FROM THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Nominating Committee has placed in nomination four candidates for the election of the Board of Unit 191.

They are listed in alphabetical order:

Ian Cloudsdale
Ann Fisher
Eric Hamilton
Deana Larus

Biographies and pictures will be available in the November Alert.

There has been a move forward in our voting procedure as we are moving to use our new web site more effectively. Ed Fuller will be running the electronic election through the Unit 191 website. Ed will provide a step by step instruction for the on line voting procedure in the November Alert.

Marian Meyer will provide the paper ballots. Paper ballots are provided only for anyone who requests a paper ballot and that information will also be provided in the November Alert.

Please send any questions or concerns to Marian Meyer and they will be shared with the committee and the board.

Marian Meyer
Chair Nominating Committee

Dear Unit 191 Members,

During these unusual times, we all strive for normalcy. The Mentoring Program Committee is trying to forge a return to our Mentor-Mentee games with the necessary changes. We want to continue our growth and socialization as bridge players while maintaining the precautions important to all of us. And so, we take this opportunity to continue the fun by reinitiating the Mentor-Mentee games and preserving the game we enjoy.

We welcome YOUR IDEAS for this year's Mentor-Mentee games and relationships. Please send us any ideas you have for the 2020-2021 Mentor-Mentee games. We will compile all ideas and try our absolute best to develop a format and schedule with our great clubs and directors to continue our development going forth.

One possibility we are considering is a laidback online game. Mentor-mentee partnerships could vary from game to game, thus providing a more relaxed mentoring relationship in this era of online bridge. An idea?

Please send your ideas to **Beverly Craig** at nursebev61@icloud.com or to **Ed Fuller** at ed-win.fuller@gmail.com by September 11, 2020.

Thank you in advance!

Unit 191 Mentoring Program Committee

Ed Fuller

Beverly Craig

Donna Walther, Board Liaison

THE GAME

Words by Richard Brown

Sung by Richard Maybin and Emory Whitaker

Some say bridge is just a card game

That lots of people play.

Some say bridge is just a hobby

To pass the time away,

Some say bridge is just for old folks

Who want to stay in touch.

I say bridge it is a passion

For those who play so much.

It's our love and when we're playing

We hope it will never end.

And our wish to be a winner

One reason we attend.

For playing lifts high the spirits

Of those who play the game.

And the soul, happy when playing,

Will never be the same.

When the session has finally started

And the play has been too tough

When things don't go your own way

And it seems you've had enough.

Just remember to be pleasant

And others will do the same.

For if you always show Goodwill

The bridge becomes THE GAME!

(Sung at a Goodwill dinner) to the tune of the
song "Evergreen"

Thanks to Kay and Randy for the article.

The Bright Leaf Alert is the official newsletter of Unit 191.

It's been a different sort of challenge during this pandemic to find material for the alert—thanks to the many contributors who constantly write and submit articles to keep the newsletter going! Much appreciation to these people!!!

If anyone has ideas for articles, please contact any board member or me at BMartin1@mebtel.net

We all miss seeing each other, but thankfully, there is bridge online every day, and we are grateful to our club owners for providing these games.

The article that appears on pages 4 and 5 in this issue comes from John Carruthers, Editor of the International Bridge Press Association (IBPA) Bulletin. Thanks to the efforts of Ed Fuller, John has given us permission to reprint his article from the August 10, 2020 issue of the bulletin (Bulletin No. 667)

There is also an article by Larry Robbins' in Bridge Winners on this same topic.

Editor's note: I saw this article online and thought it explained well the various ways of cheating in bridge. It also gives one the opportunity to help if this kind of investigation is something you would like to do.

WHAT NOW?

By John Carruthers

Whether we consider cheating at bridge to be a disease or a crime, there are two aspects that need to be considered: prevention and cure (it it's a disease) or; prevention and penalties (if it's a crime). Effectively, it does not matter whether it's a disease or a crime or both, we need to have penalties sufficient both to punish the perpetrators and to serve as a deterrent.

1. Develop a Criminal Code Collusive Cheating—as Larry Robbins has suggested, cheating can be subdivided into two main categories, collusive and individual. The proliferation of online events has seen the emergence of a subcategory of collusive cheating which we can call “partner kibitzing”. This occurs when two players in the same household look at each other's hands or, if in different households, transmit the data of each other's hands electronically to each other, most often via telephone. It could be argues that this is no different from developing a set of signals to tell you partner across the table from you what yo have in your hand. Partner kibitzing is just more precise, not to mention easier to execute.

(i.) At-the-table signals

(ii.) Partner-kibitzing

(iii.) There is another category which has come to light with the advent of Swiss Teams and mostly with professional players. That is score cheating. For example, if three teams are close to the lead and two are playing each other in the last match of an event, the winner of the match gets a blitz, regardless of the actual match score, ensuring a win in the event. Another type might occur in an earlier match near but not at the end of the event, with both teams in contention: the teams agree on a draw, keeping both in contention. Professional players cynically regerred to this practice as “professional courtesy”. This had

Become so prevalent in Regional Swiss Teams that the ACBL decreed that if two teams played each other in the wrong direction (which used to be declared a draw). Both would receive o VP. Thus, if they misreported a score as a tie, severe penalties would ensue.

Individual Cheating—There has apparently been a proliferation of individual cheating concurrent with the explosion of online bridge events. Individual cheating can consist of, but is not limited to, the following subcategories:

(i.) Table kibitzing/self kibitzing. The perpetrator logs on twice, once to play and once to kibitz, sometimes anonymously.

(ii.) Scoping unplayed boards. This most often occurs in pairs games when a player wanders around, looking at boards he has not yet played. One world-famous lightning-quick player was so well-known for this practice that the tournament directors tracked the results of his odd-numbered boards. They discovered that his even-numbered board scores were 10% higher than his odd-numbered boards scores. As he finished two boards a few minutes ahead of most players, he'd get up from the table and wander, looking at other tables playing their even-numbered boards in their private score-card.

(iii.) Transmitting data to teammates with the relayed boards in Swiss matches. One ingenious method might be to expose one of your cards, telling your teammate(s) that they have a difficult-to-bid slam. All that's required is for teammates to notice that their opponent has one card turned the wrong way. Or the information might indicate the location of a key queen,

(iv.) Intentionally fouling a poor-result board to ensure that it is thrown out of

Competition. This has definitely happened in ACBL events (perhaps even by a former World Champion) and was alleged to have occurred in the 1996 Olympiad Teams in Rhodes (see Bobby Wolff's book *The Lone Wolff* for the details). There are undoubtedly other methods of cheating that have escaped my attention. We can add them to the list. Currently, there is a tendency for bridge organizations to ignore reality with an ostrich-like approach to cheating, or worse, to try and sweep it under the rug. For example, the WBF has repeatedly stated that it is up to the players to catch the cheats. Imagine if the IOC and WADA said the same. Wouldn't it be better for the Laws Commission, for example, or the WBF in consultation with its constituents, to prescribe penalties for each of the seven items (and any others they can think of) listed above? We need a Criminal Code to do this.

2. Prevention Before 2015, it's fair to say that bridge organizations did little to halt cheating or punish perpetrators. The ACBL had a few high-profile cases over the years (Katz/Cohen, Sion/Cokin and a handful of others). But many more players were quietly told to end their partnerships with no other repercussions. Europe had its own cases (Reese/Schapiro), as did Asia (Manoppo/Manoppo). Players and pairs had been told not to come to World Championships by, initially, Jaime Ortiz-Patino (all four of those above-named pairs) and latterly, by the WBF Credentials Committee (notably Balicki Zmudzinski). The EBL also has a similar body. Subsequently to Boye Brogeland's revelations in 2015, the ACBL formed its Anti-Cheating Commission, the EBL formed a similar group and the WBF formed its High-Level Players Commission. Although these groups work diligently to investigate cases of suspected malfeasance, according to those authorities, it's up to their sponsoring organizations to take action. The Commissions themselves have no authority to prosecute or convict, merely to recommend action to their sponsors. There has also been formed a special Credentials Advisory

Team to assist and advise the organizers of online championships such as the Alt and OCBL events.

Another step in the right direction was taken by ACBL National Recorder Robb Gordon when he suggested that the ACBL make all NABC events invitational. Thus, like World and European Championships, a player or pair can remain uninvited or, indeed, be disinvented. BBO can (and has done) help catch self-kibitzers by paying attention to login i.d.'s, computer locations, telephone numbers and Internet Service Providers. Statistics can help determine if a pair under suspicion is good, "lucky", or cheating. BBO was critical in catching Michal Nowosadzki and Sylvia Shia, and statistics and the evidence of the deals themselves reinforced their guilt and elicited their admissions of guilt. There are many more players and pairs to be outed soon. However, more needs to be done. If bridge organizations are truly interested in saving our game from these predators, as they all proclaim, hiring Nicols Hammond (*Detecting Cheating in Bridge*) and forging a closer relationship with BBO would be good steps in that direction. Additionally, when bridge organizations are trying to determine what they ought to do with these offenders and the penalties they ought to assess them, the authorities do well to take heed of what the FBI's Behavioral Science Unit has been telling us for more than four decades, to wit, "The best indicator of future behavior is past behavior."

3. Help the CAT Do you want to help? The members of the Credentials Advisory Team are working tirelessly in compiling data and investigating chargers and complaints. With other players in their sights, there are not enough members of the team to investigate all those players thoroughly. So, if you are interested in being an examiner/spotter for the committee, you can contact the CAT directly at: credentialsadvisoryteam@gmail.com.

Another Intriguing Hand (#3)

By Randy Joyce

At a virtual club game in Winston Salem this past Friday, I was playing with Craig Robinson, and the following hand appeared on my screen...

S...ATx

H...Axx

D...QJxxx

C...Ax

Craig opened 1NT (15-17), and it was passed to me. I drew back from bidding a knee jerk 4NT and paused to draw on my many years of experience of going down in pushy slams. I reasoned that if partner had hoped for 17 points, our partnership had only 32 points. If partner had an attractive 16, he might go to slam, and we would only have 31 points.

I decided to try to bid scientifically and see if we had a source of tricks in Diamonds. I asked partner about his Diamonds via 2NT. Craig could show that he liked or disliked his Diamonds by his response. Craig bid 3 Clubs. This meant (by our agreement) that he disliked Diamonds. Since it was possible that we were off the AK of Diamonds and at most partner had A or K doubleton, I signed off at 3NT. If the Diamonds were 3-3 and we made a slam, I would have to apologize.

Craig thought for a moment and bid 4 Diamonds. What was that? How would you treat that bid? Or would you have just assumed that partner mislicked? After a short thought, I paid my partner a great compliment and jumped to 6NT. What do you think partner has in Diamonds? I worked it out that he had AK doubleton!!! He also had a goodish hand with 16 points...

S...Jxx

H...KTxx

D...AK

C...KQTx

Now for an explanation of the bids after the transfer: Craig didn't want to show that he liked Diamonds initially since he had only 2. If I had a 6 card suit in Diamonds to the QJ and say the Spade A, I might try 3NT. If my entry was dislodged early, then I would have no entry to all those Diamond tricks.

Why did Craig later bid 4 Diamonds? He now knew (because I didn't sign off in 3D) that I had a good hand and was looking for slam! Do we have secret keystrokes to clue each other in to our hands? No! It is all quite logical. If I had a bad hand and was trying to get out of 1NT, I would have bid 3 Diamonds over 3 Clubs.

I would never transfer to Diamonds trying to get to 5 Diamonds. As I tell my classes, you cannot score in 5 of a minor when 3NT is a possibility. Also, it's a lot easier to take 9 tricks than 11, and it scores more in 3NT. From this deduction, that I was not trying to get to 5 Diamonds and that I must have a good hand, Craig came up with a thoughtful bid. If he had not had a reasonable hand, he would have just passed 3NT.

Now a little side story to the main story. Before I ever played with Craig, Kay had lined up a couple of games with him. In her first couple of forays, I inquired as to how Craig played, and Kay said GREAT except we have gotten a couple of zeros on specious 4 Diamond bids by him. What do you mean I inquired? I'll just tell you the first. In a competitive auction, Craig pushed on to the 4 level in our suit, Diamonds. Craig told the story thusly. For my bid to be right the opponents had to be able to make 3 Hearts (they couldn't), the opponents had to not Double 4 Diamonds (they didn't) and Kay had to be able to hold the contract to down 2 (she couldn't).

Kay also noticed, as she was often Craig's opponent, that she got top boards when Craig bid 4D against her. I don't quite remember the 2nd time, but it was a hideous result also.

I gave this hand to Nancy Crow as a problem, and she remarked, "Didn't Kay used to remove the 4 Diamond bid from Craig's bidding box before play began?" Kay had tried, even when they were East-West, to beat him to the table to take the 4D card out of the box while he was there to use it.

Stick with virtual bridge, Craig! You not only get to keep your favorite bid in the bidding box, but you get a lot better results!

From the archives..... 10 years ago.....

- **Kay Richardson and Barbara Haskell** were heading up the mentoring program for the year
- **Paul Morrisette and Ken Dye** chaired the future life master tournament
- The Peggy Stokes Memorial Award was established for the person playing in the non life master tournament who accrued the most points
- Membership report stated there were 520 members in Unit 191
- 6 bridge classes were of varying topics were being offered for unit members
- Junior Life masters were: Janet Hitti and Ann McCaffery; Club masters were : Ken Chuk, W. Clay Hamner and Phyllis Fuller; Sectional Masters were: Gordon Berg, Judith Bolt, Gregory Bolt, and Germaine Pinckney; Regional Masters were Anne Boyd, Bea Prosnitz, and Doris Elkin; and Life Master was Lillian Levine

More bridge myths from Julian Lederman's book
"Bumblepuppy Days"

8. Whist was an easier game to play well than bridge.

Reality: This point can be argued. Playing whist did not involve any bidding. The last card dealt was turned over, and the suit of that card automatically became the trump suit. Very simple. No partnership bidding mistakes, or bidding arguments could occur. The card play was identical to bridge except that there was no exposed hand (dummy). This greatly complicated card play, provoking the use of numerous very sophisticated signaling methods. A player was forced to master these methods or fear being labeled a "bumblepuppy."

7. The evolution of bridge went straight from whist to auction bridge.

Reality: Between 1897 and 1910, dozens of books were written on the earliest form of bridge. This very popular game was called either bridge whist or, by the shorter name, bridge. The earliest known document describing the method of play was dated 1886. Around 1910, this game quickly disappeared when its offspring – auction bridge – replaced it in the hearts of card players.

6. Our bid ranking system is logical.

Reality: The logic is questionable. In modern bridge, 3♣ is a higher bid than 2NT, but the trick value of making 3♣ (60) is less than that for 2NT (70). Another example: 5♣ is higher than 4♥, but 100 (the score for 5♣) is less than 120 (4♥). A system of ranking bids based on a bid's value is called "value bidding" or "value calling." This was the standard method of ranking bids in the U.S. until 1915 and in the U.K. until around 1930. For simplicity of explanation, I provided this example using modern trick values. In 1910, however, a spade trick had the value 2, while a heart trick had the value 8. Using the actual trick values at that time, a bid of 7♠ had only the value 14 ($7 \times 2 = 14$), while the bid of 2♥ was higher ($2 \times 8 = 16$). 2♥ was a legal bid after an opponent bid 7♠! No, I am not kidding

TRIANGLE BRIDGE

I hope everyone is adhering to the CDC guidelines and wearing a face mask.

We currently offer the following game online—
VACB252858:

Monday—7:00 Open

Tuesday—12:20 0-750
12:30 Open

Wednesday—7:00 Open

Thursday—12:20 0-750
12:30 Open

Friday—7:00 Open

Saturday—9:50 0-750
10:00 Open

Sunday—1:50 0-750
2:00 Open

**BE HAPPY AND
STAY SAFE**

*Please join us for
friendly competition
at its best*

Chris Moll

[trianglebridge-
club@gmail.com](mailto:trianglebridge-club@gmail.com)

[504-495-7485](tel:504-495-7485) cell

BBO name: mollbridge

TEN BRIDGE THOUGHTS YOU SHOULD ALREADY KNOW

YES You should greet the opponents and be kind to your partner.

NO You don't like boards being taken away from you....and neither do the opponents when you play too slowly. Please be mindful of the clock and claim quickly whenever you can.

YES You are required to post your convention card (call me for assistance)

NO You cannot bid 1 NT without self-alerting your range per ACBL regulations....even if you are playing "standard" 15-17

YES We charge \$8.00 per player....the thinking still is that playing to help raise funds is more enjoyable than another fund raising effort

NO Your partner doesn't alert your bids....YOU DO....Remember to "self-alert" by typing your explanation BEFORE you bid and subject to penalty if you don't.

YES ACBL raises the fees to clubs for certain events....that is why we charge different entry fees from time to time

NO I am not as happy directing online as in person...I prefer to see your smiling faces and hear your comments in person....but I am glad to chat back and forth during the game

YES I really appreciate your support of Triangle Bridge and UNIT 191

NOT Playing bridge on BBO is not the same as in person....but it's much better than no bridge at ALL!!!

BE HAPPY AND STAY SAFE

Chris