

THE KIBITZER

May 2012

A NEWSLETTER OF THE CONNECTICUT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION

Volume 16 • Number 2



Levels of Expertise

by Harold Feldheim

A common cry heard at the bridge club is, "Everybody makes mistakes against player X. If they made those mistakes against me, I would win just as often." While there may be some truth to this complaint, more often than not the expert player chooses a line of play or defense that gives the opposition a chance to go wrong. As a general rule, deception or what is often referred to as a "swindle" is most effective when perpetrated as early in the hand as possible. The theme is to provide a losing choice before the opponent has any real information. The following hand is from the finals of the strongest event in the North American championships: the Resinger Board-a-Match. Declarer is bridge immortal Edgar Kaplan and as you might imagine, the defenders were world class players who simply sat in the wrong seat at the wrong time.

Dealer: South
Vulnerability: East/West

NORTH		EAST	
♠	K J 7 6 2	♠	3
♥	10 4 3	♥	K 9 8 6 5
♦	5	♦	8 4 3 2
♣	A 9 7 3	♣	Q 8 2
WEST		SOUTH	
♠	9 4	♠	A Q 10 8 5
♥	A J 2	♥	Q 7
♦	A 10 9 6	♦	K Q J 7
♣	K J 10 5	♣	6 4

South	West	North	East
1♠	Dbl	4♠	All Pass

Opening Lead: ♠9

The auction and lead were straightforward and duplicated at most tables. The holding of a singleton diamond opposite KQJ7 was an unfortunate duplication. At most tables, declarer drew the last trump in dummy and played a diamond to the king and ace. Realizing that declarer was getting ready to pitch losers from the dummy, most Wests chose an active continuation by leading a heart. The defense then scored two hearts, one diamond, and an eventual club for down one. Against proper defense, these losers were unavoidable so it was time for some sort of artful swindle. It is interesting to determine declarer's thinking.

Mr. Kaplan looked at the dummy. Prospects look hideous, especially since West was considered one of the world's premier players and, against normal play, would certainly work out the winning defense. He considered the lead and tried to draw a picture of the East-West high card placement. First thought: If West had the AK of hearts, he

might well have led one of those cards. Similarly, if he held the KQJ of clubs he would've led that suit. With this in mind, he won the opening lead in dummy and at trick two, led ♦5, covering East's low spot-card with the 7! This strange play risked nothing since, if his analysis of the defensive high card holding was accurate, West's takeout double located the ♦A. In any event, West won with the ♦9 and, sensing no danger, returned his last trump (thoughtfully left outstanding by declarer). Note that not pulling the last trump is a lovely fine point. Since, if he does, East will have the opportunity to signal for a heart. In any event, the deed was done and Kaplan, now thoroughly in control, won the trump in hand, and led the ♦K, ruffing West's ace. Returning to the closed hand, he parked two of dummy's losing hearts on the now established diamonds, thus losing only one diamond, one heart, and one club to fulfill his contract. Please notice that West did not really do anything wrong. He simply didn't have sufficient information to do that which was right. Sympathies to the defense, but kudos to declarer.



Connecticut's Jason Rotenberg Wins Red Ribbon Pairs

Congratulations to Connecticut's Jason Rotenberg (left) who, playing with Daniel Neill from Lexington, KY, finished first in the Bean Red Ribbon Pairs at the Spring Nationals in Memphis. The pair then followed that up by winning the Arthur Flowers Fast Pairs two days later!

Can't Cost – Chapter 31

by John Stiefel



In this recent deal from a National Swiss Team event, declarer went down in a hand that could (and should) have been made with a “can’t cost” play.

Dealer: South
Vulnerability: East/West

NORTH
♠ J 7 5 4
♥ 10 2
♦ Q 3
♣ A K 8 6 4

SOUTH
♠ Q 3
♥ A K 7 4
♦ A 10 9 6 2
♣ Q 7

South	West	North	East
1NT	Pass	2♣	2♠
3♥	Pass	3NT	All Pass

Opening Lead: ♠8

The bidding merits some discussion. Some would question South’s 1NT opening bid with two doubletons, but that bid has this writer’s approval. If South opened 1♦, he would have a rebid problem over 1♥ (with 2♥ being inadequate but 3♥ being too much) or 1♠ (with 1NT being inadequate but 2NT being too much).

More open to question is South’s decision to bid 3♥ over 2♠. He should have passed. Then North would double 2♠ and, as can be seen later, North-South would collect +500 or +800. What if North had held hearts and not spades? Then North would cuebid 3♠ and North-South would still get to 4♥.

At any rate, East played ♠AK10 to the first three tricks, South discarding a heart, West discarding two hearts and North winning trick 3 with his ♠J. Surely, by his play of the spade suit (leading high three times) he showed a

very good holding in hearts; (e.g. QJx or, more likely, QJ9) and was alerting West that heart discards would be safe.

At trick 4, declarer called for dummy’s ♦Q, East played the ♦5, South the ♦2 and West the ♦K. (Declarer would normally start diamonds by leading low toward dummy’s ♦Q, but he couldn’t afford to let East gain the lead if that defender had the ♦K.)

West led the ♥8 at trick 5, dummy played the ♥10, East the ♥J and South the ♥K.

At this point, declarer paused to consider. East, from his play of ♠AK10 in that order, presumably was showing strength in the higher-ranking other suit – hearts. If East also started with an original holding of ♦Jxx, declarer would have to lead a low diamond from dummy and insert his 10 because (again) he couldn’t allow East to gain the lead. Dummy’s only entries, however, were in clubs and that suit was blocked unless South played his ♣Q first. If South did that, however, he would have to play dummy’s ♣A and ♣K and, if the suit didn’t divide 3-3, the defense might be able to take five tricks (East’s ♠AK, West’s ♦KJ and a club trick from West).

South finally decided to play diamonds from his hand; so he led the ♦A to trick 6. If East didn’t have the ♦J and diamonds were no worse than 4-2, South could then make his contract via one spade, two hearts, three diamonds and three clubs.

The good news at trick 6 was that East didn’t have the ♦J. The bad news was that East showed out; so South was now in danger of going down. He tried to split the clubs, playing Q, K and A to tricks 7, 8 and 9; but West showed up with 109xx and South now had to go down. The defense took one club, two diamonds and two spades.

South did well up to the point where he cashed the ♦A at trick 6. However, he

missed a “can’t cost” play to trick 7: Lead the ♥A! That play couldn’t cost because, at that point, the defense only had three hearts between them – so leading the ♥A couldn’t set up a heart entry for East to gain the lead. West had shown up with one spade and five diamonds at that point. If he followed to the ♥A, he would presumably have started with 4 hearts (assuming East had QJ9 of hearts for his definitive suit-preference signal). This would leave West with three clubs – so the club suit was going to provide five tricks. In the actual hand, however, West started with 1-3-5-4 distribution and would have no good discard on the ♥A. If he discarded a club, the suit would run. If he instead discarded a diamond, South could lead the ♦10 to set up a third diamond trick, and the ♣Q would provide him with an entry to cash the ♦9 and ♦6.

The entire hand was:

NORTH
♠ J 7 5 4
♥ 10 2
♦ Q 3
♣ A K 8 6 4

WEST
♠ 8
♥ 8 6 3
♦ K J 8 7 4
♣ 10 9 3 2

EAST
♠ A K 10 9 6 2
♥ Q J 9 5
♦ 5
♣ J 5

SOUTH
♠ Q 3
♥ A K 7 4
♦ A 10 9 6 2
♣ Q 7



Negative Inference (2)

by Larry Lau



Definition: Negative inference is information deduced from a player's failure to take a specific or expected action in the auction or play (Bridgeguys.com).

West leads a deuce (fourth best) against South's opening bid of 1NT. What are West's possible distribution patterns?

Against a contract of 1NT, we would expect West to lead fourth best from his longest suit. With the lead of the deuce we infer that West does NOT have a 5-card suit (negative inference), else he would have led it. If West's longest suit is four cards, there are only three possible distribution patterns he can hold: 4-3-3-3; 4-4-3-2; 4-4-4-1.

Example: West leads the spade deuce against South's opening bid of 1NT. North's and East's hands are as follows:

NORTH

- ♠ Q 8 5
- ♥ 6 3
- ♦ K 9 6 5 2
- ♣ J 8 5

EAST

- ♠ J 10 9
- ♥ Q 7 2
- ♦ A J 10 8 3
- ♣ 7 2

What are West's and South's EXACT distribution?

Answer: West's spade deuce lead implies that he does not have a five card suit (negative inference). Therefore, West must have one of the three patterns mentioned above. As soon as we see that dummy has five diamonds, plus our five diamonds (10) we know the exact distribution pattern for both West and South.

Because South opened 1NT, he should have two or three diamonds. But West must have one diamond, else he would have a 5-card suit and would have led that suit. That leaves South with two diamonds for the opening 1NT bid.

Therefore, before declarer says "thank you, partner" East knows that West has four spades, four hearts, one diamond and four clubs (4-4-1-4). South has three spades, four hearts, two diamonds and four Clubs (3-4-2-4).

Problem: Sue Rodricks and I recently bid this hand against Jim and Elaine Misner. We were red vs white, and I held in first seat (which was also the dummy):

LARRY

- ♠ 8 6
- ♥ A Q J 7
- ♦ 10 9 5 4 2
- ♣ A Q

Larry	Jim	Sue	Elaine
1♦	1♠	Pass	1NT
Pass	Pass	2♣	All Pass

The opening lead against the final contract of 2♣ was the ♦A, which Sue ruffed! Identify the negative inferences and then construct Sue's probable distribution. HINT: she had no diamonds.

See next quarter's bulletin

TIP: Counting down a hand starts with the auction. Pay close attention and keep track as the bidding progresses.



Giving Thanks

Connecticut Tournaments Join 21st Century

Thanks to tournament director Peter Marcus, Connecticut bridge Sectionals are now scored with Bridgemates, the individual electronic scorepads available at some Connecticut club games. Bridgemate has many advantages. Results are ready and available almost instantly and there is no chance that paper scoring slips will get lost, misread or incorrectly input. Remember to check the score on the device when you sit East/West and make sure you agree before hitting "next."

Those who have used the electronic scorepads know how easy and efficient they are. Many thanks to Peter for bringing our tournament bridge scoring into the 21st Century.

And We Snack Well Too

Thanks as well to Deb and Mike who have been providing our bridge Sectional tournaments with delicious snacks and edible delights! They have kept the tables full and nourishing as well as healthy throughout the tournament hours. Their menus are varied and offer something for everyone. Their budget requires imagination and ingenuity in order to fill the snack tables as they do for the three days of our tournaments. They do all that and more! If you haven't come to a Sectional recently, besides the bridge, you have no idea what you are missing! Thanks, Deb and Mike.

An Unconventional Preempt

by Geoff Brod



It was the first round of the Friday night KOs in Cromwell and we were down 11 imps at the half. Midway through the second half I picked up at favorable vulnerability:

♠ A ♥ 10 8 7 5 4 2 ♦ J 6 ♣ Q 8 4 3

Right hand opponent opened 1♠. My experience is that most people would not consider bidding with this hand but in my view it is close to automatic. Consider:

1. You have bad hand (7HCP), the opponents have opened the bidding and it is likely to be their hand.
2. You are at favorable vulnerability and you have some shape. Furthermore your stiff spade suggests that the opponents are likely to have a fit. If you pass, the opponents are likely to have a smooth auction to their best contract.
3. Clearly you don't have the values for 2♥ which should show something that looks like an opening bid so the only alternative is 3♥.

The negatives are quite clear:

1. You have a bad suit with only 6-card length.
2. You have several defensive values in the side suits that partner will not expect starting with the A♠. The saving grace of the A♠ is that it will also surely take a trick on offense. That's not true of the J♦. Imagine for example partner with ♦Qxx and the opponents with a 4-4 diamond fit. Now your combined holding in the suit is such that you probably will get a diamond trick on defense while at the same time it is likely to be useless to you if you declare. The ♣Q is less problematic primarily because it is in a 4-card suit. Here at least you can hope to catch partner with some club length and perhaps a card or two in the suit which will be good for you offensively. But if partner has just two small clubs, the Queen will be a defensive value only. On balance, for preemptive purposes you would prefer to have just small cards in both clubs and diamonds.

The negatives are not trivial but I love to get into the auction when I can and I've always been a sucker for 6-4 shape, so 3♥ it was.

So what was the outcome? Well rather fortunately partner held ♥AKJxx and a singleton club and he was not to be denied. The opponents bid to 5♦ but partner took the pump to 5♥ which was doubled and off just one for -100. At the other table our teammates bid to 5♦ in an uncontested auction and were +600. We won 11 imps on the board and only won the match by 10 imps.

This was doubly fortunate since there was a defense to 5♦. Lead the ♠A and now try to find your partner's entry. Since the opponents hearts were 1-1 you would presumably would have led to his Ace and received a ruff in return. Might I have found that? I really don't know. Happily I was not put to the test.



A View From the Bottom

by Gene Coppa



Remember when...

The first time you played duplicate bridge at a club and how nervous you were?

The first time that you used a bidding box; how you fumbled with the cards; and how it took a while to not verbalize your bid?

You discovered you could not add 100 points for the honors in your trump suit?

Your right hand opponent opened, you took some time but passed and when your partner overcalled, the opponents called the director and you had no idea what was wrong? That hesitation in the game of bridge is a "no-no"?

Your partner made an initial discard and the opponent asked you what it meant and you had no idea what he was talking about? And later, a kind soul said to say "standard" and that is what you did from then on?

An opponent led out of turn and when the director offered so many options that you decided the easiest choice was to let your partner play the hand?

The first time you bid and made a 6 NT contract and how proud you were? And then you looked at the traveler and found that everyone else bid and made 7 NT?

You found out that the bridge you knew and loved before playing duplicate is now called "kitchen bridge"?

You thought that Stayman was the only convention you needed to learn?

You thought that "counting" meant making sure that you had thirteen cards?

You got your first master point (or a tenth of a point) and how thrilled you were?

Your partner opened 2♣ and you passed because you forgot that was a forcing bid?

You played North for the first time and how confusing it was keeping a proper score and entering it on the right line?

Your partner opened 4 NT and you passed?

Bridge players were so friendly at the table before the start of the game but when you started playing how competitive they became?

You acquired your first gold point at a tournament and how pleased you were?



Bridge Psychology Part One

by Burton Saxon

The January, 2012 issue of The ACBL Bulletin contained a fascinating letter. Mr. Witold Palosz carefully explained how immediate discussion of bridge hands at the table can be valuable. He advocates immediate criticism of one's partners. Mr. Palosz makes four points, which I will address one at a time.

1. Not everyone has good enough memory to remember all details of a given hand. This is true, but often hand records are provided and when they are not, you can usually grab the board(s) in question after the game. After the game, both partners have usually settled down so the discussion will be much more helpful and non-emotional.

2. Open and critical discussions are necessary for a successful partnership. This is absolutely true, but the best discussions begin with self-criticism, not criticism of one's partner.

3. Discussions should not be intimidating or derogatory and partner must be open to critical comments. This sounds okay in theory, but things seldom work this way in practice.

4. The time limit for the round should not be compromised. To me, this means discussion should occur only after the final board of the round has been played. Even if the first or second board is passed out, the final board could involve a difficult problem in bidding, play or defense. But once the final board has been played, other tables may have finished and discussions can easily be overheard. In other words, it's true that the time limit should not be compromised, but that point does not mean criticism at the table is okay.

On balance, criticism at the table is a bad idea.

And now I want to tell you about my recent trip to a warm climate. I called the local bridge club and asked for a partner. I gave my number of master points and said yes indeed I can play two over one. The director promised me a partner but I knew the risk. I might get the one club member who could become abusive. The first time we played, there was no problem. We even finished first in a small game. So we decided to play again. This time my partner was slightly critical of a decision I made on hand number three. He became more critical on hand number five and I again remained silent. Then came hand number six. We were vulnerable and the opponents were not. My partner opened 1♦ and I heard 3♣ on my right. This put me in a dilemma holding:

♠ xxx
♥ Axxx
♦ Jxxx
♣ Kx

I weighed three options:

1. A negative double: I don't like this bid since partner will rightly expect me to be 4-4 in the majors and I don't have enough extra strength to compensate for the shortage in spades.
2. Pass: I showed this hand to two near experts who both said I should pass-but I really wanted to bid something.
3. Three diamonds: This is the bid I chose. I want to tell my story with one bid and this seems the best choice. On this auction, the odds are good that partner has four diamonds.

Do I even have to tell you the sad ending? Partner had three diamonds and four hearts. So down one was the result.

And now partner keeps saying, "You should have made a negative double. Do you know why?" And I exercised my Miranda rights by remaining silent.

Partner then said, "Do you understand what I am saying?" I am now saying to myself, "You are going to say that you would bid three hearts. Duh...I know three hearts is a better contract, but let's not play results. I mean, dude, I'm not Bozo the Clown." So I simply responded, "I know what you are saying but I do not agree with you." (*Note at this point that both partners are arguing in favor of two different bids, neither one of which would likely be the choice of most better players. I have to agree that Pass is probably the best bid. – Ed.*) At this point partner was playing the role of the accuser and I was the accused. I am almost never the accuser and over the years have often been the accused. But now I am a few months away from getting my Medicare card and I am getting tired of being the victim. So...

A few hands later, declarer was playing 3NT. Declarer had five tricks and we had two. My partner was on lead to the right of declarer and dummy looked like this.

♠ K9x
♣ Axx

Partner held 10-x in spades, three small clubs, and a red suit loser. Declarer had three red suit winners and Q-x-x in clubs. I had K-J-10-x in clubs and two red suit losers.

Partner led the 10♠ and declarer took four tricks. So now I decided to go on the offensive, noting that partner had made a play that assured the contract. I observed that a club lead would have given us a fighting chance. We ended up with an average score that day. My partner called three times to schedule another game, but it was starting to get really warm and I decided to wait to play bridge again in Connecticut with the easygoing Harold Miller.

Mr. Palosz, I won't say that criticizing one's partner at the table is always a bad idea. It's just a bad idea 99% of the time.





Woodway Country Club DBC

Winners of the Woodway Duplicate Bridge Winter Series are as follows:

- 1st Betty Hodgman and Linda Cleveland
- 2nd Kathy Rowland and Mary Richardson
- 3rd Millie Fromm and Ann Fuller
- 4th Audrey Cadwallader and Martha Hathaway
- 5th Janet Soskin and Barbara Johnson

Bridge Forum (Hamden)

First Quarter Results

TUESDAY

Leading Pairs: Harold Miller-Rita Brieger had a hot winter to lead Bill Reich-Brian Lewis and the feast-or-famine Howard Cohen-Pat Rogers. Don Stiegler is fifth with Paul Proulx and ninth with Harold Feldheim. In the battle of the sexes, the Wives (Helen Selmon-Sara Ann Auerbach) finished the quarter in fourth place, with the Husbands (Hill Auerbach-Tracy Selmon) in sixth.

Player-of-the-Year: Harold-Rita and Bill-Brian are tied for first and third, respectively. Don Stiegler and Billie Hecker are within striking distance.

Leonora Stein Memorial Cup (through quarterfinals): Bob Hawes, who missed nearly two months after an injury, was the only former champion not to get out

of the qualifying round. Louise Wood had unlucky draws and finished tied for thirteenth. Our top two pairs swept through the first half of the quarterfinals and threatened to give me a big headache if they all made the semifinals, but they missed the second week of the quarterfinals. Brian and Harold survived against Robert Klopp and Howard Cohen, but Tracy Selmon and Fredda Kelly, who had both just squeaked into the quarterfinals, were able to upset Rita and Bill, setting up semifinals of Brian-vs-Tracy and Fredda-vs-Harold.

FRIDAY

Leading pairs: Perennial contenders Hill Auerbach-Larry Stern lead again. George Levinson-Lucy Lacava finished the quarter in second, just ahead of Burt Saxon-Harold Miller. Sylvia Alpert was half of the two pairs tied for tenth, playing with Pieri Graebe and Vera Wardlaw.

Player-of-the-Year: This one begins wide open. Arlene Leshine and Judy Long are tied for the lead, slightly ahead of the Burt-Harold partnership. George Levinson, Sylvia Alpert, Rita Brieger and Gert Pedersen are all close behind.

Aldyth Claiborn Memorial Cup (through quarterfinals): The tradition of this cup being won only by women will continue for another year, as the three men to reach the quarterfinals were eliminated. Vera Wardlaw defeated Harold Miller comfortably, while Lucy Lacava and Louise Wood narrowly took out Hill Auerbach and Burt Saxon (Louise had to play a cold grand slam in 7NT instead of 7H). In the fourth quarterfinal, Billie Hecker defeated Irene Kaplan, to create semifinal pairings of Vera-vs-Lucy and Billie-vs-Louise.

Wee Burn News

The 12 week Winter (of no snow) Series ended March 22 with the following winners:

1. Janet Soskin-Kathie Rowland.
2. Mary Richardson-Betty Hodgman.
3. Audrey Cadwallader-Belinda Metzger.
4. Marilyn Tjader-Martha Hathaway.
5. Linda Cleveland-Karen Barrett.
6. Lynn Reilly-Joan Bergen.
7. Jim Metzger-Betsy Philips.
8. Lois Berry-Ann Fuller

The Spring Charity game win was shared by Mary Richardson-Betty Hodgman-Joan Hoben, and Penny Glassmeyer.

Kathie Rowland, Audrey Cadwallader, Joan Hoben, and Penny Glassmeyer led the field in the Swiss team event of April 5.

Country Club of Darien

The winners of the Winter Series at The Country Club of Darien were:

1. Rhea Bischoff & Liliana Geldmacher
2. Meredith Dunne & Joan Bergen
3. Jim Metzger & Nancy Gramps

The Opponents Giveth and Taketh Away

Playing at the Hartford Bridge Club on Friday 3/30, Larry Wallowitz and Paula Beauchamp attained a 76.16% game, a new high for both players. The very next Wednesday, they played a solid game and received 45.99% for their troubles!

This just confirms that good bridge is critical, but help from the opponents goes a long way.



Milestones and Congratulations

Congratulations to Victor King who has now passed 10,000 masterpoints to become a Platinum Life Master.

New Life Masters

Marcia Clark
Donna Doyle
Michael Dworetzky
Alvin Hamilton
Carol Kesmodel

Gold Life Master (2500 MP's)

Micki Schaffel
John Segal

Silver Life Master (1000 MP's)

George Holland
Gordon Kiernan
David Tracy

Bronze Life Master (500 MP's)

Marcia Clark
Janusz Jablonski
Margaret Molwitz
Valerie Orefice
Maureen Smith

RESULTS



UNIT-WIDE CHAMPIONSHIP Monday, January 23, 2012

FLIGHT A EVENT LEADERS

- 1 **Marilyn Tjader – Martha Hathaway**
- 2 Lenny Russman – Sarah Corning
- 3 Ursula Forman – Ruth Johnson
- 4 Gene Coppa – Libby Pearl
- 5 Margot Hayward – Judith Hess
- 6 Edgar Ramspeck – Barbara Heidel

FLIGHT B EVENT LEADERS

- 1 **Marilyn Tjader – Martha Hathaway**
- 2 Ursula Forman – Ruth Johnson
- 3 Gene Coppa – Libby Pearl
- 4 Margot Hayward – Judith Hess
- 5 Edgar Ramspeck – Barbara Heidel
- 6 Julius Fuster – Lothar Stiberth

FLIGHT C EVENT LEADERS

- 1 **Ursula Forman – Ruth Johnson**
- 2 Mary Ellen McGuire – Gail Ord
- 3 Nancy Hall – Gerald Gilstad
- 4 George Peteros – Robert Kistner
- 5 Julia Farkas – Deborah Neiman
- 6 Mary Kohler – Doris Farquhar

UNIT-WIDE CHAMPIONSHIP Tuesday, January 31, 2012

FLIGHT A EVENT LEADERS

- 1 **Janet Gischner – Jane Smith**
- 2 Nancy Robertson – Mildred Fromm
- 3 Patrick Salve – Jose Gaztambide
- 4 Gerry Cameron – Marjorie Ehrenfreund
- 5 Joel Krug – Geoffrey Brod
- 6 Mario Sa Couto – William Wood

FLIGHT B EVENT LEADERS

- 1 **Gerry Cameron – Marjorie Ehrenfreund**
- 2 Kathryn Henriques – Jeff Henriques
- 3 Carl Palmer – George Holland
- 4 Sandra Gould – Armanda Buscher
- 5 Renee Pomerantz – Ruth Twersky
- 6 Louis Brown – Partab Makhijani

FLIGHT C EVENT LEADERS

- 1 **Kathryn Henriques – Jeff Henriques**
- 2 Sandra Gould – Armanda Buscher
- 3 Paul Grande – Howard Gelin
- 4 Jon Marx – Clifford Abraham
- 5 Richard Fronapfel – Bob Rowley
- 6 Judith Glazer – M. Nadel

UNIT-WIDE CHAMPIONSHIP Friday, April 13, 2012

FLIGHT A EVENT LEADERS

- 1 **Jailue Lai – Dinesh Gupta**
- 2 Yeong-Long Shiue – Ellen Perell
- 3 Robert Rising – Nora Tkacz
- 4 Mildred Fromm – Susan Rodricks
- 5 Helen Walker – Doris Andrews
- 6 Stan Gedansky – Pete Amedeo

FLIGHT B EVENT LEADERS

- 1 **Jailue Lai – Dinesh Gupta**
- 2 Helen Walker – Doris Andrews
- 3 Stan Gedansky – Pete Amedeo
- 4 David Doolittle – Edward Gentino
- 5 Muriel Lipman – Doris Kerwin
- 6 Gernot Reiners – Lawrence Stern

FLIGHT C EVENT LEADERS

- 1 **Jailue Lai – Dinesh Gupta**
- 2 Roz Sternberg – Anant Patel
- 3/4 Betty Payton – Barbara Clark
- 3/4 Howard Gelin – Paul Grande

- 5 Tom Burke – John Townsend
- 6 Jean Clark – Kendall Clark

WINTER IN CONNECTICUT Hamden, March 2-4, 2012

Friday AM Open Pairs

- 1 **Richard DeMartino – John Stiefel**
- 2 Cynthia Michael – Margaret Mason
- 3 Howard Zusman – Allan Clamage
- 4 Larry Bausher – Phyllis Bausher,
West Haven CT
- 5 1 **Linda Green – Paul Miller**
- 6 2 1 **Jill Fouad – Karin Olsen Nye**
- 3 2 Peter Solomon – Michele Raviele
- 4/5 3/4 Shirley Derrah – Robert Derrah
- 4/5 3/4 Tracy Selmon – Hillel Auerbach
- 5 John Dinius – James Geyer

Friday 10 AM Senior Pairs

- 1 1 **Donald Brueggemann – Esther Watstein**
- 2 Sharon Santow – Jatin Mehta
- 3 Sarah Budds – Jane Smith
- 4 Gloria Sieron – David Benjamin
- 5 2 1 **Margaret Molwitz – Rodney Aspinwall**
- 3 Robert Kistner – Anthony Tusa
- 4 2 Elizabeth Grant – Jackie Stone

Friday 2:30 PM Open Pairs

- 1 **Richard DeMartino – John Stiefel**
- 2 1 **Paul Miller – Linda Green**
- 3 2 1 **Carol Hill – Lila Englehart**
- 4 Larry Bausher – Phyllis Bausher
- 5 Sandra DeMartino – Joyce Stiefel
- 6 3 2 Michele Raviele – Peter Solomon
- 4 Robert Kistner – John Farwell
- 5 Elaine Misner – James Misner
- 3 Shirley Derrah – Robert Derrah
- 4 Renee Janow – Joan Stroup

Friday 2:30 PM Senior Pairs

- 1 **Sarah Budds – Jane Smith**
- 2 1 **Donald Brueggemann – Esther Watstein**
- 3 Gordon Jonas – Elliot Ranard
- 4 2 1 **Rodney Aspinwall – Margaret Molwitz**
- 5 3 2 Elizabeth Grant – Jackie Stone
- 4 3 Leonard Messman – Woody Bliss

Sat 10 AM A/X Pairs

- 1 **Lawrence Lau – Brett Adler**
- 2 1 **Brian Lewis – Bill Reich**
- 3 Richard DeMartino – Larry Bausher
- 4 2 Linda Starr – Thomas Gerchman
- 5 Tania Reyes Hiller – Howard Zusman
- 6 Harold Feldheim – Jill Fouad
- 3 Linda Green – Terry Lubman
- 4/5 Ruth Teitelman – Micki Schaffel
- 4/5 David Rock – Sonja Smith

Sat 10 AM B/C Pairs

- 1 1 **John Willoughby – Sandra Werkheiser**
- 2 Elizabeth Nuki – Lucie Fradet
- 3 2 Richard Lebel – Barry Buehler
- 4 Barry Kaplan – Jay Kaplan
- 5 William Niemi – Timothy Yentsch

Sat 10 AM 299er Pairs

- 1 **Jackie Scott – Walt Rinehart**
- 2 1 **Leonard Messman – Woody Bliss**

- 3 2 Kathleen McIntosh – Lou Filippetti
- 4 Thomas Greehan III – Liz Brian
- 5 Susan Byron – Donna Bauman
- 6 3 William Halsey – Carolyn Halsey
- 4 Eric Vogel – Irene Rivers
- 5 1 **Tony Mortimer – Edward Van Deventer**
- 2 Jan Rosow – Tina Yablonski
- 3 Ann Drabkin – Marsha Shiff

Sat 2:30 PM A/X Pairs

- 1 1 **Terry Lubman – Linda Green**
- 2 2 Ellyn Plato – Dede Pochos
- 3 3 Ruth Teitelman – Micki Schaffel
- 4 Tania Reyes Hiller – Howard Zusman
- 5 4 Arthur Crystal – Debbie Benner
- 6 Robert Stayman – John Boyer

Sat 2:30 PM B/C Pairs

- 1 **Susan Smith – Michael Smith**
- 2 Robert Klopp – Barbara Sloan
- 3 Elaine Misner – James Misner
- 4 1 **John Willoughby – Sandra Werkheiser**
- 5 2 Richard Lebel – Barry Buehler

Sat 2:30 PM 299er Pairs

- 1 1 **Eric Vogel – Irene Rivers**
- 2 Walt Rinehart – Jackie Scott
- 3 2 1 **Jan Rosow – Tina Yablonski**
- 4 Donna Bauman – Susan Byron
- 5 3 Kathleen McIntosh – Lou Filippetti
- 6 4 Howard Cohen – Patricia Rogers
- 5/6 William Halsey – Carolyn Halsey
- 5/6 2 Claire Bassett – Walt Bassett

Sunday A/X Swiss Teams

- 1 **Steve Becker – Larry Bausher; Richard DeMartino – John Stiefel**
- 2 Frances Schneider – Bernard Schneider; Dean Montgomery – Allan Clamage
- 3 Cynthia Michael, Constance Graham, Sarah Corning, Richard Blair, William Titley
- 4/6 Howard Lawrence, Gordon Kiernan, Farley Mawyer, Richard Wieland, Harold Feldheim
- 4/6 Sonja Smith – David Rock; Bruce Downing – Krystyna Ciesluk
- 4/6 Phyllis Bausher – Mark Stasiewski; Joyce Stiefel – Sandra DeMartino
- 1 **Solomon Field – Jill Marshall; Linda Otness – Lynn Condon**
- 2/3 Roger Brown – Robin Brown; Timothy Baird – Jason Fuhrman
- 2/3 Deborah Noack – Gary Seckinger; Robert Rising – John Farwell

Sunday B/C Swiss Teams

- 1 **Robert Derrah – Shirley Derrah; Susan Smith – Michael Smith**
- 2 Thomas Gerchman – Linda Starr; David Landsberg – Michael Wavada
- 3 1 **Barry Buehler – Richard Lebel; Lawrence Eppler – Paul Stanton**
- 4 Renee Janow – Paul Burnham; Mary Whittemore – Joan Stroup
- 5/6 2 Donna Doyle – Carol Kesmodel; Margaret Molwitz – Luisa Kelso
- 5/6 Richard Bobilin – Glen Perry; Kay Lang – Diana Lack
- 3 Margaret Garilli – Linda Kesselman; Carol Tellar – Karen Emott



An advanced player offered, in a polite way, constructive criticism on your play or bid and how you good you felt?

You built up enough courage to ask better players to play with you and they declined?

You had a bad game and said, "I am never playing this game again!" but were back at the table the next day?

In first seat you bid a club, your left hand opponent bid two clubs, and you wondered what was going on?

You find out that, as dummy, you could not say anything as the hand is being played?

You realized, for the first time, that bridge was not just a game but a way of life?

When I entered the duplicate world, I found many better players willing to share their knowledge and who answered a plethora of questions for me. Do think about giving back to this great game that has given you so many hours of pleasure. Most importantly, be kind and considerate to new players for they are the future of the game.



2012 CALENDAR

MAY

7 Mon. Day
Unit-wide Championship, Local clubs
10 Thurs. PM
ACBL Int'l Fund Game #2, Local clubs
18-20 Fri.-Sun.
Connecticut Spring Sect., Hamden, CT
23-28 Wed.-Mon.
New York City Regional, New York, NY

JUNE

1 Fri. PM
Worldwide Bridge Contest #1, Local clubs
2 Sat. PM
Worldwide Bridge Contest #2, Local clubs
4-10 Mon.-Sun.
STaC with North Jersey (U106), Local Clubs
12 Tues. Day
Unit-wide Championship, Local clubs
15 Fri. Day
Unit-wide Championship, Local Clubs
18-24 Mon.-Sun.
NE Summer Regional, Sturbridge, MA
28 Thurs. PM
Local (Split) Championship, Local clubs

JULY

11 Wed. Day
Unit-wide Championship, Local clubs
12-22 Thurs.-4th Sun.
ACBL Summer Nationals, Philadelphia, PA
13 Fri. PM
ACBL Int'l Fund Game #3, Local clubs
31 Tues. Day
Unit-wide Championship, Local clubs

AUGUST

6 Mon. PM
Local (Split) Championship, Local clubs
14 Tues. PM
Local (Split) Championship, Local Clubs
17-19 Fri.-Sun.
Connecticut Summer Sect., Greenwich, CT
21 Tues. Day
Local (Split) Championship, Local clubs

Aug.-Sept.

27-3 Mon.-Mon.
New England Fiesta Regional, Warwick, RI

SEPTEMBER

14 Fri. Day
Unit-wide Championship, Local Clubs
19 Wed. Day
Local (Split) Championship, Local Clubs
20 Thurs. Day
Unit-wide Championship, Local clubs
22 Sat. Day
Local (Split) Championship, Local Clubs

OCTOBER

4 Thurs. PM
ACBL-wide Instant Match Point, Local clubs
5-7 Fri.-Sun.
Sid Cohen Sectional, Hartford, CT
12-18 Fri.-Thurs.
STaC with North Jersey (U106), Local Clubs
20-21 Sat.-Sun.
District 25 NAP Qualifying
22-28 Mon.-Sun.
District 3 Regional, Danbury, CT

NOVEMBER

1 Thurs. Day
Unit-wide Championship, Local clubs
2-4 Fri.-Sun.
Jeff Feldman Memorial, Hamden, CT
14-18 Wed.-Sun.
NE Masters Regional, Mansfield, MA

Nov.-Dec.

22-2 Thurs.-1st Sun.
ACBL Fall Nationals, San Francisco, CA
26 Mon. PM
ACBL-wide Charity Game #2, Local clubs

DECEMBER

5 Wed. Day
Unit-wide Championship, Local clubs
10 Mon. Day
Local (Split) Championship, Local clubs
11 Tues. PM
Local (Split) Championship, Local Clubs
14 Fri. Day
Unit-wide Charity, Local Clubs

THE KIBITZER

The Kibitzer is published quarterly by the Connecticut Bridge Association, Unit 126 of the American Contract Bridge League.

All comments, news, items related to the bridge world and of interest to our readers are welcome. Please send all items for the next Kibitzer by July 15, 2012.

Editor: Tom Proulx
34 Saint Mary's Lane
Norwalk, CT 06851

Phone: 203-847-2426
Email: twproulx@optonline.net

You can see The Kibitzer
in blazing color
at the CT bridge site:
<http://www.ctbridge.org>

If you would like to receive
The Kibitzer via e-mail, let us
know. Email Tom Proulx at
twproulx@optonline.net

Your CBA

President	Phyllis Bausher	203-389-5918
Vice President	Sandy DeMartino	203-637-2781
Secretary	Debbie Noack	203-924-5624
Treasurer	Susan Seckinger	860-513-1127
Past President	Burt Gischner	860-691-1484
Tournament Coordinator	Susan Seckinger	860-513-1127
Unit Coordinator	Don Stiegler	203-929-6595
Recorder	Leonard Russman	203-245-6850

CBA Web site <http://www.ctbridge.org>

Your Link to the Board

Central	Kay Frangione	860-621-7233
Eastern	Janet Gischner	860-691-1484
Fairfield	Esther Watstein	203-375-5489
Hartford	Betty Nagle	860-529-7667
Northwestern	Sonja Smith	860-653-5798
Panhandle	Allan Clamage	203-359-2609
Southern	Sarah Corning	203-453-3933
Southwestern	Tom Proulx	203-847-2426
Members-at-Large	Susan Rodricks	
	Judy Hess	203-255-8790
	Joyce Stiefel	860-563-0722
	Bill Watson	860-521-5243