

# THE KIBITZER May 2010

A NEWSLETTER OF THE CONNECTICUT BRIDGE ASSOCIATION

Volume 14 • Number 2



## Monitoring the Merrimac

by Harold Feldheim

Needless to say, this has nothing to do with famous naval battles but rather an interesting after-the-fact analysis of a failed game contract. The question was, irrespective of the result, did South take the correct line of play or did he overlook an obvious play at trick one?

Dealer: East

Vulnerability: None

NORTH

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

WEST

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

EAST

♠ Q J 10 9 8  
♥ 9 5 3  
♦ K 9 8  
♣ Q 4

SOUTH

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

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

This hand is from the finals of a team match between world class opponents.

The auction is self-explanatory. After East's opening weak 2♠ bid South had no choice but to pass and hope for a re-opening double, planning to pass for penalties. Quite logically, however, North reopened with his six card heart suit. South sat and thought a while before bidding 3NT. There were a few reasons not to do so. First, was the anemic qual-

ity of his spade stopper. Second, holding only one heart made potential communication questionable. Third, North might well have bid South's values when he balanced with 3♥. Remembering that "*Cowards die many times before their deaths; The valiant taste of death but once,*" he bravely bid 3NT.

West led the ♠K and South studied the hand. After some thought, playing East for a six card suit, he grabbed the first spade and attacked hearts. But reality struck when West put up the ace and played his remaining spade allowing partner to cash four more spade tricks - down one.

North was not happy with South's play and asked, not very politely, why he didn't simply duck the first spade, win the second spade, and only then begin his establishment of the heart suit. South listened patiently and then, as he sorted the next hand, offered the opinion that indeed, despite its failure, he took the best line of play and felt badly that North was too blind to see it. What do you think?

North's analysis was correct, but only to a point. South could certainly win the second spade and attack the hearts. When the smoke clears, he'd come to at least one spade, five hearts, one diamond, and three clubs. Look what happens, though, if West doesn't continue with a spade at trick two, but being cognizant of dummy's long suit, leads the ♦Q for an entry-killing switch. This play, known as the *Merrimac Coup*, defeats the contract. If South wins the diamond, he is cut off from the heart suit without two entries, while if he ducks West will continue diamonds and again the crucial entry is eliminated. Please notice that for this play to work, the only right card is the queen. If West switches to a small diamond, declarer can simply duck and the defenders are unable to kill dummy's entry to the heart suit. But against this defense, South cannot come to nine tricks. So, having foreseen this specter of the Merrimac coup, South made the only correct technical play by winning the first trick hoping that the spades divided 6-5-1-1.



### Outstanding Hospitality is our Goal

The goal of the Connecticut Bridge Association (CBA) and our tournament managers is to make the time you spend at our tournaments as enjoyable as possible. To that end, as the price of groceries has continued to increase over the past few years, we have worked hard to make our hospitality budget go as far as possible without having to increase table fees. That has allowed us to continue to offer a continental breakfast on Sunday mornings and a variety of snacks throughout the tournament that we hope appeal to all tastes and allow for special diet restrictions.

Unfortunately, our budget does not allow us to provide lunch for everyone during the short breaks between the two sessions each day. We recommend that you bring your own lunch or snacks to supplement those that we offer or plan to purchase the lunch we have delivered on Sundays. We would like to remind you that soda is NOT part of the free hospitality provided. Sodas are available for \$1.00 each.

We ask for your patience if there are times when we run out of snacks or have not had a chance to replenish the snack tables. We are doing our best to accommodate everyone and make your experience at our sectional tournaments pleasant and fun.

We also want to remind you that our sectional tournaments would not be possible without the work of volunteers. There are a variety of ways that you can support the CBA and its tournaments by volunteering just a small amount of time. If you are interested in helping out, please contact any of the Board members listed on the back page of this newsletter. We will be happy to help you find a task that suits your availability and interests.

Finally, because our tournaments are run by volunteers, we need your help keeping our sites neat and clean. Please pick up after yourself, and have a great time at the tables!

# Grand Slam Swings

by Brett Adler



Grand slams aren't that common, and in a recent Regional tournament, three potential grand slam hands were dealt to my partner and me. Because the risk/reward for grand slams is substantial, they always heighten the tension at the table. But as you can often count all 13 tricks in the bidding, rarely will they generate a swing. Of course, all three of these hands generated swings!

The first was in the final of the main knockout event and I had a nine-card trump fit missing the Queen. There were two reasons that I bid the grand slam on this hand. First, from the auction I thought we had a trump fit with at least 10 cards so I was less worried about the Queen. Second, even if I had known we only had nine trumps, the match wasn't going well and we needed a big result to get back into the match.

The good news was that the grand was absolutely cold as I could finesse either opponent for the missing Queen. The bad news was that I couldn't see through the backs of the cards and went one down when trumps broke 3-1 (I played for a 2-2 split).

Making the grand slam wouldn't have saved the match, but it would have made it a lot closer. On to the next event which was a Compact Knock Out and this hand occurred in the semi-final:

NORTH			
♠ 5 4			
♥ K J 5			
♦ 10 9 7			
♣ A K J 8 6			
SOUTH			
♠ - - -			
♥ A Q 10 8 4			
♦ A K Q J 8 6 4			
♣ 3			
West	North	East	South
1♠	2♣	3♠	1♦
			?

As with a lot of bridge hands, there are many ways to bid the cards. In hindsight I think 4♦ might be the best bid as it is natural and forcing, but there are many other options such as 4♠; 5♠; 5♥; 4NT, 5NT, 6♦, and I'm sure some of you will come up with more options. I of course wasn't thinking of just 7♦, but

thought 7♥ might be the right contract (which it was), so I made the "master bid" of 4♥. At the time I thought this was a reverse and forcing, but in hindsight this was a dumb thing to do as I was playing with a brand new partner and we had never discussed sequences like this.

I've shown this hand to a few experts most of whom agreed that 4♥ was forcing, but my endeavor was not rewarded as my 4♥ bid ended the auction. I suppose on the positive side I made three overtricks when our opponents at the other table made no overtricks in their 7♦ contract, but this was a very costly IMP swing. In the auction at the other table, West had also overcalled 1♠, but that was the end of the interference and the grand slam was easily bid. Despite this bad result, we still squeaked through the match and I had the opportunity for a return match against the team that had beaten me up the day before (grand slam hand one above), even though all of my teammates were different.

The match overall was close, and there was one big hand that was going to swing the match:

NORTH	
♠	K J 5
♥	7 4
♦	A K Q 10 9 8 4
♣	6

SOUTH (my hand)	
♠	A 8 6 2
♥	A Q J 8
♦	- - -
♣	A K Q 9 7

West	North	East	South
	1♦	Pass	2♣
Pass	3♦	Pass	3♥???
Pass	4NT	Pass	5♦
Pass	6♦	Pass	Pass ???

Sitting South and with 20 points, I was surprised that partner opened the bidding and then almost fell off my chair when he jumped to 3♦ rather than bidding 2♦ which still would have been forcing. The problem was that I had no idea what the jump meant. I knew it related to a quality diamond suit with at least seven in the suit, but had no idea

if it promised a no loser suit or a one loser suit. Partner meant to show a no loser suit so I should have bid 4NT, then 5NT, and bid 7NT once I found out about partner's K♠ to go with seven winning diamonds so I could count 13 tricks.

As I wasn't sure what partner had, I stalled by bidding 3♥ and partner now bid 4NT which we had agreed to play as Roman Key Card for the last bid suit (hearts). I showed my three key cards, and partner signed off in 6♦ as he wasn't sure if the missing key card was the ♥K (immaterial) or an Ace (extremely material). I now sat and stared at partner's small slam sign-off and thought for an absurd amount of time thinking about the auction, and whether I should raise partner to 7♦ or 7NT. After all, I had shown partner three Aces and still had eight more points I hadn't shown.

In the end, I decided I couldn't mastermind the final bid, as I had not limited my hand, but partner would/should have bid 5NT if all the key cards were held. I went quietly and held my breath as the hand played out.

According to the Bridge Encyclopedia, the probability of partner's diamond suit playing for seven tricks is 54% so in hindsight I don't want to be in the grand slam on a coin toss. Fortunately the diamonds did not break so we safely made our 12 tricks, while the opponents went down two in their contract of 7NT.

As we thought, this was the swing hand of the match. So at least I was able to get revenge for having been beaten up the day before.



## ANNOUNCEMENT

Unit-wide game results, besides being published in the Kibitzer and posted on the CBA web site, are posted to the ACBL web site under the link 'club game results', under the state, 'Connecticut' and the city, 'Norwalk'.

The club name is 'Unit 126 - Connecticut'.

# Can't Cost – Chapter 23

by John Stiefel



Are you a good defender? This is a trick question, because you don't defend any hands by yourself. So the question should be worded: Does your partnership defend well? True, it's good to give a careful analysis to the defensive prospects. But, in the end, defense is a partnership effort.

In this deal from a recent New England Knockout, East came up with a good analysis of the defensive prospects and defended accordingly. He would have been better off if he had asked for help from his partner.

Dealer: South  
Vulnerability: Both

NORTH  
 ♠ 8  
 ♥ 7 6 4 3 2  
 ♦ A K 8 2  
 ♣ Q 9 2

EAST  
 ♠ Q J 10 4 3  
 ♥ Q 9 5  
 ♦ 3  
 ♣ 10 7 4 3

The bidding:

East	South	West	North
	2NT	Pass	3♦
Pass	4♥	Pass	6♥
All Pass			

Opening Lead: ♥10

South played low from dummy at trick 1 and captured East's Queen with his King. He played the ♥A trick 2, West following and then led the ♥J to trick 3, West discarding a low diamond.

South took quite awhile to play to the first three tricks; so East took the opportunity to plan his defense. (Note: the next time *your* opponent plays a hand slowly, assume that it's a tough hand and use the time to plan your defense, instead of getting annoyed.) South probably has a diamond honor because West would likely have led the Queen from an original holding of QJ.

South also has shown up with ♥AKJ, so he probably has nine or ten points in the red suits. If he does have nine or ten points in the red suits however, he must have 11 or 12 points in the black suits. Therefore, he can't have AK in each black suit.

At trick 4, South led a diamond, West played low and – after some thought – South called for dummy's ace. Trick 5 was a low diamond and East threw a low spade, which rated to be safe. South played the ♦J to trick 5 and West won the Queen. At trick 6, West continued with the ♦10, dummy played the King, East discarded a club and South followed with the five.

East had given his discard to Trick 6 a lot of thought. He reasoned that:

1. If South has as little ♣AK8x, he will probably pick up the suit by leading the 9 to his ace, a low one back to the queen (scooping up the jack) and then a low one to his 8. (This is a "restricted choice" play. The odds favor finessing the 8 on the third round and South was a "plenty-good-enough" declarer to know that). So there didn't seem to be much point in keeping his clubs, as West would need to hold the jack *as well as the eight* to stop the suit.
2. On the other hand, throwing a spade would allow South to set up 2 winners in the suit with a ruff if he started with 5 spades to the AK. That would bring his total to 12 – five hearts, two diamonds, one club and *four* spades.

At this point, however, South had 12 tricks, having started with ♣AK65 and ♠A65. He ran two more trumps from the dummy and then cashed out the club suit. (It no longer mattered what the defense did after East threw a club at trick 6.)

Note that it doesn't even matter what East discards to trick 6. South was going to make the hand on a "double squeeze." In other words, he was going to play ♣AK to tricks 7 and 8 and then a club to dummy's Queen at trick 9. Then he would lead dummy's two good trumps to tricks 10 and 11. At trick 11, when dummy's last trump was led, East would have to discard from ♠QJ and ♣10. So, he would throw a spade to keep his club

guard. Declarer would then discard his ♣6 and West would have to discard from the ♠K9 of spades and the ♦9. He would presumably discard the ♠9 to keep his diamond guard. Then South's ♠Ax would take the last two tricks.

East analyzed the hand well *by himself*, but he missed a simple "can't cost" discard. At trick 5, when he threw the "safe" low spade, how could it have cost to discard the ♠Q? If he had, then West would realize that it "can't cost" to lead away from his ♠K at trick 6. He would lead the 2 (attitude – since E-W play "attitude in mid-hand" on defense). Then East would play West for the ♠K and keep all his clubs – and South would be down 1. (Try it.)

"Deep thought" people will point out that this hand is about "double squeeze defense" and how "attacking the entry to the central suit" is one good way to break up a double squeeze. I prefer to look at this hand as a simple "can't cost" opportunity – first for East to discard the ♠Q instead of the ♠3 and then for West to shift to the ♠2 (attitude).

What would have happened if West had the ♣K instead of the ♠K? Then he would have led a high spade spot to trick 7 (instead of the 2) and (later) East would keep his spades and West would keep the ♣K and his diamonds. South would not have enough tricks to develop a twelfth trick via a club-diamond squeeze against West.

The full deal was:

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





## Bridge Forum (Hamden)

### FIRST QUARTER RESULTS

#### TUESDAY

**Leading Pairs:** We are seeing more regular or exclusive partnerships on Tuesdays, with no individual in two top-ten partnerships. Al Guntermann-Carl Yohans have a modest lead over Don Brueggemann-Esther Watstein, Shirley Fruchter-Rita Levine, Jean Pyne-Pat Rooney and Fredda Kelly-Louise Wood.

**Player-of-the-Year:** It appears likely that we may have a first: the Tuesday and Friday sessions swapping Players-of-the-Year. Louise Wood, last year's Friday POY, has a good lead over the Guntermann-Yohans partnership (neither has played with anyone else yet), who are comfortably ahead of Shirley Fruchter.

**Leonora Stein Memorial Cup Preliminary Rounds:** Six of our seven living multiple cup winners reached the round of sixteen, but none reached the semifinals. Defending champion Bob Hawes and 20-cup winner Louise Wood went out in the third round. In the quarterfinals, Shirley Fruchter defeated 2001-2 champion Muriel Romero; Rita Brieger defeated Rita Levine by half a matchpoint; Carl Yohans defeated 2000 and 2008 champion Billie Hecker, and Joe Pagerino defeated 2003 champion Fredda Kelly. The women meet in one semifinal and the men in the other. Any winner other than Carl would be our 28th different cup winner.

#### FRIDAY

**Leading Pairs:** Hill Auerbach-Larry Stern have a modest lead over a tight pack: Billie Hecker-Fredda Kelly, Shirley Fruchter-Arlene Leshine, Brenda Harvey-Bob Hawes and Donna Hersch-Pat Rogers. Fredda is in three of the top ten pairs; Billie and Joe Pagerino are in two.

**Player-of-the-Year:** Bob Hawes, Arlene Leshine and Fredda Kelly are well ahead of Greg Klein and a tightly-bunched pack. Louise Wood's run of four years as the Friday POY is in jeopardy, as she finishes the winter in 21st place. As Arlene tends to be a closer and Bob plays golf, it seems reasonable to establish Arlene as the favorite to win her third POY to go with wins in 2001 and 2004.

**Aldyth Claiborn Memorial Cup Preliminary Rounds:** All four semifinalists have won other cups, but the Claiborn is guaranteed to extend its record of being the only cup no one

has won twice. In the quarterfinals, Arlene Leshine defeated Pat Rogers; Carl Yohans defeated Shirley Fruchter; Fredda Kelly defeated Robert Klopp, and Bob Hawes defeated 2007 champion Brenda Harvey. The women meet in one semifinal, the men in the other. Carl or Bob would be this cup's first male champion; Carl or Arlene would be our tenth multiple cup winner.

**Tuesday-Friday Combined:** The top five players overall for the winter quarter were Rita Brieger, Tracy Selmon, Harold Miller, Fredda Kelly and Shirley Fruchter.

## Wee Burn News

The 2010 Winter Series ended March 25 with the following pairs as winners:

1. Audrey Cadwallader-Belinda Metzger.
2. Linda Cleveland-Karen Barrett.
3. Lois Berry-Ann Fuller.
4. Mary Richardson-Betty Hodgman.
5. Barbara Trainer-Barbara Johnson.
6. Ellie Allen-Lorraine Belleveau.

Wee Burn players participated in the Interclub on February 25. With 129 tables in play, Betty McCoy and Martha Murphy placed 5th in flight A.

Our April 1 Charity Game was won by Bobbie Oakford and Barbie Upson, with Lois Berry and Ann Fuller as runners-up. Proceeds went to the ACBL Charity Foundation.

The April 8 Swiss Teams was won by Janet Soskin, Kathie Rowland, Linda Cleveland, and Karen Barrett with Audrey Cadwallader, Belinda Metzger, Marilyn Tjader, and Martha Hathaway as runners-up.

We extend congratulations to Audrey Cadwallader who took some time off from bridge in February so that she could climb Mt. Kilimanjaro. She was in a group of three, so no bridge was played at the summit.

## Madison Duplicate Bridge

The Madison Duplicate Bridge Game, at the Old Town Hall on the Green in Madison, CT, has changed its starting time from 7:00 P.M. to 1:00 P.M. You may call for a partner or walk in without a partner.

For information, contact Sarah Corning: (203) 453-3933 or sarah@shorelinebridge.com  
Connie Graham: (203) 421-3500 or connie@shorelinebridge.com

The club will hold the following special games in 2010:

- May 4 Club Championship
- June 8 STAC game
- June 15 Unit Wide game
- July 20 Club Championship
- Aug. 3 Unit Wide game
- Sept. 21 Club Membership game
- Oct. 12 Club Appreciation game
- Nov. 16 Club Championship

## Shoreline Affiliated

Do you like to play Swiss Teams at a club game? Shoreline Affiliated Bridge Clubs has games –

#### MONDAYS:

- May 17 Club Championship
  - June 7 STaC
  - Aug. 9 STaC
  - Sept. 13 or 20 Club Champ Championship (Annual Party)
  - Oct. 18 Club Appreciation
  - Nov. 22 STaC
- All games start at 6:45 PM at Branford Community Center

#### THURSDAYS:

- June 10 STaC
  - Aug. 26 Club Chair (Memorial for Roy Andrews & Dee Altieri)
  - Oct. 7 Club Appreciation
  - Nov. 18 STaC
- All games start at 10:00 AM at Madison Old Town Hall (on the green).

For more information, or to register, call Dave Hyatt 203-506-7753. Also on the web: [www.cuebid.com](http://www.cuebid.com), then chose CT and Shoreline Affiliated.

It would be appreciated if you would advance register for these games.

## MILESTONES AND CONGRATULATIONS

Congratulations to ACBL President Rich DeMartino who has passed the 20,000-masterpoint mark!

#### New Life Masters

Ellen Finch  
Donna Malitzis  
Carolyn Olschefski  
Phillip Olschefski  
G. Thomas Pumo  
Inge Schuele  
Diane Storey  
Michael Wavada

**Bronze Life Masters**  
(500 MPs)  
Stanley Berkowitz  
Joan Carter

#### Bronze con't

Robert Hawes  
Virginia Labbadia  
Carolyn Olschefski  
Sally Title

#### Silver Life Masters

(1000 MPs)  
Renee Nelson  
Jose Pantoja  
William Watson

**Gold Life Master**  
(2500 MPs)  
Arthur Crystal



# Bridge at the Lunatic Fringe – #14: A Steppingstone Squeeze - Pseudo-Crocodile Coup

by Al Wolf

Today's hand features Cecil Horne on defense. Cecil of course is notorious for making the expert play at the wrong time, sometimes allowing impossible contracts to make. On the following hand, his extreme efforts to avoid an awkward throw-in did not cost anything, but resulted in declarer making a trick from a most unlikely source.

NORTH  
(Prof. Lobochevski)

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

WEST  
(Minna)  
♠ J 10 6 4  
♥ Q J 4  
♦ Q 9 4 3  
♣ 8 2

EAST  
(Cecil Horne)  
♠ 8 5 3  
♥ 7 5  
♦ A K J  
♣ Q 10 9 7 5

SOUTH  
(Warren)  
♠ A K  
♥ A 10 9 8 6 2  
♦ 10 6 5  
♣ K J

The bidding:

West	North	East	South
Pass	Pass	1♣	1♥
Dbl	Reddbl	Pass	3♥
4♥	All Pass		

The bidding featured several marginal calls, all rather aggressive, starting with Cecil's light third-hand opening. Warren's overcall was sound, but Minna's negative double was minimal, and not to everyone's taste. North redoubled, showing "cards" (e.g. a fairly good hand), and tolerance for hearts. Cecil passed, allowing his partner to rescue if needed. Warren might have passed at this point, and then decide what to do when the opponents pulled the redouble. But with a fair 6-card suit and a sound overcall, he thought it better to bid 3♥ immediately (a bit light), inviting game. Professor Lobochevski accepted the invitation, carrying on to the 4♥ game.

Clearly, the contract could have been defeated with a diamond lead, as the opponents can take three diamonds off the top, plus a sure trump trick. But Minna not surprisingly chose to lead the

♣8, top of a doubleton in partner's bid suit. Cecil played low, and Warren won the first trick with the Jack.

Now Warren had an opportunity to shed a diamond loser on the third round of spades, as the spades were likely divided 4-3 based on the negative double. So he cashed the ♠AK, and led a trump to dummy's King. Then he took the ♠Q, shedding a losing diamond from hand.

Next, Warren led a trump from dummy. Missing the Q and J of trumps, it is often right to take a "safety" play at this point, and insert the eight, nine or ten of trumps when second hand plays low. This saves a trick when second hand holds QJxx.

But on this hand, Warren was concerned about the opening club lead being a singleton. In that case, there was a danger that West would win, lead a diamond to partner, and make a second trump trick by ruffing a club. So he instead decided to take the straightforward line of going up with the ♥A, relying on a normal 3-2 trump break. He then led the third round of trumps.

Winning the ♥Q, Minna saw that there was no future in clubs. She should have worked out that partner almost surely would have the ♦A and ♦K, to justify even a light third-hand opening, but she did not do so. She thought instead that leading the J♠ for declarer to ruff would be a safe exit. Cecil began to squirm as he discarded a club on this trick.

At this point, many declarers would throw in the towel, conceding two diamond tricks, but Warren played on, expecting that Cecil might be under some pressure on the run of trump winners. On the next trump lead, Minna discarded her remaining club immediately, giving both her partner and declarer a perfect count of the hand.

Cecil anticipated the trouble ahead, as he had to keep the guarded ♣Q in order to prevent declarer from overtaking with the club winner in dummy, and making extra club tricks. Yet if he discarded normally in the three-card ending he would be down to a diamond winner and two clubs. Declarer would cash the ♣K, throw him in with his winning diamond, and make the last trick with the ♣A. This advanced position is known by the descriptive name of a Steppingstone

Squeeze. In an attempt to avoid this unhappy fate, Cecil discarded the A♦ and K♦ on the next trump leads, resulting in this four-card ending:

NORTH

♠ - - -  
♥ - - -  
♦ 8  
♣ A 6 4

WEST

♠ - - -  
♥ - - -  
♦ Q 9 4 3  
♣ - - -

EAST

♠ - - -  
♥ - - -  
♦ J  
♣ Q 10 9

SOUTH

♠ - - -  
♥ 8  
♦ 10 6  
♣ K

Warren caught himself just in time from leading his last heart. If Cecil's remaining diamond was the Q or J, then Warren must NOT lead that last heart, allowing Cecil to discard that diamond honor as well, leaving Minna with the Q 9 sitting over his ten.

So in the diagrammed position, Warren led the ♣K, followed by the ♦6. It did not matter now what the defense did. Declarer was bound to make an extra trick in either clubs or diamonds.

In actuality, Minna was still relatively new to the game, and had not counted out the hands perfectly. But, she saw Cecil's discards of the ♦A and ♦K, clearly trying to avoid an end-play. Minna had recently heard of the expert play called the Crocodile Coup, where a defender plays an unnecessarily high card to win a trick, swallowing up partner's honor and taking partner off an end-play. So she thought she could be a heroine, going up with the ♦Q, swallowing the ♦J. Warren then took the thirteenth trick with the ♦10. Four hearts making with an overtrick was a cold top on the board.

The main lesson of this hand: You don't need to have knowledge of these advanced plays. When there's nothing better to do, run your winners. Sometimes the opponents make a mistake, and sometimes they come under pressure in an unexpected way.



# Play to Win

by Robert L. Klopp



Duplicate bridge is a “zero sum game” in that half the players win, or place by rank order, in comparison to the other players in the same game. This means, necessarily, that half the players lose. Fifty percent (50%) then is the mean for each hand, game and match. If the goal is to win, then players must continuously monitor their bidding, playing, and results. Starting from scratch, as in Zero Base Budgeting (popular back in the 1960’s), the new player has many books, teachers, and even computer software from which to learn how to play. There are many approaches. Which approach is best depends on each student and the level of commitment in time, money, and effort.

I would like to suggest that learning to play bridge is an on-going process, that scoring well is an integral part of the never ending feed-back process and that earning rewards (master points) serves to motivate the student. What, then, is necessary for winning and improving?

Before going further there is one important point to make. The best players and authors will always tell you that good matchpoint tactics are not necessarily good bridge. The new player can easily lose sight of this fact when he makes the “correct” bid and gets a poor score on any given board. New players need to focus on playing good bridge. Then they can make the adjustments necessary to score better at matchpoints.

What will be presented here is a feed-back loop that each student can use for self evaluation at any level of play. Each student, or, player, needs a critical review of his play, starting with each hand played, so that the student can know what is the optimum solution for each hand and how well did he do in comparison. This implies that there are many possibilities for each hand. The “Bidding Box” and “Your Call”, both monthly features in the ACBL’s *Bridge Bulletin* point out not only the different possibilities for each hand, but also the optimum results.

At the club level, bidding and making the contract for each hand may be the starting goal. Then, as the student progresses, each hand can be evaluated in terms of optimum contract, and the final result.

With a hard copy of the score sheet for each game, and with the individual score card, the student can review, overall, how he did in comparison to the other winners. This takes time. And learning how to evaluate and compare results will not be given here.

This entire process is made much easier when hand records are available for each player to use as an aid in his self evaluation and critical review of his play. This hand record, together with the individual score card, and the score sheet of the final results will allow comparison of his score with the top-ranked players in each game. Take the spread sheet, highlight the column for your pair, and those of the top three players in the same direction, and compare each board. You will learn what each score means, Each player will learn how to match point hands, how to interpret results and how to find and correct bidding and playing errors.

An example of this, similar to hand below, was from a game in Washington, D.C. this last summer, where my partner and I were in 3NT, making, for a bottom board, when everyone else was in 4♣ making 4, 5, or 6.

Dealer: South  
Vulnerability: North-South

NORTH		WEST		EAST		SOUTH	
♠	K Q 10 7 4	♠	A 6	♠	J 5 2	♠	9 8 3
♥	K 5 3	♥	10 6 2	♥	Q 9 8 4	♥	A J 7
♦	A 6 3	♦	9 8 7 5	♦	J 4	♦	K Q 10 2
♣	7 2	♣	K 10 8 6	♣	A 5 4 3	♣	Q J 9
West	North	East	South				
Pass	1♠	Pass	1NT				
Pass	3NT	All Pass					

This is the bidding by my partner and I. At most other tables, the bidding was:

West	North	East	South
			1♦
Pass	1♠	Pass	1NT
Pass	2♣ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	2♠
Pass	4♠	All Pass	

<sup>1</sup> New Minor Forcing

New Minor Forcing is a popular convention which can be used by responder to ask opener to describe his hand further. In this case South bids 2♠ which indicates three-card support and North bids the game in spades. I suggest you consult one of the many good descriptions of this convention to see the full details. Because of this result my partner and I decided to try New Minor Forcing and have not repeated that error.

To summarize, correct the errors and become better players. Then, see what is necessary to improve your matchpoint score.



## Baldwin Flight A NAOP Champs!



Congratulations to Frank Merblum of Bloomfield and Doug Doub of West Hartford, the winners of the Baldwin Flight A North American Open Pairs in Reno, NV. In a very close final Merblum and Doub finished with a score of 417.53 (13 top) which was 1.32 points ahead of the second place pair and 3.67 points better than third.

# Results



## UNIT-WIDE CHAMPIONSHIP January 25, 2010

### FLIGHT A EVENT LEADERS

1	<b>C. Nadel Farin – P. Farin</b>
2	L. Stiberth – B. Titley
3	J. Orr – H. Feldheim
4	P. Amedeo – C. Marcella
5	M. Tjader – M. Hathaway
6	N. Augenstein – S. Augenstein
7	J. Merrill – S. Pflederer

### FLIGHT B EVENT LEADERS

1	<b>C. Nadel Farin – P. Farin</b>
2	L. Stiberth – B. Titley
3	P. Amedeo – C. Marcella
4	M. Tjader – M. Hathaway
5	N. Augenstein – S. Augenstein
6	R. Doucette – A. Fuller

### FLIGHT C EVENT LEADERS

1	<b>C. Nadel Farin – P. Farin</b>
2	B. Moore – M. Molwitz
3	M. Moynihan – L. Holland
4	D. Rowland – C. Ferguson
5	G. Hayes – S. Schroeder
6	C. Hue – M. Raphan

## WINTER IN CONNECTICUT HAMDEN CT February 26-28, 2010

### FRIDAY MORNING OPEN PAIRS

A	B	C	Names
1			<b>J. Orr – H. Feldheim</b>
2			L. Bausher – P. Bausher
3			C. Graham – C. Michael
4			B.J. Corbani – P. Miller
5			H. Zusman – D. Montgomery
6			T. Hyde – E. Lewis III
1	1		<b>M. Colburn – J. Dinius</b>
2			L. Green – D. Blackburn
3/4			J. Mehta – O. Chhabra
3/4	2		J. Condon Jr. – J. Young
5	3		R. Hawes – B. Harvey
4			L. Englehart – C. Hill

### FRIDAY AFTERNOON OPEN PAIRS

A	B	C	Names
1			<b>D. Elie – S. Corning</b>
2			S. Budds – A. Clamage
3			L. Lau – S. Rodricks
4			J. Stiefel – R. DeMartino
5			J. Stiefel – S. DeMartino
6			J. Orr – H. Feldheim
1	1		<b>C. Hill – L. Englehart</b>
2	2		S. Smedes – G. Smedes
3	3		E. Finch – J.S-M. Lee
4	4		J. Morrin – L. Bowman
5			R. Hawes – J. Tames

### SATURDAY MORNING STRATIFIED A/X PAIRS

A	X	Names
1		<b>C. Joseph – D. Doub</b>
2		S. DeMartino – P. Bausher
3		J. Gischner – B. Gischner
4	1	<b>A. Geaski – B. Kliman</b>
5		L. Bausher – R. DeMartino
6		J. Orr – H. Feldheim
2		A. Brookes – W.Y. Qi

3		D. Montgomery – H. Lawrence
4		L. Zeisler – J. Martin

### SATURDAY MORNING STRATIFIED B/C PAIRS

B	C	Names
1		<b>M. Strickland – J. Bramley</b>
2	1	<b>T. Thompson – R. Lebel</b>
3		A. Hummel – A. Housholder
4		R. Aspinwall – J. Schiaroli
5		R. Klopp – R. Hawes
6	2	M. Wavada – S. Smith
3		L. Somers – B. Payton
4		H. Jancis – M. Jancis

### SATURDAY MORNING 299ER PAIRS

A	B	C	Names
1	1		<b>B. Kaplan – J. Kaplan</b>
2	2	1	<b>R. Talbot – L. May</b>
3			S. Byron – W. Rinehart
4	3		A. Jain – A. Jain
	2		H. Dobyns – B. Adams

### SATURDAY AFTERNOON STRATIFIED A/X PAIRS

A	X	Names
1		<b>K. Chawla – D. Kowarsky</b>
2	1	<b>A. Crystal – D. Benner</b>
3		J. Greer – A. Clamage
4		C. Michael – C. Graham
5	2	S. Seckinger – S. Rodricks
6		L. Bausher – R. DeMartino
3		A. Geaski – B. Kliman
4		S. Smith – D. Rock

### SATURDAY AFTERNOON STRATIFIED B/C PAIRS

B	C	Names
1	1	<b>M. Eisenberg – E. Inman</b>
2	2	T. Thompson – R. Lebel
3		R. Klopp – R. Hawes
4		L. Green – D. Blackburn
5		R. Aspinwall – J. Schiaroli
6		E. Misner – J. Misner
3		K. Largay – J. Gillin

### SATURDAY AFTERNOON 299ER PAIRS

A	B	C	Names
1	1	1	<b>R. Talbot – L. May</b>
2	2	2	K. Wood – B. Adams
3	3	3	J. Zucker – H. Dobyns
4	4		W.Y. Qi – A. Brookes
5			S. Byron – W. Rinehart

### SUNDAY SWISS BRACKET 1

Rank	Names
1	<b>V. King, D. Doub, D. Wolkowitz, S. Huhman</b>
2/3	M. Lucey, J. Greer, L. Lau, B. Adler
2/3	S. Smith, D. Rock, D. Stiegler, P. Burnham

### SUNDAY SWISS BRACKET 2

Rank	Names
1	<b>D. Noack, G. Seckinger, J. Farwell, R. Rising</b>
2	H. Pawlowski, E. Nagle, S. Seckinger, H. Strauss
3	B. Sloan, J. Bramley, M. Stasiewski, A. Ardolino

### SUNDAY SWISS BRACKET 3

Rank	Names
1	<b>R. Klopp, C. Heckman, G. Holland, R. Hawes</b>
2	J. Pagerino, H. Shields, R. Manger-Tilney, D. Kerwin
3	J. Hirsch, C. Joseph, P. Makhijani, J. Striefler
4	T. Gerchman, M. Wavada, R. Derrah, S. Derrah
5/6	R. Sternberg, V. Labbadia, J. S-M Lee, E. Finch
5/6	R. Lebel, P. Kelsey, A. Jones, B. Buehler

## UNIT-WIDE CHAMPIONSHIP Friday Morning, March 26, 2010

### FLIGHT A EVENT LEADERS

1	L. Selig – A. Siuta
2	C. Marcella – B. Fisher
3/4	L. Stiberth – G. Holland
3/4	L. Cale – B. Titley
5	Y.-L. Shiue – C. Hurley
6	V. Labbadia – J. Pyka
7	J. Cleary – D. Margolin
8	N. Krech – N. Mumford

### FLIGHT B EVENT LEADERS

1	L. Selig – A. Siuta
2	C. Marcella – B. Fisher
3/4	L. Stiberth – G. Holland
3/4	L. Cale – B. Titley
5	V. Labbadia – J. Pyka
6	D. Keller – J. Tames

### FLIGHT C EVENT LEADERS

1	S. Lewis – R. Aspinwall
2	J. Dean – E. Dean
3	J. Larkin – M. Garilli
4	R. Talbot – L. May
5	D. Sanford – E. Fisher
6	F. Bird – J. Little

## UNIT WIDE CHAMPIONSHIP Friday April 16, 2010

### FLIGHT A EVENT LEADERS

1	Y.-L. Shiue – C. Hurley
2	J. Lai – D. Roy
3	M. Strickland – B. Sloan
4	J. Gensheimer – B. Cohn
5	H. Zusman – A. Clamage
6	G. Holmes – J. Hamm
7	R. Teitelman – S. Corning
8	H. Jacobs – J. Gischner

### FLIGHT B EVENT LEADERS

1	J. Lai – D. Roy
2	M. Strickland – B. Sloan
3	J. Gensheimer – B. Cohn
4	G. Holmes – J. Hamm
5	R. Lahey – J.M. Carmiggelt
6	B. Heidel – L. Brown

### FLIGHT C EVENT LEADERS

1	G. Holmes – J. Hamm
2	M. Mahland – N. Healy
3	E. Konowitz – L. Bowman
4	G. Levensen – L. Lacava
5	J. Little – F. Bird
6/7	M. Karbovanec – D. Storey
6/7	J. Moen – G. Moen



# Five-Five Come Alive?

by Gloria Sieron

When Marty Bergen wrote "Points Schmoints," he had in mind the power of the distributional hand, where the quality of the hand is more important than the actual point count. Another catch phrase that applies to distributional hands is: "Six-Four Bid Some More."

At the end of a three-board session, East/West arrive at Table 1 to play the last round. This is what happened on Board 27, the last board of the day.

Dealer: South  
Vulnerability: None

**NORTH**  
♠ 10 9 8 7 6  
♥ Q 5 3  
♦ Q 9 5 4  
♣ J

**WEST**  
♠ A K Q J  
♥ J 9 8  
♦ A 8 7 3  
♣ 5 2

**EAST**  
♠ 5 4 3 2  
♥ 4 2  
♦ 6 2  
♣ A 7 6 4 3

**SOUTH**  
♠ - - -  
♥ A K 10 7 6  
♦ K J 10  
♣ K Q 10 9 8

South West North East  
1♥ Pass 2♥ Pass  
4♥ All Pass

Opening Lead: ♠A

After South opens 1♥, what would you do with West's 15-high card points?

You have three options: Pass, overcall with a four-card suit, or double with no support for clubs. (*Personally, I bid 1♠.* – Ed.) Whatever you do, you will most likely be outbid by South when he comes alive with his five-five hand.

North, with a singleton and two Queens (one in trumps), raised partner one level. South, with a four loser hand, decided to blast to game.

West led the ♠A, but it was trumped by South. South, disregarded the singleton club, proceeded to draw trump in three rounds, ending up in his hand. At trick five, South played the enigmatic ♦10. This was West's moment. He could either put on his Sherlock Holmes deerstalker deductive thinking cap or conclude, "This game is almost over and I have to go home to walk the dog."

Sherlock Holmes would reason, "Why didn't declarer make use of the singleton ♣J? Why did he draw trumps immediately? Could the ♦10 possibly



be declarer's tenth trick? (*If West ducks, declarer switches to clubs and makes ten tricks.* – Ed.) Rising to the occasion, West pounced on the innocent looking ♦10 with his Ace and led the ♠K, forcing declarer to utilize his last trump. When partner took the ♣A, he led another spade to the Queen and Jack. The defense took four tricks and set declarer one.

Sherlock Holmes would say "It's Elementary."



## 2010 Calendar

### MAY

26-31

New York City Regional,  
New York, NY

### JUNE

4 Night

Worldwide Bridge Contest

5 Day

Worldwide Bridge Contest

7-13

Sectional Tournament at Clubs

15 Day

Unit-Wide Championship

21-27

New England Summer Regional,  
Sturbridge, MA

### JULY

1 Night

Local (Split) Championship

6 Night

Local (Split) Championship

14 Day

Unit-Wide Championship

22- Aug 1

ACBL Summer Nationals,  
New Orleans, LA

23 Night

ACBL International Fund Game

### AUGUST

3 Day

Unit-Wide Championship

9 Night

Local (Split) Championship

20-22

Summer Sectional, Greenwich, CT

17 Night

Local (Split) Championship

24 Day

Local Championship

### SEPTEMBER

1-6

New England Fall Regional,  
Nashua, NH

10-12

Sid Cohen Sectional, Hartford, CT

15 Day

Local (Split) Championship

16 Night

ACBL-wide Instant Match Point

23 Day

Unit-Wide Championship

### OCTOBER

8 Day

Unit-Wide Championship

16 Day

Local (Split) Championship

25-31

Danbury Fall Regional (District 3),  
Danbury, CT

### NOVEMBER

2 Night

Local (Split) Championship

4 Day

Unit-Wide Championship

10-14

New England Regional,  
Waterbury, CT

17-23

Sectional Tournament at Clubs

25-Dec 5

Fall Nationals, Orlando, FL

29 Night

ACBL-wide Charity Game #2

### DECEMBER

Nov 25 - 5

Fall Nationals, Orlando, FL

8 Day

Unit-Wide Championship

10-12

Jeff Feldman Sectional, Hamden, CT

13 Day

Local (Split) Championship

26-30

New York City Holiday Regional,  
New York, NY

## Your CBA

**Kibitzer Contact: Tom Proulx**  
[twproulx@optonline.net](mailto:twproulx@optonline.net)

President	Burt Gischner	860-691-1484
Vice President	Phyllis Bausher	203-389-5918
Secretary	Debbie Noack	203-380-0107
Treasurer	Susan Seckinger	860-513-1127
Past President	Ausra Geaski	860-533-7271
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

If you have something to say, suggest, or complain about, tell your representative, who is a Board member and your link to being heard.

Central	Kay Frangione	860-621-7233
Fairfield	Esther Watstein	203-375-5489
Hartford	Betty Nagle	860-529-7667
Northwestern	Sonja Smith	860-653-5798
Panhandle	Sandy DeMartino	203-637-2781
Southern	Sarah Corning	203-453-3933
Eastern	Ed Sheperd	860-442-7418
Southwestern	Jennifer Williams	203-563-9468
Members-at-Large	Joyce Stiefel	860-563-0722
	Judy Hess	203-255-8790
	Bill Watson	860-521-5243