

VOL. 56 No. 1 MARCH 2015

Let's embrace online bridge, not punish it

The ACBL management and board of directors have something of a schizophrenic attitude toward online bridge.

On one hand, they love the growth of online bridge and particularly the extra fees the league gets from sanctioned online games – most prominently, the 12-board speedball mini tournaments on Bridge Base and other sites.

Nonetheless. the league seems to be looking for ways to discourage or demean online play. Longstanding masterpoint award structures have been modified to limit the number of points awarded online. Points won online have been excluded from the Barry Crane Top 500 and other annual masterpoint races. And, most recently, the ACBL board of directors decided that on all printed lifetime masterpoint lists, online points will be included in a separate column next to the totals - as if there is something cheaper about online play that the general bridge public needs to recognize.

The going sentiment at ACBL seems to be that we are giving away too many masterpoints online, that it is a hotbed of cheating and that we shouldn't be awarding so many points for playing with so-called "robot" partners and opponents.

Masterpoints

There is no reason to treat masterpoints won online any differently from points won at club games. The online field is not very strong, but neither are most club games.

If we are paying too many masterpoints for a 12-board online game, then we should reduce the number of points. In fact, ACBL has already done that.

Really what is happening is that people are winning more points online because they

(Continued on page 2)

can play more — every hour. Isn't that a good thing? Isn't that how the masterpoint system works — encouraging people to play more? If necessary, we can put a limit on the number of minis you can play in a day.

Cheating

There probably isn't any more cheating online than anywhere else. Online cheating arguably is easier to spot and investigate because there is a complete record of every bid and play by every player.

Robot tournaments

There is nothing inherently wrong with paying masterpoints for "robot" tournaments in which both your partner and opponents are computer programs. One sore point is that you can finish a 12-board mini robot game in about 25 minutes or less and then play a second robot mini, all in the space of an hour, possibly winning points in both. If this is objectionable, it can be easily remedied: Only allow people to win points in one mini per hour. Or cut the number of points paid in robot events.

Going forward

Online bridge makes it possible for more people to play duplicate bridge. This includes shut-ins, people who live in

remote locations, those whose schedules do not fit with the usual club game start times, and those who can't or do not want to commit four hours to an afternoon or evening of bridge.

In the last year, total tournament attendance is down about three percent, as is the table count at "face-to-face" clubs. Meanwhile the online table count is up more than six percent. If these rates continue for another decade or so, there will be more tables played online each year than at "live" clubs.

What ACBL ought to be doing is making improvements in the online experience. For example, the league should be requiring a higher standard of play by the robots in sanctioned events. (There are much better programs available than the one currently used for robot minis on Bridge Base.) Some flighted games should be offered. And the league should start running sectional and regional rated tournaments online.

Rather than dreaming up new ways to punish online play, ACBL should be looking for ways to make it bigger and better.

-Marty Hirschman, editor

Michigan Bridge Association's

Michigan State Sectional March 26-29, 2015

SITE: The Bridge Connection (248-356-6254) 26776 Twelve Mile Road, Southfield (just west of Northwestern Highway)

Thursday, March 26

Swiss Team Lesson for New Players	12:30 p.m.			
Stratified Swiss Teams	1 p.m.			
*Stratified Non-LM Swiss Teams	1 p.m.			
Stratified Open Pairs				
*Stratified Non-LM Pairs	7 p.m.			
Friday, March 27	•			
Stratified Open Pairs	10 a.m.			
*Stratified Non-LM Pairs	10 a.m.			
Stratified Open Pairs				
*Stratified Non-LM Pairs				
Stratified Open Pairs	7 p.m.			
*Stratified Non-LM Pairs				
Saturday, March 28	•			
Stratified Open Swiss Teams	10 a.m.			
Playthrough–7 matches				
Stratified Open Pairs (single session)	10 a.m.			
*Stratified Non-LM Pairs (single session)	10 a.m.			
Stratified Open Pairs (single session)	2 p.m.			
*Stratified Non-LM Pairs (single session)	2 p.m.			
Sunday, March 29				
Stratified Open Swiss Teams	11 a.m.			
Playthrough–7 matches				
Stratified Open Pairs (single session)	11 a.m.			
*Stratified Non-LM Pairs (single session)				
Stratified Open Pairs (single session)				
*Stratified Non-LM Pairs (single session)				

*Starred events are open only to non-Life Masters with fewer than 500 masterpoints.

Stratified Events: A = 3000+, B = 1000-3000, C = 0-1000

Non-LM Strats: (0-20) (20-50) (50-200) (200-500) (as attendance warrants)

Average MP will be used to determine your strat.

Tournament Chair: Richard Temkin, 248-477-5642, richardtemkin@gmail.com Partnerships: Marilyn Crane, 734-591-3431, mqcrane@yahoo.com Sue McIlhiny, 313-563-4039, SUEMCILHINY@msn.com

Food will be provided on Saturday and Sunday NO SMOKING IN THE BUILDING

District 12 Website: www.district12bridge.org

TABLE TALK PAGE 3

TABLE TALK

Official publication
of the Michigan Bridge Association
30660 Woodgate Dr.,
Southfield MI 48076
248-646-3967
e-mail: MBATalk@aol.com

MARTIN HIRSCHMAN, Editor Production editor: Marcia Abramson

MBA Corresponding & Membership Secretary: Paul Pomeroy, 34069 Hathaway St., Livonia MI 48150, ppommd@aol.com, 734-421-0193

MBA Officers

Kurt Dasher.......president Richard Temkinpresident-elect Martin Hirschman chairman Stacey Tessler...recording secretary Bob Webber.....treasurer

Board of Directors

Julie Arbit, Shelley Boschan, Marilyn Crane, Kurt Dasher, Jonathan Fleischmann, Martin Hirschman (non-voting), Robert Katz, Grant Petersen, Paul Pomeroy, Patti Stoner, Richard Temkin, Stacey Tessler, Rosanne Winokur, Willie Winokur

MBA CLUB DIRECTORY

- ■Ann Arbor BC, Walden Hills Clubhouse, 2114 Pauline, Ann Arbor. Ray Gentz, 734-769-3994. Wednesday 7 p.m.
- ■Burns Center Bridge, 1320 Baldwin, Ann Arbor. Dick Fortune, 734-677-5674. Wednesday 12 p.m.
- ■Burns Park Bridge, 1320 Baldwin, Ann Arbor. Stacey Tessler, 734-623-8050. Thursday 12 p.m.
- ■Downriver BC, Southgate Civic Center, 14700 Reaume Pkwy., Southgate. Ron Smith, 519-969-4441. Tuesday 10:30 a.m.
- ■Ford DBC, Ford Motor Company World Headquarters, Michigan Ave., Dearborn. Ellen Silverest, 810-225-2278. Tuesday 7 p.m.
- ■Friendly Friday BC, St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church, 375 Lothrop, Grosse Pointe Farms. Ed Anthony, 248-648-0989. Friday 12 p.m.
- ■Huron Valley Bridge Club, 9525 E. Highland Rd., Howell. Jim &

Cheryl Perna, 248-887-9283. Thursday 6 p.m.

- ■Neighborhood Club, 375 Lothrop, Grosse Pointe Farms. James Schmidt, 586-463-9835. Thursday 12 p.m., Sunday 1:30 p.m.
- ■Plymouth Community BC, 525 Farmer, Plymouth. Jim & Cheryl Perna, 248-887-9283. Tuesday 11:30 a.m., Wednesday 11:30 a.m.
- ■Thursday Evening Bridge, 1830 Washtenaw, Ann Arbor. Dorothy Kuhn, 734-761-6691. Thursday 7 p.m.
- ■Trenton DBC, 2700 Westfield, Trenton. Charles May, 734-301-3872. Thursday 7 p.m.
- ■War Memorial, 32 Lakeshore, Grosse Pointe. Judith Thomas, 313 -372-4218. Monday 12 p.m.
- **EYoung Center BC,** R.A. Young Recreation Center, 5400 McKinley, Dearborn Heights. Joyce Kozma, 313-274-5587. Wednesday 11 a.m.

PAGE 4 TABLE TALK

IT'S YOUR BID

By Marty Hirschman

Double, 4NT and the cuebid are particularly popular choices for those answering bidding contests such as this one. Strikingly often, the proponents of those bids seem to think – with varying degrees of reasonableness – that their bid shows almost exactly what they have. Take a careful look at some of the comments in problems 4 and 5 to see what I mean.

Congratulations to Jonathan Fleischmann and Don Rumelhart for their perfect 500s on this tough set. Also congrats to Valentin Enache for high score among readers.

You too can feel free to harbor intended meanings of varying reasonableness while submitting your answers to next issue's problems, found at the end of this article.

1. MTPTs. N-S vul. As SOUTH, you hold:

A1065 ♥KQ1084 +Q432 Avoid WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH 1A Dbl ?

Action	Score	Votes
4♣	100	12
4♠	60	4
2♣	60	3
Rdbl	50	2
3♥	40	1
Pass	30	0
2♥	30	0
3♣	30	0
2NT	10	0
3♠	10	0

First and foremost, we must get to at least 4\(\pm\). Secondarily, we would like to make it harder for the opponents to find their probably profitable 5\(\pm\) save and, if they do so, we want our partnership to make the winning 5-level decision.

Lastly, slam is still possible and we'd like to get there if partner has the right hand.

The panel choice of 4♣ – a splinter raise showing short clubs, 4+ spades and power raise to game – seems like the best way to achieve all these objectives. It commits to game, takes up room, and properly describes the essential features of the hand.

Julie Arbit (4♣): Splintering gets most of my hand off my chest, and I want partner to be able to make an informed high-level decision.

Howard Perlman (4♣): Leaves partner as well placed as possible should opponents save.

Joe Chiesa (4♣): Although I might prefer going more lei-

SCORES

Bob Webber

Willie Winokur

Experts: Jonathan Fleischmann Don Rumelhart Myles Maddox Joe Chiesa Bob Webber Suzy Burger Readers: Valentin Enache David Graff Gerald Wahl James Walter	500 Sarah Lampert 330 470 Sy Goodman 300 460 Bob Ondo 290 460 Michael Betzold 280 450 Margaret Carden 280 Stuart Dombey 280 Steven Jacob 280 Bob Solomon 280 Clarke Cunningham 260 360 Jerry Jefferies 260			340 330 290 280 280 280 280 m260	
HOW THE PANEL VOTED					
	1	2	3	4	5
Julie Arbit	4♣	<u>-</u> 4♠	5 ♣	4NT	5 ♠
Gene Benedict	4♠	3♠	5♠	4♠	6♥
Norm Bolton	2♣	3♦	5♣	5♦	5♠
Bob Brent	4♣	4♠	5♣	4NT	6♥
Brenda Bryant	2♣	3♠	4NT	Dbl	5♠
Chuck Burger	3♥	3♣	5♣	Dbl	5♠
Suzy Burger	Rdbl	3♠	5♣	Dbl	5♠
Bob Cappelli	4♣	2♦	4♠	Dbl	4NT
Joe Chiesa	4♣	3♠	5♣	Dbl	4NT
Jonathan Fleischmann	4♣	3♠	5♣	Dbl	5
Sam Hirschman	4♠	3♠	5♣	Dbl	6♥
Bob Katz	4♣	4♣	4♠	4NT	5
Sheldon Kirsch	4♣	4♠	5♣	4NT	5♠
Morrie Kleinplatz	4♠	4♠	5♠	Dbl	5♠
Marilyn Maddox	4♠	3♠	4NT	Dbl	5♠
Myles Maddox	4♣	3♠	4NT	Dbl	5♠
Howard Perlman	4♣	4♠	4NT	Dbl	4NT
Irv Rosenstein	2♣	3♣	4NT	4NT	5NT
Don Rumelhart	4♣	3♠	5♣	Dbl	5 ♠
Dick Temkin	4♣	4♠	4NT	Dbl	5♠
	4 -	^ .		4 N I T	- .

PAGE 6 TABLE TALK

Rdbl 2♦

3♠

5♣

5♣

4NT

5♦

5♠

5♠

4♣

surely (to maximize room), this offers a fair approximation of my hand type and strength and anticipates a club barrage.

Bob Katz (4♣): I prefer not splintering on voids since partner thinks we have a club loser, but if I bid 2♣ I likely never get a chance to show my hand. There could easily be a slam opposite even a relatively minimum overcall. MUCH too good to jump to 4♠.

On the other hand, bidding 4- gives West a chance to double clubs and encourage his partner to take a save.

Gene Benedict (4♠): This may prevent the opponents from finding a 5♣ save.

Morrie Kleinplatz (4♠): Tactics or precision? I choose tactics. 2♠ is technically right

but gives LHO a chance to bid or double. If after 4♠ LHO bids 5♠ and it comes around to me, I will have a problem. But in any other scenario I will be happy with my bid.

Sam Hirschman (4♠): I'm going to outbid them to 4♠ anyway. I might as well get there first and then let the opponents guess what to do. I'm not worried about missing a slam (I might not make 4♠), and I don't think I can get rich defending.

Other ideas:

Norm Bolton (2♠): Rather than a spade jump. More room to look for slam.

Irv Rosenstein (2♣): To be followed by another cue bid if partner responds with a minimum 2♠. My values rate to be working, and partner does not

Humor: Bridge Definitions

Partner: Player to blame for

your lack of success

TABLE TALK

Overtaking: Clever maneuver to get partner off lead so you don't have to watch him make another bad play

Stealing the contract: Bidding NT despite a big fit with partner's major so you don't have to watch his pitiful declarer play

Defensive signal: Play by partner that is highly likely to fool you into making the wrong shift

Postmortem: Discussion about

how partner screwed up

Bad luck: Failure of life to provide you with a better partner.

Optimist: One who believes he will soon have a better partner

PAGE 7

need much more than KQxxx of spades and a high diamond for game.

Chuck Burger (3♥): 2♥ nonforcing, but 3♥ is. 4♣ is reasonable but doesn't get source of tricks into play, and I hope to cue clubs later.

Suzy Burger (Rdbl): This is our hand. At least game, slam possible.

Willie Winokur (Rdbl): Ah, but the next round will be more interesting.

2. MTPTs. None vul. As SOUTH, you hold:

≜AKQJ62 ♥Q4 ◆KJ103 ♣10 WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH

14

Dbl 1	NT 2	?
Action	Score	Votes
3♠	100	10
4♠	70	6
2♦	50	2
3♣	50	2
3♦	50	1
4♣	40	1
2♠	20	0

If partner has as little as ♠xx ♥Kxxx ♠Qxxx ♣xxx we are a favorite to make a game, and he should have at least a little more than that to justify bidding over the double. I don't want to give him a chance to pass below game. So I would bid 4♠. Howard Perlman (4♠): Bid what I think I can make. Partner didn't have to bid here, so he should have 8-9. Diamond queen and ace or king of hearts are more than enough.

Bob Brent (4♠): Nine tricks at NT may be easier, but we may lose five tricks first. Partner only needs the diamond queen and a high heart honor to score up 10 tricks.

Morrie Kleinplatz (4♠): Should make easily as 1NT shows values.

Sheldon Kirsch (4♠): Get there fast before they know what's going on.

For the majority:

Marilyn Maddox (3♠): Would bid 4, but partner could have wasted club cards.

Myles Maddox (3♠): Right six points could make 4♠. Wrong 10 could go down at 3♠.

Bob Webber (3♠): My guess is that 4♠ will have good play, but conditions (not vul., matchpoints) dictate nonaggression.

Gene Benedict (3♠): Partner will realize that club values are probably wasted.

Joe Chiesa (3♠): Albeit after 1♠-1NT uncontested I would bid 2♠, I suspect 3♠ showing

an invitation to game with good spades provides more useful information and is less likely to elicit a pass from the unlucky soul facing me. Those are the only two bids in my repertoire as the 2♣ bid tempers my enthusiasm for 2NT or 3NT.

Sam Hirschman (3♠): I think this accurately states the values and quality of my hand. I'm happy if partner bids 3NT or 4♠, and I don't really want to play anywhere else.

Other ideas:

Chuck Burger (3♣): I need info. AJ of hearts and ace of diamonds and I have a play for slam. ♠xx ♥Jxxx ♦Qxx ♠KQJx and we have no game. Pard can help.

Irv Rosenstein (3♠): Partner has 8-10 points. His next call should clarify his hand. I will pass 3NT or bid 4♠ after 3♦ or 3♥.

Bob Cappelli (2•): Plan to rebid spades if partner raises diamonds.

Willie Winokur (2♦): Maybe 3NT is the only biddable and makeable game.

Norm Bolton (3*): 3NT a possibility.

Thinking of bigger things:

Bob Katz (4♣): 4♣ should show a very good spade suit of at least six cards and game-going values with a singleton club.

3. IMPs. Both vul. As SOUTH, you hold:

AQ854 ♥753 ♦532 ♣A6 WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH

-- 1♦ Pass 1♠ Pass 4♣* Pass ? *Shortness in clubs with a raise to 4♠

Action	Score	Votes
5 ♣	100	12
4NT	70	6
4♠	50	2
5♠	50	2
4♦	50	0

Partner has at least four spades, a stiff club and about 16+ to 19 HCPs. About the worst he can be is ♠Kxxx ♥KQx ♠AKJxx ♠x, in which case 6♠ would basically be on a finesse. So we need to make a big move toward slam.

Chuck Burger (5♣): Cue the card I have. If he has club void it's probably no good for slam. Otherwise off we go.

Suzy Burger (5♣): How good are your reds?

Jonathan Fleischmann (5♣): Denies any red-suit control, but promises enough useful black cards that slam is still likely.

Sheldon Kirsch (5♣): A bit pushy – would rather have any other ace – but I should make some sort of try.

Other approaches:

Irv Rosenstein (4NT): I will bid slam as long as we are not missing two key cards. At minimum, partner might have ♠Kxxx ♥AKxx ♦AKQx ♠x or ♠Kxxx ♥AKx ♦AKJxx ♣x.

Dick Temkin (4NT): If partner has all three keycards, I'll bid 5NT so that he can bid a grand with ♠KJxx ♥Ax ♠AKQxxx ♣x.

Brenda Bryant (4NT): Partner could easily have a minimum, e.g. ♠Kxxx ♥Axx ♦AKQxx ♣x, where 6 is a laydown. And we could easily make a grand here. So we might as well start with key card Blackwood. If we have all the key cards, I intend to invite 7.

Marilyn Maddox (4NT): Partner's high cards should cover the two red suits.

Morrie Kleinplatz (5♠): At first glance I hate all those red suit losers, but it is hard to imagine a 4♠ bid that doesn't cover. A minimum such as ♠KJxx ♥KQx ♠AKJxx ♠x has chanc-

es for 6. Partner will usually have more. Second choice: 6♠.

Going under:

Bob Katz (4♠): Partner doesn't have a running minor. Hand would be better if my ace of clubs was instead a red ace.

This hand came up in a recent sectional Swiss team event. Partner held ♠KJxx ♥Axx ♦AKQJx ♠x. Both teams played this cold grand slam in game.

4. IMPs. N-S vul. As SOUTH, you hold:

≜KQ1072 ♥void ◆AJ1054 ♣Q75WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH

-- 1♣ Pass 1♠ 4♥ Pass Pass ?

Action	Score	Votes
Dbl	100	13
4NT	60	6
5♦	50	2
4♠	40	1

Is this problem just a guess?

The majority, mostly without much confidence, votes for the flexible but not very descriptive double, hoping partner will know what do.

Brenda Bryant (Dbl): Flexible and keeps options open. Partner should know you are under the gun here...

Joe Chiesa (DbI): UGHII-ness. Partner will know 1) I have four or more spades and 2) it is our hand. I hope he is able to divine an answer easier than I can. While it is incontrovertible that any game bid may score more than 4♥ whipped, we may have to find the one game in three or four that makes. Moreover, we may encounter some UGHIy distro undermining our quest.

Morrie Kleinplatz (DbI): Hate it if partner passes, but all other bids seem worse. 4♠ is a complete gamble. 4NT is more reasonable but may miss a 5-3 or even 5-4 spade fit if partner is minimum. Dbl under the bidder must show values and no clear direction.

Marilyn Maddox (DbI): Partner could have heart cards. If not, hope they will take out the double.

Chuck Burger (DbI): Most flexible action. Not penalty. No clear direction. 4NT would be ambiguous. Can't drive to club slam with three. 4♠ second choice.

Jonathan Fleischmann (Dbl): Extra values with no clear direction. Partner will not often leave this in, especially given the colors. I expect to go high and cuebid 5♥ over whatever

partner bids, driving to slam (except over a 5♠ rebid) and confirming the fit. If partner happens to pass with wasted heart cards, we may be high enough.

The problem with double is that partner most likely has two or three hearts and will not know about your heart void and willingness to play in any of three strains. He will pass and you will be lucky to beat 4♥ at all let alone collect adequate compensation for your probable vulnerable game.

Sheldon Kirsch (4NT): Have enough to play at the five-level and can't ignore clubs.

Bob Katz (4NT): Clearly not to play. Should show some clubs but longer diamonds and a very good playing hand. And at least five spades since with a very good hand you would not bypass diamonds at your first bid.

Bob Webber (4NT): Takeout (more diamonds than clubs). I won't be bidding slam without encouragement.

Julie Arbit (4NT): Should imply two places to play, which is helpful in evaluating strain and level. We know partner has nothing too special, but a balanced minimum

from partner nearly guarantees the 5-level is safe at the least.

Willie Winokur (5♦): My glass is half full!!

Norm Bolton (5*): Hope partner can do something smart.

Going bigger:

Irv Rosenstein (5NT): Pick a slam. Partner did not double, so hopefully not much wasted value in hearts. As little as ♠xx ♥xxx ♦KQx ♣AKJxx (6♣) or ♠x ♥xxx ♦KQxx ♣AKxxx (6♣ or 6♦) or ♠Axxx ♥xxxx ♦Kx ♣AKx (6♠) gives play for slam.

If partner had doubled, what would it really mean? Wouldn't it show just about any hand that is too good to pass but has fewer than four spades?

When this hand came up on Bridge Base, partner, North, held ♠AJx ♥xxx ♦Kxx ♣Axxx. What should he do if you, South, double?

Howard Perlman (DbI): Toughest hand of the set! Don't want to lose a possible 4♠, so don't like 4NT. DbI is clearly values but not purely takeout. Still partner should bid 4♠ with three-card support and no heart wastage. 4♥x could be our best result if partner is 2-3-3-5.

At the virtual table, South

doubled and North — presumably placing his partner with a more balanced hand — passed. 4♥x went down two, -300. N-S lost about 7 IMPs against the average result of about +600 for N-S.

Gene Benedict's lone stab in the dark would have been the winner.

Gene Benedict (4♠): I think my hand is better for offense, so I won't double 4♥.

5. MTPTs. None vul. As SOUTH, you hold:

♦void ♥AJ102 ♦KQ1043 ♣AQ62 WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH

4♠

Pass 1♦

0

0

?

Action	Score	Votes
5♠	100	15
4NT	60	3
6♥	60	3
5NT	60	1

30

10

Dbl

3♠

5♥

Dbl

Partner's negative double of 3\(\pi\) pretty much committed us to game, so he should have at least close to opening values. And since we are missing only 14 HCPs outside of spades, pretty much everyone is headed for slam.

That, plus the spade void, explains the heavy vote for 5♠. But among the 11 of 15 5♠ bidders who revealed their

plans, there was a wide difference of opinion about where we are headed and even what partner's next bid will mean.

Brenda Bryant, Marilyn Maddox and Norm Bolton: (5♠): Pick a slam.

Chuck Burger (5♠): Drive to slam and hope for 30-point deck. Pard has something extra for 3-level. Brings in clubs for slam, which could well be better than hearts.

Don Rumelhart (5♠): Pick a slam, and by the way I have first-round control of spades.

Morrie Kleinplatz (5♠): Partner has forced to the 4-level. A grand may be cold, though tough to bid at this level. 6 is 90 percent. 5♠ is better than 5NT because partner can pick a suit or punt with 5NT, over which I would bid 6♥.

Bob Webber (5♠): 6♥ next unless partner bids it first.

Dick Temkin (5♠): With partner willing to play at the 4-level, we must have a good play for at least a small slam. If partner responds in a minor, I will bid 6♥. This auction should show interest in a grandy since I could have just bid 6♥ in the first place.

Jonathan Fleischmann (5♠): Setting hearts as trumps and

reflecting spade shortness.

Bob Katz (5♠): If you play exclusion Blackwood, this should be it. If not, then you have shown a commitment to 6♥ with a try for 7.

Julie Arbit (5♠): Letting partner know I have first-round spade control and fixing hearts are my first priorities. If partner is looking at a minimum with good trumps and prime cards (e.g., ♠Jxx ♥KQ9x ♠Axx ♠Kxx) he should cooperate with a cue bid.

So several panelists' choice of a place to play is another's fit-showing cue bid.

Other ideas:

Irv Rosenstein (5NT): Pick a slam. Partner can bid 6♥ with good hearts. With weak hearts and good clubs, 6♣ will be better as we get pitches for hearts on the diamonds. Example:

♦xx ♥xxxx ♦AJx **♣**KJ10x.

Bob Cappelli (4NT): Partner pick a place to play.

Joe Chiesa (4NT): This should say pick a minor. Now when partner bids 5♣ or 5♠, I can bid 5♥ which now morphs into a slam try in hearts. Perhaps with KQxx(x) of hearts and ace of diamonds, partner can visualize a slam.

PAGE 13

Howard Perlman (4NT): Theoretically minors, but subsequent correction to 5♥ shows a hand that was too good to merely bid 5♥ immediately. This sequence is highly invitational to slam.

I have a lot of problems with the last two comments. First of all, how is partner to know that we have control of spades? Isn't that what he will think we are asking for if we bid this way? Second, if partner already showed opening values, why do we need to ask him again if we have enough for 6? Just a 12-count with no wastage in spades will give us 13 probable tricks.

Taking the direct route to the probable average-plus spot:

Sam Hirschman (6♥): I don't

see any way to have a scientific auction at this point. I know we have a heart fit, and the missing high cards rate to be onside with East.

Gene Benedict (6♥): 5♠ would sound like I was interested in a grand slam. I will be satisfied to make this.

Most of us would tend to assume partner has at least (or exactly) four hearts for his negative double, but is that a sure thing? Some players might double with any balanced 13-count with no spade stopper, hoping we could bid 3NT. If that is possible, it complicates our decision as to strain and is further reason to involve partner by cuebidding 5♠, then passing partner's 6-level choice of slams.

We're older

The average age of MBA members increased by just under a full year in 2014 – from 71.09 to 72.08.

This is an apparent testament to the overall good health and longevity of our members, but also a sign that we have not added many younger people to our rolls.

Of the 1,182 "junior" (under 26 years old) players in ACBL, only 13 are in District 12, which covers Lower Michigan and northwest Ohio. Of those, 6 are also in the 19-and-under "youth" category. MBA is one of five units in District 12. No breakdown was available for the number of juniors in MBA.

The ACBL average age increased to 71.13 from 70.7 a year earlier.

PAGE 14 TABLE TALK

NEXT ISSUE'S HANDS

1. IMPs. N-S vul. As SOUTH, you hold:

AQ10 AK10 K KJ8543 WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH Pass Pass Pass 1♣ Pass 1♦ Pass ?

MTPTs. Both vul. As SOUTH, you hold:

AJ102 ∀AQJ2 +9 410953 WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH **Pass** 1. **Pass** 1NT 2.

1

MTPTs. N-S vul. As SOUTH, you hold:

♦KJ10852 ∀K ♦62 ♣A632 WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH Pass 1♥ Pass 1♠ Pass 2♦ Pass ?

IMPs. None vul. As SOUTH, you hold:

AQ ♥Q ◆A42 ★KQ97652 WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH Pass 1♦ 2♠ 3♣ Pass ? 3♠ **Pass**

N-S vul. MTPTs. As SOUTH, you hold:

★K7 ♥A972 ◆KQ32 ♣A53 WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH

2♦ Dbl 1♠ Pass 4♥ **5**♣

> Mail your answers to: Table Talk Magazine 30660 Woodgate Dr. Southfield MI 48076 Or email to: MBATalk@aol.com

Newman wins Marsee again

Bert Newman, MBA's top masterpoint holder, was the 2014 winner of the Grant Marsee Memorial Trophy, awarded to the Michigan player who wins the most masterpoints in the Barry Crane Top 500 race.

Newman won 898 total points in the year, putting him at 89th on the national list. It was Newman's fifth Marsee win. He previously won in 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2013.

Second place in the Marsee race went to Jonathan Fleischmann, who won 678 points. Leonard Melander was third with 591 points.

IN MEMORIAM

Tony Braceful Carol Evatt Peggy Ford

KAPLAN

"The modern fashion cuebids is not to show anvthing in particular, but to cast a rosy glow over the whole auction."

"Anybody can take a finesse. But if you produce an endplay, you have made an educated play."

–Edgar Kaplan

Letter: Thanks, MBA

Note: Last fall, the MBA board designated \$7,800 of ACBL Charity moneys to the Run4Papa effort to fund advanced research on dementia at Northwestern University Medical School's Cognitive Neurology and Alzheimer's Disease Center (CNADC).

Dear MBA board and membership:

Thank you very much for your generous donation to Run4Papa (partnered with Northwestern CNADC). The bridge community has been invaluable with their non-profit donations throughout the years and particularly helpful with organizations involved with dementia research.

This year, we are launching a cutting edge research project which will enable our physicians to trace dementia protein markers through the use of a specialized contrast formula used in PET scans of living patients. Previously, the definitive research could only be conducted during autopsy. We are extremely grateful for your support.

More information on our past and ongoing projects is available at:

http://www.run4papa.com/

Sincerely, Jason F. Boschan

Letter: Good partner

To the editor:

I want the bridge world to learn how a desirable partner behaves. At the Bridge Connection recently Jonathan Fleischmann led the diamond jack against the contract of 6NT doubled.

His partner (me), holding the AQ5, ducked (just one of the many egregious things I did that session). Making 7. Minus 1880, instead of +1700.

How many of my regular partners would have said, "What the *#!\\pmathbf{**}\text{***}\text{**}\text{***}\text{***}\text{were you thinking of?" Not Jonathan...he couldn't stop laughing...naturally being joined by our opponents.

Oh yes, declarer's diamond holding was the singleton king, so we could have taken the first 7 tricks.

-Willie Winokur

SHEINWOLD

"It's not enough to win the tricks that belong to you. Try also for some that belong to the opponents."

"One advantage of bad bidding is that you get practice at playing atrocious contracts."

"A player who can't defend accurately should try to be declarer."

-Alfred Sheinwold

Susan P. tops field at Ann Arbor sectional

Susan Parnes of Flint had a win and a third-place finish to top all masterpoint winners at the Michael Graham Ann Arbor Sectional, held Jan. 24-25 at Eastern Michigan University in Ypsilanti. Here are the results of the tournament:

TOP MASTERPOINT WINNERS:

1, Susan Parnes, 19.61 2/3, Wilbur Argersinger, 15.61 David Graff, 15.61 4/7, Julie Arbit, 13.16 Frank Treiber III, 13.16 Robert Katz, 13.16 Jordan Kaye, 13.16 8, Anastasia Tessler, 12.65 9/10, Bob Rasmussen, 10.45 Arthur Wasserman, 10.45

SATURDAY OPEN SWISS FLIGHT A: 1, Anastasia Tessler, David Graff, Wilbur Argersinger, Susan Parnes. 2, William Niemczyk, Thom Al-James Smyth, Allan Tushman. 3, Leonard Melander, Brenda Bryant, Mark Bendure, Joe Chiesa. FLIGHT B: 1, Niemczyk team. 2, Brand & Susan Marwil, Deepak Dighe, George Christian. 3, Eric Holder, Thomas Weeks, Susan Bowers, Dianne Sradeja. FLIGHT C: 1, Marwil team. 2, Holder team. 3, Thomas King III, Warren Block, Victoria Vallone, Thomas Ciaramitaro.

OPEN SUNDAY **SWISS** FLIGHT A: 1, Julie Arbit, Jordan Kaye, Frank Treiber III, Robert Katz. 2, Bob Rasmussen, Arthur Wasserman, Stephen Carpman, Richard Baumann. 3. Martin Hirschman, Lynne Schaeffer, Susan & Gordon Parnes. FLIGHT B: 1, Rasmussen team. 2/3, Yi Ouyang, Zachary Wasserman, Jonathan Fleischmann, Herstein. 2/3. Schafer, Joseph Stephenson, Dhruman Shah, Linda Hill. FLIGHT C: 1, John Philbrook, John Allen, Mark Hugger, Martha Toon. 2, Jeanne Hendry, Pauline Murray, K. Van Alstine Jr., Mark Gensterblum. 3. Renata Wasserman, Corey Powell, Klaus Brondum, Genie Baker.

Non-LM winners

SATURDAY AM PAIRS: Janis James-Rubin, John Vollmayer SATURDAY AFTERNOON PAIRS: Linda Lutze, Mary Beebe SUNDAY AM PAIRS: Evelyn Longsworth, Joan Wentz SUNDAY AFTERNOON PAIRS: Chris Hill, Ann Margosian

TABLE TALK PAGE 17

MOVING UP...

Junior Masters

Steven Miller Brian Morton Laurence Schiff

Club Masters

Edmund Baprawski James Korte Jamie Ling Henry Zhang Yanping Zhang

Sectional Masters

Rosalyn Monticciolo Anne Parker

Regional Masters

Joyce Bear Chris Brewer Brad Dracka Richard Durham Patricia Hill Tom Hill Mark Hugger

WELCOME, NEW MEMBERS

Mary Bergmann Beverly Poffenberger Wendy Sanders S. Wu

WELCOME, TRANSFERS

Thomas Allor Jr. Sandy Altman William Holmes Graham Putnam Michael Sullivan

CONGRATULATIONS, NEW LIFE MASTERS

Stuart Dombey Beth Gursky Kenneth Hays Edward Lough

Sheri Rotenberg Giles Schnob Charles A. Smith

Advanced NABC Masters

John A. Nelson Yi Ouyang

Bronze Life Masters

Aileen Bement Nancy Hohlfeldt Steven Winokur

Silver Life Masters

P.L. Oates

Gold Life Masters

Joyce Bell

CADDIES WANTED

MBA needs caddies for upcoming tournaments. The pay rate is \$35 per session, plus \$10 for lunch when the caddy works two consecutive sessions in one day and lunch is not otherwise provided.

If you or someone you know wishes to caddy, contact caddy co-chair Marilyn Crane at mqcrane@yahoo.com or 734-591-3431.

PAGE 18 TABLE TALK

2014 MBA Mini-Ace of Clubs

2014 MBA Mini-McKenney

Note: Categories denote points held at the beginning of 2014.

- **0 to 5:** 1, Maria Conti, 29.81. 2, Carrie Osborne, 29.62. 3, Bob Ondo, 17.21.
- **5 to 20:** 1/2, Marce Lee, 20.34. 1/2, Beth Kordt, 20.34. 3, Marge Wolber, 15.43.
- **20 to 50:** 1, Craig Ross, 60.34. 2, Barbara Ferrera, 35.40. 3, Bruce Ridley, 18.31.
- **50 to 100:** 1, Susan Smith, 45.41. 2, Charles Smith, 39.56. 3, Giles Schnob. 37.10.
- **100 to 200:** 1, Dennis Ebendick, 49.30. 2, Jack Lessing, 35.35. 3, Martha Bhatia, 31.31.
- **200 to 300:** 1, Calvin Waisanen, 70.89. 2, Susan Higbie, 47.07. 3, Jordan Kaye, 46.45.
- **300 to 500:** 1, Martha Henkel, 63.41. 2, Gail Terry, 60.18. 3, Suzanne McIlhiny, 53.52.
- **500 to 1000:** 1, Gail Geiger, 90.46. 2, Lynda Thal, 72.05. 3, Richard Bauman, 65.63.
- **1000 to 2500:** 1, Grant Petersen, 154.44. 2, Jonathan Fleischmann, 150.15. 3, James Smyth, 119.44.
- **2500 to 5000:** 1, Lynne Cook, 139.51. 2, Ruth Metevier, 132.37. 3, Ed Herstein, 126.34.
- **5000 to 7500:** 1, Brenda Jaffe, 147.19. 2, Robert Brent, 144.13. 3, Richard Becher, 118.05.
- **7500 to 10,000:** 1, Norman Bolton, 277.30. 2, William Winokur, 151.53. 3, Kathy Newman, 46.75.
- Over 10,000: 1, Leonard Melander, 212.27. 2, Bert Newman, 162.93. 3, Robert Crafton, 72.96.

- **0 to 5:** 1, Carrie Osborne, 42.90. 2, Maria Conti, 42.62. 3, Bob Ondo, 33.55.
- **5 to 20:** 1/2, Marce Lee, 23.39. 1/2, Beth Kordt, 23.39. 3, Yang Hai, 20.15.
- **20 to 50:** 1, Mark Hugger, 67.55. 2, Craig Ross, 62.43. 3, Barbara Ferrera, 57.15.
- **50 to 100:** 1, Susan Smith, 76.81. 2, Charles Smith, 64.92. 3, Reuven AnafShalom. 49.62.
- **100 to 200:** 1, Dennis Ebendick, 101.18. 2, Martha Bhatia, 56.02. 3, Timothy Romlein, 49.03.
- **200 to 300:** 1, Jordan Kaye, 306.90. 2, Yi Ouyang, 124.63. 3, Calvin Waisanen, 119.61.
- **300 to 500:** 1, Julie Arbit, 260.53. 2, Steven Winokur, 129.42. 3, Edward Lough, 117.40.
- **500 to 1000:** 1, Dan Sutherland, 200.49. 2, Wilbur Argersinger, 171.76. 3, Gail Geiger, 115.95.
- **1000 to 2500:** 1, Jonathan Fleischmann, 678.38. 2, Grant Petersen, 325.35. 3, Joe Monro, 246.37.
- **2500 to 5000:** 1, Robert Katz, 484.13. 2, Ed Herstein, 377.65. 3, Kurt Dasher, 327.73.
- **5000 to 7500:** 1, Robert Brent, 285.66. 2, Sondra Schubiner, 274.95. 3, Suzy Burger, 257.75.
- **7500 to 10,000:** 1, Norman Bolton, 493.57. 2, William Winokur, 264.99. 3, Kathy Newman, 197.91.
- **Over 10,000:** 1, Bert Newman, 898.40. 2, Leonard Melander, 591.74. 3, Martin Hirschman, 411.66.

TABLE TALK PAGE 19

MBA Top 100

Here are the top 100 MBA masterpoint holders as of the end of 2014 (fractions omitted):

- 1, Bert Newman, 21,258
- 2, Martin Hirschman, 16,693
- 3, Chuck Burger, 15,970
- 4, Myles Maddox, 15,285
- 5, Marilyn Maddox, 14,459
- 6, Susan Parnes, 13,058
- 7, Bob Webber, 12,079
- 8, William Arlinghaus, 11,716
- 9, Leonard Melander, 10,730
- 10, Lynne Schaeffer, 10,635
- 11, Robert Crafton, 10,405
- 12, Kathy Newman, 9,926
- 13, Norman Bolton, 9,618
- 14, Mary Smith, 8,804
- 15, William Winokur, 7,860
- 16, Allan Falk, 7,712
- 17, Brenda Jaffe, 7,391
- 18, Robert Brent, 7,239
- 19, Richard Becher, 5,894
- 20, Sondra Schubiner, 5,889
- 21, Suzy Burger, 5,727
- 22, Richard Temkin, 5,712
- 23, Jeffrey Starr, 5,629
- 24, Donald Rumelhart, 5,628
- 25, Robert Katz, 5,477
- 26, Joe Chiesa, 5,362
- 27, Beverly Riordan, 5,271
- 28, Howard Perlman, 5,145
- 29, Ruth Metevier, 5,042
- 30, Lynne Cook, 4,926
- 31, Ed Herstein, 4,908
- 32, Irving Rosenstein, 4,700
- 33, Sheldon Kirsch, 4,654
- 34, Anastasia Tessler, 4,576

- 35, Michael Giordano, 4,304
- 36, Kurt Dasher, 4,209
- 37, Daniel Marcus, 4,173
- 38, Barry Lippitt, 4,095
- 39, Rhonda Monro, 4,005
- 40, Frank Sensoli, 3,869
- 41, Barbara Marcus, 3,831
- 42, Clerely Chaney, 3,794
- 43, Fred Will, 3,725
- 44, David Thomson, 3,673
- 45, Cono Emanuele, 3,669
- 46, Arthur Golumbia, 3,608
- 47, Joan McKean, 3,541
- 48, Gargi French, 3,461
- 49, Esther Scheppele, 3,352
- 50, Mary Ann Will, 3,163
- 51, Edward Bloom, 3,161
- 52, Walter Goldsmith, 3,123
- 53, Marion Litt, 2,810
- 54, Dorothy Kuhn, 2,808
- 55, Donald Curtis, 2,770
- 56, Shirley Gluklick, 2,769
- 57, Cheryl Perna, 2,748
- 58, Suzanne Stevenson, 2.741
- 59, Nathan Banker, 2,715
- 60, Judi Amatangelo, 2,692
- 61, James Anderson III, 2,623
- 62, Richard Fortune, 2,615
- 63, Martha Hooberman, 2,606
- 64, John Dreifus, 2,604
- 65, Joyce Bell, 2,516
- 66, Joanna Brumfiel, 2,508
- 67, Neil Manley Jr., 2,458
- 68, Rose Burke, 2,450
- 69, Elwood Ott, 2,441
- 70, James Armstrong, 2,423
- 71, Peter Bolgar, 2,421
- 72, Jacqueline DeRouin, 2,369
- 73, Joe Monro, 2,367

74, David Graff, 2,352

75, Steven Jacob, 2,338

76, Myron Charfoos, 2,335

77, Mark Bendure, 2,302

78, Allan Becker, 2,276

79, Patricia Becker, 2,275

80, James Smyth, 2,273

81, Ray Gentz, 2,268

82, Jonathan Fleischmann, 2.227

83, Shahan Kavafian, 2,220

84, Clarke Cunningham, 2.202

85, Samuel Hirschman, 2,199

86, Carol Neef, 2,199

87, John Koschik, 2,162

88, Thelma Bilbrey, 2,144

89, William Rouse, 2,143

90, Paul Pomeroy, 2,105

91, Julie Kraus, 2,077

92, James Bloom, 2,077

93, Martin Gaerttner, 2,061

94, Jim Goodman, 2,044

95, Benjamin Lev, 1,968

96, Edward Zujko, 1967

97, Richard Menczer, 1,947

98, Charles Federman, 1,918

99, Ed Williams, 1,906

100, Grant Petersen, 1,888

Just off the list:

101, Daniel Feldman, 1,876

102, Elmer Johansen, 1,860

103, Richard Radtke, 1,856

104, J. Morris Swiger, 1,851

105, Joan Bentz, 1,838

106, Marilyn Crane, 1,814

107, Harriet Brent, 1,803

108, Judy Hocher, 1,768

109, Terry T. Brown, 1,764

110, Anand Agarwal, 1,733

TABLE TALK

Where do you rank?

MBA had 849 members as of the beginning of February. Here is a breakdown of their

masterpoint categories:

Rookie (0-5): 120

Junior Master (5-20): 72

Club Master (20-50): 106

Sectional Master (50-100): 67

Regional Master (100-200): 90

NABC Master (200+): 49

Advanced NABC Master (300): 4

Life Master: 43

Bronze LM (500): 112

Silver LM (1000): 120

Gold LM (2500): 37

Diamond LM (5000): 13

Emerald LM (7500): 5

Platinum LM (10000): 9

Grand Life Master: 2

ACBL ups sanctions for cheating FL club director

The ACBL Appeals and Charges Committee has increased the discipline for a part-time Naples FL club director who copied hand records for sessions he was about to play. (Table Talk, December 2014, p. 28)

At its November meeting in Providence RI, the committee expelled Tom Urso and removed all of his masterpoints. A unit committee had previously suspended Urso for 21/4 years and taken away 2,000 of his 3,900 points.

TOURNAMENT CALENDAR

Mar. 26-29: Southfield sectional (MBA)

Apr. 10-11: Bloomfield Hills I/N sectional

April 11-12: Grand National teams district finals (Southfield)

Apr. 13-19: Spring STAC Apr. 23-25: Grand Rapids sectional

May 1-3: Davison sectional
May 1-3: Frankfort sectional
May 9: Lansing NLM sec-

tional

May 11-17: FARMINGTON HILLS REGIONAL

May 28-30: Kalamazoo sectional

June 14-19: FLINT REGIONAL June 25-28: Southfield sectional (MBA & SOMBA)

June 27-28: Petoskey NLM sectional

July 10-12: Toledo sectional July 13-19: LANSING REGIONAL

July 24-26: Freeland sectional

Aug. 27-30: Southfield sectional (MBA)

Sept. 11-13: Traverse City sectional

Sept. 20: NAP district finals (Lansing)

Sept. 25-27: Petoskey sectional

Oct. 2-4: Midland sectional Oct. 12-18: FARMINGTON HILLS REGIONAL (MBA)

2014 MBA Treasurer's Report

	<u>2014 </u>	<u>2013</u>
<u>RECEIPTS</u>		
Sectionals	1,677	(2,047)
Motor City Regional	11,190	11,956
NAP	(400)	(1,500)
Dues	3,027	3,123
Interest	<u>157</u>	<u>169</u>
	15,651	11,701
<u>EXPENDITURES</u>		
Table Talk	6,721	4,727
Honoraria	4,800	4,800
Office and postage	646	886
Novice trophies	413	-
Board meetings	403	1,285
Miscellaneous	1,120	1,888
	14,103	13,586
Gain (loss)	1,548	(1,885)
Cook belones at beginning of year	27 022	20.007
Cash balance at beginning of year	<u>37,022</u>	38,907
Cash balance at end of year	<u>38,570</u>	<u>37,022</u>

-ROBERT WEBBER, treasurer

PAGE 22 TABLE TALK

BULLETIN: Editor guesses queen

(Oh, yeah, follows up with Vienna Coup and squeeze to make Grand Slam)

I was South (positions rotated) on this hand: Bd. 4 from the 6 p.m. Nov. 6, 2014, ACBL pairs mini on Bridge Base. My partner was Lynne Schaeffer.

IMP PAIRS Both vul.

NORTH **★KJ10 ♥**KQJ4 ***A8** ♣AJ63 **WEST EAST ♦**98542 **★**763 **♥**973 **¥**6 **+10952 ♦**KJ64 •Q8742 **49** SOUTH ΑQ **♥**A10852 **♦Q73** ★K105

WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH

— 1♣ Pass 1♥
Pass 4♥ Pass 4♠
Pass 4NT Pass 5♥*
Pass 5NT Pass 6♣**
Pass 6♦***
Pass 6♦***

*2/5 key cards, no Q of trump

**K of ♣

Who overbid? I guess we both stretched.

Tr. 1: 9\(\perp -10 - 3 - A\)
2: 2\(\neg -3 - K - 6\)
3: Q\(\neg -6 \perp - 5 \neg - 7 \neg \)
4: 4\(\neg -7 \perp - 10 \neg - 9 \neg \)
5: Q\(\perp - 2 \perp - K \perp - 2 \perp \)
6: J\(\perp - 4 \perp - 3 \perp - 4 \perp \)
7: 3\(\perp - 4 - 10 - 9\)
8: K\(\perp - 2 \perp - 6 \perp - 7 \perp \)
9: 7\(\perp - 9 - A - 6\)
10: J\(\neg - 1 \perp - 4 \perp - 1 \perp \)
11: 8\(\neg - 8 \perp - 8 \perp - 8 \perp \)
12: 5\(\perp - 5 \perp - A \perp - Q \perp \)
13: J\(\perp - K \perp - Q \perp - 1 0 \perp \)

+2210 was worth 13.66 IMPs Note that Tr. 11 includes the 8♥ (squeeze card) and the other three 8s!!! It didn't matter here, but East should have held his clubs and pitched the king of diamonds on that trick, hoping his partner had the queen. Perhaps he just could not resist matching the other three 8s already on the trick!

-M.H.

CANDIDATES WANTED

The annual MBA board election will be held at the Motor City Regional in October. If you are interested in running for the board, contact election chair Martin Hirschman, 248-646-3967, MBATalk@aol.com

^{***}Further grand slam try

SOLUTION TO AT THE WHEEL From back page NORTH **★1083 ♥**10643 **♦**A42 **♣**J92 **WEST EAST \$54** 6♠ **♥**K92 **♥**J875 **♦Q965 *1087** ♣KQ105 **♣**87643 **SOUTH AKQJ972** ♥AQ **♦KJ3** ♣Α

After winning the ace of clubs, lead the 7 of spades to dummy's 8 and ruff a club high.

Next play the 9 of spades to dummy's 10, then play the jack of clubs from dummy and, assuming East plays low, discard the 3 of diamonds.

On winning the queen of clubs, West is endplayed.

If West returns a club, you can ruff in dummy and pitch the queen of hearts.

If West returns a heart, you can claim.

If West returns a diamond, play low from dummy and take two diamonds in your hand. Then play your carefully preserved 2 of spades to

dummy's 3 and pitch your queen of hearts on the ace of diamonds.

If you play along these lines but do not save the spade 2 for the entry to dummy's 3, West can beat you by returning a diamond.

If you knew West's hand, you also could make by running spades to strip squeeze West, then endplaying him. However, the recommended play works whenever spades are 2-1 and West started with KQ of clubs, regardless of the location of the king of hearts and gueen of diamonds.

If East started with the queen of clubs and covers the jack, you will ruff high and still have time and entries to take two red-suit finesses for your contract.

LIKE US ON FACEBOOK!!!

MBA has a new page on Facebook, with lots of interesting features, results and links. To view the page, go to Facebook.com, then type "Michigan Bridge Association" into the field at the top and hit enter. Be sure to "Like" the page.

The administrator of the page is Marilyn Nathanson. You can contact her at: mnathanson@ameritch.net

MBA board pushes for more affordable NABCs

Worried about the high cost of attending ACBL's three annual North American Bridge Championships, the MBA board has sent the following letter to the league's CEO and national board of directors:

We are very concerned about the spiraling cost of attending a North American Bridge Championship.

At the 2015 Spring NABC, players will pay the host hotel \$185 per night, including tax and occupancy charge.

Entry fees in NABC+ events, already \$20 per player per session, will now be \$30 when screens are in use.

Add a small budget for meals, and we are talking a total cost approaching \$300 per day. And that doesn't account for the price of a plane ticket to the host city.

Do we really want to run tournaments that only millionaires can afford to attend?

We urge the ACBL to make every effort to keep costs at the NABCs within reasonable bounds.

Thanks for your continued efforts.

-Board of Directors, Michigan Bridge Association (ACBL Unit 137)

ACBL CEO Robert Hartman sent the following reply:

The costs of attending NABCs was a topic that was discussed in committee and with the full Board in Providence.

Hotel prices in large cities are becoming more and more expensive. We do not want pricing to create a barrier to attend for our members.

It is also becoming increasingly difficult to secure convention space at reasonable prices.

As such, we have focused our attention on "second-tier cities" (I use that term affectionately) where we are bigger fish swimming in a smaller pond. We have some price leverage and these cities typically roll out the red carpet for our members.

For example, the Board approved returning to Memphis and we are looking at Columbus, OH and Austin, TX as possible future sites.

While we are not leaving any stone unturned, it becomes discouraging when large cities like Toronto are asking \$234 in 2023!

-Robert Hartman, Chief Executive Officer

TABLE TALK PAGE 25

ASK MARTY

By Marty Hirschman

Bob Rasmussen inquires about a controversial committee ruling involving an expert pair in a Swiss team event at the 2014 Motor City Regional. Both vul., East held ♠KJ965 **♦**10872 **♣**43. West opened 1NT, East transferred to spades and then bid 2NT. West broke tempo, then signed off in 34. East nonetheless went on to 4♠. which made. At the other table, where there was no break in tempo. East passed the 3♠ bid, losing 10 IMPs.

How would you rule?

The directors polled seven players. Four of them said they would have passed 3♠. The directors then ruled that the break in tempo suggested that bidding on would be more successful, and that passing 3♠ was a logical alternative for East. Under Law 16, the contract was rolled back to 3♠, making 4.

On appeal, a committee reversed the decision, opining that the director "must have polled players of lesser skill," and that the 44 bid would be allowed to stand.

My opinion is that the East hand upgrades after West shows three-card support, and that few top players would consider passing 3♠. There are many minimum West hands that would provide an excellent play for 10 tricks, and it is routine to bid close games vul. at IMPs. Therefore I probably would have allowed the 4♠ bid.

Still, the case leaves a bad taste in my mouth.

I think the problem is with the all-or-nothing approach of Law 16. Even accepting that passing was not a logical alternative, it could have been a successful choice. The break in tempo made bidding 4♠ less of a risk than it was at the other table.

I would rewrite Law 16 to provide a procedural penalty when there was a colorable alternative choice that was not deemed a "logical alternative." One approach would be to award an IMP penalty based on how much more likely it was as a result of the hesitation that the chosen action would be successful.

However, I am not the International Laws Commission. For now, at least, we are stuck with the law as written.

P.S. The West hand was ♠A82 ♥QJ6 ♠A963 ♣A92. 4♠ made because both major suit finesses worked and spades broke 3-2. Was West actually thinking about bidding 4♠ with that minimum hand?

Magic By Marty Hirschman

This hand is a modification of a partscore hand I played in a matchpoint mini on Bridge Base.

KJ8 **♥**AK542 **♦**A10 **◆943** 474 4653 **♥**Q96 **♥**J1083 **♦QJ842 ♦**K96 **AKQ ♣862 ▲**AQ1092 **∀**7 **♦753 ♣**J1075

WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH 1♦ 1♥ Pass 1♠ Pass 4♠ All pass Opening lead: Ace of clubs

West cashes three clubs and gets out the queen of diamonds, which you win with the ace.

On the surface it appears that you have an unavoidable diamond loser:

- 1. You can't throw dummy's diamond on the J of clubs unless you first pull trump, in which case dummy won't have a trump left to ruff the diamond.
- 2. You can establish dummy's fifth heart by taking two ruffs in hand, but you can't cash the established heart (to pitch

a losing diamond, having pitched the other diamond loser on the king of hearts) without first pulling trump, in which case you will be out of trump in hand to ruff dummy's diamond loser.

3. And you can't set up the heart and then cash both the heart and the club because first you will have to pull trump, and the third round of trump will freeze you into one hand or the other and you won't be able to cash the winner in the other hand.

Nonetheless:

Tr. 5: A♥

6: K♥ (diamond pitch)

7: 2♥ ruffed with 9

8: 2♠ to dummy's 8.

9: 4♥-J♥-A♠-2♦, establishing dummy's 5th heart.

10: 10♠ to dummy's K♠, leaving:

When you now play the 5 of hearts from dummy, East has no reply.

TABLE TALK

AT THE WHEEL **By Marty Hirschman NORTH ▲1083 ♥10643 ♦**A42 \$J92 **WEST EAST** SOUTH **AKQJ972 ♥**AQ ♦KJ3 ♣Α NORTH EAST SOUTH WEST Pass 2♣ **Pass Pass** 2♦ Pass 2♠ Pass Pass 4NT 3♠ 5NT Pass 5♦ Pass Pass 6♣ Pass 6♠ **All Pass**

Opening lead: K of clubs

Spades break 2-1. Plan the play. Solution, page 24.