

TABLE TALK

A Publication of the Vermont Bridge Association
Editor: Frank Hacker

October 2013
frhac@charter.net



Linda and Ken Kaleita are newcomers who are moving up very quickly. They have been doing very well and won one of the open pairs at the recent Williston sectional tournament. Linda tells us their story.

Well, I begin by stating that I am writing this, because Frank apparently ran out of interesting folks ... or maybe they were interesting, but did not succumb so easily to his pleading. At any rate, Ken and I went to the same high school on Long Island, fell in love .. and out of love ... in again, etc., etc. It was opposites attracting .. he came from a large noisy family and I came from a quiet and polite one (dysfunctional, but polite). He saw the glass half full and I half empty. He made friends easily and I was shy. One thing we did have in common, however, was his EGO. He was an athlete and I cheered him ... KEN KEN HE'S

OUR MAN ... IF HE CAN'T DO IT NO ONE CAN! I think that at a young age I had a survival instinct that said he would be good for me ... eventually.

Ken went off to college and studied engineering, then business, learned quite a few drinking songs and somewhere along the line realized he missed me. We got engaged at the end of his junior year and the end of my sophomore year. And now I confess to being a college dropout. I went to Ohio State, hated it, was miserable, had my doubts that Woody Hayes was a god and still think that football is way overrated. I did finish my degree many, many years later ... just to know I could.

Having no idea what he wanted to do with his life (another thing we had in common!), Ken applied to the Naval Officer Candidate School. We moved to Pensacola, Florida. We were there for one day when Ken tried out for the base basketball team, tore his ACL and spent the next month in the hospital. I was pregnant (this was so long ago that back then only the wife got pregnant!) and doing the morning sickness thing. Six months later, Ken finally returned to active duty, discovered that he was not cut out to be a jet pilot (morning sickness!) and attended Air Intelligence School. After a year in Florida (our son Tim was born there ... in August ... no air conditioning) we were sent to Denver, Colorado (quite similar to Vermont, bigger mountains, but Vermont is better and has less smog.) Six months there, and we changed duty station to Albany, Georgia. During our three years there, Ken served aboard two air craft carriers and had a tour of the Gulf of Tonkin. I kept the home fires burning, volunteered for the Navy Relief Society and generally behaved like an officer's wife. During Ken's WESTPAC tour, the ship's captain requested a volunteer to teach math to the sailors who were trying to get their high school equivalency diplomas. Ken fell in love with teaching and decided to go back to school.

We moved (again) to Oneonta, NY. We were very broke (again), but had a great time there. Ken got his Masters in Math Education, did his student teaching and got a job ... at the high school we had both graduated from about ten years earlier. He taught there for thirty years, coached soccer, went back to school for another Master's degree (Educational Administration) and played as many pranks as he could think of on unsuspecting colleagues. I stayed home until Tim was in junior high, went back to college and got a degree in accounting ... loved studying it and hated doing it. I went to work for a much hated and feared agency of the Federal Government and worked there for eighteen years. Tim graduated from high school (whew!) and was somehow accepted to UVM. He eventually married a fellow student (our daughter-in-law Paige) and they made their nest in Richmond.

In 2003 Ken was retiring ... I had another two years to go and we had bought a piece of property at the end of Long Island (the North Fork) with plans to build a house there. Fate intervened via a phone call announcing that we were going to become grandparents. (A note at this point ... my grandparents were wonderful to me ... I feel that I am the person I am because of them ... so it was very important to me to try to pay that forward.) Bottom line ... tore up the house plans, drove to Vermont and gave ourselves three days to find a house!

Ken wasn't quite ready for the quiet life and he was lucky to get a part time job teaching math at the Essex High School. He taught there for seven years and made some great friends. I took care of our grandson Luke ... the best job I ever had. Four years later Haley came along and the job got tougher, but

we wouldn't trade a minute of it (well, we might if we could find someone willing to trade some gold points).

Anyone who has ever tried to hold a conversation with me clearly knows that I am quite deaf. I started losing my hearing when I was 11 ... no one knows why ... I tried hearing aids a number of times over the years, but the technology to deal with my type of loss was not available. About three years ago I finally got hearing aids that helped. They changed my life. Without them I would not be playing bridge.

Ken and I played a bit of duplicate for a year or so when we were in our early 30's. Then life got too busy and we never thought about it again until I got wired! We can't believe how lucky we have been to find such a great club right around the corner. We would like to thank all of you for being so patient, friendly, instructive, encouraging and just making us feel at home. We have learned so much from you and look forward to making our game better with your help. We know we have come a long way (I'm not even scared of the bidding box anymore!) and have an even longer way to go. There are days when we think we are finally getting it together ... and then we crash and wonder if we have learned anything ... and I think that is the nature of the game and what keeps us all coming back for more. Well, we have been playing now for almost three years. I suspect there has been some speculation as to how long we will be able to continue as partners. Let the record show that I have .67 more Master Points than Ken! So long as this status quo is maintained, we will continue to be partners.

President's Message

The VBA annual meeting was held Sunday October 6th at the Burlington Bridge club. Once again Unit 175 subsidized the entry 50% to encourage more members to attend. There was plenty of good food throughout the day thanks to June Silverman, Linda Kaleita, Lynn Carew, Marti Gazley and several other 'bakers'! The approximately 56 players voted on the following:

- Keep the president's cup on the first Sunday in October
- Allow the sectional entry to increase to \$10 in 2014 to counter the approximate \$300 loss per tournament
- Move one additional sectional from Rutland to the Burlington club in 2014

The Board will act on these matters and others at the next meeting on October 26th. Thank you to all members who were present and brought up these matters for action.

Tournament Changes

The Vermont Fall Sectional was held on October 25 -27. We'll report on tournament results next issue. The Vermont Bridge Association Board of Directors met between sessions on Saturday. The board approved the following changes.

1. All first session starting times will be 10:00 AM. There will be no more Friday evening sessions. Attendance is typically poor at the Friday evening session. The tournament just completed had only 7.5 tables. The Sunday Swiss will start at 10 instead of 10:30. The board discussed the option of reducing sectionals from 3 days to 2. Both Maine and New Hampshire have already done this.
2. The per session fee will increase from \$9 to \$10. We have been experiencing losses on most of our tournaments. The \$1 increase will get us on an even keel.
3. The October tournament will move from Rutland to Williston. For several years the October tournament has been the weakest, generating much less revenue than our other 3 tournaments. For many years, the VBA has held 3 tournaments in Rutland and one in the Burlington area. After the change, we will be holding the end of May tournament and the July tournament in Rutland. The September and October tournaments will be in Williston.

More Than Meets The Eye

By Frank Hacker

Simple suit combinations can be quite tricky. We have all encountered many times Q10xxx in dummy opposite Kxx in our hand. Absent entry problems, most of us would lead toward the king and, whether the king won or lost, we would finesse the 10 the next round. We would hope for a favorable split and an on-side jack to give us 4 tricks in the suit. The “normal” play is sometimes not the best. Consider the following hand.

North

S 10
H A32
D Q10654
C AQ75

South

S KQ2
H K85
D K87
C KJ64

You are South, declarer in 3NT on the opening lead of the spade 7. East plays the jack and you win your queen. You have just 7 tricks without the diamond suit. Prospects are grim. You are facing a spade avalanche. If East has the diamond ace, you have no chance. On the other hand, you need only 2 tricks in the suit – one if you can get a second spade trick. The “normal” line of play would lead to catastrophe if East has either the ace or jack. You ought to be able to improve upon that.

One possibility is to lead low to the king and then on the second round play the queen. This would keep East from winning a doubleton jack. We'll gladly give West a second diamond trick to keep East off lead.

We could also lead from the board and insert the 8. This fails, because we have not won our first diamond trick and West could just give us our second spade trick.

We seem to be groping in the dark. I would like to make a few observations.

1. We have to decide how to play diamonds, but we should probably play off our 4 club winners, making sure to end up in the correct hand to start the diamond suit. Sometimes good things happen if you pressure the opponents. On the actual deal, West will discard a heart and East will discard a heart and a spade.
2. Opponents can be very tricky. If East has a doubleton jack of diamonds, West may realize this and duck his ace. If he does that, you should lead low and put up the queen. Don't forget that you're not making this hand if East has the ace. He probably would have played it already, but, if not, you should not let West confuse the issue with his clever duck.
3. The key to this hand is to prevent East from winning a trick with the jack of diamonds. The best way to do that is to start diamonds from your hand by leading low toward the queen. After the queen wins, lead low toward the king planning to duck unless East plays the jack. West will have to win the trick and you are safe. Here is the entire hand. What an interesting avoidance play!!

		<u>North</u>			
		S	10		
		H	A32		
		D	Q10654		
		C	AQ75		
	<u>West</u>			<u>East</u>	
S	A9876			S	J543
H	764			H	QJ109
D	A9			D	J32
C	932			C	108
		<u>South</u>			
		S	KQ2		
		H	K85		
		D	K87		
		C	KJ64		

Slam Doubles

By Phil Sharpsteen

Slam doubles are an important subject, but much too extensive to cover completely in a brief article on the subject. At a recent club game, there was an interesting hand that deals with one aspect of slam doubles. This is where a double asks for an unusual lead (not suit bid and raised) probably looking for a ruff. First the hand:

	<u>North</u>	
	S AKxx	
	H AQJxx	
	D AJxx	
	C Void	
<u>West</u>		<u>East</u>
S Void		S J109xx
H xx		H x
D xxxxx		D Void
C QJxxxx		C AK10xxxx
	<u>South</u>	
	S Qxxx	
	H Kxxxx	
	D KQxx	
	C Void	

North is the dealer and NS are vul. The opening bid was always 1H. East had various bids to consider: 2H Michaels (showing spades and an unknown minor suit), 2C overcall or 1S overcall. The first two calls will get partner to cooperate in the very competitive auction!

Whatever East chooses, South will certainly drive to the heart game. He may choose 4H or a 4C splinter bid. For the point of this article, let's assume the following auction:

<u>North</u>	<u>East</u>	<u>South</u>	<u>West</u>
1H	2C	4C	5C
6H	7C	P	P
7H	P	P	Double
All Pass			

The final double warns against a club lead (which would allow 7H to make on a ruff/sluff!). If East leads a spade the brief cross ruff results in an 800 point penalty! Even a heart lead (which is NOT requested) will result in +200 because of the unfortunate NS exact distribution duplication!

Also interesting, if South leads anything but a heart against East's 7C contract, East will be able to make the contract by establishing dummy's fifth diamond for a heart discard.

Nice Going Dick Tracy

Richard "Dick" Tracy of Sharon, VT has qualified to represent Vermont and New England at the North American Pair Championships at the Dallas Spring Nationals this coming March. Dick and his most regular partner, Nora Miller of Grantham, NH, entered the District 25 Flight C North American Pairs Finals in Sturbridge, MA on October 19. In the 2 session event, the Miller – Tracy tandem had a very slight first place lead after the first session. They hit a rough patch in the second session, but still managed to hang on to 2nd over all.

Miller and Tracy earned 7.50 master points (1.88 gold). Additionally, they earned a travel stipend of \$300 each which will be awarded to them if/when they decide to make the trip. Miller and Tracy also finished second in flight C in the 52.5 table Gold Rush pairs at the Sturbridge regional in June.

Dick has earned over 60 points this year and is currently second in his category for District 25 (the New England District). He will probably be first when the November standings come out.

Dick is a relatively new player who has put Vermont on the New England bridge map. This doesn't happen often. Nice going, Dick.

Vermont Summer Sectional

Holiday Inn, Rutland VT

July 12 – 14, 2013

Friday Afternoon Open Pairs

MP	A	B	C		Pct
4.33	1			Patricia DiVincenzo – Kathleen Farrell	68.75
3.25	2			Gail Rust – Deborah Drury	65.38
2.44	3			Mary Savko – Ellie Hanlon	58.33
3.21	4	1	1	John Newton – Sally Newton	57.85
2.41	5	2		Jay Friedenson – Ruth Stokes	57.37
1.81	6	3		James Thomas – Frank Giuffreda	56.41
1.35		4		Donald Campbell – Jan Gisholt	54.97
1.50		5	2	Dulany Bennett – Deirdre Ellerson	52.72
1.13		6	3	Kenneth Kaleita – Linda Kaleita	52.56
0.84			4	Rhoda Chickering – Sandy Desilets	49.04
0.63			5	Michael McDonald – Tom Floyd	48.24

Friday Evening Open Pairs

MP	A	B	C		Pct
4.00	1			Philip Sharpsteen – Frank Hacker	59.78
3.00	2			Gerald DiVincenzo – Michael Farrell	58.17
2.25	3			Walter Fontaine – James Thomas	57.85
2.92	4	1	1	Michael McDonald – Tom Floyd	56.09
2.19	5	2		Joseph Morein – Courtney Nelson	55.61
1.20	6/7			Ellie Hanlon – Mary Savko	55.45
1.64	6/7	3		Elaine Misner – James Misner	55.45
1.41		4	2	Joan Dobert – Carolyn Accardi	53.69
0.92		5		John Conova – Elizabeth VonRiesenfelder	53.04
1.06		6	3	John Newton – Sally Newton	52.88
0.79			4	Kenneth Kaleita – Linda Kaleita	51.76

Saturday Morning Open Pairs

MP	A	B	C		Pct
5.00	1	1		Robert Dickson – Michael Rogers	63.07
3.75	2			Gerald DiVincenzo – Michael Farrell	62.85
2.84	3	2		Elaine Misner – James Misner	62.20
2.13	4	3		Lynn Carew – Patricia Nestork	59.80
1.58	5			Ellie Hanlon – Mary Savko	59.15
1.60	6	4		Judie Muggia – Albert Muggia	57.19
1.32		5		Kerry Cotterell – Glen Perry	56.86
0.90		6		Helen Miron – Michael Miron	55.45
2.36			1	Michael McDonald – Tom Floyd	54.68
1.77			2	Susan Wright – Diana Thompson	53.81
1.33			3	John Newton – Sally Newton	53.59
1.00			4	Joanne Church – Barbara Taraska	51.31
0.75			5	Israel Perlman – Shirley Perlman	49.78
0.62			6	Judith Ward – Linda Baker	49.67

Saturday Afternoon Open Pairs

MP	A	B	C		Pct
4.33	1	1	1	Sally Newton – John Newton	69.44
3.25	2			Michel Farrell – Gerald DiVincenzo	67.25
2.44	3			Patricia DiVincenzo – Kathleen Farrell	63.68
2.41	4	2		Lynn Carew – Patricia Nestork	62.14

1.81	5	3		Judith Siegel – Myron Siegel	58.04
1.50	6	4	2	Marjorie Cameron – B L “Tink” Tysor	57.60
1.02		5		Ruth Stokes – Jay Friedenson	56.30
0.80		6		Kerry Cotterell – Glen Perry	56.25
1.13			3	Michael Bell – Jenny Bell	55.24
0.84			4	Marguerite Gousie – Marshall Williams	51.89
0.63			5	Michael McDonald – Tom Floyd	45.96

Sunday Swiss Teams

MP	A	B	C		Score
6.00	1			Gail Rust– Deborah Drury Mary Savko – Ellie Hanlon	97
4.50	2			Rudolph Polli – Frank Hacker Fred Donald – Philip Sharpsteen	86
3.38	3			Michael Farrell – Kathleen Farrell Patricia DiVincenzo – Gerald DiVincenzo	74
4.15	4	1		Marjorie Cameron – Robert Cameron B L “Tink” Tysor – Judith Donald	71
3.11	5	2	1	John Nelson – Linda Nelson Elizabeth VonRiesenfelder – Israel Perlman	69
2.33		3	2	John Conova – Donald Campbell John Newton – Sally Newton	63
1.75		4		Diane Burger – Robert Donald Kerry Cotterell – Glen Perry	58

2013 Tiernan Trophy Race

Every year the Vermont Bridge Association awards the Tiernan Trophy to the Vermont player who wins the most master points in the 4 Vermont Sectional Tournaments. VBA president, Here are the top 10 after the three tournaments. As usual, I apologize for any errors or inadvertent omissions.

1.	Mike Farrell	31.98	5.	John Newton	24.07
1.	Jerry DiVincenzo	31.98	7.	Fred Donald	22.64
3.	Patty DiVincenzo	25.59	8.	Phil Sharpsteen	22.37
3.	Kathy Farrell	25.59	8.	Frank Hacker	22.37
5.	Sally Newton	24.07	10.	Judie Donald	19.31

2013 Aborn Trophy Race

Every year the Vermont Bridge Association awards the Aborn Trophy to the Vermont player who starts the year as a non-life master and wins the most master points in the 4 Vermont Sectional Tournaments. Here are the top 10 after three tournaments. Karen Kristiansen is leading again. For heaven's sakes, Karen, would you hurry up and become a life master already. As usual, I apologize for any errors or inadvertent omissions.

1.	Karen Kristiansen	13.93	5.	Jenny Bell	5.19
2.	Linda Kaleita	11.08	7.	Linda Nelson	5.10
2.	Ken Kaleita	11.08	8.	Israel Perlman	4.70
4.	Mark Oettinger	6.15	9.	Jim Abbott	3.58
5.	Mike Bell	5.19	9.	Eric McCann	3.58
			11.	Richard Tracy	3.56

Eight Ever, Nine Never

By Frank Hacker

The recent Burlington Sectional produced at least one interesting hand. As East, at favorable vulnerability, you hold **S** KJ1076 **H** 105 **D** A853 **C** 82

Here is the auction	<u>East</u>	<u>South</u>	<u>West</u>	<u>North</u>
	P	P	1D	2C
	2S	3C	4S	P
	P	5C	P	P
	???			

What now? The opponents are vulnerable, you're not. Maybe they are hoping to make this. What can partner have? You have the spades and diamonds. They appear to have the hearts and clubs. North bid 2C and never peeped again. South passed originally and did a lot of bidding afterward. There seem to be 3 possible actions --- Pass, Double and 5S. Pass seems chicken. Maybe they're stealing. Double seems optimistic. Maybe they're not stealing. You finally bid 5 spades. Everyone passes. South leads a low club and here's the layout.

	<u>West</u>		<u>East</u>
S	A542	S	KJ1076
H	A94	H	105
D	KQJ97	D	A853
C	9	C	82

Partner has a very suitable hand. You actually have a chance to make 5S --- with an overtrick! North wins the club ace and returns a heart to South's jack and dummy's ace. Guess the trumps correctly and you make 6, guess wrong and you're down 1. Are trumps 2-2, 3-1, or even 4-0? If they are not 2-2, who has the length? South, with his 5 club bid, could be short in spades, or he could be long and have deduced shortness in partner. You decide that South would not have bid 5 clubs vulnerable, if he thought he might have 2 quick spade losers. You also decide to keep it simple, and play South for the shortness. Also, if trumps are actually 4-0, you can pick them up if North has the 4, but not if South has the 4. It turns out that North had Qxx of spades and your finesse wins --- making 6.

Here is the entire hand.

	<u>North</u>		
	S Q83		
	H Q82		
	D 102		
	C AQJ106		
		<u>East</u>	
<u>West</u>		S KJ1076	
S A542		H 105	
H A94		D A853	
D KQJ97		C 82	
C 9			
	<u>South</u>		
	S 9		
	H KJ763		
	D 64		
	C K7543		

Double was the winning action. They're down 2 for 500.

The Hearts Have It

By Phil Sharpsteen

The following hand occurred at a recent flight A regional team event.

	<u>North</u>		
	S Jxx		
	H AKJ72		
	D Q10		
	C xxx		
		<u>East</u>	
<u>West</u>		S void	
S AKQxx		H Q9543	
H 1086		D xxxx	
D AJx		C AKxx	
C xx			

South

S 10xxxx
H void
D Kxxx
C QJ10x

West was dealer with NS vul.

At one table the bidding went 1S 2H all pass! At the other table it was 1S pass 2H pass 4H all pass! So BOTH directions declared in Hearts!

The defense against North's 2H took the first 8 tricks as follows: club A, club K, club ruff, AKQ of spades on which 3 diamonds were discarded and a spade ruff. Declarer now managed 4 heart tricks for -400. East/West managed 9 tricks on defense, but defense is difficult and so ...

In the 4 heart contract, declarer was able to see the need to play the Ace of diamonds at trick nine followed by a diamond ruff followed by a club ruff with the 10, making 4 for +420! So our team lost 1 imp on the board.

I Don't Believe What I just Saw

By Frank Hacker

I witnessed recently a truly amazing hand. Nearly every declarer went down in a game contract he/she probably should have made. The only plus scores went to pairs that missed game or allowed the opponents to play the hand. Nearly every declarer (can't say for sure --- all) misplayed a hand where the correct play, once pointed out seems obvious. Not only that, but the correct play sometimes breaks even with, but never loses to, the only logical alternative. Here is the hand

North

S A75
H J9843
D J6
C Q64

South

S KQ6
H AK752
D A42
C 53

South declares 4H on the opening lead of a small spade. What now?? With three outside losers, declarer must obviously avoid a trump loser. I believe most declarers won the spade in hand and simply led a high heart. Hearts split 0-3 (Q106 lay over the jack) and declarer had 4 losers. This was obviously bad luck, but declarer didn't give the hand the best play. Declarer should win the opening spade lead in dummy and lead the jack of hearts. Declarer has no intention to take the finesse. If East follows low, declarer will simply play for the drop (the obvious intention all along). If East covers (an obvious mistake on a hand where East know that declarer has 5 hearts – less obvious when the auction starts with a 1NT opening bid), he will give declarer a present.

An interesting point about the lead of the jack is that it costs nothing. If trumps are 2-1, declarer will still pick up the suit. If trumps are 3-0 with West, declarer just has the same loser he always had. The entire hand was

	<u>North</u>	
	S A75	
	H J9843	
	D J6	
	C Q64	
<u>West</u>		<u>East</u>
S 98432		S J10
H ---		H Q106
D KQ5		D 109873
C J9872		C AK10
	<u>South</u>	
	S KQ6	
	H AK752	
	D A42	
	C 53	

Vermonters On The Way Up

Many Vermonters have recently achieved new ranks in the ACBL masterpoint hierarchy. Well done! Here is a list. My apologies to anyone I inadvertently omitted.

Junior Master:

Sandra Castlebaum
W Lane Morrison

Joanne Church
Elaine Vanbrunt

Jane Davis

Club Master:

Vicki Green
Eleanor Ranzal

Frances Griffis

Arlene Okun

Sectional Master:

Linda Aronsson
Don Sharp

Dorothy Carpenter
Richard Tracy

Jody Petterson
Dorothy Williams

Regional Master:

Dulany Bennett
Susan Ransom

Arlene Fleming

Matthew Fleming

NABC Master:

Judith Ward

Silver Life Master:

C Kirk Osterland

Edward Schirmer

Gold Life Master:

Lynn Carew

Director (Please)

By Jim Thomas

Unauthorized Information (UI) is one of the toughest rulings a director has to make. Law 16 defines many types of UI, for example, “a remark, a question, a reply to a question, an unexpected alert or failure to alert, or by unmistakable hesitation, unwonted speed, special emphasis, tone, gesture, movement or mannerism.” After a player makes UI available to his partner, the partner may not choose from among logical alternatives one that could demonstrably have been suggested over another by the extraneous information. A logical alternative action is one that, among the class of players in question and using the methods of the partnership, would be given **serious consideration** by a significant proportion of such players, of whom it is judged some might select it.”

Although this discussion revolves around hesitations, remember that “fast” passes and bids also give partner UI. Failure to wait 10 seconds after a skip bid qualifies as UI.

The last article dealt with misinformation. Hesitations are the 800 pound gorilla and the other side of UI. The director has to determine:

1. Was there unauthorized information available? Was there a hesitation? If yes
2. Were the opponents damaged? If yes
3. Were there logical alternatives to the call chosen by the partner of the hesitator? If yes
4. Could the extraneous information demonstrably suggest the call chosen over a likely less successful logical alternative(s). Is it obvious? Is it readily apparent? Is it easily understood? If yes

5. Assign an adjusted score.

When should you call the director on a hesitation? You may call the director at any time. However, one way to handle the situation is to ask the partner of the hesitator if he agrees there was a hesitation. If he agrees, then you do not have to call the director until after the hand is played and you were injured. If there is disagreement on the hesitation, call the director immediately.

Let's look at an auction.

<u>N</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>W</u>	
1S	4H	P	P	of course S hesitated over 4H
4S	P	P	P	

Some common misconceptions about hesitation/huddles are as follows:

1. North is barred by partner's slow pass unless he has 100% action. FALSE! South's hesitation, if it was undue, restricts North's options, but only when alternatives are logical and then only in respect to those alternatives that could be suggested. So North is often entitled to act.
2. North may bid 4 spades so long as he did not base his decision on partner's slow pass. FALSE! Directors/committees should pay scant attention to testimony such as, "I always bid in auctions like this", or "I hardly noticed South's huddle - I had already made up my mind to bid 4 Spades." It is not that these statements are self-serving and unverifiable--the real point is that they are IRRELEVANT. The issue is not whether the slow pass suggested the 4 spade bid to this particular North, but, whether, to North players in general, the hesitation COULD make the 4 spade bid more attractive than a logical alternative.
3. After South's slow pass, North may not take a doubtful action. FALSE! North will commonly be faced with a choice among a number of reasonable options, all of them doubtful. The rules of bridge require that North do something at his turn - every one of his options cannot be illegal. The illegality is for North to select a particular option that could be suggested over another by partner's huddle.
4. North may bid 4 spades if that would have been reasonable action had partner not hesitated. FALSE! The issue is not whether 4 spades was reasonable, but whether any alternatives were.
5. North may not make a risky 4 spades bid, which could result in a huge set when South has nothing, now that the huddle tells him that South has something. FALSE! Even if the 4 spade bid would be disastrous one time in three, there may be no logical alternative to it. The test is not whether the bid would be successful an overwhelming proportion of the time, but whether an overwhelming proportion of players would choose to run the risk.
6. The director's decision to bar North's 4 spade bid, to adjust the score, in effect convicted North-South

of being unethical. FALSE! What the director found was that North's 4 spade bid was a technical irregularity, like a revoke. The adjusted score is to redress possible damage from that irregularity, just as it would take away a trick or two had North revoked. In all cases, directors are concerned not with crime and punishment, but with damage and restoring equity.

Novices are often reluctant to call the director because they feel that they are accusing the opponents of something unethical. Nothing could be further from the truth. Calling the director protects both sides. You should never make your own ruling at the table nor should you accept a ruling from an opponent. The ACBL convention card says in large print across the top inside: "When attention is called to an irregularity – CALL THE DIRECTOR."

The preamble to the new (2007) law book says: "The Laws are designed to define correct procedure and to provide an adequate remedy when there is a departure from correct procedure. They are primarily designed not as punishment for irregularities but rather for the rectification of situations where non-offenders may otherwise be damaged. Players should be ready to accept gracefully any rectification or adjusted score awarded by the Director."

As always, any questions or suggestions for discussions can be sent to mftjet@aol.com.

Vermont Autumn Leaves Sectional

Williston, VT
Sept. 20 – 22, 2013

Friday Afternoon Open Pairs

MP	A	B	C		Pct
4.17	1			Judith Donald – Fred Donald	66.19
3.13	2			Philip Sharpsteen – Frank Hacker	64.26
3.06	3	1	1	Stephen King – Susan King	63.45
2.30	4	2	2	Lorraine Streeter – Tom Cronin	61.40
1.32	5			Gerald DiVincenzo – Michael Farrell	60.44
1.46	6			J Peter Tripp – Penny Lane	58.59
1.72		3	3	Claire Beckler – Karen Kristiansen	54.99
1.53		4	4	Ronald Weiss – Mark Oettinger	54.78
1.07		5		Ruth Stokes – Jay Friedenson	53.98
0.77		6		Lynn Carew – Patricia Nestork	52.18
0.74			5	Kenneth Kaleita – Linda Kaleita	51.26

Friday Evening Open Pairs

MP	A	B	C		Pct
3.50	1			Mary Savko – Ellie Hanlon	60.03
2.63	2			June Dorion – Wayne Hersey	58.87
2.62	3	1	1	Claire Beckler – Karen Kristiansen	57.87
1.97	4	2		Patricia Nestork – Lynn Carew	55.81
1.47	5	3		Bonnie Clouser – Mary Tierney	55.05
1.23	6			Philip Sharpsteen – Frank Hacker	54.32
1.41		4	2	June Silverman – Joyce Stone	54.12
0.83		5		Jon Stokes – Ruth Stokes	52.48
1.06			3	John Newton – Sally Newton	50.21
0.79			4	Jody Petterson – Dorothy Carpenter	49.30

Saturday Morning Open Pairs

MP	A	B	C		Pct
4.50	1			Patricia DiVincenzo – Kathleen Farrell	70.51
3.38	2	1	1	Michael Bell – Jenny Bell	62.34
2.53	3	2		Bonnie Clouser – Mary Tierney	61.86
1.90	4			Mary Savko – Ellie Hanlon	60.26
1.42	5			Frank Hacker – Philip Sharpsteen	59.13
1.88	6	3	2	Richard Clark – Michael Borushok	56.57
1.41		4		George Onni – Michael Rogers	55.93
1.19		5	3	Ronald Weiss – Mark Oettinger	54.01
0.96		6/7		Patricia Nestork – Lynn Carew	53.69
0.96		6/7		Kotze Toshev – Gary Feingold	53.69
0.89			4	Rhoda Chickering – Sandy Desilets	53.37
0.74			5	Richard Tracy – B L “Tink” Tysor	50.64

Saturday Afternoon Open Pairs

MP	A	B	C		Pct
4.33	1	1	1	Kenneth Kaleita – Linda Kaleita	67.99
3.25	2			Michel Farrell – Gerald DiVincenzo	64.06
2.44	3			Philip Sharpsteen – Frank Hacker	63.15
2.41	4	2	2	Mark Oettinger– Ronald Weiss	61.85
1.37	5			Judith Donald – Fred Donald	61.84
1.03	6			Ellie Hanlon– Mary Savko	61.61
1.81		3		Mary Tierney – Paul Reardon	58.20
1.35		4	3	Mark Adair – Vivienne Adair	55.36

1.02	5	4	John Newton – Sally Newton	54.88
0.76	6		George Onni – Michael Rogers	53.24
0.63		5	Rhoda Chickering – Sandy Desilets	52.10

Sunday Swiss Teams

MP	A	B	C		Score
6.25	1			Bob Gorsey– Vincent Grande Mary Savko – Ellie Hanlon	86
4.69	2			J Peter Tripp – Penny Lane June Dorion – Wayne Hersey	83
3.72	3	1		Paul Reardon – Jackie Kimel Lynn Carew – Pat Nestork	73
2.64	4			Philip Sharpsteen – Frank Hacker Rudolph Polli – Fred Donald	68
2.79		2	1	Richard Clark – John Newton Sally Newton – Rhoda Chickering	58
2.09		3		Jay Friedenson – Alan Wertheimer Ruth Stokes – Jon Stokes	54

299er Swiss Teams

MP					Score
1.41		1		Jody Petterson – Karen Hewitt Don Sharp – Sheila Sharp	49

Marilyn Hacker Pairs

The Marilyn Hacker Pairs has become an annual August ritual. This year's event was held on August 3 at the Burlington Bridge Academy. The format was the usual 2 sessions of bridge with a lasagna dinner in the middle. This year's winners were John Kimel and Phil Sharpsteen. Second went to Jerry DiVincenzo and Mike Farrell. There were 11 tables for bridge. Here are the overall standings.

MP	A	B	C		Score
4.46	1			John Kimel – Philip Sharpsteen	269.50
3.86	2			Gerald DiVincenzo – Michael Farrell	265.70
2.51	3			Thomas Smith – Frank Hacker	245.20
1.88	4			Jackie Kimel – Rudolph Polli	231.90
1.49	5			Mary Savko – Ellie Hanlon	229.90
3.35	6	1	1	Stanley Rosenthal – Carol Slesar	228.30
2.51		2		Alan Wertheimer – Wayne Hersey	227.70
1.88		3	2	Luis Chernyshov – Frances Wager	219.50

1.41	4		Patricia Nestork – Lynn Carew	215.70
1.34	5	3	Ken Kaleita – Linda Kaleita	213.60
1.00		4	Janine Gauthier – Katharine White	212.80

President's Pairs

The Vermont Bridge Association annual meeting took place on October 6 at the Burlington Bridge Academy in Williston, VT. The format was the usual 2 sessions of bridge with dinner and the VBA business meeting in the middle. This year's bridge winners were Phil Sharpsteen and Frank Hacker. There were 14.5 tables for bridge. Here are the overall standings.

MP	A	B	C		Score
4.68	1			Philip Sharpsteen – Frank Hacker	379.62
3.51	2			Judie Donald – Kathy Farrell	379.56
4.32	3	1		Lynn Carew – Alan Wertheimer	376.41
3.01	4	2	1	Stephen King – Susan King	349.48
2.32	5	3	2	Layton Davis – William Wade	347.40
1.57	6	4		Jackie Kimel – Rudolph Polli	344.29
1.24		5		Abe Brown – Jean Brown	337.42
1.69		6	3	Rhoda Chickering – Sandy Desilets	328.63
1.28			4	John Newton – Sally Newton	317.02
1.00			5	Mark Adair – Vivienne Adair	316.44

The margin between first and second place was very small, just .06 match points out of a total of 624. Before the coming of computers, the ACBL rule was that differences of less than .50 match points were considered to be ties. I believe the current rule is that the difference has to be only .01. I think I like the old rule better.

The ACBL had another interesting rule about factoring. All factoring had to be up. What in the world does this mean? What difference does it make? Suppose you have a game with a sit out. One pair has a sit out and for them average is 133. Another pair has no sit out and for them average is 144. The scores are not comparable unless you do one of two things. You can multiply the score for the pair with the lower average by 144/133 or you can multiply the score for the pair with the higher average by 133/144. The ACBL used to prescribe the 144/133 approach. Differences expand with the 144/133 approach and contract with the other. Suppose the pair with the higher average scores 177 and the pair with the lower average scores 163. Using the factor up approach, the 163 becomes 176.48. The 177 is the winner, since the difference is greater than .50. Using the factor down approach, the 177 becomes 163.48 and the result is a tie. The ACBL adopted the up approach to avoid this type of tie. Before computer scoring, a lot of very bright people spent a lot of time on incredibly geeky things.

Vermont On The Tournament Trail

Many Vermonters have had success (10 or more points) at the Atlanta Nationals or at regional tournaments. Here is a list. Sorry for any inadvertent omissions.

Atlanta Nationals:

Allan Graves 201.29

Council Bluffs:

Penny Lane 24.47 Peter Tripp 24.47

Reston:

Allan Graves 69.81

Montreal:

Mary Savko 34.38 Ellie Hanlon 34.38 Gerald DiVincenzo 18.71

New York:

Judith Ward 13.24 Robin Cocking 13.24

Warwick:

Mary Savko 50.23 Ellie Hanlon 50.23 Frank Hacker 45.16
Philip Sharpsteen 45.16 Jay Friedenson 20.62 Alan Wertheimer 16.13

Coming Attractions

Nov 6 – 10: NE Master's Regional, Holiday Inn, Mansfield, MA
Nov 28 – Dec 8: Fall Nationals, Sheraton Phoenix Hotel Downtown/Hyatt Regency, Phoenix, AZ
Dec 7 Perrin Pairs, Burlington Bridge Academy, Williston, VT
Jan 3 – 5: Keohane Individual Regional, Newton Marriott, 2345 Commonwealth Ave, Newton, MA