

The winners of the 1997 Vanderbilt Knockout Teams were presented with their Vanderbilt Trophy replicas here. Harold Vanderbilt, inventor of contract bridge, left a legacy in his will which provides for sterling silver trophies to be given to all Vanderbilt winners each year. Displaying their trophies are, seated, left to right: Mark Lair, Richie Schwartz and Peter Boyd; standing, Bobby Goldman, Paul Soloway and Steve Robinson.

## Systems and conventions: what's fair and reasonable?

Among ACBL members, there are strong feelings on both sides of the issue of conventions and Alerts. Many ACBL players simply do not enjoy events where the opponents Alert frequently or the conventions are difficult to fathom. The issues are more complex in high-level competition, particularly in international competition, but the viewpoints expressed in the following two pieces should be of interest to, and possibly enlightening for, all players.

## Bridge needs simplicity for public acceptance

## By Bob Hamman

The most successful bridge team of this decade has been the French team consisting of Paul Chemla Michel Perron, Hervé Mouiel, Alain Lévy and, in the last Bermuda Bowl, Christian Mari and Frank Multon.

Every pair on the winning team in the 1997 Bermuda Bowl plays a natural system with none of the destructive conventions that require specialized defenses. In fact, in international competition many of the most successful partnerships reject destructive systems.

In order for any sport to rise above the niche level, it must be comprehensible to a public of amateur enthusiasts. This means that bridge -- from the world championships on down -- must be understandable to existing fans and to potential fans.

If we consider that one of our game's most serious problems is lack of comprehension by the public, where do we go for a remedy? These are my recommendations:

1. Outlaw all conventions except weak notrumps, where the values promised are less than that of a minimum traditional opening bid and no suit is dis-


Bob Hamman

## Bramley foursome in Reisinger BAM lead

The squad captained by Bart Bramley held a lead of approximately two and a half boards with two sessions left to play in the Reisinger Board-aMatch Teams.

Bramley is playing with Sidney Lazard, Howard Weinstein and Steve Garner. After four qualifying sessions, their score was 37.91 .

In second place with 35.48 were Steve Zolotow, Harold Lilie, Marc Jacobus, Ron Smith and Bob Crossley.

In a virtual tie for third and fourth were two teams with strong Chicago connections: Tom Fox, Walter Schafer (both from Chicago suburbs), John Sutherlin and Russ Ekeblad (34.19) and Jerry Goldfein, Larry Robbins and Gary Cohler (suburban Chicago), playing with Dan Rotman (34.13)

Missing from the final is the team that has won three of the last four Reisingers -- Nick Nickell, Richard Freeman, Bob Hamman, Bobby Wolff, Jeff Meckstroth and Eric Rodwell.

## Blue Ribbon final is

## exciting for newcomer

Until about a year and a half ago, Richard Riezman's only contact with bridge was remembering how much he played during his college days in the Sixties. At the Fall NABC, the relative newcomer to the ACBL found himself smack in the middle of the Blue Ribbon Pairs final.
"It was quite a thrill," said the 53-year-old St. Louis attorney who started the NABC with the grand total of 65 masterpoints. In fact, Riezman was the only non-Life Master (or foreign equivalent) out of the 288 pairs to enter the Blue Ribbon His partner was Roger Lord, who also happens to be Riezman's bridge mentor

Lord, also of St. Louis, said he and Riezman were matched up by a mutual friend, attorney Alan Popkin

Says Lord: "Richard is more than a good student. He has a knack for figuring things out, and he's a perfect gentleman at the table."

Riezman says he decided to return to bridge
continued on page 3

## Coleman maintains lead in NA Swiss

Bidding to lead the event from start to finish, the squad captained by Jack Coleman put more distance between themselves and second place after the second day of qualifying play in the North American Swiss Teams

Coleman, Matt Granovetter, Mark Molson, Boris Baran, Mark Stein and Drew Cannell ended the day Saturday with 132 Victory Points. In second place with 113.3 VPs were Jeff Schuett, Craig Gardner, Mary Gardner, Kerry Smith and Dick Bruno

Coleman's team, minus Granovetter, has won the North American Swiss two of the last three years

In third place after two days of play were Edith Rosenkranz, Robert Morris, Bob Etter, Curtis Cheek and Hjordis Eythorsdottir.


Karen Allison

Vugraph to feature Reisinger matches

A key table during each three-board round in the Reisinger Board-a-Match Teams final will be featured throughout the afternoon and evening sessions today. The show will take place, starting at noon, in Ballrooms A-B-C-D on the fourth level of the Adam's Mark

Karen Allison, who has made major strides in putting bridge matches on the Internet, will be the chief commentator, assisted by George Jacobs. As usual, many great players will take the mike as well from time to time.

## Tunisian residents?

Henry and Dorthy Francis missed their Air France flight when they were attempting to leave Tunisia -- their bus left the hotel almost an hour late and their seats were canceled and sold to someone else. They spent three of the most frustrating hours of their life in Tunis Airport on Sunday trying to find some way to leave Tunisia before Wednesday. For a moment it appeared they could get out on Tunis Air for 903 dinar apiece (that's $\$ 803$ American). But that fizzled too. Finally they gave up and took a taxi to a downtown Tunis hotel.

The rest of the story has "Pretty Woman" accents -- remember the hotel manager who took such good care of Julia Roberts? Well, Henry and Dorthy found that kind of hotel manager. First he reduced their room rate when he heard their sad story. Then he called Air France -- no luck, the earliest was Wednesday. But then he said he had a travel agent friend who might help -- "See me when I come on duty tomorrow morning."

On Monday morning, he saw Henry in the lobby and said, "Let's go." They walked a few blocks to a travel office, and he told
his friend about Henry's problem. The agent went to work on his computer, and an hour and a half later he announced he had found a flight -- Tunis Air to Barcelona, then Lufthansa to Frankfurt. "I'll take it," Henry said quickly. "How much?"
"438 dinar (\$390) each."
"Yesterday they told me 903 dinar," said Henry.
"Ah," said the hotel manager. "But yesterday you were a foreigner. Today you're a Tunisian resident."

The tickets were round-trip of course -after all Henry and Dorthy were Tunisian residents! Then Henry tried to pay with a credit card.
"You can't use that," said the hotel manager. "That credit card identifies you as an American resident. You'll have to pay cash. Come with me. I have a friend in the money business."

So off they went, and Henry got the money even though he didn't have his passport. "He's a friend of mine from America," the hotel manager told the money man.

A happy ending to a sad story. It's going to be a long time before Henry and Dorthy forget that hotel manager.

## Three roads to ruin

We have all heard of Morton's Fork, a picturesque way to describe a situation where a player (usually a defender) has two options, both of which lose. Fred Gitelman engineered a fascinating ending on this hand from the second final session of the Blue Ribbon Pairs, where the defender had three losing options.


Gitelman, North, ended up as declarer in $2 v$ after and opening 1 from East. A club was led, won by the king, and Gitelman led a heart to the king and played another round of trumps. East won the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$, cashed the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and led a diamond to his partner's ace. West did well not to touch spades now, exiting with a club to dummy.

Three more rounds of clubs followed, putting the defenders under some pressure. Gitelman read the position correctly and took the bold step of giving up on his chances of finding West with the $\wedge \mathrm{A}$, coming down to a singleton $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$. Meanwhile, West made the small but fatal error of keeping two diamonds, resulting in this ending:


Now a spade to the 10, king, and ace left East with three equally unpalatable choices. The $\quad \mathrm{J}$ would be ducked to the queen, the $\bullet \mathrm{K}$ would be ruffed, establishing the queen, and a spade would be ruffed in hand, setting up dummy's $\uparrow J$ when West's queen fell. Now we need a name for this kind of maneuver: maybe the Cerberus Coup?

## Little things mean a lot

## By Barry Rigal

The late great Jean Besse of Switzerland won a Bols Bridge Tip prize by pointing out the importance of what he called Neutrinos. By this he meant the significance of not discarding ALL your cards in a side suit to led declarer count out the hand.

Wynn Allegert showed me this hand, which actually relates to the theme.

- K Q 7
- Q 64
-J 932
* K 52

A --

- K 85
- K 108754
\& J 943
- A 109853
- J 642
- A J 10
- A Q
* A 1087

You play 3NT with a combined 28 high card points -- normally enough! On a diamond lead to the queen, you play a spade to the king and West throws a diamond. East wins and returns a spade -- you win in dummy to run the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$. West wins and returns a diamond, and you get another piece of the picture when East throws a heart.

You run the $\$ 7$ to East who plays a third spade to your jack as West pitches the 10 and you now take your heart winners. This is the position:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { J } 9 \\
& * \text { K } 5
\end{aligned}
$$





-     - 
- A 108

Now the significance of East's innocent discard of a low heart becomes apparent. Had he retained it, you would have to guess if West was 6-4-0-3 or 6-3-0-4 originally. As it is, you can cash the $\& \mathrm{~K}$ and exit with a diamond. West is endplayed at trick 12 to lead a club into your tenace.

## Just an overtrick

## By Adam Wildavsky

My sweetheart, Ann Raymond, taught me that "it's only the last board that counts." That was never more true for me than Thursday night in the second final session of the Blue Ribbon Pairs. After 25 boards, I thought Allan Falk and I were only a board or so above average, and while we were leading by a small margin after the fifth session, I was not confident that we were in contention.

| Dlr: East <br> Vul: Both |  | AA 954 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | - Q 9 |  |
|  |  | $\text { - A J } 9$ |  |
| - 872 |  |  | - Q J 63 |
| $\checkmark 1085$ |  |  | -K 74 |
| -87643 |  |  | - Q 102 |
| *A 2 |  |  | *Q 63 |
| - K 10 |  |  |  |
| - J 632 |  |  |  |
| -K 5 |  |  |  |
| *J 874 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | Me |  | Allan |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \vee$ |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 3NT |

All Pass
With the North hand, I had to decide what to respond. 1a is reasonable but I chose an equally reasonable 2 NT , showing a balanced $12-15$ highcard points (game forcing). I didn't want to have the same auction as the field, since I didn't want an average on the board, and I knew we'd be one of the only pairs in the field to have a natural 2NT available.

As it turns out, our game was a little better than I had hoped and our opponents' games a little worse than I had feared, so an average on the board would have been enough to win the event for us.

Average on the board was not available, however. We could be plus 400 for 8 out of 25 or plus 430 for 18.

I was mildly concerned about wrong-siding the contract on account of my spade holding. Tough! My fears were realized when East led the - 3. As it turns out, we had actually right-sided the contract. Allan would have been hard-pressed to make even nine tricks after the likely lead of the - 8 by West.

In any case, I passed the first hurdle by ducking in dummy after much thought -- West followed with the $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$. Once the $\boldsymbol{\wedge} 10$ held, my contract was secure and I could consider overtricks. The $\uparrow 8$ seemed the right card to lead at trick two.

West went up with the ace to lead back the - 8. I should have thought more about West's play. Often a player will play the ace second hand when holding the queen as well, but there was a live possibility that her partner held the $\& 10$. On the other hand it looked as though spades were 4-3 and there seemed no pressing reason to part with the \&A since if East won the trick and continued spades West would still have one to lead when she did score the $\%$ A. Had I switched my attention to hearts, I could have made 11 tricks, hopefully by taking the percentage play in the suit of low to the 9 .

In any case, it was late, I was tired and I took a second club finesse by playing the 4 to the 10 . East won and exited with the $\uparrow$ Q. I won and led the Q , covered by the king and ace. After more thought, I decided that the diamond finesse was my best play for 10 tricks without risking holding myself to nine. I could force one more discard first, though, so I led the $\& \mathrm{~J}$ to the king (West pitched a diamond). Then I led the $\uparrow$, covered by East with the 10 . This was a suspicious card. While it could be from three to the 10 , most players wouldn't think of the play, and I decided to play East for the $\bullet \mathrm{Q}$ as well.

I cashed the $\vee$ and played the $\& 4$ to the 9 . West pitched a heart and East was squeezed on this trick. She discarded a heart, so I could throw her in with a spade to lead into my diamond tenace. I like to think that I would have guessed correctly had she discarded the 2 . In any case, plus 430 was good enough to win the event. Plus 400 would have put us second.

## Newcomer

continued from page 1


## Roger Lord and quick learner Richard Riezman

after 30 years because in playing bridge it is necessary to employ some of the same problem-solving skills he uses in his law practice.
"I thought it would be great recreation as I get older," Riezman says.

The attorney praised Lord for his tutoring skills. "Roger is extremely diligent," says Riezman. "He has high standards of play and high ethical standards."

Riezman says he and Lord did not expect to go as far as they did in the Blue Ribbon Pairs, but they started the event with a section top and went on from there.

Riezman says he was surprised at how much stamina he needed to play six sessions of bridge in three days, the length of the Blue Ribbon. "It was intense," he says. "I'm just starting to recover."

## Sender Defense Award

Swedish Count Gunnar Hallberg won the Sender Defense Award for his performance as East on this hand. He found the right play by using the most important tool of defense, counting the declarer's tricks. The journalist who reported this deal was Robert Sheehan of Great Britain.

## Dlr: South © J873 <br> Vul: None $\downarrow 2$ <br> - K Q J 5 <br> * J 64

| A A 65 |  | A K 1092 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -6543 |  | - K 87 |
| - 32 |  | -10987 |
| * K 1082 |  | * Q 5 |
|  | - Q 4 |  |
|  | - Q J 109 |  |
|  | - A 64 |  |
|  | * A 973 |  |


| South | West | North | East |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1NT ${ }_{(12-14)}$ | Pass | $2 \&$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |
| Declarer played low from dummy on the $\% 2$ |  |  |  |

Declarer played low from dummy on the $\approx 2$ lead, East played the queen and declarer won the ace. Declarer played on hearts, East winning the third round with dummy discarding a spade. At this point many players would return a club. Now after West takes his king declarer has nine tricks.

When Hallberg won the $\vee K$, he counted declarer's tricks. South was bound to have the A -- else why wouldn't he be playing on diamonds, rather than removing the A as an entry to them? Hence it was clear that South had seven tricks in the red suits to go with the \&A, and a club return would obviously set up his ninth trick. South needed the $\uparrow Q$ to make up his $12-141 \mathrm{NT}$, which meant that the defense couldn't make more than two tricks there.

So East returned a diamond. This innocuous looking play scrambled the declarer's entries. If he won in hand to lead a club, he would never be able to cash his fourth heart. If he cashed the fourth heart first, what was dummy to discard? One spade had already gone on the third heart, and if he discarded another the defense could take four spade tricks when they came in with the $\& \mathrm{~K}$. The only other choice was to discard a diamond, but that would leave declarer a trick short.

# No Charity 

By Roger Lord

- 104
- A Q 974
- Q 6
*K983
- 975 - K 862
- J 1065 - K 82
*J 42
- 1054
- A Q J 3
$\bullet 3$
- AK 72
* A Q 76

Larry Kolker, North, upon seeing dummy thought he'd better play for the maximum number of tricks to salvage a few matchpoints after missing the club slam. He let the opening spade lead ride to his 10 , then finessed the jack and cashed the ace, pitching a heart. Next he ran clubs. East could afford one heart discard, but the fourth round of clubs squeezed him in three suits. He elected to unguard diamonds.

Then the run of the established diamond suit squeezed East again. Protecting his high spade, East blanked the $\vee \mathrm{K}$. At trick 12 Kolker guessed right -- he went up with the $\downarrow$ A to score all 13 tricks.

As East left the table he was heard to mutter, "I've never been squeezed like that before."

## Sad story

Tadashi Yoshida of Tokyo had a sad tale to tell from the second session of the Tuesday Stratified Open Pairs. Yoshida and his partner sat East-West.


Pass $4 \bullet$ (1) All Pass
(1) Intended as a Texas transfer.

South forgot what the partnership was playing, so North ended up in the serendipitous 4-4 heart fit despite the snafu. East led a club, won in dummy with the king. Declarer then called for the $\checkmark$ Q, taken by West with the king. A club came back to declarer's ace. An instant later, the $\mathbf{J}$ was on the table, smothering the 10 and picking up the suit for two losers.

Yoshida and his partner could only lament their bad luck. At virtually every other table, of course, South was declarer in $4 \boldsymbol{4}$. The normal lead of a top heart would quickly produce a heart ruff for the defenders, holding declarer to 10 tricks. Minus 450 for Yoshida was a tie for bottom.

## Machine vs. man

Players often complain about computer-dealt hands, saying they're too far out of the norm to be real. Then how about this one, dealt by humans in a bracketed knockout teams on Saturday afternoon? Mike Jinks of Greenville SC held these cards:

```
A--
* AKJ8753
*A K Q 6 5 3
```

*---

He and partner Ed Word of Monroe LA quickly reached 7 despite interference by the opponents. Partner put down three diamond to the jack and a singleton heart in dummy -- and the $\checkmark$ Q was doubleton onside -- so 7 rolled home for plus 2140, a 16 -IMP gain since East-West stopped in $4 \boldsymbol{\text { at }}$ the other table.

## Home away from home

Eight players from Winnipeg jumped into a motor home last Saturday, drove 1100 miles to St. Louis, and played bridge for a week. Tonight they'll climb back into the huge vehicle and drive through the night -- and day -- back to Winnipeg. Four of the eight lived in the motor home throughout the tournament, and four decided to stay in the Holiday Inn, in front of which the motor home has been parked.

The "togetherness" group includes Gail Arnott, Ron Heron, Bob Waite, Ron Sawiak, Andrew Petrick, Bill Trebel, Len Doerksen and Ferd Bernjak. Gail, Ron, Andrew and Ferd shared the group's most successful venture of the week -- a victory in one of the bracketed knockouts.

Ron is heavily into Junior bridge -- he teaches 11 classes to schoolchildren from the sixth grade through high school.

## All the news that's fit to print

## By Barry Rigal

Michael Einberg, playing with David Sokolow in the North American Swiss qualifier, found a neat defense. Although the play may seem obvious, it defeated the many-time champion in the West seat at the other table.

- A J 5
-K 7652
- Q 974
* J


Both tables reached $4 \boldsymbol{a}$ from the South seat, and both declarers received a trump lead, won in dummy. They passed the \&J and West won to play a second trump, won cheaply in hand. Now came the $\% \mathrm{~K}$, and at one table West covered this. Declarer ruffed and played a heart to the queen. West took this and played a third club, but declarer won it, drew trumps and gave up a diamond. Ten tricks made.

Einberg ducked the $\approx \mathrm{K}$, forcing declarer to ruff a club in dummy. Now he got in with the $\leqslant$ and forced declarer with another club. South could draw trumps, but when diamonds did not behave and with the A in West who had a long club ready to cash, declarer was down down no matter what he did.

## One-track mind

Chuck and Elaine Said of Nashville were about to sit down for dinner at Tony's Friday night between sessions when they spotted Rita Shugart, who had just finished her meal after an afternoon playing in the Reisinger Board-a-Match Teams.

Chuck was hoping to get a hint about a good dish, so he asked Shugart, "What did you have?"

Without missing a beat, Shugart replied, "Fourteen."

## Truly international

Players from at least 17 countries are competing at this NABC. Of course we have players from the four ACBL countries -- United States, Canada, Mexico and Bermuda. In addition, we have players from Argentina, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Barbados, Great Britain, Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Iceland, Poland and Germany.

## How our members feel about Bulletin format

The object of the survey was to determine how members feel about a change in the format of The Bridge Bulletin, from the current digest size to that of Time or Newsweek.

The first part of the project involved production of a magazine in the new size -- 8.5 by 11 inches -- with better-quality paper and revamped design inside.

That was accomplished and the new-style magazines were displayed during the 1997 Summer NABC in Albuquerque with a questionnaire asking the opinions of ACBL members.

Members are asked to examine the magazine and answer the following questions (responders' options were Yes, No and No Opinion):

1. Do you prefer the appearance of the largesize magazine to that of the present-size Bridge Bulletin?
2. Does the layout of the large-size magazine appeal to you?
3. Do you think the type size of the Bridge Bulletin is large enough, considering the high average age of our membership? (The type size was increased by about $5 \%$ about a year ago.)
4. If we were to change to the large-size magazine, the cost of producing the Bridge Bulletin would rise significantly. Would you be willing to earmark approximately $\$ 2$ per year to finance this change?

In Albuquerque, 255 questionnaires were completed.

The next part of the project was to produce more Bridge Bulletins in the new format and to make them available to members who frequent bridge clubs in North America.

Twenty clubs were recruited to participate in the survey. Their mission was to display the sample magazines and to make the questionnaires available -- with exactly the same questions that were posed in Albuquerque. After the magazines and surveys were mailed, a club owner in Los Angeles asked if he could take part, and he was included.

Although the questions were the same, there were two additions to the survey.

First, there was a notice that only ACBL members were invited to take part in the survey.

Second, those who filled out the questionnaires were encouraged to include their player numbers. The reason for this was that we hoped to be able to gather some demographic information about those who responded through the use of the membership files in our main computer. Most of the membership entries have such information as age, the date the person joined the ACBL, masterpoints, etc.

To hold down expenses, the sample magazines in Albuquerque and the ones sent to clubs were only 24 pages and were thus only one-third the size the magazine would be in the new format.

To illustrate what the magazine would look and feel like at 72 pages, each club was sent a 72 page magazine with the same cover as the others but blank pages inside. These were not available in Albuquerque.

Nineteen of the 21 clubs returned completed surveys. The two clubs which did not return surveys are located in Canada, the problem owing no doubt to slow mail service

A total of 1326 ACBL members completed the survey sent to clubs. The results of those surveys, plus the one in Albuquerque, can be found in attached documents.

## Survey results

From the 1997 Summer NABC in Albuquerque 255 responses (percentages are rounded)

1. Do you prefer the appearance of the largesize magazine to that of the present-size Bridge Bulletin?

| Yes | No | No opinion |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 180 | 70 | 5 |
| $70.5 \%$ | $27.5 \%$ | $2 \%$ |

2. Does the layout of the large-size magazine appeal to you?

| Yes | No | No opinion |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 183 | 50 | 22 |
| $72 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $8 \%$ |

3. Do you think the type size of the Bridge Bulletin is large enough, considering the high average age of our membership? (The type size was increased by about 5\% about a year ago.)

| Yes | No | No opinion |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 185 | 44 | 26 |
| $72 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $10 \%$ |

4. If we were to change to the large-size magazine, the cost of producing the Bridge Bulletin would rise significantly. Would you be willing to earmark approximately $\$ 2$ per year to finance this change?

| Yes | No | No opinion |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 139 | 109 | 7 |
| $54.5 \%$ | $42.5 \%$ | $3 \%$ |

## From the mail survey of 19

ACBL-affiliated bridge clubs:
1326 responses (percentages are rounded)

1. Do you prefer the appearance of the large-
size magazine to that of the present-size Bridge Bulletin?

| Yes | No | No opinion |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 560 | 690 | 76 |
| $42 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $6 \%$ |

2. Does the layout of the large-size magazine appeal to you?

| Yes | No | No opinion |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 637 | 550 | 139 |
| $48 \%$ | $41.5 \%$ | $10.5 \%$ |

3. Do you think the type size of the Bridge Bulletin is large enough, considering the high average age of our membership? (The type size was increased by about $5 \%$ about a year ago.)

| Yes | No | No opinion |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1060 | 151 | 115 |
| $80 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $9 \%$ |

4. If we were to change to the large-size magazine, the cost of producing the Bridge Bulletin would rise significantly. Would you be willing to earmark approximately $\$ 2$ per year to finance this change?

| Yes | No | No opinion |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 418 | 803 | 105 |
| $31.5 \%$ | $60.5 \%$ | $8 \%$ |

## Demographic information

Using player numbers, we attempted to compile some demographic information on the members who responded to the surveys. Because some of the surveys arrived at Headquarters late, only 13 sets of surveys were researched in this fashion. These 13 involved 833 total responses, 606 of which contained information about the players' ages.

Breakdown by sex ( 833 responders)
Women: 498 (59.8\%).
Men: 335 (40.2\%).
Average age of the 606 responders: 63.8 .

## Survey-specific information

Average age of players who answered yes to Question 1: 62.1

Average age of players who answered no to Question 1: $\mathbf{6 5 . 2}$

Average length of ACBL membership, yes to Question 1: 10.9.

Average length of ACBL membership, no to Question 1: $\mathbf{1 3 . 8}$.

Average masterpoint holding, yes to Question 1: 450.5.

Average masterpoint holding, yes to Question 1: 858.9.

## Commentary and conclusions

It was apparent from reading the surveys -many contained comments by the responders -that some members did not understand the questions.

For example, some appeared to think that in the new format, The Bridge Bulletin would be only 24 pages. This no doubt influenced at least some to vote against the change who might otherwise have chosen yes for Question 1. Some, in fact,
indicated this in so many words
A frequent comment among those who voted no to Question 1 was that the small size is preferred because it fits in a purse, or because the new size would not fit in with a collection of Bridge Bulletins that is many years old (the spines can be displayed on a bookshelf to show the month and year of publication, unlike the new format)

Others said they did not like the "shiny" (glossy) paper.

There was also an apparent misunderstanding of Question 4. Many responders appeared to believe the survey was asking whether the member would approve a $\$ 2$ increase in dues. This question elicited the strongest negative reaction among club members to any of the questions.

The stark contrast in results between the Al buquerque survey and the club survey may be the product of the way in which the survey at the NABC was done. In Albuquerque, a strong advocate of the change to the new format oversaw at least some of the survey process and was there to explain points that were unclear -- and to lobby for a particular point of view. This was not the case at the clubs.

The negative vote on Question 1 -- the key issue in the survey -- may have been influenced by the resistance to change which is part of human nature. Even people who don't save their magazines feel the way one survey responder put it: "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."

One who favored the change, however, also had a strong opinion, voiced in this manner: "Let's get modern!"

This survey is not at all scientific and was without controls of any kind to assure uniformity or comprehension on the part of the participants.

The information does provide a rough guideline as to the mood of the membership at the club level, which constitutes the majority of the ACBL membership.

## Accidents will happen

(But why do they always happen to me?) By Barry Rigal
The quote is not mine -- it's the quote of the players who played this hand against Jill Mellstrom. While I was playing in the North American Swiss qualifying, a mournful figure came up to me and presented me with the following deal:

- 8752
$\bullet$ Q 108
A K 3
- AK 3
* A K J
- AJ 64
,
- J 9
- K 76
-J752
- Q 98
\& 94
-A5432
- 1064
* 108752

|  | $1 N T$ | Pass | $2 \downarrow$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\star}$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\oplus}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ |

All Pass
Yes, North was playing forcing Stayman, and South, Jill Mellstrom of Sweden, had forgotten -she thought it was a transfer. On the diamond lead South hopped up with the ace, ruffed a spade, then crossed back to dummy three more times with dummy's top cards to ruff spades.

Having taken the first eight tricks, she exited with a diamond. The defense won and played a heart to her bare ace. She got out a club, won by West, who put her to the guess with the 13th diamond. But Jill got it right, ruffing with the 10 , taking the queen and making her game.

That was the only swing of the seven-board match -- for some reason they missed game in the other room!

## TOUBNAMENT APPEALS

## CASE SIXTEEN

Subject: Tempo
Event: Blue Ribbon Pairs, 26 Nov 97, Second Session

Board: 21 Michael Rosenberg
Dealer: North J 10876542
Vul: N/S $\quad 832$

- 2

Dan Marcus Petra Hamman

- Q
- 93
- K 9
- A J 1064
- KQ965 •J8
* A Q J 103 *K972

Bob Hamman

- AK
- Q 75
-A 10743

| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | 1 * |
| 2* | 3. | $4 *$ | 4. |
| Dbl (1) | Pass | 5* | All Pass |

(1) Break in tempo

The Facts: $5 \%$ made five, plus 400 for E/W. The opening lead was the 2 that was won by South with the ace. South played the $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$ and North played the $\star$ 2. South then attempted to cash the $\uparrow$ K. Declarer ruffed and won the rest of the tricks. The Director was called after the hand was over and ruled that West broke tempo before he doubled 4 A . E/W did not agree. The Director ruled that pass was a logical alternative to the $5 *$ bid and changed the contract to 4- doubled down one, plus 200 for $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$.

The Appeal: E/W appealed the Director's ruling. North, East, and West attended the hearing. North stated South had a previous commitment and could not attend. East stated that she asked about the 3 a bid, South told her that the bid showed good spades and she paused another five seconds and then passed. East stated that she almost bid $5 \&$ over 3 but decided to bid $4 \bullet$ in case each side had a double fit. E/ W stated that the $5 *$ contract should have gone down. The Committee discovered that E/W play weak twobids but their discussion had been that in first and second seat they showed a six-card suit. They had not discussed jumps in competition.

North stated that he believed West's break in tempo was about eight seconds. He also stated that since East was a passed hand which denied very long hearts, a club fit was implied and that passing an intempo double of 4 was a logical alternative. East did not immediately pull the double to $5 *$; she had paused for a "little while." North stated that he realized the Director should have been called immediately after the break in tempo, but because his opponent was his partner's wife, he had hoped there would not be a need for the Director. The Committee inquired about N/S's carding agreement and were told their agreement is primarily attitude -- the only time they would ever give count would be if the opponents had led the suit.

The Committee Decision: The Committee first discussed the defense of the $5 \%$ contract. Some believed that the A was a peculiar play at trick two. The $\boldsymbol{a} 2$ said "don't continue". The Committee unanimously agreed that N/S, two of the greatest players in the world should get this right. It was decided that the damage they had suffered was subsequent to, not consequent of any infraction that may have occurred. Their result was decided to be $5 \&$ made five, minus 400 .

The Committee next considered the $5 *$ bid. The auction had been unusual and complicated; a passed hand had jumped to 3 and a passed hand had bid $4 \vee$. A slow double in this situation would tend to make removal a more attractive alternative. In theory East had shown a club tolerance, but the fourth club was definitely an offensive defect, as were the doubleton spade and doubleton diamond. East was aware that the double had not been made with a trump stack since she had been told that North had a good spade suit. It was certainly possible that East would exchange a plus score for a minus score by bidding (and, in fact, should have.) The Committee finally decided, in a split decision, that the tempo of the
double, because of the unusual auction, did not sug gest one logical alternative over another and allowed the table result, $5 *$ made five, plus 400 for $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ to stand.

Dissenting Opinion (Henry Bethe): I have no problem, in fact strongly support the decision to give N/S minus 400 under the particular circumstances: that beating $5 *$ should have been easy and that plus 50 was a better score than they could have achieved in 4a doubled. I also firmly believe that East "always intended" to bid $5 \%$. The question, however, is whether there was an undue hesitation by West over 4^ and then whether a slow double demonstrably suggests that bidding $5 \%$ will be more successful than passing 4 doubled. (There is also the question of what tempo would be acceptable to this particular North!) I do believe that complex competitive auctions create the same sorts of problems as skip bids and that players have similar responsibilities not to act particularly quickly or slowly when involved in such auctions. But there are pregnant pauses and virginal ones, and pregnant pauses of any length create onus for partner to act appropriately. This pause was an undoubtedly pregnant. Just look at West's hand, and while bidding was reasonable it became more reasonable after the pause. Since I would probably have changed the contract for both sides if 4 a doubled would make, I would change it here to give E/W plus 200.

Chairman: Karen Allison
Committee Members: Henry Bethe, Bart Bramley, Jerry Gaer, Barry Rigal, (scribe: Linda Weinstein)

## CASE SEVENTEEN

Subject: Tempo
Event: NABC Senior KO Teams, 23 Nov 97, First Session
Board: 8 Paul White
Dealer: West
Vul: None $\quad 72$
-K 953

* A Q J 1064

Jack Bryant
Rod Van Wyk

- A 1082
- 

K J 1086

- Q
- J 1064
- Q2
* ---

Tom Brown - ---
-A 9543
-A 87
-K K 953

| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ | Pass (1) |
| Pass | $5 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ | Pass | Pass |
| $5 \boldsymbol{~}$ | All Pass |  |  |

## (1) Break in tempo

The Facts: 54 went down one, plus 50 for N/S. The Director was called after North's 5 * bid. All four players agreed that South hesitated before passing 44. No Stop card was used, but the table Director was never informed of this. The Director ruled, based on the player's agreement that there had been a "significant break in tempo," that there had been unauthorized information and disallowed North's $5 \%$ bid. The contract was changed to 4 made four, plus 420 for E/W.

The Appeal: N/S appealed the Director's ruling. All four players appeared at the hearing. All agreed with the facts as presented, although there was some disagreement as to the length of the hesitation; everyone agreed that it was no longer than $15-20$ seconds. North stated that, although he had passed originally, he did not want to be passive with his hand considering they were behind in the match. The Committee determined that N/S played that a double of 44 would have been for takeout.

The Committee Decision: The Committee decided that the failure to use the Stop Card was the critical factor. The hesitation, estimated by the various players as ten to fifteen seconds (South), about fifteen seconds (West and North), and fifteen to twenty seconds (East) was about the time which would be provided by the Stop Card. E/W could not force South to bid in less time by not using the Stop Card. Any "unauthorized" information had become "authorized" by East's failure to follow proper pro-
cedure.
The Committee determined that even had South's hesitation been considered unauthorized information, it would not have suggested bidding over other actions such as pass or double. In a split decision the Committee decided to allow the $5 *$ bid and changed the contract to 54 down one, plus 50 for N/S. They returned N/S's deposit and strongly suggested that E/W protect themselves by using the Stop Card.

Dissenting Opinion (Jeff Meckstroth, Ed Lazarus): We believe that the agreed upon hesitation by South made it much easier for North to find an equal vulnerability $5 \%$ bid. While we agree with the majority that many would make the $5 *$ bid, the lengthy hesitation makes the bid appear to have a much greater likelihood to be successful and we would have changed the contract to $4 \uparrow$ made four, plus 420 for $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$.

Chairman: Henry Bethe
Committee Members: Bob Gookin, Bob Hamman, Ed Lazarus, Jeff Meckstroth

## CASE EIGHTEEN

Subject: Tempo
Event: Life Master Pairs, 22 Nov 97, First Session

Board: 7 Michael Penick
Dealer: South 82
Vul: Both $\vee 543$

- 862
* K J 85

| Bob Gookin |  |  | Richard Popper |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - 1074 |  |  | - A Q J 953 |
| - K J 7 |  |  | - 2 |
| - K 4 |  |  | - Q 95 |
| * 109742 |  |  | * A Q 3 |
| Jack Bryant |  |  |  |
| - K 6 |  |  |  |
| - A Q 1096 |  |  |  |
| - A J 1073 |  |  |  |
| * 6 |  |  |  |
| VEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
|  |  |  |  |
| ass | 2 | 24 | 3 |
| ass | 3 | Pass (1) | ) Pass |
| bl |  |  |  |

(1) Break in tempo

The Facts: 3 doubled went down two, plus 500 for E/W. All players except West acknowledged the presense of a slight break in tempo after the $3 \mathbf{v}$ bid. The Director ruled that East's break in tempo could suggest full values for his 2 a bid, thus suggesting action with West's (admittedly well-placed) minimal values. The Director removed the double (Laws 73F1 and 16A) and changed the contract to 3 down two, plus 200 for E/W.

The Appeal: E/W appealed the Director's ruling. Only E/W appeared. East acknowledged that he broke tempo, taking "about five seconds" longer than usual before he passed. West said he noticed no hitch, and that at matchpoints it was clear to double with three defensive tricks and partner's known values for a two-level vulnerable overcall. West also argued that a break in tempo would more likely be based on a desire to bid more spades than on extra high cards.

The Committee Decision: The Committee determined that a break in tempo had occurred. The Committee rejected West's argument that partner's break in tempo would more likely be based on the desire to bid more spades, and noted that East had considerably more in high cards than he might have held on the auction. One Committee member liked West's argument defending his double, but the others felt that pass was a strong logical alternative when there was a danger that the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ or, less likely, the $\bullet$ A10, might be in the dummy. Thus, damage had occurred. The Committee changed the contract to 3- down two, plus 200 for E/W.

The Committee considered changing the contract to $3 \uparrow$, but since N/S had not appealed, and West had not bid 3 over 3 , they decided against doing so. However, the Committee noted that West's pass over 3 did not necessarily indicate unwillingness to compete to $3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$, but may have been intended not to induce partner to save over 4 .

Chairman: Bart Bramley
Committee Members: Doug Heron, Steve Onderwyzer, Judy Randel, Phil Warden

## closed.

For example:

- The Multi 2 bid. As played in the U.S., this is a weak two-bid in either major.
- 2 NT or $2 \uparrow$ opening showing a random minorsuit preempt.

One of the major points of contention in today's bridge world is the issue of which systems and conventions should be allowed. For many years, bidding theorists contented themselves with building better mousetraps, designed to improve constructive bidding.

In recent years the innovations have been in the direction of methods which are extremely difficult to defend against. This problem is magnified by proprietary innovations which put an unusual spin on these complicated gadgets.

The net result of the use of differing response structures and treatments is that the opponents need different defenses for each of the many complex variations of the same conventions.

One solution to this problem is to require that players who use the conventions provide opponents with written defenses, but these cannot cope with all treatments.

- Defenses to 1NT openers involving a bid higher than $2 \%$ where no suit has been promised or denied unless substantial values are promised.

2. Outlaw any psychic bids where the system in use creates a controlled psychic operating system, for example:

- Psychic responses to $10-12$ 1NT openers where opener is not allowed to raise.
- Psychic responses to weak two-bids in suits where raises in competition are not allowed.
- Psychic responses to opening bids, such as $2 / 1$ responses, where the use of a forcing $1 \%$ system virtually precludes opener's driving to slam.

Here is an example of a problem with the Multi 2 and the booklet prepared by the ACBL which purports to offer defenses to this convention.

Suppose the bidding goes:

## West North East South

2•(1) $\mathrm{Dbl} 3 \uparrow \mathrm{Dbl}$
(1) Multi: weak two-bid in either major.

What does South's double mean in this situation? The suggested defenses in the booklet do not even attempt to cover this type of situation.

There are many other variations and permutations of problems caused by not knowing opener's suit.

The bottom line is that every variation of the Multi 2 changes the defenses that should be used. It is not possible to prepare for multiple variations of weak artificial bids. A book of prepared defenses is something that you would expect in postal chess. The sum total of all this is an abomination and has no place in a fair and open game.

Pairs who do not use these methods are at a disadvantage to those who do because those who do not use such methods cannot require all pairs who will play against the Multi, for example, to prepare for it. The result is that the Multi users will score a significant number of windfall results because their opponents have disasters that arise because of confusion and lack of preparation.

Considering what we have now, we would be better off to do away with convention cards and allow all pairs who are asked questions about their bidding to respond, "It's none of your business."

## An IMP tax?

The following is a letter sent by Chip Martel to the Systems Committee of the World Bridge Federation during the 1997 Bermuda Bowl in Hammamet, Tunisia. Martel is a member of that committee. The letter is entitled "Basic Principles of the Systems Policy" with the subtitle "Consistent with the objectives of the WBF systems policy."

1. Players must have a reasonable opportunity to prepare defenses to their opponents' methods (particularly weak conventional calls).
2. Players should have a free choice of bidding methods as long as it does not conflict with \#1.
3. We want to promote a congenial atmosphere at WBF events and avoid conflicts between players.

Currently, we are failing point \#1 badly in the

Bermuda Bowl and Venice Cup. With 54 pairs competing and playing a wide array of weak conventional bids, it is impractical to prepare adequate defenses against all opposing teams.

In an event this large, a pair playing unusual methods will gain an unfair edge. Since it is unlikely any given bid will come up in a 20 -board match, it is tempting not to bother to do much defensive preparation. In effect, the pair playing these methods collects a small "IMP tax" from each unprepared opponent they face.

Since the "IMP tax" collected from each opposing team is small, it isn't a big deal to them, but over 17 matches it does matter to the pair playing these methods.

The effort required to prepare properly for a bid such as $2 \wedge$ (a weak preempt in any suit) is substantial. I have three pages of notes for dealing with this and really should have more. In addition, even this "one" convention is really a host of different ones depending on the style of opening and follow-up used -- Do they usually correct to partner's suit? Does passing $2 \uparrow$ show spades or just no desire to bid? What do bids mean after $2-$-(Dbl)? Bids such as this 2 $\downarrow$ bid, which could have length in the suit opened, are by far the most complex to defend against and require the most careful disclosure.

For this Bermuda Bowl not one pair playing brown-sticker conventions gave a complete description of both their bids and the follow-ups. (Note: by WBF regulations, brown-sticker conventions can be used only if the WBF is informed of their use; they can be used only in certain events, and written defenses must be made available for the opponents.) A small minority gave descriptions which were reasonable. Most were woefully inadequate.

In fact, it may be impossible for a pair to provide an adequate description of some of these bids, for two reasons.

First, many of the bids have a low frequency, thus the pairs playing these bids have not had much experience concerning what sort of hands they open or what happens in the subsequent auction. One of the pairs, in clarification of a bid, commented honestly: "It might also be a random hand non-vulnerable against vulnerable -- but my partner and I have actually never made that bid in serious bridge!"

Second, developments in competitive auctions will depend on the meaning of the opposition bidding (for example, whether double is card-showing or takeout), and because of the difficulty of developing defenses, the pairs playing the brown-sticker bids have had little exposure to different defenses against them.

Thus, I would suggest the following three policy changes:

1. Brown-sticker openings and overcalls which could have length in the suit bid should be reclassified as HUM bids (highly unusual methods), including such bids as $2 *$ and 2 showing any hand with 0-7 high-card points, $2 \downarrow$ to show a weak hand with hearts or spades, the 2 opening mentioned above, and so forth
2. HUM bids should not be allowed in matches which are shorter than a full day ( 64 boards).
3. Written defenses should be allowed to any conventional opening which may not be strong and to any conventional bid on the first round of the auction (the first four calls, starting with the opening bid) which could be weak.

If item \#3 is not endorsed, I would favor sharply restricting what is allowed in any match of fewer than 64 boards. It is totally unreasonable to expect players to memorize defenses to literally dozens of different bids, most of which are unlikely to arise. In addition, I doubt if there are five players out of the 220-plus competing who consider memorizing defenses an enjoyable part of bridge. Making the competitors miserable should not be a goal of a system policy.

Finally, with regard to the third principle above, I should point out that at this tournament, it is my belief that any time an opponent made a brownsticker bid which I had trouble defending against, I could have called the director and asked that the result be adjusted because of the inadequate description provided. Such actions would certainly not promote the enjoyable and friendly atmosphere at the table that is one of the positive features of the WBF championships.

## Bowles (sic) bridge tip

Andy Bowles, who has been playing all week, dropped by the Daily Bulletin office to offer a bridge tip in the spirit (pun intended) of the Bols Co., the Dutch liqueur company that used to sponsor the bridge tips competition.
"If you're trying to decide whether to finesse or play for the drop," said Bowles, a London resident who represented England as a Junior player, "look at the clock (timing the round). If it's on an even number, finesse. If it's an odd number, play for the drop."

Bowles applied the tip Friday night against former world champion Billy Eisenberg. Bowles had these cards in a side suit:

AK 82

## J 102

He played the jack and let it ride. Next came the 10 , covered by the queen and ace. Bowles returned to his hand and played the 3. Eisenberg followed low and Bowles looked at the clock. There were 12 minutes left in the round, so Bowles played the 8 . Success! Four tricks taken and a bridge tip born.

## Neat endplay <br> \section*{By Barry Rigal}

Mark Lair found a neat way to endplay his opponents on a hand from the pairs game a few days ago.


All Pass
Mark made a weak jump overcall, then intro duced his spades at the four level. Richie Schwartz had no reason to look any further.

On the lead of the $\$$ Lair put up the king and led a low trump to the queen, followed by a second spade, intending to duck this to East's presumed ace doubleton. When the jack forced the king, East was known to have $3-5-5-0$ shape. At this point East erred by cashing the $\vee$ A on which West played the 9 . Back came the $\bullet$ Q to the ace, and now Mark drew the last trump, forcing West to release a small heart.

Lair crossed to the $\approx \mathrm{K}$ and played the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$, covered and ruffed. The $\star \mathrm{A}$ and a club ruff, followed by the $\vee 10$, endplayed West to lead into the $\approx \mathrm{Q}-10$ at trick 12 . Contract made.

## Sorry, Bill!

After the Thursday piece on national tournament directors, it was necessary to follow up with the name of a director who was left off the list of inactive or former national TDs.

Our faces are slightly red, but there's one more we must add -- Bill "Tornado" Adams, late of the ACBL Headquarters office in Memphis and now a resident of Wichita KS.
21 Teams
1 Bart Bramley - Howard Weinstein, Chicago IL; Sidney Lazard Sr, New Orleans LA;Steve Garner, Northfield IL2 Steve Zolotow - Harold Lilie - Marc Jacobus, Las Vegas NV; Ronald Smith, SanFrancisco CA; Bob Crossley, Greenbrae CA3 Tom Fox, Glenview IL; Walter Schafer Jr, Bloomingdale IL; John Sutherlin, Dallas34.19
TX; Russell Ekeblad, Providence RI
34.13 Aventura FL; Gary Cohler, Highland Park IL
Lew
Lew
Stansby, Castro Valley CA; Paul Soloway, Mill Creek WA; Bobby Goldman, Highland33.93
Village TX
6 Georg
Merek Szymanowski - Marcin Lesniewski - Cezary Balicki, Poland ..... 32.48
7 Allan Graves, Vancouver BC32.43
8/9 Paul Hackett - Jason Hackett - Justin Hackett, Manchester England
Brigitte Mavromichalis, Martigny: John Armstrong John Holland, England ..... 31.45
8/9 Jim Krekorian - Robert Blanchard, New York NY; Bob Richman - Paul Marston, Australia10 Ralph Katz - George Jacobs, Burr Ridge IL; Peter Weichsel, Encinitas CA; RobertLevin, Orlando FL; Fred Stewart, West Hurley NY; Steve Weinstein, Glen Ridge NJ

## NORTHAMERICAN SWISS

40 Teams

$$
1 \text { Jack Coleman, San Francisco CA; Matt Granovetter, Richmond Hghts. OH; J Markland }
$$ Molson, Cote St Luc PQ; Boris Baran, Montreal PQ; P Drew Cannell, Winnipeg MB; Mark Stein, Ottawa ON

2 Jeff Schuett - Ginny Schuett, Riverwoods IL; Craig Gardner - Mary Gardner,

## Streamwood IL; Kerry Smith, Milwaukee WI; Dick Bruno, Chicago IL

3 Edith Rosenkranz, Mexico City; Robert Morris, Houston TX; Bob Etter Sacramento CA; Curtis Cheek - Hjordis Eythorsdottir, Huntsville AL
4 John Malley, Pascoag RI; Shome Mukherjee, Randolph MA; William Hunter, Reading MA; Daniel Colatosti, Waltham MA
5 Howard Hertzberg, Alpine NJ; Robert Ryder, Caldwell NJ; William Esberg, Elberon
NJ; Amalya Kearse - Jacqui Mitchell, New York NY
6 Allan Siebert - David Siebert, Little Rock AR; Randall Pettit, Marietta GA; Paul Munafo, Huntsville AL
7 Perry Van Hook - Sidney Brownstein, Santa Monica CA; Mary Oshlag - Richard Oshlag, Germantown TN
Richard Gabriel, Chicago IL; Jim Burt, Darien IL; Stanton Subeck, Olympia Fld IL;
Suzi Subeck, Olympia Flds IL; Les Perlmutter, La Jolla CA; Mark Perlmutter, San Francisco CA
9 Tony Ames - Peggy Kaplan, Minnetonka MN; Joan Remey Moore, Troy MI; Corina Iukovici, Saint Louis MOIukovici, Saint Louis MO
10 Douglas Heron, Ottawa ON; Barry Rigal, New York NY; Jerry Helms, Charlotte NC; Michael White, Atlanta GA
11 Jacobo Podbilevich, Huixquilucan 53 95; Gonzalo Herrera, Mexico Df 11200; Jim Looby, Burbank CA; Cameron Doner, Richmond BCLooby, Burbank CA; Cameron Doner, Richmond BC
12 Harvey Brody, San Francisco CA; Martin Miller, Rochester NY; Ken Monzingo, San Diego CA; Charles Coon, Marshfield MA
13 David Adams, Kennesaw GA; Rose Mary Pace, Memphis TN; Rashid Khan, Fredericton NB; Sandra Fox, Sackville NB 95. 14/15 Barry Schaffer, Dallas TX; Colby Vernay, Lacon IL; Mark Kessler, Springfield IL; Ed Schultz, Chesterfield MOEd Schultz, Chesterfield MO
14/15 Robin Klar, Spring TX; Michael Lawrence, Berkeley CA; Jeanne Rahmey, Brooklyn NY;
Alan Sontag, Gaithersburg MD; Norman Kurlander, Flushing NY
16 John Kissinger - Becky Kissinger, La Jolla CA; Weishu Wu, Santa Barbara CA; Vivian Ding Li, Emeryville CA

## 20 Pair

|  | A | B | C |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.57 | 1 | 1 |  | Barbara Russo, Cary IL; Melissa Silvestre, St Louis MO | 97.50 |
| 1.93 | 2 | 2 |  | Bill Willis, El Dorado AR; Beverly Marshall, Mt Vernon MO | 96.50 |
| 1.45 | 3 | 3 | 1 | Leah Maddox, Florissant MO; Brian Rodewald, St Louis MO | 95.00 |
| 1.08 | 4 | 4 | 2 | Ronald Koritz, Springfield IL; David Thomas, Riverton IL | 94.50 |
| 0.81 | 5 | 5 |  | David Nagler, La Pointe WI; Joe Sharp, Noblesville IN |  |
| 0.74 | 6 |  | 3 | Mark Brightfield, St Louis MO; Ellen Volpe, Clayton MO | 94.00 |
|  | 99ER TROPHY PAIRS |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 92.00 |  |  |  |
| 12 Pairs |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.80 | 1 | Yi-Der Chen - Martha Chen, Potomac MD | 126.00 |  |  |
| 2.10 | 2 | Jay Ponder - Kathy Ponder, Clayton MO | 123.00 |  |  |
| 1.58 | 3 | Ruth Gurwell - Allen Gurwell, Leawood KS | 104.00 |  |  |
| 1.04 | $4 / 5$ | Charles Fleisher - Eugenia Fleisher, St Charles MO | 102.00 |  |  |
| 1.04 | $4 / 5$ | Daniel Parsons, Webster Grove MO; Nolan Ulla, St Charles MO | 102.00 |  |  |

## Reisinger omission

In the list of former Reisinger winners printed in Friday's Daily Bulletin, Billy Cohen was inadvertently omitted from the winning team in the 1978 event.

## Don’t forget Chip

Last week, in listing the international accomplishments of Life Master Open Pairs leaders Chip Martel and Michael Rosenberg, the fact that Martel was on the winning squad in the 1994 Rosenblum Knockout Teams was inadvertently omitted from the report.

## New Life Master

ROY C. LEWIS became a Life Master by placing third overall in the Senior Stratified Pairs yesterday. His partner was Roland Boehm.

## Attendance disappointing

It appears likely that the total attendance for this tournament will be somewhat less than 8800 . This is quite a bit below the original estimate. Apparently the problem is the fact that people went home for Thanksgiving and didn't come back.

The total to date is 8238 tables. Chances are attendance will be under 300 tables each session today.

## Soloway adds to lead in lifetime points

Three-time world champion and professional player Paul Soloway continues to pile on the masterpoints, maintaining his position as the top masterpoint holder of all time.

Soloway inherited the top spot with the death of Barry Crane in 1985 and has not relinquished it. Soloway led \#2 Mike Passell by 6133 points last year. This year, he has stretched the lead to 6557 points through the November cycle. Points from this tournament are not included.

With the death of Ron Andersen in July, Mark Lair took over the \#3 position. There are only five players with more than 30,000 masterpoints (the same as last year), but the number of players with more than 20,000 masterpoints has increased from 19 in 1996 to 24 in 1997.

Mary Jane Farell, the woman player with the greatest masterpoint holding, was poised to return to the top 10 but was overtaken by Eric Rodwell, who leapfrogged from the \#15 position last year to the \#10 position this year.

Deceased players whose masterpoint totals would have placed them in the top 100 are commemorated in the list.

It took 12,248 masterpoints to make the top 100 list this year, 306 more than last year.

1. Paul Soloway, Mill Creek WA 47,615
2. Mike Passell, Dallas TX 41,058
*Ron Andersen (July 1997) 38,338
3. Mark Lair, Canyon TX 37,526
*Barry Crane (July 1985) 35,138
4. Eddie Wold, Houston TX 33,470
5. Jeff Meckstroth, Tampa FL 31,452
6. Grant Baze, La Jolla CA 29,362
*Jim Jacoby (Feb. 1991) 25,226
7. Fred Hamilton, Fresno CA 25,071
8. Gaylor Kasle, Boca Raton FL 24,642
9. Bobby Goldman, Highland Village TX 23,895 *Hermine Baron (Sept. 1996) 22,646
10. Eric Rodwell, Naperville IL 22,577
11. Mary Jane Farell, Los Angeles CA 22,572
12. Mark Itabashi, Murrieta CA 22,016
13. Bobby Wolff, Dallas TX 21,928
14. Steve Robinson, Arlington VA 21,868
15. Zeke Jabbour, Boca Raton FL 21,581
16. Lynn Deas, Schenectady NY 21,287
17. Gene Freed, Los Angeles CA 21,106
18. Alan Bell, Fullerton CA 20,975
19. David Treadwell, Wilmington DE 20,813
20. Bob Hamman, Dallas TX 20,660
21. Chuck Said, Nashville TN 20,362
22. Mike Lawrence, Berkeley CA 20,280
23. Peter Weichsel, Encinitas CA 20,012
24. Mike Shuman, Pasadena CA 20,010
25. Glenn Lublin, Silver Spring MD 19,806
26. Garey Hayden, Tucson AZ 19,669
27. David Adams, Kennesaw GA 19,192
*Jim Becker (April 1994) $\mathbf{1 8 , 8 1 8}$
28. Joan Remey Moore, Troy MI 18,528
29. Robert Levin, Orlando FL 18,481
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { 30. Alan Stout, Lisbon IA } & 18,286 \\ \text { 31. Kerri Sanborn, Stony Point NY } & 18,062\end{array}$
*Howard Chandross (April 1996) 17,933
30. John Fisher, Dallas TX 17,528
31. John Sutherlin, Dallas TX 17,483
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { *Mike Smolen (Nov. 1992) } & \mathbf{1 7 , 4 1 7}\end{array}$
32. Jo Morse, Palm Beach Gardens FL 16,984
33. David Siebert, Little Rock AR 16,735
34. Allan Siebert, Little Rock AR 16,694
35. David Berkowitz, Old Tappan NJ 16,666
36. Peter Boyd, Silver Spring MD 16,646
37. Carol Sanders, Nashville TN 16,630
38. John Mohan, Santa Monica CA 16,406
39. Michael Seamon, Miami Beach FL 16,325
40. Alan Sontag, Gaithersburg MD 16,300 43. Tom Sanders, Nashville TN 15,978 44. Kit Woolsey, Kensington CA 15,926 45. Gerald Caravelli, Des Plaines IL 15,857 46. Mike Cappelletti, Alexandria VA 15,817 *Morris Portugal (July 1997) $\mathbf{1 5 , 5 3 9}$
41. Dennis Clerkin, Bloomington IN 15,091
42. Helen Shanbrom, Tamarac FL 14,970

| Rhoda Walsh, Beverly Hills CA *Bob Glenn (June 1994) | $\begin{aligned} & 14,894 \\ & \mathbf{1 4 , 8 9 2} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 50. Dennis Sorensen, Gresham OR | 14,830 |
| 51. John Anderson, Sixes OR | 14,632 |
| 52. Richard Pavlicek, Fort Lauderda | 554 |
| 53. Bernie Chazen, Tamarac FL | 14,544 |
| 54. George Bloomer, Pittsboro NC | 14,374 |
| 55. Jim Kirkham, San Bernardino CA | 14,373 |
| 56. Frank King, Alexandria VA | 14,288 |
| 57. Bill Passell, Coral Springs FL | 14,283 |
| 58. John Zilic, Houston TX | 14,149 |
| 59. Allan Cokin, Palm Beach FL | 14,111 |
| 60. Malcolm Brachman, Dallas TX | 14,060 |
| *Edgar Kaplan (Sept. 1997) | 13,975 |
| 61. Gene Simpson, Redlands CA | 13,721 |
| 62. Ross Rainwater, Portland OR | 13,699 |
| 63. Steve Lawrence, Athens TX | 13,671 |
| 64. Kathie Wei-Sender, Nashville TN | 13,629 |
| 65. Jim Linhart, Piscataway NJ | 13,562 |
| 66. Marc Jacobus, Las Vegas NV | 13,543 |
| 67. Marty Baff, Beachwood OH | 13,541 |
| 68. Jan Weyant, Cincinnati OH | 13,512 |
| 69. David Ashley, Las Vegas NV | 13,497 |
| 70. Lew Stansby, Castro Valley CA | 13,461 |
| 71. Ron Smith, Chattanooga TN | 13,409 |
| 72. Phil Leon, Grosse Pointe MI | 13,337 |
| 73. Roger Bates, Mesa AZ | 13,322 |
| 74. Gail Greenberg, New York NY | 13,264 |
| 75. Norman Kay, Narberth PA | 13,177 |
| 76. Rick Henderson, Los Angeles CA | 13,170 |
| 77. Russ Arnold, Miami FL | 13,094 |
| 78. Sidney Lazard, New Orleans LA | 13,036 |
| 79. Ron Smith, San Francisco CA | 13,019 |
| 80. Charles Coon, Marshfield MA | 13,008 |
| *Lou Bluhm (April 1990) | 12,932 |
| 81. Jan Janitschke, Littleton CO | 12,912 |
| 82. Syd Levey, Valley Village CA | 12,873 |
| 83. Beverly Rosenberg, Sherman Oaks CA | 12,855 |
| 84. Mark Molson, Cote St. Luc PQ | 12,845 |
| 85. Jacqui Mitchell, New York NY | 12,742 |
| 86. Betty Ann Kennedy, Shreveport LA |  |
| *Oswald Jacoby (June 1984) | 12,666 |
| 87. Ed Manfield, Hyattsville MD | 12,642 |
| 88. Frank Hoadley, New Orleans LA | 12,640 |
| 89. Marinesa Letizia, Louisville KY | 12,577 |
| 90. Judi Radin, New York NY | 12,558 |
| 91. Alvin Roth, Boca Raton FL | 12,549 |
| 92. Paul Ivaska, Las Vegas NV | 12,468 |
| 93. Chris Compton, Oklahoma City OK | 12,434 |
| 94. George Rosenkranz, Mexico City | 12,386 |
| 95. Hugh MacLean, Gonzales TX | 12,385 |
| 96. Marshall Miles, Redlands CA | 12,383 |
| 97. George Dawkins, Austin TX | 12,378 |
| 98. Marty Bergen, Farmingdale NY | 12,344 |
| 99. Robert Lipsitz, Palm Harbor FL | 12,294 |
| 100. Jerry Clerkin, North Vernon IN | 12,248 |

The above list is published each year to confirm those players who have automatic entry into the Blue Ribbon Pairs at the Fall NABC in November. For interest, the second 100 are also listed.

| 101. | Larry Cohen, Boca Raton FL | 12,227 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 102. | Bruce Ferguson, Boise ID | 12,168 |
| 103. | Howard Piltch, Andover MA | 12,167 |
| 104. | Ron Sukoneck, Annandale VA | 12,005 |
| 105. | Ellen Allen, Summerville SC | 11,901 |
| 106. | Jim Robison, Las Vegas NV | 11,861 |
| 107. | CorinneKirkham, SanBernardinoCA | 11,822 |
| 108. | Ellasue Chaitt, Palm Beach Gardens FL | 11,821 |
| 109. | Ed Lewis, Falls Church VA | 11,805 |
| 110. | E X Snovel, San Antonio TX | 11,778 |
| 11. | Jim Krekorian, New York NY | 11,735 |
| 112. | MikeAliotta, Oklahoma City OK | 11,716 |
| 113. | Larry Allen, Summerville SC | 11,706 |
| 114. | Gerald Bare, Pacific Palisades CA | 11,660 |
| 115. | John Onstott, New Orleans LA | 11,624 |
| 116. | Norman Coombs, Brookville IN | 11,599 |
| 117. | Ralph Katz, Burr Ridge IL | 11,591 |
| 118. | Hugh Ross, Oakland CA | 11,591 |
| 119. | George Pisk, Manchaca TX | 11,580 |
| 120. | Erik Paulsen, Upland CA | 11,542 |
| 121. | Cliff Russell, Miami FL | 11,540 |
| 122. | Kay Schulle, Santa Monica CA | 11,536 |
| 123. | Arnie Fisher, Clementon NJ | 11,519 |
| 124. | Jon Wittes, Claremont CA | 11,508 |
| 125. | John Gustafson, Des Moines IA | 11,507 |
| 126. | Mike Moss, New York NY | 11,493 |
| 127. | Bart Bramley, Chicago IL | 11,491 |
| 128. | Jim Zimmerman, Shaker Heights OH | 11,459 |



## MIKE SHANNON KNOCKOUT TEAMS

16 Teams Bracket 1
Rita Shugart, Pebble Beach CA; Michael Rosenberg, Tuckahoe NY; Zia Mahmood, New York NY; Geir G Helgemo, Trondheim, Norway; Tony Forrester, Boston MA; Andrew Robson, Carmel CA
vs
Charles Bantz, West Allis WI; Joshua Stark, Grayslake IL; William Malesevich, Mayville WI; Suzanne Dunn, Crystal Lake IL

Jim Linhart, Piscataway NJ; Dorthy Francis, Memphis TN; Sharon Jabbour - Zeke Jabbour, Boca Raton FL; Arnold Fisher, Clementon NJ; Per Olov Sundelin, Stockholm Sweden
James Koley, Omaha NE; Gene Simpson, Redlands CA; Clay Brooke Mc Farland, Owego NY; Paul Erb, Scottsdale AZ

16 Teams Bracket 2
Susan Perez, St Louis MO; Bob Bainter, San Antonio TX; Walter Dedio, Morden MB; Zenon Rowicki, Lambertville MI

Lilly Lachter, Culver City CA; John Wong, Rowland Hgts CA; Richard Bender - Patrick McCammon, Springfield MO

Joseph Machotka, Chicago IL; Larry Bass, Urbana IL; Bert Newman - Kathy Newman, West Bloomfield MI vs
Dennis Daley, Stamford CT; Stephen Shane, White Plains NY; Walter Smith, W Sand Lake NY; Mary Savko, Pittsford VT

16 Teams Bracket 3
Daniel Levin - Matt Johnson, Wheaton IL; Jeffrey David, Lisle IL; Bob Fashingbauer, Waukegan IL; Linda Ivanoff - Joe Aramowicz, Harrisburg PA

Thomas Ahmann Sr, Mexico MO; Tarokh Taefi, Dunwoody GA; Kendall Keely, Palm Beach FL; Floyd Berkat, Edmonton AB

Jason Meyer - Barbara Doran, Silver Spring MD; Helene Bauman, Arlington VA; Jim Alison, Huntsville AL
vs
S. Gail Arnott - Ronald Heron - William Treble - Leonard Doerksen, Winnipeg MB

15 Teams Bracket 4
Douglas Dougherty - Carol Dougherty, Chicago IL; Dennis O'Dowd, Burbank IL; Jack Russell, Lyons IL

## vs

Kathleen Burt, Darien IL; Ruth Goodpasture, Bourbonnais IL; Judith Gidden, Chicago IL; Ivor McGloughlin, Pittsburgh PA

Kenton Hayes Jr - Leonard Schmidt Jr - Betty Mattison, Louisville KY; Mike Sloan, Marengo IN

Michael Tomlianovich, Bloomington IL; Ron Sawiak, Winnipeg MB; Jennie Scott - Claudia Zimmermann, Keokuk IA

## Goodwill message

As we prepare to leave St. Louis and the 1997 Fall NABC, take a moment to say "thank you" to our hosts. They've done a wonderful job.

See you in Reno at the 1998 Spring NABC.
Aileen Osofsky
Chairman, Goodwill Committee

## Well done, Daley

Members of the Daley team from the second bracket of the Mike Shannon Knockout Teams deserve congratulations for their active ethics. As they were comparing results of their quarterfinal match, their opponents came over and conceded a 2-IMP victory to Daley. When they finished their comparison, the Daley team had the match scored as a tie. The other team had left the playing area.

The Daley team told the director of their dilemma and followed his suggestion that they search the hotel. They located one pair in the bar and the other in their hotel room. A four-board playoff ensued. Appropriately, Dennis Daley, Mary Savko, Walter Smith and Stephen Shane were the winners.

John Ashton
KO Teams director



## TODAY'S SCHEDULE

| Sunday, November 30, 1997, 11:00 a.m. \& 3:00 p.m. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Event | MP Limit | Session | Entry Fee | Sold |
| St. Louis Cardinals Stratified Fast Open Pairs* |  | 1st \& 2nd | \$40 pair | Level 4 Adam's Mark |

## Sunday, November 30, 1997, 11:00 a.m. \& 4:00 p.m.

Dick Edwards Memorial

Stratiflighted Open Swiss Teams* (30 VP)
Jerry Levitt Stratified Senior Swiss Teams* (30 VP)
Mike Shannon's Restaurant Bracketed KO Teams V
Stratified Open Side Game*
199er Pairs, 99er Pairs, 49er Pairs
Non Master Pairs
Newcomer Pairs
Stratified 99er Swiss Teams (100/50/20)

1st \& 2nd
1 st \& 2nd
3rd \& 4th
single
single
single
single
single
$\$ 80$ team
\$80 team
$\$ 40$ team
\$18 pair
\$18 pair
\$18 pair
\$18 pair
\$36 team

Level 2 Adam's Mark
Marriott Pavilion Ballroom
Level 2 Adam's Mark
Level 4 Adam's Mark Salon F
Level 4 Adam's Mark Salon F Level 4 Adam's Mark Salon F Level 4 Adam's Mark Salon F Level 4 Adam's Mark Salon F

Sunday, November 30, 1997, 12:00 Noon \& 7:00 p.m.
REISINGER BOARD-A-MATCHTEAMS NORTHAMERICANSWISSTEAMS

| 1st \& 2nd F | \$96 team | Level 2 Adam's Mark Salon B** <br> 1st \& 2nd F |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\$ 88$ team | Level 4Adam's Mark Rose Garden <br>  | **Note location change |

*Unless otherwise indicated, Stratiflighted Open events are divided: A (unlimited and separate); B, C \& D stratified -- B (750-1500), C (300-750), D (0-300). Strat breaks for Open and Senior Stratified Pairs and Teams are: A (1000+), B (300-1000), C (0-300). Strat breaks for Continuous/Side Pairs and Zip Swiss teams are: A (750+), B (0-750).

Make your plans now to play at the Spring NABC in Reno -- March 19-29, 1998


