



December
2005

Published bi-monthly by
District 8
of the American Contract
Bridge League

Editor: [Karen Walker](#),
Champaign IL

Happy Holidays
from the 2005 Advocate staff and contributors:



Jim Chiszar, Chicago IL
Karen Coe, Carbondale IL
Tom Dodd, Boerne TX
Georgia Heth, Morton IL
Tom Kniest, University City
MO
Martha Leary, Urbana IL
Scott Merritt, Arlington VA
Jim Pelletier, Ft. Wayne IN

Dennis Ryan, Janesville WI
Susan Rechter, St. Louis
John Samsel, St. Louis
Jack Spear, Kansas City MO
David Stevenson, Liverpool UK
Mike Tomlianovich, Bloomington IL
Karen Walker, Champaign IL

And your District 8 tournament chairmen:

Mary Jo Sergent & Dee Witte (Rockford IL Sect.)

Mike Carmen (St. Louis Regional & Sectionals)

Jim Pelletier (Ft. Wayne IN Regional)

Roger Chitty & Karen Coe (Carbondale IL Sect.)

Jay Coleman (Robinson IL Sect.)

Kate Dickens (Effingham IL Sect.)

Karl Dencker & John Diehl (Elgin IL Sect.)

Dick Ellis (Kokomo IN Sect.)

Raj Kohli (South Bend IN Sect.)

Doug Edwards & Sandra Lemon (Gilbertsville KY
Sect.)

Bruce Gardner & Robin Lampley (Paducah KY
Regional)

Jim Kallaher (Paducah KY Sect.)

Doug Gugger & John Pree (Rockford IL Regional)

Jim Moon (Bloomington IL Sect.)

Ruby Nelson (Edwardsville IL Sect.)

Chris Patrias (District 8 Tournament Coordinator)

Bernie Riley & Phyllis Rahn (Peoria IL)

Mike Tomlianovich (North American Pairs & STAC)

Karen Walker (Champaign IL Regional)

Liz & Chuck Zalar (Springfield IL Sect., Grand
National Teams & North American Pairs)



ACBL Director's Report

by **Georgia Heth, Morton IL**

District 8 Representative on the ACBL Board of Directors

Happy Holidays to all. As I look out my window, everything is covered in snow and looks perfect for the season. It almost makes me forget how much I have to do between now and New Years.

Congratulations to all of our winners from the North American Pairs District 8 Final in November. I was unable to play but I did come down for the start of the event. It was wonderful to see the big turnout.

Denver Board meetings

The Denver agenda was very full – the meetings were the longest in the past few years. We passed a lot of changes to the Code of Disciplinary Regulations, some housekeeping-related and some substantive. If you are involved in disciplinary proceedings, please make sure you refer to the current version of the CDR available online. The new changes go into effect January 1.

Non-member surcharge: The surcharge at tournaments for non-members and non-service fee paying life members becomes mandatory on July 1, 2006. The fee is at least \$1.00 per person per session at sectionals and \$2.00 for regionals. This fee is retained by the local organization and does not apply to charity events or events limited to players with fewer than 20 masterpoints.

Amnesty for lapsed members: An amnesty program was passed which would allow people to reinstate their masterpoints without charge if they rejoin the ACBL between January 1 and June 30, 2006. If you know players who have stopped paying their dues the past few years, please encourage them to take advantage of this opportunity.

Play where you live: New residency requirements were passed for the North American Pairs and Grand National Teams, effective with the 2006-2007 GNT event. You must now play in the district where you live, not according to your district affiliation. Violations can result in disqualification from the event and disciplinary charges. The requirements will be in the new conditions of contest.

Tournament sanctions: A new policy dealing with tournament conflicts was passed. Since the policy is about seven pages long, please read the Board meeting minutes to get the details. The most important aspects to know are that as long as you send you sanctions in on a timely schedule (one year in advance for sectionals and three years in advance for regionals), you shouldn't have any problems. A new board has been formed to resolve conflicts.

Fee increases: The budget for 2006 was passed. Tournament director fees were increased as usual and entry fees for NABC events were raised by \$1.50 per session. Club game fees were increased slightly and STAC sanction fees were raised to the same as all other sectional sanctions.

Charity program: The Charity Foundation really benefited from the new policy allowing almost unlimited

special-event games at clubs. This year, the Foundation collected more than twice as much money as last year, allowing us to fully fund the new grant program and still make some additional grants. One special program we donated to is an animal shelter in Florida that collected animals abandoned and lost in the hurricanes and is now trying to place all of them in new homes. It will be District 8's turn to determine which charities receive \$20,000 in 2007. I was re-elected as president of the Foundation.

Other Board actions include:

- The NABC Senior Swiss Team Trophy was named the Alan Truscott USPC Senior Swiss Trophy in honor of Mr. Truscott and the United States Playing Card Company, the sponsor of the trophy. Mr. Truscott's contributions to the game of bridge are legion.
- New conditions of contest were passed for the major knockout events. I had no idea how volatile an area this was. Bye matches are now allowed in these events.
- The NABC Appeals books will no longer be printed. They will be available only online.
- The NABC 0-1500 Mini-Spingold will be limited to five days.
- Action on the future of ACBL Junior camps was deferred to the next meeting.
- The Insurance Committee is still working on their search for uniform insurance policies for the units and districts. They will report again in the spring.

As always, please refer to the ACBL website for the complete minutes of the Board meetings.

I have really enjoyed my first term as your representative on the National Board. I was pleased to be re-elected this year and look forward to serving you again.

If you have questions or suggestions about ACBL Board actions or other bridge matters, please contact me at gketh@hotmail.com or 917 S. Main Street, Morton IL 61550-2419.

See you at the tables,
-- Georgia.

On to Dallas for nine District Pairs

District 8 North American Pair finals

November 12 & 13, 2005 -- IDOT Building, Springfield IL

Congratulations to the winners and runners-up in District 8's annual North American Pairs. The event, conducted in three separate flights, was open to all District 8 members who qualified in club-level NAP games earlier this summer.

The top two pairs in each flight won travel awards to Dallas TX in March to represent District 8 in the national finals of their respective flights. The third-place pair in each flight also qualified for the national finals, but receives no ACBL travel award.

Flight A (Open Championship):

1 - Milt Zlatic - Tom Oppenheimer, St. Louis

2 - Mike Halvorsen, Champaign IL - Richard Blumenthal, Lincoln IL

3 - Mark Kessler, Springfield IL - Ed Schultz, Chesterfield MO

4 - Tom Kniest, St. Louis - Karen Walker, Champaign IL

5 - Jim Hudson, DeKalb IL - Mike Abarbanel, Belvidere IL

6 - Dick Ellis - Jim Davis, Kokomo IN

7- Marvin King, Creve Coeur MO - En Xie, St. Louis



A1 - Milt Zlatic & Tom Oppenheimer



A2 - Mike Halvorsen & Richard Blumenthal



B2 - Bobbie Straker & Steve Babin



B3 - Debbie Avery & Martha Leary

Flight B (0-2000 masterpts.):

1- Richard Whitsitt, Rockford IL - Doug Gugger, Freeport IL

2 - Bobbie Straker, Pekin IL - Steve Babin, Normal IL

3 - Debbie Avery, Champaign IL - Martha Leary, Urbana IL

4 - Dariel Richardson, Rochester IL - Larry Wilcox, Springfield IL

5 - Sheryl & Bill Finkenstadt, St Charles MO



C1 - Eric Gettleman & Paul Holmes



C2 - Bill Lindemann & Dan Faulkner

6 - Loren VanDegraft, Byron IL
- Glen Orr, Oregon IL

7 - Pat Carrington, Champaign
IL - Jim Scott, Rantoul IL

8 - John Kessinger - Marciann
O'Brien, Decatur IL

9 - Karen & John Coe, Ewing
IL

10 - Leah Newell, Springfield IL
- Terry Goodykoontz,
Champaign IL

11 - Jason Clevenger - Sasanka
Ramanadham, St. Louis

12 - Doug McQuaid, Lebanon
IL - Chris Shaw, Carlinville IL

13 - Carole & Ron Sholes,
Springfield IL

14 Mark Daily - Claire
Krukenberg, Charleston IL

15 - Steve Hawthorne - Zack
Freehill, Bloomington IL

Flight C (Non LM -- 0-500):

1- Paul Holmes, Champaign IL -
Eric Gettleman, Normal IL

2 - Bill Lindemann Jr.,
Champaign IL - Dan Faulkner,
Monticello IL

3 - Mary & Bob Johnson,
Godfrey IL

4 - Wayne Carpenter, Chesterton
IN - Laverne Niksch, Portage IN

5 - Rolland Struebing -
Sherman Tucker, St. Charles
MO

6 - David Short - Bill
Lindemann Sr., Champaign IL

District 8's Top 100

Here are District 8's top masterpoint holders and their total career points as of November 7, 2005.

1	Colby Vernay, Lacon IL	15,480.44	51	Robert Hayes, Joliet IL	3764.96
2	Jack Bryant, St. Louis	12,745.28	52	Sheldon Margulis, St. Louis	3752.95
3	Dick Benson, Le Roy IL	10,974.85	53	June Singer, St. Louis	3694.46
4	Gary Kessler, Springfield IL	10,279.45	54	John Kinst, Batavia IL	3691.14
5	Tom Oppenheimer, Ballwin MO	9489.51	55	Larry Rabideau, St. Anne IL	3684.46
6	Robert Carteaux, Ft. Wayne IN	9288.24	56	Wayne Morris, Mt. Carmel IL	3633.34
7	Chris Benson, Le Roy IL	8527.05	57	Howard Schmid, Merrillville IN	3616.43
8	Roger Lord, St. Louis	8036.28	58	Mic Weiss, Chesterfield MO	3616.05
9	Larry Kolker, St. Louis	8026.76	59	L. Greenman, St. Louis	3595.23
10	Dean Duncan, Mishawaka IN	7969.43	60	Marcie Stauder, St. Charles MO	3536.61
11	Suzanne Dunn, Crystal Lake IL	7921.83	61	Karen Erlanger, St. Louis	3513.46
12	Tom Kniest, St. Louis	7617.95	62	Carol Mahoney, Kokomo IN	3505.98
13	Dave Fred, Granger IN	7313.30	63	Susan Perez, Maryland Hts MO	3460.44
14	Joshua Stark, Grayslake IL	7113.58	64	Bobbie Holmes, St. Louis	3452.90
15	Karen Walker, Champaign IL	6600.71	65	Robert Butz, Kankakee IL	3443.89
16	Ed Schultz, Chesterfield MO	6453.48	66	Peggy Wald, Chesterfield MO	3386.84
17	Rod Van Wyk, Alton IL	6388.87	67	Dalton Darnell, Murray KY	3369.48
18	Mark Kessler, Springfield IL	6328.44	68	Don Define, St. Charles MO	3356.53
19	Nancy Popkin, St. Louis	6002.77	69	Lee Hastings, St Louis	3272.76
20	Ed Weiss, St. Louis	5941.50	70	Phyllis Rahn, Dunlap IL	3235.78
21	Robert Giles, Marion IL	5785.51	71	Don VanBuskirk, Hammond IN	3233.19
22	Eunice Portnoy, St. Louis	5763.15	72	Kitty Mol, Fort Wayne IN	3227.44
23	Lynne Feldman, Champaign IL	5500.19	73	Paul Ellebracht, St. Ann MO	3224.24
24	Zoe Hutchins, Portage IN	5382.74	74	Rony Adelsman, So. Bend IN	3221.49
25	Jacque Sincoff, St. Louis	5327.67	75	Kay Schirmer, St. Louis	3193.87
26	Milton Zlatic, St. Louis	5270.04	76	Jo Echols, Paducah KY	3190.95
27	Marvin Shapiro, St. Louis	5260.01	77	James Ward, Champaign IL	3180.45
28	David Bish, Leo IN	5237.65	78	W. Botzum, Notre Dame IN	3164.11
29	James Davis, Kokomo IN	5183.28	79	Donna Pedrotti, St. Louis	3149.71
30	James Hammond, St. Louis	5158.97	80	John Burgener, Noble IL	3141.43
31	Ralph Behrens, St. Louis	5158.69	81	Jacqueline Tating, Peoria IL	3126.15
32	Wes Adamczyk, Deerfield IL	5077.78	82	Carol Schaffer, St. Louis	3124.62
33	Jack Snyder, Rockford IL	4952.02	83	Karl Austin, Burlington IN	3119.23
34	Denny O'Connor, St. Louis	4859.05	84	John Startzel, Cherry Valley IL	3077.33
35	Alan Popkin, St. Louis	4858.66	85	James Feinstein, So. Bend IN	3030.61
36	Kent Feiler, Harvard IL	4489.20	86	Mark Ehret, St. Louis	3023.12

37	Tony Astrologes, St. Louis	4359.99	87	Carl Brueckner, Champaign IL	3002.76
38	Richard Ellis, Kokomo IN	4357.06	88	Nell Schneider, St. Louis	2985.06
39	Tod Moses, St. Louis	4256.02	89	Eleanoir Munson, Ft. Wayne IN	2983.15
40	Glenn Smith, Creve Coeur MO	4176.26	90	Baird Hutchins, Portage IN	2961.79
41	John Chmielowiec, MI City IN	4174.96	91	Ron Wolf, Mattoon IL	2949.61
42	Ken Bland, St. Louis	4173.50	92	James Carbaugh, Metamora IL	2913.19
43	Frank Yoder, Goshen IN	4054.95	93	Rosemary Zonker, Elkhart IN	2904.60
44	Don Florida, Marshall IL	3993.67	94	Charles Fortney, Wheaton IL	2879.67
45	Gerald Schneider, St. Louis	3952.43	95	Richard Blumenthal, Lincoln IL	2828.45
46	Mike Carmen, St. Louis	3939.12	96	Fran Scheifler, St. Louis	2823.38
47	Mike Halvorsen, Champaign IL	3932.69	97	Joseph Chin, Highland IN	2822.99
48	Diane Shotliff, Rockford IL	3814.34	98	Will Engel, Freeport IL	2800.86
49	John Dicks, St. Charles MO	3777.34	99	James De Serio, Peoria IL	2788.88
50	Irene Singleton, South Bend IN	3774.04	100	En Xie, St. Louis	2779.99

Director, please

by David Stevenson, Liverpool, England



Question (from St. Louis): I have a question about how directors interpret incomplete claims. In the case in question, the trump suit was A432 in dummy opposite KJ873 in declarer's hand. Early in the play, with the lead in her hand, declarer claimed, stating she was going to finesse in trumps. However, if she had led a trump to dummy's ace, the singleton queen would have shown up on her left.

The opponents now called the director and pointed out that declarer *could* have entered dummy in a side suit to lead low from A432 and take a first-round finesse into the singleton queen. Declarer argued that this was clearly not her intent because this would be a silly way to play the trump suit. The director agreed with the opponents, ruling that declarer must concede a trump trick that she would not have lost with normal play. How would you have ruled?

Stevenson: A very interesting case. While a number of claims contain errors that lead to problems, it is very rare to claim so early in the hand that trump-drawing has not started, except when trumps are solid. Basically the two rules of claims are to use common sense, but to allow the non-claimers the benefit of the doubt.

Following these rules, I would not have ruled as the Director did but for a different reason. People who make casual claims always claim afterwards that such-and-such is obvious, but if it was obvious, why did they not say so? If declarer had been in dummy, I would have given the defense a trick, as she did not say she would cash the ace first. I consider it careless not to cash the ace, but not irrational. But she was *not* in dummy. Having said she would draw trumps, it is completely illogical that she would go over to dummy in a side suit, risking a ruff, when she could clearly go over with the ace of trumps. So because the lead was in her hand, I would let her make all the tricks.

Question (from Wisconsin): I have recently been reviewing director calls, decisions, appeals and expert panel comments at NABC events. A large number of calls result from a break in tempo resulting in a possible passing of illegal information. I notice that we frequently have breaks in tempo at our club. So my questions are: How important is it to make a director call after a break in tempo at the club level? At what master-point level should breaks in tempo be penalized? I think novice players should get some leeway here.

Stevenson: This is difficult in part because it depends on what each player wants. When I personally play at local clubs, I am usually the best player there, or one of the top two or three, and I would never call for a ruling myself unless my opponent was one of the other top players. But the average player in a club has a right to expect fairness. The problem with tempo breaks is that they confer an advantage on players who use them, whether intentionally or not. Somehow people seem to have moved away from considering the fairness.

In your question you refer to when should breaks in tempo be penalized. The answer is really just about never, but adjustments should be made so that players do not gain an advantage.

Let us take as an example an old favourite, "Hesitation Blackwood". There is a bidding sequence, followed by a Blackwood bid. Partner shows how many aces he has, and the Blackwood bidder ruminates, considers deeply, sighs, and finally signs off. Three tables away, it is obvious that he is missing precisely one ace and

has decided not to chance the slam. Then his partner bids the slam, using some rubbishy argument about having two extra queens or something.

This is not fair, and there is no reason at all why the opponents should suffer, especially as ethical players will never progress at such times. An ethical pair will not bid the slam, and this pair would not have bid the slam if the signoff had been quick. It is only because they use the break in tempo as an additional aid that this pair has reached it, and it is important that they do not gain.

How about novices? Well, really, breaks in tempo mean nothing and are not used. Anyone who calls the Director when a novice breaks tempo is not trying to get fairness that has been taken away; he is trying to gain something. When a player has enough understanding to realize the difference between a bid made in tempo and a bid made out of tempo, he is no longer a novice.

Do you have questions about bridge laws, a ruling you received (or made) at a tournament or club game, how to handle an ethical dilemma? David, who is very knowledgeable on North American bridge, will explain laws and proprieties, share opinions on specific cases and offer advice on any aspect of game direction. You can submit questions on his [web form](#) or by email to laws2@blakjak.com . In your message, include a note that you're an *Advocate* reader from the U.S.

David maintains an archive of articles on laws and proprieties on his web site:
http://www.blakjak.demon.co.uk/lws_menu.htm



District 8 Solvers Forum -- December 2005



by Tom Dodd, Branchburg NJ

1. IMPs, none vulnerable

West	North	East	South
	1S	Pass	1NT*
Pass	2C	Pass	???

* Forcing notrump

What is your call as South holding: ♠Q5 ♥A9765
♦K109542 ♣Void ?

Action	Score	Votes	% Solvers
2D	100	10	42
2S	90	7	49
3D	70	1	2
3H	70	0	7

I read a pair of articles in last Sunday's *New York Times* that speculated on the probability of bridge and chess becoming as popular as poker with the American public. Yeah, sure. I can just envision Joe Blow leaning back in his Barcalounger, taking a big slug of his Bud Light, screaming out, "How can you possibly bid 2S on this hand when ya got 11 cards in them thar red suits! Idiot -- cantcha see yer pardner had a diamond fit and ya just missed a dadbum easy game? Geez Louise, where's the clicker? I'm switchin' back to poker."

On the other hand, it would be nice to watch pocket cam and see what North was holding. It'd make bidding hands like this one a whole lot easier. For those of you who think I'm going to state what I believe to be the "correct" answer here ... sorry, there isn't one. Both 2D and 2S could be right in BWS. A lot depends on the tendencies of your partnership. If North tends to be aggressive, 2D will probably work better here. If your North tends to be a bit cautious -- if he might dump you in 2D fearing a big misfit -- then 2S will probably work best. My partners tend to be aggressive, hence I prefer 2D ... at least on days that don't begin with a "T".

BERNHARD: "3D. All two-bids greatly understate the hand's value. I need to make an invitational bid and 3D is less of a lie than 2NT or 3H, and much safer."

I told you my partners tend toward the aggressive style.

KNIEST: "2D. Many ways to land on your feet here. Partner might raise diamonds (over which I'd bid a game), or he might bid 2H with a 5-3-1-4 pattern and extras (bid a game), or rebid 2NT (bid 3H), or rebid 2S (raise to 3S). A simple preference is a gross underbid here."

MERRITT: "2D. Simple, and it gives partner a chance to bid again. If partner would have opened 1C with 5-5 in the blacks with a minimum hand, I certainly want to get more information out of him."

FEILER: "2D. In the best of all possible worlds, partner will now introduce his three-card heart suit and we'll get to game."

Another way to approach this problem is that the 2D bidders tended to be optimistic, while the 2S crowd was by and large pessimistic:

HUDSON: "2S. Let's not get ambitious; this is probably a misfit. We might yet end up in a red suit if partner takes another call."

DELL: "2S. If partner has a good hand, he can bid again."

GUTHRIE: "2S. In spite of the apparent misfit, it is possible that you have game in diamonds or NT. It is barely conceivable that you have game in hearts (How about spades? You KNOW we have at least a decent fit there. --TJD); but the overwhelmingly most likely result of further investigation is that you get too high or languish in a stupid contract."

I didn't realize 2D was such a constructive call. Okay, it is a bit more hopeful sounding than a drop-dead 2S, which is a call you'd make here with a piece of trash like xx, QJxx, Kxxx, xxx. But this hand would be a good one to show on a TV finals if bridge were to become popular like poker. It has all the right elements -- exciting distribution, the potential for action and drama, and if North-South do end up in an idiotic contract, the potential for a, shall we say, "spirited" post mortem.

2. Matchpoints, both vulnerable

West	North	East	South
		Pass	Pass
1S	DBL	2S*	Pass
3S	4D	Pass	???

* Non-constructive raise (5-7 pts.)

What is your call as South holding: ♠J42 ♥A104 ♦J93
♣J865 ?

Action	Score	Votes	% Solvers
5D	100	16	58
Pass	70	2	32
4H	70	0	6
Other	50	0	4

I wasn't sure why this problem snuck its way into an otherwise interesting set. Then I read MERRITT's comments, and realized it was a trick question. If anyone's interested in the actual hand, please email Scott, not me, cuz I'm not telling. Suffice it to say that in the actual hand, North had nothing resembling the hand he had advertised, and you're hosed here no matter what call you make.

That said, the real problem here is whether you think your one trick (plus the filler Diamond Jack) is worth a raise to an 11-trick game. Personally, playing with one of my former favorite partners (I've played only money games for the past 12 years), I would not hesitate to bid game. If partner was pushing, well hey, at least I don't have to declare!

NELSON: "5D. No doubt in my mind -- I have two tricks for sure. The Club Jack may also be of help. Partner didn't bid 3S, so I certainly am not bidding 4H."

KESSLER: "5D. Even at matchpoints, you cannot defend a pass. Partner has bid to the 4-level red and you have a fit, an ace, and possibly a working jack. If I thought I could say 'I cue-bid 4H', I would."

FEILER: "5D. Partner must have a whopper. I'm more worried about missing slam than getting too high."

BERNHARD: "5D. More worried about missing slam than going down in 5, or partner is a bidding fool."

STRITE: "5D. Close, but I feel I have just enough. Those two minor-suit jacks and the heart 10 tip the balance. Easy raise at IMPs."

DELL: "Pass. 5D may be too high and it's matchpoints."

And the last word goes to the submitter of this problem:

MERRITT: "5D. When I played this hand, it took my opponent (North) more than a minute to bid 4D. His partner holding the South cards then passed, and I shot through the roof. I couldn't get anyone to agree with me that Pass is from Mars!"

I still cannot get excited about this problem, the actual result notwithstanding, but at least Scott gets his vindication, albeit ex post facto. Scotty, feel free to show this column to the director next time you see him.

3. Board-a-match, none vulnerable

West	North	East	South
	1C	Pass	1S
3D	Pass	Pass	DBL
Pass	3H	Pass	???

Action	Score	Votes	% Solvers
4H	100	15	58
3S	80	2	13
4D	70	1	8
Other	60	0	21

What is your call as South holding: ♠AK854 ♥QJ4 ♦65 ♣QJ10 ?

I doubt most folks would agree with me, but Board-A-Match is easily the best form of scoring that the bridge Gods ever invented. If bridge is to challenge poker as a TV phenomenon, I predict this will be the scoring format to succeed. You win, lose or tie the board -- no silly IMP formulas to confuse the audience, who are left wondering why their team lost the match even though they played better on 6 out of 8 boards.

So much for the B-A-M plug. The panel and Solvers pretty much called this a non-problem, opting for the Moysian fit without much further ado.

NELSON: "4H. Ruffing from the right hand, a nice club fit -- should be the right contract."

KESSLER: "4H. Best shot at game. Hearts may break badly and we may still make. Partner can still have a good hand."

MERRITT: "4H. This may not make, but my hand is too pure not to take the push. I feel that as long as partner doesn't have the wasted Diamond Queen, we'll have enough fillers to make this seem reasonable. Even as little as ♠Qx ♥A10xx ♦xxx ♣AKxx gives us reasonable play."

FELDHEIM: "4H. This looks like an ideal Moysian fit; short diamonds with a 3-card heart suit."

STRITE: "4H. All the hallmarks of a fine Moysian game."

Some of the 4H bidders actually took time to analyze the problem a little deeper, which is often necessary at B-A-M (and probably why this format isn't used much anymore!).

WALKER: "4H. At Board-a-Match, there's also the option of taking a view and passing 3H, but I'm not all that pessimistic about this hand. Even if partner has a dead minimum, the 4-3 fit should play well here."

At least Karen recognizes that all may not be as rosy as we'd like it to be here. I really hate to rain on peoples'

parades (OK, I actually love to play devils' advocate!), but did anyone consider this possibility?

FEILER: "4H. I'm a little worried that this is a 3-3 fit. Oh well, it'll be a good hand to talk about in the bar after the game."

Exactly! How else is partner supposed to bid something like ♠Qx ♥AKx ♦Jxx ♣Axxxx ? Rebid those moth-eaten clubs at the 4-level? 3NT without a full stopper? Pass and try for a plus score and hope we don't have a decent game?

My guess is that if you posed this as a problem for North after the reopening double, there would be votes for all of these, with maybe a couple of "UGH 3S" preferences thrown in. That's one reason B-A-M is such a tough game. Every board counts the same as the next one. Even if 4H is a decent Moysian game, 4S might score a trick better when suits break evenly -- and they had better be breaking well for you to score this one up.

Maybe 5C is the only making game opposite something like my example hand. The real question that I'm surprised nobody asked is: Who are my opponents and what is their likely result on this hand? Are my teammates active sorts who will shove in the preempt, or will N-S get a free run at the other table? These are all questions that need answering in any BAM game. It's enough to drive you crazy.

An alternative view, and much more to my liking at BAM:

KNIEST: "3S. Seems like this should show this shape. Maybe I'm a tad heavy, but we haven't found trumps yet, so I'm still looking. I'll convert 4C to 4H, and hope we have a chunky 4-3 and they don't go out 5-1. At IMPs, I'd bid the club game after 4C; BAM scoring edges me back to the 4-3. I agree that 3S is not forcing, but I won't give up the suit without an effort."

4. Matchpoints, none vulnerable

West	North	East	South
			1C
1H	Pass	2H	???

What is your call as South holding: ♠AK ♥A4 ♦K6 ♣AJ108543 ?

Action	Score	Votes	% Solvers
3C	100	9	55
DBL	80	3	10
3H	70	5	15
2NT	60	1	0
Other	50	0	20

Finally a true multiple-choice problem! At least the panel thought so:

KNIEST: "3H. Don't let them steal. If partner can bid 3NT, then that's where I want to be. If he bids 4C, I'm out. I don't know if he can bid anything else, but if he bids 3S, it must be a long suit with few points, since he couldn't find a 1S bid. Over 3S, I'll retreat to 4C myself."

GUTHRIE: "3H. Game is possible opposite as little as xxx xxx Axxx xxx, so 3C is a severe underbid. 3H keeps 3NT in the picture but allows us to reach the more likely 5C game. We just hope that 4C does not go one down."

One of the reasons I decided to devalue the cuebid was the likelihood that 3H might just be the only way (besides passing, which thankfully nobody even considered) to score a minus on this hand. In more ways than just the immediate: another argument for not cuebidding is that E-W may not be finished bidding yet.

As a longer range plan, rebidding the clubs can't hurt you if West comes in with another heart bid, because you can now double without fear that North will misinterpret your action. But if it goes 3H by you, then 4H-Pass-Pass-DBL, now poor North may think you can support spades or (gasp!) diamonds.

The majority knew they were underbidding, but really saw no viable alternative.

KESSLER: "3C. Very tough hand. Color me yellow, going for the plus."

HUDSON: "3C. We should be playing Good-Bad 2NT. Failing that, I'll trust the opponents' bidding, which indicates that partner, who very likely has at least 4 spades, is very weak. So I'll settle for a partscore without inviting game. If pard has Jxxx xxx xxxx KQ, I will suffer for my timidity."

WALKER: "3C. An underbid, but a takeout double with 2-2 in the unbid suits is too eccentric, and this hand is wrong for 2NT. A suit that needs this much help will need more than Ax as a stopper for a notrump contract."

Spokesperson for the alternative double:

STRITE: "Double. You can make a case that 2NT natural shows this hand type, but will partner not read me for minors? Double brings Lebensohl into play, permitting me to bid aggressively if partner shows any sign of life. There's little chance that pard will bid an embarrassing level of spades, given his initial pass."

This would be a good thought, except Bridge World Standard plays Lebensohl only after an opening weak two-bid or an overcall of our 1NT opening. Last word goes to our man in Africa:

MERRITT: "2NT. I had a long response written out about how to deal with my next bid after I double, and then I realized it was all junk. While double seems right, I just can't fathom how it will work out – unless partner responds 2S, where you will only have to guess between 2NT and 3C. So I just bid what seemed most likely with 2NT. Question: Since partner has already all but denied spades by not bidding the first round, is my double followed by 3C (over partner's 2S) more likely to be minors or good clubs?"

5. IMPs, NS vulnerable

West	North	East	South
			1D
Pass	1H	3S	Pass
4S	5C	Pass	???

What is your call as South holding: ♠A4 ♥K8 ♦KJ9653
♣J62 ?

Action	Score	Votes	% Solvers
Pass	100	13	61
5H	80	3	19
5D	70	1	4
5S	60	1	0
6C	50	0	16

I was convinced after seeing the votes that the panel had lost its collective mind. After reading the comments, I am even more convinced.

FELDHEIM: "Pass. I stay preempted. Slam may be there, but partner might be under pressure. The Ace of Spades rates to be a duplication. If he holds a good hand, e.g. x AJxxx x AKxxxx, slam is still tenuous."

FEILER: "Pass. I have a couple of good cards but nothing to write home about. Partner is probably 6-5 but who knows whether he's slam going or game hopeful."

KESSLER: "Pass. Guaranteed to be at least an 8-card fit. At IMPs, which game we play is not important. If

partner is 1-5-2-5, 5H could be disappointing.”

NELSON: “Pass. I am not sure I see the problem. I guess I could correct to 5H, but I think a Pass is in order with my ruffing power in clubs.”

PAULO: “Pass. I don't take preference because over 4S, our best contract may be 5C. That is the case with a layout like North holding ♠x ♥A10xxxx ♦x ♣AQ10xx.”

And so went most of the rest of the comments for Pass. Let me see if I got this right: An unlimited partner has just freely introduced a brand new suit at the 5-level, advertising a monster playing hand, as well as big distribution, and I'm going to pass because I have a minimum opener and 3-card support?

I guess we could always say that our glasses got fogged over and we dropped the ace of spades and forgot we ever possessed it. Or we could shrug and tell poor North that our other partner would bid this way with FELDHEIM's or PAULO's example hand. If you're thinking, “Geez, Tom, aren't you giving North a more powerful hand than he might hold? After all, he was under pressure?” ... Horsefeathers!

Just take a brief look at the auction. West passed originally over your opener, so how much strength can he hold? East tossed in a nonvulnerable preempt, practically shouting that he holds garbage outside spades. What is North supposed to do here with a real monster two-suiter? Jump to slam and pray you can guess the right suit? Or make some amorphous 4NT bid (which should show something like 0-5-4-4 or 1-5-3-4 and a huge playing hand that doesn't want to take a paltry penalty against 4S hammered) and hope you can guess that he really holds the big two-suiter?

Those who nudged forward at least gave themselves a chance to save face with their teammates:

HUDSON: “5H. My diamonds are probably worthless, but everything else looks good. Therefore, I'm not quite pessimistic enough to pass. I'll give partner another chance to bid slam. Maybe he holds x AQxxxx – KQ10xxx and will bid on after my 'cheerful' preference.”

I wouldn't be that excited about slam opposite this hand, given the very real possibility of bad breaks in both hearts and clubs. But I have to believe North's hand is stronger given the bidding to this point. Another possibility:

KNIEST: “5D. I have a minimum hand that doesn't seem to be a great fitter. I've been preempted, and don't have any reason to make a SWAG at 6 of anything. Yes, pass is a possibility, but it takes away another chance to hear North speak. I can also stand a heart rebid, so I want to give him that chance. I don't think I'm overstating my diamond strength since I passed over 3S. Give partner a hand like ♠x ♥AJxxx ♦Ax ♣AKxxx and 6D looks pretty good.”

At least Tom realizes that North is likely to hold this sort of playing strength. Add a round suit ten to the mix and I like my chances of making slam. However, I must confess a reluctance to rebid my cheesy diamond suit at this level, despite the negative inference of not having bid it freely over 3S.

Finally, our wild-eyed optimist from the dark continent:

MERRITT: “5S. Tell partner that I am in. I hate only having one stick, but my hand really isn't awful. We may be playing a little poker at the 7-level, but this may induce them into the dive at 7S that would make me feel the most comfortable.”

Remind me of this if we ever sit at the poker table, Scott. It might induce me to call your all-in on a marginal hand.

6. Matchpoints, NS vulnerable

West	North	East	South
		Pass	1NT
Pass	2C	Pass	2S
Pass	3D *	Pass	3NT
Pass	5NT	Pass	???

* Forcing, 5+-card suit

What is your call as South holding: ♠KJ72 ♥K6 ♦K10
♣AJ973 ?

Action	Score	Votes	% Solvers
6NT	100	9	53
6D	90	1	12
6C	80	7	14
6S	70	0	7
Pass	50	1	12
7D	50	0	2

At least the majority got it right this time! Let's see what we have: North makes an out-of-the blue jump to 5NT after taking the time to tell us he has a 5-card diamond suit. Had he simply bid 5NT without the diamond waystop, we would assume he had a balanced 20+ or 21 highs. Old 1940s Standard bidding tells us this sequence is a force to 6NT and an invite to a grand slam if we have a maximum. What could be easier?

So why do seven expert player suddenly decide that since it was OK for North to stop off and tell us about his suit, it must be OK for us to now introduce our long suit at the six-level! Are they hoping to go exploring for a grand this way? Perhaps they are angling for a "safer" slam? Perhaps they think 5NT is the infamous "pick a slam" call we hear so much of in this forum? Let's find out:

KNIEST: "6C. Partner's forcing to slam. Here's a last chance to find clubs. I'll correct 6D to 6NT to get the lead up to me."

WALKER: "6C. If partner wanted to make a quantitative grand-slam try -- with or without a 4-card major -- he wouldn't have shown the diamond suit. 5NT here is 'pick a slam' and 6C is just a suggestion, not a final decision. Since diamonds is the only contract where I really have a ruffing value, 6D would be a better suggestion, but only if partner would take it as a good doubleton. Here, though, I think he'd assume 6D showed 3-card support."

HUDSON: "6C. 5NT means 'pick a slam', rather than 'choose between a small slam and a grand slam' (which is what it would mean if no suit had been mentioned) or Grand Slam Force (if we had unambiguous suit agreement). But I'm not sure which slam to pick. The hand might play better in diamonds, allowing him to ruff a heart in my hand (Ax Axxx AQJxxx x). Probably it belongs in 6NT, but I don't have to commit us; I'll let partner bear the onus. Unfortunately, partner will never guess my distribution, and he won't imagine I have doubletons in both his suits. That's my fault, for opening 1NT."

I can't see how North could ever mean 5NT here as pick-a-slam. Even assuming somehow that BWS doesn't define this sequence (it doesn't because it's as basic as if partner's last call had been an invitational 4NT!), we haven't tortured each other with several rounds of bidding, introducing three or all four suits, perhaps giving a cheap preference to one or two of them, and there is now some doubt as to which suit will play best. North showed a suit; we showed a suit; neither was supported. Conclusion- he's making a good old-fashioned quantitative raise. Why complicate simple auctions? For the record, I also wouldn't open 1NT here because of the easy rebid, but I would start with 1NT if the spade and heart (or spade and diamond) holdings were reversed.

DELL: "6C. I have no idea what 5NT means. Grand Slam Force in diamonds? I wouldn't even know what 4NT

would be. Does this auction mean that partner doesn't have four spades? When you're lost, don't mess things up. 6C preserves flexibility; I even have the ace and five of them.”

Nope. If North had transferred (via 2NT in Bridge World Standard) and then bid 5NT, then 5NT here would be the Grand Slam Force in diamonds. That's why notrump openers have so few rebid problems. With the notrump opener's hand well-defined and limited, more exact meanings can be attached to various auctions. The real question for me here is whether North could hold 2-4-5-2 or some such, since he didn't use the immediate diamond transfer. Not that it would matter much, since I'd guess all roads will eventually lead to 6NT, except perhaps this one:

FELDHEIM: “6D. This is interesting. I'm going to presume that this is a GSF in diamonds and North may have started life with a black suit void. Though a bit IMPish, 6D should have a much better play than 6NT. Yeah, I know, matchpoints, but without a void, North can convert to notrump.”

Since we've established what North should have on this auction (and that 5NT can't be the GSF), this could turn ugly. Or it could end up in clover opposite AQ Axxx AQJxx Kx, when North decides the hands fit perfectly and bids the cold grand.

Most of those who bid the obvious 6NT were lackadaisical:

JONES: “6NT. In my book that's a quantitative try for seven, which I reject and have to sign off in six.”

PAULO: “6NT. Without any known fit, 5NT is a quantitative trial for seven. I must reject it.”

MERRITT: “6NT. I can't imagine any other choice. The odds of 6D being right on a heart ruff seem minute, compared to the fact that it scores so much less. If partner had spades, he could choose 6S over 3NT. If partner was asking for which level to be in -- 6 or 7 -- he could continue with 4 of a minor. I just don't get it.”

Me neither, Scott. The time for exploration is over. We've been asked to value our hand as minimum or maximum for 6NT or 7NT. I wouldn't even consider 6D at matchpoints. This should have been the gimme problem of the set.

Well, you've all been spared more of my ranting for another six months! A happy and safe holiday season to each and every one of you, and we'll catch you all in 2006!

Thanks to all who sent in answers to this high-scoring set and especially to our guest panelist, **Gary Dell**. Congratulations to **Oyvind Tafjord** of Eugene OR, who scored a perfect 600 to lead all Solvers. Close behind with 590 were **Micah Fogel** of Aurora IL and **Bill Lindemann** of Champaign IL. All three are invited to join the February panel.

As always, we appreciate your participation and your comments, which are often very helpful in our analysis. We're especially thankful when we receive good ideas for new problems, so please keep a lookout and send along anything you think might be interesting. The best problems are those that have at least three possible (and reasonable) solutions.

The six new problems are below. Please submit your solutions by **January 21** on the [web form](#) or by email to our February moderator:

Tom Kniest -- kniest@swbell.net

How the Panel voted (Panel/Staff Avg. -- 561):	1	2	3	4	5	6	Score
Bob Bernhard , New Smyrna Beach FL	3D	5D	4H	3H	Pass	6NT	540
Gary Dell , Champaign IL	2S	Pass	4H	3C	Pass	6C	550
Kent Feiler , Harvard IL	2D	5D	4H	3H	Pass	6NT	570
Harold Feldheim , Hamden CT	2D	5D	4H	3H	Pass	6D	560
Nigel Guthrie , Reading UK	2S	5D	4H	3H	Pass	6C	540
Jim Hudson , DeKalb IL	2S	5D	4D	3C	5H	6C	520
Kimmel Jones , Euless TX	2D	5D	4H	3C	Pass	6NT	600
Mark Kessler , Springfield IL	2D	5D	4H	3C	Pass	Pass	550
Larry Matheny , Loveland CO	2S	Pass	4H	3C	Pass	6NT	560
Bev Nelson , Fort Myers FL	2S	5D	4H	3C	Pass	6C	570
Manuel Paulo , Lisbon, Portugal	2D	5D	4H	3C	Pass	6NT	600
Larry Rabideau , St. Anne IL	2S	5D	4H	DBL	Pass	6NT	570
Toby Strite , San Jose CA	2D	5D	4H	DBL	Pass	6C	560
Hugh Williams , Carbondale IL	2S	5D	4H	DBL	5H	6NT	570

How the Staff voted

Tom Dodd , Branchburg NJ	2D	5D	3S	3C	5H	6NT	560
Tom Kniest , University City, MO	2D	5D	3S	3H	5D	6C	520
Scott Merritt , Abuja, Nigeria	2D	5D	4H	2NT	5S	6NT	520
Karen Walker , Champaign IL	2D	5D	4H	3C	Pass	6C	580

Solvers Honor Roll (Average Solver score: 515)

Oyvind Tafjord , Eugene OR	600	Bill Rotter , Granite City IL	570
Micah Fogel , Aurora IL	590	Larry Wilcox , Springfield IL	570
Bill Lindemann , Champaign IL	590	Bob Carteaux , Fort Wayne IN	560

Bob Shair, Champaign IL

580

Judy Eaton, Carbondale IL

560

Kevin Jones, Crestwood KY

570

Uður Tap, Istanbul, Turkey

560

Tied with 550: Steve Babin, Normal IL; Alvan Bregman, Champaign IL; Rich Peer, St. Louis MO; Glenn Smith, Chesterfield MO; Richard Troth, Columbia MO; David Wetzel, Rantoul IL.

Solvers Forum -- February 2006 Problems

1. IMPs, NS vulnerable

West	North	East	South
--	1D	3C	???

What is your call as South holding:

♠K84 ♥AQ10932 ♦106 ♣96 ?

2. IMPs, both vulnerable

West	North	East	South
--	--	--	1D
Pass	1H	Pass	2C
Pass	2S*	DBL	???

* Fourth-suit force, may be artificial

What is your call as South holding:

♠Void ♥942 ♦A9543 ♣AKQ87 ?

3. Matchpoints, EW vulnerable

West	North	East	South
--	--	--	1D
Pass	1H	Pass	???

What is your call as South holding:

♠AQ74 ♥KQ86 ♦AJ84 ♣K ?

4. IMPs, none vulnerable

West	North	East	South
--	--	--	1H
2D	2S	3D	???

What is your call as South holding:

♠A53 ♥AJ98654 ♦Void ♣A82 ?

5. Matchpoints, NS vulnerable

West	North	East	South
--	--	--	1NT
2S	3D	Pass	3NT
Pass	4S	DBL	???

What is your call as South holding:

♠K854 ♥K103 ♦A65 ♣AJ6 ?

6. Matchpoints, NS vulnerable

West	North	East	South
--	1S	3D	3S
4D	4H	Pass	???

What is your call as South holding:

♠K43 ♥Q1086 ♦54 ♣KJ83 ?

Thanks for the problems above to Mark Leonard (#2), Sheldon Margulis (#3) and Ed Schultz (#5).



Pair Fare

News from Northwestern Illinois Unit 239

Editor: Dennis Ryan, 118 Glenview Court, Janesville WI 53545
drchezmoi@aol.com

Bob Brightup: Life Master



Bob Brightup of Rockford, one of our Unit's latest life masters, won his gold card playing in a club game with Mort Linsky (Rockford), one of his favorite and most frequent partners.

Rockford born and raised, Bob first began playing rubber bridge at Rockford West High School, which is a middle school now. He continued in college at the University of Illinois in Champaign-Urbana, where he majored in accounting. He emerged from college in 1955 "ready and waiting to terrorize the duplicate bridge community."

Now retired, Bob has worked as an accountant over the years for the Winnebago County Sanitary District, the Cudahy Company (a meatpacking firm) and the Rockford Park District.

Bob, who is single, has played bridge widely throughout the Stateline area. He declares a special fascination with the psychological elements of bridge. "But I'm probably interested in the social elements, too," he adds. "At least it's social to the extent that it keeps me off the streets and out of the taverns," he laughs.

Congratulations to . . .

. . . **Doug Gugger** (Freeport) and **Rich Whitsitt** (Rockford,) who placed first overall in Flight B of the District 8 North American Pairs finals in Springfield on November 12.

. . . **Richard Blumenthal** (Lake-in-the-Hills,) who placed second overall in Flight A of the District 8 North American Pairs finals in Springfield on November 12. He played with **Mike Halvorsen** of Champaign.

. . . **Will Engel** (Freeport), who currently stands second overall nationally in the junior players (under age 25) masterpoint race. Will has won 805 masterpoints so far this year.

♠ Upcoming tournaments in Unit 239 ♠

Elgin Early Spring Sectional -- March 11-13, 2006, Elgin Community College

Rockin' Rockford Regional -- June 19-25, 2006, Clock Tower Resort

Rockford Classic Sectional -- September 8-10, 2006, Clock Tower Resort

Aurora Turkey Bowl -- November 24-26, 2006, Prisco Community Center

Elgin Early Spring Sectional -- March 2-4, 2007, Elgin Community College



CIBA Digest

News from Central Illinois Unit 208

Editor: Karen Walker, 2121 Lynwood Drive, , Champaign IL 61821
(217) 359-0042 kwalker@insightbb.com

New site for the Illini Champaign Regional

It's not too early to make your plans for our Unit's annual Memorial Day regional, coming up **May 23-29** in Champaign. A full schedule of events is [here](#).

We have a new site this year -- the Hawthorn Suites Hotel. The Chancellor Hotel, where we've hosted the tournament for the past 13 years, is undergoing major renovations and won't be open until late 2006.

The Hawthorn, located one block south of the Chancellor site, is an all-suites hotel with free hot breakfasts and free high-speed Internet. The hotel is offering a deeply discounted bridge rate of \$75 for a double room, which includes the daily breakfast buffet, free parking and access to the hotel's fitness center and indoor heated pool.



Please make your reservations early. Call 800-527-1133 *or* 217-398-3400 and ask for the bridge rate. Click [here](#) for driving directions and more details on the hotel.

North American Pairs

Congratulations to all everyone who played in the District 8 North American Pair finals in Springfield in November. Six of our Unit pairs placed in the top three overall in their flights and won trips to play in the national finals at the Spring NABC in Dallas TX in March. Congratulations to:

- A2 - Mike Halvorsen, Champaign & Richard Blumenthal, Lincoln
- B2 - Bobbie Straker, Pekin & Steve Babin, Normal
- B3 - Debbie Avery & Martha Leary, Champaign
- C1 - Eric Gettleman, Normal & Paul Holmes, Champaign
- C2 - Bill Lindemann Jr., Champaign & Dan Faulkner, Monticello
- C2 - Ron Vogel & Chuck Young, Peoria



Central Illinois Top 100

Here are the top masterpoint holders in Central Illinois Unit 208 and their career point totals as of November 6, 2005. The first 21 players on the list are ranked in the top 100 of all players in District 8 (see the [District](#)

[Top 100](#) list in this issue).

1	Colby Vernay, Lacon	15480.44	51	Elizabeth Zalar, Springfield	1604.11
2	Dick Benson, Le Roy	10974.85	52	Don Marystone, Springfield	1581.28
3	Gary Kessler, Springfield	10279.45	53	Margaret Ferguson, Peoria	1578.03
4	Chris Benson, Le Roy	8527.05	54	Mike Reid, Peoria	1566.27
5	Karen Walker, Champaign	6600.71	55	Betty Miller, Mattoon	1564.38
6	Mark Kessler, Springfield	6328.44	56	Donald Murray, Manteno	1559.04
7	Lynne Feldman, Champaign	5500.19	57	Ronald Simmons, LaSalle	1547.97
8	Donald Florida, Marshall	3993.67	58	Joanne Glazebrook, Washington	1532.76
9	Mike Halvorsen, Champaign	3932.69	59		1524.18
10	Robert Hayes, Joliet	3764.96	60	Stephen Babin, Normal	1524.05
11	Larry Rabideau, Saint Anne	3684.46	61	Teresa Parker, Washington	1516.60
12	Robert Butz, Kankakee	3443.89	62	Kris Maillacheruvu, Peoria	1508.37
13	Phyllis Rahn, Dunlap	3235.78	63	Aldo Mancinelli, Decatur	1504.86
14	James Ward, Champaign	3180.45	64	Earl Bennett, Mattoon	1501.14
15	Jacqueline Tatting, Peoria	3126.15	65	Charles Zalar, Springfield	1497.57
16	Norinne Anderson Nelson,	3088.34	66	Clay Cuthbertson, Quincy	1495.04
17	Peoria	3002.76	67	Edna Larkin, Urbana	1474.35
18	Carl Brueckner, Champaign	2949.61	68	Joyce Baehler, Peoria	1471.69
19	Ron Wolf, Mattoon	2913.19	69	Bernard Riley, Pekin	1465.82
20	James Carbaugh, Metamora	2828.45	70	Raymond Russ, Henry	1463.87
21	Richard Blumenthal, Lincoln	2788.88	71	Michael Jones, Champaign	1458.70
22	James De Serio, Peoria	2642.49	72	Richard Schnepf, Springfield	1457.77
23	George Nett, Macomb	2459.86	73	Bette Wright, Paris	1436.79
24	Betty Capodice, Bloomington	2376.00	74	Richard Nelson, Peoria	1426.65
25	Laura Addison, Bloomington	2368.03	75	Betty Primm, Athens	1419.56
26	Leonard Kaufman, Peoria	2367.96	76	Brenda Cash, Paris	1406.03
27	Alan Wienman, Morton	2269.88	77	Dorothy Lanphier, Mattoon	1405.75
28	Richard Gibons, Princeton	2259.19	78	Jason Feldman, Champaign	1398.35
29	Ann Wienman, Morton	2095.14	79	John Kessinger, Decatur	1388.67
30	Rick Voss, Macomb	2086.25	80	Martha Neal, Mattoon	1385.14
31	John Seng, Champaign	2063.10	81	Martha Stutz, Springfield	1364.65
32	Deborah Avery, Champaign	2007.95	82	Shirley Fanjoy, Decatur	1359.93
33	Ronald Sholes, Springfield	2006.73	83	Loren Alexander, Kewanee	1359.33
34	Helen Conn, Springfield	1974.76	84	Virginia Larsen, St Petersburg	1339.27
35	Phyllis Collins, Springfield	1973.77	85	Carole Sholes, Springfield	1338.70
36	Georgia Heth, Morton	1949.97	86	Mike Tomlianovich, Bloomington	1336.41
37	Edward Horton, Champaign	1869.27	87	Thelma Cheneler, Peoria	1298.65
38	David Hanna, Springfield	1807.00	88	Stephen Borbely, Dewey	1286.78
39	Carol Umbach, Havana	1737.13	89	E. Anderson, Mattoon	1271.49
40	Kay Jackson, Ridge Farm	1733.06	90	Helen Kramp, Springfield	1265.43
41	Pat Carrington, Champaign	1725.20	91	Martin Angell, Marshall	1229.25
	Virginia Krueger, Bushnell			Paul Soper, Champaign	

42	Doris Foltz, Springfield	1719.78	92	Melvyn Regal, Peoria	1229.22
43	Joyce McEldowney, Dunlap	1713.78	93	Donn Miller, Decatur	1225.83
44	James Melville, Springfield	1707.95	94	Phillip Wagner, Springfield	1223.49
45	Gail Moon, Bloomington	1707.66	95	Beverly Bakunas, Decatur	1200.82
46	Fred Crockett, Danville	1700.08	96	John Parsons, Springfield	1194.88
47	Martha Leary, Urbana	1693.01	97	William Langendorf, Champaign	1192.09
48	M. Foltz, Springfield	1692.97	98	Janice Franz, Springfield	1164.44
49	Elsie Wolff, Deerfield	1662.31	99	Martin Steinberg, Bloomington	1162.27
50	Marciann O'Brien, Decatur	1631.25	100	C. Taft, Springfield	1159.02

Movin' Up

Congratulations to these Unit members who recently advanced in rank:

New Junior Masters (5 pts.)

Alfred Au, Urbana
 Dan Bunde, Champaign
 Linda Goersch, Tolono
 Jerry Hinds, Morton
 Joe Krause, Bloomington
 Deborah Mitchell, Peoria
 Jan Nelle, Springfield
 Norman Nelson, Dunlap
 Jean Roese, Springfield
 Gene Vernon, Springfield

Club Masters (20 pts.)

Vernon Andrews, Dunlap
 Marcia Bondurant, Champaign
 Fei Dong, Peoria
 Becky Groeninger, Springfield
 Alfred Pranske, Springfield
 Barbara Schaad, Bloomington

Sectional Masters (50 pts.)

Jean Bingenheimer, Chatham
 Sandra Dayton, Mahomet
 Rita Harmon, Springfield
 Marjorie McIntyre, Springfield
 Buddy Shuler, Dewey
 Mary Jo Wehmhoff, Chatham

Regional Masters (100 pts.)

Susan Donnelly, Springfield
 Margaret France, Astoria
 Helen Healy, Springfield
 Paul Holmes, Champaign
 James Pollard, Normal
 Maggie Stephens, Champaign

NABC Masters (200 pts.)

Bill Lindemann, Jr., Champaign

Life Master

Art Berg, Danville

Bronze Life Master (500 pts.)

Alvan Bregman, Champaign
 Linda Fisher, Tolono
 Zach Freehill, Bloomington
 James Nixon, Galesburg
 Marilyn Toubeaux, Peoria



ILLINI REGIONAL

**Memorial Day weekend: May
23-29, 2006**

**New location: Hawthorn Suites
Hotel**

101 Trade Centre Drive, Champaign, Illinois



**Please join us for seven days of bridge and our
special Illini hospitality:**

- **Wednesday: Seniors Day** -- \$4 off your 2-session Open Pairs entry for ages 65+.
- **Thursday: Fighting Illini Fans Day** -- Prizes, drawing for Illini football tickets, \$2 off your afternoon entry if you wear Illini orange and blue!
- **Friday: Juniors Day** -- Full-time students age 25 and under play **FREE** in the 2-session Stratified Pairs!
- **Saturday: Barometer final** in the Flight A Strataflighted Pairs (1:30 & 7:30).
- **Monday: FAST Swiss Teams** -- playthrough with free continental breakfast & cash snack bar.
- **Novice/Intermediate Program:** 0-300 events Wednesday through Sunday. Expert speakers at 1:00 & 7:00, Wed. evening through Sun. afternoon.
- **Non-stop hospitality** -- Evening buffets, hotel hospitality suite, registration gifts, door prizes, champagne splits & glasses to section winners, *Daily Bulletin*, [Daily Web Bulletin](#), bridge bookstore, *more!*
- **Discounts** for full-time students under age 25. *NO entry-fee surcharge* for non-ACBL members.

Bracketed Knockout Teams:

Big Ten -- 7:30 Tuesday & 9:30, 1:30 & 7:30

Tuesday, May 23

7:30 -- **Big Ten KO Teams** (continues Wednesday)

7:30 -- Tue-Wed Side Series Pairs

Wednesday, May 24 -- Seniors Day

♣ **\$4 off 2-session Open Pair entry for ages 65+.**

9:30, 1:30 & 7:30 -- Big Ten KO (2nd, 3rd & 4th sess.)

9:30, 1:30 & 7:30 -- Tue-Wed Side Series Pairs

1:30 & 7:30 -- Stratified Open Pairs

7:30 -- 299er Pairs

Thursday, May 25 -- Illini Fans Day

♣ **\$2 off your afternoon entry if you wear Illini orange and blue!**

9:30 -- **Orange & Blue KO Teams** (continues Friday)

9:30 -- Charity Side Series AM Pairs

1:30 & 7:30 -- Thu-Fri Side Series Pairs

1:30 & 7:30 -- Strataflighted Swiss Teams (Flt. A separate: Flts. BCD in one event)

7:30 -- 299er Pairs

Friday, May 26 -- Juniors Day

♣ **Students age 25 and under play FREE in the Stratified Pairs.**

9:30 -- Orange & Blue KO (2nd, 3rd & 4th sess.)

9:30 -- Charity Side Series AM Pairs

1:30 & 7:30 -- Stratified Open Pairs

Wed.

Orange & Blue -- 9:30 Thursday & 9:30, 1:30 & 7:30 Friday

Chief Illiniwek -- 9:30 Saturday & 9:30, 1:30 & 7:30 Sunday. *Dorner-Meyer trophies to winners in bottom bracket.*

OskeeWowWow Compact KO (two sessions, four 12-board matches) -- 1:30 & 7:30 Sunday

Side-Game Series: Enter any or all sessions. Play two or more sessions in any series to qualify for overall awards (gold points).

Charity Side Series AM Pairs -- 9:30 am, Thursday through Sunday (to benefit the Champaign County Humane Society)

Tue-Wed Side Series -- 1:30 & 7:30, Tuesday & Wednesday

Thu-Fri Side Series ---- 1:30 & 7:30, Thursday & Friday

Sat-Sun Side Series ---- 1:30 & 7:30, Saturday & Sunday

Novice/Intermediate Pairs:

299er Pairs (0-300) -- 7:30 Wed., Thu., Fri. & Sat.; 1:30 & 7:30 Sunday

Easybridge Pairs (0-100) -- 1:30 Saturday

Strata: A=Open A/X=3000 B=1500 C=500
D=200

[Daily Bulletins](#) from the 2005 Illini Regional.

Host hotel:

Bridge rate (\$75 double) and free parking at Hawthorn Suites, 101 Trade Center Drive, one block south of the site of our previous regionals (the old Chancellor Hotel, Neil & Kirby).

The Hawthorn is an all-suites hotel with a free daily hot breakfast buffet and free high-speed Internet. Facilities include a heated indoor pool, Jacuzzi and fitness center. A wide variety of restaurants are within walking distance. [Hotel info & driving directions](#)

Reservations: 800-527-1133 *or* 217-398-3400 (ask for bridge rate). *Please reserve by May 15.*

1:30 & 7:30 -- Thu-Fri Side Series Pairs
7:30 -- 299er Pairs

Saturday, May 27

9:30 -- **Chief Illiniwek KO** (continues Sunday)

9:30 -- Charity Side Series AM Pairs

1:30 & 7:30 -- Flight A/X Strataflighted Pairs (qualifying with barometer final)

1:30 & 7:30 -- Flight BCD Pairs

1:30 & 7:30 -- Sat-Sun Side Series Pairs

1:30 -- Easybridge Pairs (0-100)

7:30 -- Barometer Final (2nd sess. of Flt. A Pairs)

7:30 -- 299er Pairs

Sunday, May 28

9:30, 1:30 & 7:30 -- Chief Illiniwek KO (2nd, 3rd & 4th sess.)

9:30 -- Charity Side Series AM Pairs

1:30 & 7:30 -- Sat-Sun Side Series Pairs

1:30 & 7:30 -- **OskeeWowWow Compact KO**

Teams

1:30 & 7:30 -- 299er Pairs (single sessions)

7:30 -- Board-a-Match Teams

Monday, May 29

9:45 a.m. --- *Free continental breakfast.*

10:30 a.m. -- *FAST* Stratified Swiss Teams. *On the road by 6:00.*

Chairman: Karen Walker (217-359-0042)
kwalker@insightbb.com

Partners: Hugh Williams (618-203-9566)
hrw97@hotmail.com

Madhu Viswanathan
madhubalan@insightbb.com



Unit 223 Reporter

News from Southern Illinois-Paducah Unit 223

Editor: Karen Coe, 12761 Webb Hill Rd., Ewing IL 62836 (618-435-4200) finesse002002@yahoo.com



Seasons Greetings to fellow Unit 223 members

In the spirit of the season, here is a list of suggested “gifts” for your fellow bridge players to be dispensed throughout 2006.

For your opponents:

- Make a prompt appearance, and give a courteous greeting at each table and round.
- Make your opening lead BEFORE writing down the contract.
- Avoid discussing hands at the table and during play.
- Bid and play in rhythm.
- And remember – bridge is only a game; not a battle to the death. Attitude is everything.

For your partner:

- Be cheerful and forbearing. Acknowledge your own errors and forgive your partner’s.
- Never begin a discussion of any catastrophe or train wreck in hot-blood or in your opponents’ presence.
- Eliminate the confrontational question “Why didn’t you....” from your bridge vocabulary.

Remember, there are several things more important than bridge results, and one of them is not destroying your friendship with your partner. Attitude is everything.

Once again, wishing you all a Joyous Holiday, and in 2006 may all your slams be Grand and Makeable!

District 8 North American Pairs Finals Report

The District 8 NAP Finals were held in Springfield, IL, Nov. 12 and 13, at the IDOT Building in a large and attractive playing area. It was an extremely interesting and challenging weekend of bridge with friendly opponents and nice hospitality.

On Saturday, there were 10 tables playing in A flight, 22 tables in B and 13 tables in C. A-flight was a 2-session event which concluded on Saturday. Flight B and C pairs played 2 sessions on Saturday, and Qualifying Pairs from B-flight and C-flight continued on for 2 more sessions on Sunday.

Finishing first in A-flight were Milt Zlatic, St. Louis, and Tom Oppenheimer, Ballwin Mo.. First in B-flight were Richard Whitsitt, Rockford IL and Doug Gugger, Freeport IL. Winners in C-flight were Paul Holmes, Champaign IL and Eric Gettleman, Normal IL.

Unit 223 players who qualified and then placed overall were:

Flight B: Karen and John Coe, Ewing IL in 9th place. Doug McQuaid, Lebanon IL and Chris Shaw, Carlinville IL in 12th place.

Flight C: Mary and Bob Johnson of Godfrey IL placed third overall. Their finish also carried a qualification to advance to the NAP at the Spring NABC in Dallas Texas. Congratulations to the Johnsons on their fine performance in Springfield.

Sectional at Clubs Winners

Unit 223's top masterpoint winners in the Fall STaC were Doug Edwards, Hardin KY (26.51 silver points -- 3rd overall in District 8) and Julia Rambo, Mayfield KY (19.88 silver points - 8th overall in the District).

The following Unit 223 Pairs Players placed overall in the recent District 8 Fall Sectional at Clubs:

Monday Evening: David Osucha and Michael Eastburn, playing at Echo DBC, 1st in A and B.
Dalton Darnell and Ron Brockman, playing at Mayfield DBC, 5/6 in B

Tuesday Evening: Mary Dunn and Margaret High, playing at Embser DBC, 5th in A, 3rd in B

Wednesday Day: Doug Edwards and Julia Rambo, playing at Metropolis DBC, 1st in A

Thursday Day: Randy Leeper and Bob Giles, playing at Echo DBC, 2nd in A.
Cynthia Powell and Dan English, playing at Echo DBC, 8th in A and 2nd in B.

Thursday Evening: Joan Fowler and Carolyn Mayo, playing at Paducah DBC, 3rd in B.

Friday Evening: Playing at Edwardsville DBC, Linda Brazier and Robert Wheeler, 4th in A and 2nd in B.
June Neier and Doris Baer, 6th in C.

(With apologies to any STaC Pairs Players I may have inadvertently omitted mentioning!)

Happy Holidays to Unit 223 members who have advanced in rank:

New Club Masters: Evelyn Williams, Mayfield KY; Louella Lyon, Paducah KY; Jill Woolf, Carbondale IL

New Sectional Master: Alice McGuire, Mt. Carmel IL

New Regional Masters: Raymond Ford, Highland; Frances Jones, Hickman KY; June Neier, Highland

New Bronze Life Masters: Jane Baker, Paducah, KY & William Meler, Mt. Carmel

New Silver Life Master: Maxine Wynn, Paducah KY

New Gold Life Master: Judy Eaton, Carbondale

Unit 223's Next Sectional Tournament

Mark your calendars and plan to attend the Saluki Swiss Sectional on Jan. 21st and 22nd. The tournament will be held this year at the Holiday Inn, Mt. Vernon IL. See the tournament flyer in this Advocate or at www.acbl.org for further information on schedule and housing.

Tournament chairs & partnerships: Karen Coe (618) 435-4200 karenann4200@yahoo.com

Jay Coleman (618) 563-9927 franklincoleman@hotmail.com

Twin Cities Winter Sectional January 6-8, 2006

Interstate Center, Bloomington IL
(west of I-74 & I-55 @ exit 160B, IL Route 9)

Friday, January 6

1:00 pm -- Stratified Pairs

7:00 pm -- Stratified Open Pairs

99er pairs (if attendance warrants)

Saturday, January 7

1:00 & 7:00 pm -- Two-session Stratified Pairs (single-session entries welcome!)

Single-session 99er Pairs (if attendance warrants)

Sunday, January 8

10:30 am playthrough -- Stratified Swiss Teams

- *Complimentary coffee and snacks all sessions.*
- *Dinner served on Sunday*

Entry fees: \$8 per person per session on Friday & Saturday.

\$84 per team on Sunday (includes dinner).

Strata: A: Open; B: <1500; C: <Non-LM under 500

Tournament manager: Floyd Sherry (309) 467-4426 sherry@mtco.com

Partners: Mike Tomlianovich (309) 662-5832 m@mt.org



St Louis Winter Sectional

Blanchette Park Memorial Hall
St Charles, Missouri

Friday, January 13th, 2006

1:30 pm	Stratified Open Pairs	0-500, 500-1500, 1500+
	Stratified Intermediate/Novice Pairs	0-199
7:30 pm	Flight A/X Open Pairs	0-3000, 3000+
	Stratified B, C Pairs	0-500, 500-1500
	Stratified Intermediate/Novice Pairs ***	

Saturday, January 14th, 2006

9:00 am	Bracketed Knockout Teams Round 1	
1:30 pm	Stratified Open Pairs 1 st Session	0-500, 500-1500, 1500+
	Stratified Intermediate/Novice Pairs	
	Bracketed Knockout Teams Round 2	
	Side Game	
7:30 pm	Stratified Open Pairs 2 nd Session	
	Stratified Intermediate/Novice Pairs	
	Bracketed Knockout Teams Round 3	
	Side Game	

Sunday, January 15th, 2006

10:00 am	Stratified Swiss Teams 1 st Session	0-500, 500-1500, 1500+
TBA	Stratified Swiss Teams 2 nd Session	

*** New Game Added by Popular Demand

Life Masters can now play in Bracket C

Terrific Hospitality after All Evening Sessions

Beverages, Popcorn and Cookies at All Sessions

*** Lunch Provided for Participants in the Saturday Knockouts ***

Continental Breakfast – Sunday Morning 9:00 AM

Hot Buffet Meal Between Sessions of the Sunday Swiss Teams

Guest Speakers both Friday and Saturday at 12:45 pm and 6:45 pm

Directions – From I-70 take 5th St North 1.8 miles to Randolph, turn left, then 0.5 miles to park entrance on the right

Tournament Chairman:

Mike Carmen 314-872-8439

Partnerships:

Mary Hruby 314-739-1574

Emergency Phone Number: 314-845-2030

www.unit143.org



Saluki Swiss

January 21 & 22, 2006

Holiday Inn Convention Center
222 Potomac Ave., Mt. Vernon IL

Saturday, January 21

1:30 & 7:30 -- Stratified Swiss Teams (one-day event)

1:30 & 7:30 -- Stratified Pairs (if attendance warrants). Evening session open to new entries.

Sunday, January 22

10:00 -- Stratified Swiss Teams (two-session playthrough)

10:00 -- Single-session stratified Pairs (if attendance warrants).

Flights/Strata: A (1500+) B (500 – 1500) C (0 – 500)

- Hospitality after the Saturday-night session.
- Sunday entry includes dinner.
- Prizes to the teams scoring the most VPs over both days of the Swiss (by flights).

Host hotel: Bridge rate at the Mt. Vernon Holiday Inn -- (618-244-7100) -- is near the intersection of I-64 and I-57. Free breakfast, indoor pool and exercise room.

Info: Jay Coleman (618-563-9927) franklincoleman@hotmail.com
Karen Coe (618-435-4200) karenann4200@yahoo.com