

NVBA Newsletter

June – July 2002

Upcoming NVBA Games and Special Events (June – July – mid-August 2002)

June 6	Beth El	7:00	Strata-Flighted Unit Championship
June 13	Beth El	7:00	Stratified NAP Qualifying Game
June 20	Beth El	7:00	Stratified Up-graded Club Championship
June 27	Beth El	7:00	WBL/NVBA STaC Swiss Teams
July 4			Closed – Holiday
July 11	Beth El	7:00	Stratified NAP Qualifying
July 18			Closed – Washington NABC
July 25			Closed – Washington NABC
Aug. 1	Beth El	7:00	Stratified Unit Championship
Aug. 8	Beth El	7:00	Stratified NAP Qualifying

Stratification Limits:

For regular NVBA Unit Games, the strats are as follows: C is 0-500; B is 0-2000; and A is unlimited.

For the NAP qualifying game, see the Conditions of Contest for the stratification limits.

***New Sunday Games
1 pm
at the Masonic Hall in Annandale
Frank Mackey—703-573-2990
0-50 game & 0-299 game & Open game***

President's Message

by Bruce Culmer

I would like to thank everyone who contributed to making the Annual Meeting such fun. The amount of work that these special events require is substantial and is done entirely through volunteer efforts. It is because of the volunteer work of the membership that the NVBA continues to be a successful organization. With that in mind, I want to welcome Bob Hartmann and Leo Cardillo to the Board, and Margot Hennings to the Vice Presidency. Kathryn Kiley and Ron Spieker were reelected as Board member and Treasurer, respectively. I would also like to thank the following persons for their service to the Unit as they finish their terms on the Board: Vice-President and Round Robin Coordinator, Bette Dudka; Education Chair and Novice-Intermediate Co-Chair, Sam McMillan; and Partnership Chair, Andre L'Heureux.

As most of you know, we continue to see a decline in membership, attendance at sectionals, and at the Unit game. We have reserves to cover the immediate situation, but if this trend continues, the Board will need to make some financial decisions with regard to expenses during the coming year. Our membership now stands at just under 1500.

The future of the Unit is with new players. We are attempting to revive the Intermediate/Novice game at the Unit—and during the month of June we have invited anyone with fewer than 199 points to play free, as guests of the Unit. Through the efforts of Ron Kral, we have supported several EasyBridge! courses over the past

year and we have plans to sponsor at least three more in the Fall. Both the NVBA and WBL have gained members as a result of Easybridge!, and both units now have Easybridge! games at their sectionals. We are continuing the mentoring program begun by Sam McMillan, and the after school program for high school students at Thomas Jefferson is very healthy under the care of Leo Cardillo. Joanne Pretti is also running a teen program at the McLean Community Center.

We are continuing to improve our web site (www.nvba.org), making it easier to find information. Visit it and let us know if we can do anything better. In August, we plan to include hand records for Unit games on the web site along with the game results. The site also has the current standings of the Mini-McKenney and Ace of Clubs races for the first quarter of this year, as well as the final standings for last year. We will post the new standings as soon as they are received from the ACBL. We will also begin posting the standings for the Man, Woman, Rush Buckley, and Rookie of the Year awards at the Unit Game and on the web site

This is an organization dependent on volunteers, and the events provided by the Unit require a tremendous amount of effort. These activities can only continue if everyone is willing to help out.

Our unit and the WBL have been putting a lot of effort into preparing for the Nationals here this summer—see page 4 for volunteer opportunities that could use your talents.

Latest Update on the Summer NABC (18-28 July 2002)

What's the latest on our NABC this summer? You know about our **special late nite entertainment**—David Levy's classical concert on Friday night the 19th, the Capitol Steps on Saturday the 20th, and Alain Nu's mind-bending magic on Thursday the 25th—but we **have just added some special events for our seniors/early game participants**. On Sunday the 21st, at approximately 7:15 pm, David Levy will play a light classical concert just for folks who have finished playing bridge for the day, and on Friday the 26th, again at approximately 7:15 pm, Bob and Jane Levey, renowned *Washington Post* columnist and local historian, respectively, will present a close-up look at "Bob Levey's Washington". All late nite and early evening entertainment will be held in the Cotillion Room of the Marriott Wardman Park Hotel and will feature snacks, sandwiches, or dessert in addition to a "no-host" bar and \$1 beer on some occasions.

Fliers containing detailed information about the exciting **Novice/Newcomer Program** that is being hosted at our NABC have been distributed widely at local sectionals, to local clubs, and to local teachers. Within the next several weeks, you should also be receiving a flier from the ACBL about all of these special events. Check out our web site (www.dcnationals.com) for all of the latest information! In particular, encourage your peers and those who would like to learn to play to attend the **World's Biggest Bridge Lesson** on Saturday morning, July 20th. Free

lessons by local teachers, coffee and doughnuts, door prizes, and lots of give-aways to one and all promise to make this event a once-in-a-lifetime experience!

In recent weeks, we have received a contribution from the Mid-Atlantic Bridge Conference (MABC)—you know, the organization behind those great District 6 Regionals in Alexandria, Hunt Valley, Ocean City, Virginia Beach, Williamsburg, and Richmond—to help make the hospitality at our NABC even better! Because of this contribution, we are able to divert some of the funds planned for entertainment to address the cost of parking for our local players.

In short, parking for players who drive daily to the tournament looks like this:

- The rate for the **hotel garages** at the Marriott Wardman Park and the Shoreham is \$19 per day, with 24-hour access, no in-and-out privileges. (Using the MABC contribution, we will be offering a **\$5 rebate** to the cost of daily parking! Once you pay the \$19 upon entering one of the garages, bring your parking ticket to the main Information Desk area at the tournament. We will stamp your ticket again with a special stamp and hand you \$5 in scrip to help pay for your entry that day!)

- **Extra parking spaces** at one of the University of the District of Columbia's (UDC) garages will be available for only \$8 per day, again with no in-and-out privileges. Courtesy of the ACBL, we will be running a **shuttle bus** to the hotel and back again from this garage from 11:30 am

Thanks from St. Elizabeth's Hospital

In April, the NVBA was presented with a plaque acknowledging our 30 years of service in helping to organize and run the St. Elizabeth's Duplicate Bridge Club. Volunteers from the NVBA (and the WBL) provide their time and energy on the first Monday of the month to host a duplicate game at St. E's. Long-time NVBA volunteers in this program include Mary Wilson, Chas Fein, and Carolyn Gibson. Thanks, folks! and congratulations!! (If you'd like more information, please call Mary at 703-941-8697.)

to 1 pm, 4:30 pm to 7:30 pm, and 10:30 pm to midnight.

- **Street parking** is available in the vicinity of the hotel **only on weekends**. During weekdays, zone parking permits must be displayed in your vehicle—you cannot park on nearby streets without one—this is **strictly enforced!**

In addition to driving:

- We encourage players to use **metro**—the Woodley Park/Zoo stop is right at the edge of the Marriott Wardman Park property, and runs until 2 am on weekends—and to **carpool** to help keep the costs of parking to a minimum.

- We will be putting up a **Bulletin Board** on our NABC web site—www.dcnationals.com—where you can sign up and create car pools among players in the areas nearest you in Virginia, Maryland and the District. This will continue to be available during the tournament so that you can look for “real-time” rides as well as try to schedule rides in advance.

Information about every aspect of the tournament—from **morning tours** to **child care** to **caddies** to the **complete schedule of events**—is available at our web site: www.dcnationals.com. There is also a “**no-host**” **Partnership**

Bulletin Board for you to arrange your own partners in advance of the tournament (there will be a Partnership Desk on-site, of course, to assist you in finding partners on the day of the event in which you wish to play). There are also special prizes and e-mail messages sent to players who register on our web site—prizes include free plays, free parking passes, free two-night stays at the Marriott Wardman Park during the tournament, cuddly stuffed panda bears, brass luggage tags, and more!

And, last but not least, we need lots of **volunteers** to help make all of our planning a success during the tournament itself. Don't miss out—be part of the fun!! Share in the excitement of hosting a National tournament! In addition to **great kibitzing and vu-graph** where you can see and meet world-famous players, **help us meet and greet** everyone who comes in from near and far—help out with **Registration, Information, Partnerships, Prizes, the Restaurant Guide, Morning Tours, Late Nite Entertainment**—the list goes on!! **Lee Ann Jensen** is our **Volunteer Coordinator**—you can contact her at 301-949-7467, at lj15x@nih.gov, or sign up directly on our web site.

Committee Action XL—What’s the Harm, Part I

by Rich Colker

Several issues ago I began a two-part article called “A Question of Alerting.” In Part One of that article (July/August, 2001) I discussed the problem of Unauthorized Information (UI) created by a side’s own Alerts and failures to Alert. Several of the points I made were based on an example of a pair playing Support Doubles. To review briefly (the reader is referred to the original article for additional details), suppose you hold ♠Qxx ♥Axx ♦KQxx ♣Jxx and the auction goes 1♦ (by you)-Pass-1♠ (by partner)-2♣. You forget you are playing Support Doubles and pass, only to be awakened from your brief siesta by your partner’s Alert and explanation (an opponent asks) that your pass tends to deny three-card spade support. I discussed your obligations in such situations since partner’s Alert and explanation has given you information to which you are not legally entitled. In particular, I emphasized that you may not now bid 2♠ to show your three-card support.

Shortly after my article appeared in the September-October-November 2001 issue of the *NVBA Newsletter*, I received a letter (reprinted on page 17) questioning my recommendations. Since I believe that letter may represent the perspective of a fair number of readers, and since it is all too rare that I receive feedback from intermediate-level players, I will take this opportunity to address the issues the author raised and to further clarify our obligations regarding UI. Thanks to Mr. Latto both for his letter and his consent to reprint it here.

Matters of Courtesy

Before I get to the matter of UI, I wish to address some of the courtesy issues raised in Mr. Latto’s letter. Players who *go out of their way* to make others feel unwelcome are in violation of Law 74A. Speaking to the Director may help if the player is being outright discourteous, but sometimes the problem is they are simply not being as sociable, friendly, or gracious as we would like. As bitter a pill as it may be for some to take, we must realize that it is not possible to force everyone to conform to our own personal standards of friendliness and sociability. It can be just as much of an imposition if a player tries to force a shy, withdrawn, or unhappy opponent to smile and act friendly as it is for him to try to cope with a morose or unsociable opponent. Bridge tournaments are social events in which we will always encounter differences in personal styles. We must be prepared to tolerate these—unless the person is being overtly offensive. If the opponents seem particularly cold or distant, a compliment (especially related to their bridge), a joke, or a kidding remark can sometimes help to break the ice. But if that isn’t *your* style (or it doesn’t produce an improvement), you may just have to deal with it.

The problem of an opponent not calling out his cards (or speaking his bids) when asked politely by a visually impaired player is a more serious one. If this is done intentionally, it is a violation of Law (74A) and calling the Director is the best way to deal with it. However, we must bear in mind that

bidding and playing, for most players, is a highly automated and reflexive process. We cannot expect players to seamlessly adapt to the unnatural and unfamiliar act of speaking their bids and/or plays at a moment's notice. Lapses will occur. When they do I recommend a polite reminder ("I'm sorry, I didn't catch what you said" or "Your card is the...what?") to stimulate their memory. You might also ask your partner at the start of the session to offer to call the opponents' bids and/or plays for them if they think they'll forget, or if they'd rather not do it themselves, or if, after trying it for awhile, there are still too many repeated lapses.

Matters of Law

If you play a social game of chess with a friend, you can play by whatever rules you agree are fair. You can pick up a piece, hold it in different board positions while considering various possible moves, and replace it in its original position and proceed to move a different piece. You can move a piece, release it, and before your friend has spent too much time thinking about his next move (after all, one can impose too much, even on a friend) ask to take your move back. Your friend will likely say "Sure." But if you enter a tournament, everything changes. If you touch a piece and later change your mind about moving it, that's too bad. Chess tournaments are "touch move": touch it and you must move it. And once you release a piece there are no "take backs." Unfriendly? Unsocial? Maybe.

Sound familiar? Bridge is no different. Perhaps it should be, but the rigor of the game still depends on where you play and with whom. Play

at home, with a group of friends for fun, and the rules are whatever you all agree is fair. Table talk, thinking out loud, no lengthy thinking,...whatever. When you play at your local club the rules are stricter (though *how* strict is up to the club owner or manager), but probably not as strict as in the Blue Ribbon Pairs. But play in any ACBL tournament (including our local unit games) and the rules become equivalent to "touch move." That's just how it is.

It would be nice if the ACBL provided "relaxed," socially-oriented tournament games for those who don't wish to play in a cutthroat environment. But the sad fact is they do not. (David Silber, the ex-ACBL CEO, and I submitted a proposal last year to run relaxed-rules games at all levels, even NABCs. This is currently "under consideration" by the ACBL Board of Directors—but take my advice and don't hold your breath.) So if you enter a bridge (or chess) tournament, you must be prepared to play "by the rules." Of course in bridge it is still up to each individual player to decide when and if to call a Director if an opponent commits an irregularity or infraction. But everyone is perfectly within his rights to play "touch move," in strict accordance with the rules. If you find yourself complaining about other players playing strictly by the rules, and you'd rather avoid the pressure of the tournament game, don't blame your opponents. The blame, if there is any, is your own (and the ACBL's for not running more socially-oriented games along side their regular ones). If you want your "druthers," stick to club games where the atmosphere is more social and the rules more relaxed.

The rules are what they are. No small group of “experts” (including many players who are decidedly non-experts, if we use the term strictly) can go “too far” in finding UI behind every rock. It is the Director’s job to enforce the rules as they are written and intended. No player, given a competent Director, should be allowed to impose his own views in contradic-

tion to what the rules provide. The information on laws and regulations which I provide in this column is, in most cases, not just my own personal view but the ACBL’s as well. (I always try to label my personal views as personal, and state what the officially-sanctioned position is so you know the difference.) So in that two-part article, when I described what the rules

NVBA Milestones

New Junior Masters

John Adams	Helene Cooper	Jeanne Muller
Ali Al-Aref	Jan Harrington	Susan Strauss
Jean-Noel Berre	Van Harrison	Mary Tubbs
Patricia Boudinot	Olivia Jenny	Carol Williams
Edwin Brawn		

New Club Masters

Edward Hong	John Lupinski	Keiko Quinn
Jay Kelkar	John McCann	Gordon Roesler
Myrna Kroh		

New Sectional Masters

Samuel Bowlin	Joseph Pieper	Betty Taff
Edward Mark	Susan Pruzensky	Robin Teale
Shayestch Nejad	S. Karen Rodina	

New Regional Masters

Gloria Donnelly	Mahadeo Patwardhjan	Holly Wills
Alfred O’Malley	Nadia Potter	

New NABC Masters

Nancy Arnold	A. J. Patel	Edward Taborek
Ibrahim Mady	Benjamin Shapo	Mel Yudkin
Julia Nasr		

New Life Masters

Issa Dorri	Jerrie Thomas
------------	---------------

New Bronze Life Masters

Marjorie Gazzola	Thomas Richardson	Inis Richardson
Lawrence Herman		

New Silver Life Master

Ron Kral

New Gold Life Masters

Lee De Simone

on UI are, those were not just my own views but the ones followed by the ACBL in all of its tournaments. Mr. Latta (or you and I) may not like those rules but they are what they are: the rules. If they seem too harsh for the typical player or appear selectively unfair to weaker players (I tend to agree with the former assertion but not the latter), then the fault is not with “several experts” but with the lawmakers.

The rules are intended to make the game as fair as possible and provide a level playing field for what is, in the final analysis, a competitive event. Players who try to obey the rules and play honestly and fairly will, as surely as the sun will rise tomorrow (even if we cannot see it through the clouds, snow or rain), infract one or more of those rules during the session. UI will occur, for example, whenever a player

Unit Game Updates

by Marshall Kushner

The NVBA will be trying to resurrect its 199er game beginning in June. Toward that end, we will offer free bridge to all 199ers for the entire month. In case you missed it, the operative word was FREE. That’s right, no card fees, on the house, gratis. What’s more, you 199ers who have, of necessity, played in the open game and wish to continue to do so, will also play FREE. The only requirement for this offer is that you have amassed fewer than 200 masterpoints. Sorry, playing like you have fewer than 200 does not qualify.

What’s more, you will get special attention from Frank Mackey who has agreed to help run the 199er game. Those of you who know Frank, know that he walks softly and carries a big cattle prod. This is to help remind you that bridge is a timed event. Yes, we know that less experienced players take longer to work things out and we will probably allow you extra time, but we will expect you to adhere to our generous schedule. Consider also that we have a curfew mandated by the temple, so staying on pace will allow you to play all your boards.

We will even offer you timesaving tips. For example, what’s the first thing you do at the end of the auction? Most inexperienced players (and many experienced ones as well) put their cards down, and carefully note the contract and declarer in their private score. Only when this task is completed does the person on lead think about what to lead. Sure, that only takes about ten seconds, but that’s ten seconds later that dummy comes down and everyone can start thinking about the hand. Multiply that by 26 boards and you have added almost five minutes to the length of the game. That may be enough to keep you from getting to play that last board. If that sounds nitpicky, please read the Jack of Hearts for an even better reason to follow this simple procedure. It may save more than time.

See you Thursday.

bids more quickly or slowly than normal, and no one who is not an automaton can maintain an absolutely even tempo at all times. Once UI occurs (and it *will* occur), the player in receipt of it must take an action, and in many cases that will be open to question (it will have, as they say, a “logical alternative”). If the action taken was suggested by the UI, then it is possible that it won’t be allowed unless the player can show that it was dictated by his system or was clear-cut from the authorized information available when he bid. This is not, as it may seem, an issue of honesty or dishonesty; it’s an issue of fairness. Not being clairvoyant, none of us can know whether the action *was* influenced by the UI. In fact, even the player himself cannot know for sure if the UI influenced his action in some unconscious way. If the UI *could* have influenced the action, and a good result is thereby obtained, the rules say the score cannot be allowed to stand.

If you listen closely, I’m sure you’ll hear Mr. Latto saying, “But why do the laws assume the player used the UI? Force the *opponents* to prove he used it. Don’t change the score just because it’s *possible* he used it.” Well, there are three reasons why the laws don’t use this approach. The first, and in some ways the most important, is that this would place the players in a highly undesirable *adversarial* relationship. One side would be forced to accuse the other of using UI rather than simply pointing out that UI was present which “could” have suggested the winning action. The second reason is that it’s virtually impossible to *prove* that UI influenced a player’s action. Which brings us to the third and final reason: The end-

result of adopting this approach would be that players who are inclined to push the envelope with “shady” or borderline behavior (hesitations and “reads”) would have a marked advantage over ethically honest players. The game would evolve into one where victory would go to the pair that comes closest to cheating without being too blatant about it. This is clearly not the sort of game most of us want bridge to become.

Support Doubles

In addressing Mr. Latto’s concerns about UI, I’ll begin with a brief discussion of Support Doubles since some of his ideas about how they are played are at odds with standard usage. A Support Double shows exactly three-card support for responder’s suit (never four-cards) and does not place any limits on opener’s strength. Also, Support Doubles do not show or deny other specific features of opener’s hand unless considerations of bidding effectiveness dictate otherwise. For example, let’s change the auction slightly to 1♦-Pass-1♠-2♥. Now consider these two hands: (A) ♠Qxx ♥x ♦AKJxx ♣Qxxx; (B) ♠xxx ♥x ♦AKQJxx ♣AQx. While hand A is well-suited for a Support Double, I would not consider doubling with hand B. To see why you shouldn’t double with hand B, ask yourself “What is it most important that I tell partner about my hand?” Clearly telling him about your source of tricks for a possible 3NT contract (by bidding 3♦ immediately) is far more important than telling him about your weak three-card spade support. If you bid 3♦ partner will bid 3NT with ♠Kxxx ♥Qxx ♦xx ♣Kxxx, while if you double he’ll probably sign off in 2♠. If he has

a constructive, spade-oriented hand such as ♠AQxxx ♥xxx ♦xx ♣Kxx he'll make a further move over your extra-value showing 3♦ bid (such as 3♥), at which point you can show your spade support with 3♠ and reach the good 4♠ game.

Another problem with doubling 2♥ with hand B is that LHO may bid 3♥. If this is passed back to you how will you convey your hand's trick-taking potential? You'd like to tell partner to bid 3NT with a heart stopper but there's no way to do it over 3♥. The best you can do is double again, but your hand is not defensively oriented and rebidding diamonds takes you past 3NT.

Change hand B to ♠Qxx ♥xx ♦AQJxxx ♣AQx, giving it less trick-taking potential and more prominent spade support (making spades more likely to be where the hand should be played), and you should double 2♥. If LHO bids 3♥ and partner passes this back to you, you can double again to show your extra values. The principle here is: make the bid over RHO's intervention which conveys the most important aspect of your hand. When you have several things to tell partner of approximately equal importance (e.g., three-card spade support, long diamonds, extra values), start with the one you can show most economically (usually the Support Double) and show the other features later.

As I said earlier, a pass by opener in a situation where a double would be Support does not show or deny any particular strength. To see why, consider the original auction: 1♦-Pass-1♠-2♣. What would you bid over 2♣ holding (C) ♠x♥AKQx ♦AKxx ♣xxxx or (D) ♠Qx♥AKJx ♦AQxxx ♣xx? You

can't double 2♠ in either case since that shows three-card spade support, nor can you bid 2♦ on a four-card suit with C or such a weak suit with D. A 2♥ bid is also out of the question with both hands since you're undervalued for a reverse and have the wrong shape (you can't be confident of finding a safe place to play if you force partner to bid again). So a pass can't deny extra values since it may be your only viable option with some very good hands. And since a Support Double is the right bid with the original hand they cannot even guarantee anything extra.

So to recap, a Support Double shows three-card support for partner's suit and says nothing about opener's hand other than that it is the most descriptive call available. If opener passes or makes another minimum-range bid (such as 2♦ over RHO's 2♣) he's unlikely to have three-card support since with a minimum hand showing the major-suit support is of primary importance. However, a bid which shows extra strength (such as 3♦ over RHO's 2♣) may conceal three-card support if the support is a secondary feature of the hand.

Matters of Alerting and UI

Now that we're on the same page on Support Doubles, we can more effectively address Mr. Latto's concerns about UI. In his Scenario 1, passing 2♣ with a hand that's suited to a Support Double is a no-win proposition. Passing risks missing your spade fit and the chance to successfully outbid the opponents for the partscore. It even risks missing a good 4♠ game. For example, if partner balances with 2♠ over 2♣ will you raise? If you do

partner may show up with ♠KJxxxx ♥xx ♦x ♣Kxxx and you'll go down on either the expected club lead (and ruff) or a heart lead. If you pass partner may show up with ♠AJ10xxx ♥Kx ♦Jxx ♣xx and 4♠ will make with the help of the spade finesse. The other danger in passing is that LHO may bid 3♣, in which case partner will not

know whether to compete or, if he does, what suit (diamonds or spades) to compete in. If he bids 3♦ will you "guess" to bid 3♠? What if 3♣ is passed back around to you? Will you guess to bid 3♠ and risk a huge set in a weak four-three spade fit (possibly doubled) when you could have gone plus in diamonds or by defending?

Hail, and Farewell

We'd like to welcome the following new ACBL members into our Unit:

Elias Arbel	Geyle Marlowe	Janice Smith
Elizabeth Badawi	Matthew Lashof-Regan	Gladys Stephens
Samir Badawi	David Miller	Linda Szyszka
Deborah Branch	Dorothy Miller	Helen Threlkeld
Alan Branigan	Nancy Miller	Eddie Timanus
Virginia Carroll	Richard Miller	Toni Vasquez
Eugene Davidson	Jan Potter	Marlene Webley
Joe Hertz	Gayle Reed	Carol Williams
Robert Hood	Josh Remington	Mary Lou Witecki
Cynthia Hull	James Rose	Thomas Witecki
Donald Hull	Leslie Rose	Sharon Wynns
Shankar Iyer	Debra Rubin	Betty Yeary
Jason Ji	Jenny Shaefer	
Rajnish Kathuria	Richard Skow	

The following persons have transferred out of our Unit:

William Buff, Jr.	Miriam Knight	Patricia Stepper
Anupam Dokeniya	Ralph Mavrogordato	Johnnie Trivette
Eleanor Gibson	William Somers	
Kim Howell	Patrick Stanton	

And we'd like to welcome the following new transfers into the Unit:

Annette Binger	Alan Gordon	Freda Miles
Rosemary Bollettino	Lucille Gotthardt	Khaled Mostafa
Margaret Brown	Weng Hong	Marie Simonson
Connie Callison	Ruth Howard	Mollie Timreck
John Fahs, Jr.	Susan Jackson	Yi Zhong
Juanita Fernandez	Margaret Jordan	
Albert Fitzgerald	Rosalie Lefler	

And we'd like to note the passing of four of our members:

Dorothy Abell (06/01)	David Magnuson	Katherine Manos
William G. Hughes		

Passing is singles, not partnership bridge. It is masterminding the hand by choosing to guess what to do on your own when you could easily have doubled 2♠ and allowed partner to make an *informed* decision.

Mr. Latto then asks “Why shouldn’t I be allowed to play bridge and take a chance on bidding 2♠?” In addition to the above answer, once partner Alerts you are not really taking the chance you think you are. Partner’s Alert reduces the risk in bidding 2♠ and tilts the odds in your favor. If partner thought you might hold three spades he would be more likely to compete with 2♠ on a five-card suit. But once he thinks you cannot have three spades he will often compete in diamonds—perhaps even with only three of them—even though he holds five spades. Thus, bidding 2♠ rates to gain any time partner has five or more spades or (only) three diamonds, both of which are more likely after his Alert.

Now with all of those reasons for making a Support Double to show your spade support and none for passing and playing singles, why should the opponents, the Director or a Committee believe that you *chose* to bid this way and weren’t awakened to your agreement by partner’s Alert? And even more to the point, no one but you—and maybe not even you—can know for sure whether you forgot you were playing Support Doubles or you simply “decided” not to make one, no matter what you say. The laws *require* the Director or an Appeal Committee to assume that any UI may have been responsible for your action unless you can produce convincing *evidence* otherwise. Since the bridge logic

is clear that you would have made a Support Double if you remembered one was available, and since it is illogical to pass and guess later, the presumption is that you forgot, were awakened by partner’s Alert, and then belatedly “told” partner that you really had support by bidding 2♠. Thus, whether this was intentional or not, the UI from his Alert influenced your action. You can’t prove otherwise, and you can’t be permitted to keep your good result. You could even be penalized if you had enough experience or expertise to have known better and your actions are judged flagrant.

Note that the only issue the Director will concern himself with here is whether you can defend your actions with hard evidence (such as system notes) or sound bridge logic. “I just chose to pass and then take my chances on bidding 2♠” won’t cut it when a double a round earlier (if you remembered it) would have solved your problem without any guessing. This is not to say that by ruling against you the Director is calling you a liar or implying that you cheated. The laws require him to rule against *any* player who had UI, took an action that was suggested by that UI, and who can present no compelling bridge reason for his actions. To do otherwise would be an open invitation for players to take unfair advantage of extraneous information from their partners.

Is the use of UI here the “one-in-a-million” chance Mr. Latto claims in his letter? Hardly. At a typical NABC, UI like this happens an untold number of times. And this is not an obscure situation that only involves Support Doubles. That was just the example I happened to choose to il-

lustrate the problem. UI occurs in countless situations, and the player who claims to have just taken a “chance” always has some reason for his miraculous recovery after he “judged” to do something odd a bit earlier. I always marvel at how odd it is that these players only seem to recover

once their partner’s Alert or non-Alert is there to prompt them. Is it possible that what they say happened is what really happened? Sure, but it’s even more likely that it was all just a rationalization to justify the player “correcting” his earlier miscalculation after he discovered his mistake through

2001 NVBA Award Winners

Mini-McKenney awards are based on total points accumulated throughout the past calendar year. Ace of Club awards are based on points accumulated throughout the calendar year at any club within our Unit.

	Mini-McKenney	Ace of Clubs
Rookie of the Year	Don Henry	Marvin Burstein
Junior Master of the Year	Martha Lackey	Martha Lackey
Club Master of the Year	Barbara Griffith	Terry Beresford
Sectional Master of the Year	Jean Schoepe	A. J. Patel
Regional Master of the Year	Issa Dorri	Ernest Klimonda
NABC Master of the Year	Hannah Moore	Jeffa Dettinger
Life Master of the Year	Dayle Masamura	Marjorie Gazzola
Bronze Life Master of the Year	La Quitta Talbot	Robert Hartmann
Silver Life Master of the Year	Ken Davis	Enid Asherman
Gold Life Master of the Year	Zeke Letellier	Donald Geerhart*
Diamond Life Master of the Year	Jeff Roman	
Grand Life Master of the Year	Ron Sukoneck	

(*One award given in Gold-Diamond-Grand Life Master category.)

New Life Masters—

Joanne Angell	Mildred Hartshorn	R. B. Latta
Lawrence Angell	Edward Heberg	Hannah Moore
Julia A. Brown	June Hoye	Mark Newman
John Corvari	Dan Kasture	Janet Otto
Jeffa Dettinger	Patricia Kuch	Danijel Zenko
Gene Gallagher	Shirley Lafferty	

Those who have won more masterpoints than anyone else in NVBA-sponsored events only:

Rookie of the Year	Gregory Belmonte
Rush Buckley (non-LM)	Paul Krueger
Man of the Year	Robert Gookin
Woman of the Year	Janet Gookin

the Alert procedure. The problem is, we never know which player intentionally took a chance and legitimately recovered and which one forgot what he was doing, fell asleep, and was then awakened (perhaps unconsciously) by the UI. The laws say we *must* presume the latter unless the player can convince us that the former was the case.

If you are involved in such a situation, don't try to convince the Director that you "just decided" to bid that way. You may be right, but that's irrelevant. Experienced players may be penalized if their action is judged flagrant. And if their sob story doesn't work on the Director and they appeal in the hopes that a Committee will buy their story, they should be prepared for yet another penalty when their appeal is judged without merit. The average Committee at a local Sectional or Regional tournament may drop the ball and not assess the appropriate penalty; some might even allow the "2♠ bid" as might some inexperienced Directors. But at the national level the hammer will fall far more often than not. So to borrow a line from an old Clint Eastwood Dirty Harry movie, "You need to ask yourself, do you feel lucky? Well, do you punk?"

Penalties and the Laws:

Permit me to digress for a moment. As a general rule, penalties for flagrant actions based on UI are rarely imposed on inexperienced players or in lower-flighted games. Experienced Directors and Committees prefer to educate these players rather than penalize them. But once they are warned, if they make a habit of this sort of thing they may end up the exception who are penalized. Of course in home or social games all of this becomes moot, since

Teen Bridge Tournament

The ACBL Instant Matchpoint Game for students was held on April 27th at the Old Fire House Teen Center in McLean. Winners were from Thomas Jefferson High School: coming in first were Randy Biggs and Margaret Barusch, and second place went to Spencer Bailey and Kyle Branigan. Students from McLean High School and Langley High School participated in earlier games. Twelve boards were played, and everyone had a great time and learned some new bridge skills! Thanks go to Joanne Pretti for organizing this event.

then the goal is just to have fun and socialize. And while this is also a major objective of the ACBL (especially in club games), we should remember that bridge is also a competitive activity. In a purely social game the rules can be relaxed and winning made secondary. But in tournaments competition is of equal importance. Just as the more socially-oriented player has a right to complain if his opponents interfere with his fun and enjoyment of the game, so too the more competitive player has the right to complain if he believes his opponents may have taken advantage of UI, whether it was done intentionally or not. Just as a negligent driver is responsible for any damage he creates, even if it was unintentional, so too the careless player who has UI available to him is responsible for his actions. The opponents can be damaged just as much by accident as by intent.

Intermediate/Novice Games

- **Tuesdays** at 10 am at KOCH: 0-299 game (Candy Boughner—703-758-0906)
- **Wednesdays** at 7:30 pm at the Reston Community Center: 0-199 game (Candy Boughner—703-758-0906)
- **Thursdays** at 7 pm at Beth El Hebrew Temple: separate 0-199 game (Marshall Kuschner—703-758-9153)
- **Fridays** at 10 am at the Masonic Temple in Annandale: separate 0-199 game (Sam McMillan—703-920-3535, or Norma Pierzchala—703-892-1292)
- **Saturdays** at 9 am at KOCH: 0-500 game, and a 0-20 game when there are three tables (Norma Pierzchala—703-892-1292)
- **Sundays** at 1 pm at the Masonic Temple in Annandale: 0-49 game and 0-299 game (Frank Mackey—703-573-2990)

It strikes me that an UI situation is not so very different from playing “adjective bridge.” Have you ever played? Each player is allowed to attach one adjective to each of his bids. So, for example, you could bid Two “forcing” hearts, or One “non-forcing” spade, or Three “ace-showing” clubs. You could bid Two “Jacoby” notrump, Two “Michaels” spades or Two “Drury” clubs. Would you ever have another bidding misunderstanding if you could play this way all the time? I suspect not. But what if, at your next duplicate game, your opponents began playing this way? Would you call the Director? Would you feel you were being taken advantage of? Well that’s how many players feel when an opponent hesitates, fishes around in his bid box making it clear to his partner what his alternatives are, or makes a bid which takes advantage of his partner’s Alert or answer to an opponent’s question. It’s all illegal in a bridge tournament and protecting the competitive environ-

ment is important, even if some less-experienced players think that this is taking unfair advantage of them. Hesitating or forgetting your system and then recovering through mis-Alerts are just as unfair to more experienced players. Knowing the rules and playing by them is not taking unfair advantage, no matter how loudly and often some players claim it is.

In what other competitive activities is it illegal or unfair to know the rules and use them to your best advantage? When a defensive player jumps offside in football, the opposing quarterback tries to take advantage of it, even by risking an interception or fumble, knowing that he has a guaranteed penalty as a safety net. When a player with the ball is fouled in basketball, he will throw up a prayer of a shot knowing that if he miraculously hits it he gets a bonus foul shot. Playing by the rules and using them to your advantage is part of any competitive endeavor. Sure, you can play a “friendly” game in which strict rules

are relaxed, but when you enter a bridge tournament you are entitled to play by the rules—the full rules. This is “touch move.” Becoming a more experienced player involves not only learning to bid and play better but also learning how to play by the rules. *Alert! This does not mean I am advocating that players complain of a foul where none exists.* But asking for protection from damage when an opponent, even an inexperienced one, may have profited from UI is a legitimate part of the game.

Still not convinced? Then try this. If it were legal, experienced players could create UI in far more subtle forms and take far better advantage of it than inexperienced players. If you make no attempts to curb the possible effects of UI, taking the Pollyanna view that everyone’s actions are well-intended, the experts will dominate even more than you ever imagined and there will be nothing the weaker players will be able to do to combat it. But if you apply the laws strictly and uniformly, even though experienced players may have a “temporary” advantage, the less-experienced players will eventually learn what they must to catch up. Unlike becoming an expert, which not everyone can do, anyone can read the law book and learn how to play by the rules. Eventually the playing field will become level. In the mean time the less experienced player can choose to play in “protected” events and the less cutthroat player can stick to the more social atmosphere of the club. But if you want to improve your game, if you want to play competitively, then you have to pay your dues and learn to play by the rules—the full rules.

The preceding was an unpaid political announcement.

Back to Alerting and UI

Let’s return now to Mr. Latto’s letter and Scenario 2. Certainly opener will never pass 2♣ with four-card spade support, but playing Support Doubles he’s unlikely to have even three. The only type of hand where opener will hold three spades and not double is when he holds extra values and a more important feature to show than his spade support. But in that case he will not pass; he will bid his other feature. In other words, with weak minimum hands and three-card spade support opener will always double and leave it up to responder to make an informed decision of whether to compete. With any stronger hand and a more important feature than the spade support to show opener will make the more descriptive bid over 2♣ (e.g., jump to 3♦, reverse to 2♥, cue-bid 3♣, etc.). This is evidence that a player who passes with a weak hand with three-card spade support is either a weak bidder or has forgotten his agreement. (If there are other restrictions the pair places on their Support Doubles, they are required to disclose that information as part of the Alert.) But weak bidders also forget their agreements, perhaps even more often than stronger players. Thus, passing 2♣ with the original hand from my article is pretty compelling evidence that the opener forgot Support Doubles.

Could opener hold a hand with strong two-card support and bid 2♠? I personally would not bid this way but if you would that’s fine, go ahead and bid 2♠ over partner’s 2♦. If your hand is not suitable for a Support Double (only two spades) then you’re free to bid; there’s no reason to be-

lieve partner's Alert awakened you since there's no evidence that you forgot anything. But if your hand *was* suitable for a Support Double and you failed to make it over 2♣, then there's reason to believe that partner's Alert woke you up and made the 2♠ bid more attractive. Thus, you cannot be allowed to bid it.

In my article I presumed that you forgot you were playing Support Doubles. But if it was partner who forgot and wrongly Alerted the pass of 2♣ as denying three spades (you aren't playing Support Doubles), things really don't change very much. If a 2♠ bid by you over 2♣ would have shown either three- or four-card support (since there was no double to distinguish the two), then the question still is: Why didn't you bid 2♠ directly over 2♣? Why did you wait and bid it over 2♦? Partner's Alert still means that he isn't playing you to hold three spades (you might have raised), so bidding them now (when passing 2♦

is a logical alternative) still looks suspiciously like taking advantage of the UI to tell partner that you have three-card support.

Finally, note that the issue here isn't one of misleading the opponents; it's using the UI to improve your chances of attaining a good score. Is there any reason to think that the UI from these Alerts is "trivial"? If the opponents end up with -110 defending 2♠ when they would have beaten 2♦ for +50, is that trivial? If they end up with +50 defending 3♠ (after your 2♠ bid allows partner to compete) rather than scoring +110 in 3♣, is that trivial? Sorry, but in my book none of this is trivial—it's all damage.

Thanks again for your letter, Larry. I hope this wasn't more than you bargained for and has helped to clear up some of your concerns with my original article. Hopefully some of our other readers found something useful in my reply as well.

Larry Latto's Letter to Rich Colker

Dear Mr. Colker,

I have just read your column ("A Question of Alerting (Part One)") and I wish to explain why I believe you are wrong. But first I want to tell you why it is important. I'm an intermediate player who, after 30 years, has accumulated 250 points. I play occasionally in the Thursday unit game (even though it's a stratified game and several of you "experts" go out of your way to make me feel unwelcome). I want to play in strict accordance with the rules but several experts have gone too far in finding UI in failures to Alert and, as in your example, Alert-

ing incorrectly. You ignore the fact that most of us try to play honestly and you are much too quick to impose restrictions or penalties when there may be only a one-in-a-million chance that the UI was used improperly or that the opponents were damaged by its use.

For someone like me, a player with seriously impaired vision whose partner often "hesitates" only because it takes her longer than you experts to figure out the correct bid, that creates problems. It's bad enough that I can't see the dummy and have to memorize it, or that opponents fail to call their

NVBA/WBL E-Mailing List

Some time ago, Steve Robinson began collecting email addresses of persons interested in receiving schedules of upcoming games, notices of changes in these schedules, Bridge Solvers problems (and answers), and so forth. If you would like to be included, please send Steve an email at robinswr@erols.com. Steve assures us that your email address will not be given out or used for any other purpose.

“Make every card count.”

cards as I've requested so that I have to guess what card they have played. But now I also have to be intimidated by trying not to take unfair advantage of my partner's hesitations, her failures to Alert, or the knowledge that my Alert may have told her that her bid actually meant something other than what she thought it meant. My point is, let's make the rules sensible and not ridiculous; you lean so far backward that you fall over.

Now to your example, which I will deal with on two levels. The situation you described is as follows. I open 1♦ holding ♠Qxx ♥Axx ♦KQxx ♣Jxx. The auction then goes:

Me	LHO	Pard	RHO
1♦	Pass	1♠	2♣
Pass ¹	Pass	2♦	Pass
?			

¹Alerted by my partner as “shows two spades or less.”

Scenario 1: I know perfectly well we are playing support doubles but, although my partner and I have never discussed it, I decide this is a good time to pass. Our methods are: We play five-card majors; we try to respond with 5-7 HCP and a four-card major (since opener could have a balanced hand with 19 HCP); we try to play support doubles even though we know we are likely to come to grief. Over RHO's 2♣ a double shows three

or four spades but keeps my hand unlimited while a pass gives my partner (at least for us weak players) more useful information (that I opened with a bare minimum and I almost certainly do not have four spades). What's wrong with that?

I choose to pass and now my partner balances with 2⁺; RHO passes. You say I absolutely may not bid 2♠ and, indeed, if I get a good result it will be denied me. I may receive a ¼-board penalty and, if I appeal, I may even get a second penalty. Nonsense. My thinking is this. We probably don't have a game. We have an eight-card diamond fit but we may also have eight spades. It's matchpoints. Why shouldn't I be allowed to play bridge and take a chance on bidding 2♠? If the opponents bid 3♣ my partner should be able to decide whether to pass or compete in either diamonds or spades.

Look again at your definition of a support double. You say it might mean that I have three spades that I don't care to show. My partner Alerted and said “We play support doubles so his failure to double means he has two or less spades,” but since I can use my judgment and not double with three spades perhaps it was my partner who Alerted incorrectly, which may or may not mislead the opponents. So I have to have the right to scrupulously ad-

here to our system and bid 2♠. My result stands. I do not get penalized even once, much less twice.

Scenario 2: Now let's suppose I forgot that we're playing support doubles. Now I'm aware (although you say I must pretend I didn't hear the Alert) that my partner and the opponents think I have two or one spade. (With a void I would probably have bid again.) When 2♦ is passed back to me I reason as follows: I did not hear the Alert. This is matchpoints and I'd like to chance playing in 2♠ with a seven- or eight-card fit rather than in an eight-card diamond fit. Moreover, the UI I have is pretty trivial. The other players all think I have one or two spades. What will they think if I now

bid 2♠? They will think either: (a) "The damn fool forgot he is playing support doubles. Since he surely would not have passed with four spades he must have three." or (b) "He may have two spades that are very good, say ace-king or ace-queen."

If I now bid 2♠, have I taken improper advantage of the trivial UI that I had? How have my opponents been damaged? They might say that they thought we didn't have a spade fit and if they had known we might have a four-three or five-three fit they would have bid (or played) differently. Come on!

Respectfully,

Larry Latto

Is buying or selling a home in your future?

A native Northern Virginian, I grew up in the homebuilding industry as my grandfather & father were contractors! My business is based on full service, honesty and integrity. 90+% of my business comes from past clients. For the best in service (before, during & after the sale), call

**Candy Clanton of Re/Max Horizons today!
(703) 550-2326 or (703) 625-0695**

- √ Top Producer, NVAR Multi-Million Dollar Club
- √ Certified Residential Specialist
- √ Graduate, Realtors Institute
- √ Accredited Buyers Representative
- √ Client Appreciation Program
- √ Member, NVBA/ACBL, since 1968
- √ References Available Upon Request

The *NVBA Newsletter* is published six times a year by the Northern Virginia Bridge Association to communicate with Unit 218 members of the American Contract Bridge League. If you need membership information or have a change of address to report, contact Norma Pierzchala at 703-892-1292; for information about the *Newsletter*, contact Marilyn Thomas at 703-442-7933.

The Jack of Hearts

by Marshall Kuschner

STOP!! Don't read this column until you have completed the prerequisite reading of the Unit Director's column (page 8). What? You don't have time? Oh, all right. The UD's column deals with the timewasting habit of recording the contract in your private score before you lead. We strongly urge you to get the opening lead on the table and allow everyone to start thinking about the hand, then do your clerical duties. Adherence to this practice would have prevented an awkward situation at the Williamsburg Regional in January, but then we wouldn't have a story to tell.

One of the great things about directing is that, no matter how long you've done it, you haven't seen everything. Case in point, a KO match in Williamsburg. It was probably the second or third bracket, so these weren't novices, evidence to the contrary notwithstanding. North-South bid to a contract of three Spades. The declarer to be, we'll call her South, placed her cards to her left on the table and proceeded to work on her private score. Clever West, placed his cards in his lap and did the same. I don't know how long the process took, but it was too long. By the time West mentally returned to the table to lead, he had forgotten where he put his cards, and picked up the hand belonging to South who was still writing. Yummy! Wouldn't a trump lead from KQJXX be devastating! West never realized this wasn't the hand he held during the auction until South came to the party and started screaming,

"Where's my hand? Somebody stole my hand!"

Enter the director who thought he had seen everything. He actually handled it quite well. First, he sagely decided that West, who had now seen his own hand and declarer's hand, and would soon see Dummy, should be recused from defending. Next, he found a kibitzer who agreed to sit in and play one hand. Luckily, there was nothing to the play. As long as everyone followed suit, declarer would take ten tricks and the defenders three. Finally, the director declined to give the defenders a 3 IMP penalty for unparalleled stupidity, reasoning that it would someday be paralleled. Never did he dream how soon his judgement would be vindicated. As he turned to leave, South called him back and suggested that since the defenders had committed this infraction, which, mind you, didn't occur until the auction was over, the contract should now be retroactively changed to four Spades. PUHLEEZE!! The director smiled sympathetically and instructed her to play the next board. Had I been at the table, I would have suggested to her that for a nominal consideration the contract could indeed be changed. Once the hook was firmly implanted, I would have hit her with the punch line. To six Spades.

www.nvba.org

Parade of Winners

Hilton Head (February 4-10)

Dolphin Bracketed KO Teams Bracket 1 (14 Teams)

2 Peggy Allen - Hugh Grosvenor - Jeff Roman - Michael Seamon - M. Passell

Bracket 3 (16 Teams)

1 John Glynn - M Cassandra Smith - Lucy McCoy - Betty Burse

NVBA March Madness (March 21-24)

Thurs. Flight A/X Pairs (73 Pairs)

1 1 David Rodney - Donald Hennings
2 Thomas Lavender - Terry Lavender

Thurs. Flight B/C Pairs (56 Pairs)

1 M Cassandra Smith - Betty Burse
1 Jon Farber - Steven Fox

Thurs. 300/200/100 (12 Pairs)

1 John Betz, Jr. - Paula Shorten
2 1 Gordon Youngwood - Stan Michaels
2 George Schropp - Chris Johnson
1 Richard Hesse - Robert Packwood
2/4 Michael Schatz - Michael Weber
2/4 Eliz. Huffman - Jan Harrington
2/4 Neal McKinney - Barbara DiCicco

Fri. Aft. 300/100/50 Pairs (20 Pairs)

1 Suellen Garrison - Phyllis Dean
2 Holly Wills - Anna Kearney

Fri. Aft. Open Pairs (51 Pairs)

2 Jim Wakefield - Gabriele Nanda
1 Aquil Ahmed - A. Patel
2 Joan Fisher - Hannah Moore

Fri. Eve. 300/100/50 Pairs (12 Pairs)

1 Scott Brown - Patricia Brown
2 1 1 Patricia Boudinot - Patrick Josselin
2 2 Jeff Youngen - Mary O'Shea

Fri. Eve. Open Pairs (36 Pairs)

2 Candy Boughner - Marshall Kuschner
2 Jim Wakefield - Gabriele Nanda
1 Larry Leviton - Richard Bingham
2 William Colket - Doreen Colket

Sat. Morn. Sr. Pairs (38 Pairs)

1 Lisa Flynn - Frances Strain
2 1 1 Virginia Murrin - Harold Ifshin
2 2 William Rogers - Edward Taborek

Sat. Morn. 100/50 Pairs (12 Pairs)

2 Michael Lusick - Freeman Adkins
2 Edwin Brawn - Susan Braun

Sat. 3:00 Seniors (22 Pairs)

2 Alan Breed - Norma Pierzchala
1 Edward Heberg - Gene Gallagher
2 Pitamber Devgon - Neal McKinney

Sat. Aft. Easybridge! (14 Pairs)

1 Alda Ball - Mary Tubb
2 1 Mary Ann Kral - Wendy Daunheimer
2 Linda Szyszka - Toni Vasquez

Sat. Aft. 299er Pairs (28 Pairs)

1 Owen Frisby - Robert Frisby
2 1 Richard Hesse - Thomas Johnson
2 1 Elizabeth Bowlin - Samuel Bowlin
2 Sue Carson - Monica Shumann

Sat. Aft. B/C/D Pairs (22 Pairs)

1 Kathryn Kiley - Ronald Kral
2 Diane Alexander - Marcia Stein
2/3 Leslie Powell - Bryan Macpherson

Sat. Eve. 299er Pairs (16 Pairs)

2 Iris Wilson - Rita Waldack
2 Victor Van Rees - Joyce Wilkinson
2 Clifford Dyhouse - Gloria Halstead

Sat. Eve. B/C/D Pairs (22 Pairs)

1 Betty Burse - M.Cassandra Smith
2 2 Frank Cardillo - Leo Cardillo

Flight A/X Pairs (28 Pairs)

1 Janet Gookin - Robert Gookin
1 Marsha Brown - William Brown

Sun. A/X Swiss (15 Teams)

1 Earl Glickstein - Ed Lewis - Ai-Tai Lo - Alan Schwartz
1 R. Sarangan - Elizabeth Nelson - Stan Schenker - Kenton Schoen
2 Jean Mayo - Eugene Schuyler - John Korfonta - David Fleischer

Sun. B/C Swiss (17 Teams)

1 Elizabeth Kinney - John Carlson - Marilyn Carlson - Carole Grob
2 1 Robert York - Richard Thomas - Edward Duffy - Ned Griffith
2 Robert Padgett - Linda Padgett - Yi-Der Chen - Martha Chen

Sun. 299er Swiss (16 Teams)

1/2 1/2 R. Cassell - S. Goldstein - G. Weinstein - G. Hatheway, Jr.
1/2 1/2 Edward Taborek - W. Rogers - Khon Lien - Michelle Cantave

Sun. PM 299er Swiss (11 Teams)

1 Martha Lackey - Nancy Arnold - Joanne Harman - William Harman
2 Suellen Garrison - Lorraine De Blasio - Mary Ann Dinger - Cynthia Cicalese

**WBL Sectional
(April 11-14)**

Thurs. AM Open Pairs (23 Pairs)

1 Fred King - Robert Gookin

Thurs. Eve. B/C Pairs (54 Pairs)

- 1 Mary Mudd - Barry Sparks
2 Norma Pierzchala - Wesley Jones, Jr.
1 Frank Cardillo - Paul Krueger

Fri. AM Open Pairs (20 Pairs)

- 1 Earl Glickstein - Robert Gookin
2 Aijazulhaq Gillani - John Laurim

Fri. PM A/X Pairs (32 Pairs)

- 1 Donna Rogall - Robert Gookin
1 Kristene Miller - Steve Bunning

Fri. Aft. 299er Pairs (14 Pairs)

- 1 William Pepelko - Barbara Pepelko

Fri. PM Open Pairs (34 Pairs)

- 2 Melissa Borsody - David Gottfried
1 Michael Deegan - Steven Fox

Sat. AM Senior Pairs (33 Pairs)

- 1 1 1 Michael Deegan - Frieda Joyce
2 Jean Levin - Carolyn Gibson

Sat. Aft. A/X Pairs (40 Pairs)

- 1 Paul Benedict - Tim Cogan
1 Steve Bunning - Kristene Miller

Sat. Aft. Senior Pairs (24 Pairs)

- 1 Bernard Oetjen - J. David Grier

Sat. Aft. 299er Pairs (18 Pairs)

- 3 3 2 Samuel Bowlin - Ali Al-Aref

Sat. Aft. 49er Pairs (14 Pairs)

- 2 2 Elizabeth Huffman - Gloria Halstead
2 Jenny Shaefer - Teresa Sakedo

Sun. AM 299er Swiss (10 Teams)

- 2 Don Henry - Bob Armstrong - Barbara DiCicco - Neal McKinney

Flighted Open BAM Teams (13 Teams)

- 1/2 S. Robinson - E. Kales - P. Boyd - W. Cole - B. Palmer - A. Schwartz

Sun. B/C Swiss Teams

- 1 Alfred Graham - David Grabiner - Joseph Ogulin - Penny Stoever

Sun. AM Open Pairs (6 Pairs)

- 2 Mark Levine - Eugene Schuyler

Sun. Aft. 299er Swiss (7 Teams)

- 2 2 Richard Cassell - Stephen Goldstein - Edward Taborek - G. Hatheway, Jr.

**Gatlinburg
(April 15-21)**

Sun. Swiss Teams A/X

- 2/4 Jeff Roman - Ron Smith - Linda Smith - Randy Pettit

Early Bird Side Series (479 Players)

- 1 Al Duncker

KO - EBay Bracket (16 Teams)

- 2 Jenny Rose - La Quitta Talbot - Jane Formet - Chris Kindt

KO - Bracket D (16 Teams)

- 2 John Kloke II - Patsy Williams - Julian Boyce - Kathryn Kiley

Fri. AM Cades Cove Compact KO Teams, Bracket 1 (16 Teams)

- 2 Warren Roberts III - Janet Gookin - Robert Gookin - Stephen Swearingen

Fri.-Sat. KO's, Bracket 3 (16 Teams)

- 2 Ronald Spath - Ken Davis - Terry Feetham - John Ashe

Weekend KO Teams, Braves Bracket (16 Teams)

- 2 Janet Gookin - Robert Gookin - Stephen Swearingen - W. Roberts, III

Late Evening ZIP KO Teams, Bracket 1 (16 Teams)

- 2 John Kloke II - Patsy Williams - Kathryn Kiley - Julian Boyce

**NVBA April Foolishness
(April 25-28)**

Thurs. Flight A/X Pairs (75 Pairs)

- 2 1 Hailong Ao - Weizhong Bao
2 Steve Bunning - Kristene Miller

Thurs. Flight B/C Pairs (52 Pairs)

- 2 Fred Hahn, Jr. - Michael Henderson
1 Glenn Young - Stu Fleischmann

Thurs. 300/200/100 (VA) (12 Pairs)

- 1 Joanne Harman - William Harman
2 1 1 G. Handwerger - Susan Cullman
2 Scott Brown - Patricia Brown
2/3 Alan Tapper - Joel Goldberg
2/3 Barbara DiCicco - Neal McKinney

Fri. Aft. 100/50 Pairs (9 Pairs)

- 1 Yvonne Markell - Elva Grillo
2 1 David Gardner - Todd Etter
2 V. Brockington - Ursula Williams

Fri. Aft. 299er Pairs (16 Pairs)

- 1 Bonnie Polk - Gerald Pittler
- 2 Jayne Eckert - Nancy Cartwright

Fri. Aft. Open Pairs (56 Pairs)

- 1 Ann Schwartz - Alan Schwartz
- 2 Steve Bunning - Kristene Miller
- 2 Harriet Schrader - Gerald Schrader

Fri. Eve. 49er Pairs (6 Pairs)

- 1 Dave Jackson - Maggie Burke
- 2 Jeff Youngen - Mary O'Shea

Fri. Eve. 300/200/100 Pairs (14 Pairs)

- 2 William Pepelko - Barbara Pepelko
- 2 Don Henry - Bob Armstrong

Fri. Eve. Open Pairs (39 Pairs)

- 2 Stan Schenker - Kenton Schoen
- 2 James Sandefur - Matthew Haag

Sat. Morn. Senior Pairs (32 Pairs)

- 1 Zeke Letellier - Jennifer Koonce
- 1 1 Marjorie Gazzola - L. Williams
- 2 Joseph Lane - Michael Stafford
- 2 Virginia Murrin - Harold Ifshin

Sat. Morn. 100/50/20 Pairs (18 Pairs)

- 2 Susan Strauss - Richard Slater
- 2 A. South - Marie-Theres Klinefelter
- 1 John Adams - James Taylor

Sat. Aft. Easybridge! Pairs (8 Pairs)

- 1 Mary O'Shea - Jeff Youngen
- 2 Myrna Kroh - Betty Yeary

Sat. Aft. Senior Pairs (19 Pairs)

- 1 Richard Zerilli - Jean Levin
- 2 John Klayman - Thomas Lavender
- 1 1 Gene Gallagher - Shirley Lafferty
- 2 Michael Stafford - Joseph Lane
- 2 Edward Duffy - Richard Thomas

Sat. Aft. B/C/D Pairs (40 Pairs)

- 1 1 Jean Marx - Nancy Hoye
- 2/3 Kathryn Kiley - Allen Shaw
- 2 William Harman - Joanne Harman

Sat. Aft. A/X Pairs (34 Pairs)

- 1 Kenneth Davis - Charles Yaple
- 2 Millard Nachtwey - Marshall Kuschner

Sat. Eve. 300/200/100 Pairs (14 Pairs)

- 1 1 Jay Kelkar - Mahadeo Patwardhan
- 2 Clifford Dyhouse - Gloria Halstead

Sat. Eve. Open Pairs (40 Pairs)

- 1 Glenn Young - Eva Klivington
- 2 John Christensen - Robert Wissman

Sun. A/X Swiss (17 Teams)

- 2 S. Robinson - M. Shaw - B. Shaw - Ron Sukoneck - Peter Boyd
- 2 Thomas Musso - Michael Cheng - Rae Dethlefsen - Diane Walker

Sun. B/C Swiss (25 Teams)

- 2 Marty McGowan - Donna Fletcher - Paul Keshishian - Marian Van Ryne

Sun. Morn. 299er Swiss (7 Teams)

- 1 Mitchell Karlick - Richard Cassell - Stephen Goldstein - Gary Weinstein

Sun. Aft. 299er Swiss (5 Teams)

- 1 Silvia Keenan - Joanne Harman - William Harman - Cathy Gallucio
- 2 Mitchell Karlick - G. Hatheway, Jr. - Stephen Goldstein - Richard Cassell

**Raleigh
(May 21-27)**

Wed. Open Pairs (92 Pairs)

- 1 Edward Gofreed - Jack Armstrong

Nags Head KO Bkt 5 (16 Teams)

- 1 Richard Anderson - Gregory Mullins - Hikmat Nasr - Julia Nasr

Fri. Open Swiss (57 Teams)

- 1 Steve Robinson - Peter Boyd - Barbara Shaw - Mark Shaw - Ron Sukoneck

Sat. Eve. Open BAM (20 Teams)

- 2 Marc Low - Sandra Low - Robert Gookin - Janet Gookin

Wilson Compact KO I (9 Teams)

- 1 Linda Smith - Ron Smith - Janet Gookin - Robert Gookin

Dinnerbell KO I (10 Teams)

- 2 J. Fletcher Smoak - Linda Smoak - Edward Gofreed - Jack Armstrong

So. Pines KO 2 (16 Teams)

- 1 Donald Van Arman - Bruce Houston - Kenneth Davis - John Ashe
- 2 David Milton - Stan Schenker - John Cobb, Jr. - John Marriott, Jr.

Sat. Open Pairs, First Session

- 2 1/21 Julia Nasr - Hikmat Nasr

Sat. Eve. BAM Teams

- 2 Marc Low - Sandra Low - Robert Gookin - Janet Gookin

Sun. Sr. Pairs, Second Session

- 4 2 Wes Jones, Jr. - Sam McMillan, Jr.

Mon. A/X Swiss (25 Teams)

- 2 S. Robinson - P. Boyd - B. Shaw - Mark Shaw - Ron Sukoneck
- 1 Thomas Musso - David Carman - Michael Cheny - Rae Dethlefsen

Mon. B/C Swiss (45 Teams)

- 1 Robert Walsh - Alan Breed - Samuel McMillan, Jr. - Wesley Jones, Jr.

Northern Virginia Bridge Association
1545 18th Street NW, Apt. 914
Washington, DC 20036

Pre-Sorted Standard
U.S. Postage
PAID
Merrifield, Virginia
Permit No. 294

2001-2002 Board of Directors

Bruce Culmer—President
Margot Hennings—Vice President
Lucy McCoy—Secretary
Ron Spieker—Treasurer

Leo Cardillo
Charlie Gregory
Robert Hartmann
Ed Heberg
Kathryn Kiley
Ron Kral
Barry Sparks

Chief Unit Director—Marshall Kuschner

Who's Open? Who's Closed?

Although many of our clubs will be closed during the DC Nationals (July 18-28), some will be open:

- Jeffa Dettinger— Monday at 7 pm at Ft. Belvoir
- Bernie Oetjen—Monday at 7 pm at KOCH
- Al Sitterson—Monday at 7:30 pm in Leesburg
- Lenore Ward—Monday at 11am and Thursday at 1 pm at Cascades Senior Center
- Jim Rocks—Friday at 2 pm in Leesburg
- Kitty Heiberg/Arlene Gray—Friday at 10 am at Lyon Park Community Center

Club managers who are closing their games include: Jan and Alan Breed, Candy Boughner, Bill Gress, Marshall Kuschner, Frank Mackey, Sam McMillan, Norma Pierzchala, Carole Grob, Will Hanak, and Louise Sellers. (On July 29th, Bill Gress and Carole Grob's Monday 10 am game at Ballston is closed, as is the Breed's July 31st Wednesday 10 am game there.)