



VOL. 57 No. 1

MARCH 2016

MBA, SOMBA boards green-light merger talks

By Martin Hirschman
Table Talk Editor

The MBA board of directors has voted in favor of pursuing a merger with neighboring Southern Michigan Bridge Association (SOMBA). The 8-0 vote (with five members absent) came at the MBA board's Feb. 9 meeting, a month after SOMBA's board voted 10-2 in favor of the idea.

Details still need to be worked out, and various approvals secured. No firm timetable has been established for the merger.

Under one plan, a so-called "Roadmap" developed by MBA President Richard Temkin and former SOMBA President Subhash Gulati, the current 13-member MBA board and 15-member SOMBA board would be compressed into a new board of 19 mem-

bers. The new board would be phased in through two elections in successive years.

The name of the new organization has not been determined. It carries a working title of Bridge Association of Southeast Michigan in the Roadmap document.

It is expected that there would be no change in the annual schedule of local tournaments. It is not known whether and in what form Table Talk magazine, an MBA publication for 56 years, would survive. The SOMBA Echo was last published in 2011.

The votes of the two unit boards came after Temkin and Gulati submitted a list of 11 "Reasons and Benefits for a Merger":

"1. There would be a synergy to combining our organizations, thereby achieving savings through economies of

(Continued on page 2)

scale and elimination of duplication of effort and service.

"2. We would have consistent policies, fees, schedules, starting times, etc. for our local tournaments.

"3. We would have consistent policies and equal support for all of our bridge clubs in the area.

"4. We would have one group to administer bridge in this area, engendering a positive atmosphere of good feelings and harmony.

"5. Both units have had declining membership.

"6. The reasons that there are two units in this area are no longer relevant.

"7. It would make us consistent with the rest of the nation in that only the Detroit and Washington, D.C., areas have more than one unit.

"8. We would be able to combine our efforts to produce common communication tools, including a newsletter, Facebook and web site.

"9. Players from both units heavily populate each other's tournaments and clubs.

"10. Both units worked together to produce an online membership directory.

"11. Many players do not even know what unit they belong to, as evidenced by the number who try to vote in the 'wrong'

unit's election."

MBA, whose membership was down to an all-time low 812 in January from 849 a year earlier, has jurisdiction over Wayne, Washtenaw and Livingston counties, plus the city of Oak Park in Oakland County. SOMBA, currently with 1087 members, was formed in about 1958 out of what was then part of MBA: Macomb and St. Clair counties plus Oakland County except for Oak Park. (Both units have snowbird members who are not included in the January totals.)

In 1958, following the break-away of SOMBA from MBA, the national ACBL board voted to allow members living in either area to join the other unit. Currently, about 225 players living in SOMBA territory, mostly in Oakland County, have elected to be MBA members. About 30 players in MBA territory, mostly in the Grosse Pointes, have chosen to be SOMBA members.

**Congratulations to
Jerry Thornton,
MBA's 2015 Goodwill
award winner**

Michigan Bridge Association's Michigan State Sectional

March 31-April 3, 2016
Bridge Connection (248-356-6254)
26776 Twelve Mile Road, Southfield
(just west of Northwestern Highway)

Thursday, March 31

Stratified Open Pairs.....	10 a.m.
*Stratified Non-LM Pairs	10 a.m.
<i>Swiss Team Lesson for New Players</i>	2:10 p.m.
Stratified Swiss Teams	2:30 p.m.
*Stratified Non-LM Swiss Teams	2:30 p.m.
Stratified Open Pairs	7 p.m.
*Stratified Non-LM Pairs	7 p.m.

Friday, April 1

Stratified Open Pairs.....	10 a.m.
*Stratified Non-LM Pairs	10 a.m.
Stratified Open Pairs.....	2:30 p.m.
*Stratified Non-LM Pairs	2:30 p.m.
Stratified Open Pairs	7 p.m.
*Stratified Non-LM Pairs	7 p.m.

Saturday, April 2

Stratified Open Swiss Teams playthrough-7 matches	10 a.m.
Stratified Open Pairs (single session)	10 a.m.
*Stratified Non-LM Pairs (single session)	10 a.m.
Stratified Open Pairs (single session)	2 p.m.
*Stratified Non-LM Pairs (single session)	2 p.m.

Sunday, April 3

Stratified Open Swiss Teams playthrough-7 matches	11 a.m.
Stratified Open Pairs (single session)	11 a.m.
*Stratified Non-LM Pairs (single session)	11 a.m.
Stratified Open Pairs (single session)	3 p.m.
*Stratified Non-LM Pairs (single session)	3 p.m.

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

Stratified Events: A = 3000+, B = 1000-3000, C = 0-1000
 Non-LM Strats: (0-20) (20-50) (50-200) (200-500) (as attendance warrants)
 Average MP will be used to determine your strat.

Tournament Chair: Jonathan Fleischmann, 734-255-6104, jafleisc@umich.edu

Partnerships: Marilyn Crane, 734-591-3431, mqcrane@yahoo.com

Rosanne Winokur, 248-661-3567, winokur@att.net

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

TABLE TALK

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

MARTIN HIRSCHMAN, Editor

Production editor: Marcia Abramson

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

MBA Officers

Richard Temkin president
Jonathan Fleischmann
.....president-elect
Kurt Dasher..... chairman
Stacey Tessler...recording secretary
Bob Webber..... treasurer

Board of Directors

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

MBA CLUB DIRECTORY

■**Ann Arbor BC**, Walden Hills Clubhouse, 2114 Pauline, Ann Arbor. Ray Gentz, 734-769-3994. Wednesday 7 p.m.

■**Burns Center Bridge**, 1320 Baldwin, Ann Arbor. Dick Fortune, 734-677-5674. Wednesday 12 p.m.

■**Burns Park Bridge**, 1320 Baldwin, Ann Arbor. Stacey Tessler, 734-623-8050. Thursday 12 p.m.

■**Downriver BC**, Southgate Veterans Memorial Library, 14680 Dix-Toledo Rd., Southgate. Cono Emanuele, 734-675-3687. Tuesday 10:30 a.m.

■**Ford DBC**, Ford Motor Company World Headquarters, 1 American Rd., Dearborn. Ellen Silverest, 810-225-2278. Tuesday 7 p.m.

■**Friendly Friday BC**, St. Paul Evangelical Lutheran Church, 375 Lothrop, Grosse Pointe Farms. Tony Faint, 586-649-3575. Friday 12 p.m.

■**Huron Valley Bridge Club**, Hartland Senior Center, 9525 E. High-

land Rd., Howell. Jim & Cheryl Perna, 248-887-9283. Thursday, 6 p.m.

■**Neighborhood Club**, St. Paul Evangelical Lutheran Church, 375 Lothrop, Grosse Pointe Farms. James Schmidt, 586-463-9835. Thursday 12 p.m., Sunday 1 p.m.

■**Plymouth Community DBC**, Cultural Center, 525 Farmer, Plymouth. Jim & Cheryl Perna, 248-887-9283. Tuesday 11:30 a.m., Wednesday 11:30 a.m.

■**Thursday Evening Bridge**, Ann Arbor City Club, 1830 Washtenaw, Ann Arbor. Dorothy Kuhn, 734-761-6691. Thursday 7 p.m.

■**Trenton DBC**, 2700 Westfield, Trenton. Charles May, 734-301-3872. Thursday 7 p.m.

■**War Memorial**, 32 Lakeshore, Grosse Pointe. Judith Thomas, 313-372-4218. Monday 12 p.m.

■**Young Center BC**, R.A. Young Recreation Center, 5400 McKinley, Dearborn Heights. Joyce Kozma, 313-274-5587. Wednesday 11 a.m.

Big changes planned for 2016 Motor City Regional

The Vincent & Joan Remy Motor City Regional will switch to a mostly morning/afternoon schedule, and all knockout team events will be flighted. The tournament will be held Oct. 17-23 at the William Costick Center in Farmington Hills.

The MBA board adopted the new schedule at its Feb. 9 meeting. The main events on Tuesday through Saturday will start at 10 a.m., with the second session commencing at 2:30 p.m. On Monday, play will be at 1 p.m. and 7 p.m., and Sunday's games will start at 11 a.m.

For "night owls" there will be two 2-session Swiss team events, each starting at 7 p.m. and running over two nights: Tuesday-Wednesday and Thursday-Friday.

The switch to flighting in the knockouts is designed to ensure that less experienced players do not have to play against pros and other top competitors. Flight A will be unlimited, and Flight B will be for players with fewer than 2,000 masterpoints.

Flight B of the knockouts "will be an intermediate-level event for members who were

previously discouraged from playing against all top-level players in the KOs," said new regional chair Zachary Wasserman. "This hopefully is an exciting way for intermediate players to compete in a knockout event that is comfortable for them."

Gold Rush events for players with fewer than 750 masterpoints will remain part of the schedule, as they have for the last few years.

A full schedule of events will be circulated at upcoming tournaments and club games, and will be published on the District 12 website and in the September issue of Table Talk.

LIKE US ON FACEBOOK!!!

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

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

**In Memoriam
Edward Bloom
Ann Katz**

Willie Winokur writes:

Edward (Eddie) Bloom passed away Jan. 23. He is survived by his loving wife of 65 years Esta, daughters Julie and Nancy, brothers Murray and Gerald (both of whom are bridge players), and many loving grandchildren, nieces and nephews. He was a Gold Life Master with over 3,300 masterpoints.

Eddie graduated from the University of Michigan in 1950 and Wayne State University Law School in 1953. He then served in the Navy as a JAG officer.

While at U of M, Eddie orga-

nized the bridge team that won two championships in the intercollegiate par bidding events.

When Murray and Eddie dissolved their Pontiac furniture business in the late 1990s, I suggested that Eddie immerse himself in the bridge world. He did, becoming a part-time director at the Bridge Connection, a bridge teacher and a member of the MBA board (1997-99). He and I were a fairly regular and fairly successful bridge partnership.

Eddie taught dozens and dozens of students. I know they will always remember him as a valued mentor and good friend.

As for me, the bridge club just ain't gonna ever feel the same.

Actually, Petersen is 2015 Bluth winner

Grant Petersen is the 2015 winner of the Beverly Bluth trophy, awarded annually to the Flight B player who wins the most masterpoints at MBA tournaments.

Jonathan Fleischmann previously was named winner of the trophy but later was found to be ineligible because he

started 2015 with more than 2,000 masterpoints.

Petersen, an MBA board member and co-owner of the Bridge Connection in Southfield, amassed 63.15 points in the Bluth race. Points won at the Motor City Regional count at 70 percent in the Bluth tally.

IT'S YOUR BID

By Marty Hirschman

Congratulations to expert panelist Irv Rosenstein and reader Patty Becker for the top scores on this challenging set.

If you want to take on a challenge or have a chance to be congratulated, send in your answers to next issue's problems, found at the end of this article.

1. MTPTs. E-W vul. As SOUTH, you hold:

♠AQ4 ♥K76543 ♦A9 ♣K7
 WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH
 -- -- -- 1♥
 Pass 1♠ Pass ?

Action	Score	Votes
3♥	100	7
2♠	70	4
3♠	70	4
2♥	60	3
2NT	60	3
1NT	50	0
2♣	30	0
2♦	30	0

You have the overall values and shape for a 3♥ jump re-bid, but your hearts are terrible. 2♠ is an underbid, while 3♠ promises four-card support. Other choices seem even worse.

Sample comments:

Gene Benedict (2♠): I feel this is more encouraging than rebidding 2♥. The heart suit is too weak for a jump to 3♥.

Howard Perlman (2♠): Accepting all game tries! Would

have opened 1NT.

Julie Arbit (2♥): I don't have enough to jump, and even though the heart spots leave a lot to be desired I find this the least of all evils. Partner's hand will be more useful to me in hearts than mine will to him in spades, so I don't want to raise his suit.

Suzy Burger (2♥): Quite the underbid, but what else to do? Perhaps partner will continue on.

Bob Katz (2♥): Unusual to rebid 2♥ with 16 points, but partner never bids 1♠ while holding three hearts unless they hold at least a limit raise. This heart suit rates to have two losers unless partner holds specifically Ax. Sure he could hold the right 9- or 10-count and you miss a game, but so it goes.

Marilyn Maddox (3♠): Should have fourth trump but have two honors, shows count and the heart suit is too weak to

SCORES

Experts:

Irv Rosenstein 470
 Bob Cappelli..... 460
 Willie Winokur 460
 Chuck Burger 450
 Myles Maddox..... 440

Readers:

Patricia Becker 470
 David Graff 420
 Kerry Lafer 390
 James Swiger..... 380

Sarah Lampert 350
 Elmer Winkelman 350
 Bob Ondo 330
 Val Enache..... 320
 Jamie Ling..... 300
 Michael Betzold..... 290
 Irv Hershman..... 290
 Doris Jefferies 290
 George Pope..... 280
 Jerry Jefferies..... 270
 Richard Fortune 260
 Gerald Wahl 250

HOW THE PANEL VOTED

	1	2	3	4	5
Julie Arbit	2♥	Dbl	2NT	3♣	5♦
Gene Benedict	2♠	3NT	2♣	4♦	5♣
Bob Brent	2NT	4♠	2NT	4NT	6♣
Brenda Bryant	3♠	3NT	Pass	4♦	5♣
Chuck Burger	3♥	Dbl	2NT	4♦	4♠
Suzy Burger	2♥	4NT	1NT	4♦	4NT
Bob Cappelli	3♥	3NT	1NT	3♣	6♣
Joe Chiesa	3♥	4♠	2♣	4♦	5♠
Jonathan Fleischmann	2NT	Dbl	2NT	3♣	5♠
Sam Hirschman	3♥	4♥	2NT	3♣	4♠
Bob Katz	2♥	3NT	1NT	3♣	6♣
Sheldon Kirsch	3♠	4♠	2♣	3♣	6♣
Morrie Kleinplatz	2♠	3NT	Pass	4♦	6♣
Marilyn Maddox	3♠	3NT	Pass	4NT	4NT
Myles Maddox	3♥	3NT	2♣	4♦	5♠
Howard Perlman	2♠	Dbl	2♣	4♦	4♠
Irv Rosenstein	2♠	3NT	2NT	4♦	6♣
Don Rumelhart	3♥	4NT	1NT	3♣	6♣
Dick Temkin	3♠	3NT	2♣	3♣	4♠
Bob Webber	2NT	Dbl	2NT	2♥	4NT
Willie Winokur	3♥	4NT	2NT	4♦	6♣

make a jump response in hearts.

Chuck Burger (3♥): Despite the lack of suit quality, the spade fit, controls and playing strength dictate aggressive action. 2♥, 3♠ or 2♣ are worse distortions. The 6th heart is why I didn't open 1NT.

Sam Hirschman (3♥): I committed to that when I opened 1♥ (not that I think opening 1NT is better). 2♠ is an underbid. Could lie with 2♣ and see what happens.

Don Rumelhart (3♥): It's the smallest lie. If you replaced two of my small hearts with the 10 and 9, there would be no discussion.

Fleischmann wins 2015 Marsee Trophy

Jonathan Fleischmann won 1,044 masterpoints in 2015, making him the winner of the Grant Marsee Trophy, awarded to the Michigan player who wins the most points in the year.

It was the first Marsee win for Fleischmann, a club director and professional player who started last year with 2,227 points.

My choice at the table was 2♠. At least I rate to get a plus there. Unfortunately I don't remember what happened.

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

♠A ♥KJ975 ♦KQ3 ♣J765
WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH
 2♠ 2NT 3♠ ?

Action	Score	Votes
3NT	100	9
Dbl	80	5
4♠	60	3
4NT	60	3
4♥	50	1
4♣	20	0
5♣	0	0

We're not quite good enough for slam unless we find a fit. We'd like to get hearts into the picture, especially after East's raise. But we don't want to commit to playing in a suit game. So a responsive-type double seems like the only alternative to just bidding 3NT.

Howard Perlman (Dbl): Take-out, though big number likely if partner passes. Possible slam but need help to find the right strain.

Bob Webber (Dbl): There is too much spade duplication to consider slam. +800 seems fairly likely.

Jonathan Fleischmann (Dbl): I plan to raise if partner bids 3NT, and I will cuebid my ace if partner bids a suit. If partner passes, that will be fine, too.

Irv Rosenstein (3NT): Going low. Assuming about 16 HCP with a stopper, partner has spade wastage for a marginal slam.

Bob Katz (3NT): Partner holds 15-18, with a lot more 15s than 18s. A hand such as ♠Q10x ♥Ax ♦AJxx ♣KQxx and you are plenty high enough.

Don Rumelhart (4NT): Right on values.

Suzy Burger (4NT): Partner could have a heavy NT.

Joe Chiesa (4♠): A raise to 4NT describes a balanced slam try, ergo I bid 4♠ as an unbalanced try. Partner should select the level and suit.

Bob Brent (4♠): If partner bids 5♦, will bid my hearts. If partner has KQx of spades, which is unlikely, we can get out at 4NT. At IMPs, it is imperative to look for slam.

Thanks to Willie Winokur for suggesting this problem. He reports that partner's hand was ♠Q109 ♥AQ10 ♦J109 ♣AKQ8, so 6♥ or 6♣ would

have been excellent. But not 6NT.

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

♠A1093 ♥A ♦A9865 ♣A32
WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH
 -- Pass Pass 1♦
 1♠ Dbl Pass ?

Action	Score	Votes
2NT	100	8
2♣	80	6
1NT	70	4
Pass	60	3
2♠	30	0
3♦	20	0

Having all four aces is worth an extra ½ to 1 HCP, and our long suits, with some little texture (10s and 9s), hold out promise of extra tricks. So the 2NT jump rebid doesn't seem like that much of a stretch. And we are vulnerable at IMPs, so we'll lose (or forego the gain of) 10 IMPs if we miss a making game. If it turns out to be a part-score hand and we go minus, we'll probably lose no more than 5 or 6.

Jonathan Fleischmann (2NT): I can't afford to try for penalties when red against white. 2NT should give me the best shot at reaching a good game and comes quite close to describing my strength and shape.

Bob Brent (2NT): I like my intermediates in spades and can't afford to miss a game at IMPs.

Bob Katz (1NT): No bid properly describes this hand. Stiff A of hearts is a drawback. All other options are gross overbids.

Brenda Bryant (Pass): Perhaps unusual, but I have five defensive tricks minimum. We seem to not have a fit. Not sure where we are going.

Morrie Kleinplatz (Pass): I might miss 3NT, but then I'll get at least 300 and possibly as much as 800. I'll be wrong if partner has a strong fit for diamonds.

Sheldon Kirsch (2♣): Too much for 1NT and the wrong distribution. I can have a lot for my 2♣ bid, and partner should strain to keep the auction open.

Actually, 2♣ should be quite limited: After the negative double, a jump new-suit bid (e.g. 3♣) would only show intermediate values, and game-forcing hands would start with a cuebid.

When this hand came up on Bridge Base, partner held: ♠K6 ♥K9762 ♦1073 ♣986, so taking the low road would have worked out best.

4. MTPTs. Both vul. As SOUTH, you hold:

♠AKQ43 ♥87 ♦KQ85 ♣102
WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH
 Pass 1♦ Pass 1♠
 Pass 2♦ Pass ?

Action	Score	Votes
4♦	100	10
3♣	90	8
4NT	50	2
5♦	50	0
2♥	40	1
3♦	30	0
3♠	30	0

3♦ won't be forcing, and 4♦ takes us past the possible 3NT. That leaves a forcing but misdescriptive (?) 3♣ as the best option in my view.

Sam Hirschman (3♣): I think 2♥ here should be naturalish, and 3♣ artificial and forcing. I'm willing to play 3NT if partner can bid it over 3♣, or bid 4♠ if partner can take a preference. Otherwise, let's see how many diamonds we should play.

Don Rumelhart (3♣): Temporing. I want to bid game in either NT, spades or diamonds. I need to hear more from partner to know which. I can always correct to diamonds if partner raises.

Julie Arbit (3♣): I tend to play this as an artificial one-round force. Unless I hear some-

thing about spades from partner, I'll likely gun for 3NT. If partner has the hand to make 5♦, then we're also making 3NT most of the time.

Gene Benedict (4♦): Forcing to game, either in spades or diamonds. Partner is aware I have bypassed 3NT, so he should make a strong effort to get to slam.

Chuck Burger (4♦): Forcing. Too much hand not to try for slam. 3rd suit forcing confuses the issue. Need controls for slam, and I am asking.

Joe Chiesa (4♦): Preserving chances for 5, 6 or 7♦ or 4♠. It gives up 3NT, but if I bid 3♣ and partner bids 3NT will I be joyful passing when ♠xx ♥Ax ♦Axxxxx ♣Ax yields 7♦?

Marilyn Maddox (4NT): Am going to 5♦ anyway and will check on aces on the way.

This was a made-up hand. In the original, you held ♠AKQ43 ♥87 ♦102 ♣KQ85, and partner opened 1♣ and rebid 2♣ over your 1♠ response. In that situation, many (most?) experts now play that a 2♦ bid by you would be an artificial game force.

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

♠J103 ♥63 ♦A6 ♣KQJ1072
WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH
3♥ 4♥ Pass ?

Action	Score	Votes
6♣	100	8
4♠	70	4
4NT	60	3
5♠	60	3
5♣	50	2
5♦	40	1

Partner presumably has spades and diamonds with a strong hand. If he was minimal, he would have just bid 3♠. So we really have to think about slam, presumably in our one-loser club suit. On the other hand, we could be off two cashing hearts or two aces. Let the guessing begin.

Howard Perlman (4♠): Taking the low road. Must give non-vul. partner some slack as he/she was under pressure. Probably has diamonds, so my clubs in all likelihood face shortage. Certainly not good enough to invite slam via 5♠.

Joe Chiesa (5♠): Insoluble. My club suit may be worthless but I have to make a try. Partner did say he could make 10 tricks when this hand may well have been on his left.

Gene Benedict (5♣): 4♠ shows no values, while 5♣

shows a good suit. I don't feel I'm strong enough to insist on slam. If partner corrects to 5♦, I will take a preference to 5♠.

Bob Katz (6♣): 6♣ can be played opposite a singleton. If he has a hand that makes a grand slam, he will be able to figure out that I have A of diamonds together with solid clubs and bid the grand. Of course we could be off two aces, but the odds are on our side.

Irv Rosenstein (6♣): Assuming stiff heart for pard, slam is

likely at worst on a finesse. If partner bids 6♦, I will correct to 6♠.

That last idea is a questionable one. Partner should have better diamonds than spades to correct to 6♦. (We would have started with 4NT to offer a choice of minors.) At the table, partner held ♠Axxxx ♥void ♦KQJ10xx ♣Ax, so there was a grand slam available in either minor, while a spade slam or even 5♠ would be in serious jeopardy.

Thanks to Joe Monro for reporting this hand.

NEXT ISSUE'S HANDS

1. IMPs. None vul. As SOUTH, you hold:

♠A ♥KQ753 ♦A43 ♣AK87
 WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH
 - - - 1♥
 Pass 1♠ Pass 3♣
 Pass 3♠ Pass ?

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

♠KQJ765 ♥J1087 ♦void ♣A108
 WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH
 - - Pass 1♠
 Pass 2♣* Pass ?

*Game-forcing

3. IMPs. E-W vul. As SOUTH, you hold:

♠84 ♥J9754 ♦KQJ108 ♣9
 WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH
 2♠ DbI 4♠ ?

4. IMPs. E-W vul. As SOUTH, you hold:

♠K72 ♥QJ654 ♦AQ5 ♣KQ
 WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH
 Pass 1NT* Pass 2♦**
 Pass 2♥ Pass ?

*15-17

**Transfer

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

♠87 ♥Q65 ♦KJ2 ♣AJ642
 WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH
 - 1♦ Pass 2NT
 Pass 3♠ Pass ?

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

Chiesa: Recount requested

Many people felt aggrieved by the decision in *Bush v Gore*, 531 US 98 (2000), and yet contend that but for that decision global warming would be a concern of the past. I feel no less aggrieved by the decision in *Table Talk's It's Your Bid*, December 2015, Problem 3.

Prefatory to a discussion of the substantive basis for my indignation the ground rules: *It's Your Bid* presents 5 bidding problems addressed by a panel of ... let's leave that for the nonce. Systemically something akin to *Bridge World Standard* (hereinafter *BWS*) is employed. Scores for each problem are based upon 1) The quantitative hierarchy, i.e. how many votes for each bid, and 2) Directorial discretion. I seldom do well as I try to provide the bid I would have made at the table as opposed to prophesying what the majority of the other ... will do. Imagine my chagrin when I was deprived of a win by Problem 3 in the last issue.

Problem 3 posed: ♠AKQxx ♥x ♦KQJx ♣Qxx. You open a spade in 4th seat and partner as a passed hand bids 2♦. Your call. When I said at the outset, "For those that believe

3♥ is a splinter, amp up the thorazine," little did I realize that a majority of 12 panelists would do exactly that.

Tellingly EVERY reported 3♥ bid in the comments section said "3♥ splinter." Similarly ALL reported 4♥ bids said "4♥ splinter." Thanks for that. The games I usually play in frown upon that.

A 3♥ bid here should describe a strong jump shift, e.g. ♠AKQxx ♥KQJx ♦x ♣Axx; a 4♥ bid a limited two-suiter as ♠KQJxxx ♥KQJxx ♦x ♣x. If you want to use any of these as splinters then you must agree that P-1♠-2♦-2♥ by opener is forcing. Then you must pass 2♦ holding ♠Axxxx ♥Axxx ♦void ♣Kxxx. Not really workable.

As to *BWS* it states in pertinent part (citations omitted) that 1) Where there is no explicit systemic agreement bids are natural rather than artificial and 2) The default position is that a DOUBLE jump shift is a splinter.

If there is justice in your soul please urge the Director to revisit Problem 3 and declare me the winner of the December contest.

-Joe Chiesa (by email)
(Continued on next page)

Joe--

Thanks for your submission.

While I am sympathetic to your concerns, I am not just going to start scoring It's Your Bid by my own standards of bidding. If I did, I'd be getting a lot more than just one complaint each issue, and the column would lose much of whatever legitimacy it still has.

Meanwhile, I'm just going to have to take the blame for using a problem in which partnership methods predominate. Sorry. --M. (by email).

Marty,

It was a joke. I really don't care about the scores. If you think this would prompt serious appellants. DO NOT INCLUDE it

--Joe

'Ten Most Wanted' conduct offenders will get talking-to from MBA president

There is a new sheriff in town, and his name is Richard Temkin.

Following a discussion at the Feb. 9 MBA board meeting about conduct and zero tolerance, Temkin, who is MBA president and a member of the unit's Conduct and Ethics Committee, said he would undertake to speak privately to our top conduct offenders in an effort to get them to behave.

The discussion at the board meeting centered on the problem of newer and less experienced players who have had bad experiences at the table, mostly with a handful of top players.

Grant Petersen, a board

member who is also a proprietor of the Bridge Connection in Southfield, said there were about 10 top or near-top players who are repeatedly rude at the table, especially toward less experienced players.

There is no official Ten Most Wanted list, and no actual names were mentioned at the meeting. However, Petersen said there probably would be a consensus that at least eight particular players belong on the list.

Temkin did not reveal exactly what he would say to these bad actors. Presumably they will be told that they are being watched, and that further bad conduct will result in disciplinary action.

Letters

To the Editor:

Enjoyed the recent issue. Hopefully “cheaters never prosper.”

--Irv Hershman

To the Editor:

Could there be a notice: As we all know, bridge players are a strange lot and sometimes bid, play, or do things that make no sense and aren't to one's best interest. In keeping with this oddity, we reserve our right to cancel membership at any time for no apparent reason knowing you will understand. Any fees paid will be refunded.

Enjoy your magazine.

--Chuck Osebold

To the Editor:

Wishing you a happy and healthy New Year and thanking you for all of your effort expended for the benefit of those “who love the Game.”

When I read your article [“The War on Cheating,” December 2015], it came after a series of letters I wrote to Bridge World magazine. I happen to believe that “Cheating” by definition goes far beyond the covert acts of those who “know how” to take advantage of their opponents. [From those letters: Allowing different conventional systems

is “a form of cheating because no {opponents}, however brilliant, can actually comprehend the subtle inferences of each Pair's systems...”]

Incidentally, the quiz you provide in Table Talk is totally objective and the fact that you grade on two different levels is perfect and meets all of the things that I consider to be “Fair Play,” “Fair Treatment,” and Honest treatment, considering all of the different elements that could cause Bridge writing to become “tainted.”

--Seymour Mandell

P.S. I never could understand how Professionals crept into a game intended to be a Non-professional “Sport.” Why have a couple of Thousand Players taken over the “GAME” that Millions play just for the fun of it?

Oops...

Last issue, Table Talk reported about the alleged bridge-playing exploits of presidential hopeful Sen. Bernie Sanders (D-Vt.). The report was based on what turned out to be a satirical article on the web. As we go to press, Table Talk has not been able to determine whether Sanders plays bridge or ever has.

Flint player gets the lead out, tops field at Ann Arbor sectional

Gordon Parnes of Flint was first and second in the two Swiss team events to lead all players at the Michael Graham Ann Arbor Sectional.

Here are results of the tournament, held Jan. 30-31 at the Eastern Michigan University student union in Ypsilanti.

MASTERPOINT LEADERS

- 1, Gordon Parnes, 22.76
- 2, Robert Katz, 20.23
- 3/5, Jonathan Fleischmann, 14.70
- 3/5, Frank Treiber III, 14.70
- 3/5, Jordan Kaye, 14.70
- 6, Michael Crane, 14.65
- 7, Sheldon Kirsch, 14.58
- 8/10, Lori Strager, 13.48
- 8/10, John Koschik, 13.48
- 8/10, Ed Herstein, 13.48

SATURDAY OPEN SWISS TEAMS FLIGHT A:

1, Michael Crane, Lori Strager, Ed Herstein, John Koschik. 2, Mark Bendure, Gordon Parnes, Jim Fatka, Joe Chiesa. 3, Jordan Kaye, Frank Treiber III, Jonathan Fleischmann, Robert Katz. **FLIGHT B:** 1, D. Abraham, Patti Stoner, Barb Marti, Peter Bolger. 2, Inderpal & Martha Bhatia, Klaus Bron-dum, Mark Hugger. 3, John Pouget, Darleen Yaskanin, Richard Muntz, Susan Yester. **FLIGHT C:** 1, Bhatia team. 2,

Pouget team. 3, Matthew & Susan Evett, Jeanne Hernandez, Marcia Abramson.

SUNDAY OPEN SWISS

TEAMS FLIGHT A: 1, Martin Hirschman, Susan & Gordon Parnes, Robert Katz. 2, Edward White, Sheldon Kirsch, Bert & Kathy Newman. 3, Jordan Kaye, Frank Treiber III, Kurt Dasher, Jonathan Fleischmann. **FLIGHT B:** 1, John Nelson, David Armstrong, Mares & Charles Hirschert. 2, David Harty, Donald Rumelhart, Bob Rasmussen, Arthur Wasserman. 3, Steven Jacob, Robert Raf, Sandy Birnholtz, Clarke Cunningham. **FLIGHT C:** 1, Nelson team. 2, Freda Mills, Sally Spalsbury, Donald Schenk, Jim Koerber. 3/4, Richard Long, Susan Bowers, Delinda Boylan, Dianne Sradeja. 3/4, Eric Holder, Kathleen & James Miller, Walter Magee.

Non-LM Pairs Winners

SATURDAY AM: Henry & Yanping Zhang

SATURDAY AFTERNOON: Henry & Yanping Zhang

SUNDAY AM: Beverly Seifert, Wanda Maturo-Mumford

SUNDAY AFTERNOON: Tom Baer, Dennis Ebedick

2015 MBA Mini-McKenney

2015 MBA Mini-Ace of Clubs

Note: Categories denote points held at the beginning of 2015.

0 to 5: 1, Shirley Lindberry, 15.37. 2, Daniel Rose, 13.99. 3, Catherine Bolton, 13.94.

5 to 20: 1, Steven Miller, 47.71. 2, Laurence Schiff, 44.60. 3, Mary Robinson, 27.30.

20 to 50: 1, Bob Ondo, 121.98. 2/3, Henry Zhang, 85.76. 2/3, Yanping Zhang, 85.76.

50 to 100: 1, Barb Ferrera, 123.23. 2, Sharyanne Kollin, 30.37. 3, Bruce Ridley, 27.14.

100 to 200: 1, Brad Dracka, 328.05. 2, Susan Smith, 89.20. 3, Craig Ross, 82.63.

200 to 300: 1, Graham Putnam, 101.17. 2, Dennis Ebendick, 98.03. 3, Martha Bhatia, 72.66.

300 to 500: 1, Yi Ouyang, 128.04. 2, Calvin Waisanen, 107.48. 3, Edward Lough, 90.45.

500 to 1000: 1, Julie Arbit, 510.45. 2, Wilbur Argersinger, 346.63. 3, Jordan Kaye, 329.04.

1000 to 2500: 1, Jonathan Fleischmann, 1044.27. 2, Grant Petersen, 320.16. 3, John Koschik, 266.78.

2500 to 5000: 1, Sheldon Kirsch, 542.07. 2, Anastasia Tessler, 386.61. 3, Kurt Dasher, 355.73.

5000 to 7500: 1, Robert Katz, 470.57. 2, Robert Brent, 453.64. 3, Richard Temkin, 315.67.

7500 to 10000: 1, Norman Bolton, 435.98. 2, Kathy Newman, 295.44. 3, William Winokur, 253.92.

Over 10000: 1, Bert Newman, 1005.94. 2, Leonard Melander, 678.25. 3, William Arlinghaus, 441.55.

0 to 5: 1, Shirley Lindberry, 15.37. 2, Catherine Bolton, 13.37. 3, Barbaranne Branca, 12.06.

5 to 20: 1, Laurence Schiff, 31.79. 2, Steven Miller, 25.73. 3, Cheryl Fitzpatrick, 20.14.

20 to 50: 1, Bob Ondo, 56.03. 2, Carrie Osborne, 42.70. 3, James Korte, 41.93.

50 to 100: 1, Barb Ferrera, 55.05. 2, Bruce Ridley, 23.14. 3, Theda Smith, 22.97.

100 to 200: 1, Brad Dracka, 106.01. 2, Craig Ross, 74.07. 3, Susan Smith, 54.99.

200 to 300: 1, Dennis Ebendick, 48.11. 2, Karen Holmes, 36.19. 3, Martha Bhatia, 35.15.

300 to 500: 1, Calvin Waisanen, 87.65. 2, Gail Terry, 73.51. 3, Patricia Cosgrove, 58.10.

500 to 1000: 1, James Walter, 134.56. 2, Marilyn Nathanson, 92.74. 3, Geraldine Spilman, 76.27.

1000 to 2500: 1, Jonathan Fleischmann, 181.83. 2, Steven Jacob, 130.34. 3, Margaret Moore, 118.06.

2500 to 5000: 1, Lynne Cook, 170.98. 2, Ed Herstein, 138.59. 3, Michael Giordano, 136.88.

5000 to 7500: 1, Robert Brent, 161.56. 2, Brenda Jaffe, 153.34. 3, Richard Becher, 120.87.

7500 to 10000: 1, Norman Bolton, 247.43. 2, William Winokur, 149.32. 3, Kathy Newman, 53.51.

Over 10000: 1, Leonard Melander, 205.87. 2, Bert Newman, 133.63. 3, Robert Crafton, 130.32.

Predictions of ACBL's imminent demise either are or aren't greatly exaggerated

Editor's note: Jonathan Steinberg, a former national ACBL board member from Toronto, recently circulated a "Denver NABC Report" criticizing ACBL for overspending and including a dire prediction about the future of the league.

At the request of Table Talk, ACBL CEO Robert Hartman provided an exclusive response which appears here after excerpts from Steinberg's December 2015 "Report." Both statements are followed by a relevant excerpt from 2016 ACBL President Ken Monzingo's goals for his year in office.

Jonathan Steinberg, former ACBL board member:

The 2005 Denver NABC had 10,145 tables. In 2015, it was just 9,059 tables, more than 1,000 tables below the pre-tournament estimate of 10,300 tables. The loss of revenue from Denver will add to the financial difficulties within the ACBL. The ACBL's net worth has steadily declined over the past several years.

The total Liabilities and Net Assets decreased from \$16,008,007 in October 2014

to just \$11,610,344 in October, 2015. The 2015 budget forecast a tiny profit of \$9,000. It now appears the actual number will be a loss of more than \$200,000. The 2016 budget approved by the ACBL Board of Directors forecasts a loss of an additional \$61,000.

ACBL membership is stagnant at around 168,000. The number of Youth & Junior members is at a five-year low, 1,035, a drop of 240 members or 18.8% from the 2013 high of 1,275.

Barry Senensky is the President of Claim Analytics, an actuarial consulting firm specializing in predictive modeling. He has been a practicing actuary for over 30 years.

Barry believes the ACBL will fail within eight years primarily due to aging membership, increasing costs and the ACBL's reluctance to control and reduce expenses. Raising card fees to \$25 per session for National+ events starting in the summer of 2016 is, in his opinion, a mistake and will result in decreased revenues as less players will attend. Barry sees this as an excellent example as how the ACBL management does not

understand the drivers of their revenue.

He added that non-profits tend to not to be managed as well as for-profit organizations where there is an organizational focus on doing the right things to make a profit. Non-profits have a tendency to focus on what is important to those in charge, especially if good governance is not in place to keep things in check. He mentioned that he is a member of three other non-profit organizations, all of them actuarial and that by far the ACBL is the most dysfunctional and mismanaged non-profit of the bunch.

The Society of Actuaries just completed a review of its governance done by an outside consultant that resulted in recommendations to reduce the size and streamline its board of directors. These recommendations were adopted and put in place. Barry indicated that a first step to getting the ACBL on track would be to employ an outside consultant to do a similar study.

Donald Mamula, the retiring District 19 ACBL Board of Directors representative, commented on BridgeWinners.com:

“Won't speak to the demographics, but the admin-

istration in Horn Lake has been spending money for the last few years as if the printing press in the basement printed Benjamins rather than master-points.

“After losing a ton on ACBL Score+, one would think that the goal would be to re-establish the previous sound financial condition. Instead, the budget for next year forecasts the third loss in a row. Net assets dropped by over 50% in 2014, 2015 will be a loss and more in 2016. Even with increases to sanction fees and TD [tournament director] session fees of over 9% [charged to units and districts by ACBL], plus NABC+ entries going to \$25, it's not enough to cover the increased spending of almost one million over last year.

“FWIW, only one board member voted against the 2016 budget. But since I'm leaving the board, who will cast that negative vote in my absence...”

I don't believe the ACBL Board of Directors is the major problem, but as a group they are costly and ineffective. The Board has proven itself incapable of reform, having turned down previous studies and recommendation regarding term limits, redistricting,

smaller size, fewer meetings. The Board has now created a “Board Composition Advisory Committee” which will issue its final report no later than Spring 2017.

**ACBL CEO
Robert Hartman:**

Mr. Hirschman--

Thank you for affording me an opportunity to reply to Mr. Steinberg’s emailed comments.

Healthy membership numbers

Predictions of declining membership have dogged ACBL for years. In 1986, the League engaged Contemporary Market Research, Inc., a New York City research firm, to better understand ACBL’s long-term membership forecast. Their study noted members’ increasing age and concluded, “If this trend continued, it would lead to an extreme decline in the level of ACBL membership.” At the rate of decline predicted, the ACBL would have fewer than 80,000 members by 2015.

Instead, today’s membership total of 168,400 is the highest in two decades. Our primary target audience is the baby boomers – the generation born between 1946 and

1964. According to the AARP President Jo Ann Jenkins, an estimated 10,000 people will turn 65 every day this year, and every day for the next 15 years, which positions our organization well for the foreseeable future.

Does that mean we spend all of our time and money chasing after older players? No. Part one of the organization’s mission is to promote, grow and sustain *the game of bridge* – not to be confused with growing the ACBL’s membership roster. Not only do we have an obligation to bring the game to young people, it is one of the more enjoyable things we do. While not currently a lucrative member market, youth bridge activities help build a future membership foundation. Exposure to the game is key.

Last year, more than 3500 juniors participated in about 535 ACBL-sponsored school-bridge programs (elementary through college level) throughout North America. There is no requirement that the kids participating in these programs be ACBL members and likely, most of them are not. We currently have 1,118 paid Youth and Junior members, but we know that doesn’t begin to represent the

full reach of our activities.

Other youth programs the League funds and/or administers include the Youth NABC; materials for bridge camps; teacher stipends; and scholarship opportunities such as the annual King/Queen of Bridge and the Collegiate Bridge Bowl.

Financial health

The ACBL is in sound financial condition: We have adequate resources to meet our operational needs, no debt and \$4.5 million in reserves. As we focus on more and better ways to serve our members, the ACBL Board of Directors and management are constantly evaluating cost-savings opportunities. Management has committed to a 2016 budget where revenue exceeds expenses.

The ACBL incurred two, major one-time liabilities in 2014 totaling \$3.6 million.

1. Pension plan termination. Financial advisors strongly advised the League to terminate the employee pension plan that was fully frozen in 2012. Rather than continuing to fund the plan (plus attendant insurance and management costs), we were fortunate to be in a financial position to offer participants either a lump sum payment or

an annuity. There was a \$1.7 million charge to eliminate this unknown future liability. The current market condition affirms our decision.

2. ACBLscore+ write off. A comprehensive software rewrite four years in the making was discontinued. We made a business decision to take the \$1.9 million loss.

To benefit our members, the ACBL is concentrating heavily in three areas:

1. IT: The money we're pouring into updating the League's technology infrastructure is money that should have been invested over the past 30 years. Our less tech-savvy members have been forgiving until now, but more modern users (i.e., anyone who knows what a mouse is) are not so patient. Everything is being reconstructed, from the membership renewal process, club sanctions and tournament scoring to player memos, servers and storage. It's expensive, but necessary. Recommended expenditures and implementation are being overseen not just by management, but by a knowledgeable board committee. We've also pulled in outside ACBL member experts to assist with our technology planning. The 2015 financials will show an

operating loss, primarily due to this investment in IT infrastructure.

2. TDs: Because the quality of tournament directing impacts a player's bridge experience, it is essential that we support TD recruiting and training programs. In the past two years, greater financial emphasis has been put on developing a structured development program and ensuring that TDs are paid equitably. Tournament-director session fees have been increased to help cover these costs.

3. "The War on Cheating": Your December editorial in Table Talk spoke eloquently to this topic, Mr. Hirschman. The ACBL must do more to catch and curb cheating. I have a task force of high-level players insisting on more screens (which come with additional costs) and greater technological surveillance, among other measures. These players speak for the majority of the NABC+ event-playing population. Nobody's naive enough to think these measures can be implemented for free. Rather than passing the costs on to the general membership or even to all NABC entrants, we've raised card fees specifically for NABC+ events to help sup-

port the environment that players competing in these events demand and deserve.

As I write this, reservations for the Reno NABC already far exceed our expectations, and staff is scrambling to find more hotel space. It looks like we're off to a good NABC year!

While some critics cherry-pick data points that support their negative view, I prefer to step back and look at the data as a whole. And what I'm proud to see is an organization earnestly serving its members and working hard to promote the greatest game in the world.

ACBL president's goals for 2016: We need to cut back

ACBL's 2016 president, Ken Monzingo addressed financial concerns about the league in his announced goals for the year:

...3. Finances. To work towards a better balanced budget I plan to create committees and task forces to file motions or actions to eliminate several excessive programs that have been "that's the way we've always done it." Waste elimination is to start at the highest and lowest

levels. I will be cutting my expected presidential travel budget by at least 25%. I will spend more time with boots on the ground in Horn Lake and online to work on these plans. I'll also take a close look at our board compensation history re: per diem, housing, travel, etc. If we will be asking management and players to tighten belts, we must do the same lest we have no real grounds to insist. Also, we should be more transparent in all our spending.

4. I have scheduled a couple of full board workshops for us in Reno to begin settling

some of our very expensive programs, including our involvement in world travel/play and how to handle it in the future. Not to simply discuss, but to get something done. The bleeding and bickering needs to stop. Under the microscope must also be our teaching stipends, advertising effectiveness, the Patron Member program (or lack of). The strategic program appears to be of utmost importance, but easy to become mired in politics and atrophy. Either it goes full bore, or goes south. We need to understand progress and reachable goals...

2015 MBA Treasurer's Report

	<u>2015</u>	<u>2014</u>
<u>RECEIPTS</u>		
Sectionals	4,582	1,677
Motor City Regional	5,912	11,190
NAP	(686)	(400)
Bid Boxes	210	0
Dues	3,202	3,027
Interest	170	157
Subtotal	13,390	15,651
 <u>EXPENDITURES</u>		
Table Talk	7,092	6,721
Honoraria	4,800	4,800
Office and postage	899	646
Board meeting	652	403
Novice trophies	0	413
District 12	419	439
Miscellaneous	1,011	681
	14,873	14,103
Gain (loss)	(1,483)	1,548
Cash balance at beginning of year	38,570	37,022
Cash balance at end of year	37,087	38,570

—ROBERT WEBBER, treasurer

**SOLUTION TO
AT THE WHEEL
From back page**

	NORTH	
	♠A32	
	♥6	
	♦AJ109	
	♣109873	
WEST	EAST	
♠Q9874	♠K106	
♥98	♥AJ10543	
♦Q6432	♦85	
♣J	♣Q2	
	SOUTH	
	♠J5	
	♥KQ72	
	♦K7	
	♣AK654	

Win trick 2 with a high heart, pitching a spade from dummy, and cash a high club to see they break. Make sure to save dummy's 3 of clubs, following with the 10, 9, 8 or 7 on the first four rounds of the suit. If you wish, you can cash a total of four club tricks, but not the fifth, keeping the 3 of clubs in dummy and the 6, 5 or 4 in your hand.

Next cash king of diamonds and lead another diamond, finessing. If the finesse loses, you have the rest of the tricks. Assuming the finesse wins, cash dummy's ace of diamonds, pitching a spade from hand. If the queen of diamonds does not drop, finish cashing the clubs, winning the

last club trick in your hand. Before the last club trick, this will be the position:

		♠A3	
		♥	
		♦J	
		♣3	
♠Q98			♠K10
♥			♥105
♦Q			♦
♣			♣
		♠J	
		♥Q7	
		♦	
		♣6	

On the last club, East must pitch down to one spade to hold onto two hearts. And West must pitch a spade to hold the queen of diamonds. Next, cash the queen of hearts. West is squeezed between diamonds and spades. Assuming he pitches a spade, you will toss dummy's diamond and score the last two tricks with the ace and 3 of spades. Making 6.

Saving the 3 of clubs so you have a late entry to hand means you don't have to cash your second high heart before taking the diamond finesse. It also leaves you in your hand as you finish cashing the clubs. If you were stuck in dummy, you would be cut off from your heart(s) and East would be able to throw hearts to keep a spade guard.

ONLINE MASTERPOINT UPDATE

Last year, I took the ACBL to task for seeming to give second-class status to masterpoints won on line. (Table Talk, March 2015) In particular, I chided the ACBL board of directors for its then-recent decision to include online points in a separate column of all printed lifetime masterpoint winners.

Subsequently the board rescinded that decision. Dennis Carman, District 12's representative on the national board, explains:

"The first vote on this issue was taken after many players, especially at the Board of Governors' meetings, expressed their feelings that it is easier to win points online, and that their hard earned club and tournament points are diminished by online players.

"After the board passed Motion #143-26 in Providence by a thin margin, 14-11, many constituents let their district directors know they were not happy with this action. These strong opinions provided the impetus for the new motion. The Table Talk article was not mentioned to me by any other board member, but certainly player opinions did have

influence. This topic has been discussed at the last few Board of Governors meetings and at the last few Board of Directors meetings.

"Online Bridge will have approximately one million tables this year, and regular club games will be around two million tables. Online bridge is expected to continue to grow. It appears that it will catch regular club games in the next 10 years.

"I have heard people asking about online tournaments (in fact, I had a plea to support them from a southwest Michigan player who is disabled with a disabled spouse for whom she provides in home care) but neither BBO [Bridge Base Online] nor the ACBL has made any proposal to implement such. Security is a major problem in such a move."

--M.H.

Welcome New Member

James McNamara

Welcome Transfers

Maralee Demorest

Kevin Fay

Adrienne Kanter

Owen Lien

MOVING UP...

Junior Masters

Betty Kaiser
Nancy Kanat
Max Rebner
Barbara Shapiro
Sheila Sikkenga

Club Masters

Thomas Allor Jr.
Inta Ertel
Barbara Gehlert
Brian Morton
Cynthia Robinson
Melvin Robinson
Charles Royer

Sectional Masters

Pearl Lim
Steven Miller
Lawrence Schiff
Joyce Van Ochten

Regional Masters

Miriam Forman
Carol Gove
Patty McCracken
Bob Ondo

Congratulations

New Life Master

Marlene Gouth

NABC Masters

Barb Ferrera
Mark Hugger
Charles A. Smith

Advanced NABC Masters

Genie Baker
Dennis Ebendick
Corey Powell
Graham Putnam

Bronze Life Masters

David Armstrong
Constance Jones
Jordan Kaye

Silver Life Masters

Richard Bauman
Marilyn Nathanson

Gold Life Master

Steven Jacob

Platinum Life Master

Norman Bolton

TOURNAMENT CALENDAR

Mar. 31-Apr. 3: Southfield sectional (MBA)

April 8-9: Bloomfield Hills I/N sectional

Apr. 9-10: GNT DISTRICT FINAL, Southfield

Apr. 23: Lansing I/N sectional

Apr. 28-30: Grand Rapids sectional

May 9-15: FARMINGTON HILLS REGIONAL

May 20-22: Kalamazoo sectional

June 6-12: TOLEDO REGIONAL

June 13-19: Spring STAC

June 23-26: Joint MBA-SOMBA sectional, Southfield

July 8-10: Lansing sectional

Aug. 5-7: Freeland sectional

Aug. 15-21: PETOSKEY REGIONAL

Aug. 25-28: Southfield sectional (MBA)

AT THE WHEEL
By Marty Hirschman

Matchpoints. None vul.

	NORTH	
	♠A32	
	♥6	
	♦AJ109	
	♣109873	
WEST		EAST
	SOUTH	
	♠J5	
	♥KQ72	
	♦K7	
	♣AK654	

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
--	--	2♥	2NT
Pass	3NT	All Pass	

Opening lead: 9 of hearts

East wins the ace of hearts and continues with the J of hearts.

East and West will both follow to the first round of clubs.

Plan the play.

Solution, page 25