



## News and Views

Sadly, two members have passed away since our last newsletter. Herman Stuifzand was a regular both in the Intermediate room and on Monday afternoons. I didn't know him very well but I talked to Tom Price who told me what a popular partner Herman was. He was born in Holland and came over to New Zealand in the 1950s, eventually starting his own business as a successful bricklayer and stonemason. He has been playing at the club since the 1990s and was, by all accounts, very keen. He was highly adaptable playing different systems with different partners. Tom particularly liked his wry sense of humour. Amongst Herman's other interests were fishing, bowls and following the gee-gees.

John Lenart played on Tuesday evenings. He was a 'natural' who claimed never to have read a bridge book in his life. All he needed to know was that an ace beats a king, a king beats a queen and that trumps beat everything else. Because he carried so little baggage of technique he could lay off for months and come back without any obvious deterioration in his game. He could also play with any partner, and make them look good. Evelyn Hurley has kindly written a tribute to him which appears later in this issue.

Our AGM was well attended at the end of March. One of the main talking points was the cost of running the club. As I noted in the president's report, our day-to-day outgoings significantly exceed the contributions from subs and table money. We can bolster our funds with sponsorship and grants but we are still on a downwards slope. After some discussion, a proposal that subs be increased next year to \$100 was passed unanimously. It was decided there should be a discount for

early payment, but it was argued that we could not determine what that would be until we are informed of the national levy.

On a brighter note, it was announced that the committee had recommended three new life members. Lorraine Stachurski, Don Kenning and Noeline Kenning will join the role of honour – and all well-deserved.

There were four changes in the committee. Bryan Northcott, Gayle Leader, Pam Mason and Graham Hubbard decided to step down. New members include Evelyn Hurley (Vice-President), Vivienne Morrison (Junior Rep), Susan Baty and Dorothy Hodges (general committee members.) Also, Lorraine Stachurski takes over as secretary (supported by Andrew Brodie), and Teresa Thorn moves from secretary to treasurer.

Thanks to Andrew Brodie who has brokered a deal with Julia Lawrence Retirement Village. They are now sponsoring our bidding pads, so you will start noticing their logo on our new improved pads.

Thanks to every one who turned up for the working bee to tidy up the borders at the bridge club. The volunteers did a lot to make the section look better. However, I think we should have left all of the shrubs on the Cuba Street side, although, admittedly, some were getting quite scruffy. I am concerned, however, that the lack of cover we now have on that side of the building makes us more appealing to mischief-makers. The white wall that is now exposed looks very inviting for any passing graffiti artist. If anyone has suitable shrubs that they could donate to the club to fill the gaps, then please contact a member of the committee.

The new set of lessons for novices start in July so it is not too early to suggest to interested friends or relatives that they might like to try the game. If you know any potential learners then get them to contact Bev Colville (ph 354 8290) or [bcolv@inspire.net.nz](mailto:bcolv@inspire.net.nz).

Ray Kemp

## Goulash Time

After about three tables on one Tuesday evening in March, my partner and I knew that the cards were going to be ‘challenging.’ That is, there were going to be strange distributions all over the place. Our fears were confirmed at the next table where Sue Parker observed that the dealing program on the computer seemed to be in goulash mode.

If you never play social bridge, you may not be familiar with the term ‘goulash’ as applied to the game. Basically, if the cards are getting boring, or everyone passes then each of the players arranges their suits in the same order before handing their cards back to the dealer. The cards are then dealt out without shuffling. To make it even more interesting they can be dealt three, four or even five at a time to each player. As can be imagined, this produces exciting hands. At times, during the evening in question, it seemed as if the computer card dealer was, indeed, in goulash mode.

One of the most bizarre hands occurred, for us, later in the evening. The deal is shown below:

<p>♠ AQT975432 ♥ T ♦ - ♣ Q87</p>	<p>♠ J8 ♥ J854 ♦ JT87 ♣ T93</p>	<p>♠ K ♥ KQ632 ♦ 9543 ♣ K42</p>
<p>♠ 6 ♥ A97 ♦ AKQ62 ♣ AJ65</p>		

Not that it matters too much but North-South were vulnerable against non-vulnerable opponents. My partner, East, was dealer and decided not to open, down-grading her singleton king of spades. After South opened with a diamond, North soon propelled the bidding up to six spades. South thought long and hard before passing. Presumably, he was contemplating six no trumps. Whatever East leads, it is all over.

Even if North takes the spade finesse losing to the singleton king, there is no way the defence can take any more tricks. A couple of other brave Norths bid the slam but many stayed in game. Some unfortunate North-Souths played in six no trumps and, after a heart lead went spinning off when the spade finesse failed.

As you might expect, deals with nine card suits only occur infrequently. I estimated that if you play one session a week then you might play a couple of deals a year where someone has a nine card suit. However, on goulash night there were, in addition, two deals with hands containing eight card suits. According to my rough calculations (again playing once a week) you should meet this situation once every eight years.

I have discussed extreme distributions before – in last May’s newsletter, in fact. Coincidentally(?), the nine card suit described there was in a very similar hand to the one given earlier. Just for comparison, here it is:

♠ AQJT65432  
♥ 8  
♦ -  
♣ A74

So, this analysis provides more evidence for conspiracy theorists to get their teeth into. Are the hands generated by the computer really random?

The answer to that is an unequivocal no. The only truly random events occur at the quantum level. Even coin-tossing can be fixed by a skilled flipper (remember this next time you are asked to toss for who plays NS.) A more sensible question is: are they close enough to being random, so that it doesn’t matter too much?

Pseudo-random number generation on the computer is normally achieved by some arithmetic jiggery-pokery. Typically, the computer starts with one number (the initial *seed*), and feeds that into a formula that generates another number. As well as being your first ‘random’ number, this becomes the new seed. It is fed back into the formula and out pops the next number. These pseudo-random number

generators are often very simple in structure. In the simplest case, each seed is multiplied by one number (the *multiplier*), and the result divided by another number (the *divisor*.) The remainder after this division becomes the next random number and so on.

As a trivial example, suppose your multiplier is 5 and your divisor is 11. If you select 4 as your initial seed, then your first random number is found by multiplying 4 by 5 (giving 20) and dividing by 11 (giving a remainder of 9.) The number 9 is now your seed for generating the next number.

Again, multiply 9 by 5 (giving 45), divide by 11 and take the remainder and out pops the next number 1.

Next multiply 1 by 5 (giving 5) divide by 11 and take the remainder, giving 5.

Next multiply 5 by 5 (giving 25), divide the result by 11, and take the remainder which is 3.

The first five 'random' numbers given by this process are 9, 1, 5, 3, 4. Since you are now back where you started, this would be a very poor number generator. You would cycle around these five numbers for ever.

In practice, the multiplier and divisor used by computers are much larger and chosen to reduce the chance of repetitious sequences.

Years ago, people thought that this was all that was necessary, until it was discovered that even with very large numbers in the formula, unforeseen patterns can occur. It would be interesting to know how sophisticated the random number generator on our computer is. Judging by its current performance, my assessment would be 'not very.'

It seems to me that most of the time the hands dealt and distributions of opponents' cards are much as one might expect. Just occasionally, though, the computer appears to go AWOL, spitting out outlandish hands for a while before lapsing into normality.

Ray Kemp

## **New Books in the Club Library**

Two books by one of the world's leading bridge teachers, Ron Klinger will be added to the club library. Both are aimed at 'keen improvers'.

The *Guide to Better Acol Bridge* takes you beyond the basics (as covered in Wayne Burrow's lessons) and will help you become a more competent and competitive bidder. Topics such as takeout doubles, shape showing, rebids and overcalls are dealt with in detail along with many others.

The *Guide to Better Card Play* concentrates on declarer play and defence and can be read by players using any bidding system. How often do you find to make a game contract and most other declarers in the room have made one more trick than you? Do you get frustrated with your defence when you find that you should have got the contract down? How often do you hear the comment, "We were lucky with the opening lead"? Reading this book could help you.

Each chapter has lots of exercise to work through which help your learning. These are not the sort of books to read in one sitting. You may find best approach is to try the problems in a chapter and then when you get incorrect answers go back and read the appropriate bits to find out why.

I can't claim to have read these books from cover to cover but I am slowly working through them choosing topics that I feel could help my bridge. Both books are recommended by several of us who have been using them.

Andrew Brodie

## John Nicholas Stephen Lenart

29 Nov 1946 – 28 Feb 2009



Johnny was well known to us at the club as a bridge player, a lawyer and one-time academic. He certainly made his mark in all of those facets of his eventful life, but of course there was much more to the man than that.

In 2007 with the help of a friend who was studying writing he published a book containing his memoirs – mainly of his early life, prior to the more “respectable” times. I’ve used the book (with the unpronounceable Hungarian title) to help with some aspects of his life, particularly the dates – Johnny had an impeccable memory for dates and numbers.

Johnny was born the 4<sup>th</sup> in a family of five to Olly and Francis who had emigrated from Hungary in 1939 as the war closed in and Jews in Budapest were in jeopardy. They lived in Karori and money was scarce. Olly and Francis were bridge players and bridge was their family pastime. As they grew up the boys (Tony, Johnny and Martin) played bridge, but as far as I know the girls did not. Olly became a New Zealand Women’s international during the ‘60s and represented us several times during the decade. Olly and Francis authored a bridge column prestigiously published in the Listener, featuring Mavis and Ponsonby, Junior, Junius and Junisimus – the thinly-veiled bridge-playing members of the Lenart family. The column featured hands from rubber bridge and from club play. It was a sad day when the Listener decided not to continue the home grown column but to replace it with a syndicated American one.

Johnny studied law at Victoria University and in 1972 took off on an extended OE including postgraduate study at Keele University in the UK. His adventures are recounted in the book....

On his return to New Zealand in 1980 his family encouraged him to play bridge competitively. We first met him playing

tournament bridge with Olly while younger brother Martin played with Francis. The brothers, especially Tony and Johnny continued to play bridge with success. Both became Grand Masters in the days when A-points were hard-earned. Tony became a New Zealand Seniors international and one of Johnny’s bucket-list items was to play for New Zealand. He was to have contested this year’s Seniors trials with his favourite partner Peter Bach. They were well-prepared, having won both the pairs and the teams at this year’s Thames Congress. Also counting amongst Johnny’s scalps was the Palmerston North Bridge Club Championship pairs – on a couple of occasions with Liz Burrows.

Johnny filled other roles in bridge as well as playing. At the time of his death he was the honorary solicitor for NZ Bridge and the NZ Congress official recorder.

Some of you may not know that Johnny’s other passion was cricket. He told me that when he came back it would be as a cricket commentator. His favourite ground was Lords and even in recent years he travelled to London to watch Tests from the members’ longroom. Over recent years Johnny led a more active life than his health would appear to have allowed him. He travelled overseas to weddings and to visit family and friends in the Northern Hemisphere taking in cricket whenever possible. We said goodbye and watched with admiration and bated breath, wondering if he would return – and each time he did, but he knew he was on borrowed time.

Johnny had the gift of making people feel worthwhile – one would always feel that life was to be lived while in his company. His family and their various extensions were very important to him, and another bucket-list item remaining unfulfilled was that of having a grandchild. Sadly, he missed this event. His first grandchild will be born later this year.

Johnny managed to live his life closer to the edge than most (especially we bridge players). Our lives have been the richer for having him as a friend. Thanks Johnny for the privilege of being counted amongst that throng.

Evelyn Hurley

Comment [B&E1]:

## Passing Virtue

Novices are often encouraged to bid more and pass less, but that is not always a good strategy. I was directing on the first Thursday in April (no, it wasn't April 1<sup>st</sup>) and, whilst entering results, must have clicked a wrong option in the scoring program. Consequently, the North-South phantom materialized as an actual pair. Obviously, the deals they played weren't very interesting since they passed all the time. However, that wasn't such a bad idea. They came fourth out of sixteen pairs with a score of 54%.

Ray Kemp

## Postscript (What the Deuce - Three)

A couple of members accepted the challenge of constructing a hand where each of the deuces wins a trick. Wayne Burrows produced the first correct solution, which is given below:

♠ T98	♠ AKQJ2
♥ AKQJ2	♥ T98
♦ 765	♦ 43
♣ 43	♣ 765

  

♠ 43	♠ 765
♥ 765	♥ 43
♦ T98	♦ AKQJ2
♣ AKQJ2	♣ T98

Assuming West is in the contract of 1NT, the hand plays out as follows:

T1:	<b>SK</b>	S5	S3	S8
T2:	<b>SQ</b>	S6	S4	S9
T3:	<b>SJ</b>	S7	D8	ST
T4:	<b>S2</b>	C8	CA	D5
T5:	HT	H3	H5	<b>HJ</b>
T6:	<b>HQ</b>	H8	H4	H6
T7:	<b>HK</b>	H9	C9	H7
T8:	<b>H2</b>	C5	DJ	CJ
T9:	D7	D3	<b>DK</b>	D9
T10:	<b>DQ</b>	DT	D6	D4
T11:	<b>D2</b>	CQ	C3	C6
T12:	CT	<b>CK</b>	C4	C7
T13:	<b>C2</b>	HA	SA	DA

In each trick, the winning card is highlighted. As Wayne points out, the deal has several interesting features. Each hand has a similar form with exactly the same cards and distribution, but in different suits, and each hand has exactly one card of each rank.

The play of the hand is notable since, in addition to each of the twos winning a trick, none of the aces does so. In fact, three of them are discarded on the last trick which is won with the two of clubs!

As Wayne notes, by moving the king and queen of spades to EW, they can make 3NT.

I also left you with the problem last time of determining what the highest possible no trump contract might be where all four deuces win a trick. If you remember, it can be shown that each hand must have exactly one deuce.

Given this fact, it is easy to work out the maximum number of tricks declarer can make. To lead a deuce, a player must have won the previous trick. Since they win that trick and the trick with the deuce, each player must win at least two tricks. Thus the opponents must win at least four tricks and declarer can, therefore, only win nine at most.

Ray Kemp