



Bridging the gap

KALAMUNDA DISTRICTS BRIDGE CLUB NEWS

17th August, 1977.

Vol.2 No.17

EDITORIAL

I have just heard straight from the horses mouth the result of the final of the State Open Teams event held last Monday night at the W.A.B.C. After being 39 IMP's down on the first night, Mike Hopper, Jack Lever, Leiv Bornecrantz, Charlie Frugte and Les Calcraft pulled back 21 IMP's but were defeated by David Schockman, Harold Pearson, Charlie Lim and Tuk Min Chin 112/94.

A good representation of the K.D.B.C. saw the Richardsons off last Tuesday week on their trip to the other side of the world. I hope they have as big an impact on the U.S.A. as they did on our club!! I would like to say that we are already missing Lynn because it seems that she is the only one who has the official date for the club's Open Teams Competition - so hurry back Lynn, we are lost without you.

I hear on the grape-vine that congratulations are in order to the old indefatigables, Ramsay/Teague and Turley/Turley who thrashed Canning (Cave), hitherto unbeaten leaders of Division 2, 20 - 0. Well done to the four of you. Perhaps we should consider promoting these pairs to Division 1 next year? I believe I also have to congratulate young Rod Charters who has started making his presence felt in the Bridge community by coming second a few Saturdays ago at the C.T.A.Club.

It was nice to see one of our members of long standing pay a return visit to the club last week. Welcome back to Sylvia Parker and don't leave it too long before making a return trip.



GARAGES—Low, low prices yet engineering quality
in materials and construction.

South of the River Congress.

The above Congress held by Canning Districts Bridge Club on August 6th/7th was by far their most successful venture to date. Kalamunda Bridge Club members had varying successes, with Bob Prince, Mike Hopper, Jeff Lathbury and Jack Lever winning the Teams on Sunday night, and Claudine and David Charters winning the consolation on Saturday night. Connie McCullough and Ellen Prince were runners-up in the consolation. Well done to all concerned.

An open letter to a Club Champion.

Dear Bob,

Winning isn't everything

Belated congratulations on winning the Club Aggregate Pairs Championship for two years running, with Roy Goddard in 75/76 and with Hans Rosendorff in 76/77. The achievement is unprecedented and remarkable; so are the statistics.

In 75/76 the figures were 55.6% from 25 scores - the lowest ever winning average from, what was at that time the lowest number of scores. This year the figures are 58.5% from 22 scores - the highest ever winning average from, this time, the lowest possible number of scores. And it is this latter which causes me concern.

The regulations of the competition lay down a minimum of more than 40% of the maximum played in the competitive year, ie in a 52 week year, the minimum is 22 scores. You suggested in committee, some time in 75/76 that a requirement of only 2/5ths of the possible was not enough and that the minimum should be raised to 50%, ie 26 scores in a full year. I disagreed. I said that there were many factors which might prevent a player from playing at the club, eg holidays, sickness, family commitments, other Bridge activities, etc. I argued that, when applied to a pair, these factors could well double but not necessarily coincide, and consume more time. With the best will in the world any pair, both of whom lead active family/social lives, could be very hard pressed to achieve 22 scores. However, the committee was persuaded to accept your point of view, committed the club to a 26 score minimum this year and I thought that you and I would have to agree to differ on this point for evermore.



PATIOS—Rich marviplate woodgrain finished solid steel beams and pure white colorbond. Just one of our range—all at low low prices.

Therefore I was very surprised when, at a meeting last year, you voluntarily renounced your case whereupon the committee rescinded its previous decision. Now (and I suppose this is where the letter really begins), I wish to argue in favour of raising the minimum. My reason for doing so is, ironically enough, your own performance.

In 75/76 you and your partner stopped at 25 scores. You chose to make a tactical withdrawal, drop out of the competition, beat a hasty retreat, call it what you will; you simply stopped competing. In my opinion you avoided playing at the club because your form was going through a bad patch, your progressive average was sliding and you were in danger of being overtaken. This year you and your partner calculatingly acquired the required minimum number of scores and then stopped, even though your score was unbeatable. You chose to make a tactical withdrawal, etc, etc. I agree that most of the reasons for this withdrawal were beyond your personal control; nevertheless you co-operated in the exercise.

The competition is intended to cater primarily for that large majority of club members who, week in week out, support the fundamental activity of the club. It provides a continuous measure of in-club performance for all club members, a competitive incentive for competitive players, a focus of interest for interested players and, ultimately, formal recognition as 'The Best Club Pair' of the pair who, playing as often as is reasonably possible in the regular club sessions, produce the best year-long average. In my opinion your wins, whilst fulfilling the letter of the regulation, offended against the spirit of the competition, devalued the competition in the eyes of that vital large majority of the clubmembers and reduced the standing of the competition to the level of just another pot-hunt. The Best Club Pair must surely be the pair who play as often as is reasonably possible in the regular sessions, display a clear willingness and intention to play as often as is reasonably possible in the regular sessions and is prepared to remain in the line at every possible opportunity. This you most demonstrably did not do, neither this year nor last.

So, as I am unable to think of a better way of discouraging such pot-hunting, I intend to press for an amendment to the regulations, calling for a minimum number of scores of more than 50%, ie 27 scores in a full year. Again I congratulate you on winning the championship; I dearly regret the manner of your winning. It is, or it used to be, alien to the Kalamunda club style.

Yours sincerely,

Peter.



ENCLOSURES—A most economical method of quality exterior home improvement designed to build more for your money.

Bob Prince has read this copy and is most upset and will write a reply in the next issue, so watch this space!!

Club Results - 3 Aug 77

Farewell performance by Richardson/Richardson - 54.8% is not a triumph but it matches their club form Reversion to form for our recent shooting stars, Doepel/Doepel - 45.6% and Harvey/Harvey - 46.1% visitors from Swan Districts top E/W, just pipping Teague/Teague who are competing together for the first time since May 76 - as competent as ever Hubbard/Pratt excel N/S and Charters/Charters return score identical to last session.

N/S		E/W	
Hubbard/Pratt	60.9	de Blank/Loveland	63.9
Peck/Peck	60.0	Teague/Teague	61.8
Hopper/Kirby	57.3	Charters/Charters	57.7
Cox/Price	56.1	Hart/Helliwell	56.1

PS - Corrections to article 27 Jul 77: 4th place E/W; Delete Ramsay/Teague, insert Turley/Turley. Ref Win by Doepel/Doepel; delete Benefit Session, insert Gala Performance. (It proves that somebody reads us, Joan. Kib). Anyway, apologies to whoever feels in need of being apologised to.

Club Results - 10 Aug 77

Only 7 Tables and a flat field - no one really successful Charters/Charters less unsuccessful than most 15½% covers the whole 14 prs. - another low top Brodie-Hall/McCullough and Hubbard/Pratt vying for title of Club Yo-Yos (look at your results!) two incidents affect scores of 5 prs - a switched board and loud discussion of a board - cost Turley/Turley outright 2nd and reverses positions (and percentages) of Gartner/Hardman (culprits) and Hopper/Kirby (victims) we must sharpen our table habits and etiquette.

Charters/Charters 58.7%; Brodie-Hall/McCullough 56.6%;
Turley/Turley 56.6%; Ramsay/Teague 53.55; 51.4%.



FACTORIES—Designed and built to suit your exact work operation, economically.