

# ANC ~ melbourne ~ 2004

daily press ~ wednesday 28 july



## results

### open stage II

#### section a

		Score	Imps
1	N Rosendorff, A Kanetkar	268.0	197.0
2	C Snashall, D Smith	246.0	124.0
3	M Bloom, P Gill	235.0	90.0
4	P Gumby, W Lazer	234.0	107.0
5	M Bracegirdle, A Glasson	227.0	51.0
6	N Giura, N Hughes	211.0	3.0
7	E Adams, T Nunn	208.0	-9.0

#### section b

		Score	Imps
1	R Klinger, B Neill	246.0	136.0
2	V Gardner, M Courtney	231.0	66.0
3	B Haughie, Z Nagy	228.0	69.0
4	P Lavings, R Mann	227.0	57.0
5	J Bailey, A Richman	223.0	48.0
6	B Richman, G Gaspar	220.0	40.0
7	I Del'Monte, C Feitelson	216.0	20.0

### womens stage II

#### section a

		Score	Imps
1	J Hay, H Lowry	255.0	148.0
2	C Herden, P Evans	247.0	122.0
3	L Kalmin, E Urbach	241.0	112.0
4	J Courtney, R Kaplan	227.0	67.0
5	K Neale, H Renton	225.0	42.0
6	F Brown, J Brown	224.0	53.0
7	W Driscoll, D Greenfeld	205.0	-14.0

#### section b

		Score	Imps
1	M Woods, M Bourke	277.0	215.0
2	A Mellings, M Spurrier	236.0	86.0
3	M Watts, B Folkard	233.0	72.0
4	H Snashall, S Murray-White	225.0	42.0
5	C Lachman, C Mill	223.0	46.0
6	A Weber, S Richman	223.0	34.0
7	V Goldberg, S Gerdan	206.0	-8.0

### seniors ~ stage a

	Name	Score	Imps
1	P Grant, R Crichton	248.0	125.0
2	R Livingston, P Hill	243.0	124.0
3	B Thorp, A Struik	243.0	105.0
4	J McGeary, P Bayliss	241.0	100.0
5	B Mill, A Paul	236.0	87.0
6	J Ashworth, T Piper	236.0	79.0
7	P Kahler, J Collins	235.0	96.0
8	J Lindsay, F Lyons	230.0	61.0
9	E Ramshaw, J Brockwell	228.0	62.0
10	J Marks, E Auerbach	226.0	66.0
11	C Shugg, C Schwabegger	226.0	50.0
12	J Stretton, T Bloom	226.0	48.0
13	R Anderson, S Arber	224.0	47.0
14	E Nunn, P Nunn	219.0	30.0

### city edge eclectic pairs

1.	Peter Grant & Faye Grant	187.8
2.	Jan Clyne & Gay Collins	167.7
3.	George Lovrecz & Dr A Blecher	162.1



# daily press ~ wednesday 28 july



**timetable ~ thursday 29 July**

**championship**

Women's Butler	Stage III	11.00am 1.30pm 7.30pm
Open Butler	Stage III	11.00am 1.30pm 7.30pm
Senior's Butler	Stage B	11.00am 1.30pm 7.30pm

**congress events**

ANC Swiss Pairs Postfree Eclectic Pairs 3/5	10.00am
ANC Swiss Pairs Postfree Eclectic Pairs 4/5	2.30pm
Congress Swiss Pairs	7.30pm

**directors seminar**  
**10am saturday**  
**conducted by Martin Wilcox**  
**please advise the desk of your intention to attend**

**honest charlie**

Charlie claimed prematurely with the opponents still having 1 trump, when this was drawn to his attention **he** immediately called the director who ruled a contract that was about to make as 1 off.

Active ethics in action



**special event**

**toorak travel pairs**

**win a trip to Christchurch with 3 nights accommodation at the millennium hotel**

**saturday 31 july**

**clash of traditional rivals ~ bill jacobs**

Year: 1989  
Place: Macquarie Resort, Sydney  
Match: Final of Open Interstate teams, NSW versus VIC

Victoria took a big lead in the 60 board match, which NSW pegged back. With two boards to go in the final set, NSW were leading by 4imps. The large Vugraph audience equipped with hand records knew that the final board was a flat game, so it all depended on board 59. These were the North-South hands:

S 64  
H AK976  
D J54  
C A94

S AKQ6  
H 5  
D AKQ873  
C 62

**Closed Room**

West	North	East	South
Bagchi	Sawicki	Klinger	Gallus
	1H	2C	2D
Pass	3D(!)	Pass	3S
Pass	4D(!)	Pass	4NT
Pass	5H	Pass	7D
Pass	Pass	Pass	

The Bulletin censor has prohibited me from showing the East hand on which Ron Klinger overcalled 2C. But if I should let the phrases "4 card suit", "5 points" and "balanced" slip out, then you get the idea.

The overcall had a remarkable effect on the auction. Firstly, Bob Gallus's 2D bid now showed at least a 5-card suit (no negative double), so Henry Sawicki was able to raise on three. Then when Gallus bid 3S, Sawicki made the remarkable and match-turning decision to not show the club stopper, but repeat the diamonds. I don't know why he chose 4D (Henry did explain after the match, but the words came out so fast that I couldn't decipher them) - perhaps he reasoned that 5D should be safe, and that 3NT might not be the right contract with the single club stopper - picture partner with AKxx-x-KQxxxx-xx for example.

Now Gallus had little choice other than Blackwood in order to choose between 5D and 7D! If Sawicki had only one ace, Gallus could expect to have two club losers, whilst if he had two aces, a grand slam was a good bet. 7D made easily, giving Victoria a sniff.

Now the attention focussed on the Open room:

**Open Room**

West	North	East	South
N.Borin	Seres	J.Borin	Wilsmore
	1H	Pass	2D
Pass	2H	Pass	2S
Pass	2NT	Pass	6NT
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Tim Seres showed the general nature of his hand with his 2H and 2NT bids, but the diamond fit was never revealed. Avon Wilsmore couldn't sensibly bid a diamond grand slam after this start.

Victoria sneaked home by 6imps. It would be 15 years before they won again.

# daily press ~ wednesday 28 july



## story three ~ victor champion introduced by ian mccance

### Comment on Fanny's Coup

It is an accepted fact that the only thing barred in Aunt Fanny's weekly game with the girls is lying by word of mouth. Hesitating with singletons and high discarding with a flourish are almost automatic.

Either by design or accident, Aunt Fanny introduced a rare if dubious defensive play which is now known as Fanny's Coup. The oldest member was in 5♠ and a bad temper for they are pulling down Scott's Hotel where she used to hitch her horse and buggy.

	♠ J764		
	♥ AQ3		
	♦ K982		
	♣ 54		
♠ 93		♠ 108	
♥ 108		♥ KJ9542	
♦ J		♦ Q643	
♣ AQJ108762		♣ K	
	♠ AKQ52		
	♥ 76		
	♦ A1075		
	♣ 93		

West, who had bid clubs, led ♦J to Aunt Fanny's obvious disgust. The Old One took ♦K and led 2 rounds of trumps, intending to strip diamonds, taking the marked finesse, and lead a club, hoping to throw East in and avoid the heart finesse. However at trick 3, Aunt Fanny, while apparently fumbling for her last trump, dropped ♣K on the table. This so shook the Old One that she actually offered to let Aunt Fanny pick it up.

Righteously Aunt Fanny insisted that rules were rules and she'd pay the penalty for an exposed card. With a malignant glare the Old One stripped diamonds and led a club. West, a dozy 70 and normally a cardpusher, delved into the shallow depths of her bridge knowledge and came up with ♣A, ♣Q and ♥10.

After the Old One had gone one down these comments were heard: West (beaming from unheard of praise) "Of course I would have gone up with ♣A even if you hadn't shown me ♣K." North (putting down her knitting) "What happened?" Aunt Fanny (smugly) "Lucky it wasn't ♥K I dropped." The Old One was far away in Glenrowan talking to Ned Kelly.

## a rose is a rose ~ frank stewart

Dealer: South  
Both sides vulnerable

<b>North</b>			
♠	K 10 2	♠	A Q J 8 6 5 4
♥	J 6	♥	5 4
♦	Q J 7 4	♦	10 5
♣	8 7 5 4	♣	J 9
<b>West</b>		<b>East</b>	
♠	9 7 3	♠	A Q J 8 6 5 4
♥	9 3 2	♥	5 4
♦	9 8 2	♦	10 5
♣	K 10 3 2	♣	J 9
<b>South</b>			
♠			
♥ A K Q 10 8 7			
♦ A K 6 3			
♣ A Q 6			

<b>South</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>
2 ♥	Pass	2 NT	3 ♠
4 ♦	Pass	5 ♦	Pass
7 ♦!	All Pass		

### Opening Lead: Choose it

Rose, the member of my club whose generosity toward partners and opponents alike has earned our admiration, was West in today's deal. South brushed aside East's feeble intervention and bid an aggressive grand slam.

As the opening leader, Rose thought for a few moments and tabled a trump -- and East couldn't resist a caustic comment: "If I'd bid diamonds, would you have led a spade?"

Rose smiled and said nothing. South drew trumps and counted 12 tricks: four trumps, a ruff, six hearts and a club. He therefore led a heart to dummy and tried a club finesse with the queen. Down one.

### DIDN'T MATTER

"It didn't matter this time," East observed, "but next time, please lead my suit."

Rose tactfully said nothing. Tact is not admitting you were right in the first place. If Rose's opening lead is a spade, South makes the grand slam on a dummy reversal. He ruffs, takes the A-Q of trumps, ruffs a spade and gets back to dummy with the jack of hearts to draw the last trump and claim.

email your contributions to [cassiec@tpg.com.au](mailto:cassiec@tpg.com.au) or hand into the hospitality desk

# daily press ~ wednesday 28 july



## a tale of two cities~ michael courtney

Lionel Wright turned up at the Mind Sports Olympiad in 2000 wearing a T-shirt. It read "I barrack for two teams – NZ and anyone playing Australia". Robert Sheehan asked me if the rivalry was really all that intense. "Well" I began "Don't tell the Kiwi's, but we just pay lip service to it. The NSWelsh are too busy hating the Victorians. The Victorians too busy hating the NSWelsh. The rest of the country is too busy hating the national government, which is largely peopled with NSWelsh and Victorians."

Robert, a devout sceptic even before he heard a few of my stories, seemed unconvinced so I told him a little of the history of the rivalry between our two most populated states. The bit where we built our capital inland (in spite of the temperature and transport problems) to attempt to placate both states finally convinced him.

Let's face it. Melbourne and Sydney are very different places in spite of very similar cultural and racial backgrounds. Melbourne seems to sort their emigres into suburbs by race. In Sydney we make them drive a cab until they know where George Street is, then they can do what they like and live where they like. Why, even the rulings can be quite dissimilar, even very simple ones...

### The Twice Played Card

Andrew Markovics effected a delightful coup many long years ago. Dealers strong-No-trump was passed out in poor company. On lead with AKQ2 of spades Andrew tried a top spade. Dummy had nine points and the spade suit was 4333. Seconds later, 1NT, down one, was entered by all four players. Andrew looked up at his partner (perhaps for praise..). "Anyone would work out to cash the spade deuce" said his antique partner. "Yes, but not many people would have cashed it four times!" said a laughing Marko (before of course restoring the score to 1NT +2 as it should have been.)

Four times must be a world record, but (though the jest is older than Andrew) a twice played card certainly caused great confusion at my table on two recent occasions:

#### 1) Melbourne Ruling

On the first deal of the recent Melbourne VCC my partner led a heart to 3♦x. Declarer won the trick with the ♥10 and the trick was quitted (ie All four players turned their card over. Declarer then faced the ♥10 (in all innocence, as players will belatedly observing some wisdom in observing the pips played.) Since the first trick had been quitted, my partner routinely followed to trick two with a heart!

At this point I called the director (you are required to, when an infraction occurs. It is forbidden to make your own rulings. If you don't believe me, look into the one year Gabriel Chagas did NOT represent Brazil) and explained the situation. He ruled that partner's second heart was a major penalty card. (so 3DX made instead of failing by two tricks). I pointed out that this meant declarer had profited by their own infraction, but, as I later discovered, he was perhaps unaware that an infraction had occurred!

At the conclusion of the match I approached the chief director in order to get an appeals form. He suggested I read the rule book. I explained that I always have had, and always will have, more profitable bridge matter to read if that is my object. I had however very clear ideas about what the thing should contain, perhaps we could read it together. He was delighted (frankly I was not surprised but shocked) to discover that a player may look at their own card after the trick is quitted. He was nonplussed to discover that they may not face it however. It is frankly forbidden.

The appeals committee likewise ruled that the second heart was a Major penalty card. That there was no penalty for declarer's infraction. The full written product of the director and the appeals committee is given before I tell you of the ruling on the same issue at the NSWBA a week later!

#### 2) Sydney Ruling.

So the next Monday Jane Dawson and I played a match against Fred Curtis and the redoubtable (well I certainly have recurring doubts) Bob Sebesfi. Fred had eight spades, I had three, Bob and Jane had singletons. Bob led his ♠8 to trick one, Jane won and lost a heart finesse. Fred continued spades, Jane ruffed low and Bob (who had absent-mindedly replaced his lead on top his hand!) followed with the ♠8 instead of overruffing.

To some extent the ethics of the situation were unclear to Fred. Are you allowed to attempt to prevent partner from committing an infraction? To some extent I think Fred thought it was as funny as I did and wanted to see what ensued. Certainly the poker-face he held surpassed even my own.

After the defence had squandered a trick or two ensuring the one-trick defeat of 5♥X I called the director and told the tale. He invoked an unusual but admirable procedure. He said "I'm not sure" and went away and read the rule book.

He returned some 30 minutes later and asked "Where do you think I found it?" Only I hazarded a guess "under revokes?". At this suggestion Bob justifiably took umbrage. "I didn't have a spade, but I played one. How could anything be further from a revoke than that?" We all laughed heartily, but since he had failed to play a legal card to the trick it was indeed a revoke so 5♥x was +850

### The Point

I still haven't got to the point of the article yet! But if you're thinking "that's not right. Shouldn't the fellow just accept the umpires ruling and carry on?" then we have reached an impasse at which a very important point can be made. Which is, as usual, YOU ARE WRONG

The point is simple enough. If you feel that something awry has occurred you **must** call the director. If the directors ruling is not compelling you **must** appeal. Having done those things the outcome is a matter of public record and it is legitimate to pursue the issue in the press, indeed the courts.

What you must never do is fail to call the director, then complain privately about the opponent's actions/ethics. The reason for this is beyond the mere rules of bridge. One of the most basic of human rights is the right to face your accusers and defend yourself. That opportunity does not arise if variously, the director, the appeals committee and the press are not invoked.

If, for example, you mistrust some of your opponents actions, fail to draw this to their attention by calling the director, then take the matter to the Recorder (for that is exactly his function) you (and he) have committed an extremely serious crime. You may say "Hang on, that's what the organisers told me to do. It must be legal." And if they told you to rob a bank? Would that then be legal?