



NOT NEWS

1999

Editor: Peter Jamieson

Assistant Editors: Amy Scudder and Sheena Larsen-Jury

WHO'S THE MUG OR IT MADE THE BULLETIN ANYWAY

by David Stern

Sometimes we make plays which look so bizarre that we think - gee well if it works they'll write me up in the bulletin. I must say that this fleeting thought did cross my mind on one of the most bizarre plays I have ever made - no small statement with such a large selection from which to choose.

Most people know that I like a flutter from time to time. One of the expressions common among gamblers is that if you sit in a game and can't see the "patsy", you're it.

Round 13 Board 19
Dealer S Vul E/W

♠ K Q 10 8 7
♥ 9 8 7
♦ A
♣ A K Q 10 5

♠ J 9	♠ A 4
♥ 10 3	♥ 9 6 2
♦ J 10 8 7 5 2	♦ K Q 9 4 3
♣ 9 7 2	♣ J 8 4

♠ 6 5 3 2
♥ A K Q J 5 4
♦ 6
♣ 6 3

West	North	East	South
			2♦ (1)
Pass	2♥ (2)	Pass	2NT (3)
Pass	3♥	Pass	5♥ (5)
Pass	6♥ (6)	All Pass	

1. Weak 2 in a major
2. Game Interest Inquiry
3. Specifically A K Q x x x in a major
4. Which major
5. Hearts
6. ????

Well I knew that I wasn't the patsy in the bidding. I told partner I had six hearts to the AKQ so I could only assume that he was asking about the ♥J or ♥10 - I had the jack so proudly

NOT Round of Sixteen after 40 boards

Those underlined went through to the Quarter Finals, those not underlined have been knocked out.

<u>HINGE (33) vs NOBLE (85)</u>	<u>LUSK (80) vs BRAITHWAITE (67)</u>
<u>SHERMAN (22) vs HAFFER (79)</u>	<u>CHADWICK (109) vs SARGENT (18)</u>
<u>ANTOFF (55) vs NEILL (137)</u>	<u>ROBERTS (102) vs SPOONER (9)</u>
<u>PARFAIT (72) vs ROTHFIELD (153)</u>	<u>BURGESS (122) vs CLARK (78)</u>

NOT Quarter Finals

<u>LUSK (82) vs NOBLE (152)</u>	<u>CHADWICK (162) vs HAFFER (78)</u>
<u>ROBERTS (110) vs NEILL (120)</u>	<u>BURGESS (136) vs ROTHFIELD (116)</u>

Mixed Teams Top Five Results after 6 of the 10 matches (Swiss)

1st	12	DAWES	126
2nd	5	EWART	121
3rd	20	MOIR	119
4th	15	JOHNSEN	115
5th	18	NIXON	114

bid six hearts.

West led the ♠J. I knew him not to be a patsy, so was convinced that this was a singleton and ducked in the hope that the player on my right was the patsy and would duck with A x x. He failed this test when, with A x he won the ace and played

another spade back for his partner to - follow with the nine. Obviously he thought I was not the patsy.

It now became clear to me who was the patsy in the game - me.

Table Tally
as at 23rd
January 1999
6754

Table Tally will be
6902
as at end of play

WRAPPING UP

This is the 12th edition of NOT NEWS and as you read this, we will be dismantling our computer set-up. Amy and Sheena will be driving back to Sydney with the sound system turned up VERY loud. After two weeks of being 'nice' to the Editor (sound wise) its time to let loose.

NOT NEWS #13 will be posted on the Internet early next week with results of the NOT Semi-Finals and the final. It can be printed out on A4 paper and stapled to place with the 12 coloured paper editions thus providing a complete set.

It has been a tiring but enjoyable 12 days for us. Some of the early issues were a bit rough with typos and hands in the wrong spot. Your editor studied the Daily Bulletins from Lille to get a feel of their technique and presentation. Not having done high volume bridge writing and hand analysis + selection rejection type work since the early eighties I was rather out of touch.

When should hands be rotated for convenience? Must South always be declarer? There is probably a Bridge Writers Specifications document somewhere on the Internet that has the answers. NOT NEWS 99 was a bit "all over the place" but most people were able to solve the glitches and move themselves into "unusual positions!" to tackle the question posed. We tried to print the SWPT hands exactly as per the hand records since most people would have been through the hand records the previous day and become acclimatised themselves to that configuration irregardless of where they actually sat at the table.

Another thorny issue was whether a "good" hand should always be written by a person other than successful declarer, defender or bidder. It looks a bit self important to say "I dropped the stiff king and then did a hexagon squeeze". One way around this issue is to present a story incognito but then that detracts somewhat from the readers enjoyment. Lets face it, it's FUN to read about a hand that interested you and be given the actual names of all or some of the players at the table, particularly if they are famous. I think it is part of the role (and the buzz) of a Daily Bulletin.

And if you have a good hand, must you hope that someone will write it up for NOT NEWS or should you bashfully ask partner to put pen to paper or even ghost write it for your partner?

What if a contribution was a bit thin but was still a 'should go in' quality. How many words should I change to get the flavour across better or to temper the writer's exuberance or shyness. It is often annoying as a contributor to find some bridge publication editor has excised what you see as a key word and thus changed the flavour of what you were trying to say. And what about when an editor seems to have mangled your masterpiece beyond all recognition.

NOT NEWS 99's approach of letting most people select the catchy title to their articles and have their own 'by-line' proved to be popular and seemed to stimulate others to try to go one better.

Likewise with "Column 8 NOT". As more and more funny stories or oopses were printed it seemed to encourage more contributions which was great. Thanks to all those players who were willing to share their embarrassment etc even if it had to be incognito. These contributions were obviously genuine not manufactured to perhaps win some award or prize.

Our selected moments from the history of bridge series attracted interest which may have been due in part to the instalment approach. As you noticed we tried to give it an Australian slant.

The issue of printing old hands is complex and is worthy of an article on its own. We heard some quite positive comments about this concept. We all like to listen to a favourite CD many times so why not re-read a few 'great' hands. Besides entertaining you with 'old favourites' or sometimes unknown goodies, we hoped to stir up your grey cells and get your minds tracking on good quality bridge since many of you may have come straight from your workplace the previous day. We all know that by about Wednesday of the SWPT our 'counting' and visualisation skills are much better than on Round 1.

Now what about the thorny issue of

copyright? One evening late last year, I was discussing this with Chris Diment who produced an extract from a late 1998 IBPA bulletin. At the end of the minutes of the IBPA AGM was matter #12 "Other Competent Business" which said:

"12. Other competent Business There was an animated discussion about copyright. Mr. Jannersten reported that one law existed to protect authors but that practice in using it differed from country to country. Participants in the ensuing discussion were: Messrs Suri, Jourdain, Francis, Meyer, and Truscott. It was an ethical matter more than a legal one with which members needed guidance. The key points to emerge for consideration by the Executive as good practice by IBPA members were: Facts such as details of an actual deal were not copyright; Editors should not copy the words of a named author without crediting the author in the case of an extract, or asking permission in the case of the bulk of an article; authors who send the same words to more than one publication should tell the Editors what they have done; analysis of a deal is not copyright; if an author is employed then ownership of copyright is a matter between the author and employer, but others may work on the assumption that it is the employer who owns the copyright, particularly where the author is unnamed in such publications as Tournament Bulletins; further to this it could be good practice for such publications to have a clear statement regarding copyright of content so that contributing authors and prospective users of copy knew the published conditions; authors can give permission to specified third parties such as "other IBPA members" to reproduce their work; IBPA is a members' club where there is an assumption that the IBPA Bulletin may be expected to reproduce members' work without payment or permission, but readers of the Bulletin must treat copy within the Bulletin as having the same copyright as the original work; invented deals such as Par Hands or Double Dummy Problems should be treated as words, and subject to copyright

The Meeting adjourned at noon."

Judging from this quoted extract, the issue of copyright for Bridge writers is not set in concrete. Several bridge club proprietors and bridge newsletter pro-

ducers have asked me if they can reproduce or extract items from NOT NEWS 99. I told them 'go ahead' but I think it would be wise to obtain permission from the writers/authors (especially the professional bridge writers) if you wish to reproduce their article verbatim. Apart from copyright, it is only proper courtesy and most of the people concerned can be contacted very easily via Internet (Email).

As for the funny stories we printed it would be silly to try to quarantine them in some way. NOT NEWS 99 was suprised and pleased by the quantity, quality and variety of amusing and self incriminating stories received. We had hoped for half dozen at most, thinking that there probaly weren't many more funnies to be told or reported. How wrong we were.

My special thanks to Amy and Sheena. They did a great job... typing up hand written contributions, obtaining a huge quantity of scores, datums and names – much of this happening late at night or in the midnight to 2am period. By the way one of our overseas vistors told me that Barry Rigal recently did a Daily Bulletin for a major tournament in Italy and he and his team rarely got to bed much before 5am. Our latest was 4am on Friday morning. Working such hours means that spelling mistakes, typos and other related errors by all of us were inevitable. We hope there were not too many for you.

As well, Sheena and Amy designed layouts and demonstrated a wide variety of computer skills. For those of you who liked it, the interesting font we used for captions is called Carrick Groovy. Thanks to Sheena and Amy for discovering it amongst the hundreds to choose from. Writing and producing a Daily Bulletin in 1999 must be a lot easier than 5 or 10 years ago. The PC's and programs and software are more advanced and the fact that contributors can submit items via Email or disc is great.

In his two "Welcome" from the Con- vener messages printed in NOT NEWS # 1 and # 6, John Scudder asked you to support this daily bulletin.

Thank you for giving it.

Peter Jamieson, Editor NOT NEWS 1999

UNTITLED

by Sue Lusk

In one of the early rounds of the qualifying I played 1NT making 7 tricks after West led AK another diamond.

♠ A 10 9 2
♥ Q 2
♦ 10 7 4
♣ 10 8 5 2

♠ 7 6 5 4
♥ 4
♦ A K J 9 6 2
♣ 9 6

♠ Q 8 3
♥ A K 10 8 5
♦ 8
♣ Q J 7 4

♠ K J
♥ J 9 7 6 3
♦ Q 5 3
♣ A K 3

♦A, ♦K, ♦2 to Q (East pitches spades at T2 and T3), ♥ to Q and K, ♣Q to A, ♠J to A and Q!, ♥2 to J, ♠K - ♥ pitch. East thrown in with ♥ to give a club trick to dummy.

At the score up. My partner exclaimed to teammates 'you don't mean to tell me you bid and made 3NT on these cards!' To which my teammate replied 'On the rest of the match we played like L.O.Ls. On this hand we played like Juniors'.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE BULLETIN

by David Stern & Team 5 NCC

As the editor of a bridge club newsletter, I understand the difficulties of producing a bridge magazine of quality in a timely manner. It relies on the combination of good editorial staff, production staff and enthusiasm of the contributors. The latter is usually a reflection of the positive sentiments towards the bulletin.

It is with this background that I express my congratulations and appreciation to Peter Jamieson, Amy Scudder and Sheena Larsen-Jury on producing an excellent bulletin for this year's NOT.

Uncommon to bridge players, I have only heard compliments about the bulletin and felt the urge to express these feelings to the editors and production staff on behalf of my team and I am sure all people attending the NOT.

I hope that Peter, Amy and Sheena continue this fine work in NOT 2000.

COUNTING ON THE KING

by Richard Webb

The importance of counting was admirably demonstrated by Jim Wallis in the second session of the mixed teams. Playing with Ashley Bach the pair had bid five (yes five!) slams in a row! This was the fifth.

Board 16

Directions changed for convenience

♠ A Q 8 6 4 3
♥ 4
♦ 7 4 2
♣ J 10 3

♠ 10 9 7 5
♥ K J 9 8 5 3
♦ -
♣ 9 8 7

♠ K
♥ Q 7 2
♦ K 9 5
♣ K Q 6 5 4 2

♠ J 2
♥ A 10 6
♦ A Q J 10 8 6 3
♣ A

West	North	East	South
		2♣ (1)	2♦
2♥	2♠	3♥	4♦
4♥	5♦	Pass	6♦
All Pass			

North's decision to bid 5♦ convinced Jim to bid the slam. The lead was a club, to the J, Q, Ace. Jim played ♥A then ruffed a heart. Then he led a small club and East did well not to play his honour. Jim ruffed this then ruffed his last heart and played dummy's last diamond for a finesse of the king.

When West showed out Jim played ace and another diamond. In with the king of trumps East exited safely with a club (or so he thought). Not so, because when Jim trumped this he felt he had a complete count of the hand. He now played off all of his trumps coming down to two spades in each hand. East had shown just 10 HCP so Jim was convinced that the ♠K was offside and singleton. It had to be anyway for the slam to make. Accordingly he played the 2 to the ace dropping the king.

A fine effort, and making Jim a contender for free entry to next years NOT.

COLUMN X REVISITED

You may recall Column X in NOT NEWS # 9. Subsequently to that article we received a nice note from that contributor which we would like to share with our readers.

"Dear Editor,

Many thanks for your kind (?) words about my recent submission (HELP!). In retrospect writing on both sides of the paper was a bit much, but I'm trying to learn to be a thrifty Kiwi after years of exposure to American Consumerism (there - that takes care of the anonymity issue as well!).

Sorry my handwriting is/was so messy - about the only things of mine which are usually handwritten these days are bids and cheques. Both of which seem to be accepted with incredulity and disdain.

By the way, the NOT NEWS is really a top notch and I've looked forward to reading each new issue.

(The 'Dear Abby' idea is a great one - the trick will be to twist some expert's arm to do it!)

Sincerely,
Not so thrift, Kiwi."

BACH SYMPHONY

Richard Webb submitted an article with the above title complimenting Ashley Bach for making 6S on SWPT round 10 Board 17. Ashley had opened the long spade hand with 4S and moments later found himself in 6S after partner's RKB. The lead and sequence of play was identical with that taken by David Weston (refer NOT NEWS # 11). Well done to both David and Ashley.

Richard points out that at Ashley's table, with East West silent throughout, an astute East who sees the end position coming should painlessly bare the DK. Now if Ashley, in the same 4 card ending exits CK, the defence takes two club tricks for down one. David Weston was in a clearer position because his RHO had bid (supposedly showing 11-14 pts)

COLUMN 8 (NOT)

The bidding proceeded 1♠ Pass 2♣. Martin Willcox couldn't quite read Curly Del'Monte's writing suggesting it was a curly bid. When the hand went down as dummy in 4♠, it was indeed Curly - it contained ♣ Q x x and ♦ A K Q x x.

On reading partner's face...

Having led a card, I ask,
"Can I take back my lead? My partner doesn't like this one."

"Overheard" During the SWPT

As a lady made her opening lead, she fainted. After it was confirmed that she was OK, someone said, "it must have been a killing lead"

Good Sportsmanship

In round 12 team 27 played 87 and the agreed score was 32 to 40 with a win by team 27. Later next morning team 27 realised they has scored a slam on board 16 when in actual fact they did not bid it.

They reported this, which altered the result of the match from the significant 40-32 to 30-33. Team 87 had not detected the error.

Q What do politicians do after they die?

A They lie still

A SILVER LINING

by Eva Hardy

Mixed Teams 1999 Session 2 Board 24, Dealer West, Nil Vul

♠ J 10 9 8 6
♥ A 10
♦ 4 3
♣ 8 7 5 3

♠ A 7 6 5
♥ 8 2
♦ A Q 10 7 2
♣ Q 4

♠ 3
♥ K Q J 6 4
♦ J 9 8 6 5
♣ A K

♠ K Q 2
♥ 9 7 5 3
♦ K
♣ J 10 9 6 2

West	North	East	South
1♦	Pass	1♥	Pass
1♠	Pass	2♣ (1)	Pass
2NT	Pass	3NT	All Pass

(1) 4th suit forcing opening lead ♠J.

Unfortunately South failed to cover play the ♠Q at trick one. As a result E/W made 10 tricks for +430. At the other table with a different lead E/W made +490 so our team gained 2 IMPS swing. There was a sting in the tail - neither side bid 6♦ which was stone cold.

CONVINCED

SWPT Round 13 Board 19
Dealer S EW Vul

♠ K Q 10 8 7
♥ 8 7
♦ A
♣ A K Q 10 5

♠ J 9
♥ 10 3
♦ J 10 8 7 5 2
♣ 9 7 2

♠ A 4
♥ 9 6 2
♦ K Q 9 4 3
♣ J 8 4

♠ 6 5 3 2
♥ A K Q J 5 4
♦ 6
♣ 6 3

Another "no names" report from the National Convention Centre.

South reached 6♥ after North had bid spades West led ♠J. South was convinced the lead was a singleton and played a low card from dummy!

East was equally convinced and overtook ♠J with ♠A and returned a spade!

We are told this all happened at a low numbered table!!