



# NOT NEWS

2000

Editorial Team: Peter Jamieson and Tina Zines

Production Team: Amy Scudder and Sheena Larsen-Jury

## FRIDAY FORTUNES

by Tina Zines

In Round 7 bold slam bidding figured on Board 10 in the match between the leading BLINMAN and TOBIN teams.

<p>♠ A J 8 6 5 ♥ - ♦ A K J 7 6 3 ♣ A 3</p> <p>♠ K 7 4 3 ♥ 9 6 5 2 ♦ 4 2 ♣ J 10 5</p>	<p>♠ Q 2 ♥ A Q 10 7 4 3 ♦ Q 10 8 ♣ 4 2</p> <p>♠ 10 9 ♥ K J 8 ♦ 9 5 ♣ K Q 9 8 7 6</p>
--	--

West	North	East	South
Foster	Dressler	Molloy	Johnman
		2♦	Pass
2♥	X	Pass	3♣
Pass	3♠	Pass	3NT
Pass	5♦	Pass	5♠
Pass	6♦	All Pass	

The dreaded queen doubleton of declarer's side suit strikes again here. You have to lead it to defeat the slam, which was not bid at the other table. This pickup was not enough to save the match, won by BLINMAN 18-12.

This board might have had a very different result for the MOIR – TRAVIS match.

The bidding went:

West	North	East	South
Godfrey	Hay	Courtney	Moir
		2♥	3♣
3♥	4♥	Pass	4♠
Pass	5NT	Pass	6♣
Pass	6♠		

Moir assumed Hay's 4♥ cue showed a huge two-suiter and gave preference with 4♠. 5NT was the general grand slam force we saw this pair wield in the first session. 6♣, I believe, showed no interest whatsoever. North no doubt

## TOP 10

### National Womens Teams (72 teams)

Congratulations to the six qualifiers for the next stage.

			VP's
1st	1	B TRAVIS, E HAVAS, J COURTNEY, A CLARK, L GODFREY	178
2nd	4	D MOIR, H PITT, R NAILAND, J HAY	176
3rd	2	J CORMACK, J ALABASTER, V CUMMINGS, C FEITELSON	172
4th	8	G TUCKER, A KEMPTHORNE, L RICHARDS, S COLLINS	165
5th	12	L KING, C WRIGHT, R TOBIN, C HERDEN	164
6th	7	J TOBIN, D MCKINNON, V DRESSLER, K JOHNMAN	163
7th	11	A BOOTH, L SHIELDS, K PICCOLO, J DEL PICCOLO	158
8th	3	M SCUDDER, I GLANGER, E URBACH, L KALMIN, L STERN, B FOLKARD	157
9th	9	P BLINMAN, M FOSTER, M ROBB, C MOLLOY	155
10th	15	M FLYNN, P CRICHTON, N CHURCH, F SMYTH	154

### National Seniors Teams (74 teams)

Congratulations to the two finalists.

1st	1	B HAUGHIE, G LORENTZ, J BORIN, J LESTER	205
2nd	6	G VARADI, L VARADI, J NEWMAN, L KALMIN	181
3rd	44	A FITZPATRICK, J DONOHOO, R OGBORNE, B MADGWICK	170
4th	10	L CALCRAFT, C GODDEN, E EZRA, L FREDERICKS	166
5th	4	L KNIGHT, E GALLIE, B HOFFEINS, P HOFFEINS	163
6th	9	G BRANTON, J BRANTON, C SCHWABEGGER, P CUNDASAMY	158
7th	7	R FOLKARD, R MILWARD, D SMITH, D SMEE	157
8th	36	D KAHAN, K LEE, M PETRIE, B GESUNDHEIT, G WIKINSKI	157
9th	23	E VAUGHAN, R VAUGHAN, L SHAW, J DRAKE	155
10th	25	W JAGO, P JAGO, S TISHLER, R HOLSMAN	154

### National 0-149 Teams (42 teams)

1st	103	P FLYNN, R COWAN, P TSE, E TSE	166
2nd	134	V HOLBROOK, R NEVILLE, R HUTCHINS, P WAIGHT, R GALLAGHER, J CLARKE	164
3rd	109	C BAILEY, T STEWART-UDEN, A CURTIS, P THRESHER	142
4th	115	P GILES, J COLLIER, G LYNGA, C LANDAU	141
5th	106	K HUIGEN, K WAYNE, J MASTERS, J GROSS	137
6th	131	B ROSENBERG, B ROSENBERG, J STEWART, R BAILEY	137
7th	133	J MURRAY, S MURRAY, J THOMAS, J PEITI, E VOVERIS, L LEWIS	130
8th	112	M COSBY, M DRISCOLL, M LAMPORT, F MASSIDDA	130
9th	114	B GOSS, D TURNER, J SEAR, E MOENS	130
10th	123	M CLARKE, D CLARKE, K CROUGH, J SELLECK	129

envisaged more than ♠ 10 9 when she converted to 6♠.

6♠ has no play, going 2 down. 6♣ however has interesting possibilities. If the likely heart is led declarer will duck to East's ace. Now, again, only a spade switch into the jaws of dummy's side suit will defeat the contract. As declarer cannot set up diamonds without promoting West's ♣J.

Strange to relate, Liz Havas had to go 2 down in 4♠ at the other table on an awkward club lead. An unusual way to get a flat board.

SCUDDER and TUCKER, lying in 7th and 8th position on 110, 11 IMPs behind the leading BLINMAN team, met in Round 7.

SCUDDER won decisively 24 - 6 putting them in 4th place. Two slam pickups helped them to victory.

*Board 11 Dealer South Nil Vul*

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

West	North	East	South
Glanzer		Scudder	
		Pass	
1NT(1)	X(2)	3♠	Pass
4♣(3)	Pass	4♥(3)	Pass
4♠	Pass	6♠	All Pass

- (1) 14-17
- (2) single suiter
- (3) cues

That was 11 IMPs in when Tucker and Richards stayed in game at the other table.

A swing on this board held the MOIR – TRAVIS match to a 16 – 14 win to MOIR. Both Easts played in 6♠. Barbara Travis led ♣10. Helene Pitt rose ace but went down when she misplayed spades. At the other table a low club was led and Jill Courtney finessed at trick one. SCUDDER's other big pickup came on

*Board 14. Dealer West Nil Vul*

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

Inez and Marcia had an uninterrupted auction.

West	East
2♦ <i>Multi</i>	2♥ <i>Pass or correct</i>
2NT 20-22	3♦ <i>Transfer to hearts</i>
3♥	4♣ <i>cue</i>
6♥	

At the other table team-mates Linda and Berri made things a little more difficult for EW

West	North	East	South
Collins	Folkard	Richards	Stern
		Pass	Pass
1♣	2♦	2♥	2♠

4♥  
Another 11 IMPs in.

Going into the final round of the Womens the standings were:

MOIR	160
CORMACK	158
TOBIN	157
TRAVIS	154
BLINMAN	149
TUCKER	141

And, most unusually for so late in the tournament they were all playing each other.

As always in these events, there were some bolters. TRAVIS defeated TOBIN 24 - 6 to take first place for the very first time in the tournament. "We Swissed it to our seeding," commented Barbara Travis.

The defending champions had to be content with second place after their quiet 16 - 14 win over CORMACK, who slipped to third.

TUCKER blitzed BLINMAN 24 - 6 to finish fourth and oust BLINMAN.

KING who had been lying seventh

defeated PHILLIPS 24 - 6 to take fifth qualifying spot.

In the mayhem around the scoreboard it was difficult to discover much about the action at the tables, but Jan Cormack's play in 3NT from the West seat on Board 4 was admired by all.

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

On ♣Q lead, Jan won and played ♥K taken by the ace. The club return was won by North's ♣9 and the ♠10 switch was taken by Jan with the ace. She then played a low heart to the queen. Now a low diamond to the king and back to the ♠K. A low heart exit endplayed south.

The excellent slam on Board 13 fails on the best line.

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

Margot Brown and Rena Kaplan liked their sequence to 6♠ - they had just the gadget to bid it with confidence.

North	South
2♣ (4441, 5440 10+ big balance)	2♦ (9 + any)
3♦ (14-16 sh. maj)	3♥ (which?)
3♠ (hearts)	4♣ (exact shape)
4♠ (40 54)	4NT (RKCB in ♠)
5♥ (without Q)	6♣

On the lead of ♠K the best chance, given the poor communications between the hands, is the ruffing heart finesse. On this hand it leads to defeat.

# Youth Final Results

## Teams Championship

1st	A <b>BACH</b> , M Murphy, J West, M Prent	177
2nd	T <b>NUNN</b> , K Robb, P Brayshaw, G Dupont	172
3rd	N <b>CROFT</b> , L Matthews, J Maddison, A Lasocki	154

The New Zealand winning team are of course ineligible to play for Australia. Hence NUNN and CROFT contested a play-off yesterday for the right to represent Australia at the Zone 7 play-off against New Zealand in Hamilton NZ later this year.

The South Australian CROFT Team came from behind to win comfortably.

In our first Under 16 Pairs Championship, contested by 8 pairs from Canberra, Sydney and Melbourne, the winners were a mixed pair, Melanie Simpson and Robin Stevenson.

The organizers were very happy with the increased numbers attending. Youth Bridge is up and away!



## Mens Pairs Results

After 3 rounds the final result of this event is as follows:

1. Roberts - Smart	943
2. Griffin - Milovanovic	933
3. Bilski - Prescott	925
4. Snashall - Hills	921
5. Dyke - Bach	919
6. Gold - Ebery	901
7. Konig - Wallis	893
8. Ozanne - Ozanne	881
9. Wenger - Rothman	872
10. Burgess - O'Hara	864
11. Kempthorne - Ward	860
12. West - Prent	847
13. Fordham - Hughes	838
14. Marinos - Kahler	835
15. Chrapot - Halmos	829

# YOUTH VIGNETTES

by Mark Abrahams

With three rounds to play in the Australian Youth Teams, the top four teams (Robb, Croft, Wyner, Pyrite) were all yet to play each other in the round robin and the scores were bunched. Tension was high, and there was even the suggestion that an appeal would result from the Croft-Wyner match - in Youth Bridge!

In the second last match Pyrite (Wilkinson, Abraham, Johnson, Gold) played Nunn (Nunn, Robb, Brayshaw, Dupont) when the following hand arose:

Board 5 Vul NS Dir North

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

Sitting North I opened 1♥ (4+♠ 0-3♥ around 10-15 HCP) and at favourable vulnerability Kylie Robb produced a 5♣ bid. The heat was now squarely on Michael Wilkinson in the South seat.

Kylie purred contentedly as Michael squirmed. Magic cards exist to make grands in hearts, spades or notrump, but he wisely settled for the prosaic 5♥. After passing this out and preventing Tony Nunn from leading out of turn (again), Kylie tabled the J♣ lead.

Dummy presented and there are two diamond losers and a trump loser if hearts are 3-0 offside. Then I looked at the club position and stifled a chortle... Could Kylie have led J from KJ10? After the club honours crashed on trick one and the appropriate derogatory comments were made about Kylie's suit, I had to concede one down since the missing spade honours were not doubleton. Teammates only "pushed" the opponents to 4♥ so that was twelve IMPs out.

In the final match against Wyner (Wyner, Wiltshire, Krochmalich, Ware) this hand arose

Board 27, Nil, S deals

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

There were two passes to me in the North seat. The system bid available to me was 1NT (balanced 11-14 no major). With my honours stacked in short suits, a barely extant minor suit and the view that partner opens almost all 10-counts and shapely ones below that, I elected to pass. Fourth hand thought little about passing and we shrugged - diamond and spade partials did exist however.

At the other table, Leigh Gold, sitting West, hit upon the flawed Acol 1♠ opening and his partner, Tim Johnson duly gave a 2♣ response. The 2♠ rebid had sights of sugar-plum fairies in Tim's eyes, and since he rated partner 75% to accept an invitation in spades, he bid game himself. Truly a youth 4♠, missing 6 tricks against almost all distributions and defences!

North duly lead K♣ and declarer surveyed dummy. Clearly club tricks were required and dummy's entries were few, so the K♣ was ducked and North decided on the timid spade switch. Leigh drew four rounds of trumps (overtaking the Q♠) and led up another club to the J, again ducked. North settled for the prosaic K♥ exit which Leigh duly won. A club to dummy allowed Leigh to part with his diamond losers. In the 3-card ending North had retained his 10♥, so when a diamond was ruffed to hand, Leigh could lead up to the J♥ for his tenth (and final!) trick. +420 and nine IMPs in!



## DOUBLE TROUBLE

by Richard Hills

My team of Charlie Snashall, Arjuna Delivera, Hashmat Ali and Richard Hills had won the Bermuda Bowl of the Summer Festival last year – the Bridge Buffs - and decided to defend our title.

The Grand Final was played against the Tasmanian team of Richman, Richman, Bailey and O'Rourke. There was a hush from the kibitzers (because there weren't any) when Board 20 appeared.

Vul All. Dealer West

HILLS  
 ♠ 5 2  
 ♥ A Q 9 5  
 ♦ A 6 4  
 ♣ K 9 6 4

O'ROURKE  
 ♠ K 4 3  
 ♥ J 8 7 6 3  
 ♦ Q J 10  
 ♣ J 8

BAILEY  
 ♠ A Q  
 ♥ 10 4 2  
 ♦ K 9 7 2  
 ♣ A Q 7 5

ALI  
 ♠ J 10 9 8 7 6  
 ♥ K  
 ♦ 8 5 3  
 ♣ 10 3 2

<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
Pass	1NT (1)	X	XX (2)
Pass	2♣	X	2♠
X	All Pass		

(1) 11 – 14  
 (2) Weak one-suited takeout. Requires a 2♣ response.

O'Rourke's natural lead of the queen of diamonds would have defeated the contract. But the penalty double of 2♣ swayed him to the jack of clubs lead – king, ace. Bailey too guessed wrong when at trick two he returned a club to partner's ten – whoops, eight.

Hashmat now unblocked the hearts, discarding two diamonds on the A Q, and scored up +670. The doubles assisted in our double victory.

Next year we will be back to try for the treble.

♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣

## WRONG PLACE, WRONG TIME

Reprinted with permission from the daily bulletins from Bermuda. Not one of our happiest matches in the Bermuda Bowl.

Indonesia's Bermuda Bowl was hot from the start in Sunday's round-robin matches. Their first victims were the Australian team, who fell, 60-11. In subsequent rounds, Indonesia took the measure of China, 70-39, and Argentina, 49-21, and moved into second place in the round-robin standings.

Here are some of the key deals in Indonesia's match against Australia in Round 4.

Board 3. Dealer South. EW Vul

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

In the closed room, Kokan Bagchi opened 3♦ with the South hand and was raised to 5♦ by Seamus Browne. Bagchi lost a spade and a club for plus 400. At the other table - where Ishmael Del'Monte and Bobby Richman opposed Henky Lasut and Eddy Manoppo — there were fireworks.

<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
Del-Monte	Manoppo	Richman	Lasut
1♠	X	4♠	5♦
Pass	Pass	X	Pass
Pass	XX	All Pass	

Lasut passed up his chance for the aggressive opening diamond preempt, but he was not reluctant to bid his suit opposite his partner's takeout double. Richman, mistakenly taking his partner's opening bid seriously - and no doubt expecting to take more than one club trick — applied the red card. There was nothing to be done after the redouble. Running to 5♠ would have probably resulted in the same score as 5♦ redoubled - minus 800 (two high

hearts, heart ruff, with tricks to come in spades and diamonds). That was 9 IMPs to Indonesia.

The next board was worse for Australia.

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul

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

<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
Panelewen	Browne	Tobing	Bagchi
Pass	1NT (1)	2♣ (2)	X (3)
2♦	X	2♠	X
Pass	2NT	Pass	3NT
All Pass			

(1) 12-14  
 (2) One-suited hand  
 (3) Values  
 Even with the lead of a low spade by East, Browne could manage only seven tricks for down two and minus 200. At the other table:

<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
Del-Monte	Manoppo	Richman	Lasut
Pass	1♦	1♠	X
2♠	Pass	4♠	X
All Pass			

Richman no doubt expected - or at least hoped for - a better dummy. The best he could do was minus 500 - another 12 IMPs away. In two slam swings that went against Australia, the opening lead was critical.

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul

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

Browne and Bagchi bid the North-South cards to 4♠, making six on the lead of the ♦J, thanks to the convenient placement of the ♦9. In the open room:

<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
Del-Monte	Manoppo	Richman	Lasut
			1♣ (1)
Pass	1♦ (2)	Pass	2♠
Pass	4♣	Pass	5♣
Pass	5♥	Pass	6♠
All Pass			

- (1) Strong, artificial and forcing
- (2) Negative

On any lead but the ♦J, Lasut would have had to guess what to do in diamonds. Unfortunately for Australia, Del'Monte chose just that card. Play was over quickly and Indonesia had scored another 13 IMPs.

Board 11. Dealer South. Love All

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

<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
Del-Monte	Manoppo	Richman	Lasut
			1♣
Pass	2♣	Pass	2♥
Pass	3♦	Pass	3♠
Pass	3NT	Pass	4NT
Pass	5♣	Pass	6NT
All Pass			

At the other table, 6NT was declared by South, and West found the lead of the ♦K. When the club finesse failed, the contract was down. The killing lead was much more difficult for East to find, and indeed he started with a heart, giving Manoppo time to set up the necessary club tricks. Australia suffered another loss, this one of 14 IMPs.



by Tina Zines

The heading for this item is unashamedly borrowed from the title of a book by Rixi Markus, one of England's greatest players. It features a hand played by Carol Rothfield who is currently partnering husband Jessel in the Bermuda Bowl. The account was in AB's report on the 1998 SNOT, won by the Rothfield team, and is reproduced with the kind permission of editor Stephen Lester.

What slam would you like to be in with the EW cards?

<b>WEST</b>	<b>EAST</b>
♠ Q J	♠ A 10 8 5 3 2
♥ A 6 2	♥ K
♦ A 10 9 7 6 3	♦ K J
♣ A 8	♣ K 9 6 2

Carole and Jessel bid the EW hands to 6♠, played by Carole from the East seat. Carole received a club lead and elected to win in hand with ♣K in order to retain as many entries to dummy as possible.

She next made the safety play of a low trump towards dummy's bare QJ, which succeeds against all 4-1 trump breaks and half the 4-1 diamond breaks. This was an example of good technique, as well as good bidding. 6♠ is a much superior slam to 6♦, which requires declarer to find ♦Q if ♠K is offside. This was 11 IMPs to ROTHFIELD as slam was not reached at the other table.



We publish the main body of an email from Warren Lazer in Sydney in response to Marcia Scudder's item yesterday on alerts.

I quote from the relevant sections of the ABF alert regs.

5.7 No explanations should be given unless there is an enquiry from an opponent.

7. EXPLANATIONS At the conclusion of any of its auctions that included self alerting calls, the declaring side should offer to give a full explanation of the auction. The defenders are under no such obligation, since by doing so they may convey unauthorised information.

Note the careful wording of reg 7. viz 'the declaring side **should offer to give**'

Check with a Director, but I believe it's not permitted under Law to give the opponents information they don't request. Declarer (or Dummy) should actually say "Do you want to know about the auction?" and follow with "You really should ask about the auction!" if the opponent says "NO" and there's something strange afoot.

This may seem rather pedantic and semantic, but I think it's an important point. I was involved in a situation many years ago (before artificial systems and alert regs) where a contract would have gone down on the lead the opponent was about to make. Declarer decided to be nice and give an unsolicited explanation of the auction and a different lead resulted and contract made..... "Director!!!"



<b>Walk In Results</b>	
Friday 14/1 afternoon session	
1. Z. Moskow & R Klugman	86
2. K. Billik & A. Swider	73
Friday 14/1 evening session	
1. K Colbert & A Little-(no prize)	74.7
2. Z Klegeris & J Pritchard	74.7
3. D Boga & A Marshall	73.5

<b>TABLE TALLY</b>
as of Midnight 14/1/00
<b>1808</b>

## FOO WAS HERE

By Andrew Struik

Our 0-149ers correspondent of yesterday, Andrew Struik, offers us further insight into the sound bridge method applicable at all levels of the game.

- count your sure tricks
- survey the various possibilities of establishing extra tricks
- rank the probabilities of success

Andrew is not a newcomer to bridge. In his student days in Canberra in the sixties he hobnobbed with George Havas, David Hoffman, John Newman, all of whom went on to make bridge important to them. Andrew got a life instead for the next 30 years. Now retired, he returned to bridge a year ago.

Yesterday Eunice Foo and I started by making some 3NT contracts on meagre HCPs. Today it was the opponents' turn.

One hand where they did have points was Board 18 of Session 6

♠ J 8  
♥ Q J 9 4 2  
♦ J 4 2  
♣ Q 10 2

♠ Q 6 4  
♥ K 10  
♦ K 8 6 5  
♣ 8 7 5 3

♠ A K 9  
♥ A 8 3  
♦ A 9 3  
♣ A J 9 4

♠ 10 7 5 3 2  
♥ 7 6 5  
♦ Q 10 7  
♣ K 6

Against 3NT by West, Eunice led the common 'fourth highest' heart. Declarer won with the 10. Now having 9 tricks, declarer played for overtricks by leading a club to the jack and then gave away a second club to make 10 tricks.

Many people advocate that a 'near sequence' like QJ9x or KQ10x should be treated as a sequence, leading the top card. (*Indeed, Andrew. Although carrying some risk, it at least avoids giving declarer an extra trick immediately. TZ*) This certainly works well here, trapping the 10.

Declarer now has to decide whether to play for a 3-3 diamond split, or to play the clubs for 3 tricks.

I don't know all the odds, (*diamonds, a priori, nearly 36% TZ*) but I suspect the clubs are a slightly better bet. (*Much better. At least 85% chance for one extra trick, with further chances for 2 tricks TZ*) Certainly the chances of a 3-3 diamond break are reduced when North shows up with 5 hearts.

How do you play the clubs? Best is to finesse twice. Since the pips are so strong this loses at most 1 trick if North holds K10(x)(x) or Q10(x)(x).

## THEY CAN'T POSSIBLY MAKE THIS!

By Lilli Allgood

Session 5 Board 4 Dealer W; All Vul

♠ K Q 10 9 2  
♥ K 6 3 2  
♦ J 4  
♣ K Q

♠ A J 3  
♥ A Q J 7 5  
♦ A 8 3  
♣ A 7

♠ 8 6 4  
♥ 10 9 8 4  
♦ 5 2  
♣ 9 5 4 2

♠ 7 5  
♥ -  
♦ K Q 10 9 7 6  
♣ J 10 8 6 3

West	North	East	South
2♥(1)	2♠(2)	3♥	4♦(3)
X!!(4)			

- (1) Alerted as 8 playing tricks in hearts
- (2) I haven't come all the way from Melbourne just to pass!
- (3) Unprintable expletive from North (under the breath..)
- (4) The cheek of it! They are definitely not going to make this!!

The lead was ♣A, followed by a small club taken in dummy. ♦J continued, taken by ♦A.

And what now? West virtually HAD to lead ♥A. South gleefully ruffed, ran all the clubs and finally exited with a spade. West was now endplayed in hearts or spades. +710 to NS. Can you hear the plaintive cry (shades of Victor Mollo) at score-up: 'But I had 20 points, partner.....?'

At the other table the bidding was more demure, i.e. 1♥, (1♠), 2♥, (3♦), 3♥, (4♦) undoubled making 5 for -150 to EW.

## MODEL BEHAVIOUR

by Tina Zines

Our Roving Reporter at the Seniors on Thursday morning kibitzed four top players.

Was there a hint of doom in the air generated by East's amused recollection of an auction where he and partner had bid 1♠ - 4♥ all out and promptly played in their 1-1 fit?

For later in the match Board 2 appears:

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

♠ A J 7 5  
♥ 4  
♦ K J 7 6 4 3  
♣ A 3

♠ 9 6 2  
♥ A K Q 10 6  
♦ A 2  
♣ Q J 8

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

EW were well on their way to the poor but ice-cold 6♦ contract when there was a sudden mechanical failure. Ever so unexpected. Ever so deadly.

East wrote 6♣ instead of 6♦. East's demeanour was totally calm. West went into the tank for two long minutes to consider this turn of events.

South, holding ♣K 10 7 6 4, was exercising his mind powers. 'Pass, pass, pass!' And eventually West did.

Play started and it was not until well into the hand, so unflappable is East, that it became clear to all what had happened.

As 6♦ is certainly a poor contract requiring both minor suit finesses and a trump break, some kind of justice was perhaps served. East certainly accepted his punishment with admirable grace.

♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣

# Appeal 2

Event: 0-149 Teams

Appeals Chairperson: I. Dahler

Appeals Committee: P. Evans, E. Ramshaw, M. Brown, M. Scudder

Round: 5; Board 11; Dealer: South; Vul: Nil

♠ 6 2  
♥ K 9 8 6 5 4  
♦ K Q J  
♣ 8 2

♠ A Q J 4  
♥ 10  
♦ 8 3  
♣ Q J 10 7 4 3

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

♠ 9 8 5  
♥ A 7 2  
♦ A 10 2  
♣ A K 9 5

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

(1) Alerted 5 hearts and other minor

Final Contract and Result: 3♥ North; +170

**Tournament Director's Report and Decision:** Called to the table by West after explanation of 2♣ bid by partner. West had made a natural overcall. I explained to East that all information given by West was unauthorised to East. I explained to N – S at the end of the play that West's action was not systemic and therefore N – S were not entitled to the true nature of West's hand. Result was allowed to stand.

**Appellant's Claim:** I opened 1 NT at South. West overcalled 2♣. This was alerted by East. North asked what it meant. Answer from East was 'Astra'. North asked what that meant. East said '5 hearts and minor'. At this West put up his hand and called the director and said 'I've given the wrong information'. Director said 'Play on'. North called 3♥, East passed. South: I had 15 points, 3 hearts and felt that if there were 5 hearts with West, I could not go four. Therefore we were not in game. At the end of the game I called the director who said we had not been disadvantaged. A second director said that West shouldn't have

openly alerted the director by calling and signalling as this also alerted his partner. I do feel that we were disadvantaged.

**Appeals Committee's Decision:** 2♣ was a misbid which is not an infraction. The damage is caused by this misbid. Damage can not be redressed unless it is related to the infraction. The explanation was correct and the damage is 'rub of the green' and most unfortunate but the laws do not allow any alteration. Appeal dismissed.

## Mea Culpa

The 3am blues struck column 1 in yesterday's NOT NEWS #3. The bad result, the **phantom** in which declarer was **punished**, referred as much to the NOT NEWS Team, as to the players at the table. We published Board 8 instead of Board 11!

Was there a presentiment of doom in the pre-dawn hours of Friday? We had prepared an item, 'Model Behaviour', for which there was no room in the final layout (it appears today on page 6). Its subject? Mechanical error. Ever so deadly! We're not fatalists, but....

Sorry guys!

## Misanalysis

Yesterday's 'Too Late' might have been better titled 'Not too late if you don't panic'

It referred to Board 17 in Session 5

♠ K Q J  
♥ K Q J 8 6 2  
♦ K 8 5  
♣ J

♠ 10 9 8 3 2  
♥ A  
♦ A Q 10  
♣ Q 10 5 4

♠ 6 5 4  
♥ 7 5  
♦ 7 3 2  
♣ A K 8 6 3

♠ A 7  
♥ 10 9 4 3  
♦ J 9 6 4  
♣ 9 7 2

After ♣ A K, declarer eliminates spades, pitching a club, and puts West in with ♥A.

There is no need for West to panic. He is not **under the gun**. He exits ♦Q, maintaining his A 10 **fourchette**.

## Womens Teams Datums

BD	Rnd7	Rnd8	Rnd9
1	-300	+400	+360
2	-70	-30	+50
3	-830	+80	+470
4	+600	-260	-310
5	-280	-160	+580
6	-550	-20	-690
7	-300	-80	+610
8	+20	-170	+140
9	-540	-260	+230
10	+700	-520	+10
11	-470	-470	-10
12	+170	+70	-120
13	+40	+630	+270
14	-500	+990	-180
15	-50	-110	+100
16	+420	-570	+80
17	-260	-120	-80
18	+470	+70	+200
19	-390	-660	+450
20	-630	-120	-540

## Seniors Teams Datums

BD	Rnd7	Rnd8	Rnd9
1	-400	+380	+440
2	-30	-80	+30
3	-990	+130	+470
4	+630	-320	-130
5	-310	-30	+650
6	-630	+160	-690
7	-300	-20	+610
8	+80	-280	+170
9	-300	+10	-20
10	+1080	-280	+70
11	-670	-460	-80
12	+60	+160	-40
13	0	+640	+530
14	-730	+990	-60
15	-70	-70	+110
16	+420	-630	+110
17	-270	-140	-300
18	+520	-50	+400
19	-360	-650	+450
20	-610	-150	-620

## COLUMN 8 (NOT)

Here is a new addition to your dictionary of bridge terminology created after a bidding misunderstanding at Rydges (aka Fawly Towers)

LHO: What does your partner's 3♣ bid mean?

Partner: I am as totally basilled as you are!

♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣

Overheard at the bar – an anxious Seniors player was bewailing the possibility that her revoke had cost the match.

Result of revoke: minus 1 IMP

Result of match: minus 89 IMPs

♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣

Did you know that **court cards** do not include the ace. The term refers only to the king, queen and jack of each suit because they are represented by coated figures rather than pips, giving rise to the expression 'coat card'. This term was corrupted to 'court card'.

♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣

Did you know that the King who graces the British playing cards we are most familiar with is thought to be a portrait of the Merry Monarch, Henry VIII?

♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣

### FROM SUCH ACORNS OAK TREES GROW

Six familiar names in a rather unfamiliar place leapt out of the pages of a 1975 issue of *Australian Bridge*. The winning team in the Youth Championships in Canberra twenty-five years ago included Peter Fordham, Bruce Neill and his sister Sue (Lusk). Runners-up included our illustrious convener John Scudder and his wife Marcia, and our hard-working editor Peter Jamieson. Ah, they really *were* young once.

♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣

X – File by Bill Jacobs

In Column 8, you tell the story of Satan, who led out his entire green suit of hippogriffs against 7NT (declarer found out the name of the suit when dummy helpfully asked "No hippogriffs partner?" after the first trick.) You might like to add the following to your X – File.

If you are a parent whose primary school age child reads the best selling Harry Potter series, you will know that the hippogriff is in fact a magical flying creature, half eagle and half horse, and it comes in many colours. I hope this information helps you in the search for the truth.

♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣

In response to our report of the use of the word **flicht** in Column 8 (NOT) #2, it has been made known to us that flichts are also a regular event in the state of WA. The married couple are called the **flicht** and the opposing couple are the 'odds and ends'!

### HOW TO CONTACT THE EDITORS OF THE 2000 NOT NEWS

Peter Jamieson (Editorial Team): Mobile: 0414 692 023

Tina Zines (Editorial Team): Mobile: 0411 562 997

Amy Scudder and Sheena Larsen-Jury (Production Team): Mobile: 0411 542 039

Email: [notnews@madcow.com.au](mailto:notnews@madcow.com.au)

Feel free to contact us at any time, or leave your articles or comments in the NOT NEWS boxes at either venue.

The NOT News will be posted daily on the Internet at the following address:

<http://www.abf.com.au/>