



NOT NEWS

2000

Editorial Team: Peter Jamieson and Tina Zines

Production Team: Amy Scudder and Sheena Larsen-Jury

BIDDING BRILLIANCY

by Richard Webb

Board 1 Session 6

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

Kieran Dyke and Ashley Bach showed outstanding bidding skills in the following auction:

North	East	South	West
Pass	2♣ (1)	Pass	3♦ (2)
Pass	4♦! (3)	Pass	4♠ (4)
Pass	4NT	Pass	5♠ (6)
Pass	7♦ (7)	All Pass	

- (1) Game Force
- (2) Positive with 5 + diamonds and a good suit
- (3) Ashley chooses to support diamonds rather than bid spades, an excellent choice since...
- (4) Now Kieran can bid spades as a cue bid which Ashley knows is a void – this bid also denies the ♥A.
- (5) RKCB
- (6) 2 aces plus Q trumps.
- (7) Ashley knows Kieran has ♣A and bids the grand slam, which would have been almost impossible to reach if he had chosen to bid spades earlier.

North led the a heart which Kieran ruffed in dummy, claiming his contract moments later... meanwhile, at the other table Jim Wallis showed his skill by opening the North hand with a weak two in hearts which was doubled by East and passed out. (3♥ might be a better way for East to get partner to bid).

SWPT Top Ten after 9 rounds

National Convention Centre

1st	3	A. Braithwaite, M. Ware, S. Lester, M. McManus M. Mullamphy, V. Cummings	180
2nd	11	G. Finikiotis, J. Chan, K. Hocking, J. Hewitt	177
3rd	1	P. Smith, P. Yovich, D. Lilley, N. Rosendorff, B. Thompson, B. Jacobs	177
4th	15	D. Woodhead, C. Haugh, K. Robb, T. Nunn	174
5th	2	P. Wyer, P. Marston, M. Mayer, G. Kozakos, J. Haffer, G. Smolanko	116
6th	29	K. Daws, C. Shugg, M. Callander, C. Schwabegger, C. Watson, S. Reed	169
7th	77	C. Evans, A. Stralow, K. Billik, A. Swider	168
8th	8	R. Dalley, P. Lavings, G. Jesner, A. Delivera, T. Bourke, B. Waters	167
9th	30	K. Wilkes, J. Gleeson, E. Pickles, A. Monteath	166
10th	5	S. Hinge, C. Chua, A. Webb, S. Henbest	165

Rydges Canberra

1st	3	B. Neill, W. Lazer, P. Gumby, A. Walsh, B. McDonald M. Hughes	186
2nd	1	M. Thomson, D. Beauchamp, P. Newman, A. Peake	174
3rd	12	G. Ridgway, D. Happell, D. Newlands, K. Muntz, V. Muntz, A. Robbins	173
4th	5	(Ziggy) S. Konig, J. Walls, A. Bach, K. Dyke	170
5th	21	B. Folkard, R. Folkard, H. Milward, R. Milward	169
6th	57	M. Dey, G. Eustace, B. Krishan, T. Carr	168
7th	8	G. Gaspar, T. Seres, Z. Nagi, M. Tencer, B. Tencer	166
8th	13	M. Jappe, B. Nagy, D. Smyth, J. Maddison, A. Lasocki	165
9th	4	B. O'Hara (npc), S. Burgess, T. Lloyd, R. Cooper H. Christie, J. Cormack, J. Alabaster	163
10th	7	J. Roberts, M. Smart, P. Jamieson, N. Perry, R. Sebesfi K. Crowe-Mai	163
11th	23	M. Bloom, R. Rawkins, I. Glanger, M. Scudder, S. Bock	163

West does have a difficult choice on this hand after the double.

East led four rounds of spades and Jim trumped the fourth round in dummy with the ♠A and made all of his 5 trumps in hand going just 2 down.

A brilliant team effort gained 15 IMPs.

It is strongly rumoured that Pettit ACOL (See Moppy for info) has the perfect bidding sequence for these types of hands, but unfortunately they forgot their convention... oh well.

Richard Webb

♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣

PLAY OR DEFEND?

by Bruce Neill

First – the defence

Trumps Bridge Club in Sydney has a traditional Xmas – New Year warm up for the SWPT. Against a good declarer this hand was a defensive test:

	Dummy		
	♠ 9 8		
	♥ A 9 7 2		
	♦ A 7		
	♣ 10 6 4 3 2		
You			
	♠ K Q 5		
	♥ K 10 6 3		
	♦ K J 10 6		
	♣ K J		
South	West	North	East
JillianHay	You	RHO	T Chadwick
1♦	1NT	X	2♣
Pass	Pass	X	Pass
2♦	Pass	Pass	X(1)
All Pass			

(1) Takeout

Lead: ♠K

The first trick goes ♠K – 2 – 5 (encouraging) – Q

How do you plan your defence??

Answer on Page 5

♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣

FIRST AT THE LAST

by Barbara Travis

Jill Courtney summed up our NWT team's effort thus: We were seeded no. 1 so started at Table 1 but managed to snare the top qualifying position on the last round. In the six-team round robin we were therefore Team 1; we were never again leading until after the last round (equal first this time). So, of course, in the final we trailed by 50 IMPs after the first quarter, and only took the lead after the final score-up! This made for a fairly 'stressful' event – I think we're all still recovering.....

It is said that finals are lost, not won. Our first set followed this dictum; the Cormack team played well, we played poorly. Liz and I had a second poor session but Jill and Lizzie played really well and we regained 8 IMPs. This seemed promising to me after performing so badly...

Our first board of the third quarter was certainly exciting:

Board 9; Vul E – W; Dealer North

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

West	North	East	South
	2♠(1)	Pass	4♠
5♦	Pass	Pass	5♠
X	All Pass		

(1) 5+ ♠ and 5+ minor, 6-11 HCP

This duly failed by 2 tricks for –300. At the other table the auction was identical up to the double. However Alida concluded that her partner's double revealed a really powerful 5♦ bid and re-evaluated her East hand, bidding 6♦ which made for +1370. Actually, after the hand, Val asked me what I'd have done over 6♦ and I replied that I'd still be thinking!

On Board 2 Liz's save proved equally successful.

Board 3; Vul E – W; Dealer South

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

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1♣	1♦	1♠	2♦
3♣	3♦	4♣	Pass
5♣	5♦	Pass	Pass
X	All Pass		

When Liz went one off for –100, together with 600 for 5♣ making, we'd gained 11 IMPs.

We entered the final 16 boards 20.5 IMPs behind.

Board 23 was a fascinating hand. Both Souths were unkeen to play in 3NT with a diamond void, though it's cold. 4♥ is also a fairly easy contract. However, the 'Jans' reached 5♣ which failed by two with the black suit layout. Liz and I reached 4♠...

Board 23; Vul All; Dealer South

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

The ♣Q lead was won by the king, and a spade led to the queen and ace. A diamond return was ruffed. When the ♠K dropped the jack trumps were

discontinued in favour of a minor squeeze on West. Three rounds of hearts held, dummy discarding a club.

The fourth heart was ruffed by East (another club discard from dummy) and another diamond return was ruffed. The final heart was led and West is in some trouble and has to bare $\diamond A$. East ruffs and returns a diamond, ruffed, the contract makes. (However, if east doesn't ruff I think $4\spadesuit$ fails!) Fortunately for me, East did not return a diamond upon winning $\spadesuit A$ at trick 2, so I could draw trumps. Now the squeeze DID operate on West for the overtrick!

We won the final set 59 – 28 to win by 10.5 IMPs. It made for exciting bridge for all. Our thanks to the Cormack team (Jan Cormack, Jan Alabaster, Val Cummings, Candice Feitelson) for a match played in good spirit, and to the organisers for an efficient and well-run event.

Babara Travis

$\spadesuit\heartsuit\diamond\clubsuit\spadesuit\heartsuit\diamond\clubsuit\spadesuit\heartsuit\diamond\clubsuit$

WILTING

by Martin Bloom

Session 6; Board 19;
Dealer South; Vul EW

\spadesuit 8 5	
\heartsuit K 7 4	
\diamond A K 9 8 3 2	
\clubsuit 4 2	
\spadesuit A K Q 10 2	\spadesuit J 9 7 4
\heartsuit Q 8 6 3	\heartsuit J 10 9 5
\diamond 10 6 4	\diamond Q
\clubsuit 10	\clubsuit A 6 5 3
\spadesuit 6 3	
\heartsuit A 2	
\diamond J 7 5	
\clubsuit K Q J 9 8 7	

West	North	East	South
Roberts	Scudder	Smart	Bloom
X	Pass	$4\clubsuit$	$3\clubsuit$
All Pass			$4\clubsuit$

I am writing this board up to show that, in most cases, IMPs are lost, not because of brilliant squeeze plays and throw-ins, but because of lack of thought and failure to concentrate.

My partner, Marcia Scudder, led her $\diamond A$, and I watched declarer play the

singleton Q from dummy. I followed with the $\diamond 5$, Marcia thought briefly and played a club. This defence hardly tested John Roberts, who drew trumps, conceded two hearts and claimed.

All I need to do is realise that Marcia only needs to hold the $\heartsuit K$ to beat this contract. The $\diamond J$ would have left her in no doubt. After the $\spadesuit A$, $\spadesuit K$ and a ruff over John Roberts would have difficulty making.

My excuse – it was hand 19 and it was late. Funny how unsympathetic my team was.

$\spadesuit\heartsuit\diamond\clubsuit\spadesuit\heartsuit\diamond\clubsuit\spadesuit\heartsuit\diamond\clubsuit$

STEPPING STONE ENDPLAY!

by Leo Goorevich

Board 11; Session 5; Dealer South;
Vul Nil

\spadesuit Q	
\heartsuit Q 10 5	
\diamond K 10 7 6 2	
\clubsuit 10 4 3 2	
\spadesuit A 3	\spadesuit 9 7 5
\heartsuit A 9 6 4 2	\heartsuit K J 8
\diamond A 4	\diamond Q J 5 3
\clubsuit J 8 7 6	\clubsuit A 9 5
\spadesuit K J 10 8 6 4 2	
\heartsuit 7 3	
\diamond 9 8	
\clubsuit K Q	

West	North	East	South
P.Wood	Bill	L. Goorevich	P.Nylon
X	Pass	Pass	$2\heartsuit$
Pass	Pass	$3\spadesuit$	X
XX	Pass	$4\heartsuit$	All Pass

How often do you get to game in a suit first bid (even artificially) by the opponents?

South opened $2\heartsuit$ showing either weak in South, both minors, or balanced strong. X by West was penalty and XX something exotic – as this sequence was not one that had been the subject of much analysis by our partnership. $4\heartsuit$ ended the auction, with a Moysian fit being a definite possibility.

Any lead other than clubs makes the hand fairly simple, as a spade lead is taken by the ace, trumps can be drawn for no loss and a second trick developed

in both diamonds and clubs.

Paul Nylon found the club lead which makes the hand less trivial since it removes one of declarer's entries prematurely. Here declarer took $\spadesuit A$, drew 3 rounds of trumps finessing North for the queen then played $\clubsuit 9$ to South's queen. The diamond switch was taken by $\diamond A$. Now, playing a diamond from dummy is of no use since declarer has no entries to enjoy the $\diamond Q$. He resisted the temptation to cash $\spadesuit J$ for a possible 3-3 break and played ace and another spade. Whatever South returns, North is now endplayed with the $\diamond K$, conceding the 10th trick either to declarer's $\diamond Q$ or into the jaws of dummy's J 8 of clubs.

Patting himself on the back, declarer was confident of a game swing for his side, only to find a 1IMP loss at score-up when the opponents made an overtrick on a spade lead.

$\spadesuit\heartsuit\diamond\clubsuit\spadesuit\heartsuit\diamond\clubsuit\spadesuit\heartsuit\diamond\clubsuit$

GOOD BRIDGE

by Peter Jamieson

There has always been some conjecture about who are the top 10 bridge players Australia has produced. There are the usual names, Tim Seres, Ron Klinger, Dick Cummings ... and the list goes on. One player often overlooked in such lists is David Lilley from Canberra.

Many years ago at the 1972 Orange Congress I was playing this hand as South in $6\clubsuit$. Having just having read "Card Play Technique", I sensed there was a winning line:

\spadesuit Qxxx	
\heartsuit 10 x	
\diamond Axx	
\clubsuit 109xx	
\spadesuit xxx	\spadesuit J10x
\heartsuit xxx	\heartsuit QJxx
\diamond Kxx	\diamond J109xxx
\clubsuit QJxx	\clubsuit -
\spadesuit AKx	
\heartsuit AKxx	
\diamond Q	
\clubsuit AK8xx	

Somehow I ended up in the wrong hand and failed by one trick. I saw David and asked him if the hand could be made. He said, "Yes", having just made the contract.

This is how David played the hand (as reported by Don Evans in his newspaper column). On the heart lead, David won and played a top club getting the bad news! Undaunted, David pressed on, next playing a diamond to the ace followed by a diamond ruff. Then came the ♠K, heart ruff, another diamond ruff. Then he played three rounds of spades finishing in hand. Now declarer's last heart was played.

<p>♠ x ♥ - ♦ - ♣ 10 9</p> <p>♠ - ♥ - ♦ - ♣ Q Jx</p> <p>♠ - ♥ x ♦ - ♣ K 8</p>	<p>♠ - ♥ J ♦ J 10 ♣ -</p>
--	---------------------------------------

West had no answer and could take only one trick.

It was therefore not surprising that David as North found the killing defence on hand 7 in Session seven, yesterday.

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

West, Paul Lavings, opened 1♥. Bob Dalley bid 2♥ and when West invited game by bidding three diamonds East was happy to raise to game. David led the spade queen, covered by the King and won by Nigel Rosendorff's ace. The three of spades return was won by David's jack. Lilley could deduce from the play that spades were 4-4-3-2.

There was little prospect of any diamond tricks for the defence. The ♠3 from South at trick 2 had McKenney connotations... so Lilley exited with the ♣5. Dummy played low and Rosendorff won the trick with the ten. Realising the implications of the underlead of the ♣A

Rosendorff returned a spade for David to ruff for one down.

Peter Jamieson

♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣

WHAT WOULD YOU BID?

(Hands from Bermuda this week)

1. Dealer West Both Vul:

West	North	East	South
Pass	4♥	X	Pass
?			

West holds

♠ A K 3
♥ 10 3
♦ 9 6 2
♣ K 9 7 4 2

2. Dealer West Nil Vul

West	North	East	South
2♥	X	Pass	?

South holds:

♠ A 4
♥ Q 7 5 3 2
♦ K Q 10 8 2
♣ 7

(see page 6)

♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣

MAYBE DIAMONDS ARE A GIRL'S BEST FRIEND!

Round 8; Board 19; Dealer South; Vul EW

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

Bidding: -

North (Kath Kean) - 1♦

East - DIRECTOR!

Opening bid out of turn - not accepted by East.

My Mullamphy explained very clearly

to South that she must pass without hesitation throughout the auction.

Bidding resumes: -

West	North	East	South
Pass	1♦	All Pass	Pass

North plays in 1♦ making 7 tricks (+70). At the other table, EW bids 4♠, making 5 - a very nice score of 12 IMPs. What a pity the rest of our scores weren't as good!

Joan Derricks

BORING DEFENCE

by Richard Hills

In cricket, elegant centuries do not prove decisive - instead catches win the matches.

Similarly, bridge matches are not won with brilliant declarer play, but rather boring defence.

SWPT Session 6 Board 2

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

Against North's 3NT, Hashmat led a diamond to my ace. The usual recommendation with my diamond holding is to give count by returning the three of diamonds.

Looking at Dummy's winners, I instead found the boring defence of firing back the ten of diamonds.

This told Hashmat what he needed to know about Declarer's diamond stopper,

So after Hashmat won the ♦K, he found the boring switch to a low heart. I won the ♥A, and returned a boring ♥8 to Hashmat's ♥K.

Hashmat now played a boring ♠J (guarding against a singleton ten in declarer's hand) to lock declarer in Dummy for one off.

NO SACRIFICE

by Derek Tyms

Board 19; Round 5;
Vul EW; Dealer South

♠ A 10 9 6 5
♥ 8
♦ A 8 5
♣ 8 7 5 4

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

♠ K Q 7 3 2
♥ Q 5
♦ 4 2
♣ A J 6 2

West	North	East	South
			1♠
2♥	4♠	5♥	Pass
Pass	5♠	6♥	X
All Pass			

Team 109 Tyms (EW)

After West's simple lead-directing overcall, his partner decided to sacrifice in 6♥ which was doubled. North led ♦A, West played his ♦J, South played ♦4. North played partner for the singleton and led another diamond and allowed 6♥X to make. NS team mates made 4♠ giving a total of 420 + 1660 = 2080 or 19 IMPs or Mount Kuring-Gai in NSW.

"Good sacrificing even better making"!

MANNERS

Many years ago my late husband made the comment that 'the better the player - the better the table manners' and anyone who has had the pleasure of playing against Tim Seres and his contemporaries will understand what I mean.

What a pity that some of the young guns have not yet learnt this. We had the misfortune to play against such a team. They never stopped talking or food getting, patronised us, and didn't even have the courtesy to thank us for the game - or even bother checking the scores. Such behaviour spoils the game for others and is not what one expects from the NOT.

Nancy Marchant

ANSWER TO PLAY OR DEFEND

by Bruce Neill

You can see declarer probably has four spades to the ace and these Kiwis are aggressive bidders.

♠ 9 8
♥ A 9 7 2
♦ A 7
♣ 10 6 4 3 2

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

♠ A 10 3 2
♥ Q 5
♦ Q 8 5 4 3 2
♣ Q

You can see that, left alone, declarer will try to ruff spades in dummy and you are at risk of eventually being end played in trumps. Better accept the inevitable and lead ♦J at trick two. If you lead a second trump when you win a spade trick, declarer seems to have one way home.

Act II - The play

Events at the other table in the same contract (!) showed that the trump endplay is a real possibility. The defence started with two rounds of spades. Declarer won and played a club. The defender in your seat now fell from grace, switching to a heart. Declarer now ruffed two spades in dummy and various cards in hand, leaving this ending:

♠ -
♥ -
♦ -
♣ 10 6 4

♠ - ♠ -
♥ - ♥ -
♦ K J 10 ♦ -
♣ - ♣ A 9 8

♠ -
♥ -
♦ Q 8 5
♣ -

Needing one more trick, all was well. West couldn't escape the endplay. Making 2♦X!

An unusual trump endplay!

So - question for the analysts. How many tricks should declarers make on best play and defence?

Answer on Page 7

♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣

'LOSING TRICK COUNT WORKS'

by Alex Ozanne

Many people in the SWPT will have heard of (and even use) the 'Losing trick count'.

Look at board 1, Session 6.

Hand 1 from evening of Tuesday, 18th

♠ 10 9 7 5
♥ K Q 10 9 5
♦ 9
♣ J 10 5

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

♠ 8 3 2
♥ A 4 3
♦ 8 4 3 2
♣ 8 6 3

We see East has 3 losers and West has 6 losers. 6 + 3 = 9. We subtract the total number of losers from '24' to get the trick potential of the hand: 24 - 9 = 15!!

Now look at the hands, 6 spade tricks, 5 diamond tricks, and 4 club tricks, 6 + 5 + 4 = 15!

The losing trick count demands a bid of 9 spades!! Which clearly makes.

I dunno how to score that!!!

♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣

WHAT'S HAPPENING IN BERMUDA?

Results of the 96-board semi-finals:

Bermuda Bowl

Brazil 137 d. Norway 125
USA1 226 d. USA2 1358

Venice Cup

USA1 219 d. Denmark 153
Netherlands 210 d. Austria 174

Those who believe the ABF Computer has devilish designs please note that the WBF Computer is in similar mould. Board 20 of the semi-finals produced the 9-card suit (not due in Canberra till Round 14) and includes the answer to What Would You Bid #1, from page 4:

Dealer West Both Vul

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

Bermuda Bowl, USA1 (N-S) vs USA2

West	North	East	South
------	-------	------	-------

<i>Wolfson</i>	<i>Hamman</i>	<i>Silverman</i>	<i>Soloway</i>
Pass	4♥	X	Pass
Pass (1)		Pass	

(1) Not the winning move with 4♠, 5♣ or 5♦ on for E-W. West's action naturally depends on the nature of East's double.

If for takeout, West has an easy 5♣ bid and some would consider 6♣.

Lead: ♣K, ace; ♦3, ace; ♣J; ten tricks +790.

Bermuda Bowl, USA2 (N-S)

West	North	East	South
------	-------	------	-------

<i>Rodwell</i>	<i>Stansby</i>	<i>Meckstroth</i>	<i>Martel</i>
Pass	4♣	X	4♥
4♠	Pass	Pass	5♥
X	All Pass		

Ten tricks, minus 200. 14 Imps to USA 1.

In other matches:

Bermuda Bowl:

Brazil 4♥ +620, Norway 5♥ +650 (!)

Venice Cup:

Denmark: 4♠X, +790, USA1 5♠X -200
Netherlands 4♥ +620, Austria 6♥ -200
(N opened 5♥, South bid 6♥)

With 16 boards to go in the semi-final, Norway led Brazil 112-102. Two boards gave Brazil double figure swings and a 35-13 session, enough to win by 12 Imps. This was Board 88, including the answer to What Would You Bid #2, see page 4:

Dealer West Nil Vul

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

West	North	East	South
------	-------	------	-------

<i>Furunes</i>	<i>Chagas</i>	<i>Helness</i>	<i>Branco</i>
2♥	3♣	Pass	3♦
Pass	3♠	Pass	3NT
All Pass			

(1) The meaning of the auction is not known but 2♦ was presumably an artificial game force.

♥K led (a good idea but not leading to glory today), ace; ♣K; ♣Q, ace takes; ♠6, ace; ♦2, jack wins; ♣J wins; ♦6, king, ace; ♥J, queen, 9 tricks, Brazil +400 (declarer could have afforded to cash some more clubs).

West	North	East	South
------	-------	------	-------

<i>Campos</i>	<i>Austberg</i>	<i>Boas</i>	<i>Helgemo</i>
2♥	X	Pass	3♥ (1)
Pass	3NT	X	4♦
X	All Pass		

(1) Intending to look for 6♦? Passing plus routine defence would have secured +500 (a 1000 point swing) and

a berth in the final.

The ♠3 was led. No further details of play. 7 tricks, minus 500. 14 Imps to Brazil.

Double dummy, 3NT seems impregnable (♠K lead, ace; diamond, jack wins; clubs . . .)

In other matches:

Bermuda Bowl:

USA2 played 3♠ E-W -100 and 3NT N-S minus 150

Venice Cup:

USA1: 4♠X, -500, Denmark 4♥X -800
Netherlands 4♣ N, -250, Austria 5♦X -500

The effect of Board 88 may have been felt on Board 90:

Dealer East Both Vul

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

West	North	East	South
------	-------	------	-------

<i>Furunes</i>	<i>Chagas</i>	<i>Helness</i>	<i>Branco</i>
Pass	1♥	Pass	1NT
Pass	3NT	All Pass	

♣2 led: 4 - 9 K; ♣6, eight, jack; ♦A; four more diamonds; ♥J: 3 - 6 - A; ♠8, ace; 12 tricks, +690.

At the other table:

West	North	East	South
------	-------	------	-------

<i>Campos</i>	<i>Austberg</i>	<i>Boas</i>	<i>Helgemo</i>
Pass	2NT	Pass	3♣
Pass	3♦	All Pass	

Unaware of the meaning of the auction but to these untrained eyes, it seems as though 2NT was taken by South as a transfer to diamonds and 3♣ was a super-accept with 3♦ then a signoff, while to North 2NT was a natural

invitation (but why no Stayman?) and 3♣ was an acceptance with stopper showing, hence 3♦ . . .

Whatever the cause of the misunderstanding in such a basic auction, the result was 3♦ making eleven tricks for +150 and 11 Imps. May it be of some comfort to you to see world class players have a calamity like this.

In other matches:

Bermuda Bowl:

USA1 3NT +690, USA2 3NT +690

Venice Cup:

USA1: 3NT +600, Denmark 3NT +690
Netherlands 3NT +660, Austria 3NT +660



Appeal 8

Event: SWPT

Round: 5

Match: 2 vs 14

Players:

North – P. Fordham

East – M. Abraham

South – M. Prescott

West – M. Wilkinson

Appeals Chairperson:

I Dahler

Appeals Committee:

E Ramshaw

P Evans

M Scudder

R Folkard

Tournament Director:

Michael Kent

Board 19 Dealer South, E/W Vul

♠ A 10 9 6 5

♥ 8

♦ A 8 5

♣ 8 7 5 4

♠ J 8 4

♥ A K J 7 3 2

♦ J 7

♣ 10 3

♠ –

♥ 10 9 6 4

♦ K Q 10 9 6 3

♣ K Q 9

♠ K Q 7 3 2

♥ Q 5

♦ 4 2

♣ A J 6 2

South West North East

1♠

2♥

4♣

4NT

Pass

5♥

All Pass

Final Contract and Result:

5♥ by West E/W + 650

Tournament Director's Report and Decision:

I was called to the table at the end of the hand by NS who stated that East had paused for a long time before making his final pass. West advised that 4NT was keycard but the sequence was un-discussed. NS contended that with 3 keycards and the ♥Q missing the long hesitation was misleading.

East told me he could take as long as he liked as there was no Law against this. Referring to Law 73 F2 I adjusted the score to NS – 50.

Appellants' Claim

I did not assert that "I could take as long as I like" but stated in response to the Director's enquiry "So what's your story?" that "My intentions are not relevant under law" when told they "most certainly were" I indicated that I was in possession of unauthorised information from partner's explanation and had to assess my logical alternative since the unauthorised information clearly makes

pass the only logical alternative. We also question whether South has a 5♠ bid after partner's thought and questions over 5♥.

Appeals Committee's Decision

In view of the conflict of evidence we are unable to ascertain the exact facts, we believe that there was an infraction. We were unable to determine what really occurred at the table.

The score to be N/S –300.



NEXT ANSWER TO PLAY OR DEFEND?

by Bruce Neill

2♦X should go TWO off on the 'obvious' and only successful lead.... The king of diamonds!

(Acknowledgements go to the great new double dummy analysis program 'Deep Finesse' for discovering this defence.)



The Bridge Shop

End of Summer Bridge Festival

Special Offers

Offer # 1

Buy 2 books & receive a 3rd for ½ price

Offer # 2

Buy 1 bridge software program & receive a 2nd for ½ price

Offer # 3

Spend over \$100 & receive a free 2000 Daily Bridge Calendar (value \$27.50)

Offer # 4

All giftware 25% off



Visit our stall at
The National Convention Centre

COLUMN 8 (NOT)

The NOT NEWS thrice daily courier lobbed into the NCC yesterday evening and was pleased to find a contribution. As the lid was being replaced on the contribution box a small slip of paper was noticed.

Extract said paper and note that it is a Summer Festival of Bridge Category Entry Form. About to deliver to a blue coated official when we got the gag.

A small square had been added in black ink below the section box for the category for 'Novice' and a tick inserted therein. To the right in neat writing were the words "Poor Players". The Team number was 6 and the signature looked familiar... D Stern.



At the NCC, the director was called – disputed claim by declarer in a 5 card ending. Declarer repeats his line, defender repeats their disagreement with the claim. Director considers the situationand then notices that there are six cards in dummy! This discovery meant that both claim and dispute were faulty. Director reviews developments and makes a suitable ruling (details not relevant to this story).



Nomination for the Pink Banana award for the worst bid of the tournament ?

Partner opens 1NT (15-17), RHO passes and its your call with

♠ 7 ♥ 10 7 ♦ K Q 10 9 8 7 5 3 2 ♣ 8

Consider your options.....transfer to 3♦ and pass?, leap to 4 , 5 or 6♦ or maybe 4♣ Gerber or maybe just pass and come back in with the broken wing routine hoping to get doubled in 5♦. At the table, the choice of bid was 3 of the contract where there is no trump suit nominated!! Alas one defender had Ax of diamonds so after one hold up, dummy was dead.

WOMEN ARE THE STRONGER SEX

What, you may wonder, do you directors talk about while play is in progress?

Director 1: You know xx, don't you?

Director 2: Of course.

Director 1: Did you know that he had a half sister 49 years older?

Director 2: Did she have a second husband?

Director 1: ?!?!?!!

NOT Rydges Datums

BD	Rnd 7	Rnd 8	Rnd 9
1	-340	+430	-120
2	-110	+480	-480
3	-330	+100	-580
4	-10	+500	-220
5	+670	0	-460
6	+120	-30	-570
7	-570	-680	+630
8	-430	-200	-400
9	-150	-250	+100
10	+1090	+70	+130
11	+370	-10	-300
12	+650	-220	+640
13	-380	-370	-660
14	+440	+360	-450
15	+140	-170	+40
16	-750	-620	-190
17	-110	-40	-50
18	+70	+1460	-350
19	+120	-650	-30
20	0	+130	+80

NOT NCC Datums

BD	Rnd 7	Rnd 8	Rnd 9
1	-450	+440	-
2	-120	+570	-
3	-400	+150	-
4	+40	+620	-
5	+650	+20	-
6	+120	-60	-
7	-380	-660	-
8	-360	-220	-
9	-90	-140	-
10	+650	+10	-
11	+290	-30	-
12	+640	-140	-
13	-140	-200	-
14	+400	+230	-
15	+60	-130	-
16	-690	-650	-
17	-130	-80	-
18	-80	+1530	-
19	+50	-650	-
20	+30	-50	-

TABLE TALLY

as of Midnight 19/1/00

4856

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

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/>