



# NOT NEWS 2003

Editorial Team: Stephen Lester & Jane Rasmussen  
 Photographer : Claire Rasmussen  
 Production: Jennifer de Livera

## Australian Open Pairs Final

PI	Name	Score
1	NICK HUGHES ROBERT KROCHMALIK	590
2	PAULINE GUMBY WARREN LAZER	588
3	PAUL MARSTON STEPHEN BURGESS	576
4	RICHARD JEDRYCHOWSKY PETER CISZAK	575
5	MAGNUS MOREN TERRY STRONG	564
6	ROBERT DALLEY PAUL LAVINGS	560
7	CALLIN GRUIA MAREK SZYMANOWSKI	558
8	BOB RICHMAN JANE DAWSON	548
9	BOBBY EVANS M MILASZEWSKI	510
10	SIMON HINGE PHILIP MARKEY	504

## Plate

PI	Name	Score
1	RON SPEISER PATRICIA MANN	745
2	ERVIN OTVOSI MAREK BOREWICZ	739
3	LESZEK LUKJANOW WALDEK MROZ	728
4	HELEN TOOTELL PETER TOOTELL	680
5	KEN OZANNE ALEXANDE OZANNE	680
6	TONY MARINOS GYTIS DANTA	680

## TIM BOURKE'S DAILY PLAY PROBLEM

### 6. TRUMP SAFETY

*Love All. Dealer North.*

♠ A K 3 2  
 ♥ A 3 2  
 ♦ K Q J  
 ♣ 10 8 7

♠ 7 6 4  
 ♥ K 10 7 6 5 4  
 ♦ -  
 ♣ A 6 4 2

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
Pass	1NT <sup>1</sup> 4♥	3♦ All pass	3♥

<sup>1</sup> 15 to 17

In the popular American style, West leads a third-highest ♠2 and East plays ♠A on dummy's jack. As all will be well if trumps divide, your thoughts should turn to what can be done if trumps are 4-0 or 0-4. What is the best way to manage these possibilities?

## Problems at the Swiss Pairs

Apologies. The Swiss Pairs encountered hardware problems during the dinner break. The seventh round could not be scored because of these difficulties. The event will be re-scored today; hopefully the Fat Controller will have things under control by the last session.

**Table Tally**  
 at Midnight 19/01/2003  
**2516**

# NATIONAL WOMEN'S TEAMS FINAL

by Stephen Lester

My aim for Sunday was to kibitz and present a comprehensive report of one of the two finals taking place – the Seniors and the Women's. But – you've got to be kidding! A 10am start! (And sorry, Seniors - the women are prettier than you). So by the time I was ensconced behind Barbara Travis for the second session, the foursome of Travis - Havas, Cormack – Rothfield had inflicted a punishing 76-10 set on SMITH.

Would SMITH be able to claw their way back from this disastrous start?

The second board suggested anything was possible:

Women's Final, Bd 18, East deals, NS vul

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

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

♠ K 9 8 2  
♥ J  
♦ K 10 7 6  
♣ A 10 8 2

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Goldberg</i>	<i>Havas</i>	<i>Alexander</i>	<i>Travis</i>
		1♣	Dbl
1♦	1♠	2♦	4♠
5♦	Dbl	All Pass	

This contract, of course, was untouchable: 11 tricks, EW +550. Perhaps South should splinter in diamonds, slowing the auction down, and making it less likely that North will volunteer a double of 5♦. No NS contract at the five-level is any bargain, but it may not be doubled.

At the other table, Feitelson and Cummings got to 5♦ quickly after Feitelson passed with the East hand. Cummings overcalled 1♥ with 4♦, and over East's 5♦ bid, South rebid 5♥. This was of course doubled.

This contract is in a lot of trouble if the defence gets everything right. But on a diamond lead, South grabbed ♦A.

Now she took her only real chance for the contract, leading ♠Q at trick two, covered with ♠K and ruffed.

West could have defeated the contract now by switching to a

club, but instead continued the diamond attack. South ruffed, and drew trumps.

East, losing her way in the defence, discarded a spade. Disaster! Now South could draw East's ♠9 and cross to dummy's fifth spade for a club discard. 11 tricks; +650 NS and 15 IMPs to SMITH.

In the Seniors, one table played 5♦x for +550, but 5♠ at the other table went down two for 8 IMPs to HAUGHIE.

It's boards like these that make it crazy for teams to concede too soon after a bad start to a match. It's not over until the fat lady sings!

But SMITH was not to capitalize on all of their chances in the second set of the four-segment 64-board final.

The negative free bid worked well for Travis – Havas on the next board:

Board 19, South deals, EW vul

♠ 9  
♥ Q J 8 7 6 5 2  
♦ J 6  
♣ 9 8 2

♠ A Q 6 5 3  
♥ A 3  
♦ Q 3 2  
♣ 6 5 4

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

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Goldberg</i>	<i>Havas</i>	<i>Alexander</i>	<i>Travis</i>
			1♣
1♠	2♥ <sup>1</sup>	4♠	Pass
Pass	5♥	All Pass	

1. Negative free bid

It's been a tough few days, and the pressure of being in the final is great. But, really, either East or West should have remembered to double Havas' contract. I've had to stop myself from saying more; my only extra comment is that this is no way to get back 60+ IMPs.

-150 from 5♥ three down and +620 from 4♠ making gave TRAVIS back 10 IMPs.

In the Seniors, somebody *did* remember to double 5♥: +500 versus -620 was 8 IMPs to HAUGHIE.



2003 NWT Champions

Having mentioned two error-filled deals, I'm going to report a well-bid and prettily played slam:

Board 27, South deals, Nil vul

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

West	North	East	South
Goldberg	Havas	Alexander	Travis
			1♦ <sup>1</sup>
Pass	1♥	Pass	2NT <sup>2</sup>
Pass	3♦ <sup>3</sup>	Pass	3NT
Pass	4♦	Pass	4♥ <sup>4</sup>
Pass	4♠ <sup>4</sup>	Pass	4NT <sup>5</sup>
Pass	6♦	All Pass	

1. Travis chose to open her better suit: 1♣ could be three
2. 18-19
3. Natural
4. Cuebids
5. Still interested

Havas did well to investigate slam possibilities, and with her short but great trump suit, Travis did well by cooperating.

After ♣J lead to Alexander's ace and ♥4 switch, Travis finished the hand off in about 30 seconds flat (Havas, of course, was out of the room having a cigarette).

She rose, ♥A, cashed ♣K,Q, then ruffed a heart low in dummy. A trump to hand and a second heart ruff was followed by ♠A,K. Nothing bad had happened; dummy still had ♦Q, and Travis held ♦AKJ and her last club. She claimed on a crossruff, and I was sent on a search for Havas.

As is often the case on hands where a great line is taken, the cards were friendly. Even my cocker spaniel would have been able to make 6♦.

In the Seniors, the HAUGHIE NS played 3NT, making +490, but the NOBLE pair bid the excellent 6♦: 10 IMPs to NOBLE.

The set I watched didn't have too many exciting hands, but then every hand is an adventure. I could find something to write on every one of the 16 boards, but with space limited, that's your bloomin' lot.

TRAVIS won the final 213 – 101.3, a convincing win, and giving the members of the team 72 playoff points for the 2003-2004 cycle.

The SMITH team (by the way, here's some trivia: Kate Smith was Kate Smith even before she was married) earn 36 points for their effort.

It's farewell to Barbara Travis, who returns to Adelaide with her family tomorrow, with yet another NWT win under her belt, and putting her into her own category: eight times NWT winner.

### Editor's Postscript

OK, I can't resist including this spectacular – but sad – hand. It possibly reflects the fortunes of the Western Australian women in the final. Sometimes when you're chasing IMPs, the Card Gods can be very vindictive. Take a look at the little number below:

Session 3, Board 13, North deals, all vul

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

When Carole Rothfield held the North cards, she opened a systemic 1♣, Polish-style, normally either a weak notrump or a 15+ strong club.

East, Dadie Greenfeld overcalled 1♥, pretty standard at equal vulnerability. But this time, South, Jan Cormack, doubled, showing a 7-9 points.

Carole, taking care not to lick too much of her lipstick off, was able to pass quietly when the bidding tray came back to her. +1100.

The SMITH North, however, had a natural 1♥ opening. East, Candice Feitelson, also had to restrain herself from de-lipsticking, until NS confidently surged to the six-level - in hearts. Then Double, +800. Thus TRAVIS earned an unusual 18 IMPs, 6♥x at one table and 1♥x at the other.

In the Seniors, the HAUGHIE NS pair played 4♥ for +620; the NOBLE NS tried 3NT, two down, -200 after a club lead. 13 IMPs to HAUGHIE.

Congratulations to HAUGHIE, also convincing winners, 204 - 123 over NOBLE.

## TIMETABLE

**South-West Pacific Teams Championship**  
Mon 20 – Fri 24 January at Hyatt and Rydges  
Hotels Canberra  
Session times:  
11.00, 3.00, 8.00 and Friday 10.00 & 2.00

## THOSE PESKY HANDBAG GREMLINS

As I write this little snippet (at the end of the third segment of the NWT Final), I have Jan Cormack's mobile phone in my pocket.

Some of you may remember that Jan's phone went off during a round of the Spring National Women's Teams. This denied TRAVIS the chance of a place in the final.

Well, it's happened again. Jan has discovered her phone has a fault, and despite it being locked, it managed to turn itself on again during the set.

Result: a 9 IMP fine. So, instead of winning the set by 5, TRAVIS lost it by 4. NOBLE also suffered a 9 IMP fine after Wally Malaczynski's mobile went off.

While it is not crucial this time, it is a worry when mobile phone problems can possibly affect the result of an important event.

## HOMER NODS

Reported by Dagmar Neumann

*Ed: A year or so ago (when I was working for Paul Marston as Editor of Australian Bridge), I might have thought twice about accepting this article, a prime contender for the Homer Nods Award. But I know Paul won't mind, so I'll bring the story to everyone's attention, instead of just a select few.*

Paul played the Men's Pairs with Sartaj Hans. They were playing a natural system, and had plenty of prepared agreements. One of them duly came up during the event.

To fully understand this story, let's first delve into Sartaj's mind:

1. Paul opens 1♣ (natural): RHO bids a strong 1NT.
2. Sartaj, with only four points but club support and hearts, bids a triumphant 2♣. This, by agreement, shows a weak hand with hearts and another.
3. LHO bids 4♠, Marston bids 5♥, which goes Pass, Pass to his RHO's 5♠.  
"Double," says the maestro.

Result: 5♠X makes six for a poorish board.

## SOLUTION TO TIM BOURKE'S DAILY PLAY PROBLEM

### 5. THE RIGHT MIRACLE

Once the defenders follow with small trumps under ♠A, you need clubs to be 3-3 and a layout like this:

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

The plan is to discard a diamond on the fourth club while East ruffs with ♠Q. However, there is a small trap to avoid.

On this layout, it is imperative to win the first trick with the ♦A. If you duck the first trick and win the second with the ♦A West can discard his last diamond on the fourth club. Then, after East ruffs the fourth club with ♠Q he plays a diamond and West scores both the ♠9 and the ♠K to defeat the contract.

If instead you win the first diamond and cash ♠A, then after East ruffs the fourth club you discard a diamond from hand. Now when East plays a diamond the difference is that West has to win the trick and, no matter what he plays next, you are in control. After regaining the lead, you advance a low trump towards dummy's ♠J and West can only score the ♠K, for the third and last defensive trick.

Now we'll enter Paul's mind (he can't understand why Sartaj entered the auction uninvited with only four points:

"Sartaj, why did you bid 2♣ with such a weak hand?"

Sartaj: "Because I was showing a weak hand with support for your clubs – plus hearts. We discussed it".

Paul is bemused for a moment or two until he is reminded that the auction actually started with a 1♣ opening bid by him, not a Pass.



## MISTAKES I HAVE MADE (2) by Neville J Moses

At last – a triumph!

It happened in Session 1 of the Mixed Pairs. West was an attractive innocent looking blonde who opened a weak 2♠ passed around to me.

I reopened with 2NT raised by DW to 3NT, passed out. The innocent blonde (whose name is Helena Drwecki) led Q♠ and I was looking at:

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

N

S

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

East played low and when I took the king I had an obvious nine tricks; but this was pairs and the club finesse beckoned. On the other hand on a heart lead I would have been struggling to make.



Helena Drwecki

Obviously exploration was required so I took a couple of rounds of diamonds and on the second, West discarded ♣5!! Enquiry “revealed” that the defence used “McKenney,” whatever that meant in these circumstances.

Not wishing to scramble my entries I decided to tackle the clubs. The ace elicited ♠2 from East and??

Surely that innocent West had not discarded from Q75?

I looked, she had and quietly claimed five more spade tricks and a complete top.

The West hand:

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

A bottom for us but as I said a triumph. Why?

Well after the hand DW admitted grudgingly: “I can’t blame you – I would have finessed myself!!!”

## FREE INTERACTIVE SEMINAR ON THE LAWS OF BRIDGE

Conducted by Laurie Kelso and Sean Mullanphy

An informal session, questions from participants welcome.

Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> January, 9:30am – 10:30am

Executive Room, Rydges Lakeside.

Sponsored by the Australian Bridge Directors Association

For further information about the Australian Bridge Directors Association, email the Secretary, Richard Hills:  
richard.hills@immi.gov.au

## OPENING POINTS AND SYSTEM CLASSIFICATION

Although system regulations are undergoing review the 2003 Summer Festival is conducted under the current ABF System Regulations. They use the concept of “Opening Points”

“Opening Points” are calculated as the sum of the high card points (Ace = 4, King = 3, Queen = 2, Jack = 1) together with the number of cards in the two longest suits in the hand.

GREEN, BLUE and RED Systems are classified by criteria that include requirements for “Opening Points”

- 1 level Bids must show no less than 18 Opening Points
- 2 level Bids must show no less than 15 Opening Points
- 3 level suit bids must show no less than 15 Opening Points, or no less than 12 Opening Points and a suit of at least seven cards in the suit bid.

Typical examples are:

- Axxxx, KJxxx, xx, x with 8 high card points + 10 cards in the two longest suits for 18 opening points.
- KQJxxx, xxx, xx, xx with 6 high card points + 9 cards in the two longest suits for 15 opening points.
- Kxxxxx, xx, xx, xx with 3 high card points + 9 cards in the two longest suits for 12 opening points

If a system allows any opening bids with less than the required number of “Opening Points” it fails the green, blue and red classifications and becomes a YELLOW system one of whose features is:

- The minimum Opening Points for Bids may be less than those prescribed above. Note that YELLOW systems require prior notification and there are restrictions on when and where they can be played.

## ENTRY PROBLEMS

On 29 October, 2002 the first one arrived - an entry for the 2003 Summer Festival. This was the first of over 500 pieces of paper which would land on my desk before the start of the Festival on 15<sup>th</sup> January. Most of them came by mail to the post office box, but some were hand delivered, some were faxed and others arrived by email. You may be interested to hear of the processing required for each of these 500 pieces of paper. The first thing that happens is that the envelope is opened, ensuring that neither the entry itself nor the accompanying cheque has been torn in half in the process. Each piece of paper is then assigned a sequence number (that's how I know just how many have actually arrived). A visual check is made to see that the entry is "sensible" and that some form of payment is there. About 20-30 entries are then grouped together to constitute a "bundle". Each bundle is then subjected to the following procedures:

1. The information on the form is transferred to Masterscore. This is linked to the latest masterpoint file, so each person in a team or pair is entered by way of their ABF number. The program automatically assigns names from the masterpoint file. The program "knows" if the ABF number is incorrect and refuses to accept it. It also knows if a person tries to enter in two different teams in the same event. For those people who neglect to give their ABF number, the program can retrieve the number from the name (some intervention - or guesswork - is necessary to determine which J Smith is actually the one in the team).
2. The finances associated with each of the 500 pieces of paper are handled by a second program, Event Minder. This collates information for each entry in each bundle. It is told which events are being entered on that piece of paper and calculates the total entry fee required. Each cheque or credit card payment for that piece of paper is then entered into the program, which keeps track of those entries which are unpaid or incompletely paid. For each bundle, the program produces banking records for all the cheques and a list of the credit card payments
3. There are a number of other pieces of information which are tracked at the same time. These include: which venue has been selected for the SWPT, any player with a disability which will require special consideration, the names of our Overseas Visitors.

As you see, the procedures involved in transforming 500 pieces of paper into the tournament entries you see here, and money in the bank, are quite involved and time consuming. There are ways that you can help to make this process easier. First, and most important, is to supply ABF numbers if at all possible. This not only speeds up processing, but it ensures that the correct J. Smith plays in your team, and is allocated the masterpoints won.

Some interesting sidelines to the entry processing that have occurred this year:

Three entries were made on old entry forms - two from 2002 and one, believe it or not, from 2000.

One entry came in the guise of Christmas card - to cut down on the postage payable.

One entry had been sent to PO Box 2001 instead of 201 - the dead letter office managed to sort it out, and it arrived, complete with cheques.

Some entries contain mathematical errors, but the most notable was from a prominent accountant!

*Marcia Scudder*

## Australian Mixed Pairs Winners



**Allison Stralow  
David Horton**



## SOLUTION TO JANNERSTEN PROBLEM FIVE

The answer, obvious once you think of it, is that you must ruff three clubs in dummy. The fact that you are ruffing a winner is neither here nor there. You ruff the opening club lead, cash the ace of spades for a diamond discard, and ruff a spade in hand. Draw just one round of trumps and, when both defenders follow, ruff the jack of clubs in dummy and ruff a spade high. Ruff the ace of clubs with dummy's last trump, ruff another spade high, and draw the outstanding trump.

This is the sort of layout that you are playing for:

	♠A8765		
	♥8763		
	♦A1085		
	♣---		
♠Q1043	N	♠KJ92	
♥102		♥9	
♦Q3	W	E ♦KJ4	
♣Q10764		♣K8532	
	S		
	♠-		
	♥AKQJ54		
	♦9762		
	♣AJ9		

Dummy's fifth spade has been established and the ace of diamonds remains as an entry. All the defenders can make is one diamond trick.

If spades are not 4-4, a small extra chance may materialize when West has the spade length along with four diamonds. If East's singleton diamond is an honour card you may reach an end-position like this:

	♠8		
	♥---		
	♦A108		
	♣---		
♠Q	N	♠---	
♥-		♥---	
♦KJ4	W	E ♦Q	
♣-		♣K85	
	S		
	♠---		
	♥Q		
	♦976		
	♣---		

When you lead a diamond West cannot afford to go up with the king, for you would duck and subsequently finesse against his jack. So East wins the queen of diamonds and West is squeezed when you ruff the club return.



## JANNERSTEN'S PROBLEM SIX

All Vulnerable. Dealer South

♠KQ7  
♥J1082  
♦52  
♣AQ104  
N

W            E

S

♠A5  
♥AK965  
♦AJ4  
♣K52

South	West	North	East
1♥	Pass	3♥	Pass
6♥	All Pass		

West leads the king of diamonds and East contributes the three. You win the first trick and test the hearts with the ace, and to your annoyance East discards the six of diamonds. How must the card lie if you are to avoid defeat?

Does the problem seem familiar? You have to harness the same technique that we used in the very first deal.

Excerpt from Eric Jannersten's book *The Only Chance* reproduced by agreement with Duplimate Australia.



### Richard Grenside's Questions and Answers

Q: My partner always bids very slowly, therefore there was no hesitation.

A: My partner always bids slowly is a common cry which fortunately, or unfortunately, whichever may be the case does not hold any sway in any directors decision. You have to remember that Tournament Directors are also players and 'know' when a slow call is slow!

*P.S. Well some are players ? FC*

## NATIONAL WOMEN'S TEAM FINAL

Team	Team Members	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Round 4	Total Score
<b>TRAVIS</b>	B. Travis E. Havas J. Cormack C. Rothfield V. Cummings C. Feitelson	76	38	50	58	213
<b>SMITH</b>	K. Smith J. Del Piccolo W. Driscoll D. Greenfeld V. Goldberg J. Alexander	11	32	45	13	101

Smith team had a 1.3 IMP Carry-Forward.  
Travis fine 9 IMPs

## NATIONAL SENIOR'S TEAM FINAL

Team	Team Members	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Round 4	Total Score
<b>NOBLE</b>	B. Noble G. Bilski K. Lasocki P. Wyer P. Chan W. Malaczynski	32	42	22	36	123
<b>HAUGHIE</b>	B. Haughie J. Borin J. Lester G. Lorentz Z. Nagy R. Klinger	52	41	62	49	204

Noble had a 16 IMP Carry-Forward.  
Noble fined 9 IMPs

### WHERE TO PUT YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS FOR THE 2003 NOT NEWS

You can either email us at [bridge@accsoft.com.au](mailto:bridge@accsoft.com.au) or leave your articles or comments in the NOT NEWS boxes at either venue.