



NOT NEWS 2004

Editor: Stephen Lester
Production: Jennifer de Livera
Jane Rasmussen

MISTAKES THE EDITOR HAS MADE (with a little bit of help from the poofreaders)



Errata is common, to forgive is divine. Sorry, Mr Klinger for daring to suggest, in NOT News Issue 5, page 6, in the 'I'm A Senior, OK?' article, that you would leap into the auction at the four-level for the first time with a bid of 4♠, holding ♠ K 4, ♥ J 10 7 5, ♦ Q 10 9 3, ♣ 9 8 5, after your RHO had shown five spades and 19+ points. The auction should show a pass by Ron and a 4♠ bid by North, Barbara McDonald.

We apologise for the odd gremlins – it seems they abound after midnight when the tireless NOT News staff are still hard at work completing the bulletin. We promise to try harder.

The Editor

WOMENS AND SENIORS TEAMS FINALS

In the first session of the Women's Final, there were only a few small swings until the penultimate board.

Board 15, South deals, NS vul

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

Table Tally
at Midnight 18/01/2004
2595

TIM BOURKE'S DAILY PLAY PROBLEM

6. Bright Ideas

South deals, all vul

North

♠ Q 10 8 5
♥ A 6 5
♦ A 8 6 2
♣ 8 5

South

♠ A K J 9 7 2
♥ 4 2
♦ K 5 4
♣ K 3

West	North	East	South
2♥	3♥	Pass	1♠
All pass			4♠

North's cue-bid in hearts showed a sound raise to 3♠ (at least). If, instead, he had made a direct raise to 3♠ it would have been preemptive. How would you play the spade game after West leads ♥K?

West	North	East	South
<i>Cormack</i>	<i>Beale</i>	<i>Clark</i>	<i>Smart</i>
2♦ 1	Dbl	Pass 2	Pass
Pass	3NT	All Pass	3♣ 3

1. Multi
2. Willingness to play in 2♦
3. Lebensohl - values

In the Closed Room, over Beale's double, Clark could show a liking for diamonds with her pass, so even if she had led a heart, hoping to find Cormack with a good suit, Cormack would have swung ♦A another when in with ♥A at trick one. Clark made it easy by leading a diamond (*the NOT News Team's preferred lead*), so the contract was three down very quickly.

In the Open Room, the bidding took a different turn:

West	North	East	South
<i>Lusk</i>	<i>Feitelson</i>	<i>Tully</i>	<i>Cummings</i>
2♦ 1	2NT	Pass	Pass
Pass	3♦ 3	Pass	3♣ 2
All Pass			3NT

1. Multi
2. Five-card major enquiry
3. At least one four-card major

(Continued page 3)

OPEN PAIRS FINAL

2004 NWT FINAL

Pl	Name	Score	Sess 2 %
1	Sartaj Hans Michael Ware	565	49.38
2	Darko Janzekovic J Varmo	562	52.47
3	Paul McGrath Wayne Smith	556	49.79
4	Michael Courtney Jane Dawson	553	52.06
5	David McLeish Paula McLeish	546	47.53
6	Julian Foster David Weston	540	52.67
7	Robert Dalley Paul Lavings	536	56.79
8	Edward Barnes Jonathan Dennis	531	54.32
9	Lynn Lovelock Beata Birr	517	52.88
10	Siegfried Konig Jim Wallis	509	54.53

TEAM	C/F	1-16	17-32	33-48	49-64
CUMMINGS	-	24	37	75	103
BOURKE	8	24	82	127	150

CUMMINGS

Valerie Cummings
Candice Feitelson
Jan Cormack
Alida Clark
Linda Stern
Jillian Hay

BOURKE

Margaret Bourke
Felicity Beale
Sue Lusk
Di Smart
Therese Tully
Meredith Woods

2004 NST FINAL

TEAM	C/F	1-16	17-32	33-48	49-64
KLINGER	-	1	38	81	118
NOBLE	4	35	60	62	120

PLATE

Pl	Name	Score	Sess 2 %
1	Fifine Hutton Doreen Payne	555	52.06
2	Denise McKinnon Nick Van Vucht	554	50.00
3	Janet Rowlatt Beverley Peters	549	54.73
4	Leszek Lukjanow Jerzy Wierucki	548	55.14
5	Tom Strong Anthony Tuxworth	541	48.56
6	Phil Hocking Normand Maclaurin	541	52.47
7	May Waddington Enid Herden	536	54.53
8	Premilla Brown John Bennett	535	47.12

KLINGER

Ron Klinger
Bruce Neill
Zolly Nagy
Tim Seres
John Lester
Gabi Lorentz

NOBLE

Barry Noble
George Bilski
Wally Malaczynski
Chris Hughes
Mirek Milaszewski
Apolinary Kowalski



NATIONAL SWISS PAIRS

Pl	Name	VPs
1	David Lilley George Smolanko	156
2	Jason Pitt Bob Evans	152
3	Sam Arber Vivienne Goldberg	150
4	Richard Jedrychowski Hugh McGann	149
5	Bob Richman Michael Prescott	148
6	John Sargent Roger Januszek	146
7	Ms Pritchard Tina Strickland	146
8	John Free Thelma Free	144
9	Theo Antoff Al Simpson	144
10	Dibley Seldon	143
11	Sara Tishler Adam Sarten	143
12	Leigh Gold Jamie Ebery	143
13	Nick Brink Julian Wyner	142
14	Stan Klofa Jeannette Collins	141
15	Jack Feiler Regina Feiler	140

Continued from page 1

I prefer Feitelson's 2NT bid, which describes her hand succinctly. It also gave no chance for East to show a liking for diamonds.

Therese Tully, with an entryless hand, chose to lead what she believed was her partner's suit. Sue Lusk, played ♠8 at trick one. Candice reeled off the first 10 tricks for +630.

14 IMPs to CUMMINGS in a low-scoring 24-16 IMP set.

In the Seniors, NOBLE ran away to a 31-1 IMP score against KLINGER in the first set. The contract was 3NT, down three at one table, and 5♣ failing by one at the other table, 5 IMPs to NOBLE.

Incidentally, we have finally had clarification of the correct full names of the two world-class Poles in the NOBLE team – they are Mirek Milaszewski and Apolinary Kowalski.

Another deal which caught my interest in the first stanza (I kibitzed the Womens table in the Closed Room) was the following:

Board 10, East deals, all vul

♠ Q 7 3
♥ 9 8 6
♦ J 6 5 4
♣ K 10 2

♠ 10 6 2
♥ A Q 10
♦ 10 9 3 2
♣ J 9 6

♠ J 9
♥ K 5 4 3
♦ A K Q 8
♣ 5 4 3

♠ A K 8 5 4
♥ J 7 2
♦ 7
♣ A Q 8 7

West
Cormack

North
Beale

East
Clark
1NT

South
Smart
Dbl

All Pass

I know you can see all four hands, so you would have bid 2♦, wouldn't you?

Without the benefit of seeing the West hand, you have the knowledge that partner could have redoubled to show a single-suiter or bid a suit at the two-level to show the lower of two suits.

The macho players tough it out in 1NT doubled (sorry, Alida), but I believe the East hand is suit-oriented, and the tricks available in diamonds may not be scored in a notrump contract. If you bid 2♦, South will bid 2♠, and now you are off the hook (although you would be happy enough if you were doubled in 2♦ when partner's hand appeared).

Beale – Smart had a chance for a big pickup. Smart led a low spade to Beale's queen, and on the spade continuation Smart cashed her five winners, being careful to play the lowest spade at trick four, followed by ♠8 at trick five. This appeared to escape Beale's attention. She discarded two discouraging hearts, ♥6 and ♥8, when she could have made it



Read Wally Malaczynski's article on spousal bridge on page 5

easier for Smart by discarding ♠10, encouraging, on her second discard. A low club shift leads to +800, but Smart switched to a heart and Clark cashed out for one down (she had discarded down to ♠ ---, ♥ K 5, ♦ A K Q 8, ♣ 5 4 on the run of the spades).

Cummings – Feitelson scored +140 in the Open Room and 1NT doubled was -200, 2 IMPs to BOURKE on a deal that could have netted them 12 IMPs.

The Seniors played a quiet spade partial in both rooms for no swing.

In the second round, BOURKE put together a big card to overtake CUMMINGS and lead by 45 IMPs.

In the Seniors, KLINGER regained some ground to be behind only 15 IMPs.

Here's a deal where a defensive falsecard changed the outcome of the deal, and gave BOURKE 11 IMPs:

Womens Closed Room, Board 20, West deals, all vul

<p>♠ A K J ♥ K J 10 8 ♦ 10 9 5 2 ♣ A K</p>			
♠ Q 10 4 ♥ 7 4 2 ♦ A J 8 ♣ Q J 5 2		♠ 8 7 5 ♥ A 5 3 ♦ K 7 4 ♣ 9 6 4 3	
<p>♠ 9 6 3 2 ♥ Q 9 6 ♦ Q 6 3 ♣ 10 8 7</p>			
West	North	East	South
Cummings	Woods	Feitelson	Bourke
Pass	1♣ 1	Pass	1♦ 2
Pass	2NT 3	Pass	3♣
Pass	3♥	Pass	3NT

1. Precision
2. Negative
3. 19-20 balanced

At every other table in the Finals, North played in their opening bid. North in the Women's Open Room played 1♦ making two, +90, and in the Seniors, one table played 1♦, +90, while the other table played 1♥, +110.

Candice Feitelson led ♣6, and Val Cummings erred at trick one when she played a deceptive ♣Q. Meredith Woods won and played ♥K, ducked. She played ♥8, and overtook with ♥9 to finesse ♠J, winning. A third heart saw Feitelson in with the ace.

Unwilling to continue clubs because of Cummings' card at trick one, she switched to a diamond. Woods played low and Cummings won ♦J. Cummings could have clarified the situation by playing a club now, but she continued ♦A and another diamond, so Woods could now claim nine tricks.

There's a lesson in here somewhere . . .

In the third stanza, CUMMINGS lost 8 IMPs on the set.

BOURKE lost just 5 IMPs on the last set to take out the Championships by 150 – 103 IMPs.

In the Seniors, KLINGER had a huge third set to take the lead, but NOBLE clawed it back on the fourth set to win the event 120 – 118 IMPs.

Finally, a hand where somebody started. It's very easy to find hands where wrong decisions or poor play lead to horrendous results. But it is so much nicer to report a fine play.

Diana Smart reports this deal from the NWT Swiss, where Felicity Beale saved her in defence:

Session 4, Board 5, North deals, NS vul

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

NS reached 4♥ from the North seat, and Smart was sure she had blown the defence when she led ♣Q.

Declarer won in hand and played a heart towards dummy. Beale won ♥K, and made the excellent counter-punch of a low spade at trick three. When she was in with ♥K, she continued ♠A and another, delivering Smart a ruff.



Felicity Beale

Truly a thoughtful defence to save partner from her inopportune lead.

Congratulations to BOURKE and NOBLE for their wins, and commiserations to CUMMINGS and KLINGER.

KROCHMALIK WINS YOUTH TEAM PLAYOFF

The Youth Playoffs concluded on Sunday. After taking an early lead, DEATON, Marc Deaton, Justin Williams, Mike Doecke, William Jenner-O'Shea were defeated by KROCHMALIK, Daniel Krochmalik, Arrian Lasocki, Griff Ware, Daniel Geromboux, 137 - 114 IMPs. The winners will join Gabby Feiler - Nic Croft as the 2004 Australian Youth Team (subject to ABF ratification)

SPOUSAL BRIDGE

by Wally Malaczynski

Some time ago in Poland a story was published that Isabel and Michael K exhausted all possible arguments about the way a certain hand should have been bid. In the end Isabel grabbed a crystal ashtray and threw it at her husband. Michael was alert enough to duck and the ashtray slammed into the TV just behind him. The tube imploded and as a consequence of the injuries suffered, he was taken to hospital. Similar situations, sometimes with even worse consequences, have occurred all over the world including England and the United States.

In England an argument developed between a married pair when the wife became enraged by her husband's poor play. The squabble came to a quick end when she pulled her pistol and shot him. Thanks to timely help he survived but he never ever played with his wife again, even though they remained happily married thereafter.

In New York, however, Mrs Betty Smith didn't have a pistol handy when her husband drew her attention to her incompetent bidding. Disagreeing with his point of view she settled the matter with a simple but most elegant reply; I am not exaggerating, she threw the scissors she happened to be holding straight into his face. Believe me, dear readers, there have been countless even more extreme repercussions that have stemmed from the multiplicity of problems that can arise when spouses play bridge together.

Bridge can be a complex game, with many baffling psychological traps where surprising and unpredictable ramifications can unfold. A civil standard of behaviour between married pairs is the first casualty of any misunderstandings that the game predisposes them to have. Each spouse will often have to make a decision faced with exceptional or unusual circumstances without any template to guide them in their actions. Neither partner can be certain of the others reaction and should any misinterpretations lead to disaster, courtesy gives way to disrespect escalating to extreme rudeness and sometimes even worse!

Eminent writers have reported numerous such events. We live in an age of husband and wife bridge, said an American lady who, not long after making this statement, threw a hot cup of coffee into her husband's face when he allowed a grand slam to make by leading away from a doubleton king that could not have been finessed in any other way. Many consider that married couples should not play together at all. They conclude that it is silly for them to bring into their lives all the unnecessary trouble and arguments that all of us are a witness to, both in rubber and competitive bridge.

"Five years ago my mother warned me not to marry that donkey but now after five years that donkey of mine leads fourth best from J109642. Mum warned me that my troubles would multiply but I had no idea it would be to this extent."

That's what a stunning, velvety voiced and lithesome blonde with gorgeous blue eyes said after her husband went four down doubled, vulnerable, in a makeable contract. It counted for nought that this poor sap worked like a dog, gave her all his pay and gave up smoking and drinking to boot; being a good, loyal and friendly husband, an excellent and interesting companion who buys his wife tasteful gifts every birthday and anniversary is just not enough. If you lead the jack instead of the queen, if you give a weak response when holding a strong hand, that type of thing brands you permanently in the eyes of your wife, and the ruin of your lucky marriage has come much closer. Likewise for many poor wives, if she can't play up to scratch all her 'thank you's' are worth nothing. New dresses won't help either because they won't even get noticed. All he expects from her is:

"Good, quick play and killing leads."

"Maybe its better if you don't play together anymore." This is the opinion of one of my friends who never ever plays with her husband. It's enough, she confesses, that we have spats and arguments at home so it's not worth having fights about bridge there as well.

Up till now I have yet to hear of any bridge arguments that have caused a divorce, even though nowadays so many occur. It should also be pointed out that there do exist married couples that play together quite beautifully – win or lose. However, we do not have accurate statistics about how many married bridge pairs are able to play competitive bridge without conflict. Most of us would probably say that there are lots of them. A few of these are actually overly pleasant to each other, conversing in a sickly sweet tone, a tone that often greatly irritates their opponents. I know of a pair like that and they are still playing together with good results. What do they do that is so irritating?

"And what did my little dreamboat bid?" she asks her dear, wonderful husband.

"It was two hearts, sweetie pie," he fawns.

Do these pairs ever clash? Certainly but never as often and it's no longer the case that 'the man is always right'. With hand on heart I recognise that in many fields women outperform men and they have kept pace with them in bridge too. Ever more often the fair sex can be seen atop the mountain, just like in life generally. The idea that in bridge only men count is ancient history. Nowadays not only can they match our skill at the bridge table but they outshine us in terms of beauty and grace, which is something we men have always valued highly anyway.

To play or not to play with one's spouse – that's the dilemma faced by many a bridge-playing partner. It's a regular talking point whenever this eternal question arises in conversations. Generally the outcome is that everybody is unhappy when they lose. Some are angry that their wives have a passion for bridge, others are disappointed that their wives not only don't play but also don't view the game as a useful recreation. They even begrudge the fact that their husbands play as often as they do.

I have a friend who is extraordinarily pleasant with a very sympathetic nature. Many times I have wanted to partner him in an afternoon bridge session, but each time I asked he explained with great sorrow:

"Listen my wife isn't too keen on bridge and she only lets me play once a week."

Another friend, a great bridge thinker, is in a worse predicament because he is not allowed to play at all, and this often leads to explosive arguments between them. This poor bloke has to think up imaginative schemes and excuses to get to play the game. Once when he came home late from a round of social bridge, he chanced upon his wife waiting at the door:

"Do you realise what time you have come home?"

"Well just as I was returning home I met Mr Kowalski, you remember him, he invited me to dinner and time got away from me."

"Do you think I believe that – tell me the truth, where were you?"

"All right then, I'll tell you the whole truth, only don't sulk. On my way home I bumped into a beautiful young girl and invited her out for a coffee. Later she invited me home for a chat and to take a look at her unusual collection of flowers. Well I stayed there for quite a while."

"And you think I will believe such crap you horrible bridgeaholic? Tell me this very instant who you played with during all these hours? Perhaps a session or two of competitive bridge" she hissed with contempt. "I'll show you which one of us is more competitive."

That was the last word my friend heard before he was knocked out when a heavy vase hit his head. Later on he confessed to me that he was not sorry about the incident because he discovered three bridge lovers in his hospital ward and outside of visiting hours, they played to their hearts' content.

I remember another similar story. I once had a doctor as a neighbour who was a rabid bridge enthusiast but his wife was nowhere as keen, in fact she was trenchantly opposed to playing on a regular weekly basis. It was unbelievable the amount of time and energy the doctor spent thinking up stories that he could use as a pretext to get out and play at least once a week. The only people who would fully understand this are those that find themselves in similar circumstances. He was at home one afternoon when the phone rang and a voice whispered:

"Listen, come on over to our place because we are short of a fourth."

"What was that about?" asked his wife inquisitively.

"Bad; a very bad accident." Clarified the husband:
"There are three doctors there already!"

In the end can we resolve this dilemma? Is it better if the wife plays or doesn't play? Perhaps it's a case of damned if she does and damned if she doesn't. Maybe it's best not to marry at all if you are going to play bridge. Dear readers I'll leave it to you to determine, but I'll have you know that I never sugar coat anything.

RED-FACED YOUTH

Board 6, Session 1, West deals, EW vul

♠ K 10 6 5
♥ 9
♦ A 7 2
♣ 10 9 7 4 3

♠ Q 2
♥ A 6 4
♦ J 10 6 3
♣ A J 6 2

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

♠ A J 7
♥ K Q 10 7 5
♦ 9
♣ K Q 8 5

West	North	East	South
1♦	Pass	2♦ ¹	Dbl
Pass	3♠	Pass	4♠

1. Non-forcing

Cute declarer play on Board 16 in the Open Pairs Final. Ziggy Konig (East), on lead to 4♠, and looking for a club ruff, led 4♦.

A surprised Jimmy Wallis won with 10♦ as declarer played 7♦ in tempo. Now it didn't take Jimmy long to work out partner had underled his AKQ of diamonds looking for a club ruff and when the smoke had cleared declarer was down two. An embarrassed declarer turned scarlet when ♦A appeared at trick 13.

STRUCK BY LIGHTNERING

Stephen Burgess and Brian O'Hara were playing in the Open Pairs. After a convoluted auction which culminated in 7♥ played by Stephen, South, RHO opponent doubled. LHO knew what this meant (after long and bitter experience) – it was a Lightner double. But with his 3-3-3-4 Yarborough, poor West agonised over the lead, trying to work out which suit his partner could possibly be void in.

Eventually he led a club, his longest suit. Stephen flinched and grimaced as the club was led, and West relaxed, sure his opening salvo was going to be ruffed.

But no. His partner had doubled holding the ace of trumps, and Stephen, convivial as usual, was merely giving West the nod that he couldn't go wrong.



The convivial Mr Burgess

SOLUTION TO TIM BOURKE'S DAILY PLAY PROBLEM

6. BRIGHT IDEAS

If diamonds were 3-3, a long card could be set up in the suit for a club discard. There is not much point playing king, ace and another diamond because there is a fair chance that East will win the third round and lead a club through the king.

You might see a clever way to proceed, playing a third round of hearts and discarding a diamond from hand! As East has indicated a doubleton heart, West, the safe hand, has to win the heart trick you can win the diamond return and ruff the diamonds good whenever the suit breaks 3-3.

Unfortunately when the full deal is as shown below you will go down because the diamonds are 2-4:

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

A slight variation will see you make 10 tricks. If you cash ♦K and ♦A before playing a third round of hearts, discarding the last diamond from hand, you make the contract when West began with either two diamonds or three diamonds. On the actual lie of the cards, for example, West has no safe exit when he wins the third round of hearts. A club lead sets up South's king while another round of hearts concedes a ruff-and-discard.

ALERT ALERT ALERT ALERT ALERT ALERT

Australian Bridge Directors' Association
presents for

Players and Directors

Free interactive seminar on alerting regulations

Conducted by
Matthew McManus
Chief Tournament Director for the NSWBA

Tuesday 20 January at 10am

**Executive Room
Rydges Lakeside**

BUS TIMETABLE, MONDAY - THURSDAY

Bus	Arr	Dep	Arr	Dep	Arrive	Dep
	City	City	Ryd	Ryd	NCC	NCC
ABF	10:00	10:05	10:10	10:15	10:20	10:25
ABF			10:30	10:35	10:40	10:45
R1				10:40	10:45	10:50
R2				10:50	10:55	11:00
R1			10:55	11:00	11:05	11:10
ABF	10:50	10:55	11:00	11:05	11:10	
R2			11:05	11:10	11:15	11:20
ABF						13:50
ABF			13:55	14:00	14:05	14:10
ABF			14:15	14:20	14:25	14:30
ABF			14:35	14:40	14:45	
ABF						17:30
R1				17:30	17:35	17:40
ABF			17:35	17:40	17:45	17:50
R1			17:45			
ABF			17:50			
ABF				19:00	19:05	19:10
R1			19:05	19:10	19:15	19:20
ABF			19:15	19:20	19:25	19:30
R1			19:25	19:30	19:35	
ABF			19:35	19:40	19:45	
ABF						22:20
R1				22:20	22:25	22:30
R2				22:30	22:35	22:40
ABF	22:25	22:25	22:30	22:35	22:40	22:45
R1			22:35	22:40	22:45	22:50
R2			22:45	22:50	22:55	23:00
ABF			22:50	22:55	23:00	23:05
ABF	23:10					

ABF = Thrifty bus

R1 = Rydges bus

R2 = Rydges Capital Hill bus

YOU WON'T WANT TO TRUMP THIS...

The bridge barbeque special WEDNESDAY NIGHT ONLY

Menu will include:

Delicious steaks & sausages

Caramelised BBQ onion

Crisp green salad

Traditional coleslaw

Bakery fresh bread roll

Fresh fruit salad

\$15.00 per person

Beverages available from the bar

Available between 5:15pm & 6:45pm on the

Terrace at the National Convention Centre

***Please PRE PURCHASE tickets from National Convention Centre
reception desk from Sunday and before 5pm Tuesday 20th of January.***

MISTAKES I HAVE MADE - 3

The tale of the missing Ace

DW thought that she had reached the stage when nothing I did at the bridge table could ever surprise her again. But for once she had underestimated me.

It happened at the end of the Mixed Pairs when all I wanted to do was to get back to the hotel to sleep. We were not going well and after a torturous sequence stopped in ♡4. Left hand opponent, an innocent looking lady bid ♠2 (the unbid suit). Dummy tracked with K x and I had 10 x. Sleepily I called "low" and right hand opponent won with the jack. Waking up, I falsecarded with the 10. Right hand opponent went into a brown study and a horrible thought struck me. "Oh Pshaw!*" I reflected (or words to that effect) "surely that sweet looking lady hasn't underled her ace!

My worse fears were realized. Right hand dealer continued with ♠9.

"A bottom for sure" I thought, as I contributed my little spade. **Then left hand opponent played low and the king held!!!!**

I peeked at the floor no missing ace there. when I looked up DW had fixed me with a stare that said something like "why in heaven didn't you take your ace at

trick 1?"

But her chin nearly hit the floor a little later, when after a couple of tricks I displayed my hand minus ♠A and claimed. The opponent nodded and put away their cards.

I was disappointed to see that I had scored only an average on the board and we were too polite (or stunned) to ask "which of you had the ace of spades?"

However, we deduced that it must have been left hand opponent, since I had only made the same number of tricks as most other declarers and this was confirmed when the hand record showed left hand opponent held ♠AQxxx.

We have concluded that ♠A was stuck behind another card (which explains the lead and the play) and unless she reads this article she will never know she held it.

But as DW put it: "I thought I was Alice in Wonderland kibitzing a hand at the Mad Hatter's Tea Party, played with a deck of only 51 cards".

PS **"Oh Pshaw" is the name given by Hoyle to the game we call "Oh Hell!".

WHERE TO PUT YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS FOR THE 2004 NOT NEWS

You can either email us at fatcontroller@migrationpath.net.au or leave your articles or comments in the NOT NEWS boxes at either venue.