



2006 DAILY BULLETIN AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIPS



Editors: Stephen Lester & Dianne Marler

Issue 5

Email us at: dianne.marler@santos.com

Wednesday, July 26, 2006

THOROUGHLY MODERN MARLENE

I really enjoyed my first spot of kibitzing at a seniors table. I obviously picked the right match, as the five of us had a great time.

The bridge was instructive too – with Marlene Watts giving two gentlemen a free lesson on “modern bridge methods”

Stage A Seniors, Round 4, Board 12
West deals, NS vulnerable

♠ J 10 7

♥ A K 10 5 4 3

♦ Q 9 7 5

♣ ---

♠ Q 6 3

♥ 8

♦ K J 10 6 4

♣ A Q 9 4

♠ A K 8 5

♥ 7 6 2

♦ 8 3 2

♣ 10 8 7

♠ 9 4 2

♥ Q J 9

♦ A

♣ K J 6 5 3 2

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
Watts	Klofa	Yuill	Schwabegger
1♦	2♥	3♣	Pass
3♥	Dbl	3NT	All Pass

Marlene asked Charlie Schwabegger whether his partner's double was asking for a heart lead or suggesting a different lead. Schwabegger replied that he was requesting a heart lead.

Schwabegger started ♠A, then switched to ♥2. Stan Klofa won ♥K and continued ♠J. Schwabegger won ♠K and exited a third spade.

At this point, Margaret Yuill claimed nine tricks with six clubs, two diamonds and one spade.

At the end of the hand, Marlene continued her lesson. “I've been taught that in this situation, double asks partner not to lead my suit, so I was worried about a spade lead”.

The men were silenced, because suggesting a different lead by doubling is the more logical meaning in this situation. Without a double, you would expect partner to lead your suit. If you double 3NT after bidding a suit, this too should ask partner to find a different lead.

TODAY'S TIMETABLE

Championship Event:

Open & Women's Butler Stage II

10am, 2.30pm, 8pm

Senior's Butler Stage B

10am, 2.30pm, 8pm

ANC Swiss Pairs

10am, 2.30pm

Congress Event:

ANC Restricted Butler

10am, 2.30pm

For players with <100 Masterpoints

SA Bridge Association Teams—1 of 3

7.30pm

Deep Finesse claims that the limit of the hand is eight tricks in notrumps, but on close analysis, we see that this is after a diamond lead. The defence is one step ahead, with declarer needing to build a trick in spades or hearts to succeed.

At another table, Margaret Bourke, defending 3NT, led a small spade at trick one. Declarer had no option but to try ♠Q, but was not up to the task. Bourke was surprised that +50 was only worth 6IMP, no doubt due to the fact that 5♣ was failing at many tables.



Marlene Watts

Quotable Quips

“ The hands at this event don’t suit the good players

“ If you keep playing like that
“ you’re going home strapped to
a Virgin Blue wing

FROM THE APPEALS ROOM

A larger proportion of appeals heard at major tournaments seem to involve hesitations. This one, from Stage II of the Open Butler, was no exception:

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

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
Pass	2♥ ¹	Pass	3♥
Dbl	Pass	3NT	All Pass

1. Both majors, weak

Committee: Marcia Scudder, Ian Thomson and Stephen Lester, with Chairman Eric Ramshaw

Details: Before passing 2♥, East enquired about the bid's meaning, and there was an agreed hesitation.

Director's Ruling: Chris Diment ruled that Pass was a logical alternative with the West hand, and the score was adjusted to NS -200.

Appellant's Submission: West thought that he had a normal takeout double as a passed hand. With NS having a fit, it was likely EW had a fit too, and he was not willing to sell out to 3♥.

Committee's Decision: It was a unanimous decision to uphold the Director's decision at the table, with no score adjustment. The committee felt East had a clear-cut 2NT bid available, and agreed that Pass was a logical alternative on the West hand.

LIKE SISTER LIKE BROTHER

The deal below provided an identical score for Bruce Neill – Andrew Peake and Sue Lusk – Therese Tully.

Stage II Butler, Round 1
Board 4, West deals, all vulnerable

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

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
2♠ ¹	Pass	3♣ ²	Pass
Pass	3♥	Pass	3NT
Pass	4♦	Pass	4♥
Pass	Pass	Dbl	Rdbl
All Pass			

1. Spades and a minor, weak
2. Pass or correct

East thought all her Christmases had come at once, but soon regretted her actions on this deal. She started ♦A, K and another diamond, immediately sacrificing one defensive trick when partner's ♦Q was wasted, and partner had no trump to ruff with.

Tully won the third trick with ♦8 and cashed ♠A,K, ♣A,K and ruffed a club. Six tricks in.

The last diamond was ruffed by East with ♥3 and over-ruffed with ♥A. Seven tricks in.

Tully was left with ♥KQ106 and when she exited from dummy with a black card, ruffing with ♥6, she could claim the last three tricks with ♥KQ10.

The identical defence and play was found at the table where Sue Lusk's brother Bruce Neill sat North. +1080 NS, not a bad score.

Val Mitchell was impressed with Sydney expert Berri Folkard's identical play in 4♥ (undoubled). How many Easts, I wonder, could diagnose not to continue with ♦K when West plays ♦10 at trick one?

POSTFREE BRIDGE BOOKS—SOFTWARE SALE!!

All software at discount during ANC Championships ONLY!

Ask for a demonstration or free tutorial....

Visit our stall for lots of bargains and specials

Huge range of new & second hand books + memorabilia online

♠ ♥ www.postfree.cc (02) 9388 8861 ♦ ♣

CLAIMING AS DEFENDER

As I have managed to obtain a photograph of Kieran Dyke with his eyes open, I am glad to be able to bring you a hand which features Kieran in action again.

In this example, Kieran claimed for declarer just a few seconds into the play of the hand:



Kieran Dyke

Stage II, Round 3
Board 9, North deals, EW vulnerable

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

♠ A K
♥ A 4 2
♦ K Q J 7
♣ A 10 4 2

♠ 7 5
♥ Q
♦ A 10 9 8 6 5 4 3
♣ Q 9

WEST <i>Dyke</i>	NORTH <i>Brightling</i>	EAST <i>Wiltshire</i>	SOUTH <i>Thomson</i>
	1♦ ¹	Pass	4♦

All Pass

1. 5-11 HCP, no other weak opening.

Bring back the good old days when double of a four-level contract was for penalties, Kieran must have been thinking.

Richard Brightling happens to be the wise soul who quipped that the hands in this event are not suited to the good players – but was he talking about himself, we wonder?

The Brightling – Thomson partnership employ a variety of weak bids to show specific two-suiters. The 1♦ bid is reserved for just about anything not described clearly elsewhere in the system.

East led ♠Q against the inelegant contract. Kieran plonked a variety of winners on the table, then said “Who’s got ♣K, because I’m going to get three diamond tricks, either four or five down”.

Brightling was quite happy to accept the claim, as he was wondering how best to play the trump suit.

HOWE TO SAVE PARTNER

It's normal to see errors escalate after the bridge has been going for an extended period. The final of a long event often sees inferior bridge to that of the qualifying rounds. With stamina an important factor in performance, it is easier to err. This deal is an example:

Stage II, Round 7
Board 7, South deals, all vulnerable

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

Table A

WEST	NORTH <i>Ewart</i>	EAST	SOUTH <i>Howe</i>
Pass	4♦ ¹	Pass	4♥
All Pass			

1. Alerted as Texas Transfer, slam interest with spades

NS were playing a 14-17 notrump, and it was (just) conceivable that South could have the right cards for a heart slam - ♠Axx, ♥Ax, ♦AQxxx, ♣Kxx, for example. North obviously hasn't read about one of US expert Bob Hamman's pet theories: "Don't play me for the perfect cards".

To his horror, North wrote down 4♦ instead of 4♣, the systemic bid to show slam interest in hearts. But good old partner, Blaine Howe came to the rescue, reasoning his controls and three-card spade support were enough to cuebid ♥A. And there the matter rested . . .

Table B – In Stark Contrast

WEST	NORTH <i>Stark</i>	EAST	SOUTH <i>Gold</i>
Pass	1♥	Pass	Pass!
All Pass			

With no forcing bids available as a passed hand, Leigh Gold was forced to jump to game, giving up on a possible heart slam.

The editor believes that Mr Gold and Mr Ewart have used up their share of luck for the tournament.

**OPEN BUTLER STAGE II
AFTER 14 ROUNDS**

NS FIELD

	Total	Total	Wins	Last	Last
	VPs	IMPs		VPs	IMPs
1 Neill & Peake	272	220	11.5	25.0	30
2 Ewart & Howe	222	37	7.5	15.0	1
3 Markey & Mill	222	35	8.5	4.0	37-
4 Noble & Bilski	209	5-	6.5	15.0	1
5 Gold & Stark	207	0	7.0	13.0	8-
6 Dawson & Demuy	206	13-	6.5	16.0	2
7 Snashall & Dixon	206	14-	7.0	15.0	0
8 Klinger & Lilley	202	26-	7.0	19.0	12
9 Brightling & Thomson	202	28-	7.5	20.0	16
10 Geddes & Jenner-O'Shea	198	43-	6.0	9.0	20-
11 Lange & Hocking	196	45-	5.0	17.0	8
12 Prescott & Hughes	194	43-	6.0	25.0	33
13 Fischer & Bookallil	172	117-	4.0	7.0	24-
14 Tishler & Sarten	163	151-	2.5	18.0	11

**WOMENS BUTLER STAGE II
AFTER 14 ROUNDS**

NS FIELD

	Total	Total	Wins	Last	Last
	VPs	IMPs		VPs	IMPs
1 Tully & Lusk	245	119	10.0	24.0	29
2 Bird & Creet	242	116	9.5	10.0	15-
3 Weal & Yule	236	93	9.0	16.0	3
4 Bashar & Moses	236	80	10.0	21.0	18
5 Manford & Clements	215	14	8.0	18.0	9
6 Chadwick & Sharp	210	4	6.5	20.0	17
7 Stephens & Pettigrew	207	7-	8.0	13.0	7-
8 Fallon & Marrett	204	12-	6.5	9.0	18-
9 Eddie & McMahon	199	36-	4.0	13.0	6-
10 Plush & Boxall	194	44-	6.5	25.0	36
11 Emerson & Harris	192	62-	5.0	12.0	11-
12 Warthold & Herring	189	73-	4.5	14.0	5-
13 Ingham & Folkard	169	133-	5.0	13.0	8-
14 Rasmussen & Daws	166	148-	6.5	11.0	14-

EW FIELD

1 Gill & Gosney	260	168	11.0	25.0	37
2 Moren & Francis	246	125	9.0	15.0	1-
3 Zollo & Eddie	238	92	9.5	14.0	2-
4 Rosendorff & Zeller	237	86	10.0	17.0	8
5 Wiltshire & Dyke	223	41	6.5	15.0	0
6 Reynolds & Appleton	222	43	7.5	10.0	16-
7 Adams & Beauchamp	219	30	8.5	11.0	12-
8 Smolanko & Middleton	210	7-	5.0	23.0	24
9 Richman & Richman	203	26-	8.5	5.0	30-
10 Chadwick & Lowry	200	28-	7.0	21.0	20
11 Robb & Thenuwara	195	44-	7.0	15.0	1-
12 McLeish & McLeish	191	60-	5.0	5.0	33-
13 Livingston & Hill	183	84-	5.0	12.0	11-
14 Zurawel & Coffey	165	143-	4.0	13.0	8-

EW FIELD

1 Glanger & Scudder	266	184	11.0	16.0	5
2 Schroor & Kaplan	248	119	10.0	20.0	15
3 Snashall & Murray-White	232	84	6.0	14.0	3-
4 Driscoll & Greenfeld	225	56	8.0	21.0	18
5 Kahler & Hopwood	215	13	7.0	10.0	17-
6 Wilson & Wilson	207	5-	7.0	19.0	14
7 Liepins & Chadwick	205	19-	7.0	17.0	6
8 Mellings & Spurrier	204	14-	5.0	18.0	11
9 Evans & Herden	201	30-	6.0	6.0	29-
10 Jagelman & Frazier	193	49-	8.0	17.0	7
11 Stewart & Hill	187	66-	6.5	17.0	8
12 Alexander & Marler	186	54-	5.0	12.0	9-
13 Andrews & Phillips	186	59-	5.5	4.0	36-
14 Tucker & Miller	186	71-	5.0	9.0	18-

**SENIORS BUTLER STAGE A
AFTER 11 ROUNDS**

NS FIELD

1 Clarke & Colmer	195	94	8.5	25.0	32
2 Berger & Berger	186	98	7.5	18.0	9
3 Dilks & Gallus	180	57	6.5	14.0	2-
4 Samuel & Samuel	165	1	5.0	14.0	4-
5 Scerri & Scerri	165	2-	4.5	17.0	7
6 Bourke & Ramshaw	159	6-	4.0	10.0	15-
7 Klofa & Shwabegger	157	22-	7.0	16.0	5
8 Rhodes & Rhodes	156	33-	3.5	14.0	4-
9 Motteram & Wagner	150	51-	5.0	9.0	19-
10 Hunt & Lachman	147	56-	4.5	6.0	27-
11 Mann & Heairfield	134	98-	3.5	17.0	7

**SENIORS BUTLER STAGE A
AFTER 11 ROUNDS**

EW FIELD

1 Bignall & Januske	218	168	9.5	20.0	15
2 Grant & Hancock	200	113	8.5	21.0	19
3 Kahler & Davis	188	83	7.0	16.0	2
4 Piper & Ashworth	183	59	7.0	16.0	4
5 Watts & Yuill	170	19	5.5	13.0	7-
6 Renton & Lund	159	20-	4.0	24.0	27
7 Marks & Rocks	156	33-	4.5	13.0	7-
8 Rutkowski & Tobin	152	40-	5.0	12.0	9-
9 Kemp & Kemp	144	69-	4.5	14.0	5-
10 Thompson & Thompson	141	79-	3.0	5.0	32-
11 Kelly & Narita	110	183-	3.0	16.0	4