

THE DYNAMIC DUO

or Twin Contenders for Play of the Year

Peter Gill holds Charlie Snashall in awe after his declarer play in 4♥ on the deal below:

Stage III, Round 9

Board 1, North deals, nil vulnerable

♠ J 10 9

♥ 8 7 4

♦ J 10 5 3

♣ J 8 7

♠ A K 7 6 5 2

♥ 9 5

♦ K 9 8

♣ 3 2

♠ 8 4 3

♥ A K Q 10 6 2

♦ 7 4

♣ K 9

♠ Q

♥ J 3

♦ A Q 6 2

♣ A Q 10 6 5 4

WEST <i>Nixon</i>	NORTH <i>Gill</i>	EAST <i>Snashall</i>	SOUTH <i>Gosney</i>
----------------------	----------------------	-------------------------	------------------------

Pass

1♥

2♣

2♠

Pass

4♥

All Pass

Paul Gosney led ♠Q against 4♥, the logical rebid on the East hand, a good suit, spade tolerance and more importantly, protecting the vulnerable ♣K.

Charlie thought for only a moment before ducking. Now the contract was impregnable. Gosney played ♦A and another diamond at tricks two and three, and when hearts broke, the contract made 11 tricks for +450.



Phil Markey & Charlie Snashall

TODAY'S TIMETABLE

Championship Event:

ANC Pairs: Open, Women's, Seniors,
Youth & Mixed
10am, 2.30pm

Congress Event:

Glenelg Bridge Club Pairs 1 –2
10am, 2.30pm

Matchpoint pairs: players must play in both sessions
One session Walk-In Pairs
7.30pm

Gill thought that Snashall could easily be written up in the IPBA Bulletin for his fine play – which had an element of risk. On leaving the playing room, however, it was to find that Phil Markey, declarer in the same contract after the same bidding, found the same duck against Leigh Gold. The defence was the same, so +450 was the result in those two matches.

Interestingly enough, the only legitimate game contracts with the EW cards are 3NT by East and 4♠ by East.

Unless your relay system allows East to bid spades first, it is a hard ask, but I quite like the idea of a 3NT rebid by East – a likely six tricks in hearts with a club trick on the go.

ON THE DISTAFF SIDE . . .

Sally Murray-White and I are enjoying our week, practising how to get things “not quite right” in the Butler, so that we will be prepared for the Women's Teams next week.

We drove over from Melbourne last Friday – we both like to sing, so we stacked in a CD of hymns. Most of our friends can't tolerate them, so we gave full vent to the anthems while we had the opportunity. This is a throwback from when we were both Sunday school teachers, some 40 years ago.

As per normal, I am chief laundress – we are sharing with Charlie, Neil Ewart and Roy Nixon, and they provide more washing in one day than I have for most weeks back home.

Charlie, Sally and Neil made two dishes each in Melbourne, which were frozen and brought over in a car fridge, so we have been dining in our unit, and have not sampled any restaurants in Adelaide as yet. We somehow find heaps to laugh about every night, as we each recall a triumph or disaster.

Oh well, I have just heard the tumble drier stop rumbling, so I must rush off to start on the ironing for the boys. By the way, I brought my Braun iron over, because I don't trust the irons provided in hotels or apartments.

Helen Snashall



Helen Snashall, Val Hopwood, Sally Murray-White & Janet Kahler at the start of their Stage III match

TAKING THE SUBWAY HOME

Bruce Neill pointed out this hand as one of the more interesting from Sunday's play in Stage I of the Butler. Declarer had to take a most unusual step in order to make a partscore in hearts.

Round 11, Board 6, East deals, EW vulnerable

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

The contract is 2♥ by North, although the weak notrumpers may have it the other way. East leads a low club to the ace and West returns ♣Q to North's king at trick two. Declarer now plays a spade to the king as East ducks, and then a low diamond, on which West rises. West now continues clubs, ruffed low by North.

North cashes ♦Q and plays a heart to the queen in dummy, which holds. When declarer plays ♦A, West ruffs, and what will North do? Discard a spade? Let's see....

If North discards a spade, West plays ♠J, holding and then ♠8 for the queen, ace and a ruff. Declarer will successfully ruff a diamond in hand but will only have trumps to play. East will rise with the ace and cash ♥10 for one down.

♠ 10 ♥ --- ♦ --- ♣ 10	♠ --- ♥ 8 6 ♦ --- ♣ ---	♠ --- ♥ A 10 ♦ --- ♣ ---
	♠ --- ♥ K ♦ 9 ♣ ---	

Rewind

The only way home is for North to underruff when West trumps ♦A with the jack. Now West leads a spade as before and holds the trick as before. The next spade is covered by the queen, ace and a trump. A diamond is ruffed to hand as before, but now declarer still has a spade to play, creating an entirely different two-card ending:

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

North leads a spade and makes ♥K *en passant*.

I am assured that the Northern Territory's Betty Mill found a line similar to this at the table, against Joel Gue and Andrew Morcomb.

INTERNET OBSERVER

It is pleasing to note that the Bulletin online attracts readers. We reproduce this letter from Geoffrey Thomas of Queensland:

Hello Dianne & Stephen,
I must congratulate you both on a well produced, timely and entertaining bulletin. It does help keep one in touch with the event in Adelaide.

I read ,with interest, your editorial regarding the attendance and status of the ANC, and especially the status of the Butler. No doubt the editorial opinion is made to draw comment and discussion and it may well have achieved much of that between rounds. However, if you seek to expose debate within the bulletin, I'll put in two ha'p'orth from a distance.

I'm an old style bridge bum, I'll go anywhere for a game, any time, any level (obviously not the highest, but I still try). I am a keen verbal supporter of the ANC, always talking about it but seldom getting there. Why not?

Why do people play bridge?? Apart from the fact that they have a bug, or they're nuts, it probably comes down to three things: a) the enjoyment, b) the challenge, c) the bridge community. If you look at every other principal congress in Australia these three ingredients continue throughout the event. At the ANC they do not.

In Canberra or wherever you roll up for the event and are a part of the event until the end, your team may be mashed early but you are afforded another challenge, more enjoyment with your peers and a continuation of the communal benefit. Sydney did not do the ANC any favours by farming the side shows out to the clubs. Not only were you 'out' if you lost, but you were consigned to the 'burbs and not encouraged to participate in the integral communal spirit of the event. That conception appears to be permeating for Perth 2007 also.

If one does not win selection for one's state representative team the primary attraction is the Butler, which is not accorded the pre-event publicity that its status deserves. The concept emanates that the Butler is an elite event, almost exclusively for people competing in the year's interstate teams championship. As long as that concept emanates, it becomes increasingly difficult to persuade partners to overcome the other challenges necessary to attend an out of state event and it must necessarily adversely affect the local entries when the show eventually reaches home state every eight years.

I didn't see much publicity for the ANC this year. Yes it was on the ABF website, but the hard copy publicity was not apparently, readily to hand in any of the half dozen clubs I visited in recent months. Yes, everyone knows when it is and what it is, but the hard times and grits just don't appear to get about to the customers. Every one knows the timing of the Gold Coast Congress and the Summer Festival, but both these events are in everyone's face early and often; their brochures are snapped up, and attendance numbers keep climbing.

It's not just this year that the ANC hasn't, (to my mind), had the publicity out in the customers' faces, it's been that way for several years. The various convenors of the

ANC, and their committees do an excellent job. Every year we finish up with a well run, successful congress, and every year it goes on the merry round and on to another Convenor. In general, the congresses that increase their participant numbers have the same convenor, year in, year out.

The ANC Butler is a marvellous event and winning it does prove one's standing in the bridge community regardless of the size of the field - never mind the width - look at the quality and the challenge.

Perhaps, however, the tournament committee should look at a continuation or plate event for those knocked out of Stage I, even to the extent of admitting more paying participants into a "plate".

I was amongst the 40 Aussies that made the trip to Hamilton this year and am amongst those who didn't make Adelaide.

Regardless of the two-star rating of the hotel, it had several plusses that should be at every congress:

- the playing areas were not crowded
- the lighting was adequate
- the catering was at people's rates
- the access and egress was good
- the social area was spacious and well-furnished
- the onsite accommodation was plentiful, spacious and cheap
- the offsite accommodation was close, plentiful and cheaper

I went to Hamilton because players kept asking me to "come to this congress", the publicity brochures were about early and often and there was follow up from the initial enquiry.

It didn't matter that the hotel was not in the middle of town, besides the hotel catering, there was easy access to shopping centres, cafes etc.

People go to bridge congresses for the bridge, not the catering, and perhaps the tournament committee may look to direct convenors to think more about customer satisfaction than luxury status.

When the ANC next visits Queensland, it will escape the clutches of the capital city and be held on the Gold Coast. I hope that this starts a trend that other states may benefit from. I am sure that there are many non-capital cities and towns around each state that are able to provide more than adequate locations for the event.

Kind regards,

Geoff Thomas

OPEN BUTLER STAGE III AFTER 13 ROUNDS

		Total VPs	Total IMPs	Wins	Last VPs	Last IMPs
1	Neill & Peake	238	131	10.0	20.0	19
2	Gill & Gosney	227	94	9.0	21.0	24
3	Rosendorff & Zeller	223	107	9.5	15.0	0
4	Wiltshire & Dyke	204	23	7.5	13.0	8-
5	Markey & Mill	204	18	8.5	10.0	19-
6	Zollo & Eddie	203	15	4.5	21.0	24
7	Adams & Beauchamp	202	37	8.0	13.0	9-
8	Reynolds & Appleton	200	16	6.0	9.0	24-
9	Gold & Stark	194	10-	5.5	15.0	0
10	Snashall & Nixon	185	40-	3.5	17.0	8
11	Moren & Francis	185	61-	4.0	16.0	4
13	Ewart & Howe	184	65-	6.0	17.0	9
13	Dawson & Demuy	174	83-	5.5	9.0	24-
14	Noble & Bilski	151	182-	3.5	14.0	4-

WOMENS BUTLER STAGE III AFTER 13 ROUNDS

		Total VPs	Total IMPs	Wins	Last VPs	Last IMPs
1	Schroor & Kaplan	252	220	10.0	10.0	20-
2	Bashar & Moses	231	140	11.0	16.0	6
3	Weal & Yule	222	95	7.5	15.0	1
4	Glanger & Scudder	222	76	8.0	21.0	23
5	Tully & Lusk	212	52	7.0	9.0	22-
6	Wilson & Wilson	201	11	7.0	15.0	1-
7	Bird & Creet	199	6	6.5	21.0	22
8	Chadwick & Sharp	189	21-	7.5	24.0	35
9	Driscoll & Greenfeld	187	36-	5.0	6.0	35-
10	Liepins & Chadwick	180	65-	4.0	20.0	20
11	Kahler & Hopwood	173	93-	3.5	9.0	23-
12	Manford & Clements	166	120-	6.0	2.0	52-
13	Snashall & Murray-White	166	125-	4.0	25.0	52-
14	Stephens & Pettigrew	159	140-	4.0	14.0	6-

SENIORS BUTLER STAGE B AFTER 13 ROUNDS

		Total VPs	Total IMPs	Wins	Last VPs	Last IMPs
1	Dilks & Gallus	231	130	7.5	25.0	49
2	Grant & Hancock	228	105	8.0	9.0	21-
3	Piper & Ashworth	225	104	8.0	21.0	21
4	Bignall & Januszke	223	74	8.0	20.0	17
5	Berger & Berger	206	23	9.0	19.0	16
6	Clarke & Colmer	206	12	6.0	15.0	0
7	Klofa & Schwabegger	198	13	6.5	15.0	0
8	Marks & Rocks	194	2-	4.5	11.0	16-
9	Rutkowski & Tobin	185	29-	7.5	10.0	17-
10	Bourke & Ramshaw	184	54-	4.0	3.0	49-
11	Kahler & Davis	184	59-	6.5	11.0	15-
12	Samuel & Samuel	177	79-	6.5	19.0	15
13	Hunt & Lachman	172	98-	4.0	12.0	11-
14	Watts & Yuill	161	140-	5.0	18.0	11

ANC SWISS PAIRS AFTER 12 ROUNDS

		Total VPs	Total IMPs	Wins	Last VPs	Last IMPs
1	Hughes & Prescott	220	162	9.5	19.0	14
2	Richman & Richman	215	135	9.0	25.0	46
3	Glasson & Glasson	208	130	9.0	25.0	57
4	Rhodes & Rhodes	208	105	8.0	20.0	19
5	Fischer & Bookallil	208	102	8.0	10.0	19-
6	McLeish & McLeish	205	107	7.0	20.0	20
7	Fallon & Marrett	193	43	7.5	21.0	21
8	Free & Calcrafft	192	58	6.5	25.0	46
9	Kelly & Narita	185	18	7.0	25.0	52
10	Mellings & Spurrier	184	8	5.0	23.0	30
11	Millar & Frazier	183	41	6.0	11.0	14-
12	Couzner & Lockwood	181	8	6.0	19.0	14
13	Thompson & Buttrose	181	2	6.5	20.0	17
14	Hill & Livingston	179	3-	6.0	18.0	12
15	Broad & Martin	179	5-	7.0	3.0	46-
16	Dennis & Johnson	178	1-	6.0	19.0	14
17	Eddie & McMahon	176	15-	7.0	9.0	21-
18	Robb & Thenuwara	176	24-	6.5	1.0	57-
19	Alexander & Daws	174	2	4.5	10.0	20-
20	Bennett & Morgan-King	173	20-	5.0	11.0	14-
21	Boxall & Plush	170	31-	5.5	10.0	17-
22	Mickevics & Waterhouse	168	49-	3.0	12.0	12-
23	Tishler & Renton	166	46-	4.5	3.0	46-
24	Webster & Luxton	162	62-	4.5	12.0	12-
25	Chapman & Cornish	158	86-	5.5	18.0	12

Quotable Quips

Helen Lowry to Ted Chadwick:
“Why did the Editor call you an
expert in the Bulletin?”

Haven't we all heard Ted say
tongue-in cheek: “When I played for
Australia . . .”