



NOT News 11

Saturday January 28th 2006

If you are leaving today then the Congress staff hope that you have had a thoroughly enjoyable N.O.T. and that you travel safely home and return next year.

Session Times

Saturday

10 am 2 pm 8 pm

Sunday

10 am 2 pm

NOT Dates For 2007

Wednesday 17th January to Monday 29th

Preceded by

Last Train for Women and Seniors Monday 15th and
Tuesday 16th January.

Womens, Seniors and Restricted Teams 17th – 19th January

Open Last Train 18th, 19th January

SWPT 22nd – 26th January

YOUTH PLAYERS – A DATE TO REMEMBER

Saturday February 18th – Gold Coast Youth Pairs

Check details on www.abf.com.au

The ABF gratefully acknowledges the support of



Tim Bourke's Problem

PIQUED

Dealer South; EW Vul.

NORTH

♠ K Q J 9 7

♥ K 9 8 6 3

♦ Q 4 3

♣ -

SOUTH

♠ A 3 2

♥ A Q J 4

♦ A 9

♣ A 10 3 2

West	North	East	South
			1 ♥
2 ♣	4 ♣	Pass	4 ♦
Pass	5 ♣	Pass	5 ♠
Pass	5 NT	Pass	7 ♥
All pass			

After North's a splinter bid of four clubs, showing a sound game-raise in hearts with at most one club, some cue bidding and the grand slam force resulted in a fine contract. Given that the trumps are not 4-0, how do you plan to make seven hearts after West leads the king of clubs?

Points of View

As John and his partner were sitting down to play, a young lady wearing a very short skirt and a very low top came to the table.

After the win, in spite of this underhanded distraction technique, his surprised partner asked, "How come you played so well?"

John replied, "I couldn't decide whether to look down her top or up her skirt so I decided to concentrate."

The management and staff of NOTNEWS would like to make it clear that he does not condone sexist attitudes which treat women as objects of sexual lust.

He used to, but can no longer remember why.

Deceptive Measures

There were some interesting swindles on the last couple of days of the Teams qualifiers. First offering is from David Appleton. David told me about this hand without the *aide memoire* of hand records, assured me it was in set 12 and gave me a rough description of the North hand which included Q x of spades. When a player gives me a hand like this, I tend to hunt for one suit – in this case Q x of spades . One thing I have learnt from bitter experience is that bridge players have no sense of direction, so I just look for one suit and then check the rest of the hand. Guess what, in set 12, 6 of the 20 boards contained Qx of spades – and David's hand was in set 11!

Once I got there, I was able to admire Peter Reynold's audacity on this layout.

Dealer: S ♠ Q 5
 ♡ A Q 7
Vul: Nil ♦ A K Q 10 9 8
 ♣ 9 4

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

 ♠ A J 8
 ♡ 10 9 5 2
 ♦ 5 2
 ♣ 8 6 5 2

West opened 1NT and Peter bid ... (go on, guess)

3NT! Perhaps not surprisingly, the defence found it difficult to read the closed hand and 9 tricks were a very wholesome result.

And then Bobby Richman pulled out a time-honoured coup at table 1 – and it still worked!

Dealer: E ♠ 10 9 8 6 4
 ♡ J 5
Vul: EW ♦ K 5
 ♣ A K 9 2

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

 ♠ J 7
 ♡ K 9 3
 ♦ J 7 3
 ♣ 10 8 7 5 4

Bobby declared 1NT from West and received a small spade lead which he took with table's King.

He immediately returned the 3 of clubs to the Jack and King. North continued spades and Bobby took his Ace. He cashed the Ace of hearts and played a heart to collect the Jack, Queen and King. South continued with a diamond to the Queen and King; only to see North persist with spades. On this trick, South pitched a potentially fateful heart. This gave Bobby 2 entries to table in the heart suit which would enable him to make an awful lot of tricks if the finesse of the diamond 10 were to prove successful. However, Bobby passed up this opportunity and offers this piece of advice :

If an early swindle pays off, don't endanger your good result by being greedy.

If the diamond finesse failed then Bobby was going down, having prepared a good result at trick 2

And when it comes to swindlers, where better to go for example than Stephen Burgess? Stephen shares few physical characteristics with Victor Mollo's Hideous Hog. He does, however, have a marked mental affinity.

There are two ways to bid and play – HH's (Stephen's) way and the wrong way.

Bridge is a partnership game – the best part of partner's game is dealing – and we're playing duplicate with pre-dealt boards.

ALWAYS support with support

To open a weak 2, you need 8 – 10 hcp

Watch Stephen apply those principles which fit his Hogishness on this one

Dealer: S	♠ K J 9	
	♥	
Vul: Nil	♦ K J 10 8	
	♣ A 10 6 5 3 2	
♠ Q 4		♠ 8 7 6
♥ A J 10 5 4 2		♥ K 8 7 6 3
♦ 7 6 4		♦ A Q 2
♣ 7 4		♣ K J
	♠ A 10 5 3 2	
	♥ Q 9	
	♦ 9 5 3	
	♣ Q 9 8	

South passed and Stephen obeyed precept 4 with a disciplined (if reluctant) pass. North opened 1C and DI Jagelman overcalled 1H. South tried 1S and Stephen, of course, obeyed precept 3 – he responded 1NT. His alibi is that he

knew that the opps had to be good for 4S so he would seek to deflect them. (However, see later*)

North now bid a competitive sounding 2S and this ran back to Stephen. Now some of us might say, "My work here is done." * and look for a lead but precepts are made to be thrown on the floor, jumped on and irrevocably shattered, so Stephen bid 2NT – and who better to play the hand?

North led a small club and Stephen guessed well to play the King; of course, if his guess is less accurate, he's about 7 off. When Stephen played a round of hearts, the table was treated to a somewhat incredulous "Having no hearts, partner?" from South. Stephen took his 6 heart tricks and then, just for the Hell of it, tried a diamond finesse, successfully for the over.

Yes, virtue is its own reward. It has to be.

Mike Cornell gave me the next swindle which he perpetrated against Ishmael DelMonte.

This was in round 14 and both teams were very much in contention.

Dealer: S	♠ J 9 6 4 3	Teams 14/3
	♥ K Q 7 5 2	
Vul: EW	♦ J	
	♣ K 2	
♠ Q 10 2		♠ K 8
♥ A		♥ J 9 4 3
♦ Q 10 8 7 3 2		♦ 6 5 4
♣ A 8 4		♣ 10 9 7 5
	♠ A 7 5	
	♥ 10 8 6	
	♦ A K 9	
	♣ Q J 6 3	

Ishmael opened 1NT (strong!) as South and Sarfraz Khan transferred with 2H. 2S from Ish saw Sarfraz offer the choice of games with 4H.

Ashley Bach chose a small diamond as his lead against 4S. Dummy's Jack provided Ish with a bonus. He pulled a small trump of table and Mike dropped the King! Not one of these false cards which presents declarer with a losing option but rather one which invites declarer to get the whole shape of the hand wrong. Ish took his Ace and cashed the top diamonds to discard two clubs. He now gave up a trump to Ash's Queen, looking somewhat surprised when Mike contributed the 8. Ash continued clubs, ruffed on table. Ish continued the King of hearts to Ash's Ace and Ash played another club which Ish let run to his Queen. A heart to the Queen and another to Mike's Jack saw Mike continue hearts to promote Ash's 10 of trumps for one off.

A Bidding Problem

Earlier in the week, this problem arose which generated some heated partnership discussions. For a couple of hours after the session, all I seemed to hear were suggestions that partner did not understand bidding theory, that his parents had never been formally introduced or that he should not be allowed to walk the streets unaccompanied. I let the dust settle and then invited some of the stars to present their opinions.

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

LHO opens 3H and 2 passes follow. What do you do?

The panel was asked to put aside their memories of the hand and to justify their action in a vacuum. Perhaps not surprisingly, the panel split into two camps – x and 4C though there were some outliers.

Let's look at the actions first and the justifications afterwards

Action	Player	Action	Player
4C	Phil Gue Jim Wallis Seamus Browne Kieran Dyke John Armstrong Stephen Burgess Paul Marston	x	Paul Lavings Mike Cornell Jerzy Russyan Ryszard Jedrichowski Jeremi Stepinski Marek Szymamowski

So a close run thing between 4C (7 votes) and double (6 votes). There are 2 other, more isolated positions. Also there are two further votes to which I will return at the end.

Can you be swayed by the expert's reasoning?

For the 4C bidders , John Armstrong probably sums it up best:

Armstrong : 4C - I wouldn't double because partner may pass when this is wrong or may lead spades against 3Hx when we need to cash minor suit tricks.

John then comes up with an action which no-one else mentioned :

3NT could be the winner but a non-heart lead could easily be problematic even if partner has hearts stopped as is likely.

Remember this for the future. If the opps pre-empt and you have a void bid no trumps because pards will have a stop. (As if we need another excuse to bid NT!)

John continues, covering all bases : *4C seems the middle of the road action. It leaves open the possibilities of part score, slam and 5C may be a better game than 3NT if partner has short spades.*

Jim Wallis seems to choose the same action more through fear of the alternative.

4C - I have only one trick, maybe 2 on a good day. You KNOW partner will pass a double. Maybe the penalty will not be enough to compensate for your possible game anyway.

Paul Marston also chooses a safe option

4C – we may miss a penalty but the risk is too high. Not 5C, because this is no time to gamble. They are well placed to penalise us when it's wrong

Like John, Seamus Browne seems to be seeking the middle way

4C - I miss out on the freakishly good results but at least, on the other hands partner will have a pretty good idea of what I have.

Now there's a novel idea – describe your hand so that partner can become involved.

Phil Gue is also concerned for the third opponent

4C - If partner has the cards to cover the losers, they'll raise to 5C. Not keen on defending 3Hx. Even if partner bids 4D, I'll continue 5C.

Kieran Dyke touches on the possibility of defending 3Hx and demonstrates his capacity to follow the request to put aside his knowledge of the actual hand.

4C – I could double in case partner has A K x, Q J 10 9 x, K x x, x x, but 4C seems normal. He could also pass with x x, A x x x, Q x x, A J x x

John, Phil and Kieran all don't want to defend. The doublers, though ostensibly asking for takeout, are of different mind.

Mike Cornell – Double – Two major upsides – 1) Partner passes (this can be a very big upside) 2) Partner bids 3S or 4S. Only downside is when only 5C makes and we don't bid.

So partner playing 4S going off with 5C cold is not a downside?

Ryszard Jedrichowski : Double – rho did not bid 4H so I expect partner to pass this double.

Paul Lavings has similar thoughts with a second string to his bow

Double – 4C may miss spades and with me having a void, partner could well be passing on a heart stack.

Out on his own is the man with a convention for all seasons, Andy Braithwaite

5C – Double is very tempting but with one defensive trick, I am reluctant to try this in case it makes. Partner is sure to pass.

Indeed, this is the one thing on which virtually everyone agrees. Andy continues :

I cannot bid 4C as this shows 5+, 5+ in clubs and spades.

Of course it does.

Erwin Otvosi bids 4H for which my pollster did not get a justification. Mind you, some things are just too difficult.

So there you are. Whether you doubled or bid 4C , you are in excellent company. Three final voices point to the difficulty of the situation :

Marek Szymamowski : *Possible double!*

Presumably when using bidding boxes, we have a pink card available.

If that doesn't clear up your doubts, here's Peter Gill

Close between 4C and double. Double keeps spades in the picture. The risk of –730 is not that great with the void under the hearts. Second choice is 4 C. I hope partner is conservative about defending partscores

Still not clear cut? So let's go to a world champion for the casting vote :

Jacek Pszczola : *4C or double*

Well, that settles that.

Bridge Across the Tasman

Read about it in New Zealand Bridge Magazine: six issues come out a year, starting in February 2006.

Sign up here at the congress for only AU\$50 a year and get the December 2005 issue FREE.

See Richard Solomon, who is playing at Rydges. Any Kiwi will point him out!

SOLUTION TO Tim BOURKE'S PROBLEM

The original declarer made something of a meal of this simple hand when the cards were distributed like this:

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

After ruffing the king of clubs, he crossed to his hand with a trump and ruffed a second club. After drawing trumps, he claimed his contract - relying on the spades to run. However declarer had to lose a trick when East pointed out that he had five spades.

I hope you saw this trap and approached the play differently. All that is needed to overcome a 0-5 spade division is a third club ruff. This is pretty straightforward for, after taking the second club ruff, return to a trump and ruff the third club with the king of hearts. As the focus is on overcoming a bad spade break, you return to hand with the ace of diamonds to draw the last trump; you make four spades, four trumps, the minor suit aces and three club ruffs for thirteen tricks.

FINALS - RYDGES

Place	Name	Score
1	Brogeland	289.5
2	Bourke	282
3	Morrison	269
4	Penline	267
5	Marston	264
6	Cummings	253.5

NCC

Place	Name	Score
1	Otvosi	299
2	Markey	282
3	Jedrychowski	271
4	McManus	270
5	Noble	268
6	Szalay	264

DATUMS
Rydgens
Round13

Board	Score
1	20
2	-900
3	-920
4	-160
5	-430
6	130
7	-370
8	20
9	50
10	-80
11	-270
12	0
13	540
14	280
15	60
16	90
17	-180
18	310
19	370
20	-400

Round 14

Board	Score
1	420
2	-30
3	120
4	-540
5	70
6	10
7	-560
8	210
9	-630
10	30
11	100
12	-10
13	-30
14	410
15	-290
16	370
17	200
18	-10
19	50
20	740

NCC

Board	Score
1	-20
2	-870
3	-750
4	-160
5	-440
6	140
7	-640
8	-30
9	-30
10	-120
11	-210
12	-30
13	620
14	430
15	40
16	120
17	-330
18	100
19	410
20	-620

Sorry no datums available

FINAL SWPT NCC

Place	Name	Score
1	Otvosi	285
2	Markey	269
3	Noble	257
4	McManus	253
5	Jedrychowski	252
6	Szalay	248
7	Puskas	247
8	Reynolds	246
9	Brown	241
10	Travis	238
11	Ware	237
12	Wawn	235
13	Ewart	234
14	Fallon	234
15	Brockwell	233
16	Sarten	233
17	Haffer	232
18	Dobes	231
19	Giura	229
20	Bremner-Moore	229
21	Miller	228
22	Parrott	227
23	Wells	227
24	Finikiotis	226
25	Walsh	225
26	Ridgway	225
27	Hart	225
28	Sebestyen	223
29	Ali	223
30	Shaw	223
31	Collins	222
32	Cuffe	222
33	Smee	221
34	Johnman	220
35	Thompson	220
36	Bracegirdle	220
37	Howard	220
38	Krolikowski	219
39	Allanson	219
40	Nicholson	218

FINAL SWPT RYDGES

Place	Name	Score
1	Brogeland	269
2	Bourke	261
3	Penline	257
4	Marston	255
5	Morrison	249
6	Cummings	248
7	Lester	247
8	Gardiner	244
9	Halmos	239
10	Nixon	238
11	Lusk	235
12	Waters	235
13	Rankin	234
14	Jeffery	233
15	Douglas	233
16	Djurovic	232
17	Jamieson	232
18	Hoffman	232
19	Ziggy	231
20	Burgess	231
21	Chrapot	231
22	Francis	230
23	Genc	230
24	Yovich	228
25	Tuxworth	228
26	Neill	227
27	Wurth	227
28	Strong	225
29	Shugg	224
30	Solomon	223
31	Sullivan	223
32	Van Vucht	223
33	Allgood	223
34	Scudder	222
35	Hutton	221
36	Mottram	219
37	Hadaway	217
38	Grahame	217
39	Pettigrew	217
40	Parfait	215

