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The Australian National Championships are coming back to Victoria in July next year after an 8-year trek around the other states and territories. It includes Australia's oldest national event - the Interstate Teams Championship.

I always think the ANC fortnight is a great opportunity for the host state to show itself off to bridge players from all around Australia, and for all local clubs and players to get involved in a real festival of bridge. There are events for everyone - from events popular with players who mostly play club duplicates, through to the championship events where you'll find international representatives battling away.

We're very fortunate that Belinda Lindsay is our convener. But despite her boundless energy and enthusiasm, she can't do everything! I know she is looking for volunteers to help in a variety of areas in organising and running this unique and prestigious festival. We'll be holding it at the Bayview Eden; the same venue as we use for the VCC.

If you would like to volunteer, whether a little or a lot, please contact Belinda (belinda lindsay@iinet.net.au).

## News from the Council

## Victorian Bridge Association AGM

The Annual General Meeting of the VBA will be held in the VBA clubrooms on Monday November $19^{\text {th }}$ commencing at 6.00 pm . Notices have been sent to all VBA members and a copy of the audited VBA financial accounts are available on the VBA website.

## ANC 2019

The 2019 Australian National Championships will be held in Melbourne from July 13 to 25 at the Bayview Eden Hotel, Queens Road Melbourne. As mentioned in The Soapbox, the VBA has appointed Belinda Lindsay as Tournament Organiser for the event.

## Sydney Spring Nationals

Hearty congratulations to Simon Hinge and Stephen Lester, who with one-time Victorian Ella Pattison and Nye Griffiths, took out the prestigious Spring Nationals Open Teams, comfortably defeating the number 1 seeds in the final.


Simon, Stephen, Ella, Nye

## For Starters

A change of pace this month: let's do a quiz. It's important to know when partner's bid is forcing - meaning you have to make a bid to keep the auction open - and when it isn't.

There's nothing worse than having a strong hand, making a bid which you consider forcing, and seeing pass pass pass.

A basic principle, which is taught widely in this part of the world, is that if you change to a new suit in an auction, then that is forcing. As the simplest possible example, if you open 1 * and partner responds $1 \vee$, then that bid is unconditionally forcing. Partner could have anything, including 20 points, and want to conduct a bidding conversation with you to the best contract, whether it be a partscore, a game, a small slam or a grand slam.

The converse principle also applies: bidding an 'old' suit - a suit that has previously been bid by either partner - is not forcing.

Unfortunately, there is the odd exception to these principles, which is what we're about to explore.

Natural notrump bids are never forcing, although use of the word 'never' in relation to bridge is rather dangerous.

Now is the time to test yourself. In each of the following auctions, is partner's last bid forcing or non-forcing?

| 1. | LHO Pass | $\begin{gathered} \text { Partner } \\ 1 \boldsymbol{n} \\ \text { 1』 } \end{gathered}$ | RHO <br> Pass | $\begin{aligned} & \text { You } \\ & \text { 1 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. | LHO | Partner | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{RHO} \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | You 1ヵ |
|  | Pass | 2* |  |  |
| 3. | LHO | Partner | RHO | You |
|  |  | 2\% | Pass | 2 |
|  | Pass | 2v |  |  |


| 4. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LHO } \\ & \text { Pass } \end{aligned}$ | Partner 1. | RHO | You |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5. | LHO | Partner | RHO | You |
|  |  | 1^ | Pass | 1NT |
|  | Pass | 2 , |  |  |
| 6. | LHO | Partner | RHO | You |
|  |  | Pass | Pass | 1 , |
|  | Pass | 2. |  |  |
| 7. | LHO | Partner | RHO | You |
|  | Pass | 3 |  |  |
| 8. | LHO | Partner | RHO | You |
|  | Pass | 2* | Pass | 2^ |
|  | Pass | 3* |  |  |
| 9. | LHO | Partner | RHO | You |
|  |  | 1. | $1 *$ | D'ble |
|  | Pass | 2 |  |  |
| 10 | LHO | Partner | RHO | You |
|  | Pass | $1 \wedge$ | Pass | 2 |
|  | Pass | 3. |  |  |

Answers.

| 1. | LHO | Partner | RHO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1* | You |  |
|  | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ |  |

Forcing. The classic 'new suit is forcing' situation. Old-fashioned players would consider this non-forcing, but the problem is that if they hold a very strong hand (say 18 or 19 points) they will have to bid 2 a to force. This crowds the auction at the very time you need plenty of room to explore the hand.

Of course, once every seven or eight years, 1n will be your last making contract. Missing out on that possibility is a small price to pay for being able to unravel stronger hands.

| 2. | LHO | Partner | RHO | You |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $1 \star$ | $1 \uparrow$ |

Forcing. New suits from partner of the overcaller are best played as forcing. Again you can have a meaningful auction without the fear of being dropped in the middle of it.

| 3. | LHO | Partner | RHO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | $\mathbf{2} \boldsymbol{v}$ |  |  |

Forcing. New suit, right? I've seen this auction disastrously passed because the poor old 2 * bidder has absolutely nothing. But this auction is not only forcing, it's best to play it as game-forcing. A 2\% opening bid is a serious hand.
4. LHO Partner RHO You
Pass
1*

Non-forcing. My legal department says this is not a 'change of suit'. Once again, there is a school of thought that says $1 *$ should never be passed. This misconception is born out of the short club and the fear of playing a 2-2 fit or the like. But if you respond with nothing, say 2 or 3 points, the auction will likely get out of hand.

I've only got a limited time remaining to debunk bad concepts!

| 5. | LHO | Partner | RHO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1 \boldsymbol{n}$ | You |  |
|  | Pass | 1NT |  |

Non-forcing. Once again, the fine print says this is not a change of suit, because you're not bidding from a suit - you're bidding from notrumps. It's only when you go from a suit to a new suit that the bid is forcing.

| 6. | LHO | Partner | RHO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | You

Non-forcing. It's that little initial pass that makes this bid non-forcing. Easy to overlook, but the 2 bidder has limited their strength through their initial pass, and so their
subsequent bids cannot be regarded as forcing.


Forcing. This one is included because usually the preempter is rather unhappy about this development, having nothing but clubs, and usually not heart support. In this auction, you're allowed to support hearts with just a doubleton.

| 8. | LHO | Partner | RHO | You |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $1 \star$ |  |
|  | Pass | 2* | Pass | $2 \star$ |
| Pass | 3* |  |  |  |

Forcing. Here is an exception to the rule that bidding suits already bid in the auction is non-forcing. You have responded at the 2level (showing 10+ HCP) and partner has reversed (a bid of a new suit higher than 2 of their first-bid suit): this shows 16+ HCP. So your side has $26+$ HCP, the auction is gameforcing and both of you should know it.

That makes 3: a forcing bid, showing extra length in clubs. So would other bids you could have made, such as $2 \mathrm{NT}, 3$ or $3 \wedge$.


Non-forcing. But it's a new suit, you cry. It really isn't. Your negative double showed hearts: indeed it acted as a surrogate 1v response. $2 v$ merely supports the hearts you have already promised.

| 10. LHO | Partner | RHO | You |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 1 |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{n}$ | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | $\mathbf{3 n}$ |  |  |

Non-forcing. Despite it being a jump bid, it's a bid of a suit already bid, and is therefore non-forcing. In this case it shows about 1012 points and at least 6 spades. If partner has even more strength, with long spades, he will either have to bid $4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$, or choose a new-
suit bid ( $2 \vee$ or $3 \star$ ) which would be forcing.
In summary. The principle of 'change of suit is forcing' stood up well in this quiz. The only exceptions were problems 6 and 8. In both these auctions, information from the earlier auction was used to override the rule.

## Congress Results

## Albury Congress

## Swiss Pairs

1 S. McConnell - R. Brown
2 S. Klofa - A. Czapnik
3 T. Coyle - L. Nicholson

## Swiss Teams

1 S. Klofa, A. Czapnik, D. Harley, N. Ewart
2 J. Carberry, K. Hart, I. Lisle, V. Lisle
3 C. Arul, R. Ellery, D. Sharman, I. Hamilton

## Warrnambool Congress

## Swiss Pairs

1 G. Ridgway - A. Robbins
2 F. Vearing - C. Arul
3 A. Park - S. Park
Swiss Teams
1 D. Newlands, D. Newland, G. Ridgway, A. Robbins

2 P. Frost, S. Irwin, J. Coventry, M. Glover
3 G. Nicholson, J. Barbour, F. Vearing, C. Arul

## Bairnsdale Congress

Swiss Pairs
1 C. Manley - L. Seychell
2 L. Robinson - C. Fernando
3 K. French - L. Norden

## Swiss Teams

1 P. Kahler, J. Collins, A. Farthing, J. Kahler
2 J. Rossiter-Nuttall, B. Rossiter-Nuttall, J. Farmer, S. Livingston

3 L. Grant, G. McCombie, S. Garrett, H. York

## Sunbury Congress

Swiss Pairs
1 C. Senior - S. Lester
2 C. Ding-D. Nie
3 A. Hegedus - J. Mill

## Queen's Slipper Nationwide Pairs

Event 19 (October 6)
1 J. Stewart - N. Holmes (Ballarat)
3 M. Baker - L. Carroll (Echuca)
Event 20 (October 21)
2 B. Romeijn - J. Day (Berwick)

## Upcoming Congresses \& Events

## South Gippsland Congress

Saturday $10^{\text {th }}$ November, 12 pm : Swiss Pairs Sunday $11^{\text {th }}$ November, 10 am: Swiss Teams

Venue Dakers Centre
23 Smith St, Leongatha
Contact: Neville Chapman, 0427392979
Enter: http://bridgeunlimited.com

## Kooyong Congress

Saturday $18^{\text {th }}$ November, 10 am: Swiss Pairs
Venue Kooyong Lawn Tennis Club 489 Glenferrie Rd, Hawthorn

Contact: Maria Campbell, 0411133133
Enter: http://www.bridgewebs.com/kltcbridge/

## Tivoli Congress

Saturday $24^{\text {th }}$ November, 10 am : Butler Pairs Sunday $25^{\text {th }}$ November, 10 am: Swiss Pairs

Venue Waverley Bridge Club
21a Electra Ave Ashwoord

Contact: Leeron Branicki, 0412884446
Enter: http://bridgeunlimited.com

Dendy Park Congress
Sunday $2^{\text {nd }}$ December, 10 am: Swiss Pairs
Venue Brighton Bowling Park
Breen Drive, Brighton
Contact: Boris Tencer, 0414353996.
Enter: http://www.dpbridge.com/entry.php

## VBA Summer Congress

Saturday $8^{\text {th }}$ December, 10 am: Swiss Pairs Sunday $9^{\text {th }}$ December, 10 am: Swiss Teams

| Venue |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 131 Poath R | urrumbeena |
| Contact: | Andrew MacReady-Bryan, 0417543076 |  |
| Enter: | http://vba.asn.au/entries/enter-an-event |  |
| Recent Master Promotions |  |  |
| State |  |  |
| Alan God | frey | MCC |
| Kerry Ho | sking | Frankston |
| Jo Leslie |  | Traralgon |
| Marie Sa | nds | South GIppslan |
| Judith Va | rlamos | Kooyong |
| *State |  |  |
| Alan Farr | ington | Waverley |
| Florence | Gibbons | Geelong |
| David Hu | dson | Sale |
| National |  |  |
| John Cam | pbell | Ballarat |
| Susan Lip | ton | Kings \& Queens |
| * National |  |  |
| Else Bailey |  | Sale |
| Graham | Davies | Waverley |
| **National |  |  |
| Honor Mid | ddleton | Dromana |
| Kumara | Nainanayake | Waverley |
| Life |  |  |
| Sarah Livis | vingston | Dromana |
| Jan Roth | lisberger | Waverley |
| Ming Zha |  | VBA |
| Bronze Life |  |  |
| Melroy D | ecouto | Waverley |
| Silver Life |  |  |
| Barbara | a'Beckett | Dendy Park |
| Wendy F | letcher | Peninsula |
| Moira He | cker | Traralgon |
| Dorothy | Read | Geelong |
| Gold Life |  |  |
| Janet Hil |  | Philip Island |
| Helen Mc | Knight | Ballarat |

The best bridge players are smart enough to understand the game, but dumb enough to think it's important.
... Zeke Jabbour

## If You Thought You'd Seen It All

This deal occurred some years ago in the Grand National Open Teams.

| DIr: South <br> Vul: N/S | - 76543 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | - 8 |
|  | -KQ10832 |
|  | -6 |
| ^ 9$\bullet$$\sim$ | $\mathrm{N} \uparrow \mathrm{K} 10$ |
|  | W E K7 |
| - 954 | W E * AJ76 |
| * AKJ10753 | S - Q9842 |
|  | . AQJ82 |
|  | - AQ1096532 |
|  | - - |
|  | ¢ - |

One North-South achieved a spectacular result to go with the spectacular layout. They played 7n redoubled, making for +2940 . Sadly, there is no postcode to go with that score.

At the other table, N/S declared $6 v$ which happened to make when West led his singleton spade - a good score. But it was not good enough!

Here's a question for you. What is the par contract on the deal - the contract that will be reached if both sides can see all the hands?

Solution on page 8.

## About the Blackwood convention ...

The most dangerous of the lot! Blackwood is much too simple and too addictive. Anyone can get hold of it and swallow an overdose. It's responsible for more fatalities than any other drug on the convention card.
... Victor Mollo's Hideous Hog
Of course there is no such thing as patenting a bid and collecting a royalty on it, but if Blackwood had a nickel for every time his bid was properly used, he'd be a wealthy man; if he had a nickel for every time it was misused, he'd be a multi-millionaire.
... Richard Frey

## Tip of the Month

## On Aggression

Bridge is war. You have to go into battle, take risks and hope for victory, realising you might die in the attempt.

It's a doubtful metaphor, but winning players, particularly in matchpoint duplicates, take calculated risks.

Here are two examples from a recent duplicate.

$$
\text { ^ } 843 \vee Q \bullet A K 873 \div A Q J 4
$$

| LHO | Partner | RHO | You |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | 1 |
| 2. | D'ble | Pass | $?$ |

Partner has made a negative double, showing length in both majors. What's your choice (both sides vulnerable)?

North took a calculated risk in passing, converting the negative double into penalties. He could see a couple of diamonds, at least two clubs, and partner should help somewhere.

In fact there were zero diamond tricks to be had, as this was the layout:


The diamonds didn't yield anything, but there were plenty of tricks elsewhere. Declarer did well to go just one down, but -200 was a bottom for $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$, and a top for the N/S.

Sometimes it's worth speculating. North could have bid 2NT (for an above average score) or 2 ( (for a below average score), but pass was best.
^ KQ9 ソ J4 • 1076 ~ 19875

| LHO | Partner | RHO | You |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1NT | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \vee$ | Pass | Pass | $?$ |

This time no one is vulnerable. Partner opens a 15-17 HCP 1NT, you correctly pass it, and LHO balances with $2 v$, passed back to you. Your call.

Don't pass! You have a majority of the points, and cannot afford to let the opponents steal the contract when they are not vulnerable.

The best bid is double. The best bid is often double. It's for takeout, and provides many possibilities, including a final contract of $2 v$ doubled.


After West's double, East could bid 3\% for a top score. Or East could pass the double (like on the other deal), converting to penalties. 2v doubled would go two down, also for a top score.

Conversely, meekly passing out $2 \mathbf{2 v}$ (for two down, +100) will get you a near bottom, as almost everyone else was scoring 120 in 1 NT .

What do you think of North's 24 bid? Was it brave or foolhardy? A bit of both, I would say, but it was only remotely plausible nonvulnerable. And when E/W went wrong, N/S got a top.

The bottom line: be brave when fighting at low levels!

## My Favourite Suit Combination Bill Jacobs

There's been a dreadful accident. You've bid yourself into 7NT, of all contracts, and West has led the $\bullet$ Q.

> • AQ108
> - J32
> - J32
> * 432
> - 432
> • AKQ4
> - AKQ4
> - A5

It seems you will need four spade tricks. You win the $\% A$ and play four rounds of hearts. On the fourth round, both opponents throw a club. It can't be put off any longer: you lead a spade from hand, and West plays the $\uparrow 5$.

What do you play from dummy?

Putting aside the possibility that East has a singleton king or jack of spades, you will need West to have both king and jack.

But what about the 9 ? If West has it, then you need to play the $\uparrow 8$ here, and take three finesses in the suit. If East has it, you must play the $\uparrow 10$, and hope that spades divide 33 (or that East has the $\uparrow 9$ singleton).

In the light of this discussion, will you change your decision?

If you chose initially to insert the 10 (I bet you did), then yes you should change your decision. The $\wedge 8$ is the correct play.

The only way to successfully make the right percentage guesses in these situations is to count holdings. Let's do it here.

In how many original layouts is the $\uparrow 10$ the winning play? Exactly 4 : East with singleton ^9, and West with aKJ5, aKJ6, aKJ7. Four winning cases, no others. (West with aKJ9 tripleton is of no relevance, as you always make in that happy scenario.)

In how many layouts is the 8 the winning play? A bit harder, that one, but there's quite a few. Let's list them. West with:

- KJ95

AKJ96
AKJ97
AKJ965
AKJ975
AKJ976
^KJ9765
Seven of them! Why it's a no-brainer ... the 8 is the right play. In fact, it's a little closer than it looks, because each of the 3-3 breaks are a tiny bit more probable than the $4-2,5-$ 1 or 6-0 breaks.

Counting the winning layouts between two options and going for the one with the larger number is the way to go.

Oh and one other thing: don't get fooled into eliminating layouts that are no longer possible once a player has played a random low card (in this example, West's a5). That will lead you into the murky world of restricted choice. You don't want to go there: people have been known to never get out. Just count the original winning and losing layouts: that will lead you to the right play.

And one final piece of good news ...
... not to be continued

## The Twelfth Trick

| DIr: South |  | ^ 65 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: all |  | - 973 |  |
| IMPs |  | - 874 |  |
|  |  | + Q8432 |  |
|  |  | N |  |
|  |  | S |  |
|  |  | * AKQJ98 |  |
|  |  | - A |  |
|  |  | - AK6 |  |
|  |  | * A65 |  |
| West | North | th East | South |
|  |  |  | 2* |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 2^ |
| Pass | 3* | Pass | $6 \wedge$ |
| Pass | Pass | $s$ Pass |  |

West leads the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$. Plan the play. Solution over page.

## The Twelfth Trick

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \wedge \\ & \bullet \\ & \vee \end{aligned} 973$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - 874 |  |
|  | - Q8452 |  |
| - 103 | N | - 742 |
| - QJ1042 |  | $\checkmark \mathrm{K} 865$ |
| - Q103 |  | - 1952 |
| * J106 | S | - K9 |
|  | - AKQJ98 |  |
|  | - A |  |
|  | - AK6 |  |
|  | * A73 |  |

Whatever precise plan you have made, it needs to involve withholding the $\%$ Q until the third round of the suit. Technically the contract can only be made by setting up the clubs, and you need that queen as the entry. One of the opponents will need to have kingdoubleton.

What about inducing a defensive error always a handy backup plan. There are two ways you might do this:

Sub-plan A. Win the $\vee \mathrm{A}$, and immediately play a low club (planning to play low in dummy). West, holding three clubs to the king, might clatter up with the king, for fear of losing it. (For example, if South held $\approx$ Ax and AKxx, that would be the only winning defence.)

Sub-plan B. Win $\vee A$ and rattle off 5 rounds of trumps, hoping that a player with $\approx$ Kxx discards one of them in an attempt to cling on to some other suit.

Give yourself full marks if, not only did you see that you had to hold back the *Q, you chose one of the two plans to make life hard for the defenders.

## Solution to Par Contract (page 5)

The par contract is 7NT doubled by East, four down, -800. 7NT is not quite so good when played by West - it won't take a single trick.

Have you ever seen a real-life deal where the par contract was 7NT, bid as a sacrifice? I haven't: and I thought I'd seen it all.

## Black Magic

 Bill JacobsI enjoy writing up deals for the Black Magic series - there is no shortage of them. It rams home to me the apparent infinity of weird and beautiful cardplay positions that can occur with just 13 tricks in a deal.

Some deals involve deception - the magic is one of illusion, but others are more pure wizardry. And of course, the simpler the more satisfying.

This hand falls into the latter category. West leads a club to South's $4 v$ contract. The question is whether declarer can make that contract. What do you think?

| - 183 <br> - 10753 <br> - K932 <br> - 74 | - AK972 <br> $\checkmark 4$ <br> - AJ876 <br> - K6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{lll}  & & \\ & & \\ & & E \end{array}$ | - Q1065 <br> - K6 <br> - Q104 <br> * AO52 |
|  | $\rightarrow 4$ <br> - AQJ982 <br> - 5 <br> * J10983 |  |

The defence starts with 3 rounds of clubs. If West ruffs with the 5, that will be their last trick. Declarer finesses in trumps, finding a lucky layout to take the rest.

Discarding on the third round of clubs won't help ... declarer finesses in hearts, losing just the one heart trick.

West has an amazing counter. He ruffs the third round of clubs with the three, allowing a cheap overruff with dummy's singleton four. Now when declarer ruffs to his hand to play ace and queen of trumps, East can give West a club ruff for the setting trick.

But wait just a minute! Declarer has a counter counter. If West does find the $\vee 3$ play, declarer can refuse the Greek gift of a free trick with the $\vee 4$ and coolly discard from dummy, allowing West to have his little $\vee 3$. Later he can draw trumps with a finesse and live magically ever after.

