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## THERE IS A LOT OF TIME LEFT

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Draw \＆Vugraph Schedule p． 2 |  |  |
| Israel vs France Jos Jacobs |  | p． 3 |
| Poland vs England David Bird |  | p． 7 |
| Joan Gerard Youth Awards |  |  |
| Beware of the Dutch Girls |  |  |
| Phillip Alder |  | p． 12 |
| Tips from the top Mark Horton |  | p． 15 |
| England vs USA1 Micke Melander |  | p． 17 |
| Results |  | p． 19 |
|  |  |  |
| 10.00 | Junior | Round 8 |
|  | Youngsters | Round 8 |
|  | Girls | Round 7 |
|  | Kids | Round 9 |
| 13.30 | Junior | Round 9 |
|  | Youngsters | Round 9 |
|  | Girls | Round 8 |
|  | Kids | Round 10 |
| 15.50 | Junior | Round 10 |
|  | Youngsters | Round 10 |
|  | Girls | Round 9 |
|  | Kids | Round 11 |
| 18.10 | Junior | Round 11 |
|  | Youngsters | Round 11 |
|  | Kids | Round 12 |



The playing area
The fields are spreading out in each event．In the Juniors，Youngsters and Kids， the difference between first and last is some five matches．In the Girls，though， it is only two－and－a－half．

In the Juniors，USA1 has maintained its undefeated run．France is comfortably second，but you could throw a blanket over the next five teams：India，Singapore， Sweden，Netherlands and Israel．

In the Youngsters，the first three stayed the same：Israel，Poland and Italy． However，each lost one match yesterday．

Canada still leads the Kids division，but after losing twice yesterday，once to France by 38 imps and once to Israel by 2，now Poland，Germany，China 3， USA and Sweden are snapping at their heels．

Last，but most definitely not least，in the Girls flight，the Netherlands have dropped from first to third after losing all three matches，against Poland，France and China．France leads，followed by Poland and，very close behind，Hungary， Norway and China．
n
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## DRAW \＆VUGRAPH SCHEDULE TODAY



ROUND 8 －TIME： 10.00

$c$
JUNIOR
CAN vs CHN

| JUNIOR |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | （1）TPE | vs | HKG |  |
|  | H SWE | vs | CHI |  |
|  | －INA | vs | COL |  |
|  | －POL | vs | ISR | S |
|  | E NED | vs | CAN | ［＊ |
|  | －EGY | vs | CHN |  |
|  | －BOT | vs | NZL | m |
|  | 11 ITA | vs | ENG | ＋ |
| ＋VG | USA 2 | vs | USA 1 |  |
|  | －SGP | vs | FRA | I |
|  | －IND | vs | AUS |  |
| ROUND 11 －TIME： 18.10 |  |  |  |  |


| YOUNGSTERS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\pm$ ENG | vs | FIN | \＃ |
|  | 1. FRA | vs | THA | 三 |
|  | 플 SWE | vs | USA | 星 |
|  | － CHI | vs | CAN | ［1］ |
|  | \％ISR | vs | BOT | － |
|  | E NED | vs | IND | － |
|  | －CHN | vs | TPE | 匃 |
| BBO＋vg | －JPN | vs | BUL | － |
|  | POL | vs | GER |  |
|  | NOR | vs | SGP | － |
|  | 1 ITA | vs | HKG | ＊ |
| ROUND 10 －TIME： 15.50 |  |  |  |  |


| YOUNGSTERS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | －NED | vs | ISR | \％ |
|  | －CHN | vs | CHI | 른 |
|  | －JPN | vs | SWE | 랄 |
| FUNBRIDGE | P POL | vs | FRA | － |
| вво | 1.1 ITA | vs | ENG | \＃ |
|  | 판 NOR | vs | FIN | $\pm$ |
|  | ＊HKG | vs | THA |  |
|  | －GER | vs | USA | Her |
|  | －BUL | vs | CAN | 1 |
|  | （6）TPE | vs | BOT |  |
|  | －IND | vs | SGP |  |
| ROUND 11 －TIME： 18.10 |  |  |  |  |



| KIDS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 㫛 | GRE vs | FRA | $\underline{1}$ |
| ＝ | BOT | USA | 国 |
| c． | TUR vs | ISR | 웅 |
| ｜＊ | CAN vs | CHN | 2 |
| 말 | CHN 1 vs | ENG | $\pm$ |
| 탄 | DEN vs | GER | － |
| 팔 | CHN 3 vs | POL |  |
| 6 | TPE | IND | － |
|  | NOR vs | SWE | 담 |
| ROUND 9 －TIME： 10.00 |  |  |  |


| GIRLS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ［ CHI | vs | CHN |  |
| －INA | vs | FRA | 1 |
| 砳 USA | vs | POL | － |
| iㅏㅜ NOR | vs | HKG | 京 |
| $\pm$ ENG | vs | BRA | 앙 |
| （6）TPE | vs | TUR | c |
| $\equiv$ THA | vs | NED | － |
| ＝HUN |  | Bye |  |

ROUND 8 －TIME： 13.30


ROUND 9 －TIME： 15.50

| KIDS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 园 | USA | vs | GRE | 㕩 |
| $\square$ | ISR | vs | BOT | ＝ |
| ［ | CHN 2 | vs | TUR | c． |
|  | ENG | vs | CAN | ＊ |
| H | SWE | vs | CHN | 1 |
| ㅌ | GER | vs | FRA | $\square$ |
|  | POL | vs | DEN | ＋ |
| － | IND | vs | CHN |  |
|  | NOR | vs | TPE | 图 |
| ROUND 10 －time： 13.30 |  |  |  |  |


| KIDS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | GRE vs | ISR |
|  | BOT vs | CHN 2 |
|  | TUR vs | ENG + |
|  | CAN vs | CHN 1 |
|  | USA vs | GER |
| $\underline{1}$ | FRA vs | POL |
|  | DEN vs | IND $\quad$－ |
|  | CHN 3 vs | NOR |
|  | TPE vs | SWE 탈 |
| ROUND 11 －TIME： 15.50 |  |  |


| KIDS |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| －CHN 2 | GRE 哿 |
| $\pm$ ENG | BOT |
| －CHN 1 | TUR |
| －SWE | CAN |
| －GER | ISR ■ |
| $\square \mathrm{POL}$ | USA |
| $\because$－IND | FRA IT |
| NOR | DEN |
| －6 TPE | CHN 3 |
| ROUND 12 －TIME： 18.10 |  |

After the opening two rounds, Israel were leading the field with a near-maximum score of 38.76 VP . No team in any category had scored more VP in their first two matches. So I decided to have a look at them immediately, hoping for some more good bridge from them, and possibly from France, their next opponents, as well. Both countries, Israel and France, enjoy a long-standing reputation of playing sensible bridge, their national Open Teams finishing as runners-up in the recent European Championships in Ostend and last year's Bermuda Bowl in Lyon, respectively. What about their future hopes in international bridge?
On the opening board of the match, the French were definitely unlucky.

Board 1. Dealer North. None Vul.

- 43
$\bigcirc 96$
$\diamond$ A 95432
\& 1093

| - QJ8652 | N | a K 109 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ AQ 5 |  | $\bigcirc 103$ |
| $\diamond$ K Q 7 | W $\mathbf{L}$ | $\diamond$ J 108 |
| $\& \mathrm{~K}$ | S | \& A Q J 62 |
|  | 4 A 7 |  |
|  | ๑KJ8742 |  |
|  | $\diamond 6$ |  |
|  | \& 8754 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Boulin | Baniri | Guillemin | Khutorsky |
|  | Pass | $1 \mathbf{4}$ | $2 \checkmark$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \mathbf{4}$ | Pass |
| $4 N T$ | Pass | $5 \Omega$ | Pass |
| $5 \mathbf{4}$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Even more so in view of South's overcall, I feel sympathy for West's idea of giving it a second try. At the bridge table, however, sympathy does not count; it's inspiration that really matters. So full marks to Baniri, who did not even need any help from his partner to find the lead of the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and another for a quick one down. Partner no doubt would have helped effectively by winning with his A At the first attempt and continuing his diamond ... Israel plus 50.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loonstein | Fragola | Zeitak | Dufrene |
|  | Pass | 1\% | 20 |
| 24 | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| $4 \%$ | Pass | 4a | All Pass |

Loonstein's approach after the same start to the auction was much more to the point. He made the excellent choice of $4 \%$ at his second turn, enabling partner to deny any red-suit control thus enabling him to call it a day at a safe level. Just made, Israel plus 420 and 10 imps to open their account.
Two boards later, there was a serious accident.
Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

$$
\text { A } 2
$$

○A8542
$\diamond$ A 1097
\&) 1062
かJ 874
s 76
$\diamond$ J 32
\& K 854
$W_{S}{ }^{N} E$

4953
$\checkmark$ Q J 1093
$\diamond 86$
\& Q 97
A AK Q 106
$\bigcirc$ K
$\diamond$ K Q 54
\& A J 3
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boulin | Baniri | Guillemin | Khutorsky |
|  |  |  | 14 |
| Pass | 1 NT | Pass | 24 |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 30 | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | 40 |
| Pass | 40 | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | 50 | Pass | 5NT |
| Pass | $6 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

The Israeli pair, with help of Gazzilli's $2 \%$ complex, found a neat way to $6 \diamond$, which proved an easy contract. Israel plus 920 . With the $\diamond \mathrm{J}$ in West, you might even make all 13 tricks, but that was not the issue at this table.

Closed Room

| West <br> Loonstein | North <br> Fragola | East <br> Zeitak | South <br> Dufrene |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $1 N T$ | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 N T$ |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

To South, the $3 \diamond$ transfer to hearts suggested much better hearts than North actually held.
Down three, Israel another plus 150 and 14 more imps to lead 24-0 after just 3 boards.
On the next board, the combined $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ hands were nowhere near a slam:

| Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.$49$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| © A J 982 |  |  |
| $\diamond$ J 743 |  |  |
| \& A 32 |  |  |
| - A K Q J 10 | N | ヘ 7652 |
| ๑K6 | W E | $\bigcirc 7$ |
| $\diamond$ AK 106 | W E | $\diamond$ Q 2 |
| \& 104 | S | \& K J 9865 |
| A 843 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 10543 |  |  |
| $\diamond 985$ |  |  |
| \& Q 7 |  |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Boulin | Baniri | Guillemin | Khutorsky |
| $1 \uparrow$ | Dble | $3 \boldsymbol{\sim}$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

Maybe also warned by North's first-round take-out double, the French E/W settled for game and were rewarded with two overtricks when Boulin called for dummy's king on North's lead of a low club. Dummy continued with a club to South's queen, and when a diamond came back, declarer had the rest. France plus 680.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Loonstein | Fragola | Zeitak | Dufrene |
| 2NT | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\uparrow} \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | Pass | Pass |

After East's heart cue-bid agreeing spades (West having shown five of them), North led a low diamond. When declarer misguessed in clubs, he could no longer make the contract and eventually went down two by a slightly careless misplay. France another plus 200 and 13 imps back to them.
The next board was intriguing but neither team came anywhere near the proper contract.

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

- Q 83
© 95
$\diamond$ K Q 87
\& K Q 82

| ¢ J 5 | N | - A 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A 64 | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ E | $\bigcirc$ KQ108732 |
| $\diamond$ AJ 953 | W E | $\diamond 6$ |
| \& 1043 | S | 4076 |
|  | A K 1096 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J |  |
|  | $\diamond 1042$ |  |
|  | \& A J 5 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Boulin | Baniri | Guillemin | Khutorsky |
|  | $1 \boldsymbol{1} \boldsymbol{4}$ | $4 \Omega$ | $4 \boldsymbol{\$}$ |
| 50 | $5 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

With the clubs 4-3, nine tricks are cold for $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ in 3NT, but who can blame East for simply overcalling $4 \bigcirc$ ? When South, West and even North accepted the ensuing challenges, the Israelis were lucky that nobody caught them for speeding. Down two, France plus 200.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Loonstein | Fragola | Zeitak | Dufrene |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | $3 \uparrow$ |
| $4 \diamond$ | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

Again, all players involved accepted the challenges, albeit at a lower level. 4 went just one down, of course, so Israel scored plus 100 but France gained 3 imps .
The next board was another slam.


Open Room

| West <br> Boulin | North <br> Baniri | East <br> Guillemin | South <br> Khutorsky |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \diamond$ |
| Dble | $4 \checkmark$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | $5 \uparrow$ | $5 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

When the French came nowhere near the slam, they had to be content with down four and plus 800 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Loonstein | Fragola | Zeitak <br> Dufrene |  |
| $1 \diamond$ |  | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \circlearrowleft$ |
| $6 \diamond$ | $4 \diamond$ | Dble | $5 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | $6 \circlearrowleft$ |
|  | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

At the other table, par was reached when the French sacrificed at the six-level. One more undertrick for an extra 300 points to Israel, good for 7 more imps.
Two boards later, both North players reached a cold contract (on double-dummy basis), but how should you play it, especially when an opponent has been unfriendly enough to double you?


Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

- A Q 96

○KQ10754
$\diamond 32$
\& 5

| ¢ 8742 | N | A K J 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A 2 | W E | $\bigcirc$ J 3 |
| $\diamond 6$ | $W^{\text {c }}$ | $\diamond$ K J 1054 |
| \& Q J 874 | S | \& 1096 |
|  | ه 105 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 986$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A Q 987 |  |
|  | \& K 32 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Boulin | Baniri | Guillemin | Khutorsky |
| $1 \%$ | $1 \varnothing$ | $1 \uparrow$ (a) | $2 \varnothing$ |
| $3 \%$ | $4 \Omega$ | All Pass |  |

(a) Transfer to 1 NT

West won partner's low-club lead and returned his singleton diamond into dummy's tenace, but this was not good enough. Dummy continued a low trump, on which West jumped in with his $\triangle A$ to return a spade. Declarer was not to be taken in, however: he went up with the ace, cashed the $\ddots \mathrm{K}$, on which both of the outstanding trumps appeared, crossed to dummy's $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ and ran the $\$ 10$ to East's jack. When the $\boldsymbol{\$} \mathrm{K}$ put in appearance perforce on declarer's next spade lead, the contact was home. Israel plus 420.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loonstein | Fragola | Zeitak | Dufrene |
| $1 \%$ | 10 | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | 2a | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 30 | Pass | 4* |
| Dble | $4 \bigcirc$ | Dble | All Pas |

When East heard his right-hand opponent bid spades, he thought he could afford a double. He led a club to partner's jack and a spade came back. Can you blame declarer now for not going up with the © A and continuing a top trump - the only winning line?
When declarer finessed the $\boldsymbol{Q}$, East won his king and tried another club, ruffed by declarer. Even at this point, a top trump from hand would still have worked, but declarer took a winning diamond finesse instead. Next came a spade to the ace and a spade ruff, bringing down East's $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} \mathrm{K}$. When dummy finally continued with a low trump, West jumped in with his
$\checkmark A$ and led his last spade to give partner the chance to ruff in front of dummy with his J . Indeed, West got a diamond ruff in return, for an unexpected two down, another plus 300 and 12 imps to Israel. Nicely done.
With the score at 50-16 to Israel, this was the penultimate board:

Board 13. Dealer North. All Vul.
A A 942
© 54
$\diamond$ K J 93
\& 864


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Boulin | Baniri | Guillemin | Khutorsky |
|  | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| 1ヵ | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

On a natural low club lead by South, nine tricks were easy with such a good spade suit in dummy. France plus 600 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Loonstein | Fragola | Zeitak <br> Dufrene |  |
|  | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \boldsymbol{1 4}$ | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | Pass | Pass |

When East saw no clear source of tricks over partner's jump rebid, he cautiously passed and thus had to be content with just plus 140, for a loss of 10 imps . This way, the final score became 50-26 to Israel, 16.03-3.97 VP.



Play bridge wherever and whenever you like!


Come and play WBF tournaments!
Twice a day

## Download for free at www.funbridge.com


iPhone, iPad, Mac, Windows PC, Android, Amazon

The Great Dealer favoured us with plenty of high contracts in this match. In the Closed Room, the lowest contract was 3NT, until the spell was broke on the final board, when they stopped in one diamond. Right, let's see some action.


Open Room

| West <br> Norton | North <br> Marcinowski | East | Natt |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | South |
| :--- |
| Sobczak |
|  |

South's Polish 1* covers many hand types and his 1 rebid was forcing for one round. The subsequent 2 showed an 18 -plus hand, and the diamond fit was then found. When Mateusz Sobczak heard of two aces opposite, the odds looked good to him for a grand slam. Dummy had nothing to spare, as it turned out, and contract required some play.
Shahzaad Natt led the $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$, warning declarer of a bad heart break. Piotr Marcinowski won with dummy's king and immediately played three top spades, throwing his club losers. When he continued with a fourth spade, West produced the jack and declarer had to ruff with the $\diamond 10$. Good news arrived when East could not overruff. Declarer played the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and $\propto \mathrm{A}$, ruffing the $\& \mathrm{~J}$ with the $\diamond 9$. It remained only
to draw trumps and claim the established long spade for his 13th trick. The grand slam was against the required odds, but the bidding had been brave and the play was wonderful.

Closed Room

| West <br> Zawada | North <br> Alishaw | East <br> Madcher | South <br> Kennedy <br> $1 ヵ \boldsymbol{q}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 N T$ |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Pass | $5 N T$ |
| Pass | $6 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

After a strong-club opening and recognizable bidding up to $5 \diamond$, Stephen Kennedy did not jump to $7 \diamond$. He bid 5 NT to ask for the $₫ \mathrm{~K}$ and stopped in $6 \diamond$ when partner denied the card. East led $\$ 7$ and 12 tricks were made, Poland gaining 11 imps .

Board 4. Dealer West. Game all.

|  | $9$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | © AJ982 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 743 |  |
|  | \& A 32 |  |
| ¢ A K Q J 10 | N | ヘ 7652 |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 6$ |  | $\bigcirc 7$ |
| $\diamond$ AK 106 | W E | $\diamond$ Q 2 |
| \& 104 | S | \& K J 9865 |
|  | - 843 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 10543 |  |
|  | $\diamond 985$ |  |
|  | \& Q 7 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Norton | Marcinowski | Natt | Sobczak |
| 14 | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass |
| 44 | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Ben Norton made no attempt to investigate a 'perfect cards opposite' slam. He won the diamond lead, drew trumps and led the 10 . North claimed his two aces and that was plus 650.

2018 World Youth Teams Championships

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zawada | Alishaw | Madcher | Kennedy |
| 1ヵ | Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass |
| 3\＆ | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | Pass | Pass |

East bid more strongly at this table，and West must have been disappointed to hear of no aces opposite． He slammed on the brakes，and North led his singleton trump．Declarer won and drew a second round，North showing out．West then played three top diamonds， ditching dummy＇s $\wp 7$ ．When he ran the $\propto 10$ ，South won with the $\%$ and returned a heart to the king and ace，ruffed in the dummy．North won the next club and led the $\diamond$ J，South overruffing the dummy for two down since there was still a heart to lose．
Poland＇s good fortune on the diamond grand slam had been balanced by going down on this one． England collected 13 imps．

Board 5．Dealer North．N／S game．
－Q 83
$\checkmark 95$
$\diamond$ K Q 87
\＆K Q 82

か J 5
© A 64
$\diamond$ AJ 953
\＆ 1043

|  | －A 7 |
| :---: | :---: |
| N | $\bigcirc$ KQ108732 |
| W E | $\diamond 6$ |
| S | 4096 |
| ＊K 1096 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ J |  |
| $\diamond 1042$ |  |
| \＆A J 5 |  |

Open Room

| West | North $\quad$ East | South |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Norton | Marcinowski | Natt | Sobczak |
|  | $1 \odot$ | $1 \odot$ | $1 \uparrow$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ | $2 \uparrow$ | $4 \Omega$ | All Pass |

I always enjoy watching BBO deals that feature a battle between the major suits．Here Natt opted to overcall at the one－level．Even though North＇s $1 \%$ opening was Polish，not promising clubs，East－West knew that Norton＇s $2 \%$ showed a sound heart raise． The auction ended in $4 \diamond$ ，and South led the 2 to the queen and ace．Declarer was just short of the dummy entries needed to establish a spade discard on the diamonds and went one down．What would happen at the other table？

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zawada | Alishaw | Madcher | Kennedy |
|  | $1 \boldsymbol{4} \boldsymbol{\$}$ | $4 \varnothing$ | $4 \boldsymbol{\$}$ |
| $5 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

East＇s $4 \triangleright$ overcall worked well in a way．South bid $4 \uparrow$ and this was destined to fail on a diamond ruff． However，West could hardly be blamed for raising the hearts and this went two down doubled for a loss of 6 imps．
The next board was splendidly bid at both tables：
Board 6．Dealer East．E／W game．
－ 1042
๑J109875
$\diamond 102$
\＆K 4


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Norton | Marcinowski | Natt | Sobczak |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \diamond$ |
| $1 \diamond$ | $4 \diamond$ | Dble | Pass |
| $6 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | $6 \diamond$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

Natt found a minimum take－out double of North＇s $4 \diamond$ ，and Norton did excellently to bid $6 \diamond$ instead of $5 \diamond$ ．He could judge that partner would not have wasted values in the heart suit．South then found the good sacrifice in $6 『$ ，convinced by the confident East－ West bidding that $6 \diamond$ would be made．It was a fine auction and East－West took all of their tricks to exact a penalty of 1100 ，still a worthwhile save against the likely 1390 the other way．

## Closed Room

| West <br> Zawada | North <br> Alishaw | East <br> Madcher | South <br> Kennedy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Dble | $4 \diamond$ | $5 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $6 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | $6 \diamond$ |
| Dble | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Jakub Zawada's double promised spades, and Arkadiusz Majcher did well to find a $5 \diamond$ bid. West raised to $6 \diamond$, and Kennedy then found the required sacrifice. At both tables it was bidding worthy of any championship. The penalty was again 1100 and no imps changed hands.
England missed a chance at both tables of this deal:
Board 8. Dealer West. Love all.
a A Q 96
$\diamond$ KQ10754
$\diamond 32$
\& 5

| ヘ8742 | N | ¢ K J 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A 2 |  | $\bigcirc$ J 3 |
| $\diamond 6$ | W E | $\diamond$ KJ 1054 |
| \& A Q J 874 | S | \& 1096 |
|  | A 105 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 986$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A Q 987 |  |
|  | \& K 32 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Norton | Marcinowski | Natt | Sobczak |
| $1 \boldsymbol{\%}$ | $1 \varnothing$ | $1 \varnothing$ | $2 \Omega$ |
| $3 \boldsymbol{\%}$ | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \Omega$ |
| $4 \boldsymbol{\%}$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

West, after explaining that the 19 bid showed at least four clubs, carried the bidding to 4\%. With the favourable lie of both black suits, it seemed that this
might be made. Declarer won the $৩ \mathrm{~K}$ lead and played a diamond to the king and ace. North won the heart return and continued with the ace and another spade. It was clear to finesse the $\mathbf{J}$, the kibitzers thought. How could the contract be made otherwise? When the jack wins, declarer can lead the 10 , unblocking the 8 or 7 , and continue with the 9 . Whether South covers or not, the entries will be present for a ruffing finesse in diamonds, followed by a discard of the last spade.
Apparently still unhappy with the 1d bid, we were told, declarer called for the $\boldsymbol{\$}$ and went two down.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zawada | Alishaw | Madcher | Kennedy |
| $1 \boldsymbol{\%}$ | $1 \odot$ | $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \Omega$ |
| $3 \boldsymbol{4}$ | $4 \Omega$ | Dble | All Pass |

East's 14 denied spades, and North ended in 40 doubled. Madcher led the $\boldsymbol{\$} 9$, overtaken by the jack, and Zawada then returned the $\diamond 6$ into dummy's tenace. If declarer had read this as a singleton, he could have succeeded by playing trumps next and guessing to ruff out the $\boldsymbol{\wedge} \mathrm{K}$ from the East hand. This would have been a bit double-dummy, and Alishaw preferred to finesse the Q . East won and delivered a diamond ruff. The $\triangle \mathrm{A}$ was still to come, so that was one down.
England lost 5 imps when they might have gained quite a few. The general bidding and play had been of a high standard, and Poland won by 29 imps to 20 (11.87 vps to 8.13).

## JOAN GERARD YOUTH AUARDS



These awards are made in each division to the player judged to best exhibit aptitude, fair play and international spirit.

Non-playing captains, coaches and officials are asked to nominate one player in each division, but no-one may nominate someone from her or his own country.

Voting forms can be picked up at the hospitality desk.

Joan Gerard
The deadline is August 14 for the Kids and August 17 for the Juniors, Youngsters and Girls.

## BEWARE OF THE DUTCH GIRLS (PART 2)

Kees Tammens

Part one of this story appeared in 2007 during the European Championships in Jesolo, when I tried to issue a warning to an unsuspecting world, especially the male half - usually in vain - that there were two good-looking Dutch girls on the loose, Meike and Marion, who would develop into top-level players. Junior girls from the Netherlands were a force to be reckoned in 2016 and 2017. But even girls can surpass the junior age limit. Here in Wujiang, the new Dutch team started well in the first three rounds, much to the delight of their captain Anneke Simons, winner of the 2000 Venice Cup in her own right. Let me describe how the Dutch girls of 2018 performed during the first day of this championship.

seemed at first glance, but life in bridge can bring many unexpected happenings.

| West | North <br> Wackwitz | East | South <br> Holm |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dble | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass |  |  |  |

The fearless $4 \diamond$ opening drove East-West to $4 \circlearrowleft$. With the bad trump break, the contract ended up three down and gave 10 imps to the Netherlands, who went on to win the match by $45-22$ in imps (15.854.15 in vps).

As a longtime visitor to junior championships, I look forward to the adventures, heroics and masterpieces of the young contenders. I am convinced that there will be a lot to write about. When the opportunity arises, I will describe deals with excellent defensive plays in 'Kees for the Defense'. 'The Dinosaur' refers to boards where a team scores 17 or more imps by adding two big plus scores, usually five-level contracts doubled and made in both directions. And there is always the 'Big Bear Award for the Best Bid Deal'. Don't hesitate to tell Phillip, our bulletin editor, or me about any of these exploits by yourself, your partners, teammates or your opponents.
The next board produced brilliancy prizes in declarerplay and defense. In the bulletin room we were curious about who had made $4 \bigcirc$ under his own steam, and which Norths had defeated $4 \bigcirc$. It turned out that Dutchies were on the giving and receiving end here.

The defense was up to the task. Sandra Kolen (West) led a trump, and Esther Visser (East) cashed the \&o K and $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \mathrm{K}$. After that, three rounds of spades tapped the dummy. Declarer could not make more than four clubs and two hearts to go three down ('fifty a piece') and a good investment against the cold vulnerable 3NT. The bidding had some flaws, I agree. That was how it had


| Dlr: East | - K Q 1092 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | $\bigcirc$ Q 7 |
|  | $\diamond 10643$ |
|  | \& J 9 |
| A A 86 | N ${ }^{\text {a J } 4}$ |
| ๑A542 | W E ©KJ 98 |
| $\diamond 82$ | W E $\diamond$ K J 7 |
| 4 A 1073 | S K 852 |
|  | A 753 |
|  | $\bigcirc 1063$ |
|  | $\diamond$ A Q 95 |
|  | \& Q 64 |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $1 \boldsymbol{1 0}$ | Pass |
| $1 \circlearrowleft$ | $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \varnothing$ | $2 \uparrow$ |
| $4 \odot$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

As North, you lead $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} \mathrm{K}$ and must lead again to the second trick when your lead holds the trick. If you continue with the Q , you give declarer a sporting chance: A and a spade ruffed, heart to the $\triangle \mathrm{A}$ and a heart to the $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$ and $\gtrdot \mathrm{K}$. Declarer now draws the last trump with the jack. After $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu} \mathrm{K}$, she endplays South with the third club, and that player has to give declarer the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$. We all wanted to know which declarer had played like that and which North shifted to a diamond at trick two (each of whom might be candidate for an award)? It turned out that Brad Johnston from New Zealand found the killing diamond shift at trick two, when Dutch declarer Thibo Sprinkhuizen as West ducked the top spade lead; that simply served to flatten the board since the game was much easier to defeat when declared by East in the other room - but well done anyway!
Even better, Aarnout Helmich, coach of the Dutch girls (and a junior world champion in 2011 and 2012), announced proudly that after the defense of repeated
spade leads Juliet Berwald had executed this very neat endplay here, in her debut in international bridge. When her partner Fleur Beekman in the same match brought home a vulnerable 4d on a hand where the opponents had gone down in $3 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$, this resulted in a second win: 57-18 (18.29-1.71) for the Netherlands.
Then came the third match of the first day:

| Dlr: North Vul: N-S | - Q 83 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 95$ |
|  | $\diamond$ K Q 87 |
|  | \& K Q 82 |
| A J 5 | N A A 7 |
| -A 64 | $\mathbf{w}^{\mathbf{N}}$ E $\odot$ KQ108732 |
| $\diamond$ AJ 953 | $\mathbf{W} \quad \mathbf{E} \diamond 6$ |
| \& 1043 | S \& 976 |
|  | ヘK109642 |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J |
|  | $\diamond 1042$ |
|  | \& A J 5 |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | $3 \uparrow$ |
| $4 \diamond$ | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |
| $5 \circlearrowleft$ | Dble | All Pass |  |

After a spade lead for A, declarer, Esther Visser, took $\bigcirc \mathrm{K}$, played a diamond to $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and led a low diamond from dummy, North hopping up with the $\diamond K$, and East ruffing. A heart to $\triangle A$ was followed by the $\diamond J$, which was covered by the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$, ruffed high by East, and South had to contribute the $\diamond 10$. With $\triangle 6$ as a precious dummy entry, East having kept a low heart, declarer came home with eleven tricks, good for the third win of the day and the lead in the overall rankings.

It is still unclear how the Dutch girls will do over the course of the next week, but at least this day was a memorable one.


## CHINA VS INDONESIA

Phillip Alder

Prior to this match, Indonesia was eleventh and China thirteenth, so each team was hoping for a good win.
Both North-South pairs misdefended on the first board.

| Dlr: North | A 10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | $\bigcirc$ J 92 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K Q 85 |  |
|  | \& Q J 1098 |  |
| A 6 | N | AAKJ97543 |
| $\bigcirc$ AK 10765 | 653 W ${ }^{\text {N }}$ | $\bigcirc 4$ |
| $\diamond 102$ | W E | $\diamond 943$ |
| \& K 74 | S | \& 3 |
|  | - Q 82 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 8 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A J 76 |  |
|  | \& 465 |  |

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Solihin | Wang | Santoso | Jin |
|  | Pass | $4 \diamond$ (a) | Pass |
| $4 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

(a) Good four-spade opening

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Miao | Satriawan | Gu | Febriyanto |
|  | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ | All Pass |

The defenders can take one club, two diamonds and one spade.
In the Open Room, North surprisingly led the club queen instead of the diamond king. South won with the ace and cashed the diamond ace, under which North encouraged with the eight. Here, the king would have worked much better, but he could not be sure he could afford that card.
When South shifted to the heart eight, declarer pitched one diamond on the club king and another on the second high heart to lose only one spade, one diamond and one club.
At the other table, South led the heart queen, not immediately fatal. Declarer shook his club loser on
the heart king, then played a diamond. North ought to have split his honors and shifted to his trump, but he played low. Then South missed the defense's last chance. He won with the jack and cashed the ace instead of leading a low diamond to his partner.
This was the second board:

| Dlr: East | ¢ J 83 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K}$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A Q 9765 |  |
|  | ¢ 1082 |  |
| 4 Q | N | A A965 |
| $\bigcirc$ AQ 10975 | $754 \mathrm{~W}^{\text {N }}$ | ○J6 |
| $\diamond 4$ | W E | $\diamond$ K J 10832 |
| \& J 965 | S | 4 Q |
|  | ¢ K 10742 |  |
|  | ๑832 |  |
|  | $\diamond$-- |  |
|  | \& AK 743 |  |

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Solihin | Wang | Santoso | Jin |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \uparrow$ |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Miao | Satriawan | Gu | Febriyanto |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| $4 \circlearrowleft$ | $4 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | Dble | All Pass |

In the Closed Room, four spades had to fail by a trick.
Against four hearts, North led the spade three. Declarer won with dummy's ace and played the club queen, which South took with the king. When South shifted to a trump, declarer understandably played low. North won and led the spade jack. Declarer ruffed, trumped a club, ruffed another spade, drew trumps and, a moment later, guessed the clubs, leading the jack to pin North's ten. That was also down one and 6 imps to China.
Five boards later, the score was 7-6 to China.

Then:

| Dlr: West | か J 8754 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Vul: None | $\diamond 4$ |
|  | $\diamond 10942$ |
|  |  |
|  | \& Q 1088 |


| A 103 N |  | - Q 62 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ○AKQJ 765 |  | $\bigcirc 8$ |
| $\diamond 8$ | W E | $\diamond$ A 5 |
| \& J 76 | S | \& AK95432 |
|  | - AK 9 |  |
|  | ©10932 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K Q J 763 |  |
|  | 8 -- |  |

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Solihin | Wang | Santoso | Jin |
| 10 | Pass | $2 \%$ | $2 \diamond$ |
| 20 | Pass | 34 | $3 \diamond$ |
| $4 \diamond$ | $5 \diamond$ | 6\% | Dble |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| Closed Room: |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Miao | Satriawan | Gu | Febriyanto |
| 45 | Pass | Pass | Pass |

When did you last see such diverse auctions?
Benjie Miao made the practical four-heart opening, and South decided against competing with five diamonds, unwisely as it turned out.
The double-dummy lead would have been the club eight. Declarer would surely have read that as a singleton and put up dummy's king, with fatal consequences.
When North led a low spade, declarer played low from the dummy. South won with the king, cashed the ace and switched to the diamond king. When both defenders followed to the first round of trumps, West claimed an overtrick.
Six clubs doubled went down two, declarer losing two spades and one club.
In theory, this was a good save, because five diamonds was makable, but declarer might not(!) have got the spade suit right.
Plus 300 and plus 450 gave China 13 imps .
China gained 2 more imps when a fit-showing double of an intervening one-notrump overcall did not work well. Then another 6 when the South players in second seat with both sides vulnerable held...

A A J 107652
© 84
$\diamond 1097$
of A

Hendrik Febriyanto opened four spades, and Kai Jin chose three spades.
It was a good day to be cautious because partner had a spade void. Nine tricks were the limit.
Board 11 was very interesting.

| Dlr: SouthVul: None |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 63$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AKQ 8 |  |
|  | \& A Q 1087 |  |
| * AJ964 | N | A 1085 |
| ๑J982 | W E | $\bigcirc 105$ |
| $\diamond$ J 92 | $W^{\text {L }}$ | $\diamond 6543$ |
| \& 6 | S | \& K J 95 |
|  | AK732 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AQ 74 |  |
|  | $\diamond 107$ |  |
|  | \& 432 |  |

Open Room:

| West <br> Solihin | North <br> Wang | East <br> Santoso | South <br> Jin |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $\mathbf{1 \infty}$ | Pass | $1 \Omega$ |
| $1 \boldsymbol{\infty}$ | Dble (a) | Pass | 1 NT |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass | 3 NT |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

(a) Support Double

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Miao | Satriawan | Gu | Febriyanto |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 10\% (a) | Pass | 19 (b) |
| Dble | $2 \%$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ (c) |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

(a) Precision
(b) 8-plus balanced
(c) Minimum

What should the declarers have done after taking the first trick with the spade queen?
They had eight winners: one spade, three hearts, three diamonds and one club. Maybe the hearts were $3-3$ or the club finesse was winning, but there was another possibility.
In the Open Room, Jin immediately crossed to his hand in hearts and took the club finesse to go a fast down one.
Febriyanto did much better, cashing dummy's three top diamonds first. When the nine and jack conveniently dropped, he had his ninth trick and 10 imps .
If the diamonds had not been so obliging, I expect he would have tested the hearts, then, if they were $4-2$, resorted to the club finesse. But as Barry Rigal
pointed out, the club finesse is a mirage.
After testing diamonds and finding them unfriendly, cash the club ace! Then play on hearts.
If they split, fine. If West turns up with four, endplay him in the suit to give you a trick with the spade king at the end (assuming he also holds the club king). If East has four hearts, lead a club toward the queen.
Next came:

| Dlr: West | A A 94 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | © AJ742 |  |
|  | $\diamond 4$ |  |
|  | \& K 1032 |  |
| ヘ1087652 | N | © Q J |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 8 | W E | $\bigcirc 96$ |
| $\diamond$ A 86 | W E | $\diamond$ Q 109732 |
| ¢ 94 | S | $\leftrightarrow$ A Q 7 |
|  | AK3 |  |
|  | ๑K1053 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K J 5 |  |
|  | \& J 865 |  |

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Solihin | Wang | Santoso | Jin |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $2 \diamond$ | 2NT (a) |
| $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

(a) Four-plus hearts, at least game-invitational

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Miao | Satriawan | Gu | Febriyanto |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | 30\% (a) |
| Pass | $3 \diamond(\mathrm{~b})$ | Pass | 3 (c) |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |
| (a) Mixed or limit raise <br> (b) Inquiry <br> (c) Maximum with a spade contr |  |  |  |

If North knows partner has four-card support and game-invitational values, he should just bid four hearts. Yes, he has a seven-loser hand, but he has a singleton, good controls and it is imp scoring.
In the Open Room, Muhammad Wisolus Solihin was certainly brave in bidding three spades; and he must have been delighted when it was passed out.
North led his singleton. South took the second trick with the spade king, cashed the diamond king and gave his partner a ruff. Two hearts and the spade ace left the contract down two.
At the other table, Gu surprisingly passed over one heart.
East led the spade queen. If declarer had drawn trumps, he probably would have made the contract, losing only one diamond and two clubs. However, at trick two, he
led his diamond to the king and ace. West shifted to the club nine and two clubs and a ruff later, the contract was down one, giving China a lucky 5 imps.
On the penultimate board, both Easts had a chance to make their game contracts of three notrump and four hearts, but both failed, giving Indonesia 3 imps for one fewer vulnerable undertrick.
This was the final deal:

| Dlr: East | ¢ A 86 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | $\bigcirc$ A J 106 |  |
|  | $\diamond 10974$ |  |
|  | \& 65 |  |
| ヘ K Q J 4 | N | A 1053 |
| $\bigcirc$-- |  | - Q 742 |
| $\diamond$ Q J 85 | W E | $\diamond 632$ |
| \& A Q J 109 | S | \& 874 |
|  | ¢ 972 |  |
|  | ৩K9853 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A K |  |
|  | \& K 32 |  |

Open Room:

| West <br> Solihin | North <br> Wang | East <br> Santoso | South <br> Jin |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dble | $3 \diamond$ (a) | Pass | $1 \Omega$ |
| Pass | $4 \varnothing$ |  |  |
| Dble | Pass | Pass | Pass |

(a) Limit raise

| Closed Room: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Miao | Satriawan | Gu | Febriyanto |
|  |  | Pass | 18 |
| Dble | $2 \diamond$ (a) | Pass | 20 |
| Dble | 30 | Pass | Pass |
| 4* | Pass | Pass | Pass |

(a) Mixed raise with three or more hearts

In the Open Room, the bidding told South that West was short in hearts and had a very strong hand that surely included the club ace. So South should have escaped for down one. However, Jin dropped a trick to go down two.
At the other table, Muhammad Satriawan was cautious in calling his hand a mixed raise, given that he had two aces. However, his partner was limited to 15 high-card points.
Against four clubs, the defenders kept plugging away at hearts to cause declarer to run out of trumps and go down one.
That was 8 imps to Indonesia and a final score of 33-27 to China, or 11.87-8.13 in victory points.

## In the Master's Footsteps

Most defensive plays are well-known and welldocumented. For example, if you as a defender have © K10x in the trump suit and declarer takes a ruff with the $\$ \mathrm{Q}$ or J , it is best not to overruff -- that way you get two trump tricks instead of one.
However, some plays are less well-known and counter-intuitive, unless you have seen the concept before.
Here's a deal from the recent GNT quarter-finals:
Dealer East. All Vul.
© K Q
© Q 10983
$\diamond 10975$
\& 109

| ¢ J 32 | N | ¢ 985 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ©K742 | N | $\bigcirc$ A J |
| $\diamond$ A | W E | $\diamond$ KJ843 |
| \& A Q 764 | S | \& K J 3 |
|  | - A 10764 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 65$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 62 |  |
|  | \& 852 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Woolsey | Blanchard | Martel | Berkowitz |
|  |  | 1\%* | Pass |
| $1 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | 10 | Pass |
| 2\%** | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 30 | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

1\% Two-plus clubs
$1 \diamond$ Transfer
2* Forcing
Recognising that if there was a weakness it had to be in spades, North led the Q , followed with the king and switched to a diamond, but declarer was soon claiming nine tricks, Plus 600.

Closed Room

| West North <br> Nistor  | Eastan <br> Karrington | South <br> Rosenberg |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass | 2 NT | Pass |
| $3 \varnothing$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ |  |
| $5 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

North led the $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} \mathrm{K}$ and followed with the queen. South overtook it and returned the 6 for North to ruff. How did South know to do that?
Well, he might have been aware of this deal from the 2017 Reisinger Board-a-Match Teams:

Dealer West. EW Vul.
かAJ10987
© J 63
$\diamond$ AK 3
\& $K$
A 543
$\checkmark$ A Q
$\diamond$ J 108642
\& Q 6


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zhao | Smith | Liu | Kriegel |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $1 \mathrm{NT}^{*}$ |
| $2 \diamond$ | $2 \uparrow$ | $3 \diamond$ | $3 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

* Forcing

I confess I see little merit in bidding on the West hand -- 'for the lead, partner'.
East led the seven of diamonds. Declarer won, unblocked the king of clubs, ruffed a diamond, cashed the ace of clubs (pitching a heart) and ran the queen of spades. Although that lost, the contract was safe, Plus 420.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Woolsey | Shen | Bramley | Shao |
| Pass | $10 \boldsymbol{R}^{*}$ | Pass | $1 \diamond^{*}$ |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{*}$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

## 1\% Precision <br> $1 \diamond$ Negative

East led the four of hearts. West won with the ace and returned the queen. To defeat the contract East must overtake and give his partner a ruff. How could he know that was required?
Here is the original and famous precedent, from a match between the legendary Blue Team and the Dallas Aces, as reported by Victor Mollo in Bridge Magazine:

```
^ J 10873
~AQ109764
\diamond-
&-8
```



```
- K Q
\(\checkmark 53\)
\(\diamond 953\)
\& AK9753
A 642
\(\stackrel{\circ}{ }\)
\(\diamond\) AK Q 1072
\& Q 104
```

A A 95
๑J 82
$\diamond$ J 864
de J 62

In both rooms the contract was four hearts by North, East-West remaining silent throughout the auction. The play to the first three tricks was the same. East led the king of clubs, saw West's two, and switched to the king of spades. West encouraged with the nine of spades, and the queen of spades followed. Thereafter, in the closed room, Belladonna was in command, dummy's diamonds taking care of the three losing spades.
With the spades blocked, could the result be any different in the open room?
Commentators and audience alike expected a flat board. Forquet took his time before playing to that third trick. Then, making up his mind, he overtook the queen of spades and gave Garozzo a ruff!
Forquet reasoned that, since Garozzo knew the club position after seeing the two, he would have cashed his ace of clubs had there been room for declarer to have another club. So, somehow, the defence had to take three tricks in spades, and it was significant that Garozzo, knowing that Forquet had the ace of spades, led the queen of spades at trick three and not a low one. Maybe, of course, he had the jack of spades too. But, maybe he had started with a doubleton. It was a chance and Pietro Forquet was quick to seize it.

Junior Players will also be able to enter the Youth Triathlon event starting on Saturday 22nd September.

## The great, the bad and the unlucky

USA1 was well ahead in the junior standings after five matches. How would they cope with England in round six? Only two imps were shared in the first three boards, then came the first big swing of the match:
Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.
J J 10653

- Q 74
$\diamond 5$
\& AK 75


AK74
ऽJ96
$\diamond$ KQ9743
\& 9
A A Q 92
© K 1032
$\diamond 8$
\& Q 1082
Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Grossack | Alishaw | Kriegel | Kennedy |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Dble |
| Redble | $2 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Why South didn't bid a second time when partner freely bid $2 \boldsymbol{\$}$ remain a mystery. Maybe he didn't want to push East-West into a game in diamonds that might have been making, and as we all know 4-4-4-1 isn't the best distribution you can have when declaring; rather the opposite. Three diamonds didn't present any problem to declarer Oren Kriegel, who lost the expected club, spade and two hearts for plus 110. (Editor's note. Normally, after an opening bid, a takeout double and a redouble, fourth hand is assumed to be very weak. The advancer may jump with very few points and a five- or six-card suit. That North hand was far stronger than South would have ever anticipated. To show surprising strength, I was taught to pass first, then to act aggressively on the next round.)
Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Norton | Kaplan | Natt | Jolly |
| Pass | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Dble |
| $5 \diamond$ | $5 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

The Closed Room auction went to a far higher level when West jumped straight to game, and Adam Kaplan competed with 54. The nine of clubs was led. Declarer won and successfully finessed in trumps. He drew trumps, cashed the clubs and exited in diamonds. East took that trick and facilitated the play by shifting to the heart jack. 13 imps to USA1.

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

$$
49632
$$

ऽ Q 107643
$\diamond$ A 3
of $K$

- K J 84
$\checkmark 85$
$\diamond$ K 102
\& Q 972

- A
$\diamond$ K J 9
$\diamond$ Q 9754
\& A 1053

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Grossack | Alishaw | Kriegel | Kennedy |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $1 ヵ$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{6}$ | Pass |
| $3 \boldsymbol{\&}$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Norton | Kaplan | Natt | Jolly |
|  | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \Omega^{*}$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

In the Open Room, South led the five of spades: eight, nine, ace. Declarer played a diamond to dummy's ten, driving out the ace. East shifted to the heart six, East's nine losing to South's ace. South exited with a diamond. Declarer would have done best to cash the ace of clubs, but he tried a low club to the queen, so took only nine tricks.
In the Closed Room, a "successful" $2 \diamond$ Multi opening left South declaring in $3 \triangle$, when neither East nor West got into the auction. Three down, vulnerable, was minus 300 and another 3 imps to USA. Norton and Natt are probably still wondering why they didn't compete or double the contract.
Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul. A Q J 954
$\bigcirc$ J
$\diamond$ A 432
\& K 74


Open Room:

| West <br> Grossack | North <br> Alishaw | East <br> Kriegel | South <br> Kennedy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3NT! |  | Pass | Pass |

This deal was a Zach Grossack special. First, over South's Multi opening, showing a weak two in either major, Zach just shut his eyes and bid three notrump.
North kicked off with the queen of spades, which ran to West's king. Declarer cashed his hearts, then took the club finesse, which lost. North cashed his ace of diamonds before playing another spade. But South took that trick and returned a diamond, forgetting that one leads king from ace-king after trick one.

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Norton | Kaplan | Natt | Jolly |
|  |  | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Dbl | 20 | Pass | 2 |
| Dbl | Pass | 3¢ | Pass |
| 5\% | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Another $2 \diamond$ Multi from Kaplan-Jolly. Norton-Natt, who had learned the lesson from the previous board, entered the auction this time. When the king of clubs was offside, five clubs was just made. Well bid and well judged, but they still lost 1 imp to USA1.
Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

- 9643
$\checkmark 54$
$\diamond$ AJ 8752
$\& 9$
AK J 2
$\diamond$ K 876
$\diamond 1093$

| N | A Q |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | © AJ 1093 |
| $\mathbf{W} \quad \mathbf{E}$ | $\diamond$ K 4 |
| S | \& K J 1074 |
| A A 10875 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 2 |  |
| $\diamond$ Q 6 |  |
| \& A 853 |  |

At both tables, South opened one spade, and North made a three-spade mixed raise. In the Open Room, Kriegel overcalled with four hearts, which was passed out. At the other table, Natt bid four clubs, non-Leaping Michaels, showing at least 5-5 in clubs and either major, over which West advanced with four hearts, pass or correct. Against Kriegel, South led a low spade. Declarer took that trick, played a heart to dummy's king and returned a heart to his jack. The defenders had two minor-suit aces to come, but the contract was home.
In the other room, Kaplan led his singleton. Jolly won with his ace and returned a suit-preference eight of clubs. North ruffed, put partner in with the ace of spades, got a second ruff and cashed the ace of diamonds for down two. 13 imps to USA1.
A few boards later was one of the most interesting in this match so far. It could very well be titled "the great,
the bad and the unlucky".
Board 12. Dealer West. E/W Vul.
A A972
© K 85
$\diamond 83$
\& Q 1064

| ¢ 654 | N | ^ K Q J 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| © A 1094 |  | $\bigcirc$ Q J 7 |
| $\diamond 1064$ | W E | $\diamond$ AK Q J 9 |
| \& A 83 | S | \& J |
|  | 4 83 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 632$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 752$ |  |
|  | \& K 9752 |  |

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Grossack | Alishaw | Kriegel | Kennedy |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $5 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | Pass | $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |

Grossack-Kriegel had a very nice bidding sequence to arrive in $5 \diamond$. The key bid was $3 \uparrow$, which alerted East that they probably had a very weak club suit and maybe not even a stopper there. East had few problems rejecting the slam proposal from West, because he knew partner was a passed hand. He was confident that Santa Claus had not come early.
As you can see, slam was all on the heart finesse, which was losing.
Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Norton | Kaplan | Natt | Jolly |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \wedge$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Identical bidding to the point where East showed his threecardsupportin hearts. WhenWestsuggested 3NT, itbecame the final contract. Clearly very bad if North led clubs, as was to be expected from the auction. Kaplan kicked off with the four of clubs, which went to the jack and king, ducked by declarer. Jolly led back the five of clubs, which ran to the eight, ten and a spade discard from dummy. Now Kaplan erred, having missed a club spot. He led back the six of clubs - blocking the suit! That was the "bad" part. Declarer won with his ace and immediately fired a spade towards dummy, North won and cashed the queen of clubs. But game over for the defense since declarer now had his nine tricks and could claim when South had the last club. Very "unlucky" to score only a push with that result from the Open Room.
When the smoked had cleared the match finished 13-36 to USA1 (4.15-15.85), who maintained their big lead in the junior series.


## YOUNGSTER TEAMS

ROUND 5

| ROHND |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| CHINESE TAIPEI | BULGARIA | 45 | 16 | 16.88 | 3.12 |
| INDIA | GERMANY | 23 | 57 | 2.37 | 17.63 |
| SINGAPORE | CHILE | 58 | 16 | 18.65 | 1.35 |
| CANADA | NORWAY | 24 | 22 | 10.66 | 9.34 |
| USA | 24 | 55 | 2.81 | 17.19 |  |
| THAILAND | ITALY | 29 | 54 | 3.79 | 16.21 |
| FINLAND | POLAND | 41 | 19 | 15.66 | 4.34 |
| ENGLAND | JAPAN | 41 | 39 | 10.66 | 9.34 |
| FRANCE | NHINA | 31 | 49 | 5.15 | 14.85 |
| SWEDEN | NETHERLANDS | 46 | 30 | 14.42 | 5.58 |
| BOTSWANA | CHINA |  | 40 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ROUND 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| JAPAN | CHINA | 18 | 32 | 6.04 | 13.96 |
| POLAND | NETHERLANDS | 32 | 19 | 13.72 | 6.28 |
| ITALY | ISRAEL | 16 | 38 | 4.34 | 15.66 |
| NORWAY | CHILE | 33 | 29 | 11.28 | 8.72 |
| CHINA HONG KONGSWEDEN | 22 | 52 | 2.96 | 17.04 |  |
| GERMANY | FRAANCE | 38 | 25 | 13.72 | 6.28 |
| CANADA | SINGAPORE | 19 | 36 | 5.36 | 14.64 |
| CHINESE TAIPEI | FINLAND | 60 | 11 | 19.38 | 0.62 |
| INDIA | THAILAND | 15 | 60 | 1.02 | 18.98 |
| BOTSWANA | USA | 6 | 56 | 0.53 | 19.47 |
| BULGARIA | ENGLAND | 41 | 24 | 14.64 | 5.36 |

ROUND 6

| USA | CANADA | 34 | 14 | 15.26 | 4.74 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| THAILAND | BOTSWANA | 78 | 12 | 20.00 | 0.00 |
| FINLAND | INDIA | 47 | 31 | 14.42 | 5.58 |
| ENGLAND | CHINESE TAIPEI | 43 | 37 | 11.87 | 8.13 |
| FRANCE | BULGARIA | 14 | 37 | 4.15 | 15.85 |
| SINGAPORE | JAPAN | 43 | 48 | 8.42 | 11.58 |
| CHILE | CHINA HONG KONG | 5 | 55 | 0.53 | 19.47 |
| ISRAEL | NORWAY | 72 | 7 | 20.00 | 0.00 |
| NETHERLANDS | ITALY | 25 | 37 | 6.52 | 13.48 |
| CHINA | POLAND | 32 | 23 | 12.71 | 7.29 |
| SWEDEN | GERMANY | 32 | 34 | 9.34 | 10.66 |

## RANKING AFTER ROUND 7

| 5 | ISRAEL | 112.91 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | POLAND | 107.33 |
| 3 ■ | ITALY | 104.86 |
| 4 ㅌㅏㅜ | SWEDEN | 99.98 |
| 5 - | GERMANY | 95.38 |
| 6 | SINGAPORE | 85.49 |


| - | BULGARIA | 83.62 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 毞 | USA | 80.63 |
| 9 E | ENGLAND | 71.76 |
| 10 | NETHERLANDS | 71.61 |
| 11 \% | CHINA HONG KONG | 69.68 |
| 12 | CHINA | 68.18 |
| 13 䨓 | CANADA | 66.50 |
| $14 \equiv$ | THAILAND | 66.04 |

66.04

| 15 | $\square$ | CHINESE TAIPEI | 60.58 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 16 | $\square$ | JAPAN | 60.02 |
| 17 | $\boxed{ }$ | NORWAY | 59.83 |
| 18 | $\square$ | FRANCE | 57.93 |
| 19 | $\square$ | FINLAND | 51.88 |
| 20 | $\square$ | CHILE | 25.46 |
| $21 \square$ | INDIA | 4.34 |  |
| $22 \square$ | BOTSWANA |  |  |

## GIRLS TEAMS



ROUND 6




## ATTENTION: BRIDGE TEACHERS AND PLAYERS!

There is a new game - HOOL - specially developed for kids to learn Bridge. It is both a face-to-face game as well as a mobile app (test version).
Please come to the MEETING ROOM
(next to the WBF President's office) for a demonstration.
If no one is present, leave your name/email/country on the Bridge table inside and I will find you.


## KIDS TEAMS

Amaresh Deshpande Bridge Development, WBF

