

## Juniors Pairs Qualifier

Session 5

| Rank | Pairs |  | Nationality | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AYDOGDU Erkmen | KOCLAR Akin | TUR - TUR | 57.59 |
| 2 | PRAIRIE Alex | SHI Sylvia | USA - USA | 57.35 |
| 3 | AGICA Marius | KAPLAN Adam | USA - USA | 56.86 |
| 4 | DI FRANCO Massimiliano | ZANASI Gabriele | ITA - ITA | 56.79 |
| 5 | MOSKOVSKY Ellena | TRAVIS Lauren | AUS - AUS | 56.19 |
| 6 | HASHIMOTO Koichiro | KIKUCHI Tadahiro | JPN - JPN | 56.15 |
| 7 | LIN Frank | VROOMAN Jacob | USA - USA | 55.72 |
| 8 | GOBEKLI Altug | GOKCE Berk | TUR - TUR | 54.92 |
| 9 | CAVALIER Andrew | JOLLY Christian | USA - USA | 54.55 |
| 10 | ETCHEPAREBORDA Juan Cruz | RUEDA Santiago | ARG - ARG | 54.31 |
| 11 | OZGUR Muhammet | USLUPEHLIVAN | TUR - TUR | 53.21 |
|  |  | Sarper |  |  |
| 12 | FERRO Felipe Jose | MONTES DE OCA Francisco Pablo | ARG - ARG | 52.45 |
| 13 | LEE Antony | WESSELS Ryan | USA - USA | 52.28 |
| 14 | ARGUEDAS Leonardo | BROWN Walter | CRC - CRC | 52.16 |
| 15 | HOLLANDS Peter | HOWARD Justin | AUS - AUS | 51.27 |
| 16 | SCHWARTZ Jeffrey | TSANG Jeffrey | USA - CAN | 51.25 |
| 17 | HENBEST Maxim | HOWARD Nathan | AUS - AUS | 50.84 |
| 18 | HARADA Yuki | ITO Kosuke | JPN - JPN | 50.14 |
| 19 | BOMBER Benjamin | SNOWDEN Burke | USA - USA | 49.72 |
| 20 | MANFIELD Sabrina | MANFIELD Seth | USA - USA | 49.52 |
| 21 | KRIVENTSOV Dennis | RATHI Anant | USA - USA | 48.21 |
| 22 | GROSSACK Adam | GROSSACK Zachary | USA - USA | 48.06 |
| 23 | GONG Qucheng | MUNGER Nathaniel | USA - USA | 46.35 |
| 24 | PEREZ Fernando | RODRIGUEZ Carlos | VEN - VEN | 46.19 |
| 25 | CABRERA Ruben Dario | GRANDA Moises | VEN - VEN | 46.01 |
| 26 | OYAMA Ryoko | SESHIMO Takumi | JPN - JPN | 45.15 |
| 27 | ARGAIN Ariel | SENGIALI | ARG - ARG | 44.20 |
|  |  | Nicolas Miguel |  |  |
| 28 | ALLEN Theo | JAMESON Charles | USA - USA | 42.35 |
| 29 | CUERVO LOPERA Juan Felipe | VELEZ Santiago | COL - COL | 42.20 |
| 30 | ORTEGA Luz Carolina | TRABAUDO Billy | USA - USA | 40.25 |
| 31 | VALENZUELA RIVERA | ZAMORA | COL- COL | 39.21 |
|  | Joan Sebastian | VILLAMIZAR Jose A | lejandro |  |
| 32 | CORREA LAGUNA Nicolas | REY ARISMENDY Luis Alejandro | COL - COL | 38.56 |

## Girls Pairs Qualifier

Session 5

| Rank | Pairs <br> 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| BOTTA Giorgia |  |
| 2 |  |
| 3 | LINZ Marianna |
| DE JESUS Karla |  |
| 4 | CHEN Yunpeng |
| 5 | JIN Huiyuan |
| 6 | GU Yihao |
| 7 | ARBIT Julie |
| 8 | LU Xinying |
| 9 | FANG Yunyi |
| 10 | LU Yijia |
| 11 | CHANG Sophia |
| 12 | COLBURN Olivia |


| CHAVARRIA | Nationality <br> ITA - ITA | 63.41 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Margherita |  |  |
| WERNIS Rebecca | USA - USA | 58.86 |
| SUAREZ Adriana | VEN - VEN | 58.41 |
| RUAN Xinyao | CHN - CHN | 56.14 |
| YUAN Aijia | CHN - CHN | 53.18 |
| YANG Xinyi | CHN - CHN | 50.45 |
| THAPA Isha | USA - USA | 50.45 |
| YU Felicia Xinying | CHN - CHN | 46.36 |
| HUANG Danlei | CHN - CHN | 42.73 |
| QIAN Li | CHN - CHN | 42.27 |
| ZHANG Lucy | USA - USA | 41.14 |
| LAUFER Olivia | USA - CAN | 36.59 |

## Youngsters Pairs Qualifier

Session 5

| Rank | Pairs |  | Nationality | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AMER Samuel | CHANG Nolan | USA - USA | 69.61 |
| 2 | KRISTENSEN Benjamin | ROSENBERG Kevin | USA - USA | 65.29 |
| 3 | CHENG Licong | LI Renyu | CHN - CHN | 64.24 |
| 4 | JENG Andrew | JENG Richard | USA - USA | 61.17 |
| 5 | JIN Tianyi | JIN Kai | CHN - CHN | 60.40 |
| 6 | HERMAN Gregory | KRIEGEL Oren | USA - USA | 59.57 |
| 7 | DU Zhecheng | SHANG Yijun | CHN - CHN | 57.78 |
| 8 | SHA Zhizhou | ZHANG Yiyang | CHN - CHN | 56.75 |
| 9 | HUNT Allison | LADYZHENSKY Asya | USA - USA | 56.73 |
| 10 | SHEN Yiling | WU Kaiwen | CHN - CHN | 56.71 |
| 11 | FEI Zelin | ZHAO Yuqiao | CHN - CHN | 56.42 |
| 12 | FASHINGBAUER Ellie | HSIEH Gianni | USA - USA | 55.78 |
| 13 | LIEBERMAN Joseph | WELLAND | USA - USA | 54.83 |
|  |  | Christopher |  |  |
| 14 | HARPER Brandon | MILLER Ryan | USA - USA | 54.74 |
| 15 | HUANG Xu | LIU Yihong | CHN - CHN | 54.24 |
| 16 | BERMAN Evan | SPENCER Cole | USA - USA | 54.22 |
| 17 | LI Hanchang | SHAO Yiqin | CHN - CHN | 54.13 |
| 18 | LIN Amber | OLSEN Jake | USA - USA | 53.57 |
| 19 | HART Tyler | KUSCHNER Benjamin | USA - USA | 51.19 |
| 20 | BERK Hakan | SOUKUP David | USA - USA | 51.07 |
| 21 | FORTE Christopher | HEADING Raianne | USA - USA | 50.53 |
| 22 | VASSILEVA Albena-Maria | WU Zijun | CAN - CHN | 50.33 |
| 23 | QIN Bin | WANG Penghao | CHN - CHN | 50.27 |
| 24 | LAMOUREUX Victor | MILLER JASON | CAN - USA | 49.62 |
| 25 | ALTMAN John | STEPHANI Isaac | USA - USA | 47.83 |
| 26 | BAI Lu | GONG Kai Lu | CHN - CHN | 47.42 |
| 27 | MA Ding Zhi | LIU Xuan Yu | CHN - CHN | 45.88 |
| 28 | COLBURN Caleb | ZHU Vincent | USA - USA | 45.39 |
| 29 | LIU Siyuan | WANG Yingqi | CHN - CHN | 45.18 |
| 30 | LI Meilun | LIU Wenyu | CHN - CHN | 44.90 |
| 31 | FONG Brandon | SUNG Alexander | USA - USA | 44.64 |
| 32 | SMITH Cooper | TRAUTWEIN Henry | USA - USA | 42.60 |
| 33 | BERK Sedef | ROBERTS Jeremy | USA - USA | 40.81 |
| 34 | GOODWIN Bryan | NOVAK Jett | USA - USA | 37.95 |
| 35 | OLIVEIRA Helber | STEPHANI Kristian | USA - USA | 37.37 |
| 36 | LAROSEE Matthew | MILLIKIN Emma | USA - USA | 35.29 |
| 37 | MAGNUSON Sterling | NOVAK Madelyn | USA - USA | 35.17 |
| 38 | ANDREWS Cherish | EDWARDS Sarah | USA - USA | 34.14 |
| 39 | BOTKINS Hailey | WILLIAMS Bernadette | USA - USA | 34.02 |
| 40 | GERRARD Marc | GERRARD Sara | USA - USA | 32.21 |




## Getting Underway

## by Phillip Alder

The opening ceremony on Saturday evening was more interesting than usual. There were two particular highlights. First was the five-minute taste of the movie about bridge presented by Jeremy Goldstein and David McAllister. It left everyone longing to see all 90 minutes, which should be ready by the fall.

Second was the performance of "We Are The World" by about 30 of the Chinese youth players, all dressed in attractive blue and white attire. As Gainarrigo Rona said, they won the first gold medal of the games.

## Getting underway

## continued from previous page

As play starts at this year's World Youth Open Championships, let's look back to the exciting final session of last year's 80 -board Junior Teams Final between Israel and the Netherlands.

These were the two teams:
Israel: Lotan Fisher, Gal Gerstner, Moshe
Meyouhas, Dror Padon, Eyal Erez and Lee Rosenthal
Netherlands: Aarnout Helmich, Gerbrand Hop, Berend van der Bos, Joris van Lankveld, Ernst Wackwitz and Chris Westerbeek

The last 16 boards began with Israel ahead by 7.3 IMPs.

That margin nearly doubled on the first deal, Board 65 .

| Dlr: North |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None |  |  | $\text { - K } 64$ |
|  | - A 92 |  |  |
|  | -1063 |  |  |
| - 74 | - 2 |  |  |
| - Q J 72 | - A10853 |  |  |
| - Q J 5 | -K1087 |  |  |
| +Q987 |  |  | K J |
| A AK 10853 |  |  |  |
| -9 |  |  |  |
| -643 |  |  |  |
| + 542 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Meyouhas | $v d$ Bos | Padon | $v$ Lankveld |
|  | Pass | 1 - | 2 2. |
| $3 \times$ | 3. | 4* | All Pass |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hop | Gerstner | Helmich | Fisher |
|  | Pass | 1 | 14 |
| 2 - | 2NT (a) | 4 | $4{ }^{1}$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

(a) Good spade raise

Four hearts made without difficulty. Four spades went down three without difficulty. Since the Dutch had not doubled the sacrifice, Israel gained 7 IMPs instead of losing 3 .

The Netherlands regained that ground immediately.

(a) Fourth-suit forcing, but not game-forcing
(b) Forcing in principle

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hop | Gerstner | Helmich | Fisher |
|  |  | Pass | 1 |
| Pass | 1 | Pass | 1 |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}(\mathrm{a})$ | Pass | 2 |
| Dble | 2NT $(\mathrm{b})$ | Pass | 3 NT |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

(a) Puppet to two diamonds
(b) Invitational

Both Norths used conventional rebids. And normally when you have two balanced hands with 25 combined points, you bid three notrump. That is what Gerstner and Padon did, but found that they were too high. Helmich led a diamond, Hop winning and switching to a club. East took declarer's jack with his queen and went back to diamonds. When declarer then misguessed hearts, he went down two.

The Dutch stopped safely when van den Bos could not think of anything to bid over two hearts. He then brought home an overtrick, losing one spade,
one diamond and two clubs. That gave 8 IMPs to the Netherlands.

The next deal was a flat partscore. Then Israel gained 2 IMPs on another partscore board.

On Board 69, Hop-Helmich bid to three notrump, which had nine top tricks when diamonds were 3-3. Meyouhas-Padon got to five clubs, which had only two losers when diamonds were 3-3.

An overtrick IMP to the Netherlands leveled the score for the session at 9-9.

van Lankveld happily reversed despite having only 15 high-card points and a singleton in his partner's suit. But now at least they reached the least bad game. When Meyouhas failed to lead a trump, understandably preferring the king of clubs, declarer won with his ace, played a spade to the and took the next eight tricks on a crossruff for plus 620 .

Three notrump was no fun for Fisher. West led the king of clubs, then switched to the king of spades. Declarer won with dummy's ace and ran the jack of spades to West's queen. West switched to a diamond, East winning and returning a club. South won, cashed his hearts and lost the rest for down three, minus 300 .

That was a huge 14 IMPs for the Netherlands, putting them back in front by 6.7.

After two quiet deals came:

(a) Weak two-bid in a major, or a game-force either balanced or with five-plus diamonds

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hop | Gerstner | Helmich | Fisher |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| $1-$ | 4 | Dble | All Pass |

Against five diamonds doubled, West led the ace of clubs, cashed the ace of hearts and played another heart. North still had to lose one spade and one diamond to go down two.

Against four diamonds doubled, East led the jack of spades. West took dummy's queen with his ace, cashed the ace of clubs and played a second club. North ruffed, cashed the ace of diamonds and continued with the queen of diamonds. East won with his king and ... returned his last trump. Declarer claimed, his heart losers disappearing on dummy's spades.

Plus 500 and plus 710 gave Israel 15 IMPs and the lead by 9.3.

The tension was palpable. On the next board, six diamonds by South was on the diamond finesse, which was working. Both pairs stopped in five diamonds.

Then, a flat board, 2 IMPs to the Netherlands for staying one level lower and therefore having one fewer undertrick, and both Souths failed in five clubs. With three boards to go, Israel still led by 7.3.

| Dlr: East | - J 1086 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | - J 542 |  |  |
| \& K |  |  |  |
| -943 | - 7 |  |  |
| - Q 1097 | - K 8 |  |  |
| -943 | - Q J 108652 |  |  |
| - AQ |  |  | 98 |
| - AK Q 52 |  |  |  |
| - ${ }^{\text {a }} 6$ |  |  |  |
| - ${ }^{7}$ |  |  |  |
| - K 1043 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Meyouhas | $v d$ Bos | Padon | $v$ Lankveld |
| Hop | Gerstner | Helmich | Fisher |
|  |  | 3 | Dble |
| 4 | Pass | Pass | 4. |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

Both Wests led a diamond, East signaling with his queen under dummy's king. The two declarers played a heart to his ace (Helmich played low, Padon put up the king), cashed the ace of diamonds (discarding a club) and drew trumps ending in the dummy.

Fisher now played a club to his king, which looks like the wrong play based on the bidding and was the wrong play here. Hop won with his ace and played a heart to his partner's king. Helmich returned his nine of clubs, West winning and leading the queen of hearts. Declarer had to lose another club trick to go down one.
van Lankveld did much better. Aided by East's honor plays, he knew who had the ace of clubs. He played a club to his ten. West won with his queen and led the ten of harts, ducked around. Then came the nine of hearts. South ruffed and led a low club to bring down the ace. van Lankveld was home.

That was 10 IMPs to the Netherlands, now ahead by 2.7 .


Four clubs drifted the obvious down one.
van Lankveld opened because he had ace-king, ace; who cares about having to bid a 5-4-2 suit?

If someone had doubled four spades, no doubt Padon would have run to five clubs, but that would have still gone down two. North, though, believed his hand would be very useful to his partner.

Against five hearts, West led the queen of spades and switched to the king of clubs. South won, cashed his top hearts, ruffed his last club in the dummy and played four rounds of diamonds, ruffing the last. Now West made a bad play. He overruffed, leaving himself endplayed. On his forced club return, declarer threw a spade from the dummy and ruffed in his
hand. South was out for down one. If West had not overruffed, the contract would have had to go down two.

Israel gained 4 IMPs to retake the lead by 1.3, but it could have been 6 IMPs. Would the 2 IMPs matter?

| This was the final deal: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: West | - AK 9 |  |  |
| Vul E-W | - A Q 8 |  |  |
|  | - J 754 |  |  |
|  | \& J 106 |  |  |
| A J 1076 | - Q 83 |  |  |
| - K 54 | $\bullet 72$ |  |  |
| - A 108 | - K Q 32 |  |  |
| - A 95 | -542 KQ32 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | - J10963 |  |  |
|  | -96 |  |  |
| -874 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Meyuchas | $v d$ Bos | Padon | $v$ Lankveld |
| 12 | Dble | Redble | $1 \stackrel{\square}{*}$ |
| Pass | Pass | 3* | All Pass |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hop | Gerstner | Helmich | Fisher |
| 120 | Pass | 2e (a) | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | Pass | Pass |

(a) Inverted raise

The Closed Room was well ahead of the Open. Against two notrump, North played three rounds of spades. Hop cashed the king of clubs, crossed to his ace of clubs, took the jack of spades, and continued the clubs, throwing a heart from his hand. North, in order to keep four diamonds, was forced down to the bare ace of hearts.

Now West could have ducked a heart to bring down the ace, but being only in two notrump, he cashed the king of diamonds and played a diamond to his ace to give this position:


West led the ten of diamonds.
North, who was clearly very tired, bizarrely did not cover with his jack -- in a way, a Grosvenor Gambit. However, West worked out what was happening. He ran the ten of diamonds and exited with a heart to North's ace. North had to concede the final trick to dummy's queen of diamonds. That was ten tricks, plus 180.

In the Open Room, the Israeli East-West had to score at least plus 140 to win the match.

After East's redouble, the jump to three clubs ought to have been forcing; with only gameinvitational values, he would have rebid two clubs. But West passed anyway.

Now Meyouhas had to take 11 tricks, which was impossible. North led the ace of spades and switched to a trump. Declarer drew trumps, knocked out the king of spades, won the spade return, pitched a heart on his last spade, played his three top diamonds, and claimed his contract exactly.

The Netherlands had gained 2 IMPs to win by 0.67 !

If Hop had taken only nine tricks, Israel would have won by 0.33 . Will we see any events that close here in Atlanta?

## Board-3 Pairs Round-Q1 by Murat Molva

Board 3 produced lively action and different
results at the five tables I watched.

| Dlr: South <br> Vul: E-W | - AKJ 76 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - K 83 |  |  |
|  | AK 10 |  |  |
|  | -64 |  |  |
| - Q 43 |  |  | -1085 |
| - Q J 96 |  |  | - ${ }^{\text {7 }} 74$ |
| - Q J 972 |  |  | - 3 |
| $\cdots$ |  |  | \& J 10975 |
| - 92 |  |  |  |
|  | - 102 |  |  |
|  | -8654 |  |  |
|  | \& AK832 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | 1 NT |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 3NT | All |  |

This was the auction at the first table I watched.
South's $2 \boldsymbol{w}$ was a puppet to 2 to show a hand in the 5-7 HCP range, but North went straight on to 3NT. West, Nathaniel Munger (USA), found the best lead of the $\mathbf{Y}$, and when the declarer, Akin Koclar (Turkey), ducked, West continued with the $\downarrow \mathrm{J}$ to collect the first four tricks and hold the declarer to 9
tricks.


Nathaniel Munger (USA)

| West | North | East | South <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \mathbf{2}$ | Pass | 1 |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{N T}$ | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | 1 NT | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

The strong-club auction left North, Jacob Vrooman (USA), playing the contract from the North

## The Man Who Knew <br> Too Much by Murat Molva

The second session of the pairs qualification brought this nice board with three voids around the table.
table.
Dlr: South
Vul:N-S

## Differing Opinions

## By David Stern

As bridge journalists, we seek out hands of beauty rich and rare, but sometimes it's the simple things of life that are worthy of comment. Here is the first board from the opening session of the pairs:

| Dlr: North Vul: None | - J 87 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - Q 8 |  |  |
|  | -764 |  |  |
|  | - AQ953 |  |  |
| - A 543 |  |  | - K 962 |
| - A 72 |  |  | - K 10543 |
| - A Q 103 |  |  | -92 |
| - J 10 |  |  | - K 7 |
|  | - Q 10 |  |  |
|  | - J 96 |  |  |
|  | - K J 85 |  |  |
|  | -8642 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| 1NT | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 2V | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 4. | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| West | North East |  | South |
|  | Pass Pass |  | Pass |
| 1NT | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 2. | Pass |
| 3. | Pass | 3NT | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| 1NT | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 2 - | Pass | 2. | All Pass |

Frequency: -120×1, -170×1, -200x1, -420x13
The first auction seems like a logical path to the best contract. While $2 \boldsymbol{\Delta}$ is invitational and West is minimum, the key controls in partner's suits, doubleton club and the finessing possibilities in diamonds make it worth an upgrade.

In the play East, Fernando Perez from Venezuela showed nice technique by playing a spade to the ace and inserting the 9 on the second round to protect against North's holding Q-J-8-7.

On the second auction, $3 \uparrow$ suggested a four-card raise, while $4 \boldsymbol{v}$ offered partner a choice of contracts suggesting 4-3 in the majors. East should probably have accepted bridge wisdom that a $4-4$ fit is preferable to a 5-3.

On the last auction, West failed to appreciate the full value of the three sharp cards and fitted suits. He passed partner's invitational bid based on the minimum strength 1 NT opening - not something recommended in the bid-em-up youth games!

## Board-3 Pairs

continued from previous page
seat. Not fearing a switch to hearts, he ducked the club lead, and right he was! West switched to the $\uparrow Q$. Now nine tricks were there. Declarer grabbed his $\bullet$ A, went to dummy with a club, and took the spade finesse. He realized, probably to his horror, that the * A was stranded in dummy. After struggling a bit more, he had to concede down one.


Jacob Vrooman (USA)

| West | North | East | South <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | 1 | Pass | 1 NT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

West led Q and declarer Maxim Henbest
(Australia) took the finesses for the $\mathrm{\Delta}$ and the $\stackrel{\mathrm{J} \text { to }}{ }$ land ten tricks - the best result so far.


Maxim Henbest (Australia)

| West | North | East | South <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass | 1 NT |
| Pass | 2 NT | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{v}$ | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

South, Jeffrey Schwartz (USA), was also one of the declarers blessed with the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ lead. So he seemed to be on his way to ten tricks. But he received another gift too. While crossing to hand in clubs to take the spade and diamond finesses, East consumed all of his high club spots; and while discarding on spades and diamonds, he came down to the bare $\uparrow$. So, when declarer exited with the low heart off dummy, East had to surrender the eleventh trick to the 8 . Plus 460 was now best result so far.


Jeffrey Schwartz (USA)

| West | North | East | South <br> $3 \boldsymbol{i}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Dble | Redble | Pass | Pass |
| 3 | Dble | 3 | Pas |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |

Would you believe that this girl sitting South, Lauren Travis (Australia), with her bright smiling face, could open 3 on a five carder? The favorable vulnerability surely brings out the monster in everyone. West chose a double that might not have been everyone's choice, and then had to decide over the redouble that came back to him. What did partner's pass mean? Was it "Let's play in 3 redoubled partner" or just "I have nothing to say"? West finally took himself out to 3 and a contract of 3 doubled was reached. When declarer could not figure out the trump situation, he went down two to concede 500 . The very best result so far.


Lauren Travis (Australia)
This was the companion Board 4:
Dlr: West A952
Vul: Both $\quad$ AQ973

- AJ
\& K 7
76
- K Q J 3
- 84
- K 54
- Q J 10542
- Q 96
*A9863
- 1084
- KJ1062
- 108732

At three of the tables I watched, each West passed and the players sitting North either started with $1 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$ or a strong club, after which a normal $4 \vee$ contract was reached. None of the East-West pairs at these three tables was able to locate the eleven-card club fit. But there was action at the other two tables.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \mathbf{~}$ | Dble | $4 \boldsymbol{\psi}$ |
| $5 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ | Dble | All Pass |  |

West, Nathaniel Munger (USA), who had found the good $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ lead on the previous deal against 3 NT , swiftly bid 5a. North doubled and the contract drifted off one, a good save against the making 4 $\mathbf{~}$. Plus 200 to North-South looked like the par score as $5 \boldsymbol{~}$ seemed to be going down (losing two spades and one diamond). Or was it?

There seems to be constant action when Lauren Travis (Australia) is at the table. After destroying her opponents on Board 3, she struck again here.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30 | Dble | Pass | $3 \vee$ |
| Pass | 4 | 59 | 5 |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

After painfully experiencing the devastating effects of Lauren's opening (with a five-card suit) on the previous board, West was presumably hoping for revenge, and he started proceedings with a vulnerable sacrifice. It was not so clear why East elected to pass first and bid 5 at his second turn, but Lauren was convinced that the five-level belonged to her. She bid $5^{*} \mathrm{H}$ and was doubled of course, but West was not sure if his partner's double was some sort of a Lightner double or just a normal "I will kill you" double.

The spade lead could not be found and Lauren just established her diamond suit to record plus 850 . Way to go Lauren Travis.


Murat Molva

## Which Blackwood is Better?

By David Stern
This was the second board in the first session of the pairs:

| Dlr: East | - A 75 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Vul:N-S | - J 106 |
|  | - 105 |
|  | \& J 10854 |
| -10963 | ^ K Q J 82 |
| - Q 87 | $\checkmark$ AK 9 |
| -K763 | - AQ942 |
| - A Q | \&- |
|  | - 4 |
|  | $\checkmark 5432$ |
|  | - J 8 |
|  | ¢K97632 |

Frequency: $+100 \mathrm{x} 1,+50 \times 1,-450 \times 1,-920 \times 1$, $-980 * 10,-990 \times 1$

All the tables I watched reached $6 \boldsymbol{A}$, but interestingly a number used Exclusion Blackwood. After by East and a spade raise by West, 5 asked for key cards excluding the A.

I question whether this was a good choice on this hand as there was a slightly better argument for normal Roman Key Card Blackwood rather than Exclusion Blackwood. Under 'normal' RKCB should partner happen to show the A, then there will be no heart loser and the deal will come down to the diamond suit. But if you adopt Exclusion Blackwood, apart from testing partner's system knowledge, you aren't any better informed when partner shows no key cards.


USA Williamsburg

