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In yesterday's Junior quarterfinal knockout matches, Norway and GreSwe Axon had comfortable victories and will meet today in the semifinals. In the other two matches, both Zlatan and Australia had close first and third sessions, but good gains in the middle set to win and set up their semifinal.
In the Girls semifinals, SX XHLD moved steadily ahead in the second and third sessions and will play against Italia in the final, who recovered from a $27-\mathrm{imp}$ deficit with 16 boards to go to win by 18 .
The Youngsters final will be between China and Azs Uw Vyceska.
In the Kids division, SX XNWY had an easy quarterfinal win. SX HYSW, their semifinal opponents, snuck through by only 2 imps . The other semifinal is between China RDFZ1 and SX XHEST. At halftime in these semis, SX XNWY leads by 9 imps and China RDFZ1 is ahead by 51 imps .
Captains of all teams are kindly invited to collect the Joan Gerard Youth award form from the Hospitality Desk

TODAY'S

## SCHEDULE

| KO TEANS | $11.00-13.20$ | $14.30-16.50$ | $17.10-19.30$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Juniors | Semifinal | Semifinal | Semifinal |
| Youngsters | Final \& Playoff | Final \& Playoff | Final \& Playoff |
| Girls <br> Kids | Final \& Playoff | Final \& Playoff | Final \& Playoff |
|  | Semifinal | Final \& Playoff | Final \& Playoff |

BAM QUALIFICATION

| $10.00-11.30$ | $11.50-13.20$ | $14.30-16.00$ | $16.20-17.50$ | $18.10-19.40$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Round 5 Round 6 Round 7 Round 8 Round 9
PRIZE GIVING OF YOUNGESTERS/GIRLS/KIDS KO TEAMS TO FOLLOW

Seating rights are marked with an $X$

## NORWAY

Christian Bakke, Harald Eide, Tor Eivind Grude,
Kristoffer Hegge
CROATIA
Borna Cicvaric, Ante Mijic, Ivan Brajkovic,
Josko Djilovic, Stella Dobrijevic, Andrea Stankovic
NONAME
Berk Gokce, Ataman Aydogdu, Mert Seker,
Mustafa Anil Bozyigit, Eren Imdat, Cagatay Birben GRESWE AXON
Adam Kaplan, Ioannis Oikonomopoulos, Ola Rimstedt, Mikael Rimstedt, Ioannis Oik. Cpt, Giorgos Oik. Coach ZLATAN
Rodrigo Garcia Da Rosa, Giuseppe Delle Cave, Simon Hult, Johan Karlsson, Daniel Gullberg, Simon Ekenberg, Johan Karlsson, Daniel Gullberg, Simon Ekenberg,
Marshall Lewis Captain, Rodrigo Garcia Da Rosa Coach FINLAND
Antti Aimala, Vesa Fagerlund, Oskari Koivu, Maria Myllaeri ITALIA
Giovanni Donati, Alessandro Gandoglia,
Margherita Chavarria, Giacomo Percario, Gianluca Bergami, Alessandro Calmanovici, Valerio Giubilo Cpt \& Coach AUSTRALIA
Jamie Thompson, Stephen Williams, Maxim Henbest,
Shane Harrison, Renee Cooper, Ella Pattison, Justin Williams Cpt

| NORWAY | $\frac{52}{9}$ | $\frac{19}{18}$ | $\frac{61}{37}$ | 132 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CROATIA | 94 |  |  |  |




## CMRTS BRACRETS

| ITALIA | 1 |  | 2 | 3 | AU |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AUSTRALIA | $\frac{20}{20}$ | $\frac{13}{38}$ | $\frac{30}{50}$ | $\mathbf{6 3}$ |  |

Yunpeng Chen, Chenyun Ge, Huiyuan Jin, Xinyao Ruan Yue Yu, Aijia Yuan, Weichang Qiu Captain SX XNMF
Wenying Huang, Xinying Lu, Min Wu, Yuqian Zhang, Yingying Sun, Liwen Shao, Yifan Cui Captain ITALIA
Susanna Broccolino, Caterina De Lutio, Agnese Di Mauro, Flaminia Tanini, Michela Salvato, Giulia Scriattioli,
Emanuela Capriata Captain \& Coach
CHINA RDFZ
Guangli Wendy Liu, Xinyi Luo, Lingyi Ma, Mengqi Hao, Ling Hu, Qi Xia, Jichao Hu Captain, Tong Jiang Coach


## COMOBUEB8 Bracriz <br> Seating rights are marked with an $X$

## CHINA

Hongji Wei, Shiyu Sun, Zhengyang Fang, Yichen Yin, Zihan Wang, Dongke Fang, Jichao Hu Captain, Tong Jiang Coach GERMANY
Stig Jesse, Leonard Vornkahl, Philipp Pabst,
Sibrand Van Oosten, Hartmut Kondoch Captain,
Florian Alter Coach

## ITALIA

Andrea Manganella, Francesco Chiarandini, Alvaro Gaiotti, Gabriele Giubilo, Gianmarco Giubilo, Sebastiano Scatà, Dario Attanasio Captain \& Coach
AZS UW VYCESKA
Stanislaw Maczka, Lukasz Trendak, Krystian Baczek, Piotr Jasinski

| 龶 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CHINA | 36 | 32 | 50 | 118 |  |  |  |  |
| GERMANY | 39 | 8 | 43 | 90 |  |  |  |  |
|  | CHINA |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
|  | 123 |  |  | AZS UW VYCESKA |  | X |  | X |
| AZS UW VYCESKA | 39 | 53 | 56 | 148 |  |  |  |  |
| ITALIA | $\overline{32}$ | 42 | 21 | 95 |  |  |  |  |

## IUDO BRAcruz

## SZ XNWY

Hanyang Dai, Yihong Liu, Jiaxin Tong, Ruizhe Wang, Wenjie Xue, Tiancheng Zhang, Qiwei Li Captain, Hui Fu Coach SX XHLD
Yihong Chen, Yang Hu, Mingtai Li, Hua Shang, Yichen Xie, Xinchen Yu, Jiong Li Captain, Yimei Zhang Coach AZSUW AKADEMIABRYDZA
Pawel Hulanicki, Tomasz Kielbasa, Kacper Kopka, Oskar Trybus, Stanislaw Maczka Captain, Krystian Baczek Coach
SX HYSW
Renyu Li, Siyuan Liu, Yijun Shang, Yiqin Shao, Yingqi Wang, Tianle Yao, Wen Cao Captain, Lin Lin Coach CHINA RDFZ1
Baozhuo Jiang, Randy Pan, Yuanzhe Ding, Zixi Cai, Shi Qiu, Haoqing Yu, Jichao Hu Captain, Tong Jiang Coach CHINESE TAIPEI BLUE
Hsiang-Yi Ko, Yen-Jung Chen, Meng-Fei Wu, Yi-Hsien Lee, Chi-Hsuan Lo, Li-Jen Sun, Shu-Chen Fan Captain
Chen-Chin Wen Coach

## SX XHEST

Licong Cheng, Ruicheng Mao, Penghao Wang, Zhe Wu,
Zhijie Yuan, Yu Yun, Hongqin Xue Captain, Jiacheng He Coach CHINESE TAIPEI WHITE
Yi-Ting Lan, Yu-Chen Huang, Ko-Wei Chang, Yi-1ing Lan, Yu-Chen Huang, Ko-Wei Chang,
Chen-Syuan Chiu, Yi-Pin Chu, Hung-Sheng Fan, Chen-Syuan Chiu, Yi-Pin Chu, Hung-Sheng Fan,
Chung-Yang Huang Captain, Yun-Ching Lo Coach

Seating rights are marked with an $X$

| SX XNWY <br> SX XHLD | $\frac{58}{25}$ | $\frac{42}{32}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AZSUW A.BR.    <br> SX HYSW $\frac{27}{43}$ $\frac{33}{19}$ $\mathbf{6 0}$ |  |  |  |



| 2 | Gо то page: | 1 | BRACKETS | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | RESULTS | BUTLERR |  |

# (IMPRESSIVE HIGHLY SOPHISTICATED METHODS! <br> by MICKE MELANDER 

The Rimstedt twins had a really impressive bidding auction in their match against France in the seventh round of the Swiss Teams in Opatija, Croatia.

Board 9. Dealer North. E-W Vul.

- A 102
© A 762
$\diamond \mathrm{Q}$
AK A 53
A J 9643
$\checkmark 3$
$\diamond$ J 94
\& 10862

$\begin{array}{ll}a & \text { Q } 7 \\ 0 & 105\end{array}$
$\diamond$ K 7532
\& 974
A K 85
$\checkmark$ K Q J 98
$\diamond$ A 1086
$\%$ Q
Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lafont | Ola R. | Sanchez <br>  <br>  <br> 104 (a) | Pass |

(a) Natural or 12-14 NT
(b) 16-plus points and 3 or 4 hearts
(c) Game-forcing relay
(d) Four hearts
(e) $3=4=1=5$
(f) Serious slam-try and a control-bid (cue-bid) in spades


No swing when the French juniors also bid the grand slam. Still, the auction from the Open Room was very impressive.
Mikael could have asked for second round controls with five notrumps to get also the king of clubs, but he knew that he would bid the grand slam even if partner didn't have it when his partner showed three aces, so he just jumped to the grand slam without revealing "any more" of the North hand for the defence. West led a trump and declarer could claim.

## AMERICA'S MEDALISTS

## by PHILLIP ALDER

In the pair events, the only United States medalists were Julie Arbit of Rochester Hills, Michigan, and Sean Gannon of Decatur, Georgia.

Here are three of their boards. First, we have a couple of bidding problems. Both sides are vulnerable, and in third position you pick up:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { A A J } \\
& \diamond \text { Q J } 43 \\
& \diamond \text { A K } 6 \\
& \& \text { K } 109
\end{aligned}
$$

The bidding starts like this:

| West | North <br> Partner | East | South <br> You |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Pass | Pass | $104 \quad$ (a) |
| Pass | 14 | (b) | Dble |
| Pass | $2 \&$ | Pass | ?? |

(a) Natural or any balanced hand outside the range for a one-notrump opening
(b) Clubs
(c) Strong hand

What would you do now?
With only the opponents vulnerable, you hold:
© K Q J 102
-AJ 62
$\diamond 1085$
\& 10

| West | North | East <br> Partner | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $1 \&$ | Pass | $1 N T$ |

??


Back to those in a moment.
They defended well on this deal when their opponents did not end in the best spot.

Dealer East. E-W Vul.

* K 102
$\checkmark 95$
$\diamond$ K J 32
\& J 1096
A A643
$\checkmark$ KQ 6
$\diamond$ A 1065
of A 3

- Q J 98
$\bigcirc$ AJ 87
$\diamond \mathrm{Q}$
\& Q 742

| West <br> Gannon | North | East <br> Arbit | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1NT | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ (b) | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

(a) Both majors
(b) Relay

Obviously, two spades would have been a better spot, but North presumably wondered if his partner had $4=5$ in the majors and that the $5-2$ fit would be better than the 4-3.

Gannon, sensing what was happening, led a low spade. Declarer won with his queen and led the diamond queen. West won with his ace, cashed the ace of spades, and gave his partner a spade ruff. Arbit returned a club to her partner's ace, then, on the fourth round of spades, she overruffed dummy's nine of hearts with her ten. She cashed the king of clubs and shifted to a trump.

The defenders took one spade, two hearts, one diamond, one club and two spade ruffs for two down, plus 100 . This was worth 33.44 out of 38 matchpoints. The only better results were two hearts doubled and made by East(!) and two diamonds doubled and made by East.
6

Now back to the first bidding problem. This was the full layout:

Dealer North. Both Vul.

- 74
$\odot 96$
$\diamond 10975$
\& A J 632
A Q 95
- A 1082
$\diamond$ Q 832
\& 75

- A J
$\odot$ QJ 43
$\diamond$ AKJ 6
\& K 109

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gannon |  | Arbit |
|  | Pass | Pass | 146 (a) |
| Pass | 14 (b) | Dble | Redble (c) |
| Pass | 2\% | Pass | ?? |

(a) Natural or any balanced hand outside the range for a one-notrump opening
(b) Clubs
(c) Strong hand

Having shown a very strong hand, Arbit trusted her partner and passed!

She then got the trumps right to lose only one spade, two hearts and one diamond to score plus 110. That gained 34.56 matchpoints out of 38 .


This was the full deal from the second bidding problem:

Dealer North. N-S Vul.
4 85
$\checkmark$ Q 74
$\diamond$ K 974
\& A Q J 4
© K Q J 102
$\checkmark$ AJ 62
$\diamond 1085$
\& 10


A A 63
© K 93
$\diamond 632$
\& K 876
A 974
$\bigcirc 1085$
$\diamond$ A Q J
9532
West
Gannon
??

North
East
Arbit
Pass
South
1NT

Gannon made a take-out double of clubs, and Arbit, eying the vulnerability, passed.

West led the king of spades, of course. He continued with the ten of spades to East's ace, took the third round with his jack, and cashed the queen of spades. Declarer discarded two clubs from the dummy, East pitched the six of clubs, low encouraging, and South released a low club.

West could not read his partner's card and was worried that South had started with five clubs and was ready to run the minor suits. So West switched to the jack of hearts, which was covered by the queen and king. East returned the nine of hearts. West took declarer's ten with the ace and cashed his last spade, but declarer claimed the rest.

The defenders were the eight of hearts away from that being a great defence. Or, if West had not played hearts, they would have got 500, but plus 200 was still worth 31.22 matchpoints out of 38. Three East-West pairs collected 500, against one notrump doubled, three clubs doubled, and four diamonds doubled!


## THANK YOU, SIR!

## by MICKE MELANDER

When playing bridge, they say that the hardest and most troublesome bid is pass. This is especially valid when speaking about junior bridge. They think that bridge is a bidder's, not a passer's, game. And often that is right, but not always.

Here is an example from Round 5 of the Junior Teams qualifying stage.

Board 12. Dealer West. N-S Vul.
A 74
$\bigcirc 853$
$\diamond 108732$
\& K 106


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zhao | Karlsson | Chen $T$. | Gullberg |
| 2NT | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 30 | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |
| West | North | East | South |
| Ekenberg | Huang | Hult | Chen B. |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ (a) | 14!! |
| Dble | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 44 | Pass | 4NT | Pass |
| 5\% | Pass | $7 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| 7NT | Pass | Pass | Pass |

(a) Transfer to hearts

The least we can say is that Chen Tian wasn't overly optimistic about his hand when partner showed a balanced 20-21. North led a diamond. Declarer played low from the dummy, took South's queen with his king, and cashed the ace of hearts. When the queen appeared, declarer could claim.

There was more action in the Closed Room, where South decided to overcall with one
spade. This came in very handy for East-West, who could use forcing spade bids on their way to West's emptying his bidding box to finish in seven notrumps.

Chen Biteng led the queen of hearts. Hult as declarer could count two spades, seven hearts, two diamonds and one club. One more trick was needed - knowing that South had bid spades, that finesse was probably working. However, declarer took an even better line when he cashed five more rounds of hearts, played a club to the ace, cashed the king of diamonds, and led a diamond to the ace in an attempt to squeeze South in two or three suits. When the queen of diamonds dropped, declarer claimed.

That was 14 imps to Zlatan. And perhaps East should have said to South, "Thank you, Sir, for that one-spade overcall."


Then we had Azs Uw Vyceska versus Germany in Round 6 of the Youngsters Teams.

Board 21. Dealer North. N-S Vul.

© Q 9865
$\diamond$ K J 85
\& J 2


Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maczka | Alter | Trendak | Vornkahl |
|  | Pass | 2 A | 44 (a) |
| 40 | 50 | Pass | 60 |

All Pass
(a) Leaping Michaels: at least 5-5 in hearts and clubs

Closed Room:

| West Pabst | North | East |  | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Baczek | Van | osten | Jasinski |
|  | Pass | Pass |  | 1\% (a) |
| Pass | 10 | 29!! | (b) | Dble |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |  | $3{ }^{1}$ |
| Pass | 45 | Pass |  | 4NT (c) |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ (d) | Pass |  | 54 (e) |
| Pass | $6 \%$ | Pass |  | 70 |

(a) Strong club
(b) At least 5-5 in spades and diamonds
(c) Roman Key Card Blackwood
(d) Zero key cards
(e) Grand-slam-try

In the Open Room, that was a very pessimistic view by South. When partner freely bid five hearts and South knew that the king of spades almost for sure was well placed, he should have bid the grand slam.

In the Closed Room, North and South were left to explore the deal alone, when East didn't open the bidding. South would have had a much tougher time finding out if the grand slam was on or not, until East could not resist showing his two-suiter. This was especially debatable because North and South were in a game-force.

Jasinski forced with three spades, asked for key cards, and made a grand-slam-try. Six clubs showed the queen of hearts and third-round control in clubs, whereupon South had no problem in bidding seven.

That was 13 IMPs to Azs Uw Vyceska. And again, a "Thank You, Sir" from declarer to the friendly opponent for his assistance.

| go to Page: | 1 | BRA | ETS | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |  | RESULTS |  |  |

## PUT YOURSELF TO THE TEST!

A POTPOURRI OF PROBLEMS

3. You have this exciting hand:

か87542 ๑9643 $\diamond 72$ \& 83

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Responder | You | Opener | Partner |
|  |  | $1 S$ | Dble |

Redble ??
What would you do, if anything?

2. Dealer South. Both Vul.
$\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & > \\ & >\end{aligned}$
$\diamond$ K J 4
\& K Q 10643
A K 74
$\checkmark$ K Q 6
$\diamond$ A 6532
\& A 8

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | NT |

24 3NT (a) All Pass
(a) Lebensohl with slow shows: game values but no spade stopper nor four hearts

West leads the queen of spades.
How would you plan the play?

## BRAIN TRAINING

4. What is the greatest number of points you can have and be unable to make any game contract?

You may place the cards as you wish.

BRACKETS 3
5

16
17
18
19
RESULTS

## THE MERRIMAC COUP

## by BRIAN SENIOR \& FERNANDO LEMA \& PHILLIP ALDER

The Merrimac was a steamship built by Swan \& Hunter Shipyard in Wallsend, England, in 1894 and named the SS Solveig. She was purchased by the U.S. Navy four years later and renamed. In the Spanish-American War in 1898, Rear Admiral William T. Sampson ordered her sunk at the entrance to the Santiago de Cuba harbor in an attempt to trap the Spanish fleet.

There is a bridge coup named after it, which might have occurred in this deal.

Dealer South. None Vul.
A 43
$\bigcirc 542$
$\diamond$ A 3
\& K Q J 1093

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { S J } 10987 \\ & \diamond \text { K } 1076 \\ & \diamond 984 \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{W}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} A & \text { A } 52 \\ \diamond & \text { Q } 98 \\ \diamond & \text { K } 1072 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A KQ6 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A J 3 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q J 65 |  |
|  | - 872 |  |


| West | North | East | South <br> $1 N T$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

When South opened with a weak notrump, showing 12-14 points, the immediate raise to three notrumps was a reasonable gamble with the North cards. True, North had only 10 HCP, but the club suit rated to provide several winners, and the fast auction gave West a blind opening lead, which could have proved to declarer's advantage.

West led the jack of spades to East's ace. An automatic spade return, the choice of many players, would have allowed the contract home. Declarer
would have won the trick and knocked out the ace of clubs while the ace of diamonds sat in dummy as an entry to the established club winners.

The killing defence for East was to switch to the king of diamonds at trick two to dislodge that dummy entry. East could then have ducked two rounds of clubs to restrict declarer to only two tricks in that suit. Though declarer would have taken three diamond winners, she would have been held to eight tricks in all.

This spectacular play is a Merrimac Coup - the deliberate sacrifice of a high honour card with the object of knocking out a vital entry to either declarer's or, more commonly, dummy's hand.

If you find this play at the table, you will be entitled to congratulations. After sending it to your favourite journalist, just yawn and say, "Oh, it was only a Merrimac Coup," as though it is an every-day occurrence for you.


| яо то page: | 1 | BRACKETS | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| ---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |  | 11 |  |
|  | 12 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## GERMANY vERSUS CHINA

## by RAM SOFFER

## Youngsters Teams Semifinal 1st Set

The Chinese took gold and silver in the Youngsters Pairs, so they started as favourites in this semifinal match. For the first half of the opening set, they indeed dominated.

Board 4. Dealer West. Both Vul.
AA943
๑A9753
$\diamond-$
\& A 754

| a 8 | N | A J 102 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ৩K84 | $\mathrm{W}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{E}$ | - J 6 |
| $\diamond$ K J 8742 | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | $\diamond$ AQ10963 |
| \& 962 | S | -108 |
|  | KQ 765 |  |
|  | Q 102 |  |
|  | 5 |  |
|  | K Q J 3 |  |

Most North-South pairs found it hard to reach the laydown slam. At several tables West opened two diamonds (weak), and a four-diamond raise by East made exploring slam quite difficult. However, in our match both North-South pairs had a free run, and it was North's choice at his second turn that made the difference.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wang | van Oosten | Fang | Pabst |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | 14 |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | $3 \%$ | Pass | 30 |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | 40 |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

The German North counted his high-card points and bid two spades. South still made a mild slamtry, but subsided in game. Germany plus 680.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Vornkahl | Sun | Alter | $W e i$ |
| Pass | $1 \Omega$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | Pass | $4 N T$ |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Dble | $6 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

The Chinese North correctly evaluated his void
plus three aces and bid three spades. Now South had the values to go for slam, as long as they were not missing two aces. China plus 1430 and 13 imps , leading by 17-1 at that stage.

Board 7. Dealer South. Both Vul.
かK 874
๑J10 93
$\diamond 832$
\& 65

| A 102 | N | - A 65 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 875$ |  | Q A 62 |
| $\diamond$ K 7 | $W_{S} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond$ AJ 96 |
| \& K Q 1092 | S | \& 743 |
|  | A Q J 93 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 4 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 1054 |  |
|  | \& A J 8 |  |


| West <br> Vornkahl | North <br> Sun | East <br> Alter | South <br> $W e i$ <br> $1 \& \&$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass |  | Pass | Dble | | Pass |
| :--- |
| Pass |

Vornkahl-Alter made a promising start by doubling one club for penalty, but after the onediamond runout, they stopped meekly in one heart when nine tricks were available in notrumps.

West could have made a forcing pass, when East would have been happy to double one diamond, but then China might well have slipped into one spade. A more practical choice for West was two notrumps, asking partner to raise if he had full values for his double (not just "balancing" values).
The play in one heart was not perfect either, just made for plus 80 .
This mediocre effort could have cost Germany 11 imps, but at the other table, the Chinese were overboard. South opened one diamond, West overcalled two clubs, and East cue-bid two diamonds. After West's rebid of two hearts, his partner got over-excited, and they landed in five clubs. They took the same nine tricks that were available in three notrumps. Thus Germany started their comeback with a lucky swing of 7 imps .

China retrieved those imps immediately.
Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

- 108
$\checkmark 52$
$\diamond$ A 752
\& K Q 1073


AK73
๑J973
$\diamond$ K 86
\& J 86

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wang | van Oosten Fang | Pabst |  |
| 14 | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 34 | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | Pass | Pass |

There is no expert consensus about the right rebid after one notrump with six spades and four hearts. Usually the more successful choice depends on partner's hand. In this case, Wang's two spades helped Fang upgrade his queen of spades and raise to three spades. Wang went on to game, even though his diamond holding was dubious.

North led the king of clubs. West won in the dummy and led the queen of spades, which was covered by the king and ace. Looking at the trump suit in isolation, declarer should cross over to dummy with a heart in order to finesse his nine of spades. But Wang decided to keep the king of hearts in dummy for a later heart discard on a diamond. He cashed the jack of spades and was lucky when North's ten fell. Now 11 tricks were easy, as he had time to establish dummy's diamonds.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Vornkahl | Sun | Alter | Wei |
| $1 \$$ | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| $2 \Phi$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | All Pass |

Vornkahl chose a rebid of two hearts, and the Germans stopped at the two-level. In the play, Vornkahl used the king of hearts for a second spade finesse and ended up with only nine tricks. He fulfilled his contract with an overtrick, but lost 7 imps .

With four boards to go in the set, China led 3414 , but then Germany rallied.

Board 13. Dealer North. Both Vul.

|  | A J 74 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J 94 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AK 98 |  |
|  | \& 1073 |  |
| A A 10832 | N | A K Q 95 |
| $\bigcirc$ AK852 | $W^{N} E$ | $\bigcirc$ Q 3 |
| $\diamond 6$ | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond 532$ |
| \& 64 |  | \& Q J 52 |

- 6
© 1076
$\diamond$ Q J 1074
* AK 98
West
Wang
$2 \diamond$

| North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| van Oosten Fang | Pabst |  |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| $3 \diamond$ | $3 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

Three spades was a misjudgment by Fang. A vulnerable Michaels Cue-Bid should be made with decent values. Even if West had as little as ace-to-five spades and ace-jack-to-five hearts, four spades would have depended on a finesse through the opener.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Vornkahl | Sun | Alter | Wei |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| $2 \diamond$ | $3 \diamond$ | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

When in doubt between three spades and four spades, and having no invitational bid available due to the opponents' bidding, East should blast into game at imps scoring. This is what Alter did in the Open Room. The difference between the two calls was 10 imps to Germany.


Board 14．Dealer East．None Vul．
－AQ 83
© J 2
$\diamond$ K 53
＊A Q 83


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wang | van Oosten | Fang | Pabst |
|  |  | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | 24 | Pass | $3 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

Two spades was an asking bid after South＇s natural weak－two opening．Three notrumps was a very happy choice of contract for the Germans．East led the jack of diamonds，and despite the expected misguess in hearts，van Oosten had no difficulty in collecting ten tricks．Germany plus 430.
At the other table China played in four hearts by North．Sun didn＇t get anything right during the play and finished down two，so，for the first time since Board 1，Germany was leading，albeit by a single imp．

The next deal showed that sometimes the only way to get a good result is blindly to trust your partner．

Board 15．Dealer South．N－S Vul．

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 今 A K J } \\ & \text { 〇 K J } 107 \\ & \diamond \text { K } 432 \\ & \text { \& } 102 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | A 1086 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } 974 \\ & \text { 〇Q } 852 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ A 9 |
| $\diamond 1086$ |  | E | $\diamond$ AQ J 975 |
| \＆ 864 |  |  | \＆$A Q$ |
|  | ¢ Q |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 6$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$－－ |  |  |
|  | \＆K | 753 |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Vornkahl | Sun | Alter | Wei |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 1NT | Dble | Redble |
| Pass | 20 | $2 \diamond$ | 3\％ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

East doubled one notrump for penalty，counting seven likely tricks after a diamond lead．South＇s hand was quite good in those circumstances， but Wei preferred not to gamble．He redoubled， which asked his partner to bid two clubs．Later， he competed to three clubs．Due to the lucky situation in hearts and clubs，eleven tricks were available．China plus 150 ．
At the other table，the bidding was much more tense when Pabst passed East＇s double，forcing North to redouble according to system．The German South meant business！
West

Wang $\quad$\begin{tabular}{l}
North <br>
van Oosten Fang

$\quad$

East <br>
Pass <br>
Pabst
\end{tabular}

At this point，Wang，who held a 4－3－3－3 hand with one queen，had a huge responsibility upon his shoulders．A wrong decision might have cost his team plenty of imps．
People so often double one notrump with any 15 HCP ，so that even when they have the cards to beat one notrump on their own，their partners chicken out．This is one of the reasons why most experts have abandoned the penalty double of a strong one－notrump opening，preferring to pass with a strong hand．

The full bidding was：

| West <br> Wang | North <br> van Oosten Fang | Easth <br> Pabst |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | $1 N T$ | Dble | Pass |
| Pass | Redble | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Dble | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |

Germany could have beaten it by two tricks after a heart lead，if North had cashed all of his spades and then switched to clubs．In the actual play，van Oosten allowed himself to be endplayed with the ace of spades．Later，he was forced to give dummy the lead so that his king of diamonds didn＇t score． China minus 100.
It turned out that despite West＇s unfortunate decision（trading plus 400 for a possible minus 300）， China won 2 imps and took back the lead，but the momentum was not with them any longer．On the final board，Germany won 4 imps ，taking the set by 39－36．At the time of writing，it seemed that the remaining two sets could be anybody＇s game．

## NONAME vERSUS GRESWE AXON

## by DAVID STERN

Wednesday morning saw the start of the Junior quarterfinals, which were being played in three segments of 16 boards to determine who advanced into the semifinals.

## Noname

(Turkey - players in bold playing this match)
Ataman Aydogdu, Berk Gokce, Mustafa Anil Bozyigit, Mert Seker, Eren Imdat and Cagatay Birben

## GreSwe Axon

Mikael Rimstedt (SWE), Ola Rimstedt (SWE), Adam Kaplan (USA), Ioannis Oikonomopoulos (GRE), playing captain; Giorgos Oikonomopoulos (GRE) coach

Board 1 started off with a whimper when both teams bid four spades. In one room, declarer made 13 tricks when the defence did not cash their trick and the spade finesse worked. In the other room, Oik underled his ace. This found his partner with the king and forced dummy, after which declarer decided against taking the spade finesse. He just made five, and 2 imps went to GreSwe Axon.

Boards two and three saw similar contracts in both rooms failing by varying numbers of tricks and GreSwe Axon ahead by 4-0.

Finally there was something worthy of our attention.


Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.
A A943
$\checkmark$ A 9753
$\diamond-$
\& A 754


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kaplan | Bozygit | Oik | Seker |
| Pass | $1 \varnothing$ | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\$}$ |
| Pass | $2 \uparrow$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\$}$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Aydogdu | Ola $R$ | Gokce | Mikael $R$ |
| $2 \diamond$ | Dble | 3NT | $4 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

It's not often that partner opens with a six-card suit opposite your six-card suit, as happened in the Closed Room. Gokce's raising the ante by bidding three notrumps certainly disrupted the Rimstedts' possibility of getting to the excellent spade or club slam. Should South have doubled three notrumps or cue-bid four diamonds to suggest better things? One can hardly blame North for passing over four spades, as South may have been stretching to bid in this situation. And while North would have guessed that the deal belonged to his side, even that wasn't certain. But North would surely have made a move over four diamonds by South.

In the Open Room, North-South had a clear run at the possibility of the slam, despite the opponents' 6-6 fit in diamonds. I would certainly regard North's raise of one spade to two spades as acceptable, albeit somewhat conservative. However, with the singleton diamond and three-card heart support, South should have taken more positive action than four spades IMHO.
$\begin{array}{lll}6 & 7\end{array}$

Now here is a bidding problem. You hold かK Q J $10843 \vee 97 \diamond 103$ \& 9 and it goes:

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kaplan | Bozygit <br>  <br>  <br> Pass | Oik | Seker |
| Dble | $2 \diamond$ (a) | Pass | $1 N T$ |
| $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | 3NT | Pass |

## (a) Hearts

I believe everybody's first thought would be to bid four spades, but partner has a good idea of your hand and chose three notrumps despite the one-notrump overcall. At the table, I would probably have bid four spades, but trusting partner is surely right.

This was the full deal:
Board 5. Dealer North. N-S Vul.

- 94
$\bigcirc 1065432$
$\diamond$ J
\& J 754


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kaplan | Bozygit | Oik | Seker |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | 1NT |
| Dble | $2 \diamond$ (a) | Pass | 20 |
| 30 | Pass | 3NT | Pass |
| 40 | Pass | Pass | Pass |

(a) Hearts

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Aydogdu | Ola $R$ | Gokce | Mikael $R$ |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $4 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

It is possible - just possible -- that against
three notrumps, South would have led the ace of hearts and switched to the king of clubs, the Merrimac Coup (see page 9). But failing that, three notrumps would surely have coasted home.

In the Closed Room, the defence took a trick in each suit for plus 50, while Kaplan in the Open Room proved that my theory about passing three notrumps was meaningless. Here North led the jack of diamonds (as North had in the Closed Room). Declarer won with dummy's ace and led the seven of spades to the king, and continued with another high spade. Seker, not appreciating declarer's spade length, won with the ace and played a low diamond, hoping partner could ruff. Alas, that was declarer's tenth trick, and when South won a trick with the ace of hearts, he played the king of clubs to set up a heart-club squeeze against his partner. Kaplan came home with an overtrick to gain 10 imps and make the match score 15-0.

Board 6 saw Nonames get onto the scoresheet with an overtrick imp. After a flat board, a deal that demonstrated the delicate art of balancing.


Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

- 108
$\checkmark 52$
$\diamond$ A 752
\& K Q 1073


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kaplan | Bozygit | Oik | Seker |
| 14 | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 20 | Pass | 2a | Pass |
| Pass | 2NT | Dble | Pass |
| Pass | $3 \%$ | Dble | All Pass |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Aydogdu | Ola R | Gokce | Mikael $R$ |
| 14 | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 20 | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| 30 | Pass | 4 | All Pass |

In the Closed Room, the defence against four spades was not optimal, with North ducking the second round of diamonds. However, declarer would have always made the contract by establishing diamonds while the king of hearts remained as an entry.

In the Open Room, it was likely that continued trump leads would have held declarer to four clubs and two diamonds for three down and minus 500. However, without trump leads, declarer was able to ruff a diamond in the dummy and escape for minus 300 and collect 3 imps. GreSwe Axon 15-4.


Board 9 saw matched contracts and results, but was kind of interesting from a judgment point of view.

Board 9. Dealer North. E-W Vul.
© 4
$\checkmark$ Q 1063
$\diamond$ AK 1085
\& K 73
© Q J 10962
$\diamond 9632$
\& Q 2


A AK5

- J 87
$\diamond$ Q 74
\& AJ64
A 873
$\checkmark$ A9542
$\diamond J$
\& 10985
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kaplan | Bozygit | Oik | Seker |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Dble | $1 \Omega$ |
| $3 \uparrow$ | $4 \diamond$ | $4 \uparrow$ | $5 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Aydogdu | Ola $R$ | Gokce | Mikael $R$ |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Dble | $1 \Omega$ |
| $2 \uparrow$ | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | $4 \uparrow$ | $5 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Dble | Pass | Pass | Pass |

After two clubs, a spade and a club ruff, both tables picked hearts correctly (and who wouldn't?) to finish minus 300. Four spades would likely have lost one heart, two diamonds and a diamond ruff. It's the age-old bridge question of whether one should take out insurance by going down minus 300 against the possibility of the opponents scoring 620. The great Tim Seres and Zia are regarded as the best money players of all time. Seres said that he would always take plus 300 regardless of what the opponents could "possibly" make. On that basis, therefore, should one be so ready to hand out 300 ? I am perhaps the last person who should be posing this question, as I always go wrong in these situations.

South in the Closed Room took a questionable action on Board 12.

Board 12. Dealer West. N-S Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kaplan | Bozygit | Oik | Seker |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |
| 2 $\boldsymbol{\$}$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Aydogdu | Ola $R$ | Gokce | Mikael $R$ |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

My first question is why neither South opted to overcall the one-spade opening with two diamonds -- this would seem "normal" holding a useful 12-count and a good playing hand. Thereafter, South's balancing over two spades in the pass-out seat is compulsory. I am very surprised that Seker in the Open Room eschewed this action. (Perhaps he was worried that his opponents would suddenly discover a double fit in the majors.) Equally, I am surprised that in the Closed Room, Mikael Rimstedt chose a unilateral action of three diamonds rather than the more "obvious" two notrumps, which would have allowed his partner to choose a minor.

In any event, GreSwe Axon bought and made a contract at both tables to gain 6 imps and lead by 22-4.

The next deal was instructive and amusing at the same time.

Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul.
A A Q 83
$\bigcirc$ J 2
$\diamond$ K 53
\& A Q 83
か 9765
$\diamond$ Q 8
$\diamond$ A 742
\& K J 9

Both tables reached four hearts, the Open Room after a one-heart opening and the Closed Room after a two-heart opening.

In the Closed Room, West led a low spade. East won, but then inaccurately switched to a low diamond. Declarer did well by putting in the nine to force the ace from West. He chose to continue diamonds. Declarer won in dummy and finessed in hearts. This lost and West led a low spade in this position:


Clearly the spade finesse working would have given declarer his tenth trick, but how about some better chances? Win with the ace of spades, ruff a spade, and run all of your trumps to make the contract whenever: (1) West has both black kings, as there will be a showup squeeze; or (2) when the king of spades drops in three rounds; or (3) the simple club finesse. These combined offer much better odds than the early spade finesse.

The story would have been interesting if declarer had done this, but he chose to take the spade finesse and drifted one down.

So what was amusing? In the Open Room, West, Kaplan, sneakily led a low diamond, which ran to East's ten and declarer's queen. South successfully finessed in clubs and lost the heart finesse to the queen. Kaplan, realising that this lead may not go down in his bridge memoirs, continued his deception in diamonds. Declarer, unluckily having the nine of diamonds, played low from dummy and lost to the jack on his right. This left declarer needing the spade finesse to make his contract, so he went one down.

The penultimate board saw another swing to GreSwe Axon.

Board 15. Dealer South. N-S Vul.


Open Room

| West <br> Kaplan | North <br> Bozygit | East <br> Oik | South <br> Seker <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 N T$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ <br> Pass |
| 1N | 2 | Pass | $3 \%$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

Closed Room

| West <br> Aydogdu | North <br> Ola $R$ | East <br> Gokce | South <br> Mikael $R$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 1 NT | Dble | Pass |
| $2 \uparrow$ | Dble | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | All Pass |

In the Open Room, South tried very hard to play in three clubs, fearing that hearts and notrumps were not the places his side wanted to be. His partner was less than sympathetic to South's plight and pushed into three notrumps. With East holding strong diamonds and being on lead and with an outside entry, the result was the expected seven tricks for the defence and North-South minus 300.

In the Closed Room, East felt his hand worthy of
three bids, whereas two were probably enough. He went minus 200, taking his five diamond tricks and two aces. GreSwe Axon 27-4.

The final board saw Nonames pushing hard.
Board 16. Dealer West. E-W Vul.
A KJ 8
$\checkmark$ A 642
$\diamond$ A Q J 96
of 3


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kaplan | Bozygit | Oik | Seker |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | Pass | $4 \Omega$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Aydogdu | Ola $R$ | Gokce | Mikael $R$ |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $2 \%$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Dble | $3 \%$ | All Pass |

The North hand was a tad light for a fourclub splinter, but I have sympathy for Bozygit. Perhaps he was encouraged to make this bid given the state of the match. Declarer certainly had his chances. West led a low spade. East won with the ace, cashed the ace of clubs, and continued with a low club. Had declarer put on the queen and won the trick in the South hand, he may well have played West for at least one trump honour by leading his ten of hearts. However, he ruffed the club in dummy, cashed the ace of hearts, and played another heart. West took two trump tricks, leaving declarer having to try a ruffing diamond finesse to dispose of his club losers. When this failed, he finished up three down and minus 150.
Three clubs in the other room was no thing of beauty with the defence taking one spade, one heart, two diamonds, a diamond ruff and the queen of trumps for two down, minus 200, and 8 imps to GreSwe Axon, who led by 35-4 with 32 boards to be played in this Juniors quarterfinal.

## SOLUTIONS

## TO THE TEST ON PAGE 8

1．You，North，are holding this hand： かK763 $৩$ A $8754 \diamond 952$ \＆ The bidding begins like this：

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Responder You | Opener | Partner |  |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Dble |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |

Do you agree with your one－heart advance？If not，what do you prefer？What would you do now？
I admit that I would have advanced with two hearts， not one heart．The jump promises 9－11 points，but you seem to have a double fit in the majors，and your singleton club is surely an extra asset．
However，given that you bid only one heart，it is time to catch up．Partner has shown a＂big double，＂ promising some 18－20 points．You should rebid four clubs，a splinter bid indicating a maximum，four－card spade support，and a singleton（or void）in clubs．
If，for example，partner tries for a slam by control－ bidding four diamonds，return the compliment with four hearts．You could have an excellent grand slam opposite something like：

$$
\text { ค AQ985 } \diamond \text { KQ } 2 \diamond \text { A \& } 743
$$

2．Dealer South．Both Vul．
¢ 52
$\checkmark 83$
$\diamond$ K J 4
\＆K Q 10643

$24 \quad$ 3NT（a）All Pass
（a）Lebensohl with slow shows：game values but no spade stopper nor four hearts
West leads the queen of spades．How would you plan the play？
It is easy to get careless on this deal by taking the first trick，cashing the ace of clubs，and playing another club．With this layout，though，you go down．

There are two ways to collect nine tricks：one spade，two diamonds and six clubs，or one spade， five diamonds and three clubs．You should try for both．But if you need five diamond tricks，you will probably have to finesse dummy＇s jack．（Immediately to cash the ace and king of diamonds，hoping to drop the doubleton queen，while you still have communication in clubs，is against the odds．）
You should win trick one，play a club to dummy＇s king，then return a club to your ace．If the suit splits，go to dummy with a diamond to the king， and run the clubs．
Here，though，when West discards a heart on the second club，lead a low diamond to dummy＇s jack， play a diamond to your ace，and claim nine tricks．
This is a rare example of a deal in which the play ＂the honour from the shorter side first＂is wrong．
3．You have this exciting hand：
の87542 『9643 $\vee 72$ \＆83

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Responder You | Opener | Partner |  |
|  | $1 \Omega$ | Dble |  |

## Redble ？？

What would you do，if anything？
Typically，when responder acts，you are off the hook and may pass．But you should bid here．You are known to have a very weak hand．So you may bid with absolutely nothing if you have a definite preference among the three unbid suits．Bid one spade．（And if you had a sixth spade，you could even jump to two spades！）
4．What is the greatest number of points you can have and be unable to make any game contract？ You may place the cards as you wish．
The answer is 39！I got this layout from Richard Pavlicek＇s website：



The Juniors quarterfinal match between Croatia and Norway started with a bang - a swing of 17 imps as early as the second board. Usually swings of this magnitude are the result of slam deals, but in this case both tables played in the same game contract.

Board 2. Dealer East. Vul N-S.
Q 984
৩J10763
$\diamond$ A J 3
\& 4


| West <br> Brajkovic | North <br> Grude | East <br> Stankovic | South <br> Hegge |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| $2 \circlearrowleft$ | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | $1 \uparrow$ | Dble |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | $4 \Omega$ |
|  |  |  |  |

One diamond was a transfer to hearts, South's double showed three-card heart support, and West's two-heart cue-bid promised 10-plus HCP with spade support.

Eventually North-South were pushed into four hearts, and East had to consider his lead.

In view of West's cue-bid, it was clear that the game wasn't based on high-card power, so there was a strong case for leading a trump, especially if dummy had the spade shortness, which could be expected from the bidding. But Andrea Stankovic led a spade, taken perforce by dummy's ace.
Tor Elvind Grude tried to establish communications for a crossruff by leading the jack of clubs at trick two. Ivan Brajkovic won with his queen and led the king of spades, hoping that by forcing dummy to ruff, it would
promote his nine of hearts.
Declarer ruffed in dummy and ran the queen of diamonds to East's king. At last a trump was led, and dummy's ace won the trick. The remaining cards were:


North needed seven out of the eight tricks, and the right way to do it in this layout was to ruff a club immediately, preparing an elopement play. Then declarer would have cashed the ace-jack of diamonds and queen of spades, and ruffed a spade.

If West overruffed and returned his last club, North would have had to ruff low.

Or, if West discarded his club instead of overruffing, declarer would have led a club to hold West to one trump trick with his $\checkmark$ K-9-5 in front of declarer's $\vee \mathrm{J}-10-7$.

Of course, Grude can't be blamed for failing to take this line, because it could have failed against a 3-2 trump break, when East would have overruffed declarer at trick eleven.

At the table, declarer took his top diamonds immediately, cashed the queen of spades, and ruffed a spade with the queen of hearts. At this point, West should have simply discarded, and after a club ruff, North would have had to lead from his $\odot \mathrm{J}-10-7$ into West's $\odot$ K-9-5 to lose two of the last three tricks.

However, Brajkovic made a serious error by
overruffing the queen of hearts, and the defence was finished: Norway plus 620.

This was the auction at the other table:

| West <br> Bakke | North <br> Mijic | East <br> Eide | South <br> Djilovic |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \propto \%$ |
| Pass | $1 \varnothing$ | $1 \uparrow$ | Dble |
| $2 \varnothing$ | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | $3 \uparrow$ | $4 \Omega$ |
| Dble | Pass | Pass | Pass |

The bidding was almost the same, except that North-South weren't playing one-level transfers, and West decided to double to final contract.

This double might have helped declarer to read the distribution, but at the table North just panicked. Harald Eide also led a spade. Then North, instead of leading a club at trick two, played a low diamond to his jack. Eide won with the king and switched to the two of hearts. It went from bad to worse when the ace of hearts

was played from dummy.
At this stage, Mijic was already going down three, and after another mistake, he finished with only six tricks: Croatia minus 1100.

It was a blow from which the host team found it hard to recover, and the first set out of three ended with Norway leading by 52-9.

## BOQOM TEAMS

RANKING AFTER ROUND 4

| 1 | NED WHITE | 55.00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | JAPAN | 51.00 |
| 3 | ZHIHAOLE | 46.00 |
| 4 | ITALIA KIDS | 44.00 |
| 5 | SX SWXH | 43.00 |
| 6 | NED ORANGE | 41.00 |
|  | COOKIE POTTER | 41.00 |
| 8 | STRONGPASS | 40.00 |
| 9 | GRANDSON XU | 39.00 |
| 10 | BILLY | 38.60 |
| 11 | SX XMXW | 38.00 |
| 12 | FRANCE | 37.60 |
| 13 | SX XNWY GIRLS | 37.00 |
| 14 | NOPRO | 35.00 |
| 15 | CHILE | 31.00 |
|  | GERMANY KIDS | 31.00 |
| 17 | SUDAMERICA | 29.00 |
|  | IMPS | 29.00 |
|  | SRBIJA | 29.00 |
| 20 | AUSSIE KIDS | 24.00 |
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## QUALIFICATION BUTREB RANTEINGS

## ภญゆI®BS

| PLAYER 1 | PLAYER 2 | BUTLER | SUMIMP | BOARD | CAT | COUNTRY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GULLBERG Daniel | KARLSSON Johan | 1,75 | 105 | 60 | Juniors | Sweden |
| KIKIC Ognjen | ZORANOVIC Jovana | 1,20 | 12 | 10 | Juniors | Serbia |
| CICVARIC Borna | DOBRIJEVIC Stella | 1,15 | 23 | 20 | Juniors | Croatia |
| CHAVARRIA Margherita | PERCARIO Giacomo | 1,11 | 78 | 70 | Juniors | Italy |
| GANDOGLIA Alessandro | DONATI Giovanni | 1,06 | 85 | 80 | Juniors | Italy |
| EIDE Harald | BAKKE Christian | 1,04 | 73 | 70 | Juniors | Norway |
| BOZYIGIT Mustafa Anil | SEKER Mert | 0,96 | 48 | 50 | Juniors | Turkey |
| GRUDE Tor Eivind | HEGGE Kristoffer | 0,94 | 66 | 70 | Juniors | Norway |
| ZORANOVIC Jovana | PEPIC Selena | 0,80 | 32 | 40 | Juniors | Serbia |
| RIMSTEDT Mikael | RIMSTEDT Ola | 0,74 | 59 | 80 | Juniors | Sweden |
| HARRISON Shane | HENBEST Maxim | 0,55 | 33 | 60 | Juniors | Australia |
| TRNAVAC Vuk | VELJA Stefan | 0,45 | 9 | 20 | Juniors | Serbia |
| DELLE CAVE Giuseppe | GARCIA DA ROSA Rodrigo | 0,40 | 16 | 40 | Juniors | Italy |
| KATAYAMA Takanori | YUGE Hirokana | 0,40 | 24 | 60 | Juniors | Japan |
| HUANG Yongkang | CHEN Biteng | 0,37 | 26 | 70 | Juniors | China |
| HULT Simon | EKENBERG Simon | 0,23 | 14 | 60 | Juniors | Sweden |
| FAGERLUND Vesa | AIMALA Antti | 0,19 | 15 | 80 | Juniors | Finland |
| GOKCE Berk | AYDOGDU Ataman | 0,18 | 11 | 60 | Juniors | Turkey |
| HUDSON Alex | JOLLY Christian | 0,13 | 8 | 60 | Juniors | U.S.A. |
| KOBAYASHI Koki | TANABE Hitoshi | 0,13 | 5 | 40 | Juniors | Japan |
| MINUTTI Guillermo | OCHOA Sebastian | 0,08 | 5 | 60 | Juniors | Uruguay |
| STANKOVIC Andrea | BRAJKOVIC Ivan | 0,08 | 6 | 80 | Juniors | Croatia |
| LAFONT Gregoire | SANCHEZ Thomas | -0,03 | -2 | 60 | Juniors | France |
| TEBHA Anam | KRIEGEL Oren | -0,04 | -2 | 50 | Juniors | U.S.A. |
| CALMANOVICI Alessandro | PERCARIO Giacomo | -0,10 | -1 | 10 | Juniors | Italy |
| CASTEL Hugo | LANGLET Vincent | -0,10 | -5 | 50 | Juniors | France |
| WILLIAMS Stephen | THOMPSON Jamie | -0,16 | -8 | 50 | Juniors | Australia |
| GURIDI Gonzalo | RAMIREZ Diego | -0,25 | -20 | 80 | Juniors | Chile |
| KAPLAN Adam | OIKONOMOPOULOS Ioannis | -0,25 | -20 | 80 | Juniors | Greece |
| IMDAT Eren | BIRBEN Cagatay | -0,34 | -17 | 50 | Juniors | Turkey |
| MYLLAERI Maria | KOIVU Oskari | -0,38 | -30 | 80 | Juniors | Finland |
| COOPER Renee | PATTISON Ella | -0,42 | -21 | 50 | Juniors | Australia |
| COENEN Joost | LUCASSEN Adriaan | -0,46 | -37 | 80 | Juniors | Netherlands |
| SCHOLS Michel | VAN DEN BOS Tim | -0,48 | -38 | 80 | Juniors | Netherlands |
| POLAK Tobias | VAN OVERBEEKE Tom | -0,51 | -41 | 80 | Juniors | Netherlands |
| HARADA Yuki | NAKANISHI Tomoaki | -0,60 | -36 | 60 | Juniors | Japan |
| VAN DEN BOOM Eddo | LANGELAAN Faan | -0,70 | -56 | 80 | Juniors | Netherlands |
| GANNON Sean | ARBIT Julie | -0,78 | -39 | 50 | Juniors | U.S.A. |
| DJILOVIC Josko | MIJIC Ante | -0,83 | -50 | 60 | Juniors | Croatia |
| TRNAVAC Vuk | PEPIC Selena | -1,00 | -20 | 20 | Juniors | Serbia |
| VELJA Stefan | VAZIC Stojan | -1,07 | -32 | 30 | Juniors | Serbia |
| GAYDIER Nicolas | LORET Xavier | -1,08 | -54 | 50 | Juniors | France |
| CHEN Tian | ZHAO Yuqiao | -1,13 | -79 | 70 | Juniors | China |
| KIKIC Ognjen | VAZIC Stojan | -1,53 | -46 | 30 | Juniors | Serbia |
| TRNAVAC Vuk | KIKIC Ognjen | -2,50 | -25 | 10 | Juniors | Serbia |
| CAZABON Philippe | PALMA Joaquin | -3,70 | -74 | 20 | Juniors | Chile |

## צOONOSTEBS

| PLAYER 1 | PLAYER 2 | BUTLER | SUMIMP | BOARD | CAT | COUNTRY |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| YIN Yichen | FANG Zhengyang | 1,65 | 66 | 40 | Youngsters | China |
| HU Yiyang | YU Zhaochen | 1,55 | 31 | 20 | Youngsters | China |
| FANG Dongke | WANG Zihan | 1,11 | 78 | 70 | Yougsters | China |
| ALTER Florian | VORNKAHL Leonard | 1,00 | 20 | 20 | Youngsters | Germany |
| JASINSKI Piotr | BACZEK Krystian | 0,90 | 63 | 70 | Youngsters | Poland |
| WEI Hongji | SUN Shiyu | 0,83 | 25 | 30 | Youngsters | China |
| VORNKAHL Leonard | JESSE Stig | 0,60 | 24 | 40 | Youngsters | Germany |
| CHIARANDINI Francesco | GAIITTI Alvaro | 0,60 | 30 | 50 | Youngsters | Italy |
| LIU Haochen | DENG Cheng | 0,60 | 12 | 20 | Youngsters | China |
| ALTER Florian | JESSE Stig | 0,40 | 4 | 10 | Youngsters | Germany |
| WANNG Zhaohong | ZHOU Zhenlin | 0,27 | 19 | 70 | Younggters | China |
| SCATA Sebastiano | MANGANELLA Andrea | 0,00 | 0 | 60 | Youngsters | Italy |
| GIUBILO Gianmarco | GIUBILO Gabriele | $-0,03$ | -1 | 30 | Youngsters | Italy |
| MACZKA Stanislaw | TRENDAK Lukasz | $-0,07$ | -5 | 70 | Younggters | Poland |
| VAN OOSTEN Sibrand | PABST Philipp | $-0,27$ | -19 | 70 | Youngsters | Germany |
| SUN Qian | WANG Xihao | $-0,30$ | -21 | 70 | Youngsters | China |
| DENG Cheng | YU Zhaochen | $-0,44$ | -22 | 50 | Youngsters | China |
| FERENCA Matko | TOMASEVIC Mateo | $-0,58$ | -23 | 40 | Youngsters | Croatia |
| GRGURIC Matea | STEFANEC Kristijan | $-0,84$ | -42 | 50 | Youggsters | Croatia |
| LIU Yizhou | LIU Haochen | $-0,88$ | -44 | 50 | Youngsters | China |
| HALAVANJA Matija | CAI Haoxiao | DOMITROVIC Andrija | $-0,96$ | -48 | 50 | Youngsters |
| Croatia |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LIU Guangfu | WANG Jiayi | $-0,99$ | -69 | 70 | Youggsters | China |
|  | LIU Quan | $-1,11$ | -78 | 70 | Youngsters | China |

ตRBR

| PLAYER 1 | PLAYER 2 | BUTLER | SUMIMP | BOARD | CAT | COUNTRY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YUAN Aijia | JIN Huiyuan | 1,73 | 69 | 40 | Girls | China |
| HU Ling | XIA Qi | 1,24 | 62 | 50 | Girls | China |
| CHEN Yunpeng | RUAN Xinyao | 0,98 | 59 | 60 | Girls | China |
| SALVATO Michela | SCRIATTOLI Giulia | 0,90 | 45 | 50 | Girls | Italy |
| DE LUTIO Caterina | BROCCOLINO Susanna | 0,73 | 29 | 40 | Girls | Italy |
| LIU Guangli Wendy | LUO Xinyi | 0,60 | 24 | 40 | Girls | China |
| LU Xinying | WU Min | 0,58 | 23 | 40 | Girls | China |
| DI MAURO Agnese | TANINI Flaminia | 0,47 | 14 | 30 | Girls | Italy |
| VILLEGAS Francisca | ROMAN Valentina | 0,30 | 9 | 30 | Girls | Chile |
| JIN Huiyuan | GE Chenyun | 0,20 | 4 | 20 | Girls | China |
| LU Yijia | YU Wenfei | 0,13 | 8 | 60 | Girls | China |
| LU Xinying | ZHANG Yuqian | -0,05 | -1 | 20 | Girls | China |
| HUANG Danlei | SHI Qinyi | -0,20 | -2 | 10 | Girls | China |
| WU Min | HUANG Wenying | -0,20 | -4 | 20 | Girls | China |
| HUANG Wenying | SUN Yingying | -0,20 | -6 | 30 | Girls | China |
| SHI Lemiao | LUO Yifei | -0,46 | -23 | 50 | Girls | China |
| HUANG Danlei | LUO Yiyang | -0,62 | -31 | 50 | Girls | China |
| HAO Mengqi | MA Lingyi | -0,73 | -22 | 30 | Girls | China |
| NACRUR Francisca | ROMAN Valentina | -1,00 | -30 | 30 | Girls | Chile |
| MOLINA Diana | NACRUR Francisca | -1,20 | -24 | 20 | Girls | Chile |
| LI Yiran | SHI Lemiao | -1,30 | -13 | 10 | Girls | China |
| CHEN Jiyao | QIU Tian | -1,37 | -82 | 60 | Girls | China |
| ZHANG Yuqian | HUANG Wenying | -1,60 | -16 | 10 | Girls | China |
| MOLINA Diana | GERSTMANN Sofia | -2,30 | -92 | 40 | Girls | Chile |

RIODS


