



WORLD YOUTH BRIDGE TEAMS CHAMPIONSHIPS

3rd - 13th AUGUST 2016

SALSO MAGGIORE TERME / ITALY

Daily Bulletin

Editor: Phillip Alder • Co-Editors: Jade Barret, Donna Lombardini, Murat Molva, Ram Soffer, David Stern • Lay-out Editor: Francesca Canali • Assistant: Sandra Leal



A TOWER OF TALENT



ISSUE No. 5
MONDAY,
AUGUST 8, 2016



CONTENTS
CLICK TO NAVIGATE

Matches Today,	p. 2
Quiz,	p. 3
USA1 vs Italy,	p. 4
England vs USA1	p. 7
USA2 vs Egypt	p. 9
The Elusive...	p. 12
Results	p. 14

SCHEDULE

Today, the Kids teams of France, China2, Poland and Israel will start knockout matches to decide the medal winners. (There is one more round, but those four must qualify.) The other ten teams will also be playing in their own events, one for teams 5th through 8th, and one for the rest.

The other three events still have two days of qualification.

In the Girls Teams, the Netherlands and China are more than two matches clear of the field. The other eleven teams are vying for the additional six spots in the quarterfinals.

The leader in the Junior Teams seems to change after each round. As today starts, the Netherlands is just ahead of China, with USA1 less than one victory point adrift in third. The six leading teams seem safe, but there are several countries able to get into the top eight after Round 21 on Tuesday.

The Netherlands is three-quarters of a match clear in the Youngsters Teams, ahead of Israel and China Hong Kong. For the other spots, twelfth-placed Sweden is less than a match behind France in eighth, so there is a lot to play for over the next two days.



10:00 - 12:00: <i>Juniors, Youngsters, Kids</i>	BAN-CHN (J)	EGY-POL (J)	ENG-NOR (J)	ISR-SIN (Y)	FRA-POL (Y)
13:30 - 15:30: <i>Juniors, Girls, Youngsters, Kids</i>	FIN-COL (J)	ITA-USA2 (J)	SWE-JPN (J)	HKG-FRA (Y)	NED-POL (G)
15:50 - 17:50: <i>Juniors, Girls, Youngsters, Kids</i>	NED-CHN (G)	NOR-ARG (J)	POL-FRA (J)	CHN-USA1 (J)	CHL-NED (Y)
18:10 - 20:10: <i>Juniors</i>	USA1-NED (J)	FRA-NOR (J)	CAN-POL (J)	ITA-CHN (J)	FIN-SWE (J)



MATCHES TODAY

JUNIORS R 15

USA2 GER
 BAN CHN
 FRA FIN
 EGY POL
 ENG NOR
 HKG JPN
 HUN COL
 ITA SWE
 USA1 AUS
 CAN ARG
 SIN NED

TIME: 10.00

JUNIORS R 16

ENG EGY
 HKG SIN
 HUN BAN
 ITA USA2
 FIN COL
 CAN CHN
 FRA NED
 ARG POL
 AUS NOR
 SWE JPN
 USA1 GER

TIME: 13.30

JUNIORS R 17

COL SWE
 JPN AUS
 NOR ARG
 POL FRA
 NED CAN
 EGY FIN
 GER ITA
 USA2 HUN
 BAN HKG
 SIN ENG
 CHN USA1

TIME: 15.50

JUNIORS R 18

EGY SIN
 ENG BAN
 HKG USA2
 HUN GER
 ITA CHN
 USA1 NED
 FIN SWE
 FRA NOR
 ARG JPN
 AUS COL
 CAN POL

TIME: 18.10

GIRLS R 12

USA HUN
 ITA FRA
 SIN IDN
 CHN AUS
 NED POL
 CHL TPE
 NOR Bye

TIME: 13.30

GIRLS R 13

NED CHN
 POL SIN
 AUS ITA
 NOR USA
 IDN HUN
 FRA TPE
 CHL Bye

TIME: 15.50

YOUNGSTERS R 13

ISR SIN
 CHN ITA
 USA SWE
 DEN TPE
 FRA POL
 CHL HKG
 LAT BRA
 IND NED
 GER BER

TIME: 10.00

YOUNGSTERS R 14

ITA ISR
 SWE CHN
 BER USA
 TPE SIN
 POL DEN
 HKG FRA
 BRA CHL
 NED LAT
 GER IND

TIME: 13.30

YOUNGSTERS R 15

ISR SWE
 CHN USA
 ITA TPE
 SIN POL
 DEN HKG
 FRA BRA
 CHL NED
 LAT GER
 IND BER

TIME: 15.50

KIDS R, 13

CHN1 POL
 USA ITA
 NED SWE
 HUN ISR
 FRA CHN2
 CZE CAN
 ENG IDN

TIME: 10.00

?

?

PUT YOURSELF TO THE TEST!

PRACTICE MAKES LESS IMPERFECT



Bridge is a bidder's game

1. With both sides vulnerable in a team game, you hold:

- ♠ Q 7 5
- ♥ 10 8 5 4
- ♦ A 6 4
- ♣ A 7 3

The auction begins like this:

West	North	East	South
	Partner		You
1♠	Pass	1NT	Pass
2♠	Pass	??	

Do you agree with one notrump if it is (a) non-forcing (6-9 or a bad 10 points), or (b) semi-forcing (6-12 points, and partner passes with a minimum 5-3-3-2 opening), or (c) forcing (6-12 points, but partner may not pass)?

What would you do now?



To know your Enemy, you must become your Enemy. (SUN TZU, Art of War)

2. With both sides vulnerable in a duplicate pair event, you pick up:

- ♠ --
- ♥ A K 4
- ♦ A K 10 8 6 5 2
- ♣ K 9 4

The auction begins like this:

West	North	East	South
	Partner		You
	1♥	5♣	??

After thinking nasty thoughts about East, what would you do?



In the midst of chaos, there is also opportunity. (SUN TZU, Art of War)

3. With both sides vulnerable in a team event, you hold:

- ♠ 7 4
- ♥ A K Q J 9 7
- ♦ K 10 4
- ♣ J 4

The bidding starts like this:

West	North	East	South
	Partner		You
	1♦	3♠	4♥
4♠	5♣	Pass	??

What would you do now?



Know yourself and you will win all battles. (SUN TZU, Art of War)

4. Dealer North. None vul.

- ♠ J 9 4 3
 - ♥ 10 9
 - ♦ A K 10 5
 - ♣ 10 9 4
- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| | N | |
| W | | E |
| | S | |
- ♠ 8 6
 - ♥ K 3
 - ♦ J 9 8 7
 - ♣ A 8 7 6 5

West	North	East	South
	Pass	Pass	1NT
Pass	2♣	Pass	2♥
Pass	2NT	Pass	3♠
Pass	4♠	All Pass	

West leads the king of clubs. When you encourage, he continues with the queen of clubs. How would you try to steer the defence from there?

Solutions on page 10.
Or **CLICK HERE** on the web version



USA1 VS ITALY

RAM SOFFER

Round 8, Junior Teams

In Friday's bulletin I made a shortlist of favourites for the Juniors event, which did not include the host team. Obviously, the Italians wanted to prove me wrong, and on Saturday they showed top form against the strong USA1 team.

They started a bit hyper-aggressively, sacrificing in 4♠ over 4♥ at unfavourable vulnerability and going down two for -500. Fortunately for them, at the other table the Americans defended poorly and allowed three overtricks in 4♥ for a push board. This was the first sign that something was going wrong for the USA1 in this match.

Board 17 Dealer North, Vul None

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

West	North	East	South
Rosenberg	Montanelli	Kristensen	Chavarria
2♣	Dble	2♥	1NT
Pass	3NT	Dble	All Pass

After South's 1NT opening, West bid 2♣ (majors). At first North doubled (missing a spade stopper), but after East preferred hearts, he bid 3NT (the normal contract). East upped the stakes by doubling.

An immediate 3NT bid would have been more successful, as a spade lead would have made it very easy for declarer.

Rosenberg led a low heart, and now the only winning play was ♥K from dummy at trick one, gaining a tempo to develop clubs before East touched

spades. Chavarria didn't find it, and after winning with the ♥J, Kristensen made a good switch to ♠8 (♠10 was even better, ensuring two down). Declarer's ♠Q lost to the ♠K, and West sensibly switched back to hearts, making sure the contract was beaten, instead of gambling on the whereabouts of the ♠10. The defenders took three hearts, one spade and one club. USA1 scored +100 – apparently a very good score.

West	North	East	South
Donati	A. Grossack	Percario	Z. Grossack
2♣	Dble	2NT	Dble
3♦	Dble	3♥	Pass
Pass	Dble	All Pass	1NT

In the replay, East bid a rather optimistic 2NT, after which the Grossacks became obsessed with penalising their opponent rather than bidding their own makeable game.

What would you have led from the South hand against 3♥ doubled?

All side suits seem to be unattractive, and a trump lead is the standard recipe when an opponent has shown a two-suiter. Wrong! In this deal, every non-trump lead is good enough to set the contract by one trick, while after a trump lead there is no hope for the defence. The reason is that in addition to the obvious four defensive tricks, the only chance for a fifth trick is a spade ruff! After Zachary's ♥3 lead, that chance was gone. Declarer led spades twice toward dummy (the second time after drawing trumps) and established dummy's long suit for two club discards, while his fourth club was to be ruffed. Italy scored +530 for an early lead of 10-0.

Two deals later, Zachary opened 1NT with 15 HCP which included five hearts, four clubs and two low diamonds. Later Adam left him in a 3♥ contract in a 5-0 (!) fit, which drifted three down, while their Italian counterparts bid naturally to a making 3♣.

Then a push board was followed by an ill-judged sacrifice in 5♦, vulnerable against not, that cost 800 while in the other room the Italians let their opponents play in 4♠ for 450.

At this stage USA1 were trailing by 26-0, but the worst was yet to come.

Board 23 Dealer South, Vul All

	♠ A 10 9 7 5		
	♥ Q 5 4 2		
	♦ 8 5 4		
	♣ 6		
♠ 4 3 2 ♥ A J 10 9 3 ♦ 7 2 ♣ 7 5 2	<div style="border: 2px solid black; padding: 5px; width: 40px; margin: 0 auto;"> N W E S </div>	♠ K Q J ♥ 6 ♦ A K J 10 3 ♣ A J 10 9	
	♠ 8 6		
	♥ K 8 7		
	♦ Q 9 6		
	♣ K Q 8 4 3		

West	North	East	South
Rosenberg	Montanelli	Kristensen	Chavarria
Pass	2♠	3NT	All Pass

After North's 2♠ opening, East had little choice but 3NT, since doubling risked a 4♥ response by West.

(Some players who opened the North hand 2♥ in order to show a major two-suiter were less lucky when East doubled for takeout and West converted it to penalty.)

Montanelli's spade bid helped Chavarria find the winning lead of ♠8, after which the defence was ahead in the race. Declarer played diamonds, and South led another spade upon winning with the ♦Q. At this stage North had developed three spade tricks while still possessing a sure entry: the ♥Q. This meant that declarer had to go one down. Italy +100.

West	North	East	South
Donati	A. Grossack	Percario	Z. Grossack
Pass	1♠	Dble	Pass
2♥	Pass	2NT	Pass
3♣	Dble	3NT	All Pass

Zachary opened light, and Percario risked an off-shape takeout double at the one-level, assuming that he could always correct hearts to notrumps (after his initial pass over 1♣, Donati was unlikely to bid 4♥). Once again South was on lead against 3NT, but this time all he knew about his partner's hand was that he had four-plus spades. Under these circumstances, leading from his five-card suit looked better. Unfortunately, it gave East the necessary tempo to fulfil his contract. At trick one, he took the ♣Q with

his ace. Then he played diamonds, and all the defence could do was win one trick in each suit. Italy +600.

Board 24 Dealer West Vul None

	♠ --		
	♥ K 8 7 5 4		
	♦ Q 8 6 3		
	♣ J 8 5 2		
♠ A 7 5 4 3 2 ♥ 3 ♦ A K 10 7 5 2 ♣ --	<div style="border: 2px solid black; padding: 5px; width: 40px; margin: 0 auto;"> N W E S </div>	♠ Q J 10 9 8 6 ♥ A Q ♦ 9 4 ♣ A 9 7	
	♠ K		
	♥ J 10 9 6 2		
	♦ J		
	♣ K Q 10 6 4 3		

West	North	East	South
Rosenberg	Montanelli	Kristensen	Chavarria
1♠	Pass	2NT	3♠
5♣	5♥	Pass	Pass
6♠	7♥	Dble	All Pass

The American East-West pair tried to bid their cards scientifically despite their opponents' violent preempting. 2NT was Jacoby, and 3♠ was a Michaels cue-bid. 5♣ was a clever bid, asking partner for his number of key cards outside clubs. They used DEPO over the 5♥ intervention, so that East's pass showed one key card outside clubs. West concluded that one key card was missing, so he stopped in 6♠, and East doubled the sacrifice bid of 7♥. At least he found the best lead - ♣A - so that East-West got their club ruff and the sacrifice cost more than the small slam. USA1 +1100.


West	North	East	South
Donati	A. Grossack	Percario	Z. Grossack
1♠	Pass	2♣	3♣
3♦	5♣	5♥	Pass
7♣	Pass	7♠	All Pass

Six-six hands were probably not meant to be bid scientifically, and the more intuitive approach of the Italian pair allowed them to reach the perfect contract. East started with an artificial game-force of 2♣. Donati showed his second suit at the three-level, and then East control-bid 5♥ (obviously, it couldn't be natural) to indicate a very good hand. Giovanni Donati decided that he had a much better hand than he already advertised, and his solution was simple and clear: 7♣ - asking his partner to pick a grand slam (which was not a very difficult task with his six-card spade support). Donati claimed 7♠ making right after the ♣5 lead - Italy +1510.

At this point the state of the match was 47-1 in Italy's favour, and Zachary Grossack hit the panic button. On the next board his over-excited opponents overbid to 6♦ while his partner was holding ♦AQJ, but he decided that this was the moment for a solo shot at 7♣, which cost an unnecessary 500. At the other table the bidding was far more quiet. Diamonds were never mentioned, and the Italians stopped in 4♣ – just making.

That made it 59-1 to Italy, but the last three boards were good for USA1, and they managed to avoid the indignity of a 0-20 defeat.

Board 28 Dealer West Vul N/S

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

Most textbooks claim that one should open a strong 2♣ with either 23+ HCP or 9+ sure tricks. According to these criteria, North's hand qualifies for 2♣, after which reaching the grand slam would be a piece of cake, but at both tables of our match North preferred

1♣, and at least one partnership had to play a guessing game after East pre-empted.

West	North	East	South
Rosenberg	Montanelli	Kristensen	Chavarria
Pass	1♣	4♥	Dble
Pass	4NT	Pass	5♣
Pass	5♥	Pass	5NT
Pass	6♣	All Pass	

The most common agreement after 1♣ (4♥) Dble (Pass), 4NT by opener denotes a minor two-suiter rather than asking for key cards. Still, North bid 5♥ over 5♣, inviting a grand slam, why should he do so when he is missing the AQ of trump, unless the rest of his hand is extremely strong? In my opinion, South displayed excessive caution by stopping in 6♣.

West	North	East	South
Donati	A. Grossack	Percario	Z. Grossack
Pass	1♣	3♥	3NT
Pass	4♥	Pass	5♦
Pass	7♣	All Pass	

In the replay East gave his opponents too much bidding room by intervening with only 3♥. North's 4♥ was a key card ask with the last bid suit as trump, and 5♦ showed two key cards plus the trump queen. Now it was very easy for Adam Grossack to bid the grand slam, which was worth 13 consolation IMPs. Italy won the match 59-20, making the struggle for the playoff spots in this event wide open.

Happy Birthday Andika Aji Permana

August 8

Also the Indonesia Girls & Kids Teams would like to thank their sponsors, Bakti Olahraga Djarum Foundation and Kementerian Pemuda dan Olahraga Indonesia.





ENGLAND VS USA1

MURAT MOLVA

Round 11, Junior Teams

You probably heard the famous chess quote from the great German grandmaster Emanuel Lasker: "If you find a good move, look for a better one." Did you know that Lasker was a mathematician, a philosopher, and also a good bridge player who even wrote books about contract bridge?

I am proud to present you herewith my own version of the quote adapted to bridge: "If you find a mediocre move, look for a good one."

Board 1. Dealer North. None vul.

♠ A Q ♥ A J 3 ♦ K 9 8 6 3 2 ♣ K 9 ♠ 10 ♥ 10 7 6 5 2 ♦ J 10 7 ♣ J 6 3 2		♠ 9 8 7 6 5 3 ♥ - ♦ 5 4 ♣ A 8 7 5 4	♠ K J 4 2 ♥ K Q 9 8 4 ♦ A Q ♣ Q 10
West <i>Z.Grossack</i> Pass Pass Pass Pass	North <i>Roberts</i> 1♦ 2NT 4♥ 4NT 6♥	East <i>A.Grossack</i> Pass Dble Pass Pass All Pass	South <i>Khandelwal</i> 1♥ 3♠ 4♠ 5♠

West, Zachary Grossack (USA), led his singleton spade. The English declarer, Ankush Khandelwal, won with dummy's ace and cashed the trump ace, to get the bad news. He went into a long tank, and finally came to his hand with the diamond ace. Then he cashed the diamond queen (!). This was the mediocre move of the day, which required that the hand with the long trumps should hold a third diamond so that declarer could pitch his two club losers before West could ruff. Khandelwal was walking on very thin ice but his luck was in. West did have a third diamond, so the club loser disappeared on the fourth diamond and slam was made.

All Khandelwal had to do, when he was in hand with the diamond ace, was to take the finesse for the trump ten, cash the heart jack, come to his hand with the diamond queen, clear trumps, and go to dummy with the spade to take all 13 tricks. 1 IMP to USA1.

Board 3. Dealer South. EW vul.

♠ Q 8 7 3 2 ♥ 10 6 4 ♦ 9 ♣ 9 7 5 4		♠ A 10 4 ♥ K 9 2 ♦ Q 7 6 5 2 ♣ 6 2	♠ J 9 6 5 ♥ A Q J 8 7 5 ♦ K 3 ♣ K
West <i>Z.Grossack</i> Pass 4♥ Pass Dble (a) Spades	North <i>Roberts</i> 1♥ (a) Pass 5♣ Pass	East <i>A.Grossack</i> 2♥ Pass Pass Pass	South <i>Khandelwal</i> 1♣ 3♦ Dbl Pass Pass

It has been a long time since someone passed in the third position at favourable vulnerability after two passes. Now the same approach applies for the responder sitting in the same chair. North responded to his partner's opening with only 2 HCP's and reached a laydown contract of five clubs with a combined total of only 17 HCP. The result was duplicated in the other room.



Board 6. Dealer East. EW vul.

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

West	North	East	South
Z.Grossack	Roberts	A.Grossack	Khandelwal
		1♣	1♠
2♦	Pass	2NT	Pass
3NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

According to an ancient myth, a stopper in a suit is in the eye of the beholder. Adam Grossack's 2NT bid gave the impression of someone looking at the spade ace-queen. So Khandelwal, the English South, opted for a low-heart lead. This gave Adam Grossack his ninth trick together with a massive 12 IMPs, when USA1 defeated 3NT in the other room after a spade lead.

On board 9, there was another five of a minor contract, five diamonds, on a combined 18-count. USA1 stopped in four diamonds making with an overtrick, but still gained 2 IMPs when the US pair in the other room played in four spades undoubled and went down two. Only one pair from Bangladesh, Rafsan Siddiqui and Amirul Islam, reached five diamonds (doubled) in the Junior series. Their reward was to lose 4 IMPs though, because their teammates had doubled four diamonds, which made with an overtrick.

Board 12. Dealer West. NS vul.

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

West	North	East	South
Z.Grossack	Roberts	A.Grossack	Khandelwal
3♠	Dble	4♠	5♥
Pass	6♥	All Pass	

If a combined 17-18 count is good for a five-level contract, a combined 20 HCPs must be enough for a slam, surely? It is not so clear who should have taken the initiative to find the good six-spade sacrifice. Should Adam Grossack have bid four diamonds first? Would this suggest a willingness to sacrifice? Or just be a lead director? Would East not be hoping to beat a slam with all those defensive values in his hand? Anyhow, six hearts made with an overtrick, while six spades went for minus 300 in the other room for 15 IMPs to England, their only IMPs for the whole match.

Board 14. Dealer East. None vul.

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

West	North	East	South
Z.Grossack	Roberts	A.Grossack	Khandelwal
		1♠	2♦
3♦	Pass	3♥	Pass
4♣	Pass	4♦	Pass
4♥	Pass	5♣	Pass
5♠	Pass	6♦	Pass
6♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

The Grossacks reached a good slam on the last board of the match. Perhaps the English North-South pair could have interfered a bit more aggressively with their nine-card diamond fit, as was the case in the other room. USA1 got 980 at this table, while their teammates went for minus 300 at five diamonds doubled. This was good for another 12 IMPs to USA1, who won the match 25-15 in IMPs (15.66 - 4.34 VPs).

Editor's note: In the above deal, what is the result in seven spades with everyone looking at all four hands?

The answer is on page 13.



USA2 - EGYPT

BARRY RIGAL

Round 9, Junior Teams

This match turned into a comfortable win for USA2, who played very soundly in both rooms, and gave up only a handful of IMPs. But there were a couple of really interesting (if highly challenging) opportunities that got away from both sides.

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
	1♠	2♣	2♠
3♣	4♠	All Pass	

Both tables reached 4♠ by North, and both Easts led ♣A. Christian Jolly took considerable time to play to the next trick, but eventually shifted to ♦K, the only defence to give declarer any problems. Karim Ashraf made the best response when he returned a diamond. Once the ♦J was allowed to hold, the deal was over. Had Jordan Kaye overtaken with the ♦Q to play a third diamond, declarer could have still succeeded, but his life would have been far harder. He would have needed to play for both major-suit finesses to succeed. If he ruffed with ♠10 and it held the trick, how should he have continued?

If he played ace then jack of spades, he would have succeeded if West had king-third of spades. If West ducked, he would have been endplayed with a spade to give dummy an entry. But as the cards lay, this would have been fatal. After ace then jack of spades, West could have won and led the fourth diamond, to promote East's trump nine.



Board 13. Dealer North. All Vul.

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

At both tables N/S had to deal with opponents who bid to 4♠. In one room Anam Tebha and Oren Kriegel found the right trump suit, if a level too low:

West	North	East	South
	1♣	1♠	Dble
4♠	4NT	Pass	5♦
Pass	Pass	Pass	

This made 12 tricks in some comfort when declarer ruffed the spade lead and used his entries to hand to finesse hearts.

In the other room Christian Jolly declared in 4♠x after

West	North	East	South
	1♥	1♠	2♥
4♣(fit)	4♥	4♠	Pass
Pass	Dble	All Pass	

Had Karim Ashraf competed with 4♦ over 4♣, that would have allowed his partner Ahmed Naser to judge the level of competition far better. Jolly ruffed the top-diamond lead and made the play I suspect all of us would have done of crossing to hand in trumps to find the bad news. Then he led a top club from hand and Ashraf seized his chance to win while clubs were blocked and return a low diamond. Try as declarer might, he could not make ten tricks from there.

The winning line is only slightly counter-intuitive. Ruff the opening lead and play a club at once. Things are easy if North ducks, so let's assume best defence. North wins and returns a diamond. You ruff, unblock

clubs, and must once again resist the temptation to play even one trump. Instead, ruff a third diamond and lead out the ♣Q to pitch a heart from hand. South can ruff and lead a heart through to his partner, to reach this ending:

♠ A 9 ♥ K 4 ♦ -- ♣ 7 6	♠ -- ♥ A Q 5 3 ♦ A ♣ 10	<table border="1" style="background-color: #2c3e50; color: white; width: 60px; height: 60px; margin: auto;"> <tr><td style="padding: 5px;">N</td><td style="padding: 5px;">E</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding: 5px;">W</td><td style="padding: 5px;">S</td></tr> </table>	N	E	W	S	♠ K Q 6 4 2 ♥ -- ♦ 10 ♣ --
N	E						
W	S						
♠ J 10 ♥ 8 7 ♦ Q 2 ♣ --							

North can lead a fourth club to try to promote a trump, but East can ruff high and draw trumps ending in dummy. If instead he tries the ace of diamonds, East can ruff in dummy, cash the ace of spades, ruff a heart to hand, and draw trumps.



Solutions to the quiz on page 3

1. With both sides vulnerable in a team game, you hold:

♠ Q 7 5 ♥ 10 8 5 4 ♦ A 6 4 ♣ A 7 3

The auction begins like this:

West	North <i>Partner</i>	East	South <i>You</i>
	1♠	Pass	1NT
Pass	2♠	Pass	??

Do you agree with one notrump if it is (a) non-forcing (6-9 or a bad 10 points), or (b) semi-forcing (6-12 points, and partner passes with a minimum 5-3-3-2 opening), or (c) forcing (6-12 points, but partner may not pass)?

What would you do now?

The first part of this problem is tough. In point-count terms, this hand is worth a game-invitational sequence. Then, if using one notrump semi-forcing or forcing, you respond one notrump, planning to rebid three spades.

However, if you are not using a two-over-one system, you have to respond with an unappealing two clubs, hoping to rebid two spades on the next round.

These plans, though, are overbids for advocates, like me, of the Losing Trick Count. This hand has nine losers, which is the number for a single raise, not a game-invitational sequence (despite those aces).

So, I guess I would bid one notrump regardless and wait to see where the dice fell.

Now partner has shown a minimum hand with at least six spades; perhaps:

♠ A K J 8 6 3 ♥ 9 7 2 ♦ K 5 ♣ Q 4

The right bid is *three notrump*, where you rate to have nine cashers from six spades, the ace in one minor suit, and the ace-king in the other. Also, you might well have only the same nine tricks in spades.

I do not think I am influenced by knowing that this was the case when this deal originally occurred in Sweden.

2. With both sides vulnerable in a duplicate pair event, you pick up:

♠ -- ♥ A K 4 ♦ A K 10 8 6 5 2 ♣ K 9 4

The auction begins like this:

West	North <i>Partner</i>	East	South <i>You</i>
	1♥	5♣	??

What would you do?

How much is five clubs doubled going down? Probably at most 1,100. East surely has at least seven trump tricks.

That beats game, but not slam -- and surely we have a slam somewhere.

To my mind, the right bid is six notrump, going for the highest-scoring strain. Partner has to have good spades, given that he presumably has nothing in clubs and has at most three points in hearts.

Picture partner with:

♠ A K 8 5 ♥ Q J 9 6 2 ♦ Q 7 4 ♣ 2

and you can see how well six notrump will score -- a tied top.

Yes, you might miss a grand slam, especially seven diamonds when partner has a club void, but you can never work that out scientifically.

3. With both sides vulnerable in a team event, you hold:

♠ 7 4 ♥ A K Q J 9 7 ♦ K 10 4 ♣ J 4

The bidding starts like this:

West	North Partner	East	South You
	1♦	3♠	4♥
4♠	5♣	Pass	??

What would you do now?

Partner is clearly short of spades and long in the minors with a good hand. Yours matches his well, so you should jump to six diamonds.

Yes, you might lose two spade tricks, but it is unlikely. And bidding six diamonds will work well when partner has a spade void and you can make seven, because he is likely to raise.

Five diamonds and five hearts seem too unenterprising to me.

What about six hearts? That might work, but could backfire.

Now to fess up. I might be biased by knowing the full deal. At a world championship, the player with this hand jumped to six hearts and lost the first two spade tricks because partner held:

♠ 5 ♥ -- ♦ A Q J 7 5 3 2 ♣ A 10 7 5 2

Six diamonds was making, of course.

4. Dealer North. None vul.

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

We are looking at the Juniors match between Italy and USA1. This was the auction at the first table:

West	North	East	South
<i>Percario</i>	<i>Z Grossack</i>	<i>Donati</i>	<i>A Grossack</i>
	Pass	Pass	1♣
Pass	1♦	All Pass	

It is virtually de rigueur these days with a weak responding hand to show a major over a one-club opening. But I like Zach Grossack's one-diamond response because his spades are so weak that he did not want to end in a 4-3 fit if partner had a near-minimum 3=4=1=5 or the like. (Yes, here partner

could have passed one spade.)

That was a strange decision by Adam Grossack to pass over one diamond with only a doubleton, even though his partner was a passed hand. I believe he thought they did not have a 4-4 major-suit fit, so why push for a very thin game? And maybe the opponents would back into the auction.

One diamond made with an overtrick.

In the other room:

West	North	East	South
<i>Kristensen</i>	<i>Montanelli</i>	<i>Rosenberg</i>	<i>Chavarria</i>
	Pass	Pass	1NT
Pass	2♣	Pass	2♥
Pass	2NT	Pass	3♠
Pass	4♠	All Pass	

West led the king of clubs. When East encouraged, he continued with the queen of clubs.

Kevin Rosenberg was confident that if his partner had started with ♣ K-Q-x or ♣ K-Q-J, he would have continued with his lowest club at trick two. So, he overtook the queen with his ace and gave his partner a club ruff. A few tricks later, West scored the king of spades to defeat the contract.

That was nicely done, and at double dummy the only winning defence. However, it is not clear that Margherita Chavarria would have made her contract if West had won the first two tricks, then shifted to a diamond.

South would probably have played three rounds of the suit to discard her club. Then she might well have taken the heart finesse, planning to ruff low hearts in the dummy. The finesse works, but she must not cash the ace of hearts and ruff a heart, even high. She must lead a low trump toward the dummy! This all seems unlikely to be found.





THE ELUSIVE SIX-DIAMOND SLAM

PHILLIP ALDER

Round 9, Junior Teams

This was Board 13 from the second match on Saturday:

Dealer North. Both vul.

♠ -- ♥ A Q J 7 4 ♦ A 9 5 3 ♣ A 10 8 5	<table border="1" style="margin: auto;"> <tr><td></td><td>N</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>W</td><td></td><td>E</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>S</td><td></td></tr> </table>		N		W		E		S		♠ K Q 6 4 2 ♥ 10 9 ♦ 10 8 6 4 ♣ K J	♠ A 9 8 5 3 ♥ K 6 3 ♦ -- ♣ Q 7 6 3 2
	N											
W		E										
	S											
	♠ J 10 7 ♥ 8 5 2 ♦ K Q J 7 2 ♣ 9 4											

As mentioned already in these bulletins, six diamonds can be made by North-South. However, with 66 tables in play, only one played in a diamond contract. This was the auction from the Italy-Poland Juniors match:

West	North	East	South
<i>Klukowski</i>	<i>Percario</i>	<i>Zmuda</i>	<i>Donati</i>
	1♥	1♠	2♥
4♠	Dble	Pass	??

This was a common start to the sequence, and other Souths passed. But Giovanni Donati realised that his partner was almost certainly void in spades and likely to have 0=5=4=4 distribution, which meant that the deal would play well in diamonds. So he bid five diamonds, and was raised to six diamonds by his partner, Giacomo Percario. This was doubled by Michal Klukowski. He then led the ace of spades.

After ruffing in the dummy, how did Donati analyse the deal?

He expected to take these twelve tricks: four hearts, five diamonds, one club and two spade ruffs in the dummy. But his communications were difficult. If he played a diamond to his hand and took a losing heart finesse, a trump return from East would be fatal.

Of course, if the heart finesse were winning, then declarer needed only one spade ruff, but he felt that the finesse was an underdog.

Backing his judgment, Donati led the queen of hearts from the dummy at trick two.

West won with his king and now paused for some time. What did he do now?

At the table, he led another spade, which was fatal. It allows declarer to take his second spade ruff without needing to waste a hand entry. Donati just ruffed, drew trumps, and claimed.

If West had returned a heart or a club, it would have defeated the slam.

This was the auction at the other table:

Closed Room:

West	North	East	South
<i>Calmanovici</i>	<i>Kazmierczak</i>	<i>Sau</i>	<i>Nowak</i>
	1♥	1♠	2♥
4♠	Dble	All Pass	

Kamil Nowak did not draw the same inference about his partner's hand that Donati had done. Is there a case for North's bidding four notrumps over four spades? This can hardly be some form of Blackwood. It would not look so good if partner's only values were in spades, but that is most unlikely.

Nowak then led a trump, after which Roberto Sau was under no pressure. He could establish the clubs and get home.

Plus 1540 and plus 790 gave Italy the biggest swing of the tournament so far: 20 imps.



Giovanni Donati celebrated his 18th birthday three days ago (August 5th) during the Championship. Was his birthday wish to make all of his slams?



7 SPADES QUIZ QUESTION

PHILLIP ALDER

The last deal in Murat Molva's article discussed this deal. How do East and West get on in seven spades with everyone looking at all 52 cards?

This is an unusual example of playing from the right side.

If East is the declarer, a trump lead defeats the contract. But if West plays it, he is immune to that lead. He takes the trick as cheaply as possible and immediately takes a club finesse through North. Back to his hand with a trump to his top spade, West repeats the club finesse, cashes the king of clubs and ace of hearts, ruffs a heart in his hand, and runs the clubs to take six spades, one heart, five clubs and one heart ruff.

Board 14. Dealer East. None vul.

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

	N	
W		E
	S	

♠ 5 3

♥ Q 10 8 7

♦ A K J 6 4 2

♣ 9



FUNBRIDGE is looking for brand ambassadors!

Our company GOTO Games is a publisher of PC, mobile and web-based applications which has specialised in the game of bridge for more than 15 years.

Our flagship product is Funbridge, a bridge game available in 13 languages: French, English, Dutch, German, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Polish, Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, simplified and traditional Chinese. Funbridge offers a multitude of game modes and innovative features. We have over 400,000 players from all over the world and more than 1,000,000 deals are played every day.

To find out more about Funbridge, please visit our website: <http://www.funbridge.com>

Brand ambassadors will help develop Funbridge in their country.

Their missions will be (non-exhaustive list): get in touch with their national bridge federation, sign partnerships with bridge clubs, promote Funbridge and provide demonstrations at bridge events, etc.

Their remuneration will be subject to an agreement with the company.

Key qualifications include but are not limited to: strong passion for bridge, motivated, self-starter, effective communication and organisational skills, results focused.

For more information on this opportunity, please contact our Deputy CEO

Jérôme Rombaut:

☎ +33 (0)6 86 52 40 68

✉ jr@funbridge.com

The Funbridge Team



RESULTS - JUNIOR TEAMS

ROUND 12	1	FINLAND	NORWAY	20	36	5.58	14.42
	2	ITALY	ENGLAND	20	45	3.79	16.21
	3	USA1	EGYPT	57	7	19.47	0.53
	4	CANADA	SINGAPORE	30	29	10.33	9.67
	5	FRANCE	BANGLADESH	88	19	20.00	0.00
	6	ARGENTINA	USA2	33	36	9.03	10.97
	7	AUSTRALIA	GERMANY	55	26	16.88	3.12
	8	SWEDEN	CHINA	12	43	2.81	17.19
	9	COLOMBIA	NETHERLANDS	11	78	0.00	20.00
	10	JAPAN	POLAND	7	63	0.01	19.99
	11	HUNGARY	HONG KONG	45	37	12.44	7.56

ROUND 13	1	ARGENTINA	FRANCE	29	38	7.29	12.71
	2	FINLAND	USA2	37	24	12.97	5.53
	3	SWEDEN	USA1	75	13	20.00	0.00
	4	COLOMBIA	ITALY	11	68	-0.50	19.50
	5	JAPAN	HUNGARY	17	41	3.97	16.03
	6	NORWAY	HONG KONG	43	35	12.44	7.56
	7	POLAND	ENGLAND	28	33	8.42	11.58
	8	NETHERLANDS	EGYPT	56	3	19.74	0.26
	9	CHINA	SINGAPORE	26	14	13.48	6.52
	10	GERMANY	BANGLADESH	15	43	3.28	16.72
	11	AUSTRALIA	CANADA	33	23	11.97	6.53

ROUND 14	1	GERMANY	CHINA	15	43	3.28	16.72
	2	USA2	NETHERLANDS	28	30	9.34	10.66
	3	BANGLADESH	POLAND	15	55	1.59	18.41
	4	SINGAPORE	NORWAY	45	12	17.49	2.51
	5	CANADA	FINLAND	9	39	2.96	17.04
	6	ENGLAND	COLOMBIA	47	29	14.85	5.15
	7	HONG KONG	SWEDEN	6	30	3.97	16.03
	8	HUNGARY	AUSTRALIA	59	5	19.83	0.17
	9	ITALY	ARGENTINA	23	30	7.84	12.16
	10	USA1	FRANCE	36	16	15.26	4.74
	11	EGYPT	JAPAN	31	33	9.34	10.66

RANKING AFTER ROUND 14

1	NETHERLANDS	198.31
2	CHINA	193.31
3	USA1	192.46
4	SWEDEN	186.19
5	NORWAY	186.09
6	POLAND	184.00
7	SINGAPORE	164.39
8	ARGENTINA	163.62
9	ITALY	159.21
10	FRANCE	152.14
11	HUNGARY	149.65
12	AUSTRALIA	142.07
13	USA2	136.51
14	HONG KONG	130.76
15	ENGLAND	127.86
16	FINLAND	114.97
17	CANADA	99.48
18	JAPAN	98.45
19	BANGLADESH	91.41
20	COLOMBIA	80.32
21	EGYPT	73.89
22	GERMANY	38.41

RESULTS - GIRLS TEAMS

ROUND 9	31	NETHERLANDS	SINGAPORE	64	1	20.00	0.00
	32	CHILE	ITALY	29	35	8.13	11.87
	33	POLAND	USA	57	21	17.91	2.09
	34	AUSTRALIA	HUNGARY	40	17	15.85	4.15
	35	NORWAY	FRANCE	20	15	11.58	8.42
	36	INDONESIA	CHINESE TAIPEI	65	26	18.29	1.71
	37	CHINA	Bye	0	0	12	0.00

ROUND 10	31	SINGAPORE	ITALY	64	24	18.41	1.59
	32	CHINA	HUNGARY	40	39	10.33	8.67
	33	NETHERLANDS	FRANCE	44	7	18.04	1.96
	34	CHILE	INDONESIA	37	38	9.17	9.83
	35	POLAND	NORWAY	39	19	15.26	4.74
	36	AUSTRALIA	CHINESE TAIPEI	38	36	10.66	9.34
	37	USA	Bye	0	0	12	0.00

ROUND 11	31	HUNGARY	FRANCE	13	32	4.94	15.06
	32	USA	INDONESIA	20	14	11.87	8.13
	33	ITALY	NORWAY	17	14	10.97	9.03
	34	SINGAPORE	AUSTRALIA	41	16	16.21	3.79
	35	CHINA	CHILE	55	14	18.53	1.47
	36	NETHERLANDS	CHINESE TAIPEI	48	11	18.04	1.96
	37	POLAND	Bye	0	0	12	0.00

RANKING AFTER ROUND 11

1	NETHERLANDS	184.14
2	CHINA	172.32
3	USA	128.86
4	POLAND	126.08
5	AUSTRALIA	124.54
6	SINGAPORE	120.92
7	NORWAY	117.11
8	INDONESIA	100.18
9	ITALY	93.57
10	FRANCE	88.68
11	CHILE	76.46
12	CHINESE TAIPEI	58.23
13	HUNGARY	57.91

RESULTS - YOUNGSTERS TEAMS

ROUND 10	21	CHILE	ISRAEL	17	57	1.59	18.41
	22	FRANCE	CHINA	23	23	10.00	10.00
	23	DENMARK	USA	35	21	13.96	6.04
	24	SINGAPORE	SWEDEN	56	19	18.04	1.96
	25	BERMUDA	ITALY	14	44	2.96	17.04
	26	CHINESE TAIPEI	LATVIA	2	89	0.00	20.00
	27	POLAND	INDIA	59	17	18.65	1.35
	28	HONG KONG	GERMANY	39	19	15.26	4.74
	29	BRAZIL	NETHERLANDS	21	61	1.59	18.41

ROUND 11	21	ISRAEL	FRANCE	42	12	17.04	2.96
	22	CHINA	DENMARK	38	54	5.58	14.42
	23	USA	SINGAPORE	55	18	17.54	1.46
	24	SWEDEN	ITALY	1	49	0.72	19.28
	25	CHILE	CHINESE TAIPEI	26	67	0.97	18.03
	26	LATVIA	POLAND	31	62	2.81	17.19
	27	INDIA	HONG KONG	18	33	5.81	14.19
	28	GERMANY	BRAZIL	55	18	18.04	1.96
	29	NETHERLANDS	BERMUDA	60	27	17.49	2.51

ROUND 12	21	DENMARK	ISRAEL	40	13	16.55	3.45
	22	SINGAPORE	CHINA	33	16	14.64	5.36
	23	ITALY	USA	57	34	15.85	4.15
	24	BERMUDA	SWEDEN	0	82	0.00	20.00
	25	CHINESE TAIPEI	FRANCE	10	16	8.13	11.87
	26	POLAND	CHILE	48	15	17.49	2.51
	27	HONG KONG	LATVIA	50	38	13.48	6.52
	28	BRAZIL	INDIA	32	49	5.36	14.64
	29	NETHERLANDS	GERMANY	22	20	10.66	9.34

RANKING AFTER ROUND 12

1	NETHERLANDS	173.22
2	ISRAEL	159.42
3	HONG KONG	156.18
4	ITALY	154.98
5	DENMARK	154.10
6	POLAND	153.39
7	USA	144.60
8	FRANCE	140.37
9	CHINA	139.30
10	SINGAPORE	134.72
11	GERMANY	130.22
12	SWEDEN	122.30
13	CHINESE TAIPEI	113.62
14	LATVIA	89.63
15	INDIA	87.71
16	BRAZIL	49.70
17	CHILE	32.19
18	BERMUDA	17.35

RESULTS - KIDS TEAMS

ROUND 10	41	SWEDEN	ISRAEL	19	44	3.79	16.21
	42	ITALY	CHINA2	15	42	3.45	16.55
	43	POLAND	CANADA	50	5	18.98	1.02
	44	CHINA1	ENGLAND	18	63	1.02	18.98
	45	USA	CZECH REPUBLIC	15	37	4.34	15.66
	46	NETHERLANDS	FRANCE	20	73	0.26	19.74
	47	HUNGARY	INDONESIA	18	51	2.51	17.49

ROUND 11	41	CANADA	ENGLAND	58	27	17.19	2.81
	42	CHINA2	CZECH REPUBLIC	53	30	15.85	4.15
	43	ISRAEL	FRANCE	25	36	6.77	13.23
	44	SWEDEN	HUNGARY	70	15	19.91	0.09
	45	ITALY	NETHERLANDS	38	50	6.52	13.48
	46	POLAND	USA	78	34	18.87	1.13
	47	CHINA1	INDONESIA	96	2	20.00	0.00

ROUND 12	41	CHINA2	CANADA	48	11	18.04	1.96
	42	ISRAEL	ENGLAND	51	31	15.26	4.74
	43	SWEDEN	CZECH REPUBLIC	17	23	8.13	11.87
	44	ITALY	FRANCE	17	63	0.92	19.08
	45	POLAND	HUNGARY	102	0	20.00	0.00
	46	CHINA1	NETHERLANDS	20	52	2.66	17.34
	47	USA	INDONESIA	48	23	16.21	3.79

RANKING AFTER ROUND 12

1	FRANCE	203.03
2	CHINA2	182.32
3	POLAND	179.21
4	ISRAEL	166.92
5	CHINA1	145.64
6	NETHERLANDS	122.69
7	USA	121.95
8	ENGLAND	114.07
9	CANADA	113.30
10	INDONESIA	85.65
11	SWEDEN	84.90
12	CZECH REPUBLIC	83.11
13	ITALY	67.24
14	HUNGARY	8.97



/WorldBridgeFederation



WBOfficial



@WorldBridgeFed



14th HCL International Bridge Championship

DATE:

October 19 - 23, 2016

VENUE:

JW Marriott Hotel
New Delhi Aerocity



Asset Area 4 - Hospitality District, Delhi Aerocity, New Delhi 110037, India. Phone: +91-11-4521 2121

www.marriott.com/hotels/travel/delap-jw-marriott-hotel-new-delhi-aerocity/

₹12.1 Million

US\$ 180,000

2nd highest prize money in any
bridge tournament worldwide

UNDER THE AUSPICES OF



www.hcl-bridge.com