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# WELCOME TO JESOLO 



## Welcome from Panos

Welcome to the 21st European Youth Championships and welcome to Jesolo. It is very nice to welcome 50 teams from 26 countries to this year's event and I hope that everyone will enjoy Venice and the area of Jesolo that is hosting us. A great thank you goes to the local authorities for the excellent facilities they have made available to us. It is wonderful to be again in Italy and to enjoy the hospitality of the Italian Bridge Federation, who were also the hosts of the previous event.
I hope that you all reach your individual goals in this championship and also that you use the opportunity to visit one of the greatest locations in Europe. Have a great game.

Panos Gerontopoulos
(Chairman EBL Youth Committee)
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| VUGRAPH |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Romania - Turkey (Juniors) | 10.00 |
| Italy - Hungary (Juniors) | 14.00 |
| Sweden - Netherlands (Girls) | 17.30 |
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## JUNIOR TEAMS



ROUND I

| Match |  |  |  | IMP's |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I VP's |  |  |  |  |
| I | GREECE | ITALY | $60-51$ | $17-13$ |
| 2 | PORTUGAL | GERMANY | $25-23$ | $15-15$ |
| 3 | NETHERLANDS | RUSSIA | $71-35$ | $22-8$ |
| 4 | FRANCE | DENMARK | $46-73$ | $9-2 I$ |
| 5 | NORWAY | HUNGARY | $70-25$ | $24-6$ |
| 6 | AUSTRIA | POLAND | $38-66$ | $8-20$ |
| 7 | SCOTLAND | ENGLAND | $62-17$ | $24-6$ |
| 8 | LATVIA | BELGIUM | $38-10$ | $21-9$ |
| 9 | TURKEY | CZECH REPUBLIC | $42-62$ | $11-19$ |
| IO CROATIA | ROMANIA | $33-34$ | $15-15$ |  |
| II SLOVAKIA | SWEDEN | $37-45$ | $14-16$ |  |

## RANKING AFTER ROUND I

| I NORWAY | 24 |
| :---: | ---: |
| SCOTLAND | 24 |
| 3 NETHERLANDS | 21,5 |
| 4 DENMARK | 21 |
| LATVIA | 21 |
| 6 POLAND | 20 |
| 7 CZECH REPUBLIC | 18,5 |
| 8 GREECE | 17 |
| 9 SWEDEN | 15,5 |
| 10 PORTUGAL | 15 |
| ROMANIA | 15 |
| CROATIA | 15 |
| GERMANY | 13,5 |
| 14 SLOVAKIA | 13 |
| 15 ITALY | 10,5 |
| 16 TURKEY | 9 |
| 17 BELGIUM | 9 |
| FRANCE | 8 |
| 19 AUSTRIA | 7,5 |
| 20 RUSSIA | 6 |
| $2 I ~ E N G L A N D ~$ | 6 |
| HUNGARY |  |
|  |  |


|  |  | ROUND |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | SLOVAKIA | GREECE |
| 2 | SWEDEN | CROATIA |
| 3 | ROMANIA | TURKEY |
| 4 | CZECH REPUBLIC | LATVIA |
| 5 | BELGIUM | SCOTLAND |
| 6 | ENGLAND | AUSTRIA |
| 7 | POLAND | NORWAY |
| 8 | HUNGARY | FRANCE |
| 9 | DENMARK | NETHERLANDS |
| IO RUSSIA | PORTUGAL |  |
| II GERMANY | ITALY |  |

## ROUND 3

| I | GREECE | RUSSIA |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | GERMANY | DENMARK |
| 3 | ITALY | HUNGARY |
| 4 | PORTUGAL | POLAND |
| 5 | NETHERLANDS | ENGLAND |
| 6 | FRANCE | BELGIUM |
| 7 | NORWAY | CZECH REPUBLIC |
| 8 | AUSTRIA | ROMANIA |
| 9 | SCOTLAND | SWEDEN |
| IO | LATVIA | SLOVAKIA |
| II | TURKEY | CROATIA |

## Today's Schedule

10.00 Junior \& Girls Teams, Round 2
14.00 Junior \& Girls Teams, Round 3
17.30 Girls Teams, Round 4


Discrimination against the legal profession?

A notice in Italian on the beach at Jesolo has this English translation below: No solicitors permitted in umbrella area

## GIRLS TEAMS

RESULTS

ROUND

|  |  | Match | IMP's | VP's |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| I | POLAND | TURKEY | $65-35$ | $21-9$ |
| 2 | GERMANY | ITALY | $39-27$ | $17-13$ |
| 3 | SWEDEN | ENGLAND | $3-52$ | $5-25$ |
| 4 | DENMARK | ESTONIA | $9-58$ | $5-25$ |
| 5 | ISRAEL | LATVIA | $50-46$ | $16-14$ |
| 6 | NETHERLANDS NORWAY | $67-37$ | $21-9$ |  |

## RANKING AFTER ROUND I

| I ENGLAND | 25 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 2 ESTONIA | 24,5 |
| 3 NETHERLANDS | 21 |
| 4 POLAND | 20,5 |
| 5 GERMANY | 17 |
| 6 ISRAEL | 15,5 |
| 7 LATVIA | 13,5 |
| 8 ITALY | 13 |
| 9 NORWAY | 9 |
| 10 TURKEY | 8,5 |
| II SWEDEN | 5 |
| 12 DENMARK | 4,5 |



## ROUND 3

| I | POLAND | DENMARK |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | ISRAEL | SWEDEN |
| 3 | NETHERLANDS | GERMANY |
| 4 | NORWAY | TURKEY |
| 5 | LATVIA | ITALY |
| 6 | ESTONIA | ENGLAND |


|  |  | ROUND |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I | ENGLAND | POLAND |
| 2 | ITALY | ESTONIA |
| 3 | TURKEY | LATVIA |
| 4 | GERMANY | NORWAY |
| 5 | SWEDEN | NETHERLANDS |
| 6 | DENMARK | ISRAEL |

## Sports News

## Football

Defending Copa America champions Brazil twice lost their lead against Uruguay before triumphing on penalties in a bad-tempered semi-final. The score was 2-2 after 90 minutes and stayed the same through extra time. Brazil came through by $5-4$ in the penalty shoot-out.
West Ham have completed the signing of striker Craig Bellamy from Liverpool for a club record $£ 7.5 \mathrm{~m}$. The 27 -year-oldWales captain has signed a five-year contract after just one season at Anfield.

## Cycling - Tour de France

Thor Hushovd (CA) won the fifth stage of the Tour de France after receiving an ideal lead-out from Julian Dean. The New Zealand champion towed his Norwegian colleague up to the 250 meter to go mark and delivered him into an unbeatable position. The victory moves Hushovd from ninth to second place in the general classification, behind the previous leader, Fabian Cancellara (CSC).

## Cavendish 2007 Henderson, Nevada

The Cavendish Teams and Auction Pairs were held in Henderson, just outside Las Vegas, this May. The format of the Teams is straightforward: a nine-round Swiss, with playbacks against previously met teams permitted over the last three matches. The Teams is run with a straight entry fee, winner getting about $30 \%$ of the pot, with prizes for the first three places and an ascender's prize. Here are some of the deals that caught my eye.

Dealer South. E/WVul.

|  | \& Q 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 10982 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AK 10 |  |
|  | \& 1052 |  |
| ¢ J 874 | N | ¢ K 109532 |
| $\bigcirc$ KQ 53 | W E | $\bigcirc$ J 6 |
| $\diamond$ Q 7642 | W E | $\checkmark 8$ |
| 9 | S | ¢ A 853 |
|  | ¢ A |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 74$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 953 |  |
|  | 2 K Q J 976 |  |

You reach 5\% doubled as South after East has overcalled I 4 , and win the spade lead to lay down the K and find the bad news. RHO ducks this trick and the second top club as LHO pitches spades, suggesting he began with four. What next? Say you play a heart to dummy's ace and a third club. RHO wins and leads the spade king. Plan the play.
If you ruff in, you will find yourself unable to execute a squeeze, even though your LHO has four hearts and the guarded $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$. You run out of trumps, or re-entries to hand. Best is to discard a heart now on the spade king, and when the defenders lead another spade, you can ruff, and run the trumps, having rectified the count with genuine pressure against West.


On the penultimate trump West still has to make a discard in the diagrammed ending, and whatever he does concedes the rest.

Note that at trick three the defenders can prevail if declarer ducks a heart, by simply winning and leading a top spade and then another spade when in with the club ace. Even more curiously, if declarer leads a low trump from hand at trick three to dummy's ten, East can set the hand by ducking - and if he gets to win a heart must NOT cash the A : By retaining the e A to ruff in with at a critical moment, the defence should always have the upper hand. This seems to run counter to all rules on defence, to the effect that you DON'T want to leave yourself with the master trump on defence, but should win it to leave yourself with a small trump. Ducking the club ace appears to cost at least one tempo, but the trick comes back with interest.
On our next exhibit declarer started well, then lost his way.


Playing against Meckstroth and Johnson, Pierre Zimmerman declared 3NT from the South seat here. This was after Franck Multon (North, playing a mini no-trump) had opened $\mathrm{l} \diamond$. After a club lead to the king and ace, he led a heart to the nine, a good start (though not as good as running the $\vee I 0$ !). Now, however, he tried the $\vee A$ and another heart, on which Meckstroth as East pitched an encouraging diamond. At this point Johnson's shift to a diamond doomed South to one down. Ducking a spade at trick three might have been better both in theory and in practice to preserve communications. Meckstroth can win the外 to shift to the $\%$, covered all around, but now can do no better than to return a diamond won in dummy.
Declarer must be careful now. The winning line appears to be to cash the spade and diamond winners, ending up in dummy. After nine tricks (two clubs, two diamonds, one heart and four spades) declarer reduces to two clubs and two hearts in hand, but West keeps three hearts and a bare $\stackrel{2}{2}$. Declarer has no exit from dummy to endplay West and can only score one more trick, since East can keep enough diamond winners.
Instead declarer cashes only two diamond and two spades, ending in hand:


Declarer exits with the ${ }^{2}$, letting West cash two clubs and then be endplayed to concede the rest.
At another table Mark Lair played 3NT from the North seat on the $\diamond$ Q lead, on which West was systemically obliged to unblock the $\triangleleft I 0$. Lair ducked, won the high diamond continuation and led a spade, ducking East's 1 . Now East could not continue diamonds, and probably should just have played a spade. But he shifted to a heart. Lair carefully put up dummy's 810 , and when West covered it was all over. Declarer had three tricks in each major and three minor-suit winners for +400 and II IMPs.
A bidding problem next. As West you deal and pass with no one vulnerable, but soon face a high-level decision.

Dealer West. None Vul.

- A Q 2

〉985
$\diamond$ KJ9 74
\& 108

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | 20 |
| 320 | Pass | 4* | Pass |
| $4 \checkmark$ | Pass | 48 | Pass |

Your 3e bid simply showed a limit raise as a passed hand (a jump to 3 might have been an alternative, as a fitjump, though this would normally deliver four trumps). Anyway, what now?
The hand opposite is:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \& \text { KJ } 10863 \\
& \& \text { AK } 10 \\
& \diamond \text { Q } 3 \\
& \& \text { AQ }
\end{aligned}
$$

So 6 makes by ruffing out diamonds, assuming no incredibly hostile breaks. Madala/Sementa reached slam using natural methods:

| Madala | North | Sementa | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | 29 |
| 3\% | Pass | 48 | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | 45 | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | 64 | All Pass |

Sementa's bid achieved its aim of making it clear at once that this was a slam-decision not a game-decision. Madala's jump to 54 was well-conceived (good trumps, nothing else to say).
Bertheau and Nystrom also managed to get to slam, using as lot more delicate modern science.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bertheau | Paulissen | Nystrom | Bruggeman |
| Pass | Pass | 1\%(i) | 29 |
| $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | 3NT(ii) | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 64 | All Pass |  |  |

(i) Strong Club
(ii) No shortage

The key here was that when Bertheau, as a passed hand, heard his partner make a slam try, he realized he was as good as could be; playing a strong club system he had denied even holding a jack more than he actually did. His $4 \diamond$ try denied a club control, so when his partner cooperated he knew he was facing a hand with a club control, and simply used Keycard to drive to slam, in spades of course.
Reaching slam here may not sound so impressive, but it turned out to be a very difficult hand for standard methods - very few pairs reached slam since even after a Drury auction it is hard for East to envisage both the good spades and the source of tricks from the passed hand.
Consider the South hand on our next exhibit. After the auction starts (I®) - Pass - (I ) to you it would be hard to quarrel with a call of 2 ; but minors are for children these days. Mark Jacobus tried INT and are promptly raised to 3 NT. Now he had to play it on the lead of the club two.


Mark ran the lead around to his hand and was delighted with the result. He cleared the clubs, and when West won the third club and shifted to spades, Jacobus ducked once, then won the heart shift, and knocked out the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$. Then he took the second spade, cutting the defenders' communica-
tions, to cash 2 . At this point he simply took his heart and diamond winners (West pitching one heart on the third round of diamonds) to exit with the $8 J$ at trick 12 to West. At trick 13, that defender had to give dummy the ninth trick with the 810 . That was good for 6 IMPs - the opponents in the same seats never bid, and defended $2 \triangleleft$ down 200.
The teams title came down to a four-way horse race. Kasle (Casen, Krekorian/Diamond, Chambers/Schermer) led going into the final match, and won it narrowly against Deutsch (Soloway, Cohen/Smith,Versace/Giubilo).That was enough for them to retain their lead, while Deutsch finished second, yet again (this is the third time in four years). They were one VP in front of Welland (Willenken, Madala/Sementa) who won their final match by enough to take third place from Narasimhan, and push the latter out of the prizes.
The format of the Pairs has been tinkered with over the years, but remains broadly the same: a field of close to 60 pairs with three-board rounds against all or most of the field. The key to the event is that all the partnerships are auctioned off the night before the event starts, and the main prizes go to the owners of the pairs, (who may well not be the players themselves) although there are some smaller prizes for the players. This year the format of the auction had been subtly modified - and as a consequence dramatically improved from the players' perspectives. A pre-auction phase of 48 hours had let the favourites and everyone else be bid on by the general public.
Only those pairs who had been bid on went forward to the


Fredrik Nystrom
auction - the rest were sold to themselves for $\$ 12,500$. Total auction proceeds went to just short of \$1.2 M - a step up from last year, and a far more enjoyable process than one in which the auctioneer sits around in an embarrassed silence, waiting unsuccessfully for pairs to be bid on. As usual, Levin/Weinstein went at the top of the list, with Helness/Helgemo not far behind.
Cross-IMPs work like Butler IMPs; you compare your result and score up like in a team game with each of the other 26 pairs sitting the other way to you. So the numbers become inflated by a factor of 26. The only problem with the cross-IMP format is that one huge swing against you, which may not be your fault, can destroy a set. And this event there were a lot of slams, and what seemed like a remarkable number of bad splits (In one session the BEST trump break in a diamond slam was 4-0! There were two four-zero breaks and a five-zero break). But for the most part the players had their own fates in their hands.
On the following deal, for example, E/W have to do their best in the auction, $N / S$ then have to provide the most challenging defence.

Dealer East. N/SVul.

|  | ¢ 64 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - A 64 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 85 |  |
|  | ¢KJ632 |  |
| ¢ AKQ 853 | N | 49 |
| $\bigcirc$ K 10 | W E | $\bigcirc$ Q J 832 |
| $\diamond$ Q 9 |  | $\checkmark$ AK 432 |
| \% Q 105 | S | 298 |
|  | \& J 1072 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 975$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 1076$ |  |
|  | \& A 7 |  |

3NT by West is a fair spot (if you avoid four club losers, which you will do three-quarters of the time, you are still by no means home, though favourite to succeed). 4eis considerably worse than needing spades 3-3. However, Tarek Sadek and Ahmed Hussein managed to find a way to $4 \checkmark$ here, which looks to me to be the best game. Hussein responded 14, then used fourth suit (doubled by Wafik Abdou, North) and eventually arranged to give preference to hearts. On the lead of the A and another club, Abdou got to play a third club and Sadek had to decide whether to ruff high or low. The percentage play might be to ruff low, or with the $\vee 8$, but the double and the lead make it just a fraction closer than it might appear in abstract. Sadek erred by ruffing high, then led a heart to the $\vee \mathrm{K}$. Abdou thoughtfully ducked, won the next heart, and led a fourth club to promote the $\vee 9$ for down one. Quite a few pairs allowed 44 (or occasionally 3NT) to make but very few other pairs found their way to $4 \checkmark$; Pszczola/Vainikonis bid $I \vee-2 \wedge-3 \triangleleft-3 \vee-4 \bigcirc$ to earn their +420 on a less testing defence.

|  | Dealer South. N/S Vul. |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | - A Q 87 |
|  | ¢K87 |
|  | $\checkmark$ A Q 6 |
|  | - QJ 4 |
| - | N |
| $\bigcirc 952$ | W E 8 AQJ6 |
| $\checkmark$ K 10973 | W E $\quad \checkmark$ J2 |
| -107652 | S AK98 |
|  | - KJ109653 |
|  | $\bigcirc 1043$ |
|  | $\checkmark 85$ |
|  | - 3 |

The most interesting declarer play deal of the Pairs event saw many declarers succeed, and some fail. At the table I was watching, Mike Passell was at the helm in 49 (Casen might have responded 3NT to 24 and had an easier time). Against 44, John Diamond led the $\diamond I 0$. Passell finessed, then without stripping the diamonds, played a second trump and a club to the jack. Krekorian won and exited with a diamond. Passell now eliminated clubs before diamonds - a mistake? At this point in the four-card ending, with three hearts and a spade in both hands, he led a low heart. Diamond's careful play of the $\varnothing 9$ doomed him to down one.
Note that on the diamond lead, declarer surely does best to finesse then strip off diamonds in the process of drawing trumps. Now he leads a club to the 2 Q and ek . To give the defence a chance, East must win and smoothly return a low club! (Or in a similar position he must duck when declarer leads the bare club honour from the board.) Now if declarer falls for the bait he will assume the missing club honour is on the left and produce the same losing position as Passell took. +620 would have been worth 168 IMPs; -I00 earned E/W I29 IMPs.
By contrast, at another table Hugh McGann played 4s on a club lead and ducked in dummy - a nice deceptive manoeuvre. Rodwell took the \%K and \&A. McGann ruffed and simply took both red-suit finesses to make his game (assuming that Rodwell might have come into the bidding with all four of the missing key-cards).
Ashley Bach played 4s after pre-empting 34, stolidly raised to 4s by Michael Cornell, over which Christiansen did not double. On a diamond lead he duplicated Passell's approach of not eliminating diamonds or trumps before playing a club to the jack. He won the diamond return and led a low club from dummy, Christiansen flickering before ducking. So he ruffed, crossed to a second trump and ruffed a diamond, then drew a third trump and led the club jack, planning to discard a heart whether Christiansen covered or not.
Fredrik Nystrom played 4s after opening 2s with the South hand. On the accurate heart lead he ducked, won the trump shift and eliminated diamonds and trumps before playing a club to the jack and ace to endplay East. West's discards and the opening lead had essentially forced him to get the position right. David Berkowitz got this position right he had been doubled in 4s so it was even easier for him.

The best result on defence came when Bakkeren/Bertens defended 54 after a three-level pre-empt from their opponents. The defenders led a heart and shifted to trumps, and when declarer played on clubs before diamonds there was no longer any endplay for down one.
Of course, E/W could get into the auction- at their own risk. Roy Welland as West heard the auction go 24 - Pass - 3NT, back to him. He doubled (light take-out or penalties - and a great view! ) and ran to $4 \%$ when it was redoubled. Willenken sacrificed in $5 \%$ over 44 and Welland ruffed the opening spade lead, tried a club to the 9 and claimed +750 for 297 IMPs! Well, perhaps claiming is not the right expression; 5 doubled might seem easy after that start but it requires a little care. Compare what happened to two declarers here. Doub ruffed the spade, passed the $\% 10$, and when that held he took a heart finesse and clamed II tricks a few moments later. A less careful declarer led a club to the nine and ran the $\diamond \mathrm{J}$ - and Hamman as North ducked! Nice play Bob; now declarer could ruff a spade to hand to take one heart finesse, but had no more entries to repeat the finesse, and had to go down one (of course had declarer led a diamond to the $\diamond I 0$ this position could not have arisen).
And that is not the end of the story; against Woolsey, declarer led a low club at trick two - and Woolsey split his honours! Now declarer feared that if he took a diamond finesse he might run into a ruff, so he played for clubs 2-2 and simply cashed the club ace; down one! +100 was actually a small loss for N/S but a lot better than letting 5\% make. At double-dummy declarer can succeed in $5 \%$ but he must be very careful.At trick three after North splits his club honours he leads a diamond to the ten and queen, and ruffs the spade return. Now he finesses in hearts, plays a diamond to the nine, ducked, and repeats the heart finesse, cashes the heart ace, and leads a third diamond. North wins and can do no better than lead a third spade, giving declarer the critical extra entry to hand for the trump finesse.
Just for reference; 13 pairs made game as N/S, six as E/W. Quite a few of the field did not do very well in the auction on our next exhibit - but were given a friendly lead, quite the reverse of what happened at our featured table.

Dealer South. N/S Vul.

\[

\]

| -102 | N | - KQ 85 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 9543$ |  | ¢ J 872 |
| $\checkmark \mathrm{A} \mathrm{Q}^{7}$ | W E | $\checkmark 832$ |
| \& 1765 | S | \& 43 |
|  | \& J |  |
|  | $\triangle$ AKQ 10 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 109654 |  |
|  | - K 10 |  |

The only East who found a diamond lead against 4as Gawrys (South had bid and rebid the suit, but N/S had
started a cuebidding sequence and bypassed diamonds). By contrast, Versace declared 3NT when Giubilo bid his black suits once, then gave up after his partner expressed no interest. However, David Birman did remarkably well when he led the $\$ 10$ to the $\$ \mathrm{Q}$ and Altschuler shifted to the $\triangle 7$ and QK - on which Birman discouraged. Now came a diamond; Birman took the $\forall A$ and played a second spade, ducked by Versace (who had to guess who had the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ ) around to the 48 for the critical club shift. Again, nicely defended. Birman covered Versace's 10 with the $\%$ and now there were no communications left between the two hands. So all Versace could do was come to the 9 K and try the $\Delta 9$. Birman took his $\diamond$ Q and exited with a club to dummy, and sat back for the third spade winner. Down one. Since 21 out of the 27 N/S pairs bid and made 3NT, many with overtricks, it looks like the Israeli E/W pair earned their IMPs here.
Could declarer have done better? Yes, at double dummy, if he infers that the spades rate to be 4-2 with the opening leader quite likely to have the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$ (else he might have ducked the $\diamond$ A or given a little more thought to it?) Declarer takes the second spade and makes the critical move when he leads the 98 to the 2 K , overtakes the 10 with the A , cashes the Q and gets out with the 2 to the m !
This manoeuvre prevents West from unblocking in clubs, so as to leave dummy on lead and endplayed. The defence have been gifted a club trick but now have to return a red suit around to declarer, and end up taking two diamonds, one club and just one spade trick. Now THAT would have given the brilliancy award to declarer, not the defenders!
Our next deal is another unusual declarer-play hand. I think N/S made three very nice decisions; first in the bidding, then at trick one, and finally at trick two.

Dealer East. N/S Vul.

|  | ¢ Q 108 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ KQ 74 |  |
|  | $\checkmark \mathrm{K} 6$ |  |
|  | \% Q 832 |  |
| \& 19632 | N | - K 7 |
| $\bigcirc$ - |  | $\bigcirc 108532$ |
| $\diamond$ J 1053 |  | $\checkmark$ A 982 |
| ¢ J 654 | S | \& K 7 |
|  | (A54 |  |
|  | PAJ96 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 74 |  |
|  | \& A 109 |  |

Howard Weinstein (South) and Gary Cohler bid INT $3 \diamond$ (optional Stayman) - 3NT.Weinstein felt his 4-3-3-3 pattern allowed him to bypass what in context was a pretty decent major; well done. In 3NT on a low spade lead, Weinstein put in the $£ 8$ at trick one and was delighted by the result. (The reason why this play is correct is that even if the 10 were to hold, West having led from the K-J, you would still not be assured of nine tricks if you misguessed clubs, whichever defender you lost the trick to. A diamond or spade play might embarrass you from one side or the other). But when Weinstein put in the $\$ 8$ and took the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ with the he could now pass the at once, so that
even if it lost to the ${ }^{2}$ and a diamond came back, he could now finesse the second club into the safe hand. This line actually ensures nine tricks, whatever the lie of the cards. As it was, declarer emerged with three spades, three clubs, four hearts and one diamond for +660 .
Incidentally, Mike Passell played $4 \oslash$ on a low spade lead and guessed to put on the $\$ 8$ as well. Now he had avoided a spade loser so when he found the 5-0 heart break, all he needed was to guess the clubs, which he did, and he had his contract.


In 3NT by East, you or I would know to lead fourth highest from our longest and strongest - wouldn't we? Verhees led the normal $\diamond$ Q of course, and Rogoff guessed to overtake. When this was ducked, Rogoff returned the $\diamond 4$ and East put in the $\diamond 9$ on the second round. Verhees won and could see that he needed to shift; what was the right suit to play?
On a low spade shift (even assuming partner is kind enough to possess the $\$ 9$ and $\$ 9$ that the shift does not cost) declarer will surely win the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ and take a club finesse. Eventually he will have little option but to drop your $\oslash Q$ in the ending.
Verhees instead switched at trick three to the $\vee 10$ ! Declarer did not put up the $\vee \mathrm{J}$. Instead he won in hand, led a spade to the $\mathbf{~ K}$, and took a club finesse.Verhees won and returned a club, and declarer now went for the endplay. After the $\Phi$ A and two clubs he had reduced to:


When he cashed the $\diamond A$ and crossed to dummy with a club, North bought into the game and pitched a low heart, then the ${ }^{\$}$. Now East could legitimately hope that North


Tor Helness
had begun life with $\Phi \mathbf{Q J x x}$ and $\oslash \mathrm{Qxxx}$. If that were so, a spade play would now endplay North to lead a heart around to the $\vee$ J. Unlucky - down one and a sadder if not wiser declarer.
With one round to go the event had come down to a horse race between Weinstein/Levin and Casen/Passell, with Rogoff/Verhees still having an outside chance.What do you think your chances are like in game here?


Passell as North played a quiet $3 \%$, making +130 , but Steve Weinstein was at the helm in 3NT:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 18 | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}(G F)$ |
| Pass | $30(\mathrm{i})$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

(i) Splinter

West led a top spade and continued unimaginatively with the spade ten. After dummy let go a heart, East pitched a heart too. Declarer took the king, and led the heart ten, West following with an unreadable (upside-down) four. East ducked, and declarer now shifted to clubs, partner following once and pitching two spades that suggested he had seven to begin with. What now? This was the ending with East on lead.

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ 187 | N | 1- |
| $\bigcirc(7)$ | $W^{\text {c }}$ | $\bigcirc$ A 96 |
| $\diamond 765$ (2) | W E | $\diamond$ A Q 109 |
| 9- | S | 2- |
|  | - A 9 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc(7)$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 4 (2) |  |
|  | 2 J 9 |  |

The bracketed cards in theWest and South hands represent the dilemma that East had. If South had begun with a 4-2-2-5 shape and an II-count, the ace and queen of diamonds would leave declarer with eight tricks. If declarer had the 4-I-3-5 pattern a low diamond now would set the game and nothing else would work. East had several indications to get this right as well as some to get it wrong. Weinstein's game-forcing $2 \%$ call on an II-count was much more likely to have two trumps than one.And West might have pitched a heart to clarify the count there if he had possessed one. But West's earlier defence might suggest he would not have found the heart discard even if he had had one!
Whatever the rights and wrongs of this, East did lead back a low diamond, and Weinstein put on the $\diamond$ J and claimed nine tricks a moment later, since he did indeed start life with the 4-2-2-5 shape.
So was your opinion that game should not make here? Wrong! When Roy Welland had the West cards he bid a natural (if frivolous) 24 as West at his first turn, and was raised to 4s by a partner without a sense of humour. Try and defeat the game when declarer first play in trumps is to lead a spade to the eight! For making 3NT Weinstein/Levin gained 280 IMPs; losing 200 would have cost them 14I IMPs - not quite enough to overturn the final results.

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Psn Cross } \\ \text { IMPs } \end{gathered}$ |  | Name | (Price) | Auction Player |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pool |  | Pool |
| 1 | 3455 |  | Bobby Levin - Steve Weinstein | (47) | 274.4 | 28.4 |
| 2 | 2987 | Drew Casen - Mike Passell | (20) | 176.4 | 18.3 |
| 3 | 2747 | Bruce Rogoff - Louk Verhees | (12.5) | 117.6 | 12.2 |
| 4 | 2664 | Curtis Cheek - Joe Grue | (35) | 88.2 | 9.1 |
| 5 | 1880 | Geir Helgemo - Tor Helness | (46) | 78.4 | 8.1 |
| 6 | 1738 | John Kranyak - G.Wolpert | (13.5) | 68.6 | 7.1 |
| 7 | 1594 | Robert Blanchard - Sam Lev | (12.5) | 58.8 | 6.1 |
| 8 | 1525 | Michael Elinescu - E Wladow | (12.5) | 49 | 5.1 |
| 9 | 1314 | Eric Greco - Geoff Hampson | (41) | 39.2 | 4.1 |
| 10 | 1235 | Peter Fredin - Michael Moss | (12.5) | 29.4 | 3.0 |

## The 3rd European Open Championships

The 3rd European Open Championships were held in Antalya, Turkey, during the second half of June 2007. The Kremlin Palace Hotel offered a complete package of allinclusive meals and drinks which some players liked very much and others disliked equally strongly. It is, of course, impossible to make everyone happy and the EBL will have to examine the player feedback carefully before making plans for future tournaments.
The playing rooms were generally good, though the frequent power losses were a mild irritant and played havoc with the BBO coverage at times. And, of course, it was hot. There appears to be a law of nature which dictates that wherever these championships are held will, for their duration, enjoy(?) record temperatures - could I recommend Greenland as the venue for 2009?
The first six days were given over to the Mixed events. Winners of the Mixed Teams were the Israel/England combination of Matilda and Lilo Poplilov, Heather and Jeremy Dhondy, while the Mixed Pairs was won by Rosen Gunev and Dessislava Popova of Bulgaria.
On to the second part of the championships, nine days of Open, Women's and Senior events. The Open Teams was won by another transnational combination, this time featuring France and Israel - Michel and Thomas Bessis, Eldad Ginossar and Ron Pachman. The Open Pairs was won by Victor Aronov and Julian Stefanov of Bulgaria. Carla Arnolds and Bep Vriend of the Netherlands did the double by winning both the Women's Pairs and Teams. In the latter they were joined by Jet Pasman and Anneke Simons, Marion Michielsen and Meike Wortel, also of the Netherlands. The Senior Teams was won by the USA/lsrael combination of Amos Kaminski and Yeshayahu Levit, Sam Lev and Pinhas Romik, Rami Sheinman and Adrian Schwartz, while the Senior Pairs went to France, in the persons of Patrick Grenthe and Philippe Vanhoutte.
Their were substantial cash prizes for the best players in the three categories over the whole tournament, each player's best three results counting. Russia's Andrei Gromor won the Open ahead of Victor Aronov and Michel Bessis; Nevena Senior of England won the Women's award from Heather Dhondy, with the Dutch pair, Carla Arnolds and BepVriend, tied for third; Patrick Grenthe won the Senior award ahead of Phillipe Vanhoutte and Dana de Falco of Italy.
Israel and Bulgaria did particularly well at the championships. Israel had representatives in three of the four gold medal winning teams, plus an Israeli won a silver medal in the Women's Teams (Matilda Poplilov), and a bronze in the Senior Teams (Shalom Zeligman).As well as the winners already listed, Bulgaria had the bronze medalists in the Senior Pairs (Christo Drumev and Ivan Tanev), and one of the Mixed Pairs silver medalists (Victor Aronov), plus, both Poplilovs and Nevena Senior (who won three medals, silver in both Women's events and bronze in the Mixed Teams) are ex-Bulgarian internationals. Indeed, they won the first European Women's Pairs Championship together back in 1987.

Lilo Poplilov was one of the heroes of our first deal from the Mixed Teams.

Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- A 94
-A5
$\diamond$ K Q 72
KJ72
- K 32
©K763
$\diamond$ J 1065
996

- Q 108

Q QJ 4
$\diamond$ A 43
\& 10843

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | INT | Pass | $3 N T$ |

All Pass
In the other room, Michael Barel played 3NT on the lead of the ten of hearts. He played low and won the ace, played a diamond to the ace and ran the ten of clubs. East won the $\% \mathrm{Q}$ and played aheart to the king, West clearing the suit. Barel threw a spade from hand and now played a club to the king, ducked by East. Barel now read the position nicely. He cashed his diamond winners and exited with a club.


Nicklas Sandqvist

East won and cashed the fourth heart, declarer pitching his losing diamond. East was endplayed and forced to lead a spade. Barel guesses correctly, putting in the ten, so had nine tricks for +600 .
East again led a heart against Poplilov. This was covered by jack, king and ace and Poplilov crossed to the ace of diamonds to play a club to the jack and queen. He ducked the heart return but had to win the next round, on which he pitched a spade. A club went to the king and ace and East cashed her last heart, on which Poplilov threw spades from both hands. East exited with a spade to the now bare ace. When Poplilov now cashed the two club winners West was squeezed in spades and diamonds to give nine tricks for +600 and a flat board.
Nick Sandqvist of the English de Botton team, who won the bronze medal in the Mixed, played this nice squeeze.

Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.

- J 74
$\bigcirc$ Q
$\diamond$ KQJ932
Q ${ }^{2}$

| ¢ 5 | W E |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ AKJI |  |  | $\bigcirc 72$ |
| $\diamond 764$ | W |  | $\checkmark 105$ |
| \% K 97 |  |  | 2 A 1085 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A |  |  |
|  | 96 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sandqvist | Sussel | Senior | Lustin |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 18 | $2 \diamond$ | 24 | 3 - |
| 38 | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |

In the other room, the French E/W pair played the inferior contract of $4 \%$, which was unsuccessful, offering the chance of a big swing if Sandqvist could bring home his contract.
The defence began with the king of diamonds, overtaken by the ace. Christine Lustin returned a diamond to Patrick Sussel's jack and Sussel played the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$, ruffed with the seven and over-ruffed with the eight. Lustin now led a trump. Sandqvist thought for a while then played the ace. Then he played three more rounds of hearts, coming down to three cards in each black suit in dummy.
Sandqvist's card-reading convinced him that the \$K was offside. On the assumption that North held the $\$$, it would not matter who held the clubs as there would be a squeeze. On the next trump, North was compelled to pitch a spade to keep the club guard and the e 10 went from dummy. South threw a club, though it didn't matter. Sandqvist continued with a spade to the ace followed by the $\Phi$ Q, ruffing out the king and pinning the jack in the process. The $\$ 10$ was the tenth trick.
Poland's Andrzej Jeleniewsky and Egypt's Mohammed Heshmat played this next squeeze played this next squeeze identically, card for card.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
\& K Q 98752
$\bigcirc 65$
$\diamond 5$
\& 852

| - A 3 | N | - J 104 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ AKQ 108 |  | $\bigcirc 1$ |
| $\diamond 832$ | W E | $\diamond$ K QJ 1074 |
| ¢ A 64 | S | 2 Q J 3 |
|  | - 6 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 97432$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 96 |  |
|  | * K 1097 |  |

Declarer played $6 \diamond$ as East after North had pre-empted with 3s. South led the singleton spade.
Declarer won the ace and tried to cash the top hearts for spade pitches. This is a dubious choice of line but declarer was not convinced that spades had to be 7-I and didn't want to give up the lead by playing trumps immediately. North ruffed the third heart and declarer over-ruffed then played the $\triangleleft K$ to South's ace. South returned a trump and declarer ran the diamonds. On the final diamond, South was obliged to throw a club to keep his heart guard so now dummy's 88 went away. The queen of clubs was covered South cannot duck or declarer continues with a low club dropping the king. But after winning the ace of clubs declarer cashed the ten of hearts and now it was North's turn to be squeezed in the black suits, completing a nonsimultaneous double squeeze.
Bulgaria's Valio Kovachev needed a squeeze to bring home this fairly horrible grand slam from the Open Pairs. Of course, 7 $\oslash$ would have been easy, but at this point his partnership needed nothing but tops so tried 7NT.

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

|  | - 9543 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 9$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 97654$ |  |
|  | \& 1054 |  |
| - AJ 6 | N | - K 8 |
| PAQJ 62 |  | QK10753 |
| $\checkmark$ A |  | $\checkmark$ QJ 108 |
| \& K 987 | S | * A Q |
|  | - Q 1072 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 84$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 32 |  |
|  | \& 1632 |  |

North led the four of spades round to the jack, so that was one less thing to worry about. Kovachev cashed all the major-suit winners and, on the last one, South was caught in a criss-cross squeeze between his club stopper and the $\diamond$ K. Not an unlucky contract.
Nevena Senior played these two 4s contracts nicely in the Mixed Teams.

- J 8653
$\bigcirc 984$
$\diamond A 96$
- 16

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul

- 10
$\checkmark$ K 10
$\diamond 104$
* AKQ 109842

- AKQ 72
- AQ 53
$\diamond$ K 73
\& 7
$\pm 94$
ค J 762
$\diamond$ Q J 852
\& 5
South led a small club in response to her partner's 4e overcall and North won the queen and returned the 8 K . Senior won the ace and drew trumps then paused to plan her continuation.
Assuming that North held eight clubs and two hearts, plus the singleton trump, she could give up a heart then run all the trumps to squeeze South in the red suits. But there was a much more elegant ending available which would always succeed when the squeeze worked. Senior simply cashed the $\oslash Q$ and both diamond honours then played the jack of clubs and discarded a diamond from hand. North was obliged to give a ruff and discard and away went the heart loser from dummy; ten tricks.

Board I8. Dealer East. N/S Vul.


Senior again played 4e, this time on the lead of a diamond to her ace. She immediately cashed the top hearts to get rid of the diamond loser then played a club from dummy, North winning the king. Senior ruffed the diamond return, ruffed a club, ruffed a heart and ruffed another club. Now she was in dummy with the hearts established but one club loser left in hand.
To play a trump would result in one down if South held the ace-queen or, if declarer guessed to cover the queen, the ace-jack, and also if North had all three trumps. In each case, there would be no club ruff in dummy so a total of four losers. Senior instead played a heart, intending to throw her club unless North ruffed, when she would have to over-ruff. This catered to North's holding all three trumps or any two-one trump split. In the case where

South ruffed the heart, she would then be obliged to lead something which could be ruffed in dummy, declarer underruffing to allow her to lead towards the QK on the next trick. Finally, if North ruffed the heart and declarer overruffed, South might also over-ruff, but she would now be able to at most cash one more trump, and there would still be a trump left in dummy to ruff the last club.
And finally, a piece of light relief, courtesy of Lilo Poplilov in the Open Teams.

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.
\& KQ 976
$\checkmark$ AK
$\diamond K 96$
\& Q 106


The $7 \boldsymbol{2}$ bid worked like a charm. Of course, N/S are cold for 74, and Lilo's teammates duly bid the grand at the other table to chalk up +2210 . But here South in particular was terrified of a possible club ruff - after all, what else could the 7\% bid be about? Seven Clubs wasn't cheap at -I700, until you work out that this translated into + I I IMPs for Lilo's team.


Lilo Poplilov

