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## MIXED PAIRS, SET 5

by Brian Senior

For most of day one the leaders had been the Polish pairing of Zuzanna Moszczynska and Rafal Marks. However, the fifth session saw them slip to fourth overall. The leaders at the end of the day were the Scots, Jun Nakamaru-Pinder and Olivia Bailey. In Round 21 they faced Mareille Kampermann and Sibrand Van Oosten of Germany.

Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul.

- 10853
© AJ 96
$\diamond 4$
\& A 1062

| ¢ Q 72 | N |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 32$ |  | $\checkmark$ K Q 108 |
| $\diamond$ Q 962 |  | $\diamond 8753$ |
| \& J 943 | S | \& 875 |
|  | A AK96 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 754$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AK J 10 |  |
|  | \& $\mathrm{K} Q$ |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bailey | Kampermann | Nakamur-P V Oosten |  |
| - | - | - | $1 N T$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | All Pass |  |

Van Oosten pulled the wrong bidding card so opened 1 NT with 20 HCP , but no harm was done as a simple


MAREILLE KAMPERMANN, Germany

Stayman auction saw him become declarer in 4against which Bailey led the two of diamonds round to the jack. Van Oosten cashed the ace and king of spades then the king-queen of clubs. Next came the top diamonds, pitching hearts from the dummy, and a diamond ruff. A heart went away from hand on the club ace and there was just one trick in each major to be lost; 11 tricks for +450 and 30 MPs out of 50 for N/S.

Board 12. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- Q 632
$\checkmark 54$
$\diamond 952$
\& K 982

| - 4 | N | A 1098 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ A 732 |  | $\bigcirc$ Q J 108 |
| $\diamond$ A 10863 | W E | $\diamond$ K 4 |
| \& J 74 | S | \& Q 1063 |
|  | A AKJ75 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 96 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q J 7 |  |
|  | d A 5 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bailey | Kampermann Nakamur-P V Oosten |  |  |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\$}$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Kampermann passed then made a weak raise to 34 but Van Oosten had sufficient strength to go on to game. Bailey led the seven of clubs, Polish style. Nakamaru-Pinder put in the ten to find out the position of the jack and Van Oosten won the ace. He played three rounds of trumps ending in dummy followed by a heart to the ten, king and ace. Back came the four of clubs to dummy's king.
There was no way to avoid four losers, but declarer did worse than that. He led a diamond to the queen and ace and was forced to ruff a club return. Now he gave up a heart but back came a fourth club, forcing him to ruff with his last trump. To come to a ninth trick he now needed to lead a low diamond from hand, dropping the now bare king. However, in practice he ruffed a heart, hoping the remaining two hearts were split. As we can see, they were not, and when declarer now led a diamond towards the jack Nakamaru-Pinder had the two red kings for down two and 43 MPs to E/W.

Board 13. Dealer North. All Vul.

- A 2
$\checkmark$ K 7
$\diamond$ Q97652
of AKQ

| 0 | Q J 104 |  | N | 0 | K 75 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Q 10986 |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | A J 54 |
| $\diamond$ | 3 |  | W E | $\checkmark$ | K J 4 |
| $\&$ | 864 |  | S | \& | J 93 |
|  |  | 4 | 9863 |  |  |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ | 32 |  |  |
|  |  | $\diamond$ | A 108 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 10752 |  |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kampermann | Guillemin | VOosten | Mourgues |
| - | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | All Pass |  |

The French pair of Jennifer Mourgues and Theo Guillemin would end the day in sixth place. This deal did their cause no harm as Mourgues scraped up a response then passed Guillemin's jump to 2NT.
Van Oosten led the four of hearts to the queen and king. The play appeared to be all about how to play the diamonds. Guillemin could see from the spot cards that the opening lead should be from a four-card suit and decided to try to find out a little more about the


THEO GUILLEMIN, France
distribution. Accordingly, he cashed two top clubs, noting the fall of the nine on his left. That was enough to suggest that East held at most three clubs and was likely to hold at least two diamonds. Guillemin therefore led the queen of diamonds, intending to take a second finesse against the jack should this lose to the king. In practice, however, the queen was covered by king and ace and declarer played a second diamond. Kampermann erred badly on this trick by throwing the eight of hearts to encourage the suit but by doing so threw away a winner. It got worse. Van Oosetn won the diamond and cashed the ace and jack of hearts then, for reasons known only to himself, tried the jack of clubs next. Guillemin had the rest now; ten tricks for +180 and all 50 MPs.

Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul.

|  |  | ค K 1063 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\bigcirc$ A107642 |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\diamond$ | - |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | A 63 |  |  |
|  | A 9 | N |  | 9 | Q 54 |
|  | Q 85 |  | $W^{\text {N }}$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | A983 |  | W E | $\diamond$ | KQ 7642 |
| 0 | K 1095 |  | S | 8 | J 842 |
|  |  | A | J 872 |  |  |
|  |  | $\bigcirc$ | K J 93 |  |  |
|  |  | $\diamond$ | J 105 |  |  |
|  |  | \& | Q 7 |  |  |


| West | North <br> North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kampermann | Guillemin | V Oosten | Mourgues |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | $1 \circlearrowleft$ | $2 \circlearrowleft$ | $3 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | $4 \circlearrowleft$ | $5 \diamond$ | $5 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

There were tables at which East found a pre-emptive opening of some kind but the hand is not ideal for either $2 \diamond$ or $3 \diamond$ and Van Oosten preferred to pass. However, partner's $1 \diamond$ opening was very good news and he next showed a constructive diamond raise (perhaps a $3 \triangle$ splinter would have been better?) and Mourgues showed her heart support. When Guillemin raised himself to $4 \triangle$, Van Oosten had sufficient extra playing strength to go on to $5 \diamond$, not really caring whether he was bidding to make or as a save.
As the cards lie, $5 \diamond$ is cold, losing just one trick in each black suit, so Mourgues now made the winning decision when she in turn went on to the five level, doubled by Kampermann. There was little to the play, with Guillemin taking the spade finesse and losing two spades and one club for down one; -100 and 27 MPs to the French pair.

Board 15. Dealer South. N/S Vul.
\& K 765
© A 32
$\diamond$ QJ743
49

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Guillemin | Wiseman | Mourgues | Shah |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | 1NT | All Pass |

Next up for the French pair were England's Yvonne Wiseman and Shivam Shah - they would end the day in seventh position. A simple auction saw Mourgues declare 1 NT on the lead of the five of diamonds to the jack and ace. Mourgues played the queen of hearts, won by Wiseman who played back a low diamond. Declarer won the ace and cashed the hearts then led the queen of spades from the dummy. Wiseman covered with the king and, when that won the trick, cashed the diamonds. Declarer came down to two clubs and one spade in each hand in hope of an endplay if the A was by now bare. It was not, and the defenders took two more spades before conceding


JENNIFER MOURGUES, France

the last trick to the ace of clubs for down one and -50 . It would not have mattered had declarer come down to two spades and the bare ace of clubs, of course, as Shah would have kept two clubs and Wiseman could then have switched to a club after cashing the last diamond. Minus 50 scored 16 MPs for E/W.

Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

- 109
© A 10863
$\diamond 975$
\& A 98

| A A |  | N | 4 | KQJ87653 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 9754$ |  | $W^{\text {N }}$ E | $\bigcirc$ | K Q |
| $\diamond$ K Q 62 |  | ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | $\diamond$ | 8 |
| \& KQ 72 |  | S | of | 54 |
|  | 4 | 42 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ | J 2 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ | A J 1043 |  |  |
|  | 4 | J 1063 |  |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Guillemin | Wiseman | Mourgues | Shah |
| Pass | Pass | 4 | All Pass |

Guillemin seems to have mislaid a high card as he passed the 14 -point West hand, leading to a very simple auction when Mourgues opened 4 $\boldsymbol{d}$ in third seat and played there. Shah led the jack of clubs to the king and ace and Wiseman returned the nine to dummy's queen. Mourgues simply cashed the ace of spades then played the queen of diamonds. Shah won the ace and tried to cash the ten of clubs but that was ruffed and declarer drew trumps and conceded a heart; ten tricks for +620 and 28 MPs.

## CLOSE TO BRILLIANCY

## by Micke Melander

Session six set some serious problems for the pairs in the European Junior Mixed Pairs 2016.

Board 21. Dealer North. None Vul.

- AK 10962
$\checkmark 105$
$\diamond$ A 32
\& 95


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Iher | Wackwitz | Maide | Verbeek |
| - | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Dble | Pass |
| $3 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass | $4 \Omega$ | All Pass |

Wackwitz kicked off with three!!! rounds of spades in the best Rueful Rabbit style, allowing declarer a ruff and discard. When that wasn't of any use to declarer it was actually brilliant - if he just could have understood why it was so...
Declarer eventually discarded a diamond and ruffed in hand. West then cashed the king of trumps and took the heart finesse, which lost to South queen. Verbeek found the return of the jack of diamonds which went to the king and Wackwitz's ace. The remaining cards were:


A fourth round of spades now would have set up South nine of trumps as a winner for two down!

Wackwitz, who was close to brilliancy, didn't see this and returned a club, soon declarer had no problem pulling the last trump and claiming; +50 for $N / S$ scored $30 / 20$ in their favour, a second undertrick would have given them almost a clear top.

Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
A AKJ10 3
© K 10765
$\diamond 3$
\& $A 5$

| 4 982 |  | N | A Q 764 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ A 942 |  |  | $\bigcirc$ Q |
| $\diamond$ K 75 |  | W E | $\diamond 10942$ |
| \& J 96 |  | S | \& K Q 108 |
|  | 4 | 5 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ | J 83 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ | A Q J 86 |  |
|  | 4 | 7432 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Iher | Wackwitz | Maide | Verbeek |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| Pass | $1 ヵ$ | Pass | 1 NT |
| Pass | $2 \mathbf{Q}^{*}$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $3 \Omega$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |

All Pass

A Godzilla auction took the Dutch pair to the wrong game. Four Hearts has better chances to make than 3NT. However, as it is in bridge, the defense has to defend and declarer to play...
Iher led the seven of diamonds and things looked more promising for declarer when she had avoided the immediately killing club lead. The play went seven, three, nine and declarer's queen. When Verbeek then ran the jack of hearts to East's queen the contract suddenly was three down - IF, East just would have attacked clubs. Instead, she continued the diamond attack and played back the two, which went to the eight and West's king, dummy discarding a spade. When West led back a third diamond declarer suddenly had ten tricks in the bag since her diamonds were good and she could pitch dummy's losing spades on them. It was all just about solving the heart position, but when declarer played a heart to the king the curtain fell since West now had two heart entries and could play back a club to establish the setting trick for the defense.

One down was a great score for E/W $(35 / 15)$ since N/S were cold for game in hearts. Three down was a clear top as would have been 3NT with an overtrick had declarer found a second heart finesse.

Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.

- J 85
$\checkmark$ K 4
$\diamond$ KJ 105
\& K 752

| A K 6 | N | ค A 107 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ Q 732 |  | $\bigcirc 1065$ |
| $\diamond$ A 4 | W E | $\diamond$ Q 763 |
| \& Q 8643 | S | \& J 109 |
|  | ¢ Q9432 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AJ98 |  |
|  | $\diamond 982$ |  |
|  | \& A |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wackwitz | Zalitis | Verbeek | Piibor |
| - | - | - | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | 2 | All Pass |  |

When Zalitis didn't make any real invitation to game and just raised to $2 \boldsymbol{\sim}$, N/S came to stop in the right contract, since they had three top losers and both the red queens were badly placed. A club was led to declarer's ace who returned a trump, Wackwitz went up with the king to play a second club. Declarer won with the king in dummy and pitched a heart from hand. The jack of spades followed, Verbeek went up with the ace to return a third round, removing declarer's eventual heart ruff. With two tricks already lost and two more to come in diamonds, there was one overtrick for $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$, giving them 32/18.

Board 24. Dealer West. None Vul.

- KQ5 2
$\checkmark-$
$\diamond$ Q J 105
\& J 10842


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wackwitz | Zalitis | Verbeek | Piibor |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{6}$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{6}$ | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $5 N T$ | Pass | $6 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

A very tricky North hand to bid when partner opens with 2NT. Asking for majors or minors is easy, but what about when you want to know about both and you don't get a fit for your major that you initially asked for?
Zalitas's 5NT didn't work when partner raised to 6NT. Four Diamonds should be natural and then a raise to five or six would probably have been a better solution.
Wackwitz led the six of spades which went to declarer's ace. With the king of diamonds offside declarer stood no chance of making the contract. Piibor tried a spade to the king and took the losing diamond finesse. Another spade followed, which declarer won in dummy and saw that West discarded a diamond. Meanwhile she got rid of a heart. Declarer would now have made the contract if she had be able to score five tricks from the club suit. The club finesse worked, which was good news for declarer, but when the suit broke 4-1 there was no way to make the contract and declarer simply gave up and could claim one down.
Before moving on we have to mention Tukenmez/ Yildiz of Turkey's bidding on this board.

| West | North <br> Tukenmez | East | South <br> Yildiz |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| - | Pass | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | Pass |  |  |
| Pass | $3 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | $4 \mathrm{NT}^{*}$ |
| Pass | $5 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | $6 \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Three Spades asked for minors and Four Hearts was a cuebid. South then went for aces and placed the contract in Six Diamonds, knowing they were missing the king of diamonds. The Turkish pair was the only one in the field that managed to get there, five pairs reaching Six Clubs which couldn't be made, while all other stopped in game.
Why didn't you ask for majors, was a question asked to the pair afterwards? 'Well - if I do that, I can't sort out the minors, if I don't get a fit'. And I have to say I like this thinking since you basically double your chances to find a fit and you would rather play in a suit contract than in no trump with 4-0-4-5.

Board 25. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- 74
$\odot 6$
$\diamond$ AK 986432
\& 104

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Piibor | Gaurilova | Zalitis | Gofmans |
| - | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |

Four Hearts didn't present any problems for declarer when South led a spade. Declarer won in hand with the king, finessed in hearts and went back to her hand with a club to repeat the heart finesse. When North discarded declarer simply cashed the ace of trumps and played high clubs and South could ruff whenever she wanted but that was it since declarer then had 11 tricks. That was $34.75 / 15.25$ for E/W when many pairs didn't act over the diamond pre-empt and North was left to play there.
With no diamonds in the South hand E/W actually were cold for slam in clubs since declarer could pull trumps, finesse in hearts and spades (throwing a diamond away) and set up a diamond for a heart discard, in the end scoring twelve tricks.


ALEKSIS ZALITIS, Estonia


Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.
A 8
© J 10543
$\diamond$ A 1087
\& 875

| ¢ A 10532 |  |  | N | 4 | K Q 64 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ | A 6 |  |  | $\checkmark$ | KQ982 |
|  | Q J 9 |  |  | $\diamond$ | 6 |
| $\stackrel{\downarrow}{4}$ | 932 |  | S | f | K J 4 |
| - 32 |  | 4 | J 97 |  |  |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ | 7 |  |  |
|  |  | $\diamond$ | K 5432 |  |  |
|  |  | 8 | A Q 106 |  |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Piibor | Gaurilova | Zalitis | Gofmans |
| - | - | $1 \Omega$ | Dble |
| Rdbl | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |
| 4 $\mathbf{~}$ | All Pass |  |  |

Here Piibor/Zalitis were lucky to get the declaration from the East hand, after South had decided to double. North needed to lead clubs through declarer twice which was impossible, if he wasn't on opening lead. South found diamond lead to North's ace, who shifted to a club which went to the jack and queen. South then tried to cash the king of diamonds, but declarer ruffed and pulled trumps as North pitched a heart and a club. Declarer being in dummy, then cashed the jack of diamonds and the remaining trumps, on which North discarded another heart setting the suit up for declarer allowing him to make 11 tricks. Plus 650 was a clear European Junior top, giving the pair all the points available.

## MIXED PAIRS, SET 7

## by Patrick Jourdain

On the first two boards of Session 7, Julien Bernard \& Sarah Combescure of France met Sean Mekie \& Emma Bentley of England. The French pair were well in contention at the time and this meeting did their chances no harm.

Board 1. Dealer North. None Vul.


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bernard | Bentley | Combescure | Mekie |
| - | 18 | 24 | 34 |
| $4 \%$ | 40 | Pass | Pass |
| 4* | Pass | Pass | $5 \bigcirc$ |

North's opening and East's weak jump overcall must have occurred at most tables. South's spade cue showed a good raise in hearts though it normally has four-card support.
Bernard wisely bid Four Clubs, both for leaddirecting purposes, and to help partner judge whether to sacrifice over Five Hearts.
Bentley duly bid Four Hearts and Bernard Four Spades and then Mekie had the decision whether to try Five Hearts.

Unless he misinterpreted Bentley's pass as an invitation to bid on, everything else suggested doubling Four Spades. His heart holding was poor and defence sound.
On a very good day Five Hearts might come home. But this was not it.

The club lead and return guaranteed it was to fail. Bentley ruffed the second club with the nine and was over-ruffed. East exited with the diamond queen.

Bentley could have suffered only two off by playing on her side suit at once with king and another, but in practice she won the king, drew two rounds of trumps using a finesse and then played ace of diamonds.
This was ruffed by West and after a spade switch declarer found she ran out of trumps to set up the diamonds, and so was four off for 200 to the French.

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.
A 106
$\bigcirc$ A8543
$\diamond$ AK 4

- A Q 5


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bernard | Bentley <br> Combescure | Mekie |  |

At most tables a simple $1 \Omega$ opening from North would lead to Four Hearts making easily. But Bernard in third seat at favourable vulnerability decided to put an oar in. And very effective it proved. Bentley had several options of which $1 \varnothing$ would have worked best, but one can understand her choice of 1NT. East's Two Hearts showed spades. Mekie had an honour there so bid the value 3 NT .
On a spade lead from East declarer misguessed, playing low, and that led to two off. Most of the matchpoints had gone to the French, giving them a boost for their title chances.

## ALL GAUL

In the year that has already seen the United Kingdom decide to leave the European Union and change Prime Ministers I am mindful of one of the lesser known works of the British comedy duo, Michael Flanders \& Donald Swann who collaborated in writing and performing comic songs. (At one Junior Camp I joined forces with Barry Rigal in an eminently forgettable rendition of their classic 'The Gas Man Cometh'.)
Back in 1963, French President Charles de Gaulle vetoed the UK's first application to join the EU (and he did so again in 1967), which caused Flanders and Swann to pen the song which provides my title.
Sung to the tune of 'This Old Man' it contains numerous verses that could be (loosely) linked to recent events, including:

This old man, he played four,
Choose de Gaulle or civil war!
Come back president, govern by decree,
Referendum, oui, oui, oui!
I could offer you all eight verses, but I expect you are impatient to see some bridge, so here we go:

Board 11. Dealer South. NoneVul.


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Balodis | Roper | Salmina | Birchall |
| - | - | - | 14\%* |
| 14 | 24* | Dble | 2NT |
| 30 | 30* | Pass | 4\% |
| Pass | $4 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | 4* |
| Pass | 5\% | All Pass |  |

## 1* $2+\infty$

24 Forcing with clubs
$4 \diamond$ Cue bid
4* Cue bid

There was nothing wrong with North/South's auction but once West had been allowed to bid hearts no game had a prayer. West cashed his hearts for +50 but N/S collected 29-21 in matchpoints.
Only two pairs played 3NT from the North side one took ten tricks for +430 and $46-4$ only to be surpassed by the +1000 for $3 N T x x+1$. One pair took eleven tricks in 3NT when West was on lead - that was 48-2.

Board 12. Dealer West. NS Vul.

- A 9
© 85
$\diamond$ Q 10764
\& 8752
$\begin{array}{ll}\wedge & \text { K } 1065 \\ \diamond & \text { J 9 } 2 \\ \diamond & \text { A J } 5 \\ \& & \text { J } 109\end{array}$

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { J } 8732 \\ \diamond & \text { A } 64 \\ \diamond & \text { K } 8 \\ \text { \& } & \text { A Q } 4\end{array}$
a Q 4
$\checkmark$ KQ 1073
$\diamond 932$
\& K 63

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Balodis | Roper | Salmina | Birchall |
| Pass | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| 20* | Pass | $2 \diamond *$ | 20 |
| 20 | Pass | 4* | All Pass |
| 2\% Drury |  |  |  |
| $2 \diamond$ N | nimum |  |  |

South flirted with danger but survived. Declarer won the king of hearts lead and played a spade to the ten and ace, but the heart return and subsequent ruff meant the contract was one down; -50 and 37-16 for NS.

East might have adopted a slower approach, perhaps bidding 2NT over $2 \boldsymbol{-}$ - on this deal West would surely have preferred the nine trick game. Well done to the seven pairs who bid 3NT which was worth 3-47 for those who took ten tricks.

Board 13. Dealer North. All Vul.

- AK 108
$\checkmark 1054$
$\diamond-$
\& QJ9532

| ¢ 92 | N | A Q65 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ K Q 7 | $W^{\text {N }}$ E | $\checkmark$ AJ932 |
| $\diamond$ K 108652 | W E | $\diamond$ A Q 4 |
| - 84 | S | \& K 7 |
| 4 | J 743 |  |
| $\checkmark$ | 86 |  |
| $\diamond$ | J 973 |  |
|  | A 106 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lember | Gotink <br> Tuus | VanOmmen |  |
| - | 1 \& $^{*}$ | Dble* | $1 \Omega^{*}$ |
| $2 \diamond^{*}$ | 2 | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |


| $1 \%$ | $2+\infty$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 10 | Spades |

I am not certain why East's initial double was alerted and the same goes for West's $2 \diamond$.
West's final double turned what would have been an average into a disaster, as after two rounds of hearts and club to the queen, king and ace declarer cashed the top spades and claimed an overtrick for +930 and 49-1.


Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul.

| 9 | J 1076 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ | 76543 |
| $\diamond$ | 943 |
| 4 | 6 |

A AK5
$\checkmark$ A 9
$\diamond \mathrm{K}_{6} 2$
\& A Q 972


Q 984
© J 2
$\diamond$ A Q 5
\& J 853

- 32
$\checkmark$ KQ 108
$\diamond$ J 1087
\& K 104

| West | North <br> Lember | East <br> Gotink | Tuus |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| - | - | Pass |  |
| CanOmmen |  |  |  |

I'm guessing that, as was clearly Staymanic, that the $1 \%$ opening bid was strong.
South led the king of hearts and declarer ducked, won the next heart in dummy perforce, cashed three rounds of spades and played the jack of clubs for the king, ace and six. A diamond to the ace was followed by a club to the queen, so that was +400 , which gave NS 38-12. That was partly because when West was declarer North frequently led the jack of spades after which even I could take 12 tricks.

The odds line in the club suit is to play low to the queen, collecting all five tricks $32.78 \%$ of the time.
The way the play went at my featured table, two things struck me, first, having started with the jack of clubs, declarer could have cashed three rounds of diamonds ending in hand before playing a second club. North, who had shown an odd number of hearts, presumably five (if I interpret their signals correctly), and had turned up with four spades, three diamonds and a club, which suggests a finesse of the club nine. Secondly, there is little point in ducking the heart lead. If the clubs play for five tricks then you might be in a position to take all the tricks via a spade break or a spade/heart squeeze.
There were five scores of +520 , but the top went to the pair who bid and made 6NT. How unlucky were the pair who collected a bottom when North led the $\bigcirc 7$ against that same 6NT?

Board 15. Dealer South. NS Vul.


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Van Engle | Altun | Visser | Bakar |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | Pass | 18** | Pass |
| $10^{*}$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |
| 10 | Spades |  |  |

South led the nine of diamonds and when declarer put up dummy's queen North made the natural but unfortunate play of covering with the king. Declarer won and played a heart to the queen and ace and North returned the nine of clubs. Declarer won with dummy's ten and played the four of spades, putting up the king when North followed with the six. When that passed of peacefully declarer cashed the winners in clubs and hearts in the course of which South pitched a diamond, so there was no decision to take at trick twelve, +490 and a massive 1-49.
The combined ages of the North/South players are a remarkable 26 ! The future of bridge is secure!

Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.
↔ KQ 8
$\checkmark$ A 1084
$\diamond$ AQ 97
\& J 6

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { A J } 1097 \\ & \diamond 975 \end{aligned}$ |  | N | $\begin{array}{ll} 4 & 632 \\ 0 & \mathrm{KOJ} 2 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\diamond 102$ |  | W E | $\diamond$ J863 |
| \& 7542 |  | S | \& A 10 |
|  | a | A 54 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ | 63 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ | K 54 |  |
|  | 4 | K Q 983 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Garkaje | Roper | Ilzins | Birchall |
| - | 1NT | Pass | 3NT |

All Pass

East led the king of hearts and continued with the jack. Declarer took the ace, played a club to the ten and king and a club for the jack and ace. This was the critical moment. If East cashes the queen of hearts the matchpoints are 19-31, but switching to the six of spades saw them swing dramatically in favour of N/S to the tune of 43-7.

Board 18. Dealer East. N/S Vul.
A 765
© K 10965
$\diamond$ AK 2
\& $A Q$
4 KJ98
© A 83
$\diamond$ Q 963
\& 108

$\begin{array}{ll}\diamond & 4 \\ \diamond & J \\ \diamond & 10854 \\ \text { \& } & \text { KJ } 97543\end{array}$

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Garkaje | Roper | Ilzins | Birchall |
| - | - | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The trump position meant 4 was doomed and declarer lost three spades, a heart and a club for -200; 12-38.

Well done to East for opening 4\% - if you start with a more modest 36 one option for North is to bid 3NT which rolls home after a club lead. Two pairs were 49-1 for +630 so well done to the three East's who led a diamond at trick one which was worth 28-22.

Should North have bid $4 \bigcirc$ over $4 \boldsymbol{6}$ ?
Only two declarers made ten tricks, because although in theory you can always get home - for example after a spade lead one obscure winning line is to rise with dummy's ace and play a heart to the king - in practice it is a tough hand to play. It looks better to put in the ten of spades at trick one - If East gets a ruff, the ace of hearts should then be the only other loser.

## A new video is online! CLICB HERE

$13^{\text {TH }}$ EUROPEAN YOUTH PAIRS CHAMPIONSHIPS

## MIXED PAIRS - FINAL RANKING

| 1 | NAKAMARU-PINDER Jun | BAILEY Olivia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | FAGERLUND Vesa | MYLLAERI Maria |
| 3 | MOSZCZYNSKA Zuzanna | MARKS Rafal |
| 4 | BERNARD Julien | COMBESCURE Sarah |
| 5 | TUKENMEZ Can Erdem | YILDIZ Busra Aslihan |
| 6 | MOURGUES Jennifer | GUILLEMIN Theo |
| 7 | COMBESCURE Baptiste | THUILLEZ Mathilde |
| 8 | BUUS THOMSEN Signe | JEPSEN Peter |
| 9 | LALOUBEYRE Clement | ROUANET-LABE Anne |
| 10 | DEAN Nicholas | NEGREANU Carina |
| 11 | BAKKE Christian | SJODAL Sofie Grasholt |
| 12 | TOMA Anca | RETZLER Rainer |
| 13 | THEPAUT-VENTOS Solene | DEHEEGER Colin |
| 14 | GOTINK Kevin | VAN OMMEN Maaike |
| 15 | BIRCHALL Alex | ROPER William |
| 16 | GARKAJE Ginta | ILZINS Janis |
| 17 | VERBEEK Thijs | WACKWITZ Janneke |
| 18 | SHAH Shivam | WISEMAN Yvonne |
| 19 | CHARIGNON Fabrice | LELEU Anais |
| 20 | SCHANKA Martin | KOHUTOVA Lucie |
| 21 | MAASIK Martin | LAAN Susanna |
| 22 | ZALITIS Aleksis | PIIBOR Johanna |
| 23 | KHANDELWAL Ankush | COVILL Laura |
| 24 | ERSEK Laura | HOMONNAY Balint |
| 25 | LEMBER Manglus | TUUS Hanna |
| 26 | PELSIS Nauris | BROKA Jolanta Gundega |
| 27 | BALODIS Martins | SALMINA Sintija |
| 28 | BUDZYNSKA Magda | MARCINOWSKI Piotr |
| 29 | VAN BEIJSTERVELDT Bas | BANAS Natalia |
| 30 | VAN ENGELEN Bas | VISSER Esther |
| 31 | LEJEUNE Mette | HUVERS Wisse |
| 32 | SCHEBERAN Philip | FLIERL Vanessa |
| 33 | SUCHARDA Edward | PIESIEWICZ Agnieszka |
| 34 | IHER Mirjam | MAIDE Rasmus |
| 35 | BRASS Tommy | LEEMING India |
| 36 | WILSON Abigail | MILNE Jake |
| 37 | WEISS Florian | HERMANN Sophie |
| 38 | VAN OOSTEN Sibrand | KAMPERMANN Mareille |
| 39 | TORV Helina | ZVOROVSKI Rao |
| 40 | MEKIE Sean | BENTLEY Emma |
| 41 | WEISS Christine | HOLZNER Michael |
| 42 | RAMOS Francisco | PIMENTA Carolina |
| 43 | BREKKE Kaja | JOHNSEN Christian Fredrik |
| 44 | YASAR Isil | EREN Umut Gorkem |
| 45 | VASAR Martin | PRII Milvi |
| 46 | DYBDAHL Sanna Emilie Dybvik | AUSTAD Marius Dalemark |
| 47 | GOFMANS Andris | GAVRILOVA Elizaveta |
| 48 | SKURULE Karina Meta | CACE Atis |
| 49 | ALTUN Toygar Tuncay | BAKAR Umran Zeynep |
| 50 | WATTERS Roisin | DOYLE Jason |
| 51 | IKAUNIECE Alvine | JAUNSKALZE Roberts |
| 52 | SENATORSKA Zofia | KAZMIERCZAK Mateusz |


| SCO - SCO | 60.89 |
| :--- | :--- |
| FIN - FIN | 59.83 |
| POL - POL | 59.33 |
| FRA - FRA | 59.06 |
| TUR - TUR | 58.27 |
| FRA - FRA | 58.16 |
| FRA - FRA | 56.57 |
| DEN - DEN | 56.05 |
| FRA - FRA | 55.56 |
| ENG - ENG | 55.29 |
| NOR - NOR | 55.02 |
| ROM - ROM | 54.85 |
| FRA - FRA | 54.53 |
| NED - NED | 54.02 |
| ENG - ENG | 53.84 |
| LAT - LAT | 53.65 |
| NED - NED | 53.37 |
| ENG - ENG | 53.08 |
| FRA - FRA | 52.63 |
| CZE - CZE | 52.22 |
| EST - EST | 52.04 |
| EST - EST | 51.48 |
| ENG - ENG | 51.37 |
| HUN - HUN | 51.26 |
| EST - EST | 50.82 |
| LAT - LAT | 50.59 |
| LAT - LAT | 50.43 |
| POL - POL | 50.16 |
| NED - NED | 50.12 |
| NED - NED | 50.03 |
| NED - NED | 49.88 |
| AUT - AUT | 49.83 |
| POL - POL | 49.70 |
| EST - EST | 49.69 |
| ENG - ENG | 49.34 |
| SCO - SCO | 49.04 |
| AUT - AUT | 47.79 |
| GER - GER | 47.35 |
| EST - EST | 47.19 |
| ENG - ENG | 46.95 |
| AUT - AUT | 46.09 |
| POR - POR | 45.36 |
| NOR - NOR | 43.58 |
| TUR - TUR | 43.38 |
| EST - EST | 42.80 |
| NOR - NOR | 42.32 |
| LAT - LAT | 42.19 |
| LAT - LAT | 41.71 |
| TUR - TUR | 41.48 |
| IRL - IRL | 38.07 |
| LAT - LAT | 34.23 |
| POL - POL | 27.49 |


| 2016 LIEPAJA <br> EUROPEAN YOUTH PAIRS | PAIRS |  |  |  | TOTAL |  | TOTAL | ONLY | TOTAL <br> by COUNTRY Players All series 10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | U26 | U26F | U21 | U16 |  | MIXED |  |  |  |  |
| 1 AUSTRIA | 4 |  |  | 1 | 10 | 3 | 6 |  |  |  |
| 2 CROATIA | 1 |  | 2 |  | 6 |  |  |  | 6 |  |
| 3 CZECH REP. | 1 |  | 3 |  | 8 | 1 | 2 |  | 8 |  |
| 4 DENMARK | 2 |  | 3 |  | 10 | 1 | 2 |  | 10 |  |
| 5 ENGLAND | 7 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 26 | 6 | 12 | 1 | 27 | 3 |
| 6 ESTONIA | 4 | 1 | 2 |  | 14 | 6 | 12 |  | 14 | 7-8 |
| 7 FINLAND | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 2 |  | 10 |  |
| 8 FRANCE | 3 | 3 | 5 |  | 22 | 6 | 12 |  | 22 | 5-6 |
| 9 GERMANY | 1 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 22 | 1 | 2 |  | 22 | 5-6 |
| 10 GREECE | 2 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | 4 |  |
| 11 HUNGARY | 2 |  |  |  | 4 | 1 | 2 |  | 4 |  |
| 12 ICELAND | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| 13 IRELAND | 2 |  | 5 |  | 14 | 1 | 2 |  | 14 | 7-8 |
| 14 ISRAEL | 3 |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  | 6 |  |
| 15 ITALY | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 12 |  |  |  | 12 | 9 |
| 16 LATVIA | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 24 | 6 | 12 | 2 | 26 | 4 |
| 17 NETHERLANDS | 8 | 3 | 5 |  | 32 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 33 | 2 |
| 18 NORWAY | 2 |  |  | 2 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 9 |  |
| 19 POLAND | 6 | 5 | 13 | 10 | 68 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 71 | 1 |
| 20 PORTUGAL | 2 |  |  |  | 4 | 1 | 2 |  | 4 |  |
| 21 ROMANIA | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 2 |  |
| 22 RUSSIA |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| 23 SCOTLAND | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 10 | 2 | 4 |  | 10 |  |
| 24 SWEDEN | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| 25 SWITZERLAND | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| 26 TURKEY | 2 |  |  | 2 | 8 | 3 | 6 |  | 8 |  |
| PAIRS | 64 | 21 | 58 | 23 | 332 | 52 | 104 | 8 | 340 |  |
| COUNTRIES | 25 | 10 | 15 | 8 | 26 | 18 |  |  |  |  |

EBL YOUTH PAIRS CHAMPIONSHIPS

| Total Countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| 2010 | OPATIJA (CRO) | U26 | U26 F | U21 | U16 | MIXED | Total Pairs | To |
| 2012 | VEJLE (DEN) | 73 | 22 | 44 |  |  | 139 | 23 |
| 2014 | BURGHAUSEN (GER) | 60 | 29 | 42 |  | 51 | 172 | 22 |
| 2016 | LIEPAJA - (LAT) | 64 | 25 | 74 |  | 51 | 217 | 25 |
|  |  |  | 21 | 58 | 23 | 52 | 218 | 26 |

