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## HE'S NOT ASLEEP, HONEST



## Zhuo Zhili from China

It is early days yet, since we are only one-third of the way through the four pair events. The most interesting aspect of the standings after the first day is that players from four different countries lead in the four competitions.

The Junior Pairs is led by Ola and Mikael Rimstedt, twins from Sweden. They lead by 1.82 percent from Julie Arbit and Sean Gannon from the United States, with Margherita Chavarria and Giacomo Percario from Italy third.
In the Girls Pairs, Susanna Broccolino and Enrica Raffa from Italy are only 0.51 percent ahead of Selena Pepic and Jovana Zoranovic from Serbia, with Michela Salvato and Giulia Scriattoli from Italy third.

China has a stranglehold on the Youngsters Pairs, holding the first three places. Sun Shiyu and Wei Hongji lead by just 0.28 percent from Fang Zhengyang and Yin Yichen, with Fang Dongke and Wang Zihan third. But players from Poland, Italy, Germany and Serbia are well in the hunt. The next Chinese pair lies ninth.
In the inaugural Kids Pairs, Leo Szucs and Andrea Toth from Hungary have a 0.61 percent advantage over Li Renyu and Shang Yijun from China, with Cheng Licong and Yun Yu from China third.

David Stern
is writing a daily (or nearly daily) diary from the Championships.

Check it at:
worldbridge.org/
2015-championship-diary.aspx


| $\mathbf{1 0 . 0 0} \mathbf{- 1 1 . 2 0}$ | Round 6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1 1 . 4 0} \mathbf{- 1 3 . 0 0}$ | Round 7 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 . 0 0} \mathbf{- 1 6 . 2 0}$ | Round 8 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 . 4 0} \mathbf{- 1 8 . 0 0}$ | Round 9 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 . 2 0} \mathbf{- 2 0 . 0 5}$ | Round 10 |

## MANY MISSED OPPORTUNITIES

## by MICKE MELANDER

FFinally the championships are up and running in Opatija, beginning with the pair events. For the first session, I covered the girls. Following the first nine boards, there were a lot of missed opportunities by both sides.

It started on the very first board when this happened at an all-Chinese battle between Hu Xia vs Shi-Lou. Xia sitting North held:


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Luo | Xia | Shi | Hu |
|  | $1 \%$ | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \circlearrowleft$ | $3 \propto$ |
| $3 \circlearrowleft$ | $? ?$ |  |  |

When North got support from partner, she seemed to have a hand with three losers and would have a cold game if partner held just one ace. But Xia eventually just competed with four clubs, which ended the auction.

Board 1. Dealer North. None Vul.


East led her singleton two of clubs. Declarer won in dummy and crossed to hand with a diamond to the king, then tried to sneak a heart trick if East would have played low. But East saw the danger and went up with the ace, cashed the ace of spades, and led another spade when partner encouraged. Declarer could now pull trumps, and when everything behaved it was an easy eleven tricks.

Plus 150 scored an amazing $69.83 \%$ when only three out of the twelve tables managed to bid their game. Some even sold out to East-West, who were allowed to play in either of the majors, making or going one off. Still, a raise to five clubs would have given them some 15\% more on the board.

Board 2. Dealer East. N-S Vul.

- A 865
$\checkmark$ A Q
$\diamond$ AK Q 103
\& J 3

- Q943
$\checkmark$ KJ543
$\diamond 8$
\& $\mathrm{A} Q 9$

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Luo | Xia | Shi | $H u$ |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \wedge$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $5 \&$ |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | (a) | Pass |
| Pass | $6 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

(a) Control-bid (cue-bid)

Here Xia decided that diamonds simply would be trump and set that suit for a slam-try. After a couple of control-bids, she arrived in six diamonds. Shi kicked off with the ten of hearts, assuming partner would be short or even void in that suit.

Xia won in hand with the ace and ran the jack of clubs, which lost to West's king. Luo now returned a diamond, and when declarer decided to finesse with the ten, the roof fell in. East won with the jack and played another heart - ruffed by West. Back came a spade - declarer again took the free finesse, losing to East's singleton king. One might think it was over here, but no -- East exited with a club, and declarer was now locked in dummy. She cashed her last club, pitching a spade from hand, but when she tried to enter her hand with a spade to the ace, East ruffed. North had gone down four in a freely bid slam!

Declarer had some winning lines available. After taking trick one in her hand, she could have cashed out her ace-king-queen of trumps, unblocked the hearts (so far, a very reasonable line of play), but then had to resist the temptation of the club finesse. Instead, play a club to dummy's ace, cash the king of hearts, discarding the club loser, play a spade to the ace, dropping East's king, then throw East in with a trump, which sets up a squeeze in the black suits against West. Declarer still has a trump entry to her hand and must be given either a free finesse in clubs or a free entry to dummy on the jack of hearts, depending on what East returns. That would have been a very elegant play - though admittedly a bit double-dummy.

Note that East had to lead a club to make sure of defeating the slam, for the same reason the contract is always made from South - since clubs can't be led into the ace-queen tenace without giving the contract away.

Board 3. Dealer South. E-W Vul.
ค 9732
$\checkmark 76$
$\diamond$ KQ 754
48

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{llll}\text { West } \\
\text { Luo }\end{array}
$$ \quad $$
\begin{array}{lll}\text { North } \\
\text { Xia }\end{array}
$$ \quad $$
\begin{array}{l}\text { East } \\
\text { Shi }\end{array}
$$ \quad \begin{array}{l}South <br>

H u\end{array}\right]\)| Pass |
| :--- |
| Pass |

Here Luo played well after Xia led the king of diamonds. Declarer cashed the king and ace of trumps, finessed in spades, played a heart to dummy's queen, drew the last trump from South, and led another spade, picking up South's king. Declarer then tried to drop the queen of clubs third, which it didn't. Then she tried for spades 3-3, and when that did not happen, she had to be happy with eleven tricks. It's possible to make twelve, following this line by a squeeze, but the timing has to be exact. It will be covered in tomorrow's bulletin.

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.

- 1082
$\checkmark$ A 42
$\diamond 652$
\& AK 52


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zhang | Salvato | Lu | Scriattoli |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 1ヵ | Pass | $2 \triangleq$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

Zhang looked like she regretted her one-spade bid over one diamond when she passed out three spades. Why not try to play in three notrump? Maybe she was worried that the opponents would run the clubs.

Salvato led the ace of clubs and shifted to the two of spades. Declarer called for a low card from dummy, and South won with the queen. The ten of clubs came back, covered by the jack and king and ruffed in dummy. Zhang did well now when she continued with the ace of spades, played a diamond to the king, cashed the jack of spades (drawing the last from the defence), and continued with the ten of diamonds toward the dummy.
This was the winning line, had she just assumed that the queen of diamonds would be dropped third. She could have put up dummy's ace and ruffed a diamond to make her contract when North had the ace of hearts and couldn't prevent declarer from getting another heart and two more diamonds.

But Zhang went for the diamond finesse, and when that lost to South's queen, the curtain fell again. South cashed the nine of clubs and the defense just waited also to score a trick with the ace of hearts and receive $79.75 \%$ of the matchpoints.


Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

- 92
$\checkmark$ K Q 6
$\diamond 10$
\& A Q 98754
↔ A 10543
$\checkmark$ A 74
$\diamond 63$
\& K 106


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bao | $W u$ | $Q i u$ | $Y u$ |
|  |  |  | $3 \diamond$ |
| Dble | $4 \propto$ | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

Sitting between West and South, it was interesting to try to predict what was going to happen on this deal. Would South pre-empt, and if so, with what? What would West do? South eventually pre-empted with three diamonds, West now made a take-out double with skimpy values and struck gold when partner held king-queen-jack six times in spades. It is surprising that South didn't try five diamonds over four spades when partner bid four clubs.

Yu led the jack of clubs, and it got even worse for North-South since North decided to overtake the jack with the queen to return her singleton diamond. South won with the ace and continued with the king before playing a third round. Declarer threw a heart away from dummy and could overruff when North tried to ruff the trick. This meant that the defense lost one of their heart tricks from that ruff-and-discard given to declarer and the contract went only one down for a split bottom (5.37\%) when two down would have been only a little below average (40.08\%).

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

- A Q 5
$\checkmark 102$
$\diamond$ AK 432
\& K 62


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bao | $W u$ | Qiu | $Y u$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | $2 N T$ | All Pass |  |

Bao opened with a weak two-bid that would not have pleased the purists. Neither East nor South found a bid when North came in with a natural two notrump, which became the final contract. And right North-South were when the diamonds didn't behave for declarer.

Que naturally led the nine of spades. Declarer won with the king in dummy and continued with three rounds of diamonds, setting up the suit. East now shifted to a low club, which went to the queen and king. But declarer then had one club, four diamonds and three spades for her eight tricks and quickly claimed. Coming to a stop in two notrump gave $\mathrm{Wu}-\mathrm{Yu} 89.67 \%$ on the board when many went down in three notrump.


Board 9. Dealer North. E-W Vul.
4. A9
$\diamond 9743$
$\diamond 874$
\& Q J 107

- K J 652

○ Q 6
$\diamond$ J 52
\& 985


A 1043
$\checkmark$ AK 85
$\diamond K 3$
\& AK 32

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bao | $W u$ | Qiu | Yu |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 N T$ |
| Pass | $2 \&$ | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

One would have expected North to pass out two notrumps, but her gamble in using Stayman paid off when South rebid two hearts. (If South had rebid two spades instead of two hearts, presumably North would have converted to

two notrumps, which would have invited game. South, with a maximum, would have raised to three notrumps.)
Now the pair played in two hearts and declarer had no problem taking ten tricks when the ace of diamonds was onside, for $45.04 \%$ of the match points. Personally I would probably have got only 6\% on that board -- since I would have languished in one notrump.

## Lost and Found

There is a lost and found collection at the reception desk just inside the hotel.
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## A FIERY START

## by DAVID STERN

## Pairs rounds 1-6

It's often hard when writing for the Bulletin to choose which players to watch and which ones could provide some protein for hungry readers. This is especially harder in Youth Championships, where the rosters change so often. This time, I went for the "soft" option of following Kaplan (USA) and Oikonomopoulos (Greece).

Board 1. Dealer North. None Vul.

- 7
$\diamond 9$
$\diamond$ AKQ 87
\& KQ9543
A K 32
$\checkmark$ Q 8754
$\diamond 54$
\& 876

a A Q J 105
$\checkmark$ AJ 32
$\diamond$ J 63
of 2
4 9864
$\checkmark$ K 106
$\diamond 1092$
\& A J 10

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kaplan | B.Thomsen Oik | Baake |  |
|  | $1 \&$ | $1 \uparrow$ | 1 NT |
| $2 \uparrow$ | $3 \diamond$ | $3 \diamond$ | (a) |
| Pass | Pass | (b) | Double |
| Pall Pass |  |  |  |

(a) Game-try
(bI Long hesitation - and rightly so to think about bidding six clubs


East, Oik (I am not going to wear out my keyboard, especially the 'o' key - henceforth "Oik") didn't believe North's long think over partner's five clubs and doubled, paying out minus 550 and a $6.66 \%$ result.

Board 2. Dealer East. N-S Vul.

- A865
$\checkmark$ A Q
$\diamond$ AKQ 103
\& J 3
$\begin{array}{ll}\wedge & \text { J } 1072 \\ \diamond & 2 \\ \diamond & 976 \\ \uparrow & \text { K } 8752\end{array}$

a K
$\checkmark 109876$
$\diamond$ J 542
\& 1064
A Q 943
- KJ543
$\diamond 8$
of A Q 9

| West | North <br> B.Thomsen | East | Oik |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | South |
| :--- |
| Baake |

The bidding seemed reasonable, except that North may have considered showing spades rather than jumping. In her defence, however, this was the first session she was playing with her partner, being a substitute for a player delayed in transit; and, of course, why bid a doomed six spades rather than a possible six notrumps, especially as it is pairs.

Kaplan thought for at least thirty seconds before placing the jack of spades at the end of his hand, then after a few more seconds and after remembering his methods, replaced it with the ten of spades only finally to opt for the two-of-clubs lead. His first choices of spade honours would have proved disastrous with declarer winning the club switch, finessing the second spade honour, and automatically squeezing the opponents in
this ending:


East has no convenient discard and must yield the slam to the opponents.

Anyway back to the real world and declarer failed by two tricks, minus 200, and yielding a handsome 87.15\% to Kaplan-Oik.

On board 5, Kaplan did extremely well at a high level.
Board 5. Dealer North. N-S Vul.
A K 1064
$\checkmark$ Q 10
$\diamond$ AK 107
\& 1042


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kaplan | Bahbout | Oik. | Khomiakou |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 3NT |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

Bidding four hearts could have turned out very badly, but the Bridge Gods smiled on Kaplan this day as he lost the five obvious tricks for minus 300 and $71.67 \%$. Eight of the seventeen Junior results included three notrumps making (once doubled), while eight played in four hearts, seven with minus 300 and one random result. It is decisions like these and a little luck that make the difference in pairs scores.

With some pairs missing, Kaplan-Oik had a bye for the next three boards. Then ...

Board 11 . Dealer South. Nil Vul.


| West | North | East | South <br> B.David |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kaplan | Ginnosar | Oik. | $1 \circlearrowleft$ |
| $2 \&$ | $4 \diamond$ | $6 \&$ | $6 \diamond$ |
| Pass | Pass | Double | All Pass |

Kaplan, having made a simple overcall, must have wondered what fury he had unleashed when the tray came back to him with six diamonds showing. Oik, looking at one almost certain ace and one dubious ace, chose to double. Don't forget that to this point nobody knew who was bidding to make and who was sacrificing. The acxe-of-spades lead saw a quick claim from declarer and $12.85 \%$ for Kaplan-Oik. On deals like these it is always interesting to see the range of results - so here they are:

| Contract | Decl. | Result | N/S | E/W | N/S Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64x | E | 11 | 100 |  | 37.62\% |
| 40 x | S | 10 | 590 |  | 50.00\% |
| 64x | W | 11 | 100 |  | 37.62\% |
| 60 | E | 12 |  | 980 | 6.66\% |
| $6 \diamond \mathrm{x}$ | N | 12 | 1090 |  | 87.15\% |
| $7 \diamond \mathrm{x}$ | N | 12 |  | 100 | 25.23\% |
| 50 x | S | 9 |  | 300 | 19.04\% |
| $6 \diamond$ | N | 13 | 940 |  | 68.58\% |
| $6 \diamond$ | N | 12 | 920 |  | 59.29\% |
| 60x | E | 11 | 100 |  | 37.62\% |
| $6 \diamond x$ | N | 12 | 1090 |  | 87.15\% |
| $5 \diamond x x$ | N | 12 | 1000 |  | 74.77\% |
| $6 \diamond x$ | N | 13 | 1190 |  | 99.54\% |
| $6 \diamond x$ | S | 12 | 1090 |  | 87.15\% |
| $6 \diamond$ | N | 12 | 920 |  | 59.29\% |
| 60x | E | 12 |  | 1210 | 0.46\% |
| $4{ }^{4} \mathrm{x}$ | E | 11 |  | 690 | 12.85\% |


| Gо то PAGE: | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | 10 | 11 |  | 12 |  | 13 | 14 | 15 | RESULTS | 7 |



Now a bidding-then-lead problem. You hold:
かAJ954 ৩K86 8 Q 94 \&K 5 First in hand, you open a 14-16 notrump. It goes pass, pass and two diamonds on your right. What would you do?

Well, having lied about your point count, you nobly choose to pass. It goes three diamonds on your left pass, pass back to you, and of course you pass. What is your lead?

Kaplan not unreasonably led a low heart, allowing declarer to make on this layout.

Board 12. Dealer West. N-S Vul.
a K763
$\checkmark$ Q J 10
$\diamond$ K 7
\& Q J 84

```
A AJ954
© K 86
\(\diamond\) Q 94
\& K 5
```



```
A Q 108
\(\checkmark 9753\)
\(\diamond 105\)
\& A 763
A 2
\(\bigcirc\) A 42
\(\diamond\) AJ8632
\& 1092
```

Declarer could win the first heart and ultimately throw his remaining losing heart on the king of spades.
What is the winning lead you ask?
Try the king of clubs and another club, and depend on partner then to play a heart and not give you a club ruff - good luck with all of that. North-South making plus 110 was Kaplan-Oik's worst board of the session at $0.46 \%$.
Staying low when trumps break 5-0 is one of the best bridge tips.

Board 15. Dealer South. N-S Vul.

- Q 1062
$\odot-$
$\diamond$ J 9876
\& K 432


| West <br> Kaplan | North <br> Castel | East <br> Oik. | South <br> Langlet <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2 \otimes$ | (a) | Pass | Pass |

(a) 10-15, three suited with short diamonds

Kaplan's very descriptive opening allowed him to buy the hand cheaply without exploring for game. Scoring plus 110 was worth $71.67 \%$. Nine of the seventeen tables attempted game, some doubled, leading to Kaplan-Oik's good score on the board. Even if trumps break favourably, game is nothing special.

Averaging just 38.9\% to this point Kaplan-Oik needed something special on the last two boards - and here it comes.


Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.

- K Q J 5
$\diamond$ Q 7
$\diamond$ QJ 94
\& AJ 9


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Langlet | Oik | Castel | Kaplan |
|  | 1NT (a) | $2 \diamond$ (b) | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

(a) 14-16
(b) One major
(c) Transfer to hearts

East led the six of spades, won in dummy with the eight. Declarer, with nothing better to do, went after hearts by playing to his queen and East's king. It was clear to Castel that he had to neutralise one of dummy's entries; otherwise, the hearts could be easily established. To that end, he tried the king of diamonds, which was won by dummy's ace. Desperately searching for his ninth trick, Oki then made the key play of a diamond to his nine and -- presto -- plus 400 . That was worth $90.25 \%$.

We shouldn't be too hard on East for his switch to the king of diamonds, as it looks "obvious" to attack that entry rather than a club. In fact, if he had attacked clubs, declarer would have retained both dummy entries and would have emerged with an easy nine tricks.



Board 18. Dealer East. N-S Vul.

- Q 2
$\checkmark$ K J
$\diamond$ AKQ 109
\& J 1087
A 863
$\checkmark$ Q 7642
$\diamond 432$
\& K 3

- AKJ 9
$\checkmark 985$
$\diamond$ J 6
\& A Q 65
A 1075
© A 103
$\diamond 875$
\& 942

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Langlet | Oik | Castel | Kaplan |
|  |  | 1NT (a) | Pass |
| $2 \diamond(\mathrm{~b})$ | Dble | $2 \bigcirc$ (c) | Pass |
| Pass | 3\% (d) | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | Pass | 30 | All Pass |

(a) 14-16
(b) Transfer
(c) Three hearts
(d) Transfer

Declarer lost three hearts and two diamonds for minus 50 and $93.94 \%$ to Kaplan-Oik. Most of the field played in two hearts for 110, and some North-South pairs made just eight tricks in diamonds.

Board 22 proved to be a tussle to buy the contract and the winner got the prize.

| GO To PAGE: | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 10 |  | 11 |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 14 | 15 |

Board 22. Dealer East. E-W Vul.

- 10
$\checkmark$ J 6532
$\diamond$ J 108743
0 J


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Van Den Bos | Oik | Schols | Kaplan |
|  |  | 14 | $2 \%$ |
| 34 | Pass | Pass | Double |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |

Larry Cohen would not be happy to see EastWest not follow the Law of Total Tricks - bid to the level of your combined trump holding. In other words, with ten spades contract for ten tricks.

Against four hearts, East led a low club, won by declarer with dummy's ace. The king of diamonds put East on lead again, who now tried a spade. Declarer won and started crossruffing, with East putting on his "useless" king of hearts. Declarer emerged with ten tricks and $99.71 \%$ when four tables played in and made four spades (some with overtricks), seven tables failed in five hearts, four tables bid and made five spades (some doubled), and a few other random results including six hearts one down for a $61.7 \%$ score.

The difference between taking the opponents one down and two down can be $44 \%$ and $82 \%$, as in this deal.

Board 25. Dealer North. E-W Vul.

- J 7
$\checkmark$ A Q J 63
$\diamond$ K 98
\& 1086
- 1032
$\bigcirc 954$
$\diamond$ A J 4
9543


ค A Q 6
$\checkmark$ K 1082
$\diamond 1073$
\& J 72
A K 9854
$\checkmark 7$
$\diamond$ Q 652
\& $A K Q$

North-South (Coennen and Lucassen) relayed to three notrumps after North's 10-13 onenotrump opening. Stuck for a lead after North had shown five good hearts, East (Oik) found the best choice: a low club. Declarer won in dummy and tried the heart finesse. Without missing a beat, Oik won this and switched to the queen of spades, declarer winning with dummy's king. It all looked rather messy for declarer now with no certain entry to his two high hearts, so he tried a spade back to his jack. East pounced on this with his queen and put declarer to the test by playing the ten of diamonds. It's easy in hindsight, but my philosophy is that if somebody is struggling to find an opening lead, as East was (and remember he didn't continue clubs), he may have chosen the jack of diamonds from jack-ten; so I would play for him not to hold the jack of diamonds.

Anyway, I wasn't declaring and North ran the diamond to his king, then ran the nine of diamonds, losing to the jack. West continued clubs, and did so again after winning with the ace of diamonds, thus establishing his long club for two down.

Here is a bidding problem. You hold: かK65 ৩AQ642 $\leqslant$ KJ 94 \& 4 and open one heart. Partner responds three clubs, showing clubs and game-invitational values. What would you bid?

My general philosophy in these situations is to "backpedal" when holding a singleton in partner's suit. I would have scored just $20.76 \%$ on this board following this rule when partner held
A Q J $\vee \mathrm{K} 7 \diamond 1065$ \& K Q 10765 and (1) the hearts broke 3-3, (2) the of 3 were onside, and (3) the $\diamond$ A Q were onside. I scored plus 110, but three notrumps made, and I also lost to all of the other higher-scoring partscores.

The Junior Pairs is 39 rounds of barometer with three boards per round (117 boards), with the leading scorers at that time being declared world champions. After 27 of those boards, Kaplan-Oikonomopoulos were running 7th with $55.62 \%$. The leaders were the Swedish twins, Ola and Mikael Rimstedt, with 64.28\%.

## PUT YOURSELF TO THE TEST!



^ K Q 43
$\checkmark$ AQ 10865
$\diamond-$
\& Q 103

| West | North <br> Partner | East | South <br> You |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | $3 \diamond$ | $1 \Omega$ |
|  | $2 \circlearrowleft ?$ |  |  |

What would you bid now?

## TRIVIA QUESTIONS

How much do you know about bridge?
4. What hand distribution is known as eau de cologne?

## TRIVIA QUESTIONS

How much do you know about bridge?
5. What is a Binsky contract?



## KIDS PAIRS - 1st SESSION

## by RAM SOFFER

TThe inaugural world championship for Kids pairs (under 16) started on Friday with 41 pairs, out of which 20 were representing China.

For the first three boards I followed the Israeli pair Yonatan Scharo-Roee Argelazi, coached here by Roee's elder brother Eliran, who was part of the Israeli world champion team for Youngsters (2006) and Juniors (2010).

The Israelis had a great start:
Board 1. Dealer North. None Vul.

- 7
$\bigcirc 9$
$\diamond$ AKQ 87
\&KQ9543


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Yu Xinchen Scharo | Shang Hua Argelazi |  |  |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $2 \uparrow$ | $3 \uparrow$ | $4 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| Pass | $5 \uparrow$ | Dble | All Pass |

Scharo opened one diamond, considering his hand insufficiently good for a reverse. Still, it was good enough to compete to the five-level despite the fact that partner had passed throughout.

Shang Hua's second bid left a lot to be desired. First of all, four spades was an overbid, but more importantly, East had an opportunity to show his other major suit by bidding three hearts, natural and invitational. Had he bid three hearts, West would have had a reasonable bid of five hearts over five of a minor by North-South. Five hearts would have been a profitable save (minus 300), while five spades would have run into trouble, declarer being tapped by repeated club leads.

Following his four-spade bid, East found nothing better to do than double North-South in their laydown game, and the Israelis duly scored plus 550 for a top.
In the following deal, the Israeli pair landed in a great contract (due to a misunderstanding!), but failed to make the most of it in the play.

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.
A A 865
$\checkmark$ A Q
$\diamond$ AK Q 103
d J J 3


A K
© 109876
$\diamond$ J 542
\&) 1064
A Q 943
© K J 543
$\diamond 8$
\& A Q 9

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Yu XinchenScharo | Shang Hua Argelazi |  |  |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \Omega$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | $4 N T$ | All Pass |  |

North's two-diamond response was game-forcing. Normally South's two-spade rebid would show some extras, but in this case North didn't need any extras to ask for key cards, since he had 20 HCP . It would have been sensible instead to bid three spades in order to check that South had a club control, but Scharo preferred a direct four notrumps, misinterpreted by his partner as quantitative.

One may easily observe that six spades is hopeless against the 4-1 trump break. According to Deep Finesse, the only makeable slam is a highly unlikely six diamonds, provided that South(!) is the declarer.

Unsurprisingly, a score of plus 660 gave the Israelis 84.13\%. But they could have done even better after a slight error by their opponents. East led from his heart sequence. Declarer cashed his ace-queen of hearts, noting the 5-1 break, and ran the jack of clubs to West's king. West continued spades, and East's stiff king fell under the ace.

| Gо то PAGE: | $\mathbf{1}$ |  |  | 3 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 11 |  | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 4 |
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At this point, declarer should have played the ace-queen of clubs followed by the king-jack of hearts and the queen of spades, resulting in an automatic double squeeze. East would have guarded hearts, West would have guarded spades, and neither of them could have kept four diamonds.

Instead, Scharo severedhis own communications by starting with the ace of diamonds. Also, note that the squeeze could have been broken up by a diamond switch from West at trick four.

In the next round, I observed a clash between two Chinese pairs with some interesting bidding decisions for West:

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.
A K 1064
$\checkmark$ Q 10
$\diamond$ AK 107
\& 1042

| A 3 |  | A Q 9872 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ AK87542 | $W^{N}$ | $\bigcirc 3$ |
| $\diamond 95$ |  | $\diamond 6432$ |
| \& K Q 9 | S | \& J 63 |
|  | A A J 5 |  |
|  | ๑J96 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q J 8 |  |
|  | \& 875 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Xue Wenjie | Yao Tianle | Tong XianjinLiuSiyuan |  |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | $1 ヵ$ | 3NT |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

Tong's one-spade overcall was extremely light, even taking into account the favourable vulnerability. At most tables the bidding went $1 \diamond$-Pass-3NT, with a tricky decision for West. Those who bid four hearts came out on top since the penalty was merely minus 300 , while three notrumps was unbeatable.

At our table, Xue probably expected more values from his partner, so he passed with the West cards, hoping to beat three notrumps while not giving his opponents the chance to run to four diamonds. He was wrong, as three notrumps was the last makeable spot.

West started with three rounds of hearts. South won with his jack, cashed his diamond tricks, and finessed East's queen of spades for his ninth trick.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
AKJ96543
$\checkmark$ K 9
$\diamond 94$
\& A J


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Xue Wenjie | Yao Tianle | Tong XianjinLiu Siyuan |  |

West had an ugly hand for his two-club overcall: a balanced 11-count, a poor suit and on top of that vulnerable against not. On the other hand, the overcall has some merit due to its nuisance value and the lead-directing aspect.

It was the latter that gave East-West a 74.87\% score, as Tong led the queen of clubs. Eleven-year-old declarer Yao Tianle, sitting North, guessed trumps correctly, but could still do no better than ten tricks.

Had West refrained from bidding, East's natural lead would have been the jack of hearts, after which the defence could not have prevented eleven tricks: West may have ducked his ace of hearts, but then declarer could have established diamonds for a club discard before drawing trumps.


In the final round of the opening session, YaoLiu faced a Polish pair.

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

- 92
$\bigcirc$ K Q 6
$\diamond 10$
\& A Q 98754

A A 10543
© A 74
$\diamond 63$
\& K 106

$\checkmark 1085$
$\diamond$ AKJ 98752
\& J 3

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kopka | Liu Siyuan Trybus | Yao Tianle <br> $3 \diamond$ |  |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | $5 \&$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | Pass | Pass |

A routine bidding sequence could have been a four-diamond opening followed by three passes, making two overtricks due to the favourable lie of the cards. More aggressive bidding might have resulted in five diamonds by South (when an attempted save at five spades would have failed by three tricks).

However, at our table the bidding was quite special. Liu Siyuan displayed amazing intuition

by bidding five clubs in response to his partner's pre-empt. Even though I can hardly support this bid with bridge logic, one should not argue with success. It prompted West (Kacper Kopka) to double a cold contract. Declarer ruffed the spade lead, finessed in trumps (West covering), and played three top diamonds, discarding a spade and a heart while West ruffed with his trump winner. Naturally plus 750 scored very well for North-South - 89.38\%.

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul. A A 9
$\bigcirc 9743$
$\diamond 874$
Q Q J 107

| 9 K J 6 5 2 | N | A Q 87 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 6 | $W^{N} \mathrm{E}$ | $\bigcirc$ J 102 |
| $\diamond$ J 52 | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | $\diamond$ A Q 1096 |
| \&985 | S | \& 64 |
|  | A 1043 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AK 85 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 3 |  |
|  | \& A K 32 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kopka | Liu Siyuan Trybus | Yao Tianle |  |
|  | Pass | Pass | 1NT |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

In this case Liu made the routine pass rather than the inspired two clubs. Bidding Stayman with 7 HCP and later inviting game in hearts would have led to a great score of plus 420 .

West led the five of spades against one notrump. Playing imps, there is no question at all that South should cash his seven top tricks. This is what Yao did. Later, he led a diamond from dummy, but East went up with ace and didn't forget to cash the jack of hearts before giving his partner four spade tricks. Plus 90 gave North-South only $42.13 \%$ of the matchpoints.

One may argue that a better matchpoints play is leading a diamond toward hand before cashing the second top heart. True, declarer may go down one, but since the spade length is probably with West (and also the club length, as it turns out), East is the favourite to hold the ace of diamonds, so that this play should gain in the long run. In the present layout, this was the way to make plus 120 , which was worth $63.13 \%$ in the Kids event.

## SOLUTIONS

## TO THE TEST ON PAGE 11

| 1. |  | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: South | 4 A | A 876 |  |
| Vul: None | $\checkmark$ Q | Q 2 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K | K 76 |  |
|  | \& 1 | 10943 |  |
| West |  |  | East |
| A 10543 |  | N | * K J 92 |
| $\bigcirc$ J 987 |  | $W^{\text {N }}$ E | $\checkmark 1043$ |
| $\diamond 2$ |  | ${ }^{W}{ }^{\text {S }}$ | $\diamond$ J 1098 |
| \& K 872 |  | S | \& A 5 |
|  |  | South Q |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A | AK 65 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A | A Q 543 |  |
|  | \& $Q$ | Q J 6 |  |
| West | North | - East | South |
|  |  |  | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

West leads the two of clubs. After winning the first trick with the ace of clubs, which card should you, East, lead at trick two?
The number one factor that separates experts from less good players is the amount of counting that they do. The more counting, the better. And counting starts during the bidding. From the auction, you know South presumably has four hearts and at least five diamonds. From partner's opening lead, showing exactly a fourcard suit, you know declarer has three clubs. This means South probably has $1=4=5=3$ distribution.

Does this point you to the right answer? Correct -- you should switch to the king of spades, just in case declarer has a singleton queen. Having diamonds under control, your side should be able to win five tricks before South collects nine. Even if partner has the king-jack of clubs, the suit can wait.
With the given layout, that's exactly how the deal works out. Declarer ducks a couple of spades, wins the third round with dummy's ace, and tries to run the diamonds. When they don't break, he has to dislodge the king of clubs to get out for down one.
2. Dealer South; both sides vulnerable.
^ K Q 43
$\checkmark$ AQ10865
$\diamond-$
\& Q 103

| West | North <br> Partner | East | South <br> You |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | $3 \diamond$ | $1 \Omega$ |
| $? ?$ |  |  |  |

What would you do now?
At the table, South jumped to four hearts. But then, when West competed with five diamonds, South did not know what to do. His four-heart jump had assumed captaincy, so North was not being asked to offer an opinion.
When you have a two-suited hand, find a fit in your first suit, and the auction is competitive, bend over backwards to show your second suit.
Here, South must bid three spades.
This would have made it easy for North, who held:

$$
\diamond A J x \diamond K \mathrm{Kxx} \diamond \mathrm{x} x \mathrm{xx} \text { \& } \mathrm{Jx} \text {. }
$$

He would have bid five hearts, which was unbeatable.
3. a. the curse of Scotland -- the nine of diamonds.

There are various theories for this, one being that it originates from the time when the Duke of Monmouth wrote orders on that card before the Battle of Bothwell Bridge in 1679.
b. the beer card -- the seven of diamonds.

If you win trick thirteen with this card, make your contract, and it is not a trump, your partner is supposed to buy you a beer.
c. the suicide king -- the king of hearts.

Take a close look at that playing card. (We will have more on this tomorrow.)
d. the Devil's bedpost -- the four of clubs or the four of spades.

There seems to be some dispute about which card gets this name. Most of my references came up with the four of clubs, but two mentioned the
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| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
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four of spades and cited Cartomancy, which is fortune-telling with a normal deck of cards, not with a Tarot deck. In Cartomancy, the four of clubs is unlucky, said to foretell an imminent major setback, an unexpected set of circumstances, a great misfortune.
Some players believe that the four of clubs is a blight upon any hand into which it is dealt, turning good cards bad (that is, transforming favorable-looking combinations into losers as the play develops). Players feel particularly cursed if
the four of clubs is dealt to them on the first deal of the session.
4. What hand distribution is eau de cologne?
$4=7=1=1$, after a brand of eau de cologne with that name, forty-seven eleven.
5. What is a Binsky contract?

One above game: four notrump, five hearts or five spades. Binsky is a Canadian with a reputation for playing in such contracts.

## BANREING JUNIOR PAIRS AFTER ROUND

| 1 | RIMSTEDT M. - RIMSTEDT O. | $1,101.02$ | 60.36 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | GANNON S. - ARBIT J. | $1,067.75$ | 58.54 |
| 3 | CHAVARRIA M. - PERCARIO G. | 971.41 | 56.81 |
| 4 | DELLE CAVE G. - GARCIA DA ROSA R. | 904.14 | 56.65 |
| 5 | TRNAVAC V. - KIKIC O. | 899.76 | 56.38 |
| 6 | EIDE H. - BAKKE C. | 894.14 | 56.02 |
| 7 | GOKCE B. - AYDOGDU A. | 915.26 | 53.52 |
| 8 | KAPLAN A. - OIKONOMOPOULOS I. | 911.93 | 53.33 |
| 9 | HARRISON S. - HENBEST M. | 845.78 | 52.99 |
| 10 | HUDSON A. - JOLLY C. | 963.50 | 52.82 |
| 11 | SCHOLS M. - VAN DEN BOS T. | 951.24 | 52.15 |
| 12 | COOPER R. - PATTISON E. | 824.73 | 51.67 |
| 13 | GULLBERG D. - KARLSSON J. | 818.88 | 51.31 |
| 14 | KATAYAMA T. - NAKANISHI T. | 876.37 | 51.25 |
| 15 | COENEN J. - LUCASSEN A. | 931.02 | 51.04 |
| 16 | GINOSSAR I. - BEN DAVID Y. | 872.58 | 51.03 |
| 17 | GAYDIER N. - LORET X. | 868.14 | 50.77 |
| 18 | FAGERLUND V. - AIMALA A. | 923.90 | 50.65 |
| 19 | VAN DEN BOOM E. - LANGELAAN F. | 856.50 | 50.09 |
| 20 | BOZYIGIT M. - SEKER M. | 852.19 | 49.84 |
| 21 | WILLIAMS S. - THOMPSON J. | 845.00 | 49.42 |
| 22 | JELIC F. - STANKOVIC A. | 899.19 | 49.30 |
| 23 | TANABE H. - YUGE H. | 898.54 | 49.26 |
| 24 | LAFONT G. - SANCHEZ T. | 892.20 | 48.91 |
| 25 | BAHBOUT S. - KHOMIAKOV R. | 832.71 | 48.70 |
| 26 | GANDOGLIA A. - DONATI G. | 776.17 | 48.63 |
| 27 | HARADA Y. - KOBAYASHI K. | 828.59 | 48.46 |
| 28 | POLAK T. - VAN OVERBEEKE T. | 819.25 | 47.91 |
| 29 | TEBHA A. - KRIEGEL O. | 816.96 | 47.78 |
| 30 | CASTEL H. - LANGLET V. | 815.26 | 47.68 |
| 31 | CAZABON P. - PALMA J. | 722.18 | 45.25 |
| 32 | GURIDI G. - RAMIREZ D. | 823.37 | 45.14 |
| 33 | CALMANOVICI A. - BERGAMI G. | 766.50 | 44.82 |
| 34 | MINUTTI G. - OCHOA S. | 812.63 | 44.55 |
| 35 | MYERS R. - VAN BEIJSTERVELDT B. | 761.11 | 44.51 |
| 36 | IMDAT E. - BIRBEN C. | 698.39 | 43.76 |
| 37 | GRUDE T. - HEGGE K. | 691.61 | 32.45 |
| 38 | DIKBAS M. - TOZOGLU S. | 547.68 | 3.03 |


| 1 | WEI H. - SUN S. | 525.34 | 59.56 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | YIN Y. - FANG Z. | 487.30 | 59.28 |
| 3 | FANG D. - WANG Z. | 507.78 | 57.57 |
| 4 | MACZKA S. - TRENDAK L. | 471.84 | 55.34 |
| 5 | JASINSKI P. - BACZEK K. | 488.06 | 54.66 |
| 6 | SCATA S. - MANGANELLA A. | 452.56 | 53.73 |
| 7 | VAN OOSTEN S. - PABST P. | 441.68 | 52.34 |
| 8 | VELJA S. - VAZIC S. | 461.60 | 51.76 |
| 9 | HU Y. - YU Z. | 428.54 | 50.15 |
| 10 | GIUBILO G. - GIUBILO G. | 415.24 | 49.25 |
| 11 | HUANG Y. - CHEN B. | 407.82 | 49.17 |
| 12 | MYLLAERI M. - KOIVU O. | 407.14 | 48.88 |
| 13 | HERMANN S. - ALTER F. | 404.76 | 47.80 |
| 14 | CHIARANDINI F. - GAIOTTI A. | 395.76 | 45.69 |
| 15 | SUN Q. - WANG X. | 378.28 | 45.53 |
| 16 | LIU Q. - LIU G. | 376.96 | 43.90 |
| 17 | CAI H. - WANG J. | 363.46 | 43.66 |
| 18 | LIU Y. - LIU H. | 361.52 | 42.75 |
| 19 | WANG Z. - ZHOU Z. | 354.00 | 40.68 |
| 20 | DENG C. - LI Y. | 336.84 | 40.08 |
| 21 | VORNKAHL L. - JESSE S. | 353.52 |  |

## BANREING

 GIRLS PAIRS AFTER ROUND| 1 | RAFFA E. - BROCCOLINO S. | 525.25 | 57.22 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | ZORANOVIC J. - PEPIC S. | 56.71 |  |
| 3 | SALVATO M. - SCRIATTOLI G. | 520.60 | 55.88 |
| 4 | HUANG D. - LUO Y. | 513.01 | 55.50 |
| 5 | CHEN Y. - YU Y. | 509.49 | 53.98 |
| 6 | RUAN X. - YUAN A. | 495.49 | 53.15 |
| 7 | LU Y. - CHEN J. | 482.64 | 52.57 |
| 8 | LU X. - ZHANG Y. | 511.15 | 52.27 |
| 9 | MOLINA D. - GERSTMANN S. | 475.51 | 52.14 |
| 10 | LIU G. - LUO X. | 509.65 | 52.11 |
| 11 | DI MAURO A. - TANINI F. | 501.10 | 51.24 |
| 12 | SHI Q. - LUO Y. | 499.21 | 51.04 |
| 13 | CHEN T. - ZHAO Y. | 467.81 | 50.96 |
| 14 | WU M. - HUANG W. | 455.85 | 49.66 |
| 15 | HAO M. - MA L. | 482.34 | 49.32 |
| 16 | LI Y. - SHI L. | 447.42 | 49.06 |
| 17 | HU L. - XIA Q. | 448.73 | 48.88 |
| 18 | JIN H. - GE C. | 418.51 | 45.59 |
| 19 | YU W. - WU S. | 413.15 | 45.01 |
| 20 | SUN Y. - SHAO L. | 393.91 | 42.91 |
| 21 | BAO Z. QIU T. | 419.57 | 42.90 |
| 22 | NACRUR F. - PALAU M. | 383.48 | 41.77 |
| 23 | VILLEGAS F. - ROMAN V. | 395.41 | 40.43 |
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## BANISING KIDS PAIRS AFTER ROUND <br> 5

| 1 | SZUCS L. - TOTH A. | 1,114.25 | 60.49 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | LI R. - SHANG Y. | 1,103.05 | 59.88 |
| 3 | CHENG L. - YUN Y. | 1,098.53 | 59.64 |
| 4 | KOPKA K. - TRYBUS O. | 1,081.30 | 58.70 |
| 5 | BUNE S. - LAHRMANN C. | 1,002.17 | 58.00 |
| 6 | NIU Y. - ZHANG B. | 999.35 | 57.83 |
| 7 | WANG P. - MAO R. | 1,054.93 | 57.27 |
| 8 | DAI H. - WANG R. | 988.68 | 57.22 |
| 9 | WU Z. - YUAN Z. | 977.35 | 56.76 |
| 10 | YU H. - QIU S. | 946.67 | 54.98 |
| 11 | LIU Y. - ZHANG T. | 928.58 | 53.92 |
| 12 | WU M. - LEE Y. | 927.62 | 53.68 |
| 13 | FAN H. - CHU Y. | 984.94 | 53.47 |
| 14 | CHEN Y. - LO C. | 982.70 | 53.35 |
| 15 | KIELBASA T. - HULANICKI P. | 920.67 | 53.28 |
| 16 | SCHARO J. - ARGELAZY R. | 974.80 | 52.92 |
| 17 | WANG Y. - SHAO Y. | 973.88 | 52.87 |
| 18 | NARKIS I. - BANIRI I. | 966.43 | 52.47 |
| 19 | KO H. - SUN L. | 905.48 | 52.40 |
| 20 | LIU S. - YAO T. | 964.05 | 52.34 |
| 21 | OTTO V. - DOERMER F. | 890.07 | 51.51 |
| 22 | LIN Z. - LIU D. | 938.18 | 50.93 |
| 23 | SHANG H. - YU X. | 935.82 | 50.80 |
| 24 | LI M. - CHEN Y. | 871.88 | 50.46 |
| 25 | XUE W. - TONG J. | 925.35 | 50.24 |
| 26 | PORTA F. - CAPOBIANCO S. | 917.12 | 49.79 |
| 27 | DING Y. - CAI 2. | 903.95 | 49.07 |
| 28 | LAN Y. - HUANG Y. | 896.47 | 48.67 |
| 29 | PAN R. - JIANG B. | 891.38 | 48.39 |
| 30 | YANG Q. - SONG Q. | 891.20 | 48.38 |
| 31 | XIE Y. - HU Y. | 882.65 | 47.92 |
| 32 | MEREGALLI M. - CARLETTI A. | 860.67 | 46.72 |
| 33 | SONG Y. - WANG J. | 772.22 | 44.69 |
| 34 | AALTO A. - HUHTAMAKI H. | 726.92 | 42.07 |
| 35 | BOREVKOVIC V. - RENNIE F. | 730.83 | 39.68 |
| 36 | ZHUO Z. - ZHUO Z. | 670.76 | 38.82 |
| 37 | RIEGER M. - NORDMANN L. | 709.65 | 38.53 |
| 38 | HOSKING C. - CLIFFORD P. | 637.45 | 36.89 |
| 39 | DRAGHI L. - BRUSOTTI C. | 625.50 | 36.20 |
| 40 | CHANG K. - CHIU C. | 641.83 | 34.84 |

## WBF SOCIAL ACCOUNTS

FOLLOW US!

/WorldBridge Federation

/WorldBridge Federation Youth


WBFOfficial

@WorldBridgeFed

2

