


CHINA2 Kids Team - Silver Medallists: Cheng Deng, Yizhou Liu, Xiaochen Kong (npc) Yunpeng Chen, Xinyao Ruan, Liping Wang (coach), Penghao Wang, Ruizhe Wang


FRANCE Kids Team - Bronze Medallists: Maxence Fragola, Romaric Guth, Christophe Oursel (npc), Hugo Rabourdin, Clement Teil, Benoit Deveze (coach)

## Speech of Sevinç Atay, Chairman of the WBF Kids Committee



I congratulate each and every one of you, and I shall be looking forward to follow your successes for many years to come in your bridge careers.

I wish you all the best of luck, and a safe return home.
Thank you.
Sevinç Atay
Isis Lundquist, winner of the Kids Joan Gerard Award

Dear Mr Gianarrigo Rona, President of The World Bridge Federation Dear Mr Gianni Medugno, President of The Italian Bridge Federation Dear Colleagues, Guests, and Young Players,
I am delighted to welcome you to the prize giving ceremony of this year's World Kids Bridge Championship.
This championship attracted the biggest participation in a kids event so far.
I am very happy to have observed that young players from thirteen different countries competed in an atmosphere of friendly competition and true sportsmanship in this magnificient venue of the beautiful Salsomaggiore.


| JUNLOR QUARITERFINALS |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | c.o. |  |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ POLAND | 11 |  | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| (-ARGENTINA | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |
|  | c.o. |  |  |  |  |
| CHINA | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| (\%) SINGAPORE | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| \% | c.o. |  |  |  |  |
| USA1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| NETHERLANDS | 7.67 |  |  |  |  |
|  | c.o. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| SWEDEN | 9.5 |  |  |  |  |
| (1) NORWAY | 0 |  |  |  | 4 |
| (1) |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |
| GIRLS QUARTERFINALS |  |  |  |  |  |
| - | c.o. |  |  |  |  |
| CHINA | 11 |  |  |  |  |
| INDONESIA | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|  | c.o. |  |  |  |  |
| NETHERLANDS | 11 |  |  |  |  |
| (\%) SINGAPORE | 0 |  | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| (10) | c.o. | 1 |  |  |  |
| USA | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |
| NORWAY | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | c.o. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| $\bigcirc$ POLAND | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 11 AUSTRALIA | 3.33 |  |  |  |  |

## YOUNGSTERS QUARTERFINALS

| (1) | c.o. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITALY | 11 |  |  |  |  |
| - USA | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | c.o. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| GERMANY | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| POLAND | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | c.o. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| ISRAEL | 8.5 |  |  |  |  |
| NETHERLANDS | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | c.o. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| (85) CHINA KONG HONG | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| DENMARK | 0 |  |  |  |  |

## PUT YOURSELF TO THE TEST!

## PRACTICE MAKES LESS IMPERFECT


In midst of chaos, there is also
opportunity.
(SUN TZU, Art of War)
(a) The ace of diamonds -- a very poor idea

West leads the king of hearts, and East follows suit with the nine. How would you plan the play?

## Solutions on page 18. <br> Or CLICKHERE on the web version

4. 

Dlr: East
North (Dummy)

Vul: E-W
$\bigcirc$ A J 9
$\diamond 6$
\& A 976432
East (You)


A AK 103
๑K 52
$\diamond$ A 532
\& 85

| West <br> Parther | North <br> Dummy | East <br> You | South <br> Declarer |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $1 \uparrow$ | $3 \boldsymbol{\sim}$ | $3 \uparrow$ | $5 \diamond$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

Against five diamonds doubled, West leads the queen of clubs. Declarer wins in his hand with the king and plays the king of diamonds. After winning with your ace, how would you defend?

## RAM SOFFER

## Kids Teams Semifinal, Sessions 2-3

According to the schedule, the Kids championship moved to the knockout stage earlier than the others. France, top finishers in the round robin, picked Israel for one semi-final, a replay of the match upon which I commented in Tuesday's bulletin. That match gave France a carryover of 5 IMPs, and they added 2 more in the first session. What followed was a complete turnaround. France was totally outplayed and outscored 12-91 during the final two sessions, which meant that Israel went through to the final.
Which team would be their rival? Poland led by 3120 after one session, but China2 started the second set strongly.

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.
AKQ984
©K642
$\diamond 84$
443

| A ${ }^{\text {A }}$ | N | 9 J 65 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ J 8 | W E | © A 103 |
| $\diamond$ A 10532 | W E | $\diamond$ K J 6 |
| \& J 872 | S | \& K Q 65 |
|  | 1073 |  |
|  | - Q 975 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 97 |  |
|  | * 109 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pigulski | P. Wang | Racewicz | Liu |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | Pass | 146 | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Dble | Pass | 18 |
| 1NT | Pass | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

According to Polish Club, a $1 \diamond$ response to a $1 \boldsymbol{\circ}$ opening is usually $0-6 \mathrm{HCP}$, any distribution, but sometimes it is $7-11 \mathrm{HCP}$ with minor-suit length. This deal featured the second case, but afterwards West found it difficult to describe his real strength. East did not make any move toward game, nor did his side compete over $2 \circlearrowleft$.
After a normal club lead, beating $2 \triangle$ was rather easy. However, West started with the A, followed by 2 .. Dummy won and played a heart. East hurried to take his ace and give partner a spade ruff, at the expense of a natural trump trick. Afterwards declarer
had time to park two club losers on dummy's spades.
At the replay Ruizhe Wang-Deng were far more optimistic, bidding 3NT with the East-West cards, and the contract was crowned with success after a A lead from North and a good diamond guess. When the defence continued spades after winning with the $\%$ A, declarer had 11 tricks. Plus 110 and Plus 660 gave 13 IMPs to China2.
Then on board 7, a phantom sacrifice in $6 \%$ over $5 \diamond$ cost Poland 500 in the Open Room, while in the Closed Room they stopped at $3 \diamond$ for plus $130-9$ more IMPs to China2.
In the following two deals, China2 completed a 40-1 run over nine boards.

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.
-9 94
$\diamond$ KQ 74
$\diamond 72$
\& A 1075

| - K 1052 | N | - A J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark 106$ |  | $\bigcirc 53$ |
| $\diamond$ K Q 105 | $W^{\text {E }}$ | $\diamond$ A J 93 |
| \& 964 | S | \& K Q 832 |
|  | A Q 763 |  |
|  | © AJ982 |  |
|  | $\diamond 864$ |  |
|  | \& J |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pigulski | P. Wang | Racewicz | Liu |
| Pass | Pass | 1NT | $2 \diamond$ |
| 2NT | Pass | Pass | Pass |

South's $2 \diamond$ showed both majors. West's 2NT was natural, but not effective. The recommended way to play after a majors intervention over 1 NT is that $2 \Omega / 2$ by responder shows strength in the bid suit (but not in the other one) and $3 \bigcirc / 3 \uparrow$ shows a shortness and enables partner to bid 3NT with a good stopper. In this case West could bid have 2 and then East would have bid 3\%. They would have either made 3\& or beaten 30 by one trick.
One would have expected many Norths to bid $3 \circlearrowleft$ over 2NT, but Penghao Wang made a clever decision to defend, and after a heart lead the defenders quickly wrapped up six tricks.
In the other room the "par score" was reached: $3 \circlearrowleft$ by North, doubled, one down. 4 more IMPs to China2.

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- 7

৩A8765
$\diamond 87653$
\& 72

| © A Q J 94 | N | 9108532 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 1042$ |  | $\bigcirc$ K Q 9 |
| $\diamond$ A 92 | W E | $\diamond$ K 4 |
| -6 Q 10 | S | \& J 43 |
|  | A K 6 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J 3 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q J 10 |  |
|  | \& AK9 8 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pigulski | P. Wang | Racewicz | Liu |
|  | $2 \Omega$ | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

North opened the bidding by showing a weak twosuiter, and East-West reached their normal contract of $4 \uparrow$.
P. Wang found the most challenging lead, $\& 7$. Liu took the $\& A K$ and continued with a third round. In view of the bidding, it was quite obvious that North had led from shortness. Therefore the only chance to make the contract was to ruff with $\mathrm{Q} / \mathrm{J} / 9$ and hope South had the $\boldsymbol{A K}$. Declarer should have counted on North holding $\triangle A$, in view of his opening bid. West's decision to discard a heart at trick 3 was rather inexplicable. Failure to keep concentration towards the end of a tournament was a bad sign. Indeed, this



Polish pair didn't play in the final session.
At the other table 4 was duly made. That opened up a 28-IMP gap in favour of China2, but it almost disappeared completely during the last four boards of the set.

Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul.
か 86
๑9876
$\diamond$ K 73
\& K Q 86

| ¢ AJ9732 | 2 N | A 104 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ K J 10 |  | ๑A5432 |
| $\diamond$ Q |  | $\diamond$ AJ 962 |
| \& 1094 | S | \& J |
|  | A K Q 5 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q |  |
|  | $\diamond 10854$ |  |
|  | \& 7532 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pigulski | P. Wang | Racewicz | Liu |
|  |  |  | $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| 1 | Dble | Redble | 1 NT |
| 3 | Pass | 4 | All Pass |

Poland stretched a bit to bid game. A trump lead was needed to prevent club ruffs and defeat the contract, but North picked the natural $\%$ K, making a late trump switch at trick 2.
Declarer overtook South's $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$ with his ace and ruffed a club. Now he should have returned to hand with a diamond ruff, finished drawing trumps and then set about finding the $\triangle Q$ (with no way to go wrong given the actual layout).

However, he played $\subseteq A$ at trick four. When South dropped the $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$, declarer probably became aware of the self-inflicted damage. He continued $\diamond \mathrm{A}, \diamond$ ruff, © J. South took his $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ and made the right move, underleading his $\% \mathrm{~A}$. North won with the $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{Q}}$ and... continued clubs without pause for thought.
44 came through when the defence missed the heart ruff, while the same contract went down at the other table. That gave Poland 10 IMPs, and 13 more followed at the next board.

Board 12. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- 5
©A985
$\diamond$ Q 86
\& A Q 762

| - 62 | N | A K Q J 1093 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 32$ |  | $\bigcirc$ Q 7 |
| $\diamond$ AK 52 | $W^{\text {L }}$ | $\diamond 97$ |
| \& J 953 | S | \& 1084 |
|  | 4 A 874 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K J 1064 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 104 |  |
|  | \& K |  |
| West | North | East South |
| Pigulski | P. Wang | Racewicz Liu |
| Pass | 180 | 34 Dble |
| 49 | 50 | Pass 60 |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |

Poland made good use of the favourable vulnerability. East jump-overcalled 3 with six cards and West supported with just two cards. But 4 was still a safe spot (meaning a good sacrifice over 4§). However, West might have done better to bid $4 \diamond$. After his initial pass this would certainly have been a leaddirecting call in support of spades.
As a result of the Polish pressure, China2 overbid to a slam. However, in the absence of a diamond bid by West, East naturally led $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$.
Now declarer had to decide whether to play for trumps 2-2 and clubs 4-3 and cash $\triangle A K$, or to finesse against West's supposed $\triangle Q$ in view of East's 3 bid. The problem with finessing was that even if it succeeded, there were no clear 12 tricks in sight, as in that case declarer could have gained only one spade ruff.
In my opinion, declarer should have taken much more time over this contract (in fact, at this table the session was finished with about 25 minutes to spare). After the trump finesse failed, East switched to diamonds and China2 were -200, while at the other room Poland stopped in $4 \checkmark$, scoring +620 .
Thus the second session finished with China2 having a slender lead of 72-69. The Chinese didn't let
the poor finish of this session distract them, and they started the final session with 42 unanswered IMPs over six boards, which settled the issue. This was a lucky 11-IMP swing for China2.

Board 18. Dealer East. N/S Vul.
A Q J 109764
๑53
$\diamond 8$
\& J 73

| A 45 | N | A 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 106$ | $W^{\text {N }}$ | $\checkmark$ AKQ974 |
| $\diamond$ A J 73 | W E | $\diamond$ Q 542 |
| \& AK 1084 | S | \& Q 6 |
|  | K 82 |  |
|  | J 82 |  |
|  | K 1096 |  |
|  | 92 |  |


| West | North | EasT | South <br> Sluszniak |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P. Wang | Kedzierski |  |  |
| Liu |  |  |  |

Here one can hardly fault Poland's bidding. Making a grand slam requires 3-2 hearts plus 3-3 clubs or 4-2 clubs and a diamond finesse or doubleton $\diamond \mathrm{K}-$ all in all, not a great proposition. But luck is part of the game. In the other room China2 bid and made $7 \Omega$. Perhaps a direct $3 \circlearrowleft$ call at East's second turn, showing a solid suit after a two-over-one response, would have done the trick, or else West could have done something over 5 as he knew that the partnership had all of the keycards plus the trump queen.

This trend continued for a few more boards - nothing went right for Poland. Nor was there any comeback in sight, as the final boards were rather flat. In the end China2 won by a comfortable margin: 110-71, and they were ready to meet Israel in the final.

## Round 13, Kids Teams

The last match before the knock-out stage of the Kids Championship was a meeting between the top two teams in the ranking list. France was the leader with 203.03 VPs and China2 followed with 182.32 VPs.

The target for all the contenders was to finish the round robin in the top four, in order to keep their medal hopes alive.

Board 1. Dealer North. None vul.

* 92
© Q J 96
$\diamond$ Q 1074
\& K 107


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wang | Guth | Deng | Rabourdin |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| $1 \uparrow$ | Dble | $3 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

The match started with a big swing to France. I do not know their system, Deng's three-spade bid looked to be a bit on the conservative side to me. After the heart queen lead, declarer Ruizhe Wang tried to ruff diamonds in dummy, but when he shortened his own trumps with heart ruffs in hand, he ran out of trumps and could not enjoy the established the thirteenth club, just making three spades.

At the other table, the French pair reached four spades doubled. When both black suits behaved, four spades rolled home for a 10 IMP pick-up by France.

Board 2. Dealer East. NS vul.

- K 942
$\bigcirc$ A J
$\diamond$ A 1063
\& Q 54


| West <br> Wang | North <br> Guth | East <br> Deng | South <br> Rabourdin |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $3 \diamond$ (b) | Dble | $2 \diamond$ <br> Pass | $3 \wedge$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

(a) Weak two-bid in either major
(b) Pass or correct

Now, it was France's turn to be conservative. Playing in part-score contracts with a combined total of 26 HCP's will not be a winning strategy in the long run. Having said that, it is not clear how they could have reached four spades, the only making game available with this layout. Perhaps Hugo Rabourdin should have cue-bid four hearts and passed whatever partner bid, hoping for the best.
The play at three spades was chaotic. Ruizhe Wang led the heart king from West. Declarer took it in dummy, came to hand with the trump ace and ducked a spade. East overtook his partner's spade 10 with the jack to fire his singleton club through. Winning with his club ace, declarer played the third round of spades, discovering the friendly break. Now he just needed another friendly diamond layout, which in fact existed. Nobody likes Mondays, but this was the friendly layout day. Anyhow, Rabourdin cashed the club queen and when he saw East discard, he got so unhappy that he played the heart jack (!). The defense was happy to win this trick and continue hearts to force declarer out of his last trump.
Rabourdin then mishandled the diamonds to go down two.
At the other table, Penghao Wang, the Chinese North, got a more challenging club-nine lead. But he played carefully to land his four-spade contract. 13 IMPs to China2.

Board 7. Dealer South. All vul.

> s 4
> $\diamond-$
> $\diamond$ A Q 96532
> $\&$ K 10852

A A Q 1086
© Q 8732
$\diamond$ J 7
\& J


A 932
$\checkmark$ A J 1094
$\diamond 4$
\& Q 643

A K J 75
© K 65
$\diamond$ K 108
\& A 97

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wang | Guth | Deng | Rabourdin |
| $2 \%$ (a) | 24 (b) | 40 | Dble |
| Pass | $5 \%$ | All Pass |  |

(a) Michaels Cue-Bid: at least 5-5 in the majors
(b) Diamonds

The French pair arrived at a normal five-club contract and aided by West's Michaels Cue-Bid, the declarer Rabourdin took the correct view in the club suit to win 11 tricks.

Normal contract, normal result, you might think. But today is the friendly layout day, remember? If you reach a diamond slam today, like the Chinese pair at the other table did, you can take advantage of the favourable club position (a tiny little bit in diamonds too) to make your slam. 13 IMPs to China2.

There was not many fireworks in the remaining boards, except for a no-play 3NT contract on Board 9 , which was let through at both tables of the match by careless defence.

France won the match $30-28$ in IMPs (10.66-9.34 VPs) to maintain their lead at the top of the list. France, Poland, China2 and Israel will play the semifinal knockout matches.

## 

## click on the picture from the web version to open the video



Opening Ceremony


Interview with England


Interview with France


Interview with Bermuda


Overture


Interview with K. Rubins


Interview with D. Ballas


Catching up with Jade


Interview with P. Bertheau


Interview with C. Lahrmann


Interview with A. Simons


Chatting with Carlotta 1


Interview with J. F. Cuervo


Plan, Count, Plan

WBF Youtube Channel: WBFOfficial
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## the UNBIDDABLE $6 \diamond$ SLAM

## Round 1, Kids Teams Final

This was Board 7 from the second match on Sunday:
Dealer South. Both vul.
A A 3
© AK 96
$\diamond A 8$
\& J 10754

| ¢ J 10842 | N | a 765 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 4$ |  | $\bigcirc 10873$ |
| $\diamond$ Q 652 | W E | $\diamond$ J |
| \& 982 | S | \& A KQ 63 |
|  | * K Q 9 |  |
|  | © Q J 52 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 109743 |  |
|  | \& -- |  |

As Ram Soffer explained in yesterday's bulletin, the analysis of six hearts after a club lead is certainly varied, depending upon both declarer's chosen line of play and the defence.
Obviously, if a pair had bid six diamonds, it would have claimed in almost no time. The chance of playing the diamond suit for at most one loser is 87.6 percent. But not one pair in any of the four divisions here played in diamonds at any level.
Only five declarers made six hearts after a club lead. Here are their stories.

| 1. | Eest | North <br> Molina | East |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | South |
| :--- |
| Villegas |

(a) 0 or 3 key cards
(b) Asking for the queen of hearts
(c) Showing that queen and the king of spades

East led the ace of clubs. Diana Molina of the Chilean Girls team ruffed in the dummy, and cashed dummy's two high hearts, which was not fatal. Now to make it, she had to establish her clubs by pinning West's eight and nine, but understandably she played a diamond to her ace and a second diamond.
At first glance, it looks best for East to discard a
spade, but although that would have been a winning defence, East did better by ruffing. If she had continued with her last trump, the contract would have gone down two. But East erred by switching to a spade.
Molina won with her ace, ruffed a club in the dummy, ruffed a diamond with her king of hearts, cashed the ace of hearts, and claimed because dummy was high.

| 2. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | Zhu |  | Dong |
|  |  |  |  |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | $3 ¢$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | 40 |
| Pass | 44 | Pass | 5\% |
| Pass | 60 | All Pass |  |

Bo Han Zhu, part of the Canadian Kids team, ruffed the top-club lead in the dummy, played a diamond to his ace, and led another diamond. East correctly discarded a spade. Now declarer erred by continuing with the four of diamonds from the dummy and ruffing West's five with his nine of hearts. East would have done well to discard a second spade, but he actually overruffed. This would not have been fatal if he had led another high club, but he switched to a spade. Zhu won with his ace, played a spade to dummy's queen, ruffed a diamond high, drew trumps ending in the dummy, and claimed.


After East led the ace of clubs, Martins Balodis of the Latvian Youngsters team, ruffed in the dummy, took dummy's two top hearts, played a spade to his
ace, ruffed a club, played a diamond to his ace, and cashed the ace of hearts to give this position:

|  | A 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K}$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 8$ |  |
|  | \& J 107 |  |
| ¢ J 10 | N | ヘ 76 |
|  | W E | $\bigcirc 10$ |
| $\diamond$ Q 65 | W E | $\diamond$-- |
| \& 9 | S | \% K Q 6 |
|  | A K Q |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$-- |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 1097 |  |
|  | \& ${ }^{\text {e- }}$ |  |

When the king of hearts was cashed, West made a fatal error: he discarded the nine of clubs. Now Balodis could just play on diamonds to establish a long card there. He took three spades, four hearts, three diamonds and two club ruffs.
4.

| West | North <br> Manganella |  | East | South <br> Scatà <br> $1 \diamond$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass | 24 | (a) | Dble | $2 \diamond(\mathrm{~b}$ |
| Pass | 20 | (c) | Pass | 2NT (d) |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | (c) | Pass | $3 \diamond(e)$ |
| Pass | $3 ¢$ | (c) | Pass | 34 (f) |
| Pass | 4\% | (g) | Pass | $4 \diamond(\mathrm{~h}$ |
| Pass |  | (h) | Pass | 5\% (h) |
| Pass | 60 |  | All P |  |

Andrea Manganella of the Italian Youngsters team ruffed the top-club lead, played a diamond to his ace and led up a diamond. When East discarded, declarer won with dummy's king and ruffed the low diamond with his nine of hearts. East would have done well to pitch again, but he overruffed with the ten. This would not have been fatal if he had tapped dummy with another high club, but he switched to a spade. North won with his ace, played a spade to dummy, ruffed a diamond high, drew trumps ending in the dummy, and claimed because dummy was high.
5.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bakke |  | Eide |
|  |  |  | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 18 | 24 | 20 |
| Pass | 2NT (a) | Pass | 40 (b) |
| Pass | 4- (c) | Pass | 5\% (c) |
| Pass | 60 |  |  |

(a) Enquiry
(b) Good hand for the bidding so far with four hearts
(c) Control-bid

Christian Bakke of the Norwegian Junior team ruffed the club lead, played a diamond to his ace, and led a diamond up. When East ruffed in, declarer was not challenged thereafter.
In this situation it is virtually always wrong to ruff in front of the long suit -- unless, maybe, it is the setting trick or you are sure you can see how the defence will succeed.
(a) Artificial game-force
(b) Minimum unbalanced hand, not 5-5 or longer in the minors
(c) Relay
(d) Five-plus diamonds and four hearts
(e) $4=6$
(f) Singleton or void in clubs
(g) Sets hearts as trumps
(h) Control-bid, five clubs definitely being a first-round control

## Round 1，Kids Teams Final

Israel beat France，the round robin leaders，in one of the semi－finals by 133 imps to 61 ，and China2 beat Poland by 110 to 71 ．So the Kids Final was a meeting between Israel and China2，where Israel started with a carryover advantage of 11 IMPs ，which was based on the result between the two teams in the qualifying section．

Board 1 brought immediate action．
Dealer North．None vul．
A 9854
©K964
$\diamond$－－
\＆J 10865

| ヘ K 6 | N | ヘ Q J 73 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ A J 1085 |  | $\bigcirc 3$ |
| $\diamond 87642$ | W E | $\diamond$ A K Q 1053 |
| do 3 | S | \＆K 9 |
|  | A A 102 |  |
|  | －Q 72 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 9 |  |
|  | \＆A Q 742 |  |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Loonstein | P．Wang | Zeitak | Liu |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Dble | $3 \boldsymbol{\&}$ | $4 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $5 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| R．Wang | Khutorsky | Deng | Matatyahou |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| $2 \diamond$ | $5 \boldsymbol{\kappa}$ | $5 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $6 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Heavy interference by the Israelis in the Open Room did not leave much space for the Chinese pair to explore．Ruizhe Wang decided to bid one more for the road and the slam went down when the opening leader had two aces to cash． 10 IMPs to Israel，who led by 21 IMPs now．

Dealer East．NS vul．
AA 97
๑AJ104
$\diamond 9$
\＆K 10965


Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Loonstein | P．Wang | Zeitak | Liu |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| R．Wang | Khutorsky | Deng | Matatyahou |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $1 ヵ$ | Dble | Redble | $2 \diamond$ |
| $2 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass | $3 \$$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

3NT by China2 in the Closed Room depended on finding the club queen．This should not have been a big problem in view of the bidding and West＇s lead of the spade queen，accounting for three of the missing HCPs．However，obviously trying to prevent the danger hand getting the lead，Yizhou Liu，after holding up dummy＇s spade ace twice，started with a club to his ace．He still had the chance to make his contract by reading the distribution of honours in hearts，but he went down．When Israel made three clubs with an overtrick in the Open Room， 6 more IMPs went to Israel，27－0 after only 2 boards．


The action continued on Board 2.

Board 4. Dealer West. All vul.

- J
© K Q 874
$\diamond$ K 64
\& Q J 72
A 1052
© A 1032
$\diamond 108$
\& K 1086

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Loonstein | P.Wang | Zeitak | Liu |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| R.Wang | Khutorsky | Deng | Matatyahou |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $2 \diamond$ | All Pass |

Liu's (apparently) non-forcing two-spade bid was disastrous and, in my opinion a bit ill-advised. A negative double, if he really wanted to bid something, might have limited the damage. The 5-1 spade contract went down four, for 6 more IMPs to Israel, as the Chinese pair played a normal two-diamond contract with three overtricks in the other room.

Board 5. Dealer North. NS vul.
A97532
$\bigcirc 742$
$\diamond$ A 83
d J 7


Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Loonstein | P.Wang | Zeitak | Liu |
|  | Pass | $1 \Omega$ | Dble |
| Redble | $1 ヵ$ | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \varnothing$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $3 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| R.Wang | Khutorsky | Deng | Matatyahou |
|  | Pass | $1 \Omega$ | Dble |
| Redble | $1 ヵ$ | $2 \Omega$ | Pass |
| $4 \varnothing$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Even three hearts was too high with these cards against best defence, as the defenders could take three diamond and two spade tricks. But after a club lead, Israel made three hearts in the Closed Room with an overtrick when the declarer, Aviv Zeitak, established his clubs with a third-round ruff in hand.
The Chinese Open Room players were more ambitious. They reached four hearts, and were favoured with the same club lead. Why is it that nobody likes to lead from their king-queen sequence these days?
All Cheng Deng, the Chinese East, had to do was to follow the same line like Zeitak. But he lost his way and tried to cash a third club trick, which North happily ruffed with his last trump. Four hearts went down two and 7 more imps were registered in the Israel plus column.

Board 7. Dealer South. All vul.
© Q J 6
$\bigcirc$--
$\diamond$ A Q J 10986
\& K Q 6

| A 3 | N | 4AK98542 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ AK J 72 | W E | $\bigcirc$-- |
| $\diamond 532$ | W | $\diamond$ K 7 |
| ¢10752 | S | \& AJ 93 |
|  | ¢ 107 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 1098 | 43 |
|  | $\diamond 4$ |  |
|  | d 84 |  |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Loonstein | P.Wang | Zeitak | Liu <br>  <br>  <br> Pass |
| 3NT |  | Dble | $4 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Dble | All Pass |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South <br> R.Wang |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Khutorsky |  |  | Deng | Matatyahou |
| :--- |
| $2 \varnothing$ |

Deng, the Chinese East in the Open Room, would ask: "Am I very wrong to bid four spades with a good seven-card suit, $7=0=2=4$ distribution and 15 HCPs?"


Well, maybe he would easily have made four spades on another day, but today was what Zia called the "Heat 3" day for China2 team. Their hands seemed unable to reach for the correct bid or card today.

Four spades doubled went down one, while five diamonds doubled in the Closed Room ended up in the hospital for -1100 and 16 more IMPS for Israel. Zeitak's double of 3NT turned out beautifully and was heavily rewarded.

Board 9. Dealer South. Both vul.
A A J 2
$\checkmark 1062$
$\diamond$ AK Q
\& J J 1062

| ¢ 954 | N | ¢ 86 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ৩Q8754 | $W^{\text {N }}$ E | $\bigcirc$ A 93 |
| $\diamond 9843$ | W E | $\diamond 1075$ |
| \& A | S | \& K9753 |
|  | A K Q 1073 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K J |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 62 |  |
|  | \& Q 84 |  |


| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West | North | East | South <br> Liu |
| Loonstein | P.Wang | Zeitak | Liu <br> 1NT |
| Pass | $2 毋$ |  | Pass |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | Pass | Pass |
| Pass |  |  |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| R.Wang | Khutorsky | Deng | Matatyahou |
|  | 1 NT | Pass | $2 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Dble | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass | $4 \$$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

Finally China2 opened their account. The Israeli Open Room pair bid to a normal four-spade contract. West's double of the two-heart transfer bid looked dubious to me, but it worked like a charm here. East, Deng, underled (!) his ace of hearts. With not much to guide him, the declarer, Nir Khutorsky, inserted the jack from dummy. The Chinese pair proceeded to take the next four tricks (including a club ruff) for an immediate down two.

In the Closed Room, the Chinese North, Penghao Wang, wisely passed the 3NT bid with his flat distribution, although aware of a 5-3 spade fit. Right he was. 3NT made with an overtrick, for a much-
needed 11 IMPS for China2.
Board 11. Dealer South. None vul.

- 8763
$\bigcirc 642$
$\diamond$ A Q 932
$\% K$

| A 109 | N | ¢ Q J 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ AKQ J | W E | $\bigcirc 73$ |
| $\diamond$ J 107 | W L | $\diamond 65$ |
| \& A 1095 | S | \& Q J 8762 |
|  | A AK5 2 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 10985$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 84 |  |
|  | \& 43 |  |

Closed Room

| West | North | East |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Loonstein | P.Wang | Zeitak | South <br> Liu |
| 1NT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ (a) | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3 | All Pass |

(a) Clubs

Open Room

| West <br> R.Wang | North <br> Khutorsky | East <br> Deng | South <br> Matatyahou |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1NT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\&}$ | Pass |
| 4\% | Pass | Pass | Pass |

If you are dealt an ace-king holding, there must be a reason for it. You had better lead one of those honors. However, Liu, the Chinese South in the Closed Room, led a trump against three clubs. Declarer went up with the ace to start the hearts right away. The club king dropping was a nice bonus. Three clubs made with two overtricks, while normal defence would have pressured the declarer into locating the stiff trump king offside in order to make his contract.

In the Open Room, there was more action. South, Gal Matatyahou, refused to pass with his 10 -count and entered the auction with a lead-directing double of two spades. When West, looking at a super fit for his partner's club suit, increased the ante to four clubs, they were bound to go down against normal defence. 5 IMPs to Israel.

The first segment finished 66-18 in favour of Israel (11 of those IMPs coming from their carryover).

## CHINA HONG KONG vs FRANCE

## PHILLIP ALDER

## Round 14, Youngsters Teams

It is probably fair to say that China Hong Kong had been doing slightly better than expected and France had been doing worse. China Hong Kong was obviously going to qualify for the knockout stage, but France needed some good results. Could the Europeans make up ground in this match?
This was the first board:
Dealer South. N-S vul.

|  | A 10763 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 3 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AKJ542 |  |
|  | \& 9 |  |
| - 8 | N | ¢ AKQ 542 |
| ๑KJ75 |  | $\bigcirc$ Q 642 |
| $\diamond 10963$ | W E | $\diamond$-- |
| \& K Q 83 | S | \& 654 |
|  | A J 9 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 1098$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 87 |  |
|  | \& A J 1072 |  |

Open Room:

| West <br> Boulin | North <br> Chan | East <br> Guillemin | South <br> Tsang <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \triangleleft$ | Pass |
| 1NT | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \circlearrowleft$ | $3 \diamond$ |
| $3 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |

Closed Room:

| West <br> $W u$ | North <br> Bellicaud | East <br> Lam | South <br> Basler <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $1 ヵ$ | Pass |
| $1 N T$ | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \bowtie$ | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

At both tables, East ruffed the diamond lead and played a club.
In the Open Room, Jackson Tsang (South) played low, so declarer Theo Guillemin won with the king. If East had now played on spades, he would have got home. When instead he led a heart to his queen, he was going down. He led a second trump, and North accurately returned a low heart to remove declarer's last trump. South then ruffed the third round of spades to leave declarer a trick short. He took only
two spades, two high hearts, two clubs (endplaying South in the suit) and three ruffs.

In the Closed Room, Raphael Basler (South) won trick two with his ace of clubs and gave his partner a club ruff (declarer not guessing to put in dummy's eight). Luc Bellicaud (North) returned a low diamond. East ruffed and led his queen of hearts to North's ace to give this position:

|  | ه 10763 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$-- |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A J 54 |  |
|  | \& ${ }^{\text {- - }}$ |  |
| ¢ 8 | N | A AKQ 542 |
| $\bigcirc$ K J 7 | N | $\bigcirc 6$ |
| $\diamond 109$ | W E | $\diamond$-- |
| \& Q 8 | S | \& 6 |
|  | ¢ J 9 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 109$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q |  |
|  | \& J 107 |  |

What should North have done, the defence needing one more trick?
North made the natural-looking play of another diamond, but Alfred Lam ruffed in his hand, played a club to dummy's queen, drew trumps, and had the rest of the tricks.
North had to switch to a spade. Then, with South holding only two spades, declarer could not have done everything.
Plus 50 and plus 420 gave China Hong Kong 10 imps on the board.


Then came:
Board 16. Dealer West. E-W vul.
AK 7
© K 653
$\diamond$ A Q 1075
\& K 2

| ¢ J 942 | N | A A 1085 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 97$ | W E | $\bigcirc$ Q J 2 |
| $\diamond$ J9842 | $\mathrm{w}^{\text {L }}$ | $\diamond$ K 6 |
| \& A 7 | S | \& Q 843 |
|  | A Q 63 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 1084 |  |
|  | $\diamond 3$ |  |
|  | \& J 10965 |  |

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Boulin | Chan | Guillemin | Tsang |
| Pass | 1NT | All Pass |  |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $W u$ | Bellicaud | Lam | Basler |
| Pass | $1 N T$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\mathbf { q }}$ |
| Pass | $2 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

In the Open Room, East found the best lead of a low club, and Chris Chan (North) threw his king under West's ace. Now a spade switch would have been best, but West tried the nine of diamonds. East took declarer's ten with his king and strangely returned to clubs. North established dummy's suit and eventually took eight tricks: one spade, two hearts, two diamonds and three clubs.
In theory, Basler guessed well to gamble with Stayman, because four hearts could have been made, but that is easier typed than played. He started well. He won the second club with his king, led the king of spades to drive out the ace, won the spade return with dummy's queen, and ruffed a spade to give this position:


Now declarer needed to continue with the crossruff theme: ace of diamonds, diamond ruff, club from the dummy, et cetera. Instead, he drew two rounds of trumps ending in the dummy, ruffed a club in his hand, cashed the ace of diamonds, and ruffed a diamond. Now, though, East had the last three tricks with the queen of clubs, queen of hearts and a high spade: two down.
Plus 120 and plus 100 was 6 imps to China Hong Kong.

After a couple of quiet deals came another big swing.
Board 19. Dealer South. E-W vul.
A K 5
© J 94
$\diamond$ K 943
\& A 853

| A 9 | N | A A Q 10876 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ A Q 10872 | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathbf{N}}$ | $\bigcirc 53$ |
| $\diamond 652$ | W E | $\diamond$ A 8 |
| ¢ K J 2 | S | \& 1097 |
|  | AJ4 32 |  |
|  | ๑K6 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q J 107 |  |
|  | \& Q 64 |  |

Open Room:

| West <br> Boulin | North <br> Chan | East <br> Guillemin | South <br> Tsang <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2 \diamond$ | (a) | Pass | $2 \circlearrowleft$ |
| (b) | All Pass |  |  |

(a) Weak two-bid in either major
(b) Pass or correct

Closed Room:

| West <br> $W u$ | North <br> Bellicaud | East <br> Lam | South <br> Basler <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \varnothing$ | Pass | $1 N T$ (a) | Pass |
| $2 \varnothing$ | Pass | $3 \Omega$ | Pass |
| $4 \varnothing$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

(a) Spades -- the Kaplan Inversion

In the Open Room, two hearts made exactly.
Not only did Michael Wu open one heart not two (I agree), but he also accepted his partner's game-try.
He received a low-diamond lead, which he ducked to South's ten. A shift to the six of hearts would have been interesting, but South tried the four of clubs. North took West's jack with his ace and returned a club, won by dummy's nine. Declarer cashed the ace of diamonds, led a club to his king, ruffed his last diamond, and played a heart to his ten and North's

| 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

BUTLER
jack. This should have been fatal, and Bellicaud found the killing lead of his last club, but his partner did not cooperate. Instead of ruffing with his king of hearts, which would have promoted North's nine as the setting trick, South discarded a spade. West ruffed, cashed the ace of hearts, and claimed when the king appeared.
That was another 11 imps to China Hong Kong and the lead by 27-1.

On Board 22, France gained a lucky 4 imps when Lam let through a three-notrump contract. In the other room, a two-heart opening by Guillemin showing a weak major two-suiter resulted in two spades three down vulnerable.

There was one more sizable swing:
Board 24. Dealer West. None vul.



Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Boulin | Chan | Guillemin | Tsang |
| $2 \varnothing$ (a) | $3 \propto$ | $3 \varnothing$ | Dble |
| Pass | $4 \propto$ | Pass | $4 \odot$ |
| Pass | $5 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

(a) Weak major two-suiter

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $W u$ | Bellicaud | Lam | Basler |
| Pass | $1 \&$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $2 \uparrow$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $3 \&$ | Pass | $3 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

This time the weak two-heart opening worked; although if North had passed out three hearts doubled, that might have gained his side 500 .

Guillemin found the only lead to beat five clubs: a low heart. Now the defenders had to take one heart, one diamond and one club. Trying desperately to make it, declarer went two down.
At first glance, three notrumps looks awkward, but with hearts 4-4 and the king onside, declarer played for two spades, two hearts, three diamonds and two clubs. He was allowed an overtrick after a slight misdefence.
Plus 100 and plus 430 gave France a much-needed 11 imps , but the other boards were quiet and China Hong Kong ran out winners by 33 imps to 20 , or 13.72-6.28 in victory points.

This consolidated China Hong Kong's position near the top of the table and made it that much harder for France to qualify for the knockout phase.

## Answers to the Quiz on page 4

1. With neither side vulnerable during a duplicate (pair event), you hold:

| A K 97 | A K 108 |  | \& 76 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The auction starts like this: |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | Partner |  | You |
|  | 14 | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | 30 | Pass | ?? |

What is your bidding plan?
I think this is deceptive. It looks obvious to bid three spades, but do you really want to play in spades? No! You want hearts to be trumps. If you bid three spades, partner might insist on correcting hearts to spades.
You could jump to four notrumps, but this breaks one of the key rules of Blackwood: you have two immediate club losers and partner has not guaranteed a control in that suit.
The best continuation is four diamonds, which is a control-bid showing first-round diamond control and denying first-round club control. Then you await partner's next move with interest.
If partner takes control with four notrumps or control-bids in return, you should know what to do. But what if he settles for four hearts? Are you worth another slam-try?
If so, presumably you would bid four spades, really trying to impress upon partner your lack of a club control.
My feeling is that pass is understandable, but I would make one more try because of the double fit. Maybe partner holds something like:

$$
\text { A AQ653 ๑Q74 } 6982 \diamond K \text { Q }
$$

He would surely bid as he has with that hand.
The main risk is that partner has king-doubleton or king-third of clubs. Then six hearts could be on the position of the ace of clubs -- and, to make matters worse, six spades might be laydown unless East can lead a heart and West can ruff, partner holding this type of hand:
2.

|  | - 652 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 8543$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A Q |  |
|  | \& 4762 |  |
| ¢J 94 | N | ¢ K 108 |
| ©J96 | $\mathrm{w}^{\text {N }}$ | $\bigcirc$ A 102 |
| $\diamond$ J 752 | W E | $\diamond 108643$ |
| * Q 93 | S | \& J 10 |
|  | A A Q 73 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K Q 7 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 9 |  |
|  | \& K 854 |  |


| West | North | East | South <br> $1 N T$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | All Pass |  |
| Pass | 3NT | An |  |

How would you plan the play in three notrumps after West has led the two of diamonds?

This is one of my favorite deals. It was declared by Jim Proctor. He is one of England's best tournament directors, but based on this performance he should be competing for a place on that country's international team.
Declarer needs to take these nine tricks: two spades, three hearts, two diamonds and two clubs. So, South needs the spade finesse and to find East with ace-third of hearts. But there are entry problems. Suppose, after winning the first trick with dummy's diamond queen, South leads a heart to his king, returns to dummy with a club to the ace and plays a second heart. East can step in with the ace and return a diamond. With no dummy entry remaining, declarer cannot enjoy the thirteenth heart.
Proctor saw the solution. After the queen of diamonds and a heart to the king, Proctor led his king of diamonds to dummy's ace, establishing the opponents' suit for them! But now, after Proctor led a second heart, he couldn't be defeated. East won with the ace and the defenders cashed their three diamond tricks before switching to a club. However, Proctor won in hand, unblocked the queen of hearts, reached the dummy with a club, cashed the last heart and took the spade finesse -- beautiful.


Bridge does involve some guesswork.
3.

|  | ヘ 72 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 43$ |
|  | $\diamond$ A 1042 |
|  | \& Q J 1098 |
| 4 64 | N ${ }^{\text {a J } 85}$ |
| $\bigcirc$ K Q J 108 | W E 09 |
| $\diamond$ K Q 75 | W E $\quad$ J9863 |
| \& 75 | S \&6432 |
|  | A AKQ 1093 |
|  | © A 7652 |
|  | $\diamond-$ |
|  | \& AK |


| West | North | East | South $2 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | $3 \diamond$ (a) | Pass | 34 |
| Pass | $4 \%$ | Pass | 45 |
| Pass | 44 | Pass | 64 |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

(a) The ace of diamonds -- a very poor idea

West leads the king of hearts, and East follows suit with the nine. How would you plan the play?

This deal occurred during the 1987 Central American and Caribbean Championships. The declarer was Mohan Seepersad from Trinidad. Assuming a favorable trump break, he could see 13 top tricks: six spades, one heart, one diamond and five clubs. But how could he cash them without a dummy entry?
If West's overcall was genuine, East must have started with a singleton nine of hearts. Now, if only East had also begun life with three spades ...
After winning with the ace of hearts, declarer cashed two top trumps and his two top clubs. Then Seepersad exited with the three of spades.
East was welcome to win the trick with his jack (or five!), but then he had to lead a minor-suit card, giving declarer access to the four winners sitting in the dummy.

4.

| Dlr: East | \& 82 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Vul: E-W | $\diamond$ AJ 9 |
|  | $\diamond 6$ |
|  |  |
|  | \& A 976432 |



| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Partner |  |  |  | | Dummy | You |
| :--- | :--- | | Declarer |
| :--- |
|  |
| $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass |

Against five diamonds doubled, West leads the queen of clubs. Declarer wins in his hand with the king and plays the king of diamonds. After winning with your ace, how would you defend?

South, who couldn't bid diamonds naturally on the first round after East's opening in the suit, overbid slightly with five diamonds. However, the king of clubs looked like a useful card.
Sitting East was Jeremy Flint, one of Britain's bestever players who died in 1989. He described this deal in The Times of London. He wrote, "Drowsily, I cashed the king of spades." At that point, the defence was finished. Declarer could win whatever Flint played next (ruffing a spade continuation, of course), draw trumps, and run dummy's clubs, aided by the helpful 2-2 break.
Flint admitted to thinking that if South had only one club, the contract was sure to fail. But Flint didn't consider how to defend if South had two clubs. Then, the only chance was to strand declarer in the dummy with a heart switch at trick three.
Declarer, with no quick hand entry, couldn't have immediately drawn trumps and run the clubs. He would have had to lead a major, but then the defenders could have taken three tricks: one spade, one heart and one diamond.

The article ended with an insight into top bridge players. Traditionally, they are late risers. A game that starts before two or three in the afternoon is greeted with dismay. This deal took place at ten in the morning, and Flint mentioned that he liked to delude himself that he would have found the winning defence later in the day.

BUTLER RANKING - JUNIOR TEAMS (AFTER ROUND 21)


BUTLER RANKING - GIRLS TEAMS (AFTER ROUND 13)

| Players | Butler | Country | Boards |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GUAN Andi - XIA Mei | 1.64 | China | 14 |
| AO Xiang - GUAN Andi | 1.57 | China | 112 |
| BANAS Natalia - TICHA Magdalena | 1.38 | Netherlands | 126 |
| WANG Wan - YU Xiuting | 1.14 | China | 98 |
| DENG Xiaojing - XIA Mei | 1.04 | China | 112 |
| BRUIJNSTEEN Merel - WACKWITZ Janneke | 1.01 | Netherlands | 112 |
| BALDYSZ Zofia - MADUZIA Anna | 0.99 | Poland | 140 |
| VAN OMMEN Maaike - VISSER Esther | 0.93 | Netherlands | 98 |
| COMBESCURE Sarah - THUILLEZ Mathilde | 0.89 | France | 28 |
| LIN Amber - THAPA Isha | 0.88 | U.S.A. | 56 |
| NINGTIAS Elsya Saktia - SIBUEA Fortina Mora | 0.84 | Indonesia | 140 |
| MOLINA Diana - VILLEGAS Francisca | 0.68 | Chile | 28 |
| HUNT Allison - THAPA Isha | 0.60 | U.S.A. | 42 |
| FULLER Kirstyn - MCGRATH Francesca | 0.54 | Australia | 28 |
| LIN Amber - WERNIS Rebecca | 0.53 | U.S.A. | 70 |
| LE PENSEC Alice - THEPAUT-VENTOS Solene | 0.48 | France | 56 |
| LELEU Anais - MOURGUES Jennifer | 0.40 | France | 84 |
| HUNT Allison - MARRIOTT Asya | 0.36 | U.S.A. | 98 |
| COOPER Renee - PATTISON Ella | 0.36 | Australia | 168 |
| GAN Germaine - YEO Hui Teng | 0.30 | Singapore | 98 |
| MOSZCZYNSKA Zuzanna - PIESIEWICZ Dominika | 0.18 | Poland | 126 |
| EKREN Katarina - HAUGE Thea Hove | 0.10 | Norway | 168 |
| BREDE Joanna - BUDZYNSKA Magda | 0.06 | Poland | 70 |
| BRAKE Jessica - FULLER Kirstyn | 0.04 | Australia | 98 |
| THAPA Isha - WERNIS Rebecca | 0.00 | U.S.A. | 42 |
| MARRIOTT Asya - WERNIS Rebecca | 0.00 | U.S.A. | 28 |
| DI MAURO Agnese - TANINI Flaminia | -0.02 | Italy | 112 |
| INDREBO Thea Lucia - SJODAL Sofie Grasholt | -0.02 | Norway | 154 |
| LI Lan - ONG Jazlene | -0.14 | Singapore | 126 |
| EVA Gabriela Bindi Desi - MARTANTI Fransisca Tri | -0.30 | Indonesia | 112 |
| DONG Muyun - LIM Jing Xuan | -0.42 | Singapore | 112 |
| BRAKE Jessica - MCGRATH Francesca | -0.57 | Australia | 42 |
| GERSTMANN Sofia - NACRUR Francisca | -0.58 | Chile | 140 |
| CHANG Chiachi - CHEN Yunan | -0.63 | Chinese Taipei | 112 |
| TSOU Hsin-Yen - TSOU Meng-Hsuan | -0.64 | Chinese Taipei | 112 |
| LE PENSEC Alice - MOURGUES Jennifer | -0.69 | France | 70 |
| MOLINA Diana - ROMAN Valentina | -0.70 | Chile | 126 |
| CAPOBIANCO Sophia - DE LUTIO Caterina | -0.76 | Italy | 98 |
| BEKO Zsuzsanna - ERSEK Laura | -0.78 | Hungary | 98 |
| BROCCOLINO Susanna - RAFFA Enrica | -0.87 | Italy | 126 |
| ROMAN Valentina - VILLEGAS Francisca | -0.93 | Chile | 14 |
| KJENSLI Agnethe Hansen - SJODAL Sofie Grasholt | -1.00 | Norway | 14 |
| BEKO Zsofia - REVAI Hanna | -1.01 | Hungary | 98 |
| BEKO Maria - LAJOS Hanka | -1.06 | Hungary | 140 |
| CHEN Kuan-Hsuan - LEE Yi-Hsien | -1.09 | Chinese Taipei | 112 |
| LELEU Anais - THUILLEZ Mathilde | -1.25 | France | 56 |
| FYTRY Yunita - SEFITA Ernis | -1.42 | Indonesia | 84 |
| COMBESCURE Sarah - THEPAUT-VENTOS Solene | -1.81 | France | 42 |
| NACRUR Francisca - VILLEGAS Francisca | -2.00 | Chile | 28 |

BUTLER RANKING - YOUNGSTERS TEAMS (AFTER ROUND 17)

| Players | Butler | Country | Boards |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| BERK Hakan - CHANG Nolan | 2.02 | U.S.A. | 42 |
| SPENCER Cole - STEPHANI Isaac | 1.61 | U.S.A. | 70 |
| JESSE Stig - VORNKAHL Leonard | 1.12 | Germany | 98 |
| STOUGIE Leen - STOUGIE Marc | 1.04 | Netherlands | 182 |
| CHANG Chengyen - WANG Yungkuang | 1.00 | Chinese Taipei | 14 |
| CASPERSEN Soeren Veel - LAHRMANN Christian | 0.96 | Denmark | 126 |
| ANDRUSZKIEWICZ Jakub - SUCHARDA Edward | 0.90 | Poland | 168 |
| ALTER Florian - STRECK Lauritz | 0.84 | Germany | 238 |
| CHAN Chris TH - TSANG Jackson | 0.84 | China Hong Kong | 196 |
| LAM Alfr ed - WU Michael | 0.83 | China Hong Kong | 126 |
| CAI Zixi - YUAN Fangqing | 0.81 | China | 140 |
| LEUNG Alvin - LIU Yu Chen | 0.76 | Singapore | 168 |
| CHIARANDIN Francesco - GAIOTTI Alvaro | 0.67 | Inaly | 140 |
| EZION Amir - ZAMIR Ami | 0.66 | Israel | 182 |
| CHANG Nolan - SPENCER Cole | 0.56 | U.S.A. | 98 |
| TOLEDANO Oren - YEKUTIELI Asaf | 0.56 | ISrael | 196 |
| CHANG Nolan - STEPHANI Isaac | 0.54 | U.S.A. | 70 |
| GIUBILO Gianmarco - PORTA Federico | 0.51 | Italy | 140 |
| SOUKUP David - STEPHANI Isaac | 0.50 | U.S.A. | 42 |
| MANGANELLA Andrea - SCATA Sebastiano | 0.46 | Italy | 196 |
| BASLER Raphael - BELLICAUD Luc | 0.45 | France | 182 |
| PAN Randy - WANG Xihao | 0.44 | China | 154 |
| NIJSSEN Oscar - OVERVELDE Sven | 0.43 | Netherlands | 154 |
| MACZKA Stanislaw - TRENDAK Lukasz | 0.38 | Poland | 154 |
| BOUULIN Arthur - GUILEMIN Theo | 0.35 | France | 182 |
| AVITAL Shahaf - BANIRI Ilai Ilan | 0.29 | Irael | 98 |
| GODLEWSKI Piotr - MAJEWSKI Konrad | 0.27 | Poland | 154 |
| BUNE Soren - TODD-MOIR Victor | 0.23 | Denmark | 210 |
| CHIANG Chiafan - WANG Yungkuang | 0.23 | Chinese Taipei | 154 |
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$7 \quad 8$
$\left.\begin{array}{lllr}\text { CLEMENTSSON Sanna - SANDIN Alexander } & & & \text { Sweden }\end{array}\right) 196$

RESULTS - JUNIOR TEAMS

|  | 1 | SWEDEN | AUSTRALIA | 21 | 65 | 1.13 | 18.87 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | COLOMBIA | ARGENTINA | 24 | 92 | 0.00 | 20.00 | RANKING |  |  |
| -) | 3 | JAPAN | FRANCE | 17 | 87 | 0.00 | 20.00 |  |  |  |
| O | 4 | NORWAY | CANADA | 40 | 29 | 13.23 | 6.77 |  | NKING |  |
|  | 5 | POLAND | USA1 | 22 | 37 | 5.81 | 14.19 | AFTER ROUND 21 |  |  |
| Q | 6 | NETHERLANDS | ITALY | 34 | 23 | 13.23 | 6.77 |  |  |  |
| 2 | 7 | CHINA | HUNGARY | 27 | 38 | 6.77 | 13.23 | 1 | POLAND | 291.73 |
| 2 | 8 | SINGAPORE | FINLAND | 30 | 21 | 12.71 | 7.29 | 2 | SWEDEN | 280.08 |
|  | 9 | USA2 | ENGLAND | 49 | 14 | 17.77 | 2.23 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ | 10 | BANGLADESH | EGYPT | 20 | 47 | 3.45 | 16.55 | 3 | CHINA | 277.15 |
|  | 11 | GERMANY | HONG KONG | 22 | 48 | 3.62 | 16.38 | 4 | USA1 | 276.43 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | NORWAY | 276.11 |
|  | 1 | NETHERLANDS CHINA | POLAND NORWAY | 4 | 46 33 | 1.35 7.84 | 18.65 12.16 | 6 | NETHERLAND | 275.37 |
| - | 2 | GERMANY | JAPAN | 16 | 45 | 3.12 | 16.88 | 7 | SINGAPORE | 258.83 |
| O | 4 | USA2 | COLOMBIA | 46 | 15 | 17.19 | 2.81 | 8 | ARGENTINA | 243.07 |
|  | 5 | BANGLADESH | SWEDEN | 40 | 50 | 7.03 | 12.97 |  |  |  |
| Q | 6 | SINGAPORE | AUSTRALIA | 31 | 5 | 16.38 | 3.62 | 9 | AUSTRALIA | 238.03 |
| $Z$ | 7 | EGYPT | ARGENTINA | 29 | 47 | 5.15 | 14.85 | 10 | ITALY | 232.97 |
|  | 8 | ENGLAND | FRANCE | 20 | 16 | 11.28 | 8.72 | 11 | USA2 | 230.67 |
| O | 9 | ITALY | FINLAND | 39 | 39 | 10.00 | 10.00 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ | 10 | HUNGARY | USA1 | 21 | 64 | 1.24 | 18.76 | 12 | HUNGARY | 226.31 |
|  | 11 | HONG KONG | CANADA | 50 | 3 | 19.18 | 0.82 | 13 | FRANCE | 214.41 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | HONG KONG | 208.76 |
|  | 1 | ITALY | HUNGARY | 68 | 5 | 20.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  | 2 | USA1 | HONG KONG | 43 | 27 | 14.42 | 5.58 | 15 | ENGLAND | 194.48 |
|  | 3 | CANADA | ENGLAND | 48 | 24 | 16.03 | 3.97 | 16 | FINLAND | 175.70 |
| 0 | 4 | FRANCE | EGYPT | 44 | 30 | 13.96 | 6.04 | 17 | JAPAN | 150.92 |
| 0 | 5 | ARGENTINA | SINGAPORE | 29 | 22 | 12.16 | 7.84 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ | 6 | AUSTRALIA | BANGLADESH | 47 | 21 | 16.38 | 3.62 | 18 | CANADA | 142.62 |
| $Z$ | 7 | SWEDEN | USA2 | 33 | 28 | 11.58 | 8.42 | 19 | BANGLADESH | 121.83 |
|  | 8 | COLOMBIA | GERMANY | 46 | 23 | 15.85 | 4.15 | 20 | EGYPT | 117.43 |
| - | 9 | JAPAN | CHINA | 26 | 45 42 | 4.94 5.58 | 15.06 14.42 | 21 | COLOMBIA | 115.48 |
|  | 11 | NORWAY | NETHERLANDS | 44 | 39 | 11.58 | 8.42 | 22 | GERMANY | 55.12 |

## RESULTS - YOUNGSTERS TEAMS



## RESULTS - KIDS TEAMS

FINAL 1

|  |  | C.O. | $\mathbf{1}$ | TOT | $\mathbf{2}$ | TOT | $\mathbf{3}$ | TOT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ISRAEL | 11 | 55 | 66 | 5 | 71 | 16 | $\mathbf{9 2}$ |
|  | CHINA | 0 | 18 | 18 | 5 | 23 | 46 | $\mathbf{7 9}$ |

FINAL 2nd/3rd

| (1) |  | c.o. | 1 | TOT | 2 | TOT | 3 | TOT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FRANCE | 6 | 42 | 48 | 12 | 60 | 24 | 114 |
|  | POLAND | 0 | 34 | 34 | 10 | 44 | 39 | 108 |

SECONDARY KO 1

|  |  | C.O. | 1 | TOT | 2 | TOT | 3 | TOT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CHINA1 | 0 | 58 | 58 | 1 | 59 | 55 | 166 |
|  | USA | 0.33 | 32 | 32.3 | 12 | 44.3 | 20 | 71.3 |
| SECONDARY KO 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  | C.O. | 1 | TOT | 2 | TOT | 3 | TOT |
|  | NETHERIANDS | 0 | 9 | 9 | 35 | 44 | 51 | 132 |
|  | ENGLAND | 1 | 37 | 38 | 12 | 50 | 42 | 111 |


| 1 | CANADA | 171.29 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2 | INDONESIA | 136.90 |
| 3 | CZECH REP. | 132.95 |
| 4 | SWEDEN | 115.08 |
| 5 | ITALY | 92.11 |
| 6 | HUNGARY | 9.67 |

## WBF Health Interview Survey

As in the previous WBF Championships in Istanbul (2014) and Opatija (2015), a health interview survey will take place at this WBF event as well.

Youngsters, Junior and Girls are welcome to fill out a questionnaire on health-related topics and undergo a brief interview. The procedure will take place in the room on the left side of the Salone Moresco on the ground floor and it will take about 10 minutes.
Players can drop in for the interview on Wednesday or Thursday (9.00-12.00 and 14.00-18.00).

In the Salone Moresco, you will also find several posters, which were prepared by the WBF Medical Commission. Three of these posters explain the purpose and methods of Anti-Doping, while a fourth describes the research activity carried out by the WBF Medical Commission.


