Auburn 2019-05-04

## Board 4

West Deals
Both Vul

A A 5
$\bigcirc$ A J 2
$\diamond$ QJ 6542
\& 107
A Q 10964

- K Q 1096
$\diamond$ K
\& 92
A K 8
$\bigcirc 87$
$\diamond$ A 1083
\& A K J 64

| NS 6 | N | 10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | Stew |  | Pete |
| Pass | $1 \diamond^{1}$ | $2 \diamond^{2}$ | $20^{3}$ |
| Pass | $2 \mathbf{N}^{4}$ | Pass | $4 \diamond^{5}$ |
| Pass | $4 \mathrm{NT}^{6}$ | Pass | $5 ¢{ }^{7}$ |

All pass

1. $2+\diamond, 11=15$ unbalanced or 12-13 balanced.
2. Michaels (5-5 majors).
3. Invitational or better with clubs (cheaper cue has 4th suit).
4. Waffle (don't know what to do).
5. Intended as forcing raise (no heart stopper).
6. Responded to keycards in clubs ( 2 without $\& \mathrm{Q}$ ).
7. Please do pick a minor (not understood).

5 \& by South
Made 5 - NS +600
This auction was not a thing of beauty, with questionable calls by both of us, and arriving at an inferior contract. That is not the primary reason I am presenting the deal.

Stew Rubenstein said that when he or Chris Parker plays with Adam or Zach Grossack, and there are two ways to show a suit, the cheaper one shows invitational strength (leaving more space to sort things out), and the higher bid is forcing to game.

At the table, I assumed what I consider to be standard: cue bid is invitational or better, and bidding directly is competitive (non-forcing). In this case, my 20 showed invitational clubs or better, and $3 \&$ would have been non-forcing. The critical issue is that, over Stew's $2 \uparrow$ waffle, I was unable to risk being passed out in $3 \diamond$.

We surely had trouble sorting this out. Playing Stew's way, 3 \& over $2 \diamond$ would be game-forcing with clubs. The auction might continue $3 \diamond-3 \uparrow-3$ NT, reaching the best contract, played from the correct side. ( $6 \diamond$ and $5 \&$ only prosper because the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ is unexpectedly on side.)

Does the competitive hand come up often? Not for me - I like the way the pros play it.

## Board 9

North Deals
E-W Vul

| Irrational Exuberance$\rightarrow 7$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A Q 8753 |  |  |
| $\diamond$ K 987 |  |  |
|  | \& 53 |  |
| A A 1032 |  | A K Q J 8 |
| $\bigcirc 4$ |  | $\bigcirc$ J 1096 |
| $\diamond 105$ |  | $\diamond$ J 63 |
| \& AK10974 \& Q |  |  |
| A 9654 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 2$ |  |  |
| $\diamond$ A Q 42 |  |  |
| \& J 86 |  |  |



1. A clear 10 opening for us, with 19 Bergen points.
2. Playing Tucker, $1 \boldsymbol{A}$ is less than game forcing with any $4+\boldsymbol{A}$.
$5 \diamond$ by North
Down 2 - NS - 100
When partner rebid diamonds freely, I got excited. My three red honors were clearly gold, but it appears I bid too much.

Guess what? We stole a cheap save, before they could find their laydown 4 game. Both sides have double fits, and there are lots of tricks on this hand.

