

344. Michaels

Playing in a team game against experienced opponents, I hold:

♠ A K Q 8 7 6 3 2 ♡ Q 7 4 ◇ 8 ♣ J 4

With both sides vulnerable, I give a fleeting thought to a four-spades opening but sometimes hands with long, solid trumps offer slam prospects opposite a source of tricks and a control or two, so I open **one spade**. West, on my left, overcalls **two spades**—Michaels for hearts and a minor. Partner passes, and East bids two notrump, ostensibly asking his partner to designate his major. My hand is not quite as good as it was initially in light of West's announced heart strength, but I still have seven top tricks. I would be unlucky to go for more than 500, so I rebid **three spades**. West tries **four diamonds**, and partner comes to life with **four spades**, which ends the auction:

South	West	North	East
1♠	2♠	Pass	Pass
3♠	4◇	4♠	All Pass

West leads the ace of clubs and partner puts down a smattering of values:

♠ J 5
♡ A 9 3
◇ Q 9 7 4 2
♣ Q 8 2

♣A led

♠ A K Q 8 6 3 2
♡ Q 7 4
◇ 8
♣ J 4

With the lead, I should have a club trick, so I am within one of my contract. West next cashes the ace of diamonds and then plays the king and another club to dummy's queen.

I ruff a diamond low in my hand, and return to dummy with the ♠J (both defenders following again), and ruff another diamond, this time high. East plays the ten and West the jack. I draw East's remaining trumps in two rounds as West discards hearts.

It appears that West's distribution was 1=5=4=3. Assuming that he has both red kings, which is indicated by his four diamond bid, he is

ripe for a squeeze. I play another round of trumps to reach this position:

♠ —	♠ —	
♡ A 9		
◇ Q		
♣ —		
♠ —		♠ —
♡ K 10		♡ x x
◇ K		◇ —
♣ —		♣ 10
	♠ 6	
	♡ Q 7	
	◇ —	
	♣ —	

On the six of spades, West throws the ten of hearts. I discard the ◇Q and the ace and queen of hearts win the last two tricks.

The full deal:

♠ J 5		
♡ A 9 3		
◇ Q 9 7 4 2		
♣ Q 8 2		
♠ 7		♠ 10 9 4
♡ K 10 8 5 2		♡ J 6
◇ A K J 6		◇ 10 5 3
♣ A K 7		♣ 10 9 6 5 3
	♠ A K Q 8 6 3 2	
	♡ Q 7 4	
	◇ 8	
	♣ J 4	

Thirty years ago, Terence Reese habitually criticized two-suited bids as "too descriptive." He lost his argument, however, because these bids are here to stay. But occasionally they become a double-edged sword, revealing distributional patterns to declarer which might not otherwise be apparent.