

Chip Martel Interview – December 2001

www.BridgeMatters.com

(c) 2001, 2008 Glen Ashton BridgeMatters

Originally conducted in December 2001, the following interview was transcribed in the summer of 2006 following the resolution of sound recording problems.

BridgeMatters: First, congratulations on winning your third Bermuda Bowl in October and the Open Board-a-Match at the Las Vegas NABC in November.

Chip Martel: Thank you. It certainly has been a good 2001.

BridgeMatters: While many players find it difficult to play with their spouses, you enjoy a successful partnership with your wife, Jan Martel. But what was it like to have your wife as team captain at the Bermuda Bowl?

Chip Martel: Actually, we had sort of a group captaincy with Jan, Fred Gitelman and Sheri Winestock sharing the duties. In a sense, it is not ideal to have a player's spouse in charge. However, Jan did mostly coaching type stuff in preparing us for the tournament. There were 18 other teams so that meant more than 50 pairs could be deployed in different lineups. Before the tournament began, some 50 systems were posted to a web site. Somebody had to look through them all, figure out what people were playing, decide what we needed to prepare against, and put together summaries of what we might have to deal with. Jan and I also prepared defenses for things we felt we might not be totally ready for.

Altogether, we had to deal with two categories: one, things where we could bring written defenses to the table – we had about 80 pages for that – and, two, things where we had to memorize the defenses – we had about 40 pages of that material. Later, on a couple of occasions, the whole team got together to deal out random hands. That way, we got to practice bidding against these sorts of things and to applying the defenses. So, yes, there was a lot of prep work.

BridgeMatters: How much work did you and Jan spend on developing defenses and ideas?

Chip Martel: Fortunately, a lot of the defenses had already been developed over the years. For example, some of the work was done when we were the co-captains of the US Olympiad team last year. Also, we worked with Eric Kokish to prepare the US teams for the previous Bermuda Bowl in Bermuda. As a result, we already had somewhat of a database. But people come up with new stuff every year so we had to get feedback from the other players. And there is always stuff to revise and refine, in part for the defense itself and in part to determine how you write them up so all of us have a clear understanding of what we are doing. For this tournament alone, we probably spent a couple of hundred hours. But over the years, we spent many hundreds of hours.

BridgeMatters: In terms of the things you faced or could have faced at the world championship, did any one thing concern you more than the others?

Chip Martel: There is always a trade-off between how bad something is and how likely it is to come up. For example, if several people play one particular thing, it will likely come up more frequently. What probably concerned us most was a 2♥ opening that showed a weak two in either major. Two pairs on contending teams – in fact, two teams we ended up playing in the knockout (and the round robin) – used that bid.

BridgeMatters: In a similar vein, didn't the Norwegians also play that a 3♣ opening could be a bad preempt in either minor?

Chip Martel: Yes. And there was also a 3♥ opening that could be a bad preempt in either major.

BridgeMatters: Are these difficult to defend against, particularly when the suit being opened may actually be the real suit?

Chip Martel: Yes. I felt that the 2♥ bid was the worst of the three. And, because it was the lowest of the three bids, it was likely to come up more frequently. Actually, the 3♣ opening did not look like it would be much of a problem since playing in the other minor is not that much of a priority. A double of 3♣ as takeout – whether they have clubs or not – is not as bad as a double of 2♥ as takeout – whether they have hearts or not. Of course, the higher the bid, the less likely it will be bad for your side if they do end up playing in the wrong suit. For example, passing out 3♣ when they don't really have clubs could be really bad for them. But passing out 2♥, when they really have spades, well, that might not work out as badly for them since they're not quite as high.

As it turned out, none of these bids ended up really causing problems for us. In fact, one of them, in a slightly indirect way, caused a problem for the opponents. After they opened 2♥, the auction continued 3♣-P-3NT. They led a heart, immediately giving us our ninth trick. Now, they might have led a heart anyway but part of their rationale for actually leading one was probably that they had not really shown the suit. Thus, they might have hoped that declarer had only so-so hearts. Other than that, it actually had no real effect on the final match. Nor did it have any real effect against France. One of Norway's pairs also played an even more exciting 2♥ opening. It could be a weak two in hearts or, at favorable vulnerability, any weak balanced hand. On one hand they opened a 3-3-2-5 five-count. Fortunately – well fortunately for them – after they got doubled in 2♥, they ran to 3♣, catching their partner with 4-card support. In the end, we were able to reach 3NT, our normal contract.

BridgeMatters: Should these so-called destructive methods be controlled, or even made illegal?

Chip Martel: One problem with such methods, or at least one of the complaints we have with them, is this: if a 2♥ opening could be weak in either hearts or spades, how can you really play this safely? In other words, how can you open 2♥ when your safety level is the two-level? Do you expect your partner to put you at the three-level to guarantee you get to the right suit? If partner opens 2♥ vulnerable, which could be hearts or spades, and you have a 3-2-4-4 11-count, you certainly do not want to play 2♥ if your partner has spades. But if you bid, you may be getting your side too high. It's important to know what they expect responder to do with that type of hand because that will influence what hands they choose to open 2♥. For example, if you expect responder to bid with that hand, you would rather have spades than hearts because with hearts you may get too high. But if you expect responder to pass with that hand, you would rather have hearts than spades. If playing against a pair like this, you would like to know if they were more likely to have hearts than spades.

In fact, in an earlier tournament, a women's pair played this convention. Later, when we looked at the hands they opened, we found that their 2♥ opening really showed the equivalent of a 3♥ opening or a 2♠ bid. Responder could often bid 2♠ over the 2♥ opening knowing that if opener did have hearts, it would be based on extra playing strength. Of course, if this is their real agreement, you would like to know that.

There's yet another problem. When people first announce they play these conventions, they probably do not have much experience with them. But by the time you play them in the tournament, they may know a lot more about their method than they have put down. In fact, what they may really have is a private, unannounced understanding about the convention, which is against the rules of course, but also kind of hard to enforce.

This sort of thing comes up a lot when you open a suit you might or might not have. It does not come up with Multi, which is not as unsound as opening 2♥ because responder can get to opener's suit without going past the two-level. So there is fundamental difference between these two things.

In my experience, people who play these methods really have no choice but to break the rules. Even though they are trying to do everything in good faith, they really can't. So my feeling is it would be appropriate to have more restrictions.

BridgeMatters: Those types of conventions seem to have a random nature to them, sort of throwing IMPs up into the air. Do you agree?

Chip Martel: There is certainly some truth to that. If you open 2♥ on Jx-xxx-xxx-Qxxxx, for example, you are definitely putting some IMPs up for grabs. On the other hand, that does not necessarily mean that we should get rid of these conventions. Nothing in the rules of bridge says that people must play down the middle. Also, other things can create random swings. In our match in the final against Norway, for example, all sorts of random swings were created by things like NT ranges, opening bid style and random systemic differences.

However, I will say there is an inherent advantage in playing something people are not prepared for. Look at it from a practical matter. There are 50 some pairs in the round robin. If only one or two pairs play something, it is likely that most if not all of the field will be unprepared to play against it. Even if they put in the work – looking the convention over in advance and figuring out what to do against it – they will not have had enough experience actually playing against it to gain the judgment they need.

When these conventions are used more commonly, people have the opportunity to gain experience, to try various defenses and to determine what tends to work well. So one of things to consider is, is it right to encourage people to come up with new systems simply for the surprise factor? In my opinion, that is really more of a problem: playing something different simply because the opponents will be unprepared. This is particularly true in the round robin where you don't gain much preparing for a specific opponent for just one match. But it is an advantage for the pairs who play something different because they get to play it throughout the round robin.

Put it this way. If somebody comes in to do a transaction and you are able to steal a penny or two from them each time, that doesn't hurt the person you're dealing with a lot. But in the end, you can reap a lot from it.

BridgeMatters: How important is it to play a particular system, as opposed to being a partnership with really solid agreements and understandings, and being able to cope with a lot of situations?

Chip Martel: The difference in the theoretical merits of different systems is pretty small unless one is playing something really foolish, like opening 3NT on a balanced 5 to 7 count. Something like that would probably produce a substantial loss over time. For all the popular systems in play today, there is not much difference.

However, there are substantial gains to be had in having strong partnership understandings about a lot of auctions, and knowing your system. And it's important that you and your partner feel comfortable playing it. In fact, that is probably more important than your actual individual system. You see different pairs playing the same system, and the pairs that have good judgment get a lot better results out of it than the pairs who don't.

BridgeMatters: Let's say your partner, Lew Stansby, retired, and you were not playing with your wife. If you established a new partnership, would you stick with the weak NT base you have now?

Chip Martel: The only reason I might be tempted to switch to a non-weak NT system is because more people now are playing those systems. As a result, more development of bridge theory has been geared towards strong NT-based systems, things like support doubles, good/bad-2NT and other useful devices. Some of these things don't work as well in a weak NT-based system. On the flip side, it can be useful to be on your own with destructive methods such as strange preemptive bids. For constructive methods, though, it might be better to be in the mainstream so you can take advantage of the broad pool of expertise in bidding development. Things used to be in reverse – and a lot of weak NT players were leading the development of bridge theory – but it has shifted.

BridgeMatters: Why do you think it has shifted? And what does it feel like to now be in the minority?

Chip Martel: I'm not sure why that is the case. I don't know enough about the history. Certainly, weak-NT systems were more of the in thing when I was starting to play bridge. Later, other developments affected the popularity of the weak NT. For example, weak-NT systems don't fit that well with strong club systems, where something like a 14-16 NT range works better and allows you to open lighter hands.

BridgeMatters: How do you feel about light openings? There was a hand in the Bermuda Bowl finals where your side didn't open 1♠ and ended up playing 1♠ after a passed hand response. Meanwhile, the Norwegians opened and got to 4♠, making.

Chip Martel: If you look at that hand closely, you'll see it had a sort of random effect. The two hands matched perfectly, with JTxxx of spades opposite A9x. If you take one of those spot cards away, it becomes a pretty bad contract. Also, every high card in the two hands was working hard. If you change the mesh of the two hands just a little bit, the person who opened light would have reached a hopeless game. Even on a good mesh of the cards, the game was by no means laydown. So, as I mentioned before, there are a lot of random effects due to style. For example, we had a hand where we opened 1NT, got to 2NT and the hands meshed horribly. One hand had QT doubleton of spades, and the other hand had four spades, but four spades only to the 8.

BridgeMatters: Yes, you went down three, while the Norwegians opened a suit, and stayed in 1NT, since their rebid showed 11-13.

Chip Martel: That's right. So, again, the range and mesh of hands worked out in such of way. We had Jxxx in another suit, and if that suit had been opposite the QT doubleton, then the cards would have been working harder. Then, there is the range of the NT. Of course, with 12 opposite 11, you would just as soon not get to 2NT regardless. But it was partly a range thing and partly a mesh thing.

Light openings do have their advantages. You get in the first shot and you take away bidding space from the opponents. By the other token, you lose some of the definition of your opening bids, so it is tradeoff. However, those advantages are part of the reason why sound openings have largely fallen off the map.

The question now is: how light is light? Partner and I used to be considered lighter opening bidders than most, but so many others have shifted that we are now closer to the middle.

BridgeMatters: You were described in one tournament bulletin as being a conservative bidder. Does that strike you as kind of funny?

Chip Martel: Oh, that's true, compared to some.

BridgeMatters: I guess compared to Meckwell, everybody is.

Chip Martel: If you look at the records, and the hands we were in, we were willing to take some risks.

BridgeMatters: Some weak notrumpers describe their opening range as a good 11 to 14. But at favorable vulnerability, a lot of those "good 11s" become "almost all 11s." How disciplined do you keep your weak NT opening bids?

Chip Martel: Certainly, more 11s get opened at favorable than at any other vulnerability. Even at favorable, we try to open NT only on hands we consider to be opening bids, so they still tend to have noticeable values. The main difference occurs when we are vulnerable; then, we open almost no 11 counts. The only one I opened recently was something like ATx of spades, AK9xx of diamonds and another T spot – a hand that is better than some 13 counts.

BridgeMatters: How often do you upgrade balanced 14 counts to a one level suit opening?

Chip Martel: A significant consideration is what my major suit holdings are. If I am 4-4 in the majors, I will often upgrade a 14-point hand to a minor suit opening. For one thing, it means the auction is less likely to get awkward. For example, partner might make a negative double or some such thing. And opening a weak NT and missing a major suit fit is not a good thing. That is the other problem: a 14 count, particularly a pure one, evaluates to rather more than a weak NT opposite partner's major suit fit, if there is one. So there are dangers if you open 1NT on that kind of hand.

Opening 1NT, weak or strong, is often a good thing. Sometimes I will open a weak NT with a 5-card minor that I would also open 1NT if playing a strong NT, just to get the NT bid in.

BridgeMatters: Some players using the weak NT – like some of the Italians – often open 1NT with a 5-card major. You do it infrequently. What is your feeling about that?

Chip Martel: We tend not to open 1NT with a 5-card major, particularly when we're vulnerable and there is an extra downside. If I had a 14 count and a 5-card major, I would not want to open a weak NT since I'm likely too good if we have a fit in that major. The same situation occurs if you open a strong NT holding 17 with a 5-card major. This is very dangerous if partner has a 4-card fit.

We do play that 1♥-1♠-1NT shows a strong NT. So sometimes, especially with exactly 2-5-3-3, we open 1NT to avoid a rebid problem.

BridgeMatters: The weak NT is often associated with two-way Stayman, but some weak-NT players, you included, have moved on to almost a strong-NT system, including Jacoby transfers. Why do you think that Jacoby transfers are just as effective with weak-NT openings?

Chip Martel: I think that playing a sophisticated transfer system is vastly superior to two-way Stayman. You get so much extra mileage out of transfer auctions. Take an invitational hand with 5 hearts. If you use two-way Stayman, respond 2♣ and opener rebids 2♠, you are kind of trapped. To my mind, it is not even a close question. The key is making sure responder has the ability to describe the hand well, such as a game-forcing two-suiter. Fundamentally, when you have a balanced hand opposite a shapely hand, it is superior to let the shapely hand describe the shape and the balanced hand evaluate how well their honors fit, the right level and the choice of game.

Still, while playing two-way Stayman is, in my opinion, clearly inferior, the net expected loss might be just 1 imp over a 64-board match compared to somebody playing transfers. That may even be too high. You could play a 64-board match and come across no hands where it made a difference, or perhaps just random differences.

Two-way Stayman has one main advantage; it is simpler because you can respond in a few bids. In transfer systems, one has to work to define it. Of course, people who play two-way Stayman can still play fancy relays after the 2♦ response. Using those relays, you can find out exactly what the notrumper has. That might be useful on some hands but more often it will have disadvantages, such as making the hand that is going to be declarer known.

BridgeMatters: Compared to the strong-NT opener, the weak-NT opening is more likely to have a weak suit, say Jxx or worse, or even two weak suits. Doesn't this make it more difficult for responder to judge the defensive and offensive potential of the hands, especially when the bidding is jammed?

Chip Martel: Compared to a minor suit opening, responder is certainly likely to have a better guess as to what your hand is like. In some situations after you have opened a minor suit, responder has to guess whether you are balanced or unbalanced. Are you saying that if you open a weak NT and the opponents bid, that responder is then not well placed?

BridgeMatters: Playing a strong NT, you can assume opener has values spread across. Playing a weak NT, responder has to worry if the values are focused in only two suits.

Chip Martel: I don't believe that's a significant problem. In some ways, it could even be the reverse because you have much more in high cards when using a strong NT. This creates more variability between the maximum and minimum because there are more high cards to shift around. On certain hands, the difference between the best and worst possible hands that opener could have for responder will be much greater than if playing a weak NT.

Perhaps this is a 'Law of Large Numbers' type thing.

[Interview note: see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Law_of_large_numbers which describes The Law of Large Numbers. In brief, the Law of Large Numbers is a fundamental concept in statistics and probability that describes how the average of a randomly selected sample from a large population is likely to be close to the average of the whole population.]

Thus, the average for opener's strong NT may be a little bit tighter, since, when using a weak NT, you are slotting fewer cards. But there may be a somewhat higher variance in the strong NT because you are more likely to be a bit away from the average. The factors do go both ways. In some sense, it is more important to have invitational sequences after a strong NT than after a weak NT because the strong NT opener is looking at more of his side's assets.

BridgeMatters: When opponents compete at the two-level over a weak NT opening, some prefer negative doubles while others believe in penalty doubles. What is your preference?

Chip Martel: We play negative doubles, more for philosophical reasons than purely theoretical ones. Certainly, we occasionally miss a penalty. However, competing effectively is important and negative doubles provide that option. I would be quicker to give up transfers, and play two-way Stayman, than I would be to give up negative doubles.

BridgeMatters: A lot of players don't play Flannery nowadays, but your partnership continues to. Why continue playing Flannery when so many argue it is unnecessary?

Chip Martel: It is not necessary but it does have its uses. People who criticize Flannery may be overlooking some of its benefits. I would not want to argue that it is right for everyone, and I have certainly toyed with giving it up for other things, but it does have various secondary advantages.

For example, an awkward hand for many partnerships is 5 hearts with 3 spades. Because we play Flannery, we can open 1♥ and raise partner's 1♠ response knowing that he expects only three-card support. That makes those hands more comfortable. Also, if responder doesn't want to be raised with just three-card support, he can choose not to respond 1♠ to your opening 1♥ bid. Certainly, you could deal with these awkward hands in other ways but using Flannery, you also get several other gains. Because partner knows we do not have 5 hearts, 4 spades and a minimum when we open 1♥, he doesn't have to worry about that hand type when responding 2NT or 2/1. As a result, the sequences work a little bit better. For example, in 2/1 sequences, we can play that 1♥-2♦-2♠ shows clubs rather than spades [*Interview note: see discussion later*].

Certainly, we have had good results using Flannery. In the semi-finals of the world championship, for example, the auction went 2♦-3♥ by us, passed out, when they were cold for 5♦. There are enough benefits for us to continue using Flannery although others may prefer to use 2♦ as Multi or something else. That is certainly a reasonable position that somebody could take.

BridgeMatters: Could you not also use Multi, and then use 2♥ for Flannery?

Chip Martel: We have certainly thought about that and, on some occasions, have even played it. In fact, Jan uses that approach with her other regular partner. So it is definitely something we have thought about doing. Part of the reason we don't do it is to avoid the hassle of having to pre-alert every round when playing in a board-a-match type of event. We play slowly enough now that we're not anxious to give up that extra time.

BridgeMatters: With the weak NT, you end up opening 1♦, or, more often, 1♣, with 15-17 balanced hands. Of course, you don't have transfers available over these openings as you would if opening a strong 1NT. We are now seeing more players using transfers over 1♣ openers. What are your thoughts on that approach?

Chip Martel: We played that for a while, perhaps a year, and basically found that the gains were so small it was not worth doing. Various other things happened on a random basis so we didn't get the advantages we thought we would. So we gave it up because the gains did not seem to be worth the trouble. It looks good in theory but did not seem to work out all that well in practice.

BridgeMatters: Before support doubles came along, when weak NT players opened a minor, partner responded, and the opponent then interfered, a double by opener would show a strong NT hand. However, many players now use that double to show three-card support. Do you use support doubles or strong NT doubles?

Chip Martel: We use the strong NT double. Of course, there are some hands where it would be useful to play support doubles, but we haven't felt it is worthwhile.

In particular, if you make a support double, your partner knows you have an unbalanced hand with three-card support or a strong NT hand with three-card support. The alternative is to raise with four-card support, or three-card support when unbalanced. You would then double with any strong balanced hand, which is the strong NT double.

If you play support doubles with a weak NT system, look what happens if I pass. Either I have an unbalanced misfit for you or a strong NT with just two-card support. These are two very different hands. In contrast, if you pass playing strong NT doubles, the pass always shows a distributional hand without a fit. For me, that seems to work better. Also, if you do pass, responder can pretty much count on you for having five cards in the minor suit you opened. In competitive auctions, that means responder can often go back to that suit. If you use support doubles in a weak NT system, responder will not have a good idea what to do when opener passes.

In fairness, if you have been playing something for a long time, there is little inclination to change unless you see a clear advantage in doing so. I do like support doubles in other situations, and when we play strong NT in 3rd seat vulnerable, we do use them.

BridgeMatters: One convention you use that is out of the norm is a jump to 2♥ after a 1♦ opening. This shows a strong hand with hearts or 10-12 balanced with four or longer clubs. Does that work well for you?

Chip Martel: It's annoying when partner opens 1♦ and you have a balanced hand in that sort of strength range. You don't want to bid 1NT with a hand that has lively game prospects opposite a strong NT hand. And bidding 2♣ on a 10 count puts too much pressure on that auction when partner has a minimum unbalanced hand. So this special 2♥ bid seemed the easiest way to handle that awkward hand. Also, you don't want to bid 2NT invitational as there is a good chance you will be wrong siding the contract. And, after 1♦-2NT invitational, it is hard to sort out forcing and non-forcing auctions in the minors. Many other weak notrumpers have now adopted the 1♦-2♥ response.

BridgeMatters: Do you have a name for it?

Chip Martel: I'm not much into developing catchy names.

BridgeMatters: You wrote an article in *Bridge World* about using the uncontested sequence, 1♥-2♦-2♠, to show clubs and the sequence, 1♥-2♦-3♣, to show spades. This works well in a Flannery system. Do you still like it?

Chip Martel: I still like it though it does not come up terribly often. The auction requires three consecutive things to happen, which is relatively rare. But it seems to work well when it does come up. It is probably worth playing for those who use Flannery because the heart-club hands are more frequent and more complicated. It is better to use a low bid for that.

BridgeMatters: You use Bart, where, after a 1♠ opening, a forcing NT response, and a 2♣ rebid by opener, then a 2♦ bid by responder shows a variety of hand types, including a hand with 5 hearts. What do you think about Bart?

Chip Martel: I think Bart is useful, since 2♦ conveniently shows 5 or 6 hearts, or a good club raise, or a constructive hand with a doubleton spade. That's a pretty large gain compared to the long diamond hand that a 2♦ bid would normally show. There is a downside. Playing standard and holding 1-4-5-3, an awkward shape, you can rebid 2♦, hoping that partner, with 5-3-1-4, will then bid 2♥. Playing Bart with these shapes, you are sort of locked into passing. That means on some hands you can end up playing in a 3-3 club fit instead of a 5-3 diamond fit.

BridgeMatters: But it does seem to have really good advantages as well as some negatives.

Chip Martel: On balance, the positive thing about Bart is that it deals effectively with three different hands, each of which is a real frequent problem hand, compared to just one or two awkward hands. It helps in getting to games, as well as getting to the right strain.

Again demonstrating the sometimes random effect of conventions, we had a hand at the US team trials where Bart showed a decent hand with a doubleton spade. That meant 1♠-1NT-2♣-2♠ would show a weak hand with a doubleton spade (or very weak with 3 spades). When we had that auction – and opener had a full 17 – we were able to stop in 2♣ because we knew we did not have the values for game. Normally, 2♠ would have been a much better contract than 2NT. But as the cards lay, 2♠ went down when 2NT would have made. You can play a convention, and in theory, a lot of good things will happen, but that does not mean you actually collect them in practice.

BridgeMatters: Playing in a world championship a few years ago, you said that you had developed a defense to nebulous 1♣ openings like the Polish Club. There was a lot of interest in it at the time.

Chip Martel: The defense was really geared to the Swedish Club, where a 1♣ opening is 10-12 balanced or 16+. We had three different goals with our defense: to bid constructively, to disrupt their auction if they had a strong 16+ hand, and to penalize them if they had 10-12 opposite a weak hand. We used double, 1♦ and pass for strong hands while bids of 1♥ or higher were destructive. Double showed a hand that you would open 1♣ if playing a standard 5-card major/strong NT system while 1♦ showed a one-diamond opener using the same system. For all other strong hands – balanced or with a major – you would pass. After a typical Swedish Club auction of 1♣ opening, 1♦ response and a major rebid by opener, a double would be penalty oriented, showing a good hand with their major or a strong NT with four cards in their major. A bid, as opposed to a double, would show a good hand with the other major as the primary suit. So after (1♣)-P (1♦)-P-(1♠), 2♣ would show a good hand with five or more hearts and four or more clubs. If you had spades you would double.

While the defense was quite effective against the Swedish Club system, I don't think it is as effective against Polish Club type systems. It is not quite as sound to be doubling or bidding 1♦. It also had the disadvantage that you could easily get into unfamiliar auctions.

We also came up against auctions we did not anticipate, such as P-P-1♣-P-1♥-P-P. Since this auction could occur only if responder was a passed hand, it wasn't in the system. So we sort of gave up playing that defense against the Polish Club. In addition, it had to be memorized. For short matches, I was not sure it was worth the trouble.

BridgeMatters: Not including all of your defenses, but in terms of your regular system notes, how long are they now?

Chip Martel: About 75 pages. We have a lot of things that we haven't documented in detail since the two of us have been playing the system for a long time. The purpose of the notes is to remind us of what we are playing. So some things we know really well may not be written down at all.

BridgeMatters: Thank you for your time, and again, congratulations on a great 2001.

Interview was conducted by Glen Ashton of BridgeMatters, edited by Alje Kamminga

(c) 2001, 2008 Glen Ashton BridgeMatters