KITCHEN KAPERS

San Francisco, November 31, 1971—In a tremendous display of strength, even-paced walking, Bob Kitchen toured the San Francisco peninsula plus twice to record a world's best-over-performance of 2:14:31.6 for 35 kilometers. Although there is not a recognized record for the event, the previous best performance was 2:14:32.2 by East Germany's Christos Doma.

Bob's time, of course, bettered the American record, and on the way he also knocked off Scott Klefler's American record at 20 miles. Bob's time there was 2:33:50.2, 9.4 seconds under the mark Scott recorded 271 days earlier. Bob completed this walk "before Scott's water-stained eyes," as Steve Land states it in the Pacific Association Walkers Report. At 30 kilometers, Kitchen missed the Klefler record by just 3 seconds, so Scott wasn't completely wiped out.

The race was held as part of a "record's nest" with everyone choosing their distance. Since Bob was the only one to go 35, and apparently the only one starting out with that in mind, there may be some question of the record being accepted. (Bob must have a thing for turning in exceptionally great performances in somehow unacceptable conditions. Two years ago he broke the 50 km mark during a 50 mile race he did not finish.) Regardless of whether it is accepted or not, competent judges and timers were on hand, and Bob has once again served notice on the younger Klefler's, at all to bowers.

After an opening mile of 7:36, Bob settled down to a steady pace in the low 7:40 range, passing 10 miles in 10:43 and 20 km in a personal best 1:35:17. He faltered slightly on the 25th mile with a 7:50, but then strode through a 7:32 to get the 30 mile mark. He finished up with 7:45 and then a 3:51 for the final 3/4 mile 10 feet 5/2 inches.

Other performances in this hodge-podge affair, included a fine 4:17:13 10K by Bill Banney and a good 1:14:23 20K by Roger Burne. Klefler started out after a 50 km record, but failed 6 days after passing 10 miles in 79:16. The results (with Kitchen's splits):


BLACKBURN AWARD

Once again it is time to announce the recipient of the Annual Dr. John H. Blackburn Award presented each year for the outstanding single performance in the U.S. race walking. And for the second year in a row, somehow, some jigsaw piece has thrown a monkey wrench into the works with an expanding late-season performance. Last year Dave Romanczyk had it sewed up with about a half-dozen outstanding performances to choose from, when along comes
The article discusses a recent event involving a record-breaking run. The text mentions that on December 2, 1971, a woman ran a 20-mile race in 11:40:26, breaking the previous record. The article highlights the effort and dedication required to achieve such a feat and includes quotes from the runner herself, emphasizing the importance of mental and physical preparation.

The article also includes a section about a horse race, discussing the names of the horses and their performances. It mentions the importance of horse racing as a sport and the events leading up to the race, including the training and preparation of the jockeys.

The text concludes with a note about the runner's personal journey and the challenges she faced in reaching her goal, emphasizing the role of perseverance and hard work in achieving success.
1. Kokoal Drapen, USSR
1:20:36.0 (2) San Francisco 7/6
1:21:07.0 (1) USSR Champ., Moscow 7/6
1:24:23.0 (1) European Champ., 8/10
1:29:25.0 (3) vs. USSR, Sochi 9/20
2. Gembre spalding, E. Germany
1:20:24.0 (3) Berlin 5 1/2 (short)
1:21:05.0 (3) Stockholm 5 1/2 (short)
1:26:05.0 (2) London 7/11
1:29:31.0 (6) European Champ., 8/10
1:31:42.0 (1) vs. W. Germany, 9/20
3. Paul Kbhill, Great Britain
1:21:30.0 (1) Preston 4/12
1:21:49.0 (1) Torino 5/7
1:23:06.0 (1) Lord 12/13
1:31:30.0 (6) European Champ., 8/10
1:32:57.0 (3) vs. USSR, Sochi 9/20

The finish in the European Championships pretty well decided the rankings as the form shown there...
The Olympic Championships was a decisive moment for some competitors, notably Helmut Seiler, who had four of five races, but Seiler giving Goldbeck a ride on the wire in the final race of the season.

The results of the Olympic Championships were

1. Helmut Seiler, West Germany
2. Peter Schmitt, East Germany
3. Christoph Hohen, East Germany
4. Otto Bartach, FRG
5. Terry Lyons, USSR
6. Bertfried Drudecki, East Germany
7. Berndt Berchchies, West Germany
8. Peter Brias, East Germany
9. Burkhard Lusth, East Germany
10. Momma, Italy

The Olympic Championships were the conclusion of the 1970-1971 season and marked the end of a remarkable year for the competitors. The results showed a strong presence of East German athletes, with Seiler and Schmitt leading the field. The competition was intense, with close finishes and high-level performances in each race.

The Olympic Championships were a testament to the skill and dedication of the athletes, who pushed the limits of their abilities to achieve supremacy in their sport. The results were a celebration of their hard work and commitment, and a precursor to the competitive season ahead.
The following four were approved pending receipt of required other suggestions and the reference:

1 Miles 4:47.2--Tom Dooley, San Francisco, Aug 9, 1972
1 Mile 4:47.2--Tom Dooley, San Francisco, Aug 9, 1972
1 Mile 4:47.2--Tom Dooley, San Francisco, Aug 9, 1972
1 Mile 4:47.2--Tom Dooley, San Francisco, Aug 9, 1972

2 Miles 8:39.2--John Dick, 1954
2 Miles 8:39.2--John Dick, 1954
2 Miles 8:39.2--John Dick, 1954
2 Miles 8:39.2--John Dick, 1954

3 Miles 1:42:20--Bill Barneby, 1964
3 Miles 1:42:20--Bill Barneby, 1964
3 Miles 1:42:20--Bill Barneby, 1964
3 Miles 1:42:20--Bill Barneby, 1964

4 Miles 5:04.2--Bob Seevers, 1967
4 Miles 5:04.2--Bob Seevers, 1967
4 Miles 5:04.2--Bob Seevers, 1967
4 Miles 5:04.2--Bob Seevers, 1967

10 Miles 1:02:16--Jack Halcomb, 1955
10 Miles 1:02:16--Jack Halcomb, 1955
10 Miles 1:02:16--Jack Halcomb, 1955
10 Miles 1:02:16--Jack Halcomb, 1955

16 Miles 1:30:40--Bob Seevers, 1967
16 Miles 1:30:40--Bob Seevers, 1967
16 Miles 1:30:40--Bob Seevers, 1967
16 Miles 1:30:40--Bob Seevers, 1967

Late results just received in the mail:
1. Bob Seevers 1:02:16 (4:42 actual) 2. Paul Hostler 59.01 (49.20) 3. John Dick 59.01 (49.20) 4. Jack Halcomb 59.01 (49.20) 5. John Davenport 59.01 (49.20) 6. John Dooley 59.01 (49.20)


All the lists of best track and field performances by walkers

Twice a year, we publish a list of the 10 best performances by U.S. men in all events in track and field and in the standard track and field events. This list of performances by American men is now designated by the National Federation of Track and Field Clubs as the National Track and Field Championship Meet. It is held in Columbus, Ohio, each year in late July and early August, and includes the Lake Erie, Ohio, San Francisco, California, Illinois, Michigan, and Central Association.

Annexed are...
Something that bothers me in regard to what is being said and written on training these days is that too many discuss the mileages in an absolute sense and typically nothing else. Just as runners, the basic meter first evolved at 100 miles per week for anyone competing at the elite level and this matter is now on the rise. As such, I can make it on less.

Dr. Doner, the arched can, in an interview in another's world stated that he would like to see a marathon but that he doesn't have time to do 100 miles per week and it would be impossible to break 3 hours on less. Rubbish. A subsequent interview with former marathon great Lou Gregory in the same publication showed that he runs every mile at least 100 and still runs under 2:30. For I am an object to guys doing 100 miles per week, nor are I saying that it isn't getting results, although I am not convinced that the elite individuals cannot achieve the same results on considerably less training. What ever he turns us is that the total variables in quantity with little thought has turned to mileage with little thought given to how it is done. We just get into more mileage and figure that if we do miles per week we are in shape, if we don't we're not. And even worse, we often derive this figure from what others are doing, again with little thought as to how they are doing it, or what has preceded their doing it.

And, turning exclusively to walking, if we accept some mileage figure as the magic one, from where do we derive it? If 100 miles per week is what runners need, how does this translate to walking? Is it a straight correlation to running? Or, is it nearer to walk a mile than it is to run one, does 10 miles walking equal 10 running? Or, has one run you are generally talking about lower, comparable distances in which those who don't run, can be divided with their running, does the walker need an even greater distance and, therefore, about twice the time? However, it has been transposed, the old 100-mile figure seems to be tossed around quite generally in walking circles, too.

Now when I start thinking in the horizontal sense, questioning the need for hard work, I am labeled as just not willing to do the work needed. That's fine for you Portland, but don't preach your way to the top and come walking and discourage them from doing the necessary work. Well, in the first place, I certainly do not advocate a lack of hard work, but that doesn't necessarily mean mileage at the upper limits. And I'm not saying that I do 100 miles per week, that continued, against the feeling that this is all it takes. As you add on more and more miles, what are the returns in improved performance and what are the risks of disability injuries? I feel that at a point, and I certainly don't know what it is, the returns are going to diminish to practically nothing and the risks of injury are going to increase. Sure, Dave Bedford is doing fantastic times on towards of 100 miles a week. But just as you can ask how much better could Lou Gregory have been had he really trained (and obviously he extremely light training did not get his miles in his body), I can ask what would have Bedford done on 100 miles a week and how much longer would he do it without breaking down?

So now you ask, alright Portland, what is the magic formula? I don't have the slightest idea. I think I have a pretty good idea of what is best for me if I want to achieve my best (I'm not doing anything like it now) but this may not work for anyone else. (I am referring to what alone these lines now and it may be interesting to see what happens if everyone follows a schedule. He might work worse. If so, we'll try something else.) The point is, that training seems to be too much of an individual thing. There seem to be many variables to this point depending on the individual, primarily on his mental and emotional adjustments to training. Possibly there is one that has a particular level of performance from the purely emotional standpoint, although from what I had read, the physicalists haven't as yet agreed on it. But even if there is, everyone won't make the same mental adjustments to be particular emotions and some will wind up far short of what they might achieve with another approach more suited to their emotional makeup. Thus, for the individual athlete, it becomes a matter of how you train and there, trial and error, and probably never really sure what he is achieving all the time he is achieving it. But, if it is the secret, that, in a running way, is how I see it anyway. Your moments and seating criticisms are welcome.

The Snappy cartoon was, of course, also stolen and also appeared in an earlier GW. It isn't stolen because as the original, Charles Schulz had substituted the word "hillbilly" for "walkers," I don't imagine this will be sufficient to save us from a suit for infringement of copyright should anyone in the Pantages kingdom get a hold of this. Having gotten away with it once, however, we boldly try again. I am sure that neither Rosen, Schulz or "other regularly read the GW as I might be safe if you don't see this.

A long-remembered photograph of the famous "666" New Year's Eve mud flat race, in which George Plimpton was seen to partake of champagne during the race and current "snooper only two miles to go?"