NATIONAL TITLES TO SCHUELER (4:06:07), O'CONNOR (1:26:21)

Carl Schueler suddenly emerged as the second fastest American ever at 50 kilometers with a 4:06:07 performance to win the National Athletics Congress title in New York City's Central Park on April 13. Moving quickly from the start, Carl never let up and left Dan O'Connor better than 15 minutes back at the finish. O'Connor came back with a startling performance of his own just one week later as he took the national title at 20 km across the continent in Seattle. Dan's time there, 1:26:21, is the fastest ever by an American, 13 seconds better than Neal Pyke did in Moscow last summer. Both races were rather sparsely attended, with many of the big guns saving their energies for the "Olympic" Trials, but that should not detract from the performance of either of the winners.

Schueler had finished third in the National 50 in both 1978 and 1979, but his previous best time was 4:24:16. He has a reputation for fading in the final stages and O'Connor expected that again on this day. It never happened. Only Larry Young with his 4:00:46 in Munich has gone faster. O'Connor's time in second was 4:19:36. A distant third in 4:32:05 was John Knifton, but he was first Master, and that ain't bad time for an elderly fellow. Alan Price was next in 4:38 and Bill Ramsey fifth. Beyond that, all I know at this point is that Chris Knotts was around 4:46, in sixth I think, and Jack Blackburn had 5:09 and was fifth Master. Full results next month.

O'Connor also had a walk-away win in the Seattle race, his 50 km race a week earlier apparently not affecting him too much. And he too showed a startling improvement on his previous personal best, which was 1:31:37 in last year's AAU title race. He was fifth in that one after a third place finish in 1978. Dan's best performances in the past have been at 50 km but obviously he is going to make some people work over the shorter route in the future. Second in the Seattle race, also with a personal best, but about 7 minutes behind, was John VanDenBrandt. And once again, that is about all I have on the race as we go to press. An expected phone call last night did not come and this must go to the printer today (May 2) so I can get it in the mail Monday (May 5). Now you can see how long it takes for your ORW to reach you. Full details on the 20 km race next month.
BAUTISTA ROLLS ON, SPARRIUS IN HOT START!

Sharp Better American Record

Daniel Bautista indicated he didn't lose much over the winter months as he launched his 1980 season with a stupendous 1 hour performance of 1:12.22 on April 6 in Mexico City. Bautista, who was 1:12:46 in 1979, marked his first American time with an 8 mile (12.88 km) victory at the Mexico City Marathon, finishing in 1:12:46. In his first American meeting, Bautista also won the 8 mile (12.88 km) race in 1:12:46.

Meanwhile, over in Spain, Jose Marín won the 50 Km title at the Spanish 50 Km Championships on March 9 in 3:51:49, with Jorge Llopis just 2.20 back (3:53:55).


permanently off the victory stand. But, on the other hand, handicap races are rarely won by the fastest walkers. I try not to penalize either group. Finally, I award a trophy to a male and female for "Best Performance", but only if warranted. That is, no one has a really outstanding walk, then the trophy are retracted for next year. "Best Performance" is judged against the walker's previous performances, but also in relation to others in his/her category nationally. So the winner of the race doesn't automatically receive this award.

Last year, for example, Travis Veon took second in the men's race, but did an outstanding performance by just edging under 1:40. I know it takes some work to arrange this setup, but it's important for the health of this sport to do such things. Not only do we need to attract new talent, and keep them motivated, but we must work to retain that small nucleus of local supporters and participants who show up race after race, rarely placing in the open events and with no hope of ever competing on a national or international level. Not only does the structure of the race itself influence participation and promotion, post-race activities can also help. Although many people don't get involved in my potluck picnic and clinic for one reason or another, those that do stay around have a hell of a good time. If weather permits, the combination of food, drink, and discussion is a relaxing training, and the latest gossip about what the Mexicans are planning to do next year... Elliott kept up his history... The San Francisco Marathon, to be held on July 13, will have an official race walking section for the first time this year. The Pacific Association 40 Km will be held as part of the race. Harry Sifton reports that the course is fantastically beautiful, encompassing several loops within Golden Gate Park, out and back along the Great Highway with a sweeping view of the blue Pacific, and a grand loop around Lake Merced. He suggests you take your vacation then and plan to hit San Francisco for the marathon. For entry write: Scott Thomas, P.O. Box 2752, San Francisco, CA 94127
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Just In--Results from Mt. SAC Relays Walks at Walnut California on April 26:

P.O. Box 2752, Smithtown, NY 11787
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SAT. MAY 10--US OLYMPIC 50 KM TRIAL, Niagara Falls (X)
100 Mls, Guadalcanal, Cal. (G)
10 Km, Sioux Falls, S.D. (D)
5 Km, Seattle (T)
Sun. May 11--5 Km, Los Angeles (D)
10 Km, Houston, 9 a.m. (C)
6 and 5.2 Mile, New York City, 9 a.m. (I)
Julie, 100 Mile, shipsplay, Cal. (T)
Sun. May 12--New York City, 9 a.m. (I)
Fri. May 16--NAIA 10 Km, Abilene, Texas
Sat. May 17--2 and 5 Mile, New York City, 9 a.m. (J)
2 Mile, Westport, Cal. (B)
Sun. May 18--2 and 6 miles, New York City, 10 a.m. (I)
10 Km, Long Branch, N.J. (L)
LOOMING BACK


5 Years Ago (From the April 1975 OW)—Ron Laird won his 57th AAU Senior title, but first since 1971, when he captured the National 25 km at Seattle in 1:56:36. John Knifton was a distant second in 2:05:13, followed by Bill Banney, Ron Kulik, Bob Rosenmont, and Steve DiBernardo. Bill Walker set a new American record for 50 miles doing 4:17:57 on the Grove Pointe, Michigan track. Dave Romanksy was still going pretty well with a 3:44:48 20 km on the track. In France, Jean-Pierre Carola set a World's 100 km record in 9:13:06. And Shaul Ladany added his list of ultra-distance titles taking the U.S. 75 km title in 7:22:20. Dan O'Connor was second in 7:39:50 and Bill Walker, perhaps still feeling the effect of his 50 mile effort less than a month before, was third.

---

A BIT OF HISTORY

(A repeat from the February 1970 Ohio Racewalker) The top U.S. walker of all time, if we are to believe his records, is Bill Mihalo, who as a professional in the 1950s recorded such times as 1:05:05 for 10 miles and 1:29:00 for 20 miles. These records were set when Mihalo won a successful, but controversial, career as an amateur. My research into the man's career is still incomplete and perhaps some of my readers can fill in some of the gaps (they never really did, but maybe some can now) on the validity of his professional times. (We did receive much comment from Elliott Donован and the world record was broken in 1975 by Mihalo. He won another 10 mile record with 1:04:30.

During the 1940's and early '50s, Bill Mihalo, representing Thompson Products of Detroit, won 20 Senior AAU walking titles at distances from 7 miles through the 50 km. All but three of these were set at 25 kilometers and up. He was on the 1948 Olympic team (24). Elliott pointed out this was not true, the 50 km team that year was Adolph Weimacker, John Deni, and Ernie Crooble and your editor took another fickle-finger-of-fate award for his continued research (but in 1952 finished fifth in the 50 km Olympic trials with 4:55:02 and fourth in the 100 km trials with 5:21:32. He won championships that year at 35 and 50 km with 3:23:14, and 4:15:50. The 35 was an extremely tight race with John Deni a second behind and Jimy Sidor another second in back of him.

It was sometime during this year that Mihalo turned professional. I am not certain what the circumstances surrounding this move were, whether he was barred as an amateur or just decided to see if there was any money to be made. In any case, his record as an amateur did not indicate the ability to walk world-class times and he was 37-years-old when he started walking as a professional. This was in Detroit, and he immediately started claiming professional records, although I don't have the history of these early marks. Sometime thereafter, he moved to California and the following capsules give testimony to his prowess as a professional walker. Whether he made any money, I don't know and whether there is anything even approaching legitimacy in any of these marks is still an open question.

---
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On Dec. 20, 1994, Mihalo won the World's Professional Association 5 mile race at Griffith Park in Los Angeles with a 3:51:01. This broke the world's record of 3:52:16 set by Frank Donavan in New York in 1932 and marked the 43rd time Mihalo had broken a record.

On Jan. 29, 1955, he broke the world's professional record at 2 miles with 12:41 on the Hollywood High School track. The old record was 12:51 by John W. Ruby of Little Bridge, England in 1883.

On May 1, 1955, he claimed a 3 mile record with 20:01 in Los Angeles, breaking Ruby's 1883 mark of 21:11.

On Sept. 27, 1956 in San Fernando, CA., walking in 101 degree heat, Mihalo claimed another 10 mile record with 1:09:30. This broke the WPWA record of 1:10:02 by Dan Donavan of New York on Aug. 10, 1897.

---

Finally on Nov. 12, 1958, he raced over the Griffith Park course for a 1:26:01 20 km. This was also listed as breaking Panckhin's record with no mention of Mihalo's earlier record.

That was all I had on the mighty Mihalo then and still is. Any further details would be appreciated. Who was judging? How accurate were the courses?
Action in this year's National TAC 2 Mile. Jim Heiring leads Todd Scully, Pete Timmons, Ron Daniel, and John Fredericks on the backstretch of the first lap. In the bottom photo, Scully is seen with a half-lap to go in his record victory. (Photos by Don Johnson)

Top Photo: Early action in the New Rochelle Race Walking Festival 5 km. From left: Howie Jacobsen, Jack Boltano, Pete Timmons, Bruce Harland, and Mike Morris. Harland edged Timmons in 21:42. (Photo by Noel Morris)

Bottom Photo: Daniel Bautista and Paul Gonzalez during a training spin at USOC Snow Valley Camp in August, 1980. Ray Sharp is hidden behind the post. (Photo by Jay Byers)
OLYMPIC SITUATION

As you all know by this time there is no Olympics for the U.S. this time around. By the time the vote came around I was more than ever opposed to a boycott, the seeming arrogance of the White House stance doing much to solidify my thinking (not necessarily a rational approach on my part, I realize). Mondale's announcement that the security of the free world was at stake sure did beat all, and the delegates apparently bought it. It may be that the security of the free world is at stake, but our presence or absence in Moscow isn't going to tip it one way or the other. My opinion, of course. Anyway, I'm glad we've let the Russians know we mean business. They don't play games with them anymore. "I'm going to take the ball and go home." I can see the war room in the Kremlin now as they plan an invasion of Iran or Pakistan. "But, the Americans have only nuclear weapons. If we do this they probably won't let the Bolshoi into their country anymore." "But we don't send the Bolshoi out anymore anyway. They never come home."

So what will happen? Well, the Olympic Trials will go on and a team will be selected. Reportedly there will be three series of meets for the team. First, meets in London, Stockholm, and Berlin beginning July 11. Then back to the U.S. for a meet or meets. Finally, to Rome, Zurich, and Athens beginning August 1. There are to be walks in at least each series, if not each meet. No further details yet.

With people all over the world concerned about the ability of judges to keep pace with the rapid improvement of walkers, a seminar on judging was held in Sweden in February. The following complete report of that seminar was published in the April issue of the Race Walking Record (British). Rather than try to condense out the meat from what is here, I'll just give you the whole hog to give you the flavor of the seminar and a sense of what people are thinking throughout the world. As you can see, there is a problem, but certainly no agreement on a solution, or even on a definition of the problem. I will reserve any further comment on the contents at this time. Also, I have no idea who Prof. Atterborn of the U.S.A. is, or how he came to be at the seminar.

JUDGING SEMINAR

(Reported by Peter Karlov & Reg Wells)

Barne, Sweden 2.7.80

We arrived late on Friday night and unfortunately missed perhaps one of the most interesting parts of the weekend when a five minute film was shown, taken at Eschborn during the Tagon Cup Final. This showed the majority of the fields "flying". The seminar was held in Barne, Sweden, snow covered and extremely cold, a very different country to that experienced a few years ago, when Britain were victorious in the Lagos Cup Final.

Sixteen nations were represented: U.S., Britain, France, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Norway, U.S.S.R., Poland, Belgium, U.S.A., West Germany, East Germany, Mexico, Italy, Austria and Spain.

Over the last few years judging problems in walking have increased in direct proportion to the speed of walking and the betterment of world records culminating in the now notorious Eschborn 'Flying Circus'. This Seminar was called to discuss the problems and possible answers.

The first speaker we heard on the Friday night was Prof. Atterborn of the U.S.A., an accomplished linguist, self confessing that he knew nothing of walking technique but associated with the U.S.A. Olympic team in New Mexico.

Be proved mathematically that times were going to be reduced even further as more ability to take in core oxygen was increased, as stride frequency and stride length were increased accordingly and predicted the possibility of a 3 hour 31 min. - 50 kilometers.

Reg Wells argued that judges should be stronger and that four red cards were then introduced only to protect judges, were they being made weaker.

Mr. Frister stressed that Eschborn was the extreme of weakness but that Moscow should not be an extreme in the opposite direction to the possible death of walking.

The next talk was given by Jurgen Kramer of West Germany and he felt it was time to follow. It is fair to point out that admirable translation plans fell down slightly because none had been prepared.

Mr. Kramer's theme was that there were four different views of walking, that of the athlete, that of the coach, that of the judge and that of the spectator.

It is important that the picture of walking as seen by each of these principles be in time common, and that there be a common understanding of rules and systems.

Our present rules are not true so judges were unable to pick quite a lot of contact at present walking speeds. This has been proved by film and film from Eschborn. Our rules must be true.

Mr. Kramer argued that a Swedish system of educating judges would not work as in most countries there were insufficient judges.

Another aspect was that rules should be over the distance. This would not solve the problem, only delay it as in time, speed would catch up. Mr. Kramer's conclusions were:

1. Common interpretation of rules
2. Increase judging qualification
3. Increase severity of judging rules
4. Should be true and application should be more efficiently monitored

Walkers should be trained to walk the rules as we understand, not be changed to suit the trend in walking at any time.

Rules should consequently be made 'too' and carefully looked at so that they may be universally understood.

Coaches should be under strict rules to train their athletes within the rules.

Mr. Atterborn spoke again. He asked the questions. "How long can you keeping going?" Mr. Atterborn put the following points:

1. Technique - based on mechanical efficiency and stride frequency
2. Leg
3. Hip flexibility
4. Strength
5. Conditioning - heart rate and intake, Velocity equation

Mr. Kramer then showed tables which showed the distribution of red cards with a red card at the end of each series.

Questions were asked of Mr. Frister among them: "Is it not the fact that more red cards would greatly increase an already heavily burdened administration system."
Walking becomes illegal under contact rule at above 9 mph. 14.5 km. per hour or 4.09 km. per hr. 23 m. 20 kilo.

Case of this is stride frequency (r)?
- 190 = Uneven walking
- 190 = d = 1.24
- 190 = 1.62
so if 190 speed 270 metres per min then d = 1.42 and gives 1.14. 20 kilometres and 3.05 50 kilometres.

After turn cover d the m.e. of shifting courses.

Given spontaneous speeds of 5 mins per kilo up and 4.10 min per kilometre down.

With 1% slope there is a time reduction of any 25% over that distance covered to up hill. So each 100 metres at change gain or loss in altitude will give a time difference of 5 sec in time.

After turn the time of no change was more than 1% gradient increase.

JERRY HAESELAER (Mexico) asked if in Race Walking a natural event?

Yes! Haeuslager argued that we should
1. Increase stride length,
2. Increase stride frequency
3. Increase training.

Problems of today are not to be blamed only on judges and judging methods but also on the coaches who are training to find techniques to keep ahead of increasing speeds. 80% of race walkers who can cover 20 kilometer in 1.25 or under are not walking correctly.

There are cases, seen in photos, where a walker appears to be walking perfectly well but in fact is not walking correctly. This is not an organic problem but a physical and mechanical problem.

Rule 191 is also a question of judging contact is obligatory when we know, now, that this, at present speeds is almost certainly impossible.

Haeuslager argued 'If we are in favour of rule 191 and the strict interpretation of rule 191 it is also a rule that is impossible'.

What should be done? There are two possibilities. 1) Change all training by complete reduction which will subsequently slow our race time. 2) The other alternative is 'for the walk' which is change the rules.

Rule 191 contains a clear definition of a conventional rule but is a rule made up by men and subsequently made to suite a specific technique.

What kind of rule do we need to describe biologically and psychologically the difference between running and walking?

It is both easy and difficult.

Making a rule requires a specialist rule maker and both a bi-chemist and bio-mechanic but then any child can tell when one person is walking and another running. We need to find a rule that is positive. Four things in rule 191 can be controlled.

1. The knee has to be straight.
2. The heel has to meet the ground first.
3. The hip has to be straight and vertical.
4. The centre of gravity must not be in front of the leading heel when at point of contact.

Diagram a 1 & 2 are incorrect though walker 1 is faster. Walker 3 is doing less than 1.45 for 20 kilometres.

All above are biologically - anatomically - same.

There are points from above that could define walking.

1. Triangle behind lead leg.
2. Spinal column

If no triangle then it is not walking.

The difference between running and walking becomes a question of how the centre of gravity moves. In walking, it remains on a level. In running, it moves up and down in waves.

J. Haeuslager made the following argument on propulsion.

The difference between running and walking was that in running there was a problem with the centre of gravity. When Haeuslager had his walkers running he had the problem. When he cut out running there was no problem as speeds increased as the problem returned.

A. He found three ways of lacking contact by body lean.

1. Is an example of a beginners' and elves' walkers, not below 1.90 for 20k, as it is a disadvantage. Could be said to be running.

B. Common between 1955 and 1970 (J. W. Welch) when times came down below 1.90. Arms had to be used excessively with heels coming down beyond centre of gravity.

C. A walk in well trained athletes with insufficient technique. They have the power to push forward and knee is straight but they push off back foot before contact is made.

CONCLUSION RULES:
1. Leading leg must be straight.
2. Centre of gravity line must be behind knee.
3. Knee, through head, spine must be straight and vertical when legs pass.

This rule will stop contact being broken but will allow faster walking which looks like walking.

We have, said Mr. Hauslager, these objectives:
1. Ruby race walking as a sport.
2. Reduce training.
3. Increase race distance. The responses will be to increase training and in time we are back to present problems.
4. Change rule. Rules are written by humans to fill a specific function and so can be rewritten.

J. Ranzer of West Germany declared that a rule not enforcing contact was unacceptable.

F. Wells spoke of again making a rule which was further complicated. There was another alteration other than those given by Haeuslager. Make judging stricter and ask when judges were adequately trained and examined to make certain that they are capable of interpreting rule 191 correctly and to make it both.

Strict judging was used for the Rome Olympics 50 kilometres. There were several disqualifications but few criticisms of the rules.

Extremely strict interpretation of rule 191 will enforce walkers to practices obedience of this rule.

Judges should be examined in order to qualify as judges and the examination should take in age, eyesight and fitness for extreme concentration. International Judges should be regularly examined.

Francis Herbst of France argued thatjudges should only be concerned with the legs and should not be expected to take account of the trunk.

Prof. Haeuslager’s talk was basically the last of the Saturday session and it was clear that everyone was pretty tired and certainly full of thoughts.

SUMMARY
The Norwegian representation appealed to the Senates to consider better education of judges. Each nation should have the same standard systems of education of judges.

The Norwegians outlined that the pamphlets ‘Guidance for Judges’ came out in 1972 and had not been updated. The International Walking Commission plans to give out a new edition and it is hoped that this will be soon. In view of problems now being experienced it is hoped that the book will be much more thorough.

It was also argued that the definition of walking must be able to interpret such that it is specific in any language.

The authorisation of a judge should show:
1. Qualification.
2. Number of races attended.
3. Upgrading seminars attended.

It was finally declared that the position of an International Judge must not be one of honour.

The U.S.S.R. delegate took the Rostrum to declare:
1. There should be no increase in each distance, that 20k’s and 5k’s should be international distances.
2. There should be no use of video. It would be too expensive and all walkers would not be covered at all times.
3. The number of cards required for disqualification should be increased.

The authorities should be more reflective when appointing judges.

There should always be pre-commission seminars to consult, advise and direct both judges, walkers, officials and coaches.

SUMMARY
The Secretary of the Swedish Judging Commission outlined Swedish systems and proposed:
1. The Walking Commission should set up a working party to examine Rule 191.
2. Reports on International Judges should be made annually.

Jorgen Kramer (West Germany) followed and proposed a change to Rule 191. This was difficult to understand in translation but appeared to be— ‘Racing walking or the progression by which without technical aid’? The movements of race
walking follows the development of the style of walking by increasing ones speed and must be obviously perceptible with the movement of walking.

This passage view of the total picture of progression of race walking gives no reason for complacency. But if the follow up of some steps is not perceptible with the total picture of walking the following detailed characteristics had to be viewed and the following regulations and actions had to be observed.

After this there follows the present rule 191.

Rule 191 should be amended as follows- Walking in a progression, by steps, so taken that unobtrusive contact with the ground is maintained.

At each step the advancing foot of the walker must be seen by the eye to make contact with the ground before the rear foot leaves the ground. During the period of each step in which a foot is on the ground the leg must be straightened (i.e. not bent at the knee) at the point of contact and continuously until the supporting leg is in the vertically up and right position.

The inclusion of the phrase 'seen by the eye' would safeguard judges from the critical evidence of the camera which can only appear after the event anyway, a judge can only use his eye. We have all seen Daniel Bautiste al full speed and we could say he was not walking. However the camera consistently shows loss of contact.

The point about the straight leg at point of contact is a straight comparison of the difference in mechanics between running and walking. A runner must have a bent knee in the forward position and invariably enforces body lean to facilitate this.

SQUEEZE- Aids to Walking Judges.

The National coach for Sweden outlined an experiment whereby Brit Olsen a leading Swedish Woman Walker was tested on a treadmill walking at various speeds.

Her shoes were wired so that intricate impulse switches were fixed at heel and toe areas. A print was used showing the pattern of contact of each foot. Then 'Test line' up on

They were able to show that at over 140 kilometers an interval was broken. This shows was argued was very prohibitive and costly.

ITALY The Italians had 5 International game judges and 100 national and 200 regional judges, put forward the following proposal.

Rule 191 must be amended to include-

The leading leg must reach ground with heel first then roll onto foot until whole foot is on ground. The leading leg must form a straight line from heel to hip, the leading leg, must be above rest of body.

The Italians were in favour of the section of Rule 191 referring to contact.

The French through Francis Heret gave the attached proposition.

The exhibition of race walking was won in the LUGANO final, in 1966, especially on 20km made the spectators smile and made the doubts and doubtful of so good a discipline, awfully sad.

The rule about contact wasn't respected. Here I do remind you of the risk of suppression if the OLYMPIC GAMES threatening our discipline if nothing new happens to protect its regularity.

In 1923, race walking was banned from the GAMES after the terrible judging of the preceding Games (1912). Are we going towards a similar decision. It's terribly important. Taking into account the technical progression applied to the search of a greater speed, our judges seem to be in the task to apply the basic rule any longer.

Video techniques exist, and one solution would be that at the highest level, an international judge be sought to be helped by a video tape recorder. If we don't want machines to interfere and if we want judgement to remain a human specialist, there is another solution and it is much longer races. Those who demand race walking to begin at a given distance after the running distances are right, and that is why we ask from now on:

1. A 50 km race
2. A 100km race, either on a circuit, or straight ahead from one point to another to replace the 20 km which are now too fast to enable the judges to apply the rule, and even to send his warnings to the leading judge in time.

All walkers demanded-

1) an efficient protection of their efforts
2) the help of video machines for the speeds.

3) They don't want to be laughed at, and it's likely to happen if there is a record or a slow motion high definition.

Judges are not the most reasonable for that. The technique who do not want to lose time with the notion of double contact have mode 'Flying robots' (as shown by all the visual documents), and this to the detriment of the true walkers who respect I.A.A.F. first rule.

PROPOSAL BY POLISH DELEGATE

LOSSES TAKE ONLY TWO FEATURES

Article 191 says that an athlete can only be warned once by the Main Referee; therefore, the second time he must be disqualified.

It is a humble opinion that the player has little chance to change his behavior after receiving the first warning.

In contests and qualification tests, athletes should be put on notice to act.

They are given up to six tries in classified throwing and distance jumping (long jump and jump) Finaley whereas in high-jumping and pole vaulting they may try up to three times for each height, as they are successful.

Running, a long distance and durability test, gives the athlete few chances. If the referees are uncondemned about section 2 of article 191, the athlete can receive a warning and be quickly disqualified at any point in the test.

We feel that some other solution should be found that would give the referees a better framework, since at those times their lack of certainly is detrimental to the results in the games.

We would like to put forward the following formula to be studied-

1. Verbal warning by the Main Referee at any point in the test. The rest of the runners actions are not necessary.

2. Warning according to parts (a) and (b) of section 2.

Disqualifications by parts (a) and (b) of article 191 normal method. This way the runner's chances are greater and he will, perhaps feel surer of himself since he had the chance to correct the mistakes the Main Referee made. It is also a human specialty, there is another solution and it is much longer races. Those who demand race walking to begin at a given distance after the running distances are right, and that is why we ask from now on:
than other things measured in an international scale. Sports have a way to strengthen local identity and local pride.

Even if television may transform the athlete into a mass entertainer, I stress that race walking during the last ten years has proved to attract far more people and far more active walkers (men and women) than ever. We do know that most often it is a relatively small number of events being televised. But we also know that when we through very clever organisations - succeed to have TV on great competitions like Hilton Keynes, Frederikstad and Eschborn it has been a success - also paying respect to well prepared editors and commentatores - and this has brought our sport into a better understanding we feel - and hope!

We also hope that these facts will raise the general numbers of deeds among the watchers. We know that the interest for strolling/hiking has increased considerably. Therefore we have to fight for still better understanding and support, for better organisation and co-operation quite out in the outer links of those organisations and federations, who further our sport.

We believe in the individual sport. We have shown it, when we fought for the 20Kms discipline to be re-entered in the Olympic programme. For the first time modern advertising was used to reach the Olympic organisation and the average man/woman. It was mainly the British who used this pattern - with success!

In our own family we also must use modern kind of management - in order to better the climate, raise the standard, so we can prevent our sport far, far better than hitherto.

Therefore, I congratulate the Swedish Walking Association for staging this first seminar, where we have to discuss and learn to better our possibilities and also be aware of our risks for misunderstanding and bad luck.

The IAAF will watch this seminar very closely. On behalf of Adrian Paulen and John B. Halt I bring their best wishes for success, so that this seminar will become a regular instrument in the activity of the IAAF Walking Committee.

The 1970's have been a decade of change and challenge. We have been watching a revolution rather than an evolution inside race walking. If we want to measure in results we have seen an improvement in records, nearly incredible.

Our sport has often been defined as a sport for veterans or nearly veterans. Now we have recruited young athletes too, and a similar list of records as the other track and field disciplines is a reality in our sport.

Nevertheless, however, we must make a similar follow-up for judges as already has been done for the active walkers.

The progress of the walkers and the inability to judge speedy walkers by the human eye is the question to be solved in the near future - if we want to maintain respect of our sport.

We do not need to change the definition, but we need to use technical facilities in order to judge in conformity with the rules and thereby pay the respect to the walkers and the results made.

This seminar, therefore, most valuable, because it will start another serious evolution, needed for many years, and now realised here in Borns. A good start, established in a nation with rich tradition inside the race walking sport. To better the education of judges and to give these important officer better terms is the most important task of the IAAF Walking Committee.

This Seminar may become such an important key to the future!