

Ohio Race Walker
3184 Summit Street
Columbus, Ohio 43202



OHIO RACEWALKER

VOLUME XXIV, NUMBER 12

COLUMBUS, OHIO

FEBRUARY 1989

Quinn, Herazo Reign in 1988 Postal 1 Hour Races

The results of the 1988 National Postal 1 Hour races, sponsored by the Shore AC, have been announced by coordinator Don Henry. In the men's open division, Richard Quinn of Potomac Valley covered 8 miles 635 yards to edge the California Walker's Rene Haarpainted by just 17 yards. The women's title went to Victoria Herazo, Valley Walkers, who covered 7 miles 859 yards, well clear of the opposition. The very extensive results follow:

Women's Open Division: 1. Victoria Herazo, Valley Walkers 12,051 meters 2. Jo Ann Nedelco, Golden Gate RW 11,045 3. Karen Rezach, Shore AC 10,783 4. Sue Klappa, Minnesota Loons 10,666 5. Dorrit Attias, Shore AC 10,643 6. Cindy Paffumi, Golden Gate 10,613 7. Martha Iverson, Front Range Walkers 10,559 8. Beth Wilson, Potomac Valley 10,423 9. Gretchen Eastler, un., Maine 10,209 10. Debby Van Orden, Front Range 10,206 11. Paula Kash, California Walkers 10,053 12. Kathy Blackmer, Easy Striders 9,823 13. Pauline Stickels, un. 9,765 14. Nancy Severson, Front Range 9,751 15. Terry Hagen, Pacific Pacers 9,446 (32 finishers)

Jr. Women 10 and under: 1. Amy Held, Missouri Milers 7,312 **Jr. Women 11-14:** 1. Kara McGeever, un. 8,680 2. Heather Funkhouser, Shore AC 7,254 **Jr. Women 15-19:** 1. Gretchen Eastler, un. 10,109 (American Junior record) **Women 44-44:** 1. Beth Alvarez, Potomac Valley 9,689 2. Emily Hewitt, New England Walkers 9,542 3. Donna Cunningham, So. Cal. Walkers 9,510 (12 finishers) **Women 45-49:** 1. Jo Ann Nedelco, Golden Gate 11,045 (National age group record) 2. Jolene Steigerwalt, Cal. Walkers 9,610 3. Helen Palomo, Easy Striders 9,101 (15 finishers) **Women 50-54:** 1. Bev LaVeck, Pacific Pacers 10,063 (National age group record) 2. Barbara Hilger, Front Range 10,061 3. Helen Jo Hillman, Potomac Valley 9,720 (15 finishers) **Women 55-59:** 1. Maurine Lia, Missouri Milers 8,771 (5 finishers) **Women 60-64:** 1. Ruth Leff, Parkside AC 9,173 (National age group record) 2. Lisa Borel, Easy Striders 8,868 (7 finishers) **Women 65-69:** 1. LaVonne Hottensmith, Florida AC 8,626 (National age group record) 2. Marie Henry, Shore AC 8,561 3. Rose Kash, Cal. Walkers 8,080 **Women 70-74:** 1. Velma Jacobs, Front Range 7,650 (National age group record) **Women 75-59:** 1. Esther Dutton, Golden Gate 5,195 **Men's Open Division:** 1. Richard Quinn, Potomac Valley 13,455 2. Rene Haarpainter, Cal. Walkers 13,440 3. Ray Funkhouser, Shore AC 13,187 4. Larry Walker, Cal. Walkers 13,019 5. Bobby Briggs, Potomac Valley 12,986 6. Steve Pecinovsky, Pot. Valley 12,877 7. Allen James, Athletes in Action 12,566 8. Dave Talcott, Shore AC 12,488 9. Roberto Gottlieb, Westchester Puma 12,430 10. Jim Coots, Easy Striders 12,231 11. Adam Pawlik, Austin Running Club 11,989 12. Philip McGaw, North Medford Club 11,832 13. David Coutts, Kansas City Walkers 11,805 14. James Wass, Potomac Valley 11,659 15. Bob Novak, Pacific Pacers 10,926 16. Justin Kuo, New England Walkers 10,786 17. Alvia Gaskill, Jr., Carolina Godiva 10,703 18. Michael Steadman, Pot. Val. 10,444 19. Pierre de Villiers, North Medford 10,098 20. Steve Brink, Minn. Loons 9,961 (26 finishers)

Jr. Men 10 and under: 1. Craig Haugaard, Minn. Loons 6,192 **Jr. Men 11-14:** 1.

SECOND CLASS POSTAGE
PAID AT COLUMBUS, OHIO

The Ohio Racewalker (USPS 306-050) is published monthly in Columbus, Ohio. Subscription rate is \$6.00 per year (\$8.00 for First Class Mail, \$9.00 for First Class Mail to Canada, and \$12.00 for Overseas Air Mail. Address all correspondence regarding both editorial and subscription matters to: Ohio Racewalker, 3184 Summit St., Columbus, Ohio 43202. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to: Ohio Racewalker, 3184 Summit St., Columbus, Ohio 43202.

Carl Thomas IV, Chillum Striders 7,792 Jr. Men 15-19: 1. Lennie Becker, Kansas City Walkers 10,650 Men 40-44: 1. Alan Price, Pot. Val. 11,807 2. Roger Brandwein, Cal. Walkers 11,326 3. Bob Rhode, Austin Running Club 11,012 4. George Lattarulo, North Medford 10,921 5. Lee Bogart, Shore AC 10,782 6. Michael Lund, Minn. Loons 10,329 7. Jack Leach, Shore AC 10,170 8. Dennis Crock, Front Range 10,144 9. Alan Segal, North Medford 9,799 10. Bob Hobbs, Golden Gate 9,710 (16 finishers) Men 45-49: 1. Larry Walker, Cal. Walkers 13,019 2. Jim coots, Easy Striders 12,231 3. Ray KcKinnis, Carolina Godiva 11,939 4. Tom Knatt, New England Walkers 11,012 5. Ron Daniel, Golden Gate 10,760 6. Bernie Finch, Front Range 10,420 7. Dr. Patrick Bivona, Shore AC 10,145 8. Scott Bentley, Pot. Valley 9,832 9. Ralph Edwards, Shore AC 9,832 10. John Murphy, Golden Gate 9,488 (22 finishers) Men 50-54: 1. Richard Ruquist, North Medford 11,566 2. John Murphy, Golden Gate 10,786 3. Richard Oliver, Walkers Club of LA 10,714 4. Jim Lemert, Pot. Val. 10,565 5. Ken Thompson, un. 10,466 6. Carl Acosta, Walkers Club of LA 10,333 7. Ben Ottmer, Shore AC 10,234 8. Bob DiCarlo, Front Range 10,206 9. Bob Morse, North Medford 9,528 10. Elliott Denman, Shore AC 9,469 (20 finishers) Men 55-59: 1. Jack Bray, Golden Gate 11,060 2. John Kelly, Cal. Walkers 10,852 3. Jim Bryan, Pacific Pacers 10,409 4. Bob Fine, Florida AC 10,272 5. Fred Dunn, Golden Gate 10,238 6. Huey Johnson, Golden Gate 10,051 7. Andrew Briggs, Car. Godiva 10,025 8. Charles Deuser, Clifton TC 9,870 9. Bill Hillman Jr., Pot. Val. 9,745 10. Dave Davies, Front Range 9,195 11. Jim Brown, Shore AC 9,194 Men 60-64: 1. Walter Morse, Shore AC 9,983 2. John Gray, North Medford 9,695 3. Vic Crosetti, Golden Gate 9,676 4. Ken Long, un. 9,321 (11 finishers) Men 65-69: 1. George Heller, East Side TC 9,586 2. Joe Nelson, Kansas City Walkers 8,839 3. Paul Geyer, Florida Race Walkers 8,628 (7 finishers) Men 70-74: 1. Don Johnson, Shore AC 9,239 2. Hal McWilliams, Walkers Club of LA 9,046 3. Ed Seeger, Pot. Val. 8,927 4. Eldon Scholl, Missouri Milers 8,760 5. Pat Kilpatrick, Shore AC 8,501 6. Richard Stark, Mesilla Valley TC 8,415 7. Hugh Yeomans, Clifton TC 8,300 (10 finishers) Men 75-79: 1. Harry Drazin, Shore AC 8,367 Men 80-84: 1. Paul Fairbank, Pot. Val. 8,189 2. Fred Brown, North Medford 6,980

Men's Open Teams: 1. Potoamc Valley 39,318 meters 2. California Walkers 37,385 3. Shore AC 35,457 4. North Medford Club 34,319 5. Potomac Valley B 34,031 6. Carolina Godiva 32,667 (28 teams) Men's Masters Teams: 1. California Walkers 35,197 2. Colden Gate RW 32,606 3. North Medford Club 32,286 4. Potomac Valley 32,204 5. Shore AC 31,186 6. Front Range Walkers 30,070 (22 teams) Women's Open Teams: 1. Golden Gate RW 30,999 2. Front Ranger Walkers 30,826 3. Shore AC 30,408 4. Potomac Valley 29,832 5. Pacific Pacers 28,146 6. California Walkers 27,973 (20 teams) Women's Masters Teams: 1. Golden Gate RW 29,090 2. Potomac Valley 28,324 3. Pacific Pacers 27,146 (13 teams)

The Shore AC will also be coordinating the 1989 1 Hour walk. Performances can be turned in anytime during the year on a certified 400 meter or 440 yard track with at least two judges on hand. Awards in open, masters, and junior divisions for both men and women. Contact Don Henry, 24 Fairview Avenue, Brick, NJ 08724 for details. You can call him on (201)-899-1550.

The 1988 race had 149 men and 103 women enter, nearly doubling the 1987 entry. Entries came from 20 states and the District of Columbia. The men walked a total of 1,398,253 meters, the women 877,266, for averages of 9,384 and 8,517 per person. The youngest walker was Tony Klappa from Minnesota (4 years 4 months) and the oldest Fred Brown from Massachusetts at 82 1/2. (Paul Fairbank was 82)

OTHER RESULTS

Women's 1 Mile, Dartmouth Relays, Hanover, N.H., Jan. 8-1. Pascale Grand, Canada 7:21.1 2. Gretchen Eastler, Mt. Blue H.S., Farmington, Maine 7:48.6 3. Leslee Kerwin, Can. 8:02.6 4. Nadrea Grochowski 8:39.9 Men's 2 Mile, same place--1. James Mann 13:36.5 2. Daniel Levesque, Can. 13:38.6 3. James Kilburn, Can. 13:40.8 4. Benoit Gauthier, Can. 13:55 5. John Tucker, Can. 14:31 6. Steve Vaitones 14:33.9 7. Mike Heitzman 15:46.5 8. Paul Winke 15:49 9. Jim Campoli 15:51 Indoor 3 Km, Cambridge, Mass., Jan. 22-1. James Mann 12:40.4 2. Mark Fenton 13:03 3. Teresa Vaill 13:07.4 4. Will Desrosiers 13:54 5. Mike Heitzman 13:56.6 6. Jim Campoli 14:11.6 7. Paul Winke 14:25.7 8. Richard Ruquist 14:32.4 9. Justin Kuo 14:59.2 Indoor 1 Mile, Cambridge, Mass. Jan. 29-1. Mark Fenton 6:33.9 2. Mike Heitzman 6:41.3 3. Robert Gottlieb 6:45.8 4. Steve Vaitones 6:55.2 5. Richard Ruquist 7:28.8 (1st over 40) 6. Tom Knatt 7:35.4 7. Justin Kuo 7:36.7 8. Gretchen Eastler 7:53.9 9. John Monteiro 8:53.5 Women's 1 Mile, Boston, Feb. 5-1. Gretchen Eastler 7:39.4 2. Kaisa Ajaye 8:31.4 3. Stella Cahsman 8:52.5 3 Km, same place--1. Reggie Davenport 12:30.4 2. Mark Fenton 12:36.2 3. Mike Heitzman 13:14.1 4. Robert Gottlieb 13:27.4 5. Quentin Cunningham 17:07.2 (lost a shoe with 2 laps to go) 10 Km, New York City, Feb. 12-1. Gary Null 47:31 2. Franco Pantoni 50:51 3. Tom Gustafsson 52:20 Millrose Games, New York, Feb. 3-1. Tim Lewis 5:56.17 2. Curtis Fisher 5:58.15 3. Gary Morgan 5:58.73 1500 meters, Meadowlands Invitational, E. Rutherford, N.J., Feb. 10-1. Gary Morgan 5:32.56 2. Richard Quinn 5:33.53 Women's 1500, same place--1. Teresa Vaill 6:14.7 2. Lynn Weik 6:31.9 3. Victoria Herazo 6:33.9 4. Susan Liers 6:39.6 1 Mile, Ithaca, N.Y., Dec. 18-1. Jim Miner 7:59 3 Km, same place--1. Jim Miner 16:13 1 Mile, Ithaca, Jan. 8-1. Dave Talcott 6:54 2. Jim Miner 8:22 3 Km, same place--1. Dave Talcott 13:56 1 Mile, Binghamton, N.Y., Jan. 20-1. Dave Talcott 6:43.3 Indoor 2 Mile, Arlington, Virginia, Jan. 29-1. Richard Quinn 13:12 2. Dave McGovern 13:44 3. Bobby Briggs 14:13 4. Jim Wass 15:29 5. Sal Corrallo 16:33 (first over 50) 6. Pauline Stickels 18:21 7. Scott Bentley 19:01 Women's 1 Mile (Indoors), Fairfax, Virginia, Feb. 5-1. Ann Peel, Can. 6:54.23 2. Lynn Weik 6:56.57 3. Susan Liers 7:18.26 4. Christine Izzo 7:39.83 Women's 1500 (Indoor), Louisville, Kentucky, Feb. 4-1. Teresa Vaill 6:12.9 2. Wendy Sharp 6:25.8 3. Victoria Herazo 6:32.6 4. Dierdre Collier 6:55.4 5. Gayle Johnson, Wolfpack TC, Columbus 7:08 (first over 40) 6. Kelli Ackman 8:06 5 Km, Chicago, no date given--1. Tom Coti 24:54 2. Will Coti 25:36 3. Paul Maglerak 25:59 (1st over 50) 4. David Lowendowski 26:45 5. Tom Iverson 26:56 (1st 40-44) 6. Al Richardson 27:46 1st 45-59) 7. Ron Love 28:46 Women: 1. Sue Ellen Krause 30:03 2. Cheryl Disque 30:09 (1st over 40) Indoor 2 Mile, Milwaukee, Dec. 17-1. Mike Stauch 13:23 2. Mike Rohl 13:31 3. Doug Fournier 14:30 4. Rob Cole 14:45 5. Jon Jorgenson 14:49 6. Wil Preischel 14:51 7. John Marter 15:23 8. Bob Lange 17:20 (1st over 40) Women: 1. Dierdre Collier 15:45 2. Ruth Leff 19:33 (1st Master) Indoor 2 Mile, Milwaukee, Jan. 7-1. Mike Rohl 13:57 2. Mike DeWitt 14:29 3. John Marter 15:08 4. Frank Porcaro 15:33 Women: 1. Ruth Leff 19:53 1 Mile, same place--1. Neal Schuster 7:49 2. Bob Brenzk 8:36 Indoor 3 Km, Boulder, Colorado, Jan. 15-1. Ray Sharp 12:33.4 2. Dan Pierce 14:01.9 3. Wendy Sharp 14:14.4 4. Martha Iverson 16:00.1 5. Bob DiCarlo 16:24.6 6. Bernie Finch 16:34 7. Kathy Finch 18:15.3 8. Bob Carlson 19:12.4 1 Mile, Los Angeles, no date given--1. Keith Ward 6:49.1 2.

Juan Izsaguirre 7:00.3 3. Karen Dunster, England 7:50.9 4. Carmen Jackinsky 7:59.5
 5. Francene Bustos 8:04 6. Wayne Wurzbarger 8:06.8 3 Km, same place--1. Larry
 Walker 12:16.4 (1st master) 2. Keith Ward 13:52 (2nd master) 3. Andy Hecker
 16:02.7 4. Wayne Wurzbarger 16:10.6 (3rd master) 5. Christian Holtz 16:37.6 6.
 Allen Brumer 17:17.3 (1st over 50) 7. John Burns 17:50.1 (1st over 60) 8. Richard
 O'Hara 17:55.3 (2nd over 60) 9. Mel Grantham 18:07.8 (3rd over 60) 10. Richard
 Nakawatasi 18:18.3 11. Stuart Ray 18:44.9 Women: 1. Sara Standley 14:24.4 2.
 Cindy Perez 15:33.4 3. Francene Bustos 15:57.7 4. Carmen Jacinsky 16:22.1 5.
 Virginia Scales 16:45.8 (1st over 40) 6. Jane Janousek 17:27 7. Jill Latham 17:43.5
 (1st over 50) 10 Mile handicap, Pasadena, Cal., Jan. 15: Women--1. Victoria
 Herrazo 1:23:32 2. Francene Bustos 1:36:17 3. Paula Kash 1:40:59 4. Jill Latham
 1:42:19 (1st over 50) 5. Margaret Coura 1:42:06 6. Virginia Scales 1:42:37 (1st 40-
 49) 7. Kathy Blackmar 1:45:15 (24 finishers) Men: 1. Jim Coots 1:22:58 (1st over
 40) 2. Murray Day 1:29:09 3. Brian LaBounty 1:29:50 4. Carl Acosta 1:35:02 (1st
 over 50) (16 finishers) 5 Km, Redondo, Cal., Jan 22 (unjudged as part of a run,
 but 30 course monitors)--1. Keith Ward 24:11 (1st over 40) 2. Victoria Herazo 24:16
 3. Francine Bustos 27:19 4. Richard Oefinger 27:36 (1st over 50) 5. Ron Laird
 28:00 6. Jesus Orendain, Jr. 28:32 7. Jesus Orendain, Sr. 28:39 8. Dana Marsh
 28:53 9. Linda Kranke 28:54 10. Carrie Weiser 28:57 3.

ON YOUR RACING HORIZON

Sat. Mar. 11 3 Km, Syracuse, N.Y., 10:30 am (O)
 Sun. Mar. 12 3 Mile, Denver (F)
 Gulf 20 Km Championship, Houston (H)
 Ohio TAC Indoor 1500 meters, Columbus (J)
 Sat. Mar. 18 20 Km and 20 Mile, Seattle (C)
 5 and 10 Km, Tacoma, Wash. (C)
 10 and 20 Km, Lake Worth, Florida, 7:30 am (M)
 5 and 10 Km, Snellville, Georgia (D)
 Sun. Mar. 19 5 Km, Denver (F)
 5 and 20 Km, Long Beach, Cal. (G)
 Missouri 1 Hour Championship, Columbia (I)
 10 and 15 Km, Women's 5 Km, Washington, DC (Q)
 Sat. Mar. 25 10 Km, Seattle, 11 am (C)
 Sat. Apr. 1 National TAC Masters Indoor 3 Km, Columbus, Ohio, 7 pm (K)
 Women's 10 Km IAAF World Cup Qualifier, Tampa, Florida (E)
 Sun. Apr. 2 Jack Mortland Invitational 10 Km, Youth 5 Km, Columbus, 9:30 am
 (N)
 Thu. Apr. 6 2.8 Mile, Seattle, 6 pm (C)
 Sun. Apr. 9 3 Km and 10 Km, Dearborn, Mich., 10 am (P)
 Masters 5 Km, Delray Beach, Florida (M)
 Sun. Apr. 16 Men's 20 Km World Cup Qualifier, Open 10 Km, Women's 5 Km,
 Washington, DC (Q)
 5 and 10 Km, Denver (F)
 Sun. Apr. 23 5 Km, Dearborn, Mich., 10 am (Q)
 10 Km, Walnut, Cal. (G)
 Sat. Apr. 29 5 Km, North Miami Beach, Florida (M)
 Sun. Apr. 30 5 Km, Denver (F)
 Thu. May 4 2.8 Mile, Seattle (C)
 Sat. May 6 10 and 20 Km, Atlanta (D)
 Sun. May 7 National TAC 15 Km, Pomona, California (G)
Contacts
 C--Bev LaVeck, 6633 Windermere Rd., Seattle, WA 98115

D--Dave Waddle, 2327 Redfield Dr., Norcross, GA 30071
 F--Bob Carlson, 2261 Glencoe St., Denver, CO 80207
 G--Elaine Ward, 1000 San Pasqual #35, Pasadena, CA 91106
 H--Dave Gwyn, 6502 S. Briar Bayou, Houston, TX 77072
 I--Columbia Track Club, 2980 Maple Bluff Dr., Columbia, MO 65201
 J--John White, 4865 Arthur Place, Columbus, Ohio 43220
 K--James Pearce, 2449 Southway Dr., Columbus, OH 43221
 L--Maine Walkers, 1570 Broadway, Bangor, ME 04401
 M--Florida Racewalkers, 4223 Palm Forest Dr. N., Delray Beach, FL 33445
 N--Gayle Johnson, 2918 Indianola, Apt. A, Columbus, OH 43221
 O--Dave Talcott, RD 3, Box 152 A, Owego, NY 13827
 P--Wolverine Pacers, 26530 Woodshire, Dearborn Heights, MI 48127
 Q--Sal Corrallo, 3466 Roberts Lane, N. Arlington, VA

Judging, Contact, and Related Issues: The Great Rehash

Race walking: A progression of steps so taken that unbroken contact with the ground is maintained. At each step, the advancing foot of the walker must make contact with the ground before the rear foot leaves the ground. During the period of each step when a foot is on the ground, the leg must be straightened (i.e., not bent at the knee) at least for one moment, and in particular, the supporting leg must be straight in the vertical upright position. International Amateur Athletic Federation (I.A.A.F.) rules.

The middle of winter with a slight lull in our sport seems a good time to reopen a subject that is rearing its head again--what constitutes fair race walking and how are we going to determine who is executing properly? This arises now from our December issue, when we took the *Monterey Walk Walk Walk* newsletter to task for speaking out on pictures showing racewalkers clearly off the ground in races they were allowed to finish. We were somewhat unfair in our hasty remarks on the issue, since we have taken similar stands in the past. Actually we made an editorial judgment in accusing of them being "aghast", a charge they denied in their January issue. They said:

"First, we want to assure Mr. Mortland we were not aghast at the Chris Maddock picture. (Ed. Their comment on a picture of British international, Chris Maddock, clearly off the ground, as shown in a British publication, had initiated this exchange.) Rather, we were and still are surprised to see the picture in the official publication of the British Race Walking Association and without any comment. Does this mean that to violate the fundamental rule of race walking is today considered normal by the British officials?

"If a judge cannot see the loss of contact with the naked eye, and we wholeheartedly agree that this is often the case, what are the subjective factors by which he rules? Will these factors be the same for all judges?

"We still think that videotapes should be made during races. That would, by itself, slow down to legality the ultrafast race walkers and constitute a deterrent.

We still don't understand the reasons for not wanting to use videotapes during races, even on an experimental basis. Why not do it before it is too late? Let's not forget that disagreement over interpreting competitors' technique in the 1924 Olympics in Paris led to race walking being dropped from the 1928 Olympics in Amsterdam. We don't want this to happen again."

Those who are new to these pages and new to the sport may think they have just stumbled on to something new. They haven't. Long time subscribers know that about every 5 years or so we go through a few months of commentary back and forth on this continuing controversy and little really changes. Over the

years, Jim Hanley has been the leading voice of those advocating videotape judging, and he has articulated his case well. Others, including your editor, have wondered about the practicality and fairness of such procedures. However, the ORW has also reacted strongly to photographs of "lifting" athletes in the past, wondering what direction the sport was taking. Perhaps because it has become somewhat old hat, we reacted somewhat negatively to this recent stand by the Monterey folks.

Anyway, I have spent some time going over back issues and found much that has been said in the past that is still of interest, relevant, and worth repeating. Were we to repeat it all, we would fill the next several issues and there would be a good deal of repetition. But I think a review of some of the highlights will let us all know that this is not a new problem and certainly not an easy one to address.

In 1969, Jim Hanley produced a group of pictures taken at the National Indoor 1 Mile Championship showing various individuals, including 1964 Olympic 50 Km winner Abdon Pamich of Italy, up in the air, so to speak. Jim had written us about the pictures and his distress with the state of walking. We published his comments and asked for reader comment. We got a lot, many telling us we shouldn't publish the pictures, that it would hurt the sport more than help. The pictures, readers comments, and our comments were published in an over-sized May-June 1969 issue. This marked the first use of photos in the ORW. Jim had provided sufficient halftone copies for our needs. Leading into our discussion at that time was a series of limericks, composed by your editor, of which the final was:

There was a young runner from Gosport,
Took a fling at the old heel and toe sport,
When he flew off the ground, with a leap and a bound,
The judges said, "None of that here sport."

Among the comments, Gerry Willwerth said: "Jim makes the statement that it is extremely difficult to catch a walker with both feet off the ground in a still photograph. So what of the poor guys who have to watch a thrashing field of eight or more walkers doing a mile in under 7 minutes, making (or not making) 1/100th if a second contacts, when the human eye can only detect 1/15th of a second actions?"

Some of the ORW's comments in that issue: "I tend to agree with one thing that comes out of several of the above commentaries, i.e., that the fault shown in these pictures lies largely with the race, not with the judges or the competitors. . . I don't think that it is impossible to walk legally at 1-mile speed (in those days we were talking about 6:10 to 6:30 per mile, today's 20 km speed, which shows how the problem has grown). Slow motion film taken of our 1968 Olympic walkers doing 110s at sub 5 minute pace show just how fast you can go legally. But, obviously, you have to be right on the edge, and as Doc Blackburn suggests, the least fatigue can throw you right off. However, I do think it is utterly impossible to judge contact objectively at this speed. It must become a subjective decision on the part of the judge based on how he thinks the guy looks."

Then, after a few comments on some of the problems of using still photos or film as judging tools (videotape wasn't yet much of a consideration) and on the merits of even competing over such distances as a mile, we commented on judging, as follows:

"There is no doubt that the overall standard of judging in this country can be, and should be improved. If nothing else, we need more judges. (Still valid comments—and that is not to criticize some of the fine judges out there, but its a

very big country.) But at any point in time, we must be willing to accept the present level of competence, while working to improve it, and to place our faith in the judges we have and accept their decisions. Otherwise, we aren't going to have a sport. The griping I often hear after races turns me off completely. I regard it as nothing but very poor sportsmanship. I sometimes think that too many people forget that walking is, after all, a sport, and that the ultimate measure of one's success is satisfaction in one's own performance. I could care less if I am first or tenth or with how other competitors looked in front of me so long as I can be satisfied with how I performed. (That statement was sincere, but I imagine I would have been upset had I lost my Olympic spot, say, to a highly questionable performance.) I guess I have never experienced this thing of traveling to a meet only to have people run away from me simply because I have never been involved in judging while I walked.

I think we can all agree that judging is very difficult at best. So where does anyone get the gaul to think they can judge while walking. Not only judge, but do it better than someone who has nothing else to do and has some degree of experience at the job. And yet, I constantly hear people trying to do it. The griping that results is not going to improve judging, but it might well completely alienate the judges, so that we lose the few that we do have. . . . (That gets a little away from the question at hand, but I think is still worth repeating.)

Then we move to word from "the guru of American race walking, the father of 50 Km walking, editor of the now defunct Race Walker, and a man who once said that 7:26.3 was the limit of legal walking (or some such time) since that was as fast as he ever went—Chris McCarthy." McCarthy, who walked the 50 in the 1964 Olympics, was a very competent judge and a real student what judging involved. He made some astute comments on judging procedures, which we are passing, since they are not all relevant today. But the rest of his comments are relevant:

"We might also profit from a short discussion of what it is that a judge does when he has a walker in his 'judging zone'. First: It is fundamental to realize that a judge never sees a violation, he infers it, that inference being his judgment. The only exception is really bad creeping; marginal creeping is difficult to place with exactitude—although here, as in lifting, experience helps. Second: What a judge does see, and what makes our sport possible at all, is "floating". When a guy is floating, he gives the appearance of being up high; when he is ultra-legal, like Laird in this year's 10 Km, he gives the appearance of being down "tight" against the ground. But somewhere along the line "takes off". It is up to the judge to say just when. On this point judges may differ. And they may be right or wrong (as later revealed by a camera, preferably 64 frames per second, slow motion, or videotape, which is continuous.) Nevertheless, when competent judges are working a race, it is certain that they will know which walkers are marginal, even if they fail to point out on which side of the margin the walker falls. Thus, it is entirely possible for a dq'd walker to later come up with films showing that at the instant he was dq's he was actually on the ground. But I believe that, at least with competent judges, the same films will show that he was marginal, probably very marginal.

"The important point here, and we might just as well face it, is this: **Judging is not an exact science.** All that a judge can do is to detect the marginal walker (but he can do that with certainty) and then make a judgment about where he will draw the line. The moral of this is: With competent judging the good walkers will never be dq'd; the poor walkers will always be dq'd; the marginal walkers will constantly be in trouble. And in fact, that is pretty much what happens. The worst walkers either change or leave the sport. The result is that the worst of those still around are the marginal walkers. These are the guys who get by here, but not there and cause a lot of trouble all around. Nonetheless,

ideally at least, it is the judges duty to let them finish when they look ok and to eject them when they don't. The good judge is not the guy who tosses out the most walkers. He is the guy who tosses out the right walkers and earns a reputation for fairness.

It has been my experience that whereas a creeper will creep along most of the race—unless you straighten him out—lifting is episodic. Lifting generally occurs for tactical reasons. Guys will bounce to a fast start to gain position: they will sprint when they pass, they will sprint to keep from being passed, they will sprint the last few yards, sometimes even when there is no one near them. And on each of these sprints, there is a danger of lifting. Especially if they go into their sprint with a burst. An experience judge knows this and is looking for it.

"The trouble with the one and two mile walks is that the average pace is so fast that any increment in the pace is bound to push a guy to the margin. It is quite likely than Hanley's shots were made during sudden bursts; if those guys looked that bad all the way, then the judging really was bad!

Finally, while on this vein, I might mention that creeping and lifting are not the judges only bane. In addition, walkers as a group have a most fantastic repertory of the oddest gaits, limps, shuffles, hops, leaps, and bounds imaginable. And some that can't be imagined; they have to be seen, for there is no way to describe them. And in each case, the judge has to make up his mind if the basic rules of contact and locking are being observed. In this regard, I find it best to concentrate on the feet alone for contact and the knees alone for straightening and not to concern myself with style problems.

"And maybe I should say something about the psychology underlying the walker-judge relationship. A naive judge, especially if he an ex-walker who never tried to take advantage of the rules, is apt to think of the walkers he is judging as having a similar outlook. But this may not be the case. It is best for the judge to assume nothing at all, to simply watch for violations and make his decisions from a completely open mind. For example, there are guys who, when cautioned, will not slow down. They may be playing a game of "chicken"; if the judge chickens out and doesn't toss them out they can win or place well up. (The editor would point here that it isn't necessarily required to slow down, but rather to concentrate more on style; after all the caution only means one is in danger of walking illegally.) But that's not the only reason a guy may fail to shape up after a warning. There are others who are willing to risk everything in a do-or-die effort to win. Such a walker, if he does get dq'd, is apt to take it as a part of the high cost of doing business. In addition, judges themselves might get psyched out if they are awed by a walkers reputation, or if they try to make allowance for the fact that the guy came hundreds, maybe even thousands, of miles at his own expense in order to compete.

"In each of these cases, and all similar ones, the judge is best advised to do his job and let the chips fall where they may. With so many cameras around these days, the truth will out anyway. In the short run, cameras might cause embarrassment all around when the pictures are released; but in the long run I think they help liberate judges from holding back from doing what has to be done. (Unfortunately, 20 years later the long run has been run and the same problems exist.) At any rate, photos such as Hanley's should not be suppressed. To do so only gives life to rumors, which are worse than anything the film shows. Our basic ills will not go away by pretending they do not exist."

Four years later we had another set of photos from the Indoor 1 Mile Championship, these taken by Don Johnson, again showing various people in various stages of flight. We again sort of wrote it off as the fallacy of walking 1 mile indoors. Coincidentally, we had a letter from Ron Daniel, who, also coincidentally, was one of those embarrassingly pictured. Ron said: "After many

years of competition, viewing films of Americans and the European "greats", I have come to the following conclusion. That 100 percent contact in race walking is non-existent at the championship level, especially in the high-speed races, such as a 20 Km. My guess is that the problem is one of mechanics, not one of poor execution by the athlete. Let me try to explain. First, we assume that 100 percent can be attained. The ideal condition would be a perfectly flat surface and physically read body (no injuries, not fatigue). There is now some maximum speed where 100 percent contact exists. In order to maintain this top speed and contact, a very high degree of coordination and timing is taking place. Neglecting fatigue or other physical problems, loss of contact can be caused by an irregular surface. The worst type being a blacktop road with occasional waves; this type of surface is so innocuous in appearance that the walker is lulled into complacency by the "smooth" fast surface. What occurs at high speed is similar to a car wheel with poor shocks. The walker steps off of one of the hidden waves and, bingo, he's lifting before he is even aware of it and his reflexes have started to damp out the lift. But not before several non-contact steps go by. Now take other irregular surfaces, or a moving surface (indoor track) and add fatigue, strain, etc., and we have the ingredients for less than 100 percent contact. Usually this type of break in contact is so slight that it only can be detected on film. Without further speculation, that is my theory on speed walking that wins the big ones."

All have not agreed that there is any problem with the walkers, as seen in the letter from "Concerned Walking Person" published in March 1979. "I think something of a crisis is developing in American short distance race walking. Whereas race walkers throughout the world are walking at speeds unthinkable just years ago, and doing it legally by harder and more scientific and more dedicated training than ever before, there are judges at major meets in the USA who do not think these rates of speed are physically possible. Thus, some of them have let their prejudices on this subject dictate their actions. A case in point involved the most recent USA international dual meet. A judge knew before the race that the other country's representative had just won his continental championship in rather incredible time. He also knew that the leading competitor of his own nation had won his own national championship and several other races in rather incredible time. Before the race, he had been heard in conversation inferring that he didn't think the US walker was physically capable of walking that fast legally, and that furthermore, the judges who had judged those ultra-fast races had to be lacking in skill since they did not DQ him. Of course, he was 3000 miles away from these races. He also said nothing about the international walker, or at least not publically. What this served to accomplish was to completely frazzle the US walker in question. . .The international man went on to win by over a lap. That is not to say the result would have been different if the pre-race comments were not made. But it is one hell of a burden for the US walker to carry on his slender shoulders. . .Pre-race comments of the same sort were overheard at the last National AAU outdoor championships. What they served to do was to condemn a man for alleged deeds past and precodemn him for deeds that the judge thinks are forthcoming. We simply cannot allow this situation. What a man has done in races past, even the most flagrant violations, bear no relation to what he will do in the future. I say give a man the opportunity to prove himself on the day. And I say let the judges judge only on the performance of the day, not on the performance of races previous. I think this is the only way to maintain the American reputation for fair play as focused on the sport we all love."

The following year things really heated up again. Photos from the 1979 World Cup Championships in Eschborn, W.G. showed all sorts of people off the ground and the event became known as the "Eschborn Flying Circus." Very negative comments appeared in both Track & Field News and the British

publication Athletics Weekly. Race walking was crying for publicity in the track and field press, but not of that nature. Colin Young, always a voice of reason in the British race walking community, wrote a long plea for some positive action in Athletics Weekly, which we repeated. Part of his commentary:

"The president of the IAAF Walking Commission stated we have been watching a revolution rather than an evolution inside the sport and if we want to measure in results, we have seen an improvement in records that is incredible. Well, it must be transparently obvious to all what it is incredible and the president, in his role of chief judge at so many major events, must take responsibility for bringing the sport to the dangerous crossroads at which it now finds itself. . . Despite what is happening to the sport there are those, particularly those with vested interests (i.e., competitors benefitting from the "explosion", team managers, and coaches), who are either turning a blind eye or stating that walkers are now so super-fit and strong that they cannot be expected to go so fast and maintain contact and the day of the 'lift off' has arrived.

"I can well believe and, in fact, am led to understand that the same was said in the late 1870s when Venn and Webster had their duels and a little later when Curtis and Sturgess took liberties during their frenetic battles urged on by their respective gangs of supporters. It is well to remember that the 2 and 7 mile times of George Larner (13:11.4 in 1904 and 50:50.8 in 1905) and Bill Sturgess (13:24.2 and 51:27 in 1895) were not beaten until Vickers/Matthews and Hardy/Allen respectively over a half century later. The reason for those long-standing records? Well, I leave you to imagine how Larner and Sturgess achieved such outstanding times. The judges of those times acted accordingly and made certain those eager to better those performances by similar methods were dissuaded by disqualifications. Many will not realize that some 35 years ago, Vaclav Garsan and Werner Hardmo went under 42 minutes for 10 Km in their juels and the Swede also set other unlikely records at various distances. However, both were pulled out in the 1946 European Championships, while Hardmo suffered a similar fate at the London Olympics.

"I am utterly convinced that in order not to have the sport ridiculed, withdrawn from major international Games, and lose all credibility with other athletes and the general public, those not maintaining contact will have to be disqualified and slow down accordingly until they keep within the stated definition. . . If, by making sure that blatant and continuous loss of contact is punished, the 'limit' of legal walking is 40-plus minutes for 10 km and 82-plus for 20 km, so be it. . ."

Your editor uttered an "amen", and concluded his brief comments with: "I really don't think most people are deliberately cheating, they are going to the limit to be competitive and so long as no one calls them, they will continue to press that limit. Let it be known that lifters will indeed be disqualified and they will stop lifting. And the top athletes will prevail, which may not always be the case now."

That was in the April 1980 issue. Two months later we had photos of more "lifters" at the "Walnut Flying Circus", the U.S. 5 Km Championship. In my comments on these, I said: "The question is: How do we get back to race walking? I don't have the answer and have yet to see where anyone else has a valid answer. To me, changing the rules to allow what is now going on, as some are suggesting, is no answer at all. If they want to introduce a new sport of straight-legged running, let them, but don't call it race walking."

The next month, Bob Bowman took me to task for my remarks: ". . . First, of all, I don't agree with you assumption that apparently no one is really race walking anymore and that no one seems willing to blow the whistle. I feel you are over reacting a bit to those photos. I do agree strongly with you that changing the rules to allow loss of contact is not the answer.

"I was one of the judges at Walnut and several walkers, including two of the three shown, were a little high in the first two laps (typical of sprint walks) and accordingly did receive cautions per the rules and did settle down. . . It is a lot easier to stand by the side line and take photos than to get involved in actually judging the race. I only wish those "brave" souls with their little cameras and big mouths would be involved in judging, because that's where we need help. I also would like to point out that it is obviously more difficult to judge these shorter distances and certainly difficult to make the close calls, where very little advantage, if any, is really gained anyway."

Jim Hanley continued to call for videotape: "All the problems with judging could easily be eliminated by applying the videotape rule to International races. (DQ the walker up to one hour after the race if the videotapes show him to be off!) Judges must realize that videotapes are an aid to their judgment--not a replacement of them. Another solution--which met great opposition when I lobbied for the videotape rule back in 1969--is to DQ a walker anytime retroactively when pictures show him to be off! (Problems with the long wait, touching up of pictures, etc., were good reason to abandon this approach.) Without photographic-videotape judging of some sort, walking deserves to be kicked out of the Olympics!"

The idea that the need for contact be eliminated from the rules was spelled out in detail by British National Coach, Julian Hopkins, in a lengthy Athletics weekly article. He felt it needless, that the straight leg rule was sufficient because one cannot "run with straight legs." That idea was certainly not well received by Athletics Weekly readers, as evidence by many letters they received, which we repeated in part.

In our December 1980 issue, comments from Mort Maling included: ". . . I am going to be ready, too. I am going to demand that they also suspend the rule that requires the leg in contact with the ground to be straight. The rationale is the same in both cases. The great Mexican walkers, who are often off the ground for that instant at each stride, are so fast and beautiful in the performance of their event that they should be allowed a small variance. Similarly, my great mentor was fast and beautiful. Admittedly, his knees did bend a little when he walked, but still Groucho Marx was a sight to behold. Groucho has passed away now, but I, as his disciple, hereby petition the rule keepers to suspend the anit-creeping rule. With bent knees I can lengthen my stride and bring the world record for the walk well under 6 minutes. And, if I am not required to have straight legs or continuous contact. . ."

Well, there were no rule changes and no apparent revolution in judging, but walking did remain a viable sport and was contested in the 1984 Olympics. Then in early 1985, the much respected Ron Laird more or less hopped on the Julian Hopkins bandwagon (Hopkins had, in the meantime, resigned as British National Coach) with a proposal that the rules recognize a "flight phase". In reality, that is what was going on, and still is, but Ron didn't get much agreement that it should be built into the rules. After all, if judges find it extremely to distinguish between very marginal contact and very slight of contact, how are they going to find it any easier to distinguish between very slight loss of contact and just slightly more loss of contact, or excessive flight phase, as Ron called it. However, his proposal was very thoughtful and very well presented. His final paragraph, a very good analysis of what is going on, read: "Judges from all over the world must look for biomechanically correct race walking technique and disqualify those who are deliberately or carelessly getting too high and really flying forward with each step. Excessive lifting is what the athletes get disqualified for and what the judges normally detect anyway. This is the way it has always been and should always be. Flexibility, technique, and fitness only help hide what is

going on with one's true ability to make perfect contact at all times. We only sink deeper into more controversial situations by continuing to ignore the fact that the flight phase is a normal part of today's highly competitive racing and training scene. Until we update our rules we will continue to be criticized by other track and field officials, coaches, athletes, writers, and spectators. Let us work together to change the rules so race walking will finally be legitimate in all its future years. If we don't, we may soon see the end of the sport."

Bob Kitchen commented on Ron's proposal: ". . . Problems in judging only really occur in the gray areas between the obviously legal and the obvious DQ. Ron's Rule wants to solve the problem of the gray areas by eliminating or ignoring them. In the process, this rule would de-objectify race walking. OURs would be the only athletic event without an objective rule, looking for a specific event to occur. The technical details of Ron's proposal are not the critical issues. It is the overall perspective that is at fault. Ron sees the crisis as one of technique: the tremendous fitness of current and future race walkers renders the old limits of contact ineffectual. I perceive the crisis as one of judging: we have never yet professionally trained and certified our walking judges. There are several programs circulating for a judging certification and training program. We must take the lead in the world in this matter and must put our priority on it in this early year of the Olympiad. Our best judges are remarkably accurate, but we need to refine our judging techniques and make them more consistent in all judges. Yes, we do have a public image problem due to technique and judging. But it will be nowhere near the problem we will have if we introduce this rule change. The criticism that we do not know or are not clear about what we are doing may be correct."

And the ORW's comments at that time: "My initial reactions on reading the suggestion were along the same lines as Bob Kitchen's; why throw out an objective rule, albeit one that must be applied subjectively because the human eye cannot detect broken contact at high speed, in favor of a subjective rule that still must be applied subjectively. I don't see it being any easier to distinguish between the "flight phase" and the "excessive flight phase" that it is now to distinguish between double contact and "flight phase". Of course, it is obvious in the extreme that Ron shows (he had illustrative figures), but I don't see anyone walking anything like that today. If we write a "flight phase" into the rules, we might see people trying to walk like that in the future, however—maybe even getting away with it because of lenient judging. (All people get away with today because of lenient judging is "marginal flight phase", to coin another term in our rapidly expanding walking vocabulary. Whatever happened to "lifting" and "creeping"?) "Now, lest Ron feel that he is being stomped on and ground into the ground by a parade of heels and toes, let me point out one positive feature of his proposal. In his description of correct race walking technique, he has very nicely defined some of the subjective factors judges must look for in trying to determine legality under today's rules. Walking fast must look like walking

"But if we build the "flight phase", which we all know sometimes exists with even the best looking walkers, into the rules, soon walking will not look like walking. The next step will be the acceptance of the "excessive flight phase", and from there we go to wings. Sorry Ron, but in the final analysis, your thinking is a bit fuzzy on this one."

We could go on with comments Julian Hopkins made in explaining his resignation and rebuttals to both Ron and Julian, but we have probably taken up more than enough space for one issue. There are problems, there have been problems, they remain pretty much the same—but the sport goes on.

Since this also started with some comments from the Monterey newsletter, it may be fitting to close with the reaction of Giulio de Petra, of that group, to the ideas of Hopkins and Laird, as printed in the May 1985 ORW.

"I read what Ron Laird in the ORW and Julian Hopkins in *Race Walking Record* wrote about "lack of contact". Because he couldn't accept the disqualification of race walkers for lack of contact, J. Hopkins resigned from the position as British National Event Coach last October. I read also the comments to Laird's proposals reported in your publication.

"I belong to the old guard of race walkers and since 1925 I've been competing with race walkers like Frigerio, Pavesi, Green, Schwab, Valente, and Altmani, all fair and correct race walkers. The judges were always strict and there was no way of losing contact with the ground without being disqualified.

"If we really want to save race walking as an Olympic sport and avoid what already happened at Amsterdam in 1928 when race walking was cancelled from the Games, let's go back to real honest race walking.

"For that, all we need is to go back to what Dr. John Blackburn wrote in the late '60s in your publication, and which has been reprinted by the *Race Walking Record* as an answer to Julian Hopkins unbelievable writing. John Blackburn wrote "let me make a plea for us to leave off the dramatics. . . and concentrate on decent walking form." Good trained judges will take care of all problems we have today in the race walking world. It is up to us.

"And to finish, I think that all real race walkers should be, as I am, happy for Julian Hopkins resignation and be ready to start a new "era" in race walking by scratching out all the race walking records established after the Second World War..."

A final note. At some time while I was typing all of the above, John White, who is doing so much to promote race walking in this area, came into my office. When told what I was doing, John quickly allowed that anytime he has asked how one can become certified as a race walking judge (and he is asking supposedly cognizant people he encounters at national race walking committee meetings) he gets no answer. Not an unsatisfactory answer, but no answer. I know that several years ago Larry Larson set up a certification procedure, Bob Kitchen alluded to in the letter quoted above written nearly four years ago, but I am really not sure if it ever was really instituted or what the status is currently. But certainly, we have a problem if, with a crying need for more good judges, someone who is interested in becoming one gets no guidance at all. And a final, final note (a page ago I said I was wrapping this up), in the August 1985 ORW we published date compiled by Frank Alongi from which he concluded that: "Racewalking judgment can be made without usage of high speed cameras or video systems." He feels that "ground contact identification should be in the limits of most observers." Which of course refutes what people have been saying for years about the subjectivity of judging, the basis of the much of the forgoing commentary. But, I think many remain skeptical about Frank's conclusions.

FROM HEEL TO TOE

Note the entry blank for the Mortland Invitational stashed in the middle of this issue. I don't suppose you could miss it since it sort of gets in you way in going from page 8 to page. The race has been scheduled for April 2 to give those coming in for the National Masters a chance for a second race—makes the travel expense more worthwhile. I would say that it's the second annual Mortland Invitational but I a'm not sure we have yet established that it's an annual affair. . . The women's World Cup Trial to be held in Tampa on April 2 is only part of an All-American Walkers Rally taking place beginning on March 31. There are many varied events throughout the weekend beginning with the Walkers of the Year Awards banquet on Friday evening through the Walking Festival on Sunday. . . There are also other events in conjunction with the men's trial in Washington on

April 16 (both events are on the schedule printed earlier in this issue). On the 15th there will be racewalk seminars on: "The Novice Judge--Problems and Solutions," "Coaching to Compete," and "The Athlete--A Winning attitude." A pasta dinner is scheduled for that night. A clinic will follow the race. .In the course of putting everything together on the contact issue, I looked back at the Rules of Walking as carried in the 1953 AAU T&F Handbook. It is interesting to note that at that time they had three, rather than two, criteria for judging. The rule read: "For all walking contests, the following code of rules governing walking must be adhered to or else disqualification will ensue: a) Walking is a succession of steps and, in contradistinction to running (wherein both feet may be off the ground at the same time), in walking there must always be contact with the ground with some portion of one of the feet. b) Leg Action--As the foremost foot in taking a step touches the ground, the knee must not be bent. The heel must touch the ground first and the toe be the last portion of the foot to leave it. It is imperative that the heel of the foremost foot must touch the ground before the toe of the other foot ceases to have contact with it. c) Carriage of the body--The body must be kept strictly upright. Note: Discretionary power is given to the Judge or Judges of Walking to decide whether, in the event of the body being inclined forward, such attitude is the result of fatigue or arises from some cause beyond the control of the competitor; and if it be, and he or they are convinced that the rule has been broken for such reason only, and that the competitor is still walking fairly otherwise, disqualification need not necessarily follow from this cause alone." There was also a "d). Carriage of Arms--The arms may be held in any way the walker likes, but it is advised that they be carried well up", but obviously that really had nothing to do with disqualification. I'm not sure when the upright carriage criterion was dropped from the rules.

Hot off the wire: European Indoor Championships, Feb. 18: Men's 5 Km--1. Mikhail Schennikov, USSR 18:35.6 2. Roman Mrazek, Czechoslovakia 18:40.11 3. Giovanni de Benedictis, Italy 18:43.45 Women's 3 Km--1. Beata Anders, GDR 12:21.91 2. Ileana Salvador, Italy 12:32.40 3. Reyes Sobrino, Spain 12:39.50

LOOKING BACK

20 Years Ago (From the Feb. 1969 ORW)--Dave Romansky was crowned ORW National Postal 20 Km champion with his 1:33:58. Bill Ranney was second in 1:39:45, as the entry was not overwhelming. . Mile specialist Dan Tothoroh walked 6:36.6 in Los Angeles with Ron Laird, Larry Young, and Larry Walker in a near deadheat only a second back. . In San Francisco, Tom Dooley turned in 30 Km in 2:31:02. . Larry Young was awarded the Ron Zinn Memorial Trophy as the outstanding walker in the US in 1968.

15 Years Ago (From the Feb. 1974 ORW)--Larry Walker edged Todd Scully by 0.4 second to win the National Indoor 2 Mile in 13:24. Dave Romansky was bounced after crossing the line 4 seconds ahead of Walker. Ron Daniel, just behind Scully was also DQ'd. . Sue Brodock recorded an easy win in the women's National mile in 7:28.6. Ellen Minkow was 9 seconds back in second and Carol Mohanco, of Kettering, Ohio, was third. . Romansky beat Daniel in the Olympic Invitational 1500 with a 6:05.4 and Walker captured the LA Times Mile in 6:28.7, ahead of Don DeNoon.

10 Years Ago (From the Feb. 1979 ORW)--Chris Shea walked the first Indoor sub-7 minute mile by a woman, winning the National title in the process. Her 6:58.4 left former Indoor record holder Sue Brodock nearly 14 seconds back. . Todd Scully had a world's best in winning the Indoor 2 Mile Title in 12:40, 10 seconds ahead of Jim Heiring. Dan O'Connor was also under 13 minutes. . Marcel Jobin beat Scully

in a 3 Km in Montreal with an 11:37. Todd had 11:40.4. . But Scully also had a world's best at 1 Mile, winning the Millrose Games in 5:55.8. . In Racine, Wisconsin, Jim Heiring took the U.S. Indoor 5 Km record away from Scully walking 20:53.9, with Chris Hansen given the same time in second. . Brodock won the LA Times mile in 7:06.4. Larry Walker took the men's race in 6:25.

5 Years Ago (From the February 1984 ORW)--Jim Heiring walked away with the National Indoor 2 Mile title. His 12:11.21 left Paul Wick almost 42 seconds back. Todd Scully was third in 13:04. . Teresa Vaill took the Women's 1 Mile title in 7:12.85, with Maryanne Torrellas 14 second back and Susan Liers just 7:30 in third. . A month earlier, Tom Edward won the National Indoor 5 Km in 21:05.2, with Scully second in 21:36.2. . In the Millrose Mile, Ray Sharp (5:52.29) just got the best of Heiring (5:52.77). Edwards had 6:01.11 in third. . Edwards won the Olympic Invitational 1500 in 5:28.82. . Tim Lewis got into the sub 6 minute act with a 5:57.2 to win the LA Times race. Larry Walker was second with a Master's record of 6:17.7. . Torrellas edged Vaill in the LA Times ladies mile with her 7:16.8. . Sharp walked an American record 3 Km in Louisville, winning in 11:16.3. Heiring was a scant 0.2 second behind.

To round out the issue, we repeat a few more of those original ORW limericks from the May-June 1969 issue.

There was a young walker named Dean,
Who forgot to apply vaseline,
He got raw, he got red,
Would have rather been dead,
For more races he's not very keen.

Same thing, another version:

There was a young walker named Sweeney,
Who forgot to apply vaseline,
50 K was the race,
At a hot, chafing pace,
As he finished, he stepped gingerleeny.

For those who remember the Cromwell theory:*

There was a young walker from Erie,
Who didn't believe Cromwell theory,
The girls he'd enrapture,
Prove his physical stature,
Then win all his races, though weary.

There was a young fellow from Natick,
Whose behavior was very erratic,
Threw his hips all around,
Kept one foot on the ground,
He was merely a walking fanatic.

*An old track and field instructional text by former USC coach, Dean Cromwell, said that "Sexual gratification is the worst thing for the athlete." We had some fun with that in the early days of the ORW

JACK MORTLAND RACEWALK INVITATIONAL MIDEAST REGIONAL TAC CHAMPIONSHIPS

Men - 10 Km, Women - 10 Km, Youth - 5 Km

Columbus, Ohio, April 2, 1989

DATE: Sunday, April 2, 1989 HOST: Wolfpack Track Club, Columbus, Ohio

PLACE: Whetstone Park near the main parking lot. Enter the park at Hollenback from N High St, US 23 in NW Columbus. Three miles north of OSU campus.

PROGRAM: An officiated women-racewalkers 10-km-race starting at 9:30 a.m.
An officiated girl-racewalkers 5-km-race starting at 9:30 a.m.
An officiated men-racewalkers 10-km-race starting at 9:30 a.m.
An officiated boy-racewalkers 5-km-race starting at 9:30 a.m.
A fun 5-km racewalk for all ages starting at 10:45 a.m.

SANCTION: Ohio Athletics Congress - event subject to TAC drug testing program

CERTIFIED COURSE: 2.5-km out-and-back loop on a riverside bikepath[OH88012PR]

ELIGIBILITY: All participants must have a 1989 TAC/USA Membership Number; sign up with your home TAC Association or purchase at the race. (only TAC member clubs may enter the team competition; funwalk participants do not have to be TAC members but must register)

T-SHIRTS: Meet T-shirts will be sold on raceday.

INDIVIDUAL AGE GROUPS: Youth 5 km - 7-10, 11-12, 13-14, 15-16, & 17-18
Adults 19&U, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, 50-54, 55-59, 60-64, 65-69, 70-74, 75-79, etc

INDIVIDUAL AWARDS: TAC medals to the top three racewalkers per age group; Special Awards for the Open Champions; funwalkers and other finishers will receive a different medal.

TEAMS: Best 3 of 5 athletes TEAM AWARDS: Award to each first place team

TEAM CATEGORIES: Open Women, Open Men

TEAM ROSTERS: identify on race day TEAM SCORING: aggregate time of athletes

ENTRY FEE: \$5.00 before 3/29/89; \$7.00 on race day; no phone entries

REGISTRATION: Opens at 8:00 a.m. RESULTS: mailed to all entrants

MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO: John White, Wolfpack Track Club

RACE DIRECTOR: Gayle Johnson, 2918 Indianola, Apt A, Columbus, Ohio 43202
evening: (614) 267-2175 or evening: (614) 459-2547

OFFICIAL ENTRY FORM - SUBMIT TO RACEWALK DIRECTOR

NAME: _____ SEX: _____ PHONE: _____

ADDRESS: _____ CITY/STATE _____ ZIP: _____

AGE AS OF 4-2-89: _____ BIRTHDATE: _____ CLUB: _____

RACE ENTERING (circle): Women-10km Men-10km Girls-5km Boys-5km Funwalk

1989 TAC NUMBER: _____ (not required for the funwalk)

IN CONSIDERATION OF THIS ENTRY BEING ACCEPTED, I HEREBY FOR MYSELF, MY HEIRS, EXECUTORS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND ASSIGNS WAIVE AND RELEASE ANY AND ALL CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, INCLUDING CONSEQUENTIAL, I MAY HAVE AGAINST THE WOLFPACK TRACK CLUB, ITS MEMBERS, THE SPONSORS, THE RACE COMMITTEE, THE RACE OFFICIALS, AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES, SUCCESSORS, AND ASSIGNS FOR ANY AND ALL INJURIES SUFFERED BY ME OR MY CHILD (ATHLETE) AT THIS RACE. I CERTIFY THAT THE ATHLETE HAS TRAINED SUFFICIENTLY TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RACE.

(SIGNED) _____ ATHLETE (PARENT, if 17 years old or younger)

JACK MORTLAND RACEWALK INVITATIONAL (additional information)

EVENT: The Jack Mortland Racewalk Invitational is a major opportunity in Ohio for athletes to engage in high level competition. The event was approved as the Mideast Regional TAC Racewalk Championships as a means for encouraging a youth, masters, and club age-group event. Columbus racewalker Jack Mortland was a member of the 1964 US Olympic team and is editor and publisher of the Ohio Racewalker newsletter. The honoree plans to assist with the events and present the awards. Racewalkers with limited experience are welcome to enter this racewalk event.

OHIO TAC MEMBERSHIP: send an SASE to OAC, PO Box 5848, Dayton, OH 45405-0848

OFFICIALS: Top officials from Ohio, Michigan, and Indiana have been invited

FACILITIES: Parking, Restrooms, Water on Course, No Showers, Fast Food Nearby

REFRESHMENTS: Soft Drinks and Light Snacks at Social Hour after the Awards

EARLY RACE INFORMATION: Pick up notes at Cross-Country Inn, 2:00 - 9:00 p.m.
(No Social Hour this year due to Track Meet at OSU)

CONVENIENT MOTELS (all located 2-3 miles south of race site near OSU campus):

-HQ-	Cross-Country Inn	3246 Olentangy River Rd	614-267-4646	800-621-1429
	Knights Inn	3160 Olentangy River Rd	614-261-0523	
	Red Roof Inn	441 Ackerman Rd	614-267-9941	800-848-7878
	Days Inn	3232 Olentangy River Rd	614-261-7141	800-325-2525
	University Inn	3110 Olentangy River Rd	614-267-7461	800-262-7468
	Parke Univ Hotel	3025 Olentangy River Rd	614-267-1111	800-344-2345
	Holiday Inn on Lane	328 W Lane Av	614-294-4848	800-465-4329

SPECIAL NOTICE FOR OPEN RACEWALKERS

The 1989 edition of the Jack Mortland Racewalk Invitational will be sponsored by the host Wolfpack Track Club. The April 2 date was selected to occur on the same weekend as the 1989 National Masters Indoor Track and Field Championships to be held at the French Fieldhouse of Ohio State University. The event will be jointly hosted by Wolfpack Track Club of Columbus, Ohio and the Over-the-Hill Track Club of Cleveland, Ohio. The indoor 3-km racewalks for 30-and-over athletes will be held around 7:00 p.m. on Saturday, April 1, a circumstance that is expected to encourage many racewalkers to come to Columbus to race on both Saturday and Sunday. Thus we expect to have a good masters field for the Jack Mortland Invitational. Transportation allowances and appearance fees are not available.

PRIZE MONEY - 10 KM OPEN MEN: 1st - \$100, 2nd - \$50, 3rd - \$25

PRIZE MONEY - 10 KM OPEN WOMEN: 1st - \$100, 2nd - \$50, 3rd - \$25

(Prize money to be sent after race day and will comply with TACTRUST rules)



"Athletes who participate in this competition will be subject to formal drug testing in accordance with TAC rules and IAAF Rule 144. Athletes found positive for banned substances, or who refuse to be tested, will be disqualified from this event, and will lose eligibility for future competitions. Some prescription and over-the-counter medications contain banned substances. Information regarding drugs and drug testing may be obtained by calling the USOC Hotline at 1-800-233-0393."