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 Haarpainter 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:


**Jr. Women 10 and under:** 1. Amy Held, Missouri Mile 7,312 2. Britta Freund, Potomac Valley 6,912


**Women 40-44:** 1. Amy Held, Missouri Mile 7,312 2. Emily Hewitt, New England Walkers 7,452


**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 Mile 8,771 (5 finishers) 2. Rose Kash, Cal. Walkers 8,080

**Women 60-64:** 1. Ruth Leff, Parkside AC 9,173 (National age group record) 2. Lisa Borel, Easy Striders 8,868 (7 finishers) 3. Rose Kash, Cal. Walkers 8,080
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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)

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 upward 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 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,
explores the reasons behind some of the fine judges out there, but it's a
problem that is not to criticize some of the fine judges out there, but it's a
be, and should be improved. If nothing else, we need more judges. (Still valid
subjective decision on the part of the judge based on how he thinks the guy looks.”
showed how the problem has grown). Slow motion film taken of our 1968
pictures, readers comments, and our comments were published in an over-sized
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 on the ground in a still
photograph. So what of the poor walkers 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 gripe 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 guilt 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
utterly 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 it 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’d his was actually on the ground. But I
believe that, 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
ject 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 creep will creep along most of
the race-unless you straighten him out—lifting is episodic. Lifting generally occurs
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 experienced 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
repertoire of the oddest gait, lumps, 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 "chickens"; 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 what has to be done.
(Unfortunately those who have 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-
existant 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
types 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 dump out the
lift. But not before several non-contact steps go by. Now take other irregular
surfaces, or a moving surface (indoors 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
publicly. 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
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
shoppers... 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 prejudge him for deeds that the judge thinks are
forthcoming. We simply cannot allow this situation. What a man has done in races
taken place, is his affair, not the judges'... 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 preformance 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
pubication 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 in the sport and if we want to measure how 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 extraordinary 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 Carts 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 involved in judging, because that's where we need help. I also would like to point out that is 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 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 photogragh-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 Grouch Marx was a sight to behold. Grouch has passed away now, but I, as his disciple, hereby petition the rule keepers to suspend the anti-cruising 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...""
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 race walking 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 #3 would 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 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 areas. 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 any easier to distinguish between the 'flight phase' and 'excessive flight phase' that it now is to distinguish between double contact and 'flight phase'. Therefore, I believe that Ron's proposal is a misstep. I do not see any rules on the horizon that would meet the same fate 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 in a way 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 that is called '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.

FROM HEEL TO TOE

Note the entry blank for the Mortland Invitationals started in the middle of this issue. I don't suppose you could miss it since it sort of gets in your way in going from page 8 to page 9. 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 am 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 of 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 the 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.


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 Totheroh 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 6:36.6 in Los Angeles with Ron Laird, Larry Young, and Larry Walker in a near deadheat only a second back. 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...Torrellas edged Vaill in the LA Times ladies mile with her 7:16...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 gingerly.

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
DATE: Sunday, April 2, 1989

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 19-24, 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

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)
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 Midwest 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):

- 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."