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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Stickels</td>
<td>30:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis Karl Doyle</td>
<td>30:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Kornhauser</td>
<td>29:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valery Burns</td>
<td>30:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Lemert</td>
<td>30:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Cucchiarra</td>
<td>29:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Nelson</td>
<td>29:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John E. Markland</td>
<td>31:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doreen Horn</td>
<td>28:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Fice</td>
<td>29:78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernhard Blech</td>
<td>27:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daneyers</td>
<td>30:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Wahlstrom</td>
<td>29:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Chase</td>
<td>50:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy March</td>
<td>50:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Chraminski</td>
<td>50:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Novak</td>
<td>50:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tranny Boschier</td>
<td>50:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madelein Svensson</td>
<td>22:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Oqvist</td>
<td>23:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahston 1:49:23</td>
<td>2:17:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donat Prasad</td>
<td>2:20:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Lenhart</td>
<td>1:25:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madelein Svensson</td>
<td>22:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy March</td>
<td>51:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Swayne</td>
<td>52:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Alexander</td>
<td>28:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vangie Campos</td>
<td>30:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vangie Campos</td>
<td>30:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Acosta</td>
<td>27:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Free</td>
<td>28:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lyle</td>
<td>28:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Danford</td>
<td>28:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude Wrathall</td>
<td>26:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Heard</td>
<td>27:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Heard</td>
<td>28:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Blanchard</td>
<td>25:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Meyers</td>
<td>28:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Blanchard</td>
<td>28:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Swayne</td>
<td>24:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Hennemann</td>
<td>25:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Cribbs</td>
<td>26:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Acosta</td>
<td>27:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Free</td>
<td>28:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Krauz</td>
<td>28:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Acosta</td>
<td>29:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Blanchard</td>
<td>29:78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Meyers</td>
<td>29:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Swayne</td>
<td>30:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Fice</td>
<td>29:78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Acosta</td>
<td>27:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Free</td>
<td>28:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Krauz</td>
<td>28:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Acosta</td>
<td>29:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Blanchard</td>
<td>29:78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Meyers</td>
<td>29:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Swayne</td>
<td>30:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Fice</td>
<td>29:78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Women’s 5 Km, Bologna, Italy, June 23–1. Ileana Salvador 20:42:31 2. Elisabet Perrone 21:46:14 Women’s 5 Km, Campania, Italy, April 23–1. Orsani


Women’s 5 Km, Hildesheim, Ger., Aug. 15–1. Monika Gunnarsson 48:18.5 2. Giovanni de Benedictis 19:27:33


DQs) Women’s 5 Km, Sept. 19–1.

Sat. Dec. 12 5 Km, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, 8 am (P)
5 Km, Virginia Beach, 9:30 am (AA)
5 Km, Kent, Washington, 9:50 am (C)

Sun. Dec. 13 Todd Scully 10 Km, Long Branch, NJ, 1:35 pm (A)
5 Km, New York City, 9 am (G)
2 Mile, Denver (H)
5 Km, Boca Raton, Florida (Q)
2 Mile, New Orleans, 4 pm (M)
5 Km, Denver (H)

Sun. Dec. 20 1 Hour, Monmouth, NJ, 10 am (A)
5 Km, Miami (Q)

Sun. Dec. 27 Polar Bear 10 Mile, Asbury Park, NJ, 10 am (A)
50 Km, Houston (BB)

Thu. Dec. 31 4 Mile, Detroit, 4 pm (O)
4 Mile, Denver, 10 pm (H)

Fri. Jan 1 8 Km, Washington, DC (J)
5 Km, Miami (Q)

Sun. Jan 3 5 Km, Long Branch, NJ, 11 am (A)

Sun. Jan 17 5 Km, Long Branch, NJ, 11 am (A)

Sun. Jan 24 Indoor 2 Mile, Arlington, Virginia, 8:30 am (F)
Roe Bowl 10 Mile Handicap, Pasadena, 8 am (B)
5 Km, Miami (Q)
5 Km, Long Branch, NJ, 11 am (A)

Sun. Jan 30 Indoor 2 Mile, Arlington, Virginia, 8:30 am (F)
3 and 5 Km, Seattle, 9 am (C)

Sun. Jan 31 Indoor 2 Mile, Arlington, Virginia, 8:30 am (F)
5 Km, Coconut Creek, Fl. (Q)

Sat. Feb. 6 5 Km, Seattle, 9 am (C)
5 Km, Miami (Q)
10 Km, Long Branch, NJ, 11 am (A)

Contacts
A--Elliott Denman, 28 N. Locust, West Long Branch, NY 07764
B--Elaine Ward, 1000 San Pasqual #35, Pasadena, CA 91106
C--Bev LaVeck, 6633 N.E. Windemere Road, Seattle, WA 98115
D--Network, PO Box 221172, Carmel, CA 93922
E--Frank Alongi, 26530 Woodshire, Dearborn Hts., MI 48127
F--DC Road Runners Club, P.O. Box 1352, Arlington, VA 22210
G--Park Walkers, 320 E. 83rd St., Apt. 2C, New York, NY 10028

German champions still look to future

During the '80s, the names Hartwig Gauder and Ronald Weigel became synonymous with excellence in 50 Km walking, their zenith when they traded one-two finishes in the 1987 World Cup and World Championship races. Weigel won the Cup race in New York, but Gauder came back later in the summer to beat him in the World Championship race. Before and since that banner year, they have been dominant figures in the event, with each also having significant success at 20 Km on occasion.

The two were in New York earlier this month for the New York Marathon, and, thanks to Helene Britton, we had the opportunity to converse with them on the phone, primarily with Hartwig. Before we attempt to summarize some of the highlights of that conversation, let's turn to the highlights of their stellar careers.

Gauder launched the decade with a gold medal in the Moscow Olympics 50 Km. He was ranked number one in the world that year and also earned number one rankings in 1985, 1986, and 1987, along with several other rankings in the top five. He was ranked third at 20 Km in 1986. He was unable to defend his Olympic title because of the 1984 boycott, but finished third in 1988 and was still good for sixth this summer at age 37. In World Cup competition, Hartwig was second in 1981, first in 1985, second in 1987, and sixth in 1991. And he had that win in the 1987 World Championships along with a third in 1991.

Born November 10, 1954 in Vaihingen in the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany), Hartwig moved with his family to the GDR at age 5. Standing just over 6 feet and weighing about 160, Gauder has a 50 Km best of 3:39:45 and 20 Km best of 1:20:51. He was a European Junior champion at 10 Km (1973 in 42:27) and is one of only three athletes to have won European Junior and Senior, Olympic, and World titles. (Decathlete Daley Thompson and triple jumper Khristo Markov are the others.) He competed briefly in 1989, but came back to competition in 1990.

Nearly five years younger than Gauder, Ronald Weigel emerged as a force at 50 Km in 1983 when he won the World Championships. The following year, he earned a number one world ranking in the event. He had number two rankings in both 1987 and 1988, and was ranked fifth last year. He also had number two rankings at 20 Km in 1984 and 1988. In the Seoul Olympics (1988) he captured silver medals at both 20 and 50 and has continued strongly with third place finishes in the 1991 World Cup and 1992 Olympics. Weigel, at 5'9 and 135 pounds, has a 50 Km best of 3:38:17 and 20 Km best of 1:19:19. He was born August 8, 1959 in Hildburghausen.

When Helene introduced Hartwig to me on the phone, she noted that the two of them had given a clinic that morning (the day before the marathon), which had been excellent. She quoted him as saying at the clinic that they do more than 200 miles a week in training and that is why they have stayed on top. Well, it turns out that may have been some what of an exaggeration, but they certainly have done a tremendous volume of training through the years.

When I asked Hartwig about training, I didn't get any real specific answer. (A telephone interview in his second language—he speaks very well, but I wasn't always sure he completely comprehended my questions—is not the best situation). However, I got the numbers of 30 to 34 hours a week in training. This consists of walking, running, and "gymnastics". In fall and winter, activities include ski-rolling, mountain bike riding, and cross country skiing. About 2 hours a week involve what he termed "athletic training". He threw out the figure of 230 Km in a typical week, and I think indicated that this includes about as much running as walking. He also mentioned 35-40 km in the morning and 15-20 km in the afternoon, which, of course, would come to much more than 230 km a week if that were a daily routine. Weigel indicated that he does 200 to 300 km a week in training. He does more running and skiing in the winter and starts specialized racewalk training in February. I got the idea from both that their training is mostly pounding it out on the roads and includes little interval work. Hartwig noted that he also enjoys volleyball and football (soccer to us).

Gauder does most of his training alone, except when he is in a training camp situation, where he might train with Weigel or others. They usually get to Mexico in the spring for several weeks. Hartwig is coached by former 1500 meter running great, Siegfried Hermann. Ron's coach, Hans Joachim Patus is also the national coach—and his father-in-law. (I competed against Patus way back in 1967 at the Lugano Cup in Bad Saarow, GDR—or, I should say, was in the same race.)

Hartwig started in sports competition at age 12 with ski jumping and did not find racewalking until age 17. He turned out to be a natural at the sport, walking a 10 km in 53:00 in his first race with little training and improving to 49 minutes just 3 weeks later. His first international race was a year later (1972) when he won at a seven-nation meet in Paris. In 1973, he captured the European Junior 10 Km title in 42:27. His first 50 Km wasn't until 1979 and was walked as a joke, he says. Some joke, as he did 4:01. The next year, he finished third in the German trials with a 3:49 and then went on to win the Olympic gold.
I asked both Hartwig and Ron why they feel they have dropped back a bit
the last few years (if battling for a medal rather than battling for the gold is
dropping off). Gauder now being 38, I gave him the option of age as an excuse,
and he felt that was part of it. He also mentioned the problem of incentive, which
obviously gets tougher once you have conquered the mountain. Ron turned more
to problems with organization since German reunification. The same support
structure is not in place now that they had grown used to. Hartwig also noted this
as a problem. Ron expressed confidence that things are getting better and will
continue to do so, and both look forward to challenging the likes of Perlov and
Mercenario in the future.

In talking to Hartwig, I tried to get into the question of how walking had
been accepted by the general public in the GDR, wondering if they were subjected
to the same sort of ridicule that walkers elsewhere get, despite their stature in the
sport. This was one question I couldn't quite get across however, and all I got was
that all sports were and all athletes were treated equally by the sports authorities.
Hartwig is an architecture student in Weimar and hopes to be opening an
architectural partnership early in 1983. His wife is a dentist and they have a 9-year
old son. Formerly a major in the army, Ron is a journalism student.

FROM HEEL TO TOE

Victoria Herazo was named Athlete of the Year by the Nevada Athletics Congress,
which is quite an accomplishment for any racewalker. Potomac Valley
Racewalkers are having weekly Saturday clinics from January 9 through February
27. Instructors will include American record holders, national team members, and
national age-group champions. The cost is $40 for eight sessions. Contact Valerie
Meyer, 2305 Buchanan St., Arlington, VA 22206 for further details. The amazing
Gary Little in New Zealand continues to improve. Now age 50, he won the New
Zealand 30 Km title on October 10 in 2:18:14! At even pace, he would have passed
20 Km in 1:32... Gordon Wallace, master's walker extraordinaire and author of the
Valiant Heart, has dropped his ORW subscription and involvement in the sport.
Why? Because at age 83 he is beginning a new career as a university professor and
needs to devote himself exclusively to the endeavor. He will be teaching an upper-
level class in American History at Southern Utah University starting next fall. Says
he needs the preparation because he has not taken a formal course in American
history since high school and has never taught anywhere outside the U.S. Army.
Gordon amazed us all when he took timeout to get his Ph.D. just a few years ago.

Another super masters walker, Jack Bray, along with his wife Sue, has organized a
new racewalking club, the Marin Racewalkers. For information on their activities,
write Jack or Sue at 605 Via Casitas, Greenbrae, CA 94904, or call 415-461-843...

The WAVA Masters World Games will be held in Miyazaki, Japan next October.

Other important events on the International calendar for racewalking are: 1993
Championships in Stuttgart. Schedule for the walks in Stuttgart is: Women's 10 Km
at 9:30 am, August 14; Men's 20 km at 5:30 pm, Aug. 15; and Men's 50 Km at 8 am,
Aug. 21. Judges for the World Cup will be M. Borghes, Italy; D. Chadderton, NZ;
J. Diaz Rodriguez, Cuba; Martin Rudow, USA; J. Dahm, France; J. Kruger, Ger; V.
Kangaspunta, Fin.; V. Samotosov, Rus., plus two judges from Mexico. World
Championship judges are N. Maggio, Italy; D. Casillas, Spain; Peter Marlow, GB; A.
Ohlander, Sweden; Elliott Denman, USA; Z. Yaping, China; Y. Morikawa, Japan;
Norman Read, NZ; plus two judges from Germany. Now here is what I could be
charging you. I recently received an offer to subscribe to a monthly newsletter
called the Editorial Eye—for $87 a year. I've seen it in the past and it's a very nice
newsletter with some good information, but not the level of content as the good old
ORW. I would probably enjoy it for, say, $20. But, they no doubt have a larger
circulation than I. Say, how many of you would pay $87 for the ORW? Don't
worry, you won't be asked to... From Steve Valtone: "How often have people in the
RW community thought to themselves that the event could support the concept
behind a movie? Well, it may become reality in the near future. John Izzo, coach,
teacher, and community theatre director (for over 25 years) has a working script and
is in the process of seeking capitalization of the project. John is hoping to begin
shooting in the spring and summer of 1993. "Steve Valtone sent a flyer, which
describes a story set against the backdrop of the 1996 Atlanta Olympics in which Joe
Conti sacrifices his career and personal life to pursue his boyhood aspiration of
becoming an Olympic racewalker. The story examines the nature of success and the
delicate balance between love, family, career, and ambition. Of course, we have
already had one racewalking movie—"Walk, Don't Run", which came out in 1966
starring Jim Hutton and Cary Grant. The Ohio Racewalker didn't give it a very
favorable review. That one was set at the 1964 Tokyo Olympics... We also had a
erather lengthy letter from Steve, which, unfortunately, arrived just too late for last
month's issue. It's sort of a pre-convention letter, so is now dated, but expresses
some things that are worth putting forward. So here it is:

As December 1 and TAC's convention are on the horizon, it's time to think
about, among other items, committee elections. At this time, there are apparently
several announced candidates for chairmen besides Bruce Douglass. One thing that
disturbs me as an active participant and administrator in the sport's many levels
and as a nine-time convention delegate is that the alleged "groundswell" of
discontent seems to have appeared with no real discussion of issues over the year.
There's been no give and take on issues and alternative routes for successes of
athletes and programs, no rough action plans on how to alternatively achieve goals
in the sport. The primary issues seem to be athlete performance, no association
programs handed down from national, and no support for "special interest"
functions.

While our number one performer in the men's events has not made a steady
progression toward the top of the world charts, our women's top times are closest
to the top ever. Looking at our sixth, tenth, and twenty-fifth performance over the
past 5 years, we can see a steady annual improvement. This depth will eventually
manifest itself in world level performers. A comment by Rob Cole after returning
from Swedish Walk Week is very insightful. He noted that the top couple of
walkers in European countries may be better than ours, but for all the talk about
their programs, they simply have nowhere near the depth that we do (Ed. We can't
include Russia in that statement.) Depth implies a program, not individual athletes.
We have a much different system of athletics than most other countries, and our
athletes perform admirably considering the reality of work and the reality of full-time subsidies ever going their way.

If one has been part of either a TAC national track and field or an LDR meeting at the convention, they'll find that racewalking has more communications with associations, more democracy in setting policy and direction, and more attention to smaller programs than any other committee. One committee awarded championships without notifying the local LDR community or the race itself. Others have no newsletter. All, though, rely on people taking the ball and running with it.

In fact, some specialty areas within racewalking may not even have jurisdiction by the RW committee in the first place. Youth activities—age 10 to 18—are supposed to be integrated into the Youth Committee, unless they are "elite" or developmental junior athletes age 14 plus. Interassociation projects are handled by the Association Committee, which has developed a strong T&F regional series after being steered there from Track and Field. The Associations Committee was set up precisely to bring regional programs and ideas together from associations, and region reps meet regularly beyond the convention. It is worth getting involved in.

With budgets being cut throughout TAC's sports and administrative committees, it has taken some special care to keep the many racewalking programs that we have existing and, in many cases, thriving. In almost two years as a full-time employee of the New England TAC, I’ve gained what is probably a unique perspective (for within the racewalk community) of TAC national activities. Bottom line, local programs are the responsibility of the association, be it track, roads, or racewalking. Local programs must become self-sufficient and cooperate with neighbors and develop regional programs. These then give the support to what is going on nationally.

Another thing that I've picked up is that there is so much happening on all levels, people who want to be part of the sport must lead, follow, or get out of the way. When elected, Bruce said up front that whoever wanted to work should step forward and take a project. No one's help was refused as far as I know. Those who did take the bull by the horns (myself/junior program, Mark Fenton/camps, Mary Howell/newsletter, Lawrie Robertson/judging video, to name a few) all stepped forward to do so with desire and a clearly presented plan and a goal, not with general grousing.

Finally, the smallness and informality within the racewalk community is the one thing that gets people involved and keeps them in the event. However, it also tends to insulate racewalkers from the whole of athletics. This requires our top level representatives to develop strong political connections and a firm basic rapport with other leaders in the sport to be part of the success of the big picture. Any executive committee will become the "good old boys" to those not stepping forward and asking to part of workload. Regardless of who is the chairman after the convention, I’ll be the first in line to volunteer for my current job of junior team coordinator. Both the event and I have too big an investment of time over the years to get bogged down in politics.

Steve Vaitones

The great contact issue

Well, we could probably fill a good-sized book with all that has been written on this topic. We have included in these pages through the years about various aspects of racewalking and running. Much of it would be repetitive, of course, as it seems to go on about 5 years cycles, often covering the same ground with maybe slightly different slants. As you have seen in the last couple of issues, it is a hot issue once again. Now Casey Meyers, author of two books on fitness walking, both of which advocated a racewalking style, has joined the plea for elimination of the contact rule, a plea set forth very eloquently by Ron Laird in these pages several years ago, endorsed by others at various times since (most recently Visha Sedlak as noted here a couple of months ago), and one generally rejected by the racewalking community large. Casey has never been a competitive walker himself, but has been a very close observer of the sport, has presented many clinics on racewalking style, and has consulted with many of the sports technical experts. Here is his plea, which he entitles Racewalking: Elimination of Required Double Contact and Other Needed Rule Changes.

Racewalking cannot achieve the stature it deserves among competitive track events until it eliminates its archaic double contact rule. In this age of slow-motion, stop action television, it opens the sport up to continuous ridicule. The foot is indeed faster than the judge's eyes. More important, however, when the biomechanical differences between the walking and running gaits are compared, the double contact rule is unnecessary and totally irrelevant because loss of contact does not contribute to the acceleration of the walker. Furthermore, when the laws of physics governing the force of gravity and horizontal velocity are applied, there is a point where double contact is not possible. (And, if this is indeed true, advocates of the contact rule would say, racewalking is not possible.)

Zoologists who study gaits of locomotion of terrestrial mammals (bipeds and quadrupeds) have clearly distinguished the differences between the two human gait—walking and running. In a paper titled "Human Walking and Running" published in the Journal of Biological Education (1984), Professor R. McNeill Alexander at the University of Leeds, England, articulated such differences.

Alexander points out that the human walking gait is mechanical in nature. The legs are compound pendulums that act as levers and cause a lifting and falling of the body as the walker's center of mass travels in a series of circular arcs. The body's center of mass is at the highest point of each arc as it passes over the foot of the supporting leg. At the top of the arc, it then starts a downward acceleration as the trailing leg swings forward to effect heel plant and stop the body's fall.

How quickly a walker can get the forward swinging foot on the ground is governed primarily by the force of gravity. Alexander states, "Man cannot pull himself downward: he can only let himself fall." He adds, "For this reason, his downward acceleration cannot exceed $g$ (gravity), the acceleration of free fall ... . " This is a major consideration as to whether double contact is physically possible at top racewalking speeds. (Ed. Of course, this statement assumes we have already eliminated the double contact rule, since as presently defined racewalking entails double contact. When double contact ends, so does racewalking. Of course, we also know the current state of the art of judging cannot always catch this.)

In a comparison of how differing forces of gravity are relevant to the speed of a walker, Alexander states, "On Earth, the acceleration of free fall is about 10 meters per second squared." He adds, "On the moon, the acceleration of free fall is only 1.6 meters per second squared, and walking is possible only at very low speeds." Gravity's pull and horizontal velocity are the two factors that determine whether a racewalker can actually make double
contact on each step. When the walker’s horizontal velocity momentarily overrides the pull of gravity on the lead foot, it will cause loss of double contact.

Alexander, using velocity \( v \), circle of radius \( r \), and length of a walker’s legs \( l \), along with gravity \( g \) put together a mathematical mechanical computation that is too complex for discussion here. However, his conclusions are readily understood. He said, “This sets an upper limit to the speed of walking. Any attempt to move faster in circular arcs must fail.” In effect, what he is saying is that every walker has a theoretical speed governed by the length of his legs and the earth’s force of gravity where it is mathematically (and physically) impossible to have double contact. (Ed. And maybe that is why the double contact rule was incorporated—to define the limits of legal walking.)

In normal walking, the horizontal velocity of the walker is slow and the lead foot falls to the ground before the rear foot toes off, thus there is always double contact. Racers, however, develop such fast ankle rotation and foot turnover of the rear foot that it propels them forward at the speed of a runner. In many instances, this causes a momentary period when both the front and rear feet are off the ground.

Loss of contact when this occurs does not contribute to the walker’s speed as long as the lead foot is straight at the knee when the heel makes contact with the ground and remains straight until it passes under the body and becomes the trailing leg. In this position, the leg is not able to store elastic strain energy which is the principle difference between the walking and running gaits. A complete understanding of the foregoing renders the double contact rule obsolete. (Ed. I don’t see how you can say loss of contact doesn’t contribute to the walker’s speed when you have already said that the walker couldn’t attain this speed without losing contact.)

Explaining running, Alexander states, “A running man is like a bouncing ball, or a child on a pogo stick. Elastic strain energy is stored up at each footfall and released as the foot leaves the ground.” The airborne runner lands with a bent knee and elastic strain energy is then stored in the muscles and tendons of the legs and feet. Tendon, in particular, is a very good elastic material. Alexander explains, “Experiments in which sheep tendons were stretched in imitation of running showed that 93 percent of the work done stretching could be recovered in an elastic recoil.” He adds, “This is about as good as the best rubbers.”

When a racewalker lands with a straight knee at heel plant, he (or she) makes ground contact with the calcaneus (heel bone). The femur (upper leg) and tibia (lower leg) are opposing each other at the knee joint and if they remain straight and rigid at the knee until the body passes over them, there is no opportunity for the leg and foot to store elastic energy. As Alexander points out, “The skeleton is too stiff to be deformed much by the forces that act in running, so it cannot store much elastic strain energy.”

Those who would argue that loss of double contact is the same as running cannot be correct if the athlete is not using elastic strain energy. In fact, racewalkers who think they can get an advantage by purposely ‘lifting’ will be sorely disappointed. They will find that excessive “lifting” is quite jarring when a straight knee is maintained. It also disrupts the walker’s rhythm and over time would probably lead to injury.

The principle use of elastic strain energy by a walker which is the principle difference between the walking and running gaits can be eliminated by one racewalking that simply states: The forward leg must be straight at the knee when the heel makes contact with the walking surface and must remain straight at the knee until it passes under the body and becomes the trailing leg.” Or words to that effect.

With this rule, three things are accomplished:

First, it eliminates the double contact rule which opens racewalking up to constant ridicule, because it cannot be consistently judged by the human eye or physically maintained at top racing speeds.

Second, it renders “lifting” irrelevant since it is the result of horizontal velocity not elastic strain energy used by runners. In addition, it silences the critics of racewalking who say a walker with both feet off of the ground is running. It is impossible to run at competitive speeds with a straight knee. Disbelievers should try it.

Third, it will make judging much simpler and more accurate since a bent knee is readily discernible.

The human eye is not infallible and even with this simplified rule some infractions will be missed. However, unlike the double contact rule, where the critics of racewalking say with considerable derision (and much justification) that racewalkers are dealing with self-deception, a missed bent-knee call is not worse than when a basketball referee misses a double dribble, a football line referee misses an offside call, or a baseball umpire calls a runner out when he is safe. In today’s sports coverage, television’s slow motion, stop action, instant replay eventually humbles all referees, judges, and umpires. (Ed. I fail to see how missing a bent knee is any less critical than missing loss of contact, particularly if that is the only thing defining what is ‘double.’ Drilled into mind can be confusing as it is a single infraction doesn’t decide the outcome of a contest. Missing a walking winner’s bent knee does. And, the argument about the fallibility of referees and judges in all sports is equally valid in defining the present rules.)

Elimination of the warning rule would be an additional simplification. Why warn someone their knee is bent? If it is bent, it is an infraction. The judge would only need one red card, which he or she could flash at the walker and say loudly, “Number 74, you have a bent right knee.” (Ed. Another case, where the present rule is not understood. The caution, not warning, is given to a walker the judge feels is in danger of breaking the rules. Someone under close surveillance. Walkers are not entitled to cautions, and if a judge actually sees there is loss of contact or a bent knee, the proper call is a red card, whether or not a caution has been given previously. But, I agree. The caution is a bit superfluous.) Each walker should be required to remember how many infractions he (or she) has had called. Any walker who has received the required number should leave the course. This would reduce the clutter of DQ’d walkers from complicating the judging of the remaining walkers. Judges would still have to keep track of infractions, however, to make sure all DQ’d walkers are eliminated from the race standings.

How many infractions a walker is granted before being DQ’d should also be reconsidered. I pose the question, would a walker walking a 5 Km race have the same exact same number of bent knee infractions allowed as one walking a 50 Km race? It seems unfair that a 50 Km walker who has to walk 10 times as far as a 5 Km walker is DQ’d with the same number of infractions. My view is that 20 Km and longer races should have more allowable bent knee infractions before disqualification. The rules committee should address this inequity. (Ed. It isn’t really the number of infractions, infractions generally are not a sporadic thing, but the number of judges that see it as an infraction, so the distance of the race has no bearing. A walker walking with a bent knee or losing contact, should be disqualified. It isn’t like a walker now has three opportunities to walk illegally—if three judges see the same infraction simultaneously and judge it as such, the walker will be out. Of course, three judges shouldn’t be together on the course, except perhaps at the finish.)

Racewalking is at a juncture where it can grow dramatically and attract great numbers of new participants or it can continue to be the object of ridicule. The double contact rule ignores the laws of physics that govern horizontal velocity and the force of gravity. Furthermore, it is not a true biomechanical indicator as to whether an athlete is walking or running. Elimination of the unnecessary, unjudgable double contact rule would be major step in elevating racewalking to the stature it deserves among competitive track events.

Casey Meyers, Route 3, Box 371, St. Joseph, MO 64505.
And, here is the first comment on Casey’s ideas, from Bob Carlson in the Front Range Walkers newsletter (he beat me to the punch in publishing this letter).

"I think the research Casey refers to is a study of normal walking in which the techniques of racewalking are not utilized—i.e., it refers to the rise and fall of the body, which does not occur in correct racewalking form where the torso absorbs all vertical movement. As for the gravitational aspects mentioned, I don’t believe that a good racewalker ever lifts his foot more than an inch off the ground. How long would it take a foot to fall an inch?"

"My own perception is that unrestricted lifting can speed a walker up in short or medium bursts to gain an advantage, but would be too tiring and jarring to work for long distances. (Ed. He then describes some experiments he personally did on a track, using legal style first and then completely ignoring the lifting rule and comparing times.) I found that I could reduce my lap times quite a bit. The problem was, it was more tiring and did not either look or feel like walking. It felt like straight legged running—it felt as though there must be some similar force than may not be identical to but similar to those a runner uses. I agree that this jarring technique would be very tiresome if done for long distances, but I am afraid that highly conditioned runners could learn to straighten their leg by relaxing at the knee and so some outlandishly fast time in short races using similar powerful rebounding forces that they use off a flat foot when walking."

Some other comments we have received on the general issue:

"Regarding Sept., 1992 issue, top half of page 12: We keep seeing more nonsense about lifting not helping race speeds (in particular, overall times), as opposed to sprint speeds. They all ignore the reduced braking on impact due to leg angle at contact and the aerobic power reduction due to slower recovery leg motion.” Martin T. Smith

"I appreciated Bob Bowman’s reply to my letter to ORW. Most of my comments were intended to stir the pot in the interests of making a better stew. Of course, the main problem with our sport is not with the judges, who do the best they can with difficult rules. Most of the blame has to be with the athletes who, having the advantage of video tape technology to improve their technique, don’t appear to be using it to try to walk as fast they can within the rules, but to see how much they can "beat" the rules and judges. It comes down to integrity and what is more important, integrity or winning. We all know what wins out in most aspects of our society. I have never yet been able to understand the Rosy Ruiz psychology (Ed. nor I), which gets some kind of kick out of cheating to win. As Bob mentions, many other events have similar problems. The best example of the attitude we need is a friend of mine, Steve Fredrickson, who, when it was mentioned that his form looked illegal in an unjudged race, went to the officials and disqualified himself. The best defense of my statement about confusion with the DQ rules comes from Bob himself where he quoted Jim Hanley. "The DQ calls are posted on a board, and when an athlete gets three MARKS he is out." As I said, the person not familiar with our sport cannot understand "DQ calls". The word discqualification means you are out, yet it takes three to be out. Jim calls these marks. That was my point. We need a name for those big red dots we all look for to our number on the board. We in the sport call them DQs, but this serves to confuse the uninitiated.”

Stan Chraminski

5 Years Ago (From the Nov. 1987 ORW)—A three-race international series was wrapped up with races in Mezidon, France and San Giovanni, Italy. In France, Sweden’s Bo Gustafsson won the 15 Km in 62:15, ahead of Roman Mrazek, Czech., and Querebin Moreno, Columbia; and Australia’s Kerry Saxby took the 10 in 21:58, with Sweden’s Ann Jansson 48 seconds back. Finland’s Reima Salonen won at 30 Km in San Giovanni with a 2:13:39, better than a minute ahead of Italy’s Rafaello Ducceschi and G. Piercelli. Moreno was fourth. Saxby was a winner here too, taking the 10 Km in 46:35, ahead of Jansson 47:17 and Australia’s Sue Cook 48:25. Moreno was the men’s series with 55 points, one ahead of Mrazek, and 5 ahead of Ducceschi. Saxby swept the women’s series with 18 points to 15 for Janssen and 10 for Mexico’s Luz-Marie Colan. Alan Price won the Columbia, Missouri 100 miler for the ninth time in 20:53:42. Chuck Hunter was the only other finisher, doing 22:42:04. Hunter went the distance for the eighth time, and the first since 1979, having been laid up with the loss of a kidney and gimpel knees. In England, John Cannell won a 100 in 17:55:10, with 5 others under 20 hours, and 38 under 24.)