

Ohio Race Walker
3184 Summit Street
Columbus, Ohio 43202



OHIO RACEWALKER

VOLUME XXIX, NUMBER 12

COLUMBUS, OHIO

FEBRUARY 1994

Indoor circuit in full swing

Several races to report as the elite racewalkers take to the indoor tracks for a couple of months.

Women's 1500 meters, Hamilton, Ont., Jan. 14--1. Debbi Lawrence 6:14.84 2. Victoria Herazo 6:20.37 3. Pascal Grand, Can. 6:28.66 4. Tina Poitras, Can. 6:32.77 5. Mylene Dupere, Can. 6:56.93 **Women's 1500, Montreal, Jan. 16--1.** Debbi Lawrence 6:14.0 2. pascal Grand 6:17.99 3. Victoria Herazo 6:24.38 4. Tina Poitras 6:29.09 **Commonwealth Games 3 Km, Boston, Jan. 21--1.** Allen James 11:27.14 2. Jonathan Matthews 11:29.87 3. Doug Fournier 11:54.88 4. Rob Cole 11:56.00 5. Gary Morgan 12:14.33 6. Curt Clausen 12:26.40 7. Marc Varsano 12:33.26 8. Mike Rohl 12:36.23 9. Andrew Herman 12:51.37 10. Phil Dunn 12:55.89 11. Kevin Eastler 13:11.45 **Millrose Games 1 Mile, New York City, Feb. 4--1.** Allen James 5:48.42 2. Doug Fournier 5:51.84 3. Tim Seaman 5:57.35 4. Sean Albert 6:06.34 5. Gary Morgan 6:08.31 6. Curt Clausen 6:18.34 7. Marc Varsano 6:28.10 **DQ--James Spahr 1 Mile, Fairfax, Virginia, Feb. 6--1.** Victoria Herazo 7:06.27 2. Kaisa Ajaye 7:50.11 3. Jennifer Praigo 8:07.87 **Women's 3 Km, Levin, France, Feb. 13--1.** Beatte Anders, Germany 12:06.24 2. Yelena Nikolaleva, Russia 12:15.35 3. Sari Essayah, Fin. 12:31.00

Other results:

1 Mile, Providence, R.I., Jan. 16--1. Brian Savilonis (43) 7:32.56 2. Joe Light (45) 7:37.3. Justin Kuo 8:03 4. Bob Ullman (45) 8:05 5. Louis Candido (64) 9:09 6. Michael Hoffer (54) 9:52 7. John Gray (69) 10:01 **Women:** 1. Meg Ferguson (43) 9:08.64 2. Maxey 9:40 **3 Km, Brighton, Mass., Jan. 30--1.** Kevin Eastler (16) 15:05.02 2. Steve Vaitones 13:39 3. Justin Kuo 15:36 4. Steve Donald 15:46 5. Ken Mattsson 15:52 **Women:** 1. Gretchen Eastler 14:05.78 2. Kaisa Ajaye 15:15 **New York City Marathon Racewalk, Nov. 14--1.** Dave McGovern 3:44:05 2. Rob Cole 3:44:34 3. Dave Marchese 3:50.49 4. Gary Morgan 3:51:00 5. Dan O'Connor 3:56:39 **Women:** 1. Lynda Brubaker 3:59.27 2. Elton Richardson (54) 4:35:55 3. Ana San Antonio (42) 4:45:14 **1500 meters, New York City, Jan. 28--1.** Khang Vo 6:23.4 2. Roberto Gottlieb 6:28.2 3. Yariv Pomeranz 6:35 4. Michael Korol 6:37.7 5. Bob Barrett (1st over 60) 7:38 6. Herbert Zydek 7:48.1 (1st 55-59) 7. Kayode Dobosu 7:50.9 8. Elton Richardson 8:01.3 (1st woman, 1st over 55) (14 finishers) **H.S. Girl's 1500, same place--1.** Sarah Caban 8:03 2. Loretta Schuwellein 8:56 (13 finishers) **3 Km, New York City, Feb. 11--1.** Gary Null 13:16.3 (1st Master) 2. Khang Vo 13:21.7 3. yariv Pomeranz 13:36.6 4. Roberto Gottlieb 14:17 **1 Mile, New York City, Feb. 12--1.** Gary Null 7:05.1 2. Franco Panatoni 8:07.4 3. Bob Barrett 8:33 **N.J. USATF Indoor 3 Km, Princeton--1.** Sean Albert 12:32.26 2. Ray Funkhouser 13:11.02 (1st master) 3. Cliff Mimm 13:47 4. John Soucheck **Women:** 1. Pat Weir 15:30.26 2.

SECOND CLASS POSTAGE
PAID AT COLUMBUS, OHIO

The Ohio Racewalker is published monthly in Columbus, Ohio. Subscription rate is \$10.00 per year (\$12.00 outside the U.S.). Editor and Publisher: John E. (Jack) Mortland. Address all correspondence regarding both editorial and subscription matters to: Ohio Racewalker, 3184 Summit St., Columbus, Ohio 43202.

Phyllis Hansen 15:43 3. Donna Cetrulo 1 Mile, Richmond, Virginia, Jan. 8--1. Al Heppner 6:24.4 2. Mike Rohl 6:43 3. James Carmines 7:18 4. Will Leggett 7:28 5. Paul Cajka 7:55 6. Geroge Fenigsohn 8:03 Women: 1. Debbie Iden 7:26 2 Mile, Washington, DC, Jan. 8--1. Cori Colling 18:01 2. Valerie Meyer 18:42 3. Lous=Is Brown 18:56 (16 finishers) Hangover Classic, Washington, DC, Jan. 1 (distance not given; probably 5 miles or 8 km)--1. William Leggett 44:01 2. Dave Eckes 46:21 3. Jim Goldstein 47:47 4. Tim Good 49:48 (14 finishers) 5 KM, Atlanta, Dec. 6--1. Ron du Preez (42) 27:46 2. Gene Falkencamp (43) 27:56 Southern Regional 5 Km, Coconut Creek, Florida, Jan. 22--1. Eric Schmook 24:00.3 2. Edgardo Rodriguez 24:36 3. John Fredericks 24:57 (1st 45-49) 4. Brandon Perry 27:31 5. Don Stockwell 27:45 (2nd 45-49) 6. Bob Cella 28:17 (1st 55-59) 7. Bob Fine 28:20 (1st 60-64) 8. Brian Mair 28:43 (1st 50-54) 10. Gerry Gomes 29:34 (2nd 60-64) 11. Marvin Goldenberg 29:58 (1st 65-59). . Sumner Shafmasater 32:33 (1st 70-74) (34 finishers) Women: 1. Linda Stein 28:25 (1st 45-49) 2. Alba Campbell 28:28 (2nd 45--49) 3. June-Marie Provost 30:01 (1st 60-64) 4. Miriam Gordon 31:34 (1st 65-59) (24 finishers) 5 Km, West Palm Beach, Florida, Jan. 29--1. Alan Jacobson 26:20 2. Nicholas Harding 28:30 3. Brandon Perry 28:39 4. Bob Fine 29:27 5 Km, Winter Park, Florida, Jan. 29--1. Edgardo Rodriguez 25:10 2. Burns Hovey 26:47 3. Steve Christlieb 28:36 (1st 40-49) Women: 1. Christiene Hoffman 31:04 5 Km, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, Feb. 5--1. Nicholas Harding 23:57 2. Eric Schmook 24:23 3. John Fredericks (46) 25:00 4. Heber Ramos 26:57 5. Brandon Perry (15) 27:03 6. Brian Mair 28:02 7. Bob Fine 28:44 8. John Ide 30:09 Women: 1. Linda Stein (46) 28:16 2. Elizabeth Nelson (40+) 3. Daysi Platero 30:29 9 Km, New Orleans, Jan. 9--1. Lisa Guevera 45:50 2. Eddie Gautreaux 61:13 Half-marathon, new Orleans, Jan. 22--1. Lisa Pitre 2:25:04 2. Ruth Lichtenfeld 2:29:30 3. Russell Dobyn 2:31:29 4. Monetta Taylor 2:32:03 5 Km, New Orleans, Jan. 22--1. Barry Creppel 27:59 Marathon, New Orleans, Jan. 29--1. Joe Citron 5:05:31 5 Km, New Orleans, Jan. 29--1. Barry Creppel 27:14 2. Eric Parker 30:55 Women: 1. Eva Beck 30:40 (10 finishers total) 10 Km, New Orleans, Feb. 6--1. David Wilbanks 51:40 2. Ed Whiteman 52:34 Women: 1. Becky Comeaux 58:02 5 Km, same place--1. Sidney Holmes 28:01 2. John Powers 30:14 Women: 1. Deborah Von Seutter 28:11 3 Km, Cedarville, Ohio, Jan. 7--1. Chad Eder 13:02.9 2. Bill McCray (44) 14:43 3. Jim Emerson 15:08 4. Jack Blackburn (58) 16:41 5. Danny Dalton (12) 17:02 6. Vince Peters 17:27 7. Frank Frazzini 17:40 8. Rachel Townsend 19:15 5 Km, Denver, Jan. 15--1. Lori Rupoll (42) 28:21 2. John Tarin (41) 28:22 3. Daryl Meyers (51) 29:01 4. Marianne Martino (43) 29:07 5 Km, Denver, Jan. 30--1. Sally Richards-Kerr (41) 26:57 2. Dee Walker 28:19 3. Joleen Reeve 29:58 5 Km, Foothill College, Cal., Jan. 8--1. Jonathan Matthews 20:17.2 2. Art Klein 31:07 Women's 3 Km, same place--1. Robin Fujinaka 15:30 2. Therese Indoian 15:36 20 Km, Palo Alto, Jan. 16--1. Therese Iknolan 1:55:57 2. Chris Sakelarios 1:58:09 3. Bryan Winter 2:02:52 (1st male) (13 finishers, 2 DQs) Portland, Oregon Marathon, Sept. 26--1. Eb Engelmann 4:30:00 2. Ronald Helm 4:46:28

3. Bob Brewer 4:56:56 (23 finishers) 1 Mile, Salem, Oregon, Jan. 1--1. Vance Godfrey 6:11.16 2. Phillip Dunn 7:06 3. Jim Bean 8:18 Women: 1. Erin Taylor 8:49

From faraway lands

Paris-Colmar 200 --1. Aleksey Radionov, Russia 22:04.39 2. Richard Brown, Germany 22:55:40 3. Jean Cacillon, France 23:52:13 Women's 20 Km, Baia Domizia, Italy, Sept. 25--1. Ileana Salvador 1:31:55 2. Elisabetta Perrone 1:33:37 3. M. Grazia Orsani 1:38:13 Women's 20 Km, Hawksbury, Australia, July 10--1. Anne Manning 1:34:27 2. Jenny Jones 1:36:16 3. J. Barbour 1:39:02 100 Km, Mirecourt, France, Oct. 10--1. Pascal Kleffer 8:59:45 2. Andre Toussant 9:16:08 3. Pascal Tournois 9:34:05 4. Patricia Faubert 9:42:58 5. Daniel Faubert 9:50:21 6. Aleksey Radionov, Russia 9:55:27 100 Km, Yverdon, Switz., Oct. 17--1. Igor Naviskiy, Belarus 9:31:52 2. Hubert Sonnek, Czech. Rep. 19:37:47 3. Ivan Koltun, Belarus 9:41:58 4. Zdenek, Czech. 9:46:15

SPRING INTO SPRING AT THESE EVENTS (Keeping one foot on the ground, of course)

Sat. March 5 National Indoor Women's 3 Km and Men's 5 Km, Atlanta (K)
5 Km, Linfield, Oregon (X)

Sat. March 12 5 Km, Seattle, 9:30 am (B)
5 Km, Longmont, Col., 10 am (H)

Sun. March 13 National 50 Km Championship, Palo Alto, Cal. (C)
5 Km, Metairie, Louisiana, 8:30 am (M)
5 Km Denver, 9 am (H)

Sat. March 19 3 Km and 5 Km, Seattle (B)

Sun. March 20 8 Km, New York City, 9 am (O)
20 Km, Los Angeles, 8 am (B)
5 Km (50 and over), Stanford, Cal., 8 am ((P)
2 mile and 5 mile, Cornelius, Oregon (N)

Mon. March 21 2.75 Miles, Brockton, Mass. (I)

Fri. March 25 National Masters Indoor 3 Km, Columbia, Missouri (R)

Sat. March 26 5 Km, Ada, Michigan (Y)
15 Km, Columbia, Missouri, 8:30 am (U)
5 Km, Denver (H)

Sun. Mar. 27 National Invitational Men's 20, Women's 10 Km, Washington (S)
50 Mile, Columbus, Ohio (F)

Sat. April 2 Elite 20 Km and 10 Km, Kenosha, Wisconsin (W)
5 Km, Denver (H)

Sat. April 9 5 Km, New Orleans, 8 am (M)
5 Km, Atlanta (D)
5 Km, Naples, Florida (Q)
5 Km, Darlington, S.C., 8 am (EE)
5 Km, Seattle (C)

Sun. April 10 3 Mile, New Orleans, 7:45 am (M)
Capt. Ronald Zinn Memorial 10 Mile, Asbury Park, N.J., 11 am (A)
Metro. 15 Km Championship, New York City, 9 am (O)
Mt. SAC Relays 5 and 10 Km, Walnut, Cal., 7 am (B)
5 Km, Brookings, S.D., 8:40 am (BB)
Julie Partridge 10 Km, San Francisco (C)

- Sun. April 17 Invitational 3 Km, Walnut, Cal. (B)
Mortland Invitational, 5, 10, and 20 Km, Columbus, Ohio (F)
3 and 5 Km, Dearborn, Mich. (E)
- Sat. April 23 North Region 3 Km, St. Louis (AA)
3 Km and 1500 meters, Boca Raton, Florida (Q)
- Sun. April 24 3 and 5 Km, Detroit (Z)
Western Region 10 Km, Seattle, 9 am (C)
- Fri. April 29 Penn Relays 10 Km Men, 5 Km Women, Philadelphia (V)
- Sat. April 30 USATF South Region 3 Km, Columbia, S.C. (FF)
5 Km, Denver (H)
- Sun. May 1 3 Mile, New Orleans, 8 am (M)
5 Km, Providence, R.I., 10 am (GG)
5 Km, San Francisco (G)
5 Km, Denver (H)
- Sat. May 7 5 Km, Detroit (Z)
5 Km, Gainesville, Florida (Q)
5 Km, Davenport, Iowa (CC)
5 Km, Sioux Falls, S.D., 8 am (DD)
5 Km Denver (H)

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--Walking Club of Georgia, P.O. Box 645, Stone Mountain, GA 30086
E--Frank Alongi, 26530 Woodshire, Dearborn Hts., MI 48127
F--John White, 4865 Arthur Place, Columbus, OH 43220
G--Ron Daniel, 1289 Balboa Court #149, Sunnyvale, CA 94086 ((415-964-3580)
H--Bob Carlson, 2261 Glencoe St., Denver, CO 80207
I--Steve Vaitones, c/o NEAC, P.O. Box 1905, Brookline, MA 02146
J--Potomac Valley Walkers, 2305 S. Buchanan St., Arlington, VA 22206
K--USA Track and Field, P.O. Box 120, Indianapolis, IN 46206 (317-261-0500)
L--New Mexico Racewalkers, 2301 El Nido Ct., Albuquerque, NM 87104
M--NOTC, P.O. Box 52003, New Orleans, LA 70152
N--Mark and Jill Crowell, 503-359-5982
O--Park Racewalkers, USA, 320 East 83rd St., Box 18, New York, NY 10028
P--Marin Racewalkers, P.O. Box 21, Kentfield, CA 94914
Q--Bob Fine, 3250 Lakeview Blvd., Delray Beach, FL 33445
R--USATF Masters, University Extension Conference Office, 344 Hearnes Center, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211 (314-882-4087)
S--Sal Corrallo, 3466 Roberts Lane North, Arlington, VA 22207 (703-243-1290)
T--Metropolitan Racewalkers, 2500 Johnson Ave., Bronx, NY 10463
U--Columbia TC, P.O. Box 1872, Columbia, MO 65205
V--Tim Baker, Weightman Hall, Philadelphia, PA 91904, 215-898-6145
W--Mike DeWitt, UW-Parkside, Kenosha, WI 53144 (414-551-0142)
X--Jim Bean, 4658 Fuhrer St., NE, Salem, OR 97305
Y--Maple Syrup Run, 9450 Grand River Drive, Ada, MI 49301
Z--Frank Soby, 3907 Bishop, Detroit, MI 48224
AA--Ginger Mulanex, 11975 Gist Road, Bridgeton, MO 63044

- BB--Dr. Charles S. Roberts, 1345 First Street, Brookings, SD 57006
CC--Jim Shaw, 334 Garfield, Davenport, IA 52803
DD--Dr. Glen E. Peterson, 1906 South Hawthorne Ave., Sloux Falls, SD 57105
EE--John Snaden, 926 Sherwood Dr., Florence, SC 29501
FF--Bill Bauer, 1706 Crestwood, Dr., Columbia, SC 29205
GG--Rhode Island Zoological Society, Providence, RI 02905

* * * * *

FROM HEEL TO TOE

Racewalking lost a great friend in Gordon Wallace who succumbed to cancer in mid-January. Gordon took up racewalking in his mid-60s following triple bypass surgery and became a master's champion and record holder. He recounted his experiences in a book, *The Valiant Heart*. He obtained a Ph.D. in history, doing his dissertation on walking, in his '70s and recently gave up walking to concentrate on a teaching career, though now past 80. . . The Walking Club of Georgia is holding an Advanced Racewalking Weekend on April 16-17, featuring national team member Ian Whatley. Ian is a bio-engineer and the USAT&F Racewalk Representative on the Sports Science Committee. A graduate of Loughborough University in England, he is listed in *Who's Who in Science and Engineering* and holds 12 patents. Besides that, he has covered 20 Km in 1:27:02 and is an articulate instructor who has presented numerous clinics and written several articles related to the technical and training aspects of the sport. Cost of the clinic is \$95 to non-club members. Contact Bonnie Stein, 4920 Roswell Road, Suite 123, Atlanta, GA 30342. . . Mr. Robert Mimm, respectfully addressing me as Mr. Mortland, has penned the following note, which I pass along: "I'm surprised there have not been any comments yet regarding your statement in the November issue about unrepresentative fields in recent nationals (Ed. Me, too). Personally, I see nothing wrong with Cokey Daman finishing 12th in a National 30 Km. It is not Cokey's problem if elite walkers do not attend national races. (Ed. I wasn't suggesting Cokey, or anyone else, shouldn't take advantage of what's offered, just that it doesn't present the best image for our sport if people think that elderly gentlemen are among the best in the nation.) If I were in a decision making position, national team members would be required to make certain nationals. But, then again, I would attempt to secure funding for this. There is a rumor circulating now that development funds are not getting to the national team members. I hope it's not true. Nevertheless, we can't expect to compete with the world's best until we spend more on our top walkers. Back to the nationals, it seems to me that the number of competitors should be of primary concern. If this is true, perhaps we should eliminate the 50 and keep the 40. The 40 always outdoes the 50 in number of competitors. We can only develop walkers if we first get more persons involved. Obviously, we need both large fields and elite participation. Our biggest challenge seems to be finding more money for development and for funding our elite walkers." . . . Various comments from Ron Daniel, who was selected as the 1993 winner of the Zinn Award for the outstanding contributor to the sport of racewalking: **"Zinn Award:** I'd like to thank those who voted for me for the Zinn award for the lifelong contributor recognition. Thank you all. It is extra special to me, having broken into the sport at about the same time as Ron Zinn. Ron had unique characteristics as a competitor, which few have ever displayed. Mike Riban and the Green and Gold AC are to be congratulated for continuing Ron's memory by sponsoring the Zinn Awards for 19 years now. Mike was at the Convention and was recognized and introduced at one of the

meetings. I'd also like to thank the many organizational members of the N.Y. Pioneer Club, NYAC, Shore AC, Walker's Club of LA, Southern Cal Association, and Pacific Association whose tireless support of Athletics and racewalking have been the strength and inspiration that I have drawn on to keep me going. Without those folks, past and present, most of my contributions wouldn't have been possible. **Introducing FAST WALK:** Yes, that's right sports fans, the California Senior Olympics is bringing us a brand new event. In the February, Palm Springs event, a 5 Km Fast Walk will replace the ever popular 5 Km Racewalk. (Ed. Note that Ron's letter was written around the first of the year, thus the future reference to something that is now in the past.) As they advertise in their flyer, TAC (USATF) Rules will be used, but 'The rules for racewalk will not be used as many senior athletes are not familiar enough with them.' I keep overlooking how difficult it is to become familiar with all the details of the complex rules of racewalking! Can hardly wait for the other group of rules-familiarity-challenged walkers that will introduce the Fly-Walk event. Seriously, though, if Senior Olympics (can they use Olympics?) or Senior Games organizers apply for a sanction to go along with the USATF rules, they cannot choose to alter the rules for racewalking or just call it by another name. **Chen Yueling:** Enclosed is a copy of my report to my association describing Chen Yueling's visit to San Jose in October. (Ed. She is the Olympic 10 Km gold medalist from China now attending Brigham Young University.) It describes Chen's visit to San Jose in October. Members of the racewalking community who wish to invite her to their area for a clinic need to make arrangements with Mr. Derek Boosey. Mr. Boosey is Yueling's advisor (not manager) and was principally responsible for coordinating her move to BYU. He can be reached by writing to Derek Boosey, Director International Relations, Natural Alternatives International, 1185 Linda Vista Drive, San Marcos, CA 92069. . . Bob Bowman offers the following correction to an ORW item: Russia's ALina Ivanova actually made her marathon debut in the London Marathon on April 18, finishing 8th in 2:37:21

Alarming shoes, flying walkers, and all that. . .

Well, the Run Alarm is certainly eliciting much commentary from all sides, which has been piling up for 2 months since we had little room last month. So let's see what is being said.

From Roman Olszewski in Canada, technical editor for Athletics:

Regarding Athletics' writer Paul Gains' commentary about the World Championships 20 Km event (From Heel to Toe, Oct. 1993), I didn't see the article before it went to print. Had I seen it, however, I'm not sure I would have suggested any changes. Paul Gains has been a good supporter of walking in the past. Following Guillaume Leblanc's Olympic silver medal performance, a Canadian television sports commentator made some rather disparaging (but obviously juvenile) remarks about racewalking. The next morning, I was sent a faxed copy of a letter that Paul had sent to the reporter criticizing him for his comments.

If people like Paul come to the conclusion that there is something very wrong with judging in racewalking, then all of us who love this discipline better take the warnings seriously and do something about it quickly. With so much pressure from new and highly popular sports to get into the Olympic Games, Olympic events that are seen as controversial are highly susceptible to getting the axe.

In support of the walking events, some of your letter writers use the argument that there are seldom protests lodged with respect to the walking events as compared to the other events. It should be noted that while the decisions of referees for the latter may be overturned by a jury of Appeal, the decisions of walking judges are final. Protests are, therefore, futile.

To eliminate some of the controversy, from the public domain at least, I favor the idea of letting all competitors who are still in the race during the final 500 meters or on the last few laps on the track finish the race. Disqualifications can be made later. This may take some of the heat off the judge in places where it may be injurious to your health and safety to pull a favorite from the track in front of his or her hometown fans."

Yours sincerely,
Roman Olszewski, Technical Coordinator
Ontario T&F Association

More from Ron Daniel:

Run along alarm: Thoughts on technology. . . Who's not using technology. Tennis stopped using the baseline camera. Football stopped using the instant replay camera. Fencing stopped using the touch light. Soccer uses just one field official. There is no video officiating in baseball or basketball. (Ed. Basketball will go to the replay in some special instances.) No underwater video in swimming or water polo. They all rely on the unaided eye of the officials. Are these sports/events slated for extinction? No. But reading the newsletters, race walking is doomed without high tech.

So then, is technology justified just because it's possible? Apparently not for those sports. But also consider the practicality in measuring and detecting the loss of contact of an athlete when that measuring system sensitivity exceeds the normal physical response of the athlete to variations in the ground surface.

Functioning of the alarm: If the alarm is set to ignore some small amount of flight time, isn't the same credibility issue at hand when a video still shows this small infraction. If the alarm emits an audible sound during loss of contact, isn't this in violation of the technical aid during competition rule.

On reliability: Even though there would still be judges judging, it is observed that when there is video back-up for an official, the official comes to rely on it and his or her skills diminish. Which is worse; when the alarm fails such that the athlete doesn't get his or her courtesy beep and the light doesn't come on and the judge not wanting to be second guessed, lets a high flyer through. OR The alarm signals and lights up when the walker is still legal and is unfairly pulled by dutiful judge.

Then, of course, what shoe company will take on the contract for building this device into a pair of shoes. We can't get a simple pair of shoes made now.

Just some thoughts. . .

On removing contact rule: This solution does absolutely nothing for the credibility issue. You will never successfully explain to the spectators or media that walking does not include continuous contact.

Part of the skill of racewalking is mastering staying on the ground at fast speeds. Do we want to be lessening the skill requirement? I hope not. Remove the requirement and the event from the athlete's perspective is changed. And those that argue that the degree of loss of contact will not change are deluding themselves. They've never heard of

the "give them an inch and they'll take a mile" axiom. But more directly, the contact rule is analogous to a manufacturing workmanship standard. A customer may require a zero defect standard from a supplier even though there is not 100 percent inspection sampling. The customer knows by the sampling plan that there will be defects that slip through; however, the customer also knows to remove or relax the standard (lowering the workmanship standard) will result in gross amounts and types of defects. The contact rule invokes a workmanship standard. It is up to the athlete's to take pride in their ability to meet the standard. You never know when the sampling plan may change during an event! The customer retains that right.

Sincerely,
Ron

Dear Mr. Editor!

"Cantering (Caminata in Mexican)--A race in which the athletes progress in such a way that both feet appear to be on the ground at the same time for a moment between single foot contacts and the supporting leg is straight for one moment when in the vertically upright position. If a judge feels a competitor to be in violation of the rules, that judge shall file a red card with the chief judge indicating a 'technical foul'. As with field events (such as the high jump), a competitor with 3 fouls from different judges shall be considered 'fouled out' of competition and asked to leave by the chief judge presenting the athlete with a blue disc."

O.K.--it's semantics! I agree with everyone. We are not walking, but we aren't running. I like whatever we are doing.

The concepts of a name change to cantering or caminata and changing the world disqualified to fouled out are oddly acceptable to most track and field athletes/officials outside racewalking. I know because I presented the ideas at a USATF coaching clinic and at several beginning racewalking clinics.

Best regards,
Ian Whatley

From Jonathan Matthews, his second lengthy contribution to the discussion:

On contact: A modest proposal

Higher heels, Run Alarms, slow motion video judging, total elimination of the contact rule: Is any such option the solution to the perception of unfairness that dogs racewalking at major track meets? Almost inevitably, in races with television coverage, some walkers are disqualified while the winner is shown off the ground on slow motion video. While the elite walkers themselves typically accept this as simply part of the sport, the casual observer feels that an injustice has been perpetrated.

Perhaps Run Alarms, higher heels, or video judges will eventually prove able to hold walkers to an absolute continuous ground contact that can pass the scrutiny of the slowest-motion television coverage, but all of these measures would require considerable testing over an extended period of time before they might be universally adopted.

There is something more modest that we could do almost immediately that might help quell the controversy at major meets. Change the rules to the following:

"Racewalking is a progression of steps so taken that the supporting leg must be straightened (e.g., not bent at the knee) in the vertical upright position and apparent contact with the ground is continuously maintained, as judged by normal human vision unaccompanied by technical aid. It is possible that slow motion photography will detect absolute loss of contact while a walker is maintaining apparent continuous contact, as judged by normal human vision unaccompanied by technical aid. In this situation, the athlete is still in compliance with the rules of racewalking."

This explanatory language needs to be explicitly within the rule. At major meets, the rules need to be announced several times over the stadium's public address system. The rules need to be placed for extended periods on the stadium's giant video screen before, during, and after a racewalk. Commentators need to be thoroughly briefed on this rule before covering a racewalk.

Why this "half-way" step? Why not absolutely eliminate the continuous contact rule? Because absolute elimination of the continuous contact rule would absolutely alter the elegant racewalking gait that makes our sport such a pleasure to perform and observe. Remember, the loss of contact that is often detectable through slow-motion analysis of silky-smooth elite walkers at maximum effort has been obtained while they were attempting to comply with the continuous contact rule. Absolutely eliminate this rule, and you will kill the racewalking gait as we know it.

Have you seen flagrant lifting? Do you like the way it looks? Do you think that that sort of form should be the new standard for racewalking? Prediction: within two years of the absolute elimination of the continuous contact rule, extremely light athletes and high-impact shoe technology will combine to absolutely shatter every "walking" record. Walkers will quickly change from, on average, being larger and heavier than marathon runners, to being considerably smaller and lighter than them. Also, racewalking will change from a sport with comparatively few injuries to one with a higher injury incidence than running.

As the gifted minority of extremely light, biomechanically perfect athletes are able to keep relatively injury free and master the new gait of launch and glide "walking", they will be getting such amazing amounts of air time that mothers and fathers will have to explain to their youngsters the old, historical genesis of the name "racewalking": "You see, they'll have to tell them, "at one point it really was race walking."

Editor: A quick word here. I agree with most of what is said in these letters. Those who want to save the sport by eliminating the contact rule will not save anything; they'll merely introduce a new sport. And, sadly, a new set of controversies. Personally, I don't think the death of racewalking is so close as many suggest. To follow up on Ron Daniel's comments on technology in sport, not only is technology being ignored or eliminated in judging and refereeing sports, many rules are virtually ignored, and you don't need technology to detect it, but no one is threatening elimination of these sports. Baseball--The phantom double play; going for the man and not the bag in breaking up a double play. The rules are very clear, but certainly not enforced. Basketball--Walking is rampant, practically no one dribbles up the floor without turning the ball over, people beat on each other throughout the game without fools being called. Football--How do they select which holding they call? Well, I could go on. And, in these cases, you don't need slow motion to see the infraction of the rules as written. But, the sports and interpretations of the rules have evolved through the years and the games are now entirely different. From time to time some of these things are brought up by people other than me, but not with a

threat to eliminate the sport if the rules aren't properly enforced. Those involved just say that you couldn't play the game if the letter of the rules was enforced.

So it may be with racewalking. Jonathan suggests an absolute shattering of records if the contact rule goes, but over 35 years I have seen an absolute shattering of "walking" records in spite of the contact rule, because styles have changed and enforcement is probably more lax. And training has improved. And records are made to be broken. But, there are already some mothers and fathers telling their children how at one point it really was race walking.

Which, brings us to the next commentary, by Giulio de Petra in the Monterrey Peninsula Walk Walk Walk newsletter:

"Take a long look at the picture below from an international walking competition in the 1920s. (Ed. Sorry. We don't have the picture, but it is as he describes.) Observe the "heel and toe" style of the two walkers in the middle of the picture. This is way we used to walk, legs straight and in continuous contact with the ground.

At the time, one judge's call was enough to disqualify a walker--and no warnings. Although the best walkers were all walking 47 to 50 minutes for the 10 Km, the judge's eye didn't have difficulty seeing loss of contact; the judges of the time were really trained to judge.

Today, the contact controversy continues--and how! I was present at Dr. Dennis Furlong's Run Alarm device demonstration in Las Vegas. The English walkers who assisted in the first demonstration by Dr. Furlong in England were very enthusiastic about it. I am of the opinion that the Run Alarm still needs some work and that the inventor should be encouraged to perfect it. . . We hope that something constructive will be agreed to and implemented for the future of our beautiful sport. It is our sincere hope that racewalking--or better, "walking" as it was called before World War II--could be brought back to what it was before: Heel and Toe. "

Along the same lines, a relative newcomer to the sport writes:

I vote for keeping the walking gait as is with no crimping or lifting. Perhaps the perfection in racewalking should start with judging. In other sports with judges and referees, infractions are missed or not called, but the rules hold.

Racewalking is a low impact sport; the most important reason to keep one foot grounded. Speed is relative. The fastest walker wins. If a walker wants a runner's time, encourage that person to participate in running races. We need to be strict about enforcing good sportsmanship (in all phases of life).

I'm 72 years old and have been racing five years. Walking is my favorite sport.

Very truly yours,

Margaret Walker

And from Ron Laird, one of the first advocates of recognizing the "flight phase", this excerpted from a letter he wrote to Dave McGovern, with a copy to the ORW:

I really enjoyed your letter in the last ORW and feel it explained our contact situation the best. Thank you for taking the time and effort to put it together.

It is true that other world-class athletes don't complain about somebody else lifting. I recall from my best racing years that we all knew we were doing it, but why bother complaining? The fittest and smoothest looking walkers usually won and that the way races were supposed to turn out. If others beat you, you figured they were better or willing to kill themselves more when it came to racing. They could be admired for their superior courage during the crucial periods of races. When creeping was present it could not be tolerated. It was blatant cheating and marked you as an international cheater. Being disqualified for lifting was to be expected now and then and no big deal. You even felt sorry for those who got tossed and ended up losing out on a medal in an important international competition. It was nice to move up into the awards if this was your case, but you realized you were lucky and it could have just as easily happened to you.

There were really no new techniques advanced by the Soviets in the '56 Games. The three who clean swept the 20 were simply fitter and blew everyone away with times considered super fast for back then. The usual pictures in the spread out, double contact phase showed loss of contact, but, as we know, this is what normally happens when racewalkers master the ability to move their legs fast, get really fit, and really push themselves.

In my first international race in Moscow in 1958 I faced the Olympic champion, Leonard Spirin. I was impressed with the amount of hip turning he used in his style. Being quite thin helped. He simply scissored away from me. Both Spirin and his teammate, V. Guk, had tremendous hip twisting that made their legs whip forward so quickly and produced a lovely smooth gliding action. Today's walkers don't have that classic hip turning. As they have gotten fitter over the years, they have neglected it for a prancing sort of action that allows for more leg speed. Their strides are just as long as the hip twisters because of the excess distance they cover through the air. They do look nice and smooth to the human, unaided eye and that is what gets them through the vast majority of their races. Of course, today's excellent camera and video equipment shows us how far up and through the air they travel with each step. If our sport ever went to video judging (and kept the contact rule on the books) we would probably be done away with as a legitimate sporting event. The conflict between what was happening and what was supposed to be happening would be too much for the IAAF and IOC to stomach. (Ed. I think this is a bit cynical. I don't favor video judging, as I have stated before, but neither do I think it is impossible to have a racewalking sport in which the competitors do maintain contact. Is it not possible the athletes would adjust and we would start out all over again--back to the days Giulio reveres.)

I agree with you when you say the leg must be straightened at the same instant the heel makes contact. It then needs to stay straight all the way underneath the walker and even driven back behind the walker. . . Racewalkers need to look as if they are smoothly pulling the ground underneath and behind them when they are moving on by. That is why I always teach it as a pulling and not pushing action. The computer experts over the past few years have figured our unique sport to be a pushing motion and have sold the concept to everyone--except me. I feel that runners push themselves up and through the air with their quads and racewalkers pull themselves forward with their hamstrings. The straight knee rule was invented so as to eliminate quadriceps pushing from the gait of the racewalker. If athletes wish to use their quads, let them take up the sports of running, jumping, skating, bicycling, etc. . .

Frank Shorter and Martin Liquori sure did us a disservice during their horrible narration of the '92 Olympic walks. Their ignorance and hostility really bothered me

because I really think they knew better. . . Since I felt I'd done a good job teaching them some years ago on trips and in various domestic meets all about our sport, I had to take it personally when they were so rough on us. But then, technique and performances have drastically changed since we were racing together, so what they saw in Spain and how they remembered the '70s may have been too much for them to take. It's tough for me to take at times to tell you the truth. Just how did our sport evolve to where it is today? If I were a young man taking an interest in it today and was able to realize how fast and fantastic a 1:18 for 20, 2:01 for 30, and 3:41 for 50 were, I'd sure be discouraged and probably be persuaded not to have anything to do with the event. The world record for 20 Km was 1:27:05 during my best years and it was held by a Russian--it stood for 12 years. Achieving 1:28:18 at least put me close to the record and gave me a lot of incentive to hang in year after year.

So, yes, I'd require all racewalkers to straighten upon contact and take it even further by having them keep on straightening back beyond the vertical upright position.

Putting some electronic gizmo into shoes I feel degrades our sport. Even if the thing worked, it just doesn't seem to me to be the way to go. It would be an embarrassment to have to perform with it on. Heels on shoes don't help. If anything, they force a longer stride, thus causing what we used to call a long lift.

But, here is a new rule guaranteed to keep you from lifting: The arms must move with (not counter to) the legs. That is, as the right leg steps forward, the right arm must also come forward, and so on. Try it. It's very hard to walk, let alone walk fast.

Sincerely,

Ron

On that bit of levity, we move on to the final two commentaries we will have space for. First an item from Elaine Ward's Southern California Racewalking News in which former National Coach and author of this country's best book on racewalking technique and training, Martin Rudow, puts forth his current views. And then a letter from IAAF Racewalk Chairman Bob Bowman responding to earlier commentary in these pages.

ELIMINATION OF THE CONTACT RULE - MARTIN RUDOW

Martin Rudow has an exemplary record of involvement at every level of racewalking, from successful athlete, to IAAF judge, to coach/writer. His love and commitment to the sport and its athletes have been proven many times over. Uniquely knowledgeable about national and international racewalking, his observations and recommendations are welcome additions to the judging debate.

I have been following with a great deal of interest the ongoing controversy over the "Run-Alarm" device. Whether or not the device turns out to be workable, I feel something has to be done, and quickly, for our sport to survive. It's gone beyond a simple fairness issue where someone who lifted won a race. We're to the point where the existence of race walking as an event in athletics is threatened by our inability to judge the lifting rule.

I am afraid that I am, very reluctantly, coming around to the point of view that the lifting rule must be eliminated. I'd like to share some thoughts that have led me to take this

position.

The judging situation is much more serious than when similar judging controversies were mostly "in house," and the rest of the sporting public didn't know or didn't care. The widespread use of slow motion videotaping has brought home to the public what we all have known for some time: that at high-level race walking competition, at least a good portion of the field is off the ground--lifting--a great deal of the time. And to this same public, when disqualifications do get made, they seem to be capricious, inconsistent, and prejudiced.

We in the sport know that really flagrant violators usually do get disqualified. The judges notice the worst offenders and warn and DQ them. It's a selection process, really, not a random or political thing (at least, not usually), in which the worst offenders get warned and DQ'd. But only the worst!

If it is a large field, it takes longer to get the real bad offenders out of the way, and the

more marginal lifters get through. If it is a small field, perhaps we get down to just the really good-looking walkers, but even then photos and videos almost always show loss of contact at some point in the race.

COMPETITORS WILL GET THROUGH IN MOST CASES IF THEY "LOOK LIKE THEY'RE WALKING,"

We in the sport have come to accept this situation as times have gotten faster, athletes more fit, and contact more marginal over the years. Competitors will get through in most cases if they "look like they're walking," even if it later is shown that they were "off." After all, we reason, the rules state that judging is to be done by the naked eyes, not by a video camera. And we applaud the technique of a great-looking walker, even if slow motion videotape does show a consistent loss of contact.

Well, maybe we "insiders" can accept this situation, barely in my case, but the public can't. And whether we like it or not, in this day and age we must have public support. With the Olympics being urged to pare back, with sports writers around the world looking for sensational stories to tell, with nationalism and a desire for medals running at a fever pitch, all the elements are there for race walking's inability to enforce its own rules to

Dear Jack,

In response to some of the questions regarding my analysis of the Run Alarm device I offer the following:

(1) Alan Wood mentioned I zealously attacked the Run Alarm "from every conceivable technical angle" and that "there are always bugs with any new system, but we should at least give it full consideration and a long trial", etc. I guess he feels I'm biased against it as a 'traditionalist' (?). Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, Furlong was not the first person to come up with this idea. Aldo Scandurra, former national long distance running chairman, treasurer of TAC and IAAF road running & cross country chairman who was also president of his own electronics company, first proposed this concept to me over 20 years ago. The main problem then was the same as today. The fact that it works is simply not good enough. It must work reliably. I merely listed some of the more obvious failure modes in my analysis. These are not just bugs that can be eliminated as Alan suggests. These are significant technical problems, many of which cannot be overcome on a practical basis. Therefore, it is foolish to continue to explore it's feasibility with long trials, etc.

(2) Elaine Wood's letter of December 9 regarding the technology used for a portion of the Run Alarm is erroneous. I have been in communication with Dennis Furlong since 1986. On November 3, 1993 he sent me his latest design circuit schematic (enclosed for the editor's benefit) which clearly shows the analog circuitry for transmitting and receiving the RF signals between both shoes. In Furlong's own words: "Frequency of transmission will be adjustable, and each walker would be assigned a frequency prior to an event." So I haven't set up "a strawman to beat down" regarding the radio frequencies and transmitters as Elaine claims. If Furlong has come up with another way of communicating between both shoes such as a bio-feedback link (which is probably even less reliable than the transmitter/receiver approach) he did not mention it in his latest proposal. In any case it certainly would need to have a more credible explanation than Elaine Ward's vague description that "the Run-Alarm monitors

This ridicule is reaching a sufficient crescendo that our sport may become so debunked that it will be eliminated from the international athletics scene. Someone with influence in the sports broadcast or journalism field who is looking for a sensational story to tell is going to blow the whistle on the whole thing, and they're going to have videotape "proof" that someone won a major international race while walking illegally a great portion of the race. Just try to tell such a person that the worst walkers got disqualified, or that the person who won "wasn't really that far off"--what a joke!! I fear having this happen at the 1996 Olympics - a perfect stage - if indeed we last that long.

Some suggested solutions - higher heels, the Run-Alarm, use of videotape while judging - may prove to be somewhat practical, and I'd love to see them work so we can maintain the contact rule. But, could any of these solutions pass this critical criteria: Will its use greatly reduce or completely eliminate walkers who are off a significant amount of time from winning or finishing high up in a race? I doubt it. I really doubt it.

This isn't just a complaint. I want to see action, and I'm willing to help in any way I can. Let's quickly test these devices and see if they are workable and can make a significant difference. If not, as I suspect, let's move to redefine legal race walking, or prepare ourselves to defend a judging policy that really is indefensible.

on/off ground contact and communicates this information via the human body so that essentially the shoes "talk to each other" in a very private conversation." If she buys that explanation, I've got some swamp land in Mississippi I'd like to sell her! The fact is there must be some electronic means of tying the contact signals of both shoes together almost instantaneously. This presents an additional significant failure mode I didn't even mention in my earlier analysis. Signal timing is critical with this concept. Even if you could somehow overcome signal interference between devices, the statistical tolerancing differences in the signal timing delays between the two sets of circuits could easily result in a situation where one foot is off at one moment and the other foot is off at another moment as in the case of fair walking, but because of statistical differences in signal delays, the Run-Alarm signals that both feet are off at the same moment. This is just another of the many technical difficulties that would need to be overcome. Space prevents me from going into all the reasons why this device is just not going to ever overcome all these problems. It is totally impractical. Elaine can continue to believe in it if she likes, but I have to be honest in my review of it. To do otherwise would be irresponsible.

(3) In answer to Dave McGovern's letter, which I thought was very insightful. However, I do differ with him on a couple of points. The public relations problem race walking has is not the contact rule itself, it is the enforcement of the rule, especially in world championships and Olympic Games when video shows walkers off the ground. The walkers don't have a problem with this but the general public and media does. However, we would have an even bigger PR problem if we eliminated the contact rule because the world from day 1 has always distinguished walking from running by the continuous contact requirement. So even if we eliminated this requirement we would not solve the PR problem but in fact would make it even worse and also introduce an additional problem of trying to further determine what constitutes 'legal' race walking. This of course is all unnecessary. People who propose eliminating the contact rule make two false assumptions. The first false assumption is that you can convince the world that walking in air is different than running (The impossible PR task) and the second false assumption is that in order to walk fast you must break contact. That is simply not true. By the way, even if it were true and you were capable of 100 percent enforcement of the contact rule via technology, etc. so that walkers would now have to walk slower (i.e. 7.5 to 8 mph as suggested by Julian Hopkins) to be legal, that is not so bad. After all the center of mass of the javelin was changed in order to accommodate legal (non-flat) throws and therefore shorten the distances. This has worked just fine with no loss of interest in this event.

Dave's equating heel thickness to "shoe alarms" is not realistic. Shoe and equipment dimensional and material requirements are quite common in track & field. These are preventative solutions to real problems. The shoe alarm is not. It is a detection device requiring a judgment reaction during the event. These are not similar solutions. I'd like to remind Dave that the IAAF has several shoe rules, some of which he must abide by. For example, Rule 139.2 states, "shoes must not be constructed so as to give the competitor any additional assistance (beyond protection and stability), and no spring or device of any kind may be incorporated in the shoes." Shoes are further limited by make and construction. For example, Rule 139.5 states, "The sole and/or heel may have grooves, ridges, indentations or protuberances provided these features are constructed of the same or similar material to the basic sole itself. I hope Dave is not in violation of this or he may be outta here before he wants to be! Only joking, Dave. How's this one grab you: Rule 139.5 further states, "In the high jump, the sole shall have a maximum thickness of 13 mm and the heel shall have a maximum thickness of 19 mm. In all other events the sole and/or the heel may be of any thickness." It is this last rule that could possibly be amended for the race walking events. So this is really nothing new.

(4) I found Martin Smith's letter interesting. A couple of comments regarding his technical analysis are in order. My hurdling versus race walking analogy regarding flight phase is not a perfect analogy, however, I wanted to make the point that time in

the air is the slowest time during any foot race. For example, in the 1920's the great sprinter, Charlie Paddock, used to jump across the finish line thinking it was faster. However, it was eventually proved to be the slowest part of his race. Leaving his feet was not a good idea. Similarly in race walking, leaving the ground is not a good idea for not only legality but for speed. Of course when we are talking about milliseconds the advantage or disadvantage may in fact be quite small. The point is race walkers do not necessarily gain any speed from loss of contact.

In answer to Martin's question regarding flying circus type races in which the combination of lax judging and much lifting results in very fast times, and if this lifting does not give an advantage why would this occur and why would these athletes risk disqualification, I offer the following explanation although there may be others. Proper technique in the heat of important races does require additional concentration and energy. If competitors know that the race will not be judged properly it is always possible that they will allow their form to degrade, resulting in extreme lifting. This does not mean it has to be deliberate but only a spontaneous reaction during the heat of the race. It also doesn't mean that a perfectly legal walker couldn't beat them. I've often noted the great technique employed by Mikhail Shchennikov of Russia. I have seen many of his races where for most or nearly all the race he has been as legal as I've seen both with the naked eye and on video. I've also seen him off, especially when he wasn't concentrating but in a relax mode. His better technical races have in fact been the ones in which he has done well (i.e. 1st in '91 World Cup and 2nd in '91 World Championships).

Martin makes a good point regarding lifting as a method of improving efficiency. However, I wouldn't call this improving efficiency because that usually refers to proper technique. I would call this a method of conserving energy. This is the one area where lifting could give an unfair advantage. However, with elite walkers this tends to be a small advantage when compared to the loss of speed and therefore a loss of efficiency due to extreme lifting. This may not be the case for a novice race walker.

Martin also concludes that "the smoothness that we associate with good race walking is further improved when a good race walker is lifting." This is possible but not always, and certainly not for extreme lifting.

Bob Bowman

LOOKING BACK

25 Years Ago (From the February 1969 ORW)--Dave Romansky was crowned ORW National Postal 20 Km champion with his 1:33:58. . . Dan Totheroh did a 6:36.6 mile in Los Angeles, just beating Ron Laird, Larry Young, and Larry Walker, who finished right together. . . Tom Dooley won a San Francisco 30 Km in 2:31:02.

20 Years Ago (From the Feb. 1974 ORW)--National Indoor titles went to Larry Walker (2 Mile) in 13:24 and Sue Brodock (1 Mile) in 7:28.6. Todd Scully was a very close second to Walker. . . Dave Romansky won the Olympic Invitational 1 Mile in 6:05.4.

15 Years Ago (From the Feb. 1979 ORW)--Chris Shea became the first woman to break 7 minutes for 1 Mile, winning the national title in 6:58.4. The 2 Mile title went to Todd Scully in 12:40, 10 seconds ahead of Jim Heiring. . . Marcel Jobin beat Scully in a Montreal 3 Km, 11:37 to 11:40.4. . . Scully won the Millrose Mile in a world best of 5:55.8.

10 Years Ago (From the Feb. 1984 ORW)--Jim Heiring was an easy winner of the National Indoor 2 Mile in 12:11.21 and Teresa Vaill won the 1 Mile in 7:12.85. . . In the Millrose Mile, Ray Sharp edged Heiring in 5:52.29.

5 Years Ago (From the Feb. 1989 ORW)--Would you believe--about 8 pages under the title: "Judging, Contact, and Related Issues: The Great Rehash." Early in that discussion we said: 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." The imminent demise of the sport was seen at that time, too. And several other times in the past. The article was a capsule review of the rise and swell of commentary over the previous 20 years.