

ROAD RUNNERS CLUB, NEW YORK ASSOCIATION NEWSLETTER  
No.40, SPRING 1969

President:V.Chiappetta,2 Washington Sq.Village,Apt.9D,NY,NY 10012

Vice-President:Bill Taylor,48 Church St.,Greenwich,Conn.06830

Secretary:Joe Paz,P.O.Box 6,Wharton,N.J. 07885--Millrose AA

Treasurer:Glenn McCarthy 185 Lenox Ave.,Uniondale,L.I.,N.Y.11556

(Please keep the Secretary informed of address changes.)

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTEND ANNUAL RRC MEETING--To be held after the Sr.Met.15  
Kilo Championship, at Queensborough Community College,  
June 1.

NOMINATIONS for OFFICERS of the RRC should be sent to RRC,  
N.Y. Association,P.O.Box 467,Port Washington,New York, or  
call Vince Chiappetta at 212-533-4717.



CORRECTION--On page 2 of the No.39,Winter 1969 Newsletter,under  
"Questions and Comments" by Vince Chiappetta,line 6,the word  
insulin should be substituted for adrenalin which was erroneously  
included.

RRC OF AMERICA NATIONAL CONVENTION--The 12th Annual RRC of America  
Convention was held April 20 at the Prudential Building,Boston. Nat'l.  
President Aldo Scandurra opened the meeting after a welcome by Larry  
Berman.Previous minutes were accepted and Committee reports followed:

AAU RELATIONS (Scandurra).RRC members can't represent the RRC in  
competition.The RRC was urged to engage in activities not being  
handled by the AAU.

ORGANIZATION (John Brennand).Brennand,Secretary Richards and Scandurra  
were involved in this aspect of the RRC's growth and public relations.

STANDARDS COMMITTEE (T.Corbitt).History of standards reviewed.The  
Committee is concerned with:course measurement; time limit runs;age  
group standards;timing procedures;and conditions of competition,e.g.  
safety.There are 26 certified marathon courses in the USA.

INTERNATIONAL SECTION (Scandurra).The BAA Marathon will be considered  
in selecting an American to run in the Korean Marathon.The American  
International Cross-Country Team will be selected from the first 7  
available men from the national x-country championship.

LONG DISTANCE LOG:Efforts are still being made to insure the continued  
publication of the "Log." You can help by subscribing.

WOMEN'S RUNNING (John Brennand for Mrs.Lyn Carman).Women now engage  
in races up to 5 miles.Special permission is needed to run further.  
In closed RRC events all members can take part in "participation  
events" (not competitions) and with no limit on distance. Any  
published results would be listed separately for men and women.

NATIONAL JOGGING ASSOCIATION (Hugh Jascourt,DC Assoc.)A special  
committee of Jascourt,Browning Ross,Scandurra,John O'Neil (Cleveland  
RRC) and Vince Chiappetta, was appointed to look into a possible  
affiliation of the RRC with the National Jogging Association.

RFYL (RUN FOR YOUR LIFE) (Scandurra). The RFYL program can help to  
support the rest of the RRC program.

CONSTITUTION (Norm Brand,Ohio River Valley).No club can have more  
than 10 votes.Otherwise there will be one vote per 25 paid up members  
as of Dec.31.Club national dues is \$10 for less than 20 members.For  
100 or more members it is \$50. A quorum is at least 4 member clubs.

NATIONAL POSTAL COMPETITION (Pat Lanin,Director,Minnesota RRC).  
Events will be conducted between April 1 and Sept.30 on a 440 yard  
track.More than one race may be conducted but results from only one  
race may be submitted for championship consideration. Races may be  
run as open events but only paid up members will count.Lap recording  
forms must be used in all events and times for each lap submitted for  
each runner. \$1 entry fee,at least 50¢ going to National RRC. AAU  
scoring rules apply in 10 mile track run to determine Assoc. winner.

TREASURERS REPORT (H.Canfield,At Large,Tenn.).Balance \$378.29.  
1969-70 NATIONAL OFFICERS(Joe Kleinerman).President:Ed O'Connell,New  
England;Sec. Arne Richards,Misso.Valley (re-elected);Assistant Sec.for  
East,Bill Marot,NY Assn.;Vice Presidents:North:Tom Coyne,Mich.,East:  
K.Steiner,NY;South:H.Canfield,Tenn.;West:J.Brennand,Calif.;Central:to  
be appointed;Women's Affairs:A.Scandurra and Lyn Carman,Calif.(re-  
elected);Canadian Affairs,to be appointed)  
National RRC Marathon,Atlantic City,Sept.28.



The Metropolitan area has the worse handicapping of any area in the United States. You can easily verify this claim by studying the results of races reported in the LDL. The explanation for this is simple--the local handicapper has never bothered to work out any kind of theory as to what the purpose of handicapping is. His methods are mechanical, and his mechanics have no point behind them.

What exactly should be the purpose of handicapping, anyhow? I think it is obvious that, if we are going to have handicap races at all, they should be designed so as to give each competitor as much chance of winning as any other competitor. Once stated, it sounds obvious, but has this in fact been the governing principle? Most certainly not. Isolated cases of runners with big handicaps winning races prove very little. What matters is the way finishes are distributed. As everyone knows, runners off "go" tend to be bunched near the bottom; runners off "scratch" tend to be bunched near the top. Runners with in between handicaps tend to finish in between. In short, the tendency is to finish exactly the way they would finish if there were no handicaps at all. This makes the handicaps farcical. I suggest that if there is any principle of handicapping operating at all it is this: Give the stragglers just enough of a start so that the officials won't have to bother waiting around all day for them to finish, but don't upset the natural order of things! In other words, the handicaps are for the benefit of the officials, not the runners.

Sometimes a runner with a very large handicap proceeds to win very easily. This seems to bother a lot of people but I don't know why it should bother them anymore than when a scratch runner comes from way back to romp home an easy winner. Why is this more acceptable? It is ridiculous to say that he just ran a great race. Supposedly his ability to run a great race is taken into consideration in making up the handicaps.

I have heard some people say there is a tendency among those who get big handicaps to lie about their performances so that the handicaps have got to be toned down to prevent them from swamping the better runners. This is absurd and insulting. (1) Even if the accusation were true it is obvious that the "toning down" has gone too far since instead of straightening out the distribution we have gotten the situation I described above, i.e., the big handicap runners are bunched up at the rear. (2) If the accusation had any merit it wouldn't explain the cause of this phenomenon. Are bad runners congenitally more dishonest than good runners? This is plain insulting. More likely it would be due to the fact that they are tired of finishing so far back. In other words, there would be a vicious circle: tired of inadequate handicaps they misrepresent their performances, and as a consequence of misrepresenting their performances they get more bad handicaps, so then they have to lie again, etc. (3) Finally, I just want to say that the extent of misrepresentation is greatly exaggerated. I think such accusations are cheap and shouldn't be made. If someone is known to be lying and violating the principles of fair play and amateurism he should be accused openly, brought up on charges by some tribunal developed to handle such cases and, if found guilty, given an appropriate penalty. Let's do away with behind the back insults.

Now I should like to say a few things which I admit are more opinionated. There are just too few handicap races in this area as compared to other areas. In fact, in my view, the only races which should not be handicapped are championship races. I know that some highly competitive runners are perfectly content to do their best and finish far back time after time. But others get discouraged and give up the sport. If you haven't noticed this it's probably because it is much more natural to remember those who are around constantly year after year than to keep a file of all the forgotten never-weres. Since these highly competitive types probably wouldn't mind handicaps anyhow and since the ones more easily discouraged would like them, why shouldn't all non-championship races be handicapped? As I see it there is no reason to keep rewarding the better runners by guaranteeing they will generally finish near the top. The sport is for all runners, good or bad. It is an amateur sport for the good runners as well as for the bad. There is nothing terrible about an Olympic gold medalist finishing last. No one will take him out and shoot him for it. The championship races are, of course, the true tests



p.3 where no excuses are allowed. Here the natural order of things prevails and the better runners get all the honors which are justly theirs. Incentives are needed for all levels of runners: championships provide the main incentives for the best but I can't think of a single reason why a championship runner should be given preferential treatment to other runners. Will someone please tell me why we shouldn't do away with all scratch races which are not championships?

VOTE

INTERNATIONAL X-COUNTRY CHAMPIONSHIP, Clydebank, Scotland, March 1969  
by Norb Sander STADE LAU/MILLROSE AA

This year's International Cross-Country Championship returned to Great Britain after last year's Tunisian edition won by Gammoudi in a torrid race. The event consisted of 6 laps over a 2 km circuit, with never more than a 100 meters at a time of flat running. The weather, cold and windy, may have hampered a bit the Latin runners but was par for this time of year for Clydebank, just outside of Glasgow. Gaston Roelants, who had to abandon last year due to a midcourse "injury," incurred while jumping an obstacle, was back and after his third victory in the International. More important, he was confronted with preventing the 34th individual victory by an Englishman and here on their own terrain. Mike Tagg, the British champion this year by a decisive margin looked a good bet several weeks ago but heavy pressures from his University work had forced him to ease off after the British National. From England's inexhaustible supply of top flight quality distancemen it was easy however to conjure up someone to give Roelants trouble even if the Belgian was to impose at the end. The first mile was led by former winner El Ghazi from Morocco who, like so many other competitors in this classic event, seem like fixtures from year to year and add a sense of tradition to the race so difficult to see in America. Shortly after Roelants lanced one of his subdued attacks and disengaged along with England's Dick Taylor. Taylor, at this point probably thinking of Roelants' control victory at Barry, Wales two years previous, decided he'd put it to the bearded wonder with number one on his chest, and stretched out a mighty 70m between him and the Belgian. A lesser man than Roelants would have given up the ghost at this point and contented himself with second place. Roelants explained after the race that he had at this point two choices, either quit or continue the race and eventually win it.

He pulled even at 8 kilometers and was smiling at the finish. England as usual made shambles of the team race with France second and Belgium a close third. One had to suffer down to eighth place to find the American team, preceded by Morocco and just edging out the Welsh. Although Bill Clark placed an excellent 11th in such elevated competition the showing of the American team must be considered dismal. The time of year is of course bad for our sending teams to the International yet several weeks preparation for someone already in top shape for 2-3 miles should be enough to make a decent showing. When you consider that only Clark was good enough to make the first five (Messinger was 48th and Smith 31st) of the English, French or Belgian teams and that the team was soundly beaten by New Zealand, Scotland, Spain, and Morocco also, it may be time for some reflection.

Despite the exciting and well contested cross-country season waged in the U.S. the caliber of performances may be surprisingly less than international class. The unexpected string of long-distance successes at Tokyo might actually have served to retard rather than further the cause of international class long-distance running in America. The reason for such a dearth of talent at the top has little to do with organization or the occasion to run since the U.S. is second to none in its broad base of participation and number of well organized occasions to compete. The older age in general of most European and African distancemen and their greater international experience is certainly a factor. Yet I'm more inclined to look closer at the individual and his methods for an answer. The assemblage of 120 of America's "elite" distancemen at Alamosa, Colorado last summer provided an occasion to get a clearer picture. What stood out most in my mind was the addiction to consistent, long, laborious, time consuming slow running, often in groups, particularly among the younger runners which seems only to deaden the spirit and body for the fight ahead. A necessary consequence of this style of training was a very evident absence of hard-nosed front runners a la Roelants, Tagg, Taylor, McCafferty (1-4 in the International) and company. While following is certainly a legitimate tactic, there must be someone reasonably decent to



p.4 follow and this is the bird we seem to be lacking. Nothing is more deafening, for example, than the void left by the departure of Peter McArdle and Oscar Moore from the New York scene. Runners hacking over 100 miles a week have failed to threaten the records at 3 and 6 miles set by those men in the Met. area. I recall running the 6 mile Met vs Moore in 1964 and watching him (from behind) run the first lap in 61 seconds much to my discouragement and enlightenment, enlightenment that a man could have the courage to run the first of 24 laps so fast and as it turned out lap the whole field during the course of the race. As clear in my mind also is McArdle's first sub 14 minute 3 mile in the Armory (I got kicked out of the race for going too slow and had a good opportunity to watch) where he weeded in and out of a cast of thousands to still pulverize the record. Such sub 14 minute 3 miles in the Armory seems a thing of the past unless we can import some one to do it!

All of this leaves me with the conclusion that the present day hopes for long distance greatness in America will have to get a bit meaner faster and lonelier, especially during the course of the race, if they hope to improve on this year's showing in cold, windy Scotland. -----(Author Norb Sander is studying medicine in Switzerland)-----

#### READ

- 1) The "Long Distance Log" magazine, 12 monthly issues \$4.00 from H.B. Ross 306 W. Center St., Woodbury, N.J. You get training tips and domestic and foreign long distance running results. Get it.
- 2) "Distance Running News", 4 issues yearly, \$1.50, from Distance Running News, P.O. Box 1082, Manhattan, Kansas 66502. News and interesting discussions on long distance running.

----- (Attend the annual meeting of the RRC-----

NOTE: WHENEVER YOU COMMUNICATE WITH THE R.R.C. OR THE A.A.U., PLEASE ENCLOSE A STAMPED SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE FOR ANY RETURN ANSWERS, ETC.

===== The "Cherry Tree" Marathon March 16, 1969, Bronx, N.Y.

New England's Leo Duart ran a 2:15:04 marathon in the '68 Plodders Marathon. There were doubters galore. Duart showed up at the '69 Cherry Tree, possibly to prove a point. At the start Leo zipped off into the cool with the reluctant pack watching and wondering.

Austria's Adolph Gruber, the former NYAC "grey fox", called the old Cherry Tree course a "mountain race." The new course, with the notorious NYU Hill eliminated, is easier but there isn't a level spot on it.

Nevertheless, Duart attacked the course as no one had ever dared to in this race. The race has seen other sensational front runners. There was the unforgettable bounding flight of Marine Alex Breckenridge in 1960. We re-measured the course after that one. J.J. Kelley's lonely flow in 1961 produced 2:25:27. Then there was the bold, surprising, pounding charge by Coleman Mooney in 1964 in which he set up the fastest mass finish in the history of the race, with former NY Pioneer George Foulds picking up the marbles with a scorching last 4 miles for the 2:25:25 record for the event. Recently, Philadelphia's Moses Mayfield's uninhibited early blast was also memorable.

Duart finally wilted and the Millrose's comer Gary Muhreck drifted into range to take charge at 23.2 miles. Results: Muhreck 2:29:24 (Course II record); Brian Drewett, Canada, 2:31:48; Duart, U. of Mass. TC 2:33:18. Duart came out of the race with several plusses to his credit: 1. He can run and he isn't afraid to run; 2. He fought on and finished after tiring (England's Don Turner says that you find out the truth about a runner by observing what he does after he is fatigued); 3. He is young enough to develop the additional stamina needed to go with his speed.

----- RRC, New York Association

Newsletter Committee: J. Chodes, J. Paz,

B. Wiklund, Dr. S. Gendin, N. Sander,

Ted & Gary Corbitt

c/o Ted Corbitt, 5240 B'way, NY, NY 10463

TO:

PRINTED MATTER