

## EDITORIAL

It was agreed at the AGM that we should produce in 1971 completely up-to-date UK All Time Lists for seniors and juniors, men and women. The junior booklet is in the very capable hands of Cliff Temple (General Editor) and Dave Cocksedge, Alan Lindop and Peter Martin (Compilers). The senior lists, which will be 100-200 deep (depending on the standard), will involve much more work of course. May I therefore appeal to any members - not necessarily list compilers - who would be willing to undertake work on a particular event or section to write to me at the earliest possible moment?

The question of economies in NUTS expenditure was also raised at the AGM and you will note that certain of these have already been implemented. In this connexion, may I ask all members not to use NUTS headed paper for continuation sheets and to use report forms for results.

Issued as a supplement to this issue is a sheet specially prepared by Dave Terry, who has probably spent more hours in the British Museum Newspaper and Periodical Library at Colindale than the rest of the NUTS membership put together!

## MISCELLANY

- ① For your 1971 Diary: 23 May - Cliff Hangers Team v Chelsea CPE at Eastbourne
- ① 7 July 1970: Liz Sissons was Civil Service captain and Surrey team manager in the same match!
- ① Peter Martin writes:  
"One morning just after I had left for the office the postman started stuffing letters from a bundle through the box on to the carpet and before Marion could stir from the chair there was a knock at the door. Thinking it was me, she tore out to find out what I had forgotten, only to meet a distraught postman who asked - not for his ball back - but his letters! Apparently they make up a Beaconsfield Road bundle (less No 23) and a NUTS bundle, and - being of equal size - he had stripped off the elastic bands and stuffed the mail for the rest of the road through our letter-box in error!"
- ① Dave McJannet achieved a long-standing (or sitting?) ambition, when at Cwmbran on 1 August, he announced his first international.
- ① WANTED: December 1964 issue of World Sports. Write to Alan Lindop stating price (if any) required.
- ① Martin James is moving house at the end of October and has a fairly large collection of programmes and magazines which he wishes to dispose of. Please write to him for details.
- ① We say farewell - at least for a year - to David Dallman who is taking up a high-energy physics post in Vienna. Carole Endersby, recently elected to membership, will be keeping his seat warm (over here). She was responsible for the actual data preparation and computer listing of the records and UK All Time Top 10 for "BA70". As a post-graduate research worker in pharmacology and endocrinology at Chelsea College, she will be contributing to the next issue an article on drugs and their uses in athletics.
- ① One of the most interesting publications of recent years is "The Physiological Basis of Athletic Records" by Ernst and Peter Jokl. How many of you realised, for example, that because "the women's discus was developed by an arbitrary reduction of size and weight of the men's discus" and that "the resultant ratio between mass and surface renders the women's conspicuously unstable."

/concluded on back page

## RUNNING NOWHERE by Bob Phillips

Of all the athletics literature in my possession, no single book is more highly prized than Norman Harris's superb autobiography, "Champion of Nothing", published only in New Zealand and so far as I know unobtainable in this country.

This slim volume was a personal gift from Norman - perhaps inspired by a seven mile training run we once did together on a dark and windswept October evening when we each did our best to burn off the other. Norman is, of course, one of the most succinct and lyrical of writers on the subject of athletics and his book is a marvellous evocation of the singular appeal of running and one which I would bracket alongside W R Loader's classic, "Testament of a Runner".

A novel which may not be well known to those unfamiliar with the delights of whiling away hours in public libraries looking for something worthwhile among all the Dennis Wheatleys and Ivy Compton Burnetts is "The Other King", by Victor Price. This is a superbly written story by a gifted novelist of the trials and tribulations of a university student who is also a miler.

It seems to be influenced quite strongly by the academic approach of Roger Bannister's "First Four Minutes". But Price is clearly a man who knows what athletics is all about and he describes vividly the lonely challenge of training and racing. He has also written another excellent novel set during the British occupation of Cyprus, the title of which I forget but which is well worth searching for.

Of course, there have been many books published in recent years about some of the outstanding figures in international athletics, and Snell, Clarke, Ryun and Jazy have all provided subjects to which their respective authors have done full justice. Jazy's "Mes Victoires, Mes Défaites, Ma Vie" adopts the sort of intellectual and chauvinistic style so beloved of French sports writers, and in the process investigates rather more fully than most such literary ventures the mentality of the athlete concerned.

But only Harris, Loader, Price and Peter Ferguson have, to my way of thinking, plumbed the depths of experience of the ordinary club athlete with any real degree of success. Anyone who has ever undergone the Wordsworthian mystique of communing with nature, and with one's own physical and mental resources, on a 15-mile Sunday morning road run, will testify to the wealth of material which such a situation can provide as the basis for a close examination of an individual's make-up.

My 14 years of running have supplied me with sufficient ethereal experiences of this nature to bore to tears almost anyone who is prepared to listen to them. You can't spend a fair proportion of your recreational hours pounding through rain, wind and snow to the accompaniment of "Up, two, three, Up, two, three" from snotty-nosed brats without seeking some sort of justification for it all.

On the face of it, success in races, and the medals, prestige, selections, free running shoes and expenses-paid trips to far-flung corners of the globe are the tangible rewards for all those unremitting hours of training. But often, over the years, I have felt nothing more than pity for those who have achieved those glittering pinnacles but who seem to have lost, somewhere along the way, the primeval motivation and the simple pleasure which really makes running worthwhile.

It was Snell who once said, when asked why he ran, that there was nothing he could think of which was more enjoyable than running through the rain on a winter's evening when everyone else was indoors hiding away from the elements. That sort of bloody-minded individuality is much of what athletics is all about. Runners, particularly long distance runners, are non-conformists - they like to think of themselves as a silent minority, taking their pleasure in what to the great majority of people must seem like some form of masochism.

Neil Allen once described Gordon Pirie as the "Fakir of the Track", and rarely has such a flowery term been so aptly applied to an athlete! Louis Malle's marvellous series of films on India have shown recently on television how religious commitment can provide people in what is largely an alien environment with the fortitude to face up to the demands of life. Those groups of runners to be seen every Sunday morning on their 15-mile treadmill are indulging in their own form of devotion as much as the sober-suited citizens on their way to a formal convocation.

Somebody once remarked to me at the National cross-country one year that they found it sad to see runners who were formerly internationals still plodding along way down the field. But, to me, there are few sights more stimulating in the whole realm of athletics than George Knight finishing 250th or Mike Fleet 600th in the National.

The sort of philosophical approach to the sport which enables a man still to go on running and competing when the primary objective of always going faster has long since been passed is the most admirable of all. I think it was the incomparable Gaston Meyer who wrote: "Every runner is a man fighting a solitary battle with himself. The man who surpasses himself is a secret winner." I like that. Secret winners: athletics thrives on them and everyone who has ever put on a pair of running shoes with any degree of serious intent can claim that personal triumph. For statisticians, accustomed to evaluating the sport purely in terms of facts and figures, it is sometimes galling to have to admit that the raison d'être for the sport is something far more mystical than a mere permutation of minutes and seconds.

One of these days I must write a book about it. I'll send a free copy to Les Crouch, of course. Set up as a psychoanalyst in Beverley Hills, he would have made a fortune in fees out of the hours we spent baring our souls (and soles?) on the country lanes of Hertfordshire. Running Nowhere ... and the beauty of it is that you need never worry about arriving anywhere.

#### NUTS MEMBERS' PENTATHLON & DINNER

The pentathlon was a more action-packed competition than last year, though Dave Terry was 50 below his 1969 winning score. Dave Turner and David Dallman reversed their 1969 positions, though both showed some decline. The most outstanding performance was by Liz Sissons who placed 4th, despite scoring 0 in LJ, where she was handicapped by a persistent injury. Dave Cocksedge, who won the "AW" staff contest, also scored 0 (in DT) while Bob Sparks collected only 5 in the 1500m. Ian Steedman won the Veteran and Scottish titles - but then he had no opposition!

Result: 1, M D Terry	2045 (5.76 34.74 25.1 26.26 5:56.4)
2, D P Turner	1506 (4.01 28.22 27.7 19.86 4:40.4)
3, D P Dallman	1494 (4.62 26.14 28.1 22.26 5:11.0)
4, E Sissons +	1263 (3.47 25.80 27.8 25.36 5:21.0)
5, P J Matthews	1242 (4.73 28.96 27.8 17.46 6:01.0)
6, R Sparks	1237 (5.16 28.88 27.7 17.85 6:38.2)
7, I D Steedman	1185 (4.98 23.48 27.7 19.66 6:25.2)
8, C G Temple	1126 (4.09 19.86 27.7 14.16 4:51.4)
9, T M Pollak	1102 (5.01 15.95 27.5 17.30 5:51.0)
10, S Greenberg	1058 (4.32 33.14 30.5 22.82 bs )
11, D I Cocksedge	843 (4.56 19.50 29.8 12.65 5:35.4)
12, M F Watman	746 (4.60 16.86 29.8 14.68 6:02.8)

+ 600 gr javelin, 1 kg discus      bs barely started

The dinner was attended by a record total of 32. Guests of honour were Richard and Ursula Ashenheim; Richard is ATFS member for Jamaica and his wife, to the delight of the Secretary, is a monozygotic twin. Also gracing the proceedings were Barbara-Anne ("chirpy") Barrett and Caroline ("Bare-foot Contessa") Marsh. Certain photographs, it is hoped, will be published in the 20th birthday issue of NUTS Notes - sorry you've got to wait 8 years!

## COMMONWEALTH AFTERMATH by Ian Steedman

- 1) During the BCG in Edinburgh it was our pleasure (on behalf of the two other Scots NUTS members, Dave Keddie and Colin Shields, as well as myself) for us to meet the various "nuts" who were at Meadowbank during the Games either as officials or spectators. We in Scotland all feel with pride that the organisation was a "job well done", but we must not take all the praise; the help from England was most valuable in many ways.
- 2) As for my own thankless and onerous task of programme editor, I am most grateful to Stan Greenberg, Bob Sparks and Peter Matthews for keeping me posted on the details of records appearing in each day's issue, also on certain name spellings. David Dallman - at very short notice - supplied me with the complete initial records list direct from the computer for use on the programme "mock-up" in mid-June and Bob Sparks kept me informed of the latest amendments.
- 3) With Peter Matthews in charge of a highly successful announcing team at Meadowbank, with Bob Sparks keeping the Press happy with the "hot news" as and when it happened, with Dave Keddie and SATS stalwart Duncan McKechnie recording field events performances - the main control room (the Meadowbank "nerve centre") certainly owes much of its success to the statisticians on duty.
- 4) Although not a BCG Technical Official, Stan Greenberg nevertheless put in long hours of work on the BBC's behalf and lost pounds (kilos - Ed) of weight in the process - as did "yours truly", whose main meal of the day was often eaten as late as 2300h.
- 5) Another "nut" to make his contribution to the success of the Edinburgh meeting was Harold Abrahams, our esteemed President, who was a member of the "Photosprint" Omega team suspended high above the stand spectators in a gondola. From here the "flash results" and detailed track results were transmitted by CCTV to the main control room; and one had to marvel at the agility of Harold (at 70 years of age!) as he clambered up and down the rickety ladder to and from the gondola between events to supervise the reading of the result and its transmission to the outside world. As a member of this team, I enjoyed a superb view of the track events, and my biggest thrill was Lachie Stewart's 10,000m victory on the first Saturday. The 1-2 by Scotland's two Ians on the final day was also an epic achievement; but, having known Lachie and seen him run in Scotland for many seasons, summer and winter, in fair weather and foul, at club, district and national level; I think his win, coming as it did at the start of the Games, was a real victory for Scottish athletics by a true "home Scot"!
- 6) While on the subject of the 10,000m, the one blemish on the organisation was the inability of the track officials/timekeepers to produce a correct result beyond the 8th place; and here, again, I am grateful to NUTS members Peter and Bob for unravelling the data recorded by the Omega team and the photos very kindly supplied to me by the Swiss firm, and so quickly producing what must surely be the only correct result of that race. (This result appeared in the 1 August issue of "Athletics Weekly".)
- 7) On behalf of SATS, I would like to thank those NUTS members and friends present in Edinburgh who did support our Statisticians' Dinner-Dance on 24 July: unfortunately, however, the function has been run at a substantial loss owing to the non-appearance of several bodies who were given tickets but did not return them in time to give us an accurate number.
- 8) Finally, SATS have only a few sets of Commonwealth Games programmes left for sale (£1 the set - Opening Ceremony, all the athletics sessions, and the Closing Ceremony) and these can be obtained by sending a remittance to me at 2 James Street, EDINBURGH EH15 2DS.

### NUTS RECORDS

Marathon 2:23:29 Dai Davies

(17) 23 Jul 70 Edinburgh BCG  
(1st Ron Hill 2:09:28)

200mH 29.7 Maeve Kyle

(5) 13 Jun 70 Edinburgh (M) BG  
(1st Teresa Sukniewicz  
(Pol) 27.0, wind -3.4m/s)

INTERVIEW WITH LIZ SISSONS - No 10 in a Series

AH: Your interest in athletics started in 1955: how did you become interested and what meetings do you particularly remember competing in and spectating at over the past 15 years?

ES: Having two sisters who took part in athletics [See NUTS Notes Vol 7, No 4 p 3], it was almost inevitable that I should follow them as I had done reasonably well in junior school meetings. Not having achieved a particularly high standard in my events, the meetings in which I have competed are mainly club, county and championship level, as well as inter-counties meetings, so there are no really outstanding memories. As a competitor there is very little time available to go and watch other events but I do remember seeing the Russians at the White City and among US athletes I particularly recall John Pennel.

AH: You concentrated mainly on the shot, ranking third nationally in the 1961 intermediate list; from 1962 to 1967 you ranked among the top 50 in this event (and also in pentathlon). Was your decision to turn more seriously to 400m and 800m in 1968 because your SP progress seemed slow, because of injury, because you realised you had potential at the events, or why?

ES: My main interest when I started in athletics was sprinting, but as time went by I was getting left further and further behind, until I was asked to pick up a shot and compete for the club. It went reasonably well and I decided that this could be my event. Progress was very slow and being in the County of Surrey, with so much potential in shot putters, it was difficult getting in the county team. In 1967 I was asked to compete for the county in the 440y at Crystal Palace, not because I really deserved it but because Surrey were hard up at the time. I recorded my personal best (1:01.3) and decided that with a bit of training for the event perhaps I could achieve a better standard. From 1968 my 400m and 800m times improved, and I now prefer running the longer distance.

AH: Your statistical interest has developed by way of compiling your own club (Epsom & Ewell H) lists, Surrey county and now UK national lists. When did you actually start taking a special interest in the statistical side? Are there any ideas you would like the NUTS to adopt or any changes in the NUTS organisation you would like to see?

ES: I started taking an interest in the statistical side of athletics when my own club ranking lists were formed. I decided that the method adopted by the club of two people sitting down one Sunday and going through all the matches of the season was not very satisfactory, and I thought that a better method would be to keep a note of performances throughout the year. I offered my services in 1964 and have been responsible for them ever since. Three years ago I was asked to compile Surrey County lists and from then on you know the rest. I am still very new at the NUTS game so don't feel that I am yet competent enough at my own job to criticise the workings of the organisation.

AH: Do you eventually hope to qualify as a Grade I AAA timekeeper (you are at present Grade III) and perhaps become Chief timekeeper at major championships and international meetings? Have you any observations on timekeeping generally?

ES: The answer to the first part is Yes, but I don't know whether I would like to be a Chief Timekeeper. I don't think the men would like it anyway. I don't get much chance to officiate at meetings because I am still competing, but I always enjoy those to which I have been asked. Most male timekeepers can accept a female operating a watch nowadays, although I have noticed, like most things, it is a closed shop when it comes to the big meetings. How can a woman be expected to pass her tests if she is not asked to enough men's meetings?

AH: Is there any question I haven't asked which you would like to have been put, and what answer would you have given?

ES: None. I'm not used to being interviewed anyway!



Elizabeth Sissons b. Chessington (Surrey) 11 July 1944; Government employee; 1.60m, 60.5 kg; Chessington CSGS; Needlework. Annual progress:

	400m	800m	1,500m	SP	Pen
1960				9.49	
1961				10.41	
1962			5:46.8+	10.67	
1963				10.59	3294
1964				10.74	3169
1965	1:07.0+	2:34.1+		11.08	3443
1966	1:05.5+	2:55.3+		10.96	3479
1967	1:01.0+	2:30.5+		11.36	3518
1968	59.6+	2:20.9+		10.76	3456
1969	58.2	2:20.1	5:08.4	10.59	
1970	59.8	2:17.6	5:06.3	10.54	

Best marks at other events: 100m - 13.1; 200m - 26.7+; 80mH - 12.7; 100mH - 19.6; 200mH - 32.2; HJ - 1.50; LJ - 4.95; DT - 30.92; JT - 32.92; 1MW - 10:56.0.

#### NUTS RECORD

1,500m 5:06.3 Liz Sissons (5) 26 Sep 70 Crystal Palace  
Arbiter trophy (1st  
Jean Lockheed 4:42.2)

#### TOP UK BROTHERS & SISTERS

Ian (13:22.8 - 5,000m) & Peter (8:26.8 - 2M) Stewart = 2022  
Dick (13:26.2 - 5,000m) & Juan (28:19.8 - 6M) Taylor = 1961  
Rita (4:15.4 - 1,500m) & Iris (2:05.8 - 800m) Lincoln = 1880  
Alix (6.27 - LJ) & Jean (6.07 - LJ) Jamieson = 1804  
Lorna (10.8 - 100y) & Noleen (24.6 - 200m) McGarvey = 1714  
Janet (1.70 - HJ) & Susan (5.65 - LJ) Oldall = 1673  
Robert (28:40.2 - 10,000m) & David (27:43.6 - 6M) Holt = 1956  
Ian (13:22.8 - 5,000m) & Mary (4:38.0 - 1,500m) Stewart = 1842  
Brian (14.79 - TJ) & Ann (1.61 - HJ) Hull = 1645  
Ian (13:22.8 - 5,000m), Peter (8:26.8 - 2M) & Mary (4:38.0 - 1,500m) Stewart = 2841

#### RESEARCH IN PROGRESS AND PROJECTED

Alan Lindop + Dave Cocksedge: Progressive UK junior and youth best marks  
David Dallman: World all-time best performances on relay legs (men & women)  
Roger Gynn: Field event series; Marathon year lists from 1896 (world & UK)  
Andrew Huxtable: Best brothers & sisters (world & UK); Best twins (world & UK); Best parents/offspring (world & UK)  
Peter Martin: WAAA junior & intermediate championship results before 1957; All-time bests and dates of birth (juniors & intermediates); Junior age groups (events, weights of impedimenta, etc) in countries other than UK  
Peter Matthews: Best 10 marks averages by individuals (world & UK); Best marks in individual events by decathletes and pentathletes (world & UK)  
Keith Morbey: UK Top 10 year lists (1919-49); World, European and Commonwealth relay lists (men & women); UK relay lists (all age groups, men & women); Championship results and record progression in relays  
Pete Pozzoli: UK all-time best performers, age records and county records by birth (women)  
Bob Sparks: Growth curve analysis  
Dave Terry + Peter Lovesey: UK Top 10 year lists (1866-1918)  
Chris Thorne: World best performers by age (men & women under 20); World all-time indoor best performers (men & women); World all-time best performers at non-standard events (men)  
Please send details to the Editor if you wish to be included in this section; as also should results of research for publication in NUTS Notes.



# ANALYSIS OF BEST U.K. 100 YARDS/METRES PERFORMANCES

by PETER MATTHEWS

Marks up to 30 September 1970

Name	No. of legal times at or better than the following Criteria:	Average best 10 Times	
	9.5/10.3 10.4/9.6 10.5/9.8	Legal marks only	Including windy times
		9.7	
Peter Radford	II 39	75 9.4	10.28 1
Menzies Campbell	5 19	18 10.2	10.38 4=
Ron Jones	5 20	48 10.3	10.36 2
Barrie Kelly	4 13	34 10.3	10.37 3
David Jones	3 18	38 10.3	10.38 4=
Berwyn Jones	1 14	20 10.3	10.46 7=
Martin Reynolds	2 13	3 10.3	10.54 11
Roy Sandstrom	1 18	1 10.3	10.58 15=
Lynn Davies	2 15	5 9.5	10.44 6
David Segal	1 18	5 9.5	10.47 8
Alf Meakin	1 18	3 9.5	10.49 10
Ian Green	1 18	4 10.4	10.43 9
Patrick Morrison	1 18	2 19.6	10.56 12
John Kilpatrick	1 18	2 10.4	10.53 19=
Don Halliday	1 18	1 10.4	10.58 13=
Michael Hildrey	1 18	1 9.6	10.60 17=
Malcolm Yardley	1 18	1 9.6	10.60 17=
Arthur Sweeney	1 18	1 10.4	10.60 17=
Alistair McCorquadale	1 18	1 10.4	10.60 17=
Brian Green	1 18	1 10.4	10.63 15=
David Dear	1 18	1 10.4	10.65 21=
Len Carter	1 18	1 9.6	10.62 21=
Brían Anson	1 18	1 9.6	10.63 21=
Alistair McIlroy	1 18	1 10.5	10.59 15=
Bob Frith	1 18	1 10.5	10.58 15=
Nick Whitehead	1 18	1 10.5	10.60 18=
Dick Steane	1 18	1 10.5	10.61 20=
Ron Nicholson	1 18	1 10.5	10.61 20=
Gerry Carson	1 18	1 10.5	10.64 20=
Ralph Banthorpe	1 18	1 10.5	10.64 20=
Edwin Pavitt	1 18	1 9.7	10.58 22=
Melvin Cheskin	1 18	1 9.7	10.58 22=
Cyril Holmes	1 18	1 10.5	10.63 22=
David Young	1 18	1 10.5	10.63 22=
Leslie Piggott	1 18	1 9.7	10.61 20=
Robbie Brightwell	1 18	1 9.7	10.65 20=
John Williams	1 18	1 10.5	10.67 21=
Joseph Speake	1 18	1 9.7	10.64 21=
Stuart Bell	1 18	1 10.5	10.64 21=
John Knowles	1 18	1 9.7	10.65 21=
George Cmela	1 18	1 9.7	10.65 21=

I Mark at 10.5: Walter Rangeley, John Wilkinson, Adrian Breacker, George Gooden, Roger Walters (10.58 in windy), Peter Pape  
 I Mark at 9.7: Eric Liddle, Terry Davies (10.65-10.65), Brian Shenton, John Harrison (10.58w), Chris Cheetham (10.62w)

Note I have converted 100 Yards times to Metric as follows:  
 9.4 = 10.21; 9.5 = 10.32; 9.6 = 10.43; 9.7 = 10.55; 9.8 = 10.66.

# 200 METRES

Marks up to 30 September 1970

Name	No. of legal times at or better than the following criteria:					Average best 10 Times			
	20.7	20.9	21.1	21.3	Best	Legal marks only		Including windy marks	
Peter Radford	I	6	21	35	20.4	20.88	I	20.87	3
Dick Steane	I	4	13	21	20.6	20.94	4	20.92	4
Martin Reynolds	I	5	11	12	20.7	20.92	3	20.83	1
Menzies Campbell	2	7	15	33	20.7	20.89	2	20.86	2
Ralph Banthorpe	I	4	5	14	20.7	21.05	6	20.98	6
Howard Davies	I	1	1	3	20.8	21.38	17	21.22	10
David Jones		2	19	54	20.9	20.99	5	20.94	5
Robbie Brightwell		2	5	12	20.9	21.13	3	21.05	7
David Segal				26	21.0	21.07	7	21.07	8
Malcolm Yardley				5	21.0	21.37	16	21.27	14
Martin Winbolt Lewis			2	3	21.0	21.47	21	21.44	20=
Barrie Kelly			1	2	21.0	21.49	22	21.48	25=
Mike Hildrey			2	7	21.1	21.28	10	21.28	15
Patrick Morrison			3	6	21.1	21.29	11	21.26	12=
Brian Smouha			1	4	21.1	21.34	14	21.34	17
Cyril Holmes			1	2	21.1				
Willie Applegarth			1	2	21.1				
Lynn Davies			1	1	21.1				
Arthur Sweeney			1	1	21.1				
David Jenkins			1	1	21.1				
Adrian Metcalfe				12	21.2	21.26	9	21.13	9
Mike Hauck				9	21.2	21.29	11	21.26	12=
Melvin Cheskin				5	21.2	21.34	14	21.33	16
Joseph Speake				4	21.2	21.44	19	21.35	18
Brian Shenton				2	21.2	21.41	18	21.41	19
George Ellis				2	21.2				
Brian Anson				2	21.2				
Roger Walters				2	21.2				
James Barry				1	21.2	21.52	24	21.47	23=
Ian Green				1	21.2				
Ricky Taylor				1	21.2				
David Dear				7	21.3	21.33	13	21.25	11
Ron Jones				1	21.3	21.44	19	21.44	20=
Mike Ruddy				1	21.3	21.50	23	21.50	28
John Williams				1	21.3			21.47	23=

I Mark at 21.3:

Stan Englehart, Walter Rangeley, John Wilkinson, John Young, John Adey, Ron Nicholson, Alf Meakin, Keri Jones, Tony Tyms, John Hemery, Stuart Bell, Gwynne Griffiths,

Nigel Rice	21.4	21.59	21.45	22
John Harrison	21.4	21.56	21.48	25=
David Edwards	21.4	21.54	21.49	27

Note; 0.2 secs added to 1/2 turn marks:

## 220 Yards Straight

David Segal	20.6(2)	20.8(3)	21.2(2)	
David Jones	20.8	20.9	21.2	Pat Morrison 21.0
Peter Radford	21.1	Dick Steane	21.2	Cyril Holmes 21.2



THINKPIECE by Keith Morbey and Len Gebbett

Surely the task of statisticians is to compare like with like - in this case to compare performances made under conditions acceptable for record purposes. British sprint, hurdle and horizontal jump lists are now, however, compiled in such a form that they are not immediately comparable with lists compiled in other countries or with the ATFS publications. Anyone trying to make a comparison between British athletes and foreign athletes or even between British lists of different eras will be faced with tediously reconstructing one or more of the lists if the current method of compilation continues. This is in itself a major defect.

However, tiresome as this is, it would be acceptable if the perpetrators of this system had a valid case and it was a question of British statisticians showing the way to the world. The NUTS though has not requested the ATFS (as far as we know) to adopt this system nor have any of the perpetrators stated that they have tried to win foreign "nuts" over to their way of thinking. What irony that we should go out on a limb in this way just as metrication is becoming accepted. It seems as if Britain must always stand apart from everybody else!

Let us categorise our objections to including wind-assisted marks in the main lists under three headings:

i) It tries to solve an alleged injustice by replacing it with another injustice

ii) The underlying implications have not been adequately considered

iii) The decision was hasty

These are discussed in detail below.

One argument advanced by the protagonists of the system is that athletes who miss the top 20 because they only have windy marks are ignored by selectors. Anybody can misinterpret statistics and as we have members assisting the main selection bodies this should prove no problem. If other selectors make foolish choices a quiet word in their ear and an offer of our services is surely the best approach. If our services are refused our responsibility surely ends there. Let us consider a hypothetical case. If two athletes topping the 100m list with 10.4 were picked for the GB & NI team to the exclusion of an athlete who had run a string of 10.2w for example, this athlete being perfectly capable of 10.4 or even 10.3 without wind assistance, then an injustice might have been done to this athlete. However, what if his 10.2w was an isolated run, his regular clocking being 10.6 and he was picked on the strength of topping the list? Would not one of the 10.4 men have occasion to feel upset. We rather suspect that this selection theory is a nebulous red herring.

Until recently compilations listed the best wind-assisted marks separately. This information was not suppressed and could be conveniently referred to without causing any confusion. Sprint and high hurdle times should always be treated with considerable caution because of doubtful starts and timing as well as wind assistance. However, the existence of other sources of error and doubt should not cause us to take too tolerant a view of known wind-assisted marks.

One of the co-authors of this article well remembers the vigour with which he was attacked when he suggested that the 14.0 by Bob Birrell in 1961 (no wind gauge present) might not have been wind-assisted. Some of those who now favour "mixed" lists were then equally emphatic on the assistance given by the wind, although in the high hurdles and horizontal jumps a following wind can be a mixed blessing. What they were saying was that there may not be much difference between 1.9 and 2.1 m/s but there is a lot of difference between, say, 0.6 and 3.5 m/s. If this is so, then why are they now suggesting that "w" denotes that the athlete was just a little unlucky. We may be deluding ourselves and officials too for that matter that our sprinters, hurdlers and jumpers are just a little better than they actually are.

The other main argument concerns the 2 m/s limit itself. It is asserted that it is a purely arbitrary limit; that it is difficult to estimate without a gauge; that it is difficult to measure accurately with a gauge. The first question we must ask ourselves is whether a limit serves any useful purpose. The authorities in the past decided to have a limit to invalidate records assisted by a "strong" wind and the 2 m/s limit was eventually chosen. By saying the limit is "purely arbitrary" the protagonists of "mixed" lists are implying that this is a bad thing. They cannot therefore in logic advance the substitution of another limit - say, 1 m/s or 3 m/s - as these would be equally arbitrary limits. Therefore, their thinking would seem to indicate that they favour the abolition of a permitted maximum level of wind assistance for statistical and record purposes. Is this what they really want? If this is so, let them come into the open and say so. We can then discuss whether this is desirable or not.

Why stop at wind speeds though? Agreed it is impossible to accurately establish the degree of assistance afforded by the wind but what about gradients? Surely the restriction here is equally arbitrary? Are we therefore to follow the modern trend and sweep aside all arbitrary restrictions? If so, would we be prepared to accept a 9.7w 100m on a downhill track as a world record? If not, we must accept a subjective opinion (by the Track Referee?) as grounds for acceptance or non-acceptance of the validity of a performance. As crowds like to see records the resulting free-for-all might draw back the missing crowds; it would certainly make the statistician's life easier if he only had to consider time and distance.

We agree that it is difficult to estimate the wind speed in the absence of a gauge but surely we only exclude a mark if we know it is aided by a gale. In other words, the athlete is given the benefit of the doubt. If wind gauges are indeed liable to error we must press for the development of more suitable equipment - all athletics impedimenta has improved over the years.

Various statements have been expressed in EC meetings and elsewhere which show that several different formats have been proposed for listing events which could be influenced by the wind. Here are some of them:

1. The traditional method of listing
2. The method used currently
3. Include wind speeds where known
4. Annotate performances where no wind reading was taken
5. Annotate performances adversely affected by the wind

This shows that several methods of listing are favoured and although the EC has the power to decide, such a radical change should not have been instituted without giving all members the opportunity to express their viewpoint.

Editor's note: Bob Sparks will put forward his views (and those of most other members of the EC) in the next issue.

+++++  
Miscellany continued

9 From "\$5,000,000 Worth of Schmalz" by John Daniel in New Statesman (2 October issue): "A few weeks ago, on Labour Day as irony would have it, Jerry Lewis went on 65 coast-to-coast TV networks in a 20-hour telethon that lasted from 10.30 pm on Sunday to 6.30 pm the following Monday. A telethon is a programme in which viewers phone in their gifts. Jerry Lewis was out to raise money for research into muscular dystrophy, and he did - \$5m, against last year's East Coast total of \$2m. It was the largest and longest TV appeal ever made.

..."We ain't heard from the Irving Trust, NBC, CBS, Caesar's Palace in Las Vegas, Tiffany's - I give them enough to stay open - the Los Angeles Times. Otis Chandler runs that. If I don't hear from them I'm goin' to tell you a few stories about Otis."

Well, does anyone know any stories about the 17.48 shot putter?

End