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ABSTRACT

This dissertation is in three parts: the story of the American sporting tradition linked to its British roots; the commitment to surpass Britannia and reign supreme in naval might at a time in history when sea power was indicative of world political power; and the marriage of philosophy and history in the ethereal fabric of a performance barrier ruptured by “breakthrough kinesis.” The question this paper addresses is this: Did Glendon and his 1920 Navy Crew influence rowing and aid nationalism in the Golden Age of sport, and has this crew had long reaching effects on the modern world? If so, then rowing and the events surrounding it largely have been overlooked by modern sport historians as a powerful catalyst in the building of the American team, and go largely unrecognized as an intriguing contributor to performance, movement science, biomechanics, and Olympic history.

Until this paper there has been no comprehensive account written on the American team of Richard “Dick” Glendon and the Navy crew, who forged the thrilling story of their quest for Olympic gold with American nationalism in the first two decades of the war-torn twentieth century. The importance of this crew in the 1920s, and their decisive break with the British sporting tradition that goes back hundreds of years in America, was indicative of an emerging Americanism that pervaded sport, and used sport, as a vehicle to propel and fuel an emerging world power.
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INTRODUCTION

No doctoral dissertation in American sport history would be complete without a statement of the problem, the relevance of this problem to the present world, and a concise thumbnail sketch of the historical events surrounding the issue. To incorporate those concerns, this dissertation comprises three parts: the story of the American sporting tradition linked to its British roots; the commitment to surpass Britannia and reign supreme in naval might at a time in history when sea power was indicative of world political power; and the marriage of philosophy and history in the ethereal fabric of a performance barrier ruptured by “breakthrough kinesis.” The question this paper addresses is: Did Glendon and his 1920 Navy Crew influence rowing and aid nationalism in the Golden Age of sport, and does this crew have long reaching effects on the modern world? If so, then rowing and the events surrounding it in the main have been overlooked by modern sport historians as a powerful catalyst in the building of the American team, and go largely unrecognized as an intriguing contributor to performance, movement science, biomechanics, and Olympic history.

It is the intent of this dissertation to examine and explore the role played by the U.S. Naval Academy crew in severing sporting ties with the British sporting tradition of rowing, through American nationalism, and to fill in what is perceived as a gap in the literature of American sport. For while much is written about British rowing, particularly at Oxford, and much attention has been draw to the Harvard-Yale race by Thomas Mendenhall, the early scullers and the issue of amateurism particularly as they pertained to American Olympic sculler Jack Kelly, Cornell’s coach Courtney, there is
comparatively little written on American rowing in the 1900s until the recent resurgence of popular books such as *The Shell Game, Red Rose Crew, and Mind Over Water*. The reason for this inattention is most likely that football overshadowed rowing as the great collegiate sport across the country, while rowing became a more regional “upper crust” sport associated with the Ivy League and private schools. Until this paper, there has been no comprehensive account written on the American team of Richard “Dick” Glendon and the Navy crew, who forged the thrilling story of their quest for Olympic gold with American nationalism in the first two decades of the war-torn twentieth century. The importance of this crew, and its decisive break in the 1920s with the British sporting tradition that goes back hundreds of years in America, was indicative of an emerging Americanism that pervaded sport, and used sport as a vehicle to propel and fuel an emerging power.

The event of the 1920 Olympic Games was the springboard on which Glendon coupled the hopes of Navy crews before him, dating to the times of Winston Churchill in 1880, through 40 years of U.S. Olympic crews after him, and lasting until 1960. Glendon was the master craftsman behind his crew that elevated the rowing stroke to a scientific method. Specific, and central to Glendon’s empirical understanding of stroke mechanics, was his identification and quantification of the prime arc for work. He applied his concept by designing boats, with oars and rigging that applied the power of the rower to the oar at an optimum arc for horizontal propulsion through the water and down the course in a straight, fast line—American Scientific Oarsmanship.

Glendon’s notes and drawings from over 100 years ago describe the mechanics of modern rowing technique, along with rudiments of boat, rigging, and oar design.
Without the aid of computers, pressure gauges, or force plates, Richard A. Glendon intuited and initiated stroke mechanics and rigging concepts that are the fundamentals of those in use today. He advanced the sport of rowing into the modern age of science over brawn, and in doing so, advanced a nation.
CHAPTER ONE
THE BIG PICTURE

While it would be improbable to claim that a single rowing coach created a style of rowing simply to influence nationalism, it would be feasible to say, based on historical evidence, that the performance of one crew, or one event, affected nations. When the U.S. Naval Academy’s eight-oared shell won the Olympic gold medal at Antwerp, Belgium in 1920—defeating Great Britain’s favored Leander Boat Club—rowing on two continents changed forever. Social prejudices were sliced through; class lines faltered, and the British were left to retreat—flattened back to the fluid surface like the tracings of blade puddles disappearing on still water.

One nation’s pride swelled while the other nation grieved. At 5:00 P.M. on 29 August 1920, in 6 minutes and 2 seconds (6:02), the U.S. Naval Academy crew racing in a unique style, exemplified “breakthrough kinesis,” a startling new vision of human performance. Coached by Richard “Dick” Glendon, the 1920 Olympic victory of the Naval Academy seized the spirit of a sport traditionally attributed to the British and stole it from the Empire by introducing a style of rowing uniquely American and uniquely Glendon—an “American Scientific Oarismanship.”
Glendon’s innovative style slashed race times and turned the heads of coaches all over the world. It is a prime example of breakthrough kinesis, defined as the moment when a performance barrier, sometimes of mythic proportions, is finally overcome. Breakthrough kinesis is a form of hope, a new vision of human possibility—that emboldens and enables other athletes to move through what were seemingly locked gates. Breakthrough kinesis is akin to what philosopher Michael Novak describes as the power of athletic achievement in revealing moments of perfect form. Historian C.L.R. James, in *Beyond a Boundary*, muses about this phenomenon but does not define his intuition concretely when he states that Roger Bannister broke a mental barrier by running a mile in four minutes; once broken, once the collective unconscious manifested itself through the conscious act, such as surpassing the four-minute mark, the barrier was broken and the mark became easier and easier to surpass. It is as if humankind had risen up and advanced through, in Jungian terms, a collective unconscious of sport.

Breakthrough kinesis differs from setting or surpassing a sport record as described and defined by noted historians Allen Guttmann and Richard Mandell. Though records can be broken when a breakthrough kinesis occurs, and factors such as better diet, invention, or superior coaching may contribute, the breakthrough is not limited to these, but encompasses realms of myth and consciousness. For the 1920 Navy crew, the elements surrounding their stroke-change were so unique that Norwegian and other European Olympic coaches sneaking a look at what was intended to be a private American practice in 1920 “emerged from the bushes along the course and proceeded to follow the crew.” Glendon recalled that exclamations of wonderment rose from the spectators. A veritable “League of Nations” followed the U.S. crew, and every time the
crew left the boat shed “awestruck silence prevailed.” The U.S. stroke style was so advanced in its system of innovations that it altered the understanding, the performance, the dynamics and forces of rowing forever.

The U.S. Naval Academy’s 1920 gold medal signaled the triumph of an American-born strategy launched in 1890 when a Naval cadet, Winston Churchill (American novelist—not to be confused with the British Prime Minister Winston Spencer Churchill of the same era) revived rowing at the U.S. Naval Academy after a twenty-two year hiatus from 1870 to 1892. Considered one of his greatest accomplishments as a midshipman—re-establishing crew through his first published literary work—Churchill made what he called “a glorious appeal to those interested in the Navy” in a letter to the editor for the crew. Coaching and rowing as a member of the crew of 1893, Churchill challenged the United States to wrest international rowing supremacy—and by implication sea power—from the British.

At this same time, Naval Captain Alfred Thayer Mahan’s monumental text on The Influence of Sea Power on History challenged and compared the American “national character” to the British, asking whether the U.S. was “fitted” to develop as a great sea power. Mahan set a keynote of idealism and inspiration for the U.S. Navy to stand unequaled second to none on the seas; to seize its own identity and supremacy. Captain Churchill, rowing in an American institution founded to seek naval supremacy yet currently following second to Britannia and its traditions, accepted Mahan’s challenge to set the U.S. above the British—and hence above the rest of the world—in “oaring.” Failure to meet that challenge, Churchill fretted, would be a “disgrace, for there is every evidence that if the cadets continue to be enthusiastic in the sport, before many years
have passed, the Naval Academy will be able to rightfully claim a place in the front rank of the rowing institutions of the world."\textsuperscript{17} The cadets’ enthusiasm reflected typical nineteenth-century American accounts of rowing’s energy, symbolizing national characteristics of American youth. The U.S. was heralded by American rowing enthusiasts as the most favored country in the world for crew due to its large fresh water lakes and rivers, and its boundaries washed on both sides by oceans.\textsuperscript{18} This favorable geography coupled with climate and the zeal Americans had for British sports advanced rowing in this time.

Born near these oceans, in Harwich, Massachusetts, the son of a fisherman, Richard Glendon combined his American born and bred coaching techniques with rowing in an American-built boat and oars.\textsuperscript{19} Coach Glendon’s life-long passion for rowing process and his unique combination of American rowing factors culminated in the 1920 gold medal. That victory, Glendon contended, “realized the fulfillment of the dreams of ‘The Old Captains of the Navy Boat Crews.’”\textsuperscript{20} Glendon began coaching at the Academy in 1904.\textsuperscript{21} At Navy he pioneered an American style, which through “breakthrough kinesis,” catapulted an American standard of rowing to the top of the Olympic medal platform, where U.S. crews would remain for the next forty years.
Glendon’s breakthrough was the culmination at the beginning of the twentieth century of the struggle between the heritage of British influence on the sport and the emergent American styles of stroke. The British style typically used a lightweight shell that spaced rowers sitting offset from the keel. They pulled a strong catch and swing-through with the arms, had a stylized drive utilizing mainly the legs, and a quick recovery. This allowed the English crews to row at a high stroke rate. The problem with this stroke is that it accentuates the catches, which is the slowest part of the stroke, and can rush the slide or recovery of the stroke (when the oar is out of the water). Rushing the slide, by having the rowers’ bodies hurry sternward to the next catch puts counter forces against the forward run of the hull. Not only does this risk stressing athletes by making them row at a sustained high stroke rate (top English crews in the 1920s typically
rowed a high forty to forty-two stroke per minute cycle), but the quick recovery, and the successive upper body and then lower body application of power is detrimental to the forward speed of the boat. In contrast, Glendon’s boats typically stroked a lower rate, had a slower recovery, with a smoother, full-bodied application of power thereby creating less loss of boat speed with fewer strokes to exhaust the men.22

Glendon’s new American style emphasized several changes in technique. A 1920 *Literary Digest* article dedicated to his innovations heralded it as “a brand-new stroke,” one that was “at variance with the fundamental principles of the orthodox stroke.” The American press labeled Navy as a “wonder crew” and lauded Glendon for his ingenious insight and his steadfast resolve to “throw all other theories to the wind.”23 He stressed that it was the forces working against the pull in the recovery that prevented the hull from continuing on its winning path. His brilliant innovation came from an understanding that the pull must be coupled with a calculated recovery incorporating a fast finish turn and first half of the slide, getting the hands out of the bow early, then slowing through the last half of a steady slide. It allowed the rowers’ weight to ride over the surface of the water with the least amount of disturbance at the finish, where the boat speed is fastest. A scientific observer of stroke mechanics, Glendon also shortened the stroke, capitalizing on the forces that send straightforward propulsion to the shell. Glendon’s new stroke technique represented a key factor in Navy’s 1920 Olympic victory. The Navy eight, with blazing speed finished a breathtaking 7.04 seconds faster than any previous crews had ever rowed 2,000 meters.24

This unique technique revolutionized rowing.25 Glendon’s breakthrough parallels Dick Fosbury’s breakthrough when Fosbury altered modern day high jumping forever
with the now famous “Fosbury Flop” in the 1968 Olympics. So too, Glendon’s innovation in movement (kinesis) radically advanced the sport of rowing to unprecedented new heights. The change was recognizable, and was seen by the global rowing community as a better way of doing things. As noted philosopher George Santayana wrote, “only the supreme is interesting: the rest has value only as leading to it or reflecting it.” Glendon’s innovation proved Santayana’s hypothesis—at least in international rowing.

To appreciate the significance of this breakthrough, one has to understand the historical intersections of crew, naval power, and nationalism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The 1920 Naval Academy crew, by developing a distinctly American rowing style that led to winning the Olympic gold through “breakthrough kinesis,” wove another strand into what sport historian Mark Dyreson cites as the grand scheme of America to use sport as a technology, as a tool in the army of athletic invasion. After the Olympic regatta, English rowing experts conceded that they would have to adopt American ideas. Glendon’s achievements would forever distinguish him as the “venerable” Dick Glendon. The synchronicity of these events, along with President Woodrow Wilson’s plans for an American-led new world order in the wake of the Great War, set the stage for this important event in sport history; and the U.S. Navy’s desire to surpass Britain set the stage for this important event. In their search for identity through science and technological advancement, the U.S. found its heart’s darlings in the 1920 Navy crew.

Cheered on by Mahan’s decree to win the “race of life,” on the high seas, the Midshipmen pulled the race of their lives for themselves and for their country in
Antwerp. With the 1920 win, the United States, (admittedly running second according to military historians at this time to the British in naval might,) “walked through” Britannia and grasped the lead, if fleetingly, on the medals stand. What greater ambassadors could the nation find than Olympic gold medallists who were dedicated to a “Sailor’s Creed” of honor, commitment, and service? This nationalistic contest is crucial to the understanding of Naval cadet rowers. It is what makes them unique in American college rowing circles. Their concentration of effort to beat the British in 1920 stemmed from a military heritage dedicated to achieving naval supremacy. Stoked by the fires of intercollegiate rivalry in the U.S., the 1920 crew was primed to lead the world in rowing.

The blueprint for this saga of the Navy crew’s demonstration of American identity and pride are outlined in the 1923 book, Rowing, written by Navy’s coach, Richard A. Glendon with his assistant and son Richard J. Glendon. The text reveals Navy’s fervent desire to defeat the British and to lead the world in the time-honored military practice of oarsmanship. The Glendons’ opus invites one to step onto a dock, and emerge in Poughkeepsie, New York, at the beginning of the twentieth century to view the Rockefellers leaning from their fresh water yacht floating among thousands of cheering fans hanging from the railings of anchored steam ships in the Hudson River to watch the crews of the University of Pennsylvania, Cornell, Syracuse, and the Naval Academy streak by. Through the mists of a bygone era, the reader glimpses Richard A. Glendon’s intention to write “a modern book” of American rowing history and science to update previous writings. Setting forth a handbook of what went before—that is to say British orthodoxy in rowing—father and son also chronicled the unprecedented American
accomplishments of the 1920 Naval Academy crew, a group of midshipmen known thereafter as the Navy Admirals.\textsuperscript{38}
CHAPTER TWO

THE NAVY’S ROWING ROOTS

To understand the mindset of the 1920 Navy Admirals, one must grasp the tradition of the Navy’s love affair with crew. The Academy’s rowing tradition sprang from its roots in warfare and the needed protection of the United States’ freedom of the seas for trade and travel. American naval historians discussed mastery of rowing as one of the keys to sea power. In their publications they argued that rowing began as a functional effort to propel Greek triremes and Roman galleys; elaborate naval-oared fleets are depicted in frescoes of the Battle of Lepanta and at Pompeii.\(^{39}\) Oared ships had complex naval strategies, as did steam powered ships, because they were easily aligned and not dependent on wind as with sail power.\(^{40}\) Naval scholars concur that rowing was a central aspect of Greek, Roman, Viking, Italian, Spanish, French, English, and American navies ensuring freedom for commerce across the oceans that was fundamental for national supremacy.\(^{41}\) Closer to home the need for the “common” American youth, the “doughboy,” to excel physically included exercises emulating the rowing stroke; and crew boat races were placed in physical education and military training manuals that are still used today. In the handbook of each Naval cadet’s training since 1902, was the fundamental idea that the United States “was born of the sea and the people who made
this nation came over the sea." Rowing found practical uses for saving lives in the first coast guards and as the first lifeboats. British fleets at anchor launched flotillas of four-oared gigs and pair-oared shells in competitions to rank officers’ qualifications. Both the American and British Navies staged these rowing contests as essential training exercises and demonstrations of physical prowess. The military gigs and barges, forerunners of the sleek rowing shells seen today, served the utilitarian aspect of rowing.

One such rivalry exemplifying America’s national determination to succeed in military rowing comes from an 1872 rowing race in Yokohama Harbor between an American Admiral’s barge and a British Admiral’s barge. The American barge, a fourteen-oared gig, defeated the British on open ocean and, upon doing so, hoisted a flag that read, “the boat that Uncle Sam built.” Naval crews raced this type of lapstrait boat on 28 May as part of the 1921 American Henley Regatta in Philadelphia. The picture below shows the crews of the Nevada, Arizona, Delaware, Oklahoma, and Columbia on the Schuylkill River.

Figure 2. Gigs racing on the Schuylkill
Reprinted by permission from Duncan Glendon.
So important was the role of rowing in the tradition of the British military, that historian J. A. Mangan described an occasion when British Naval rowing races in Japan in 1883 were so popular they were attended by the Emperor. Exposure to the sport through the military led to the Japanese starting university crews.\textsuperscript{46} From these military practices and training exercises came the waterman’s means of rowing for hire, the recreational pastime of rowing, and the highly refined sport of crew.

Those who plied their oars inadvertently developed an immensely popular pastime that surpassed practical need and encompassed professionalism, entertainment, private clubs and a multitude of college rowing programs.\textsuperscript{47} As early as 1800, rowing was a leisurely pursuit in England. Noted historian Richard Holt observes that these early modern contests drew enormous crowds and that rowing enjoyed a popularity that was “quite phenomenal.”\textsuperscript{48} By mid 1850 crew had become the premier sport at Oxford and Cambridge. According to English educator Archibald MacLaren, by 1870 rowing was considered the top form of exercise, competition and rivalry, dwarfing “all our [British] other national pastimes put together.”\textsuperscript{49}

Rowing quickly crossed the Atlantic and invaded Britain’s former colony. In the United States, college rivals Harvard and Yale began building the first college boat-clubs—first at Yale in 1843; followed by Harvard in 1844.\textsuperscript{50} Rowing was central and uniquely important in British sport traditions in the U.S., unlike some other British pastimes that underwent rule changes and other adaptations from the original British to the American version, for example, the British bat-and-ball sport rounders to American baseball. However, in rowing the rules were not malleable \textit{per se}. American rowers competed head to head with the British, highlighting rowing’s link to England. Rowing
remained fundamentally English until the 1920 Navy breakthrough. There was therefore, a two-fold pressure on the U.S. Naval Academy in 1920. Navy had to win for their school and their nation, thus shattering the image of rowing as a distinctly British sport that Americans inherited and to whose development they contributed little.\textsuperscript{51}

Rowing is both the oldest intercollegiate sport in the U.S., beginning with the first Harvard-Yale boat race in 1852, and the first international intercollegiate competition, with the Harvard-Oxford boat race in London in 1869.\textsuperscript{52} American historian Joseph Mathews maintains that at the 1869 Harvard-Oxford race the examinations of the respective merits of American and English character, culture, education, technology and muscle by their respective national press corps had already begun.\textsuperscript{53}

As he did with many of the British sports, Baron Pierre de Coubertin included rowing in the first modern Olympic Games.\textsuperscript{54} Ever the Anglophile, he saw rowing as “the most complete sport that one could imagine.”\textsuperscript{55} The earliest Olympic races did not go smoothly and many of the details are relevant to the appreciation of the Naval Academy’s 1920 achievement. The inaugural Olympic boat race in 1896, an exhibition of eights only—no singles, pairs, or fours—was canceled because of bad weather.\textsuperscript{56} In 1900 and in 1904, again as exhibition sports, the crew races encountered dubious timing practices and lacked a qualified international field. For example, Vesper Boat club of Philadelphia won the 1900 Paris race but no multi-oared British boat was present.\textsuperscript{57} These problems alarmed Baron de Coubertin because he wanted to see the Games thrive and not falter.\textsuperscript{58} The logistics of transporting eights (which are over sixty feet long) necessitated borrowing boats, a practice that deterred some countries from the travel—as still happens today. The 1908 and 1912 Olympics were truly representative in regards to
both the categories of boats and the international character of the field. British crews dominated the racing. Overall, as an Olympic event, the early years were a mixture of racing styles, boats, events, and venues. But one truth could be seen clearly by all: Rowing was without question a British sporting tradition, with British style considered the best in the world. Some claim that rowing was the premier sport of England, and prior to 1920 the global sporting world ranked the English style of rowing as far and away the world’s best.

British oarsmen long had touted themselves as the greatest rowers in the world with the richest and finest traditions of crew. Historian Eric Halladay, in his social history of rowing in England, states that the rowing clubs of London during the years before the Great War were consumed with the task of having to defend English rowing against foreign invaders. In 1896, an anonymous correspondent to the English sporting journal, The Field, revealed, “when the international element comes in, sport ceases to be sport and is turned into a branch of foreign policy.” To underscore the involvement of British national identity in crew in this era, Guy Nickalls, a British Olympic rower boasted that “he had never in his life been beaten by a colonial or a foreigner and that he had no intention of ever doing so.” In the era before the Great War, premier English crews rowing the English orthodoxy dominated.

Beginning in the twentieth century, British rowing and stroke style tradition were embedded in the rhetoric of British identity. While much had been written on the tradition of British orthodoxy in rowing, not until the unique reversal of roles which the Naval Academy crew led in creating an American standard which surpassed the British, which then began to be imitated in its own right, did the world take notice.
Walter Camp, who, in his role as athletic director at Yale was conversant of the various stroke styles, understood the strength of this tie and the power of Great Britain in shaping the sport.\textsuperscript{64} “To no branch of American athletics does this apply with greater force than to boating, because in that sport we still adhere in the principal points to almost the same general line as that prevailing in England for a long series of years,” admitted Camp.\textsuperscript{65}

From 1850–1920 heated tension over British orthodoxy of stroke raged across the Atlantic.\textsuperscript{66} The search for an American orthodoxy to rival or surpass the British orthodoxy took place over this seventy-year period. Traditionalists Harvard and Yale rowed English orthodox style with English coaches and even English hulls when they could get them.\textsuperscript{67} But most other American crews in this time period rowed a stroke that was either strictly English or a hybrid of English and American style. Most top American coaches were actually English trained, schooled or born; they were either direct products of England who emigrated to the U.S. or British-American hybrids.\textsuperscript{68}

Examples of early American rowing czars were Hiram Conibear and the Pocock brothers. Conibear, as told by rowing writer, Bob Harron, was an Easterner, “who learned his rowing out of a book.” Harron pointed out that Conibear trained baseball players before going to Washington before the Great War, where he taught a very Eastern “leg and arm stroke,” that was nothing new. Three other coaches, Leader, Callow, and Ulbrickson all moderated the Eastern stroke learned from Conibear and added their own insights.\textsuperscript{69} The Pococks from Vancouver, though of England’s Eton school lineage, produced a legacy of rowing at the University of Washington from 1907–1917 based on
English style—yet described by noted rowing historian Thomas Mendenhall, as searching for an American orthodoxy.70

Cornell, coached by the legendary Charley Courtney from 1883–1916, utilized the English style, with the sliding seat.71 His style was said to be that of a natural sculler to which was “joined an import from England” which again was the prevailing tendency in America in the nineteenth century.72 He was “openly courted” by Harvard in 1894 and served as Harvard’s adviser and coach for a year.73

No U.S. crew was strictly an American creation in boat, oars, and style until Glendon’s came onto the scene. In the shadow of Harvard and Yale, Navy developed slowly. The first Navy Academy crews existed sometime before 1870, but the exact records of those crews are lost. A strong storm destroyed the Navy boathouses, and it was not until 1892 that crew was revived. In 1893, Navy bought an eight for between $800 and $900, hired the former Columbia coach, Coach Lahens, and “turned out a varsity eight that won a race against the Neptunes of Baltimore.”74 In 1894 the aforementioned Churchill aspired to beat the British and urged the Academy crews to master the art of rowing on a world scale. In 1895 Penn defeated Navy. That same year, Navy was also defeated by Potomac Boat Club of Washington, D.C. In 1896 Navy rowed four races—winning two, losing two. A Yale oarsman was hired in 1897 to coach and Navy beat Penn but lost to Cornell. In 1898 Navy beat Columbia but lost to Penn. The year 1899 shows no crew racing. In 1900, J. H. Ten Eyck was hired, and Navy beat Yale but lost to Penn. In 1901 crew Capt. Roger Williams hired J. Herbert Hall to coach Navy, beating Yale and Georgetown but losing to Penn. No races were recorded in 1902,
and in 1903 Navy beat Penn but lost to Georgetown and Yale. Glendon was hired and began in 1904, ending the seesaw nature of Navy’s success.75

Under Glendon, and through his innovations, the crew solidified, and routinely challenged for the medals in American Henley Regatta in Philadelphia and the Intercollegiate Rowing Championships in Poughkeepsie, NY. Glendon crafted his American Orthodoxy and scientific oarsmanship through his crews from 1904 until the Great War. Mendenhall, in describing American orthodoxy, notes that not until 1920 did one style coalesce as “the best evidence of success.” This tradition began with Navy in 1920 and continued thereafter, with American college eight-oared shells winning eight successive Olympic gold medals from 1920 to 1960.76

On the eve of the Great War, the Americans began to threaten British hegemony. So proficient did American imitators become at the English style of rowing that on 4 July 1914 at the world’s most prestigious race, the Henley Royal Regatta, Harvard beat England—on England’s home waters. The New York Times crowed that “this is Independence Day, the Anniversary of the date when America decided to be independent, and she has come forward today to show that the child has overcome her mother in oarsmanship.”77 Racing to the front ranking in the world by defeating “mother England,” who gave the sport of rowing to the U.S. in the first place, is an example of sporting imitation discussed by Guttmann when referring to the dynamics of imperial hegemony.78

The British seemed to be flattered and newspapers played up the imitation that in this great upset at Henley, Harvard rowed the English style. “Harvard’s victory is popular in England,” read the special cable to The New York Times, “as English oarsmen assert that it is a vindication of the English style, which they [Harvard] took from Eton to
America.”

Harvard’s win brought no clear break from English orthodoxy. Each American rowing club or collegiate crew cultivated its own traditions generally derived from British models and was often thought to be the secret, guarded ingredients to success. Coaching protégés and fans were loyal to the mentor coach’s program. Typically a rower thought that his school or club style and the coach who taught it, were the best. A fierce allegiance to the traditions of a school or club characterized rowing. When a rower went on to coach, he typically coached the same style as his previous coach, and ingrained the ingredients of that tradition in another generation of loyal rowers. *Esprit de corps* was as vivid in the boat clubs as in rowing’s military roots, soon to become part of the fabric of the Great War.
CHAPTER THREE

THE WAR YEARS: 1916–1918

America faced a quandary when war broke out in 1914 in Europe. Wishing to preserve its own isolationism, the country was reluctant to interfere with what it saw as a European dispute. The U.S. was experiencing its own growing pains: The Northern U.S. was undergoing a boom in manufacturing with Henry Ford’s assembly line. Ward politics and unions soaked up pages of the newspaper, and radio and newsreels paid attention to the money they could make by making the news. Regions of the South struggled to keep the secrecy of what one historian has called a horrific American Congo. Frederick Jackson Turner’s thesis on the vanishing Western frontier framed a new model for American history and enticed thinking in psychological terms, embodied in Roderick Nash’s heroes, of what would be deemed the American frontier spirit and the implications of its demise.

The unconscious was discovered, and exploded into literature, medicine, and everyday dinner conversation. Hemingway began writing of his experiences as a WWI ambulance driver in For Whom the Bell Tolls. And the increased scientific curiosity and efficiency in the machine’s promise to mechanize work and reduce the yoke of physical labor, promised a taste of the long envied leisure-class life to the common man—who
now rose on a pedestal close enough to the rich that the worker merited a symphony titled “Fanfare of the Common Man.” Aaron Copeland, its composer, returned from his music studies in France after the war to embed himself in America.

Woodrow Wilson was President, prohibition was just around the corner, the stock market was good and along the riverbanks of America and the world, rowing was still an equal to its upstart cousin, football, and ranked as one of the great American pastimes along with baseball and boxing. The European problem of war was a nuisance to Henry Ford’s rendition of the American dream “a chicken in every pot and a car in every garage,” soon to be carried on by his son Edsel. Most Americans just wanted to ignore the war and hoped it would go away, but with pleas for money, food, and weaponry from England, the U.S. reluctantly entered in, on the battlefields “over there” and on the sporting fields over here.

In 1917, when the U.S. entered World War One, the military enlisted sports figures such as Walter Camp of Yale and Joseph Raycroft of Princeton to preside over Navy and Army athletic programs. Formal intercollegiate athletic competition ceased; however, informal rowing contests persisted. Glendon had been coaching a decade at Navy. The Naval Academy, savoring this fresh wave of patriotism, victory, and pride set its sights on England’s sporting styles and traditions on the water; symbolically seeking to surpass Britannia, the world’s leading sea-faring nation. Indeed, rowing style may have represented one of the last great sporting umbilical chords between mother England and the United States. Severing this tie, by excelling beyond the imaginable, became Navy’s goal.
Harvard and Yale became veritable “armed camps” and “khaki campuses.” Yale’s Adee boathouse was taken over by the U.S. military for boat training. War altered the running of American regattas, necessitating for example, that the host crews share equipment because travel was difficult and expensive. The informal regattas being held were truncated and rowing ranks decimated—but the top schools of Harvard, Yale, Navy, and Penn tried to keep some semblance of crew alive. Navy, competing against these crews through the war years continued to fine-tune its all-American system to seating arrangement of in-line seats, American blades, Belgium style swivel oar locks, and a new hull. Literary Digest ran an entire article on the Academy’s new shell (broader and flatter bottomed than other designs so it could plane on the surface) that was designed by the ingenious Glendon and built by an American boat builder.

By the war years, crew racing began including shorter, straight-line courses to the traditional river racing as coaches recognized a need to promote greater fairness. This was an advantage for the Naval Academy. Owing to the rigorous routine of their daily duties, Navy midshipmen could not take the time necessary to train for the long, 5,000-meter distances typical of collegiate river rowing at the time. Each college’s home-river course yielded a substantial advantage to that school which intimately knew its own home water’s rocks and currents. New standardization practices, such as those being inaugurated in the fledgling Olympic Games for course length, timing, allowable wind speed, obstacles, current, and officiating were employed. Collegiate crew racing was reduced from 5,000 meters to the international course length of 2,000 meters. Standardizing factors that might yield any one crew an unfair advantage eliminated many of the earlier problems rowing had experienced, particularly at the highly charged
international and Olympic levels. Navy now could train for distances that were its strength.

In 1919, the Allied nations with troops still stationed in war-ravaged Europe staged the Military Olympics as a sign of hope and transition. Nation-building and militarism were preeminent in the larger global picture emerging from the ashes and to the political structure of the United States—and sports were part of it. The idea of the Military Olympics is a credit to the commanders of the Allied nations. These commanders, concerned about a demobilization process that left two million Allied troops waiting to go home, staged games to signal a new beginning, “a unique love feast of diverse races and nationalities, of a greater and hopeful peace than the world had yet known.”91

Elwood S. Brown, Director of the Department of Athletics of the Y.M.C.A. described in 1918 to Col. Bruce Palmer, his concerns regarding the demobilization that would soon follow the war’s end. Brown, concerned about the moral temptations and dangerous physical displays that might erupt with two million idle men waiting, outlined the need to replace the physical aspects of active fighting, with informal and competitive games.92 Suggestions were made to host mass athletic contests in Paris for every service man in service during the Great War. Soldiers would participate in an elimination tournament running from regiments through divisions, with the finals culminating at Pershing Stadium.93

Brown’s idea grew and was met with enthusiasm. The French indicated that they were “keenly interested in American sports and the fine spirit of play that permeates them” and hoped that the American sports would make a lasting impression on their
society. The idea grew to encompass bands, choral singing, and artistic competitions paralleling the format of the Olympic Games held in tandem with the 1900 World Exposition (World’s Fair) in Paris. From Brown’s initial letter of suggestion and interest, the Allied nations eventually competed in twenty-six events. The expansive program favored no one country, and there was no single Army named as over-all winner. Events were intended to highlight the individual efforts of the service men. Rowing was the culminating event of the “largest and most successful service Regatta ever held.”

The Inter-Allied Games were held from 22 June to 6 July 1919. Crew teams began taking quarters and practicing on the Seine in early July, waiting for the regatta competition—the last scheduled event of the Military Olympics—to commence. The prominence of rowing in this era was evidenced when the regatta date of 17–18 July was chosen to allow the international crews competing in the long established Henley Royal Regatta in England to compete there first, and then join the festivities in Paris. The Times reported the Henley of 1919 as a fair-like atmosphere with the American Army crew headquarters dubbed “Dreamland” conspicuously decked out in stars and stripes. The racing in the “Allies Eights” at Henley was for the King’s Cup trophy.

Belgian, Czechoslovakian, Portuguese, and Italian crews arrived first in Paris. By 11 July, New Zealand, France, Britain, Australia, Canada, and U.S. Army crews arrived from Henley—their shells followed a few days later. Elimination heats began in single, four oared, and eight oared shells on the afternoon of July seventeenth. A cloudless sky and negligible breeze made rowing conditions on the mile and a half course between the St. Cloud and Suresnes bridges near perfect. Singles and fours progressed
the first two in each heat to the finals; the eights however, progressed only the winner from each heat to the final.  

Czechoslovakia, Italy, and Australia raced first, with Australia taking an early lead and maintaining it throughout. New Zealand, Canada, Portugal, and Belgium raced next—with Canada challenging Belgium at the end but remaining in second. The third and closest heat of the day pitted the French, English (Cambridge), and the American Army competitors from Henley against one another. The American Army Crew consisted of: Capt. Douglas Kingsland at stroke; seven - Lt. J. Amory Jefferies; six - Maj. H. L. Rogers; five - Capt. Louis Penny; four - Lt. Henry S. Middendorf; three - Lt. J. H. McHenry; two - Capt. Royal Pullen; bow - Lt. Colles J. Coe; and coxswain (cox) - Lt. Guy H. Gale. Cambridge, the eventual overall winner of the regatta, battled the United States throughout their heat; Cambridge gained an early lead and held off the United States by half a length (roughly thirty feet) at the finish.

These races, though important for morale, were not of major significance in rowing and had little if any impact on the international collegiate rowing scene. They were, however, a matter of national pride that contributed to a post-WWI nationalism.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE BRITISH QUESTION INTERNATIONAL ROWING

The onslaught of foreign crews rowing on England’s famed Henley course previous to the Military Olympics yields a unique entrée into the British side of the pond’s view of international rowing. Without going in depth concerning the amateur question and the gentleman rower/athlete debate which has haunted all sports since the nineteenth century, it is relevant to look at the British growing pains that convulsed their inner sporting sanctums.

The history of the British Empire, after spreading across the world, introduced sporting culture in their colonies and along the path of their military trails. While the British longed to spread their sports and culture, however, they didn’t want to share them. This sounds like a contradiction in terms, but one need only look at the various examples of the British hosting games to see that they tried to keep the winning and regulatory aspects of their games in their control. Flaunting this sporting hegemony in their colonies proved in particular to be a double-edged sword, because the colonized nations imitated their imperialist leaders so well as to later invariably vanquish them on the athletic fields. Colonized people worked to overcome and surpass the imperialists. The colonial desire to beat the imperialist power was at the essence of the 1920 Naval
Academy quest to beat Britannia. It is not unique; similar cultural tendencies throughout the British colonies have been traced by Allen Guttmann, who writes on the dynamics of these sporting scenarios, in *Games and Empires*.101

Sport historians David Lane and Ian Jobling discuss and outline a similar process in Australia. Amateur inter-colony eight-oar races had been held annually since 1878 between New South Wales and Victoria. In the 1890s, Queensland, Tasmania, Western Australia, and South Australia began racing against one another too; by 1905 all states were competing on a regular basis. A look at sculling and eight and four-oared racing and World champion victories in 1876 by Edward Trickett led to “the growing attitude that they (colonials) should think of themselves as Australians first, and inhabitants of separate colonies second.”102 Much of the research in Australian sports in the nineteenth century has shown that it contributed “in no small way” to the development of an Australian National Identity.103 Nor was this limited to rowing—the eloquent C. L. R. James relates his saga of the similar struggle through cricket to surpass the West Indian British Administrators in order to beat them at their own game.104

It is against this anti-colonial backdrop that the British defeats at Henley and the later defeat of the Leander crew in Europe must be understood. Rugby had already been taken from the pages of *Tom Brown’s Schooldays* onto the American village commons; baseball had usurped British rounders, and cricket a true British class sport had already journeyed from the cliffs of Dover to Australia and the West Indies. Rowing was for the British one of their final sport sanctuaries. After all, the Henley course was in Henley-on-Thames. It could never be held anywhere but there, never pass beyond British shores.
Halladay tells us that the British were divided over several issues pertaining to international participation at Henley; but essentially rowing and the Henley Royal Regatta were revered by the British as their own, with the Henley course considered as a more important race than Baron de Coubertin’s revived Olympic Games.\textsuperscript{105} Having foreigners on their course appalled many sportsmen. The idea of international competition, and the necessary money and preparation needed to compete, raised questions and affronts to the standard British way of looking at sporting things.\textsuperscript{106} True athletes were not to work—as dictated in the British definition of amateur. And striving at sport and competition was considered work in British terms, thereby raising the athlete to the state of a professional. The Olympic Games challenged their close-minded, British views on rowing.

The debate over eligibility and governance heightened when the The Amateur Rowing Association (ARA) found “a breach in the amateur code” and took umbrage in 1912 with the British Olympic Association (BOA), issuing a statement “that in view of the efforts that are being made in other branches of athletics to raise funds by the public subscription for the expenses and training of competition at the next Olympiad, this committee deprecates such actions as tending to professionalism in sport, and calls the attention of the affiliated members to the fact that under ARA rules, oarsmen are no longer amateurs if their expenses are paid by funds raised outside their own rowing clubs.”\textsuperscript{107} Halladay explained that this ARA statement was in reaction to a *Times* article where the BOA suggested raising 100,000£ for the 1916 Berlin Games (not held due to the Great War) that gained the support of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and T. A. Cook, who
was the only British oarsman on the International Olympic Committee (IOC) at the time.¹⁰⁸

Following the conception of a recurring international sporting event such as the Olympics, countries formed new athletic organizations known as National Governing Bodies which reported to the Olympic Committee. This created a paradigm shift in the power structure within some countries that had enjoyed decades of high-level sport within their own boarders—such as the French school of fencing and the German *Turnerbund* of gymnastics.¹⁰⁹ Many countries had elaborate committees and unions that set guidelines if not veritable rules for competition and practice within the individual sport.

Suddenly, athletes and the administrators—snubbed by the inner workings of an old guard network dominated by an elite inner circle of families, politics, and lineage—found their carefully constructed athletic bastions beleaguered with the supra imposed Olympic organization casting an internationally wide net over many sports. This threatened the smaller social network of individual sporting associations that previously had found little need to communicate with other sports.¹¹⁰

A score of new acronyms found their way into the minutes of amateur athletic unions. Britain found its ARA and its National Amateur Rowing Association (NARA) and the new BOA in conflict with *Fédération Internationale Sociétés d’Avignon (FISA)*, the International Governing Body of Rowing) and the new IOC.¹¹¹ The original association, the ARA, was considered old school in its adherence to the amateur code and touted as being backward-looking to the days of the Victorian era. The NARA had, previous to the forming of the BOA, joined ideas with FISA and dipped its toes
tentatively into the pond of international rowing, welcoming new blood into the Henley and continental college races.\textsuperscript{112} The NARA, having shown an established interest in international rowing, was approached by the BOA to select a representative British boat for the 1920 Olympics; snubbing the ARA. The ARA, in its patent refusal to join pace in 1920 with the trend of the NARA and the BOA to reach a harmonious resolution, set a precedent for itself of being outside the ever increasing larger international community, this continued throughout the inter-war years, even after 1945.\textsuperscript{113} For example, the ARA, controlled the Henley Royal Regatta and refused to permit professional coaches to coach the amateur college rowers while racing at Henley. Because of this, Hubert Glendon (son of Olympic coach Richard Glendon) was not allowed to accompany his Columbia Lions’ lightweight crew at Henley. For six weeks prior to racing the crew had to be coached by an “amateur coach,” Don Farley, that Hugh himself handpicked from the previous ranks of Columbia oarsmen. Hugh did see the crew off and joined them—as a spectator—in England, after the Poughkeepsie Regatta.\textsuperscript{114}

Thus, overseas rowing by the British and international competition coming to the Henley, such as the Allied army crews of the Military Olympics, had a significant impact on the amateur issue and thus the domestic affairs of the British. The sporting culture of Britain pervaded the British fabric of society in its schools and social clubs, in its betting patterns, and in its own national pride. The very waters of the Royal Henley Regatta course were considered nothing short of sacred. The races held there were considered “Little England” races for the select few—not for the colonies and certainly not for the uncivilized professional sporting world.\textsuperscript{115} The Olympics of 1908, held in London, were
initially not welcome to row the Olympic course on Henley water in what the Henley Stewards considered their section of the Thames. Fearing international embarrassment by this provincial attitude, the secretary of the Henley Stewards sent “an artful letter” to the *Field* praising the virtue of the stewards for allowing the race and thereby causing them to lose face if they did refuse. As a result, they were trapped by the very highbrow attitudes that they preached.\textsuperscript{116}

These matters of international competition came to bear on the 1920 Olympic contest with Navy, because previous to 1920, Navy had never been allowed to race in international competition.\textsuperscript{117} There could be no suspicion of a professional internationally experienced crew coming to race the British. Navy was perceived as an underdog by the British, and was virtually unmentioned in the British Press.\textsuperscript{118} The Leander club was thought to surely triumph.\textsuperscript{119}

The Leander club, because of the more progressive attitude of the NARA and changing tides of thought throughout Britain, had benefited by the international exposure at Henley and elsewhere in FISA regattas. The 1920 Royal Henley, after an interval of five years due to the war, was revived to its full program of eight challenge cups. Nearly four hundred crews were entered. Initial doubts regarding the quality of the crews due to the diminished ranks from war would soon be cast aside, as the *Times* reported that “keenness and enthusiasm promise well for the future.”\textsuperscript{120}

Leander, in colors of pink and white, and sporting a hippopotamus for a mascot, was housed near the Stewards’ area, at the finish of the Henley course. For them, winning the prestigious race in July 1920 came easily. The crew had set a world record in 1912 in the Olympics at Stockholm of 6 minutes, 10 seconds.\textsuperscript{121} There was no 1916
Berlin Olympics due to the war, and the undefeated 1920 Leander crew, Henley Grand Challenge Cup winners (consisting of E. D. Horsfall, G. O. Nickalls, R. S. Lucas, W. E. C. James, J. A. Campbell, S. Earl, R. S. Shove, Rev. S. E. Swann, and coxswain R. T. Johnstone) would have its chance at Olympic gold in Antwerp.\textsuperscript{122} Sidney Swann and Ewart Horsfall were returning 1912 Olympic gold medallists.\textsuperscript{123}

G. O. Nickalls, son of the famous rower, and 1908 Leander boat club Olympic gold medallist, Guy Nickalls, held opposing views on the Olympic issue. The father was reported to have preferred to have nothing at all to do with the Olympic movement.\textsuperscript{124} His son, an advocate of the younger generation’s view which sought international competition, “found himself frequently acting as deputy to Gold the chairman of the ARA at international meetings since early on perceived—‘it did not take any particular foresight on my part to realize that the ambition of the majority of young men…was to succeed internationally and to set their sights beyond the somewhat restricted competition to be found in this country.'”\textsuperscript{125}

The contention, long held in Britain and extolled in the press, that “England has believed absolutely in the supremacy of its system in rowing over that of America,” would be tried to the breaking point very soon, in Antwerp.\textsuperscript{126}
Figure 3. Leander crew in Belgium
Reprinted by permission of Duncan Glendon.
CHAPTER FIVE
THE AMERICAN SEASON OF 1919

The stage was set; a British routing was afoot. The overthrow began when one college crew’s greatness overcame the adversities of war. By the end of World War One Navy emerged as the best college rowing program in the United States. Under Dick Glendon’s skillful eye Navy won Philadelphia’s “American Henley” in 1919 and 1920.127 Esteemed rowing historian Thomas Mendenhall pinpoints 1919, when the Navy crew left Harvard a distant second in the collegiate championships, as the telltale race in which Coach Glendon’s Navy Olympic eight dynasty began to take shape.128

Indeed, something unique was happening at Navy, Glendon knew it and other coaches were starting to suspect it. A clipping entitled “Call Navy a Marvelous Eight: Rowing Men Loud in their Praise of Middies” described, “old and experienced rowing men, like Pres Pilkington of the NAAO (National Amateur Athletic Organization); Jim Rice, formerly coach of Columbia, Dr. Duncan Spaeth, coach of Princeton, and even Joe Wright, coach of Pennsylvania, speak of Navy as not only being an exceptional combination in the point of speed and power, but collectively rated it as one of the best crews of all time.”129
In a highly significant statement, the same article describes Navy’s work as, “standing out above the efforts of all others, and the uniform success of the crews plainly indicates that the victories of the crews are due to a system, and that there is nothing haphazard about their success.” Farther in the article, and giving an insight to Glendon’s preference for tall, muscular athletes was the statement, “Rowing man for man the oarsmanship was equal, but they had it on us in weight, and that is what eventually counted….”

Due to the war and graduation, the crew of the 1919 boat needed to be filled mostly by experienced but untried underclassmen. Glendon’s scientific oarsmanship continued to be honed, and glimpses of his strategy of bigger rowers can be seen in a New York Times article of 5 April 1919 that lists the physical statistics of all his crews. Losing six of the varsity to graduation, Glendon looked to the ranks of the second varsity and the Plebe crew to build his dynasty. His ideas were in place—and in crew, the boat, the oars, the technique, coaching, and training were the real avenues of success. In rowing, a coach’s vision is greater than the men in the seats. It is the collective combination of vision and manpower that elevate single bodies into the common greatness of a crew. Glendon saw the possibilities coming together too. From bow to stern the 1919 eight was: Sanborn, Graves, Wiedman, Skinner, Ballreich, Repplier, Harris, Ingram, and Crawford. He states in April 1919 that, “his material is the best he has ever had from a new class.” The article ends on the very optimistic note, “The Navy crews are progressing finely, and the finest rowing season in the history of the academy is anticipated.”
The 1919 season began with a Navy win over the University of Pennsylvania at home on the Severn River over a distance of two miles. The *New York Times* reported “Navy’s Crack Crew Beats Penn Easily.”136 After much anticipation of a great season, the next race against Harvard, Princeton, and Navy at home was crucial. Navy won and never looked back. The press referred to the 1919 Academy crew as “the mighty Navy crew.”137 The Naval Academy won all of its seasonal regattas in 1919, which drew much attention to the national championship at the American Henley in Philadelphia.138

On 29 May 1919 the *New York Times* heightened the attention given the event by noting that, “The Navy crews that are to participate in the American Henley Regatta over the national course on the Schuylkill River on Saturday arrived in the city today. They came by train, but their shells and attendants were on four U-boat chasers, which anchored in the river.”139 The message was clear that Navy came to fight. One newspaper caption stated “Navy Here with $65,000 to Bet on Crew; $13,000 Covered by Penn.”140 The article continues—“the Middies, always noted for their keen desire to bet, raised a pool of $65,000 but up until last night were only able to get $13,000 covered by red and blue followers. The other $52,000 may be swung over to the pool that has been raised to bet against the Army in the annual baseball game tomorrow.” (There was no Army/Navy football game to bet on since this annual event was halted due to the War in 1916.)

Glendon, with crews arriving on the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad and shells arriving on the submarine chasers, knew and seemed to be practicing the art of intimidation as part of his scientific oarsmanship.141 At 4:10 P.M. on Saturday the thirty-first of May, they left no doubt.142 Navy crossed the line first to win the Stewards
Challenge Cup, beating Syracuse and the University of Pennsylvania. After winning the American Henley, so-named because the length of the course—a mile and five-sixteenths—is exactly the same as the prestigious Henley Royal Regatta in England, Navy had proved “beyond all cavil that it was the best eight in the East.”

Headlines on page 28 in the *New York Times* of 8 June 1919 crowed the “Annapolis Crew Declared to be by Far the Best College Eight of the Season” even before the prestigious Harvard-Yale race. A revealing and stunningly important article by Dr. Walter Peet, past coach of Columbia, proceeded to dissect and analyze the empirical thinking of Glendon that in a nut shell is a synopsis of the Glendon stroke which is the basis of the newly found and tried American Orthodoxy. Peet explained that:

Rowing enthusiasts are most curious to know why these middies are in a class by themselves, and what manner of stroke this wonder crew uses, especially as it has been ‘pointed out’ that their style is at variance with that of other rowing institutions, and not in accordance with the orthodox fundamental principles of the English stroke, which more or less closely, have been followed by our universities.

The writer has been in touch with the Navy’s rowing development for over twenty years and coached a Columbia crew that won at Annapolis. Dick Glendon has been the Navy mentor for seventeen seasons. This clever coach has worked along the ideas of the old professional sculler and has thrown all other theories to the wind. Also, he is a close student of the mechanics of rowing. Briefly, Glendon—teaching his men a homely, awkward stroke, according to all accepted theories—gets them to commence to put on their power while the blades are just a bit forward of the right angle to the side of the boat. Glendon’s rowing creed is: ‘Stick to the arc nearest the right angle.’ According to the simplest mechanics this is where power properly propels. With an abnormally long reach the blades push water away from the sides of the boat and with a torso swing too far toward the bow they shove water inward—which is wasted energy and which does not count in putting the boat ahead….

This is how Glendon does it: There is a fairly long torso swing toward the stern—much shorter however, than that of any of the others—and the slide goes a bit aft of the pin of the rowlock, which makes for a good beginning of the leg.
drive. The leg muscles are the most powerful in the human anatomy, and on the long sliding seats the middies get all there is to be gathered from them. At the beginning of the stroke the slides, (leg drive) body swing and arm work start together with the idea in each man’s head that the eternal right angle is to be uppermost for the efficiency point.

Glendon has been a great student of rigging and shell construction. In rigging he places the stretchers (footrests) so that the kinetic kick comes precisely at the right angle.

The Navy coach’s order for the shell that won from Pennsylvania in last year’s final race and that won so consistently this Spring, covered a great many points. Al Ward of Englewood was the builder. Glendon had an exceptionally heavy boatload of men and his designs called for a shell with a flat bottom and wide floor. This craft, which was trimmed so that she rode up at the bow, floated the crew perfectly and ‘skimmed’ over the water with consequent little resistance. Also the flat bottom and wide floor made for stability and an even keel, which always spell speed.

Glendon’s theories certainly have made good. He has had no ‘lucky combinations,’ as so many coaches have had, but he has been a consistent teacher of winning crews for years….

But it must be said that conditions and environment are all in favor of successful aquatics at Annapolis for these simple reasons: (1) Everybody has to pass a rigid physical examination on entrance, and he practically is in training throughout his four years; (2) the boat houses are right on the grounds….And from the very nature of what is to be his life work, every prospective naval officer wants to ‘make the crew.’

In short, Peet described Glendon’s empirical thinking as that of someone who deduced and intuited power and performance ratios and techniques that modern rowing coaches still use and have confirmed with computer analysis. Glendon’s break from English orthodoxy led him to develop new stroke, boat, and rigging designs that are the harbingers of the modern era of rowing, as it exists today.
Figure 4. Dr. Peet on the dock.
Reprinted by permission of Duncan Glendon
What does Peet’s description of Glendon’s scientific oarsmanship mean to coaches and to the man in the boat? By examining the stroke, the boat, and the oars, the mechanics of Glendon’s American orthodox rowing, which he perfected by 1919, became the integral part of winning the 1920 Olympic gold. His innovations from one hundred years ago are still employed by coaches today, and rowed by modern crews.

To understand Glendon’s innovations it is necessary to understand the rowing stroke. The athlete sits inside the gunwales (sides) of a rowing shell (boat) with the feet facing the stern (rear) and the back of the athlete’s head facing the bow (front). The boat, in most circumstances, is to be propelled by the athlete, forward, in the direction of the bow. The athlete cannot see in this direction and relies on a coxswain (a person who steers) who is seated facing forward. The rower sits on a seat that rolls over two tracks (the slide).

In sweep rowing, as opposed to sculling, the oars are longer and two hands rest on one oar; in sculling, an oar is pulled by each hand. The stroke in either sweep rowing or sculling is broken into distinct areas of transition: the catch, the drive, the finish, and the
recovery. The catch is the point in the stroke cycle where the rower first places the oar in the water. The following figure illustrates Glendon’s preferred position at the catch.

![Figure 5. The Glendon catch](image)

Dr. Peet described the Glendon catch as long, but not as long as others of that era. To a modern rower, both catch and finish might look extreme, but Glendon did recognize the forces at play and began the shortening of the stroke—at least at the catch—toward the stroke used currently. Since Dr. Peet was a contemporary of Glendon and a coach himself, he would have been capable of analyzing this.

The drive refers to when the oar is submerged after the catch and the rower is applying force through the legs, back and arms to pry the boat past the oar plant. His interpretation, along with Glendon’s photograph of what he sees as the optimum layback angle, is worth studying in the following photograph. The finish is that point in the
stroke when the legs have flattened, the back has opened, the arms have drawn in, the boat has been propelled forward across the water, and the oar is released from the water with a quick downward motion of the hands.

Figure 6. The Glendon finish
Reprinted by permission of Duncan Glendon

From the finish, the recovery begins again as the oar handle is pushed forward, away from the rower toward the stern of the boat. Sequentially the body of the rower is now sliding toward the feet, compressing the legs, readying to place the spoon (face) of the blade into the water at the next catch. The rower is now again ready for the next complete stroke cycle of catch, drive, finish, recovery, catch.

In terms of the effect of these transitions and positions in the stroke cycle, the catch is currently understood as the place where boat speed is the slowest. The drive, when the athlete is pulling on the oar handle and pushing against the footplate is a place
where boat speed is picking up and is greatest at the finish of the stroke. The finish is when the athlete releases the oar from the water at the end of the slide, and the recovery is when the athlete has the oar out of the water and is sliding back up toward the stern getting prepared for another catch. One complete cycle from catch to finish to catch is called a stroke cycle and the rate is the number of stroke cycles per minute.147

The full experience of repetitive strokes to a rower would include periods of extreme exertion during the drive phase of the stroke cycle of the back and legs when the blade is in the water and the boat is moving forward, coupled with a relaxed, slow return during the recovery phase when the rower has the oar out of the water and is sliding back toward the catch and the boat speed is slowing down. As in a car traveling at sixty miles an hour, there are four points at a dead stop—these are the bottoms of the wheels in contact with the pavement. So, too, when an eight-oared rowing shell is traveling forward, there are eight points at a dead stop—the wide spoons of the blades that are being anchored against the water.

The most critical features of the rowing stroke are the drive, when it is critical how the body applies the force; and the recovery, when the body weight is sliding back over the surface of the water, against the forward propulsion of the shell that the drive just created. The nuances of how to apply pressure and when, during the stroke cycle, is critical to boat speed and must be applied the same way by every rower in the boat, at the same time.

As stroke mechanics evolved through the centuries, rowers have gone from the British nineteenth century stroke—what can best be described as a series of separate motions of legs, then back, then arms yanking—to Glendon’s twentieth century
smoother, full-bodied stroke where the legs straighten as the back and arms open and
draw. The motion that the athlete imparts to the oar handle translates through the oar, to
the face of the blade into an action in the water. And how the oar works to deliver its
force and power that cause the boat to move is determined largely by the placement of the
oar in the water relative to the oarlock and the rower’s center of mass. In terms of simple
physics: the oar is a lever where the oarlock is one fulcrum, the rower is exerting
pressure; the water is the weight that the rower pushes against, thereby driving the boat
beyond the oar-plant. However, the physics of the rowing stroke are elaborate with the
face of the blade in the water acting as a fulcrum also—these intricacies are described in
length in various rigging books and for the most part, are outside of the scope of this
paper.

The oar, through the stroke cycle, moves around the pin of the oarlock with the
rower’s hands on one end and the large spoon of the blade anchored in and against the
water on the other. The speed and timing of the rower as they open through the stroke
creates many turning forces—some that act on the hull and some that act on the water.
These turning forces can make the hull undulate and veer from side to side as the sets of
blades catch and release. Minimizing these forces—and indeed all forces except those
that propel the hull straight forward with the greatest speed—is the goal of every crew
and every coach. Glendon recognized the importance and counterintuitive nature of
applying more force in a smaller, yet more efficient area of the stroke than other coaches
did, who in effect, wasted their crews’ physical energy by having them apply power over
a larger less efficient area, with the result of a slower boat speed. Intuitively, the
unschooled rower thinks a big, long, powerful stroke, with a quick return for another
stroke should move the boat swiftly—when in actuality, the controlled application of power in a specific, limited area, with careful, slow, balanced sliding in the recovery to the next stroke, actually makes for fewer strokes and greater boat speed. This balance of force and timing, and the counterintuitive nature of the stroke were inculcated in Glendon’s crews in what became known as his creed.

Specifically, Glendon’s creed of “stick to the arc nearest the right angle,” ensures that the power applied to the oar by the rower is translated into forward movement of the rowing shell down the race course, rather than the power pushing water away from or toward the hull. This is illustrated in following diagrams, the first from Glendon’s own notes.

Figure 7. Glendon’s stroke dynamics
Reprinted by permission of Duncan Glendon
Glendon’s diagram shows a port oar that is at the catch, the point where the blade enters into the water, at 45 degrees and at the finish, when the blade comes out of the water, at 60 degrees. It is important to note that the boat moves past the oar plant at the catch and through the stroke until released at the finish, rather than the oar simply pushing water past the boat. The curve at the top of the drawing relates to slippage.

This next drawing is from the 1992 U.S. National Rowing Team boatman, Mike Davenport, and his understanding of stroke mechanics. Here the arc the oar travels is labeled with turning direction and propulsion direction of the hull during the pull of the oar from catch to finish. These types of indications are readily determined with computer analysis in modern rowing, but in 1919, it was only Glendon’s careful eye and analytical mind that assessed these forces as described by Dr. Peet. By applying the greatest pressure in the drive phase of the stroke just before the right angle (accomplished by traveling up the slide until the seat is through the pin in the oarlock) and grasping the effects of these hydrodynamics, Glendon adjusted the stroke technique to gain the advantage of rowing in the arc closest to the right angle. Thus, minimizing the turning forces that push water away from the hull, (thereby doing nothing for making the boat go forward), and also minimizing the turning forces that push water toward the hull at the finish (thereby causing turbulence and slowing the boat down as it exits the boat along the side of the hull causing drag) the boat goes faster. These forces are multi-million dollar concerns on America’s Cup boats—particularly what is considered to be a more recent discovery of how water moves along and exits the hull.
Below, Mike Davenport’s drawing from 2000 further illustrates the forces relevant to the modifications in stroke Glendon prescribed and what Dr. Peet’s *New York Times* article referred to in Glendon’s 1919 crews.

![Diagram of arcs in rigging](image)

**Figure 8. Davenport**

Mike Davenport from *The Nuts and Bolts of Rigging*

Additionally, the following diagram by Micheal Purcer, a master of the physics of rigging, illustrates the most efficient arc in another example.\(^{149}\) It is important to note that many modern coaches and boatmen consider Purcer’s work as the rigging “Bible” and defer to his suggestions.
Purcer’s rigging book, which is considered a highly detailed and physics-oriented scientific book on rigging, diagrams above the power aspects of the stroke. The oar, from catch to finish, can travel a larger arc than what is most efficient to the forward movement of the hull. Glendon’s creed of “row the arc closest to the right angle” (above at 0 degrees, which is perpendicular to the boat) was the most efficient arc to row in 1919.
and is the most efficient arc to row nearly a century later. How did Glendon modify the stroke to achieve this efficiency, and turn coaches heads away from a style which had been rowed for hundreds of years toward a more advanced style? He had his rowers reach out less at the catch than other crews of the time (though his rowers still did have a long “Glendon layback” at the finish). This advancement of shortening the swing to the catch kept his crews sitting more upright at the catch and in the middle of the drive than other crews of the 1919–1920 period, which enabled them to apply more power.

This new application of power—perceived as a shorter, awkward stroke—required bigger stronger athletes. For this, Glendon had another saying: A good big man is better than a good small man. This means that his new stroke mechanics required bigger, more powerfully built men to apply this power in what was less a swinging motion (English orthodoxy) than a prying motion (American orthodoxy).

Another aspect that Glendon perfected was using an American oar, (see 1 and 3 below), which was wider than an English oar, (2 and 4) yielding the equivalent of a broader “sweet” spot (as in a Prince tennis racket) thereby extending the point of leverage to add more force. The following figure from Glendon’s book Rowing illustrates his idea of how this concept worked.
Glendon also had a stiffer boat built. A stiff hull meant less flexion along the hull during the drive—less flexion meant the boat would track along in the water straighter and faster. Dr. Peet described the boat as flat-bottomed and able to skim along in the bow; and due to its new hull shape, it also could withstand the heavier rowers. Heavier men needed a strong, well-built hull to structurally withstand the strain of their pulling and pushing. Also, since Glendon was experimenting and eventually choosing taller, heavier men than the English crews, the boat had to be able to float the increase in weight. Glendon therefore considered hull shapes, hull material and the slickness of the
bottom of the shell to be important (he reportedly oiled ducks, testing their buoyancy in order to determine the proper amount of oil to be rubbed over the hull).  

The aforementioned stroke, oar, and boat refinements and discoveries that Glendon had been tinkering with and perfecting for some fifteen years since his beginning at Navy, were about to finally be put into practice with a large crew to complete the extraordinary picture. This is the motor racing equivalent of building the best race car, with the fastest engine, best tires, and best drivers. It was the combination of all the American Orthodox factors of Scientific Oarsmanship that Glendon was about to unleash and stun the world.
CHAPTER SEVEN
THE AMERICAN SEASON OF 1920

The season of 1919 led to the 1920 winter indoor training in the tanks, with anticipation of the upcoming Olympic year, spring rowing, and scheduling. According to the 1921 Lucky Bag, the Naval academy yearbook, “1920 had been replete with epoch-making occurrences.” In early February, a special to the New York Times disclosed a change in the usual Navy home schedule. Princeton, Syracuse, Harvard, Yale, and Union Boat Club would be coming to the Severn River for a “brush with the Midshipmen.”

The news, “Navy Crews Quit Tank” was printed on March 13, 1920. The fact that a major newspaper would even publish the day the crew went outdoors to practice from the indoor rowing tanks is indicative of the intense interest in Glendon’s crews. The first varsity, second varsity, lightweight, and freshmen (plebe) crews were all important to Glendon. Glendon would change rowers around throughout the season to get the ultimate combination. In March, the Navy crews of 1920 were set as follows: First varsity: Bow, Jacomini; 2, Renard; 3, Jordan; 4, Graves (Captain); 5, Sanborn; 6, Johnston; 7, Weldman; stroke, King. Second varsity: Bow, Gallagher; 2, Reisenger; 3, Lee; 4, Moore; 5, Richardson; 6, Holland; 7, Litchfield; stroke, Wanselow. Plebe crew: Bow, Schade; 2, Will; 3, Kirkpatrick; 4, White; 5, Jackson; 6, Bradley; 7, Browning;
stroke, Huntington. From these crews, after finding the right combination, Glendon would eventually choose his Olympic eight.

On 24 April, with Navy at home on the Severn River, Harvard came to row. It was the first race of the season at the Academy. After a long winter of training and “stirring the water in the tanks at the natatorium,” and cold practices beginning on the water in late February, their home waters on the Severn River were still rough and choppy with small whitecaps. A heavy southwest wind made it impossible for the crews to row on Saturday. Navy and Harvard waited for the weather to cooperate. Sunday racing was “out of the official question.” Monday morning the weather cleared enough for the crews to go head to head. As was typical of the time, the competition ran from novices, to second varsity, to varsity.

With few fans to cheer them, the Harvard freshmen and the Navy Plebes finally launched their shells and rowed “to the start of the two mile race.” The Plebes got off the line first against the Harvard freshmen and never lost their lead. They finished 4 lengths ahead—Navy 12:24 and Harvard 12:40. The second varsity eight was about the same with Navy winning by six lengths—Navy 12:15 to Harvard’s 12:38. The Harvard varsity proudly touting what it considered its “Middy beating machine” in its varsity oarsmen intended to save the day with a win. It wasn’t to be. Harvard finished “about five lengths astern of Navy;” Navy with a time of 11:48 to Harvard’s 12:28. Harvard, unaccustomed to losing, left the Severn with a resolve to wait and beat Navy later in the season.

The news that Navy easily out rowed Harvard, hit the New York Times on 27 April. The article praised the watermanship of the Midshipmen as, “easily superior to that of their rivals, and better prepared to meet the roughness of the water…in spite of
this [the rough water] the Midshipmen got a splendid drive to their shell, which was lacking in Harvard’s boat.” The article went on further to point out that Dick Glendon’s son scored a Navy win also.156

Columbia would arrive to race Navy next. According to a New York Times article, Columbia Coach Rice was enthusiastic to race but during a practice session on the rough water the afternoon before the race, “the superior physique of the Navy oarsmen was very plainly in evidence.”157 Two weeks after Harvard’s defeat, Columbia fared no better. On the shortened Henley style course of about a mile and five-sixteenths, the Navy plebes won by six lengths in 7:25 with Columbia’s freshman at 7:36. The second varsity had Navy at 7:25 and Columbia at 7:46. All eyes were on the varsity crews. Columbia jumped to a fast lead but only to be rowed down in the rough water by Navy who won by five lengths. Times: Navy 7:19 and Columbia 7:36.158 Not a Navy crew had seen defeat yet. Cantler, the Navy boatman of many years, who had seen crews and seasons come and go said early on in this spring of springs, “It suttinly looks to me as though we’re goin’ to have a mighty fine crew this year.”159

Heavy weather again stepped in to upstage scheduled events when Boston’s Union Boat Club had to leave without racing its intermediate and senior eights. This was a grave concern to Navy, who had to face mighty Syracuse next. On the fifteenth of May, the second varsity race was the closest Navy had seen all season. Navy just barely nosed out Syracuse 10:37 to 10:38. The varsity crews were next on the two-mile course. Syracuse took off to an early lead and was ahead by a length at a quarter mile from the start. Navy pulled even throughout the body of the race until nearing the finish, Syracuse handed Navy its sole defeat by 7 feet—Syracuse 10:20, Navy 10:21.160
Sources at the time hint that perhaps Navy lost due to overconfidence, and with its toughest races ahead, the loss to Syracuse instilled the “will to win” in Navy.\textsuperscript{161} The college championships, American Henley, and the Olympic trails would soon tell if Glendon could get the focus back into the crew.

At 5 P.M. on Memorial Day weekend Navy raced and won (7 minutes 3 2/8 seconds) in the heats for the Child’s Cup (1-Navy, 2-Princeton, 3-U. of Penn, 4-Columbia) of the American Henley held in Philadelphia. This prestigious race has been annually rowed since it began in 1879 with a regatta between Columbia, Princeton, and University of Pennsylvania.\textsuperscript{162} By special invitation the Navy crew was asked to row in 1920. The next day, Saturday, as part of the same prestigious regatta on the Schuylkill River, Navy was in the final. Racing against what were considered the best collegiate crews in the country, Navy won in 6 minutes 30 seconds (1-Navy, 2-Syracuse, 3-Princeton, 4-Union Boat Club).\textsuperscript{163} Navy looked unbeatable, refusing to let the earlier loss to Syracuse deprive them of their goal—winning the Olympic Trials in July.

Figure 11. Navy winning the Child’s Cup, 1920
Reprinted by permission of Duncan Glendon
The Navy Admirals’ accomplishment was nothing short of miraculous. From that event, every aspect of the crew’s journey to destiny made the papers. The Olympic trials of 1920 were scheduled for July 23 and 24 on Lake Quinsigamond in Worcester, Massachusetts. Glendon took 20 oarsmen: 2 full eights, 18 men total—8 rowers in each shell and 2 coxswains and four substitutes. This typical method of training is used even today. Two boats of equal numbers allow the coach to switch seats from boat to boat to find the fastest combination. The selected men were given a short leave from school and were exempt from their summer naval cruise required at the Academy, to begin training on 14 June.164

The Navy crew faced fierce competition for the right to represent the United States in the Olympic Games, including rival Syracuse who had beaten them in the college season. Many members of that crew formed a club team named Duluth Rowing Club under the coaching of James Ten Eyck, but rumor had it that the stroke man, Rammi, of the Syracuse boat would not be with their club boat. Rammi was indeed replaced by the 6 seat of the Syracuse boat that won the Intercollegiate Championship earlier that spring, a man named Loakamp, who did a good job stroking, but not good enough to beat the unstoppable Midshipmen.165 Navy rowed the mile and a quarter course in 6 minutes 20 seconds.166

The thrill that this particular crew gave to Annapolis, the Academy and the Navy is reflected in several newspaper articles. The New York Times of 15 August discusses not only this current Olympic crew but also the prospects for the next several years of rowing at Navy, “the whole standard of rowing at the Naval Academy will be elevated by the trip to Antwerp....Rowing, already highly regarded by every Navy man, will be given
additional and lasting impetus whether the Academy crew wins or loses in the International event.”

The people of the United States were embracing these young men as their team, representatives of themselves and of a cross-section of America. In an article of unknown origin, found in the July 1920 Olympic Trials program, Navy’s crew is labeled as “Lads from 7 states” who were “truly a representative American crew—it’s the best eight in the country, college or club and it’s the big favorite to prove itself the best in the world after the competition with the European and English crews.”
Excitement over the Naval Academy’s chance to beat the British grew as the 1920 Olympics approached. That summer, Edward R. Bushnell of the *Pittsburgh Press*, in a preview shortly before the crew was to set sail to Europe, opined that “experts who have seen the Middies [Midshipmen] row are confident that they can beat anything Europe has to offer.” The nationalistic attitude of the day—that not only the “Middies,” but also all the athletes in this Olympiad embodied the ideals of America—surfaced again in early August as the Olympic fever heightened at the onset of the Games. Ralph Davis of the *Pittsburgh Press* predicted, “Uncle Sam is confident that his boys will come through with another victory.” Davis spelled out exactly what victory would mean. “The example of a super-type of athlete we would hold up to the world—strong of heart, clear of eye, clean of heart, lovers of honor—all.” Davis concluded with a rhetorical flourish, “Is it any wonder if they are proud, or that we are proud of them?”

Great Britain’s Leander club began practicing for the Olympic Regatta at Henley on Thames after the Henley Royal Regatta—where they won the Grand Challenge Cup—in July. *Times* coverage of their practicing for the Olympic Regatta was summarily upbeat, “the crew rowed in the new Sims boat which appeared to carry them
admirably." In the same article, they reportedly tried a new set of oars on 16 July, sent their Sims boat ahead to Antwerp, finishing their practices at Henley in a Magdalen boat.

Accolades by the *Times* rowing correspondent included, “The rowing was a long way in advance of anything seen at Henley during the last two regattas.” The confidence of success for the Leander crew was evident: “The crew promises well, and with another fortnight’s practice should make a really first-class eight likely to retain the trophy which Leander won at the Olympic regatta of 1908 (Henley) and 1912 (Stockholm).”

In July 1920, the Anglo-American rowing controversies over orthodoxy of stroke, equipment, and tradition were poised for the transatlantic showdown, to be decided on a canal outside Antwerp. The Navy proudly transported its crew to Belgium on the armored destroyer, *U.S.S. Frederick*, while many of the other Olympic athletes suffered through the crossing on Army transports. W. Pitt Scott, the Captain of the *U.S.S. Frederick*, reporting on the transport mission gleaned the prestige and importance of the trip by summing up his armed escort as, “indicating to what extent the Government was back of them.”
American fans rallied behind the Navy boat as more than just men and wood. The boat and its crew became a symbol of the United States, something to be protected. Department of the Navy records indicate numerous transmissions and special arrangements made for the *U.S.S. Frederick*, including a special docking permit and live-aboard arrangements for the duration of the stay in Antwerp harbor arranged by the U.S. with the Belgian Ambassador. In contrast, the other Olympic athletes, transported on a steamship as Army transport, were housed in a schoolhouse in Belgium living under substandard conditions. The accommodations and transport raised umbrage, prompting the athletes to compile an indignant letter of protest. *The New York Herald Tribune* on 7 August 1920, highlighting the differences in the treatments of the Olympic team athletes, carried both stories ("U.S. Olympic Athletes Threaten to Go on Strike: Dissatisfied with
accommodations...” and “Navy Olympic Team Arrives in Antwerp In Good Condition”) juxtaposed in adjacent columns. A potential Navy win over England in the Olympics was indeed generating attention and excitement. With the U.S. Navy athletes steaming nearer to European shores the rivalry heightened.

When the U.S.S. Frederick arrived on foreign shores, Glendon reports, “We procured a pilot at this point and proceeded up the river twenty miles to the ancient city of Antwerp arriving at the dock at 6 P.M. on 6 August after 12 days at sea.

“At this point the officials in charge (both the Olympic committee officials and our own) seemed to take the line of least resistance. There was no receiving committee for the athletes, and no arrangements had been made for housing the racing shells; in fact, no one seemed to know even where the races were going to be held! The result was that the crew squad was on the Frederick for five days, while the other athletes were in training. We kept the squad in condition by taking long hikes about the city and viewing points of interest.”

Though the following photographs show the stadium and the Navy crew marching in, despite Glendon’s aforementioned surprise over the lack of organization, 1920 stands in sharp contrast to today’s focus on a grand Opening Ceremony and meticulous venue details.
Figure 13. The Olympic Stadium
Reprinted by permission of Duncan Glendon

Figure 14. Navy Marching in the Olympic parade
Reprinted by permission of Duncan Glendon
The rowing shells were taken by barge through canals twenty miles inland and housed in the King’s Boathouse, Nautique, at Three Fountains Estate. The Belgian shells housed here during the war were in disrepair. The Germans had occupied the boathouse for a year and put the wooden shells outside exposed to the weather.177

When the rowing events began, European spectators, abandoning ancient rivalries, bonded together as one community of Europeans rooting for the British rowers against the Americans.178 The 1920 rowing event took on a global social and nationalistic significance. Brand Whitlock, the American Ambassador, came to watch and have his picture taken with the crew.179 Feelings ran so high that the amount of riverbank betting against the U.S. by the largely European crowd was considered extraordinary by the press.180

Figure 15. Semi-finals win
Reprinted by permission of Duncan Glendon
Friday, 27 August, all the Olympic crews were gathered at a meeting to hear the starting commands of Mr. V. De Visschop. The honor of being Olympic starter was given to De Visschop who was a member of the King’s royal Nautique boat club. The commands and regulations for a false start were explained to all competitors. The French international start of “Etes Vous Prêts? Partez!” would be used, which means, “Are you ready? Go!” A red flag would be held upright throughout the commands and dropped on the “P” of Partez. The crews would be permitted to engage on the “P” of Partez. They would race 2,000 meters down the calm waters of a canal turned Olympic race course.\(^{181}\)

Friday afternoon’s heats consisted of the singles, doubles, and eights. Saturday’s semi-finals would see the fours, singles, and eights. On Sunday all of the aforementioned events, with the inclusion of the pairs, would be rowed as the last events of the Olympic Games. A complete outline of the Olympic program is in Appendix F.

In the eights, the first race of the Friday’s heats Norway defeated Czechoslovakia, in a time of 6:35. Then Britain’s Leander crew defeated Switzerland in 6:19, the United States defeated Belgium in 6:26, and in the final heat France defeated Holland in 6:33. Leander’s race with the Swiss proved to be a tight, fast heat for the British. The American draw against Belgium did not push the American crew, and so their speed and potential threat remained unseen by the confident Leander eight.\(^{182}\)

Saturday’s semi-finals pitted England against Norway and the American crew against the French. Both Great Britain and America won handily in an easy pace of 6:26 and 6:24, respectively. The two crews were now selected for Sunday’s final Olympic race for the gold medal.
On Sunday afternoon, Navy paddled to the line first. In Glendon’s own words:

The English came down on the line (the pride and flower of England) and when both crews were lined up the starter said in French: ‘Are you ready America,’ ‘Are you ready England?’ Every heart stopped beating. ‘Are you ready all?’—‘Row.’ The starting cannon boomed, the flag dropped, the oars flashed and the men in both boats started to row the race of their lives.

Down at the finish line the great mob yelled, ‘Here they come,’ and every neck was craned to watch the crews.

At the half-way mark England was leading by one half length, and rowing like demons; but the Navy crew kept their heads; one slip then and all was lost. On they came until the two big crews were 300 yards from the finish. It began to look like England’s race, but Clarke yelled, the stroke went up and the Navy crew began to gain. Up they came foot by foot, until the two crews were even. Ten more heart breaking strokes and the Navy shell slid across the line half a length ahead of the fastest crew England ever turned out, breaking the world record by five seconds.183

Figure 16. Olympic finals
Reprinted by permission of Duncan Glendon

The 1920 Olympic rowing coverage in The Times of London reflected the British surprise and inability to cope with the American breakthrough. In the article entitled

“Defeat of Britain in the Eights,” the readers could see Glendon’s race strategy of under stroking the British unfold. “Great Britain started at 41 strokes a minute to 39,” reported
The Times observer. By letting the British crew play themselves out, near the end of the race (always the critical time to sprint if a crew can), the Americans rowed through the British from being down “half a length” (roughly 30 feet), to winning by “a few feet,” all in the “last 30 yards.”

To put this in perspective, being rowed through is the most embarrassing insult one crew can inflict on another—in crew races it is still seen as a failure of the leading crew’s manliness. In front of all the cheering fans, racing for the Olympic gold medal, the British could not hold off the Navy crew. The Navy cadets wisely held position until they broke the spirit and physical limits of the British crew. At the critical moment, the U.S. crew decisively accelerated the pace to gain 32 feet in only 30 yards. A winning distance of “a few feet” in rowing is considered a sound thrashing; and a crew that has been coached to keep a cool head, pace itself, and know when and how to unleash its ability to deliver such a blisteringly fast pace (due to rowing an arc closest to the right angle thereby yielding more power and speed) while at the edge of exhaustion, is indeed exhibiting effort of Olympic proportion. The American win was complete—the British would not win another Men’s Olympic Eight race in the twentieth century.
The American press coverage of the event underscored the prowess of the American team. News of the Admirals defeat of the British made newspapers coast to coast. *The Washington Post* reported that the Americans sat upright at the finish while the British were bent over while crossing the line—a telltale indication that the U.S. Navy crew was superior. Glendon himself reported that the British were so impressed that they “came by the American quarters that night” in respect for their conquerors.

Newspapers coast to coast covered the win in the U.S. while headlines in *The Times* of London lamented, “Defeat of Britain in the Eights.” *The Washington Post,* nearest to the Academy, proudly boasted “Navy Eight Oared Crew Win at Brussels.” The *New York Tribune* reported the King of Belgium himself would hang gold medals on
the Olympians’ necks.\textsuperscript{189} From the \textit{Atlanta Constitution} and the \textit{Los Angeles Times}, the Navy Admirals had secured a glorious Olympic niche.\textsuperscript{190}

![Image of Olympic coxswain](image)

Figure 18. Tossing the Olympic coxswain
Reprinted by permission of Duncan Glendon

Perhaps the strongest evidence for the thrill and significance of the Navy crew lies in the fact that this rowing event—this day in Olympic history—was attended by the greatest crowd for any Olympic event to that time.\textsuperscript{191} U.S. Navy documents reported, “The president of the American Olympic Committee pronounced it probably the best performance by Americans in any department of the Olympic Games.” The report also stated that, “it was particularly gratifying that this distinction was won in a characteristic Navy sport.”\textsuperscript{192} Secretary of the Navy Daniels cabled his congratulations to the crew saying, “This crew’s record will serve forever as an inspiration to the young men of the Navy to strive for excellence in rowing, in which the Navy should always lead the world.”\textsuperscript{193}
A ticker-tape parade in New York welcomed the American Olympians home. Six of the nine Navy Admirals walked in the parade to the roar of thunderous crowds “cheering for the men and women who won glory for their native land.”¹⁹⁴ That night, during the dinner for the Olympians at the Waldorf Hotel, nationalistic rhetoric of addresses from Father Duffy and Commissioner Whalen reminded the crowd that, “what they accomplished was no more than what America expected of them. It is an American’s duty to win and to win always.”¹⁹⁵ Navy went on to win consecutive National Poughkeepsie Regattas in 1921 and 1922. The Navy Admirals accomplished what no other American crew had done before.¹⁹⁶ The U.S. success story continued for forty years with American eight-oared shells winning every Olympic gold from 1920 until 1960.¹⁹⁷ British style and tradition gave way to American scientific oarsmanship, and because of it rowing on all continents changed.

Such was the road taken, from that first Harvard-Oxford crew race in 1869 to the 1920 Olympics. The 1920 British Olympic crew, a composite of Britain’s best rowers mainly from the Leander club, was considered the fastest crew ever sent out of England.¹⁹⁸ Mendenhall, in describing American orthodoxy, notes that not until 1920 did one style solidify as “the best evidence of success,” starting with Navy in 1920.¹⁹⁹
Coach Dick Glendon, Olympic gold to his credit, decided to retire from the Naval Academy in 1921 after beating Harvard, Yale, Penn, Cornell, and Washington at Poughkeepsie. Glendon’s American style, though, had captured the imagination of even the most resolute Anglophiles among the nation’s crews. In 1921, and again in 1922, both Harvard and Yale tried to lure him to take over their crews. Harvard and Yale had been steeped in British rowing orthodoxy since the 1850s. So deeply was Yale ensconced in the British tradition that in 1919 Yale acquired a Leander Boat Club hull.
from England and brought it to America. But after the Admirals’ defeat of the British, the alumni associations of Harvard and Yale pressured their teams and coaches to win—even if it meant breaking with the English tradition. Glendon was a proven winner. He touted his total American system and methods (boats, oars and stroke style) as scientific oarsmanship. He proclaimed that his innovations were, “acknowledged as the standard American style—the salient points already being adopted by progressive American coaches.” Both Harvard and Yale wanted to adopt the new American orthodoxy.

This was a radical turn of events: The American stroke style was being copied by the defeated British and even by the Anglophiles at Harvard and Yale who were seeking to alter their seventy-year lineage in the English orthodoxy in favor of the standard American style. Navy’s victory with the new American system represented a takeover, a coup of the highest order. Harvard and Yale pursued Glendon. In a tell-tale news article, reflecting the shift of power, Harvard—long noted for its club officers running the crew with coaches as little more than figure-heads doing their bidding or getting ousted—made an offer to Glendon of “large expense” and promised a “free hand” in the way the Crimson crew would be run. “A few live ones are ready to forget the Mayflower ancestry and the imitation Oxford accents,” the author noted including mixing Jewish athletes in with the Puritan Groton blood.

At a New York City dinner interview for the coaching job at Yale, Glendon was tight-lipped about his coaching secrets and spoke only about “resistance on the hull skin and fluid dynamics.” But Glendon’s standard American style was forever out-of-the bag. The U.S. now led the world in rowing. Epitomizing the words of Mahan on what it
takes to affect the sea power of the nation, Glendon’s leadership, will, and energy achieved its destiny and fulfilled cadet Churchill’s dream.206

West Point sent a warm congratulation to the Navy, “West Point sends its heartiest congratulations on your magnificent victory in the Olympiads which clearly entitles you to a world championship on the water.”207 And Navy gratefully acknowledged, “…Midshipmen keenly appreciate the Cadets’ loyalty to the sister service and prize their approval more than that from any other source.”208 Coach Glendon received personal honors at the Annapolitan Club as guest of honor at a dinner for the Navy Oarsmen.209

It was the first time that America had sent athletes from the Navy as part of its Olympic All-American team.210 J. G. Ware, Lieutenant Commander, writing the American Olympic Committee Report on what all the Navy athletes in all events did at Antwerp, emphasized that Navy’s rowing win was the “best performance by Americans in any department of the Olympic Games” and that it was “particularly gratifying to the service that this distinction was won in a characteristic Navy sport.”211 Ware proudly stated, “Participation in the Olympic Games and the winning of the world’s rowing championship by the Naval Academy crew has had an inspiring influence on the service in general, as well as attracting recruits.” He heralded the crew as leaders who would return to their shipmates and stations and “inspire those around them with a greater zeal for physical education.”212

The broad-sweeping energy that this win gave can be gleaned in several letters: The President of the National Association of Amateur Oarsmen, James D. Denegre, wrote, “My dear Mr. Glendon: “...It was the greatest triumph that any American crew
has ever won anywhere and everyone interested on this side of the water in rowing felt
that it was a distinctive victory of his own crew, for the Navy boys were representing us
all…I feel that this victory has done much for rowing in America….”

At last the Anglo-American rowing “debate” was resolved. It culminated at that
dinner in New York—having begun with Harvard and Yale in the mid 1800s, to Oxford
and Cambridge, to the 1919 Inter-Allied Games, to the 1920 Olympics, full-circle to the
conversion of England rowing Orthodoxy—and now back to Harvard and Yale. This
testament witnessed the fact that rowing traditions, social practices, and the stories they
evoke are valid and evidential in sporting history and nationalism. The reality of the U.S.
beating the British—not just defeating them, as had been done previously by mimicking
their form—but through punishing them by setting a world record in 1920 was an
unprecedented feat performed by the U.S.

The English were stunned. A sarcastic article after the defeat expressed English
opinions as to what happened, “Oarsmen in England haven’t had a very easy time of it
since that famous little race at Antwerp during the Olympiad in which certain
midshipmen from a charming little Maryland town on the river Severn, a stream that
leads up from the Chesapeake Bay, defeated Leander crew. English oarsmen have a habit
of sitting forward and looking out of the car window when a Leander crew pulls second
to a crew of any other nation.

“Superiority on the water is something on which Englishmen prides himself in
countries of white men. He might go a little shy in paddling a canoe off the Marquesas,
or outrigging with the Hawaiians, but he will not take a back seat, if he can avoid it, in anything which has to do with pulling a shell.”

The article examined heavier crews, rigging, swivel oar locks to replace the British thole pins, and Glendon’s larger oar blades, saying, “Much has been made of the large oars which were used by the Annapolis crew at Antwerp.” The article, after examining a broad sweep of English cultural pride ended on an interesting national note, listing crew as a means available to anyone who wanted “his share of American athletic prowess.”

The later decades of the 1800s and early decades of the 1900s give credence to the reality that the U.S. was taking vast strides toward its own identity, and winning; beating England at sporting events was a central catalyst. Navy’s walking through the British on the racecourse contributed to a tangible shift in world naval power, as reflected in the Washington Naval Conference, where the U.S. was seen as the equal to, and then surpassing Britannia. Like Lexington’s “shot heard ’round the world,” the Olympic race of 1920 began a revolution.

In the decades following the 1920 Olympic Games the British never won the Olympic gold medal in the men’s eight-oared shell again. Until 1960, the U.S. won every Olympic gold medal in this event. The American style had triumphed. Scientific approach and study had succeeded. A new world order, highlighted by the age of Americanism, technology, and invention, had won. Breaking through English orthodox tradition in the 1920s with a new American orthodoxy exemplified the best of American know-how and ingenuity. Moreover, having been achieved through a moment of “breakthrough kinesis” by a U.S. military academy strengthened the image of
nationalism. The 1920 Navy crew was integral to the American team earning its right to be packaged as part of the winning sport culture of American power.217
CHAPTER NINE

“POWER TEN”: BIOGRAPHIES OF THE 1920 CREW

There were ten men on the Antwerp dock the day the Navy Admirals won the 1920 Olympic gold medal. The coxswain, the stroke, and up through seats seven to bow—Gallagher, Johnston, Sanborn, Moore, Jordan, Graves, Jacomini—and of course their coach Dick Glendon. What a moment it must have been as they laid hands on the hull and at the coxswain S. R. Clark’s bark, lifted it, “overhead, ready up!” And the Olympic shell rose even higher than its watery glory into the air, droplets streaming off, and then resting down to the shoulders of the Olympians to be walked off, into the world away from Olympic records and cheering crowds. Their battle won, their point proven, the Navy Admirals strode off the dock with Dick Glendon undoubtedly beaming with pride—clapping backs, shoulders, and the backs of heads in unabashed glee as his boys walked by. They had done it—ten together—a power ten.218
Figure 20. The Olympic crew and coach  
Reprinted by permission of Duncan Glendon

The above photograph shows these ten men, with the coxswain in the middle with Dick Glendon. From the stern of the shell forward, stroke to bow the Olympic eight consisted of men from around the U.S. who were at the Academy first and foremost to be sailors. The Naval Academy was a rigorous institution then as it is now, so we can assume that all of the men listed below were academically sound and above average in physical prowess. What happened to the nine young Midshipmen after their Olympic race? Impressively, all graduated from the Naval Academy.  

In the coxswain’s seat was S. R. Clarke from Baltimore, Maryland. He was twenty years old, weighed 113 pounds and was 5’8” tall. This young man was as close to a hometown boy as the Academy might get, due to its proximity to Baltimore. Sherman
Clark is the only American coxswain to win an Olympic medal in two different boats at the same Olympics. In Antwerp he coxed Navy to gold, then substituted into the four with for Penn Barge Club and won silver. He retired from the Navy as a rear admiral.

The stroke man, Clyde Whitlock King, chosen for his strength and endurance, was from Grinnell, Iowa; he weighed 178 pounds was 6’ tall and 22 years old. He also played football for Navy and this factored into the Navy defeat of Army in 1919, by scoring all of Navy’s points in a 6–0 victory by kicking two field goals. Like several others in the boat, he resigned his commission after the War when he graduated in 1922. He was called back to active duty in WWII where he remained until his retirement as a rear admiral in 1958. As a civilian, he was in the glass business.

At seats seven and six were two New Yorkers, one from the city, one from the capital. V. J. (Vincent Joseph, Jr.) Gallagher was from Brooklyn. Gallagher, who did not row previous to college, started his college career at Rutgers but transferred to the Naval Academy when he received an appointment in 1919. As well as winning the Olympic Gold, Gallagher won the 1921 and 1922 IRAs with Navy at Poughkeepsie. He retired in 1957 as a commander after a lifelong Naval career. D. (Donald) Johnston in six seat was from Albany, New York and had only one year of previous rowing experience before winning the Olympic Gold. A powerfully built 6’2” and 190 pounds, he joined Sanborn in the “engine room”—the widest part of the boat where the most powerful rowers were placed. He retired as an Air Force captain in 1952.

Seat five, again in the “engine room” of the boat, held A. R. (Alden Ream) Sanborn from Jefferson, Wisconsin. Considered the strongest man in the crew, he was 6’3” tall and weighed 183 pounds. Sanborn started his college career at Beloit College,
but received an appointment to Navy in 1918. After the Olympics he graduated in 1922 and became a Naval officer. He earned a second degree in engineering from MIT in 1928 and retired from the Navy as a Captain before working as a civilian for Wright Aeronautical Corporation.223

E. P. (Edward Peerman) Moore from Ringgold, Virginia was in four seat. With only one year of experience, he had been only a junior varsity rower a matter of weeks before the Olympic Trials; yet his determination won him a seat in the Olympic boat. An impressive athlete and leader, Moore was elected captain of the 1921 crew. He was a lifetime career officer in the Navy winning the Legion of Merit and two Presidential Unit citations during his term as chief of staff to the commander of the Pacific Task Force. He retired in 1945 as a rear admiral.224

Three seat was W. C. (William Conrad) Jordan from Cleveland, Ohio. He was the tallest member of the crew at 6’ 3 1/2” inches. Jordan rowed in the 1921 and 1922 IRA crews as well, graduating from the Academy in 1922. As a civilian he worked in aeronautics for Curtiss-Wright Aircraft in Columbus, Ohio, later being named President of Curtiss-Wright from 1948–1954. In 1954, Hughes aircraft hired him to be President and General Manager.225

E. D. (Edwin Darius) Graves, Jr. rowed two seat. He was the captain of the 1920 crew and was 23 years old, weighing in at 176 pounds. Graves graduated from the Naval Academy in 1920 but stayed with the crew through the Olympic Games before starting his career in the Naval Air Force. Edwin Graves retired in 1950 as a captain.226

The bow seat was V. V. (Virgil Victor) Jacomini from Pasadena, California, who was only twenty years old. Like many others after the war years, Jacomini resigned his
commission and joined the civilian work force as an engineer. These nine men plus their coach formed the power ten that etched their names into the Olympic annals forever.

The prestige of the 1920 Olympic win by these young men, and the success of Glendon’s crews thereafter, stirred a great deal of interest in all the members of the Naval Academy crew associated with Glendon. The 1920 Olympic crew grew to legendary status and the individual men of the 1920 crew became symbolic of all the great crews at Navy, so much so that tales began lumping the great Navy rowers together.

The achievements of these men would be remembered. When Admiral Scales, the Superintendent of the Naval Academy, retired in 1921 he mused over this crew in his farewell speech, “that since he came here, the Midshipmen have defeated the rival West Point Cadets in all branches of athletics, two or more times. The loss of this year’s baseball game after a hair-raising battle,” he said, hurt, “but the crew,” he added, “is the greatest of all time.” He went on to compliment Glendon and the 1921 crew, many of whom were from the 1920 Olympic boat that had just won the National Intercollegiate Championship in Poughkeepsie.

Who were these rowers and oarsmen and why did people admire them? In a dialogue in Vincent Treanor’s “Looks Them Over,” New York Evening World of 1929, interviewed the famous athletic trainer Doc Barrett and Coach Dick Glendon, as they sized up the sport:

Doc began, “I’ve been in all kinds of sports for thirty-five years and there’s nothing that can compare with rowing. A boy has to be a he-man to get on those slides. I’d like to see some of those fighters get in there with an oar in their hands. They’d quit sure. And those husky football players don’t fall over themselves trying to make the crew. It’s too hard for them…now take those other sports,” went on Doc Barrett. “Baseball first. They knock the ball out to the shortstop. He grabs it and tosses it over to first. Then he stands there up straight and relaxes. The football player gets into a scrimmage and then he enjoys a
period of relaxation. And those fighters, what do they pull? Three minutes of slapping and then dance back to their corners for a minute’s rest.”

Glendon, cut in saying, “Rowing is like thoroughbred horse racing. Like the race horses, the crews start, and then they finish. There is NO in-between let up. They must give up all they have all the way. It’s a real test of strength and courage.”

Doc came back with, “They can’t make any mistakes either. If one man goes bad, he spoils the entire boat.”

“That,” resumed Glendon, “is one of the chief worries of a coach. A sick stomach, or a touch of indigestion on the day of the race in any of the boys, and the best laid plans go wrong....” What do the coaches look for? “A youngster who can get into the boat on the day of the race and just settle down as if he is rowing against one of his own crews, is the natural oarsman. But it’s the same with crews as it is with good horses. You can tell a good oarsman sometimes just by the way he sits up straight in the shell.

“...I [Glendon] once heard Clyde King...say that it takes more nerve and courage to stroke a crew in a championship race than to do anything else in the sport line. There is a tenseness about the start of a rowing race that isn’t associated with any other branch of competition. You can’t move around like other athletes do. You must sit still, wait, and then get under way with the slightest possible loss of time.”

Glendon also had a set opinion about what was required to be a good stroke and good coxswain. He described his ideas about King and Clark as:

An ideal stroke oar should be able to set the pace according to the caliber of the crew he is up against, never forgetting for an instant the limits of his own crew. It is better to be beaten one-half or three-quarters of a boat length in rowing a heady race, than to row the crew off their seats trying some new stunt and probably get beaten by a dozen lengths.

Clyde King, stroke-oar of the 1920 Navy Crew was an exceptional oarsman, inasmuch as he always seemed to know what his rivals were doing and the best move to counteract it. In his two-mile race against Harvard on the Severn he rowed the Harvard crew off their feet in the first mile of the race, forcing them to hold a stroke of 34 per minute, which was a little more than they were accustomed to. Although he was driving his own crew to the tune of 36, he was quick to notice the first break in the Harvard boat and immediately lowered the stroke, easing the strain on his crew without affecting the pace of the boat perceptibly, and drawing slowly away from Harvard. He eased his crew through the middle distance enough to leave them reserve strength to drive over the last quarter at 38 a minute, finishing with his crew in good shape five lengths in front.

In the same year this wonderful stroke-oar in his race at Antwerp, against the Leander crew, shot up to the front a few feet at the very start, but at once eased the pace enough to let Leander go to the front, and allowed them to set the pace to the 1,500 meter mark, just taking enough out of his crew to prevent
Leander getting more than one-half length to the lead; carefully conserving the forces of his crew for the final dash to the finish line, and completely demoralizing the English eight, by the way he jumped from 36 to 39, and simply tore down the lead of one-half length, hitting the finish three-quarters of a boat length to the good.

A successful stroke-oar should have many qualities necessary in a captain, he should be a natural leader and must have the confidence of the whole crew in his ability to set the pace and hold it. A stroke oar should know the pace to set for his crew that will produce the best results; how to get off the starting line, and just when to lower the beat enough to hold his rivals through the middle distance, when to spurt if necessary and to always hold something in reserve for the final dash to the finish line.\textsuperscript{230}

A coxswain should be elected primarily for his weight. He should not weigh more than 110 pounds. Outside of calling the beat of the stroke, and watching the watermanship of the crew, he should above everything else, steer the boat straight and keep a sharp watch ahead. Coxswains who are continually yelling at the crew, picking out faults in their oarsmanship, as a rule do more harm than good. Except to call attention to prominent faults, a coxswain should maintain a discrete silence in connection with this phase of his work.\textsuperscript{231}

Rowers of other eras were compared to the Olympians, and stories of Glendon’s impact on the crews at large—the strength of their mettle, and types of men crew turned out at Navy over the years dotted the press for decades, particularly as the Navy men grew to public stature as industrialists and WWII heroes. It is interesting that records indicate that, through WWII at least, the crew and how the crew was doing in general, was always of great interest to the larger Navy, moreso than any other sport.\textsuperscript{232}

One WWII article stated:

Navy’s varsity crew has an unusual opportunity not only to sweep through to an undefeated season…but in doing so to bring more than a cheer to the lips of two old Navy Oarsmen who have proved in the few months since Pearl Harbor that they learned not only to be good crew men but good fighting men as well under the teaching of Old Dick Glendon.

These two former pupils are Admiral Chester W. Nimitz and Rear Admiral Francis Rockwell, who was in Manila with Gen. MacArthur and journeyed from Bataan to Australia with him on their epic trip. Both Admirals Nimitz and Rockwell pulled in varsity boats under the elder Glendon during twenty years and more as head coach at the Naval Academy and both were outstanding oarsmen.
Admiral Nimitz rowed in the days before Navy crews were permitted to leave the academy and he was stroke oar of the 1905 varsity eight, one of the best crews the Navy ever had.

Rockwell, known to his mates as Skinny, a nickname that has stuck to him ever since, followed Nimitz to the Academy. Rockwell was in the 1907 eight stroked by Ingram.

Glendon recalls Nimitz as a serious kid who would plot out for days ahead of time how he would stroke each race. Glendon says he was one of the best stroke oars I ever had. Had instincts for how hard to press and when to put the pressure on, a brainy stroke.

Rockwell, Glendon says, came back to the Academy on different times for numerous details, he was Director of Athletics, and crew representative—didn’t surprise Glendon that Rockwell made it to Australia with MacArthur. He visited me on the Cape before he left for the Philippines last fall, but had no idea what he was heading in to.233

Glendon began coaching oarsmen like these at the Academy in 1904.234 Coach of the Academy for eighteen years previous to the Games, Dick Glendon found himself uncharacteristically sought after by Harvard and Yale following the Olympic win; Glendon was signed by the Academy for only two more years in the fall of 1920.235

Beloved by Navy, hoping to keep him under contract by showing their appreciation, on the night of 1 December 1920, in Annapolis at the Annapolitan Club, where Glendon resided during coaching months, he was presented a loving cup by John de P. Douw, ex-Mayor of Annapolis.236 After seeing in the paper the giving of the loving cup the night before, A. G. Spalding wrote on 2 December 1920 “…for over forty years I have seen pretty much every college crew in this country row, and I never saw one that impressed me as having the speed that your crew possessed.”237

But, at the end of his contract, Glendon at first explored other crew offers and then decided to retire to try his hand at cranberry farming on Cape Cod.238 On 15 December 1923, officers of the U.S. Navy paid signal testimony to Glendon on news of
his retirement. He was presented an eighteen-inch tall, handsome silver loving cup at the Armory from the U.S. Navy Rear Admiral Henry P. Wilson, Superintendent of the Naval Academy, from the officers. It was of Greek design with the handles made in the form of dolphins. It was inscribed, “Presented to Richard A. Glendon, rowing coach, 1991–1922, as a tribute of appreciation and affection. From the officers of the United States Navy, 1923.”239
Who was this man and how did Richard A. Glendon get to Navy in the first place? Born in 1870 near the ocean on Cape Cod, in Chatham, Massachusetts, the son of a fisherman, Richard Glendon combined his American born-and-bred coaching
techniques with rowing in an American-built boat and oars. Coach Glendon’s life-long passion for rowing process and his unique combination of American rowing factors culminated in the 1920 gold medal. That victory, Glendon contended, “realized the fulfillment of the dreams of ‘The Old Captains of the Navy Boat Crews.’” His crews returned his respect by visiting him often in his retirement. The personable nature of his wit and welcoming aspects of his personality endeared him to many.

One insight comes from a letter from his granddaughter who recalls her “grandpa” as being, “about 5’11” tall, medium build with sandy colored hair and exceptionally blue eyes. He loved to sing and had a beautiful tenor voice. He always had a folk-song for us children such as ‘My dame had a lame, tame, crane.’” She continues, “He was an accomplished artist as well as a man with a keen knowledge of weather and sea. One insight gained about the wizened Richard Glendon tells of several of his past crew members coming to visit on the Cape to go for a row in the bay. It was a clear sunny windless morning. Grandfather stood at the water’s edge for a moment, studying the sky and air and announced that he was sorry, but there would be no rowing that morning due to bad weather. One of his crew, every one a Ph.D., looking at the clear skies asked, ‘Why?’ and Glendon responded, ‘You have your science, I have mine.’ And within an hour the seas were rough and the wind whipping the shore.”

His family, the Richard Alfred Glendons, were from the West coast of Ireland. Leaving Ireland in the mid-1800s, the family settled in Nova Scotia. Richard A. Glendon, married to Alice McNulty, came to the United States from Nova Scotia in the 1860s. They had five children: Thomas, Mary, Richard, Alice, and John. The middle
child, Richard “Dick” Glendon, destined to be an Olympic coach fifty years hence, was born 14 April 1870 in Harwich, Massachusetts.

After attending Brook Academy in Harwich Center, young Dick went to sea at age thirteen following in the footsteps of his father and family. Fishing and working in the waters of the North Atlantic fishing grounds, he acquired hands-on watermanship skills that would shape the basis of his scientific oarsmanship in years to come. Dick Glendon left the decks of the mackerel schooner in Boston and found work on the Charles River at the Boston Athletic Association’s floating boathouse around age sixteen. A sculler himself, he dedicated his life to the sport of rowing. Glendon, however, saw himself as “different from other rowing teachers in one thing: he came to his profession by way of deep water.”

Dick Glendon by age eighteen was considered one of the youngest professional coaches in the country. The *Noble and Greenough Academy Bulletin* states Glendon had “complete charge of the coaching, taking different crews at stated hours.” As a coach and trainer of the Boston Athletic Association, Glendon received much press coverage in the *Boston Daily Globe* and the *Boston Evening Record*, between 1892 and 1893. Glendon was credited with the winning of the junior championship in sculling by James Shea in 1891. Articles state he is “by long odds the youngest professional coach in the country.” The same article renders him “quick to grasp an idea” with “just enough professionalism in his make-up which, together with his experience for the past three years with college oarsmen makes him almost indispensable….” In another article Glendon simply is touted as, “coaching differently.”
Other indications of his thinking in his formative days as a young coach are seen in a comprehensive article about “Schoolboy Oarsmen” in Boston which explained, “Coach Glendon was supreme in power in the direction of the work of the boys…in the first stages of the coaching, Glendon put the boys through a very careful drill, and devoted a good deal of time to the rowing machine in the clubhouse.” And, “the candidates (chosen) were the largest and strongest boys of each school.”

In 1899 an article outlines Glendon’s initiative and progressive ideas in changing the old system: “…having held several informal talks on rowing matters, and as a result there has been a complete change in the rowing system in vogue at the club for several years. Heretofore the crew candidates have been called to the gym and put to work on the rowing machines prior to the opening of the season on the water, but this spring they will be taken to the water and lumbering up in pairs, singles, and four-oared gigs. There appears to be excellent reason for this innovation. Heretofore the candidates on taking to the water felt reasonably sure of their seat in the eight, and if it were not forthcoming, they lost interest in their work. Under the present system a man will have to prove his right to a seat by showing form in pairs, and fours…”

These early articles give hints of his early training ideas that he would later utilized at Navy. One such regimen was his decision as a trainer to “keep the men on body work” before they do any blade work whatsoever. This dovetails with the interview on his first day at work at Annapolis and his lifelong commitment to strong, well-built crews who knew their way around the inside of a weight room. He designed indoor rowing machines and indoor tanks for Navy that he felt was cutting edge technology for building bodies as well as for rowing technique.
One article pinpoints the advice he handed down to his sons:

Patience is the highest tree in heaven is an old proverb; it fits the everyday task of a crew coach to a nicety. One quality a crew coach must possess to be successful is patience.

Some men are slow in learning the rudiments of the stroke and awkward in its performance, and sometimes with the exercise of a little patience on the part of the coach, what appears to be mediocre material develops into varsity quality.

In coaching a crew care should be taken not to continually correct one man, even though he is slow to learn. When picking out faults in an oarsman’s style tell what causes him to commit the fault and how to correct it…oftentimes an afternoon goes by without the athletes hearing their coaches’ voice.252
Rowing reporter Robert Harron stated, “At Columbia, ‘Young Dick,’ taking his father’s words to heart, is reported to have been one of the most silent of all rowing coaches and his brother Hubert, directing the lightweight crews, is not much less so.” He added, “Don’t ask this writer how that morale has been developed up there under the Glendons. There is no back-slapping, nothing of the, ‘hip, hip, hooray, now let’s go get’em boys,’ stuff. There’s a minimum of casual conversation before, after, and during practice. There is noticeable, however, a feeling of mutual confidence between the coaches and the boys that we’ve seen equaled in few college squads.” And there were a few other items Harron stated—not the least of which he reported as the Columbia rowing committee’s extension of a multi-year contract to the Glendons that showed confidence in the regime.253

Dick Glendon married Mary Wynn and they had seven children: Mary Marguerite, Richard John, Alice Theresa, Thomas Alfred, Hubert, Charles Francis, and Kathleen “Rose.” The family stayed near Harwich in Chatham, Massachusetts, on the south side of Cape Cod and lived a life of summer cottages, Olympic glory, and personal tragedy in the seemingly idyllic Cape Cod village. Two sons followed in the footsteps of rowing; Hubert coached rowing at Columbia and Richard John coached crew at Navy. Richard J. married Mary Fehey. After coaching both the Plebe crews and the varsity, and helping his father write *Rowing*, he was tragically killed in a hunting accident in Chatham in 1937 at Christmas.

Richard J. and Mary Fehey had three children: Richard John, Jr., Thomas Alfred, and Mary Elizabeth. In a hauntingly similar manner, Thomas Alfred was also killed in a hunting accident near Chatham, with a school chum, during Christmas vacation in 1938.
The chilling story tells of the two boys set adrift by a strong tide and offshore winds. With temperatures near freezing and darkness upon them, the boys drifted past the anchored lightship *Stone Horse*. Their location was sent via shortwave to a Coast Guard surfboat that launched an all night search but only an upturned duck boat was ever found—spotted by a low flying search plane.254

There is some family lore relating the Glendon ancestry to Scottish and English, rather than Irish, which shows up in print in several newspaper clippings. But family genealogy records place the family in Ireland, immigrating to the U.S. at a time when Irish immigrants were considered lowlier than a good slave.255 It is as if the family lore was altered in order to make a better life for the new American Glendons settling in Boston.

The *Annapolis Chronicle*, in January 1904, celebrated Glendon’s arrival and first day of work at Annapolis. There would be no coaching in anonymity at the prestigious Naval Academy. Glendon hadn’t even seen the crews yet when the anxious public asked questions in the Maryland Hotel such as: where he was staying, when he would start practice, what type of practice he would be running, and who would they be racing. No doubt his answers to reporters in these early years would endear him to the town and to the crews or not with his direct responses such as, “I only arrived here this afternoon, I haven’t had a chance to look over my new field as yet.”256 Following in his same straightforward way, Glenden also said, “No I will not wait for the weather to become sufficiently warm so as to get the shell out on the river. In all probability I shall
commence indoor training on Monday next. A lot of good coaching can be done on machines.

“I have already arranged several good matches.” He listed Georgetown College, Penn, Cornell, Yale, Harvard. Then he added, “I arranged these rather blindly as I do not know my men.” He added that he would be meeting with Midshipman Kimmel the crew manager to look over the equipment, men, and ground. Interestingly, at the end of the two column article, the unnamed reporter sums up Glendon himself, saying, “Mr. Glendon is a tall man, well built, with a light, short-cut beard, and a genial manner.” [After which on the scrapbook page immediately following the article, someone in the Glendon family had handwritten, “wouldn’t that warm your feet.”]257

The Glendons dominated rowing news at Columbia and Navy for the next decade in a series of decisions and tragedies that would see Richard A. “Old Dick, Glendon come out of retirement three times to carry on the family pride.

In 1920, 1921, and 1922, Young Dick assisted Old Dick at Navy, until Old Dick retired the first time. He gave crew to Young Dick, who then resigned in 1925 over a dispute with Navy. Young Dick left Navy for Columbia while Old Dick stuck to his cranberry farming in Cape Cod and would not enter into the politics of the dispute between Navy and his son. In 1925–1927, Old Dick came out of retirement the first time and assisted Young Dick at Columbia.

Hubert joined Young Dick, at Columbia in 1927—coaching the lightweight crews. Hubert was the most successful coach in that division with two champion lightweight eights and two runners-up. Young Dick’s varsity won the Poughkeepsie Regatta in 1927 and 1929 with a second in 1928 to his father’s first place.258
The following photograph from spring 1929, shows the three coaches with Hubert on the left, Dick Glendon in the middle, and Richard J. at the right.

Figure 23. The three coaches
Reprinted by permission of Duncan Glendon

Old Dick returned to Navy in 1928 and won that year at Poughkeepsie. In June of 1931, Navy was the surprise winner at Poughkeepsie again, where the Glendons were portrayed megaphone to megaphone with the respective eights in between father (Navy) and son (Columbia) in the Boston Globe. In a surprise announcement, on 22 September 1931, at age 67, Glendon resigned totally from Navy. He was succeeded by, C. A. “Buck” Walsh, his assistant of the previous four years.
Urged out of retirement by necessity in May 1932, Glendon came to the aid of Young Dick at Columbia. Old Dick proudly and humbly coached the 150 lb. crew when Hubert, the lightweight coach, became ill with scarlet fever.260

For the third and final time, in 1935, when Richard J. was killed in the hunting accident on Cape Cod over the winter, Hubert took the varsity job at Columbia that spring and Old Dick came again out of retirement at nearly age seventy to help get the Lions going.261

Old Dick’s leaving Columbia for the final time and returning to the Cape was a huge honor for tiny Chatham with a world-renowned figure back in its midst. Many celebrities came to visit Richard Glendon in his twilight years. The illustrious names included, Capt. Noble E. Erwin, the First Athletic Officer at the Naval Academy who allowed Navy crew to row in the 1920 Olympics. Also visiting were Admiral King, the 1920 Olympic stroke, Wallace Simpson, and Bull Halsey visited. Charles Francis Adams III, Secretary of the Navy, whom Old Dick simply called “Charlie,” was once a schoolboy rower in Boston of Dick Glendon.262

Family members remember many dignitaries visiting their Cape Cod home over the years, and the family house was littered with memorabilia. The following photographs are of the signing of the Japanese Surrender on deck, of the U.S.S. Missouri, Tokyo Bay, September 2, 1945 from Admiral Chester Nimitz inscribed, “To Dick Glendon with best wishes and warmest regards,” signed, Nimitz - Fleet Admiral, stroke 1905.”263
Figure 24. Nimitz signing the Japanese surrender
Reprinted by permission of Duncan Glendon

Tell-tale of their friendship, another photo (below) from Nimitz is inscribed, “To Dick Glendon old friend of long standing - the best crew coach the Navy ever had-best wishes and warmest regards, C.W. Nimitz, Fleet Admiral.”
Nimitz also said, “Dick Glendon, by what he put into successive generations of Navy midshipmen, undoubtedly helped us win the naval battles of WWI and WWII.”

It isn’t surprising that many of his rowers felt a life-long bond to Glendon, who was referred to affectionately as Old Dick, the Old Man, and Pop Glendon. Unlike many of his contemporaries who wielded megaphones of criticism instead of praise, Glendon was known for saying almost nothing while on the water, and then speaking to the men one at a time. His son Richard, trained by his father, reportedly would ask men to “think
about not rushing the slide” and, if they could “just concentrate on that what a great
oarsmen they would be.”

Boston sports writer Bob Guild told of the days when Glendon taught him to row
in Boston. He reminisced about the good old days when Glendon coached from a single
scull—keeping up effortlessly with a four, or coaching from the coxswain’s seat. Guild
tells of Glendon overseeing the boat building for crews too, saying he had his boats built
in Cambridgeport. Guild recounted how Glendon’s 1899 crew won the national juniors
race on the Charles River.

Sports writer Harry Cross revealed that Glendon had a secret ambition from the
early days, of beating Leander. Cross tells of a young Richard Glendon around the turn
of the century, meeting the great Leander coach, Lehmann, who was in the U.S. coaching
the Harvard crews. Lehmann, overheard Glendon saying that he felt Yale would beat the
Harvard crew, and Lehmann remarked about “the opinion of a novice.” Cross’ story goes
on to tell of the “giant picture hanging proudly over the fireplace at the Annapolitan Club
on Franklin Street of the victorious 1920 Olympic Crew” and how Glendon, when seeing
it, would wryly smile, “deliciously, in his fine feeling of satisfaction.”

In an insightful article by George Carens written two years before Glendon’s
death, Old Dick is described as sitting serenely in his shady back yard on Lower County
Road, his house a veritable rowing museum, himself a living and lively monument to
American rowing and:

To the current generation of sports enthusiasts the name means little.
Among rowing, cogoscenti, he is a legend. For his has been a great career as a
coach. He taught oarsmen what he called the dory-style of rowing, taken he said
from the way Cape Codders row their dories…The great names of the nation are
just old friends to him. As he talks of the old days, such as in 1920, when his
Navy Crew won the Olympic championship, his eyes light up.
Something new has been added at the Glendon’s residence—a miniature rowing Hall of Fame. There’s a gaudy array of silver trophies. There’s a picture gallery that includes fleet Admirals of WWII who were winning strokes under Old Dick. And of course there are the heroes of 1920 who manned the oars, at the express command of Boston’s late Charles Francis Adams, then Secretary of the Navy.

Chester Nimitz and Jonas Ingram are centerpieces in the pictorial display. Also framed is the Tip Goes Trophy, which perpetuates the names and fame of Cornell’s Charley Courtney, Syracuse’s Jim Ten Eyck, and Navy’s Glendon, for the annual triangular regatta involving the modern eights of these old rivals. Add the diplomas and Olympic doodads, and you can understand how Old Dick’s memories, remain sharp. His forty-two year coaching span ended decades ago, but he recalls them as though they were yesterday.268

The aging process was not kind to Dick Glendon. He lost both legs in later life due to circulatory problems. Having distinguished himself and the Naval Academy with his famed Glendon Stroke, “Old Dick,” as he was affectionately known, died in 1956 in Cape Cod hospital at the age of 86.269
The forty-year U.S. Olympic winning streak from 1920 until 1960 held many points of interest, notably, with the 1920 “breakthrough kinesis” in the Olympic win, Navy crew unwittingly spurred an East versus West rivalry in the United States that shaped American rowing during the golden age of sport. Glendon’s Navy crew was not from New England boarding schools or the Ivy League colleges. His was a crew from across the nation, thereby diminishing the notion that the best U.S. rowers were solely from up East. Perhaps inspired by Navy’s Olympic win, West Coast crews, coming into their own, believed they had a chance now also to threaten the dominance of long established East Coast crews that were steeped in tradition and wealth. The development of West Coast rowing, mainly at Stanford, the University of California, and the University of Washington, coupled with the boat building talent of Seattle’s George Pocock, soon rivaled the eastern powerhouses of Harvard, Yale, Syracuse, Penn, Cornell, Columbia, and Navy.  

The surprising threat of West Coast “bumpkins” using native red cedar to build boats that could beat well-heeled Eastern crews is a memorable story in the U.S. intercollegiate rowing dynasty that dominated the Olympic scene for forty years between
The rivalry sparked controversies in several areas including biases in journalistic coverage, treatment of athletes, coaches and equipment, and racing. The Intercollegiate Rowing Championships held at Poughkeepsie, New York, the American Olympic trials, and Olympic Eights’ finals from 1920 to 1939, produced intense media hyperbole and showcased the controversies and the regional rowing rivalries. Charles W. Paddock, U.S. Olympic sprint champion wrote an article dedicated to this rivalry whose caption read, “East vs. West at Poughkeepsie: It will be a Battle of Stamina and Grit, a Fight to the Finish, When California’s World Champion Sweep Swingers Meet Columbia’s Crew Tomorrow in the Poughkeepsie Regatta, for There Is an Old Score of Trans-Continental Rivalry To Be Settled There.”271

It is important to explain that popular writers and sports writers in the twenties focused on the rough pioneer Western image versus the sophisticated well-bred Easterner and mused over its origins and possible deeper meaning.272 Gertrude Stein, Ernest Hemmingway, and F. Scott Fitzgerald wrote about the nostalgia of the past and the loss of the predictable Victorian mind-set.273 Frederick Jackson Turner wrote on the loss of the frontier and the impact and struggle with modernity that faced America at this time.274 For example, in the *North American Review* for October 1929, A. A. Brill, a leading American Freudian analyst, wrote on the meaning of American athletics.275 Brill concluded that sports stem from the hunting impulse of primitive societies and that the primary motivation for play is the “mastery impulse”—an inherent aggressiveness in human nature. Moderns had largely transcended direct physical challenge with the advent of machines and the industrial age, but the need for it remained in the human psyche. The theme, coupled with coastal polarities and rivalry, became a popular venue
for expression across American society at large, with sport writing being a dominant and popular outlet.

Rowing was not the only sport shaped by geographical conflicts during this era. Regional rivalries, hyped by the media, successfully took center stage in other sports of this era, namely football and boxing. Historian Bruce Evensen’s *When Dempsey Fought Tunney* describes boxing in the 1920s as a media contrast created between Westerner Jack Dempsey and Easterner Gene Tunney to “personify a certain anxiety about living in the 1920s.”276 The mass media took a down-on-his-luck Westerner, Dempsey, and found it could sell newspapers by hyping the Western boxing rivalry of Dempsey against Eastern shipping clerk and ex-Marine Gene Tunney; Dempsey’s image was created by his handlers and media promoters, Jack Kearns and Tex Rickard.277 One New York jazz-age journalist quipped, “the fundamental principle of metropolitan journalism is to buy white paper at three cents a pound and sell it at ten cents a pound.”278

Regional differences, and the way the media depicted these differences, were extremely influential in shaping the perception of teams and players. Crowd size evidenced the growing popularity of other media-driven sports in this era. Historian Michael Oriard in *King Football*, states “football teams became public symbols of universities, communities and entire regions in a hugely publicized national drama, intersectional games and post season bowl games proliferated in the 1920s and 1930s. For example, the Rose Bowl served in the 1920s as the unofficial East-West championship.”279 Further, the power of images in art, newspapers, radio, and by the late 1920s, newsreels, painted the sounds and sights of American culture.280 As sport
historian Ronald Smith notes, in these decades sports grew within the emerging national culture, “taking on many of the features of the larger America.”

One such image is rowing. It is typically perceived as solely an Eastern sport. Thomas Eakins’ late nineteenth century paintings of languid waters, the Schuylkill River’s leafy banks, and dedicated oarsmen, immortalized Philadelphia’s Boathouse Row and etched images of Eastern rowing in the mind of a nation. The perception of East Coast colleges—leaves turning in the fall, sculls gliding on the Charles, football bowls packed with fans, snowy columns at Harvard—invited the association of academic and athletic greatness with the East. Whether these associations were factual or contrived, they existed nonetheless.

Evensen reveals that the media in the 1920s moved from factual presentation to playing up perceptions and associations to fuel, and, to even create the “slant” and drama it was selling. He states, “Dempseymania was a struggle between competing visions of journalism’s future.” In short, regional rivalries manipulated by media hype became formulaic to sell newspapers—surging from 28 million papers sold in 1920 to 34 million in 1925.

Furthering the media hype, newspaper newsreels are seen by Oriard as a powerful driving force in sports that by the mid-1920s showed weekly in 85–90% of the 18,000 movie houses in the U.S. reaching weekly attendance of 108 million people. The media frenzy created around East Coast versus West Coast rowing drew attention and crowds to the sport. Olympic attendance records indicate that rowing was second only to track and field in over-all attendance at the era’s games. As stated earlier, the 1920 Olympic Eights final won by Navy in Antwerp recorded the largest crowd at any one
Olympic event to that date. Collegiate rivalries of the day at the Poughkeepsie National Regatta drew record crowds of as many as 100,000 who lined the race course, flotilla style. These numbers testify to the popularity and importance of rowing in the U.S. in these decades.

Adding to the thrill was the ability of aerial photographers to present a birds-eye view that provided a treat for newsreel viewers in contrast to the text and still-pictures of the press. The visual appeal of this added dimension of viewing a race, and the sixty-foot-long boats striking paddles rhythmically along the entire 2,000 meter length of the course, as in the film footage of the 1933 National Sprint Championships, adds a beauty and grace to the contests not seen in newspapers or magazines. While not live, the Universal Newsreel’s thrilling footage of the short-lived Intercollegiate Sprint championship, viewed from the Goodyear Blimp’s camera, shapes and completes an image for the fan.

Biases in coverage also existed. First and foremost, the press in all its forms favored the East. The predominant Eastern crews, Navy, Harvard Yale, Penn, and Cornell, were covered in the media as a matter of course. The newsreels covered even their lesser cup races, such as the Carnegie Cup in Derby Connecticut—an early season race between Yale, Princeton, and Cornell—and billed them as “gala” events. Newsreels showed the East Coast crews more frequently than the West Coast crews. Of the 24 newsreel citations in the 1930s, 20 of them refer to Eastern school dual meets (Harvard and Yale as an example), or to a nationally interesting event beyond the races
themselves, such as President Franklin Delano Roosevelt coming to see his son row for Harvard against Yale or Navy.\textsuperscript{293}

The public perception of the East Coast and West Crews showed differences also. The stock image of the Eastern rower is typically that of a tall, muscled man holding an oar straight up on a dock.\textsuperscript{294} But the media portrayed West Coast rowers as sun-drenched men engaged in battles of courage and blood, and often photographed them clumped in front of the boathouse or even bare-chested.\textsuperscript{295} One photograph, shown below, had a shirted Columbia on top, coached by young Dick Glendon, with a dock full of bare-chested California Golden Bears beneath.\textsuperscript{296}

Figure 26. Rowing “shirts and skins”
Such flamboyant behavior seemed too outlandish for the Ivy Leaguers. Capitalizing on this mystique and perhaps upping the ante on their boats’ ability to win, in 1923 the Washington Huskies, after soundly beating Navy, Cornell, and Syracuse to win the Poughkeepsie Regatta, handed out totem poles to the fans who were heard asking, “Where on earth is Seattle?”

Young Dick Glendon’s crews were fodder for the regional depictions. The New York Telegram ran a headline “Boys From the City Streets Heroes of Columbia Crew.” The article reads:

C-O-L-U-M-B-I-A! C-O-L-U-M-B-I-A! C-O-L-U-M-B-I-A! Until the wee sma’ hours groups of young men and men not so young were lock-stepping in and out of the hotel corridors, restaurants, night clubs and we suspect speakeasies, of this village chanting those eight letters over and over again.

You could tell at a glance that they were city men. There was a distinct contrast in physique, in complexion, and in general appearance between them and certain bronzed rugged, onlookers who, by their armbands or other bright-hued accoutrements, were readily identified as the sons of the open spaces of Wisconsin, Washington, California; of that stern school of physical fitness at Annapolis or some other virile section.

Their bizarre parades and chanting were expressions of pride in other city young men—young men from teeming city streets of New York and its immediate environs; young men who but recently and under conditions which only those who had battled daily with raw nature seem suited to survive, had fought a double fight against the physical pick of the hardy hinterland and Pacific coast, and had won...

In that race they faced the stout-hearted and sinewy sweep-swingers of California, unconquered in two years of rowing with a world title and two world records to their credit; of Washington, that breeding place of giant oarsmen and talented rowing coaches....

The decades of the 1920s–1930s saw the University of California win the Olympic Gold medal in the eights in 1928 and 1932, and in 1936 the University of Washington won the Olympic eights. Yet, even the Olympic prestige did not seem to affect the coverage of the crews as one might think, the extensive coverage of rowing continued to stem mainly from the four-mile International Collegiate Poughkeepsie
Regatta, held in June on the Hudson.\textsuperscript{300} Interestingly, the snobbishness of the Big Three extended from the gridiron to the rowing waters, and Harvard, Yale, and Princeton did not compete at Poughkeepsie, yet the site loomed large in the rowing coverage.\textsuperscript{301}

Why might this be? This course is a picturesque setting, flowing past the foot of West Point, a living American landscape from the Hudson River School of American painters.\textsuperscript{302} The visual backdrop in Poughkeepsie is dramatic, and the proximity of the Metropolitan East Coast areas, particularly New York City, the communication center of America, might certainly affect the coverage. President Roosevelt’s son was a rower at Harvard, so it is easy to understand the draw of the press coverage also to any Harvard races at this time.\textsuperscript{303} The Roosevelt estate is on the banks of the Hudson in Hyde Park, New York, near Poughkeepsie. The national and international draw of a U.S. president in the crowd watching his son compete in an athletic contest was noteworthy to American people; their president was “just a regular dad.”

In contrast to the picturesque and old money milieu of the East Coast, the West Coast held its Rowing Championships at the Oakland Estuary or Long Beach Marine Stadium, the latter site of the 1932 Olympic regatta course.\textsuperscript{304} As seen in the photographs below, the visual backdrop of the rotted wharfs and hundreds of oil derricks raking the sky behind the spectators gathered for the race, is a notable contrast—in descriptive print or newsreels—to the forested cliffs of the Hudson.\textsuperscript{305}
Figure 27. Long Beach Marine Stadium

Figure 28. Photo of the forested banks and picnickers at Poughkeepsie
The spectators in Long Beach stood along the sun-baked bank, whereas the spectators in Poughkeepsie, formed a flotilla line on the river and thereby, became an integral part of the actual rowing course. For the viewer of a newsreel, Poughkeepsie is more visually appealing. And since the newsreels especially were a visual medium, appeal meant money. Newspapers tried to induce this with photos of spectators picnicking along the tree-lined banks, watching the crews streak by and descriptions of “Prospects for the race beneath the wooded highlands of the sweeping river are for fast and close finishes.”

Other Eastern regatta sites, such as the home course of Yale on the Thames River in New London, Connecticut were quaint and portrayed in the June 1938 newsreel as “colorful background.” It is not difficult to close one’s eyes and envision a New England river, flanked with pleasure craft bobbing in the tidal basin with Harvard and Yale eights streaking by. Eastern school’s regattas carried a more social atmosphere that was covered by the press like a society page with a veritable who’s who in the crowd, further diminishing the rightful respect given to western successes.

Perceptions and biases influenced the treatment of crews. This matter is presented in two parts: first, in physical housing and reception of crews at regattas, and secondly, in the treatment of crews in the press. One example of Westerners ungraciously accommodated on the East Coast took place in 1923 at Poughkeepsie. Yankee hospitality failed when it housed the University of Washington Huskie “frosh eight” in the boat shed region along the Hudson River. There was no inside plumbing; it was infested with bed bugs, and illuminated by antiquated oil lights instead of electric.
The University of Washington varsity was properly housed but the team remembers being tagged as “rugged” and with the implication that they therefore should not mind the challenging accommodations.310

Lifestyles—real or perceived—of the students in the East versus West universities were different also. One popularized perception of the 2,000 students of the University of Washington, in the 1920s, was that of a pioneer life-style.311 However, the traditional Eastern schools were close to New York jazz clubs and speakeasies that lent an air of sophistication to the Eastern crews—at least in their own perception. They could draw on nearby prep schools for athletes, while the West Coast had no preparatory or high schools that supported rowing in this era.312 The Western schools had rowable water year-round.313 For an athlete trying to decide which school to enroll in, the two coasts offered quite a difference in daily life, yet both coasts thrived in the sport.

In an article by Joe Williams, rowing enthusiast Bob Harron related a story of an Easterner’s look at a Western crew practice, early in the season, at the University of Washington:

Coach Al Ulbrickson invited the Easterner to ride in the launch for a four to five mile row. The easterner was astounded that five or six crews, forty-five rowers launched, leaving as many back at the dock. The crews, after settling down, looked to the Easterner like mid-season rowers, he asked the Washington coach, “isn’t this a pretty tough work-out for opening day?”

“Well,” said Ulbrickson, “you saw that crowd of boys we left there in the boathouse and on the float. Any one of these fellows out here in the boat who can’t take it, or don’t want to, don’t have to do so very long. They knows that there are always plenty of other fellows who are willing and glad to slide into their seats.”314
“Here in the East the crews have to pack more work into a shorter space of
time than the Westerners. While they’re rowing time trials out there in March,
Columbia, Cornell, Penn and Princeton, to say nothing of Yale and Harvard, are
still on the machines or in the tanks waiting for the ice to clear.
“‘It is true that Navy gets a slightly better break, but they get plenty of
rough water down there at Annapolis in early spring too. Mileage in practice is
what wins boat races, and we don’t get a chance to pick up that mileage here in
the East until the season is well along....’”315

The combination of good material—athletes, lots of them, and good water from
January on, related Harron in the article, was why Washington and California crews had
won nine of the seventeen post-war races at Poughkeepsie.

In actuality, East Coast crews cultivated a traditional conservative heritage. The
Western crews brandished a “man’s-man” ruggedness that added to their mystique; when
the Cal men’s eight beat Washington in the first race of their 1928 season, their hands—
bloodied and blistered—stained their crew shirts red. The Cal eight, superstitious and
wanting to keep the winning streak going, wore the same “lucky” shirts for every race in
their season.316 At the time, the winner of the college championship became the
Olympic boat; so for luck, they wore the same rumpled and dirty racing shirts on which,
after they won, they hung their Olympic gold medals on.317

Washington crews were featured in a photograph in one paper as using
lumberjack saws to keep in shape.318 The rowers were paired off down the length of a
log several feet in diameter. The crews lunged back and forth; driving the saw through
the log with the caption reading, “Don’t rush your slides boys! Huskies at Play.”
The article poked fun at the Washington training program, with rowers wielding saws instead of oars and in a faux advertisement indicates where “prime fir lumber can be obtained.” The article illustrated a rare instance where East and West thinking met with the likes of Old Dick Glendon and the Washington coach, Al Ulbrick, urging regatta officials to go to a series of heats to lessen the boats spread abreast the wide Hudson River. This idea would make competition fairer and limit the advantage given to crews who got a boost in the main current. They further recommended that the observation train be filled with coaches and spectators to limit the launch wake on the river to only necessary referees’ and officials’ safety boats. The article also carried the slant that both Glendons would be coaching in a “family affair” at Columbia, with Old Dick coaching the frosh crew and his son Richard A. coaching the varsity.
Perhaps one can accept a certain collegial spirit of rivalry, but even at the Olympic level there seemed to be biased treatment. In 1928, when University of California traveled to Amsterdam, the USOC failed to pay for the travel of the trainer, Charles Volz, and his assistant, Russel Nagler. Cal had to pay, and this was accomplished only after “much difficulty, though,” reports the head coach Carroll Ebright, “many non-participant passengers were on board the U.S.S. Roosevelt.” It is hard to imagine that Yale’s or Harvard’s trainer, for example, would be left with passage unpaid.

Wythe Williams, a *New York Times* reporter for the trip, gives a classic example of the ballyhoo technique used by the press to manipulate and entice the public, in the 1928 Olympic final between the British and California in Amsterdam. He described the Cal “Golden Bear” coxswain Donald Blessing by saying, “Blessing’s lungs are magnificent and for the entire 2,000 meters he gave what by unanimous accord was one of the greatest performances of demonical howling heard on a terrestrial Planet.”

The form of media too, particularly with the addition of motion through newsreels, contributes to the popularization of sports in these decades in the United States. In the Olympic year of 1932, while newsreels focused on the events in Los Angeles, newspapers gave an interesting look at the continuing prejudice toward the West. For example, the Olympic trials were held in the East, on Lake Quinsigamond in Worcester, Massachusetts. The headlines and hackneyed stories of the trials repeatedly portray Eastern crews of Yale, Harvard, Syracuse, and Columbia in front of 40,000 fans. Ten-inch square pictures of the Columbia Lions and full-page columns of text covered the Eastern crew *defeats* at the trials, while California, noted as being the
favorite, is given but one paragraph. Harvard’s Crimson got an equally large picture and headline just by showing up to practice! But on July 10th California made believers out of the East when the collegiate champions beat the national champion Penn AC boat, (heralded as the very best boat of the modern age, though it had not won an Olympic medal and California had won in 1928) to win the Olympic trials and gain the right to represent the U.S. in the Los Angeles Games.

One might think that West Coast papers would cover their own with top billing. However, while Cal was in the East training for the Olympic Trials, one Los Angeles Times headline reads, “Penn Crews Make Grand Slam” referring to the Penn AC boat club in Philadelphia. Buried in the article on page two is a small box which states that Cal is a popular favorite to win, but “Yale looked particularly impressive, as did California and Syracuse”—Cal is thrown in as just part of the lot. On 9 July, nearing the end of the trials, the Los Angeles Times highlighted that, “Bears Reach Finals of Crew Trials” and the subtitle reads, “Penn Oarsmen Oppose Californians Today.” An interesting choice of words appears on 10 July. When the trials are over, the Los Angeles Times, typically having identified the University of California crew as the “Bears” or “Cal,” now embraced these men as people who have had to earn the respect of their own state, which endears them only in victory with, “[fellow] Californians qualify for Olympic Battles.”

In front of 100,000 fans, oil derricks, and a stiff cross wind from the Pacific, California in its home state, went against the Italians on August 13, 1932, in the culminating event of the Olympic summer Games. “California’s Crew for a California Olympics” was the rallying cry for the Golden Bears all season long, and they did not
disappoint. In tough international style racing the Bears won, with only half a length (roughly 30 feet) separating first through fourth.

The rivalry continued in 1935 when the University of Pennsylvania set its sights on the collegiate national championship race. The *Literary Digest* quipped that Penn’s eight, “with Navy, Constitutes East’s Chief Bulwark Against West Coast Threat at Poughkeepsie.” The University of California, after winning, was portrayed the same month in *Literary Digest* as a team lacking in form and technique—relying on brawn.

The newsreels of the 1936 Olympics focus on the departing ceremonies from American docks and the opening and closing ceremonies overseas. In like manner, when the University of Washington beat Italy and Germany in the eights final in 1936 at the Berlin Olympic Regatta, the *New York Times* reported, “Courage boiled high and gray, cold waters were churned into white flecked foam by the fury of their efforts.” The word choices used to describe Washington seem more colorful and more dramatic, again conjuring up images of the courageous, rugged, frontier West in contrast to the sophisticated, well bred East. The romance and nostalgia—accurate or not—was fodder for the press to magnify the popularized West Coast images.

The West Coast crews were heralded as sunburned giants, and the man-against-man, man-against-nature image was a pleasant anomaly, but it did not readily overcome the mindset of America that the Ivy League and Philadelphia clubs were the real competitors. Further, the media response to a Western school’s win was flat. For example, the June 1935 newsreels billed Cornell’s Big Red Eight as an “unexpected powerhouse”—yet they lost to Cal’s Golden Bears by ten feet in a thrilling race. A ten
foot margin in rowing terms is a sound thrashing, but the newsreel reported it as “a scant” ten feet.\textsuperscript{341}

While equipment, coaches, and boatmen go hand in hand in rowing, there were differences between how the East and West coast rowing programs dealt with the myriad details of running a crew. Coaches and boatmen were sometimes one and the same, or when separate individuals, were inseparably involved in success of the crews. The “high brow” East Coast attitude pervaded boat making in East Coast rowing also. Eastern crews rowed English made and or designed boats.\textsuperscript{342} There were relatively few East Coast boat builders that manufactured an American-style boat.\textsuperscript{343} Traditionally, the Eastern companies, such as Troy or the Philadelphia Boat Company, that did make shells, built them from Eastern white spruce. The West Coast crews began rowing Western built boats made by George Pocock using native red cedar.\textsuperscript{344} This connection of Pocock to Connibear and the Huskie crew contributed largely to their success over the East. Pocock was English born and used English style boat design, with Western red cedar that was cheaper and less rot prone wood than the white spruce of the Eastern boats.\textsuperscript{345} In the late 1920s, Pocock altered the traditional English boat design with his own innovations for hull speed. These aspects of boat construction and maintenance were essential to keeping Western crews in competition readiness, even in their travels East.

The mere transportation of shells, on the same coast, or from the west Coast to the East Coast was nothing short of a Herculean effort at times. Boats were sent across country by train or ship. Transportation of the sixty-four foot long shells across country was usually by rail and extreme expense and creativity was often used to move the
cumbersome yet fragile equipment. When train tracks weren’t available to move the boat from the dock, 2 automobiles were used, spaced about 40 feet apart and tethered to one another with 4 men sitting up with the top down, holding the bow and 4 men holding the stern for a wild ride (seen below) through the city streets.

Figure 30. Early shell transportation

The Western-built boats, ridiculed in the press as “banana boats” for their unusual, though misunderstood beneficial camber, eventually filled every lane in Poughkeepsie. Pocock recalled, “One big prejudice I had to overcome for a decade or more after 1912 (the first time a Western built boat traveled East) was the opinion that anything made west of Chicago had to be inferior.” For instance, in 1915 Stanford found it too expensive to transport its shell to Poughkeepsie, so “they borrowed an Eastern shell and came in second in the race. And yet a New York newspaper reported
that, ‘If Stanford had not been using a clumsily built Western shell, they would have won the race.”350

A philosophic Pocock recalled another instance where a Harvard crew was swamped in the Charles River and a Boston newspaper reported the Pocock-built shell broke into a thousand pieces, yet when Pocock inquired as to whether that was true, the Harvard coach said, “No, it was a New England built boat.”351 By 1935, every boat at Poughkeepsie was a “clumsily” built Pocock.”352

The West Coast surpassed the East Coast in other innovations too. California coach Ky Ebright in 1932 invented a single bar rigger adopted by Pocock and the Eastern crews.353 The single metal bar was lighter than a rigger made with two or even three of these stabilizing braces and made a boat faster. These Western innovations drew national attention and became the standards of the day.

Coaches were different in style from coast to coast also. Boatman George Pocock, and Rusty Callow, the coach of Washington from 1922–1927, were very much “hands on.” Necessity forced them to take care of travel and engineering details that Eastern coaches did not have to meet. After winning the Poughkeepsie Regatta in 1923, the two men began to build, by hand, a crate seventy-four feet long for the shell’s return to Washington by ship. They labored madly in Dutton Lumber Yard in overalls in the heat to whispers of, “Is that guy really the coach of the University of Washington?” Pocock recalled, “I realized that the rugged democracy I was beginning to get used to in the Far West was still puzzling to people of the more effete East.”354

Perhaps the greatest compliment given to the West Coast programs and the surest sign that they had arrived was the hiring of the West Coast rowing coaches into the
Eastern powerhouses like Yale. By 1937, *Time* magazine reported that of the 19 U.S. Colleges reported to have crew, 18 of them had coaching staff members from the Washington Huskies, with 8 being head coaches.

Biases, some severe, some slight, occurred on the water during racing also. When California first traveled to Poughkeepsie in 1921, the press did not rate the Golden Bears, and “all but ignored” them, even though they came in a solid second to Navy’s 1920 Olympic gold medallists. Just how far the Eastern prejudice went can be seen in a controversial finish in the 1923 Poughkeepsie Regatta freshman race when Washington charged through Cornell, seemingly to win. The Cornell oarsmen took off their shirts to give to the Huskies in traditional rowing style. But an official’s launch, without a representative from Washington, roared up to the two crews and declared Cornell the winner. The Huskies, now the losers, took their shirts off and gave Cornell’s shirts and their own to Cornell. Weeks later, the Washington coach received a photograph in the mail from the *Literary Digest* taken from a camera mounted at the finish, decisively showing Washington as the winners after all—though the record books stand as Cornell winning.

If there was one clear prejudice, it is that for over thirty years, the roads and rails in national collegiate rowing competition ran East. Beginning the decade, the Olympic Trials for the 1932 Los Angeles Olympics were held in the East at Quinsigamond, even though Cal won the 1928 Olympics gold. There are no accounts in the newsreels or the texts of the eastern colleges traveling *West* to race until 1933. In this sole example, the Long Beach Marine Stadium, built for the 1932 Olympics, was fenced in to act as a
gated facility following the football stadium trend and was utilized in 1933–1935 to host international style rowing sprint races of 2,000 meters. Eastern schools were invited for the trip West. The event got little attention and died after only three years in favor of the Poughkeepsie course.\textsuperscript{362}

Interestingly, one of the rowing powers of the nation was Wisconsin and yet, in these decades there is no mention of an East/Midwest/West rivalry. The press divided rowing into the East and West Coasts. They played up this regional competition on a bi-coastal stage. For example, in 1938 when Harvard beat Navy on the Severn River, the newsreels hyped it as an “end to the Navy’s supremacy in the East.”\textsuperscript{363} In like manner, in June of 1938 when Navy went on to beat California at Poughkeepsie, the Middie oarsmen are portrayed as bringing the “country’s rowing supremacy back East.”\textsuperscript{364} The news service seems to be trumping up the rivalry to engage the largest population base—the entire \textit{country}—to sell its product. And the choice of words, “bringing it back East” leaves one to believe that the East is rightly where the supremacy belongs.

The press did not give the West Coast crews their due until the end of the 1930s. In 1939, after winning the Poughkeepsie Regatta, four times each, after winning the Olympics three times, California and Washington heard words like “thrilling” “brilliant” and “famous” now attributed to their West Coast rowing.\textsuperscript{365}

Olympic rowing struggled during World War II and briefly afterwards as athlete ranks were decimated and war damage wreaked havoc on the financing and staging of Olympic games. The 1936 Berlin Olympics was bannered in Adolf Hitler’s swastika and military image. The 1940 and 1944 games were cancelled due to the world war. It led to an uneasy feeling about whether the Olympic movement would survive at all. In 1948,
1952, and 1956, however, the U.S. Crews did not disappoint. They picked up the reins of
the pre-war record breakers and carried on the tradition of winning gold in the Men’s
Heavy Eights.\textsuperscript{366}

In Rome, Italy, on 3 September 1960, the Navy men’s eight made history again. In 1920, Navy began the unprecedented forty-year winning streak by one country in one
event. It stills stands today. However in 1960 Navy had a hand in tarnishing the record
streak. The vaunted Navy eight came in fifth, losing to Germany in the finals.\textsuperscript{367} It is an
intriguing and perhaps fitting culmination for Navy—to have the honor to begin and end
the Olympic gold medal streak of such magnitude. It is a credit to the depth of their
program over the years and a contributing factor adding to the mystique of the great Navy
crews of old.

Echoing by-gone Olympic days in Antwerp, Navy beat Britain, and proceeded to
the Olympic finals.\textsuperscript{368} Once in the finals the Germans outclassed the Midshipmen,
leaving them behind by three lengths of open water.\textsuperscript{369} The Midshipmen managed to beat
only the host team Italy at the Olympic regatta held on Lake Albano, where nearby, Pope
John the XXIII was summering at the papal palace of Castel Gandolfo. The 1960 Navy
crew, unpolished and uncharacteristic of the great Navy style of the past, was more a
lucky than a talented entry to the Olympic finals.

This medal was the first Olympic gold for Germany that had a composite crew
from nearby villages of Kiel and Ratzeburger. Rhetoric in the \textit{New York Tribune} drew
heavily on nationalism depicting the Germans “storming” Uncle Sam’s American rowing
“citadel.” The fighting words were not enough to see the U.S. boat across the line first,
but seem a fitting end for the much heralded military crew. This unusual beginning and
end saga of the Navy crew is but one more piece in the puzzle of their *opus*. Their young rookie coach, Lou Lindsay, had no reason to hang his head—he failed trying to fill the large shoes of the venerable Dick Glendon and the Navy Admirals.

In the end, the East versus West rivalry undoubtedly strengthened U.S. rowing and pushed America’s best oarsmen to the front of the world rowing community. Newsreels captured the glory and excitement of the Olympic, for example the teams of 1932 and 1936 readying for world competition. The newsreels gave added life to shipboard efforts to keep the athletes in training to inform and pique the national interest of viewers. To an audience in the Midwest, for example, scenes from the boat deck in newspapers and newsreels could conceivably have been the first time some landlocked viewers glimpsed the challenges of sea travel. To fans who only heard or read of these great regattas as one of the nation’s most popular sports, the jumpy, fast whirling newsreels of the late twenties and thirties captured the East versus West Coast rivalry and indulged the senses to the elegance, grace in strength, and seemingly effortless flight of a shell being hurled along the waters that previously only those privileged enough to be at the regatta site, would have witnessed.

How much these pictures and images added to the media “hype” of newspapers and radio affected participation of athletes and fans from the 1930s on is not clear, but we know these formulaic techniques influenced the rise of interest in sports in this time across the United States. Newsreels and visual arts, such as the photographs in the Glendon Collection, enhanced the silent stealth of rowing shells. Images of cheering fans, Adonis-like physiques, and froth-filled oar puddles diminishing into the temporarily
etched water surface, captured the essence of rowing in these decades—making rowing one of the most widely watched intercollegiate and Olympic medal events of its time.373
In 1920 the Navy rowing team initiated an innovation in stroke style that caused them—and all other U.S. men’s eight crews until 1960—to win Olympic gold. The nature of this achievement goes beyond skill, effort, or training. Speculating on where that beyond might be and why such acts end up there is the focus of this chapter.

It isn’t good enough to simply say that Glendon’s Scientific Oarsmanship won the medal that led to the 40 year winning streak by the U.S. If it were as simple as that, everyone would have read Glendon’s 1923 text on the matter in Rowing, and simply copied his methods. In this book Glendon covered everything from training table, to rigging, to oiling boat bottoms for the race, to selecting a good coxswain, and the right psychological attributes of a stroke-oar. There was more to the winning of this gold than the mechanisms of rowing. A seed had been planted by Churchill—the challenge to go beyond, to stretch the envelope, to move into the realm of hope, ideals, mystery. Glendon had set before himself the personal challenge to beat the Leander crew as a young coach, and at the intersection of these two visions, a transubstantiation occurred. The world had literally seen the results; there was no refuting it, the British admitted the American stroke was better, so suasion was no longer not part of the problem. Glendon’s
own sons knew the intricacies of his coaching if there had been anything there to hide. The empirical bases of technique, invention, improvement seemed to be covered. So why did the U.S. dominate this event for the next forty years? What empowered the U.S. colleges from the East to the West to leap, suddenly, in a single upward step—not a curve of hit-or-miss tries—but a definitive shift to another plateau—a rise to the greatest in the world, almost instantly? As much as Glendon’s Scientific Oarsmanship held a blueprint for rowing, the empirical knowledge ended on page 240 his text *Rowing*, and that which is beyond science, took over.

Relying primarily on the writings of the French philosopher M. Merleau-Ponty and his contemporary the eminent Swiss psychiatrist Carl Jung, this chapter addresses a unique issue of movement change and presents the following theory regarding something I will call “breakthrough kinesis.” Using primarily the theories of Merleau-Ponty and Jung I will speculate on how intelligence and consciousness affect and create new and better movement.

Breakthrough kinesis occurs when a performance barrier, sometimes of mythic proportions, finally is overcome. While this unusual athletic advance may be grounded in several factors including better technology, invention, improved diet, superior coaching, and new equipment, it cannot be attributed entirely to these causes. A breakthrough kinesis has to do with a rebirth of hope, a new vision of human possibility. When a breakthrough takes place, when one athlete accomplishes the heroic act, other athletes are somehow emboldened and enabled. They too rush through the previously impenetrable gates.
Sport has been full of such barriers—the 4-minute mile, Babe Ruth’s 60 home runs, the 7 foot high jump, ice-skating’s quadruple jump, Ty Cobb’s base hits, a sub-10 second 100 meter dash, the summiting of Everest without oxygen. As years passed and individual after individual fell short of these goals, the barriers became in some ways larger than life. “Out of reach,” “can’t ever be broken,” “beyond human capability,” “never seen in our lifetime,” are descriptions often given to such mythic barriers. But strangely, when someone finally did surpass the mark, the barrier quickly lost its aura. The hero soon had company.

As mythic barriers fall, of course, other barriers of mythic proportion take their place. Athletes are forever looking for the next great feat, the performance that resides just beyond what is humanly reasonable to expect—a perfect 10 in each event of All-Round gymnastics competition, a .400 season baseball average, a field goal kicker in football who places 80 yard kicks through the uprights every time, the archer who splits every arrow in a match. And when these speculative moments are someday reached, they too may be recognized instantly as the new mark, the better way of doing things.

These breakthrough feats, though possibly couched in invention or innovation, will advance the sport from that moment forward toward the next mythical realm. Differing from setting or surpassing a sport record as described and defined by noted historians Allen Guttmann and Richard Mandell, “breakthrough kinesis” represents a new—and intangible—component added to a skill or event that thrusts the level of performance and aesthetics of the contest beyond the previously unattainable feat, beyond the scientific. The idea of such an event as a breakthrough kinesis, can be intuited from the following passage in C.L.R. James’ *Beyond a Boundary*: “The achievements of
athletes in recent years which have so astonished the world are not as great as so many people imagine that they are. None of them is anywhere near the ultimate limits. By far the most important part of a great importance is played by the mind.” He continues, “Long hours of training are not at all necessary.” And, “the greatest performances will be produced by the ‘poet, the artist, the philosopher.” Such a perception by the great cricketer, James, turned social spokesman and philosopher is intriguing. His claims lead one to ponder other writings regarding the phenomenon of mind and performance, including Carl Jung and his theories of the collective unconscious. Is there a deeper “well” feeding the spring waters of great performances?

It seems that some philosophers imply that there must be something more than just aspects of athletic ability that can be attributed to hard work. Even those who explore the realms of the “inner athlete,” are still looking primarily to the mind/body conscious abilities, in present time, to synthesize and execute. But what if time takes on a different role? What if the present is also heavily influenced by the past? What if the past is not lost back there, but it is with us, and the collective memories in that past consciousness are with us too? What if there is a collective body wisdom, inherited from all the past body movements of the human race and beyond, from the moment we learned to walk upright until now that is stored and transmitted in the collective unconscious as described by Jung? This would represent a collective kinetic intelligence in each one of us that is in the unconscious, that is passed from generation to generation and is greater than the single self-embodiment knowledge of any one individual. Wouldn’t that be something?
Historian and philosopher C.L.R. James, in Beyond a Boundary, muses about this phenomenon that interested me when he writes that after Roger Bannister broke a mental barrier by running a sub four minute mile, it became easier and easier for others to surpass that formerly unbeatable boundary. At times as many as three and four runners a day were doing it.\textsuperscript{377} It was as if, through Bannister’s run, humankind rose up and advanced. It was recognized and accepted, yet remained perplexing. In Jungian terms, Bannister’s run had influenced the collective unconscious of many, and the parameters of the sport of running were expanded.\textsuperscript{378} How might this work, and what is the collective unconscious?

According to Jung, “In addition to our immediate consciousness, which is of a thoroughly personal nature and which we believe to be the only empirical psyche, there exists a second psychic system of a collective, universal and impersonal nature, that is identical in all individuals. This collective unconscious does not develop individually but is inherited. It consists of pre-existent forms, the archetypes, which can only become conscious secondarily and which give definite form to certain psyche contents.”\textsuperscript{379} The archetypes are images that arise from the unconscious and give it form. Jung discusses the use of the term archetype as stemming from the Greek, Roman, and early Church writings as the images that are found in various literary and mythological references.\textsuperscript{380} Expression of the archetypes is in primordial, archaic forms or images such as those found in tribal lore, myth and fairy tales.\textsuperscript{381} This is to say, cultures and societies, no matter how far dispersed on the planet in time or physical space, reflect images such as these in their verbal and written traditions that affect the race. Sporting traditions have had significant impact on societies and one would think that, by Jung’s
definition, would not be outside of the influences of the collective unconscious whose manifestations can influence and form conscious acts.

Sport culture and sporting behavior is a monumental component in most societies—it should therefore exhibit the archetypes that Jung describes. Can we then, as sport scientists, philosophers, and historians combine and synthesize across the discourse communities to fine-tune and decipher movement in these terms? Would Jung be appalled by such an attempt? In a recent phone interview, a psychiatrist told me that speculating on the possible influences of the collective unconscious on sport is “safe” and that Jung’s concept of the collective unconscious has evolved historically and is dynamic. This is to say—the concept can be metaphorically “stretched” since it is not a static idea.382

As stated earlier, Jung’s greatest contributions to the understanding of the psyche include the archetypes of the collective unconscious. Some such examples of archetypes are the images of rebirth, mother, trickster and hero. The images are re-created in settings or scenes of intense drama. For example, no need for a hero exists unless something is drastically wrong. For our purposes of understanding the “breakthrough kinesis,” and the 1920 Olympic crew’s empowerment of other American rowers for 40 years—for this idea in particular—we must include Jung’s further consideration that, “as personal complexes have their individual history, so do social complexes of an archetypal character. But while personal complexes never produce more than a personal bias, archetypes create myths, religions and philosophical ideas that influence and set their stamp on whole nations and epochs.”383
Certainly the hero archetype is of interest to sport and has been the subject of many studies. Are the researchers unwittingly studying the public’s response to the collective unconscious’ archetypes? Sport psychologist, Janet Harris, in her work on American sporting heroes, touches on the role of the athlete and the symbolic contribution to culture when talking about sports. “Talented athletes are clearly central components in the symbolic or expressive functioning of sport.” Also, “Sports operate symbolically in ways similar to other popular cultural performances.”

The symbolic component of sport is important and the movement intrinsic to sport is important. And looking at the aspects of intelligence and embodiment that facilitate movement as arising not just from skill, talent, and hard work, but also from the archetypes of the collective unconscious, to the conscious action executed by the athlete and witnessed by fans is largely unexplored. Examining and speculating on this link from the collective unconscious to the action of the present conscious state may constitute the beginning for understanding breakthrough kinesis.

Jung proposed that the collective unconscious is carried through the generations. Contemporary writer Leonard Shlain believes that Jung’s idea of not coming into the world “as a tabula rasa devoid of any information, but rather as being born with the unconscious memories that embody the great events of our evolutionary development, extends Kant’s proposal of a priori categories to include knowledge of archaic events.” What Shalin is saying is that Jung believed that symbols and myths (archetypes) like heroes, which have distinct and otherwise inexplicable commonalities found in all cultures, are universal because they are carried forward through time and space within the collective unconscious of the species.
These archetypes then, might be inherent components of the driving forces within that guide, steer, and contribute to the make-up of personal existence and the events that shape existence—such as sport. Like the power of a current under the water, or a tide whose existence is undeniable and tangible but whose substance untouchable; only the effect of their presence can be surmised, like a reflection from something greater, and far away. As moonlight is to the sun or the tide is to the moon, archetypes exist in the collective unconscious mind of both the individual and society, stirring occasionally when something in the human experience is “nudged” to its core. Then, from a powerful primordial source that is both removed and ever being distanced from the conscious moment by time, integral with it, but not recognized by it except through hindsight—archetypes influence. The manifestation, small or large, individual or group, is telltale of the magnitude of the tide, if you will. For example, the human reaction to the impact of the Holocaust is generational, not soon to be forgotten because it stirs the human experience to a core level—the horror reaches the collective unconscious of the many, not the few.

As Merleau-Ponty maintained, the personal experience of the archetype’s effect influencing movement, perception, writing, dreams, can be truer than the reductionary theories of science that “cannot produce an archetype so therefore it doesn’t exist.” Jung’s archetypes baffle science yet ring true to personal experience. In that the archetypes address base elements such as human struggle, survival, existence, and love, qualifying their effect is a moot point. They exist as historical thread within, connecting present to past. The thread is what it is and cannot be deemed a good thread or a bad thread just as the tide is not good or bad though it can be either in its effect on various
situations. For Jung as a psychotherapist, the manifestation of archetypes served as signposts along a trail from which he could help diagnose and treat patients as well as understand non-pathogenic “normal” behavior; both sick and well embody archetypes.

Concomitantly, Merleau-Ponty speculates on the phenomenology of movement and also relates his early ideas and conceptions to myth and primordial images. Merleau-Ponty says, “mythical consciousness does indeed open on to a horizon of possible objectifications. Primitive man lives his myths against a sufficiently articulate perceptual background for the activities of daily life like fishing, hunting, and dealings with civilized people, to be possible. The myth itself, however diffuse, has an identifiable significance for primitive man, simply because it does form a world, that is, a whole in which each element has meaningful relations to the rest. It is true that mythical consciousness is not a consciousness of any thing. That is to say that subjectively it is a flux, that it does not become static and thus does not know itself.”

Being in a state of flux, and in a state of not knowing, itself is interesting. What does it mean to know itself or not know itself? Does Merleau-Ponty mean one does not recognize aspects of the self inside the self because the conscious and the unconscious do not readily communicate? Or does the not knowing, become known, thus recognized, when an unconscious phenomenon breaks out and skids across the stage of consciousness in such astounding presence and to such thundering applause that it instantly brings the conscious global audience to its feet—as if jumping out of their theater seats? Such would be an explanation for breakthrough kinesis. Jung encourages these moments stating that “by distilling the experience of one’s life, one affirms that the survival of our
civilization may well depend upon closing the widening gulf between the conscious and
unconscious aspects of the human psyche.”

Philosopher Michael Novak distills the power of athletic experience in the
revelatory moments of perfect form. Novak looks at these psychically enhanced
performances, if you will, in sport and likens them to being or coming from or belonging
to another plane (the spiritual, perhaps, in Novak’s understanding). But Novak’s
description I believe also captures the essence of a “breakthrough kinesis” in the
following passage: “Tens of thousands of passes are thrown every year, thousands of
games are played in grammar schools, high schools, colleges, and professional stadia; all
the routines are thoroughly known. Occasionally, however, often enough to stir the heart,
a player or a team executes a play so beautifully, achieves such classic perfection, that it
is as though they cease for a moment to be pedestrian and leap into a realm of precision
as lovely as a statue of Praxiteles. Athletic achievement, like the achievements of the
heroes and the gods of Greece, is the momentary attainment of perfect form—as though
there were, hidden away from mortal eyes, a perfect way to execute a play, and suddenly
a player or a team has found it and sneaked a demonstration down to earth. A great play
is a revelation. The curtains of ordinary life part, and perfection flashes for an instant
before the eye.”

To this reader, the phrase “hidden away from mortal eyes, a perfect way” is the
key to Novak’s explanation. Where is the “perfect way” “hidden,” yet available to the
extent that we witness it enough times that people recognize it, philosophers think about,
writers elaborate on it and athletes occasionally achieve it? Does it lie in Merleau-
Ponty’s realm of unrecognized unconsciousness coming to know itself in the conscious
act? I think one must answer that it lies within the mind/body experience in a rare yet certain intersection of space, planes, consciousness, movement, and moment. I think that the element of “moment” or “timing” is unique to breakthrough kinesis because it places the action in a unique reference to all other actions past and future. It is THIS action—right now—that is the first and therefore the unique breakthrough and it came forth due to a paradigm shift in the collective unconscious of body knowledge.

Speculating within the framework of Jung again with his idea of synchronicity, Jung believed that all human events interweave on a plane to which we are not consciously privy, so that in addition to prosaic cause and effect, human events are joined in a higher dimension by meaning. What is the higher level of meaning? Could it be that a limiting factor of many philosophers is the narcissistic nature of their looking at one (presumably their own) body and its own embodiment, oriented toward the single lived body/mind experience of self or at most, the single self in relation to others?

But what of a collective “body knowledge” of all the bodies who have moved and lived and the collective—collected—wisdom of those experiences? The sum total would be an enormous wealth of experience and wisdom of physical perception that it could, and speculatively would, supersede any one single embodiment. The perception of Roger Bannister’s accomplishment by James was that many people went with Bannister, through this barrier. Once the gate was open the log jam cleared, because the wave rising from the collective unconscious of embodiment took many single bodies with it. We are created and set up to see the individual effort, but James articulated the synchronicity of the phenomenon as a mental barrier that many people passed through once it was broken.
This is to say that many people almost immediately shared the idea or the energy or at least the benefit of Bannister’s accomplishment.

The mechanisms of the collective unconscious cannot be outlined because they are by definition unconscious and therefore outside of conscious logic. However, speculating on these mechanisms, one might conclude that they may simply reach a saturation point of understanding, insight, impression, frustration, response, struggle, or timeliness that is manifest in a shift or thrust forward in human thought or accomplishment; advancement happens. A less complicated example is that of a child learning to walk; many trials and errors occur before success—and then once “walking” happens the child simply walks—never to crawl again. The child doesn’t rise from crawling a centimeter at a time until upright. Rather, a conglomeration of conscious physical and mental trial and errors produce, one day, a sudden outcome, an achievement, greater than the sum of the hourly individual efforts. Once a human has mastered basic movement or even complicated movement within the realm of logic, balance, physics, skill, learning, the only “beyond” to advance into has to be a realm previously seen as unattainable because it defied understanding by means of normal conscious methods. Therefore, once the unconscious and the inestimable forces of a collective unconscious are factored into the equation of possibilities, by the very definition of being outside of the norm, events beyond current comprehension could and should occur—as in imagination actualized or barriers defied.

It seems that Jung’s idea of a collective unconscious that could connect and influence many athletes makes sense. It is almost as if there were a mass embodiment—unique to that brief moment in time for that event—that took place. Like a fold or an
intersection in planes or energy fields of the collective unconsciousness—something is made conscious to all, that is remarkable, that is irrefutable, that exists; and then the wave disseminates back to the individual one-on-one embodiment experience, which is the individual ego’s normal relational stance to the world. A breakthrough kinesis has occurred.

John Walker, a New Zealand runner who ran sub 3:50 gives us a clue to evidence of the breakthrough kinesis. When interviewed by Jim Dennison, for a book compiling thoughts by other sub-four minutes miles on the mystique of accomplishing this feat, Walker said, “People say that my breaking 3:50 for the first time was comparable to his breaking four minutes for the first time, but I don’t believe it. I think what he did was harder and more significant. He had more psychological baggage and pressure to contend with. People thought it couldn’t be done.”

Examining the concept of what constitutes a breakthrough kinesis, one might argue that while the issue of Bannister is clear enough, what about something like Fosbury’s “flop” in the 1968 Mexico Olympics that won gold and turned the world of high-jumping literally upside down? Is that a breakthrough or just an invention? I would say that breaking the mythical seven-foot high-jump barrier was a breakthrough kinesis and that the “flop” aided human kind in vaulting beyond that barrier. A breakthrough kinesis does not conflict with the idea of invention but enhances it. A breakthrough kinesis can come out of the blue, or it can be embedded in what is seen as an invention that someone clearly has been imagining or pondering. Breakthrough kinesis would not be in conflict with chemist and social scientist, Michael Polanyi’s, concerns that even the most remarkable inventions can become commonplace.
There are many inventions, even inventions that work well, that do not influence and cause change on a global scale and never become commonplace. For example when Torvill and Dean skated to *Bolero* and won the gold medal in ice-dance at Sarajevo in the 1984 Olympics invented the notion of lying on the ice for 18 seconds while the music played, creating a dramatic backdrop of suspense. They stayed on the ice for eighteen seconds before they began to skate. The rules state that the timing of the performance does not begin until the “skating” begins. Obviously they invented a very dramatic and effective dance element. After all it won the gold medal. However, unlike the Fosbury Flop that brought an about face, literally through-out the high-jumping world, Torvill and Dean’s invention did not touch any mythical barrier and is today recognized as a beautiful anomaly. In short, it did not breathe life into the sport by carrying skating, as a whole, to a new or sustained level. In contrast, when the Navy Admirals surpassed *Britannia* in the 1920 Olympic rowing event, their win began an unprecedented forty year winning streak of Olympic gold in the men’s eights. American rowing “beat” its own origins by surpassing Britain on that day—and all that the British sporting traditions and rivalries entailed to the American athlete of that era. It was akin to the mythical slaying of Goliath. A breakthrough kinesis can include invention, technique, innovation, or be occasioned by it. Yet it is also something more.

A breakthrough kinesis is graced with the mythical. “Breakthrough kinesis” represents a new component added to a skill or event that advances the level of performance and aesthetics of the contest. What is the component? If it isn’t just the imagination integrating Merleau-Ponty’s pool of tacit knowledge, and it isn’t just an attribute such as innovation or invention—what is it? To answer that question by way of
example, all athletes and coaches would agree that we advance physiologically by plateaus. We reach plateaus, we stay there awhile and then we advance, upwards to the next level, the next plateau. The training curve is rarely a straight line or a symmetrical curve rather; it looks more like steps. A breakthrough kinesis is such an advancement. The collective unconscious moves the mind/body to another level in a leap forward where it remains for a time before another breakthrough. This leap is in the realm of the intangible that stumps science because it cannot be reduced to any “thing.” It has, is, and forever retains, the element of the mythical. And, I have speculated that the collective unconscious helps to explain the mythical. For if we do carry within ourselves a collective memory of the experiences from all those who have lived before us to the very beginnings of our origins, we carry, and in fact are those origins. Extending presumably, earlier than eyes and the ability to integrate subsidiaries and concepts of Polyani and Merleau-Ponty, to the essence of the mythical exchange in Michelangelo’s “Touch.” Be it God or a god or an unnamed energy that created what became who we are—the collective unconscious has its beginnings in that primordial era which is why its images are based in the fear of fire, the fear of falling, and the like. They are primeval.

Our ability to learn, and the way in which we learn and set forth our experiences has a much greater potential than the single lifetime of collective subsidiaries for instance, when we include the gamut of possibilities of the collective unconscious. We then include all the time and space in which human consciousness and the forming of human consciousness has had through the ages, to form the background “screen” on which to perceive and view, in example, the idea of subsidiaries; a background including
the entirety of human experience which our present self at times taps into and integrates into a current day occurrence.

I think Merleau-Ponty expresses, touches on the essence of these occurrences this way: “We need to say merely that the phenomenal layer is literally pre-logical and will always remain so.”\(^{395}\) “Natural and primordial space is not geometrical space, nor correspondingly, is the unity of experience guaranteed by any universal thinker arraying its contents before me and ensuring that I possess complete knowledge of, and exercise complete power over it.”\(^{396}\) And stepping further into these phenomenal layers of Merleau-Ponty, the quantum physicist Frijof Capra might interpret these layers as folds of energy previously unseen as a “something,” as a presence that “warps” the time and space around the occurrence in such a way as to “map” the incidence of the action: a breakthrough kinesis.\(^{397}\)

In conclusion, though Jung is not here to dispel my errors or concerns I feel it is safe to at least theorize or ponder these ideas that there is a collective unconscious; and it contributes and, in fact, may create the phenomenon I recognize as breakthrough kinesis and that sports figures, heroes have been the recipients of that symbolic, mythical wreath from the unconscious more often than not. People seek heroes, they seek the times of “breakthrough kinesis”; as George Santayana says in the 1800s, “…only the sublime is worth while, everything else is held up to it.”\(^{398}\)

I realize that these thoughts ask one to stretch the known relationship of mind/body embodiment to form a cohesive past, present, and future through the collective unconscious, that leaves us all waiting on the edge of our collective kinetic intelligence seat, waiting for the next moment, when manifestations of the collective
unconscious burst through barriers in conscious acts of “breakthrough kinesis” that inform us with our recognition of its greatness—that we have once again advanced. The idea stretches the imagination and in the words of Julien Offray de la Mettrie asks us to, “Break the chain of your prejudices, arm yourselves with the torch of experience, and you will render to nature the honor she deserves, instead of inferring anything to her disadvantage, from the ignorance in which she has left you.”
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APPENDIX A

“Speech on the Olympic Trip,” 18 March 1921 by Richard Glendon

I have been requested to give an account of the trip to Antwerp with the Navy crews. I do not feel that I can do the topic full justice, but will do the best I can. Someone has said, that in order to make any subject interesting, one must have the proverbial “gift of gab.” Such being the case I feel that I can only make a feeble attempt. But Burnham Rigby says, “that a gift of gab is not a gift at all, but an affliction--a leakage of brain. All you get is words, words, words. You expect a pint and you get a gallon.

For my part I may be able to produce a pint--I refer of course to dry measure.

But I am getting away from my subject. On July 24th 1920, the Navy eight-oared crew, won the national Championship in a mile and a quarter race, on Lake Quinsigamond, Worcester, Mass; breaking the record for the course by 6 seconds, thereby winning the right to represent this country in the Olympic Games at Antwerp, Belgium.

We left Worcester the day after the race, and arrived at Newport, Rhode Island; on the afternoon of July 25th. We went aboard the ship Frederick which was anchored in the harbor, and stayed over night. The next day we loaded the shells and weighed anchor and put to sea at three o’clock on the afternoon of July 26th. It was a beautiful day and I’m sure everyone was looking forward with anticipation to the trip.

Beside the crew squad there were track men, fencers, wrestlers, boxers and swimmers on board the Frederick. They all took daily exercise of some kind, and any morning about 10 o’clock, the quarter-deck of the ship resembled a small gymnasium.
Moving pictures were shown every evening on the quarter-deck and the ship’s band furnished music.

I have always been more or less interested in bird and animal life and will try to describe for you some of the things that interested me on the way across the ocean.

As soon as we passed out of sight of land I noticed some small birds following the ship. They flew very close to the surface and resembled our Chimney-swift in flight. I found that they were Stormy Petrel, better known as Mother Carey’s Chickens, and that their appearance was the indication of a storm. They followed the ship day and night across the Atlantic, (approximately 3000 miles) and I never once saw one alight on the surface of the water, or on anything floating on the water, which demonstrates what a remarkable power of flight these small birds have. I have often read of migratory birds traveling great distances on one flight, but the Stormy Petrel seem to do it as a steady thing.

Three or four days out we entered the Gulf Stream. I remember as a boy reading about the Gulf Stream in the old school geography, and had often wished I could view it with my own eyes. The color of the water in the stream is a deeper blue than the surrounding body of water--approaching ultra-marine. We noticed tropical vegetation in the form of kelp and seaweed floating on the surface and also, transparent jelly-like formations. One day we saw a large sea-turtle apparently sunning himself on the surface of the water. It was about two feet long and probably weighed 200 lbs. or so. It was a small specimen though as I have seen them on the New England coast weighing 600 lbs. They have been known to attain a weight of 800 lbs.
During the rest of our trip we saw porpoises, dolphins, flying fish, and one day saw a whale.

Porpoises belong to the whale genus. They have to come to the surface to breathe, are four or five feet long and weigh four or five hundred pounds. They are gregarious, and some of the old-timers call them “puffin pigs,” on account of the puffing sound when they come to the surface to breathe. They much resemble revolving wheels in the water while swimming.

The dolphins also belong to the whale family. We ran into a school one day and they gave us an exhibition of speed swimming that made the swimmers on board the ship hang their heads in shame. They can gather such speed in the water that they are able to make a broad jump of fifteen or twenty feet through the air, which is a remarkable feat, considering the size of the fish. They are gregarious, and are found in every sea from the equator to the poles. It is said that they have a very acute sense of hearing and are attracted by regular or musical sounds.

I never really believed the stories I had heard of flying-fish until I had actually seen them myself. They are small fish about five to twelve inches long and much resemble our “whiting.” They have extended fins which resemble wings, and I have seen them leave the water and travel a distance of seventy or a hundred feet. They do not move the fins but seem to glide through the air, resembling a small monoplane in flight.

On the last legs of our journey we encountered a storm which drove us from our course, which was found by means of radio-compass. Messages were received from England and France. The directions from which the messages came were indicated on the chart by two straight lines. The point of the intersection of the two lines showed our
position and it was found that we were 100 miles north of our proper course and
continuance in that direction would have landed us in the Irish Sea. We changed our
course, the next day the storm abated and we got our first sight of England. Our passage
through the strait of Dover was inspiring. The sun was setting and the white chalk cliffs
of Dover stood out sharply in the semi-darkness; the shore-line of France was dimly
visible in the distance, the channel at this point being only twenty miles wide.

The next day we awoke to find the ship at anchor in the river Schnelt, two or three
hundred yards from the big dikes of Holland.

Holland is a very picturesque country with its big dikes, canals, windmills and
quaint little homes. Some of the big dikes slope 300 feet toward the sea, are forty feet
above high water mark and forty wide on top. Some idea of their size may be had when
it is known that they accommodate roadways and service railways on the same dike.
Some of the homes in Holland are situated twenty feet below the level of the sea and the
dikes are patrolled every half mile. The united length of the canals of Holland exceeds
1500 miles and tall poplar trees line the canals on both sides which give a very scenic
effect to that part of the continent.

We procured a pilot at this point and proceeded up the river twenty miles to the
ancient city of Antwerp arriving at the dock at six P.M. August 6th, after twelve days at
sea.

At this point the officials in charge (both the Olympic committee officials and our
own) seemed to take the line of least resistance. There was no receiving committee for
the athletes; no arrangements made for housing the racing shells; in fact, no one seemed
to know even where the races were going to be held. The result was that the crew squad
was on the *Frederick* for five days, while the other athletes were in training. We kept the squad in condition by taking long hikes about the city and viewing points of interest.

One day we visited the “Steen” or ancient castle of Antwerp, which dates back to the tenth century. It was very interesting as the castle contained many relics of the middle ages. The dungeon was the most interesting part. On payment of a few centimes to the guide we were furnished with candles and allowed to explore the dungeon, which was famous as a torture chamber during the Spanish Inquisition. We saw a chamber with smoke still visible on the walls in which victims were smoked to death. In some places dark blood stains had soaked into the stone floors and were still visible. Rusty chains and hooks hung from the walls and ceilings. The ancient water-torture machine was in one compartment and consisted of a stone seat over which an arrangement was hung which allowed a drop of water to fall a drop at a time on the victims head, which finally drove him crazy. In another part a deep well led to the river underneath into which the victims were thrown alive.

One day we visited the Antwerp Cathedral, which was started in the fourteenth century and finished in the sixteenth; a period of 200 years to complete. The cathedral contained many beautiful Flemish oak carvings, and paintings by the old masters. Peter Paul Ruben’s masterpiece, “The Descent from the Cross” is there. It was taken down and hidden during the war and twenty minutes after a German shell crashed through the window and exploded a few feet from where the picture had hung. The Belgians attach some spiritual significance to this incident. A gold line ran diagonally across one part of the floor, and a hole as large as a quarter was cut in the glass skylight above through
which the sun's rays came. This arrangement was an ancient time-piece and the Belgians could tell the time of day by the position of the sun's rays on the gold line.

We finally procured a canal barge and transported the racing shells twenty miles through a series of canals and locks up to the Royal Nautique boathouse, (the King's own) at Three Fountains. This was another interesting trip. Ruins of churches and homes could be seen in the distance on either side. We stopped at one of the locks and bought some wooden shoes from the little Belgian children for a few centimes. Before leaving America there was much talk here about the starving children of Belgium, but they appeared to be very well fed to me, and looked as healthy, if not healthier, than any group one would see in this country.

The Germans had occupied the Royal Nautique Boathouse for a year during the war, and as a result the Belgian shells were in poor condition having been left out in a field exposed to the weather.

We put up at the Steamboat Tavern a short distance from the boathouse. The windows had been shot out during the war and had not been replaced and living there was much like camping out. There were many small children in the vicinity whom natives claimed were born during the war of German fathers. We visited a beautiful Chateau nearby the grounds of which were nicely laid out and well stocked with game. One morning about sun-rise I was passing through the grounds and saw as many as twenty Belgian Hares in one small field.

During the two weeks of training the crew rowed on an average of fifteen to twenty miles a day, and most of the coaching was done on a bicycle or in a broken down
army truck, driven by one of the most reckless daredevils it has ever been my pleasure to meet. I could tell some stories about this driver and his truck but will not have time.

August 29th, the day of the big race arrived at last. Here it might be well to mention that up until this time the crew squad had been in almost constant training for seven months; seven long months of hard work in the biting winds of March, on the Severn, and under the hot sun of August and July; months of self denial and sacrifice. In Belgium there were bar-rooms and dancing parlors and places of the sort every few steps and in spite of this glaring temptation the crew behaved themselves nobly. It is unnecessary to dwell on the long siege of coaching, training and anxiety, under which the coaches labored. The elimination heats were past history and the English and Navy eights were left to battle for the supremacy of the World.

The Navy eight was finally placed on the starting line, 3000 miles from home in a foreign country, and no one could detect by their calm exteriors the nervous strain under which each man in the boat labored.

The English came down on the line (the pride and flower of England) and when both crews were lined up the starter said in French: "'Are you ready America,' ‘Are you ready England?’ Every heart stopped beating. ‘Are you ready all?’--‘Row.’ The starting cannon boomed, the oars flashed and the men in both boats started to row a race of their lives.

Down at the finish line the great mob yelled, ‘Here they come,’ and every neck was craned to watch the crews.

At the half-way mark England was leading by one half length, and rowing like demons; but the Navy crew kept their heads; one slip then and all was lost. On they came
until the two big crews were 300 yards from the finish. It began to look like England’s race, but Clarke yelled, the stroke went up and the Navy crew began to gain. Up they came foot by foot, until the two crews were even. Ten more heart breaking strokes and the Navy shell slid across the line half a length ahead of the fastest crew England ever turned out, breaking the World’s record by five seconds.

No one clearly remembers the order of events after that. The Englishmen proved to be good sports by coming around in the evening to congratulate us. The midshipmen dispersed, some went to France, some to Switzerland, some to Germany, and some to England. On the way home we visited Harwich, London, and Southampton, England and Charbourg, France. We spent a day in London, visited Westminster Abbey, and other points of interest, and left England on the Cunard Liner *Aquitania*, from Southampton; and five and one half days later arrived in N.Y. and then home sweet home.
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Photos of the 1920 Crew\textsuperscript{401}
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APPENDIX C

Comparisons of Various 1919 and 1920 Crews

1919 Varsity Crews - Bow to stern by name, pounds, and height

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Princeton</th>
<th>Harvard</th>
<th>Naval Academy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael – 165, 6’</td>
<td>Whitman – 171, 6’1”</td>
<td>Sanborn – 181, 6’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell – 166, 6’</td>
<td>Batchelder – 176, 6’</td>
<td>Graves – 178, 6’5”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan – 176, 6’2”</td>
<td>Linder – 180, 5’11”</td>
<td>Wiedman – 180, 6’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walters – 168, 6’3”</td>
<td>Morris – 172, 6’</td>
<td>Skinner – 185, 5’11.05”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marston – 180, 6’1”</td>
<td>Sedgwick – 193, 6’3”</td>
<td>Ballreich – 182, 6’3”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrisholm – 170, 5’11”</td>
<td>Lathrop – 183, 6”</td>
<td>Repplier – 176, 6’3”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dent – 173, 6’1”</td>
<td>Brazer – 175, 6’</td>
<td>Harris – 175, 6’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paxton – 174, 6’</td>
<td>Leighton – 170, 6’</td>
<td>Ingram – 182, 6’1”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total – 1372 lbs., 47.86’</td>
<td>Total – 1420 lbs., 46.5’</td>
<td>Total – 1439 lbs., 48.31’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two lists are from the official program of the 1919 American Henley by name and pounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syracuse</th>
<th>University of Pennsylvania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shaw – 176</td>
<td>Ames – 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoople – 175</td>
<td>Keller – 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimshaw – 178</td>
<td>Roberts – 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salin – 190</td>
<td>Supplee – 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busch – 195</td>
<td>Ellson – 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rammi – 187</td>
<td>Winslow – 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decker – 176</td>
<td>Wilson – 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loskamp – 170</td>
<td>Thomas – 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total – 1447 lbs.</td>
<td>Total – 1347 lbs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1920 – From the Official Program of the 16th Annual American Henley, May, 1920, by name and pounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harvard</th>
<th>Naval Academy</th>
<th>Columbia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson – 163</td>
<td>Jacomini – 178</td>
<td>Waldecker – 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batchelder – 173</td>
<td>Graves – 182</td>
<td>Curry – 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borland – 174</td>
<td>Jordan – 182</td>
<td>Swinburne – 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan – 168</td>
<td>Moore – 182</td>
<td>Gallico – 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgwick – 194</td>
<td>Sanborn – 183</td>
<td>Herman – 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batchelder, Jr. – 192</td>
<td>Johnston – 180</td>
<td>Scovil – 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond – 171</td>
<td>Wiedman – 182</td>
<td>Van Houten – 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmstead – 188</td>
<td>King – 182</td>
<td>Leys – 164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Princeton</th>
<th>University of Pennsylvania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page – 162</td>
<td>Ames – 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry – 165</td>
<td>Keller – 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham – 168</td>
<td>Swan – 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke – 172</td>
<td>Hinkley – 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair – 174</td>
<td>Ellson – 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont – 176</td>
<td>Copeland – 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milne – 175</td>
<td>Guenther – 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cresswell – 168</td>
<td>Thomas – 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total – 1360 lbs.</td>
<td>Total - 1405 lbs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Rowing at the U.S. Naval Academy

RECORD OF NAVAL ACADEMY CREW RACES

FRESHMAN EIGHTS

1905-May 6 (Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy, 2 Georgetown Prep. School. (Severn River course.)

1908-May 30 (Distance 1 1/2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 Baltimore Polytechnic. Time: 8m.

1909-May 8 (Distance 1 mile. Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 Philadelphia Central High School. Time: 9m., 56s.

1910-May 7 (Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy, 2 Philadelphia Central High School. (Severn River course.)

1911-April 22 (Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy, 2 Philadelphia Central High School. (Severn River course.)

1911-May 26 (Distance 1 mile, 550 yds., First entry in American Henley, Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pa.) 1 Navy, 2 Columbia, 3 University of Pennsylvania.

1912-May 4 (Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy, 2 University of Pennsylvania. (Severn River course.)

1912-May 16 (Distance 1 mile, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 Ariel Boat Club, Baltimore, Md. Time: 6m., 2s.

1912-May 23 (Distance 1 mile, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 Philadelphia Central High School. (Time not given.)

1913-May 31 (American Henley Regatta, Schuylkill River Philadelphia, Pa.) 1 University of Pennsylvania, 2 Navy. (Time not given.)

1914-April 118 (Distance and time not given.) 1 University of Pennsylvania, 2 Navy. (Time not given.)

1915-April 17 (Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy, 2 Princeton. (Severn River course.)

1915-April 24 (Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy, 2 Philadelphia Central High School. (Severn River course.)

1915-April 30 (Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy, 2 University of Pennsylvania. (Severn River course.)

1916-May 13 (Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy, 2 University of Pennsylvania. (Severn River course.)

1916-May 20 (Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy, 2 Philadelphia Central High School. (Severn River course.)


1917-April 17 (Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy, 2 Princeton. (Severn River course.)

1917-April 24 (Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy, 2 University of Pennsylvania. (Severn River course.)

1918-No Plebe races owing to the war.

1919-(Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy, 2 University of Pennsylvania. (Severn River course.)

1919-(Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy, 2 Princeton. (Severn River course.)

1919-(Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy, 2 Syracuse. (Severn River course.)

1919-(Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy, 2 Philadelphia Central High School. (Severn River course.)

1919-(American Henley Regatta, Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pa.) 1 Syracuse, 2 Navy, 3 University of Pennsylvania.
1920-April 26 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Navy, 2 Harvard. Time: 12m., 24s.

1920-May 1 (Distance 1 mile, 550 yds. Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 Columbia. Time: 7m., 45s.


1921-April 30 (Distance 1 mile, 550 yds. Severn River course.) 1 Navy first crew, 2 Washington Central High School, 3 Navy second crew. Time: 7m., 27s.

1921-May 21 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Syracuse, 2 Navy. Time: 11m., 35s.


1922-April 29 (Distance 1 mile, 550 yds., Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 Massachusetts Institute of Technology Junior Varsity. Time: 8m., 24s.

1922-May 6 (Distance 1 7/8 miles, Charles River course, Boston, Mass.) 1 Navy, 2 Princeton, 3 Harvard. Time: 11m., 1s.

1922-May 13 (Distance 1 mile, 550 yds., Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 Navy second Plebe crew, 3 Washington Central High School. Time: 7m., 45s.

1922-May 20 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 Syracuse. Time: 10m., 29s.


JUNIOR VARSITY EIGHTS

1898-May 21 (Distance 2, miles, Severn River course.)
1 University of Pennsylvania, 2 Navy. (Time not given.)

1900-May 12 (Distance 1 1/2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Navy, 2 University of Pennsylvania. (Time not given.)
1904-(Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 University of Pennsylvania. Time: 10m., 51s.

1904-(Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 University of Georgetown. Time: 9m., 41s.

1905-April 15 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 University of Georgetown. Time: 10m., 25s.

1905-April 29 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 University of Pennsylvania, Freshmen, 2 Navy. (Time not given.)

1905-May 20 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 Columbia. (Time not given.)

1906-April 14 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 University of Georgetown. Time: 10m., 58s.

1906-April 28 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 University of Pennsylvania. Time: 10m., 40s.

1907-June 1 (Distance 1 1/2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy second crew, 2 Navy third crew, 3 Vesper Boat Club, 4 Philadelphia Central High School. Time: 10m., 36s.

1908-May 9 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 Columbia. Time: 10m., 31s.

1908-May 30 (Distance 1 1/2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 Arundel Boat Club. Time: 7m., 30s.

1909-May 15 (Distance 1 1/2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 Potomac Boat Club second crew. (Time not given.)

1910-May 7 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy third crew, 2 Arundel Boat Club. (Time not given.)

1910-May 14 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 University of Georgetown. (Time not given.)

1911-May 26 (American Henley Regatta, Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pa.) 1 Cornell, 2 Navy, 3 University of Pennsylvania, 4 Harvard, 5 Yale. (Time not given.)

1912-April 27 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 Harvard. (Time not given.)
1912-May 16 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Syracuse, 2 Navy. (Time not given.)

1913-May 31 (American Henley Regatta, Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pa.) 1 Cornell, 2 Navy. (Time not given.)

1914-April 25 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Harvard, 2 Navy. (Time not given.)


1915-April 30 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 University of Pennsylvania, 2 Navy. (Time not given.)

1916-May 13 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 University of Pennsylvania, 2 Navy. (Time not given.)

1916-May 31 (American Henley Regatta, Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pa.) 1 Syracuse, 2 Harvard, 3 Yale, 4 Navy. (Time not given.)

1919-(Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 University of Pennsylvania, 2 Navy. (Time not given.)

1919-May 31 (American Henley Regatta, Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pa.) 1 Navy, 2 Princeton, 3 University of Pennsylvania. (Time not given.)

1920-April 26 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Navy, 2 Harvard. Time: 12m., 15s.

1920-May 1 (Distance 1 mile, 550 yds., Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 Columbia. Time: 7m., 25s.

1920-May 15 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Navy, 2 Syracuse. Time: 10m., 37s.

1920-May 29 (Distance 1 mile, 550 yds., American Henley Regatta, Philadelphia, Pa.) 1 Navy, 2 Syracuse, 3 Princeton, 4 Harvard, 5 Union Boat Club. Time: 6m., 31 2/5s.
1920-July 23 (Distance 1 1/2 miles, National Regatta, Worcester, Mass.)
   1 Navy, 2 Detroit Boat Club, 3 Duluth Boat Club, 4 Norton Boat Club
   first crew, 5 Norton Boat Club, second crew. Time: 6m., 57s.
   [NOTE: By winning the above event the Navy second crew won
   the right to compete in the first Varsity event the following day,
   which they did, winning third place.]

1921-April 30 (Distance 1 mile, 550 yds., Severn River course.)
   1 Navy, 2 University of Pennsylvania. Time: 6m., 41s.

1921-May 28 (American Henley Regatta, Philadelphia, Pa.)
   1 Princeton, 2 Navy, 3 University of Pennsylvania, 4 Harvard, 5 Yale. Time: 6m., 57s.

1922-April 29 (Distance 1 mile, 550 yds., Severn River course.)
   1 Navy Junior Varsity, 2 Navy Plebes, 3 Massachusetts Technical
   Junior Varsity. Time: 8m. 13s.

1922-May 20 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
   1 Navy, 2 Syracuse. Time: 10m., 21s.

1922-May 27 (American Henley, Philadelphia, Pa.)
   1 Princeton, 2 Navy, 3 Harvard, 4 University of Pennsylvania
   (150 pound crew.) Time: 6m., 38 2/5s.

JUNIOR FOURS

1914-May 16 (American Henley Regatta, Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pa.)
   Navy crew lost this race.

1920-July 23 (Distance 1 1/2 miles, National Regatta, Worcester, Mass.)
   1 Duluth Boating Club, 2 Navy. Time: 7m., 35s.

VARSITY EIGHTS

Note: Asterisk (*) denotes record.

1893-(Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy, 2 Neptune Boat Club, Baltimore, Md. (Severn River course.)

1894-June 2 (Distance 3 miles, Severn River course.)
   University of Pennsylvania, 2 Navy. Time: 19m., 33s.

1895-May 18 (Distance 1 1/2 miles, Severn River course.)
   1 Potomac Boat Club, 2 Navy. Time: 8m., 26s.
1896--May 9 (Distance 1 1/2 miles, Severn River course.)  
1 Baltimore Athletic Club, 2 Navy. Time: 7m., 33 1/2 s.

1896-May 16 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)  
1 University of Pennsylvania, 2 Navy. Time: 10m., 53s.

1896-May 24 (Distance 1 mile, Severn River course.) 1 Navy,  
2 Columbia Athletic Club. Time: 5m., 22s.

1896-May 30 (Distance 1 mile, Severn River course.)  
1 Navy, 2 Potomac Boat Club. Time: 5m., 32s.

1897-May 15 (Distance and time not given.) 1 Cornell,  
2 Navy. (Severn River course.)

1897-May 29 (Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy,  
2 University of Pennsylvania. (Severn River course.)

1898-May 14 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)  
1 Navy, 2 Columbia. Time: 11m., 29s.

1898-May 21 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)  
1 University of Pennsylvania, 2 Navy. Time: 11m., 3s.

1900-May 5 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)  
1 Navy, 2 Yale. Time: 10m., 10s.

1900-May 12 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)  
1 University of Pennsylvania, 2 Navy. Time:  
10m., 26s.

1901-May 4 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)  
1 Navy, 2 Yale. Time: 10m., 26s.

1901-May 11 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)  
1 University of Pennsylvania, 2 Navy. Time: 10m., 33s.

1901-May 15 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)  
1 Navy, 2 University of Georgetown. Time: 10m., 33 2/5 s.

1903-(Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy,  
2 University of Pennsylvania. (Time not given.)

1903-(Distance and time not given.) 1 Yale, 2 Navy.  
(Severn River course.)
1903-(Distance and time not given.) 1 Georgetown, 2 Navy. (Severn River course.)

1904-(Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 University of Pennsylvania, 2 Navy. Time: 10m., 37s.

1904-(Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Yale, 2 Navy. Time: 10m., 31s.

1904-(Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 University of Georgetown. Time: 9m., 38s.

1905-April 15 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 University of Georgetown. Time: 10m., 21 2/5s.

1905-April 29 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
   1 Navy, 2 University of Pennsylvania. Time: 12m., 4s.

1905-May 6 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
   1 Navy, 2 Yale. Time: 11m., 54m., 2/5s.

1905-May 20 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
   1 Navy, 2 Columbia. (Time not given.)

1906-April 14 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
   1 Navy, 2 University of Georgetown. Time: 10m., 17s.

1906-April 28 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
   1 University of Pennsylvania, 2 Navy. Time: 10m., 25s.

1906-May 5 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
   1 Navy, 2 Yale. Time: 10m., 10s.

1906-May 19 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
   1 Navy, 2 Columbia. Time: 9m., 31s.

1906-June 2 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
   1 Navy, 2 Ariel Boat Club. Time: 9m., 30s.

1907-April 1 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
   1 Navy, 2 University of Georgetown. Time: 11m., 51s.

1907-May 18 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
   1 Navy, 2 Columbia. Time: 10m., 33s.
1907-June 25 (Distance 4 miles, Poughkeepsie Regatta, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., Hudson River course.) 1 Cornell, 2 Columbia, 3 Navy, 4 Pennsylvania. Time: 20m., 51s.

1908-April 22 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Harvard, 2 Navy. Time: 10m., 37s.

1908-May 9 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Navy, 2 Columbia. Time: 10m., 23s.

1908-May 23 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Syracuse, 2 Navy. Time: 10m., 33s.

1909-April 24 (Severn River course.)
1 Navy Varsity, 2 Navy third Varsity, 3 New York University, 4 Arundel Boat Club. Time: 9m., 1s.

1909-May 8 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Navy, 2 Columbia. Time: 9m., 56s.

1909-May 15 (Severn River course.)
1 Columbia. Time: 8m., 44s.

1909-May 20 (Distance and time not given.) 1 Syracuse, 2 Navy. (Severn River course.)

1910-April 21 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Harvard, 2 Navy. (Time not given.)

1910-May 7 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Navy, 2 Columbia. (Time not given.)

1910-May 14 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Navy, 2 University of Georgetown. (Time not given.)

1910-May 21 (Distance 2 miles and time not given.)
1 Navy, 2 Syracuse. (Severn River course.)

1911-April 29 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Navy, 2 Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (Time not given.)

1911-May 20 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Navy, 2 Syracuse. (Time not given.)
1911-May 26 (American Henley Regatta, Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pa.) 1 Columbia Boat Club, 2 Navy, 3 Union Boat Club. (Time not given.)
[NOTE: First entry in this regatta.]

1912-April 27 (Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy Varsity, 2 Navy Graduate crew. (Severn River course.)

1912-May 4 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Navy, 2 University of Pennsylvania. (Time not given.)

1912-May 16 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Syracuse, 2 Navy. (Time not given.)

1913-May 17 (Lake Carnegie course, Princeton, N. J.) 1 Columbia, 2 Navy, 3 Princeton. (Time not given.)

1913-May 24 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Navy, 2 University of Pennsylvania. (Time not given.)

1913-May 31 (American Henley Regatta, Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pa.) 1 Navy, 2 Columbia. (Time not given.)

1914-April 18 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 University of Pennsylvania, 2 Navy. (Time not given.)

1914-April 25 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Navy, 2 Harvard. (Time not given.)

1914-May 16 (American Henley Regatta, Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pa.) Navy crew lost this race.

1915-Note: A blow fell from the Academic Board at this time in the shape of a rule that prevented midshipmen unsatisfactory in any subject from participating in a race.

1915-April 17 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Princeton, 2 Navy. (Time not given.)

1915-April 24 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Harvard, 2 Navy. (Time not given.)
1915-April 30 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 University of Pennsylvania, 2 Navy. (Time not given.)

1916-April 29 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 Analostan Boat Club. (Time not given.)

1916-May 3 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 University of Pennsylvania. (Time not given.)

1916-May 20 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Syracuse, 2 Navy. (Time not given.)

1916-May 31 (American Henley Regatta, Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pa.) 1 Princeton, 2 Navy, 3 Columbia. (Time not given.)

1917-(Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 Potomac Boat Club. (Time not given.) [Note: The varsity crew season terminated here on account of the war graduation.]

1918-(Distance 1 mile, 550 yds., Patriotic Regatta, Severn River course.)
1 Navy, 2 Columbia, 3 University of Pennsylvania. (Time not given.)

1919-(Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 University of Pennsylvania, 2 Navy. (Time not given.)

1919-(Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Navy, 2 Harvard, 3 Princeton. (Time not given.)

1919-(Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 Syracuse. (Time not given.)

1919-(American Henley Regatta, Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pa.) 1 Navy, 2 University of Pennsylvania. (Time not given.)

1920-April 26 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Navy, 2 Harvard. Time: 11m., 48s.

1920-May 1 (Distance 1 mile, 550 yds., Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 Columbia. Time: 7m., 19s.

1920-May 15 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Syracuse, 2 Navy. Time: 10m., 20s.

1920-May 30 (Child's Cup Race, Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pa.) 1 Navy, 2 Princeton, 3 University of Pennsylvania, 4 Columbia. Time: 7m., 3 2/5s.

1920-July 24 (Distance 1 1/4 miles, National Regatta, Lake Quinsigamond, Worcester, Mass.) 1 Navy Varsity, 2 Syracuse, 3 Navy second Varsity, 4 Duluth Boat Club Varsity, 5 Duluth Boat Club second crew. Time: 6m., 20s.


1920-August 28 (Distance 2000 meters, Semi-finals of Olympic Regatta.) 1 Navy, 2 France. Time: 6m., 24s.

1920-August 29 (Distance 2000 meters, Finals of Olympic Regatta.) 1 Navy, 2 Leander Boat Club, England. Time: 6m., 2 2/5s.

1921-April 30 (Distance 1 mile, 550 yds., Severn River course.) 1 Navy, 2 Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Time: 7m., 40s.

1921-May 6 (Distance 1 1/2 miles, Charles River course, Boston, Mass.) 1 Navy, 2 Princeton, 3 Harvard. Time: 10m., 28s.
1922-May 20 (Distance 2 miles, Severn River course.)
1 Navy, 2 Syracuse. Time: 9m., 56s.

1922-May 27 (American Henley Regatta, Philadelphia, Pa.) 1 Navy,
2 University of Pennsylvania, 2 Union Boat Club. Time: 6m., 43 1/5s.

1922-June 26 (Distance 3 miles, Hudson River course, Poughkeepsie,
N.Y.) 1 Navy, 2 Washington State, 3 Syracuse, 4 Cornell,
5 Columbia, 6 University of Pennsylvania. Time: 13m., 33 3/5s.

SENIOR FOURS

1892-(Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy, 2 Severn
Boat Club. (Severn River course.)

1912-May 16 (Distance 1 mile, Severn River course.)
1 Navy, 2 Arundel Boat Club. Time: 6m., 17s.

1913-May 17 (Distance and time not given.) 1 Navy,
2 University Barge Club. (Severn River course.)

1913-May 31 (American Henley Regatta, Schuylkill
River, Philadelphia, Pa.) Won by Navy crew.

1916-May 31 (American Henley Regatta, Philadelphia,
Pa.) 1 Navy, 2 Vesper Boat Club, 3 University Barge
Club. (Time not given.)

150 Pound Crew

1919-(American Henley Regatta, Philadelphia, Pa.) 1 Navy,
2 University of Pennsylvania. Time: 7m., 2 4/5s.

1920-May 31 (American Henley Regatta, Philadelphia, Pa.)
1 University of Pennsylvania, 2 Yale, 3 Princeton, 4 Navy.
Time: 6m., 43 2/5s.
APPENDIX E

Henley Royal Regatta Grand Challenge Cup Winners

GRAND CHALLENGE CUP, FOR EIGHT-OARS
(established 1839) DISTANCE 1 MILE, 550 YARDS

1884 London R. O. 7.27
1885 Jesus College, Cambridge. 7.22
1886 Trinity Hall, Cambridge. 6.53 1/2
1887 Trinity Hall, Cambridge 6.56
1888 Thames R. O. 7.01
1889 Thames R. O. 7.04
1890 London R. O. 7.04 1/2
1891 Leander Club 6.51
1892 Leander Club 7.48 1/2
1893 Leander Club 7.45
1894 Leander Club 7.22
1895 Trinity Hall, Cambridge 7.30
1896 Leander Club 7.43
1897 New College, Oxford 6.51
1898 Leander Club 7.13
1899 Leander Club 7.12
1900 Leander Club 7.06
1901 Leander Club 7.05
1902 Third Trinity, Cambridge 7.17
1903 Leander Club 7.09
1904 Leander Club 7.20
1905 Leander Club 6.58
1906 Gand Club, Belgium 7.09
1907 Gand Club, Belgium 7.31
1908 Christ Church, Oxford 7.10
1909 Gand Club, Belgium 7.08
1910 Magdalen, Oxford 7.19
1911 Magdalen, Oxford 7.02
1912 Sydney R. O. (N.S.W.) 7.06
1913 Leander Club 7.11
1914 Harvard 7. 20
1920 Magdalen, Oxford –
1921 Magdalen, Oxford 6.54

No race during war period.
APPENDIX F

Records of the Intercollegiate Regatta Races, 1895-1921

Junior Varsity Eights-Two Miles

June 26, 1914-1 Cornell, 2 Columbia, 3 Pennsylvania. Time: 11m., 15 3/5s

June 28, 1915-1 Cornell, 2 Pennsylvania, 3 Columbia. Time: 10m., 1/5s

June 17, 1916-1 Syracuse, 2 Cornell, 3 Columbia, 4 Pennsylvania. Time: 11m., 152/5s

June 19, 1920-(Rowed on Lake Cayuga at Ithaca NY) 1 Cornell, 2 Syracuse, 3 Pennsylvania 4 Columbia. Time: 10m, 45 3/5s

June 22, 1921-1 Cornell, 2 Pennsylvania, 3 Syracuse, 4 Columbia. Time: 10m., 38s.

June 26, 1922-1 Cornell, 2 Columbia, 3 Syracuse, 4 Pennsylvania. Time: 9m., 45 3/5s.

Freshman Eights-Two Miles

June 24, 1896- 1 Cornell, 2 Harvard, 3 Pennsylvania, 4 Columbia. Time: 10m., 18s.

June 23, 1897-1 Yale, 2 Harvard, 3 Cornell. Time: 9m., 19 1/2s.

June 30, 1897-1 Cornell, 2 Columbia, 3 Pennsylvania. Time: 9m., 21 1/5s.

July 2, 1898-(Rowed on Saratoga Lake NY) 1 Cornell, 2 Columbia, 3 Pennsylvania. Time: 10m., 57 3/5s.

June 26, 1899-1 Cornell, 2 Columbia, 3 Pennsylvania. Time: 9m., 55s.

June 30, 1900-1 Wisconsin, 2 Pennsylvania, 3 Cornell, 4 Columbia. Time: 9m 45 2/5s.

July 2, 1901-1 Pennsylvania, 2 Cornell, 3 Columbia, 4 Syracuse. Time: 10m, 20 1/5s.

June 21, 1902-1 Cornell, 2 Wisconsin, 3 Columbia, 4 Syracuse. Time: 9m, 39 4/5s.

June 26, 1903-1 Cornell, 2 Syracuse, 3 Wisconsin, 4 Columbia. Time: 9m., 18s.

June 28, 1904-1 Syracuse, 2 Cornell, 3 Pennsylvania, 4 Columbia. Time: 10m., 1s.

June 28, 1905-1 Cornell, 2 Syracuse, 3 Columbia, 4 Pennsylvania. Time: 9m., 39 4/5s.

June 23, 1906-1 Syracuse, 2 Cornell, 3 Wisconsin, 4 Columbia. Time: 9m., 51 3/5s.

June 26, 1907-1 Wisconsin, 2 Syracuse, 3 Pennsylvania, 4 Columbia. Time: 9m., 58s.
June 27, 1908-1 Cornell, 2 Syracuse, 3 Columbia, 4 Wisconsin. Time: 9m., 29 3/5s.
July 2, 1909-1 Cornell, 2 Syracuse, 3 Pennsylvania, 4 Wisconsin. Time: 9m., 11 3/5s.
June 25, 1910-1 Cornell, 2 Columbia, 3 Syracuse, 4 Pennsylvania. Time: 10m., 40 1/5s.
June 27, 1911-1 Columbia, 2 Syracuse, 3 Cornell, 4 Pennsylvania. Time: 10m., 13 1/3s.
June 29, 1912-1 Cornell, 2 Wisconsin, 3 Syracuse, 4 Pennsylvania. Time: 9m., 31 2/5s.
June 21, 1913-1 Cornell, 2 Wisconsin, 3 Syracuse, 4 Pennsylvania. Time: 10m., 4 4/5s.
June 26, 1914-1 Cornell, 2 Syracuse, 3 Pennsylvania, 4 Wisconsin. Time: 10m., 26s.
June 28, 1915-1 Syracuse, 2 Cornell, 3 Columbia, 4 Pennsylvania. Time: 9m., 29 3/5s.

Varsity Eights-Four Miles

June 24, 1895-1 Columbia, 2 Cornell, 3 Pennsylvania. Time: 21m., 25s.
June 25, 1897-1 Cornell, 2 Yale, 3 Harvard. Time: 20m., 34s.
July 2, 1897-1 Cornell, 2 Columbia, 3 Pennsylvania. Time: 20m., 47 4/5s.
July 2, 1898-(Three miles rowed on Lake Saratoga) 1 Pennsylvania, 2 Cornell, 3 Wisconsin. Time: 15m., 51 1/2s.
June 27, 1899-1 Pennsylvania, 2 Wisconsin, 3 Cornell. Time: 20m., 4s.
June 30, 1900-1 Pennsylvania, 2 Wisconsin, 3 Cornell. Time: 19m., 44 3/5s.
July 2, 1901-1 Cornell, 2 Columbia, 3 Wisconsin. Time: 18m., 53 1/5s.
June 21, 1902-1 Cornell, 2 Wisconsin, 3 Columbia. Time: 19m. 5 2/5s.
June 26, 1903-1 Cornell, 2 Georgetown, 3 Wisconsin. Time: 18m., 57s.
June 28, 1904-1 Syracuse, 2 Cornell, 3 Pennsylvania. Time: 20m., 22 3/5s.
June 28, 1905-1 Cornell, 2 Syracuse, 3 Georgetown. Time: 20m., 29s.
June 26, 1907-1 Cornell, 2 Columbia, 3 Navy. Time: 20m., 2 2/5s.
June 27, 1908-1 Syracuse, 2 Columbia, 3 Cornell. Time: 19m., 24 1/5s.
July 2, 1909-1 Cornell, 2 Columbia, 3 Syracuse. Time: 19m., 2s.

June 25, 1910-1 Cornell, 2 Pennsylvania, 3 Columbia. Time: 20m., 42 1/5s.

June 27, 1911-1 Cornell, 2 Columbia, 3 Pennsylvania. Time: 20m., 10 4/5s.

June 29, 1912-1 Cornell, 2 Wisconsin, 3 Columbia. Time: 19m., 31 2/5s.

June 21, 1913-1 Syracuse, 2 Cornell, 3 Washington. Time: 19m., 28 3/5s.


June 28, 1915-1 Cornell, 2 Leland Stanford, 3 Syracuse. Time: 19m., 36 3/5s.

June 17, 1916-1 Syracuse, 2 Cornell, 3 Columbia. Time: 20m., 15 2/5s.

June 19, 1920-(Two miles rowed on Lake Cayuga at Ithaca NY) 1 Syracuse, 2 Cornell, 3 Columbia. Time: 11m., 2 3/5s.

June 22, 1921-1 Navy, 2 California, 3 Cornell. Time: 14m., 7s.

June 26, 1922-(Distance Three Miles) 1 Navy, 2 Washington, 3 Syracuse. Time: 13m., 3/5s.
IRA continues with winners up until 1960 here\textsuperscript{406}

1923 – Washington
1924 – Washington
1925 – Navy
1926 – Washington
1927 – Columbia
1928 – Cal
1929 – Columbia
1930 – Cornell
1931 – Navy
1932 – Cal
1933 – no race held
1934 – Cal
1935 – Cal
1936 – Washington
1937 – Washington
1938 – Navy
1939 – Cal
1940 – Washington
1941 – Washington
1942 – 1946 - no races held
1947 – Navy
1948 – Washington
1949 – Cal
1950 – Washington
1951 – Wisconsin
1952 – Navy
1953 – Navy
1954 – Navy
1955 – Cornell
1956 – Cornell
1957 – Cornell
1958 – Cornell
1959 – Wisconsin
1960 – Cal
APPENDIX G

Birth and Death Records of the 1920 Crew


Coxswain-Sherman Rockwell Clarke born 1899 Baltimore, Maryland. Died 8 November 1980 in Annapolis, Maryland.
APPENDIX H

1920 Olympic Regatta Events Schedule

The results of the first day’s heats in the order that the crews finished are as follows:

Friday, August 27th, 1920

SINGLE SCULLS – Distance 2000 meters

2:00 P.M.

1. Great Britain - Jack Beresford, Jr.
2. Switzerland - Max W. Schmid
   Time 7.45

2:25 P.M.

1. Holland – Fritz Evert Eyken
2. Italy – Nino Castelli
3. Belgium – Jacques Haller
   Time 7.50

2:50 P.M.

1. America – John B. Kelly
2. Sweden Nils Ljunglof
   Time 7.44

3:15 P.M.

1. New Zealand – D. C. Hadfield
2. Denmark – Theodore Eyrich
   Time 8.05

DOUBLE SCULLS

3:40 P.M.

1. Italy – Ermineo Dones, Pietro Annoni
2. Belgium – Ernst Saswaka, Georges Leonet
   Time 7.25
4:05 P.M.

1. Switzerland – Charles Schochlin, G. G. Walter
2. France – Alfred Ple, Gaston Giran
Time 7.26

4:30 P.M.

1. America – J. B. Kelly, Paul V. Costello
2. Holland – Koos Marinus de Haas, Bastian Marinus Veth
3. Brazil – Withdrew
Time 7.16

EIGHT OARS

4:55 P.M.

1. Norway
2. Czechoslovakia
Time 6.35

5:20 P.M.

1. Great Britain
2. Switzerland
Time 6.19

5:45 P.M.

1. America
2. Belgium
Time 6.26

6:10 P.M.

1. France
2. Holland
Time 6.33
Saturday, August 28th, 1920, the second day of the Regatta

SEMI-FINALS

FOUR OARS

2:00 P.M.

1. Switzerland
2. Sweden
3. Canada
Time 7.01

2:25 P.M.

1. Norway
2. Belgium
3. France – Withdrew
Time 7.15

2:50 P.M.

1. America
2. Brazil
3. Czechoslovakia
Time 7.17

SINGLE SCULLS

3:15 P.M.

1. Great Britain – J. Beresford, Jr.
2. Holland – Fritz Evert Eyken
Time 7.40

3:40 P.M.

1. America – J. B. Kelly
2. New Zealand – D. C. Hadfield
Time 7.26
EIGHT OARS

5:20 P.M.

1. Great Britain
2. Norway
Time 6.26

5:45 P.M.

1. America
2. France
Time 6.24

Sunday, August 29, 1920, the last day of the Regatta

FINALS

FOUR-OARS

3:00 P.M.

1. Switzerland – Dr. H. Walter, Dr. H. Rudolf, W. Bruderlin, P.E. Rudolf, Cox Staub
3. Norway
Time 6.54

SINGLE SCULLS

3:30 P.M.

1. America – J. B. Kelly
2. Great Britain – J. Beresford, Jr.
Time 7.35

PAIR-OARS

4:00 P.M.

1. Italy – Ercole Olgeni, Giovanni Scatturin, Cox G. de Felip
2. Brazil – Jao Jorio, Abrahao Saliture, Cox E. F. Filho
3. France – Poix, Bouten, Cox Barberolle
Time 7.20
DOUBLE SCULLS

4:30 P.M.

1. America – Kelly, Costello
2. France – Alfred Ple, Gaston Giran
3. Italy – Ermino Dones, Pietro Annoni
   Time 7.02

EIGHT-OARS

   Time 6.02 – World Record

   Time 6.05
APPENDIX I

46th Annual National Association of Amateur Oarsmen Regatta

(Excerpt from the Official Olympic Trials Events Schedule
Held on Lake Quinsigamond, Worcester, Massachusetts.
Price ten cents, July 23 and 24, 1920)

Events Start at 2 o’clock P.M.

Contestants will bear numbers which correspond with numbers
Opposite names on score card. The positions are numbered from the
Worcester shore.

At the end of the first half-mile, and at the finish of each race,
Smoke-bombs will be exploded in the air, to show the positions of the
contestants in the race. The colors of the smoke will correspond with
the numbers of the contestants as follows:

No. 1 AMBER       No. 5 WHITE
No. 2 GREEN       No. 6 BLUE
No. 3 RED         No. 7 RED AND GREEN
No. 4 BLACK       No. 8 AMBER AND GREEN

The bombs will be fired by men of the Chemical Warfare Section
Of the U.S. Army.

The results of each event and the time of the winners will also be
Displayed on the roof of the launch “Uncle Sam.”

Winner of the Senior Double, Senior Four Shell, Championship
Single, and Single Eight will be sent to represent the United States in
The Olympic rowing events.

All races one mile and a quarter straightaway, with the exception
Of the Senior Quarter-Mile Dash.
Event No. 6 – SENIOR EIGHT – 3:40 P.M.

1. Duluth Boat Club, Duluth Minn. Crew No. 1.


2. Duluth Boat Club, Duluth Minn. Crew No. 2.


3. Syracuse University Crew, Syracuse, N. Y.


5. Navy Athletic Association, Annapolis, MD.


6. Navy Athletic Association, Annapolis, MD.

VITA
Susan Saint Sing
3023 SE River Terrace
Stuart, FL 34996

Degrees
2004 - Ph.D. The Pennsylvania State University, Sport History and Philosophy, Dept. of Kinesiology
1978 - B.A., cum laude - The Pennsylvania State University, GNAS in Physical Education and Fine Arts

Work Experience
2001 - 03 - Teaching Assistant - Biomechanics Lab, Sport History and Philosophy, The Pennsylvania State University
2002 - Instructor, Rowing Activity ESACT Class, The Pennsylvania State University, NCAA research assistant
2001 - 03 - Head Club Varsity Men’s and Women’s Crew Coach, The Pennsylvania State University
1994 - 97 - Girl’s Varsity Assistant Crew/Swim Coach, Kent School, Kent, CT
1993 - Manager, U. S. National Rowing Team, Racice, The Czech Republic - World Rowing Championships
1992 - 93 - Adj. Faculty - English, Journalism, and Anatomy/Physiology - Thomas More College
1986 - 92 - Head Coach, Xavier University Men’s and Women’s Crew
1990 - U.S. Rowing Olympic Festival Manager, Minneapolis
1988 - 89 - Instructor of Racquetball, University of Cincinnati
1987 - 89 - Program Director, U.S. National Rowing Center, Cincinnati

Memberships and Awards
Postgraduate Session Participant for North America at the International Olympic Academy
Member of the National Catholic Press Association
Inductee, Berwick High School Sports and Academic Halls of Fame, Berwick, PA

Published Works
Thesis - University of Cincinnati, "Select Respiratory Variables Compared at Max and Submax Levels Between a Concept II and WaterRower Rowing Ergometer"
Books
2004 - Body and Soul: Search for the Inner Athlete, the Way of Sport, St. Anthony Messenger Press, Cincinnati, Ohio
2003 - Chapter, “1928 St. Moritz Olympics” in The Encyclopedia Of Sport, edited by John Findling (to be released)
1995 - A Retreat with Francis and Clare of Assisi, St. Anthony Messenger Press
1987 - Coping with Sickness, St. Anthony Messenger Press
1985 - Poet of Creation, Franciscan Herald Press, Chicago
1982 - Pilgrim in Assisi, St. Anthony Messenger Press
Newspaper and Magazine Articles
1989 - Mar/Apr, "The Organizers," American Rowing
1986 - Jan, "Settling on the Church Steps," Cincinnati Magazine
1985 - Sept, "Crewing," Cincinnati Magazine
1982 - Oct, "St. Francis Of Assisi," Our Sunday Visitor

Professional Papers
2002 - “The 1920 Olympic Rowing Gold Medal: Breakthrough Kinesis and Nationalism” Paper accepted for the National Conference of the North American Society of Sport History. (did not attend)

Music
1984 - The Desert Speaks, Cassette Album, St. Anthony Messenger Press
1981 - Seasons, Cassette Album, St. Anthony Messenger Press
1980 - The Song of St. Francis, Cassette Album, St. Anthony Messenger Press
1978 - Hundredfold, Record Album, World Library Publication, Nashville/Chicago