

1927 National Championships

RICHARD L. HAPGOOD

The goal of America's competitive figure skaters resolved itself into a Mecca and Medina this year due to the monetary demands of professional tennis. After completing the first day's events of the National Figure Skating Championships at New Haven, the conclave hauled up tent-pegs and moved to New York City where the final clean-up of competitive strife was held at the New Madison Square Gardens and Iceland.

The number of contestants in this year's program, not including many couples who entered the dances as their only events, was twenty-one; and like last year only eight of the nine authorized national events were held. Just why no fours have been organized for two years is a matter for some speculation; but the neglect in this branch of the sport is quite apparent. This year the junior school figures were increased to include both outside rockers and inside counters, but the change did not prove a deterrent to the less experienced skaters of the country. The men's junior event called out thirteen competitors all of whom were fairly well prepared for the competition; and the women's junior skaters numbered four. Both events were made particularly interesting by the presence of entries from St. Paul,—Margaret Bennett and Roy Shipstad, who were brought by Mr. A. C. Bennett, Vice-President of the Twin Cities Figure Skating Club. Mr. Carl Gandy, one of the oldest members (in skating, not age!) and the professional, J. B. Nelson, accompanied Mr. Christenson and this party.

The standard of championship material in the United States is still improving rapidly. In both the men's and ladies' departments ability and form in the difficult figures as well as increased difficulty in free skating is apparent. Further the number now able to compete on a championship basis has increased in the last two or three years. With the 1928 Olympics just around the corner, this writer

LADIES' CHAMPIONSHIP OF UNITED STATES

CONTESTANTS		MISS LOUGHRAN New York					MISS VINSON Boston					MRS. BLANCHARD Boston					MISS KNAPP New York				
Judges		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
Figure Rocker	No. Val.																				
RIF	21A 4	23.	22.2	21.	22.	22.	22.	21.44	19.	18.	20.	22.	21.36	20.	20.	20.	19.	20.72	19.	20.	20.
LIF	21B 4	22.	21.32	21.	22.	22.	19.	20.8	17.	19.	19.	19.	20.64	17.	20.	20.	18.	20.24	19.	21.	19.
Counter																					
RIF	23A 3	17.25	16.23	16.5	17.25	17.25	16.5	15.72	15.75	15.75	16.5	16.5	14.82	15.	14.55	15.	14.25	14.82	14.25	15.45	15.75
LIF	23B 3	15.75	15.42	16.5	17.25	17.25	15.75	15.3	15.75	15.9	16.5	15.	14.82	15.	15.3	15.75	14.25	14.7	15.	15.75	15.75
One Foot Eight																					
ROIB	25A 3	15.75	16.14	14.25	16.5	15.	15.75	15.81	14.25	15.75	15.75	15.	15.96	15.	15.	14.25	14.25	14.82	13.5	15.	13.5
LOIB	25B 3	15.75	15.81	14.4	16.5	15.	15.	15.81	14.25	15.	14.25	15.	15.	14.25	15.	12.75	13.50	14.7	13.5	14.25	13.5
Change Dble																					
ROIB	29A 3	16.5	16.5	16.5	17.25	17.25	16.5	16.05	14.25	15.75	16.5	13.5	12.48	10.5	15.	12.	15.	15.18	14.25	15.	14.25
LOIB	29B 3	15.	16.08	15.	17.25	17.25	15.	15.6	15.	15.75	16.5	14.25	15.72	14.25	15.	15.	13.5	14.82	14.25	15.	13.5
Loop Ch. Loop																					
ROF	38A 4	20.	22.2	21.	23.	22.	23.	21.76	21.	22.	23.	20.	20.32	18.	21.	20.	21.	21.12	19.	22.	22.
LOF	38B 4	22.	21.48	21.	23.	21.	23.	21.36	20.5	23.	23.	20.	20.4	18.	21.	21.	20.	20.24	19.	22.	21.
Bracket Ch. Bracket																					
ROF	40A 4	22.	21.16	22.	23.	23.	19.	20.72	17.33	21.	21.	19.	20.32	20.	20.	19.	18.	20.48	18.67	21.	20.
LOF	40B 4	22.	20.48	22.	23.	23.	20.	20.32	18.	21.	22.	20.	20.84	20.	20.4	20.	19.	19.76	19.	20.6	21.
Total School Figures		227.	225.02	221.15	238.	232.	220.5	220.69	202.08	217.9	224.	209.25	213.28	197.	212.25	204.75	199.75	211.60	198.42	217.05	209.25
Program Performance																					
		5.58	5.33	5.67	6.	5.17	5.5	5.33	5.08	5.5	5.5	5.17	5.03	5.17	5.33	5.	5.08	4.87	5.17	5.25	5.
		5.75	5.47	5.66	5.92	5.42	5.42	5.2	5.25	5.	5.33	5.58	5.34	5.5	5.75	5.42	5.09	4.76	5.25	3.83	3.92
Total Free Skating		158.62	151.2	158.62	166.88	148.12	152.88	147.42	144.62	147.	151.62	150.50	145.18	149.38	155.12	144.68	142.38	134.82	145.88	127.12	124.88
Total School Figures		227.	225.02	221.15	238.	232.	220.5	220.69	202.08	217.9	224.	209.25	213.28	197.	212.25	204.75	199.75	211.60	198.42	217.05	209.25
Grand Total		385.62	376.22	379.77	404.88	380.12	373.38	368.11	346.7	364.9	375.62	359.75	358.46	346.38	367.37	349.43	342.13	346.42	344.3	344.17	334.13
Ordinal Ranking Result		I	I	I	I	I	II	II	II	III	II	III	III	III	III	III	IV	IV	IV	IV	IV

Judges: Mrs. C. Frothingham, Boston; J. K. Savage, New York; J. B. Liberman, New York; C. I. Christenson, St. Paul; R. Van Name, New Haven.

A.

C.

E.

B.

ventures to predict that the American team will contribute several stumbling blocks to the hitherto marked superiority of European skaters in winning Olympic titles.

LADIES' CHAMPIONSHIP OF UNITED STATES

Miss Beatrix Loughran of New York (1st) successfully defended her championship title against a formidable field of competitors. Her school figures as in the past few years were almost beyond reproach or approach. The same accuracy and ability to make sure turns; round hard edges, and three prints almost on top of each other, which she has shown in recent championships, still distinguishes her skating. To us in this country, it is difficult to imagine anything better. Her free skating, likewise, is a finished performance. Her program has reached that proper balance in composition, variety and difficulty which years of changing and patching alone can produce.

Miss Maribel Vinson of Boston (2nd) edged out her place from Mrs. Blanchard in the first national event in which she has topped the former champion. This young skater is making great progress from year to year, and seems to be on a steady upward track toward the title. She won her place mainly through her school figures which in the opinion of every judge were superior to those of Mrs. Blanchard and which were also close to those of the winner. Accuracy and control mark them, and they show the result of patient and earnest toil. Her free skating is also good, but her positions are not always the best and the contents of the program has been accented too much on the borderline of the spectacular. The prevalence of too many spins is to be deplored.

Mrs. Theresa Weld Blanchard of Boston (3rd) lost out in the race for second place only by a small margin. That she was beaten despite the fact that her standard in both school figures and free skating has materially improved is in itself proof of the vast strides the sport is making in this country. Holder of the national title for almost a decade and twice America's representative in the Olympics, she is still running the winners a hard race and keeping the standards well up. Much can be said for Mrs. Blanchard's graceful style in attacking the problem of a figure or a program. The spectator is

MEN'S CHAMPIONSHIP OF UNITED STATES

	N. W. NILES Boston					R. TURNER Boston					G. BRAAKMAN New York				
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
Judges															
Figure No. Val.															
Rocker															
RIF	14.	20.	19.6	20.	16.8	14.	20.4	20.	22.	19.2	13.	20.	19.2	19.	9.6
LIF	17.	20.	21.2	21.	16.	15.	20.4	20.	20.	16.	13.	20.	17.6	18.	8.
Counter															
RIF	13.5	15.3	15.6	16.5	14.4	12.75	15.6	15.9	17.25	15.	12.	15.	15.	15.75	10.2
LIF	12.75	15.	15.	15.75	14.4	12.75	16.5	15.3	16.5	15.6	12.	15.	14.4	16.5	15.
One Foot Eight															
ROIF	8.5	10.2	10.8	11.	10.	9.	10.4	11.2	11.	10.	8.	10.2	10.4	11.	7.
LOIF	8.5	10.2	10.6	10.5	9.6	7.5	10.4	10.8	11.	10.4	8.	9.	10.4	10.	7.6
Change Dble Three															
ROIF	13.5	15.6	14.1	15.75	15.	13.5	16.5	14.7	16.5	15.	11.25	13.5	12.6	14.25	9.
LOIF	12.	15.	14.4	15.	14.4	11.25	15.6	13.5	15.38	14.4	9.75	15.3	13.2	12.75	8.4
Change Bracket															
RIOF	13.5	16.5	16.2	15.38	15.	13.5	15.6	16.5	15.75	12.	12.	15.3	15.	15.	9.
LIOF	13.5	15.6	14.4	15.75	12.	12.75	15.15	15.3	15.75	10.5	11.25	15.3	15.	15.	10.5
Loop Ch. Loop															
ROF	18.	20.8	20.8	20.5	22.	16.	20.8	20.4	20.	16.	10.	16.	16.	16.	8.
LOF	18.	20.4	21.6	21.	20.8	16.	20.8	20.	20.5	22.	13.	20.	17.2	19.	12.
Total School Figures	162.75	194.6	194.3	198.13	180.4	154.	198.15	193.6	201.63	176.1	133.25	184.6	176.	182.25	114.3
Program Performance	4.25	5.07	5.17	5.17	3.6	4.	5.07	5.33	4.92	3.17	4.	4.83	5.27	5.25	2.67
	4.	5.16	4.9	5.08	3.5	3.75	5.1	5.	4.83	3.33	3.75	5.	5.06	5.08	4.66
Total Free Skating	103.12	127.87	125.87	128.12	88.75	96.88	127.12	129.12	121.87	81.25	96.88	122.87	129.12	129.12	91.62
Total School Figures	162.75	194.6	194.3	198.13	180.4	154.	198.15	193.6	201.63	176.1	133.25	184.6	176.	182.25	114.3
Grand Total	265.87	322.47	320.17	326.25	269.15	250.88	325.27	322.72	323.5	257.35	230.13	307.47	305.12	311.37	205.92
Ordinal Ranking	I	II	II	I	I	III	I	I	II	II	IV	III	III	III	V
Result															

JUDGES: Mrs. E. E. Second, New York; A. W. Weld, Boston; S. C. Badger, New York;
J. A. Cruikshank, New York; J. K. Savage, New York.

MEN'S CHAMPIONSHIP OF UNITED STATES—Continued

			C. I. CHRISTENSON St. Paul					F. T. MARTIN New York				
Judges			A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
Figure Rocker	No.	Val.										
RIF	21A	4	14.	18.	16.4	16.	12.	11.	18.	16.	18.	8.
LIF	21B	4	15.	18.	18.4	19.	8.	14.	16.	20.	18.	12.
Counter												
RIF	23A	3	12.75	15.	15.3	14.25	11.7	10.5	15.	15.	15.	13.8
LIF	23B	3	11.25	13.5	13.2	12.75	10.5	10.5	13.5	13.8	14.25	11.4
One Foot Eight												
ROIF	24A	2	8.	10.	10.4	10.5	9.8	7.	10.	10.	10.5	8.
LOIF	24B	2	8.	10.	11.	10.5	10.	7.	9.	9.6	10.	9.
Change Dble Three												
ROIB	29A	3	13.5	15.	13.8	15.	12.	10.5	15.	12.9	13.5	9.
LOIB	29B	3	12.	15.	13.2	15.	10.2	9.	13.5	12.6	12.	6.
Change Bracket												
RIOF	33A	3	13.5	15.	15.3	15.	11.4	12.75	13.5	14.7	13.5	6.
LIOF	33B	3	12.	15.	12.	12.	11.4	10.5	13.5	12.	14.25	6.
Loop Ch. Loop												
ROF	38A	4	17.	20.	19.2	19.	16.	12.	18.	20.	18.	14.
LOF	38B	4	18.	20.	20.8	20.5	18.	14.	20.	18.4	19.	16.
Total School Figures			155.	184.5	179.	179.5	141.	128.75	175.	175.	176.	119.2
Program												
Performance			4.	4.	4.17	4.67	2.67	4.25	4.23	5.	5.08	4.
			3.75	4.	4.33	5.	4.	3.25	4.33	4.33	4.83	3.
Total Free Skating												
Total School Figures			96.88	100.	106.25	120.87	83.37	93.75	107.12	116.62	124.	87.5
			155.	184.5	179.	179.5	141.	128.75	175.	175.	176.	119.2
Grand Total			251.88	284.5	285.25	300.37	224.37	222.5	282.12	291.62	300.	206.7
Ordinal Ranking												
Result			II	IV	V	IV	III	V	V	IV	V	IV

JUDGES: Mrs. E. Secord, New York; A. W. Weld, Boston; S. C. Badger, New York;
J. A. Cruikshank, New York; J. K. Savage, New York.

B. D.

tempted to forget the harsh grind of national championships and pauses for a moment to drink in the beauty of artistic production.

Miss Rosalie Knapp of New York (4th) who did not compete last year, is by no means far behind the pace of the leaders. On the whole, her school figures are better than her free skating as the judges' marks show. Her free skating form is very good, and with more difficulty of contents and abandon in performance she will turn her free skating into a sizeable asset.

MEN'S CHAMPIONSHIP OF UNITED STATES

Nathaniel Wm. Niles of Boston (1st) regained the title after one year's intermission. As always, Niles's school figures were of the best, and in free skating, he gave the best performance that this writer has ever seen him do in national championships. Study during the last few years as well as patient hours of practice this season have made his school figures a marvellous combination of accuracy and control unhampered by anything that looks studied or labored. His free skating program upon close inspection contains great balance as to difficulty, variety and especially composition. His performance revealed much more life and pace than in former years and the jumps which have been disappointing were astonishingly clean and accurate.

Roger F. Turner of Boston (2nd), last year's Junior Champion, gave the winner a hard battle for the title. This almost instantaneous jump from the top of the junior class to almost the top of the championship class is alone worthy of great commendation. Turner's figures are his forte; and were in the opinion of two judges superior to those of Niles. That he has spent long hours of practice on the easy as well as the hard ones is plain to see. But what he gains in carefully executed prints he lacks in an easy manner of skating; for in almost every case the form is slightly sacrificed for the sake of making a perfect groove on the ice.

George Braakman of New York (3rd) was tied for third place with C. I. Christenson of St. Paul, each having 18 points in the ordinal ranking of judges. The tie was broken when it was discovered that the New Yorker totalled about 14 points more from

the judges than Christenson. Braakman is not yet a finished skater. His style is full of life and pace, but is marred in school figures as well as free skating by too much abandon and freedom from controlled execution.

C. I. Christenson of St. Paul (4th), last year's champion, is a steady skater whose school figures are well on the championship level. His school figures and free skating were by no means up to the standard of last year or he would have made a decided difference in the results.

Ferrier T. Martin of New York (5th) was well within striking distance of the field. His school figures are very good; his free skating program is good as to contents. Both departments, however, would have been much better if they had not revealed uncertainty probably due to his very recent illness.

LADIES' JUNIOR CHAMPIONSHIP

Miss Suzanne Davis of Boston (1st) scored heavily on her first appearance in competitive skating circles. She is a skater of great natural ability, but lacks a certain amount of polish and smoothness which only years of painstaking effort and practice can produce. Her school figures were astonishingly accurate as to print and tracing and were done in an easy flowing style. Her free skating also recommends itself not only for the contents but for the superior style in execution. As yet Miss Davis appears somewhat untutored in the finer points of skating technique; but this condition is due no doubt to lack of practice closely scrutinized for severe corrective suggestions.

Miss Grace Munstock of New York (2nd) skated dangerously close to the winner in both school figures and free skating. In both departments her marks averaged but a few points behind those of Miss Davis, and she has that combination of ease and sureness in execution which must be most disconcerting to her rivals.

Miss Margaret Bennett of St. Paul (3rd) demonstrated that Western Juniors are not far behind our Eastern ones. Her school figures were not quite as good as the other juniors, but her free skating must have been a surprise to the judges who are often too much influenced in their decisions by a contestant's exhibi-

U. S. JUNIOR MEN'S CHAMPIONSHIP

	F. GOODRIDGE Boston					G. BORDEN New York					R. SHIPSTAD St. Paul				
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
Judges															
School Figures	78.2	83.	80.5	68.	77.4	76.4	76.5	79.	67.	77.	78.2	75.5	75.5	65.	75.
Free Skating	49.5	52.9	55.	45.	52.5	48.5	47.55	52.5	46.65	47.5	49.15	50.4	52.5	45.	52.
Total	127.7	135.9	135.5	113.	129.9	124.9	124.05	131.5	113.65	124.5	127.35	125.9	128.	110.	127.
Ordinal Ranking	I	I	I	II	I	III	VI	II	I	III	II	V	V	V	II
Result	I					II					III				
	J. L. MADDEN Boston					R. HARVEY New York					T. COOLIDGE Boston				
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
Judges															
School Figures	75.6	78.	77.5	64.	74.4	76.	80.	80.5	70.	68.6	70.2	75.	72.	64.	72.4
Free Skating	47.5	50.4	53.	45.4	45.	45.5	40.85	50.	42.5	44.	44.65	51.65	50.5	46.65	50.
Total	123.1	128.4	130.5	109.4	119.4	121.5	120.85	130.5	112.5	112.6	114.85	126.65	122.5	110.65	122.4
Ordinal Ranking	IV	III	IV	VI	VII	V	VII	III	III	XI	IX	IV	VII	IV	V
Result	IV					V					VI				
	J. K. SAVAGE New York					G. E. B. HILL Boston					R. REED New York				
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
Judges															
School Figures	73.6	72.5	75.	61.5	77.4	74.	80.	74.	61.5	70.	73.4	73.	74.5	60.	71.
Free Skating	41.85	46.65	52.5	45.	45.	44.35	49.6	47.5	41.65	42.5	42.5	39.15	42.5	37.5	47.
Total	115.45	119.15	127.5	106.5	122.4	118.35	129.6	121.5	103.15	112.5	115.9	112.15	117.	97.5	118.
Ordinal Ranking	VIII	VIII	VI	VII	IV	VI	II	VIII	VIII	XII	VII	IX	IX	X	VIII
Result	VII					VIII					IX				

W. F. L. T. Vn Fr L R T Vn Fr L. K T

	W. J. NAGLE Brooklyn					E. BRIGHAM Boston					P. CARRIERE New York					L. SHEPARD Boston				
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
Judges																				
School Figures	63.8	69.5	67.5	55.5	72.	70.8	72.	68.5	55.5	72.8	50.	52.	46.	46.	61.	43.6	52.5	45.5	41.	51.2
Free Skating	43.85	40.4	45.	42.1	48.	40.85	40.	35.	32.9	42.5	46.15	32.1	45.	40.85	52.	30.35	30.4	20.	25.85	30.
Total	107.65	109.9	112.5	97.6	120.	111.65	112.	103.5	88.4	115.3	96.15	84.1	91.	86.85	113.	73.95	82.9	65.5	66.85	81.2
Ordinal Ranking	XI	XI	X	IX	VI	X	X	XI	XI	IX	XII	XII	XII	XII	X	XIII	XIII	XIII	XIII	XIII
Result																				

JUDGES: Mrs. C. C. Frothingham, Boston; Mrs. E. E. Knapp, New York; J. A. Fower, Boston;
J. B. Liberman, New York; R. G. Van Name, New Haven.

U. S. JUNIOR LADIES' CHAMPIONSHIP

	Miss S. Davis Boston					Miss G. Munstock New York					Miss M. Bennett St. Paul					Mrs. M. Herbst New York				
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
Judges																				
School Figures	98.4	85.8	82.2	66.8	97.	94.6	74.4	76.8	69.2	101.5	83.6	67.8	77.	64.	92.	90.4	69.	79.	56.8	94.
Free Skating	52.5	59.5	75.81	49.	63.	54.39	56.7	72.31	49.	77.	50.19	49.	61.81	23.31	73.5	52.5	45.5	63.7	17.5	70.
Total	150.9	145.3	158.01	115.8	160.	148.99	131.1	149.11	118.2	178.5	133.79	116.8	138.81	87.31	165.5	142.9	114.5	142.7	74.3	164.
Ordinal Ranking	I	I	I	II	IV	II	II	II	I	I	IV	III	IV	III	II	III	IV	III	IV	III
Result																				

JUDGES: Mrs. R. Secord, New York; Mrs. T. W. Blanchard, Boston; F. Goodridge, Boston; C. Gandy, St. Paul;
S. C. Badger, New York

tion in school figures properly to synchronize their marks in free skating.

Mrs. M. Herbst of New York (4th) suffered mainly through the fact that her free skating is superior to her figures. As has been shown conclusively in past competitions, the school figures are the basis of winning championships; and with the raising of her standard in this department, Mrs. Herbst will be a factor in future junior contests.

MEN'S JUNIOR CHAMPIONSHIP

Frederick Goodridge of Boston (1st) who has reentered competitive skating circles after a lapse of three or four years, snatched the junior title by a clear margin from the largest field of contestants ever entered in a men's junior competition. Of the whole number, Goodridge was ranked first by four out of the five judges and the fifth had him only .65 of a point behind Gail Borden. Goodridge's school figures were superior throughout and his free skating was also above that of the others. He is a natural skater, quite capable of laying down fine looking prints on the ice; and his form in execution is easy, graceful and full of life: His free skating performance is careful, controlled and telling, and on the whole he is a well balanced skater without any undue superiority in one particular part of the sport.

Gail Borden of New York (2nd) as well as those who ranked after him in order caused considerable variation in the judges' cards. He received one first, one second, two thirds, and a sixth. This fact reflects no discredit on his exhibition, but rather seems to indicate the difficult position in which the judges were placed to make any judgment from the large numbers of excellent competitors entered. Both Borden's school figures and free skating were near enough to those of the winner to run him a close race.

Roy Shipstad of St. Paul (3rd) received two seconds and three fifths. His school figures were rated quite close to those of Borden and his free skating averaged almost as good. The composition of his free skating program is specially to be commended because it

was placed in the centre of the ice and did not wander aimlessly over the whole ice surface—a fault too prevalent in most programs.

Lester Madden of Boston (4th) well deserved a high place in the ranking of the thirteen skaters of his event. He received one third, two fourths, a sixth and seventh; and was sufficiently close to the leaders to mix up the result of the judges. His school figures were very good, skated with an easy style which can be readily seen as the result of hard practice. His free skating averaged within one point of the winner per judge, and the program contained several difficult jumps well executed.

Raymond Harvey of New York (5th) tied with Thornton Coolidge of Boston for the sum of ordinals, each having 29 points, won out by the narrow margin of .9 of a point in the sum of the judges' marks. He put himself well up in the ranks of the leaders on his school figures, but his free skating standard fell below and dragged down the total.

Thornton Coolidge of Boston (6th) though below Harvey's standard on school figures, averaged better on his free skating. Coolidge's school figures have always been somewhat below the standard of his free skating. His form is good, but the tracing on the ice has not the evenness and accuracy shown by winners. On the other hand his free skating is excellent; and he usually makes a good showing over any field of free skaters.

The remaining competitors, with sufficient variance on the judges' cards to indicate a close contest, finished as follows: Joseph K. Savage of New York (7th); George E. B. Hill of Boston (8th); Robert Reed of New York (9th); William J. Nagle of Brooklyn (10th); Edmond F. Brigham of Boston (11th); Paul Carriere of New York (12th); and Dr. Luther D. Shepard of Boston (13th).

PAIR CHAMPIONSHIP OF UNITED STATES

Mrs. Theresa Weld Blanchard and Nathaniel Wm. Niles of Boston (1st) successfully defended their title by winning for the tenth consecutive time. The composition, variety and difficulty of their program combines the best seen so far in pair skating in this

UNITED STATES PAIR CHAMPIONSHIP

	Mrs. Blanchard—Mr. Niles Boston					Miss Loughran—Mr. Harvey New York					Miss Baumann—Mr. Braakman New York				
Judges	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
Program	3.3	5.17	3.83	5.2	5.12	5.33	4.92	5.	5.	5.33	3.3	5.08	2.67	5.	5.42
Performance	3.37	5.58	4.83	5.23	5.4	3.	5.25	4.	4.5	5.	3.27	5.17	2.67	5.	5.28
Total	6.67	10.75	8.66	10.43	10.52	8.33	10.17	9.	9.5	10.33	6.57	10.25	5.34	10.	10.7
Ordinal Ranking	II	I	II	I	II	I	III	I	IV	III	III	II	V	II	I
Result	I					II					III				

	Miss Munstock—Mr. Liberman New York					Mr. and Mrs. Martin New York				
Judges	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
Program	3.17	4.25	4.	4.83	5.17	3.17	3.75	4.33	4.33	5.08
Performance	2.87	4.83	3.33	4.83	5.08	2.77	4.67	4.33	4.67	5.12
Total	6.04	9.08	7.33	9.66	10.25	5.94	8.42	8.66	9.	10.2
Ordinal Ranking	IV	IV	IV	III	IV	V	V	III	V	V
Result	IV					V				

JUDGES: Mrs. E. Secord, New York; J. A. Cruikshank, New York; S. C. Badger, New York;
 J. K. Savage, New York; C. I. Christenson, St. Paul.

country. It is based upon the fundamental principles of pair skating developed, changed and modified but slightly, until this season, for a number of years. It follows the correct standards recognized by Europeans in authority, and constitutes pair work in the truest sense of the word with not too much separation. Certain changes taken, in a general way, from the Austrian and French (World's Champions) pairs, and introduced barely a week before, most assuredly interfered with their exhibition in this particular contest. They obviously were not sure of their steps and for this reason probably did not skate nearly up to their best. Form and individual execution were fairly good but they were not together, as they undoubtedly will be later on. These facts unquestionably influenced the judges who reached most startlingly divergent results in ranking the contestants.

Miss Beatrix Loughran and Raymond Harvey of New York (2nd) skated a novel and ingenious program without the synchronization that winning pairs should have. Positions were good, but Miss Loughran is so superior in ability, that it is difficult to imagine her paired with Harvey. This statement should not be interpreted to cast reflections or discredit on Harvey's work, but is made to show that in pair work two people should appear to be of equal ability. From the marks of some judges it would seem that this pair actually received credit for "originality." There is of course no place for this on judging blanks; a pair is better or worse, under the rules for competition, regardless of novelty.

Miss Ada Bauman and George Braakman of New York (3rd) are both strong skaters of about equal ability. They are well matched in unity of performance; and their program contains a requisite amount of difficulty. They skate with terrific pace, and it is a marvel to the spectator that they are able to keep it up until five minutes have elapsed. With slightly more care exercised in the construction and execution of their program, they would rank with the best.

Miss Grace Munstock and Joel B. Liberman of New York (4th) exhibited some very interesting pair work. Their program does not contain quite the difficulty of the leaders, but its composition and variety are good. Their performance is also another example of

good pair work by two skaters of almost equal ability, and they illustrate quite successfully how much simple attractive spiral positions add to the general appearance of a pair program.

Mr. and Mrs. Ferrier T. Martin of New York (5th) skated an attractive pair not quite up to the standard of excellence of the preceding couple. Their program was moderately difficult and skated moderately well. Although placing third in last year's junior pair event, they elected to enter the seniors this year, and fairly conclusively demonstrated that they are capable of attacking the problems of the five-minute senior program.

JUNIOR PAIR CHAMPIONSHIP

Miss Maribel Vinson and Thornton Coolidge of Boston (1st) well deserved to win the event. Their program contains all the difficulty necessary for a senior program with hard jumps, two or three spins, and a spread eagle and spread eagle jump. Their performance was distinctly superior as they passed from one figure to the next with amazing accuracy and control. Both are good free skaters, although Miss Vinson is the better. In very few places was her ability noticeably greater than that of her partner.

Miss A. Boyrer and Gail Borden of New York (2nd) were not up to the standard of the winners either in program or performance, although they were not far behind. The execution was marked with considerable pace and style, and their program contained sufficient difficulty for a junior program.

Miss Dorothy Weld and Richard L. Hapgood of Boston (3rd) rendered a simple program in an excellent style which however was lacking in speed and abandon. The effort to keep their program in the centre of the ice surface may well have handicapped their appearance and detracted from the pace.

Miss Grace Madden and Lester Madden of Boston (4th) offered a simple program in a pleasing manner. What they lacked in difficulty, they certainly made up in performance which was not too studied or labored.

WALTZ

Miss Rosalie Dunn and Joseph K. Savage of New York (1st) retained their title of last year over a formidable field of competitors. The dancing competitions always bring out a large number of pairs eager to take part, but the experience of the last few years has shown that a considerable amount of accuracy and skill in execution is necessary to win the title. The winning couple were without question the best waltzers on the ice.

Mr. and Mrs. Ferrier T. Martin of New York (2nd) gave the winners a good competition; and Miss Ada Bauman and George Braakman of New York (3rd) followed close after. The waltzing was all excellent, but these three couples certainly gave the best exhibitions.

FOURTEEN-STEP

Miss Rosalie Dunn and Joseph K. Savage of New York (1st) made a very creditable showing in this, the livelier of the dances. Their complete synchronization unquestionably netted them the title.

Miss Ada Bauman and George Braakman of New York (2nd) also made a good showing, but lacked that indefinable something to put them ahead of the winners: and Mr. and Mrs. Ferrier T. Martin of New York (3rd) were practically as good.

The judges who officiated in the National Championships were Mrs. E. Secord, Mrs. Edward Knapp, J. B. Liberman, J. K. Savage, J. A. Cruikshank, S. C. Badger, of New York; A. Winsor Weld, F. Goodridge, Mrs. C. Frothingham, Mrs. T. W. Blanchard, J. A. Tower of Boston; C. I. Christenson and Carl Gandy of St. Paul, and R. G. Van Name of New Haven.

This year's competitions produced much better balanced and well rounded skaters than in former years. Last year, it will be remembered, in almost every case the winners gained their places through an overwhelming lead in school figures, and while this year the winners were ahead in school figures, they also led in free skating. As time goes on, skaters are becoming more settled in ability. The realization of the importance of school figures is more wide-

spread. But free skating is not being neglected for them. Possibly the addition of rockers and counters to the junior figures may have been the cause of it, going on the assumption that if a skater can do rockers and counters, they ought also to be able to free skate in a creditable manner.

Each year the National Championships seem to drive home one outstanding truth. Last year it was the importance of school figures. This year it seems to be the need for a more systematic standardization of style. Considerable variation in the judges' cards is seen this year, and from the marks which were given in some cases, it is fairly obvious that no one really knows what is good and what is bad. Each skater feels that he or his group are going along the right track, until a sudden bump comes to awaken him. And such bumps will be many and arguments will be rife until we settle down to a willingness to define more clearly skating interpretations.