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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There is no blueprint of the future, however, a segment of today's population believes that there is. They believe this blueprint was devised unconsciously by an industrial society and its present course is unalterable unless social and psychological attitudes are changed.

According to Reich, the industrial society has produced three categories of conscious awareness. Each level of awareness is highly impressionistic and arbitrary, and because each type of consciousness is a construct, no real individual is expected to exhibit all the types of characteristic consciousness. The first level, known as Consciousness I, was formed in the nineteenth century. It may be described as the "traditional outlook of the American farmer, small businessman, and worker who is trying to get ahead."\(^1\) It does not accept the reality of an interdependent society and believes in a narrow, rugged individualism.

The second level, Consciousness II, developed in the first

half of this century and is characterized by the individual who "represents the values of an organizational society." This type believes in the Corporate State and derives happiness from its material rewards. There is a belief in rationality, planning by experts, and attending reform.

Consciousness III is the new emerging generation which rejects what the technological society stands for. This type is difficult to categorize. It is this third level of awareness with which we will be most concerned. There appears to be an underlying theme which is characteristic of this group:

The United States is the most powerful nation in history, but it now appears that the price of such national power is the increasing—and eventually complete—powerlessness of the individual citizen. The almost perpetual state of civil strife which has recently emerged can be seen as a direct result of the refusal of rapidly growing numbers of people to accept this intolerable condition of powerlessness. Unfortunately, the tactics of lawlessness and violence used by those who seek to remedy their powerless condition are giving rise to an equally intolerable condition of social anarchy. The counter-tactics of repression are in turn leading us to the development of that very thing we have all thought can't happen here, the police state. Nobody will be free in America, and few will have any real power over their own lives, if it becomes necessary to have policemen and/or soldiers on every street corner of our cities. And yet such a prospect is clearly possible in light of recent events.

Americans neither deserve nor want such a future, nor do they have to accept such a future. Traditionally, Americans have looked forward to a future of increased freedom rather than diminished freedom. Such a future still lies before us, but to get there we must change some of our social and psychological attitudes. Our present social and psychological

\[\text{\textsuperscript{2}Ibid.}\]
attitudes are leading us to disaster.³

Basically, this is the leit motif of current thought in the rhetoric of what has popularly come to be known as the "counter-culture"—the powerlessness of the individual to control his own life and destiny due to external forces over which he has no direct control. In our modern American culture there has been a tendency for human activities, which originate in human needs and desires, to become heavily regulated and organized by elite bureaucracies. This bureaucratic network within institutions eventually becomes omnipotent and the individuals in power often place their ambitions ahead of the original goals of the institution. The original human needs that the institutions were designed to serve often become totally usurped by the institutions leaving the individual and his needs without service. When individual needs are no longer served and the individual does not seem to have the power to change what exists, frustration occurs. The energy generated by frustration often becomes the catalyst which moves the individual to decide upon a course of action. He may decide to take no action at all or to pursue avenues of action which are legally open to him. If for some reason these fail, illegal avenues may be pursued.

Heavy bureaucratic controls and technocratic efficiency have literally entered all institutions originally designed to serve individuals, only to make them pawns in a chess game. These conditions

may lead individuals to express themselves in the following way:

I am losing my self-sufficiency, my privacy, my individuality—I am dependent on machines and the people who control them. I have less influence on the development of my own children than the TV set...I have less and less influence on society. Computers calculate the results of an election before I even cast my vote.4

The technological mentality often brings the dehumanizing agent to the fore of the individual in society:

Machines get between me and other people. They make me feel less human. I send a letter and get an IBM card.5

There is also a fear in the obsolescence of man:

I feel that my world is no longer guided by human intelligence and human values. If computers can outthink us now in some ways, perhaps in a few years they will outthink us in all ways. Then what will happen to the human race?6

The feeling of not being able to control one's environment is not limited to only a few in our society but is reflected in the literature of the past and present by Dostoevski, Tolstoy, Kafka, Sartre, Camus, and Kesey just to name a few. Science fiction-prediction, which often becomes reality, expresses the loss of individuality in a variety of ways such as those dealing with genetic, psychological, and sociological controls. Huxley's Brave New World, Orwell's 1984, and Skinner's Walden II project the possibilities in which society may evolve. Non-fiction literature such as Miller's The Assault on Privacy tend to confirm the individual's loss of privacy and his helplessness


5Ibid., p. 164.

6Ibid., p. 174.
to do anything about it.

This lack of personal control prevails in all aspects of our culture. Even the omnipotent scientist has had his problems. Einstein's theory $E=MC^2$ was the basis for the powerful tool of destruction called the atomic bomb. The theoretical development of this formula was not intended for the destructive forces to which it gave rise. He had no control over its use. Robert J. Oppenheimer, a director of the development of the atomic bomb, refused to work in the development of the hydrogen bomb for what he claimed were humanitarian reasons. Because of his refusal to participate, his position at the Los Almos Institute was taken from him and he was branded as a security risk.

This realization of external forces which control individuals and reduce them to near non-entities probably has had its greatest affect on youth—the inheritors of bureaucracy and technocracy. Individual powerlessness underlies the "youth movement" and has been the catalyst for action. Discontent with the "system" leads them to rebellious action. They may refuse to participate in activities where they are aware of being exploited and used for ends to which they are antagonistic. Individuals, in addition to refusing to participate may attempt alternative methods to elicit change; they can compromise and join the "system" and work from the "inside" or go "underground" and work from the "outside."

---

The "youth movement" is beginning to reach the system. Unfortunately the catalyst for change, for the most part, has been precipitated by young people in revolt. For example, at the governmental level we can see the changes which have taken place between the 1968 and 1972 Democratic Conventions. The youth were involved in the Chicago chaos which was, to a large part, responsible for the drastic change in the structure of the 1972 Democratic Convention. The fact that approximately 80 per cent of the delegates had never attended a convention before, that a more equitable distribution of women, minority groups, and youth were present, and that old-time party machines (e.g., Mayor Daly of Chicago) were eliminated, are all significant changes in the party structure. For the most part, these changes were brought about by the devastating Chicago convention in which the elitist party machines all but controlled the convention and therefore excluded those elements of the culture who fostered change. Where all of this will lead on the governmental level is far too complex for analysis here, nor is it the purpose of this thesis. However, these problems pervade all elements of society.

Within the university setting for example, changes are also occurring but once again, in the main, these changes were precipitated only by student revolt. The specter of man's being dehumanized by, and made subservient to, technology and bureaucracy is deeply disturbing to many of the young people in the society. For this reason it would seem appropriate in the educational setting, where the primary concern is with youth, to investigate possibilities for change of or
alternatives to some of the prevailing social and psychological patterns that Theobald claims are leading the society to disaster.

The possibility for change exists in all institutions. The institution of higher education already has begun to feel the pressures exerted by discontent, and changes are beginning to take place, however, usually under crisis situations. In order to avert crisis situations from arising, universities must become more sensitive to student needs and be able to take action before such crises develop. Educational institutions should become more introspective and critical of existing institutions within education in order to interpret possible problem areas and then to suggest and test alternatives.

To date, many of the institutions within higher education have been virtually untouched and will quietly continue to exist until a crisis situation arises to precipitate change. Universities must begin to explore alternatives now in order to anticipate future needs. One area within higher education which may be heading for a crisis is the institution of athletics. Because athletics is an integral part of higher education, it should be viewed critically in order to explore its potential for change and develop alternatives.

There are many methods which could be used to attempt interpretation, however, this investigation will attempt to elicit the main elements of the counter-culture, project ideas of its relationship to

---

8 We must realize that institutions are contained within larger institutions which are also potentially capable of change, i.e., the institution of athletics is contained within the larger institution of education.
athletic competition, attempt to make application of these ideas to a particular sport (figure skating), produce a theoretical alternative model, examine its potential and then conduct a pilot study of the proposed alternative. The theoretical model suggested will not attempt to provide a single answer. The main thrust will be to suggest a scheme which may have appeal and provide a viable outlet for individuals who find available opportunities in the system, as we know it today, less than satisfying. The objective then, will be to respond to the call for a more open, participatory experience for those engaged in the activity itself. The design will use some of the principles of the counter-culture—however, this does not infer that it is designed only for those of the counter-culture.
CHAPTER II

THE COUNTER-CULTURE--AN OVERVIEW

This chapter will attempt to portray society (in a general way) as viewed from the perspective of the counter-culture, the basic response of the counter-culture to this view, and a general view of education and its attending response by the counter-culture.

Basic Foundation of the Counter-Culture

The basic tenet of the counter-culture is that there no longer exists a "real" human society but rather a society based on technique of which "humans" are a part. This has occurred without a visible ideology and is presently in the process of subverting and suppressing traditional values in all societies to produce a monolithic world culture in which technology will be uncritically worshipped. This view is not the "technological determinism" which Veblen envisioned because technology produces the dilemma without plan. No one arranges for this Machiavellian scheme. It is just a response to the "laws of development" of technique. This does not mean that humanity must accept an ultimate course. Humanity can respond to these laws by charting its direction for the benefit of human beings to make technique the robots of humanity rather than humanity the
robots of technique.

At this point it is essential that we define the use of the word "technique." This term does not refer only to machines, although without the mechanics of machinery, technique would probably not exist. The term "technique" refers to the "totality of methods rationally arrived at and having absolute efficiency (for a given stage of development) in every field of human activity."¹ It is a sociological phenomenon based on the outcome of technology.

The strategy of technique is based on expertise which is guided by bureaucracy and elitism. This strategy has spawned "technocracy" which we define as "...that society in which those who govern justify themselves by appeal to technical experts who, in turn justify themselves by appeal to scientific forms of knowledge. And beyond the authority of science, there is no appeal."² Technocracy exists in all forms of institutions and controls American culture.

We do not have to search far in the culture to find the technocrat par excellence—the following quote gives one an idea of technology and its strategy:

Some critics worry that our democratic, free societies are becoming overmanaged. I would argue that the opposite is true. As paradoxical as it may sound, the real threat to democracy comes, not from overmanagement, but from


undermanagement. To undermanage reality is not to keep free. It is simply to let some force other than reason shape reality. That force may be unbridled emotion; it may be greed; it may be aggressiveness; it may be hatred; it may be ignorance; it may be inertia; it may be anything other than reason. But whatever it is, if it is not reason that rules man, then man falls short of his potential.

Vital decision making, particularly in policy matters, must remain at the top. This is partly, though not completely, what the top is for. But rational decision-making depends on having a full range of rational options from which to choose, and successful management organizes the enterprise so that process can best take place. It is a mechanism whereby free men can most efficiently exercise their reason, initiative, creativity, and personal responsibility. The adventurous and immensely satisfying task of an efficient organization is to formulate and analyse these options.  

The counter-culture would argue with this statement in the following manner:

Rationality and reason alone do not shape reality; they may be part of reality but not total reality, as man is not totally rational. The machines may possess an objective consciousness but man is incapable of this. (As Mumford has suggested of man "...as compared even with other anthropoids, one might refer without irony to man's superior irrationality." ) McNamara assumes that greed, aggressiveness, hatred, unbridled emotion, ignorance, or inertia are not present in rationality and reason. The counter-culture would suggest the opposite—that man does base his decisions in part on emotional levels but then develops what appears to be a rational, objective criteria for these decisions to give the appearance of

---

objective consciousness. Here then is the "rational character" of irrationality which is a point of departure for the technocrat.

The second criticism would be levelled at those who are selected to make the rational decisions which are "true reality." These are the few selected "experts" of given areas who are brought together to derive objective reasons based on the myth of objective consciousness in man. This elitist group of Grand Inquisitors then sets out to produce "reality" for mankind. Unfortunately, what is "reality" for these "experts" is not always "reality" for all human beings due to the uniqueness of each human being. However, McNamara goes on to say that if this produced "reality" does not go on to rule man, "...man falls short of his potential." The counter-culture would suggest that man falls short of his potential because he is unable to express the full range of his potential—emotional, physical, social, and mental, due to the decisions based on a narrow mode of operation, namely, the non-existent objective consciousness of elitist groups of "experts."

Once these hypothetical realities are found, the top of the bureaucratic structure has the job of making the decisions about reality. This group then makes decisions which will affect the social structure. They choose what is objective reality and then decide on a course of action to place this "reality" into operation. The mechanism of this operation is supposedly a method whereby "...free men can most efficiently exercise their reason, initiative, creativity, and personal responsibility." But who are these "free men" who
exercises reason, initiative, creativity, and personal responsibility? Only the selected elitist groups who make decisions which will affect society. The individuals of the society are subject to the authority of the "objective bureaucrats." When do the members of society (who are not members of the decision making bodies) exercise their initiative, creativity, and personal responsibility to determine their own lives?

Another criticism is that these "objective elitists" derive formulas which are often the antithesis of human realities, but this is "... the adventurous and immensely satisfying task of an efficient organization." In other words, it doesn't really matter what is managed--its all part of the game of juggling which is adventurous and satisfying to the jugglers and it is always performed in the most efficient manner even though the most efficient manner may be, in humanistic terms, unrealistic.

The counter-culture believes the culture to be technocratic. They view the objective of technocracy to be:

...to level life down to a standard of so-called living that technical expertise can cope with--and then, on that false and exclusive basis, to claim an intimidating omnicompetence over us by its monopoly on the experts. Such is the politics of our mature industrial society. 4

In the past, the popular mind intimately related science to the social good as technological progress promised security and affluence. However, it was not foreseen that the impersonal, large-scale processes of technocracy would spawn its own social problems;

4Roszak, op. cit., p. 12.
that of deferring one's destiny to the experts or those who own the experts. The counter-culture does not agree that these experts reliably know about all things relevant to each individual's happiness and survival. They do not agree that reality is based on "scientifically sound" principles which are based on objectivity. Their attitude regarding this objectivity can be best described by what Roszak terms the myth of objective consciousness:

There is but one way of gaining access to reality—so the myth holds—and this is to cultivate a state of consciousness cleansed of all subjective distortion, all personal involvement. What flows from this state of consciousness qualifies as knowledge, and nothing else does. This is the bedrock on which the natural sciences have built; and under their spell all fields of knowledge strive to become scientific. The study of man in his social, political, economic, psychological, historical aspects—all this, too, must be objectively, rigorously, painstakingly objective. At every level of human experience, would-be scientists come forward to endorse the myth of objective consciousness, thus certifying themselves as experts. And because they know and we do not, we yield to their guidance.⁵

The counter-culture believes that this attitude has extended to all domains of living and spawns a hierarchy committed to the goals of constantly improved means which lead to unexamined ends. So long as the means are sane and objective, the ends can be insane.

Objective means have spawned what Marcuse calls one dimensional man—man who is redefined by the rationality of a particular system which is then extended to its quantitative equivalent. Kelvin said something to the effect that if something could not be measured,

⁵Ibid., p. 209.
it could not be known. And over thirty years ago Sorokin coined the name "quantophrenia" because he felt the desire to measure and quantify everything was excessive to the point of madness. But "quantophrenia" still exists and has come to be the essence of technique which is "to compel the qualitative to become quantitative, and in this way to force every stage of human activity and man himself to submit to its mathematical calculations."*

Many believe that the present society is totally suppressing:

By virtue of the way it has organized its technological base, contemporary industrial society tends to be totalitarian. For "totalitarian" is not only a terroristic political coordination of society, but also a non-terroristic economic-technical coordination which operates through the manipulation of needs by vested interests. It thus precludes the emergence of an effective opposition against the whole.

Not only is it suppressing but it renders the individual powerless as he cannot produce any effective means to resist the technocracy. This feeling of powerlessness plus the redefining of man into systems (brought about by technocracy) has contributed to the alienation and dehumanization of the individual which they leads to the problem of individual worth.

In order to more fully clarify what has been hypothesized as

---


the counter-culture's view of society, the following scheme is suggested:

Technology, which exists in all institutions, spawn bureaucracy and elitism which leads to a system based on expertise. These experts base their mode of operation on objective consciousness which (1) spawns technology and (2) dehumanizes the individual in society. The bureaucracy then applies "reality" as defined by the spectrum of technology to the individual, which ultimately renders him powerless. This dehumanization and loss of power to determine one's life then leads to the problem of individual worth.

Basic Response to the Technological Society

The counter-culture sees this above view as contemptuous to human beings and attempts to reject the roles that society presents to the individual. The strategy that it uses begins with each individual and each individual's relationships with other individuals.

The counter-culture starts with the basic premise and belief
in every individual. Each individual is a unique entity, one person is no better or worse than any other person, and each person has the right to choose his own destiny. The counter-culture also believes in full personal responsibility and truth in their relationships with others and society. These premises then, lead to a critique and view of society which is counter to the view of what Reich has termed Consciousness I and Consciousness II types.

Working from these two basic premises, we can postulate the general reaction to the societal view as discussed earlier in this chapter. It should be realized at this point, however, that we are engaged in an intellectual process of analysis which the counter-culture would reject.

It is necessary to realize that the counter-culture looks upon the individual in-toto. He is not separated into systems but is viewed in a gestalt manner which implies a purposful give and take between every organism and the environment. This assumption makes no appeal to scientific methodology which relies on the technique of allocating systems and then defining them in quantitative terms. This type of methodology is viewed as possessing a dehumanizing quality which is therefore not a valid method when dealing with human beings because it does not consider them in-toto. If any method is valued, it would be a method on the experiential level using the affective domain as its basis of operation. This naturally negates the appeal to the scientific method and to objective-intellectual modes of discourse when dealing with human beings. Also because of the uniqueness of each
individual, to deal with people en masse is impossible.

If we accept the holistic view which leads to a humanizing quality, and then reject objective consciousness and its attending scientific methodology, we then must also reject technical expertise which is, of course, based on objective-scientific methodology. The rejection of expertise and its attending bureaucracy and elitism (which is not palatable if each human being is equally important) brings the counter-culture to the opposite end of the continuum from the existing powers in American culture.

Because of the belief in personal commitment and the importance of each individual, in conjunction with the rejection of technocracy's methods, the counter-culture does not want to be excluded from the decision-making process. They would like participatory government rather than representative government in all institutions because representative government is prone to the atrocities of technology. It should be pointed out that the counter-culture does not reject the materials of technology but rather rejects what technology stands for and how its method of operation has led to the dehumanization of human beings.

As Reich points out:

...the first half of the twentieth century saw the coming of an elite supposed to be based upon ability and motivation. This elite was thought to be premised upon equal opportunity for all, recognized no "irrational" distinctions between people, and created a hierarchy that was functionally necessary to the requirements of an industrial society...The meritocracy became a class system by degrees...Are there any workers or clerical employees on our boards of trustees, boards of directors, presidential commissions, or government councils?...It is
simply not part of the concept of meritocracy that "low achievers" should personally participate in decisions. Even where the decisions concern their own lives in an immediate sense--design of factory working-space and offices, actual working conditions, rules, promotions, hiring, and dismissals--there is at best only participating by an elite representative.\(^{10}\)

At the present time, the counter-culture views technology as that which controls their personal lives and destiny; they would like to reverse this phenomenon to make technology work for them. Therefore, they want the right to gain access to the decision-making level to have some control over the environment in which they live. If the technology is made to work for them (and because we are leaving the industrial age and entering the computer age) society will change from a goal-oriented society, based on aggressiveness, competition, etc., to a process-oriented society. When this occurs, it will be possible for individuals to develop their natural uniqueness, to foster different life styles and to discover others with whom they would like to live.\(^{11}\) In a process-oriented society, in which individuals may foster their uniqueness, Maslow's self-actualizing person will become more possible. Maslow's thesis is based upon the premise that once people have the essentials of life (food, clothing, shelter, etc.) they will move toward self-actualization and become more fully human.\(^{12}\)

Becoming more fully human is what the counter-culture seeks and they

\(^{10}\)Reich, op. cit., pp. 313-314.


believe that this is possible for all human beings because

...man now has the material ability to provide all human beings with the goods and services required to serve as the basis for full human development. Today, national and international poverty results from a failure of will rather than a failure of productive ability; those who are powerless sense or know this and naturally consider it intolerable.13

If man uses the electronic age and changes his psychological and sociological attitude from the Skinner box industrial age society, which is based on bureaucracy and elitism, to a different set of psychological and sociological attitudes which have their basis in the individual worth of all human beings, then all humans can benefit from the electronic age. It then may become the robot of society rather than society being the robot of the electronic age. Reich suggests that this basic change is possible.

It will not be like revolutions of the past. It will originate with the individual and with culture, and it will change the political structure only as its final act. It will not require violence to succeed, and it cannot be successfully resisted by violence. This is the revolution of the new generation.14

The basic structural rejection of technocracy by the counter-culture may be stated as follows:

The counter-culture works from the basic premise of equality and individual worth for all individuals and believes in the holistic viewpoint. Equality therefore negates a hierarchy which is the essence of bureaucracy and elitism. The holistic view negates the objective method which leads to dehumanization and is the cornerstone of

13Theobald, op. cit., p. 16.
14Reich, op. cit., p.
bureaucracy. The rejection of the methods and administrative basis of technocracy ultimately leads to a rejection of technocracy itself.

The basic foundation of the counter-culture and its response to society as postulated in this thesis, can be applied to all institutions of the society. We will specifically look, however, at an example of the counter-culture's view of the educational institution and its place in the technocracy as this would be more relevant to the development of this thesis.

Education can probably be looked upon as a product of technology and viewed as a giant Skinner box based upon positive and negative sanctions. This is true of all levels including "higher education."

The average university today is a giant Skinner box, although nobody meant it to happen this way. If you want a good job, you need good grades. If you want good grades, you need to do well in multiple-choice questions. If you want to do well in multiple-choice questions, you need to keep discrete those nice, attractive, discrete pieces of data you are learning, because if you get them confused you cannot give a simple yes or no answer. It is therefore essential that one does not think, because if you think you get confused.\footnote{Theobold, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 22.}
This idea does not support creativity. Bob Dylan supports the idea in his statement, "Colleges are like old age homes; except for the fact that more people die in colleges than old age homes, there's really no difference."\(^{16}\)

What is the purpose of this "education?" The counter-culture views education's purpose to be that of producing "human products" for technocracy to devour. Economists such as Galbraith, view education as the basic suppliers of the present industrial economic system:

Modern higher education is, of course, extensively accommodated to the needs of the industrial system. The schools and colleges of business administration, mentioned in the last chapter, are preparatory academies for the technostructure. The great prestige of the pure and applied sciences and mathematics in modern times, and the support accorded them, reflect the needs of the technostructure. The ample sums available for research and related graduate training in these areas reflect specific adaptation to such need, whereas the lesser prestige and lesser support for the arts and humanities suggest their inferior role. No modern university administration would insist, in fact as distinct from speech, that the study of the theater, fine arts, or Beowulf had the same claim to funds in the same amounts as an electronic accelerator or a computer center. Such is the influence of the industrial system.\(^{17}\)

It is also claimed that education conditions students for the technocratic society:

If you have to bring up people so that they will accept the present traps--the war trap, the efficiency trap, the job trap, and the consumption trap--you dare not set people free to think and study. The educational system ceases to be an opportunity for people to find out for themselves what they believe and becomes a method of manipulating people into accepting what the society currently accepts. It serves as a method for inculcating a set of beliefs from the past which

---


are not relevant to today's world.\textsuperscript{18}

Because the educational system fits people to the technostructure, it does not meet personal needs.

Our educational system presently fails almost completely to meet the personal needs of the individual for it is designed to turn out people who will fit the systemic requirements of an industrial age which has already ended.\textsuperscript{19}

It then follows that because of technology, certain techniques are used which will subtly "normalize" the student for the technostructure. The superstructure of the school is viewed in expertise-bureaucratic terms with the administration making just about all the decision which come to bear on the student's academic life; even in some cases determining where the student should live while attending university.

Of great irony to the counter-culture is education's constant rhetoric regarding "individual differences," however, the entire system is based on "norms." Students are often given a series of tests upon entering higher education which will place them into slots based on "norms." The elitist professional "guidance" counselors at all levels will suggest particular tracks based on the outcome of tests which are based on norms. In higher education the students are required to seek a "major" and often required to take specific courses within and outside of the major field of concentration. These things are decided by elitist curriculum specialists who know what is best for the student

\textsuperscript{18}\textsuperscript{18} Theobald, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 32-33.

\textsuperscript{19}\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., p. 10.
to take to fulfill the requirements of the technostructure. Once all of these decisions are made for the student, the data which is given in these compartmentalized courses must be memorized, regurgitated, and then tested through a system which is based on competition with fellow students. "Norms" for the tests are given and those who best suit the situation are then promoted to continue their "education." There is little thought given to "individual differences" only verbal rhetoric.

In viewing this minimal aspect of education alone, we can see why problems exist. The student is once again powerless to chart his own course even in education. And education does not value individual worth because it is based on success in competition; either against other students (based on norms) or against "standards" set by the "experts" who are really part of the technostructure. Those who are most successful in the school structure then go on to compete in the technostructure for elitist positions in the hierarchy of the bureaucracy.

Education is therefore viewed as an institution in and of the technological society which operates in the same way, on the same basis, and with the same outcomes as technology. Therefore it dehumanizes individuals, makes them powerless, and negates the basic premises of the counter-culture. That each individual is a unique entity with personal needs and equal worth, and that each has the right to choose his own destiny, including his educational destiny.
CHAPTER III

THE COUNTER-CULTURE'S VIEW OF CONTEMPORARY ATHLETICS

One of the fundamental characteristics of the technocratic society is its utilization of competition as a major source of motivation and manipulation. Sport also exhibits this same characteristic. Webster's definition of the word "compete" is simply "to enter or be in rivalry" or "strive in opposition;" Chamber's Etymological English Dictionary suggests "to seek or strive for something in opposition to others" as the meaning of the word. For purposes of this discussion, "to compete" in its broadest sense will imply the active striving of an individual or group of individuals in opposition to another individual, group of individuals, or object. It will logically follow then that the noun "competition" implies the existence of conditions necessary for individuals to compete—that is to strive in opposition to someone or something.

Is aggression intimately involved with competition? We will define "aggression" to be a process of conscious action by one individual or group of individuals or animals against another individual, animal, or object or group of individuals, animals,
This definition does not make it essential for viciousness, ferocity, or destructiveness to be present but rather that the necessary condition of willed agency be present. Nor does it negate violence but rather views violence as one of the possible outcomes of aggression. For purposes of this discussion, violence refers to the presence of physical force which is used to overcome conflict between the coercer and coerced.

If aggression is willed agency against someone or something, and competing is the active striving against someone or something, it appears as if competing may be associated with aggression. Vaughn and Diserens concur that aggression is a necessary part of competition.

The counter-culture would suggest that the basic structure of our society rests on competition and its attending outcome of aggression in individuals. For example, bureaucracy is viewed as a pyramidal structure which follows the principle of hierarchy; that is, each level is under the control and supervision of a higher level. All other things being equal, those who are most successful in the hierarchy are those individuals who are the most aggressive. Aggression and competition lead to hostility. "Experiments have

---


found that...under competition hostile attitudes will develop." The competitive structure is such that aggressive action is rewarded. This positive sanction, in turn, encourages continued aggressive action so that additional levels on the hierarchical ladder can be reached. The levels of bureaucracies bring about positions which lead to roles and suitable behavior patterns.

Since behavior varies with rank or position of the other, it is important to be able to categorize people; many organizations have uniforms, and members of others can usually be placed by more subtle aspects of their appearance. When an outsider enters an organization, even for a short visit, there is great pressure to find out his "equivalent rank" so that everyone shall know exactly how to treat him. Roles and levels lead to inequality among individuals which leads to such things as a breakdown in communication and the classification of people based on technique. Inequality and roles are rejected by the counter-culture and the means to achieving this, competition and aggression are also rejected. As Reich points out:

Consciousness III postulates the absolute worth of every human being—every self. Consciousness III does not believe in the antagonistic or competitive doctrine of life.

It is possible for technocrats to capitalize on the view that man is naturally aggressive and competitive and, therefore, is provided with an outlet for this part of his nature. In Golding's

---


5Ibid.

6Reich, op. cit., p. 242.
popular novel *Lord of the Flies*, a group of school boys are marooned on an island. During the course of their forced stay on the island, their aggressive tendencies and eventual violent tactics lead to the murder of two non-aggressive members. They are finally rescued by the British Navy who are appalled by their behavior. What Golding is probably trying to say (although this is a simplistic view) is that man by nature is aggressive and violent. The boys, who possess only a veneer of civilization, resort to their true nature. In the symbolism involved in being rescued by the Navy, we see that civilized man is aggressive but his aggression can be sanctioned and condoned by "civilized" society.

The belief in man's innate aggressiveness is scientifically supported by ethologists such as Konrad Lorenz\(^7\) and other popular writers like Ardrey\(^8\). Lorenz's conclusions come from the study of animal behavior which he then applies to man. Ardrey's work attempts to validate Raymond Dart's theory that man's ancestry was cannibalistic in origin, predatory, and carnivorous.\(^9\)

However, there are others who scientifically support the other view that man is not innately aggressive. Montagu suggests that man


is innately co-operative\textsuperscript{10} and that it is man's nurture rather than nature which brings about aggressive behavior. Scott\textsuperscript{11} has argued that from a physiological basis, spontaneity of aggression does not exist in man. He believes that external conditions cause aggression in man to be exhibited and internal conditions for aggression are not self stimulating. Whether or not aggression is innate or learned is difficult to answer and far too complex for analysis here. However, we cannot deny its existence nor can we deny that certain external conditions are prone to encourage aggressive behavior.

Competition does provide a setting for aggressive behavior. The counter-culture views competition and aggression as destructive forces which can eventually lead to violence—for example the international system which sanctions war. On the individual level, the males of the counter-culture have rejected the typical aggressive attributes associated with traditional masculinity.

So, too, one of the most remarkable aspects of the counter-culture is its cultivation of a feminine softness among its males. It is the occasion of endless satire on the part of critics, but the style is clearly a deliberate effort on the part of the young to undercut the crude and compulsive manliness of American political life.\textsuperscript{12}

All forms of competition, aggression, and subsequent domination are rejected by the counter-culture. They believe the human

---


\textsuperscript{12}Roszak, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 74.
society cannot exist if these qualities are pursued because, on the international level, many governments now have the power to destroy mankind if they so desire. On the domestic level, they view bureaucracies and their competitiveness as destructive forces to the natural environment and man's humanness. On the interpersonal level they believe that competing against other individuals rejects their basic premise of the worthiness of each individual. Because of these basic premises, the counter-culture believes that co-operation between individuals is absolutely essential.

Man's survival in the future depends on his giving up the attempt to dominate nature and learning to co-operate with it. Similarly man can only survive with other men if he abandons the present stress on competition and learns to co-operate with others.\(^\text{13}\)

Co-operating with other individuals is viewed to be superior to competing against individuals because in a co-operative venture, each individual can be accepted as he is. He is neither superior nor inferior to anyone. He is not compared to anyone else, which is the natural outcome of competition, because competition in its final act will show one person to be superior to another person.

Consciousness III rejects the whole concept of excellence and comparative merit that is so central to Consciousness II. III refuses to evaluate people by general standards, it refuses to classify people, or analyze them. Each person has his own individuality, not to be compared to that of anyone else. Someone may be a brilliant thinker, but he is not "better" at thinking than anyone else, he simply possesses his own excellence. A person who thinks very poorly is still excellent in his own way.\(^\text{14}\)

\(^{13}\)Theobald, op. cit., p. 156.

\(^{14}\)Reich, op. cit., p. 243.
In traditional sports, co-operation can take place on a "team level" however, its end is to compete against another team in order to decide which group is superior. On an individual level, the end of a competition is to show the superiority of one individual over other individuals. This superiority in competition is then rewarded. (This situation runs parallel to the technological society.) The desire to show superiority is rejected by the counter-culture along with the aggressive behavior which attends competition. Co-operation then becomes the desired framework of the counter-culture rather than competition. Acceptance of co-operation and rejection of superiority and competition run counter to the techniques of the technological society.

Because of the emphasis on competition by the technology and the desire to win, a great deal of reliance is placed on technique. The strategy of technique is based on expertise which is guided by bureaucracy. Where is the expertise and bureaucracy in athletics? The expertise resides with the coaches and judges; the administration of athletics is related to the bureaucracy and also expertise. In the following discussion we will look at the various examples of expertise and administration in a rather general way. Chapter V will deal specifically with the sport of figure skating.

The coach may be viewed as the one responsible for "training" rather than "educating" the individual. He can control almost all

---

15Technique has been defined as "the totality of methods rationally arrived at and having absolute efficiency (for a given stage of development) in every field of human activity."
elements of the game, practice and training, and even impinge on the individual's life style. For example, the individual's life style can be determined by such concepts as the training table which was devised by coaches in order to make sure that the individuals received "proper" nutrition. (The expertise of nutritionists were called upon to devise dietary controls which are naturally based on objective methodology. These controls are geared to the physical needs of the body so that the body will be physiologically at its efficient best for optimum response to physical performance.) He may be required to live in a particular dormitory, wear his hair a prescribed length, dress in a particular fashion, or even be told what courses to take while in college. For example:

Joe Szombathy, the varsity end coach, was also in charge of the athletic tutoring program. He would take the freshman football players' class cards and simply fill out the courses he wanted them to take. Szombathy not only enrolled most of them in the remedial program, but decided on their courses with one of the main criteria being whether or not they interfered with afternoon football practice. 16

The coach is usually responsible for the "training" which consists of a devised regimen to enable the individual to be most efficient for maximum performance. Here the individual is often divided into a physical and mental realm. Physically, the coaches or trainers may devise certain programs to increase mechanical physiological efficiency and output by using such things as weights, circuit training, or prescribed exercises. Besides the use of "natural" aids,

"artificial" aids may be used to enhance physiological output.

Jim Calkins, co-captain of the football team, told me that the coaching staff and the team physician had put him on anabolic steroids. Both assured him such drugs would make him bigger and stronger, and this is true. But they didn't bother to tell him that there are potentially dangerous side-effects.17

Artificial aids may also be used in order that the player may continue in a game:

When a player is injured, he is sent to the team physician, who is usually more concerned with getting the athlete back into action than anything else. This reversal of priorities leads to unbelievable abuses. One of the most common is to "shoot" a player before a game and numb a painful injured area that would normally keep him out of action. He can play, but in so doing he can also get new injuries in that part of his body where he has no feeling.18

In the so-called "masculine sports" (sports involving strong body contact), coaches may use psychological tactics which are related to the culturally defined traditional masculine ego. It is "masculine" not to complain of pain and to continue playing even while injured. In talking of this sub-cultural trait, Meggysey compares it to "...the fictional American soldier played by John Wayne who fights on with crippling, fatal wounds. In the Catch-22 world of football, as in war, this passes for reasonable behavior."19

Again, for technique's sake, psychological tests may be given to athletes. Schollander made the following observation:

Then someone came up with the idea of giving us a battery of psychological tests. The results were supposed to help the coaches to help us during the Olympic Games. If the tests

showed that a guy was easily depressed, they could work with him one way; if they showed another guy was too easily keyed up, they could handle him another way... Well the results came back, and out of all the teams... We were the most oversexed, under-cultured, temperamental, and easily bored team ever tested. So from then on we had a reputation to uphold: hell, the most oversexed team...

The process of "psyching up" and "psyching out" individuals (which can go on in all competitive sports) may be used to put the individual in a particular psychological position. Meggyesy described part of the ritual involved in getting psyched up:

...finally, I would kneel down and the team would gather around me. We would all put our hands together. Then I'd say "We're going to get them," and they'd scream, "Yeah." Then I'd holler, "OK, let's go get them," and we'd break out and head for the locker room feeling psyched up for the game.

Schollander describes "peaking" for a meet as a much longer affair. He describes swimming four for five hours a day for several months before a major meet.

Then four or five days before the meet, you stop this intense training and you begin to peak. You reduce training time to a half hour or an hour a day, just enough to stay loose. You change your whole way of life. You adopt the schedule that you will keep during the meet...you do nothing to dissipate your energy...the idea is that in competition you're just going to explode. Finally, just before the meet, you shave all the hair off your body. This is partly for physical reasons, because tiny droplets of water collect on the hair and make you less streamlined; but it is partly psychological, too, even symbolic. With this final gesture you feel that you've done everything you can to get ready for this race. The idea of peaking


works—and it drains you—totally.\textsuperscript{22}

"Psyching out" is also quite prevalent. Schollander discusses the technique used to avoid being psyched out:

You make a conscious effort to stay immune to it, not to let it get to you, and as your event draws closer you go out of your way to stay clear of it altogether. You avoid your competitors, you avoid friends of your competitors, and you eat only with your closest friends—all to keep psyching-out opportunities directed against you at a minimum.\textsuperscript{23}

A system of plays is often developed by the coaches for the game. This is probably more noticeable in team sports, however, in individual sports such as figure skating, the entire program is usually designed by the coach. Once the plays are devised, the players are "drilled" during practice sessions until the plays become almost automatic. During the actual competition the plays which the individuals use are usually those which have been designed by the coach. The coach may often direct which plays to use and when, from the sideline. For example, every play may be called by the coach in football simply by giving the play to substitutes who are rotated into the game before each play. In addition to calling plays, the coach makes just about all of the decisions about the game such as which players will "start" the game, when to take an individual out of the game, and when and which players will enter the game. In short, the coaches control the individuals.

The judges are another group of elite experts whose job it is

\textsuperscript{22}\textit{Schollander, op. cit., pp. 23-24.}

\textsuperscript{23}\textit{Ibid., p. 40.}
to use their expertise to judge and to use their power to enforce rules. For example, their expertise is used to quantify "form" in judging and to ultimately select a winner based on the quantification of form. The judge may also exert his power by enforcing rules. Some of the rules which are enforced are based on outdated modes of behavior, for example, the rule prohibiting the individual from wearing a moustache in wrestling competitions. This was enforced just recently when an athlete was required to remove his moustache before he could compete in the finals for the 1970 N.C.A.A. wrestling tournament. The role of the judge then is authoritative—to administer rules.

At the administrative level, there are different degrees of bureaucracy depending on the size of the organization. Regardless of the size, this level has the basic function of developing policy and making sure that the policies are followed. Policies may often be devised with the coaches and judges present as they provide the expertise in certain areas of policy development, however, the players have little direct access, if any, to policy making. Although the rules are supposedly developed to serve the individuals, the administrative bureaucracies develop to such an extent so as to impede their original purpose of serving the individual. The classic example of this type of development is the ongoing battles of the A.A.U. and N.C.A.A., who are in a continual power struggle for supremacy. The power struggle usually uses the individuals as pawns in a chess game. The A.A.U.'s power lies in the right to approve individuals for Olympic competition and the N.C.A.A.'s power lies in its control of the college athlete.
Schollander has recognized the powerlessness of the individual in relation to the bureaucracies of the A.A.U. and N.C.A.A.

Both groups make loud noises about their devotion to the quality and integrity of American amateur sports, but the record shows devotion primarily to the power struggle between the two groups. To gain the upper hand, each group has worked to strengthen its own power. The N.C.A.A. has moved to become absolute dictator over college sports.1

Just how much power the N.C.A.A. has over the individuals can be revealed in the following statement:

The N.C.A.A. rulebook is sprinkled with regulations that give the athlete--so long as he remains an athlete--less political freedom and academic flexibility than the average student. And the rules often apply whether the student-athlete (a term found only in the N.C.A.A. dictionary) is on an athletic scholarship or an academic scholarship or is paying his own way... A strong example is a rule the N.C.A.A. passed in 1968. The rule was designed to intimidate athletes into staying away from demonstrations of any kind. It allows a college to "terminate the financial aid of a student-athlete if he is adjudged to have been guilty of manifest disobedience through the violation of institutional regulations or established athletic department policies and rules applicable to all student-athletes."2

Here once again, we see the individual involved in a state of personal powerlessness. He is controlled by the bureaucracy and expertise of organizations who are obsessed with technique. The epitome of the "technique mania" is suggested in the following statement of Vince Lombardi's philosophy, paraphrased by Kramer:..."when we don't use our ability to the fullest, we're not only cheating ourselves

---

1Ibid., p. 154.

and the Green Bay Packers, we're cheating the Lord; He gave us our ability to use it to the fullest." 26

In a recent speech given at the National College Physical Education Association for Men, Mathews criticized the collegiate athletic world:

Athletic programs are also considered to be part of the "establishment," the establishment that certain groups would like to change, or worse than that, destroy. We as a profession, have not done much to keep our program abreast with changing ideas of society. Some of us are still concerned with length of hair, sideburns, beards, and dress rather than performance during practice, in the classroom, and at games. Some of us still set arbitrary rules based on modes of behavior accepted twenty years ago, and not those of today. When this type of thing continues to happen, it is no wonder to me that there is disenchantment. 27

This naive statement shows Mathews' inability to understand what the "establishment" is and what the counter-culture is saying. True he has recognized some of the obvious manifestations of technological controls but the central control has escaped his recognition. The statement "Some of us are still concerned with length of hair, sideburns, beards, and dress rather than performance during practice, in the classroom, and at games," blatantly reveals his inability to recognize what technology is and has done, He obviously believes the emphasis should be on performance during practice, performance during games, and performance in the classroom. All of this performance is naturally based on technique which is the stronghold of the technological society. This revelation reveals the strength that the


27 Alfred R. Mathews, Jr., "Student Unrest and Athletic
pursuit of technique has upon individuals, an obsession so great that Mathews is unable to recognize its existence as being what he describes as "part of the establishment." Mathews may be described by a person of the counter-culture as being "well programmed" by the technological society.

However, it is not only the coaches who are well programmed by and for the technological society. The athletes also may be programmed with an obsession for technique which leads to winning:

As far as exploitation of the athlete, sure we're going to push them," says Indiana football coach John Pont, one of the more open-minded young coaches. "We want to win. We want to enhance the reputation of the University. We want to go to the Rose Bowl, but that's all within a football area, an athletic climate, and he (the athlete) wants to do those things..."

This obsession with technique has changed the nature of sport according to Beisser who suggests that the light-hearted play element characteristic of sport has been transformed to assume the qualities of hard work:

As traditional work becomes less familiar and serious, sports assume the characteristics formerly associated with work. Player and worker become paradoxical terms.

This transformation tells us that the technological society has won! A number of educators would like to abolish athletics because


28 Wolf, op. cit., p. 449.

they feel that higher education and competitive athletics have
different goals—but they are wrong. Considering the medium to be the
message, rather than professional, elitist, objective, education,
rhetoric which states the goals of education and athletics, both produce
the same product and have the same goals. They produce "happy robots"
for the technological society—robots programmed for existence in the
technological society. And at this point we should mention that
athletics does every bit as good a job of producing these individuals
as does the rest of higher education. Coaches and administrators
stress what they are offering individuals:

They are giving him the opportunity to learn the most
essential American values: the endurance of pain, respect for
authority and self-reliance. "Football's main feature is
teaching responsibility," says Tom Hamilton, Commissioner of
the Pacific Coast Conference and former coach at Navy and
Pittsburgh. "This is what the military likes about sports
...I think football is the greatest thing we have in educa­
tion today."30

The media of education and athletics are the same. They are
both elements of technology. They use the techniques of technology—
bureaucracy, expertise, and objective methods which lead to the
dehumanization and powerlessness of individuals. Their end products
are the robots which technology willingly consumes,

30Wolf, op. cit., p. 449.
CHAPTER IV

THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMPETITIVE FIGURE SKATING

This chapter will briefly outline the historical evolution of figure skating, subsequent competition, and the nature of present day figure skating competitions in the United States.

Historical Considerations

In order to fully assess figure skating as it exists today, it would probably be beneficial to trace briefly the evolution of skating from the beginning of its inception as an organized form of recreation and competition.

The Edinburgh Skating Club was probably the first organized body which guided skating. The exact date of its formation is not definitely known although historians place its formation between the years of 1683 to 1742; the oldest minute book of the club dates back to the 39th of January, 1784. The Edinburgh club had an admissions test which consisted of the following:

1. The ability to skate a circle on each foot (each circle was performed independently rather than being joined as it is today

---

in the simple figure eight.

2. To jump over one hat, then two hats, and then three hats.²

In addition to the admissions test, a standard costume was also required which consisted of pantaloons, swallow-tail coat, white tie, and a tall hat. Women were not allowed to become members of the organization although paintings attest to the fact that they too were skating on the various ponds.³

This club undoubtedly brought the British influence to skating and guided the developing sport. The English soon replaced the long, flat, broad Dutch blade which had a functional suitability for transportation but a very limiting effect of "artistic moves" with numerous blades which would be more suitable to the variety of skating moves they would attempt to perform.⁴

**British Influence.** Once organized skating had taken a firm root in England, its direction was toward elegance in movement.⁵ Blades were improved along with the method of fastening blades to the boot. By 1772 the first treatise on ice skating in the English language was written by Robert Jones.⁶ This book deals with the


⁴Wilhelm Boeckel, *On Figure Skating*, (New York: W. Boeckel, 1937), p. 17.


fundamental principles of "plain skating" and "graceful rolling" which is made up of the inside and outside edge, and a long curved outside edge called "rolling," "stopping," or "running," all of which were used in drawing figures on the ice. Jones suggests a form of the present "hockey stop" as the best way of stopping.

During Jones' time, skating as practiced in England was an exclusively male occupation even though a century earlier the Princess of Orange and other women of the court skated. He, however, laments this fact and states: "No mention can be more happily imagined for setting off an elegant figure to advantage, nor does the minuet itself afford half the opportunity of displaying a pretty foot."^8

In the second part of Jones' book, free skating movements are presented with the outside Spread Eagle considered the most difficult. The author states at the conclusion of his book that there are many other movements but he does not elaborate upon them as they are neither "graceful" nor "pleasing."^9 From this point in time, skating in England began to lean toward art and grace, as can be attested by literature of the period.^10, 11

^7Brown, op. cit., p. 42.
^8Jones, op. cit., pp. 14-16.
^9Ibid., p. 39.
^11George Anderson, The Art of Skating, (Glasgow: Thomas Murray and Son, 1852).
German and French Influence. By the end of the eighteenth century, skating was practiced in Germany and France and probably reached these countries via Holland. During this period, it appears as though poets and artists were engaged in espousing the "art" of skating through their various artistic media. The fore-edged book The Seasons is a typical example of this type of work. The gilt edges of the book reveal a painting of a skating scene while the interior reveals poetry of which skating is an integral part. Paintings such as Goethe Skating at Frankfurt, by Raab, after Von Kaulbach, 1862, also reveals the artistic community's interest in skating. In Goethe's book Aus Meinen Leben, he made reference to artistic skating and its benefit to health.

The court of Louis XVI (1774-1792) enthusiastically partook of skating and made it a fashionable pastime for the elite of Paris. At this time, skating possessed quite a variety of figures and most were outlined in Jones' book, however, Parisian circles were not interested in the scientific aspect of skating figures but were interested in refining the movements on ice and presenting them as an art form.

Skating began to grow in popularity and repertoire during the nineteenth century. Le Vrai Patineur (The Real Skater with the subtitle How to Skate With Grace) was written by the Frenchman J. Garcin.

12G. V. A. Vieth, Ueber das Schrittschuhfahren, (Graz: Widmanstattschen Schriften, 1790).

in 1813.\textsuperscript{14} The book describes thirty-one figures, pirouettes, jumps, steps, and poses. Both Germany\textsuperscript{15,16,17} and France\textsuperscript{18,19,20,21,22,23,24} began to contribute to the literature of skating.

An elite of skaters, known as the Gilets Rouge did much to promote skating. J. Garcin, a Gilets Rouge wrote the first French treatise on skating (\textit{Le Vrai Patineur}) and throughout the book Garcin emphasizes grace and poise as being very necessary in executing the technical difficulties of a figure. He gave exaggerated artistic names to figures such as Adonis, Venus, and Step of Apollo just to name a few. The classic four edges (forward outside, forward inside, backward

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{14} Jean Garcin, \textit{Le Vrai Patineur}, (Paris: J. Fils, 1813).
  \item \textsuperscript{15} E. Christ, D. Siegm, and A. Zindel, \textit{Der Eislauf odor das Schrittschuhtfahren}, (Nurnberg: Friedrich Campe, 1825).
  \item \textsuperscript{16} Julius Zohler, \textit{Das Schlittschuhlaufen}, (Leipzig: J. J. Weber, 1866).
  \item \textsuperscript{17} Fritz Emrich, \textit{Anleitung zum Schlittschuhlaufen}, (Berlin: Selbstverlag, 1866).
  \item \textsuperscript{18} A. O. Paulin, \textit{Desormeaux: Patinage}, (Paris: Encyclopedique Roret, 1853).
  \item \textsuperscript{19} Alphonse Silva, \textit{Sur le Patin}, (Paris: Alphonse Taride, 1857).
  \item \textsuperscript{20} A. DeSoultrait, \textit{Les Patineurs}, (Paris: R. DeFables, 1861).
  \item \textsuperscript{21} Robert Douiet, \textit{L'ecole du Patin et Recreatione sur la Glace par Douiet}, (Paris: Chez l'auteur, 1863).
  \item \textsuperscript{22} Robert Douiet, \textit{Physiologie due Patineur}, (Paris: Dentu, 1862).
  \item \textsuperscript{23} Robert Douiet, \textit{Almanach des Pateneurs, Fetes et Plaisirs de l'Hiver}, (Paris: R. Douiet, 1864).
  \item \textsuperscript{24} J. Amiens, \textit{Les Patins et l'art de Patineur}, (Paris: Bray et Retaux, 1869).
\end{itemize}
outside, and backward inside) and the classic eight were being practiced at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

With the development of various types of blades in both Europe and North America during the nineteenth century, the bracket, loop, and rocker took their place along with the three and serpentine in figures and completed the basic repertoire of elements which are present in the compulsory figures of today.25,26,27,28

While the North Americans worked hard at developing various figures,29,30,31,32 the Europeans were involved in the "Viennese" school33 originated by Jackson Haines. Haines (born either in the United States or Canada) a one time ballet dancer, juggler, and teacher of physical culture, introduced the "international" style of skating

25 G. Alroy, Practical Handbook on Figure Skating, (Perth: J. Young and Sons, 1881).

26 W. C. Marshall, The Figure Skater's Pocket-Book, (London: Wyman and Sons, 1882).

27 Montagu Monier-Williams and Stanley Monier-Williams, Combined Figure Skating, (London: Horace Cox, 1883).

28 Douglas Adams, Skating, (London: George Bell and Sons, 1890).


32 George H. Browne, Figure Skating, (Boston: Perry Mason and Co., 1892).

33 Brockaw, op. cit., p. 27.
which exists to this day. His skating emphasis was not on the various kinds of figures he could make on the ice, but rather on covering space in a series of poses, turns, jumps, etc., with the use of music and costumes. He was also the founder of modern pair skating. During the nineteenth century, Haines' emphasis was on artistic expression and the Victorians, particularly H. E. Vandervell, developed the scientific aspect of figures.

Skating Competitions. Local skating competitions began to be held informally in various skating centers, and in Vienna in 1882 the first international competition was held. In the special-figures section, each competitor presented a number of elegant movements joined together to make a special figure which in reality was the beginning of free skating. One contestant, Theodore Langer, produced a four-pointed star figure on the ice. The figure was made while skating on only one foot and was considered to be anti-skating because Langer had emphasized the figure as the end product rather than the process of producing the figure. Although the first three places were given to the "free skaters", a new branch of skating emerged and in competitions, thereafter, the end product (the tracing) became the most

---


35 Brown, op. cit., p. 94.

36 H. E. Vandervell and T. Maxwell Witham, A System of Figure Skating, (London: MacMillan and Co., 1869).

37 Brown, op. cit., p. 127.
Important element.

Brockaw's book says these "special figures" "...ought as far as possible, to be original, the creations of the artistic faculty of each individual, and a proof of his ability to adapt, combine, and harmonize." 40

In 1909 at Wiborg, compulsory school figures were entirely absent and only "special figures" and "free skating" was part of the competition in order to promote "special figures." 41

The first International Skating Congress (later re-named the International Skating Union) was formed in Holland in 1892 and in the following winter the first world speed-skating contest took place. 42 In 1896 the first official world competition in figure skating was held. From this time to the present control of amateur figure and speed skating has been in the hands of the International Skating Union.

The World Championships were open to all and in 1902 Madge Brown, op. cit., p. 82.

Ibid.

Brockaw, op. cit., p. 113.

Ibid.

Bang, op. cit., p. 22.
Seyers surprised the International Skating Union by being the first woman to enter a World Competition. Seyers placed second to Ulrich Salchow but many believe she should have won.\textsuperscript{43} The International Skating Union then decided to separate the World Championships on the basis of sex and in 1908 Seyers won the Women's World Championship. Because Seyer's had achieved a skating performance level roughly equivalent to the best male skater, it was now realized that pair skating could be developed to a high level. In 1908, the International Skating Union gave pair skating an official place in the World Championships. The three competitions were held annually until the First World War.\textsuperscript{44} These events also appeared for the first time in the 1908 Summer Olympic Games.

Organized competition brought about the solidification of rules—what figures must be done, what must be attempted in free skating, and a host of other requirements. The requirements have changed only slightly over the years and no revolutionary patterns of competition have emerged. Some slight variations in figures have occurred but no startling changes have taken place.

Present Figure Skating Competition in the United States

The United States Figure Skating Association is the governing and controlling body of all amateur figure skating competitions (on

\textsuperscript{43}Brown, op. cit., p. 148.

ice) within the United States.\textsuperscript{45} It, in turn, is a member of the International Skating Union which governs all international figure skating competitions on ice. (For purposes of this thesis we shall only discuss competitions within the United States).

**Eligibility to Compete.** The first requirement for competition is that the individual be a member in good standing of the United States Figure Skating Association. The person may "...upon application and upon compliance with all the requirements of the United States Figure Skating Association, become an individual member upon approval of his application by the Membership Committee."\textsuperscript{46} The individual may also become a member by joining a member club provided the individual meets the "requirements" of the club.

The second condition is that the person be an amateur which is described as follows:

An amateur in skating is a person who participates in the sport as an avocation, for pleasure and not as a means of livelihood and who is not disqualified as an amateur under any provision of the Official Rules of the United States Figure Skating Association.\textsuperscript{47}

Certain acts can cause an amateur to be restricted from competition, such as:

Any person who takes part in an unsanctioned competition, exhibition or other event requiring a sanction under the rules

\textsuperscript{45}United States Figure Skating Association, The 1972-73 Official USFSA Rulebook, (Boston: United States Figure Skating Association, 1971), p. 2.

\textsuperscript{46}Ibid., p. 47.

\textsuperscript{47}Ibid., p. 155.
of the United States Figure Skating Association or International Skating Union shall be restricted for a period of one year following the act.48

A third prerequisite for competition is that the individual has passed certain tests (this varies with the level and type of competition) which are given periodically by member clubs to which "approved" judges49,50 are present in order to pass or fail the individual.51 These requirements will be discussed within each level.

Structure of the Competition. Within the United States Figure Skating Association at the present time, there are four fundamental divisions of competition, namely: female singles, male singles, pairs, and dance. Along with these divisions there are classes within each division and levels of competition within each division. (See Table 1) Because the requirements for both the men and women's singles competitions are identical, only one single's grouping appears.

Each of the categories has requirements for participation. We will take each fundamental division separately in order to understand the requirements.

48 Ibid.

49United States Figure Skating Association, Committee on Judges and Judging, (Boston: United States Figure Skating Association, 1942).

50United States Figure Skating Association, Committee on Judging Standards, (Boston: United States Figure Skating Association, 1945).

51United States Figure Skating Association, The 1972-73 Official Rulebook, (Boston: The United States Figure Skating Association, 1971), p. 51.
**TABLE 1**

ANALYSIS OF AVAILABLE CHAMPIONSHIP COMPETITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Regionals</th>
<th>Sectionals</th>
<th>Nationals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Singles (male and female)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Singles (male and female)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice Singles (male and female)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Singles (male and female)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Singles (male and female)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Pairs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Pairs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice Pairs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Dance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Dance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Dance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The "Regionals" (lowest level of championship competition) consists of nine groups of States as divided by the United States Figure Skating Association. Only those skaters who place first, second, or third in the "Regionals" may then go on to compete in the "Sectionals." There are three Sections, namely: Midwestern, Pacific Coast, and Eastern (each consisting of three Regions). Those who place in the top three of their categories then go on to compete in the National Competition provided their class exists at this level.

**Singles Competition.** As previously stated, there are five classes of competition in up to three different levels. In order to qualify for competition at the lowest level (Regionals) in any class, specified United States Figure Skating Association tests must be completed which are as follows:

1. Juveniles: second test only and under age thirteen at date of competition.
2. Intermediate: third test only.
3. Novice: fourth or fifth test only.
4. Junior: sixth or seventh test only.
5. Senior: eighth test only.$^{52}$

In each of the tests, a series of figures must be skated on the ice using a prescribed edge of the blade, foot, specific figure (depending on test level), and forward or backward movements. (See Appendix A). In addition, a free skating program must be passed at

---

the fourth, sixth, seventh, and eighth level tests for which there are prescribed durations of time with slight time differences for men and women at the higher levels.\textsuperscript{53}

\textbf{Pairs Competition.} The "pairs" contain three classes of competition at up to three levels. In order to compete at the lowest level in any class, specified tests must have been completed. There are three tests in pair skating namely: bronze, silver, and gold, for which eligibility can be had based on these tests at the novice, junior, and senior classes respectively.

The requirement for the Bronze pair test consists of:

\ldots a three minute program which shall be skated rhythmically and in harmony with the music. The pair must show a moderate degree of basic unison and demonstrate the fundamentals of pair skating.\textsuperscript{54}

There are a number of steps and recommended moves given although they are not mandatory.

The Silver pair test consists of:

\ldots a four minute program harmoniously skated, that will fit music, mood, rhythm and include some change of pace, cover the ice well and have partner relationship. The pair shall show good basic unison.\textsuperscript{55}

A number of steps and combination moves are also recommended.

The Gold pair test states the following requirements:

\ldots shall consist of a five-minute program of championship


\textsuperscript{54}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 73.

\textsuperscript{55}\textit{Ibid.}
calibre, choreographed and skated to express the feel for the music. The pair must show a marked degree of basic unison. Various lifts, jumps, and combination moves are recommended but not mandatory.

**Dance Competition.** The dance competition contains three classes in up to three levels. Certain tests must be passed in order to compete in any class. Excluding the preliminary dances, there are seven test levels namely: bronze, pre-silver, silver, silver free dance, pre-gold, gold, gold free dance. The bronze, pre-silver, and silver each contain three specific pattern dances while the pre-gold and gold contain four. The silver free dance is two and one-half minutes in duration and the gold free dance is four minutes long. Both are original dances and not based on a set pattern.

The requirement for competition at the Regional level in the Bronze Dance is to have completed the Bronze Dance test but no more than two Silver Dances. In the Silver Dance Class, each must have completed the Silver Dance test but not more than one Gold Dance. In the Gold Dance category, one must have completed at least two Gold Dances and the Silver Free Dance.

**Summary of the Development of Figure Skating**

Organized skating originally had as its end goal the produc-

---

56. Ibid.

57. Ibid., pp. 75-76.

58. Ibid., p. 76.
tion of tracings on the ice done with grace and style. Both elements were important as a unit rather than standing alone. Jackson Haines was instrumental in affecting the separation with his emphasis on the artistic side of skating. With the beginning of competitions, artistic creativity was measured by the originality of the tracings and the way in which it was performed. Langer's performance, with emphasis only on the tracing, was instrumental in activating a separation between free skating and figures. As the sport became more structured and organized, the split (free skating and figures) became complete although both are required for competition in single's events. The figures became standardized and today, much of the free skating is also standardized. The events have been categorized and each event has its own particular set of rules.
CHAPTER V

A CRITIQUE OF CONTEMPORARY FIGURE SKATING—
THE SYSTEM AND AN ALTERNATIVE

The theory developed in Chapter II and III may easily be
applied to the present conditions of amateur figure skating competi-
tion in the United States. In the first half of this chapter we will
attempt a critical analysis of the component parts of the competitive
figure skating structure. This analysis is based on the author's
interpretive view of the counter-culture and the way this sub-culture
might view the figure skating structure. The second part will attempt
to present a rationale for an alternative system and suggest an
alternative system based on previously stated principles of the
counter-culture.

The Present Competitive System

Organizational Structure. The United States Figure Skating
Association monopolizes all amateur figure skating in the United
States and controls all participants. For example, if a U.S.F.S.A.
skater was to skate in a competition not sanctioned by the U.S.F.S.A.,
the competitor would not be allowed to compete for one year following
participation in such an event. If an individual had aspirations to
make the Olympic team, there is no way to get there except through
the system of the U.S.F.S.A.

This organization controls all the rules of amateur skating in the United States. It controls judging, and selects the United States representatives to all international figure skating events including the World University Games.¹ There is one advantage to this monopoly. There is no continuing power struggle between organizations. However, the individual is left with little choice if he wishes to compete. Either compete within the U.S.F.S.A. or do not compete at all.

Judging System. The judges and referees are part of the elitist group within the hierarchy of the U.S.F.S.A. The duty of the judges is to see that the contestants abide by the rules and then appraise their performance based on rules for performance. These "experts" form a group whose function is to quantify the performance of each individual. Within the U.S.F.S.A. most of the judges have not passed the tests which they judge. Neither have most of them reached the technical skill level over which they pass judgment.

One of the interesting idiosyncracies associated with the U.S.F.S.A. system of appointing judges is that only "amateurs or restricted amateurs"² who are current members of the U.S.F.S.A. in good standing, and eighteen years of age or older, are eligible to be appointed as judges. This rule eliminates professional skaters

¹The system used in the World University Games is that which is used by the U.S.F.S.A. and the International Skating Union.

and coaches from participating in the judging system. Professionals are usually those skaters who have come up through the system of tests and competitions as skaters and are aware of its demands. However, even though they may have insights as to demands placed on the competitors by the system, they are never given the opportunity to express their opinion via the system of judging.\(^3\)

An elaborate system has been devised to select judges at various levels through "trial" judging and appointments.\(^4\) If an individual aspires to be a judge, he must resort to the following action:

1. Join a U.S.F.S.A. club and be classified as an amateur or restricted amateur by the U.S.F.S.A.
2. Contact the "test chairman" of the club and indicate an interest in judging.
3. Make arrangements to trial judge.
4. Trial judge.
5. Arrange to have two members of U.S.F.S.A. clubs or two individual members of the U.S.F.S.A. to recommend you for judging. These recommendations must be given to the Sectional Vice-Chairman of the U.S.F.S.A. Judges Committee.

One must continue in the system of judging in order to secure

\(^3\)Neither are they allowed to participate in the hierarchical structure of the administration. Positions in the hierarchy of the U.S.F.S.A. are limited to amateurs and restricted amateurs only.

appointments to higher levels of judging and refereeing. The judge's creed reads as follows:

I consider it an honor and a privilege to be a judge of figure skating or ice dancing. I shall make my judgment to the best of my ability with all humility and then shall keep my own counsel unless questioned officially. I shall free my mind of all former impressions, be cooperative and punctual, and do my best always to improve my knowledge of the sport.5

The organization may control criticism by eliminating critics from the structure. If a judge should publish any statement concerning competitions or tests in which he has served as a judge, this violation is sufficient for action by the U.S.F.S.A. Judges Committee. This may mean removal from judging.6

This type of hierarchical structure and control leads to what Toffler describes as the "organization man:"

Power laden hierarchies, through which authority flowed, wielded the whip by which the individual was held in line. Knowing that his relationship with the organization would be relatively permanent (or at least hoping that it would be) the organization man looked within for approval. Rewards and punishments came down the hierarchy to the individual, so that the individual, habitually looking upward at the next rung of the hierarchical ladder, became conditioned to subservience.7

Toffler further states:

Finally, the organization man needed to understand his

5Ibid., p. 153.
6Ibid.
place in the scheme of things; he occupied a well-defined niche, performed actions that were also well-defined by the rules of the organization, and he was judged by the precision with which he followed the book. Faced by relatively routine problems, he was encourage to seek routine answers. Unorthodoxy, creativity, venturesomeness were discouraged, for they interfered with the predictability required by the organization of its component parts.8

This statement may be used as a description of the hierarchical structure of the U.S.F.S.A.

Technique. Technique has become the most important element in figure skating competition. This end runs counter to the thinking of many.

Technique requires predictability and, no less, exactness of prediction. It is necessary then, that technique prevail over the human being. For technique, this a matter of life and death. Technique must reduce man to a technical animal, the king of the slaves of techniques. Human caprice crumbles before this necessity; there can be no autonomy in the face of technical autonomy. The individual must be fashioned by techniques, either negatively (by the techniques of understanding man) or positively (by the adaptation of man to the technical framework), in order to wipe out the plots his personal determination introduces into the perfect design of the organization.9

The glorification of technique reaches its height in the compulsory figures (Appendix A). The rules control how one starts, the size of the circle, where one changes feet, what edge of the blade to be on, and how one leaves the circle. Every figure must be skated three times on each foot without pause and marks are recorded for the ability to retrace the original figure that the skater

8Ibid., pp. 145-146.
traced on the ice provided that the tracing is not faulty. In order
not to have a "faulty" figure, it should be as perfectly round and
symmetrical as possible. For example, part of the general rule for
circles is:

The diameter of the circle should be approximately three
times the height of the skater. Each radii of all of the circles
and half circles of a figure should be approximately of the
same length. The circles and half circles should begin and
end as near as possible to the intersection of the long and
transverse axes. The long axis of the figure divides it
longitudinally into symmetrical halves. The transverse axis
divides the figure into symmetrical lobes. It forms a right
angle with the long axis where the lobes join. Figures
which consist of three lobes have two transverse axes which
divide the figure into its three lobes. Maintenance of the
long axis, the transverse axis and symmetry of the figure is
to be especially observed.10

These types of rules produce the required technique which is
the mainstay of technology. In order to achieve the perfection which
the organization constructs, the individual must be machine tooled to
produce mechanical performance. This type of machine tooling serves
to negate creativity. In all competitions at the present time, the
compulsory figures constitute 50 per cent of one's total score; free
skating accounts for the other 50 per cent. However, there are
"recommended" moves (stunts) and other rules which must be followed
for free skating. It should be noted also that, at the lower levels of
competition, only those who finish high in figures are allowed to
compete in free skating.

Each category of competition (singles, pairs, dance) has its

own rules but all emphasize technique. For example, the free dance category has rules related to duration of performance, kind of music, and various types of music. This places a restricting force on the creativeness of the performers or the performances. Experienced skaters, who have been through the system, know what the judges are looking for in programs. They usually choreograph the programs accordingly. Technique itself then becomes the end or the most important element of the performance rather than it being used as a means to an end. This environment does not enhance creativity within figure skating thus limiting the development of figure skating as a creative art form. Figure skating may be either sport or art, or for that matter anything which the performer wishes it to be. The important factor to note at this time is that the rules which emphasize technique provide a number of restrictions which inhibit creativity in performance and encourage mechanical performance. This situation can easily be compared to the conditions which formerly existed in synchronized swimming:

The 1954 rules (A.A.U.), requiring solo routines to include five listed stunts, changed the picture. Compulsory stunts had to be included in routines and performed exactly as stated in the rules whether or not they fit the theme or the accompaniment. Execution and synchronization became ends in themselves, and no longer the means to an end.

In 1955 the International Academy of Aquatic Arts was formed in order to promote artistic self-expression and interpretation with

the emphasis on technique as a means to an end rather than as an end in itself. 12

The Coach and Technique. The life style of the individual is often controlled directly by the coach. When a person decides to skate "seriously" he will often reside at the coach's house. This occurs because the individual is usually under the age of sixteen and desires a particular coach who may reside in a city other than the one in which the individual lives. 13

In an indirect manner the individual may be controlled by the coach through technique. A schedule for skating may be devised by the coach and the individual's school schedule may be modified to accommodate the practice hours. 14 Of the total amount of time spent in skating, at least one-half is spent practicing the prescribed figures if the person is interested in individual competition. (see Appendix A) The end of this action is to have a "perfect" figure and to be able to retrace the figure three times as perfectly as possible. The other half of the time is spent in practicing jumps, spins, and footwork which is eventually put together by the coach for the individual so that he has a "free skating" program for competition.

12 Annie Clement, Judge, National Aquatic Arts and Amateur Athletic Union, Interview, December 18, 1971.

13 Marylin House, former U.S.F.S.A. competitor and National Silver Dance Title Holder, several interviews.

14 Often the student may attend high school during the evening and skate during the day.
The University Student and Competition. The system as it operates today renders the majority of university students ineligible to compete. They find it almost impossible to reach the required "technical" levels necessary for competition. The lowest level of championship competition open to the university student is the Intermediate Singles contest (you must be under thirteen years of age at the date of competition to compete at a lower level in singles). This requires the competitor to have completed the third test. For a university student who begins skating as a freshman, completion of the test would be difficult to say the least. To date, no university student at the Ohio State University who began skating as a freshman, has completed this test. Students have generally shown little interest in sustained practice of figures and do not usually consider them of great importance. However, the U.S.F.S.A. places great stress and importance on figures. The student's interest usually lies in free skating and they wish to spend their time attempting this type of movement rather than repeating the same figures continually.

If the student did meet the requirement for competition, he would be subjected to competing against someone much younger. This is often a psychological deterrent to competition. (A nine year old girl has completed her eighth test recently which would theoretically place her at the highest level of competition.)

The Placement System. Competition in athletics is the major source of motivation and manipulation. The desire to win and therefore to prove superiority over other competitors may become the driving force behind the competitor. As stated in Chapter III this a fundamental characteristic of the technocratic society.

The placement system in figure skating rests on meritocracy and aggressive action. As described earlier, each event has only one person who places first, second, and third. Those who finish at the top may then go on to compete at another level where the placement system will be used to select those who will compete at the next higher level. The system has a limiting effect on the number of people who are able to compete at various levels. This pyramidal form of placement places one person above all others and is done on the basis of quantification of performance by "experts." However, if it is possible to lose by .01 of a point, the validity of the system may be legitimately questioned. If the validity is questionable, then the system of advancing through the ranks may be invalid, also.

We see once more that the system rests solely on the authority of judges to make the final decisions. The authoritarian figure is a stronghold of the technocratic society. The competitor is dominated by rules of the organization both directly and indirectly and his performances are evaluated and quantified by "experts."

Discussion

The argument against competitive figure skating as it exists
today may be based on personal powerlessness. The organization monopolizes figure skating competition and is in complete control. It is based on a system of experts who quantify and determine good performance based on techniques devised by them. This emphasis delimits creativity and supports mechanical technique which is necessary to advance in a system based on meritocracy. This leads to dehumanization of the individual and renders him powerless as he has no other alternative for competition.

In order to counteract this force and to apply some of the principles of the counter-culture, the following ideas will be postulated:

1. Develop a new structure controlled by the participants.
2. Let the participants do the judging.
3. De-emphasize technique and let the competitor determine his own goals relative to performance.
4. Develop an alternative in which university students may compete regardless of technique.
5. Use a placement system which does not have only one winner.
6. Displace the emphasis of competing against other individuals.

Rationale for Design of New Model Program

In designing the model program, the basic principles of the counter-culture will be used. The purpose of this proposal is not to attract only individuals from the counter-culture but rather to use
the principles only as a suggested alternative.

The New Organizational Structure. The organization itself should exist for the competitors rather than the competitors existing for the organization. In order to assure that this does, in fact, happen, it is the competitors who should evolve and administer the organization in a participatory form of government rather than a representative form of government. (See Chapter VII for a possible application of this scheme.) This type of operation gives the control to those directly involved in competing and gives them the opportunity to plan their competitive destinies.

The New Judging System. The judgment of competitive performances within the U.S.F.S.A. have been made by judges within the traditional hierarchical position of technology and with the use of "objective methods," namely the categorization of performance and ensuing quantification of categories. The counter-culture would object to the hierarchy, expertise, and quantification of performance. In a hierarchy, the communication is vertical. Orders are given from the top and carried down to the bottom. This type of system leads to roles and ways of interacting between levels. If the hierarchy is eliminated and people communicate "sideways" on the same level, they will behave differently and operate under different pressures than those who must communicate in the traditional vertical hierarchy. The view of traditional expertise would be eliminated. The individuals who are the creators and performers can then make the decisions about performance. These individuals will have greater empathy for the
other performers as each will have shared in the experience of the competition at the same level. They will share some of the insights of the other competitors which can only be gained through the shared experience of the competition on the same level. This situation allows those who are actually involved in the competition to voice their opinions via the medium of critiquing performances.

Another element which will be changed is the breakdown of performance (e.g. technical merit, difficulty, etc,) in judging. The performance should be viewed in toto which would follow the counter-cultures preference for Gestaltism. (See criteria for critique in format of model competition.)

With the limitations of technique and various rules imposed on performance, the creative process becomes limited. The individual becomes machine tooled to the rules set forth by the competition; the competitor, in all likelihood, is not involved with the choreography of his or her own program but depends on the "coach" to develop the program, thus limiting the opportunity for creativity and also becoming a tool for someone else's ideas.

The type of program that is developed is one that will have most appeal to the judges in order to "beat the competition," which becomes the end for participating. The inhibition of the creative process runs contrary to educational objectives and it therefore appears necessary to delimit these kinds of restraints on creativity. In developing an alternative, creativity should be encouraged as much as possible.
The New Placement System. Is the most important element of a competition winning? Why must it be necessary to advance in further competitions? Should an alternative to competition in the traditional sense be provided? In Charles A. Reich's, The Greening of America, we are given a look at the "Consciousness III" type of individual which most likely reflects the thinking of many individuals of the counterculture. He states:

"This world demands a different personality than the old world, which asked for aggressive, disciplined, competitive pursuit of definite goals. One prime attribute is that it is anti-competitive. The tough high school athlete, measuring and one-upping his opponents, catches a whiff of the elixir of Consciousness III and he plays varsity basketball with a happier sense of enjoyment, or he quits altogether in order to play his guitar."

If this statement is true, it would appear that an alternative to competition as we know it today ought to be available. One way, though not the only way, would be to provide a situation where the competitor competes only against himself and his ability rather than against other individuals. This structure may be accomplished by changing the placement system from a pyramidal one to one which possesses a cylindrical effect. This would imply that several people could reach the top. In order to achieve this structure, the traditional concept of only one winner would be eliminated along with the traditional placement system of first place, second place, and third place. In its place, a system could be used in which all of those who performed outstandingly would be accorded equal honor. This would

---
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eliminate the pyramidal effect which produces only one winner.

It is possible that this kind of situation would lead the participants to develop a more co-operative spirit with each other since each person is not in competition with every other person. This spirit may prove to be of benefit to those involved. It would certainly provide a choice between intensities of competition.

Format of Model Competition

Based on the foregoing rationale and in order to have a minimal amount of structure, the following ideas have been established for the competition:

It is hoped that the skaters will use their skating creatively to suggest new ideas and ways of communicating. This statement simply explodes all ideas of preconceived form on ice and invites the skater to develop new kinds of movement and form in order to communicate in a variety of ways.

The program may consist of one or more participants, whichever is best for the program and the statement one wishes to make. In other words, the programs will not be segregated on the basis of function, number of participants, or sex. Dance is not a separate entity, nor is pair skating or singles. It is desirable first to have an idea one wishes to communicate and then draw upon the necessary number of people and forms which best communicate the idea.

The amount of time necessary for the performance and type of music is entirely dependent on the performers. There is no time
limit in which a program may be performed. Its length is entirely dependent upon the performer's wishes. The music may be of any type. These modes of communication are entirely dependent on the desires of the performer.

It is entirely within the realm of possibility for the skater to perform a more "traditional" program if one so desires. It is valid for a skater to be interested in technique as end rather than means, therefore, opportunities for this type of skating must be made available also. The judging of this type of performance will be made in light of its objective, namely, technique as the important factor.

It is believed that these ideas will bring flexibility to the competition and broaden the type of skating one is able to exhibit. It also broadens the base for participation and hopefully will bring about the creation of new ideas on the ice.

The critique, or judging of performance, will be made by all of the performers. It is suggested that all performers watch each performance in the competition even though all programs will be videotaped. Those skaters who wish to repeat their program because they feel they are capable of a better performance may do so after each competitor has skated his or her program once. The skater will then have a choice as to which performance he wishes to have critiqued.

At the end of the competition, the skaters will meet to critique each others performances. Prior to viewing the performance of each skater, the performer will verbally relate to the viewers the purpose of his program—what communication was intended. The program will then
be viewed by the other performers. After viewing the performance, a discussion can take place regarding the strong and weak elements of the performance in toto. Each viewer will then rank the performer.

Criteria for Critiquing Performance. There are no strict rules which govern the critique or judgment of the performance. Each "judge" must work from the basis of whether or not the performer met his or her goals as stated prior to viewing the performance; the "judge" then works from a "holistic" or Gestalt viewpoint. It is assumed that through participation in figure skating and competition, knowledges and insights are gained about this activity and absorbed by each individual. It is these attributes which then come into existence when critiquing the other participants. Their perceptions are not simply impressions based on an "objective" world but rather patterned wholes which exist between the perceiver and the perceived. This type of critique explodes what Roszak calls the myth of objective consciousness.

There is but one way of gaining access to reality—so the myth holds—and this is to cultivate a state of consciousness cleansed of all subjective distortion, all personal involvement. What flows from this state of consciousness qualifies as knowledge, and nothing else does. This is the bedrock on which the natural sciences have been built; and under their spell all fields of knowledge strive to be scientific.

This type of critique then, calls into play the total individual and asks for total involvement by the viewer and performer. Once the critiques have been made, the viewer will then place the performance into the following categories: (1) First Class Honors,
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(2) Second Class Honors, (3) Third Class Honors and (4) Fourth Class Honors.

To summarize, this theoretical format would provide the participants with control over the structure of the competition so that flexibility of administration can be maintained in order to meet the needs of the participants. They would also be responsible for judging on a "holistic" basis, thus eliminating the need for "experts" and the objective method. By de-emphasizing technique in performance and the rules of technique, it should encourage creativity as it will allow for greater variety of movement on the ice. In allowing the participant to set his own goals for the program, he maintains control over the type of program he wishes to perform. In addition, it allows skaters of various abilities to compete. By eliminating the traditional placement system, the struggle for supremacy is dissipated. This in turn should eliminate the feeling of competing against the other participants. These ideas then, should meet the criteria of the fundamental principles of the counter-culture.
CHAPTER VI

EXECUTION OF THE MODEL PROGRAM

After the establishment in theory of a new format for figure skating, the next logical step was to test it in practice. Ohio State University proved to be a good institution for the trial because for the past eight years it has offered students a series of courses in skating from beginning basic skating through figure skating. In addition, there has been sufficient interest in figure skating to support a student skating club.

A total of eleven students who were members of the Ohio State University Skating Club indicated an interest in participating in the skating competition when approached by the writer. These students were called together, given an explanation of the focus of the program, an explanation of the format of the program, and then given the opportunity to ask questions pertaining to the program in order to clarify or question the format of the event. Once these questions were answered, the students were informed about practice hours, time and date of event, and of the kind of help they would receive relative to their programs.

Six hours per week (for nine weeks) were formally allotted to the skaters. In addition, the students were allowed to skate during
physical education classes provided they did not interfere with the classes. During the formal hours set aside for practice, the writer or assistant were present in order to assist the skaters with their programs. No formal instruction, in the conduct of the study, was given to the students relative to choreographing their programs. The choreography was basically their responsibility in order that the students be involved in the creative process. When problems in choreography did arise and the student wanted assistance, the writer or assistant tried to use a series of questions which might help the skater to arrive at an answer. The students also derived help from each other on occasion. Music selections, number of participants in each program, and choreography were left essentially for the student to determine.

Structurally, the event was kept as flexible as possible. One day prior to the meet, the skaters informally decided the order in which each would appear, discussed the criteria for placement, and were given an hour of ice time to practice their programs. The following day the skaters were given one hour of ice time during which the event was held. Prior to the meet, they were informed that if they so desired they could repeat their entire performance if they thought they could do better and then select the performance they wished to have criticized. It was also recommended that they watch each performer as a "judge" and note comments that they would wish to convey to the performer after the presentation.

The order of appearance followed the schedule which the
students had outlined the previous day. During the program, the following equipment was used in order to record each performance: (1) Sony AV3600 Video-Tape Deck, (2) Sony AV3210 Camera, (3) Sony AVF3200 ViewFinder, and (4) Sony 18" Monitor.

Upon completion of all performances, those who so wished had the opportunity to repeat their program which was video-taped.

**Critique of Performance.** During the presentation of each skater's program (on the ice), all of the contestants viewed the presentations with the idea of critiquing each program. Once the presentation of programs was completed, the skaters were called together for the critiquing phase. During this phase, the performer verbally presented the objectives of his program prior to the video-tape of the program being viewed by the other performers. The taped program was viewed and the viewers were then given the opportunity to critique (through discussion) the program and to assess the degree to which the performer had met his objectives. The skater was then grouped by the other participants using score sheets. (See Appendix B). The scores ranged from 0 to 4 points with 4 being the highest category. This score was given to those who made an "outstanding contribution;" 3 designated "superior" performance; 2 "above average" performance; 1 "average" performance; and 0 "below average" performance. In translating these scores, 4 would be the equivalent of First Class Honors; 3 of Second Class Honors; 2 of Third Class Honors; and 1 of Honorable Mention.

Upon completion of viewing and critiquing all of the
contestants, the score sheets were collected and the scores were tallied by two volunteers. The total for each contestant was tallied and then divided by the total number of critiques in order to arrive at an average score. The average score was then used to determine the placement. Totals of the following amounts determined the placement:

- 3.5 - 4.0 First Class Honors
- 2.5 - 3.4 Second Class Honors
- 1.5 - 2.4 Third Class Honors
- 0.5 - 1.5 Honorable Mention

Once the scores were tallied, the contestants were then verbally informed of the level they reached. They were not ranked nor were they compared with one another.

Assessment of New Model Program by Participants

Upon completion of all phases of the new model competition, it was desirable to have the participants assess the model competition. A questionnaire was distributed to the skaters. (See Appendix C). It was designed to obtain information regarding (1) the skating background of the participants (2) reaction to the cylindrical rather than pyramidal placement system (3) the effect of displacement of competition (4) reaction to the method of judging and (5) overall reaction to the structure of the model competition.

It was mentioned earlier that the majority of university students have not had the experience of skating prior to entering university, and that consequently they are ineligible for organized
skating competitions due to lack of required techniques. The composition of the group of students participating in the model competition reflects this situation. Of the eight skaters only one had extensive training and competitive experience prior to attending university. The amount of total skating experience ranged from five months to thirteen years. This wide range is probably reflective of the range to be expected in any collegiate meet that is totally open. There are always a few skaters who have had pre-college training and experience. It is interesting to note that the problem of designing a framework which would accommodate skaters of such diverse abilities and experience is rather neatly solved in the suggested model. This was done by shifting the emphasis to creativity, originality, and communication rather than allowing only technique to be important. By having the skater choose his own goal, an atmosphere is created which is more self-competitive rather than interpersonal.

The design of this competition does provide opportunities for a much greater number of skaters than the present U.S.F.S.A. format. Only two of the participating students were eligible for U.S.F.S.A. competition of any sort. One of these was eligible only for low dance competition when actually her main interest was in free skating.

The information revealed in the questionnaires indicates that the participants unanimously approved of the placement system.

1 Three did not participate due to injury or illness.
It cannot be determined if this approval is due to the cylindrical effect of the placement system or because the individuals did the judging. If a rank order system had been used with the participants doing the judging, would they still approve unanimously? It is possible that approval might be made simply on the basis of participation alone. For example, if the participant has his say in the judging he may approve any system that is used.

Questions 5, 6, and 7 are related to the effect of the displacement of competition. The answers revealed that the atmosphere of the program was predominantly self-oriented. Six out of the eight participants felt that they were competing against their own abilities; one had no definite feelings of competition at all and the other felt that she was competing against her own abilities and her competitor's abilities. In addition, it appeared as though the atmosphere was not only devoid of hostility but that group identity and co-operation was evident during the practice session and during the competition. For example, during practice sessions the more experienced skaters were often observed helping and encouraging the less experienced skaters. They also helped each other in securing music and cutting tapes for each other's programs. In answering the questionnaire regarding the feeling of animosity toward other competitors, all answered negatively. One participant emphatically answered "Heavens no!!!!" 

During the judging period, the students were asked to verbally critique each performer after viewing the video-taped performance and
also to note briefly on the judging form any comments they wished to make. It was observed that during the formal period allotted to the "judging," relatively few verbal comments were made. However, upon completing the formal judging period, several of the competitors viewed the tapes again and in the more informal atmosphere the students were much more open in their critiques which led to animated discussions on form. When asked if they found the comments of the competitors, during the judging period, to be constructive, six out of seven participants felt the critiques were useful and one felt that they were not. Two of the six felt that not enough comments were made.

In view of the fact that the students were totally inexperienced in the use of this type of critiquing it is to be expected that the process of critiquing might suffer from its novelty. With repetition, the competitors may become more free and expansive in their critiques.

The overall reaction of the students to the structure of the model competition was enthusiastically positive. They were in support of the idea of utilizing this type of program in conjunction with another university. Some suggestion were made relative to future programs and appear in Appendix C.

---

2 One subject did not participate in the judging session due to other time commitments. His critique was solicited at a later date.
As explained previously, the levels of competition within the United States Figure Skating Association are based on a pyramidal placement (1, 2, 3) of advancement through the ranks to the national level of competition. The participants at the international level of competition are chosen as a result of the outcome of national level competitions in various countries. The purpose of this chapter is to apply theoretically the new model to various stages of participation.

Organization of University Competitions

It is necessary that there be only minimal amounts of organization and that only those individuals involved in this organization participate. The organization exists for the participants rather than the reverse. Hopefully, they will benefit from the organization and use it to their advantage rather than being used by it. The ideal situation would be to have all participants from each school present in order to formulate the structure of the program. If this is impossible, a representative system could be used. The following hypothetical suggestions would be made to the participants
in order to have a starting point.

It is possible to have three kinds of performance levels: international, national, and intranational. We will discuss each individually.

Intranational Level. This type of event would exist when any two or more universities (within a given country) met in order to present the programs of the various participants. It must be remembered that, in the context of which we are speaking, the traditional competitive situation does not exist. It is not university A vs. university B or contestant A vs. contestant B. Rather, it is individuals participating with other individuals and sharing a common experience. Under these conditions there would naturally not be any "team competition" nor special recognition for and "outstanding team" as teams per se would not exist—only individuals who happen to be from different locales with a common interest.

Structurally, there would be no breakdown of sections within the country so that only certain universities are brought together but rather a great deal of flexibility would be maintained. It is suggested that a university invite others to participate with them in a program to demonstrate skilled performance. This could be done as often as any group desired. The fundamental purposes of these contests would be to generate new ideas in skating to further the creative possibilities of the sport and to give students a chance to interact with others who have similar interests and goals. It is
believed that by co-operating and working with students in other groups, new ideas about skating can be transferred and generated.

At this point, one may begin to question the feasibility of this kind of meet when large numbers are involved. Because this problem may develop at the National and International levels of competition, a section of this discussion has been devoted to it below.

It is suggested that at this level the participants from the "home" school act as hosts. With this type of scheduling, each group can make decisions which are best suited for them as a number of these kinds of decisions will be based on external factors such as those related to the economic situation and geographical locale of the university.

National Level. A national meet may be held once every year, preferably in the spring so that relatively new skaters could be able to participate also. At the first organizational meeting (discussed earlier) it would be desirable to decide upon a place and time at which a national meet could be held. If more than one university volunteered to host the meet, a draw could be held to decide upon the place. The university selected could then make a decision as to the time which would hopefully meet with the agreement of the other participants.

In order to have continuity, it is suggested that after each national meet, the same procedure for selecting a time and place for the following year's competition be made. It is also suggested that no
university have the opportunity to host a second national meet until all of the universities who so desire, have the chance to hold a national meet.

Along with making decisions relative to time and place of each successive national competition, it would also be desirable for the participants to meet in order to discuss changes in the structure of the organization or in the competitions themselves. The purpose of this is to keep the structure flexible in order to fit the desires of the participants and to accommodate changed wishes from year to year. If the number of participants became so large that communications became difficult, it would be desirable to have only one student representative from each university present at the meetings. Changes in structure could be discussed and voted upon and then communicated to the other participants for approval.

There would be no pre-requisite for participating. This is contrary to the present practice of having to place at a certain level in competition in order to progress to a national meet. The only pre-requisite is the desire and ability to participate and to be a university student. Participants from other organizations would be permitted to enter provided they are university students.

It is hoped that the university organization would remain autonomous rather than joining any other organization. The reason for this is that external decisions made by another body would not have any control over the organization. With this type of autonomy, the organization could exist to serve the members. The proposed
flexibility built into the organization enhances continual change and, therefore, it is most desirous to have autonomy.

Another important aspect to consider is that the participants alone would control the organization. No other athletic organization is so controlled. The A.A.U., N.C.A.A., or D.G.W.S., all function in the traditional hierarchical manner. The participants often become the pawns of a situation in which they have no control. For example, the various battles of the N.C.A.A. and A.A.U. provide glaring evidence in which the participants are the losers because the individuals within the hierarchy of the two groups are fighting to establish their own empires. This is a classic example of an athletic organization having complete control over the participants rather than the participants having control over the organization.

International Competition. At the level of international competition, the Federation International Du Sport Universitaires (F.I.S.U., begun in 1948) exists in order to facilitate athletic competition for university students. The major objective of the F.I.S.U. is the "...promotion of major international athletic events among university students from all over the world, with the hope of increasing international understanding through wholesome athletic competition." The U.S.A. affiliate is the United States Collegiate Sports Council (U.S.C.S.C.). There are approximately 1400 member colleges. Both the summer and winter games have been held biennially since 1960.

1Federation International Du Sport Universitaires Charter.
In addition to the games, cultural programs and symposia on physical education and athletics for coaches and doctors are an integral part of the F.I.S.U. program. This organization appears to offer the best situation for university figure skaters in terms of international schedules. Unfortunately, this organization possesses the typical hierarchical structure. Figure skating is controlled by the International Skating Union of which the U.S.F.S.A. is an affiliate member. Because of this control, it allows access to U.S.F.S.A. members only. This is unfortunate because U.S.F.S.A. members already have access to three international competitions: the Olympics, World Figure Skating Championships, and the Kennedy International Memorial Winter Games. The situation offers two alternatives: (1) infiltrate the F.I.S.U. structure or (2) establish an international competition for university skaters without affiliating with the F.I.S.U.

No matter which alternative is selected, the first step is to establish a national competition, once an agreed upon format is established, in order to test the structure and to resolve difficulties. If such a structure is highly feasible, a course of action relative to international competition can be initiated and determined by the participants at the national level if they so desire.

Competition with Large Numbers. In the trial model, only eight students participated. However, it is possible that twenty students could easily have participated on the ice within the hour. It is not unreasonable to assume that the actual performances of
twenty people could take place within one hour and that judging such a session would be quite feasible. However, it may not be wise to attempt to accommodate greater numbers that these. If for example there were 400 competitors at the national level, we would have twenty groups of twenty people each. The assignment of people to groups could be completed simply by drawing names. It may be preferable to have only one person from a specific university in a group in order to keep the groups heterogeneous, the hope being that heterogeneity will stimulate a greater variety of responses to each performance.

Each group would be allotted two hours for the critique session. In order to facilitate maximum use of facilities it would be best to have one group on the ice with two other groups, in separate areas, involved in their critique session. By rotating the groups and using the facilities efficiently, the competition would be completed in two days. Each competitor could view all of the other performances, if he so desired, with the exception of the two hours he would spend during the judging session. Because the performances would be on video-tape, the participant could view those he missed. It is realized, however, that a certain dimension is lost when one does not see the original performance.

Discussion

If we consider the new model's process and administration in the framework of traditional thought regarding competition, its success
may be difficult to visualize. Reich's "Consciousness I" individuals may be characterized as comprising those individuals involved in self-interest, competitiveness, and suspicion of others. These people believe that the "American Dream" is still possible and that success is determined by hard work, morality, character, and self denial. They do not believe that organizations predominate over individuals or that social problems are due to something other than bad character. The "Consciousness II" archetype adheres to the logic of objectivity and machinery. He believes in accepting the priority of institutions, society, and organizations and ties his destiny to those things larger than himself. He adopts as his personal values what the organization defines as success and therefore adopts the goals set for him.

Consciousness I and Consciousness II archetypes would readily accept what we have called traditional competition. Its administration and process mirrors and reinforces the goals and values of their society. They would find it difficult to visualize the success of the proposed model. Their concerns might revolve around a lack of specific rules, lack of good criteria for quantification of performance, lack of "experts" to do the judging, lack of a hierarchy, and lack of the possibility of being the best as this would not exist.

Whether or not this type of meet would be successful is unknown at the present time. However, it does provide an alternative. It is different from other athletic systems because the performers
control all elements of the organization. When this happens on the athletic scene, we will have a real change in athletics. The changes will not be on a superficial level, such as modification of rules and eligibility. But the change will be at the structural level which in turn may change the whole concept of competition.
The purpose of this thesis was to examine the characteristics of the counter-culture in terms of its criticisms of contemporary culture. The central themes of these criticisms were extrapolated and applied to competitive athletics with special reference to figure skating. Based on this, an alternative method of competition for figure skating was postulated.

To develop this thesis, an examination of the characteristics of the counter culture and its relationship to society was necessary. Because no definitive work can be cited as the position of this sub-culture, it was necessary to examine many current literary works related to this subject. Then it was necessary to synthesize the material in order to arrive at a central theme.

The theme revealed deals with the inability of the individual to control his own life and destiny due to external forces over which he has no direct access and control. It should be realized that this theme is an interpretation made by the author based on the literature cited here.

Upon selecting a central theme, the ramifications of it were explored to suggest an overview of society as viewed by the
counter-culture. The technocratic society and its methodology was viewed as the primary cause for the existing state of personal powerlessness. It was then suggested that the primary defense used to thwart domination by technocracy is the individual worth of all human beings on a non-comparative basis. The ramifications of this does not allow for the development of the structure of technocracy to survive in any given institution because this would bring about the dissolution of the hierarchical structure.

The implications of the theoretical counter-culture critique were applied to the institution of competitive athletics and then to a specific form of competitive sport, namely figure skating. As a consequence of the counter-culture oriented, critical look at current practices and philosophy in figure skating, an alternative form of participation was suggested. The alternative form used some of the basic premises of the counter-culture to establish a framework in which these ideas might operate. Although the model was designed to reflect some of the goals and values of the counter-culture, it was not meant to attract only those individuals who are part of the counter-culture.

A trial event was conducted along with an evaluation of student response. A framework was then suggested for the possibility of broadening the scope of participation. Students who participated in the model were not members of any one cultural group.

The format used in the trial event appeared to foster group identity. The students appeared to enjoy both preparing for the
performance and the event itself. Judging of the performers was conducted by all of the participants. The skaters expressed approval of this technique. Exactly why they approved of the system is unclear. They may have approved of any system in which they did the judging.

The students were not adept at verbally critiquing each other. This may have been due to the formal atmosphere. It was noted that after the formal judging period, the skaters were much less inhibited in critiquing each other. It must also be realized that the experience was new to them and probably suffered because of its novelty. If the student is provided with more opportunities for this type of action, his ability to respond in this situation may be enhanced.

The placement system eliminated the traditional first, second, and third place form of reward. Instead, a system of categorizing the individuals into four groups was used. This was done by deciding whether or not a performer had reached his own goals. The performers approved of the placement system because it was possible for all to reach the highest classification regardless of the amount of time a person had been skating. In addition, they did not feel as if they were competing against other individuals in the group. Because of this they did not feel any great amount of pressure to perform. This may have come about because there was no "winner."

The group clearly displayed co-operation and gave encouragement to others both in preparing for and during the performances.
This suggests that the structure of the event was, at least, in part responsible for the atmosphere. However, one cannot rule out the possibility that the particular interactions of this particular group may have taken place under any conditions.

It does appear as though some of the basic goals of the counter-culture can be brought about within the framework offered by this model. The basic worth of each individual was accepted and it was reported that there was no feeling of competing against the other individuals. The students controlled the competition administratively and in the judging. Therefore, they were able to have direct access to the rules. When these conditions are met, we then have an alternative to the traditional competitive situation.

It may be argued that competitive athletics is not "reality" and because of this, what the counter-culture has postulated should not be applied to it. But this thesis has shown that athletics holds the same values and goals as the technological society, and "reality." It helps produce individuals who will accept these goals and values. Techniques which are used in both participation and administration of athletics follow the same patterns as those of the current society. Sanctions and rewards are given to those who are most successful.

In this case, sport mirrors the culture and reinforces its goals, values, and emphases on technique. Because many people regard sport as being more play-like rather than life-like, the nature of this reinforcement escapes their attention. Reich points out:

"Competition, within the limits of a sport like tennis or swimming is accepted for its own pleasure, although even
as athletes III's are far less competitive (and sometimes, but not always, poorer athletes as a result). But III's do not compete "in real life."¹

It well may be that the counter-culture believes athletics not to be "real life." This would explain their failure to realize the "programming" process of sport which runs contrary to their beliefs about the "real world."

As a result of the conclusions reached in this thesis, future investigations may fall into three categories:

1. The individuals who participated in the trial competition were not of a particular sub-culture (e.g. they were not all members of the counter-culture). It would be informative to examine the reactions of individuals within different sub-groups to this kind of competition.

2. Possible variations of the model and the reaction to these variations may determine which would best achieve certain outcomes. For example, the traditional form of placement system could be used with the competitors making the judgment or there could be no placement system utilized at all.

3. Utilize the basic framework and goals of this model and apply it to other athletic activities.

The alternative to traditional competition presented here does not attempt to provide a single answer to problems confronting the competitive sport of figure skating. The primary purpose has been to present only one of a number of possible alternatives which

¹Reich, op. cit., p. 242.
may have appeal to some who participate in figure skating. In our present day complex society, it appears as though alternatives to traditional activities will be necessary in the future in order to accommodate diverse groups within the culture. This thesis is an attempt to offer one such avenue.
APPENDIX A

UNITED STATES FIGURE SKATING ASSOCIATION FIGURES
CIRCLE EIGHT

Description | Test
---|---
rfo, lfo | 1
rfi, lfi | 1
rbo, lbo | 1
rbi, lbi | 2

SERPENTINE

Description | Test
---|---
rfoi, lfio | 1
lfci, rfio | 1
rboi, lbio | 2
lboi, rbio | 2

b = backward
f = forward
i = inside
l = left
c = outside
r = right
THREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rfo, lfo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rfo, lbi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfo, rbi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rfi, lbo</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfi, rbo</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DOUBLE THREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rfo, lfo</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rfi, lfi</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rbo, lbo</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rbi, lbi</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rfo, lfo</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rfi, lfi</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rbo, lbo</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rbi, lbi</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BRACKET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rfo, lbi</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfo, rbi</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rfi, lbo</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfi, rbo</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rfo, lbo</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfo, rbo</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rfi, lbi</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfi, rbi</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTER</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rfo, lob</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfo, rbo</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rfi, lbi</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfi, rbi</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ONE FOOT EIGHT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rfoi, lfoi</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfoi, rfio</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rboi, lbio</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lboi, rbio</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHANGE THREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rfoi, lboi</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfoi, rboi</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rfio, lbio</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfio, rbio</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHANGE DOUBLE THREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rfoi, lfio</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfoi, rfio</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rboi, lbio</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lboi, rboi</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHANGE LOOP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rfoi, lfio</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfoi, rfio</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rboi, lbio</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lboi, rboi</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Change Bracket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rfoi, lboi</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfoi, rboi</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rfio, lbio</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfio, rbio</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paragraph Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rfo, lfi</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfo, rfi</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rbo, lbi</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lbo, rbi</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARAGRAPH DOUBLE THREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rfo, lfi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfo, rfi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rbo, lbi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lbo, rbi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARAGRAPH LOOP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rfo, lfi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfo, rfi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rbo, lbi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lbo, rbi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARAGRAPH BRACKET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rfo, lfi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfo, rfi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rbo, lbi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lbo, rbi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

SCORE SHEET AND SCORING ANALYSIS
### Score Sheet Used in Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honor Type</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Class Honors</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Class Honors</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Class Honors</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorable Mention</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E+H(^1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\text{E+H = pair participants}\)
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESPONSES

Assessment Questionnaire

Skating Background of Participants

Evaluation of Structure of Model

Comments of Participants
1. Had you skated prior to entering university? If yes, how much?

2. Are you presently eligible to compete in U.S.F.S.A. competitions? If yes, at what level?

3. Have you ever competed in U.S.F.S.A. competitions? If yes, at what level and age? When was the last time you competed?

4. In assessing this competition, did you like or dislike the placement system? Why? Would you rather have an alternative system? What?

5. Did you feel you were competing against the other competitors or against your own ability?

6. During practice sessions and during the competition, did you feel any sort of animosity, relative to skating, directed toward you or by you for the other competitors?

7. Were the other competitors helpful (if you wanted help) to you during the practice sessions held prior to the competition?

8. Did you find the comments of the competitors during the judging period to be constructive? Do you like or dislike the idea of the participants being the judges?

9. Have you any suggestions for improving the rules, regulations, structure, etc., of this type of competition?

10. Would you recommend trying this competition with other schools competing?

11. Any other comments or recommendations?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skt. exp. prior to univ.</td>
<td>A: 9 yrs., B: 0, C: 0, D: 0, E: 0, F: 0, G: 0, H: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total skating experience</td>
<td>13 yrs., 7 yrs., 3 yrs., 1 1/2 yrs., 9 mo., 9 mo., 6 mo., 5 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility to compete</td>
<td>A: Yes, B: Yes, C: No, D: No, E: No, F: No, G: No, H: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of eligibility</td>
<td>A: JM1, B: ED2, C: -, D: -, E: -, F: -, G: -, H: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you competed USFSA</td>
<td>A: Yes, B: No, C: -, D: -, E: -, F: -, G: -, H: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last USFSA competition</td>
<td>A: 1968, B: -, C: -, D: -, E: -, F: -, G: -, H: -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Junior Men
2Bronze Dance
3Novice Men
TABLE 4

EVALUATION OF STRUCTURE OF MODEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval-disapproval of placement system</td>
<td>Approve 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of judging criticism</td>
<td>Dissaprove 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval-disapproval of meet format</td>
<td>Approve 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate with other universities</td>
<td>Dissaprove 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) compete against self or compete against others</td>
<td>Self 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) display of animosity among participants</td>
<td>Others 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) other participants helpful</td>
<td>No 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1One participant absent
2One student undecided. One student competed against self and others.
COMMENTS OF PARTICIPANTS

With regard to the final question regarding comments or recommendations, the subject's responses naturally varied.

Subject A. As stated earlier, this subject had previous experience in U.S.F.S.A. figure skating competitions and it is interesting to note that he expressed a very affirmative reaction to the competition's structure particularly because "...there was no pressure on you."

Subject B. This student suggested the possibility of breaking down the critiquing into three areas (1) achievement of goal (2) technical merit and (3) artistic merit. Each area would then be given equal weight in the final judging. This subject felt that the critiques were not of much use but if they were broken down as above it would give the competitors something specific to look for. She also suggested that competing with students from other schools might help to stimulate critiques.

Subject D. Expressed the competition as "...a great experience" and liked the way the students were judged "...all of us could judge each other fairly since we worked together and helped each other throughout the quarter."

Subject E. This subject suggested having at least two competitions per year and also expressed agreement for the cylindrical effect in the placement system because "...then the people that have the least experience don't have to compete against someone who
is really good."

**Subject F.** This student stated that, "I loved every minute of it!!!" Although she approved of the judging system, she did not personally feel qualified to judge. This was the only student who felt she was not "qualified" to judge.

**Subject H.** In regard to the cylindrical placement system, this student stated "... this system did not place the competitors at levels; it provided for skaters at all levels to be judged equally."
BIBLIOGRAPHY
BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS


Boeckl, Willy. *How to Judge Figure Skating*. Lake Placid: W. Boeckl, 1940.


Brown, George H. *A Handbook of Figure Skating*. Springfield, Mass.: Barney and Barry, 1900.


———. *Figure Skating*. Boston, Mass.: Percy Mason and Company, 1892.

———. *The International Style of Figure Skating*. Springfield, Mass.: Barney and Barry, 1904.


Lindsay, Sally. *Figure Skating*. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963.

Lussi, Gustave and Richards, Maurice. *Championship Figure Skating*. New York: A. S. Barnes and Co., 1951.


———. *Figure and Fancy Skating*. London: Bliss, Sans A. Foster, 1895.


Phillips, George D. *Figure Skating*. Worcester: The Samuel Winslow Skate Manufacturing Co., 1897.


Schafer, Karl and Feix, Gustav. *Living Pictures of My Figure Skating Compulsory Figures, Technical Notes.* Vienna: Carl Dravani, 1937.


B. INTERVIEWS

Clement, Annie. Judge, National Aquatic Arts and A.A.U., December 18, 1971, Bowling Green, Ohio.

House, Marylin. U.S.F.S.A. Competitor, National Silver Dance Title Holder, Columbus, Ohio.

C. PERIODICALS


