

1913 331

# The RIPOSTE

J  
U  
N  
E  
  
V  
O  
L.  
4  
  
N  
O.  
4



of The  
We  
all the  
ly col-  
at day  
r. She  
sports.  
much  
bles up  
er re-  
nt and  
and as  
olated  
ng fun.  
for a

e one.  
a good  
grow  
men in  
opposi-  
omen's  
riggles  
have  
ne day  
thank  
ion of  
nd the  
es our  
e ideal  
short  
ned at  
after  
F.L.A.  
than  
odified  
nce in  
nce in

s has  
nitely  
n girl.  
anfor-  
sports  
ted in  
efore,  
t one  
sider-  
n eye  
ed to  
f the  
e the  
m to  
ously.  
ilder.  
who  
p the  
mus-

you

**GEORGE SANTELLI WISHES TO ANNOUNCE**

The Opening of his new

**SALLE SANTELLI**

**24-34 University Place, New York City**

(1 Block East of 5th Avenue at 9th Street)

•

Special Summer Classes For Beginning  
and Advanced Fencers

•

Limbering, Reducing and Stretching Classes and Ortho-  
pedic Gymnastics by the Renowned Hydrotherapist,  
**ALEXANDER NAGY** of Budapest, formerly with  
the Saint Gallert hydrotherapeutic cure estab-  
lishment in Budapest.

## FIRST ALL EASTERN CHAMPIONSHIPS

**Dow, Armitage, Lewis and Mrs. Vokral Win Foil**

New York City took 23 of its foilsmen on April 30th, mixed them together and drew off 8 to represent that city in the All Eastern and National Championships. They were John R. Huffman, Ralph E. Marson, Nathaniel Lubell, Daniel Bukantz, Norman Lewis, Warren Dow, Silvio Giolito and Peter O'Connor. Three weeks later these eight were joined by 12 other qualifiers from the Divisions and again the weeding out process began. The eight survivors of this competition entered the Finals on May 24th at the Fencers Club.

As we review the final eight of Dow, Alessandrini, Levis, Bukantz, Lewis, Lubell, Steere and Giolito we see a very compact group of hard competitors. The failure of Jose or Miguel de Capriles, Diaz Cetrulo, Ralph Marson, Philip Shakespeare or Harry Kinnard to make the Finals becomes more understandable for any let down with these eight meant elimination. Had Dernel Every or John Huffman, the No. 1 and No. 6 ranking foilsman been able to compete the 8 Finalists would probably have been forced to include them. Which of the eight would have bowed remains a mystery.

Warren Dow, throughout the entire three rounds of the Championship, lost only one bout and that bout, surprisingly enough, was lost to a relatively inexperienced young fencer from Harvard University. The stronger his opponent the better his score seemed to be. Two of the three times he was forced to 4-4 scores were at the hands of Norman Lewis, his only team mate in the Finals. A scrappy contestant with a well rounded and sound game, Dow has shown greater improvement than any other foilsman during the current season.

Trailing closely behind Dow were Alessandrini and Joseph Levis whose placing as medalists was no mystery. Redoubtable competitors over the past ten years, the surprising thing is perhaps that Levis placed as high as he did. This was his first 1939 appearance in National type competition and he could hardly have been expected to maintain top form in foil without constant top-flight experience. Nevertheless he did repeat his 1938 National position, an unusual performance.

### Summary of the Foil Finals.—Fencers Club, May 24th.

Warren Dow (Salle Sante'i) defeated Bukantz 5-2, Levis 5-2, Alessandrini 5-2, Lewis 5-4, Lubell 5-2 and Steere 5-4.  
 Hugh Alessandrini (Fencers Club) defeated Bukantz 5-3, Levis 5-3, Lewis 5-2, Lubell 5-3 and Steere 5-3.  
 Joseph Levis (Salle Peroy, Boston, Mass.) defeated Bukantz 5-1, Lubell 5-1 and Steere 5-3. (20 touches against)  
 Daniel Bukantz (Salle D'Armes Vince) defeated Lewis 5-4, Lubell 5-4 and Steere 5-0. (23 touches against)  
 Norman Lewis (Salle Santelli) defeated Levis 5-4 and Steere 5-1.  
 Nathaniel Lubell (Salle D'Armes Vince) defeated Lewis 5-3 and Steere 5-4.  
 Lieut. Richard Steere (U.S. Navy) lost all bouts fenced.  
 Silvio Giolito (N.Y.C.) defeated all bouts.

### Sabre

A weird collection of foilsman and epeeists and a few legitimate sabremen, 21 in all, assembled on May 21st to qualify 8 sabremen from New York into

(Continued on page 6)

## MID WEST CHAMPIONSHIPS

There were 75 entries out of a possible 80 in the four events which made up the Mid West Championships this year. Michigan, Illinois and Northern Ohio had full entries, four in each event, a total of 16. Columbus had 15 and St. Louis had 12. An Individual Championship was held in Women's Foil and Men's Foil, Sabre and Epee. For the team scores, the total bouts won by the two top-scoring fencers from each Division in each round of each event were counted.

These Championships were all held on April 10th in the new Gymnasium of Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio. President Harold Van Buskirk of the A.F.L.A. went to Columbus to act as Director of Bouts in the Men's Championships. Wallace Goldsmith of Cleveland and New York acted as Director in the Women's Foil Finals.

### Final Results:

- Men's Individual Foil**
  1. Frank S. Righheimer, Jr. (Illinois)
  2. Robert Fickell (Columbus)
  3. Douglas Deppe (Northern Ohio)
- Men's Individual Epee**
  1. Loyal Tingley (Illinois)
  2. Robert Fickell (Columbus)
  3. Frank S. Righheimer, Jr. (Illinois)
- Men's Individual Sabre**
  1. William Osis (Michigan)
  2. Carl Hamisch (Michigan)
  3. Edward Gustafson (Illinois)
- Women's Individual Foil**
  1. Carol King (Illinois)
  2. Mrs. Gerda Michels (Michigan)
  3. Cornelia Sanger (Michigan)
- Team Scores**
  1. Illinois — 50
  2. Michigan — 40
  3. Columbus — 27
  4. Northern Ohio — 20
  5. St. Louis — 18

College, repeating its victory of the year before. It made a clean sweep in all three weapons by piling up the high team score in foil, sabre and epee for a total of 101 points toward a naturally undisputed first place in the three-weapon total. Fourteen teams participated with a total of 106 competitors.

## PACIFIC COAST CHAMPIONSHIPS

The Pacific Coast Championships were held at Treasure Island, Golden Gate International Exposition, San Francisco, Calif. on April 14th through April 16th. The results of the several competitions were as follows:

- Foil Team:** 1. The Olympic Club (Ferard Leicester, Harry Mortimer and Alfred R. Snyder) defeated 2. Los Angeles Athletic Club (Edward Carfagno, Duris de Jong and Herman Hersum) 5-4.
- Open Foil:** 1. Edward Carfagno, L.A.A.C., 2. Alfred R. Snyder, Olympic Club, 3. DeLoss McGraw, Unattached.
- Intermediate Foil:** 1. Harry Mortimer, Olympic Club, 2. DeLoss McGraw, Unattached, 3. Arthur Kaye, Faulkner School of Fencing.
- Junior Foil:** 1. Sydney Getzowitz, Faulkner School of Fencing, 2. Robert Irwin, Faulkner School of Fencing, 3. Wayland Gilbert, L.A.A.C.
- Novice Foil:** 1. Kermit R. Schweidel, Funke Fencing Academy, 2. Robert Irwin, Faulkner School of Fencing, 3. Belan Wagner, Santa Barbara State College.
- Epee Team:** 1. Los Angeles Athletic Club (Fred Linkmeyer, Duris De Jong and Edward Carfagno) defeated 2. Funke Fencing Academy (Richard Mercer, Harold Rives and William G. F. O'Brien) 5-0.
- Open Epee:** 1. John L. Thompson, Olympic Club, 2. Harold Corbin, Hollywood A.C., 3. Harry Mortimer, Olympic Club.
- Intermediate Epee:** 1. DeLoss McGraw, Unattached, 2. Harry Mortimer, Olympic Club, 3. Robert Irwin, Faulkner School of Fencing.
- Junior Epee:** 1. Wayland Gilbert, L.A.A.C., 2. Weston Irwin, L.A.A.C., 3. Salvatore Giambra, G.G.I.A.

(Continued on page 3)

## THE RIPOSTE

America's Oldest Fencing Magazine

114 Washington Place, N. Y. City

Jose R. de Capriles ..... Founder

Dernell Every ..... Editor

Warren A. Dow ..... Business Manager

Miguel A. de Capriles ..... Technical Advisor

Barbara L. Cochran ..... Circulation Manager

## Contributing Staff

George H. Breed ..... Foreign Correspondent

Frank S. Righeimer, Jr. .... Illinois

A. A. Hurwitz ..... Maryland

William J. Hammond ..... Michigan

Ferdinand Uebel ..... Minnesota

Earle Goodrich Lee ..... Minnesota

Alan Beck ..... Missouri

Royall H. Snow ..... Ohio

Richard F. Warren ..... Philadelphia

Ferard Leicester ..... San Francisco

## Subscription Rates

6 Issues — \$1.00

12 Issues — \$2.00

The Editors and Publishers do not necessarily endorse the opinions or statements offered in this magazine, or the claims made in the advertisements.

## CONTENTS

All Eastern Championships .....	Page 1
Mid West Championships .....	Page 1
Pacific Coast Championships .....	Page 1
Editorial .....	Page 2
The National Championships .....	Page 2
Women's Intercollegiate Championships .....	Page 3
Michigan News .....	Page 3
How to Compete in a Foil Competition .....	Page 4
Maryland News .....	Page 7
Fencing Personalities .....	Page 7
Long Island News .....	Page 7
A.F.L.A. Competitions in N.Y.C. ....	Page 8
Ohio News .....	Page 9
The Scimitar .....	Page 9
More About the Italian Foil .....	Page 10
The Remise .....	Page 11

## EDITORIAL

An occurrence probably unique in the history of magazine publication will take place during the current month. The entire Editorial Staff, the five top names in the column at the left, will pack up and leave New York City, travel 3,200 miles to San Francisco, enter the National Championships on Treasure Island at the Golden Gate International Exposition and return to resume their Editorial work as before. In other words, all of the Editors of the magazine will take their vacations at the same time and together, doing what they like most to do — fencing.

\* \* \* \*

Look for our next issue which will be published late in July. It will contain complete details of the 1939 National Championships. It will also introduce a new series of articles on epee written especially for this magazine by Lieutenant Philip C. Wehle, U. S. Army.

\* \* \* \*

We wish at this time to clear up a misunderstanding concerning our publishing dates. We publish each issue when the following three requirements have been fulfilled: when we have assembled enough fencing news to make up an interesting issue, when the Editors have found sufficient time outside of their business and fencing activities to write the necessary news stories and articles and when enough money has been assembled to meet the printer's bill. Despite intentions to the contrary, the Riposte is not a monthly magazine. That is why we sell our subscriptions on the basis of number of issues to be received rather than by the year or half year. Actually our publishing dates average about once every six weeks.

Since every penny we receive goes back into the magazine, we cannot help but feel that we are giving full value to our subscribers. That they may think so too is confirmed by the fact that 95% of our subscribers renew their subscriptions at expiration. As magazines go, this is a perfect record and the Editors gratefully appreciate the support the fencers have given their modest enterprise.

The National Championships as previously announced, will be held in the Auditorium, Treasure Island, Golden Gate International Exposition, San Francisco, Calif.

The Schedule by weapons is as follows:

Monday, June 26th — Men's Foil — Teams.  
 Tuesday, June 27th — Men's Foil — Individuals.  
 Wednesday, June 28th — Women's Foil —  
 Individuals.  
 Thursday, June 29th — Men's Epee — Teams.  
 Friday, June 30th — Men's Epee — Individuals.  
 Saturday, July 1st, Men's Sabre — Teams.  
 Sunday, July 2nd — Men's Sabre — Individuals.

## WOMEN'S INTERCOLLEGIATE CHAMPIONSHIPS

With eight teams entered, the largest in the history of the tournament, Hofstra College emerged the undefeated victor in the team championship, while its captain, Helena Mrockowska, won the Individual Championship with only one defeat in 23 bouts. Beryl Petchesky of New York University took second place, being the only girl to defeat the new champion throughout the long day of competition. Elizabeth Bruskin of Brooklyn College took third place on a one touch advantage over Maria Cerra of Hunter College, the defending champion. New York University, the defending Team Champion, took second losing only to the Hofstra College team. Hunter College, the 1937 champion, took third, losing only to Hofstra and N.Y.U.

With every bout counting toward both the Individual and Team scores, it was necessary to complete all matches in the round robin. As a result every girl had to fence 23 bouts which made the fencing last from 10 A.M. to 10 P.M. with time out only for lunch and dinner.

Hofstra College and N.Y.U. had well balanced Teams. Hunter College did unusually well with only one veteran and three less experienced fencers but here again it showed that experience is a so important factor in fencing competition. Brooklyn College was definitely a one-girl team. The other colleges showed weakness through the lack of competitive experience and relative newness to the sport.

The last match of the evening between Hofstra College and Hunter College was packed with drama. After the lead had see-sawed back and forth, the score in bouts was 3-3 with Helena Mrockowska of Hofstra to meet Maria Cerra of Hunter in the last bout for each. A win for Helena here would give her the individual title, while Maria, the defending champion, needed that bout to enter a three way tie for first place. The Hofstra captain jumped into the lead and kept it throughout to win the bout 4-2. Dorothy Wahl of Hofstra then defeated her opponent 4-1 to clinch Hofstra's first Intercollegiate Team Championship.

**COMMENTS:** Brooklyn College deserves congratulations for the excellent arrangements for the fencing. The girls must also be congratulated for their fine spirit and camaraderie. Despite the long, hard fencing session they were in jovial mood at dinner (each girl had fenced 20 bouts by that time). The various college groups were seated together at the long horseshoe table, each group singing its alma mater in turn. The Directors and Judges, not to be outdone, sang their theme song, "Three Blind Mice".

### Summaries and Final Standing

Hofstra College defeated Jersey Teachers College 7-2, Cornell 5-4, Wagner 8-1, College of William & Mary 6-3, Brooklyn College 6-3, N.Y.U. 5-4 and Hunter 5-4.  
 N.Y.U. defeated Jersey City Teachers College 7-2, Brooklyn College 6-3, Hunter 5-4, College of William & Mary 8-1, Wagner College 7-2, and Cornell 6-3.  
 Hunter College defeated Cornell 5-4, Wagner College 6-3, Jersey City Teachers College 8-1, College of William & Mary 7-2 and Brooklyn College 6-3.  
 Brooklyn College defeated Wagner College 7-2, Jersey City Teachers College 8-1, Cornell 7-2.  
 Cornell defeated College of William & Mary 5-4, Jersey City Teachers College 8-1 and Wagner College 7-2.  
 College of William & Mary defeated Brooklyn College 6-3, and Jersey City Teachers College 6-3.  
 Wagner College defeated College of William & Mary 5-4 and

### Individual Championship, (First Ten)

	Won	Lost
Helena Mrockowska (Hofstra College)	22	1
Beryl Petchesky (N. Y. U.)	21	2

Elizabeth Bruskin (Brooklyn College)	20	3
Maria Cerra (Hunter College)	20	8
Josephine Mancinelli (N. Y. U.)	17	6
Dorothy Wahl (Hofstra College)	14	9
Geraldine Mason (Cornell)	14	9
Constance Eberhardt (Cornell)	13	10
Elaine Klepfer (Brooklyn College)	12	10
Doris Locke (William & Mary)	12	11

### Pacific Coast Championship (Continued)

**Novice Epee:** 1. Belan Wagner, Santa Barbara State College, 2. Weston Irwin, L.A.A.C., 3. Kermit R. Schweidel, Funke Fencing Academy.

**Saber Team:** 1. Los Angeles Athletic Club (Edward Carfagno, Duris De Jong and Taro Mori) defeated 2. Olympic Club (Ferard Leicester, Harry Mortimer and Victor Arnautoff) 5-0.

**Open Sabre:** 1. Edward Carfagno, L.A.A.C., 2. Kermit R. Schweidel, Funke Fencing Academy, 3. Ferard Leicester, Olympic Club.

**Intermediate Sabre:** 1. Kermit R. Schweidel, Funke Fencing Academy, 2. Ned Davenport, Faulkner School of Fencing, 3. Leonard Bellman, Faulkner School of Fencing.

**Junior Sabre:** 1. Salvatore Giambra, G.G.I.A., 2. Herman Hersum, L.A.A.C., 3. Lawrence Bocci, G.G.I.A.

**Novice Sabre:** 1. Belan Wagner, Santa Barbara State College, 2. Robert Irwin, Faulkner School of Fencing, 3. Evo Luporini, G.G.I.A.

**Women's Foil Team:** 1. Unattached Team (Helene Mayer, Roberta Fritz and Elizabeth Hankey) defeated 2. Los Angeles Athletic Club (Louise Reordan, Muriel Calkins and Marjorie Kumler) 5-3.

**Women's Open Foil:** 1. Helene Mayer, Unattached, 2. Moreene Fitz, The Cavaliers, 3. Irene Chaves, Faulkner School of Fencing.

**Women's Intermediate Foil:** 1. Louise Reordan, L.A.A.C., 2. Bette Powers, Faulkner School of Fencing, 3. Roberta Fritz, Unattached.

**Women's Junior Foil:** 1. Maxine McMasters, The Cavaliers, 2. Moreene Fitz, The Cavaliers, 3. Betty Jane Nevis, Funke Fencing Academy.

**Women's Novice Foil:** 1. Maxine McMasters, The Cavaliers, Marian Washko, Faulkner School of Fencing, 3. Helen Sander, Funke Fencing Academy.

## MICHIGAN

A full report of the fencing season in Michigan now permits us to supply the names of the winners of all competitions not reported in our April-May issue. Figures in parenthesis indicate number of entries.

**Women's Prep.** — December 11th (3) — 1. Paula Sweeney, 2. Bette Fisher, 3. Betty Parks.

**Women's Novice** — Jan. 15th (5) — 1. Paula Sweeney, 2. Lucy Dale, 3. Betty Parks.

**Women's Junior** — Feb. 5th (6) — 1. Mrs. Charlotte Finch, 2. Paula Sweeney, 3. Lucy Dale.

**Men's Prep. Foil** — Dec. 11th (8) — 1. Richard B. Watson, 2. Gregory Flynn, 3. David Eddy.

**Men's Novice Foil** — Jan. 8th (13) — 1. Wm. Osis, 2. Dave Logan, 3. David D. Merriman.

**Men's Novice Sabre** — Jan. 8th (8) — 1. Wm. Osis, 2. Dave Logan, 3. John Spitzer.

**Men's Novice Epee** — Jan. 8th (9) — 1. Wm. Osis, 2. Eugene Jakubowski, 3. David D. Merriman.

**Men's Junior Foil** — Jan. 22nd (14) — 1. Dave Logan, 2. Harold Mottershaw, 3. Byron Krieger.

**Men's Junior Sabre** — Jan. 22nd (7) — 1. Wm. Osis, 2. Jack Briner, 3. Harold Mottershaw.

**Men's Junior Epee** — Jan. 22nd (8) — 1. David D. Merriman, 2. Dave Logan, 3. John Spitzer.

The Salle de Tuscan Fencers Club team of Karl Hanisch, Howard A. Hayden and Harold Mottershaw won the Michigan Foil Team Tournament on November 6th, the Michigan Sabre Team Tournament on November 13th and the Michigan Three Weapon Team Tournament on November 27th.

The Grosse Pointe Sword Club team of Saul Karch, William Osis and John Spitzer won the Dr. Michels Trophy Team Tournament on December 4th.

## HOW TO COMPETE IN A FOIL COMPETITION (3)

There have been many books written about the art of fencing. Generally these books deal with the actual technique of handling the sword. As you look for advice on what to do when once you enter competition you find less and less help from authors. We have endeavored to give some pointers in this regard in the earlier essays of this series. We soon learned that we were almost completely on our own after doing so and had few if any sources of reference for help in the matter. Now as we come to deal with Team Competition, as compared with Individual Competition, we find no written discussion of the former subject in any authoritative tomes of the past. Nevertheless, we consider the subject important and herewith tackle it, admittedly with more courage than authority.

### Team Competition A New Development

There are probably good reasons for the lack of any writings concerning team competition. In the first place team competition has only recently developed into an important type of fencing competition. Prior to recent Olympic Games and a few more recent World Championships stress has always been placed upon Individual combat. When France and Italy each had a man whose ability they wanted tested they arranged for a 10 or 20 touch match between these two Champions and the entire fencing world turned out to witness this single battle of giants. Today, all of the leading fencing nations meet in team competition and it is the sum total of the team bouts that keeps the crowd tense and excited. Professional championships have given way to amateur championships and teams of amateurs have become a popular sport unit.

The most prolific and authoritative fencing writers have been professionals who spent their lives thinking of the theories and preferred technique of the sport. Competition to these writers was always that of Individual contests. Where they have given any thought to Team Competition they have considered it nothing more than a series of Individual bouts. We believe that there is considerably more to it than just that and present herewith a few ideas to support our contention.

### Individual vs Team Competition

What is the difference between Individual and Team competition? The obvious difference is that the Individual competitor is entirely dependent upon himself for his own success or failure. If he wins all his bouts he naturally wins the competition. If he loses all or too many of his bouts he is eliminated. A team competitor does not suffer the same personal pressure. He can lose all of his bouts and still receive a gold medal at the end of the evening. On the other hand he can win all of his bouts and never reach the Finals. Two thirds

of his success depends upon the results achieved for him by his teammates. (We refer here and henceforth in this essay to three man teams. Olympic teams consist of four men.) This distinct difference is of more importance than most competitors realize.

In entering a team competition a competitor immediately assumes a two-fold duty; a duty to himself and a duty to his teammates. The duty to himself is readily understood for anyone with individual competitive experience has had himself to deal with in many former competitions. The duty to his team is variable. Your teammates are not always the same and each man generally requires different handling. There is the man who needs to be left alone. There is the man who needs to be cheered on or whose victories must be highly praised. There is the man who profits by being told what actions of his are working badly so that he will correct them. Another man would be upset by this but would benefit by being told what actions he is doing very well so he will concentrate upon them for his remaining bouts. You must work upon some fencers to make them fight. You must work upon others to keep them cool. These differences are all psychological traits of character and the good team competitor or team captain is the man who understands them and can use the best psychology with each of his teammates.

### Team Captains

Every club has a man whom his clubmates instinctively respect and like. That man should be your team captain. He need not be your best fencer nor need he even be an active member of the team. However, he should be on hand when his team fences and take it upon himself to fraternize with his fencers and work upon each of his men as he knows those men respond. So many clubs or colleges choose their strongest fencers as captains. This may be entirely wrong for often the strongest fencer is prone to be an individualist, incapable of understanding any problems other than his own. The presence of a true captain would have brought about different results in many a team competition.

### The Important Bouts

Team competition is so much more straight arithmetic than many fencers ever realize. A team of three men meets another three man team. There will be a maximum of nine bouts. The objective is to win five. One five is as good as another insofar as the results are concerned but some five bouts are naturally easier than others. Now let us review the possible bouts. The normal club team consists of a good first man, a fair second man and a doubtful third man. Some fortunate teams have three equally strong men. Some unfortunate teams have three equally weak men. Other variations

might be two very strong and one weak man, one fair and two weak, etc. There are seven possible arrangements of these variations. However, as we have said before, the normal team grades down from top to bottom with one A, one B and one C grade fencer. For the sake of argument let us presuppose that all other teams in the competition are also made up of an A, B and C fencer. Your A should and must defeat the opponent's B and C men. Similarly, your B must and should defeat the opponent's C man. The opponent's A and B fencers may turn around and do the same to your team. The result is now 3-3. Where are the other 2 bouts to come from? The only remaining bouts are A vs A, B vs B and C vs C. In exact, theoretical team analysis, all team competitions depend upon the bouts between the men of similar standing on their teams.

Anyone can appreciate the fact that a first man who can win all his bouts is a most valuable man for the team. How many people similarly appreciate the fact that a second man who can win two bouts or a third man who can win one are every bit as valuable? Each man will have done his full duty to his team if he can do such justice to his assigned position. Personally I have always felt that the most important man on any team was the third man. If he can win one bout, the team's chances of winning a match are about 60 - 40. The eyes of the audience are all focused upon the A and B men. The C men go along quietly without much attention being paid them. If every C man would only appreciate that he must win just one bout in each match, that that bout is every bit as important to his team as any other bout in the match, that he is freer to slip over that victory than his teammates may be before people realize what is happening, many a team competition would have had a different ending.

It is just as important to grade the bouts you have to fence and place the emphasis on the right bouts in a Team Competition as it is in Individual Competition. It is only in this way that the best results can be obtained. What are the important bouts? The most important bouts are those which you are not supposed to lose, those which are difficult or impossible to make up elsewhere. Any of these bouts which were included in the even 3-3 score in the analysis two paragraphs earlier are the most important bouts. Even winning these, your team still has the problem of having two out of your three men come off best against the same weight men from the opponent's team. Should you lose one of the key bouts you would have to upset all three of your opponents in the A-A, B-B and C-C bouts. Failing this, you would have to make up your loss the hard way by having your B man defeat the opponents A man or have your C man defeat their A or B man, an assignment neither

should be expected to have to undergo.

### Use of the Line Up

Each team is free to arrange the order of its men prior to a match. Neither team is entitled to know the opponents' line up beforehand. An intelligent use of the lineup can often benefit a team far more than an arbitrary entry of the team in the order of their A, B and C rating.

Some men are timid about leading off in the first bout of a team match. There are usually men on every team who do not care where they are placed in the order of competition. Use one of these as a lead-off man.

Some men are by their very nature excellent anchor men. An anchor man is the man who has to fence the last bout if the team score goes to 4-4. He should be a fighter who will never say die and who seems to gain strength from the very fact that so much responsibility has been placed upon him. We consider Leo Nunes and Miguel de Capriles as the country's best team fencers in any weapon. We consider them so not from any mere analysis of their all-round skill, which is admittedly high, but from the fact that they are anchor men par excellence. Put either of these men into a last important bout of any team match and you will see a fight. Spot their opponents the first four touches and even blindfolded they would manage somehow to make touches. That should explain what I mean by a good anchor man. Naturally it is stupid to waste him. Place him in your lineup so, if necessary, he will come up for that last bout.

As I stated in the Individual competition discussions, some fencers are defensive stylists and others are offensive stylists. There is another very similar distinction between fencers, not entirely based upon offense and defense, but more upon caution versus courage. The best explanation of what I mean is to compare one type to the cobra and the other to the mongoose. Both are dangerous fighters, fast and clever, but the one beats you before you know what has happened while the other slowly and annoyingly wears you down before the kill. Both are valuable for team competition but common sense directs that the mongoose must be so placed in your lineup that he will meet and tire out as many of your opponents as possible. He must be followed by the cobra who will strike the weakened opponents before they have fully recovered. It is by such blending of your fencers' potentialities that the team can be markedly improved.

### Conclusion

Much will probably be written about the psychology of team competition in the future. It is relatively new insofar as fencing is concerned. What I have said here may all be very elementary. Newer

*(Continued on next page)*

### How To Compete In Competition

(Continued)

and better arrangements will be evolved as we learn from experience. It is nevertheless an interesting subject and one which requires a great deal of further development. Americans particularly must devote thought to the specialized study of team psychology.

I have mentioned the Americans here purposely for their greatest opportunities in International competition lie in team competition. Deprived of equal opportunities with Italy, France and Hungary for the development of great individual stars, the Americans have proved in more than one Olympics that their teams can function as a unit and place in the Finals. Give us as good teams as we have had in the past, a thorough training in team competition and psychology, a leader who carries the respect of each of his men with full authority to manipulate his teams to the best interests of all and America can win an Olympic Team Championship.

#### All Eastern Championship

(Continued from page 1)

the All Eastern and National Championships. One was reminded of sabre competitions of 15 or 20 years ago when anyone with a knowledge of foil or epee would enter sabre competitions without preliminary training in that weapon. Unlike yesteryears, the foilsmen and epeeists did not survive the first round. The qualifiers Armitage, Marson, de Nagy, Lubart, Stewart, N. Muray, Acel and J. de Capriles, were without question the 8 strongest sabremen in the competition. These 8 were joined by 7 others from other Divisions on May 22nd and again the field was reduced to 8, the same 8 except that Miguel de Capriles from Long Island displaced his teammate, Philip Lubart. Unfortunately, John Huffman, the No. 1 U.S. sabreman, could not enter the competition because of his duties at New York University.

In the Finals, Norman Armitage maintained the supremacy he had shown throughout the previous rounds. He was undefeated throughout the entire competition. Miguel de Capriles and Samuel Stewart ended in a tie for second with five wins and two losses apiece.

They finished in that order on touches. Stewart fenced brilliantly most of the time but lost second place after leading on the change-over in both of the bouts he lost. It was that close and de Capriles displayed remarkable recovery and stamina to take second after a poor start.

#### Summary of the Sabre Finals:—Fencers Club, May 25th.

Norman Armitage (Fencers Club) defeated Muray 5-1, Marson 5-4, de Nagy 5-0, Stewart 5-3, Acel 5-2, M. de Capriles 5-2 and J. de Capriles 5-1.

Miguel de Capriles (Salle Santelli) defeated Muray 5-3, Marson 5-0, Stewart 5-3, Acel 5-1 and J. de Capriles 5-4.

Samuel T. Stewart (N.Y.A.C.) defeated Muray 5-4, Marson 5-2, de Nagy 5-1, Acel 5-3, and J. de Capriles 5-4.

Ralph Marson (N.Y.A.C.) defeated Muray 5-3, de Nagy 5-4, Acel 5-1 and J. de Capriles 5-2.

Bela de Nagy (N.Y.A.C.) defeated Muray 5-2, Acel 5-3, M. de Capriles 5-2 and J. de Capriles 5-4.

Nicholas Muray (N.Y.A.C.) defeated Acel 5-3 and J. de Capriles 5-1.

Dr. Ervin Acel (N.Y.A.C.) defeated J. de Capriles 5-3.

Jose de Capriles (Salle Santelli) lost all bouts.

#### Epee

Only 16 men entered the qualifying round on May 7th to send 6 New Yorkers into the All Eastern and National Championships. This was the smallest field of recent years and left much to be desired in the quality of fencing. The matches, however, proved to be close and hard fought. Unlike the foil and sabre there were some marked upsets. The qualifiers were Von Munchhausen, Di Giacinto, Driscoll, Mijer, Jaeckel and Cornett. Among those eliminated were Kapner, Santos, Thompson, Stark, Ohlsen, Skrobisch and Grombach.

Seven more epeeists joined the New York six in the second round on May 26th and six of these seven survived the day with only Jaeckel and Cornett carried over from the New York group.

Norman Lewis topped the 8 man Finals on May 23rd at the Fencers Club. After losing his first bout to Miguel de Capriles, Lewis settled down to careful epee to lose no more bouts and take first place over the National Champion, Jose R. de Capriles. Jose de Capriles was actually tied for second with Commander Leonard Doughty, both having lost two bouts and won five, but de Capriles in his seven bouts had been touched by the remarkably low total of 9 touches as against Doughty's total of 14.

#### Summary of the Epee Finals:—Fencers Club,

Norman Lewis (Salle Santelli) defeated J. de Capriles 3-1, Jaeckel 3-2, Edwards 3-2, Cornett 3-1, Manzo 3-1 and Doughty 3-2.

Jose de Capriles (Salle Santelli) defeated Edwards 3-0, M. de Capriles 3-1, Cornett 3-0, Manzo 3-2 and Doughty 3-0.

Commander Leonard Doughty (U.S. Navy) defeated Jaeckel 3-2, Edwards 3-2, M. de Capriles 3-2, Cornett 3-2 and Manzo 3-1.

Tracy Jaeckel (Fencers Club) defeated J. de Capriles 3-0, M. de Capriles 3-2, and Manzo 3-1.

Miguel de Capriles (Salle Santelli) defeated Edwards 3-2, Lewis 3-1, and Manzo 3-0.

Winslow Cornett (Fencers Club) defeated Jaeckel 3-1, M. de Capriles 3-2, and Manzo 3-1.

Lieut. Morris Edwards (West Point Fencers Club) defeated Jaeckel 3-2 and Cornett 3-0.

Cadet Salvatore Manzo (West Point Fencers Club) defeated Edwards 3-2.

#### Women's Foil

Of the 18 girls entering the qualifying round on April 25th to decide the six qualifiers from New York into the All Eastern and National Championships, there were six carrying National rankings. These six were the six qualifiers, again confirming the correctness of those rankings, although at times it appeared that upsets were in prospect. The six qualifiers were the Mrs. Carol Alessandroni Hamilton and Dolly Funke and the Misses Madeline Dalton, Maria Cerra, Barbara Cochrane and Dorothy Grimmelmann.

At the Finals on May 19th at the Fencers Club we saw 11 qualifiers from the Divisions join the 6 New Yorkers, and wreak such havoc before the evening was over that they took 1st, 3rd, 4th, 6th and 8th places in the 9 women Finals. Mrs. Jarmila Vokral of Philadelphia led the field in the Finals by winning six out of her eight bouts. A triple tie for second among Miss Barbara Cochrane, Mrs. Marion Lloyd Vince and Miss Mildred Stewart was decided on touches in that order. There was considerable erratic fencing during the evening, but the field was strong and the evening presented a well-balanced program of strong bouts to an interested and excited group of spectators. The surprise of the evening was the



failure of Miss Maria Cerra (No. 3 ranking), Mrs. Dolly Funke (1938—No. 3) and Miss Helena Mroczkowska (New Intercollegiate Champion) to reach the Finals.

### Summary of the Women's Foil Finals:—Fencers Club, May 19th.

Mrs. Jarmila Vokral (Salle Herrmann, Phila.) defeated Miss Dalton 4-1, Mrs. Oppenheim 4-1, Mrs. Hamilton 4-1, Miss Cochrane 4-3, Miss Principe 4-1 and Miss Grimmelmann 4-2.

Miss Barbara Cochrane (Salle Santelli) defeated Miss Dalton 4-1, Miss Stewart 4-1, Mrs. Vince 4-0, Miss Principe 4-3 and Miss Grimmelmann 4-2.

Mrs. Marion Lloyd Vince (Salle D'Armes Vince) defeated Miss Dalton 4-3, Miss Stewart 4-1, Mrs. Hamilton 4-2, Mrs. Vokral 4-3 and Miss Grimmelmann 4-2.

Miss Mildred Stewart (Salle Santelli) defeated Mrs. Vokral 4-1, Mrs. Oppenheim 4-3, Mrs. Hamilton 4-3, Miss Principe 4-2 and Miss Grimmelmann 4-2.

Mrs. Carol Alessandrini Hamilton (Fencers Club) defeated Miss Dalton 4-2, Mrs. Oppenheim 4-1, Miss Cochrane 4-3 and Miss Grimmelmann 4-2.

Mrs. Lisele Oppenheim (Unattached, New England Division) defeated Miss Dalton 4-2, Miss Cochrane 4-3, Mrs. Vince 4-3, and Miss Principe 4-0.

Miss Dorothy Grimmelmann (Salle Santelli) defeated Miss Dalton 4-3, Mrs. Oppenheim 4-1 and Miss Principe 4-1.

Miss Aida Principe (Salle Messineo, Wash. D.C.) defeated Mrs. Hamilton 4-1 and Mrs. Vince 4-3.

Miss Madeleine Dalton (Salle D'Armes Vince) defeated Miss Principe 4-2 and Miss Stewart 4-3.

## MARYLAND

In the Open Maryland Championships there were 12 entries in foil and sabre and 13 entries in epee. There were six Finalists in each weapon, each of which received credit toward a three weapon award donated by Prof. Clovis Deladrier of the U.S. Naval Academy. Lt Richard Steere was first in the three weapons with a total score of 15 points with Andre Deladrier of the Annapolis Fencing Club second with 13 points

The medalists in each weapon were as follows:

- Foil — 1. Richard Steere, unattached, 2. Harry Enten, Y.M.H.A., 3. Andre Deladrier, Annapolis H.S., 4. Stanley Sarnoff, Y.M.H.A.
- Epee — 1. Stanley Sarnoff, 2. Richard Steere, 3. Fred Eckhardt, Y.M.C.A., 4. Andre Deladrier.
- Sabre — 1. Andre Deladrier, 2. Robert Levin, Y.M.H.A., 3. Richard Steere, 4. Fred Eckhardt.

There were 14 girls in the Women's Foil Championship on May 13th. Miss Muriel Guggolz of the Baltimore Athletic Club won first place after a fence-off with Miss F. Limpert of the Bard Avon School. Miss V. Yancey of the Bard-Avon School was third and Miss S. Blake of the Parry and Thrust Club was fourth.

The Maryland Junior Foil Championship on April 22nd attracted 8 entries of which Miklas of the Y.M.C.A. was first with 7 wins and no losses, Kavanaugh of Annapolis H. S. was second with 6 wins and 1 loss, S. Levin of the Y.M.H.A. was third with 5 wins and 2 losses and Eitel of the Y.M.C.A. was fourth with 3 wins and 4 losses.

The Maryland Junior Women's Foil Championship attracted 17 entries on May 13th and in a woman Finals. Miss F. Limpert of Bard Avon School was first with 4 wins and 1 loss. Miss H. Bishop of the University of Maryland was second with the same bout score but who lost in a fence-off of 4-5 with Miss Limpert. Miss V. Yancey took third with 3 wins and 2 losses. Miss R. Stoncstreet of the Parry and Thrust Club was fourth with 2 wins and three losses.

## FENCING PERSONALITIES

By M. A. de Capriles

The Riposte is happy to be able at this time to give to its readers the latest news about the activities of Lieutenant Colonel Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, United States Marine Corps Reserves. This internationally known sportsman from Philadelphia is an enthusiastic swordsman and has been President of the Philadelphia Fencers Club since its foundation in 1895. The Club, the oldest in Pennsylvania, is under the direction of Major William J. Herrmann and includes in its membership such well known stars as the veteran champions Frank H. Goodfellow and Francis Tetaz and the present Women's All-Eastern Champion, Mrs. Jarmila C. Vokral.

Colonel Biddle has served many years as instructor in personal combat to the Marine Corps. In his youth he sparred with Bob Fitzsimmons while the latter was preparing for his fights with Jim Jeffries, Tom Sharkey and Gus Ruhlin. During the World War he organized the Philadelphia Military Training Corps, which in 1917 had twelve thousand men in training. This organization was the nucleus from which the Marine Corps Reserves were drawn. He himself was commissioned a Captain and went to France with the Fifth and Sixth Regiments as a bayonet instructor.

Colonel Biddle's great contribution to the art of individual combat has been in the application of the principles of swordsmanship to bayonet and knife fighting. He is considered to be the greatest American authority on the use of the bayonet and the knife in personal defense.

The 64-year old expert has also an intimate knowledge of boxing, wrestling, jiu jitsu, and Kendo, which has helped him to develop remarkable proficiency in all round personal combat.

Colonel Biddle's latest assignments have taken him to San Diego and to Honolulu. He is particularly proud of the achievement of one of his pupils, Lieutenant Gordon Warner of the Punahou Faculty. He is the only Caucasian to hold a degree in Kendo, the Japanese art of swordsmanship which is said to be the oldest sword fighting art in the world. Lieutenant Warner, who stands 6 feet 3 inches in height and is a tremendously powerful all-round athlete, has acquired exceptional renown in Hawaii and Japan by his contests with Mizuhashi, a 6 foot 1 inch Japanese Kendo and Judo fighter, and with one of the remaining few Samurai in Japan, Mochida, who held the highest rank in Kendo.

Colonel Biddle's interest in fencing has repeatedly brought him to New York where he has been a student under Professor Julio Martinez Castello. He is the donor of the Biddle Trophy which for the past six years has drawn an average of 200 schoolboy fencers in the Metropolitan area.

## LONG ISLAND

The Men's Foil Competition held at Sewanhaka High School in Floral Park on June 6th attracted 11 entries. The competition was won by Peter O'Connor of the Greco Fencing Academy with Ralph Leiderman of Long Island University second and Moulton Farnham of Salle Henry IV third.

## A. F. L. A. COMPETITIONS IN NEW YORK CITY

Individual Junior Foil Championship — 11 Entries  
April 13th

Ralph E. Marson of the N.Y.A.C., a National Ranking Sabreman, scored a mild upset by winning the Junior Foil Title in a fence-off with Silvio Giolito of N. Y. U. In the six man Finals, Giolito appeared headed for the Championship with four victories and a 3-1 score in his fifth against Max Goldstein of C.C.N.Y. A sudden reversal of form overtook him and he lost the bout 5-3 to go into a tie with Marson. Marson then profited by his second opportunity to win a very exciting and close fence off 5-4.

## Summaries:

## Final Round:

Ralph E. Marson (N.Y.A.C.) defeated Cetrulo 5-4, Bukantz 5-3, Lubell 5-4 and Goldstein 5-3.  
Silvio Giolito (N.Y.U.) defeated Marson 5-4, Cetrulo 5-2, Bukantz 5-3, and Lubell 5-3.  
Max Goldstein (C.C.N.Y.) defeated Giolito 5-3, Cetrulo 5-3 and Bukantz 5-3.  
Nathaniel Lubell (Salle D'Armes Vince) defeated Cetrulo 5-4 and Goldstein 5-3.  
Daniel Bukantz (Salle D'Armes Vince) defeated Cetrulo 5-4 and Lubell 5-4.  
Diaz Cetrulo (Seton Hall College) lost all bouts.  
**Fence-off:**  
Marson defeated Giolito 5-4.

Three Weapon Team Championship — 10 Teams —  
April 16th

The Salle Santelli trio of Jose and Miguel de Capriles and Warren Dow regained the trophy they lost last year to the N.Y.A.C. by defeating that team in the last and deciding match of the finals by a score of 2-1. Philip Lubart, the fourth member of the winning team, competed in sabre in the earlier rounds.

## Summary of Finals:

Salle Santelli "A" 3 — Salle Santelli "B" 0  
Foil — Warren Dow (Santelli "A") defeated Norman Lewis (Santelli "B") 5-4.  
Epee — Jose de Capriles (Santelli "A") defeated Hans Stark (Santelli "B") 3-2.  
Sabre — Philip Lubart (Santelli "A") defeated Kevis Kapner (Santelli "B") 5-4.  
N.Y.A.C. 2 — Fencers Club 1  
Foil — Hugh Alessandroni (Fencers Club) defeated Dernel Every (N.Y.A.C.) 5-2.  
Epee — George Thompson (N.Y.A.C.) defeated Tracy Jaekel (Fencers Club) 3-1.  
Sabre — John Huffman (N.Y.A.C.) defeated Norman Armitage (Fencers Club) 5-4.  
Salle Santelli "A" 2 — Fencers Club 1  
Foil — Hugh Alessandroni (Fencers Club) defeated Warren Dow (Salle Santelli "A") 5-4.  
Epee — Jose de Capriles (Salle Santelli "A") defeated Robert Driscoll (Fencers Club) 3-1.  
Sabre — Miguel de Capriles (Salle Santelli "A") defeated Norman Armitage (Fencers Club) 5-3.  
N.Y.A.C. 2 — Salle Santelli "B" 1  
Foil — Norman Lewis (Salle Santelli "B") defeated Dernel Every (N.Y.A.C.) 5-2.  
Epee — George Thompson (N.Y.A.C.) defeated Hans Stark (Salle Santelli "B") 3-2.  
Sabre — John Huffman (N.Y.A.C.) defeated Kevis Kapner (Salle Santelli "B") 5-2.  
Salle Santelli "A" 2 — N.Y.A.C. 1  
Foil — Warren Dow (Salle Santelli "A") defeated Dernel Every (N.Y.A.C.) 5-4.  
Epee — Jose R. de Capriles (Salle Santelli) defeated George Thompson (N.Y.A.C.) 3-2.  
Sabre — John Huffman (N.Y.A.C.) defeated Miguel de Capriles (Salle Santelli "A") 5-4.

Individual Junior Epee Championship — 11 Entries  
April 18th

The three members of the Fencers Club who, as a team on January 12th, won the Junior Epee Team Championship finished in one-two-three order in the Individual Championship. Their unusual success in this weapon gave the Fencers Club a clean sweep in

all divisions of Junior epee throughout the year. Alfred Skrobisch, Hugh V. Alessandroni and Winslow Cornett took the first three places in that order.

## Summaries:

Alfred Skrobisch (Fencers Club) defeated Flynn 3-0, Wehle 3-2, May 3-0, Metzger 3-1, Ignatow 3-2, Farnham 3-1, Manzo 3-1, Alessandroni 3-2, Martinez 3-0 and double-  
lost with Cornett 3-3.  
Hugh V. Alessandroni (Fencers Club) defeated Flynn 3-1, Wehle 3-1, Metzger 3-2, Ignatow 3-1, Cornett 3-1, Farnham 3-1, Manzo 3-1 and Martinez 3-0.  
Winslow Cornett (Fencers Club) defeated Flynn 3-0, Wehle 3-0, Metzger 3-1, Ignatow 3-0, Farnham 3-0, Manzo 3-2, Martinez 3-0 and double lost with Skrobisch 3-3.  
Lieut. Philip Wehle (West Point Fencers Club) defeated Flynn 3-0, Metzger 3-0, Ignatow 3-2 Farnham 3-1, Manzo 3-1, and Martinez 3-2.  
Cadet Salvatore Manzo (West Point Fencers Club) defeated Flynn 3-1, May 3-2, Metzger 3-2, Ignatow 3-1, Farnham 3-1, and Martinez 3-0.  
Dr. James H. Flynn (Salle Santelli) defeated May 3-0, Metzger 3-2, Ignatow 3-1, Farnham 3-2, and Martinez 3-1.  
Ernest May (Fencers Club) defeated Wehle 3-0, Cornett 3-2, Alessandroni 3-1 and Martinez 3-2.  
Archie Ignatow (N.Y.U.) defeated May 3-2 and Farnham 3-2.  
Moulton Farnham (Salle Henri IV) defeated May 3-2 and Metzger 3-0.  
Marvin Metzger (Columbia) defeated May 3-1 and Martinez 3-1.  
Abraham Martinez (Columbia) lost all bouts fenced.

Individual Junior Sabre Championship — 15 Entries  
April 20th

Anthony Hyde of the Philadelphia Sword Club made a clean sweep of the nine man Finals to upset New York's dominance in the sabre and win the Junior Sabre Title. It was only the second, third and fourth men in the Championship who seemed to give Toby any trouble and these he defeated by 5-4 scores.

New York's dominance in the sabre was not only swept aside by the winner but by four other Finalists who came from nearby cities to eliminate such promising local sabremen as Flynn, Kapner, Gordon Wallis, Egan and Ritayik.

## Summary of Finals:

Anthony Hyde (Philadelphia Sword Club) defeated Brownlee 5-2, Welles 5-4, Kellerman 5-4, Littlehale 5-1, Edwards 5-3, Newton 5-0, Castello 5-3 and Rorick 5-4.  
James Welles (Columbia) defeated Kellerman 5-2, Littlehale 5-4, Edwards 5-0, Newton 5-2, Castello 5-3 and Rorick 5-2.  
Leo Kellerman (Yale Medical School) defeated Brownlee 5-3, Littlehale 5-1, Edwards 5-2, Newton 4-2, and Rorick 5-2.  
Alan Rorick (West Point Fencers Club) defeated Brownlee 5-3, Littlehale 5-4, Edwards 5-2, Newton 5-4, and Castello 5-1.  
Lieut. Brownlee (West Point Club) defeated Edwards 5-2, Welles 5-4, Newton 5-4, Castello 5-4 and Littlehale 5-1.  
James Castello (N.Y.U.) defeated Kellerman 5-1, Littlehale 5-1 and Edwards 5-3.  
Harold Newton (Greco Fencing Academy) defeated Littlehale 5-1 and Castello 5-2.  
Lieut. Edwards (West Point Fencers Club) defeated Newton 5-4 and Littlehale 5-2.  
Bradner Littlehale (N.Y.A.C.) lost all bouts.

Metropolitan Epee Team Championship — 3 Team  
Finals — April 23rd

This local championship ended in a three way tie on March 26th (incorrectly reported as March 6th in our last issue) which was finally fought off late in April. The Salle Santelli "A" team defeated both its own "B" team and the Fencers Club team by substantial margins to break the previous tie and win the Championship. Norman Lewis of the winning team went through the two matches undefeated.

## A.F.L.A. COMPETITION IN N.Y.C.

### Final Summaries:

Santelli "A" 5 — Santelli "B" 2

Norman Lewis (Santelli "A") defeated Stark 3-2 and Kapner 3-2.

Peter Mijer (Santelli "A") defeated Stark 3-1.

Jose de Capriles (Santelli "A") defeated Stark 3-1 and Kapner 3-2.

Rudolph Ozol (Santelli "B") defeated Mijer 3-1 and Jose de Capriles 3-1.

Hans Stark and Kevis Kapner (Santelli "B") lost all bouts fenced.

Santelli "A" — Fencers Club 1

Norman Lewis (Santelli "A") defeated Von Munchhausen 3-1 and Alessandroni 3-1.

Jose de Capriles (Santelli "A") defeated Von Munchhausen 3-2 and Jaekel 3-1.

Miguel de Capriles (Santelli "A") defeated Alessandroni 3-0.

Tracy Jaekel (Fencers Club) defeated M. de Capriles 3-2.

August Von Munchhausen and Hugh Alessandroni (Fencers Club) lost all bouts fenced.

### Women's Foil Team Championship — 5 Teams — April 11th

It appeared as if the Salle d'Armes Vince's perennial claim to this Championship might be threatened this year by the Salle Santelli team. These two teams competing on parallel strips each disposed of the other teams in the competition with the unusually similar scores of 5-1 in every match fenced. Then came the deciding match and the surprise of the Championship. The Salle d'Armes Vince team shut out the Salle Santelli 5-0 for its best team score of the evening.

#### Teams:

Salle d'Armes Vince — Miss Maria Cerra, Miss Madeline Dalton and Mrs. Marion Lloyd Vince.

Salle Santelli — Miss Mildred Stewart, Miss Barbara Cochrane and Miss Dorothy Grimmelmann.

Hofstra College — Miss Helena Mroczkowska, Miss Dorothy Wahl and Miss Ruth Maxwell.

New York University — Miss Beryl Petchesky, Miss Josephine Mancinelli, Miss Harriet Mc Glennon and Miss Ruth Barcan.

Composite Team — Mrs. Dolly Funke, Miss Erna Treiling and Miss Grace Acel.

#### Summaries:

Salle d'Armes Vince defeated Hofstra College 5-1, Composite Team 5-1, N.Y.U. 5-1 and Salle Santelli 5-0.

Salle Santelli defeated N.Y.U. 5-1, Composite Team 5-1 and Hofstra College 5-1.

## OHIO Columbus

The Men's Championships of the Columbus Division were held on Saturday, April 1st, in the Ohio State University Gymnasium in Columbus. The results of the Finals were as follows:

Foil: 1. Robert Fickell, Ohio State Univ., 2. William Chaikin, Ohio State Univ., 3. Scott Breckinridge, Jr., Univ. of Kentucky.

Epee: 1. Robert Fickell, O.S.U., 2. Stephen Viers, O.S.U., 3. William Chaikin, O.S.U.

Sabre: 1. Robert Bruce, Columbus Fencing Club, 2. Robert Fickell, O.S.U., 3. Charles Harbst, O.S.U.

The Women's Foil Championship was held on April 5th in Pomerene Hall with the following results:

Women's Foil: 1. Eleanor Evans, 2. Jane Simmons, 3. Esther Miller (All of the Foil & Mask Club).

## THE SCIMITAR

An honorary fencing fraternity, known as the "Scimitar", was started several years ago at the University of Illinois. It remained local in character for a year or more and then spread to the University of Michigan. Michigan State College has just organized a chapter and the University of Detroit and Lawrence Institute of Technology are reported as organizing chapters at the present time.

The aims of the organization are to promote national collegiate fencing, general fencing competition, conduct tournaments among college students and further the best ideals of sportsmanship. Any collegians interested may obtain further information from Mr. William Hammond, 208 Beal Street, East Lansing, Michigan.

## QUALITY FENCING EQUIPMENT

A. J. DE KROON

LAAN VAN MEERDERVOORT 96<sup>B</sup>

THE HAGUE — HOLLAND

Importer - Distributor to the Leading  
Wholesale and Retail Concerns in  
Europe - U.S.A. - Canada - So. America -  
Asia and Australia

Weapons, Masks, Uniforms, Gloves and Accessories

### MORE ABOUT THE ITALIAN FOIL

A serious-minded amateur coach in a city which has no professional writes to say that the Italian foil is being adopted almost wholesale among the younger fencers there. He feels that it is tending to create much wildness in movements and fears for the welfare of fencing in his city if the trend continues. He asked for more explanation of the differences in the two weapons and Schools. We print our reply and our explanation of some of the technique of the Italian fencers which, though different from the style he learned originally, need not be interpreted as wild, dangerous or unorthodox.

"Essentially what is the difference between the Italian foil and its School and the French foil and its School? The weapons vary in the handle, the cross section and length of the blade. The handle of the Italian foil is of medium length, straight and with a cross-bar. It is strapped to the wrist to assure its security and to counterbalance the weight of the foible so that the blade itself feels lighter from guard to tip than does the French foil. The Italian blade in cross section is thinner one way and wider the other way than the French blade. This makes it whippier and more effective for coupés. It is tempered differently, being apparently softer and requiring straightening after nearly every effective attack. This is so because the Italian attacks are stronger than the French attacks and were their blades tempered the same the Italian foilsman would go poor buying new blades. The Italian blade is about a quarter inch longer than the French blade. I do not know why except that most French blades are made about a quarter inch short of the maximum allowance whereas the Italians come right up to maximum. It may be because the French blade being heavier is shortened to keep its balance at about  $\frac{3}{4}$ " from the guard.

As for the two Schools, they have blended very closely together today. Each has its own pet principle that the other borrows but each principle is more effective with one weapon than the other.

The French believe in deception. Their favorite attack is preceded by a true feint into an open line to draw the parry. They endeavor to deceive this parry and lunge to the target. Their game dissolves to a choice of two things, one of which would be wrong and the other right. Essentially, there are only two ways you can parry. You can parry by closing your line with a single parry or you can parry by holding your original position with a counter parry which removes the point from threatening the open line. The choice in endeavoring deception, therefore, depends upon the opponent's choice of parry. If you parry with a simple parry, the attacker must disengage back into your newly-opened line. The entire attack would be called a **one-two**. If you use a counter parry, the attacker must deceive and continue his attack in the original line. This attack would be called a **double**.

This is all very elementary. However, you can count the men who have mastered this during the last 50 years on the fingers of one hand. The hand must become part of the eye to perceive and deceive in the fractional second allowed by any fast parry.

It must be assisted by intuition and experience plus hours and hours of accurate exercise.

The Italian School is also based upon a two choice premise. Its game is not based upon deception, but

upon force. They do not attack into air, but rather against your blade. They start with a "pris de fer", pressing against your blade even to pressing it out of line. You must press back and recover your line or circle under and take their blade on the inside. If you don't do one of these, they press right on to hit you in the line they have forced open for themselves. If you press back, they disengage and allow you to press out as widely as you please while they follow you around and lunge to the target or follow around to catch your foil when it stops, give it a hard beat and lunge straight in. The first part of this attack is done by stepping forward, closing distance and not fully extending the arm until their lunge, which follows your particular reaction. (In the French School the feint of disengage is made with a straight arm well ahead of the final lunge.) Their final extension and lunge coming late and when they are close to you makes their attack very strong and results in their blades being bent into corkscrews more often than occurs with the French foil.

There is much more to both schools, both in variety and in principles than I have time or experience to tell you. A good fencer of either School is able to fence the other style too and does so throughout an evening, depending on the type of opponent. But with the above bold explanation of the two schools I can approach a definite answer to your questions more easily.

1: The Italian foil will not tend to accentuate your pupils' faults. It will not make them wilder in their attacks or in their defense. If anything it will make their defense better for their foil is secure at all times, they cannot bend their wrists and are consequently held into fairly sharp line. The preparation of attack with bent arm is part of the Italian School so that cannot be declared "wildness". The Italian foil is no good for infighting, so they cannot close and start jabbing as so many do in the French School. The Italian foil in itself limits their wildness.

2. If you want to make a boy into a fencer during a four year course in school and want to get the best results out of him in the quickest possible time, the Italian foil is your weapon. You may spoil a good French foilsman 10 years hence by doing so but the cold blooded answer to your question is the Italian foil. I would not bother with the French foil for a girl. Her years of effective competition are much more limited than a boy's. You must train her for quick results and she has a wrist that is by nature weak and needing the support of a strap. Give her an Italian foil and let her have as much fun out of effective competition in the few years she will find fencing interesting as possible. Her competition will never be as strong and smart as it is in men's competition and a few tricks with the Italian foil will go far. By the time she would become really proficient with the French foil she will have married and lost interest in athletics.

There is no doubt but that the Italian foil is spreading in the United States. We have passed the worst of this phase here in New York and some of those who adopted it during the past two years have now returned to their former French foil. No one here is now choosing blindly but is weighing each weapon against his particular style and preference. This is as it should be. Almost all of our girls are now using the Italian foil and I think their fencing has improved as a result of this. I think that this is right for them as I have explained above.

## THE REMISE

The pressure of other activities made it impossible to prepare a column for the last issue of The Riposte. Apparently it was no great loss for no fencers dashed off letters of protest to The Times and as far as this humble scribe was concerned the column was never missed. We do not discourage easily and since our pen is mightier than our sword we continue to wield the former preferred weapon.

\* \* \*

As a self-appointed columnist with but little experience in this interesting ink splashing sport we have already learned that the reader often gains impressions contrary to the intent of the writer, despite the pains taken by the latter. Some of the things we have said in all innocence have come back to us as bitterly resented. A certain amount of this is to be expected. The same thing happens in everyday conversation. A fencer once asked me how I liked his foilwork in a particular competitoin. I said that I thought it had been "just tolerable". He glared at me and has never been civil since. Just another case of poor pronunciation.

\* \* \*

I never did get around to writing my impressions of the Intercollegiate Fencing Championships. Perhaps it is just as well for I was disgusted at the time and now that they are well past we can all look back with a smile at what proved to be a horrible experiment. In case you are not familiar with the Intercollegiates let me explain that they had come to be the outstanding sporting and social event of the entire fencing season. All fencers, young and old, looked forward to the Intercollegiates as the big affair that neither rain nor shine could make them miss. For a grand good time and for an affair packed with thrills and excitement there was nothing to touch it in the fencing calendar. It was a combination of athletic event conducted under the best rules of sportsmanship and a respectable social gathering with all the frivolity of a College Prom. We certainly hope that those days are not gone forever.

This year, for some unknown reason, all that was changed. Instead of the usual hotel ballroom, the fencing was conducted in a gymnasium. The college fencers after a long season of practice in gymnasias must have been as unimpressed with the setting as were the spectators. Backless wooden benches served as bleachers for the unfortunately large number of people who attended. The failure to provide the usual raised platforms for the fencing and the crowding of the main floor with non-transparent and non-fencing onlookers gave one the impression that he was sitting on a wooden crate in the Times Square subway station. The scoreboard, that former center of great interest and excitement, suffered obscurity along with the fencing. Through it all, however, one sensed the excitement of the Bout Committee which worked hard and well to make the most of a poor arrangement. With such men as they and the other amateurs who volunteered their services, despite it all, we do not fear for the future of this fine affair or that the 1939 fiasco will ever be repeated.

There was some excellent fencing in all three weapons and as always happens there were also some of the weirdest stances seen anywhere except among melting snowmen. Navy won the majority of laurels and rightfully so. Its team was strong and as well balanced as any aggregation we have seen at these championships. The other teams had good perform-

ers here and there but seldom clicked as units. Army, Columbia, N.Y.U., City College, Harvard and Yale renowned Navy in that order both in score and actual merit.

There was no Grand Ball. There were the final bouts, a handout of medals and then a general shutting off of lights. If I had been one of the Navy boys to be so treated after such a grand victory I would have headed out to sea. It was a shame that they were thus deprived of their evening of proud rejoicing after having suffered several slim years. If they revive the Grand Ball next year, as they must do, they should make it into two parts; one part in honor of the great Navy team of 1938 and the other part in honor of the 1939 winner whoever it may be.

\* \* \*

And now we come to the weaker sex and, as we write this, tears of laughter roll down our cheeks. The Womens' Intercollegiate Championships was a round robin of eight 3-girl teams, to decide the team and individual champions for the current year. That meant that each girl had to fence 21 representatives from the other colleges plus her own two teammates, a total of 23 bouts. Furthermore, these bouts all took place on one day between 10 A.M. and 10 P.M. Fencing for 4 touch bouts, the winner Miss Helena Mroczkowska of Hofstra College, won 22 out of 23 bouts and made a total of 91 touches. In the Men's Intercollegiates the maximum number of bouts for each competitor was 11 which at 5 touches apiece required 55 touches for a perfect score. Furthermore, the men fenced over a two day period, approximately halving the physical strain.

Personally, I feel that the girls overdid it, but I also have to admit that they never gave any indication of faltering. They took time out for a social luncheon and dressed formally for a dinner that preceded the Final Matches in the evening. When all was set for the Finals, the Hofstra Team, supposedly resting, was found down in the recreation room engaged in a fast doubles game of ping-pong. Then after the Finals, back into evening gowns, the awarding of prizes and then — I just can't go on. They all turned jitterbugs and danced until after midnight.

I am worn out at this point, but before leaving the young ladies I want to comment favorably upon their fencing. The five leading girls, whose records you will find elsewhere in this issue fenced beautifully. They were attacking with authority, riposting in good time and balance and fencing clean foil throughout. The younger girls showed promise but lacked the experience and training of the leaders, as might be expected. Most important, they seemed to be enjoying themselves and afforded pleasure and excitement to a good crowd of spectators. Girls' fencing is coming along rapidly and is today well developed and organized and deserving of the attention and support of fencers and spectators alike.

\* \* \*

Dr. Accl threw consternation into a group of fencers by declaring that fencing was improving so rapidly in India that it was his opinion that India would put an end to Italian, French and Hungarian supremacy in 1940. He stated that India was sending a complete team of Untouchables to the next Olympics.

\* \* \*

The season which started out so promising with the Prep and Novice competitions weakened considerably as the year progressed. To account for this is difficult. One reason is definitely the loss of

### The Remise (Continued)

many of the promising fencers from former years. We miss **Sands, Heiss, Hurd, Bruder, Pecora, Castello, Grasson, Weidel and Gold.** We seldom see **Levis, Steere or Cetrulo.** **Potter, Goldsmith and Howard** have left the city. These are just a few of the many men whose presence in the past added much to the competitions they entered. Their places are not easily taken.

The Senior competitions held up well through the perseverance of approximately a score of fencers whose love for the sport would not let them waver. The Juniors, however, did not maintain their proper quality. The Junior Championships this year were evidence of this. Brilliant at times, they were in full analysis weaker than in former years. The same can be said of many of the prize competitions. The team competitions were spotty with one or two strong teams and the rest of the field small and ineffective. We hope this lull is only of temporary nature. We have the important year 1940 approaching so rapidly that it frightens us. Where we will find the right men for a good Olympic team should worry us all. This summer must be used for the formation of large Olympic squads and spent in pounding and pounding to see if the material we have can possibly be formed into a team worthy of following the good teams we have assembled in the past.

\* \* \*

With the National Championships scheduled for San Francisco there were many changes necessary in the New York closing competitions. The All-Eastern Championships were substituted for the usual Nationals, but failed to attract as many out-of-town competitors as had been hoped. That plus the fact, previously mentioned, that the field is slimmer this year made for less keen competition. Nevertheless, they were good competitions and served to bring the Eastern season to a climax.

\* \* \*

The All Eastern Women's Championship was distinguished by the best fencing field of the year. **Mrs. Jarmila Vokral** of the Salle Herrmann of Philadelphia won six of her eight final bouts to take first place. Her steadiness offset the more fiery nature of some of her opponents and gave her a well deserved victory. During the year there had been as many different winners as contests and **Mrs. Vokral's** patience was well rewarded by winning the last and most important competition in the East.

\* \* \*

**Norman Lewis** won the All Eastern Epee Championship against a solid field of contenders. Again we saw a patient, steady fencer win against more aggressive opponents. Mixing counter-time with occasional shots for the foot he won all but his first bout in the Finals. **Jose de Capriles** had to be content with second place which he claimed with a remarkably clean touch score from **Commander Leonard Doughty** who was tied with him in bouts won. **Commander Doughty** was perhaps the surprise of the tournament fencing very well in both the semi-finals and finals to upset several leading epeeists who, we thought, would outplace him eventually through their broader 1939 competition experience.

\* \* \*

The All Eastern Foil Championship attracted the largest field of all the weapons. New Jersey, New England, Philadelphia and West Point were severally represented. Unfortunately, **Dernell Every** and **John R. Huffman** could not enter, but even so 5 of the 8 finalists carried National rankings which they confirmed by taking the first 5 places in the contest.

**Warren Dow** swept through the Finals undefeated as he has done in every individual contest he has entered this season. With compact defense adroitly mixed with opposition and counter-time he demonstrated the value of the newer more mobile school of foil. On the offense too his courageous straight lunges mixed with well prepared compound attacks gave his opponents no relaxation. **Hugh Alessandroni**, well recovered from an apparent slump in the semi-finals, was clearly second best, losing only to **Dow**. His fine hand and fast ripostes rarely failed him and his ability to gain distance upon his opponents with well conceived attacks gave him many of the finest touches of the evening. **Joseph Levis** found in his first New York contest that the lack of stiff competition during the year can wreak sad damage to one's fighting ability. When he flashed the amazing speed for which he is famous, a score was inevitable, but these occasions were too infrequent. He found three opponents cunning enough to turn his speed back against him. Given a few more competitions under his belt though and our greatest Internationalist should be back in top form.

\* \* \*

**Norman Armitage** of the Fencers Club went through the entire All Eastern Sabre Championship undefeated. The fencing in this weapon was probably the best of the All Easterns with **Armitage** clearly the outstanding contestant. **Samuel Stewart** fenced brilliantly most of the time but impatience and poor strategy cost him the two bouts he lost to take second. **Miguel de Capriles**, who took third, started poorly and never really reached his best fencing. Even so he did exceptionally well for any man fencing competitively five days out of six. **Samuel Stewart**, practically out of competition last year, was the only man of the 8 finalists who did not have a 1938 rating. The competition, therefore, was decidedly of the best. It was unfortunate that **John Huffman's** work at the University made it impossible for him to compete in this weapon or in foil.

\* \* \*

The Gala Night at the N. Y. A. C. was an innovation that met with remarkable success considering its short notice. The opening fencing exhibitions gave proper tone to the evening's gathering and was a correct prelude to the awarding of the year's medals and trophies. The dance which followed capped a fine evening in which the fencers proved that as a sociable group of good friends they are hard to beat. It was unfortunate that so few of the older fencers and former champions were on hand but this had been due to the hurried arrangements. Nevertheless, the younger fencers proved that they have the social instinct to carry on the sport in the manner in which it is probably unique. One needs not fear for any future deterioration in this important aspect of our sport. Everyone had a good time and the Gala Night should become an annual institution of importance.

\* \* \*

**Mrs. Huffman**, our sabre champion's mother, is a fencing personality known to practically every fencer in the United States. Known affectionately as "**Ma**" Huffman, she is friend and confessor of all the boys and probably the best sport of the bunch. Her wit and good humor are well known. At the semi-finals of the All Eastern Foil **Hugh Alessandroni** was disappointed with his fencing that day. **Mrs. Huffman** told him not to worry for after all he had qualified. "Yes", said **Hugh**, "but only by one touch". "Even so, that is not so bad", said **Mrs. Huffman**, "if you work hard next year you will qualify by two touches".