

# An Olympian's Oral History

ANITA L. DEFRANTZ

*1976 Olympic Games – Montreal  
Member, 1980 United States Olympic Team  
– Rowing –*

*Member, International Olympic Committee*

Interviewed by:  
Allys Swanson  
May 13, 2001  
Dana Point, California



© 2015 LA84 Foundation  
All rights reserved.

This oral history may not, in whole or in part, be copied, photocopied, reproduced, translated, or converted to any electronic or machine-readable form without prior written consent of the LA84 Foundation

May 13, 2001

*This is an oral history with Anita L. DeFrantz, first vice president of the International Olympic Committee (IOC), president and board of directors member of the Amateur Athletic Foundation of Los Angeles (AAFLA), vice president of the International Federation of Rowing (FISA), and executive committee member of the United States Olympic Committee (USOC). Anita DeFrantz was a member of the 1976 and 1980 United States Olympic Teams, winning a bronze medal in rowing at the 1976 Montreal Olympic Games. In 1980 she was a leader in the fight against the United States government-led boycott of the Moscow Olympic Games. The IOC, in recognition of this leadership, awarded her the Bronze Medal of the Olympic Order in July, 1980.*

*This interview is being conducted in Dana Point, California, on March 29 and 30, 2001. The interviewer is Allys Swanson, associate professor in the Exercise and Sport Sciences department at St. Catherine University (formerly the College of St. Catherine), St. Paul, Minnesota.*

**Swanson:** Anita, on February 4th you officially announced your candidacy for the International Olympic Committee presidency. This is a historic event, because you are the first woman in the 107-year history of the IOC to run for this office. What was that experience like for you?

**DeFrantz:** I had decided to make the announcement just before the Executive Board meeting, which I knew, was scheduled for Dakar, Senegal. I made it the day before the meeting actually started because I felt it would be inappropriate to have the news coming out of the Executive Board meeting. Although I thought it would be appropriate to announce the day before, I did not know that I would be president pro tem of the IOC that day. President Samaranch was suffering from the flu, and was in Barcelona, Spain, being examined by his personal physician. He had decided not to travel until his personal physician gave him the ok.

I tell you all that as background for the fact that on the day I made my announcement, I was also taking on the agenda of President Samaranch. First, I gave the awards at the golf tournament, "The Judge Mbaye Golf Tournament," the first ever held in his honor. That was a great deal of fun for me. I have great respect for Judge Mbaye who currently is second vice president of the IOC.

Those who wished then traveled to Ile de Goree; even saying that gives me chills. This is the site where much of the trade of enslaved human beings occurred from the 1500s through the early 1900s, and Ile de Goree was the stepping off point.

While I had fully intended to go there, I had not intended to go as president pro tem of the IOC. This added a whole new dimension to this trip. I not only had to deal with the very personal emotional experience of Ile de Goree, but also the unplanned experience of acting as president pro tem. That made it very, very difficult.

On we went; taking a boat trip, which the people enslaved, had to take. We were told these people had already traveled many miles as captives of war; that's how it was set up. These captives were already disoriented and exhausted, and who knows what had happened to them already? Then they were put on some kind of boat, obviously wind aided, to take another horrific journey, this time much shorter. On our diesel-fueled boat ride to Ile de Goree, I'm

already chatting with my colleagues; were having polite discussions while I'm going through all my personal set of emotions. I'm dealing with emotions of profound sadness for these enslaved people; men, women and children. It was a very difficult time for me.

People would say, "Well didn't they know what was happening? Couldn't they see what was going to happen?" But, you cannot possibly see the port from the land. Not only that, this is in the 1500s to 1900s, and the people were going about their daily lives. These war captives were not their family or friends; they were complete strangers to them. Our guide also explained that, during that time, using captives of war in that manner was something normal in Europe and other parts of the world as well, sad to say.

As we arrived you could clearly see that the port is another part of the island, completely distant from the shore of Dakar. Again, my emotions are coming back. After we had gone around and put into port, it was very clear that you could not see the mainland. The island is structured in such a way that it completely blocks the city of Dakar. We put in to shore, climbed down from the boat and began our visit of Ile de Goree.

**Swanson:** The strong emotions you felt were obviously reflecting the connections you have with your own family history.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, and also empathy with the people and the history of the great and long standing nation of the Senegal, and what they had to struggle with as they recognized that they were complicit in this trade. This was the jumping off point for the millions of enslaved peoples. As the guide told us, and he was very clear about the story, the continent of Africa probably lost about thirteen million people, six million lost at sea, and seven million to America. He also explained, among other things, that the Arab Nations were the people setting up the wars to create the prisoners of war. They were a part of enslaving people and had been a part of enslaving people for a long time. The Europeans, when they found America, needed more human labor.

Of course America had been here for a long time. Another part of my ancestry is American Indian.

The Indians in America, after receiving many diseases from the Europeans, could not do this enormous work demanded by the Europeans who came to have farms, tobacco farms, sugar cane, cotton and all that. They started importing enslaved people. They looked for people who could find people who could be enslaved to help fulfill the enormous labor needs in the new country. This was all in the story the guide was telling our group on Ile de Goree.

I held it together until he showed us the very tiny space the captured men were kept in; and told us about the huge number of men and the length of days they were confined. He then showed us the room and started talking about what was done. By the way, an IOC staff member was asked to do the translation from French to English, and I just don't know how he was able to do it. The tour director was explaining primarily how it was the African Americans, obviously meaning those of us who are now in the United States, are the descendants; and also how descendants of enslaved people were in the Caribbean and to a certain extent in South America, mainly Brazil. Clearly, in the U.S.A., we are the descendants of this process. When he got to where they kept the children, I just lost it. Fortunately I had on my shades. I didn't have enough Kleenex for that experience, and unfortunately I'd left my handkerchief back at the hotel, but here I am president pro tem. I just sort of melted to the back of the group. What they did to children was unthinkable.

I had some realization of what had happened, but the physical presence of being at the actual site was overwhelming. To look out at the sea and know of the sharks, and how the sharks would follow the ships because they would just throw people off as they died, or got sick, or for punishment---there was absolutely no respect for human life---zero.

Then, as president pro tem of the IOC, I was asked to sign the book. This was a great honor, but for me, I had to struggle in my mind to understand that signing the book, was an honor. The people were so proud, knowing that I was an African American and knowing that I was really more connected to them. They were very proud, recognizing the fact that President Samaranch could not be there, but that I was the one in his stead, signing the book. Let me say that, I think they were proud.

Standing in the room where the transactions were finalized, was a really difficult struggle for me. I finally made it by thinking that signing the book meant that this practice had ended. But, at first, I had these images that I was signing one of these transactions, and I could not do that. You had asked me what it was like announcing there, and I had to tell you all of this.

**Swanson:** This is certainly an amazing connection of events all embodied in one person. With your empathy for your ancestors, the history of the world, signing the book, and the historic announcement you made as the first woman to run for the IOC presidency, somehow it seems as if a large circle has been completed.

**DeFrantz:** I had decided to make my announcement in Dakar to honor the people of Africa for all the work they have done over the years on behalf of the Olympic Movement. There are so many volunteers, so many people who have given, and so many athletes; the many we know and the many we'll never know. I determined I would make my announcement in Dakar to honor the people of Africa and the continent of Africa. They don't get the recognition they deserve, so this was my tribute to them.

**Swanson:** Obviously you gave a lot of thought to this. What do you hope to accomplish should you be elected IOC president? What do you think the challenges are for the IOC over the next eight years?

**DeFrantz:** President Samaranch has built the Olympic Museum in Lausanne, and he has built unity. He believed that the Olympic Movement had to be unified. It's interesting to look at his statements before he even became an IOC member and after he became an IOC member. He continued to say that he felt it was absolutely necessary to bring in the International Federations or IFS, as well as the national Olympic committees. The NOCs are truly a franchise of the IOC; the NOCs have no reason to exist without the IOC. President Samaranch has worked throughout his entire term to make sure that happened, and he has succeeded. I call this structure of unity the Olympic Pyramid, which we can't forget has four sides: the IOC, the NOCs, the IFs, and the athletes.

As Olympians, all athletes are members of the Olympic Movement. We now have more athletes as members of the IOC with the athletes' elections, which I managed from the beginning.

**Swanson:** The accomplishment of unity during the last term lays the foundation for the challenge of the next term. What is that?

**DeFrantz:** Inclusion. Now that we have unity, in my opinion, we now need inclusion. The [Olympic] Museum is available to those who want to go there, but how many people can go to

Lausanne, [Switzerland]? I want to include so many more. I have already sent my first discussion paper to my IOC colleagues for review. I said I would contact my colleagues. It's very difficult for me to travel in person because I live very far away and it's expensive, but I will do my best to contact them through the magic of the telephone, and I will travel the world as best I can. I want to hear from them, how they feel and what they would like to do in the future in the IOC. I have begun the process by sending out that paper, and I have begun calling them. Fortunately, I know most of the members and feel quite comfortable talking with them.

**Swanson:** When will the vote for the IOC presidency be held?

**DeFrantz:** The vote will be taken on July 16, [2001] in Moscow. It's interesting to note that if I had been able to compete in the 1980 Olympic Games, so much of this would be different. It was really my work to fight the boycott in 1980 that led to my work in the IOC.

**Swanson:** How would you describe your leadership style?

**DeFrantz:** Inclusive. It's an inclusive style. I am a good decision-maker, which is important. I seek advice, I hear what people have to say on an issue, but I also make decisions before a problem becomes critical.

**Swanson:** Perhaps you base your decision making style on the honors thesis you wrote during your senior year at Connecticut College?

**DeFrantz:** Yes, that was a lot of fun. I still have it somewhere. It's called "The Philosophical Value in the Plurality of Ideas." During my junior year the college decided that there could be something called, "Student Designed Inter-Disciplinary Majors." Prior to that I had been a music major, although I also loved philosophy and government. By the end of my junior year, I had enough credits in all of those departments that I was able to persuade the faculty that I was qualified to spend my senior year working in the inter-disciplinary area of political philosophy. Even the music credits and the history of music were just perfect for this political philosophy inter-disciplinary work.

**Swanson:** It seems as if you were trying to understand different viewpoints, and this better understanding would lead to better decision making. Was this the main thrust of your honors thesis?

**DeFrantz:** Yes. This has absolutely influenced my leadership style over the years. Even when I became an IOC member, I was interviewed and asked a similar question. I said, "I believe I'll do a good job because so many people talk to me about issues. They will keep me informed about how they feel about the IOC and the things we are doing. I believe that I will be a very good IOC member for that reason. I'm not isolated, they know where I am, they can reach me and I'll be able to receive that information."

**Swanson:** I just read sport sociologist Richard Lapchick's recently published article, "What the IOC Needs, Anita DeFrantz Offers." In this article he talks about your well-earned reputation for integrity, courage and fairness, and thinks that your particular blend of these qualities is exactly what the IOC needs at this time. What is your reaction to that?

**DeFrantz:** Well, I am certainly honored that Professor Lapchick would say those things in writing. I learned those things long ago. Courage is something that I have called upon many times in my life. Certainly in 1980, but I had to have courage long before in order to be able to

call upon it in 1980. Fairness, I trust I am fair. As president of a major foundation, I need to be fair; fair as we consider grants, and certainly, as I act as president dealing with the staff and the issues one has to deal with in the day-to-day operations in a foundation of this size.

**Swanson:** What is the AAF and how was it created?

**DeFrantz:** A tripartite contract was signed in 1977 or 1978, first with the IOC, the LAOOC (Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee) and the USOC. Then a second contract was signed with the LAOOC and the USOC. This contract stated that any surplus, whether it was 10 cents, \$10, or as it turned out to be, \$230 million, would be divided 60 percent to the USOC, 40 percent to [promote youth sports in] Southern California. The 40 percent became the AAFLA. The LAOOC did very well in managing the [1984] Games and therefore we had a very sizeable surplus of funds.

The board first elected someone else to be president, and I was a member of the staff, and then, in 1987, they elected me to be the president.

**Swanson:** Let's now begin to talk about your own life history. After that we will wind our way back to your present day professional life.

**DeFrantz:** I know a great deal about my family history. I first learned about it from my parents, because they encouraged me to ask questions. I knew all of my grandparents, my great-grandparents, and to a certain extent my great-great grandparents. Longevity runs in our family. On my mother's side my grandmother is still alive. My great-grandfather and great-grandmother were very dear to me. We spent time with them in the summers and I would ask them questions. They lived in Muncie, Indiana. Actually, the sociological studies that are published about Muncie left out a lot about colored people. That was what we were called then.

My Grandma Lucas, actually my great-grandmother, but I called her Grandma Lucas, raised my mother because my grandmother traveled a lot. I was just fascinated with Grandma Lucas's strength. She wasn't a big woman, but she had such internal strength, such commitment. I had to make deals with her to not be so talkative, and then I could walk with her to the grocery store. Sometimes she drove an old Buick, but she had very little money. Her husband, my great-grandfather, had retired after years and years of service at Ball Glass Company. Working so many years in the furnace room had compromised his health. After 50 years of service, he received a gold watch, \$2,000 and severely poor health. Actually, Grandpa Lucas was a very wise man and he had just missed being enslaved [because of the Emancipation Proclamation].

I also have papers. I have saved a manumission paper in the proper way to preserve it and keep it from deteriorating more. Also there was an emancipation paper that was in the big family bible, which my brother now has. Also in the giant family bible are all the names of people who were married and died and things like that. We know that the first DeFrantz born in the United States was Henry David DeFrantz in 1709. I've also had our family history researched, and I am continuing with that work.

When I was about 8 or 9 I remember asking my mom why Grandma Lucas didn't have a better job. I said, "Why doesn't Grandma Lucas have a better job? She works for other people, cleaning houses, washing clothes, but she's so smart. I talk to her about lots of things."

My mom looked at me and said, "You ask her."

So I did. "Grandma, why don't you have a better job?"

She looked at me and said, "Well, sweetheart, I wanted to be a nurse so I could help people. But when I was little, colored girls didn't do that. Things have changed now. You can do whatever you want to do. You just have to be very good in school and continue your education. You promise me that you will do whatever you want."

**Swanson:** So you made her a promise.

**DeFrantz:** Yes. I said, "Yes, Ma'am. Yes, Ma'am, I will." I was just a little kid, but I think I saw a tear in her eye. I'll never forget that moment.

**Swanson:** What about your father's side of the family?

**DeFrantz:** My father's side, the DeFrantz's, also has oral traditions. In addition, I had the DeFrantz family traced.

**Swanson:** Did you find out about your family history?

**DeFrantz:** Yes, some \$10,000 or so later.

**Swanson:** Wow.

**DeFrantz:** This stuff costs a lot. I am now continuing the process, but this work completed a chapter of our family history in time for the year 2000. I sent it out to my generation and to my mother, and uncle and aunt. I wanted them to know about the DeFrantz history. It is fascinating. I knew from our oral history that my father's father's father was Alonzo David DeFrantz. He was part of the [Benjamin] "Pap" Singleton Movement. He was an educated man because his father, Charles DeFrantz, was the son of Charles DeFrantz who held people enslaved. He said, "If you wish, I'm going to make sure that you are educated because I really love your mother who I have held in slavery. But you can go and you will own land." This was in Natchez, Mississippi. For a long time they always said Louisiana, but this area was part of the Louisiana Purchase.

**Swanson:** That is very unique. Wasn't it against the law to teach an enslaved person to read?

**DeFrantz:** It depends on exactly what time. For a while there was all this Puritanism, everyone had to know about the Bible. Then they realized that if you knew about the Bible, you couldn't be enslaved. People went around saying, "I've been saved, I've got religion, so now I can't be enslaved anymore." Then they started passing the laws making it a crime to teach an enslaved person to read.

**Swanson:** It's to your credit that you have taken the initiative to research your family history.

**DeFrantz:** I also found out two very dramatic things. Alonzo married a woman who was Creek Indian, so I have that in my history. Actually, many people back then couldn't spell, including some of the census takers. Sometimes they just put down whatever they wanted, even though it was wrong.

Alonzo and his wife were in Tennessee and her father and mother, but maybe her mother had passed away by then, traveled with them to Kansas. Alonzo and his wife, who are the parents of my grandfather, traveled to Kansas as part of the "Pap" Singleton Movement of emancipated people, and settled there. That was a very large movement. My great-grandfather, Alonzo David DeFrantz, was both president at one time and secretary-treasurer of the "Pap" Singleton Movement. This long history of standing up for people plays a significant role in our family. My grandfather, who was called "Big Chief" ("Little Chief" was my grandmother) continued the tradition of the "Monster Meetings" at the YMCA in Indianapolis. I called him "Pappy."

I saw him quite a bit; in fact he walked me to school when I first started kindergarten. My birthday wasn't until October, and I couldn't go to the neighborhood school until I turned 5. We would walk to school every day. I remember he always told me to hold my head up high, and to be courageous and proud.

He'd gone through a lot in his life. As a student at Kansas University he played on the football team until the time his helmet came off. The other team realized he was colored, as they said then, and that was the end of his playing on that football team. I have another picture of him playing on a football team of all colored guys. I don't know who they played, but he was determined to keep playing football because he was quite good. He had made the varsity team at Kansas University.

He finished college and two years of medical school at Kansas University. My father showed me his grades and I saw that he had done well. Then it was time for his internship. At that time the "no touchy" rule was in effect which meant that a colored doctor could not touch white patients. Therefore, to do his internship, he would have had to travel something like 200 miles to the colored hospital. Because of this he dropped out of medical school.

Now Alonzo – let me not forget Alonzo – was a musician and a poet. His writings are still in the Kansas Historical Society. My brother James saw them. I have three brothers, David, James and Thomas.

**Swanson:** And you are the second oldest.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, the peacemaker.

**Swanson:** Talk about the YMCA and your grandfather, the "Big Chief."

**DeFrantz:** Yes, after he dropped out of medical school, he went back to college and got his master's in social work or maybe it was sociology. After he got his degree he was offered a job. I have the copy of the letter that was sent to him which says, "If you come, you have a job." That was in either 1910 or 1912. Out he went, by train or bus or whatever humiliation he had to suffer back then.

All the Y's for colored people had street names like Senate Avenue Y, never the John Smith YMCA like the Y's for white people. Why? So that traveling folks could find them. They were the only place, other than people's homes, where traveling colored people could get housing. For a long time that continued, in fact, when I went to college that was still true.

The "Monster Meetings:" at one time we thought maybe Pappy had instigated them, but it may have been his predecessor, and he kept them going. Throughout the spring, they would bring in the leadership of the African American world to give speeches. People could hear them and



ask questions. They were called “Monster Meetings” because they were so large. I thought that was such a funny name as a child. I guess it could be dangerous to bring that many people together at one time to hear these leaders. The speakers would usually stay at my grandparents’ house so my father had the opportunity to meet these great people: artists, architects, scientists and others. Some of the speakers included W.E.B. DuBois, Langston Hughes, Paul Robeson, artist Hale Woodruff, and others.

These people said to our people that they could achieve, they could stand up and say yes, I am who I am, and I can do these things. They said don’t be downtrodden, you can be educated and you can do what you want to do, just like my great-grandmother said to me. You can do this. Set your own goals. Even George Washington Carver, who had lots of fights back and forth, offered a sense of pride and hope to the people at these meetings.

I want to speak for a moment about Madame C. J. Walker. She gave the largest gift to the renovation of the Senate Avenue Y, but she was not going to be allowed to speak at the gathering. All the other people who were allowed to speak had given gifts so much less than Madame Walker had. Finally, she took the floor and said, “I will speak. Why are you letting these other people speak who have given so much less?” This story is related in A’leila Bundle’s new book, “On Her Own Ground: The Life and Times of Madam C. J. Walker.” In it she mentions F.E. DeFrantz and the Senate Avenue Y. It’s now on sale and I have an autographed copy.

**Swanson:** Do you think it was because she was a woman?

**DeFrantz:** Yes, absolutely.

**Swanson:** You have a long family history of people giving other people hope and inspiration.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, and importantly that history has been shared. My great-grand uncle went to Indiana University in the early 1900s. He, like his brother-in-law, wanted to be a collegiate athlete. He wanted to play basketball, but he was denied that opportunity. So he found another way. He went out for the track team and became the first African American to win a letter at Indiana University. He was the first African American “I-Man.” His name is Frank L. Summers, and his picture is on the wall at Indiana University. He went on to become an attorney in East St. Louis. Interestingly, he was a mentor to Arthur Ashe among others. He funded him in his early days when he went on tour, and Arthur Ashe remembered him. He also mentored me, his grandniece.

My parents met at Indiana University in the late 1940s, after my dad came back from the war. He was getting his master’s in sociology. Also, he was president of the NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) at Indiana University. They met during my mother’s second year, while he was working to integrate student housing. He and the other members of the NAACP recorded this process where they struck a deal with the university to integrate. I have typed up his handwritten memoirs from this time. The integration began in women’s housing, and my mother was one of five or seven women that integrated student housing at Indiana University.

**Swanson:** So many “firsts” in your family history, as well as your own life.

**DeFrantz:** Yes. After college, they left for Philadelphia, where David and I were born. Dad began his work in the Christian Street YMCA. Then, over my objection – I was only 18 months

old and probably screaming all the way – Dad moved the family to Indianapolis and worked at the Senate Avenue YMCA.

**Swanson:** With both your father and grandfather working in the YMCA, were you allowed to go the YMCA?

**DeFrantz:** Yes, but I learned to swim at the YWCA day camp when I was 12.

Actually, Indianapolis is very religious, and there seems to be a church on every corner. I was steeped in religion. When I visited my grandma's place in Muncie, I went to her church. My great-grandmother was Baptist, my grandmother was Seventh Day Adventist, my parents are Presbyterian, and my father's parents are Lutheran. I have lots of religious training. I learned all this stuff at home, also when I was at home. I would listen to the Rosary on the radio. That's probably why philosophy was so interesting to me when I was in college. My mother taught us all at a very young age that there is only one race, the human race. I learned that over and over again. I learned to respect all people.

**Swanson:** Education is also respected in your family.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, my father's family had been educated for generations. It never occurred to me that people hadn't been educated. We never really discussed college because I knew I would go. The trick was to escape Indiana University.

**Swanson:** With three brothers, did you ever feel left out of the YMCA activities? I know, in the mid '50s, the [all-white] YMCAs were quite specific in their programming for the male population.

**DeFrantz:** No, there were other girls at the Y, too. The only thing that I didn't get to go to was the father and son banquet – this left me time with mom. The father and son event was such a big thing; my pappy was so proud of his sons and grandsons. Even with all that he and his own family went through, out of twelve brothers and sisters, some became doctors and lawyers, also his brother went to the national office of the black YMCAs in New York. There are still people who remember the DeFrantz's in the YMCA.

**Swanson:** What do you recall your parents saying or doing to prepare you for kindergarten?

**DeFrantz:** I remember a lot. I even went to nursery school while my mom was getting her degree at Indiana University. I would walk to nursery school with my little lunch box. One day these huge lawnmowers were mowing. They were so noisy and I was so scared I just couldn't go where I was supposed to go. Finally one of the teachers came out to ask why I wasn't coming over. She couldn't come out to get me, and I was too scared to cross over by myself. Finally, they took a teeter-totter and put it over the fence so I could to climb over and go to school. Those lawnmowers were just huge and I was only 4 years old.

**Swanson:** It's interesting that you attended a University pre-school because they are usually very diverse.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, and I remember lots from that experience. I remember when kids would take milk boxes from other kids. I defended a boy who had his milk box taken. Later in life I actually met a classmate who remembered me from nursery school. She remembered the lawnmower incident and also the time I had defended the boy who had his milk box taken. She remembered all that years later.

**Swanson:** Were there any racist experiences in your early childhood education?

**DeFrantz:** Oh, lots of times, lots of them. My brother David suffered more because he was a guy. I also suffered a lot. There was so much racism in Bloomington; I call it "Bloomingulch."

We moved back there when my mother went back for her master's degree. We were in the public school system and my brother and I were the only two [African Americans] in the whole school. I was in the fourth grade at the time. It was just brutal. There was also a Soviet kid named Davide who was in the same class as my brother David. My brother protected Davide many times.

He was in so many fights, and he is nonviolent at heart. Now David is a pied piper, he is always protecting kids, although he is about to be an "empty nester" because all of his kids have grown. Two have graduated, one with a doctorate in pharmacology, married and working, and the youngest one is a junior. He really is a lovely man. But when he was in sixth grade it was horrible for him and pretty bad for me.

In fact one day, there was this boy who was just harassing me and harassing me, pushing, shoving, calling me names. The whistle has already blown to go in to start the day, when he took a swing at me. Luckily, I had the presence of mind to duck, but it was wintertime, so it was icy. He fell down and I fell down. I broke my wrist. To this day you can see that my wrists are different.

The teacher said, "That was very smart of you to duck and avoid getting hit."

I was crying because my wrist hurt so much. I said, "Well, what about him? He hit me."

He said, "I'll take care of that."

But I said, "What about my wrist? It really hurts."

He said, "Go to class and tell your teacher."

My teacher went back and forth from being mean to me, to being impressed with my grades. I was getting very good grades in school. I said to her, "My wrist really hurts, it really hurts." She sent me to the nurse. Again, I said, "I fell on the ice and my wrist really hurts."

The nurse looked at it and said, "Oh yeah, you might have broken it. I think I can give you some aspirin." I spent the whole day in this incredible pain in school.

Fortunately or unfortunately, I had really bad asthma at the time. Bloomington's climate and the fact that our family was living in married student housing seemed to add to that. Anyway, my mom picked me up from school to go to the allergist to get my shots. As soon as we got there, the nurse said, "What happened?" My mom was of course furious. Unfortunately, she spent a fair amount of time being upset at what was happening to her kids. We then went to get it X-rayed and put in a cast. My poor brother wanted to go after him and I said, "No, don't do that, it'll just make it worse for you."

**Swanson:** That whole experience was so unnecessary. Were there any teachers who had a positive influence on you?

**DeFrantz:** Yes, in grade school it's hard to say, but in high school, the music teacher, Mr. Preble was excellent. I learned so much that I literally did not have to open a book in music theory in college. I did, but I had such a firm grounding in theory from high school and his class. He was amazing.

**Swanson:** Was swimming your primary experience in sports at this time in your life?

**DeFrantz:** Yes, I learned how to swim at age 4. When my dad realized that his daughter knew how to swim and his son didn't, we then had a lot of opportunities to go the Y and go to beaches and things like that. It was great. He did spend a lot of time with his first-born, but that was fine because I could have free time or spend time with mom.

I also learned to read very early. I don't know how, but I did. I knew I knew how to read because when I went to the 10-day overnight camp, I was standing in the line that was for swimmers. They [the camp counselors] came up to me and said, "Do you know how to swim?"

I said, "Yes, and I know how to read."

They said, "Well, we didn't ask if you knew how to read."

I said, "Well, but that sign says, 'For Swimmers'."

**Swanson:** One of the articles I read stated that your father wanted you and your brother to become the first African Americans on the United States Olympic swim team. That was unusual. Why do you think he wanted that?

**DeFrantz:** I think it was because it was something denied to African Americans at that time. My family was about opportunity. I'm about opportunity. He said, "Let's do it kids." It was about getting us to think more broadly. Swimming was something I loved to do, and I didn't know much about the Olympic Games. We'd probably watched what coverage there was. It was an idea he had.

Also my grade school physical education teacher at James Whitcomb Riley P.S. 43 was an Olympian. She was my teacher, Joann Terry (married name, Grissom). She never wore her Olympic gear or anything, but my parents knew she was an Olympian and they told me. Her event was track and field. Since then I've researched it.

**Swanson:** What do you recall about your swim team competitive experiences?

**DeFrantz:** Fredrick Douglas Public Park Pool. It was an enormous pool – this huge oval. I think it was more than 50 meters. The women's dressing room was very dark and had stalactites and stalagmites everywhere. I was usually the only one in there and my dad would wait outside to make sure I got out. He couldn't go in there with me, being a dad and all, but he'd wait. Every once in a while there was another girl there who was a much better swimmer than I, but she didn't come that often. It was a very old facility, probably named something else before it was named Fredrick Douglas. The scariest part was the dressing room.

I was probably 8 or 9 and we were competing with AAU (Amateur Athletic Union) kids. The AAU had a big strong program in Indianapolis. The other teams would come from other AAU

clubs or other public parks. It was all-comers throughout the summer and we would compete. I actually had my first ethical challenge in sports during that time.

During my second season the coach told me that I was going to get a special award, and that I would receive it at the end of the next meet. I was very troubled by this and said, "I don't think I can accept this."

The coach said, "What?"

I said, "Just let me talk to my dad about this." It was the high point medal award for girls. I told my dad about the award and that I was worried.

He said, "Well, did you do the work?"

I said, "Yes, I worked very hard."

He asked if anybody else worked harder and I said, "No."

"Were you there every time supporting your team?"

I said, "Yes." Then he asked why I felt badly about the award. I said, "I feel badly because of my brother and the other guys on the team. They worked hard too."

He asked if I wanted to think about it more and if I wanted to talk to my mom about this.

I said, "I did."

He said, "All right, you can talk to her, but remember this is going to have to be your decision. You are going to have to make it. I'm sure you'll make the right one."

I did talk with my mom and she agreed that it had to be my decision to make. I did accept the high-point medal award for girls. Now what was the problem? I was the only girl on the team.

**Swanson:** I understand now, but you did get the most points.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, I did. I'd only won a bronze medal in one race that season and in one race the season before, but I was always doing my best. I'd worked so hard. My brother had won a couple silver medals and some others. The guys were pretty good, but I was younger and not as good a swimmer. This reminds me of a story I'll tell you later about the AAF.

It was an ethical issue to me. Of course I was the high-point girl; I was the only girl. It was impossible for anybody else to be the high point. It just didn't feel right. They also gave a high-point award to the guys, and there were about eight guys on the team. Even today it doesn't seem right.

**Swanson:** Well, you can't control the fact that there were no other girls.

**DeFrantz:** There was that one girl who came from time to time, and I don't know why she stopped coming. Maybe it was a problem with transportation. It usually is with kids.

**Swanson:** What do you remember about the differences between your team and the other teams?

**DeFrantz:** Training; the difference in training. Also, the kids weren't always particularly nice to me, a little chunky kid who didn't have all the fancy stuff. Some of them were OK, but you didn't get a chance to really know them. They had all their "rah rah" parents, and they had access to year-round training. We had an outdoor pool that was only open during the summer.

**Swanson:** It's interesting that as an adult your professional career is primarily focused on providing access for kids and giving them more opportunities in sport. Let's continue on and talk about your academic experiences in high school. In particular, I'd like you to talk about any leadership experiences that you recall.

**DeFrantz:** When I finally got back to Indianapolis and James Whitcomb Riley P.S. 43, we had mainly Anglo teachers. I think, at that time, we were migrating from being Negro to becoming Black and Proud. This was early '60s and I clearly remember a white principal coming in and telling us how grateful we should be for all that we had. He was speaking to my fifth grade class and he kept saying, "Grateful, and you people should be grateful." There must have been something that was making him upset, and he was taking it out on our class. Meanwhile, I was spending most of my time daydreaming and he was interrupting me.

Our family would talk about things that happened during the day at dinner. I always had a lot to say. I recall, as a seventh grader, the auditorium program where they would give out awards to eighth graders for the best in every class. An eighth-grade boy said to me, "I bet you'll receive every award next year." I'd never even thought about that until that guy said it to me. I was in junior high and I was starting to look at guys, but because I always had a big brother around looking out for me, it was kind of hard. Now he was a freshman in high school, and finally, the guys could look at me. When this guy said that to me, I thought, maybe I should work on that.

**Swanson:** Did you?

**DeFrantz:** Yes. The awards were for excellence in each of the subjects, and I got the awards.

**Swanson:** Did those awards refocus your efforts?

**DeFrantz:** Yes, because at home it was expected so we didn't really talk about it. We would talk about grades, which were always pretty good for all of us, but again there was no whip and there was no payment for grades. It was just something that we did.

**Swanson:** What do you recall about high school? Did you have any other leadership experiences?

**DeFrantz:** I had so much fun. Our high school was under a "deseg" [desegregation] ruling and my father had been elected to the school board. Actually, my mom spent a lot of time going to school board meetings, but they decided that dad should be the one to run for the school board election. Shortridge High School was designated as a magnet school. It was just wonderful. Everyone was there because they wanted to be. I could go there automatically because I was in the region, but if you lived outside the region you had to apply to go there. If you were not African American, you got in, pretty much. We had such an eclectic group there.

It was wonderful. I still have friends from high school that I communicate with. What a magic place it was.

**Swanson:** What extra-curricular activities did you participate in?

**DeFrantz:** Everything I could. I was in choir. I was in Madrigal, a very elite group; we spent a lot of time traveling. I was in marching band and orchestra. I played clarinet in marching band and bassoon in orchestra. When I went to college I majored in music. Also, I was in Quill and Scroll, and Thespians. I did everything.

We had some great teachers. I don't recall spending much time in class; I was majoring in fun and learning from my classmates. I had fun in biology. I remember in chemistry, they would turn the lights out to show these films and everyone would go to sleep. I wondered why they did that; they knew we were high school students. We had a great history teacher; they called him "The Sheriff." Our botany teacher, Mr. Ventura, was great. We especially loved him because he would run the films backwards. We had so many great teachers.

**Swanson:** And your father was on the school board during this time.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, and it was a difficult time. He actually voted, without telling me, to close my school. It was something that had to be done, but we had a lot of talking to do after that because he didn't tell me what he might have to do. I didn't have to go to another high school because it didn't happen then, but it was a part of what needed to be done in order to finish desegregating all of the high schools in the district. The school closed maybe three or four years later.

**Swanson:** How did you choose Connecticut College?

**DeFrantz:** Actually, two things happened. A man in the class ahead of me went to Connecticut College. That was the first year they accepted men. He was a good friend, and his brother was in my class. He came back saying how wonderful it was there, so I applied. It turned out that a friend of my mother's had also gone there, and she had been hoping I would apply. Many of my friends in my class were going east to school. I also had the bug to go East. I actually applied to Connecticut College, Radcliffe and Yale. I like to say that Connecticut College chose me.

**Swanson:** Did you get a scholarship?

**DeFrantz:** Actually, I did get a scholarship from Shortridge, and a financial aid package from Connecticut College which included some scholarship money. I also worked and received loans.

**Swanson:** It's interesting that Connecticut College had been a women's college just a few years earlier.

**DeFrantz:** The history was that it existed because Wesleyan stopped admitting women in 1910. A woman had become the valedictorian and another woman the salutatorian and the guys thought that was too much. They stopped admitting women. The alumnae of Wesleyan wanted a place of higher learning for women. They thought Yale would never do the right thing in Connecticut, so they formed Connecticut College for Women. It's interesting that the same year Connecticut College went co-ed, Wesleyan went co-ed again.

**Swanson:** I think your choice of Connecticut College is interesting. As a former women's college, they obviously nurtured leadership among women and valued strong leadership.

**DeFrantz:** I would not have gone there if it wasn't co-ed. Interestingly enough I was quite comfortable competing with men, having lived with my dad and three brothers, but my mom wanted me to go to Sarah Lawrence or Barnard. She wanted me to go to a women's college because she felt that this was another area in which African American women were denied access. Her wish was for me to go to one of the Eastern women's colleges. In her time that was not allowed.

**Swanson:** Let's talk about your mother. When you were a young child, she was working and going to the University of Indiana for her master's degree. She continues to work full time to this day. Was this different from your friends?

**DeFrantz:** That's interesting. I go to some meetings where women of my era talk about how it was so difficult for their mothers to make the decision to work or not. Every woman in my family has always worked. These difficult decisions of others to work or not are very foreign to my experience. In my family and in the families around me I've never known a woman who didn't work. Every woman in my family always worked. It was very strange for me to hear their angst. And now, people are talking about how the children today are running into trouble because of having no one at home. It's like, well, let me understand this better. This concept is foreign. They're blaming it on having no parents at home.

**Swanson:** I do remember, while playing golf at a country club one day in the early '80s, an octogenarian mumbling to the other men in his foursome, "If these women would stay home, we wouldn't have all the problems we're having today."

**DeFrantz:** You asked me to talk about my mother. First of all she gave me her name, which meant to me that she trusted me and wanted me to be able to do all the things that she did. She went back for more education, winding up with a Ph.D. in communication from the University of Pittsburgh. I think I was at Connecticut College when she was getting her doctorate. This meant that her youngest was still in grade school, and her second youngest was in high school. She left Dad at home with the two boys. She had trust in her husband and felt certain that he was taking care of those two. I honor my mother and my father for doing that. He had a lot of pride in her achievements.

My father was also a proud man. When he was studying for his master's in sociology [at Indiana University], his advisor told him that he would have to rewrite his thesis. My father insisted that he would not rewrite it. His topic was the NAACP at IU. He then had to go back to school and get his master's in social work. He did complete his master's in social work and I do remember that because I was maybe around 7 years old. After seeing how hard he worked, I vowed at that time to be sure to finish all of my education before I married and had a family.

**Swanson:** Did he keep the thesis he wrote on the NAACP? It was obviously very important to him. You have to admire him for his principles and for his determination to go on and get a master's in another field of study.

**DeFrantz:** All that was passed on to me. My mother told me about this and I think I've seen his thesis, but it's not on file anywhere. I believe that's also why they supported one another as she went on for her advanced degrees. It was very difficult for her. She was determined, and



again I have the wonderful legacy of all of that including her name. I always introduce her as the “original” Anita DeFrantz. I am a mere imitation, trying my best to keep up with the legacy that she has given me.

**Swanson:** Both of your parents I’m sure are very proud of your accomplishments, not just your work, but your integrity, your commitment to the value of life and your respect for each individual. You also have a strong sense of responsibility and service to others.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, absolutely, and I learned all that from my parents and our family. They taught me to ask – ask for help, ask for information. They taught me respect, self-respect and respect for others; and they taught me to make my own decisions. My mother, obviously, is my greatest role model, my great grandmother is the woman I knew and admired most, and the historical woman I admire most is Harriet Tubman.

Harriet Tubman decided she would be free. She asked others to come along and no one did. She got to freedom herself and then she came back many times to lead others to freedom. I’m told through historical treatises that she helped free over 300 people, always at great personal risk. Then she became a scout for the Union Army. She was probably the first woman to carry a weapon in the army, and then finally they told her what she was doing was too dangerous. What could be more dangerous than what she had already accomplished? She then became a nurse for the Union Army. After the war was over and in her later years, she ran a home for the aged. She was always giving of herself. That is why this amazing woman is my “shero.”

**Swanson:** Let’s talk about your college experiences. What was important to you when you were a freshman at Connecticut College?

**DeFrantz:** I’m doing as much as I can and actually petitioning the freshman dean to let me take classes at Wesleyan and Yale and get credit for them. One day as I walked through the administration hall, the dean of the college appeared and asked, “Are you a DeFrantz?”

“Yes, ma’am,” I said. “I am Anita DeFrantz.”

“Are you any relation to a Bobby or Fay DeFrantz?”

“Yes, ma’am. I believe you are speaking of my father and my uncle.”

She said, “Oh, I’ve known them for a long time. I hope I’ll have a chance to talk with you sometime.”

“Absolutely, would you like me to make an appointment with you?” I asked.

“Oh, whenever you have time,” she replied.

I thought I had escaped the questions of my parents by not going to Indiana University, but no.

**Swanson:** How did she know your uncle and your father?

**DeFrantz:** Actually, I think she knew my uncle better because he was older. There is a place in Michigan called “Idlewild” where African Americans, especially those in the Midwest, went to vacation; where they could go to vacation. My family, and my grandparents’ family, went up there in the summertime. We have pictures of us up there with our cousins. It was a lot of fun.

Dean Cobb apparently went there with her family during the same time my father and his brother and their parents went. It was a real hot spot in that era. That's how she knew Bobby, my father, and Fay, his brother.

**Swanson:** Now, you're a sophomore and the story is that you almost trip over the rowing shell on the sidewalk.

**DeFrantz:** Well, it was at the front of Crozier-Williams, which at that time was the equivalent to a student union building. I wasn't looking for anything else to do; I was already on the women's basketball team. But I had certainly heard of rowing. My friends at Smith had been rowing and told me about it. I'd seen it on television at the Olympic Games, and I wanted to be a rower. Something in me knew that I wanted to be a rower. I knew how to swim and I wanted to be a rower.

Bart Gullong (Connecticut College head rowing coach) said, "It's for rowing, and you'd be perfect at it."

I thought that was quite a line because I'd never been perfect for anything, but I did want to do this. I said, "I know how to swim, so tell me what to do."

**Swanson:** Being perfect meant being tall with long arms?

**DeFrantz:** He could see that I was tall, but couldn't tell that most of my height was in my legs. When I sit in a boat I look short. Having long legs is very good, but it would be better if my upper body was in proportion because the body also has leverage. I do have long arms, which is fine.

**Swanson:** Did you have to drop basketball or did you do both?

**DeFrantz:** I did both for most of my collegiate career. We were not a particular force in athletics at that time. In fact our mascot was the camel: "We could go for a long long time or a long dry spell without a lot of winning!"

**Swanson:** That's funny. Historically, way before our era, the stories about the early crew experiences at Wellesley relate that most women had to have a good singing voice, because they would simply row across the lake to an island and sing.

**DeFrantz:** I sang a lot when I was rowing. I sing a lot today, much to the dismay of many, but I was a music major. I love music—all kinds of music. To me music was the team sport that I could take part in; it's much like a team sport. It was something that my mom also did. When she was in high school she played violin and piano; she was an excellent pianist. Music is very important to me still.

When I would get to row with Coach [John] Hooten, we would sing a lot. But I don't sing unless the other people in the boat accept it; it's quite rude to do so. Often my pals would do me a favor and put up with me.

**Swanson:** Who was in your conference?

**DeFrantz:** Whoever wanted to be. Often we would row against Princeton and other teams who had long-established rowing programs for men and excellent coaching for women. We

were just beginning, so when you compared personnel and the size of the schools, we were way outclassed. Long after I left, they moved into Division III, but when I was there, they were in Division I, and that was painful to admit. Title IX had just been passed and we were making intercollegiate sport happen.

I'm smiling now, because two years after rowing on the varsity, I am demoted to junior varsity during my senior year. There was a new coach in town who made us do a lot of land training, which was important. I was a senior, I was a house-fellow, and I had a dormitory to run. Connecticut College gave a lot of responsibility to their students. We had a student honor code, which has a judiciary board chairman. In my junior year, I helped reinstate the tradition of matriculation, which we did for freshman when they came in. We had the ceremony explained, what the honor code was, and we had them sign the book of matriculation. We put a lot of things [traditions and regulations] back that had fallen off with the turmoil of 1969 and so forth. A lot of things needed to go away, parietals and other regulations of a women's college.

My mother thought I'd have to serve dinner for other students, and dress up for certain occasions. She called me one time and asked, "How was Friday dinner?"

I said, "Fine. So Mom, why are you asking about that?"

She said, "I thought you might have to do some things that they had to do in the early days."

I said, "Mom, that's so sweet. No, I don't have to do that."

**Swanson:** So you got rid of those things, but you brought some good things back.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, we brought back the traditions that had been at Connecticut College for so long and were a part of what we now call a civil society; important things. Part of what I wrote about in my honors thesis had to do with decisions you make to be part of a civil society. That was my junior year.

In my senior year, I was a house-fellow, and trying to figure out what I'm going to do after I graduate. This new coach has all these physical training things we had to do, and I hadn't connected with the program properly. So I got demoted. At the same time, Bart Gullong, the head coach, sees I'm a little troubled by this, it's not my image – a senior demoted to JV.

He said, "Well, Anita, if you worked hard, you could make the Olympic team."

This is the man that gave me that line two years ago. I said, "Bart, Bart, Bart – come on."

He said, "No no, I really mean it."

I said, "Thank you Bart, that's really nice, thank you."

**Swanson:** Do you think he knew that women's rowing was going to be a part of the 1976 Olympics in Montreal for the first time?

**DeFrantz:** Well, maybe, but I knew that he needed me so that the JV could row. You need a certain number of people in the boat. On the other hand, I'm a very loyal person. I knew that those other athletes who were younger than I needed to be out there. There was a little bit of a challenge to that, and I needed to make a decision. I was applying to law school. Dean Cobb,

the one who had asked me if I was a DeFrantz had become a mentor to me. She seemed determined that I apply to law school. Her support and my family tradition and history of standing up for things that needed to be done led me to believe that I wanted to go to law school. I'd done similar things at Connecticut. For example, I noticed there was no Student Bill of Rights, so I wrote one up. I went through all the things that needed to be done – introducing it to the faculty, and getting it passed. And, it's still there. There are things I have even forgot about that made a difference for life at Conn. Back to Bart Gullong telling me that if I worked hard, I could be on the Olympic team. I thought, well you know, maybe I can. I should do this. All of this led me to apply to only one law school. Since Harvard had turned me down once, I certainly was not going to give them that opportunity again.

Although Dean Cobb said, "You know, you have to apply to Harvard."

I said, "No, I don't think so. I will apply to Penn, my parents will be proud." I'll say, look you made it in Philadelphia, and also the Vesper Rowing Club is there. I had already applied for a Coro Fellowship near the other great rowing club in Long Beach (Long Beach Rowing Association). What I didn't initially realize was that Los Angeles and Long Beach were so huge. While I was accepted to the Coro program in Los Angeles, I was also accepted at the one law school that I had applied to. Miracles do come true.

**Swanson:** Why did you pursue law?

**DeFrantz:** Law is the language of power. My other path was to be one of the Supremes, the ones that wear the long black robes.

**Swanson:** Is there anything else you would like to say about your years at Connecticut College?

**DeFrantz:** I really loved Connecticut College. It was a wonderful experience for me. Of course, I rode the roller coaster of college life as any student does. I also learned that people can have more than one house; something else that never occurred to me. Wealthy people may have more than one house, and I went to friends' houses; their house in New York, their house in New Hampshire, their house in Connecticut. I had no idea about this.

I also have wonderful friends from college years. I was elected to the Connecticut College board of trustees in the alumni position. That was a great honor. I served my term, and then I was voted back on to the board of trustees, and served a longer term. We then put in a rule to limit terms of service, and I went off the board just as we were electing a wonderful new president to the college. I was then re-elected to the board of trustees, and finally, left the board just last year. Most of the recently elected trustees had no idea of my former years of service, and they were stunned when my citation was read thanking me for my 24 years of service on the Connecticut College board of trustees, at that time, half my life. I think that's a great honor.

**Swanson:** That is a great honor. Very few people serve that long as a trustee of their alma mater.

**DeFrantz:** It didn't seem that long. I like to say, "I think they were trying their best to educate me, that I was a tough case."

**Swanson:** That's funny. Well, they certainly succeeded. Initially, what kind of lawyer did you want to be when you first started law school?

**DeFrantz:** I wanted to learn the language of power. Truly that's what I wanted to be able to do. I also wanted to see if I could be an Olympian.

I became somewhat disappointed at Penn; Penn is a rather small law school among the Ivy Leagues. I think it's the second smallest, only Yale is smaller in its class size. I said that I was disappointed because I realized that most of my classmates were there to learn what they needed to learn to make a lot of money. That was different than the kind of learning I had experienced at Connecticut College. I was rather shocked by that. I was also disappointed, because again at that time, maybe it's still the case but in a different way, the undergraduate students were attacking the few African American students in law school. There were 10 or 12 of us. They were saying how unfit we were to take up space at the law school.

**Swanson:** Ten or 12 out of how many?

**DeFrantz:** Oh maybe 175, less than 200. Every day it seemed, in the student newspaper, maybe it wasn't that often but it felt so, there was another horrible attack on us saying we were unfit, and talking about the special admittance process. Well, if you looked at our LSAT scores, they were really good scores. My colleagues had come from UCLA, University of Michigan, Princeton, Yale, Harvard and Amherst. We were clearly qualified. All of us graduated, except for Gerald Early who decided the last semester of his third year that he would go to Columbia to get his Ph.D. By now he's written several books and is often seen on Ken Burn's histories and documentaries on baseball and jazz. He is a dear friend.

**Swanson:** Sounds like these attacks in the student newspaper were clearly unfounded and the writers were ill informed.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, and the law school administration never defended us.

**Swanson:** This kind of experience is so unfortunate, and all too common in those days.

**DeFrantz:** Two years ago I was invited back to give a lecture. I entitled the lecture, "Who Calls the Shots?" My topic was ethics in sport. I typically give them a title because they insist on it. But when I speak to the audience, and get a sense of what they are interested in, then I let the speech evolve. There is a tradition in one of the Indian nations that if you read a speech, it is a speech from somebody else, but if you present your own words, then they are your own words.

**Swanson:** What about the curriculum in the law school?

**DeFrantz:** This first year I took the required courses. The second year I spread out a bit and took a course from a wonderful man, Ed Sparer. He said, "Look around you. The first year after you graduate, everyone of you will be making \$50,000 or more." Of course that would have been in 1977 and at that time it seemed like an enormous sum for people who had not done anything except graduate from law school. He was saying how outrageous this was, how there were people with little or no income and all these law students had done was become educated. I thought to myself, "No I won't. I'll be in public interest law." Sure enough my starting salary was \$14,000 at the Juvenile Law Center of Philadelphia.

**Swanson:** What was your life like as you tried to juggle all the demands of law school as well as train for the Olympic rowing team?

**DeFrantz:** That was very challenging because the cost of law school was quite high. I'm sure today's law students would laugh at that statement, but given the times, it was quite high. I, as a law student and as an athlete training for the Games, had to make a decision. Since I intended to be on the national team, I would be required to spend my own money for the privilege of representing the United States. We had to contribute for our airfare and even for our uniforms, and I needed to save for that. My other colleagues got high-paying summer jobs at law firms to finance their next year in law school.

I therefore sought jobs during the school year. I finally found a job working nights, the graveyard shift; first two nights, then three and sometimes five nights a week, I worked at the police headquarters in Philadelphia at a place they called the "Roundhouse." This was where defendants were taken and held before their bail hearings. We interviewed those defendants, asking very personal questions, which taught me a lot about dealing with people. It varied. Some were very tense situations. We interviewed what we called "pilots," drunk drivers who were the worst type of person to interview, because of the aroma and their difficulty in coming up with answers. We interviewed people who had murdered or were about to be charged with murder, to people from MOVE group who, when asked their mother's name, would say the "Moon," their father's name, they'd say the "Sun," and things like that.

This experience taught me a lot. It taught me about my willingness to work hard for something I really wanted to do. I would arrive at police headquarters at 10:00 p.m., do my interviews, finish my shift and maybe have time to go to my house, oftentimes not, and arrive at the boat house at 5:30 a.m. and prepare for my practice. Practice for me was always a great release – to go to the boathouse and row. I finished practice about 7:00 or 7:30 a.m., changed and went off to law school. During the middle of the day, because I had the credentials as a Penn law student, I would go the gymnasium and do my weight work out, or "stadiums." In the wintertime I would do stairs in one of the tall dormitories, and then again change and go back to class. After class I went back to the boathouse for our evening workout. After that I'd go home. All of this was probably on my bicycle. If I was scheduled to work that night, I'd show up at the Roundhouse. If not, I would study, or sleep. That basically was my schedule for two of my three years in law school. Of course, the summer of 1976 I was in Montreal at the Games, and the other summers I was in Europe training and competing.

The fall of 1976 I had the great privilege of working in Washington, D.C. at the Center for Law and Social Policy. I applied. It was competitive, and I was accepted into the program. This was a great experience. I met third year law students from a number of other top law schools. I have a dear friend from that experience who I have maintained contact with until this day, and I also met some people who would be key in the struggle against the boycott in 1980. It was an important experience to begin to understand the process of public interest law and also for things that would happen later in my life.

That was the fall of 1976, right after the Olympic Games. I always say Olympic Games because 'Olympic' is a modifier. My mom was always a strict grammarian as I was growing up.

**Swanson:** Relate some of your training and international competitive experiences in rowing during the years you were on the national rowing team.

**DeFrantz:** We were a part of the national team by then, so were going there to compete. Our training was pretty much over, but we trained between the competitions. Most of the international competitions, if not all, are in Europe. Because we were from the United States, it

was always quite expensive and quite difficult. In 1978 we did compete in New Zealand, and interestingly enough, we went first to Australia and entered a competition in Penrith, which is very near the rowing competition site of the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games.

**Swanson:** When did you first make the United States national team?

**DeFrantz:** In 1975. For the first time there would be a national camp to select the eight rowers. That was considered a hardship for the Vesper Team, in particular. In the past there was always a trial and whatever club or entry won, would become the national team. For the working woman of Vesper, it would be a hardship to have to go to where the camp would be held and go to a trial. A request for arbitration was filed, probably the first arbitration filed [in amateur sports] in the United States for the right to compete. The American Arbitration Association filed the arbitration against the national governing body of the sport, USRowing. The outcome of the arbitration was that if Vesper won the national championship in the eight, then they would have the right to go [to the world championships]. If not, then the camp would go forward. There was a lot of pressure because we were competing in several boats at the national championships, and not everyone fully understood what was up. I later learned that people considered me a leader, I guess because I was in law school. All I was doing then was going to law school, doing my best to make the first boat at Vesper, and hoping to make the national team. But there I was at this arbitration, speaking on behalf of Vesper knowing a bit about the situation having read the constitution of the USOC, and reading all I could while going to this fancy law school. I was doing all I could to stay in law school, too. I was doing a lot.

**Swanson:** Did you make the first team at Vesper?

**DeFrantz:** I had made it in the fall at the Head of the Charles, but there were always a lot of people competing to be in the first boat. I had made the four, I think the pair also, and I thought I'd be in the eight, but as in all sports, it's up to the coach to make that decision; perhaps even on the day of the race. But we were still in arbitration, so this was before the nationals.

**Swanson:** How did it turn out?

**DeFrantz:** I think Wisconsin beat us at the nationals in the eight. We won in the four, and then another ethical question was raised. Two of us from the four were offered the opportunity to essentially be in the eight, all we had to do was go to the training camp on weekends, and we were practically in. I know an offer like that would probably not hold, that they would have to see us in that environment, and of course we'd have to pay to go up there every weekend. But this would break up the four, which had won the right to go to the world championships; and it would make it impossible for the two other women, the coxswain from Vesper, and the coach to have that opportunity.

This coach said to me, "We'd like for you to come to the camp and while I've been authorized to make this offer to you, we expect for you to be in the eight. We know that you've very strong and very capable."

Now this is my first chance to be on the national team, and this is my first year of rowing for Vesper. This was a real dilemma, and as I've said before, another ethical sports situation.

**Swanson:** What did you do?

**DeFrantz:** I stayed with Vesper. The U.S. national team won a silver medal in the eight that summer [1975] in Nottingham, England. We, that is Vesper, were fifth at the world championships in the four with coxswain. People still believe I was in that eight. They can't imagine me not having done that, but I was loyal to my team. I have very strong loyalties. Most people don't know the background of that experience. Only Pam [Behrens] and I and the coach at Vesper, and of course the coach who made the offer, know the details of what happened. This is the first time I've really explained the situation.

**Swanson:** Yes, loyalty does seem to be very important to you.

**DeFrantz:** That was my first international trip. No actually, Canada, with my family to the World's Fair in Montreal, was the first international trip.

**Swanson:** International travel plays such a major role in your professional life. Did that experience begin your love of travel?

**DeFrantz:** No, long ago I had the love of travel, but it was always through books. I read so much as a child. I think growing up on a block where there were all boys, although my brother insisted from time to time I could play with them, gave me time with books. I threw the football very well, but books, I read and read and read. I learned to read at a very young age, as I said earlier, I'm not quite sure when. Certainly by the time I was five I could read very well. I read a lot. My dad gave me his comic books, I'm sure my mom gave me books. I read the L. Frank Baum series, the whole Oz Series. I read all the Edgar Rice Burrough's books. Travel, fiction and fantasy are wonderful. I still read a great deal. You can read and experience a thousand lifetimes through books.

**Swanson:** Do you recall any strong impressions from your world championship experiences in Nottingham, England?

**DeFrantz:** Certainly the East Germans; they were so strong and so dominant. And I loved the pageantry of our sport, the noblest of sports.

**Swanson:** Explain that to me.

**DeFrantz:** It's so fair. All the rowers respect one another, and at the end of the regatta we have a tradition of changing and negotiating for shirts or parts of uniforms with one another; that level of respect. In the collegiate level, you win shirts by winning. You have what we call betting shirts, but the winner takes the shirts. At the international level you negotiate, you make deals with one another and trade this for that. It's so lovely and there is so much respect. It's absolutely true, it really is. From my first regatta, then-president Thomi Keller [of the International Rowing Federation] wanted to hear from the athletes about how they felt. I expected that to be true of all the Ifts and it just wasn't. Rowing is the noblest of sports; the rowers stay involved with the sport. Now the executive committee, of the noblest of sports, and the council is made up of people who have rowed and who want to give back their time and effort.

**Swanson:** Where did the impetus come from to include women's rowing in the 1976 Montreal Olympic Games?

**DeFrantz:** Certainly, Thomi Keller, but there was also a Dutch woman by the name of Nelly Gambon, who worked very hard for many years to keep encouraging our IF and Thomi Keller to



make a stance with the International Olympic Committee. During that period, and for a long time and still, it's up to the IFs to come to the IOC. The IOC doesn't say, "You must do this," although now as an IOC member I've learned that and I often encourage the IFs.

**Swanson:** After the summer of 1975 you went back to your regular routine of training and going to law school. How did you get selected for the 1976 Olympic team?

**DeFrantz:** There was a camp. First you had to be selected to go to the camp; that was based on what the head coach had seen and I guess other coaches submitted names, and said, "Please look at this person." I was one of approximately 100 people who were invited to the camp in Boston. The head coach was Harry Parker; Coach Parker he was called. Coaching women changed his life because we were typically older and less reverent than his legions of men who had been coached at Harvard. We started calling him Harry. Yikes, [his] men had always called him, Coach Parker,

**Swanson:** Where did you live?

**DeFrantz:** In Boston, in a dormitory that they called "the zoo" so we called it "the zoo." It was a huge dorm so that's probably why the undergraduates called it "the zoo." I think our weekly stipend was \$50 for food. The poor coxswains I think got \$25; they were only supposed to weigh 98 pounds.

**Swanson:** How long did the camp run?

**DeFrantz:** We arrived at camp in June and the Games started in July. The camp couldn't start before Harry, Coach Parker, finished his responsibilities at Harvard. Of course, the Harvard-Yale race ended his responsibilities for the year. The selection camp lasted about four weeks. We did a lot of seat racing. As it became clear that you were not going to be selected, you sort of packed up and went home.

**Swanson:** What exactly is seat racing?

**DeFrantz:** Seat racing: two boats line up and race across three minutes of water. Let's say they were even the first time. That makes it easier to explain. They go back and switch the woman in boat A seven seat to boat B seven seat. Now, the woman who was originally in boat B is in boat A. They race across the same piece of water for three minutes and this time boat A wins. The woman who switched from boat B to boat A won that seat race. The first time, when she was in boat B, they tied and she made boat B go fast. The second time, when she was in boat A, she made boat A go really fast, so she won that seat race.

We were doing this from four to six weeks. People were falling apart. There are lots of people involved, there are so many mind games, there is so much happening, but rowing is a mental sport as well as a physical sport. When you're sitting on the line at the Olympic Games you've got to be totally together, mind and body. By the time you get to the Olympic Games, there's nothing more to do for your body. Except, you know, certain people have different jellybeans than we have, but there's really nothing to do for the body. It's all up there in your mind. That's why it's a sport for older people, older meaning in your 20s.

Now, the eight is selected and we are training as a group. We had seven to 10 days at Dartmouth, when the eight started rowing together. Then we had our so-called processing in

Plattsburgh, New York. Every team goes through processing where we get our uniforms and other gear. Here is where history takes a turn for me.

I was, at some point, elected team captain. It turns out that the USOC had failed to order, or Adidas had failed to supply enough uniforms. We had our rowing gear because that is up to the national team, but there were not enough uniforms that said, "United States Olympic Team." The men and women's rowing teams were the last to go through processing. They had enough for the guys. Rowing is the second largest sport at the Games. As team captain, it's my responsibility, I believe, to get the uniforms and all the gear that is due for the women's rowing team. That began my crusade through time and the Games. This is now three days before Opening Ceremonies.

**Swanson:** Three days to go, and you were still in Plattsburgh?

**DeFrantz:** Yes, and they were going to see a lot of me throughout the Games because my crusade is to get the uniforms for the women's rowing team. We made the United States Olympic Team and we deserved to have all the gear that was due us; all the gear that the rest of the members of the United States Olympic Team had. A year later, I accomplished the task. It took me a year. I was not going to stop until everyone had every piece; including the rain suits, warm-ups, all the stuff that says United States Olympic Team.

During the Games I found the USOC office and I went down there every day. I wasn't hounding, but I was there. I think Don Miller [Col. F. Don Miller, USOC executive director] was impressed. The other people there may have been irritated, but I just would come and sit. Finally, I got to talk with someone. I said, "I'm here to inquire about the status of our gear." They told me that Adidas just didn't care, they were now dealing with other teams and they didn't make enough, and they are not going to make anymore right now, they're at the Games, and they're too busy with other things, and they just don't care about the U.S. team. A lot has changed now, but at that time, the United States team wasn't important to them. Isn't that stunning?

I said, "Well, there are other things than the uniforms that we didn't get, and I expect for us to get them. I'm going to keep asking, and I'm going to keep coming, because I will report to the team. As team captain, I will do my job." Not only that, there were other women in the boat who were bigger than I was. (Laughter)

**Swanson:** What about the competition itself?

**DeFrantz:** It was just thrilling. Our first race at the Olympic Games was the first race that we ever had as a boat. I figured this out maybe three years later; and this is just stunning. That may be why, later as I read some of the news reports, or even more recently as I read some of the news reports, that the people were so shocked that we won a bronze medal. Now it makes sense. We had never raced together before that first race in the Olympic Games.

In our first race, at the 500-meter mark we were in the lead. Even the GDR (East German team) was behind us. We get to the 250 and they had pulled even or slightly ahead and our coxswain calls for a sprint. It felt like we literally came to a halt. I'm the seven seat and I'm thinking, What? She calls for a sprint again two strokes later, and I've never raced before with these folks, but that was unusual. I thought, "All right, I'm going to pull this boat across that finish line." I'm still with the stroke, but I can't imagine what is going on back there. So I'm pulling, and pulling, then suddenly the pressure goes off from slowing us down. We finally get

to a sprint, and all the other boats are coming on. Suddenly, I see out of the corner of my eye, an oar floating past. We get to the finish line, amazingly second, which is good. We have something in rowing called *repechage*, which means second chance. As it turns out, our bow person had caught a boat-stopping crab. In the Olympic Games, that is a rookie thing to do. I had done that in my rookie year at Connecticut College, but my oar went over my head. I had to get the oar, bring it back. But, for an elite rower – I don't know how she survived. The pressure that we have at that level could have created substantial injury or thrown her out of the boat.

**Swanson:** Explain exactly what you mean by “catch a crab.”

**DeFrantz:** It's when the blade doesn't go in the right way, so it's a technique issue at the elite level. It's called catching a crab to suggest that something under the water has grabbed your oar. If the oar is not put in the right way, the pressure of the water drags it down. We had a lot of pressure. We were steaming forward with everything we could put on it. So it's just in there and the oar was against her. Probably the pressure against the oarlock finally pulled it out; then she let go and the oar went into the water. I give her all honor. We said nothing, maybe the coach did, but we had to prepare for another race in two days. No one said anything, but I'm sure she knew what we were thinking. At least I said nothing, I don't know if anybody else did.

People worry about having too many athletes staying together. There were 13 of us in one apartment in the Olympic village. I jokingly say, we had a rule, “No fewer than three people in the bathroom at any one time.” That's the way it was; 13 of us. There were two rooms and everyone else slept in the so-called living room; there were four of us in one room, three in the other, and the rest in the living room. I thought, “OK, we'll make things better as we go along,” but this is the way we did it; it wasn't great, but we did it.

Our next race ... What courage that woman had to have had to get back in the boat. God only knows what her mid-section must have looked like. The pressure of that oar against her body, and the mental agony of what had happened, and yet being able to get back in the boat with us – what courage. I don't remember a word being said. That was our first race ever as a group. This race, two days later, was a must win to get to the finals: for us a do or die. We won.

Now, for the finals, there is a picture of us in the USOC yearbook, it's the mid-section of that book and we are just staring at the waves. Again no one said a word. At that time they alternated race days between the men and women, today men and women race on the same day. The women's day always had an ocean: whitecaps. It was so bad that day that they moved the course over a lane. And yet lane one was “glass” for the last 100 meters, which is what you want to race on. We had the “ocean” the whole way: lane six. Amazingly enough, every U.S. finalist had lane six. It was just a fluke. And, just to finish the story, every Canadian finalist had lane one. We have a saying, “Someday you'll get lane one.” Lane one is always more sheltered from the stands. It's an outdoor sport, so we have this joke, “Someday you'll get lane one.”

We're in lane six, which is up against the rocks, and there's this great picture in the yearbook where we are all just staring at the waves. No one said a word. We were focusing on what we had to do. We looked like a cement mixer coming down the course, and we got a bronze medal.

I remember, as we pulled over to the awards dock, well it's the same dock, but I remember hearing this little voice calling out to me in my family name, which is not Anita, “Get out of the boat. Get your shoes on.”

At the Games, when I entered the village, that's what changed my life: coming to this village and to this community where everyone was successful, and going to the dining hall where you could sit with anyone, and speak the language of the Olympic Movement, and share this "spiritual" experience. Spiritual is and is not the right word, but I don't have the right word yet. I realized then that this was the sort of thing that I had both experienced and not experienced when we were in Bloomington and my brother was taking up for Davide, and the other kids were not enlightened.

I'm reminded now of another childhood story that happened during the Cuban Missile Crises. I had gone to the corner store, and while I was waiting in line, I heard the adults talking about how terrible it would be if the missiles came. I thought then that what they ought to do is just get their best athletes, and we'll have our best athletes, and whoever wins the contest should win. Then not everybody else would have to die. We were getting a lot of "what to do if the siren sounds," and how you had to go under your desk, at school. Our family had decided that we would all go to our grandmother's house and go to the basement. We'd seen all those horrible pictures, and I was really scared. How was I going to get out of school and go to my grandmother's house? They weren't going to let us out from under our desks. Those were terrifying things, but, I had this solution which I thought would work.

**Swanson:** What uniforms did you wear for the Opening Ceremonies?

**DeFrantz:** We did get those at processing. We had dresses, which I believe were designed by Ralph Lauren. I think he thought athletic women should be covered up; the less we see of them, the better. Our dresses were these long blue uniforms. When three of us stood together, people thought we were from the Salvation Army. Our team leader, the USOC women's team leader, said, "No, you can't wear those. You will wear the blue pants and the white jackets." We immediately called the jackets, "marshmallow jackets." We later learned that the Canadians were really upset because they intended to be the first women's team marching in wearing slacks. Other teams wore tracksuits. The German team had these wonderful tracksuits, made by Adidas that were white tops and bottoms. I made a trade for one of those. But the Canadians wanted to be the first team to march in wearing slacks. Just because our dresses were so ugly, we were told to use the slacks instead. It was not our intention to make the host team upset.

The other thing that was funny was that the host broadcasters in the United States missed us when we marched in. Montreal used the French alphabet and the United States was "Etats-Unis d'Amerique." The broadcasters were asleep at the switch. I think they had gone to commercial just as we were marching in. They were probably going, "A-B-C-D-E", nothing for the U.S. there, and looking for us to come in much later in the procession.

**Swanson:** Did the African nations boycott the 1976 Olympic Games, and were you aware of that?

**DeFrantz:** Lots of them did and here's how I became aware. We were waiting at the gate to the village because that's where they passed out the credentials. I had first eyeballed the Polish team to make a trade because I was already starting to have thoughts about how to make deals, when I noticed a delegation that seemed to be from Africa.

I went over and said, "Hi. Are you guys excited about the Games?"

Some of them spoke English and they said, "No."

I said, "Why not?"

They said, "We're going home."

I said, "Why?"

They said, "We're boycotting because New Zealand played a rugby game with South Africa. We don't know much about it, but now we have to go home." (Several African nations protested the IOC's refusal to punish New Zealand for its rugby contacts with South Africa, the first nation expelled from the Olympic Movement.)

I said, "I am so sad."

The man said, "So are we. It's just terrible. We've been here for a week and now we have to go home."

I said, "I am so sad for you. I'm going to learn more about this. I know that doesn't help you, but I will commit to learning all I can. I want to help to make sure this will never happen again."

He said, "Thank you sister."

**Swanson:** So that was your first experience with a boycott at the Olympics.

**DeFrantz:** Well, we had heard about the U.S. team staying home because of Taiwan. And there was an issue over China not coming if Canada let Taiwan in. Well, China didn't come after all. The general feeling was, "No way. Of course the U.S. would go to these Games." Little did we know then about what would happen in 1980.

**Swanson:** When did you go to the Senate to testify for the Amateur Sports Act?

**DeFrantz:** It was 1977. That's when I first met Senator Stevens. The Athletes' Advisory Council (AAC) was working with Senator Stevens, Senator Stone and Senator Culver. Now only Senator Stevens remains among those senators. The President's Commission on Olympic Sports (PCOS) had been meeting the year before. (The final report deplored "the actions of governments which deny an athlete the right to take part in international competition.")

I'm not sure why I was asked to testify. There was a boat that had come out to watch us train and I must confess that I had a penchant for looking out of the boat. I saw this giant in the boat; of course Harry Parker was a giant, but also I saw another giant with him. I thought, "Who is that? That man is a god!" We came in from the practice and there was Rafer Johnson, (1960 decathlon gold medalist). He may have mentioned me to Donna de Varona (gold medalist Olympian and broadcaster) and perhaps she mentioned me to the senator. Also, I think I was on the administrative committee of the USOC by then so Ed Williams, who was the chairman of the Athletes' Advisory Council, probably said, "Yes, she can do it." That may be why I was called to Washington, D.C., to meet with them. After I'd met with them, they probably thought I'd do a good job.

I did speak and certainly Kenny Moore [marathon athlete and fellow speaker] was impressed with what I had to say. (Moore later became a writer for Sports Illustrated. See his article from

Sports Illustrated, August 29, 1988, titled "An Advocate for Athletes; Anita DeFrantz is an Unlikely Member of the Powerful IOC".) There were a couple of very difficult questions that they posed. One of them was, "Why should athletes have rights?" I replied, "Because athletes are decision makers. When they compete, they make hundreds and thousands of decisions during their competitions. That's what athletes are, they are decision makers. Of course, they should have rights. All of us are not children. There are a few who are very young who compete at the Games, but more and more athletes are adults who had made the decision to compete, life-changing decisions." Therefore, we must have rights. My testimony is somewhere in the Congressional Record and a part of that history.

There was another important time that I spoke: this time before the USOC. That was a very difficult moment in the USOC, and I was asked to make a speech that would unite the organization on this issue. I had 45 minutes to write the speech; I wrote it in the ladies room so I could focus. I wanted to make sure other members of the Athletes' Advisory Council and other members of the board who were recent competitors or Olympians agreed with what I had to say, so I passed it around and they made some adjustments. Then it was show time. The issue was again athlete's rights: how we could adjust it for the USOC board of directors to accept what I had to say in light of the fact that the Amateur Sports Act no longer said much specifically about athletes' rights. It was now up to the USOC constitution to include words about athletes' rights. That meeting was in Orlando, Florida, in 1978.

My presentation there also became part of the Congressional Record. During that time, the NCAA was still fighting the AAU. That [meeting] was the final step to resolution. Well, there are still ongoing fights, but that was a major step.

**Swanson:** What decisions did you make regarding your own athletic career at that time?

**DeFrantz:** I had made a decision in 1976, after consulting with my coach. I said, "Coach, do you believe that I really have what it takes to be gold medalist?"

He, to his credit, thought for a minute and then said, "Yes."

I said, "OK coach, I'm going to give four more years. I know I'll graduate from law school and I believe I'll pass the bar, and I will commit four more years to this pursuit of the Olympic gold medal. After that I have to go on to my law career. I will have this education and there will be people who I must use this career in law for. I'll give it four more years and then I'm finished."

He said, "OK."

I made that commitment and I knew I was going to keep it. After I graduated from law school, I applied for and miraculously was accepted at the Juvenile Law Center of Philadelphia as a staff attorney. They later told me they thought it was cool that I had arrived on my bicycle in my tennis shoes, and I guess I did a good enough interview to persuade them to hire me. I was hired [as a staff attorney] and started work shortly after law school commencement. I believe I studied for the bar, although my housemate claims that I did not.

**Swanson:** Was this your \$14,000 a year job?

**DeFrantz:** Yes. Maybe I started for less, but at least when I took my leave of absence it was that astonishing amount. It was great work. After I passed the bar I was representing kids in court. I was already doing work that my classmates wouldn't be able to do for several years

because they were working at big law firms, of course pulling down much more money than I would for many years to come. But I was doing all sorts of work that they wouldn't be able to do for many years to come. I was even doing federal work. In one case I actually was able to get a 16-year-old girl emancipated in federal court. You know what that meant to me; you can imagine what that meant to me.

**Swanson:** Yes, absolutely.

**DeFrantz:** She had gotten herself out of a terrible home situation. She actually had found a place to live and found a job, but she could not find a way to get back into school. An adult was required to sign her into school, and she wanted to finish high school. So I plead her case before the Eastern District of Pennsylvania federal judge and was successful in getting her emancipated. Yea!

**Swanson:** What about your rowing competitions during this time?

**DeFrantz:** This was 1977. I sandwiched the bar in between two athletic commitments. The weekend before the bar, I had to row in a regatta to qualify for some funding. We had two races to make a certain time standard, and then the United States Rowing Association (USRA) would give us some funding to go to Amsterdam for the world championships. The next week I took the bar. The next weekend, I had a USOC Athletes' Advisory Council meeting at Squaw Valley, California.

The fact that I took the bar between these other two activities may have been why my housemate accused me of not studying for the bar. When I got my notice that I'd passed, he said, and I quote, "If you passed, I know I passed." We've been long time friends and he has since said that he probably shouldn't have said that.

**Swanson:** How did you get elected to the Athletes' Advisory Council?

**DeFrantz:** I was team captain. Also at that time we elected an AAC member from both the men's and women's team of every team that went to the Olympic Games. I guess the women's team decided that I had been a good enough team captain, that they elected me AAC member. At that time it was a vote of all the members of the Olympic team. I'm not sure how they do it today because I'm now dealing with the elections of the Athletes' Commission of the IOC. I know more about the IOC athlete elections than I do about the USOC athlete elections.

About that time in 1978, when the Amateur Sports Act had been enacted, it no longer had an Athletes' Bill of Rights. (On November 8, 1978, Public Law 95-606 [The Amateur Sports Act] was enacted by Congress.) The athletes of the USOC and especially the athletes of the AAC were very concerned that athletes' rights would become non-existent. The USOC may or may not have been concerned, but the athletes were very concerned. Indeed, the problem with the NCAA and the AAU was that neither of them seemed to care much about athletes' rights. The battle between them was who had the right to sanction races or meets. In the meantime, athletes were being used as pawns. We were saying, "Wait, this is about us."

What I needed to do was to present something that would represent the athletes and that the members of the USOC would vote in and make a part of their constitution, and give athletes rights and representation within the USOC. That was my 45-minute or less challenge.

**Swanson:** What about 1979?

**DeFrantz:** I took a leave of absence from the Juvenile Law Center and moved to Princeton. The woman I wanted to train with, in the pair, was a graduate student in the school of engineering. She had gone to Princeton as an undergraduate and began her rowing career there. She graduated and was now in their master's program in the school of engineering and wanted to stay there. The head coach for the U.S. Olympic team was also the Princeton coach, so he would be there throughout the year. I moved, and essentially made life-decisions. I think it's OK because I think we're going to have a chance to be trained by the head coach. I'm still grateful to Princeton. They gave me a place to live and food. In exchange, I was the pre-law advisor and had some other administrative duties as they saw fit, knowing that I would be in training. The only thing we didn't get was any coaching by the coach. There's more I can say about that man, but I will not. It turns out the school was even more gracious to me because as the year went on [and] the boycott was announced, they never once said anything even though they knew I was receiving hate mail and hate letters. I became a little bit known in the U.S., but more known outside the U.S. because of my stance on the boycott issue. But Princeton, and especially Dean Joan Girgus, was most gracious to me. Dean Girgus stayed on for a number of years, and there is not enough that I can say about how kind she was to me.

**Swanson:** You mentioned the boycott and that brings us to our next topic of the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games boycott. What is your side of the story?

**DeFrantz:** My side. We had heard some rumblings and I had gone to Washington to spend part of Christmas with my rowing partner's family. Her name is Cosema Crawford. She's named after the famous composer Wagner's wife. Her mother had insisted I come down. We met a friend of hers who is Greek, and she invited us to come after the Games to her house in southern Greece. She described this wonderful place and said, "You must come and bring your friends and rest after the Games. Shouldn't you come to Greece to see where the Games began?"

We said, "Yes, that sounds like fun."

There were warning clouds amassing and rumblings about Afghanistan even then. (On December 27, 1979, the Soviet Union launched an invasion of its neighbor, Afghanistan.) In January, I was at a friend's birthday party, and I happened to be watching television when President Carter came on and said, "If the Soviets don't leave Afghanistan, we won't be sending spectators to the Olympic Games." I thought, "If he thinks we send spectators, we have a problem. Our President doesn't know anything about the Olympic Games. Not only that, doesn't he know that we are hosting the Olympic Winter Games next month?" I wondered why he was saying these things. I realized then that this could be an enormous problem. I thought I'd better get on the line with the folks I knew in Washington. Some of them I'd met during the semester I worked in Washington at the Center for Social Law and Policy. In fact, Joe Onek had left the Center for Law and Social Policy to serve in President Carter's administration. I thought I needed to get on this very quickly.

I began talking to people and explaining how the Olympic Games belong to the world; they do not belong to Moscow. I said, "Don't do this. There are better ways to make a point." I also stated that I thought I needed to talk to the President about this. Some of my colleagues scoffed at that but I said, "Yes, he needs to be informed about how this works. And, the Olympic Winter Games will be in Lake Placid very shortly, and not only that, the 1984 Olympic Games will be in Los Angeles."



By then I had been placed on the board of the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee. Because the USOC was a financial guarantor for the 1984 Games, and the deal had already been made for the 60 percent-40 percent split of any surplus, although no one believed there would be any surplus, I'm now thinking, "What would the chances of those Games be, if we're starting to do this saber rattling?"

The Games had survived two world wars and now we're putting the Cold War on top of this, "we" being the United States. I now am doing my best, me a former seven-seat in an eight, but who am I? I'm doing my best to get to the President of the United States, the most powerful man on the face of the earth, to tell him, "Mr. President, I don't think you understand, and I need to help you understand what the Olympic Games are about. Having lived in the Olympic village, I know what it's about." Thus began the next stage of my life, and it was very, very difficult.

I was living in Princeton the entire time; I had no place else. I had abandoned my home, my stuff was at my coach's house on the third floor, what stuff I had at that point, and I was still training. I had very little. The only food I had came from eating in the student housing at Princeton, and I had so little money. Also, in 1979, my father had had a massive heart attack, and that was a real strain on our family. My oldest brother had finished college and had his own family. My younger brother had just graduated from Dartmouth, and my youngest brother was still in at University High School in San Francisco, a private high school. My parents had to figure out how they could get him through high school. Times were tough. Certainly, I was independent and very involved in all that I was doing, but I told my parents that I had to fight this battle, and I hoped they understood.

They said, "Absolutely, absolutely."

I said, "Mom I hope this doesn't make dad any sicker."

She said, "No, I think he is already so proud of you."

I did whatever I could. I would drive to Washington. I would make phone calls. I figured out how I could pay my bills and still do my training. Again, thank goodness for Princeton. I did my best to explain to the U.S. what the Games were about, and how this had nothing to do with the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union.

**Swanson:** When did you get your first audience?

**DeFrantz:** I think the real turning point was when someone from a magazine called and stated, "President Carter said, 'We won't be going to Moscow'." I shot back, "We? What do you mean 'we?' Where was 'we' when I was training all year in the cold and freezing my butt off?" I went on to say, "There's not one penny of federal money that goes into training. It is a private enterprise and I, as a private citizen, have the right to decide." I went on and on. And then the calls started coming in. That was the major turning point for me.

**Swanson:** You clearly stated your position. Who were the people who started to call?

**DeFrantz:** Mainly athletes, and that's understandable. Most athletes follow their coach, they follow their leader, and for the president of the United States to say, "We're not going," I understood their concern. I basically said it was our decision to make. At that point I hadn't made the team, so I needed to keep training and make the team so that I had standing. There was a wonderful man in Princeton, Robert Zagoria, who was and probably still is an attorney.

He had been a javelin thrower at Princeton and had a passion for the Olympic Movement, the Olympic Games. He kept encouraging me to file suit. I kept saying, "I can't file suit until the USOC votes not to go, and I'm doing my best to get them to vote to go." I was also working with athletes from other NOCs throughout the world hoping that they would be able to go. I was doing a lot.

I just remembered about a letter I got from Don Miller, executive director of the USOC, in which he asked me to be the women's team administrator for the 1980 Winter Games in Lake Placid. I think the letter came in January. I was flattered, but at the time I was preparing to go for training in Florida and it would mean that I would have to leave my rowing partner, which wouldn't be fair to her. A cynical person might think he was offering me this great opportunity so that I would become quiet. Was it a bribe? I don't know. I do know he seemed surprised that I turned it down.

**Swanson:** How did you communicate with these athletes around the world?

**DeFrantz:** With letters and by phone. I hoped they would call me because I was getting short on cash. I was also getting letters from Penn demanding that I pay back my student loans. There was a lot of stress at that time in my life: but courage kept me moving onward.

**Swanson:** What did the USOC do?

**DeFrantz:** On Saturday, April 12, [1980] in Colorado Springs, Colorado, they voted not to go. I did my best to convince them, and I was a voting member of the House of Delegates, but they voted not to go.

**Swanson:** Who was the president of the USOC at that time?

**DeFrantz:** Bob Kane. Colonel Miller was there, and although both of them have passed away, my parents taught me that it's not right to speak about the dead. I truly believe Colonel Miller wanted me to win. He had conversations with me during that time and also later during the lawsuit. Although he was on the opposite side, I truly believe that he wanted me to win so the team could go. I truly believe that.

**Swanson:** Were there any other government people at that meeting?

**DeFrantz:** Yes, Vice President Mondale.

**Swanson:** He came to deliver President Carter's message.

**DeFrantz:** Absolutely. I believe that if the meeting had ended after his speech, I could have won. Then Bill Simon (former secretary of the treasury) spoke, and I think his speech was far more influential. He won the day for the Carter administration, in my opinion.

**Swanson:** What were his main points?

**DeFrantz:** You have to do what the president asks you to do. It had little to do with our perspective. And by the way, I don't believe we sacrifice; we make decisions. That's my belief – other people use sacrifice all the time, including other athletes, but I make decisions.

In my speech, I paraphrased Ben Franklin. It was something to the effect of anyone who would sacrifice liberty for temporary security deserves neither security nor liberty. That's what it was about. The USOC was afraid of what the President said he would do. It's our liberty to make decisions. He said a few other things, but to me that was the most important message I was given.

**Swanson:** The final vote was 2 to 1.

**DeFrantz:** Which means 2/3 to 1/3. I prefer to say it that way. A lot of people believed we should have the right to make the decision. Many of those people have since said I was right.

After that I went back to Princeton. I wanted to meet with Robert Zagoria and also continue with my training. I really needed to make the team now. I also began going about getting people to join us, and getting the ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union) to act as pro bono. As I understand it, the national board of the ACLU, in New York, voted maybe seven-to-six. Those may not be the right numbers, but it was only by one vote that they voted to take our case. The major law firm of Covington and Burling was the other pro bono for us, along with Robert Zagoria, who I'm sure spent a lot of his money from his law firm, he's a solo practitioner.

Other people joined as plaintiffs and I worried about that, because I had no idea what would happen to me, but I was determined. Bob said I had to have some co-plaintiffs, so I did get some. A lot of them were rowers. We got one coach, and at least one member of the board of directors, Col. Don Hall, and one man from the rowing team who was an enlisted man at the time. I was so worried about him. I don't know if he's part of the reserves now, he may be, and I need to find out if he is. He really took a risk. I was taking a risk, but here was someone in the military. He was taking a very big risk.

**Swanson:** What was the worst thing that could have happened to you?

**DeFrantz:** No future. At every turn I might have had trouble getting a job. I understand the power of the United States government.

**Swanson:** You now have your co-plaintiffs, what was the next step?

**DeFrantz:** My goal then, while I was suing the USOC, was to save the team: I mean I was taking the risk to make sure that we could go. But meanwhile, for those who I knew might not have the courage or the wish to go anyway, because you know, it's easy to say I was on the team, but we never got to go, I could have been a gold medalist. I wanted to protect them. I also wanted to protect the USOC. This could have been a really bad thing for the USOC. I'm looking down the road at the future of the Olympic Games. I wanted to protect the USOC too, even though, as I have found over the years, the USOC seems not to have a long-term vision. It is unfortunate, but I have to say it at this point, because I've been there since 1976, that's 24 years, and it happens over and over again. I can say with a lot of confidence that they tend not to have a long-term vision. So I needed to protect them, although this was only after I'd been there for four years.

I decided that while I would say some things about how the Games belonged to the world and it's not one city, and it's a celebration of human excellence, but also that there needed to be an Olympic team regardless if it competed or not. I needed to get support for that concept of having a 1980 Olympic team, and I needed to get support from the Congress for having a United States Olympic team for 1980. That was my other goal then, and I don't think many people had

thought about that, [was] to make sure that the team was selected and clothed, so that they could know that they were on the United States Olympic team of 1980.

They had done all this celebration for the 1980 Winter Olympic team. President Carter had welcomed them to the White House, and their pictures were up. On one of my trips to the White House, I had a meeting with White House Counsel Lloyd Cutler. He had actually invited me to ride with him from the State Department back to the White House so I could meet with him in the West Wing. As we walked through the corridor, I saw all these pictures of the 1980 Winter Olympic team. I knew they had celebrated the 1980 Winter Olympic team and I thought, "What about us?"

That was the major part of the pitch I made. I reminded them about the spirit of the Olympic Movement and how it's about friendship across cultural lines. I wasn't as eloquent as I may be today, but I did my best. There I sat, doing my best with all my courage knowing that I may have no future.

I filed suit against the United States Olympic Committee, which was almost immediately joined by the Attorney General of the Justice Department. This meant that by then I was essentially suing the White House (*DeFrantz, et al., v. United States Olympic Committee* U.S. D.C., D.C. Cir. 1980, Doc. 80-1530).

**Swanson:** And then what happened?

**DeFrantz:** The team selection continued. Then the USOC had a White House reception and celebration for the 1980 United States Summer Olympic team in July. Some people said I capitulated, because I went there. I said, "Well, my parents had never been to the White House, my dad had never met Edward Moses' dad." They met there. Our team had shirts made up that said "US Rowing Team" on the front, and on the back "Threat to National Security." We wore those shirts during that weekend, and by then, no one messed with us. One of our team members, I believe it was Holly Hatton, maybe it was Carol Brown, had stickers made up. A lot of us wore those stickers on our cap or hats or other places while we were on the bus or at the White House. The sticker said, "We're here to make sure this will never happen again." Athletes from other sports asked for the stickers and wore them too.

The women's rowing team and the women's field hockey team were the most vociferous about the boycott. I think the women's hockey team members, at that time, were much like the women's rowing team. Some of the men spoke out, including the enlisted man. The athletes on the women's hockey team were more in our age bracket, and they too were making life-changing decisions. Indeed, one of their members was the daughter of a Supreme Court Justice, and that is really why the decision was made that we wouldn't pursue an appeal after we lost at the federal court. The justice would have had to recuse himself. And, as we counted up, potential votes in our favor, we would not have enough without Justice Stevens.

Our last chance occurred when the rowing team was in Europe. If we could get our IF to officially enter us, then we could go to Moscow and compete. I had communicated with Thomi Keller, the president of FISA and asked if he would do that. He said, "Absolutely, but you need to have a letter signed by US Rowing saying that you are the Olympic team." I wrote to the president of US Rowing, asking him; I even sent the letter he needed to sign, and asked if he would please sign this letter. He wouldn't do it. That was really the last chance we had.

Then the most beautiful thing happened. I'll tell you, by then, I was really a mess. I had just run out of gas completely. I had made the team, but I was really exhausted, totally out of steam, completely. So much else had happened that I can't put on tape, but anyway I was really out of steam; I was just barely there. A team meeting was called; I had no idea what it was about. I was just going through the motions in everything, brushing my teeth in the morning, whatever. So a team meeting was called. I was there, and I can't even remember all of the things that happened, usually I'm very aware of all that is going on around me, but as I said I was just trashed, and we were in this place called Ratzeburg, Germany, one of the Valhallas of our sport.

Holly said, "We want to thank you for all that you have done. We all signed this." She presented me with a certificate that all the members of the women's team and all the coaches had signed. "Thank you for" – I can't remember the exact words – but, "Thank you for all you've done for our Olympic cause." I was crying. I am crying.

**Swanson:** I'm crying, and I wasn't even there. They certainly were appreciative.

**DeFrantz:** They also had all chipped in to buy me a pair of lederhosen. I'd been looking for a pair, and they obviously had all chipped in to buy them for me. I still have them. That was before our very last race in Europe. Our last race was in Amsterdam and we were then in Ratzeburg, Germany, training for our very last race. This was probably in early July because the Games were July 19-August 3. We went on to Amsterdam for our last race.

Afterwards, my teammate Jan Palchikoff and I did go to Greece and hung out at the place we had been invited to go. Coz Crawford joined us, which was important, and we spent time in East and West Berlin with her brother David. Before we got to that special place in southern Greece, we visited Athens and the Olympic Stadium there and then we went to Ancient Olympia. Little did I know how often I would visit there in the future! Then I went back to the U.S. to go to the White House celebration, so my dad and mom could meet the Olympians, and also so I could be there. A couple of reporters asked why I was there? There were some delicate moments where I had to explain this. We were invited to have our pictures taken and shake hands with President Carter; most of the rowing team declined as did I.

Having been denied the right to compete in 1980, I was determined to see as many athletes as possible compete in 1984. People keep saying that there was a withdrawal of several dozen states and that is just not true. This numbers game is just wrong. If you look at the number of countries that have participated in the Games historically, you'll find that many who could compete never made it to the Games. But, the U.S. government made a big deal saying all of these countries didn't go, when some of these countries never went anyway. It's unfortunate, but that perception persists.

We, in 1984, worked very hard to get as many teams to the Games as possible. As a staff member, I stayed up nights to call NOCs to make sure they were coming, because it was very important for television coverage. To have the ratings was so important because we had no government financial support. We needed the ratings in order to get the payment from ABC. That was essential for us. The numbers game was very important. Since then, it has always been a numbers game. At least we were honest about how many NOCs were coming, but it was for a completely different reason. The numbers for 1968 Mexico City were 112, 1972 Munich 121, 1976 Montreal 92, 1980 Moscow 80. The facts are that the numbers fluctuated and had been in decline leading up to Moscow. For 1984, we managed to have 141 NOCs.

**Swanson:** The IOC recognized your efforts and leadership during this time.

**DeFrantz:** In 1980, the IOC recognized me for my courage in fighting on behalf of the Olympic Movement, and awarded me the Bronze Medal of the Olympic Order in Moscow. I was the only American awarded a medal in Moscow. Because I didn't go to Moscow, I didn't receive it until the next year in Baden-Baden, Germany. And although I would have preferred to win a medal for rowing in Moscow, the IOC Bronze Medal of the Olympic Order was a great honor.

**Swanson:** What was your experience in Baden-Baden like?

**DeFrantz:** It was very interesting. I had no idea what it would be like. I think I was only the third American to receive the Bronze Medal of the Olympic Order, at that time. I wore my very best suit, which was made of ultrasuede. At that time the award was a pin, not a necklace as it is today. I'm standing while my citation is read. Then President Samaranch tries to pin my award through my ultrasuede suit – it was very difficult to do. I believe that experience helped convince them to go to the necklace award they use today. That may not be true, but I think it certainly helped.

**Swanson:** Scholars have studied this period of the 1980 and 1984 Olympic boycotts and have written master's theses and Ph.D. dissertations on the subject. Several that come to mind include: Wilson, Harold Edwin, Jr., "'Ours Will Not Go.' The U.S. Boycott of the 1980 Olympic Games." The Ohio State University, 1982. Barton, Laurence, "The American Olympic Boycott of 1980: The Amalgam of Diplomacy and Propaganda in Influencing Public Opinion." Boston University, 1983. Hulme, Derick L., Jr., "The Viability of International Sport as a Political Weapon: The 1980 US Olympic Boycott." Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy (Tufts University), 1988. Wilson, Harold Edwin, Jr., "The Golden Opportunity: A Study of the Romanian Manipulation of the Olympic Movement During the Boycott of the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games."

Books about international law and politics, and political abuse of Olympic sport document further study of the boycotts. In one example, Jeffrey M. Marks reviewed *DeFrantz v. United States Olympic Committee*. He concluded that:

It [the court] could have taken an affirmative stand by simply according to the athletes' claims the legal enforcement that Congress intended in the Amateur Sports Act of 1978. The court was bound to uphold the statute and not a coercive action by the government which contravened the legislation. Clearly, the statute chartered a private corporation purposefully designed to resist governmental tinkering. The court lost sight of this overriding principle. It should have invalidated the USOC decision not to send a team, thereby compelling the Carter Administration to devise other methods to implement its foreign policy.

Although you lost the court case, it is now widely recognized that you were indeed on the right side of the issue. Marks also cites a Jan. 27, 1980, New York Times article: "Anita DeFrantz, the named plaintiff, a lawyer and an Olympic rower said, 'I just don't see that it will have any effect on anybody but the athletes, and I don't believe the world is with us on this. What does it say about our foreign policy that our only weapon is the Olympic team? That is just plain shocking.'"

Let's hope the rowing team's stickers, "We're here to make sure this will never happen again," hold true. It might be helpful, at this point, to review just how it was that Moscow was awarded the 1980 Games.

**DeFrantz:** The Cold War was prevalent throughout that time period. Los Angeles was bidding for 1976 and Moscow was bidding for 1976. The IOC realized that this was now very political. Montreal was going to bid for 1980 and the IOC very much encouraged, in fact practically insisted, that Montreal bid for the 1976 Games to get them out of this conundrum of the two “giants” up for 1976, and so they could figure out a longer range set of possibilities. Lo and behold, 1976 is awarded to Montreal. They did have difficulties with their building projects, because they were really not quite ready to host the 1976 Games.

**Swanson:** It’s widely reported that they lost a lot of money.

**DeFrantz:** No, they didn’t lose a lot of money. What cost more than was anticipated were the capital improvements that included subways, housing, stadiums, and so forth. These are things that stayed there and benefited the people of Montreal for years. So to say you lose money on something that is capital construction is just not right. The IOC now insists that there be a separate budget for capital construction, because it’s not right to put capital construction costs on a budget for a two-week sporting event.

**Swanson:** That makes sense, but a lot of people still have that misconception.

**DeFrantz:** The taxpayers screamed that they were paying for this event. Well, in a sense, but they were paying for what they got to use for another 20-plus years.

**Swanson:** In 1981 you changed from being a board member to become a staff member of the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee. Explain the television contract that dramatically changed the financial picture for, not only the 1984 Games, but all subsequent Games as well.

**DeFrantz:** Because the people of Los Angeles refused to be exposed to taxes for construction and the other problems in Montreal, another solution was necessary. So, the one and only tripartite agreement had the IOC signing with the USOC, which was supposed to be the financial guarantor of the Games and with the LAOOC, which as a private organizing committee would be responsible for organizing the Games. The financial risk was all on the USOC, instead of the City of Los Angeles. The LAOOC then signed a separate agreement with the USOC in 1978 that had any surplus funds from the Games divided 40 percent to stay in LA and 40 percent to the USOC and 20 percent to be divided equally among the NGBs.

The US television rights alone totaled \$300 million with ABC paying \$75 million for the host broadcast center and \$225 million to the LAOOC. Then the IOC was to receive 30 percent of the TV rights. The LAOOC negotiated a lower number based on the true cost of the TV broadcast. The contracts since have been increasingly larger, but now the IOC controls all of the contracts. I believe that contract was the last one to be negotiated by an organizing committee. It was also the last time that an organizing committee paid the IOC so much in advance of the Games. The first payment that went to the IOC was \$20 million in October of 1979, well in advance of the 1984 Olympic Games. For some reason, the IOC did not cash the check for 30 days! Remember interest rates back then? The LAOOC made enough money in interest at 19 percent to cover the running costs for more than a year!

**Swanson:** Was Teheran the only other bid for the 1984 Games?

**DeFrantz:** We like to say there was a management change in Iran.

**Swanson:** Yes, the revolution in Iran. Well then, Los Angeles was the only viable bid, but the support of the local citizens seemed to be very thin at the time.

**DeFrantz:** Remember that Los Angeles had bid continuously for decades and by 1977 the other bidders, Montreal and Moscow had been awarded the Games. In the world of Olympic sports, it did make sense for Los Angeles to get the 1984 Games. They [the IOC] are looking ahead to 1988. Already people are talking about bidding for 1988 and 1992. The Games were not really in a state of disaster, although 1976 was scary. (Mexico City 1968 had social unrest and the Munich Massacre marred the 1972 Games.)

Now we know the 1984 Games will be in Los Angeles, but that got a little scary because the taxpayers of Los Angeles, especially in the [San Fernando] Valley, just did not want to have more traffic coming over the Sepulveda Pass.

**Swanson:** How did the LAOOC address that issue?

**DeFrantz:** Earlier, the city council voted by one vote to go ahead and bid for the Games. Los Angeles then had to win the USOC vote against New York City. The Athletes' Advisory Council seemed to be essential in LA winning that vote. Now, Los Angeles had the right to bid for the Games with the IOC. Los Angeles won with the IOC, and I explained probably why earlier.

After the referendum passed that said the voters didn't want to have any of the financial responsibility, then mainly, John Argue and others of the SCCOG (Southern California Committee for the Olympic Games) cut a deal with the IOC. Howard Allen was part of the team, I believe, that cut this deal with Madame Monique Berlioux and Lord Killanin, president of the IOC, to have a tripartite agreement that the USOC would be the financial guarantor of the Games. This was very difficult for the USOC. They maybe had \$5 million dollars in assets, if you counted everything, including its house on Fifth Avenue. They did get some insurance and so forth.

As a result, the Games stayed in Los Angeles and the government was completely out of it. The LAOOC was truly an organizing committee in the private sector, truly without any financial backing except what Peter Ueberroth, once he was hired [as LAOOC president], could come up with. He was creative in finding people to work with him and for him. When I joined in 1981, three years before the Games, there were less than 30 people on staff. I may have been number 27 or somewhere in there.

**Swanson:** What were the major challenges for you on the committee?

**DeFrantz:** Harry Usher [LAOOC executive vice president/general manager] actually asked me what I wanted to do before I joined the staff. I'm very interested in international things, but the village is the heart of the Games. I wanted to make sure the village was right. First, I read all of the final reports and especially the section on the village. Then I talked to as many Olympians as I could to find out which village was the very best village they experienced. At the same time I went to the two places, USC and UCLA, that had been contracted to be the village. I looked at the footprint and said, "Houston, we have a problem. This is not going to work." I knew that we would have to do some negotiating. I then began that process.

One of the other significant issues that I had recognized from my experience at Montreal was the issue of separate housing for men and women. That had to go. It was important for the NOCs to be able to administer their teams. By the way, without this change it would be



impossible for a woman to be *chef de mission*. It was important for me to get rid of this segregation stuff.

I said to Harry, "We have to desegregate the village." He said, "OK, you tell Peter."

I said, "Peter, we've got to 'deseg' the village."

Peter said, "We have a meeting with the IOC executive board; you tell the executive board."

I remember when I made my proposal during the IOC meeting at the Biltmore Hotel in Los Angeles, one of the IOC members said, "Extraordinary! Remarkable!" It seemed to be such a good idea that not only for the 1984 Summer Games, but Sarajevo and every Olympic village since has kept the teams together. It's so important for the management of the teams.

**Swanson:** That innovation worked very well. What about other challenges for the committee? I read that the Greeks were not happy with the fund-raising efforts associated with the torch relay.

**DeFrantz:** It was Peter's idea. He asked a lot of people what they thought about even having a torch relay. I said, "Peter, that is a great idea and you are going to meet with a lot of resistance. It's very risky, but it's a great idea. How does the USOC feel?"

He said, "What do you think?" And, he also said we were going to do fundraising for it. I said, "Hmm."

"But the funds will not go to us. They will go to [kids' programs]." Initially it was a smaller group, but then others said, "What about us?"

I said, "That's going to be trouble."

He said, "So you don't like it because of that?"

I said, "Well, I do like it, but first of all for little people, raising that kind of money is going to be very tough." It was maybe \$1500 or \$3000. Either way, I knew I couldn't raise it. People did and there are great stories. One little girl had bake sales and the whole community helped her. I think she was only 9 years old.

The Greek Olympic Committee criticized us for "commercializing" the torch. Yes, and no. It was a benevolent effort to help kids' programs. They couldn't understand that. In this country we do a lot of giving, which is not the way it's done, and certainly not to the extent that we do it in our country, in other places. So, it was hard for them to get past that. Also it was hard for them to get past us not asking them first, although that actually happened, but I guess not in the right way. By then, we did a lot of saying "no" to things that had happened in the past. We didn't have the Congresses, and other things. In fact, we were called the "Spartan Games." We didn't have government financial support, we were using stadiums already built and we were having two villages instead of one.

**Swanson:** There were so many successes, and certainly you were financially successful.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, and we wanted to give the NOCs back the cost of the village stay, but we ran into difficulty with the USOC. Because of the 1978 contract, the USOC demanded that we take

it all from our share, and that we'd still have to pay them 60 percent. We suggested that we both share. I remember going with Harry, by then Peter had left to be the baseball commissioner, so Harry was the president of LAOOC, and the USOC would hear of none of this, which actually would have been in their best interest. It was very odd.

**Swanson:** Now the structure is different.

**DeFrantz:** The contract is huge now. The television rights from each region are so much larger, because the LAOOC and David Wolper and others made it so big. The rights in the United States were really \$ 300 million, but it was reported as \$225 million, because the host broadcast was another \$75 million.

**Swanson:** The television rights for the 1984 Games were really \$300 million?

**DeFrantz:** Yes, if you include the host broadcasts, but it's often reported as \$225 million.

**Swanson:** Explain your transition from athlete to administrator in your sport of rowing.

**DeFrantz:** Actually, it started when I was first at Vesper. I believe it was in 1975 or shortly thereafter I was elected to the board of directors of what was then called the National Association of Amateur Oarsmen (NAAO). Shortly thereafter, there was something called the Bud Boyce Committee named after the gold medalist rower who chaired the committee, which was given the task of revising the structure of the NAAO and indeed coming up with a name change that would include women. We did that, and since then we are called the United States Rowing Association. I guess that was my first move to administration.

**Swanson:** In what other ways did your transition from athlete to sports administrator evolve?

**DeFrantz:** After the 1984 Games, I experienced a period of time where I wanted to get away from sports. I was then doing some consulting work, but the consulting work became tied to sports. Although I wanted to get away from sports, it seemed as though I was being called back to sports. One of the consulting jobs I received was from Stan Wheeler, the man who was elected to be president of the AAF (Amateur Athletic Foundation). He came from Yale Law School, and his specialty is white-collar crime, although he is not a lawyer. I believe his doctorate is in sociology. He's also a musician, which I think after his two years in Los Angeles, called him back the East Coast. He adores jazz. He plays a pretty mean trumpet. He's back at Yale, teaching and serving as the master in – I forget which house – and really loving it. So I worked at the AAF, first as senior associate and then I became vice president.

Among the programs I began was the coaching program. After a one-year stint as a novice rowing coach at Princeton in 1981, I realized how much power a coach had over the lives of the athletes. While I had been an athlete at the highest level in rowing, I realized that I had never been trained as a coach. The athletes would do anything I asked them to do. I enjoyed the coaching, but realized that coaches needed training. When I had the opportunity, I designed the program for AAF. To this day it is one of our best programs at the AAF. We have had great success and national governing bodies have even adopted some of our programs.

**Swanson:** How did they find the house you use for the AAF?

**DeFrantz:** The house was originally found by Peter Ueberroth to house what was called the Helm's Hall of Fame Collection. This collection was created in the late 1930s after the 1932

Olympic Games in Los Angeles, and belonged to Mr. Helms. He owned the Helm's Bakery that delivered bread, but was put out of business with the rise of the supermarket. Actually, Mr. Helms was a coxswain, a member of the noblesse of sports, in upstate New York before he moved to Los Angeles. I like to point out this interesting connection. He kept his memorabilia at his bakery on Venice Boulevard. Today, Venice Boulevard is part of a historical monument in Los Angeles. The Helms' collection moved around until Peter Ueberroth and his wife bought the collection and then bought this house. Peter then went into partnership with what was then First Interstate Bank, and they renovated this house. When First Interstate Bank took over the house, Peter put in the collection. During the 1984 Games, the house was a place for hospitality. About a year after the Games, the First Interstate Bank offered the property to the AAF. The board gladly accepted it and opened for business in September of 1985. By then I had accepted the offer Stan Wheeler made and I worked there. In 1986 I was elected a member of the IOC. In 1987, the AAF board of directors elected me president of AAF after Stan had decided to return to Yale.

The AAF is a wonderful place. If I had had the imagination to create my ideal job, it would have been my work with the AAF. First as a staff member, I was given the opportunity to create the coaching program. In addition, we created the guidelines for the grants program under the leadership of Dr. Stanton Wheeler, who proposed it to the board. The board actually adopted the grant guidelines. What a wonderful board of directors it is. It is the "A" list, and has always been the "A" list of Los Angeles. It started out being the executive board from the LAOOC. Over time people have left and still we continue to have the leadership of Los Angeles come onto the board. I serve on many boards and there truly is none like this board. It's just a wonderful board.

Initially, we developed everything from the ground up. It was so much fun. Then two years later I became the president, and that was even more fun. We have a great staff and we are completely independent, so we can do lots of things that other institutions cannot. We can look at the Olympic Movement with fresh eyes. In addition we can give out information when people call us, and I insist on correct information. Our library is also a wonderful resource and it is very rewarding to be able to give out the correct information. Many times I've read things that I know are not accurate about the Olympic Movement so giving out the correct information is very important.

We also have a thriving grants program. We call it sports programming. It's not just grants which go to existing youth programs, but also an incubator program where we can help people who have not done sports programming before, but seem to have the capacity with our help and technical assistance to be able to do it. We will assist these people and help them come along until they are capable of doing it. In addition we have a small grants program for organizations that have done good work or organizations like leagues that just need a little bit of help, but it's leagues, not individual teams.

Besides the several kinds of grants we also do our own programming in areas that otherwise wouldn't have it. That was the genesis of our sports clubs. We are doing programming in parts of the cities where there seemed to be a great need, but there was really no one there to request the grants to provide programming for kids. So we developed the sports club concept where we found volunteers who really wanted to help their kids out. In these areas of great economic need we found volunteers who would help if we gave them direction. We taught them how to develop clubs and how to coach. We fund the referees and fund the clubs and get the uniforms so these kids can be proud just as other kids in other parts of the city are proud with their uniforms and sports programs. There are so many wonderful stories from these clubs.

Now the program has been spun off to an independently standing entity called Kids in Sports. They have their own board and they do their own fundraising. I'm very proud of that. I'm president of Kids in Sports so I have that responsibility as well, but it is a joyous one.

Among the other things the AAF does is the high school sports awards program. The AAF-CIF Sports Awards program is the continuation of the longest standing sports awards program we do in Southern California. It's just wonderful to see how proud the kids are to receive these awards. Some of the awards are presented at the AAF headquarters, and the baseball and softball awards are presented at Dodger Stadium. For a long time we were able to get all of the kids on the field, but now the new ownership has changed that a bit and fewer kids can get on the field, but they all get to go to the game.

We have a wonderful library. Twice a week we bring kids to the AAF. For a lot of kids in the Los Angeles Unified School District this is their only field trip, because there is no funding available for field trips, although it is astonishing that the budget for the LA school district this year is \$9 billion. We also undertake research. We develop other awards, and bring the Olympians there. It's just a wonderful place.

**Swanson:** You indicated that some of the research to produce the 2000 Oscar award-winning documentary, "One Day in September," was done at AAF.

**DeFrantz:** Yes. We have a lot of footage from the 1972 Olympic Games in Munich. It was a gift from board member and chairman emeritus of AAF, David Wolper. He was responsible for the official 1972 Olympic film, "Visions of Eight," and gave us all the outtakes from this film. Most of the footage of Munich in "One Day in September" was from the AAF library.

**Swanson:** The unique role of the AAF in providing research opportunities will only expand as the Olympic Movement continues to expand. This is very important.

**DeFrantz:** We care deeply about this. And also, because of my connection with the IOC, we have been able to help the Olympic Studies Centre with their library and OTAB (Olympic Television Archive Bureau) which provides access to the world to do things such as this documentary. I'm not certain that OTAB would have liked to have this [documentary] made, but since it was our property, we were willing to allow it. We are probably much freer with access than the IOC and OTAB, but that is who we are.

**Swanson:** Now your professional life is divided between the IOC and the AAF.

**DeFrantz:** To me there is no division. It is a continuum. The work I do for children is a continuation of my life experiences. I want to make sure the children have opportunities to experience sport, and that adults have opportunities to help children. At the IOC level it's the same thing. There's no division, it's part of the same. Certainly living in Los Angeles is parallel to the international and intercultural work I do with the IOC. The song, "We Are the World" immediately comes to mind.

**Swanson:** The diversity of Los Angeles is a model for what the future of our country will look like.

**DeFrantz:** There is no majority here.

**Swanson:** What goals do you have for the AAF? You have one of the top sports libraries in the world. Did you build the library?

**DeFrantz:** The library was built during my presidency. The board adopted and approved the library, but the previous president was very wise in having the research center named after the chairman at the time, Paul Ziffern. Who could say no to that? The funding was approved for that purpose. I thank him in his wisdom for doing that. The building was then built and finished on time and under budget. I have to say that it is the best sports library in the world. The best Olympic library is in Lausanne, Switzerland.

AAF is both a showcase and a laboratory. We can undertake research, we can commission studies, and we have kids doing things. For example, The Sports Club program was created in-house, funded, and now it's independent. It's called the Kids In Sports or the KIS program. We continue to fund them, but they also raise money on their own. We also have Summer Swim, which I love.

At one of the Summer Swim program meets, I noticed a very worried-looking girl standing in the marshalling area. I said to her, "You look very worried, are you OK?" She looked a lot like I did when I was that age, a little pudgy.

She said, "I am. I'm afraid I'm going to run out of steam."

This is a 50-meter pool. Thinking I could help ease her anxiety, I tried out my sports psychology skills and asked, "What's your very favorite thing in the world to do?"

She said, "Swim."

I said, "Well, that's great because that's just what you're about to do."

She said, "I know, but I'm just so worried I'm going to run out of steam."

I said, "I will be at the other end of the pool waiting for you, OK?"

She said, "OK, OK"

As promised I was at the other end of the pool. She had a beautiful stroke, but as feared she did run out of steam in the last 15 meters, but she made it. She got out of the pool and said, "How'd I do, how'd I do?"

"Oh," I said, "I was looking at you, I wasn't looking at the other kids."

She said, "Oh no, I really wanted to qualify for the next race."

I said, "That's all right, the best I ever did was a bronze medal."

She looked up at me, hugged me and said, "That's all right, you did your best."

Here she was comforting me. That was just a wonderful experience; I was trying to help her and she was comforting me. It actually was true, the best I'd done was a bronze medal, of course it was at the Olympic Games, but she was so quick to hug me, to comfort me.

**Swanson:** Are there any kids in the AAF programs who grow up and become Olympians?

**DeFrantz:** Yes. While walking through the Olympic Village in Nagano someone tapped me on the back. I turned around and got a big hug from an Olympian, Rusty Smith, a short track speed skater. He was there for his first Olympic Games. He started out in one of the programs that we funded in Los Angeles, and there he was in the Olympic Games in Nagano. He's not the only one.

In the Sydney Games, there were at least four medalists, three of them gold medalists, who had taken part in our programs. Lenny Krayzelburg, (gold medalist in 100m, 200m backstroke and 4 x 100 medley relay) and I were both in New York sitting at the sports medicine awards dinner, when I was talking about our Summer Swim programs. Lenny said, "I took part in that."

I said, "Lenny, you already knew how to swim when you came to the U.S." But when he was 17, he was one of the coaches in our program. That year we also had a race for the coaches, and that's the race Lenny swam in. We wanted the kids to know that not only are they competing, but their coaches are competing as well. I was so proud when he told everyone at our table that he had been part of one of our AAF programs. He still comes over to talk whenever our paths cross. When I was at the White House, someone was trying to introduce Lenny to me and we said, "Oh, we know each other."

Brenda Villa told me she took part in our program. She won a silver medal in water polo at Sydney, one of the programs for women that was developed from work that I did collaboratively with others. Women's water polo is on the program now and forever more. I'm very proud that she was part of our AAF water polo program. We now also have programs in synchronized swimming and diving. Another gold medalist is Venus Williams. I gave the medal to her and said the words I love to say, "You shall forever be known as an Olympic champion." Both Venus and her sister Serena actually started in the AAF/JTL tennis program. There was a picture in the LA Times with them in their AAF/JTL tee shirts when they were 8 or 9 years old.

During the first Session I attended as an IOC member following my election in 1986 – so the Session would have been in 1987 – I spoke up on the issue of tennis. The issue being discussed was tennis. Should it be brought back onto the program since it had all these professional players? I said, "Yes, they're athletes." Today you have to be a professional to see just how good you could become. You could be at the top of the ladder, and yet the Olympic Games were not an option. I basically said the athlete wants to see if they can beat the best. Why shouldn't we let them compete? I later learned that new members were not expected to "speak up" at IOC meetings for quite some time.

**Swanson:** I recall that Venus stated to the press that she thought winning the Olympic medals was more important than other tournaments because it only happened once every four years.

**DeFrantz:** I'm very proud of the work we do at the AAF. We have 20 full-time staff. Interestingly enough, they absolutely reflect the population diversity of Los Angeles. It just happened. It's wonderful for me. I just look at them and just say, "Wow. I'm president of that." The president is in charge of the day-to-day operations and I just check in on them from time to time. I'm very proud of the work that they do.

We have a lot of volunteers at the sports clubs. I think it is nonsense when I hear people say poor people do not have time to volunteer. They care about their children and they volunteer a lot of their time. It's more of a struggle for them because their lives have more turmoil and

challenges; they can't say I'm going to be here at a certain time and be able to do that. The bus may not come, there may be a medical emergency, and it is much more difficult for those people with less economic certainty.

**Swanson:** What about the research activities of the AAF?

**DeFrantz:** We can see a problem and begin the process. We noticed three or four years ago, the high incidence of ACL injuries in girls. We wanted to find out what was going on and what could be done to prevent it. We actually received some requests for funding and agreed it was a problem. We are now in the second year of what may be a five-year project to find ways to do warm-ups that might help alleviate the problem. It's interesting, the day I was giving a speech to the Medical and Sport Science Association, there was an article in USA Today saying there would be 30,000 ACL surgeries on female athletes this year. Possibly the research we are funding and working on will help.

**Swanson:** That is interesting. What other research projects are in process?

**DeFrantz:** We are doing a longitudinal study on concussions in young kids who play soccer. There are so many kids playing soccer. We're looking at injuries related to headers, hitting the ground and some goal posts injuries that result in concussions.

**Swanson:** Speaking of soccer, I want to tell you that our college has one of your AAF award winners, a soccer player from San Diego. When I told her about this oral history project, she was very interested. She told me how proud she was of the AAF award she earned in high school.

**DeFrantz:** We've found that so many young people, and their parents, and older people are very proud of those awards. That award program was inherited from Helms. It started about 35 years ago and is now the longest continuing high school sports award program in the country.

**Swanson:** Those award programs are very beneficial for so many people. You just can't measure the ripple effect they have.

Let's now begin to talk more specifically about your experiences with the IOC.

**DeFrantz:** I first became aware that an IOC position was open for the United States when a journalist, Ken Reich, called to talk with a member of the AAF to tell him that he had been given an award for his work. Bob Helmick, president of the USOC and an IOC member who had been elected but not yet sworn in, was asked the question regarding who he thought the new IOC member would be. He said some names had been floated, and yes, Anita DeFrantz's name had been floated. Steve Montiel, LAOOC staff member, said, "Anita, you're being considered for the IOC."

I said, "What? I didn't know that." In fact, I didn't know that Julian Roosevelt (former United States IOC member) had died. By then I was no longer a voting member of the USOC, but Bob Helmick had asked me if I would chair the USOC Eligibility Committee.

The USOC Eligibility Committee work was important to me. We worked to finally make it possible for United States athletes to be able to receive funding as they were training. In 1985 it was still against the rules for athletes to receive funding, at least from the USOC. My largest opponent, unfortunately, was Bob Kane, USOC president. He believed in the amateur rule,

which had not been in the IOC Charter since 1973. I was determined, after the experiences that I had gone through in the-mid '70s, to get this passed.

One thing I forgot to mention, the Vesper team, at one time, literally stood on a street corner with coffee cans, begging for funds. We didn't do that for long because it just didn't seem right. Here we were, representing the United States, begging for money. It just seemed too unseemly.

**Swanson:** You were successful in changing the eligibility rules for the athletes in the USOC. There is a theme emerging in your work that shows you are always advocating for the rights of the athletes. That theme goes back even further to your time in college when you successfully wrote and implemented the Student Bill of Rights at Connecticut College.

Now you are no longer a voting member of the USOC.

**DeFrantz:** Until 1986, when I was elected to the IOC, I was not a voting member of the USOC. IOC members, by charter, must become voting members of the highest body of the NOC. With my induction as an IOC member, I went back to being a member of the USOC executive board. Because of the way the USOC is structured, I also had a vote on the full body, not only on the executive board, but also the full body as well.

Back to my election as a member of the IOC. That happened while I was not a voting member of the USOC, but when I was chair of the USOC Eligibility Committee. Also during that time, I was a volunteer on the Anchorage Bid Committee to host the 1992 Winter Games. I was actually in Lausanne, Switzerland, and was also, by then, one of six people named by the USOC as acceptable candidates for the United States IOC position. Other people on the list included LAOOC President Peter Ueberroth; Olympic swimmer and then TV broadcaster, Donna de Varona; USOC Vice Presidents Evie Dennis and William Tutt; and the late swimming official Harold Henning. Eventually only three names went to the IOC executive board for consideration. The IOC executive board put my name forward to the Session and I was elected.

This is the story of how it happened. I'm in Lausanne attending the IOC meeting and I'm nervous about Anchorage's chance to win the bid, and also nervous about the election. When I was paged to report to the desk, I thought that I was going to hear some news [about the election], but instead I had a message to make a call. I made the call and it was from a journalist, it had nothing to do with my candidacy. I thought, "once burned, twice learned," my chances are not good. Then I found out that my accreditation would not permit me into the auditorium to hear the results of the bid cities. I went to the president of the bid committee and asked about getting access to the auditorium. He assured me it would be all right just to walk in with him. While standing at the door of the auditorium, an IOC staff member came up and said, "Anita, we've been paging you."

I said, "I already answered that page."

They said, "No, you have to go up to the second floor and wait. The president of the IOC wants to talk to you."

I thought, because he is such a kind man he probably wanted to tell me in person that I had not been elected. I thought now I would not only miss the announcement of the host city in the auditorium, but I also had to go upstairs and get the bad news about my election.



I went upstairs, sat down and waited for a very long time. Finally, someone came out and escorted me down a large dark hallway. When we got to the room, a very tall elegant gentleman said in his French accent, "Please, follow me." I am still thinking that I am going to be told that although I am a very fine candidate I am not yet ready to be an IOC member. Then, Bob Helmick came over to say congratulations. I'm still not clear about what is happening, but I'm escorted up to the front of the room where I am again told to wait.

Another person, Dr. Kim, had been waiting outside the hall with me, and he just could not sit still. I had met him earlier, in 1983, when he had been NOC president, and he couldn't sit still then. We were interviewing people to find out what they wanted for their teams during the village project, and assigning village space for the 1984 Games. He's very nervous, we strike up a conversation and he asked why I was there. I told him I thought I might be elected to the IOC, but I think I'm going to be told that I'm not. He said, "I'm elected." I said, "Congratulations." Still not knowing when I would be allowed to enter the room. I waited for some time. He left and returned and we chatted. All this continued for quite some time, at least 45 minutes. I was pretty calm, especially since I was convinced that I was going to be told I was a fine candidate and to continue my work in the Olympic Movement, but that I was not elected. Finally, the door opened. I thought, "This is a big room and they need more light," but in I went. I'm sure Dr. Kim did his oath first. I climbed the steps and was instructed to hold the flag and read a statement. I found myself reading the IOC Oath of Membership. Then, President Samaranch said, "Congratulations," as he put the medal around my neck and shook my hand.

I was the last member to take the IOC Oath of Membership. I came down the steps and was immediately surrounded by other IOC members. I remember someone saying, "Welcome to the club."

**Swanson:** What words are in the IOC Oath of Membership?

**DeFrantz:** Accorded the honor of becoming a member of the IOC, in my country, the United States of America, to keep myself free of commercial and political influences and uphold the Olympic Movement. That is a paraphrase. It is a bit longer than that.

Then we went out onto the stage in the auditorium. In protocol, I was the last one in line. When the people from Anchorage saw me, they stood up and applauded because they were so pleased. As all the other bidding cities noticed this, they too stood up and applauded!

My IOC election was the last order of business at that meeting. I made calls to mom and dad, and the office, and then left Lausanne the next day and flew home. I was only there one night as a member of the IOC. It really didn't hit me until I was halfway over the Atlantic Ocean. I was so excited, but I couldn't really scream on the plane. When I arrived at LAX, my friends had made a sign, "Welcome Home IOC Member."

**Swanson:** What a marvelous honor and you were so young, only 34 years old. You were the 98th IOC member to be elected. Were you also the youngest member ever to be elected to the IOC?

**DeFrantz:** I love that question. The Grand Duke was elected when he was 25. At that time Prince Albert of Monaco, was the youngest member, he was 29.

**Swanson:** Now that you are bona fide member, what are your duties?

**DeFrantz:** Interestingly enough, the duties of a member are not laid out, except that we are to protect the Olympic Movement, and that's very broad. That's one of the things that I want to address if elected president, and it's also one of the things I talk about when I talk with other IOC members.

The first thing I did was to speak up. I began to ask questions and make suggestions. For example, when I found out there was no specific orientation, I would ask my colleagues, "What do I do?" They indicated that it was quite unusual for a member to speak up during their first Session, but I did speak up regarding the tennis issue I related earlier. That's what we do in the United States; we are taught to speak up; it's part of our culture and our education. I didn't always speak, but I learned early on that if you didn't speak, a decision could be made without your input.

I did ask someone specifically about an orientation, and they said there was none, but maybe I should work with a staff member and submit something in writing. That took several years to get approved. There was some reluctance to do this, which I did not understand. Most boards and indeed the United States Congress have an orientation process. To me it's so important, and perhaps it would have avoided some of the issues we've had to deal with in recent years.

**Swanson:** Perhaps it would have avoided the problems associated with IOC members visiting bid cities.

**DeFrantz:** The process of visiting bid cities absolutely started in 1986. It never happened before 1986 in that organized fashion. At that time there were six summer cities and seven winter cities all bidding for the Games of 1992. Two countries had cities bidding for both the summer and winter Games. Because of the financial success of the 1984 Olympic Games and the amount of money involved, countries figured it was a very positive thing to do.

**Swanson:** Yes, it's an economic development program.

**DeFrantz:** Exactly. And because of that, countries were willing to have well-funded bid committees. Also most of those countries have national airlines and therefore it was much easier to provide the tickets for the incoming athletes and their coaches. IOC site visitations did not happen for the 1984 Olympic Games in Los Angeles, but people thought it had always happened. No, that is simply not true.

**Swanson:** Was there any controversy when the Games were awarded to Barcelona?

**DeFrantz:** No, and in fact some people thought that might be when President Samaranch would retire, and it would be important for the president to have the Games in his home city.

Paris put in a very strong bid, but I wasn't an IOC member when the bid came in so I really did not know. I was at the 1988 Olympic Games, but I was not an IOC member when the voting occurred years earlier.

**Swanson:** The 1988 Seoul Olympic Games were your first Games as an IOC member.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, and then we had the Ben Johnson episode, and I spoke out on that. I thought, "Oh my goodness, here I am speaking out again," but it was really because of Craig Masback, who I knew from Princeton.

He said, "Anita, I really need to get this on television, could you please do this."

I had gotten calls very early in the morning where I'd said, "If it [his drug violation] is confirmed, he's a coward." Craig really wanted me to say that one the air. I explained that I was a rookie on the IOC.

He said, "But Anita, you're an athlete, I know you're brave. I remember 1980 and I was on the wrong side of that, but please put this on television." I did.

**Swanson:** Did other people support your position?

**DeFrantz:** Yes. However, it was difficult because never before had such a high profile athlete been stripped of a medal. The first headline in one newspaper was, "Canadian Wins Gold Medal in 100 Meter." Then after Ben Johnson was stripped of his gold medal, the headline was, "Jamaican Shamed by Positive Drug Test." I think that's where he was born.

**Swanson:** It's interesting how quickly he was distanced from Canada. Were drugs part of the 1976 Montreal Games as well?

**DeFrantz:** The jellybeans?

**Swanson:** Is that what they call them?

**DeFrantz:** No, that's what I call them. Yes, the GDR had systematic state sponsored doping. Now that they've gone to court and finally sentenced the guilty parties, we are getting the stories of all the athletes whose lives have been forever changed. We'll never know the stories of those who have died from it. And, yes, I still hear from people who want the medal order changed, so that the gold medalists who were from the GDR would be removed and the others would move up. Certainly, for Shirley Babashoff, the great United States swimmer who won six silver medals in 1976, it was really a personal tragedy. But can we roll back history and undo what was done by the GDR? In rowing, five of the six gold medals were won by the GDR.

**Swanson:** Five of the six is a telling fact.

**DeFrantz:** Yes. We learned the East German anthem that day.

**Swanson:** Let's go back to the doping issue of 1988. What happened after that?

**DeFrantz:** In 1989, I proposed, not only speaking from the floor but also bringing proposals to the floor, that we not only ban the athletes, but that we have to also ban or sanction heavily the doctors, the coaches and the entourage. There was a long debate on that. I didn't know then what I know now. And that is, I should have been writing down what each IOC member was saying so that I could respond. That goes back to our lack of orientation. How would I know that? After this long debate, the floor was given back to me, I didn't realize I had rebuttal time. I did my best and repeated my arguments without responding to those who had supported and those who had opposed me. I could have done a better job, but I hadn't taken any notes during the discussion.

**Swanson:** The search for performance enhancement goes on, but the doping violations violate human health and distort the competitive fairness of the competition.

**DeFrantz:** We are spending so much money on those who cheat. We are providing a lot of funds to help people, but to me it is terrible that so much money is spent on those who cheat. I am so tired of people believing that all athletes cheat. I don't believe that. First of all you have to have a lot of money to buy the drugs, it's expensive to cheat.

**Swanson:** Well, there is a fallout, and that fallout is on the high school and junior high school students that take drugs to improve strength or performance.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, and now we're finding that the supplements that you can buy over-the-counter are really bad because they are contaminated when they are produced. Actually, the supplements are regulated, but you have to report, and the FDA doesn't have the time or the money to do everything. The labeling or the mislabeling has to be reported. Meanwhile it is the kids who get hurt.

**Swanson:** What other issues do you recall from your early days in the IOC?

**DeFrantz:** Another issue was the transition regarding the eligibility of athletes. I thought that was very important. At the end of the day, after you've trained so hard and competed, why would you want to have to say, well I competed against the best except those who are really too good to compete at the Games? As I so often say, "Nobody checked my bank account at the starting block." If they did, they may fall over laughing, but some people in rowing are very wealthy and some people are not. What does that matter? What does it matter that somebody has been able to perfect their skills at a very high level and get paid for it? The question is, "Are they willing to compete under the rules of the competition?"

Another issue was women's opportunity and how to make that happen. Actually, the 1994 Olympic Centennial Congress helped that a great deal. My first step was getting onto the

Program Commission, which no longer exists. The chairman at that time was Vitaly Smirnov. I brought up softball because originally when baseball was put on the program, before I was a member, softball was supposed to come on at the same time. There was a confederation of both baseball and softball. Somehow, softball didn't make it. Since I wasn't an IOC member I don't know what the discussion was or how that happened. Once I became an IOC member, I said, "Now, get this corrected. If we have baseball for men, we must have softball for women. It's a similar game, not exactly the same, but similar. Let's make this right." Once I was put on the Program Commission, I brought it up at every meeting. Finally, before I would even speak the chairman would say, "OK Anita, we know what you are going to say." All I had to say was "softball."

**Swanson:** Your work was appreciated and the International Softball Federation awarded you their Medal of Honor in June of 1995.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, that was very nice. There were other people working on it to, but it needed to happen and I knew it would.

**Swanson:** Softball was first included in the 1996 Atlanta Centennial Olympic Games.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, and that was with collaboration with the organizing committee [ACOG] too. I never do anything alone; there is always collaboration. Women's soccer was also included in the 1996 Olympic Games in Atlanta.

**Swanson:** True. Many people in the United States credit Title IX for the development of team sports to that level.

**DeFrantz:** That's only in the United States. They also have to compete against others. We often think that we are the center of the universe. The Olympic Movement has been the greatest source of opportunity in sport for women, worldwide. Title IX affected the United States, but that was only in the last quarter of the last century. What about the women's sports movement in the rest of the world? If it hadn't been for the Olympic Movement, and the efforts they have directed toward providing opportunity in sport for women throughout the world, we would not see the level of sports performance that we see today. The Olympic Movement has been the greatest source of opportunity for women worldwide.

**Swanson:** There also is a downside to Title IX. Women have actually lost leadership positions in sport. There are now significantly fewer women serving as athletic directors, coaches, women's dean of students, academic department chairpersons of physical education departments and even physical education teachers K-12, than there were before Title IX.

**DeFrantz:** They say it's because women now have other opportunities. The truth of the matter is men are appointing their male buddies. We want all kids to recognize that there is a place for them after their competing days, and that they can give back to their sport.

**Swanson:** Who was your mentor in the IOC?

**DeFrantz:** I had lots of them. I was young enough when I entered to ask questions and talk to other members. It is difficult to have one or two mentors because they are very busy people. Every IOC member is someone who has accomplished a lot in his or her life. The press has painted the IOC with a horrible brush, and it is completely unfair. There are only a few members who may have abused their privileges and responsibilities.

**Swanson:** I'm sure that's true. The press tends to overplay the behavior on the fringes in my opinion. Let's continue with the women's movement in sport development.

**DeFrantz:** There was a conference in Brighton, England, in May of 1994 and the IOC sent our member in England as an observer. That conference was organized by the British Sports Council and had much more to do with governments. The attendees received support from their government and not from the IOC because it was not an IOC conference. That was a wonderful conference, and the Brighton Declaration that came out of the meetings is a great declaration.

As I said before, the Olympic Movement has been the greatest supporter over the years of the opportunity for women to take part on the field of play. That is true only with hindsight, and it was certainly not a goal of the founders. And further, it has been a long, long road to 2000! In 1896, at the first modern Olympic Games, women had no opportunity, but since 1900 the Games have been there for women, and worldwide for women. I believe the Olympic Movement has done and will continue to do very good things for women. In the last quarter of the 20th century, the Olympic Movement has done spectacular things.

At the 1994 Centennial Olympic Congress: Congress of Unity, many things in the area of women and sport were discussed. After that meeting a study group was put together and I was charged with finding out about the recommendations regarding women and sport. Clearly, it was apparent that while the field of play was slowly coming close to parity, there was a need for

women to have more opportunities in the policy-making roles of sport. One of the recommendations that I forwarded on was that there needed to be an increase at every level, in every arena of the IOC. That recommendation was taken up during the 1996 Atlanta Olympic Games, and the goals to have at least 10 percent of the policy-making structures within the Olympic Movement occupied by women by December 31, 2000 and at least 20 percent by the year 2005 were established.

The IOC Women and Sport Working Group was actually established in December of 1995 and I was asked to chair that group. Certainly, the IOC has acknowledged that women in sport are something that is important, and has acted on that by increasing the numbers of women's sports on the program. This working group has the goal of working itself out of existence. The issue of women and sport should become a non-issue.

**Swanson:** In 1996 the IOC conducted the 1<sup>st</sup> IOC World Conference on Women and Sport in Lausanne, Switzerland. What criteria did you use to invite people to this congress?

**DeFrantz:** The president always appoints working groups. We made some recommendations and he accepted some of our recommendations. We also made suggestions about the others. We had members of the IOC, representatives of the NOCs, and individual members, both men and women. It needs to be both men and women working together. As I think about the recommendations that came out of that meeting, I can say that substantially all of them were fulfilled. Some of them couldn't be under the way the IOC works, but substantially all of them have been fulfilled. For example: gender verification. I hope people understand that when gender verification was implemented, it was a necessary thing to protect women's competition, which is closed competition so only women can compete. Now we have stopped the process.

We were going to do our 2nd IOC World Conference on Women and Sport two years later, but it would have put it at the same time as the group from the Brighton conference, so we moved it to every four years. We've also been doing sub-regional conferences on women and sport every year. We had hoped to finish all the sub-regional conferences last year, but had some difficulties doing the Asian sub-regional.

The 2nd IOC World Conference on Women and Sport was held in March of 2000 in Paris to celebrate 100 years of women competing in the Games. It was a huge success. Unfortunately, the facility was not large enough so we had to divide the participants into two rooms. We didn't like that arrangement, but we couldn't do much about it. We had at least 100 more participants register within the last week before the conference. In all, nearly 500 leaders in women's sports from throughout the world attended the conference. It was very well attended. The participants wanted all the papers. As soon as we put them out, they were gone. We had a very small staff and they worked extremely hard. I also think our speakers were just wonderful.

**Swanson:** Yes, they were. As a participant, I was very impressed with the speakers as well as the overall program. How did you get the different speakers?

**DeFrantz:** We explained what we wanted to accomplish at the conference. People had known about our first conference and it had been very well received. Now this was our second conference and it worked. I also think it helped to have it in Paris. Paris was easily accessible for both our speakers and the participants. And also, the movement itself continues to move forward. It was a world conference with multi-national participation. It was a very successful conference; in fact it had the largest participation level of any of the IOC conferences.

The resolutions that came out of that conference are now in place. We want to continue to work toward meeting our targets, and we believe we can. Thirty of the NOCs have [met their target of women's representation], but I will say that it's hard to get some NOCs to respond. President Samaranch is writing to them requesting them to send their information in. More NOCs may have reached their target, but we don't know that yet. They simply haven't responded to our request for information. Some of the IFs have reached their target, and exceeded. For example, in the noblest of sports, women represent 30 percent of their executive. Our FISA council is well represented by women. Some international federations have gone beyond even the 2005 target. We're working on it. With more female athletes participating in the Olympic Games, we anticipate that Olympians will in time fill more of these roles. Most of the men in sports positions within the Olympic Movement have come through sports, so we anticipate that women will also come through sports.

The IOC Working Group on Women and Sports recognizes that it really depends on the NOCs to take these issues through their national governing bodies. Now we know the NOCs need to have their national sports federations do a better job of having women take part. Then these women can work up to the international federations. Again, the IOC needs to encourage the NOCs to send at least one woman to the regional and world assemblies, because there are always only men coming to those meetings. We are continuing to make that request. We are also calling upon the IOC to ask the Olympic Solidarity to provide more scholarships and training for women leaders.

Some of the resolutions made at the Congress were things that the participants needed to take back to their governments to do. They were beyond the scope of the IOC except that the IOC can report this and put it on our website and hope that people will read it and take action. We agree with all the mandates, but we also recognize some are beyond our scope to implement.

As I actually read the resolution about sexual harassment, I see we could have more clearly stated our implied position. We want to do things against sexual harassment. That is so important, including coach-conduct toward athletes. We want to include these issues in all workshops, conferences, etc. That definitely hasn't happened. I doubt that it has been talked about because people are afraid to talk about it. In the noblest of sports, we have begun to talk about those issues. Most workplaces and probably most NOCs do not really talk about those issues properly. At the AAF we have had two presentations on sexual harassment and we probably need to do it every other year.

**Swanson:** How did the Olympic Solidarity program begin?

**DeFrantz:** The IOC began giving sport support funds to emerging nations in 1960. It's been a program of the IOC ever since and now is called Olympic Solidarity. Substantially, the funding of the IOC comes through television rights, sponsorship and investments. Most of that funding goes to support the organizing committees, to put on the Games. It used to be that 30 percent stayed with the IOC to share with sports partners, and now it is 50 percent. The amount of income from television rights and sponsorship has grown, and although the percentage has changed, the organizing committees are actually now getting more financial support than they did before. The NOCs' and the IFs' parts of funding are also larger. The NOCs' part is what is called Solidarity. The IFs' part is just divided up and given to them. The other part, which is much smaller, is left to run the IOC. I think that amount is now around 10 percent. This information, by the way, goes onto the Internet.

**Swanson:** This solid financial support has made a significant difference between how the IOC operates now and how the IOC had to operate in its early years.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, a lot of that money during the early years was out of member's pockets. Also they had to rely on the power of persuasion to get governments to fund the Olympic Games.

**Swanson:** Where do you see the greatest potential for growth in the women's sports area?

**DeFrantz:** Asia is a huge area, and I'm having discussions with them. We are very serious about this. Qatar hosted a track meet for women and Qatar will be the site of the next Asian Games. Again, as people doubt, we are moving ahead, really moving ahead. It's true there are no women in position for the Olympic council of Asia, but we're still working in this. Meanwhile amazing things have happened.

Certainly opportunities need to expand for women in officiating, judging, and positions on policy-making boards. In some cases it will mean expansion of boards. While some men don't believe in the theory of expansion of the universe, opportunities have to expand. I think there are men on these boards who fear it may be discovered that they didn't get their position on their merits, but rather through their connections. Yet, they often say women don't have the capabilities to do these things, and they don't believe in token women. Therefore, one possible solution would be to expand the membership of these policy-making boards.

One of the things the IOC reforms did was to allow people outside the IOC membership to make nominations for IOC membership. We now allow nominations to come in from the NOCs and the IFs and that had never happened before. For example, there is a category of IOC members called NOC presidents, and there is a category of IOC members called IF presidents, and there is a category of IOC members called athletes, elected by athletes. We never had those categories before, and these are all voting members. IOC membership is now scheduled to become limited at 115 and will include 15 members who come from the ranks of the International Federations, 15 from among national Olympic committee presidents, and 15 active Olympic athletes (elected by their peers at the Olympic Games). Once you become an IOC member you are a full voting member. The nominating committee was stunned, but the reforms were all passed.

**Swanson:** There have been so many firsts, not only in your personal life, but your professional life as well. You have had many significant leadership opportunities to make a difference for others. What are some of the leadership experiences you have had as an IOC member and as an IOC vice president?

**DeFrantz:** As you know, I was elected to the IOC in 1986. At that time there was one other United States member of the IOC, Robert Helmick. He had been elected in 1985 and had not been sworn in before the meeting in Lausanne when I also was sworn in. Therefore he was sworn in at the beginning of the 1986 IOC Session meeting and at the end of the Session meeting, I was sworn in. Then, as I explained, during an IOC Session in 1987, I spoke up on behalf of athletes during the discussion of eligibility and professional tennis athletes. You only meet IOC members at the Sessions, and it's difficult to meet all these people at once. Also, compared to a lot of other members, I live very far from Lausanne, so I was sort of isolated during those early days by living in Los Angeles. The commissions meet once a year and the Session meets once a year. Other than that, you really don't have much contact with other IOC members.



The IOC president appoints members to commissions. I suppose because I cared a lot about many aspects, and I would speak up at the Sessions and show my interest, President Samaranch appointed me to various commissions. The first commission I served on was the Athletes' Commission where I worked with Peter Talberg and Pal Schmitt. That was a wonderful commission for me because I was essentially only six years away from being an athlete myself. The USOC has a 10-year limit for eligibility on their Athletes' Advisory Council, and since I was only six years away from competition, I felt very comfortable on the IOC Athletes' Commission. I felt that I could contribute a lot. I could talk about how athletes' commissions and councils were formed in the United States, and I could encourage them to develop rules for other commissions and federations and the NOCs of the world. I could help them work on athletes' rights issues, and also on the issue of how long they should serve on such a commission. All this was the groundwork for what eventually happened in the IOC: to have athletes, elected by their peers, serve on the IOC Athletes' Commission.

During the 1996 Atlanta Centennial Olympic Games, we held our first election for athletes to serve on the IOC Athletes' Commission. I actually took the responsibility to manage that in Atlanta. I remember some of my colleagues scoffed and said what a mess that would be, but it worked. Amidst all my other worries and responsibilities, including having the Games in your own country, and the huge issues surrounding the bombing in the public venue called Olympic Park, the election went forward. It was quite successful. It continued in Nagano and Sydney, and it will also continue in Salt Lake City.

**Swanson:** That is an amazing change in the governance of the IOC. Also, this is a very consistent theme in your professional career. It must be very pleasing to you, after all your work over all these years, to see that now athletes are elected to the IOC by their peers and can serve on the IOC Athletes' Commission.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, we are giving a voice to the athletes, and it began in the IOC when I first served on the IOC Athletes' Commission in 1987. I also served for a brief time on the Eligibility Commission in 1991.

In 1992 I was elected to the executive board, in a little bit of an extraordinary fashion. My colleague, Robert Helmick, resigned from the IOC in December of 1991, at a time when the press raised questions about his ethical conduct. He also resigned from his position as president of the USOC. Perhaps he should talk about this in his own voice. I know a lot about it from my viewpoint. Much of it was public. There was an inquiry, and the executive report was made public. The report is available from the media or communications department of the USOC. It's fairly condemning of his actions. He presented his resignation from the IOC in the very early hours before the executive board most certainly would have begun their own investigation. In other words, he resigned before such an investigation would have been undertaken. He resigned from the IOC and thus a vacancy was created on the executive board.

The election for the position on the executive board was held in Barcelona, Spain, in 1992. At that Session, there were several positions, and I stood for the position to complete the one-year term of office that Mr. Helmick had vacated. I succeeded to be elected for that one-year term. When I completed that term, I then ran for the four-year term on the executive board and was elected.

At that time, and for a long time, there were 11 members on the executive board: six ordinary members, four vice presidents and the IOC president. Now, because of the reforms that were voted in place, there are 15 members on the executive board: one athlete, one person

representing the summer international federations, one person representing the winter international federations and one person representing the NOCs may be elected to the executive board. I say “may” because it’s up to the Sessions to conduct these elections and they may choose not to.

I served that four-year term. We had rules on the executive board that recently changed with the reforms, which I suspect may change back. These rules stated that when you were on the executive board you had to go off for a year as an ordinary member before you could be re-elected. The executive board members rarely speak at the Sessions because we have had a chance to meet and go through all the issues. We usually have very detailed conversations at the executive board, so we rarely speak. On this issue, when the president made the proposal that no member on the executive board may stand for re-election for four years. That to me was unnecessary because the Session elects. If they don’t want someone back on the executive board, the Session need not elect that person. That proposal succeeded. Now, when you go off the executive board you can’t even stand for election for four years. To me that is a very unfortunate outcome. I think we have to change that back. I think it will be changed very soon. It was not a proposal of the reforms. In fact the reform committee said they had addressed that issue and thought it was fine because, of course, the Session elects the members, and they elect whom they think should be on the executive board. Now with the expanded executive board there really is no need for this proposal. Each year, whoever has fulfilled their four years as ordinary members will go off, and a vice president will go off every year. A vice president cannot be elected vice president again for four years, that’s always been the case. Now, with the new proposal, nobody who has served on the executive board can go back for four years. That is what I think is out of line.

**Swanson:** You also serve on the Juridical Commission. How does the process work to change the proposal?

**DeFrantz:** The proposals first go to the Juridical Commission, then it would be put on the floor for discussion and vote at the Session. I was first appointed to this commission in 1993, and I’m still on this commission. All the commission members are IOC members who are attorneys. I really enjoy this commission. We look at juridical issues, the legal issues, not the policy issues, but legal issues. Sometimes we get policy issues and we determine if they are legal or policy issues. Often they are really policy issues, which we send back to the executive board after our discussion.

**Swanson:** What are some legal issues?

**DeFrantz:** Often doping issues are legal issues. We have carefully studied the Olympic Movement anti-doping code to make sure all the legal issues have been thoroughly addressed.

**Swanson:** For example, did you discuss the snowboarder issue in the 1998 Nagano Winter Olympics?

**DeFrantz:** No, because that was an issue during the Games. The Medical Commission found that it was a positive test, and they sent it to the executive board. That is the way it happens at the Games. We discussed it, and as fate would have it, two or three of the members of the executive board were also members of the Juridical Commission. One indicated that he had a conflict of interest, because he was Canadian, as was the athlete in question. He did not take part in the discussion. Although, as an IOC member, sometimes you wonder what your higher responsibility is; to be an IOC member, or a national of your country who is more interested in

your athletes. These are the issues that you have to work through, as you are a member of the IOC.

**Swanson:** What other issues do you recall?

**DeFrantz:** All of that was in the public domain, because we have set up the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS). Our decision was overturned eventually by the CAS and some things went to the public that perhaps should not have. But our work in the Juridical Commission is not for public knowledge. The executive board minutes are released 20 years after the fact, and the IOC Session minutes are released 10 years later. Now, one of the IOC 2000 reforms was to open the Sessions to the public. So, it's easier for me to talk about it, but I'm very careful, as always, not to speak about things that are restricted. You're asking me about things that I have to be careful about.

**Swanson:** The transparency of the IOC organization has been criticized in the past.

**DeFrantz:** It has, but talking about things that happened in 1980 and 1984 illustrated the importance of closed Sessions.

In 1980 and in 1984, members of the IOC were taking enormous risks to keep the Games going. The IOC Sessions were closed to the public. Those discussions and debates were risky to the lives of those IOC members. They were talking about going to Los Angeles or going to Moscow and this was in the middle of the Cold War. In light of what their governments were doing, their discussions were very risky. If those discussions had been open to the public, they perhaps would not have been able to say those things, and keep the Olympic Movement going through the Cold War period.

**Swanson:** There is a value to having closed discussions among people who have the facts and the power to make decisions, but often bits and pieces surface out of context, and initial misperceptions become very difficult to change.

**DeFrantz:** I give speeches now where I typically begin with, "When did you first hear about the IOC?" Often, the answer is 1999. The IOC began in 1894 and we've been around for over 107 years. We have survived the two world wars and the Cold War. We have made certain that the Olympic Games have existed. And, you just heard about the IOC in 1999.

**Swanson:** That's reflective of the information age. They don't have a background or an understanding, but yet they have strong opinions.

**DeFrantz:** And, no one cared. No one cared that the Games went on over all those years, and survived two world wars and the Cold War. I say, "That's fine, but I want you to understand that through all those years the IOC existed and the Games went on." That's the point I want to make.

**Swanson:** You have discovered, through your speaking engagements, that most people admit they first learned about the IOC in 1999. This, of course, is related to the "Salt Lake City Scandal." From your perspective as athlete, USOC member, IOC member, lawyer, United States citizen, how do you perceive that situation?

**DeFrantz:** I first heard about that particular set of issues around Thanksgiving of 1998. I thought what is this all about? It had to do with a letter from Dave Johnson telling a now

deceased member of the IOC that his daughter would no longer be receiving support for her education. Now, the committee had changed from a bid committee to an organizing committee [SLOC]. Essentially the letter was from the organizing committee, and it explained that because they were now an organizing committee, their priorities had to shift. I thought, "What is this?" When I returned to Los Angeles, I can't remember exactly what happened then, but I understand there was communication with the president of the IOC. I communicated with the folks in Salt Lake and said, "What is this?"

They said, "Oh, it's really nothing. Nothing to worry about."

I can't remember exactly what happened, but if I thought about it long enough I could give you a more precise chronology. We had an executive board meeting and set up this ad hoc commission. And since I'm a member of the United States, I, of course, couldn't be a part of it. I was investigated by the ad hoc commission, and asked to present my knowledge, such that it was, of the situation. I said, "I am astonished. I could never imagine a bid committee offering scholarships." I didn't know the depth of what the problems were at the time.

**Swanson:** How was this different from the bid committee you were on for Anchorage?

**DeFrantz:** I was a volunteer for that bid committee. The gifts they were offering were little "bimikins." The jackets, that the bid committee wore, were made of cloth. Someone in the USOC later accused me of having a fur coat. It was a cloth coat that had a hood trimmed with coyote fur. Every volunteer was given this coat and the whole coat cost no more than \$45. If they had bothered, in their investigation, to call the bid committee and talk with the director, he would have given them that number. Yet, they wrote in their investigative document that I had received this coat. This was the Mitchell Commission (USOC Special Bid Oversight Commission). They were doing an investigation of me without really following it up which, as you can tell, is causing me some irritation to this day. It did cause me some difficulty, maybe not. I follow up on things, but they did not.

Now, I've skipped around a tad here again, for which I apologize, but my life is so connected.

**Swanson:** It certainly is. We were talking about Salt Lake City and your amazement with the bid committee offering scholarships.

**DeFrantz:** I had been a member of the board of trustees at Connecticut College for such a long time. If anyone said to me that thus and so person was going to thus and so university and had received a scholarship, it would mean to me that they had gone through proper processing to get a scholarship. It would never occur to me that the bid committee was paying money for someone's tuition. That was far beyond anything that I would ever experience. That reference specifically said, "The bid committee is funding their education." At which point I would have said, "No, you cannot do this. Stop. Cease and desist."

**Swanson:** Was that your first experience?

**DeFrantz:** They never ever said that to me. I was at a meeting in Lausanne. All this that I now know unfolded over a period of time. Now I can't tell you precisely when I learned all this information. That's the difficulty now; what dates, what time.

**Swanson:** I think your perception of the experience is of value. I think what I'm hearing is the unnecessary counterproductive results of simply not asking questions or doing good follow up work. For example, the hooded coat with the coyote fur collar experience.

**DeFrantz:** The internal investigation happened on two tracks. There was the Mitchell Commission (Bid Oversight Commission) and then the investigation by the USOC's own attorneys, which was not necessarily date- and time-sensitive with the USOC's own policies. For example, the USOC did not have a policy on volunteers accepting gifts. Since I was not a member of the board at that time, when I was volunteering for Anchorage, and they didn't have the rules for the bid committee, looking after the fact and suggesting that there were rules is disingenuous. All that notwithstanding, if they'd checked on this coat, I certainly would not have violated the rules if they had rules and the rules were in effect. So that was, as you can tell, irritating to me, because after I had testified before the House of Representatives committee, they [USOC] released this document, which by the way they still have not given to me, even though I am a member of the USOC executive committee. They said, "It might violate attorney client confidence." How can a member of the executive committee not have a document that was in the hands of many people in the press? I was a member of the executive board and they were denying me access to that document. By the way, I still don't have it.

**Swanson:** What's the problem? I think you should be able to clarify your position with reference to how it was presented in the document. Especially when members of the press have copies of it.

**DeFrantz:** Well, it's just what it is.

**Swanson:** Let's now talk about the IOC 2000 Reforms: another response to this situation.

**DeFrantz:** The IOC really had completed its part of the crises with the investigation of the IOC members. Investigating them was certainly a painful process. Those who chose not to resign and wanted to have the entire body hear them out. That was very painful too. The members were very eloquent and that's all I can really say because that was a closed Session. The Session voted and the world knows the result.

**Swanson:** Was it necessary and wise for President Samaranch to conduct a vote of confidence?

**DeFrantz:** It was his decision, and the outcome, which the world knows, showed that some members had no confidence, and a lot of members had confidence. It shows that we are not in lock step.

**Swanson:** You talked earlier about the fact that the problems associated with bid committees were relatively recent problems. Perhaps we can review and clarify that issue.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, it is very recent. It began precisely in 1986. And, at some point following the 1986 Session a member said to me and I think, I don't regret it, but it caused me a great deal of difficulty that I said this because I couldn't remember who said it to me or when. A member said, "Oh, you missed the big birthday party." I said it to the press and people said this and yes, someone said it to me. Because I was not a member in 1986 and that was when the bid cities started lavishing, giving gifts to members and inviting them to come and visit. It had never happened before.

All of the sites to host the Games were selected without visits and without gifts. It never happened before 1986. Never, never, never. All of the Games sites were selected without IOC members traveling for only that purpose, period. I had researched the bidding process as part of the reform commission work and the first time the concept of visiting the candidate cities was mentioned was during the 1985 Session in Berlin. A member asked if it would be alright to make a visit to a candidate city, and the response was yes. So any IOC member who believed it was necessary to go and see the site years in advance to be able to decide how to vote is misguided. It's just not true. So the number of years that the Games have gone on from 1896 to 1988, it was OK to be selected without site visits. The first time IOC members visited a bid city was for the 1992 Games. The last time IOC members visited bid cities were for the 2004 Games. For the 2006 Winter Games in Turin, there were no visits by IOC members because we changed the rules for those Games. I want to get that on the record. Most people think that was always the case, that you had visits.

Now, the gift thing ... In different cultures it's important to give gifts when somebody visits, even the poorest of the poor, when you visited huts, or even if there wasn't a shelter, you gave food as a gift. Even if you had no food, you found something. So for us as Americans to say, "This is horrible," is just a misunderstanding of cultures. Indeed, when I was talking with our elected officials and even people on the Mitchell Commission, I found that they thought the gift giving is OK and the visits are OK. Now, there should be a limit on the gift giving. Well, how do you limit this stuff? And, who's going to be the "gift police?" What we did say was that you cannot visit a city's bid committee. Of course you go to Paris or of course you go to Istanbul in your normal course of events, or maybe you go to Osaka, or to Beijing. In the normal course of events you visit major cities for things that you're doing. But what we needed to put a stop to was visiting the bid committees. Now we call them the candidate city committees, because that was getting way out of control.

When I would visit a city, I wanted to know about the technical issues. For me it was important to know how the athletes would be treated, and there were a lot of questions to be answered about that. I wanted to know how the Olympic Movement would be treated. And then I wanted to know how it would affect the city. Under each of those three headlines I had a number of questions, but often they wanted to take me to dinner or they wanted to take me to these other things. I would typically be in a city for a day or maybe a day and a half, so I didn't want to do all these other things. I wanted to be polite, but I had very precise things I wanted to understand. I didn't want to be carried around; I wanted to be able to do things on my own to get a feel for it. That is me. Now other IOC members are different and have different approaches. But I was very serious about what I wanted to know. I had been part of an organizing committee so I understood how you put the Games together. I had been part of Anchorage's bid committee, so I also understood how the winter Games were put together.

The Anchorage bid was a very modest bid. Right after putting together the 1996 Olympic summer Games, the USOC asked Anchorage to put in their bid from little or nothing. They had wanted to wait for a later date, but the USOC actually called on them to put in their bid, I later learned. They actually weren't ready but the USOC asked them to put in their bid, which is another interesting part of the story. They had a credible bid the first time, and then they learned what all these other cities were doing. They weren't doing any of that. When they came to Lausanne for the vote, they found out what all these other cities were doing and they thought, "Wow."

All of this is before I became an IOC member. Then when I'm an IOC member I came back on board with the USOC. So I don't know what the USOC really is doing because I'm not on the

executive board or a member of the USOC board of directors, I just came to the board meetings to do my eligibility work. This was back in 1985 when I'm a volunteer for Anchorage.

Then the USOC switches to Salt Lake City under USOC President Helmick's leadership. And, so much has happened that I learn about later. For example, in 1989, while Anchorage is still bidding, according to the indictment of Alfredo LaMont, he's already working for Salt Lake City. Before Salt Lake City is the official candidate of the USOC, he's a staff member for the USOC, and I must say a good friend of mine, and I didn't know this. Now, I'm already an IOC member and I didn't know. This is among the things that I don't know about Salt Lake City.

**Swanson:** Is LaMont being charged with tax evasion?

**DeFrantz:** The federal count is, but I can't remember although it is public knowledge. I think one of the counts might have been tax evasion. It makes me very sad. He's a friend, and his family is a lovely family, but I can't talk to him. I haven't been able to under orders of my attorney until this case is over.

**Swanson:** When will the case be over?

**DeFrantz:** When it is. When it goes to court or whatever.

**Swanson:** What did you learn from all of this?

**DeFrantz:** I've learned that people are people and I recognize that I can't know what goes on in their minds.

**Swanson:** What do you think the IOC has learned from this?

**DeFrantz:** We've learned that we must be much more vigilant and we have done the things that my working group proposed which are very good. We've set up contracts with the NOCs. The NOCs were not doing their job. Certainly the USOC really didn't do its job monitoring Salt Lake City. It was interesting that most people also didn't realize that from 1991 to 1994, I was the only IOC member in the United States of America. That was a very difficult period for me because we had the right to host the Games and the responsibility of hosting the Centennial Games in Atlanta, and we had Salt Lake as a bid city. I had a lot of work to do, and I also had my full-time job as well. I was also on commissions and we had a lot of people wanting to become an IOC member. And then we had the issues of Beijing and I was the only one who could work with the U.S. Congress, and I believe I did a very good job with all those different responsibilities. Except we had Salt Lake up to things I didn't know about. I was not a member of the bid committee.

I later found out, during the latter period, and I didn't find this out until 1999, that they had changed their articles of incorporation to include the members of the IOC in the country as ex officio members. By then there were two of us and we could vote, however, we could only vote if we were at the meeting, but they didn't have to notify us of the meeting. All this stuff is very, very interesting. They didn't have to notify us of a meeting, which meant we would never know if there was a meeting.

So, I didn't know and continue to maintain that I was never a member of the bid committee until a journalist said, "But you were."

I said, "No I wasn't."

Then he showed me a document saying that the IOC members were members of the bid committee. Absolutely astonishing!

**Swanson:** It is. It seems so convoluted.

**DeFrantz:** Well, another word might be devious.

**Swanson:** Yes, and it also seems so counter-productive.

**DeFrantz:** Well, I was busy doing my best because I, to this day, believe Salt Lake City is going to be an excellent place for the athletes. This is why I supported the bid. It will be an excellent place for the Games because it will be good for the athletes. It always begins with what will be good for the athletes.

**Swanson:** Is there a backlash against the United States in the IOC because we have hosted so many Games?

**DeFrantz:** We are the 800-pound gorilla. Maybe we haven't always been, but potentially we always have been. In another 500 years, will we be? Don't know. Will I be around? Definitely not.

The United States does many good things. We do some bad things to some countries. It's hard to say. That's such a generalization.

**Swanson:** Why did the United States House of Representatives, on September 28, 2000, in H. Res. 601, express the sense that without improvement in human rights the Olympic Games in the year 2008 should not be held in Beijing in the People's Republic of China?

**DeFrantz:** It's the IOC members who vote. The United States Congress can have hearings on any number of things, although it's interesting that it's taxpayer's money at work. But I am a U.S. citizen and I respect what our congressional folks say. This time they were talking about the 2008 Games, but in 1993 they were talking about the 2000 Games. I've been there before.

**Swanson:** What's your personal opinion?

**DeFrantz:** I don't give my personal opinion. Sometimes I do, but not in this case. I haven't read the documents yet. I will vote by secret ballot when the IOC votes at the July meeting in Moscow.

This gives me a chance to say that I believe in the ballot box; now we do electronic voting. My parents, my grandparents, my great grandparents worked so hard to have the right to vote, to go to the ballot box. That is why it is so important for me to have the right to a secret ballot.



**Swanson:** I do recall the people of the Philippines and their fight to get the vote in the '80s. People were actually killed while standing in line to vote. Yet, I often wonder why so many people in the United States do not exercise their right to vote.

**DeFrantz:** Let's think about the folks who went to the polling places in Florida [last November] and were turned away. They were primarily African American people who were stricken off the poll because anybody who was African American was thought to be a criminal. That was just a horrible thing to have happened in Florida.

**Swanson:** I have a question from my perspective, and I certainly don't have access to all the information that other people may have. If the United Nations can host the 4<sup>th</sup> Women's Congress in Beijing in 1995, what negative message would there be to hosting the 2008 Olympic Games in Beijing?

**DeFrantz:** [Pause] The long pause is attributed to me thinking. I don't know. There are a lot of reasons. Maybe there's a chance of people pulling out and all the things they think. I don't know. There are lots of things I could say, but I think the best answer for me to give at this time is, I don't know.

**Swanson:** Let's go back and talk about your testimony before Senator McCain and how it was characterized in the media.

**DeFrantz:** The media suggested that he was grilling me and that I was not answering the questions to his liking. I was answering the questions based on the knowledge, and indeed it was later confirmed, that for example I said I don't know how much money goes directly to athletes. Well, nobody knows. Even the USOC would not be able to answer that question because the money goes through the NGBs. Indeed there is a substantial amount of money that comes from the IOC to support the USOC. In fact, without the money from the IOC the USOC would be in dire strait, dire straits. I'm both proud that the IOC supports the USOC and I'm frightened that the USOC will not be able to raise as much money as it has without hosting the Games. Once the Salt Lake City Games are over, the U.S. will have hosted four Games in 22 years. No nation has had that kind of opportunity. Two summer Games and two winter Games in 22 years. That's a third of the Games in 22 years. (1980 Lake Placid, 1984 Los Angeles, 1996 Atlanta, 2002 Salt Lake City). Seven over-all, but four in 22 years (1932 Lake Placid, 1932 Los Angeles, 1960 Squaw Valley).

**Swanson:** Well, that certainly supports the 800-pound gorilla concept.

**DeFrantz:** We've contributed a lot and now we're getting a lot more. Now, we are a very important NOC. In 1976 we weren't really as important. We've always sent as large a team as we could, and we've always sent as large a women's contingent as we could. Having said that, I am sure that the number of women that have represented the United States at the Olympic Games is less than 1,700 – 1,700 in 100 years of Games. You're looking at one of 1,700 American women who can say, "I am a United States Olympian." Of the men, it's less than 8,000. I'll get you the exact number.

**Swanson:** That thought gives us an opportunity to think about sport and culture worldwide. What do you think the challenges and opportunities will be for the IOC to contribute to the development of sport and culture worldwide?

**DeFrantz:** I think it's essential to understand that we need to help broaden the sphere through education, through communication and the inclusion that I want to work toward. The field of play and the number of elite athletes will not grow much. I am committed to making sure that controlling the size of the Games is not done by limiting the opportunity for athletes. So many times they say we have to control the number of athletes. No. The issue is not the number of athletes. The issue is primarily the media. It is the media and the cost of the media and the logistics of a lot of things. We need to look at a lot of things, but not to say that we need to control the number of athletes. To me that is far too easy because it overlooks a number of issues that relate to controlling the size of the Games. It is overlooking and misunderstanding the real purpose of why we put on the Games.

**Swanson:** The logistics do limit the hosting sites. Do you think it is important to reach all continents for hosting sites?

**DeFrantz:** Absolutely. Some of the things that I saw happening, even with the evaluation commissions in the past, go back to some strongly held beliefs that people have about what can and cannot happen in parts of the world. To me that is very sad. It goes back to the leadership in the IOC.

I do believe that the Olympic Games are a celebration of human excellence. It proves to the world that we can come together. At the end of my days, I hope to have written on my tombstone, "She helped make the world more like an Olympic village."

**Swanson:** That would be nice. That is a lofty goal and I hope you achieve it. It's certainly possible because you have many more years of service in the IOC ahead of you.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, we're grandmothers in to serve until 80, if we're re-elected. That was one of the reforms. You have to stand for election even though you are an individual IOC member.

**Swanson:** That structure gives you the opportunity to set long range goals which is important when you think about the impact the Olympic Movement can have on improving cultural understanding for people throughout the world. I'm sure you will be a strong voice long into the future and that you will indeed help make the world more like an Olympic village.

I'd like you to talk about your role in helping the Women's Sports Foundation in the United States. As you know, since the 1970s there has been a surge in organized women's and girls' sports activities as well as an increased awareness of this movement.

**DeFrantz:** Women have been around as long as men and women have been as determined as men have. Indeed women have been doing as much labor and hard work as men, probably more. The strength of women has been known. If one looks at ancient carvings and pictures one will always see that women have been involved in sports. It is not really radical to think of women as athletes. The difficult thing was getting them to have the opportunity in modern times. As Title IX [1972] came around in the U.S., in other cultures all the same things I said before apply, but in this country we had legislation, needed legislation, because sport primarily is associated with education. Title IX is an Educational Amendments Act and therefore people recognized sports as part of the educational opportunity. That was the revolutionary idea, not evolutionary but revolutionary. This has made all the difference in our culture now. Now boys and girls think it is quite normal to be active in sports and that is a comforting idea.

The Women's Sports Foundation was actually created by Billie Jean King. She said, "It's time. We have to do something to support girls and women in sport." Eva Auchincloss was the

person who really followed through. She gathered people around her to fulfill the initial mission. To this day she continues to care deeply about the foundation. I know Donna de Varona and other original board members were the ones who really worked hard for it.

I remember receiving a visit from Eva Auchincloss and Holly Turner in Los Angeles when I was on the staff of the LAOOC. They told me about this foundation and I said, "That's a great idea. I'd love to help in any way I could." That was how I became involved. They had known about me as a 1976 Olympian in rowing. I was not one of the creators, but I came along shortly thereafter and have been involved for a very long time in the work of the foundation. What they did in recognizing women in sport is wonderful. The recognition dinner is just fabulous, where they have all the women together. Sometimes men ask why they have this dinner for only women, and why is it necessary? I like to point out that they have lots of these dinners for men, the NFL, and the Major League Baseball dinners for example. We needed to have a coming together to recognize all that women have accomplished, and these dinners are wonderful. Come and support girls and women, as they are beginning and continuing in sport. You'll see how much you get out of being there from that little bit you pay for these dinners.

**Swanson:** Yes. This certainly is a movement whose time has come. What about your other interests in the many other boards you serve on? You are a very active board member with a long list of affiliations on your vita. This multi-dimensional aspect of your professional life represents a variety of interests, yet they all seem to relate to your basic belief in human rights and the inherent right to the pursuit of excellence for each individual.

**DeFrantz:** Yes, it is. People were put on this earth, I believe, to experience and to create their own history. I have a sense that I was put on this earth to help other people have the opportunities they need to develop their own history. Whenever I'm asked to help, I'll do my best to do that. Whenever I'm asked to serve on a board, if I can fulfill the request, then I'll say yes. Perhaps I've said yes a few times too often from time to time. Now I'm having to say no a lot. I've enjoyed my work immensely on the various boards. When I've served on boards, I've always learned a great deal from each experience. Often, I've gotten more than I've given, which embarrasses me a bit. I've done my best to give more than I've received, but it's very difficult to do.

**Swanson:** You've also received many honorary degrees. Talk about what those experiences mean to you.

**DeFrantz:** It is such a remarkable experience. Usually I'm required only to give a short speech, and I do my best to fulfill that requirement. If it's to be a two-minute speech, it's exactly two minutes. I've noticed that I'm usually the only one who follows that requirement. It's so wonderful to look out on the crowd of soon-to-be graduates. There they are, chaffing at the bit generally, to finish this, so I respect their desires. What a wonderful view I get from the stage.

Getting that hood is really wonderful, but I learned about the hood from my mother. All the various hoods that she had received, and that my father had received, and all the regalia of graduation and the meaning of educational achievements all go back to my family training. Now I have a closet full of hoods from those honorary degrees; there they are, but it's wonderful.

**Swanson:** These experiences reflect yet another aspect of your commitment of passing information and values and your philosophy on to the next generation. In addition to your honorary degrees, you also have many honors, awards and distinctions. What do those awards mean to you?

**DeFrantz:** All of them mean a great deal to me. Each time, I recognize that an organization has chosen to say something about what I've done. It amazes me that an organization has decided to say, "Yes, you've done something important." It causes me to pause and say, "Wow." I recognize that sometimes it's a fundraiser for the organization, but they feel that me, my name or what I've done will somehow bring a group of people together that will contribute to their cause. That is an important thing. Something about me will bring people to them if it's a fundraiser, or something about what I've done is important to them. It suggests something significant about my ... I would like to say one more thing that you have reminded me of. In all these "firsts" my job is to make sure they are not the "last."

**Swanson:** That commitment is apparent in your work. What advice do you have for young people?

**DeFrantz:** Ask questions, be sure to ask questions. Keep asking questions, gather information and then you can make decisions. The more decisions you make, the better you get at doing it, but it begins with asking questions.

**Swanson:** How would you like others to perceive you?

**DeFrantz:** I want other people to think of me as someone who provides opportunity. I'm about opportunity.

**Swanson:** In closing I would like to say that it has been my pleasure to conduct this oral history with you. All the best to you, Anita, as you move forward in your life and your professional career. Thank you very much.

**DeFrantz:** Thank you.