
“It Was Communism Versus the Free World”: The USA-USSR Dual Track Meet Series and the Development of Track and Field in the United States, 1958–1985

by Joseph M. Turrini[†]

AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORY RESEARCH CENTER AND UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Eighty-one thousand spectators packed into Stanford Stadium on a sunny California afternoon in Palo Alto to see the US and USSR national track teams battle on the second day of their two-day dual track and field meet. The July 15-16, 1962 meet was the fourth competition in a dual track meet series between the two strongest national track powers in the world that spanned 28 years (1958-85). On this second day, Valeriy Brumel, a popular Soviet high jumper, thrilled the crowd when he jumped 7'5" and broke his own world record in the high jump.¹ The day before most of the enthusiastic attendees stayed late, after the running events had finished, and watched American Harold "Hal" Connolly heave the hammer 231' 10" to break his own world record.² A national television audience tuned in to watch what was arguably the biggest non-Olympic track event ever held in the United States. According to a *New York Times* editorial, "the most dramatic moment came at the conclusion of the meet when athletes from both countries walked arm in arm around the stadium to the accompaniment of their national anthems and a tremendous ovation from the large audience."³ Just months before Soviet Prime Minister Nikita Khrushchev and U.S. President John F. Kennedy neared the brink of nuclear war in Cuba, Soviet and American track athletes competed in harmony.⁴

[†]The author would like to thank Jon Rabin, Rob Gordon, Mel Small, Christopher Johnson, Elizabeth Faue, Julie Turrini, Sarah Fitzsimmons, and the two anonymous *Journal of Sport History* reviewers for their helpful comments on this essay. The title quote is from Rafer Johnson (with Philip Goldberg), *The Best That I Can Be: An Autobiography* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 114.

The Cold War impacted track and field as it did most aspects of American culture, society, and politics. Other than the quadrennial Olympic Games, the USA-USSR dual track meet series was the most important and visible of the Cold War sport competitions that emerged in the late 1950s and 1960s. Between 1958 and 1985 the US and the USSR national track teams competed in nineteen outdoor meets, seven indoor meets, ten junior meets, and eight multi-event competitions. These athletic contests served many purposes for the leaders and people of the two countries; for example, they functioned as propaganda and foreign diplomacy tools.⁵ Despite the loftier ambitions of politicians and patriots from both countries, the events were first and foremost athletic competitions.

This history of the USA-USSR track meet series explores the impact of the Cold War on track and field. It demonstrates that, particularly during the initial years, the USA-USSR dual track meet series profoundly affected the development of track in the United States. During its first phase (1958-65), the series rivaled the Olympic Games in international and domestic importance. The series forced a greater inclusion of women's participation in track and altered the international program of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States (AAU), then the governing body of track in the United States. Because of the series' unusually high profile and political importance, it created stars, facilitated television coverage of track, played a role in the bureaucratic power struggle between the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and the AAU, and helped reshape the uneasy relationship between American track athletes and the AAU.

The history of the USA-USSR dual track meet series also illuminates the changes that occurred in track during the series' 28-year existence. Its importance and impact declined dramatically during the second phase (1969-85) as economics altered the sport. The emergence of a consumer-based running industry that accompanied the running boom in the United States created a material base that encouraged and financed both the internationalization and professionalization of track. These changes emboldened the athletes who demanded and eventually obtained a large measure of independence from the AAU. The USA-USSR dual meet series became the primary area of conflict in the athletes' fight for athletic independence. The transformation of amateur track into a formally professional sport made the USA-USSR dual meet series obsolete. This study supports Stephen Hardy's perceptive insistence that sport historians need to more seriously consider the role that the sport marketplace has on the development of sport.⁶ Put simply, this history of the USA-USSR dual track meet series will demonstrate the impact that the series had on the development of domestic track in the United States and how the changes that occurred in track later undermined the series' importance.

The Opening Phase

Organizing the first USA-USSR track meet took years of patient negotiations between Soviet and U.S. sport and political leaders. Sport leaders first discussed the possibility of track exchanges following the 1952 Olympics and continued to negotiate sporadically until 1958.⁷ The sport leaders encountered many obstacles. The Americans sought an exchange of individual athletes to compete as attractions in non-team-scored meets, similar to the AAU's already established international program.⁸ The Soviet Union, on the other hand, desired scored dual meets between the two national squads. Unlike the AAU's

international program, the Soviet Union's international program focused on national team meets. In the early 1950s, for instance, the national Soviet squad competed in dual meets against Romania, Hungary, and Britain.⁹ But negotiations resolved this and other issues, such as the financial arrangements and the scoring of the meet, because sport leaders in both countries eagerly sought the exchange.¹⁰ Cold War era legislation proved to be a much more difficult obstacle.

The 1952 Immigration and Nationality Act (McCarran Act) stymied all attempts to arrange a meet between 1952 and 1957.¹¹ Passed near the peak of anti-Communist hysteria in the United States, the McCarran Act sought to control the threat of Communism from outside the country. Among other things, the McCarran Act, named after Nevada Senator Patrick McCarran, required that people entering the country from the Soviet Union or its ally countries be fingerprinted. The Soviet Union steadfastly refused to submit any of its citizens to the fingerprinting requirement. The fingerprinting requirement in the 1952 McCarran Act halted discussions of many other proposed cultural exchanges between the two nations between 1952 and 1957.¹² AAU Secretary-Treasurer Daniel Ferris assured the Soviet Union on a number of occasions that the U.S. State Department would waive the fingerprinting requirement or that the law was to be rescinded. Ferris arranged a meet in 1957 based on assurances that Soviet athletes and coaches entering the country would not be fingerprinted. But the USSR declined when it became apparent that Ferris was wrong and Soviet athletes and coaches would be fingerprinted.¹³ The incredible attention given to the US and Soviet battles on the track at both the 1952 and 1956 Olympic Games encouraged the tenacious sport leaders of both countries to continue the discussions in the face of Cold War obstacles.¹⁴

In October 1957 Congress rescinded the fingerprinting requirement and opened the door to a variety of educational and cultural exchanges between the two countries. There are several explanations for the legislative change. Pressure from organizations like the AAU that desired exchanges with the Soviet Union helped garner political support for its repeal. Some elements in the Eisenhower administration argued that cultural exchanges could be a useful tool in demonstrating to the Soviet people the success of American capitalism and democracy.¹⁵ Perhaps more importantly, by 1957 the more extreme paranoid anti-Communism displayed by Senator Joseph McCarthy and others had been discredited. The notion that shotputters and sprinters were spies held much less credence than just five years earlier.

The two sport federations quickly hammered out an agreement in early 1958 for a two-meet exchange, the first in Moscow in 1958 and the second in the United States in 1959.¹⁶ The USA-USSR dual track meets were one part of the emerging cultural and educational exchanges between the two countries opened up by the legislative changes.¹⁷ Sport exchanges in basketball, weightlifting, and wrestling, for example, were also negotiated in early 1958.¹⁸ The USA-USSR track meets, however, easily captured more public and political attention in the 1950s and 1960s than the basketball, weightlifting, and wrestling exchanges combined. Henry Luce's patriotic sports weekly, *Sports Illustrated*, eagerly and confidently awaited the first USA-USSR track meet, declaring that the USSR was "asking for a licking."¹⁹ Although the initial agreement included only the 1958 and 1959 meets, sport leaders in both countries desired a long-term series.²⁰

The seven meets that occurred during the series' first phase represented the height of international and domestic interest in the series as well as political importance. Most contemporary observers agreed with Italian track and field journalist and historian Roberto Quercetani, who called the first USA-USSR track meet in 1958, "the meet of the century."²¹ Long-time AAU leader Pincus Sober proudly proclaimed that the first USA-USSR meet was "probably the single greatest amateur sports endeavor other than the Olympic Games."²² Throughout the eight years between 1958 and 1965 interest in the competitions remained simply spectacular. The track series captured the public imagination and the athletes' interest as did no other non-Olympic sporting event.

The basic rules of the meets heightened interest, patriotism and tension. Each meet included just two competitors from each country in all men's and women's Olympic events.²³ The meets were scored on a 5-3-2-1 basis for the individual events and 5-3 for the relay events.²⁴ Apparently the initial agreement separated the men's and women's scores into two separate and distinct competitions: there would be no combined score total. This issue, as explained below, generated the biggest conflict early in the series. The small number of competitors in each event (four) made the competitions both tense and easy to follow, generated excitement, and encouraged patriotism. The Olympics included the distraction of many athletes from other countries. The USA-USSR meets, on the other hand, provided a direct and undiluted competition between the two countries that mirrored the bipolar perspective that pervaded the Cold War period.

The USA-USSR dual meets inspired a patriotism and excitement among athletes and coaches not found outside of the Olympic Games. Eddie Southern won a silver medal in the 1956 Olympics in the 400-meter hurdles, captained the US team at the 1958 USA-USSR meet, and competed in the 1959 USA-USSR meet. After the 1959 meet he insisted that he "would rather die than lose. . . . I wasn't running to get a point or two, I was running to beat the Russians."²⁵ U.S. national Coach George Eastmont emphasized the seriousness of the team when he acknowledged during the inaugural meet in 1958 that he had "never seen such a keyed up team."²⁶ After the meet he exclaimed: "I've had lots of thrills in my life, but I kind of think this is it. The US against Russia—this one was important and we did it."²⁷ After the 1963 meet veteran distance runner Peter McArdle said that he "realized he had a duty to perform... I had to show them that I hadn't failed my country." At the same 1963 meet 400-meter hurdler Rex Cawley claimed that in losing at the AAU meet "you've only lost for yourself," but in the USSR meet, "you not only lose for yourself, you let your team and country down."²⁸ Olympic decathlon champion and world record holder Rafer Johnson recalled over 40 years later that his battle with world record-holder Vasily Kuznetsov at the 1958 meet "was not just man-on-man for the unofficial title of World's Greatest Athlete, it was Communism vs. the Free World."²⁹

The meet generated as much interest by the American public as it did by the athletes and coaches. The American media and public became enchanted with Soviet sport when the USSR reentered the Olympics in 1952.³⁰ The US media closely followed the track competition between the US and the USSR in both Helsinki in 1952 and Melbourne in 1956.³¹ The yearly national dual track meets extended Olympic-like attention to every year and dramatically increased the visibility of track and its athletes. US athletes who competed in the USA-USSR meets gained easy access to the media to promote the meet

and the sport. Bob Schul recalled that in the week prior to winning the 5,000 meter race at the 1964 Los Angeles meet, he was “a guest on almost every type of television program in Los Angeles.”³² Attendance at the American-hosted meets in 1959, 1962 and 1964 reached unheard of proportions for a dual meet.³³ Although bad weather limited the paid attendance to a “disappointing two-day crowd of 54,380” in 1959 at Franklin Field in Philadelphia, this figure still easily outdistanced the regular yearly AAU national championship meet.³⁴ The 1962 two-day meet at Stanford University drew a phenomenal 153,000 in paid attendance, which *Track and Field News* claimed was the “largest in US track history.”³⁵ Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy was among the over 105,000 spectators at the 1964 meet in Los Angeles.³⁶

The USA-USSR dual meet series also increased television exposure for track at a time when it rarely found its way onto television sets.³⁷ The most popular television sports in the late 1940s and early 1950s were wrestling and roller derby. Historian Benjamin Rader argued that television framed these quasiathletic competitions as “morality play(s)” that clearly delineated “incarnate absolute good” and “absolute evil.”³⁸ The USA-USSR track meet series fit perfectly into this pre-existing model for televised sport. The Cold War environment created the good and evil for the networks within the framework of real athletic competition. The popularity of the national broadcast of the 1959 meet among non-track fans demonstrated “the potential of such telecasts, and of the sport.”³⁹ The USA-USSR series became the cornerstone of televised track in the United States.⁴⁰

The high visibility of the series created a platform similar to the Olympics to create track stars. The AAU placed Gerry Lindgren on the 1964 national team as a last second replacement. The slight (5'5", 118 lbs.) and young (18 years old) Lindgren became an instant national celebrity when he became the first American to win the 10,000 meter race against the Soviets in Los Angeles in 1964.⁴¹ *Amateur Athlete* reported that “young Lindgren seized America’s imagination as few other runners have ever done when he defeated the grizzled Russians, Leonid Ivanov and Nikolay Dutov.”⁴² *Track and Field News* maintained that Lindgren “stole the hearts of the sun-drenched spectators” when he shocked the Soviet runners by winning an event dominated by the USSR.⁴³ The recent high school graduate received a “hero’s welcome” when he arrived home at the airport in Spokane. Lindgren was made the Grand Marshal of the Seattle Seafair, and a day of celebration was designated to honor his achievement.⁴⁴ If Lindgren had run the same time in any other non-Olympic meet he would have remained an anonymous athlete. But the spectacle of the USA-USSR meet made him a star. Americans also became enamored with Soviet stars, like high jumper Valeriy Brumel. Brumel became a media and fan favorite after setting world records in the first three USA-USSR meets while engaged in epic battles with popular US high jumper John Thomas, a previous world record holder.⁴⁵ In fact, the level of competition in the early meets was consistently impressive: fourteen world records fell in the seven USA-USSR dual meets between 1958 and 1965.⁴⁶

The popularity of the series encouraged the AAU to alter its international track exchange program. Prior to 1958, the AAU international program focused almost exclusively on bringing foreign star competitors into the country for a series of meets to generate interest and increase attendance.⁴⁷ In return, the AAU sent out small groups of US track athletes, usually between five and twelve, who competed in a series of meets during

two-to-six week periods, usually in European countries, but also in Asia and Africa. Neither the traveling American track stars nor the visiting foreign athletes competed in formal scored dual meets.⁴⁸ Prodded by the public relations explosion created by the USSR meet, the AAU's international program increasingly hosted and competed in national dual meets. In fact, international dual meets almost immediately became an AAU priority. When the US national track team traveled to the Soviet Union in 1958, 1961, 1963 and 1965, the team also competed against the Polish (1958, 1961, 1963 and 1965), Greek (1958), Hungarian (1958), West German (1961, 1963 and 1965) and British (1961 and 1963) national track teams in similar dual meets. The US also imported entire national teams for dual meet competitions in years that the USA-USSR meet was in the United States. For example, the Polish national team competed in Chicago in 1962 and in Los Angeles in 1965, and the West German team competed in Los Angeles in 1965.⁴⁹ Consequently, the popularity of the USA-USSR dual meet series transformed the focus of the AAU's foreign exchange program.

Official national team scoring in the meets represented an important departure from previous tours. When the foreign tours consisted of non-team-scored competitions the AAU had little concern if invited athletes chose not to compete. The AAU had plenty of high-caliber, internationally popular athletes to choose from, and would just ask another if one declined.⁵⁰ Once the meets included national team scoring, it became imperative to travel with the best team possible because it was now the American national track team. This was rarely a problem between 1958 and 1965 because participation in the international tours was among the few perks for international-class amateur track athletes. But this developed into a headache for the AAU when the economics of track changed and the athletes' priorities diverged from the AAU's beginning in the late 1960s. Most importantly, the combination of increased visibility and team scoring altered the dynamics in the relationship between the athletes and the AAU. It provided the athletes more power because it was now much more important that they agree to participate in specific meets.

Including Women

The inclusion of a women's national track team in the USA-USSR series also had a significant impact. In 1958 women's track in the United States barely existed. It is difficult to find any high school girls' track programs in the 1950s; the situation was only slightly better on college campuses. Historically black colleges—most notably Tennessee State University and Tuskegee Institute—had the only consistently competitive women's college track programs.⁵¹ These two programs produced most of the top women's track athletes in the country in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s. Tuskegee Institute dominated women's competitive track in the US from the late 1930s through the early 1950s winning fourteen outdoor national championships between 1937 and 1951.⁵² Coach Ed Temple, who became the women's track coach at Tennessee State University in 1950, built the Tennessee State Tigerbelles into a national powerhouse that overtook Tuskegee. Coach Temple's Tigerbelles won the national AAU outdoor track championship meet eleven times between 1955 and 1967.⁵³ After the Soviet women soundly beat the American women (67-40) at the second dual meet in 1959, Hank Soloman noted that if it was not for "Ed Temple's vaunted Tennessee State charges, we would be smarting from a great American

tragedy—no women's track."⁵⁴ The results of the 1962 USA-USSR meet supported Solomon's assessment of three years earlier. The only women athletes that beat their Soviet counterparts at the 1962 meet were Tennessee State University-trained athletes and Czechoslovakian immigrant Olga Fikotova Connolly.⁵⁵

Not surprisingly, there were very few meets in which women could compete. The Tuskegee female runners, for instance, usually competed in only three meets a year: the AAU indoor championship, AAU outdoor championship, and the Tuskegee Relays.⁵⁶ The most important meet was the AAU sponsored women's outdoor national championship meet. In this period, the women's annual AAU meet was always held on a different day and location from the vastly more important men's meet. The women's meet received scant attention from the media.⁵⁷ Olga Fikotova Connolly, the 1956 Olympic discus champion who moved to the United States from her native Czechoslovakia after marrying U.S. hammer thrower Harold (Hal) Connolly in probably the most celebrated Olympic romance ever, complained bitterly after competing in her first AAU national championship meet in 1957. She wondered why the women athletes bothered to come to the "absolutely unprepared stadium" where there was "no interest, a meet of the lowest standard, and no encouragement and understanding."⁵⁸ Outside of Tuskegee, Tennessee State, and a few scattered clubs, there was almost no interest in the women's meet.

The women's team that competed in Moscow in 1958 was the first women's national track team ever assembled by the AAU outside of Olympic and Pan-American Games competitions.⁵⁹ It was a momentous turning point for women's track in the United States. Considering the neglect of women's track, it was no surprise that the older and more experienced Soviet women dominated the American women in all seven meets between 1958 and 1965 (see Table 1, page 434). Unlike the United States, the Soviet Union had egalitarian athletic programs which encouraged mass participation of both men and women and sought to develop fully the most talented, irrespective of gender.⁶⁰

The poor results for the American women during the first phase forced the AAU and others in the country to acknowledge the country's neglect of women's track.⁶¹ Coach Temple complained that, among other things, the paucity of meets hurt the women's chances because they remained inexperienced.⁶² After the 1961 USA-USSR meet, Wilma Rudolph, three-time Olympic gold medalist at the 1960 Olympics, complained about the lack of training for women in the United States and remarked that in Europe women track athletes "receive the best training available and are considered as important as men." AAU chief Dan Ferris agreed that there was "no question that girls in Europe receive better training."⁶³ The AAU monthly publication, *Amateur Athlete*, is peppered with articles urging increased opportunities for women track athletes throughout the latter half of the 1950s and into the 1960s. The articles often contrasted the US women with their Soviet counterparts.⁶⁴ But the majority of elite trackmen trained on college campuses, and most of these institutions had little interest in women's track in the late 1950s and early 1960s—regardless of how much the AAU and others complained.

The superiority of the Soviet women made the method of scoring the dual meets a critical issue. The US men won the first six meets before losing for the first time in Kiev, Ukraine, in 1965. Unlike the lopsided women's scores, the men's scores often were quite close. The USSR, therefore, had a larger combined score total in six of the first seven

Table 1: Outdoor Track Meet Results^{6 5}
1958-85

Date	Location		Total	Men	Women
1958	Lenin Stadium	USSR	172	109	63
Jul. 27-28	Moscow	USA	170	126	44
1959	Franklin Field	USSR	175	108	67
Jul. 18-19	Philadelphia	USA	167	127	40
1961	Lenin Stadium	USSR	179	111	68
Jul. 15-16	Moscow	USA	160	124	36
1962	Stanford U.	USSR	173	107	66
Jul. 21-22	Palo Alto, CA	USA	169	128	41
1963	Lenin Stadium	USSR	189	114	75
Jul. 20-21	Moscow	USA	147	119	28
1964	Los Angeles Coliseum	USSR	156	97	59
Jul. 25-26	Los Angeles	USA	187	139	48
1965	Central Stadium	USSR	181.5	118	63.5
Jul. 31-Aug. 1	Kiev	USA	155.5	112	43.5
1969	Los Angeles Coliseum	USSR	178	111	67
Jul. 18-19	Los Angeles	USA	195	125	70
1970	Lenin Stadium	USSR	200	122	78
Jul. 23-24	Leningrad	USA	173	114	59
1971	U. of California	USSR	186	110	76
Jul. 2-3	Berkeley, CA	USA	186	126	60
1973	Republic Stadium	USSR	216	121	95
Jul. 23-24	Minsk, USSR	USA	163	112	51
1974	Duke U.	USSR	192	102	90
Jul. 5-6	Durham, NC	USA	184	117	67
1975	Central Stadium	USSR	225	129	96
Jul. 4-5	Kiev	USA	138	89	49
1976	U. of Maryland	USSR	211	107	104
Aug. 6-7	College Park, MD	USA	157	115	42
1977	Sochi, Russia	USSR	207	118	89
Jul. 1-2		USA	171	105	66
1978	U. of California	USSR	177	102	75
Jul. 7-8	Berkeley, CA	USA	190	119	71
1981	Lenin Stadium	USSR	204	105	99
Jul. 11-12	Moscow	USA	178	118	60
1982	Indiana U.	USSR	207	118	89
Jul. 2-3	Indianapolis, IN	USA	167	100	67
1985	National Olympic Stadium	USSR	221	104	117
Sep. 21-22	Tokyo, Japan	USA	164	114	50

winning score in bold type

meets. The only meet at which the United States won the combined score victory between 1958 and 1965 was in Los Angeles in 1964. Early in the series the AAU insisted that the Soviet Union renege on its agreement to score the meet as two completely independent competitions, a men's and a women's meet.⁶⁶ The USSR combined the scores anyway because the dominance of the Soviet women resulted in Soviet combined score victories.⁶⁷ The USSR claimed victory based on the combined score, while the United States claimed victory based on the men's score and sought to ignore the women's score. The issue of scoring created more antagonism between the AAU and the Soviet sport officials than any other issue during this period. Regardless of whether the Soviet Union should have combined the scores or not, the practice increased the attention paid to women's track. American newspapers often simultaneously complained that the combined scores had no legitimacy, but then gave them credence by reporting them.⁶⁸

The scoring conflict focused attention on the US women's poor showings. It dramatically increased awareness of women's track and slowly led to increased opportunities. The inclusion of the women's team in the series instantly increased international competitive opportunities for US women track athletes from zero to a couple meets per year. Prior to 1958, the foreign tours were exclusively men's affairs. The AAU only rarely included women on foreign tours.⁶⁹ The USA-USSR dual meet series provided international track experience that was not previously available and helped prepare the women for future Olympic competitions.⁷⁰ More importantly, women's track teams were included in all the national team scored meets against countries like Poland, West Germany, and Great Britain, increasingly organized by the AAU. Throughout the 1960s indoor meet promoters began including occasional women's events, partly due to the increased visibility and popularity of female stars like Wilma Rudolph, but also due to the Soviet Union's desire to import both male and female track athletes to indoor meets by the mid-1960s.⁷¹ It was probably not a coincidence, for example, that the AAU combined the men's and women's indoor championship for the first time in 1965, the same year it brought spectacular Soviet shot put star Tamara Press to the United States for the indoor season. Press easily won her event at the meet.⁷²

Women's track clubs slowly emerged across the country. Between 1955 and 1965 the number of competitive women's track clubs increased from two dozen to more than 200.⁷³ Soviet dominance in both the Olympic Games and USA-USSR dual meet series provided the primary motivation for formation of many of the new track clubs. For example, Jim Lorimar founded the Ohio Track Club in late 1959 after watching the Soviet women beat the American women 67-40 in Philadelphia. The Ohio Track Club won 20 medals at the 1960 AAU indoor championship meet and beat Tennessee State in the 1963 indoor championship by a mere three points.⁷⁴ Larry Synder and Olympic gold medalist (400 meter hurdles) Glenn Davis sometimes assisted Lorimar with the team.⁷⁵ Opportunities for women in the early 1960s slowly increased in the United States as a result of the USA-USSR series. The pace of inclusion, however, should not be overstated. Most high schools and colleges waited until well after Title IX of the Educational Act (1972) compelled them to initiate women's track programs.⁷⁶ But it is important to note that the series increased opportunities for women and changed the attitudes of many track officials, coaches and meet directors toward women's track prior to Title IX.

The Battle Over Sanctioning

The importance of American success in the USA-USSR dual meet series enhanced the position of athletes relative to the AAU. In response to an onerous schedule, a number of athletes declined invitations to the 1961 USA-USSR meet. Informally led by outspoken hammer-thrower Hal Connolly, the athletes complained that the AAU required them to be in Europe for nearly a month and compete in all four scheduled international dual meets—Poland, Great Britain, West Germany, and the Soviet Union.⁷⁷ The schedule conflicted with many of the post-collegiate athletes' jobs and family obligations. The nine athletes wanted the opportunity to compete against the Soviet Union and then come home, allowing other athletes to compete in the other meets, a request the AAU refused.⁷⁸ Although most athletes enjoyed the foreign tours, they also consistently complained about their lack of input, the low per diem money, poor accommodations, wages lost from missing work, and the AAU's general lack of concern for the athletes when planning the trips.⁷⁹

The nine athletes' informally organized boycott brought the AAU unwanted attention. After hearing about the athletes' complaints, Senators Engle and Fulbright (chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee) complained that since the US State Department loaned the AAU over \$90,000 for the trip to the Soviet Union, it should have had some control in ensuring the team's quality. Moreover, the AAU squad was the national US track team. Senator Engle argued that it was important that the United States field their best team: "We all know the Russians use these athletic events for propaganda purposes..... We may be supplying them with another opportunity of claiming superiority."⁸⁰ The senators thought it made little sense to force athletes to stay in Europe for the entire month and compete in all four meets or compete in none at all, especially when the meet against the Soviet Union mattered most.

Athletes' complaints about the AAU dated back to the early 1900s, but their earlier haphazard attempts to influence the rigid bureaucratic structure had failed miserably.⁸¹ The AAU continued to function under the myth that as a private voluntary organization it had no public responsibility to anyone, including the athletes, the government or the colleges that supplied and trained most of the athletes.⁸² Gripping athletes like Connolly were told they did not have to belong to the AAU if they did not like it. Of course, this meant that the athletes would be ineligible for all international and most serious domestic competition. The importance of the USA-USSR dual meet series, however, focused increased attention on the athletes' dissension and provided them with a public platform. More importantly, it made the AAU's position that it was a private organization without public responsibilities—which it argued in court when legally challenged—difficult to maintain. How could the organization responsible for assembling the national team that competed against the USSR not have a public responsibility or oversight? In the face of the informal 1961 athlete boycott, the AAU halted the negative publicity by appointing two athletes to act as representatives for the others for the duration of the tour. The federal government temporarily backed off and the tour went on as planned without the nine athletes.⁸³ Even though real changes failed to materialize, the USSR meet increased the athletes' visibility and potential power.

More complicated difficulties emerged for the AAU in the next few years when unhappy National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) coaches used the USSR meet as a lever to try and gain control of track from the AAU. The complex origins of the NCAA-AAU conflict date back to the 1920s.⁸⁴ In April 1960 the NCAA canceled the Articles of Alliance, an agreement signed by the AAU and the NCAA in 1946 which had guided the two organizations to a relatively peaceful coexistence between 1946 and 1960.⁸⁵ In the middle of 1962, NCAA college track coaches formed the United States Track and Field Federation (USTFF)—which was only nominally independent of the NCAA—to take control of track from the AAU.⁸⁶ The USTFF attempted to combine the dissatisfaction of the post-collegiate athletes, displayed by Connolly and the others in the informal 1961 boycott, with its control of collegiate track athletes to take control of track. The USTFF threatened to stage a competing meet on the same day as the AAU national championship meet in 1962, which also was the qualifying meet for the US national team that would compete against the USSR.⁸⁷ Any athlete who competed in the USTFF meet would be unable to qualify for the US national squad. The USTFF postponed this direct challenge after Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy negotiated a temporary truce between the USTFF and the AAU in late 1962.⁸⁸ But the agreement broke down almost immediately and throughout the first half of 1963 the USTFF again threatened a collegiate boycott of the 1963 AAU championship.⁸⁹ President John F. Kennedy appointed General MacArthur to settle the dispute once and for all. MacArthur imposed a truce that “preserved the necessary modicum of peace through the 1964 Olympiad.”⁹⁰

Soon after the 1964 Olympic Games ended the moratorium expired and the USTFF immediately went back on the attack.⁹¹ It initiated a sanctioning war that sought to compel the AAU to recognize the legitimacy of the USTFF. The USTFF insisted that the AAU ask for a sanction from the USTFF if it wanted college athletes to compete in AAU meets. The AAU claimed that it could not allow its meets to be dual-sanctioned. The AAU also maintained that non-collegiate athletes could no longer compete in college invitational meets unless they acquired a sanction from the AAU. Most collegiate invitational meet directors refused to ask the AAU for a sanction.⁹² Neither side recognized the right of the other that asking for a sanction implied.⁹³ The sanctioning war escalated and the for the third time in the past four years the USTFF threatened a collegiate boycott of the AAU national outdoor championship meet, which was once again the qualifying meet for the 1965 USA-USSR meet.⁹⁴

This time the USTFF did not back down. The USTFF threatened athletes with loss of grant-in-aid scholarships and collegiate eligibility if they competed in the AAU meet. It also applied pressure on college administrators and coaches. The USTFF threats were serious business for the colleges and the athletes. The USTFF, college coaches, and athletic departments hounded and threatened their athletes who wanted to compete in the AAU meet. The AAU officials, on the other hand, encouraged the college athletes to defy their coaches and college administrators. Only thirteen collegiate athletes defied the USTFF ban and competed in the AAU national championship meet in 1965. Three of the thirteen collegiate athletes won their events.⁹⁵ The collegiate boycott seriously damaged the quality of the meet and the U.S. national team that competed against the USSR.⁹⁶ The US national men’s team lost (118-112) for the first time.⁹⁷ In fact, it was the first time that a US

national men's track team had ever lost a meet, be it a dual meet, Olympic or Pan-American Games competition. Although injuries, illness, and the improvement of the USSR men's team all contributed to the defeat, the team unquestionably suffered from the USTFF boycott.⁹⁸

But the USTFF boycott had the biggest impact on the collegiate athletes. It placed them in an untenable situation. Washington State University freshman Gerry Lindgren, the high school star of the 1964 USA-USSR meet, defied the ban and qualified for his second USA-USSR meet when he finished second to 1964 Olympic Games 10,000 meter champion Billy Mills in the six-mile race by less than half a step. They both ran identical world record times. The strong performance startled Lindgren because the conflict had played havoc with his training schedule. He complained after the meet:

I received little sleep the last ten days. Everybody, mostly NCAA people, was calling me up all hours of the night and days. I was unable to train properly because of it. Naturally it worried me. The threats that my school would be subjected to suspension or probation if I ran. School people told me I would lose my eligibility and scholarship too.⁹⁹

Tom Farrell, a St. John's University 800-meter runner who also competed despite the ban, understood that "it is like using me as a pawn in this situation. It is a disgrace."¹⁰⁰ A *New York Times* editorial expressed the exasperation of many: "It seems incredible that college athletes should be threatened with punishment for the crime of representing their country in international competition; yet the ludicrous rivalry has apparently extended to that point of idiocy."¹⁰¹ The USTFF exploited the importance of the USA-USSR meet in its battle with the AAU.

The inability of the US to field its top team against the Soviet Union and its defeat by the USSR in 1965 encouraged increased federal involvement in track and field.¹⁰² To be sure, the NCAA-AAU feud dating back to the 1920s the negotiations with the Soviet Union to create the dual meet series, and the financing of the meet had already increased federal government involvement in the AAU's affairs. But the level of involvement increased markedly when the U.S. Senate established formal hearings to investigate why the U.S. national team lost to the Soviet Union and why the NCAA (through the USTFF) threatened collegiate athletes who wanted to represent their country against the Soviet Union. At the congressional hearings U.S. senators listened, sometimes in amazement, at the situation that US track athletes encountered. They heard the partisan testimony of bureaucrats, coaches, journalists, and even a few track athletes.

The hearings led to the creation of an arbitration panel. Both the AAU and the NCAA agreed to halt the damaging sanctioning war while the panel met.¹⁰³ But the arbitration panel proved futile. After a few months Theodore Kheel—the experienced labor arbitrator who headed the panel—claimed that the AAU and NCAA representatives made "the Teamsters look like undernourished doves. This is the toughest situation I've ever been involved in. The primary problem is that there is no law I can invoke. I can't send them to jail."¹⁰⁴ In the middle of the arbitration hearings when both organizations agreed to a truce in hostilities, the AAU refused to submit Jim Ryun's world record 880-yard time to the International Amateur Athletic Federation (IAAF) for ratification. The AAU argued that because Ryan ran the record time at the USTFF championship meet—which did not have

an AAU sanction—it could not submit the time for ratification. The AAU also tried to ban all athletes who competed in the USTFF meet from the AAU championship meet the following week, which was, as usual, the qualifying meet for the USA-USSR meet. The Kheel panel forced the AAU to retreat and Ryun and the other college athletes competed.¹⁰⁵ Ryun ran the first ever New York City sub-four-minute mile at the 1966 AAU meet.¹⁰⁶ Even though the NCAA and the AAU had both agreed to binding arbitration when the panel was formed, the NCAA quickly rejected the sport arbitration board's final decision when the board failed to strip the AAU of authority.¹⁰⁷

The USA-USSR meet series' large public profile encouraged these kinds of manipulations. The USTFF consciously exploited the importance of the USA-USSR meet to force federal government involvement in the conflict. The nine athletes who informally boycotted the 1961 meet similarly sought to exploit the importance of the USA-USSR meet to facilitate changes in the sport and in the AAU. They knew that turning down an invitation to one of the freelance AAU foreign tours would go unnoticed. But refusing to compete on the US national team that competed against the Soviet Union damaged the credibility of the AAU and to some people and politicians, the credibility of the United States.¹⁰⁸ Likewise, non-Olympic-year feuds between the AAU and the NCAA meant much less to the federal government and the public prior to the USA-USSR dual meet series. Like the boycotting athletes, the USTFF knew that if its actions threatened the quality of the American national team it might force the capitulation of the AAU or compel the government to intercede. While the Kheel Commission sorted through the competing interests, the Soviet Union stunned everyone when it abruptly terminated the consistently successful eight-year USA-USSR track meet series in July of 1966.¹⁰⁹

Hiatus

In a protest against US military actions in Vietnam, the Soviet Union boycotted the 1966 meet. The Soviet Union announced its boycott of the 1966 Los Angeles meet less than two weeks before it was scheduled to occur. The boycott made front-page news.¹¹⁰ The next day the Polish track team scheduled to compete the week before in Berkeley also canceled.¹¹¹ The USSR boycott of the 1966 USA-USSR dual meet foreshadowed the increased use of international sport in politics.¹¹² The Soviet boycott made further competitions between the two countries problematic. Some claimed that the USSR's actions jeopardized the entire cultural exchange program that had flourished since 1958.¹¹³

Most American observers did not believe the government's claim that Soviet athletes initiated the boycott in protest against the American role in Vietnam. They argued that Soviet leaders canceled the meet "to save face."¹¹⁴ A U.S. State Department spokesman stated what many thought: "They [Soviet Union] saw a bad licking staring them in the face... and used Vietnam as an excuse."¹¹⁵ Sport journalist Arthur Daly made the insupportable accusation that the "Russians never risked entering an event unless they were reasonably certain of winning."¹¹⁶ Soviet claims that the athletes initiated the boycott seem farfetched. But it is equally unlikely that fear of losing motivated the USSR's actions. The Soviet women had won seven times in a row, and there was no reason to believe they would lose in the near future. The Soviet men had been much more competitive in the last few years. For example, in 1963 the Soviet men lost by a mere five points. After having lost

six meets in a row, the Soviet men finally beat the American men for the first time in 1965. The USA-USSR meets were getting more competitive. If the USSR's motivation for the boycott was fear of losing, it seems illogical that it would allow its men's squad to withstand six losses in a row.

Although the AAU and the media harped on the implausibility of the Soviet Union's explanation, lost revenue was their real problem. The AAU, the sponsors, and the meet promoter had already invested substantial time and money that could not be salvaged. Over \$300,000 in tickets (60,000) had already been sold.¹¹⁷ The 1964 Los Angeles USA-USSR meet had netted a profit of well over \$200,000.¹¹⁸ The AAU expected a similar financial payoff in 1966. Quickly organized substitute all-star meets took place, but they did not generate the same level of interest.¹¹⁹ Restitution of money lost as a result of the late cancellation became the AAU's primary goal.¹²⁰ AAU President Cliff Buck recommended forcefully that sport exchanges with the USSR (and Poland) should not be renewed until proper reparation payments were received.¹²¹ Poland agreed and reimbursed the AAU. But the money the AAU calculated that Poland owed—around \$11,000—was a pittance compared to the debt it argued that the Soviet Union should reimburse. The meet with Poland simply generated much less revenue.¹²² Eventually the Soviet Union agreed that it owed the AAU roughly \$100,000. But it appears that the USSR never made restitution.¹²³

The cancellation of the USSR and Poland meets had some unintended positive consequences. American miler Jim Ryun privately thought that the “withdrawal of the Poles could be a blessing” because the substitute meet might provide him an excellent chance at the mile world record.¹²⁴ At Ryun's request, meet director Sam Bell changed the distance of the 1,500 meter race to a mile and provided rabbits for a record attempt in the alternate all-star meet at UC Berkeley's Edwards Stadium. Ryun destroyed Frenchmen Michael Jazy's world record by over two seconds when he blazed the distance in 3:51.3.¹²⁵ It had been 29 years since an American held the world mile record.¹²⁶

But track in the United States desperately missed the rivalry with the Soviet Union. The AAU staged many dual meets against other national teams in 1966 and 1967, but none had the interest or the appeal of the USSR meets.¹²⁷ In 1967, the AAU hyped a dual meet against the British Commonwealth in Los Angeles.¹²⁸ The meet included the increasingly successful and popular Kenyan distance runners and a much anticipated 1,500-meter duel between Jim Ryun and Kip Keino. Ryun, who would finish second to Keino in the Olympic 1,500 the following year in the high altitude of Mexico City, beat the Kenyan ace in Los Angeles. In an effort to contrast the meet with the highly successful and popular USSR meet held in Los Angeles in 1964, UCLA head track coach Jim Bush claimed that the meet against the British Commonwealth would be “the greatest track meet in L.A. since the 1932 Games.” The great Australian distance runner Ron Clarke was more direct, and wrong, when he insisted that the British Commonwealth would “provide much more competition than the Russians.”¹²⁹ After the meet drew less than 45,000 spectators over the two days, sport journalist Pete Axthelm observed that “an international dual meet lacks appeal unless the rival teams consist of natural enemies, like the US and the Russians.”¹³⁰ None of the other national dual meets captured the interest of the public, media or the television revenue of the USSR meet.

Seven Soviet athletes competed in the United States during the indoor season in 1968, even though the reparation payment for the canceled 1966 meet had not been settled.¹³¹ The AAU had brought over select Soviet stars, such as high jumper Valeriy Brumel and long jumper Igor Ter-Ovanesyan, for indoor meets beginning in 1961 because they were so popular with US fans and the media.¹³² A standing-room-only crowd had watched an 18-year-old Brumel beat rival John Thomas in the high jump at the 1961 AAU indoor championship meet, making the charming Brumel the first Soviet athlete to win a U.S. track championship.¹³³ The Soviet track athletes who competed during the indoor season in 1968 were the first to compete in the United States since the 1966 indoor season, which was prior to the boycotted 1966 outdoor meet. When asked how the Soviet athletes rationalized boycotting in 1966 and competing in 1968 even though the U.S. position in Vietnam had not changed, Peter Stepenenko, chair of the Soviet track federation, said: "We know this is still a dirty war, but we have begun to see it in terms of a tragedy for American families and mothers, and the Vietnamese as well."¹³⁴

A small number of US athletes likewise competed in the Soviet Union during the indoor season in February and March of 1968.¹³⁵ Shot putter Dave Maggard came back from the Soviet Union convinced that Soviet sport officials desperately wanted a resumption of the dual meet series, as well as a yearly indoor meet.¹³⁶ Maggard proved correct. The AAU and the British Commonwealth altered their already scheduled 1969 dual meet into a dual scored tri-meet that included the Soviet team.¹³⁷ However, the original sponsor of the USA-British Commonwealth meet, the *LA Times*, pulled out immediately because it had taken a large loss when the Soviet Union boycotted in 1966. Likewise, CBS contracted two separate fees, one if the Soviet team showed up and a much lower figure if they did not.¹³⁸ Despite the lack of trust, the series resumed, and the AAU eagerly hoped it would pick up where it left off

The Second Phase

In 1969 the Soviet Union and the United States renewed the outdoor dual meet series and quickly expanded the series to include separate indoor, junior, and multi-event competitions. During the second phase of the dual meet series (1969-85), the two countries met twelve times in outdoor competitions. The national teams also competed seven times in indoor dual meets between 1972 and 1979, The USA and USSR junior (19 and under) national squads competed ten times between 1972 and 1978. Finally, the two countries initiated a multi-event (decathlon/heptathlon) dual series. Multi-event athletes from the two countries competed eight times between 1974 and 1982. Although the number of competitions expanded during the second phase of the dual meet series, the importance of the competitions, including the outdoor meet, diminished. The growth of professional and international track undermined the importance of the USA-USSR dual meet series. Moreover, the indoor and outdoor meets became the primary area of conflict between the athletes and the AAU in the rapidly changing world of track.

The Soviet Union desired an indoor-dual series for many years.¹³⁹ It experimented with an indoor track season in the 1950s. As we have already seen, the United States began importing select Soviet stars for the indoor track season in 1961.¹⁴⁰ The Soviet Union desired an indoor series to help it develop its own indoor track program. The AAU, on the

other hand, hoped that the series would capture public attention. But the seven indoor-meets that took place between 1972 and 1979 never rivaled the popularity of the outdoor meets. The first two, both held at the Richmond Coliseum in Richmond, Virginia, drew over 9,000 spectators. The 1975 meet at the same Richmond Coliseum, however, drew barely 6,000.¹⁴¹

Some interesting moments marked the short-lived indoor series for the American women who, surprisingly, beat the Soviet women in four of the seven indoor meets. Many US teenage female track stars emerged during the meets. The crowd favorite at the first meet in 1972 was 16-year-old mile winner Debbie Heald.¹⁴² The following year 14-year-old Robin Campbell was the “surprise winner” in the 800 meter race and then anchored the winning medley relay—the last race of the meet—which broke a 60-60 tie and provided the US women with a narrow three-point win.¹⁴³ The USSR hosted the 1974 indoor meet in Moscow at the Znamenskiy Brothers Hall, a Moscow practice facility that accommodated a mere 600 spectators (plus 500 standing). At the meet 15-year-old Mary Decker, with pigtails and braces, won the 800-meter race.¹⁴⁴ The indoor series afforded increased racing opportunities previously not available for women, who still were included only marginally in indoor track. However, the indoor series did little else to enhance the already well-established US indoor season. In fact, the meet crowded an already busy indoor season for the men and created many problems when athletes preferred not to run in the USA-USSR indoor meet.

The initiation of the junior meet series in 1972 had a more significant impact on track in the United States than the indoor series. Most European countries had junior programs and held yearly national junior championship meets.¹⁴⁵ The United States had a well-developed national college system and local high school competitions, but the AAU lacked its own junior program. Developing athletes had very little chance of participating in national or international competitions, unless they competed at an unusually high level

Table 2: Indoor Meet Results^{1 4 6}
1972-1979

Date	Location		Total	Men	Women
1972	Richmond Coliseum	USSR	112	69	43
Mar. 17	Richmond, VA	USA	131	79	54
1973	Richmond Coliseum	USSR	146	84	62
Mar. 16	Richmond, VA	USA	141	76	65
1974	Brothers Znamenskiy Hall	USSR	163	89	74
Mar. 2	Moscow	USA	126	72	54
1975	Richmond Coliseum	USSR	106	98	44
Mar. 3	Richmond, VA	USA	171	62	73
1976	Leningrad Winter Stadium	USSR	171	96	75
Mar. 6	Leningrad	USA	117	64	53
1977	Maple Leaf Garden	USSR	120	69	51
Mar. 3-4	Toronto	USA	159	90	69
1979	Tarrant Cty Con. Ctr.	USSR	118	66	52
Mar. 3	Fort Worth, TX	USA	121	75	46

winning score in bold type

and qualified for the NCAA or the AAU national meets. The AAU sought to use the junior series with the USSR to develop its own junior program. However, the internationally accepted age for junior competitions (19 and under) caused problems because it meant that an AAU junior team would include both the most talented high school athletes and collegiate underclassmen.¹⁴⁷ The age division for international junior competition did not mesh well with the US system which divided its athletes based on educational level, between high school and college.¹⁴⁸ This had always made a coordinated junior program based on international competition awkward.

The AAU created a national junior championship for the sole purpose of selecting a national junior team to compete against the USSR juniors.¹⁴⁹ The Chrysler Corporation funded the initial meet and the scheduled return meet in the USSR the following year. Although the AAU promoted the meet heavily, athlete development was its main purpose, as opposed to generating publicity and finances like the outdoor and indoor meets. Thus, the USA-USSR junior meets served a similar purpose for the US as the indoor meets did for the USSR.¹⁵⁰ The first USA-USSR junior meet, held in 1972 in Sacramento, California, drew roughly 15,000 over the two-day period. The Soviets won the men-only meet 123-109.¹⁵¹ The junior meets from 1973 on included female competitors. The first AAU national junior team tour was quite successful when the team bested the Soviet, West German, and Polish national junior teams in separate meets in 1973.¹⁵² The US junior women beat the Soviet women in 1975 and 1977 (see Table 3).

Table 3: Junior Track Meet Results^{1 5 3}
1972-79

Date	Location	Total	Men	Women
1972	Hughes Stadium	USSR 128	128	—
Jul. 28-29	Sacramento, CA	USA 108	108	—
1973		USSR 182	108	74
Jul. 27-28	Odessa, Russia	USA 194	123	71
1974	U. of Texas	USSR 181	99	82
Jun. 28-29	Austin, TX	USA 197	133	64
1975	U. of Nebraska	USSR 163	105	58
Jul. 4-5	Lincoln, NE	USA 217	129	88
1976		USSR 213.5	123.5	90
Jul. 2-3	Tallin, Estonia	USA 163.5	109.5	54
1977	U. of Richmond	USSR 163	96	67
Jul. 2-3	Richmond, VA	USA 214	135	79
1978		USSR 186	111	75
Jul. 4-5	Donyetsk, Ukraine	USA 194	123	71
1978		USSR 190	114	76
Jul. 8-9	Donyetsk, Ukraine	USA 163	106	57
1979	Bakersfield College	USSR 201	114	87
Jun. 29-30	Bakersfield, CA	USA 190	120	70
1979	Boston U.	USSR 178	102	76
Jul. 3-4	Boston	USA 188	118	70

winning score in bold type

The national junior dual meets helped the AAU develop track athletes. The meets provided these future stars outstanding international experience previously unavailable. The list of competitors on the US junior teams reads like a who's who of future US Olympians and record holders: Renaldo Nehemiah (110 high hurdles, 1977), Houston McTear (100 meter, 1974), Dedy Cooper (110 hurdles, 1974), Lynn Jennings (mile, 1977), Alberto Salazar (10,000 meter, 1977), Craig Virgin (5,000 meter, 1973), Carol Lewis (long jump, 1979), Evelyn Ashford (440 yard relay, 1975), and Michael Carter (shot put & discus, 1978-79), to name just a few, all competed in the USA-USSR junior dual meets. The 1977 junior national championship meet was high school star Carl Lewis's first big meet outside of his native New Jersey. In one of the few disappointments in his prolific career, Lewis finished third and just missed an invitation to be on the national team that competed against the USSR.¹⁵⁴ The inclusion of women in 1973 further enhanced the still developing and sparse women's track opportunities. Carl's younger sister Carol won the long jump at age 14 at the same 1977 junior meet.¹⁵⁵ Carol became the best female long jumper in the country during much of the 1980s.

The multi-event meets were perhaps the most innovative and interesting of all the USA-USSR competitions. Similar to the junior meets, the main purpose of the multi-

Table 4: Multi-Event Series Results^{1 5 6}

1974-1982

Date	Location		Men	Women
1974		USSR	46,812	—
Aug 3-4	Tallin, Russia	USA	46,369	—
		West Germany	45,469	—
1975	U. of Oregon Eugene, OR	USSR	46,328	13,599
		USA	48,899	12,015
		Poland Canada	46,091	12,406
1977 Aug 13-14	Indiana U. Indianapolis, IN	USSR	46,234	13,263
		USA	46,725	11,089
		Canada	—	11,427
1978		USSR	47,765	—
July 29-30	Donyesk, Russia	USA	47,596	—
1979	Army Field	USSR	32,885	16,891 [†]
March 1-2	West Point, NY	USA	32,932	15,887 [†]
		Canada	—	15,091 [†]
1979 Aug 11-12	Quebec City and Montreal, Canada	USSR	47,820	—
		USA	31,294	15,145
		Canada	39,371	15,862
1981		USSR	46,740	18,484
Aug 1-2	Leningrad, Russia	USA	36,885	18,615
1982		USSR	48,125	18,770
July 17-18	Santa Barbara, CA	USA	45,663	18,614

winning score in bold type

[†] The septathlon is a rarely contested truncated multi-event contest altered specifically for indoor meets.

event meets was athlete development through increased international competition. The 1972 USA-Soviet Union-West German team decathlon competition was the first time the US had ever participated in the unusual team decathlon event. The events usually included the United States, Soviet Union, and one other country. All of the meets included the men's decathlon, and about half included the women's multi-event equivalent, the pentathlon or heptathlon.¹⁵⁷ meets were scored by combining the total score of six competitors for each country, or three for the women's meets (see Table 4). Competing as an individual in a multi-event was quite an endeavor. Athletes traveled with a wealth of equipment, including pole vault poles (men only), discuses, shot puts, extra uniforms, and a variety of specialized spikes. Hosting multi-event meets required more space, time, money, and organization than any other competition in track. Consequently, multi-event competitions were rarely included in non-championship track meets.

The multi-event international dual meets provided American athletes additional high-level competitions with important AAU financial and organizational support. Unlike the indoor and outdoor dual meets during the second phase, the multi-event meets included the best multi-event athletes in the world. The 1975 meet in Eugene, Oregon, for example, included all three decathlete medal winners from the 1972 Olympic Games and six of the top ten decathletes from the 1974 season. It was the highest-quality decathlon competition in the world in 1975.¹⁵⁸ American multi-event athletes appreciated the meets because they offered excellent competition and support. American decathletes showed "great enthusiasm," according to 1974 Coach Sam Adams.¹⁵⁹ The top American multi-event athletes of the 1970s gained important competitive experience at the USA-USSR multi-event meets. For example, Bruce Jenner set his first world decathlon record when he won the 1975 Eugene meet. It was an important breakthrough performance the year before he won the gold medal at the Montreal Olympic Games.¹⁶⁰ Although the multi-event and junior competitions served their general purposes well, the other meets did not.

None of the meets in the second phase of the USA-USSR series (1969-85) approached the level of political importance or national attention of the outdoor dual meets between 1958 and 1965. Spectator and media interest waned; the patriotic impulses of the athletes declined; and the quality of the athletes and competitions diminished. At the 1971 USA-USSR outdoor meet long jumper Willye White—the only American who competed in all of the first ten USA-USSR outdoor meets—summed up the general mood change when she stated simply that "these meets are not as interesting as they once were."¹⁶¹ White's male Soviet counterpart, Igor Ter-Ovanesyan—the great long jumper who competed in nine of the first ten meets—echoed her sentiments at the same meet: "It is a much more relaxed competition now, even more so than last year. In the old days it was so very serious. Everyone used to be so nervous."¹⁶²

Some things about the USA-USSR outdoor dual meet series did not change during the second phase. As in the first phase, the women continued to lose. The surprising success of the US women's team in the USSR indoor meets was not duplicated in the outdoor meets. The 1969 women's victory was their only win in twelve meets during the second phase. In 1973, 1975, 1976 and 1978 the women lost by over 40 points. In 1976 they lost by an astounding 62 points (104-42). The men did not dominate as they once had, but still won more (seven) than they lost (five). A pattern emerged in the second

phase for the men: in the nine meets between 1969 and 1979, they won the meets held in the United States and lost the meets held in the Soviet Union. The Americans won the combined score victory only twice (1969 and 1978) in the second phase.

Decline in Importance

It is easy to chart the declining popularity of the meet in the United States. Attendance at the meets between 1969 and 1985 never approached the totals at the meets between 1958 and 1965.¹⁶³ For example, the 1969 meet in Los Angeles drew barely 30,000 spectators during the two days.¹⁶⁴ The 1976 meet at the University of Maryland drew only 10,000 on the first day and only 7,000 on the second.¹⁶⁵ Clearly interest in the meet had plummeted. This decline occurred at a time when track was still relatively popular in the United States. Attendance figures for other important meets while not spectacular, remained stable.¹⁶⁶ More importantly, Olympic battles in the 1970s between the superpowers in other sports still possessed Cold War tension and patriotism, and at times captured the public attention as had the first phase track meets.¹⁶⁷ Hence, the decline of the USA-USSR dual meet series cannot be explained simply by the decline in Cold War tensions which were still evident in the 1970s.

The increase in highly organized and competitive international invitational track meets reduced the importance of the USA-USSR dual track meet series. For example, in the early 1970s the Bislett Games, in Oslo, Norway, became well known as one of the consistently highest quality meets held on one of the fastest tracks in the world. Similar high-profile elite invitational meets emerged throughout Europe in the 1970s. Year after year cities like Stockholm, Cologne, and Milan held well-organized elite international invitational track meets. The European meet directors focused more and more on arranging publicized world record attempts in these meets.

The increased attention and importance placed on organized world record attempts undermined the USA-USSR dual meet series because the series could not facilitate world records in the same way. The structure of the USA-USSR series, for example, did not allow for hired pacesetters, by the 1970s an essential component in organized world record attempts. More importantly, the elite invitational meets highlighted a dramatic decrease in the quality of the USA-USSR dual track meet series. Unlike the first phase when the meets averaged more than one world record per meet, the outdoor USA-USSR meets between 1969 and 1985 produced only five world records (four women and one man). The only US outdoor world record set during the second phase was Pat Matzdorf's "totally unexpected" 1971 high jump.¹⁶⁸ The USA-USSR meets at one time included the best athletes in the world; by the 1970s this was no longer true.

The creation of international championship track meets also contributed to the USA-USSR meet series' decline. Prior to the 1970s World Cup meets, the IAAF held no world championship competitions. Consequently, between 1958 and 1965, the USA-USSR meets were usually the only non-Olympic competitions that included both Soviet and US athletes. Beginning in the early 1970s, the IAAF increased its efforts to promote international track competitions. It finally realized a primary goal with the first World Cup meet in 1977.¹⁶⁹ The World Cup meet quickly became "the No. 1 attraction in the track world" in the years it was contested.¹⁷⁰ The best athletes in the U.S. looked forward to the World

Cup meet as they once had looked forward to the USA-USSR meet. Carl Lewis insisted that he “really wanted to win the 100 meters here [1981 national AAU meet] so I can run it in the World Cups.”¹⁷¹ The IAAF organized a real World Championship meet based on national teams beginning in 1983. Steve Scott, America’s premier miler in the late 1970s and early 1980s recalled that “from every standpoint, the 1983 World Championships were a smashing success.”¹⁷² By the end of the 1970s there were numerous important high-quality track meets where US and USSR athletes competed. This had not been true during the first phase when the competitions were unique and when the American public, and the world, were intensely curious about Soviet sport. The summer schedule became so crowded that in 1979 the USA-USSR outdoor meet never took place simply because the Soviet sport leaders and the AAU could not find a mutually agreeable date.¹⁷³

The internationalization of the sport impacted the television scheduling of track in the United States. The USA-USSR meet had been easily the most important and valuable non-Olympic track meet on television when the Soviet Union terminated the series in 1966. It was a critical meet in proving the viability of televised track. When the meet was renewed in 1969, however, television coverage of track had expanded. In 1969 the AAU sold a single package, of which the USA-USSR meet was just one component, to a single network, CBS. It was an important meet, but not crucial because the package contained a number of other international meets of higher quality. The AAU track package purchased by CBS in 1969 included thirteen different meets. Four of those meets were international dual meets. The USA-USSR meet earned the second-highest rating of the thirteen televised meets, lagging behind the USA-Britain dual meet and barely exceeding the ratings for several other meets.¹⁷⁴ In 1970, the CBS track package included six international invitational meets and three national dual meets (including the USSR) among its seventeen televised track meets. The 1970 CBS track series drew around seven million viewers, enough for CBS to earn a profit. But the USA-USSR meet television audience plummeted to sixteenth of the seventeen meets; the only televised meet it beat in the ratings was the Martin Luther King Games.¹⁷⁵ In 1973 CBS expanded its track coverage to cover a 32-week period.¹⁷⁶ In the mid- 1970s track became a staple on ABC’s popular weekend sports show, *Wide World of Sports*.¹⁷⁷ The IAAF and the AAU catered to the invitational meet directors who sought to arrange world record attempts and desired star matchups for the television industry, neither of which the USA-USSR meet could offer.¹⁷⁸ Even U.S. promoters created more highly publicized world record attempts that drew increased attention.¹⁷⁹

Other Opponents

By the end of the 1960s, the Soviet Union had started to decline as a track power. In 1969 the Soviet men lost to the East German men’s team in a dual-scored tri-meet. It was the first time that the USSR had lost to another European national team.¹⁸⁰ 1970 the USSR lost again to East Germany at the European Cup and beat West Germany by a mere 1½ points.¹⁸¹ In fact, much of the early fascination with the Soviet Union track team transferred to East Germany during the 1970s as the much smaller country’s athletic juggernaut emerged. The American public and media showered the East Germans with attention because the small country became so successful in international track.¹⁸² We now

know that a large part of East German athletic success rested on the most sophisticated state-organized drug program in the world of sport.¹⁸³ Interest in East German athletics at the time, however, coincided with the decline of interest in the Soviet Union.

As the sheen wore off the USA-USSR dual track meet series the US athletic bureaucracy focused more attention on exchanges with countries that had been off limits to these kinds of athletic exchanges. The US national team competed in highly publicized dual meets against the East Germans in 1982 and 1983.¹⁸⁴ The AAU excitedly took a large group of track stars to China to compete in a series of non-scored meets and exhibitions in 1975.¹⁸⁵ The China trip represented a breakthrough for women track athletes because it was the first time that the AAU had ever organized the men and women as a single team on an international tour.¹⁸⁶ The AAU negotiated with Cuban track officials for over two years to arrange its heavily publicized importation of eight Cuban track athletes, including the legendary double gold medalist, Alberto Juantorena, in 1979 to compete in the UCLA/Pepsi meet in Los Angeles. Neil Amdur astutely noted that the AAU's interest in Cuban track emerged because the "curiosity and luster have faded from the once popular cold war sports rivalry between the US and USSR and AAU officials see Cuba's emergence in boxing and track as potential attractions, particularly in a package for network TV" It was the first time that Cuban athletes had competed in the United States since 1959.¹⁸⁷

Interest in the USA-USSR meet also suffered because both countries often did not field their best athletes, further undermining the quality of the competition. For example, at the 1975 indoor meet the original USSR list of athletes included all of its top track athletes, but only 14 of the 55 names on that list actually competed, the other 41 athletes were replaced with second-tier competitors. American officials complained when popular USSR stars like 100-meter gold medalist Valeriy Borzov did not compete.¹⁸⁸ The inferior quality of the USSR team showed when the US men won easily, 171-106.¹⁸⁹ The poor competition may explain the poor attendance; the 1975 indoor meet drew barely 6,000 spectators. Thirteen US indoor meets in 1975 drew more spectators, many of them double that number.¹⁹⁰ Track officials and athletes from both countries complained when the better athletes did not compete.¹⁹¹ At the 1971 outdoor meet the Soviet javelin Olympic Gold medalist (1968), Jan Lusis, commented on the US absences: "It is a great pity that the best Americans are not competing here, and they don't think the meet is very important any more."¹⁹² At the 1977 outdoor meet in the Soviet Union, Soviet track and field official Anatoly Yetimenkov complained about the missing US track stars and said that the two countries would have to have discuss the "need to send only the best and most outstanding athletes for the US to compete against the Soviet athletes."¹⁹³

The power struggle between the AAU and the NCAA again damaged formation of the US national team. In a replay of the conflicts of the-mid 1960s, the NCAA threatened its collegiate athletes with the loss of their college eligibility if they competed in the 1973 USA-USSR indoor meet.¹⁹⁴ Six collegiate athletes, including 1972 Olympic gold medalists Randy Williams (long jump) and Rod Milburn (high hurdles), pulled out of the meet because of the NCAA threats.¹⁹⁵ But Fred Samara (Penn State) and Dennis Walker (Adelphi) competed in the 1973 USA-USSR indoor meet despite the NCAA's opposition. Samara objected strongly to the NCAA's position: "We have been threatened by the NCAA with ineligibility... and are aware that our schools have been threatened with reprisals should

we compete.” He continued, “we consider the freedom to participate free from reprisals... is a matter of national and international public concern particularly to all NCAA college athletes.”¹⁹⁶ Samara and Walker received temporary injunctive relief prohibiting NCAA punishment.¹⁹⁷ The Samara-Walker conflict became a long, drawn-out affair that publicized once again the difficulties between the NCAA and the AAU, the problems the AAU had in fielding competitive teams for the USA-USSR meet, and the athletes’ lack of power. The NCAA initially ruled the two ineligible, but later retracted the suspension.¹⁹⁸ However, the NCAA-AAU conflict now had much less impact on the meet than the problems the AAU faced with athletes who increasingly sought their athletic independence.

In the United States, the USA-USSR dual track meet series became a critical battleground in the growing fight between the AAU and its track athletes. Whereas in the late 1950s and early 1960s the USA-USSR meet was an important perk for many athletes, by the 1970s it actually cost many of the top athletes money in lost revenue. This was especially problematic when the AAU insisted that track athletes on the national team compete in either all the dual meets scheduled or none. This often resulted in tying up track athletes for as many as three to four weeks during the middle of the summer European season, when elite US track athletes now made their living. In this regard, the growth of underground professional track undermined the quality and the importance of the USA-USSR series.¹⁹⁹

Changing Economics

Amateur track had always had an underground labor-relations system.²⁰⁰ Prior to the 1970s however, even the best and most popular athletes could usually not make a living from the under-the-table payments available in track. But the economics of track were changing rapidly. The track shoe scandal at the 1968 Olympics Games signaled a start to this transformation. Rival shoe companies Puma and Adidas—owned by feuding brothers Armin and Adi Dassler—bid furiously against each other to convince the top athletes to wear their shoes during the 1968 Olympic Games.²⁰¹ One source claimed that 200 track athletes received over \$100,000 for wearing Puma or Adidas at the Mexico City Olympic Games.²⁰² An American shoe company representative insisted that 20 of the 25 U.S. men’s track medal winners at Mexico City had accepted illegal payments from either Puma or Adidas.²⁰³ The sibling rivalry between the Dassler brothers fueled the competition to get athletes to wear their brands. The 1968 Olympics raised the stakes of illegal promotional payments to athletes. More importantly, it was only the tip of the iceberg. Illegal covert promotional payments would only expand in the 1970s as sport equipment and apparel companies like Nike, Reebok, New Balance and others emerged and competed with Adidas and Puma. The United States running boom of the 1970s and 1980s fueled the growth of the running industry that financed the massive increase in promotional payments to athletes.

The economics of track meets themselves also changed, beginning in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Through most of the 1960s meet promoters relied exclusively on attendance revenues to finance meets. They often had local sponsors, usually non-profit organizations like the Knights of Columbus or newspapers that provided little more than free publicity. As has already been discussed, television coverage expanded greatly beginning in

1969. The increase in television revenues provided increased budgets for track promoters. As more meets became televised, national sponsors flocked to meet promoters, providing much more substantial revenues than the local sponsors. The Los Angeles Invitational, for instance, one of the consistently best indoor meets in the country, gained Sunkist as a major sponsor in 1969. The meet soon became the Sunkist Invitational. The sponsorships and television rights soon generated more revenue than ticket sales. For example, by the early 1980s NBC paid \$50,000 to televise the Pepsi meet in Los Angeles.²⁰⁴ The increase in both sponsorship and television revenues complemented each other and changed the economics of track meets.

Considering the changes in the finances of track meets, it is not surprising that the illegal promotional revenues available to track athletes were accompanied by escalating growth in illegal appearance fees throughout the 1970s. European meet directors lusted after world record attempts and star athletes and paid handsomely for them. Illegal appearance fees in US meets grew as well, but track athletes could make far more money in Europe during the summer outdoor season than in the United States.²⁰⁵ In 1975 Olympic marathon gold medalist Frank Shorter admitted that he had “probably violated nearly all of the [amateur] rules.” Shorter estimated that the top five Americans in each event drew illegal appearance fees and said that if the amateur track rules were enforced “no one would be running.”²⁰⁶ World record discus thrower John Powell maintained in 1975 that a top level track athlete could make as much competing in Europe as at most regular jobs in the U.S.²⁰⁷ More precisely, by 1979 US miler Steve Scott, the third-ranked miler in the world during the 1979 season behind Sebastian Coe and Steve Ovett, received about \$1,000 per race on the European circuit. He also received \$10,000 per year for wearing New Balance shoes and another \$10,000 per year for wearing a Sub-Four singlet when he raced.²⁰⁸ By the end of the 1970s athletes like Scott no longer needed jobs to support themselves; they were professional track athletes. A couple of Nike executives spotted a sports agent at the 1980 Olympic Trials at Hayward Stadium in Eugene, Oregon. One of the Nike executives, Nelson Farris, understood well that the transformation was earth shaking to the sport. “Shit,” he exclaimed to the other Nike man, Geoff Hollister, “The sport’s never going to be the same again.”²⁰⁹ Indeed, these changes had already made the USA-USSR meet a financial burden to the top US track athletes.

The changes taking place swirled around the issues of professionalization and internationalization, but also included the athletes’ increasing desire for greater athletic control. The AAU and the athletes battled over the direction of the changes that were taking place, with the athletes becoming more and more independent and aggressive. Steve Scott recalled in his autobiography that the “track officials also pressured us [the athletes] into competing on U.S. national teams in dual meets against other countries. The bureaucrats made it seem as if patriotism was the issue, but it was really about power—about our rights as athletes to determine our own destiny.”²¹⁰ The athletes regularly complained about how the AAU organized the international dual meets and their lack of input. For example, during a 1969 tour that followed the USA-USSR-British Commonwealth meet held in Los Angeles, the athletes threatened to boycott the upcoming USA-Great Britain meet because of travel expense conflicts, poor accommodations, and treatment of athletes. The athletes were particularly upset because the AAU opposed long jumper Bob Beaman’s

request to go home early from the tour due to personal problems. Instead of boycotting, the athletes sent a telegram to President Nixon complaining of their mistreatment at the hands of the AAU. At the USA-West German dual meet in 1969—almost three weeks after the USA-USSR-British Commonwealth meet and just one week before the USA-Great Britain meet—a large number of US athletes wore white tape over the AAU emblems on their uniforms to protest the poor organization of the tour.²¹¹ In the wake of the 1969 European tour conflict approximately 100 US track athletes formed the short-lived American International Athlete (later called the United Amateur Athletes) to press for increased athlete involvement in AAU decision-making.²¹²

Athletes complained that the AAU's attempts to force them to compete in the USA-USSR and other national dual meets damaged not only their financial opportunities, but also their development as athletes. Many in the AAU and in the media were highly critical of the especially large number of star athletes who opted out of the 1970 national team.²¹³ In response, young miler Marty Liquori explained that his "independent running tour of Europe concerned my preparation for the 1972 Olympics." Liquori argued correctly that the competitive level in the three national dual meets was inferior to the competition and experience he gained running against the best in the world in invitational meets. Liquori further explained that if the AAU would stop insisting that athletes either compete in all three international dual meets or none, then many of the top athletes could fit one or two of the meets into their European schedules.²¹⁴ Steve Scott concurred that the international dual meets often "disrupted our personal racing schedules and resulted in a loss of earnings. Pressure [from the AAU to compete] was always greatest for the U.S.-Soviet meet."²¹⁵ It is important to note that if the amount of under-the-table appearance and promotional money had not increased dramatically, these independent tours would have been impossible for most athletes to finance independent of the AAU. Rumors flourished about the rise in illegal payments as American track stars roamed through Europe in the summer months.²¹⁶

By the mid-1970s the AAU became more aggressive in its attempts to compel the athletes to compete in the USA-USSR dual track meet series. In a disagreement over expense money, the entire Pacific Coast Club (PCC) declined to compete in the 1974 AAU indoor championship.²¹⁷ Headed by the aggressive, difficult, and openly confrontational Tom Jennings, the PCC boycott damaged the quality of the AAU meet and US indoor national team. The resourceful Jennings, a 1:52 half-miler in the early 1960s, formed the Pacific Coast Club in 1967 out of the remnants of his bankrupt 49er Track Club. In the late 1960s and early 1970s the PCC was a complete track club that competed successfully against some of the best club and college track teams in the country in dual meets.²¹⁸ But Jennings found it impossible to finance a complete squad, so he pared down the roster; by the mid-1970s the PCC was a small band of elite athletes. By his own admission, Jennings functioned more as a manager than a coach. He arranged the competitions, travel arrangements, foreign tours, dealt with the AAU, and, most importantly, took care of the financial arrangements. In a different time period, Jennings would have been called an agent.²¹⁹ The Jennings-inspired PCC boycott contributed to the US national team's loss to the Soviet men 89-72 in Moscow at the indoor meet in 1974. Some of the nation's best track athletes, like high jumper Dwight Stones, were members of the PCC.²²⁰ Moreover,

only four of the winners at the AAU indoor national accepted their invitations to the USSR meet.²²¹ The US men's team was one of the youngest and least experienced.²²² The poor quality of the US men's team embarrassed the AAU.²²³

In response, the AAU imposed a draconian moratorium which sought to force the athletes to compete against the USSR and in other international dual meets by not allowing them to run in other meets in the same period.²²⁴ The new rule stated that US track athletes would not receive travel permits (issued by the AAU) for 10 days preceding the AAU national meet (because it was still the qualifying meet for the national teams) or for five days preceding any international dual meet.²²⁵ In 1974 the USA-USSR meet (July 5-6) was the only outdoor international dual meet and the national AAU meet was on June 21-22. According to the new moratorium no US track athlete would be granted a travel permit between June 11-22 or July 1-6. Not surprisingly, the AAU's moratorium upset the athletes. Outspoken distance ace Steve Prefontaine exclaimed that he still would not run in the AAU meet and that he would defy the AAU and "compete all through the moratorium, and if they want to take me to court that's fine with me... The AAU doesn't care about the athletes; why should I care about them?"²²⁶

The PCC continued to annoy the AAU. Jennings turned the AAU threats around and maintained that unless the AAU issued travel permits for his athletes, including allowing meets directly before the USA-USSR meet, all of his athletes would boycott the AAU outdoor meet, just as they had done months earlier at the AAU indoor. Jennings dramatically pronounced: "It's interesting that you are supposed to be so loyal to your country, and here they are restricting your freedom so much. The US-USSR meet represents the clash of two different social structures, but it looks to me like the same ideology."²²⁷ After all the posturing, Prefontaine skipped the AAU meet and the PCC athletes competed, including Dwight Stones (high jump), Al Feuerbach (shot put), and John Powell (discus), who all won their events. But the PCC athletes who qualified declined their invitations to run on the AAU national squad.²²⁸ The USSR dual meet missed many of the top US track athletes, including Prefontaine, Frank Shorter, Marty Liquori, and all the PCC athletes. Most of these athletes, moreover, ignored the moratorium. The AAU considered suspending the athletes from AAU competition and denying travel permits for a year, but apparently did not punish them.²²⁹

The struggle between the AAU and the athletes continued. Though it did not punish the offenders from the previous year, the AAU imposed another moratorium for the 1975 season. The AAU clarified the rules, however: only athletes who qualified for the national meet but chose not to run and athletes who qualified for a national team but declined were subject to the moratorium. The moratorium added up to a staggering 30 days—June 10-21, June 29-July 8 and July 13-19—in the most important part of the outdoor season.²³⁰ The AAU looked increasingly desperate when it threatened nations that allowed AAU athletes to compete during the moratorium, without an AAU travel permit, with a one year ban on allowing American athletes to compete in their countries.²³¹ The AAU's attempt to get tough, however, had no impact on the athletes' attitudes. After winning the 1975 AAU indoor meet Dwight Stones explained that the Mickey Mouse shirt he was wearing exemplified his "feelings about the meet." Stones vigorously maintained that he "couldn't care less about this meet."²³²

More reserved athletes than Stones also expressed more disappointment than in the previous year. Some of the more cautious athletes may have been emboldened by the tragic death of their brash informal leader, Steve Prefontaine, who died in a car crash in May of 1975.²³³ Since the AAU moratorium required athletes to compete in the national meet and then to run in the USSR meet if they qualified, rumors spread wildly about athletes who planned to compete badly at the AAU meet on purpose. If an athlete did not qualify for the USA-USSR meet by competing well at the AAU meet, the moratorium did not apply. Speaking at the Track Writers' Association weekly lunch, miler Marty Liquori claimed that the AAU was "forcing us to run lousy in the AAU." Liquori continued, "I've run on plenty of national teams over the last eight years. Now I've got to do what I need to do for me."²³⁴

Many of the rumors involved the PCC athletes. Jennings denied that his athletes planned to perform poorly on purpose; but at a private USTFF meeting Jennings admitted that his athletes in fact planned to throw the national meet so they would not qualify for the USA-USSR meet. Jennings already had a 15-meet, 31-day European tour planned for eleven of his athletes which would be precluded by the moratorium. The USA-USSR meet was not on the tour.²³⁵ Rumors also spread that Jennings planned to sue the AAU if it maintained its hard line.²³⁶ The AAU, however, bowed to athlete pressure and public opposition and rescinded the moratorium about a week before the AAU meet. The AAU may have been influenced by the rumored lawsuit. It may also have been influenced by a television broadcast rights controversy that threatened to cancel the USA-USSR meet in 1975, making the moratorium unnecessary.²³⁷ Even more likely, the AAU may have been influenced by President Ford's formation of a special commission to investigate why the conflicts between the AAU, NCAA and the athletes persisted.²³⁸ President Ford established the President's Commission on Olympic Sports (PCOS) to "find direction in this quagmire."²³⁹

The composition of the AAU's national teams continued to degenerate. The PCC athletes boycotted the 1976 AAU indoor championship meet, and hence the USSR meet.²⁴⁰ Even with the diminished competitive level of the meet, only four of the thirteen men's winners and seven of the nine women's winners competed on the national team against the USSR at the 1976 indoor meet.²⁴¹ In 1977 both the men and the women lost to the USSR in Soshi. Moreover, the Italian and West German Federations complained bitterly about the quality of the national teams that competed against their national teams on the same 1977 tour. Consequently, the AAU once again talked about a competition moratorium, despite its inability to enforce the 1974 and 1975 moratoriums.²⁴² The athletes became even more hostile and dismissive toward the AAU. After Dwight Stones won the 1978 AAU indoor title, he responded "Big deal, who cares?" When asked if he would take his spot on the AAU national team, Stones replied: "Of course not. I'll be competing in the World Superstars in the Bahamas." Stones laughed at the choice between the AAU's \$5 per diem and staying at "some dump where you can eat pasta all day" and the potential to win tens of thousands of dollars in the sunny Bahamas.²⁴³

In a most unusual move, the AAU encouraged athletes to participate in the 1978 USA-USSR outdoor meet by accommodating them. National discus champion Mac Wilkins told the AAU he would compete against the Soviet Union only if the AAU paid

his way from Scandinavia—where he would be competing prior to and after the USSR meet—and then back. The plane ticket would cost around \$1,200. The AAU took Wilkins' suggestion and offered to pay round trip travel expenses for any athlete who qualified wherever he or she might be competing. This created a big financial incentive for athletes like Wilkins who competed in Europe prior to the meet and who planned to return after the meet.²⁴⁴ Previously, the AAU would only pay for a domestic flight from an athlete's home city. If an athlete competed outside of the US prior to the meet, they would have to pay their own way to the states, and then back out again after the meet. Some athletes like Stones and pole-vaulter Dan Ripley already had commitments and wanted nothing to do with the AAU regardless of the offer. But other athletes who qualified, like Arne Robinson (long jump), Clancy Edwards (100 meter), Steve Scott (mile), Jan Merrill (mile), and Renaldo Nehemiah (110 high hurdles) claimed that the AAU offer was very important in their decision to compete.²⁴⁵ The 1978 national team that competed against the USSR was the strongest overall US national team in many years. The men won 119-102 and the women lost by only four points, 71-75, their second-best outdoor performance in the series. The US teams' combined score win, 190-177, was only their third combined score win in sixteen meets and the first since 1969.²⁴⁶ But the changes athletes fought for throughout the 1970s were on the verge of transforming the AAU, their sport, and the USA-USSR series, despite the AAU's olive branch.

The Amateur Sports Act

In 1978 Congress passed the Amateur Sports Act (ASA) in response to the recommendations of the President's Commission on Olympic Sports (PCOS).²⁴⁷ The AAU had ruled track informally since it was founded in 1888 and formally as the US member of the International Amateur Athletic Federation (IAAF) since the IAAF's founding in 1913.²⁴⁸ The ASA forced the AAU to divest itself of all its Olympic sports franchises, including its most precious, track and field. The AAU transferred its track franchise to The Athletic Congress (TAC), a newly created entity, in February 1980. To many it seemed that TAC was the same as the AAU because the officers of TAC included many of the people from the Track and Field Committee of the AAU. For example, Ollan Cassell, a former president of the AAU and 1964 Olympic track competitor, was the first executive director of TAC.²⁴⁹ But the emergence of TAC signified that the track athletes' opposition from the previous decade was finally coming to fruition and changes were occurring rapidly.

Track athletes who focused on the new road racing circuit created a timely source of pressure that proved to be the last straw for amateurism in track. As we have seen, the enormous growth of recreational and competitive running in the United States created a massive material base within the running shoe and apparel industry which altered the structure of track. The money that could be earned by top distance runners who competed on the emerging road running circuit was considerable by the end of the 1970s.²⁵⁰ International class distance runners formed the American Road Racing Association (ARRA) in the late 1970s and planned a professional over-the-table road racing circuit. But before the ARRA implemented its circuit, Ron Nabers, a little known journeyman marathoner and 31-year-old sporting goods sales clerk from San Francisco, won the Jordache marathon and captured the \$15,000 first place prize. Some claimed that it was the first openly professional running race in the United States in decades.²⁵¹ Ollan Cassell quickly sus-

pended Nabers and the others who competed in the professional section of the race. But Nabers, who was not an Olympic-caliber marathoner, ignored Cassell and won the next Jordache marathon, and another \$12,500, less than two months later in November 1980.²⁵² National-class marathoner and Olympic hopeful Tom Fleming won the third Jordache professional marathon race in early 1981. Fleming had finished second in the Boston Marathon in 1973 and 1974 and as late as 1979 finished fourth.²⁵³

The willingness of national class athletes to abandon their amateur status threatened the structure of amateurism. An athlete the caliber of Ron Nabers leaving the amateur ranks had little impact on the sport. The AAU, however, was seriously challenged when national class athletes like Fleming openly accepted prize money and by the ARRA organizers preparations to break ranks and start an openly professional circuit. The ARRA's proposed professional tour and the Jordache professional marathons combined with the track athletes ongoing opposition finally compelled TAC and the IAAF to realize that strict amateurism—even if not observed—was over.

TAC attempted to control the form that professional running would take when it instituted, and the IAAF approved, a trust fund rule. Money made competing could be put into a trust fund monitored by the athletes' club and dispersed to cover training expenses.²⁵⁴ Although this was the official TAC position for a period of time, most road racers ignored the new rule and openly accepted prize money. In 1982 TAC organized the \$100,000 USA/Mobil Grand Prix indoor circuit, which paid athletes based on their finish place in a series of domestic indoor events.²⁵⁵ TAC distributed \$52,000 to the top finishers in thirteen select events at the national outdoor championship meet in 1982.²⁵⁶ By the end of 1982 formal amateurism was dead.

The AAU/TAC's control of track athletes was also over; the end of the USA-USSR dual track meet series followed soon thereafter. TAC lacked the ability to force athletes to compete in the USA-USSR meet and although it tried persuasion, the meet had clearly outlived its usefulness. Consequently, only 14 of the 32 track athletes who won their events at the 1981 AAU meet accepted their invitations to the 1981 meet at Leningrad. TAC had to go all the way down to ninth place in one event to find someone who would compete in the meet.²⁵⁷ The financial lure of the European circuit drew all of the best US athletes. On July 11, 1981, the second day of the USA-USSR meet, American mile star Steve Scott ran 3:49.25 and set an American record in the mile. But Scott set the record at the prestigious Dream Mile in Oslo, Norway, where he finished third in the fastest mile field ever assembled. The *New York Times* story of Scott's American record and his picture ran right next to its coverage of the much less important and lower quality USSR meet.²⁵⁸

The 1982 USA-USSR meet replayed the 1981 meet. The Indianapolis, Indiana, meet drew barely 8,000 spectators per day. Almost half of the TAC national championship meet winners declined invitations to participate. Recently naturalized miler Sydney Maree (South African born) may have been the only American—athlete, spectator or official—truly excited about the meet. TV announcer Marty Liquori, who had competed in three of the USA-USSR meets when he was an athlete, compared competing in the meet with going to a party that your wife makes you attend: "It's OK once you get home."²⁵⁹ The USSR and the US track teams met one more time in 1985 at a dual scored tri-meet with Japan in Tokyo. The USSR trounced the US, 221-164.

Conclusion

The USA-USSR dual track meet series devolved from the biggest non-Olympic track meet in the world, a meet of enormous political and athletic importance, into a meet of little significance and inferior quality. During the first phase, 1958-65, the importance of the meet facilitated the growth of track in the United States. Most importantly, the meet helped expand women's track awareness and opportunities at least a decade prior to Title IX. The series initiated changes in track that expanded greatly in the late 1970s and 1980s for US women track athletes. The series also transformed the priorities of the AAU's international program toward large national dual meet competitions. This required the AAU to have more coherence in its organization and control of its athletes—ironically, at a time when the athletes became more difficult to control. The USA-USSR series between 1958 and 1965 also provided publicity that the AAU could not duplicate in any other way and laid the foundations for televised track.

During the second phase, 1969-85, the competitions expanded to include indoor, junior and multi-event meets, but declined in significance at the same time that changes in track and field undermined the importance of the meet. The internationalization of track and the growth of financial opportunities doomed the USA-USSR series that became increasingly irrelevant to the athletes and the spectators. The series also became an area of conflict between the athletes, who became more vocal and aggressive in demanding athletic freedom, and the AAU, which sought to maintain its control of the sport and its athletes. The AAU's increased focus on international dual meets, encouraged by the success of the early meets in the USA-USSR series, increased the conflict between the athletes and the AAU and later TAC. The increased internationalization and revenue, created by television and the growth of the running industry, made athletic independence possible for the top track athletes. By 1985, the year of the final USA-USSR outdoor meet, the sport was openly professional and athletes had gained considerable independence.

This history of the USA-USSR dual track meet series also demonstrates the primary ideological conflict that festered and grew in the AAU for decades. The AAU always insisted that it was a private organization and thus should be able to govern itself independent from domestic concerns, international affairs, collegiate athletic administrators, and government meddling. It likened itself to a private golf club. But as the decades went by it became increasingly apparent that the AAU's control of international athletics through its IAAF sanction created a public responsibility. The USA-USSR dual track meet series highlighted and made public the chasm between the AAU's insistence that it was a private organization and its actual public responsibility. This is why the federal government's involvement in track increased greatly in this period, as evidenced by the 1965 congressional hearings, the President's Commission on Olympic Sports (1975-77), and the Amateur Sports Act of 1978.

Finally, the history of the USA-USSR dual track meet series demonstrates clearly the importance of athletic activism in the development of the sport. Track athletes played the largest role in instituting and influencing changes in their sport. Some have argued that the more general changes in Olympic sport resulted primarily from changes in the leadership of the International Olympic Committee.²⁶⁰ However, the pressure exerted by ath-

letes was by far the most important factor in initiating the changes that transformed track and field from a formally amateur into an openly professional sport. The economic changes in the sport facilitated the ability of the throwers, jumpers, and runners who competed in elite track and field to demand their athletic independence. The growth in the material base was essential in helping the athletes finally break the century-old grip of the amateur ideology. The USA-USSR series served as a battleground in this fight before permanently fading away.

-
1. Joseph M. Sheehan, "Brumel's 7-5 Sets World High Jump Mark," *New York Times*, 23 Jul. 1962; Corder Nelson, *Track's Greatest Champions* (Los Altos: Tafnews Press, 1986), 146-47.
 2. Joseph M. Sheehan, "Connolly's Throw of 231-10 Wins Hammer-Soviet Girls Lead," *New York Times*, 22 Jul. 1962.
 3. "The U.S.-U.S.S.R. Track Meet," *New York Times*, 25 Jul. 1962.
 4. Michael S. Sherry, *In the Shadow of War: The United States Since the 1930s* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 246-48.
 5. For more on the political uses of athletics in the Cold War, see Thomas Domer, "Sport in Cold War America, 1953-1963: The Diplomatic and Political Use of Sport in the Eisenhower and Kennedy Administrations" (Ph.D. diss., Marquette University, 1976); Richard Espy, *The Politics of the Olympic Games* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981); Benjamin Lowe, David Kanin, and Andrew Strenk, eds., *Sport and International Relations* (Champaign: Stipes Publishing Company, 1978).
 6. Stephen Hardy, "Entrepreneurs, Organizations, and the Sports Marketplace," in *The New American Sport History: Recent Approaches and Perspectives*, ed. S.W. Pope (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 341-65.
 7. "Visits of U.S. Athletes Sought Under New Policy of Soviet Union," *New York Times*, 10 Feb. 1954; "Soviet Request Weighed," *New York Times*, 12 Feb. 1954; "Russians Turn Down U.S. Track Tour Bid," *New York Times*, 5 Mar. 1954; "Chinese Athletes Eligible for the Olympics," *Amateur Athlete*, Oct. 1954, 10; "Russia Wants to Meet the US," *Track and Field News*, Nov. 1955, 16; "Russians Invite U.S. Track Squad," *New York Times*, 14 Aug. 1956; "On Your Marks," *Track and Field News*, Jan. 1956, 5; "On Your Marks," *Track and Field News*, Sep. 1956, 11; "Moscow Track Bid Accepted by U.S.," *New York Times*, 17 Nov. 1956; "AAU Track Team Is Invited to Russia," *New York Times*, 14 Apr. 1957; "Track Meets Between United States and Russia," *New York Times*, 19 Jun. 1957.
 8. Beginning in 1916 the AAU sent small groups of track athletes abroad to compete, usually during the summer months, and in the mid-1920s began importing individual foreign athletes to compete in the U.S. indoor season. These small tours remained the primary focus of its international program until 1958. James Abramson, "Foreign Aces," *Amateur Athlete*, Feb. 1933, 3, 10; Daniel Ferris, "The Greatest Stimulant for Sports," *Amateur Athlete*, Oct. 1961, 5.
 9. Zoltan Subert, "Russian Athletes Successful in Rumania," *Track and Field News*, Nov. 1950, 7; R.L. Quercetani, "2-Lituyev Runs 50.4," *Track and Field News*, Sep. 1953, 1-2; Don Canham, "Russia Will Win the 1956 Olympics," *Sports Illustrated*, 25 Oct. 1954, 10-12, 60; "European Report," *Track and Field News*, Sep. 1957, 2.
 10. "Soviet Track Men Hope to Tour U.S. in 1955," *New York Times*, 27 Jun. 1954.
 11. Immigration and Nationality Act, 66 Stat. 166 (27 Jun. 1952), *codified as amended at* 8 U.S.C. § 1101 *et seq.* This should not be confused with the Internal Security Act (1950), a better-known piece of Cold War legislation also sponsored by Senator Patrick McCarran that is commonly referred to as the McCarran Act. This legislation mandated the official registration of the Communist Party of the United States, its members and any organization associated with it. Ellen Schrecker, *Many Are the Crimes: McCarthyism in America* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1998), 130, 141; Walter L.

- Hixson, *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture, and the Cold War, 1945-1961* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 102-03.
12. Hixson, *Parting the Curtain*, 101-08.
 13. "Russia Invites U.S. Track Squad," *New York Times*, 14 Aug. 1956; "Moscow Track Bid Accepted By US," *New York Times*, 17 Nov. 1956; "RSVP to the USSR," *Sports Illustrated*, 26 Nov. 1956, 25; "AAU Track Team is Invited to Russia," *New York Times*, 14 Apr. 1957; "Khrushchev Backs Track Bid," *New York Times* 30 Apr. 1957; "AAU Decision Delayed," *New York Times*, 29 May 1957; "Track Meets Between United States and Russia," *New York Times*, 19 Jun. 1957; "Track Tour to USSR Off," *Amateur Athlete*, Jul. 1957, 9.
 14. For example, see "How The Reds Mobilized," *Life*, 28 Jul. 1952, 15-17; "US & USSR Fight It Out," *Life*, 4 Aug. 1952, 65-66; "Stalin's 'Iron Curtain' For Athletes," *US News & World Report*, 25 Jul. 1952, 42-44; "Reds Hope To Rule Sports Too," *US News & World Report*, 20 Aug. 1954, 35-37; "If Russia Wins the Olympic Games-Red Athletes Will Become Bigger Weapon in 'Cold War,'" *US News & World Report*, 10 Feb. 1956, 35-39; "Russians Bear Down For Olympics," *Life*, 6 Aug. 1956, 91-95; Daniel J. Ferris, "The Olympics: How We'll Beat the Russians at Melbourne," *Look*, 4 Sep. 1956, 69-73; "Are Reds World's Best Athletes?" *US News & World Report*, 14 Dec. 1956, 71-73; "How the Russians Won All Those Points," *Life*, 17 Dec. 1956, 95-98.
 15. Hixson, *Parting the Curtain*, 109-11.
 16. "On Your Marks," *Track and Field News*, Oct. 1957, 8; "On Your Marks," *Track and Field News*, Nov. 1957, 14; "U.S.-Russia Track Meets Gain Green Light From AAU Unit," *New York Times*, 30 Nov. 1957; "AAU Awaits Bid to Russia Track," *New York Times*, 23 Jan. 1958; "Funds Assured for Reciprocal Meets Between Russia and U.S. Track Teams," *New York Times*, 25 Feb. 1958.
 17. For an excellent look at the larger importance of the exchange programs, see Hixson, *Parting the Curtain*.
 18. "AAU Plans For Soviet Swap," *Amateur Athlete*, Apr. 1958, 5.
 19. "Events & Discoveries: Moscow's Invitation," *Sports Illustrated*, 22 Apr. 1957, 24.
 20. Bert Nelson, "So They Tell Me," *Track and Field News*, Mar. 1957, 15
 21. R.L. Quercetani, "Decathlon, HSJ Records," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1958, 4.
 22. Pincus Sober, "U.S. Track and Field Teams Compete in Moscow, Warsaw, Budapest, Athens!" *Amateur Athlete*, Sep. 1958, 5-6.
 23. The 50 kilometer walk and the marathon were the only Olympic events not contested. The 4 relay races (both men's and women's 440-yard and mile relays) included just one entry from each country.
 24. The scoring did cause complaints in the United States because many thought that it should be 5-3-1, with last place gaining no points, and the relays 5 and 0. Corder Nelson called the 5-3-2-1 method a "communistic type of scoring, wherein everybody gets points no matter how poor." Corder Nelson, "Track Talk," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1958, 19.
 25. Tex Maule, "Those Darlin' Djerachle," *Sports Illustrated*, 28 Jul. 1959, 22-23.
 26. "World is Watching," *New York Times*, 28 Jul. 1958.
 27. "Soviet Defeats U.S. Track Team," *New York Times*, 29 Jul. 1958.
 28. Dick Drake, 'Athletes Views Europe Trip.'" *Track and Field News*, Sep. 1963, 11.
 29. Rafer Johnson (with Philip Goldberg), *The Best That I Can Be* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 114. On the competition between the two great decathletes, see "Moscow's Hero," *Time*, 11 Aug. 1958, 52; "The Summit for Rafer," *Life*, 11 Aug. 1958, 91.
 30. On the reentrance of the Soviet Union into international athletics, see James Riordan, "The USSR and the Olympic Games," *Stadion* 6: 291-313 (1980).
 31. For examples see note 14.
 32. Bob Schul (with Laura Rentz Krause), *In The Long Run* (Dayton: Landfall Press, 2000), 138-39.

33. Attendance at the meets held in the Soviet Union was equally impressive. For example, the 1961 and 1963 meets had two-day crowd totals of 130,000 and 140,000. R.L. Quercetani, "3 World Marks Fall," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1961, 1; "Brumel Reaches 7'4¾"," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1963, 2.
34. The last day of the AAU national championship meet in 1959 drew 8,000 spectators. Joseph Sheehan, "Burlson Breaks 1,500 Meet Mark," *New York Times*, 21 Jun. 1959; Dick Bank, "US Beats Russia 127-108," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1959, 1; Tex Maule, "Victory Without a Smile," *Sports Illustrated*, 27 Jul. 1959, 15-23.
35. In contrast, the 1962 AAU national championship meet in Los Angeles drew 18,000. Corder Nelson, "Drayton Ties World Mark," *Track and Field News*, Jul. 1962, 3; Joseph Sheehan, "Brumel's 7-5 Sets World Record High Jump Mark," *New York Times*, 23 Jul. 1962; Corder Nelson, "2 World Marks Broken," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1962, 1.
36. Harold Zinman, "U.S. Hopes Climb Over Russians," *Amateur Athlete*, Aug. 1964, 10-11.
37. "Coverage of Track Meet," *New York Times* 20 Jul. 1959; Dick Bank, "A Slight Blow for Extremism in Sport's Cold War," *Sports Illustrated*, 27 Jul. 1964, 46-47; Wallace Turner, "Coast Track Meet Makes Money as Quickly as It Makes Friends," *New York Times*, 23 Jul. 1962.
38. Benjamin G. Rader, *In Its Own Image: How Television Transformed Sports* (New York: Free Press, 1984), 36-40.
39. Bert Nelson, "Of People and Things," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1959, 12.
40. The AAU received \$25,000 for the broadcast rights to the 1962 meet at Stanford. Over half (\$35,000) of the \$65,000 the AAU received for the television rights to three meets in 1964 was for the USA-USSR meet held in Los Angeles. It was easily the AAU's most marketable meet. Senate Commerce Committee, *NCAA-AAU Dispute: Hearings Before the Committee on Commerce*, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., 16-27 Aug. 1965, AAU exhibit, schedule 33, 300 and Paul Zimmerman testimony, 156; Wallace Turner, "Coast Track Meet Makes Money As Quickly as it Makes Friends," *New York Times*, 23 Jul. 1962, 24.
41. Bank, "A Slight Blow," 46-47; John Underwood, "Raves for the Young," *Sports Illustrated*, 3 Aug. 1964, 8-13; Frank Lirsky, "World Records To Lead Soviet in Track," *New York Times*, 26 Jul. 1964; "US-Soviet Meet to Draw 150,000," *New York Times*, 19 Jul. 1964.
42. Tim Horgan, "Gerry Lindgren: Soviet, Sand, & Teas," *Amateur Athlete*, Sep. 1964, 22-24, 38.
43. "US-USSR: Distance Runners, Hansen, Long Star," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1964, 1.
44. Dick Drake, "On Your Marks," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1964, 17.
45. Tex Maule, "Power Versus Perfection," *Sports Illustrated*, 17 Jul. 1961, 16-17, 46-47; Roy Terrell, "The High Meet the Mighty," *Sports Illustrated*, 24 Jul. 1961, 13-19; Gerald Lawson, *World Record Breakers in Track & Field Athletics* (Champaign: Human Kinetics, 1997), 181-82.
46. Pete Cava and Hal Bateman, *1985 United States Track and Field Team: USA-USSR-Japan Triangular Meet* [TAC media guide], (Indianapolis: The Athletic Congress, 1985), 47.
47. The international program can easily be traced in the AAU's monthly publication, *Amateur Athlete*, starting in 1930. James Abramson, "Foreign Aces," *Amateur Athlete*, Feb. 1933, 3, 10; Daniel Ferris, "The Greatest Stimulant for Sports," *Amateur Athlete*, Oct. 1961, 5.
48. American national teams, however, competed in a number of post-Olympic meets against Britain in the 1920s and early 1930s. Although it was noted which country had more winners of specific events, these were not formally scored dual meets. A U.S. national team competed against Germany in an organized formal meet in 1938. John Lucas, "The Greatest Gathering of Track and Field Olympians: The British Empire Versus the U.S.A., 1920, 1924, and 1928," *Journal of Olympic History* (Sep. 1999): 41-43; J.P. Abramson, "British Empire vs. U.S.A.," *Amateur Athlete*, Sep. 1936, 7, 12-13; Count Jean Baptist Gudenus, "U.S. vs. Germany," *Amateur Athlete*, Aug. 1938, 3; Arthur Daley, "U.S. Beats Germany," *Amateur Athlete*, Sep. 1938, 7.
49. Cava and Bateman, *1985 United States Track and Field Team*, 47; Dick Drake, "On Your Marks," *Track and Field News*, Dec. 1964, 20.

50. Although they often complained about the accommodations and organization of the tours, the athletes rarely declined the invitations. For example, John Telford competed on an AAU tour in Italy in 1957 and recalled fondly that "We loved it. We had a ball." But he also went on to complain about the poor hotel accommodations and general unresponsiveness of the AAU to the athletes. John Telford, interview with Joseph M. Turrini, Detroit, Michigan, 20 Jul. 1998.
51. Daniel Ferris, "Let's Have More Co-Ed Sports," *Amateur Athlete*, Oct. 1952, 16-17; Susan Cahn, *Coming on Strong: Gender and Sexuality in Twentieth-Century Women's Sport* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994). 118-20.
52. Louise Mead Tricard, *American Women's Track and Field: A History, 1875 Through 1980* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co., 1996), 245-46.
53. Temple coached the best women track athletes in the world in the 1950s and 1960s, including Mae Faggs, Wilma Rudolph, Wyomia Tyus, and Willye White. Ed Temple (with B'Lou Carter), *Only the Pure in Heart Survive: Glimpses Into the Life of a World-Famous Olympic Coach* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1980), 20-22, 68; Tricard, *American Women's Track and Field*, 350-513.
54. Hank Soloman, "It Happened in Philly," *Amateur Athlete*, Aug. 1959, 6-12.
55. Corder Nelson, "2 World Marks Broken," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1962, 3.
56. Cahn, *Coming on Strong*, 120.
57. The men's and women's outdoor championship meets were not held together until 1976. "ET-CETERA," *AAU News*, May 1976, 15. For an unfortunate but common perspective on women's track and field, see *Track and Field News* editor Bert Nelson's explanations why his magazine ignored women's track. Bert Nelson, "Of People and Things," *Track and Field News*, Sep. 1959, 7; Bert Nelson, "Of People and Things," *Track and Field News*, Mar. 1965, 22.
58. Corder Nelson, "Track Talk," *Track and Field News*, Sep. 1957, 13; Allen Guttmann, *The Olympics, A History of the Modern Games* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992), 101-02.
59. The first Pan-American Games were held in 1951, and once every 4 years thereafter. The Olympic Games included women's track events for the first time in 1928. Dick Bank, "U.S. Women Make History," *Track and Field News*, Oct. 1958, 12.
60. Much is assumed about the role of steroid use and the success of Soviet women in sport. Certainly steroid use occurred in the USSR and elsewhere, including the US. But the USSR's encouragement of women's sports should be considered a major factor in their early success. On Soviet women in sport, see James Riordan, "The Rise, Fall, And Rebirth of Sporting Women in Russia and the Soviet Union," *Journal of Sport History* 18 (Spring 1991): 183-199. On perceptions of Soviet athletics and steroids, see John Hoberman, *Moral Engines: The Science of Performance and the Dehumanization of Sport* (New York: The Free Press, 1992), 193-207. For an enlightening look into steroid use among U.S. track athletes, see Robert Voy (with Kirk D. Deeter), *Drugs, Sport, and Politics* (Champaign: Leisure Press, 1991).
61. Cahn makes this general point in relation to the Olympic Games competition. The USA-USSR dual track meet series, however, greatly enhanced and showcased the inferiority of the US women in respect to the USSR women track athletes on a yearly basis and in a more direct manner. Cahn, *Coming on Strong*, 130-32; Robert Daley, "Brumel High Jump Record 7-5¾ at Soviet Track Meet," *New York Times*, 22 Jul. 1963; Tricard, *American Women's Track and Field*, 456-57.
62. Earl S. Clanton III, "A Rich Return," *Amateur Athlete*, Sep. 1960, 28-29.
63. "Scoreboard: Neglected Girls," *Sports Illustrated*, 14 Aug. 1961, 8.
64. For example, see Jack Clowser "Boost the Women," *Amateur Athlete*, Sep. 1959, 37; Harold Zimmerman, "Memo From the Publisher," *Amateur Athlete*, Jun. 1960, 3.
65. Table 1 was compiled by the author from results found in the *New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times*, *Track and Field News*, *Sports Illustrated*, *Amateur Athlete*, *AAU Media Guides*, and Louise Mead Tricard, *American Women's Track and Field*.
66. For example, see "Moscow Meet Raises 2 Posers: How we Train, How They Count," *New York Times*, 30 Jul. 1958; Arthur Daley, "Sport of the Times," *New York Times*, 17 Jul. 1959.

67. Opportunism obviously encouraged both the USSR's and US's positions in the combined score conflict. But their differences were also a product of the different way that the two countries thought about men's and women's track. The USSR, for example, competed in combined score meets with other countries and simply considered the men and women as part of one singular track team. In the US the men and women were always considered as separate squads. For example, US college and high school meets always scored men and women separately.
68. Pincus Sober, "U.S. Track Teams Compete In Moscow, Warsaw, Budapest, Athens!" *Amateur Athlete*, Sep. 1958, 5-6; "U.S., Russia Dither on Track Scoring," *New York Times*, 25 Jul. 1958; "Soviet Defeats U.S. Track Team," *New York Times*, 29 Jul. 1958; "Moscow Meet Raises 2 Poises: How We Train, How They Count," *New York Times*, 30 Jul. 1958; Arthur Daley, "Sport of the Times," *New York Times*, 17 Jul. 1959; "U.S. Men Beat Soviet in Track; Russian Women Are Victorious," *New York Times*, 20 Jul. 1959.
69. The AAU brought female athletes to compete in Canada in 1946. This is a very rare example, however. Tricard, *American Women's Track and Field*, 284.
70. For example, see 1958 800-meter national champion and USA-USSR meet participant Lilian Greene's recollection. Tricard, *American's Women Track and Field*, 392-94.
71. The success of Wilma Rudolph in the 1960 Olympics contributed greatly to the inclusion of women's events in indoor meets in the early 1960s. On Rudolph and women's indoor track, see Al Franken, interview with Joseph M. Turrini, Detroit, Michigan, 9 Apr. 1998; Gwilym Brown, "Olympians Indoors," *Sports Illustrated*, 16 Jan. 1961, 4; "A Big Night for Wilma," *Sports Illustrated*, 30 Jan. 1961, 48-49.
72. Frank Litsky, "Mills Wins 3 Mile and Igor Ter-Ovanesyan Takes Broad Jump in AAU Meet," *New York Times*, 20 Feb. 1965; Tricard, *American Women's Track and Field*, 481.
73. Gilber Rogin, "Flamin Mamie's Buffer Bells," *Sports Illustrated*, 20 Apr. 1964, 30-36; John Underwood, "This is the Way the Girls Go," *Sports Illustrated*, May 1965, 34-46.
74. Tricard, *American Women's Track*, 454-55.
75. Snyder was a nationally renowned track coach. He coached at Ohio State University and was the 1960 men's Olympic track coach. "Columbus Delivers America," *Amateur Athlete*, Dec. 1960, 13, 38.
76. For a brief introduction to Title IX, see Cahn, *Coming on Strong*, 250-56.
77. "Scoreboard: Stay-At-Homes," *Sports Illustrated*, 10 Jul. 1961, 10; Joseph Sheehan, "39 Named to U.S. Track Team After 7 Decline," *New York Times*, 27 Jun. 1961; "U.S. Trackmen Upheld," *New York Times*, 6 Jul. 1961.
78. Harold Connolly Testimony, Proceedings of the Committee For a Better Olympics, Dec. 10-11, 1972, Chicago, Illinois, [published in *USTCA Quarterly Review*, Jun. 1973], 89, Sport-by-Sport T and F—US Track Coaches Association Folder, Box 72, President's Commission On Olympic Sports Records, Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan (hereafter, PCOS Records).
79. For Connolly's recollection of the 1961 conflict and comments on the tours generally, see his testimony at the 1965 congressional hearings. Senate, *NCAA-AAU Dispute*, 83-103.
80. Joseph Sheehan, "Senators Ask Inquiry On AAU Track," *New York Times*, 8 Jul. 1961.
81. On the difficulties in challenging the AAU, see the failed legal suit brought by suspended mile star Wes Santee in the 1950s. Joseph M. Turrini, "Wes Santee, the Four-Minute Mile, and the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States," *Sport History Review* 18 (May 1999): 56-87.
82. Robert Korsgaard, "A History of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1952), 267-68.
83. Sheehan, "Senator Asks Inquiry."
84. For background on the conflict, see "United States Olympic Crises: The Problem That Won't Go Away," NCAA International Relations Committee, 24 Nov. 1972, Olympics Folder, Box 154, Gerald R Ford Vice-President Records, Box 154, Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan; William A. Flath, *A History of the Relations Between the National Collegiate Athletic Asso-*

- ciation and the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States, 1905-1963* (Champaign, IL: Stipes Publishing, 1964).
85. Eric Danoff, "The Struggle For Control of Amateur Track and Field in the United States—Part I," *Canadian Journal of History of Sport and Physical Education* 6(1): 57-58 (May 1975).
 86. For a detailed account of the formation of the USTFF, see William H. Freeman, "In the Interest of Sport: Bill Bowerman's Parr in the Formation of the United States Track and Field Federation," *Canadian Journal of History of Sport and Physical Education* 7(1): 54-65 (May 1976). The NCAA funded the USTFF with yearly grants. 1973 USTFF Financial Statement, Major Multi-Sport Organizations—NCAA—Track and Field Folder, Box 96, PCOS Records; 1974, 1975, 1976 USTFF Financial Statements, Sport-by-Sport—T and F—USTFF Folder, Box 71, PCOS Records.
 87. "Colleges Threaten AAU with Rival Meet," *New York Times*, 13 Jan. 1962; "Schools Boycott AAU," *New York Times*, 19 Jan. 1962; "An Analysis of the NCAA's Struggle to Capture Control From the AAU," *New York Times*, 21 Jan. 1962; "AAU and Colleges Fail to Settle Their Differences," *New York Times*, 13 Feb. 1962; "Formation of 2 Sports Groups Delayed," *New York Times*, 7 Mar. 1962.
 88. On the failed Kennedy agreement, see "Track Fight Ends," *Track and Field News*, Nov. 1962, 1, 21; Bert Nelson, "An Uneasy Peace," *Track and Field News*, Dec. 1962, 16; National Collegiate Track Coaches Association advertisement in *Track and Field News*, Dec. 1962, 17; Jim Dunaway, "Peace Breaks Out," *Track and Field News*, Jan. 1963, 4; "Scoreboard: Love By Fiat," *Sports Illustrated*, 26 Nov. 1962, 7; Tex Maule, "The AAU Yields Its Control of Track and Field," *Sports Illustrated*, 26 Nov. 1962, 49-51.
 89. The AAU Convention refused to ratify the Kennedy agreement. "Scoreboard: Not Now, Right Now," *Sports Illustrated*, 24 Dec. 1962, 9. On the threatened boycott, see "One Meet Penalty Is Asked For By the NCAA," *New York Times*, 3 Jan. 1963, 3; William J. Briordin, "Move Threatens US Track Team," *New York Times*, 4 Jun. 1963, 44; Frank Litsky, "US Prestige at Stake," *New York Times*, 4 Jun. 1963, 44; "Track Meet Here Will Feel Impact," *New York Times*, 4 Jun. 1963, 44.
 90. U.S. Senate, Commerce Committee, *Sports Arbitration Board Report: Hearings Before the Committee on Commerce*, 90th Cong., 2d sess., 1 Feb. 1968, 21 [hereafter Kheel Commission Report]; Bert Nelson, "Dispute Still Unsolved," *Track and Field News*, Feb. 1963, 21; Bert Nelson, "NCAA, AAU Still At It," *Track and Field News*, Mar. 1963, 22; Joseph Sheehan, "MacArthur Orders Colleges to Allow Athletes to Compete," *New York Times*, 7 Jun. 1963; Joseph Sheehan, "MacArthur Reaffirms His Edict; Federation Lifts Track Boycott," *New York Times*, 8 Jun. 1963; "Scoreboard: The Pax MacArthur," *Sports Illustrated*, 28 Jan. 1963, 5.
 91. Bert Nelson, "NCAA-AAU War Revives," *Track and Field News*, Dec. 1964, 1, 10; "NCAA's Ruling Assails AAU," *New York Times*, 19 Nov. 1964; "Track Coaches' Units Backs NCAA," *New York Times*, 9 Jan. 1965.
 92. Frank Litsky, "NCAA Directive Reaffirms AAU Track Ban," *New York Times*, 2 Jun. 1965; "AAU and NCAA Exchange Charges of Threats, Recruiting," *New York Times*, 19 Jun. 1965.
 93. "War Begins to Hurt," *Track and Field News*, Apr. 1965, 1, 20; "Concern Over Track War Grows," *Track and Field News*, May 1965, 1-2.
 94. It is important to note that the USTFF/NCAA could not use the Olympic Games as leverage because the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) functioned under legislative guidelines. The AAU, NCAA and others periodically battled for increased power within the USOC structure. In addition, any attempt to force collegiate athletes to boycott the Olympic Games would surely have been a public relations blunder. For background on the bureaucratic power struggles in the USOC and its predecessor organizations, see Robert E. Lehr, "The American Olympic Committee, 1896-1940: From Chaos To Order" (Ph.D. diss., Pennsylvania State University, 1985).
 95. Frank Litsky, "Marine Triumphs by 15-Inch Margin," *New York Times*, 28 Jun. 1965.
 96. "Now What Happens?" *Track and Field News*, Jul. 1965, 3.
 97. R.L. Quecetani, "How the US Lost," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1965, 1-3.
 98. Jesse Abramson, "World Series of Track," *Amateur Athlete*, Jul. 1966, 4-7.

99. Corder Nelson, "6 Mile Mark Comes to US," *Track and Field News*, Jul. 1965, 13-16.
100. Farrell finished third in the 800 and did not qualify for the US national team. However, the AAU rewarded Farrell by placing him on the team as an alternate. This was highly unusual as the alternates were always sprinters because they were needed to fill out the two sprint relay teams, It was clearly a sop to Farrell for defying the USTFF. U.S. Senate, *NCAA-AAU Dispute*, Tom Farrell testimony, 62-64 (quote on 64).
101. "Overdue Truce," *New York Times*, 17 Aug. 1965.
102. "Senate Investigates," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1965, 21; "AAU and NCAA Agree To Temporary Truce," *New York Times*, 17 Aug. 1965; "Overdue Truce," *New York Times* 17 Aug. 1965; Domer, "Sport in Cold War America," 154.
103. "AAU and NCAA Agree to Temporary Truce," *New York Times*, 17 Aug. 1965.
104. "Quotable Quotes: Theodore Kheel," *Track and Field News*, Feb. 1967, 27.
105. "New Fight Flares in Amateur Track," *New York Times*, 10 Jun. 1966; "Ryun Sets World 880 Mark," *New York Times*, 11 Jun. 1966; Gordon S. White, "Ryun Permitted To Run In AAU Meet," *New York Times*, 16 Jun. 1966.
106. Frank Litsky "Ryun Runs AAU Mile in 3:58.6," *New York Times* 27 Jun. 1966.
107. For the arbitration board's final decision, see the Kheel Commission Report presented to Congress in 1968. See also "Arbitration Board Offers Program to Stop Track War," *Track and Field News*, I Mar. 1968, 10; "Track War Escalates," *Track and Field News*, I Apr. 1968, 3; "Look For 1969 Resumption of NCAA-AAU War," *Track and Field News*, I Jul. 1968, 13; "NCAA-AAU Feud Fires Up," *Track and Field News*, Oct.-Nov. 1968, 41; "AAU and NCAA Will Accept Arbitration of Track Dispute," *New York Times* 26 Aug. 1965.
108. *Track and Field News*, for example, thought that "our national image has been tarnished a little more by the loss to Russia, a meet we should never lose." Corder Nelson, "Track Talk," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1965, 21.
109. Peter Grose, "Soviet Leaders Spurn U.S. Meet in War Protest," *New York Times* 12 Jul. 1966.
110. The announcement of the USSR boycott came through TASS on 11 July. The Los Angeles meet was scheduled to begin just 12 days later, on 23 July "Russians Call Off Dual," *Track and Field News*, Jul. 1966, 23; Grose, "Soviet Leaders Spurn U.S. Meet in War Protest."
111. "U.S. and Soviet Warn the War Perils Exchange," *New York Times*, 13 Jul. 1966; "Poles Call Off Contests," *New York Times* 13 Jul. 1966.
112. There were national political boycotts in every summer Olympic Games between 1968 and 1984.
113. Peter Grose, *New York Times*, 13 Jul. 1966.
114. Harold Simian, "Memo From Publisher," *Amateur Athlete*, Aug. 1966.
115. "Scoreboard: Spoilsports," *Sports Illustrated*, 18 Jul. 1966.
116. Arthur Daly, "Sport of the Times: An Unwarranted Intrusion," *New York Times*, 15 Jul. 1966.
117. "U.S. Athletes Official Will Go to Soviet to Try to Salvage Meet," *New York Times* 12 Jul. 1966.
118. U.S. Senate, *NCAA-AAU Dispute*, AAU Exhibit, schedule 33, The *Los Angeles Times* USA-USSR Dual Track Meet Financial Report, 330; "Kip's Korner," *Amateur Athlete*, Jul. 1966, 36.
119. Although over 60,000 attended the two-day all-star substitute meet, virtually all of these tickets were sold before the USSR announced its boycott. Shavenau Glick, "Who Needs the Russians," *Amateur Athlete*, Sep. 1966, 65, 38; Frank Litsky, "Is This Why the Soviets Stayed Home?" *Amateur Athlete*, Sep. 1966, 6. The USSR and Poland held their own substitute meet in Minsk on 25-26 July. R.L. Quacetani, "European Report," *Track and Field News*. Aug. 1966, 12.
120. "Soviet Will Pay For Missing Meet," *New York Times* 3 Sep. 1966; "Soviet and Poland Agree to Pay for Quitting U.S. Track Meets," *New York Times*, 6 Sep. 1966.
121. "Quotable Quotes: Clifford Buck," *Track and Field News*, Dec. 1966, 21.
122. Deane McGowan, "Poles Pay \$5,500 Towards Debt," *New York Times* 13 Jan. 1967.

123. Dick Drake, "On Your Marks," *Track and Field News*, Apr. 1957, 23; "Four Score Years of Service To Sports," *Amateur Athlete*, Jan. 1968, 4, 7, 20-21; "Russia Agrees to Pay US For Track Loses," *New York Times*, Apr. 18, 1967, 46; "Scoreboard: The Russians Are Coming?" *Sports Illustrated*, 24 Mar. 1969, 16-17.
124. Anita Verschith, "A Time to Remember: 3:51.3," *Sports Illustrated*, 25 Jul. 1966, 11-13.
125. *Ibid.*; Cordner Nelson, "Ryun Forges New Era," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1966, 1-3.
126. Lawson, *World Record Breakers*, 88-94; Jack Stevenson, "Jim Ryun, All-American Hero," *Amateur Athlete*, Sep. 1966, 7-8.
127. In 1967 U.S. national teams competed in dual meets against Great Britain, West Germany, the British Commonwealth, a tri-meet against Italy and Spain, and in an Americas vs. Europe meet. Dick Drake, "On Your Marks," *Track and Field News*, May 1967, 30.
128. Hank Ives, "World Class Athletes LA-Bound," *Amateur Athlete*, Jun. 1967, 6-7; "Colossus At the Coliseum," *Amateur Athlete*, Jul. 1967, 4; Bill Becker, "Kansas Sophomore Timed in 3:33.1," *New York Times*, 9 Jul. 1967.
129. "Colossus At the Coliseum," *Amateur Athlete*, Jul. 1967, 4.
130. The US bested the British Commonwealth 356-295. Interestingly, the score of the meet included both men and women and unlike when the US competed against the Soviet Union, the US apparently agreed with the combined scoring. Peter Axthelm, "The Best Record Yet," *Sports Illustrated*, 17 Jul. 1967, 16; Hank Ives, "World Class Athletes L.A. Bound," *Amateur Athlete*, Jun. 1967, 6-7; Shavenau Glick, "U.S. Rules British Again," *Amateur Athlete*, Aug., 4-5, 29; Cordner Nelson, "Ryun KO's Keino, 3:33.1," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1967, 1-5; Bill Becker, "Kansas Sophomore Timed in 3:33.1," *New York Times*, 9 Jul. 1967; Bill Becker, "Keino's Late Sprint Beats Clarke," *New York Times*, 10 Jul. 1967.
131. "Four Score Years of Service to Sports," *Amateur Athlete*, Jan. 1968, 4-7, 20-21; "Scoreboard: Turn of a Phrase," *Sports Illustrated*, 12 Feb. 1968, 9; "A Not-So-Young Man Is Thinking Gold Again," *Amateur Athlete*, Mar. 1968, 10-13, 34; "Foreign Athletes Stimulated US Indoor Track Campaign," *Amateur Athlete*, May 1968, 13.
132. Three USSR athletes competed indoors in the United States in the winter of 1961. This was the first time Soviet athletes had competed indoors in the United States. "Foreign Stars Enter Nationals," *Amateur Athlete*, Feb. 1961, 21; "The National Championship: Records and the Russians," *Amateur Athlete*, Mar. 1961, 8-9. For more on the tour see numerous articles in the Feb. and Mar. 1961 *Track and Field News* and Jan.-Feb. 1961 *New York Times*.
133. Joseph Sheehan, "Boston Sets Indoor Record in AAU Broad Jump," *New York Times*, 26 Feb. 1961; "The National Championship: Records and the Russians," *Amateur Athlete*, Mar. 1961, 8-9.
134. "Scoreboard: Turn of a Phrase," *Sports Illustrated*, 12 Feb. 1968, 9.
135. Dick Drake, "On Your Marks," *Track and Field News*, Feb. (I) 1968, 18; "3 US Views on SU Trip," *Track and Field News*, Mar. (I) 1968, 18; "Gaines, McGrady, Maggard Triumph in Moscow," *Track and Field News*, Mar. (I) 1968, 8.
136. "3 US Views on SU Trip," 18.
137. Dick Drake, "On Your Marks," *Track and Field News*, Dec. 1968, 19; "Scoreboard: The Russians Are Coming?" *Sports Illustrated*, 24 Mar. 1969, 16-17.
138. "Scoreboard: The Russians Are Coming?" *Sports Illustrated*, 24 Mar. 1969, 16-17.
139. For example, a USA-USSR indoor dual meet was scheduled in 1970 but was canceled. Dick Drake, "On Your Marks," *Track and Field News*, Dec. 1969, 9.
140. Rostislav Orlov, "Twenty-Four Rounds of the 'Match of the Giants,'" in *USSR-USA Sports Encounters*, ed. Victor Kuznetsov and Mikhail Lukashev (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977) [trans. John Williams], 45.
141. "AAU Results," *Amateur Athlete*, Mar. 1975, 11.
142. Neil Amdur, "Schoolgirl, 16, Wins Mile As US Beats Russians," *New York Times*, 18 Mar. 1972, 23, 25.

143. "USA Women Win, Absences Hurt Men's Efforts At Richmond," *Amateur Athlete*, Apr. 1973, 1, 4-5; Ron Reid, "Thank Heavens for this Little Girl," *Sport Illustrated*, 26 Mar. 1973, 70-71; Neil Amdur, "Robin Campbell Excels—Soviet Trackmen Win," *New York Times* 17 Mar. 1973.
144. "Records by Outlin, Hill Can't Salvage US," *Track and Field News*, I Apr. 1974, 14; Anita Verschith, "Mary, Mary Not Contrary," *Sports Illustrated*, 22 Apr. 1974, 78-80; "Soviet Trackmen Win; US Loses Dual Meet," *New York Times*, 3 Mar. 1974.
145. Most European countries did not have high school or collegiate track programs, but relied on clubs to train track athletes.
146. Table 2 was compiled by the author from results found in the *New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times*, *Track and Field News*, *Sports Illustrated*, *Amateur Athlete*, and Tricard, *American Women's Track and Field*.
147. The age limit for the first meet was 16-19.
148. Eighteen and under would have been a much better age division for the US system. There were a number of other problems caused by the international inconsistency in divisions. For example, U.S. high school and collegiate track seasons were not identical. This made it difficult to schedule junior competitions that accommodated both collegiate and high school track athletes in the U.S.
149. The AAU had a junior meet previous to 1972, but participation was not based on age, but rather, on not being good enough for the senior championship. The 1972 junior championship meet was the first for athletes nineteen and under. "First-Ever Under 20 US Championship Set," *Track and Field News*, Apr. (I) 1972, 18.
150. "Last Lap: Initial US-USSR Junior Meet Set Jul. 28-29," *Track and Field News*, Mar. (II) 1972, 29; "First Ever Under 20 US Championships Set," 18; "US-USSR Jr, Meet at Sacramento to Include Clinic," *Track and Field News*, II May 1972, 28.
151. "US-USSR Junior Championships: Williams Outduels Podluzhny," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1972, 45; "USA Sweeps Shorrer Races But USSR Team Triumphs in 1st Junior International Meet," *Amateur Athlete*, Sep. 1972, 14-15.
152. Jon Hendershott, "The Good, the Bad, and the Sometimes Ugly," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1973, 14-15.
153. Table 3 was compiled by the author from results found in the *New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times*, *Track and Field News*, *Sports Illustrated*, *Amateur Athlete*, and Tricard, *American Women's Track and Field*.
154. Carl Lewis (with Jeffrey Marx), *Inside Track: My Professional Life in Amateur Track and Field* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992), 28.
155. Ibid. But Carol's parents would not allow the 14-year-old girl to go on the trip to the Soviet Union by herself. If Carl had qualified and could accompany her, she would have been allowed to go.
156. Table 4 was compiled by the author from results found in the *New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times*, *Track and Field News*, *Sports Illustrated*, *Amateur Athlete*, and Tricard, *American Women's Track and Field* The women's multi-event competition internationally and at the Olympics prior to 1981 was the pentathlon. Starting in 1981, the women's multi-event competition was changed to the heptathlon, and remains so today. The multi-event competitions in this series prior to 1980 were pentathlons, while the competitions after 1980 were heptathlons, as implied by the greatly increased scores in 1981 and 1982. See Lawson, *World Record Breakers*, 445.
157. For example, the USA-USSR multi-event meets included Canada (1975 [women only], 1977, 1979), West Germany (1974), and Poland (1975 [men only]).
158. Bert Nelson, "Ten Steps to Ecstasy," *Track and Field News*, Oct. 1975, 4-5.
159. "3-Way Decathlon: Jenner Does it Again," *Track and Field News*, Aug. (II) 1974, 8.
160. Bert Nelson, "Ten Steps to Ecstasy," *Track and Field News*, Oct. 1975, 65; Jeanette and Bert Nelson, "TFN Interview With the Jenners," *Track and Field News*, Oct. 1975, 67.
161. "Pat Matzdorf Explodes to Brilliant," *Track and Field News*, Jul. (I) 1971, 20.
162. Gwilym Brown, "Still Something of a Summit Meeting," *Sports Illustrated*, 12 Jul. 1971, 20.

163. Several of the dual meets included other countries in the second phase, although they were always scored as dual meets. This was itself an indication that the USSR alone no longer made it a special event.
164. Jim Henderson, "Morozov, Saneyev Pilot USSR; Luzins, Carlos Spark US," *Track and Field News*, Jul. (II) 1969, 6; Neil Amdur, "Liquori Wins 1,500 Meter Run," *New York Times*, 20 Jul. 1969.
165. Neil Amdur, "Riddick, Foster, Roberts Regain Pride in Track," *New York Times*, 7 Aug. 1976; Neil Amdur, "US Trackman Win, Women are Routed," *New York Times* 8 Aug. 1976.
166. For example, the two day attendance at 1969 AAU national championship meet at Miami-Dade Junior College on 28-29 June was 20,000. A standing room only crowd of over 12,500 attended the final day of the 1976 AAU championship meet held at Drake Stadium (UCLA) on 12 June. Bill Mallon and Ian Buchanan, *The United States' National Championships in Track and Field Athletics, 1876-1985* (Indianapolis: The Athletic Congress, 1986), 13; "Women Steal the Show With 4 ARs," *Track and Field News*, Jul. 1976, 23.
167. One need only recall the 1972 Olympic basketball match between the US and the USSR, which the USSR won after a number of very questionable calls, and the US ice hockey win at the 1980 Winter Games, to dispel the notion that the Cold War in athletics was no longer important.
168. Neil Amdur, "Matzdorf of US at 7-6¼ Breaks Brumel's Record," *New York Times*, 4 Jul. 1971; "Pat Matzdorf Explodes to Brilliant," *Track and Field News*, Jul. (I) 1971, 20, 22-23; John Henderson, "Pat Matzdorf Gonna Take You Higher, Higher," *Track and Field News*, Jul. (II) 1971, 16; Cava and Bateman, 1985 *United States Track and Field Team*, 47.
169. The IAAF organized the World Cup as a biennial meet. The World Cup meets were odd because half of the teams were based on region and half on nation. There were eight teams in each competition and only one competitor from each team. The IAAF organized it this way to eliminate heats or semi-finals that sometimes tired the best athletes. The IAAF believed that if the athletes had to run just one race, the final, their performances would be better. But there could then only be a total of eight competitors in each event because there were only eight lanes on most conventional tracks. The teams were America I, America II, Europe I, Europe II, Europe III, Africa, Asia, and Oceania. For the inaugural World Cup meet in 1977 the America I entry was the country in the Americas that did best in the 1976 Olympics (virtually guaranteed to be the US) and America II was comprised of athletes from the rest of the American countries. The top two national teams at the European Cup competed as national teams (Europe I & II); Europe III, similar to America II, included athletes from the rest of the European countries. Africa, Asia, and Oceania were continental teams. The Soviet men's national team qualified in 1979 and 1981. The USSR women's team qualified for all four the World Cup meets (1977, 1979, 1981, and 1985). Both the men's and women's U.S. teams qualified for all four World Cup meets as national teams. The IAAF began a real World Championship meet based on national teams in 1983. The IAAF World Championship meet was very similar to the Olympics-each team could enter three athletes in each event if they had athletes who met the qualifying times. The IAAF thought that the World Championship meet would complement the World Cup, but the World Cup soon faded away because its regional team organization never worked well and too many of the best athletes were left out because each team could enter only one athlete per event. For example, since the US could enter only one person in the 100, 200, and 400-meter races, often the second and third best 100, 200, and 400-meter athletes in the world could not compete, because they were also Americans. This was likewise true for the Kenyan distance runners in events like the steeplechase, 5,000 and 10,000 meter races. "Last Lap: World Cup On for 1977," *Track and Field News*, Oct. 1976, 28; Bert Nelson, "Of People and Things," *Track and Field News*, Feb. 1979, 56; "The World Cup-All the Facts," *Track and Field News*, Apr. 1979, 49; Kenny Moore, "Good Times and Good Time at LA," *Sports Illustrated*, 20 Jun. 1970, 2629; Kenny Moore, "Give The Girl a Great Big Hand," *Sports Illustrated*, 3 Sep. 1979, 19-23.
170. "The World Cup-All the Facts," *Track and Field News*, Apr. 1979, 49.
171. Kenny Moore, "Double Double, Broil and Bubble," *Sports Illustrated*, 29 Jun. 1981, 22-25.

172. Steve Scott (with Marc Bloom), *The Miler* (New York: MacMillan, 1997), 137, 141.
173. Kenny Moore, "Shifting Into High Gear For Moscow," *Sports Illustrated*, 25 Jun. 1979, 16-19.
174. "AAU Releases Partial TV Schedule," *Track and Field News*, Apr. (II) 1969, 20; Art Hoffman, "USA-USSR-BC," *Amateur Athlete*, Sep. 1969, 6-11; Dick Drake, "On Your Marks," *Track and Field News*, Dec. 1970, 20; Dick Drake, "CBS-TV's Track Series," *Track and Field News*, Feb. (II) 1971, 26-27.
175. Dick Drake, "On Your Marks," *Track and Field News*, Dec. 1970, 20; Dick Drake, "CBS-TV's Track Series," *Track and Field News*, Feb. (II) 1971, 26-27.
176. "AAU and CBS to Expand TV Series to 32 Weeks in 1973," *Amateur Athlete*, Dec. 1972, 1.
177. Rader, *In Its Own Image*, 105.
178. For a good example on how track's governing bodies accommodated television, see Kenny Moore, "The Golden Mile," in *Best Efforts: World Class Runners and Races* (Tallahassee: Cedarwinds Publishing Company, 1982), 145-55.
179. For example, consider the "made-for-TV" mile at the Astrodome that CBS paid \$20,000 to televise in 1979. Scott, *The Miler*, 83-84. On the growth of the importance placed on the constant improvement in athletic performance and the obsession with ever increasing world records, see Hoberman, *Mortal Engines*.
180. Dick Drake, "On Your Marks," *Track and Field News*, Jul. (11) 1969, 12; "East Germans Score Upset," *Amateur Athlete*, Sep. 1969, 36.
181. R.L. Quercetani, "Field Events Hot Focus," *Track and Field News*, Sep. 1970, 3.
182. For example, see Wolfgang Gitter, "East German System of Success," *Track and Field News*, Oct. 1970, 12-13; Doug Gilbert, *The Miracle Machine* (New York: Coward, McCann, & Geoghegan, 1980); Kenny Moore, "Preview of Coming Attractions," *Sports Illustrated*, 4 Jul. 1983, 17-21.
183. Hoberman, *Mortal Engines*, 286.
184. The men won both meets and the women lost badly in both meets. The East Germans won the combined total both years. Cava and Bateman, *1985 United States Track and Field Team*, 44.
185. "Unprecedented Visit to China Slated for May," AAU News, Apr. 1975, 3; "Scalzo Leads China Visit, Names Coaches," AAU News, May 1975, 3, 5; Joseph Scalzo, "President's," AAU News, Aug. 1975, 2; John Underwood, "And the YU-I Flowed Like Wine," *Sports Illustrated*, 2 Jun. 1975, 24 26; Neil Amdur, "65 Athletes US Track Team to Make China Tour in May," *New York Times*, 20 Mar. 1975; Neil Amdur, "US Stars Approve China Trip," *New York Times*, 21 Mar. 1975.
186. Dr. Leroy Walker (AAU Men's Track and Field Committee and past Olympic Head coach), interview notes with the President's Commission on Olympic Sports (PCOS) at AAU Convention, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1-4 Dec. 1975, 1; Martha Watson (national long jump champion, three time Olympic member, and participant in the China trip) interview notes with PCOS at the AAU indoor championship, New York, NY, 27-28 Feb. 1976, 1, Sport-by-Sport, T and F—Interview Notes Folder, Box 71, PCOS Records.
187. David Binder, "Bingham Finds Cuba Ready to Talk," *New York Times*, 16 Feb. 1977, 2; Neil Amdur, "AAU Weighs Staging of Cuba Vs. US Meets," *New York Times*, 10 May 1977; "Cubans Will Compete in US," *New York Times*, 25 Apr. 1979; Pat Putnam, "Close, But No Cigar," *Sports Illustrated*, 14 May 1979, 36-39.
188. Neil Amdur, "Floopers Get AAU Push," *New York Times*, 27 Feb. 1975.
189. The absence of the best Soviet athletes is explained by the European indoor championship meet the following week. Although a relatively new meet, the European meet was apparently more important than the USA-USSR indoor meet. "US Squad Swamps Soviet Secondaries," *Track and Field News*, Apr. 1975, 15.
190. "Last Lap: '75 Indoor Attendance Up," *Track and Field News*, Apr. 1975, 60.
191. As other meets became more important, the quality of the USSR meet also suffered because athletes peaked for other meets. For example, part of the reason for the USSR's poor showing at the

- first USA-USSR indoor meet in 1972 was that Soviet athletes were tired after competing the previous week in the more important European indoor championship meet. Bob Hersh and Jim Dunaway, "Frenn, Craft Juiced: Beat Soviets With Records," *Track and Field News*, Mar. (II) 1972, 10.
192. Gwilym S. Brown, "Still Something of Summit Meeting," *Sports Illustrated*, 12 Jul. 1971, 21.
 193. "Strong Soviet Squad Defeats US in Track: 207-171 Triumph is 12th in 15 Meets," *New York Times*, 3 Jul. 1977.
 194. "Samara Prepares To Break the NCAA," *New York Times*, 14 Mar. 1973.
 195. "The Samara Case: Outline of the Facts of the Conflict," Langer Case Folder, Box 6, PCOS Records; Ron Reid, "Thank Heavens for this Little Girl," *Sport Illustrated*, 26 Mar. 1973, 70-71; Neil Amdur, "Robin Campbell Excels—Soviet Trackmen Win," *New York Times*, 17 Mar. 1973.
 196. "Restraining the AAU," *AAU News*, Apr. 1973, 3.
 197. "Samara Prepares To Break the NCAA," *New York Times*, 14 Mar. 1973, 33-34.
 198. For a detailed recap of the Samara-Walker/NCAA conflict, see "Samara-Walker vs. NCAA," PCOS Report, Sport-by-Sport, T and F—General (1) Folder, Box 71, PCOS Records; "The Samara Case: Outline of the Facts of the Conflict," Langer Case Folder, Box 6, PCOS Records.
 199. Other factors, such as the creation of the International Track Association (ITA) in 1972, also impacted the quality of the meet to a lesser extent. The ITA, an openly professional track circuit, drew a number of talented athletes out of amateur track during its three-year existence (1973-76).
 200. Because the payments were covert, it is difficult to trace the extent of this underground labor relations system. But, for examples, see John Lucas, "In the Eye of the Storm: Paavo Nurmi and the American Athletic Amateur-Professional Struggle (1925 and 1929)," *Stadion* 17 (1992): 225-245; Andrew Strenk, "Amateurism: The Myth and the Reality," in *The Olympic Games in Transition*, ed. Jeffrey Seagrave and Donald Chu (Champaign: Human Kinetics, 1988), 303-27; Joseph M. Turrini, "Wes Santee, the Four-Minute Mile, and the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States," *Sport History Review* 18 (May 1999): 5687; Jack Newcombe, "Athletes Tell How Illicit Pay-Offs Destroy the Amateur Code," *Life*, 30 Apr. 1956, 113-20; Wes Santee, "Names, Places and Pay-Offs—Santee Blows the Whistle," *Life*, 19 Nov. 1956, 99-110.
 201. For a brief introduction to the truly fascinating early history of Adidas and Puma and the feud between the Dassler brothers, see J.B. Strasser and Laurie Becklund, *Swoosh: The Unauthorized Story of Nike and the Men Who Played There* (New York: HarperCollins, 1991), 40-45.
 202. *Ibid.*, 83.
 203. "Take the Money and Run: What About the Shoe Companies?" *Track and Field News*, Nov. 1971, 4.
 204. Al Franken [long time track meet promoter, including the Sunkist meet], interview with Joseph M. Turrini, Detroit, Michigan, 9 Apr. 1998; Tom Moore [longtime track meet promoter], interview with Joseph M. Turrini, Detroit, Michigan, 26 May 1998.
 205. "Take the Money and Run," *Track and Field News*, Nov. 1971, 4-5.
 206. Frank Shorter, transcript of testimony given at the first PCOS hearing, Washington, DC, Sep. 9, 1975, 46-47, 1st Committee Hearing, Washington, DC, 9-10 Sep. 1975 Folder, Box 19, PCOS Records.
 207. Powell was a Los Angeles police officer at the time. Interview notes with John Powell, Dec. 14, 1975, New Orleans, LA, Sport-by-Sport, T and F—Interview Notes Folder, Box 71, PCOS Records.
 208. Scott's career as an international class athlete spans across the divide of formally amateur and openly professional track. His autobiography is refreshingly honest and illuminating explaining how athletes made a living in crack both before and after professionalization. For the figures cited above specifically, see Scott, *The Miler*, 73.
 207. Strasser and Becklund, *Swoosh*, 232.

210. Scott, *The Miler*, 85.
211. "US Women Lose by Two Points," *New York Times*, 7 Aug. 1969; "Unhappy US Track Team Plans To Appeal To Nixon," *New York Times*, 7 Aug. 1969; Dick Drake, "On Your Marks," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1969, 20; "Dialogue Vitally Needed," *Track and Field News*, Sep. 1969, 3, 15-16.
212. "Last Lap: United Amateur Athletes, New US Union," *Track and Field News*, Feb. (I) 1971, 20; Neil Amdur, "Group of Dissident Athletes Demand Changes in Organization," *New York Times*, 6 Jan. 1970; Neil Amdur, "Track Athletes Ask 'Liberation,'" *New York Times*, 1 Dec. 1970.
213. Twenty-three athletes who were in the top ten in their events passed on the national team. This was the first large group of absentees since the nine in 1961. These athletes seem to have acted completely independently, unlike the athletes in 1961. "US Team...Nonmembers," *Track and Field News*, 1 Jul. 1970, 22; James Clarity, "Soviet Conquers US In Track, 200-173," *New York Times*, Jul. 25, 1970.
214. Marty Liquori, "Opinion 70," *Track and Field News*, Sep. 1970, 18.
215. Scott, *The Miler*, 85.
216. "US Team.. Nonmembers," *Track and Field News*, 1 Jul. 1970, 22.
217. For background on the PCC, see Garry Hill, "T&FN Interview: Tom Jennings," *Track and Field News*, Apr. 1979, 58-60. The PCC athletes and Jennings had yearly conflicts with the AAU that were often resolved. For example, PCC athletes threatened to boycott both the 1973 indoor and outdoor meets. Arthur Daley, "Fastest Human," *New York Times*, 20 Feb. 1973; "10 Stars May Skip AAU Meet," *New York Times*, Jun. 6, 1973. Jennings had regular personal run-ins with the AAU. In 1972 the Southern Pacific AAU attempted to bar Jennings from AAU meets because of his continued derogatory remarks about the AAU. "Incredible! Club Leader Barred for Derogatory Statements About AAU," *Track and Field News*, 1 Feb. 1972, 30. Although many agreed with Jennings' criticisms of the AAU, some also thought that he was simply a very difficult person. For example, Willye White, an athlete member of the PCOS, thought Jennings opposed and was skeptical of the PCOS reform and would "do his best to destroy it. That is Tom." Willye White, to Kent Maxfield, 2 Jul. 1976, Sport-by-Sport, T and F—Correspondence Folder, Box 71, PCOS Records,
218. The PCC, for example, won the 1968 and 1969 AAU indoor championship meet, the 1969 and 1970 AAU cross-country championship meet, and the USTFF outdoor track titles in 1971, 1972, 1973, & 1974. "1976 Pacific Coast Club Roster," Sport-by-Sport, Track and Field—General (1) Folder, Box 71, PCOS Records; "1976 Pacific Coast Club Outdoor Schedule," Sport-by-Sport, Track and Field—General (1) Folder, Box 71, PCOS Records.
219. Garry Hill, "T&FN Interview with Tom Jennings," *Track and Field News*, Apr. 1978, 58-60.
220. "1976 Pacific Coast Club Roster," Sport-by-Sport, Track and Field—General (1) Folder, Box 71, PCOS Records.
221. "AAU Marred by Defections," *Track and Field News*, Mar. (II) 1974, 10; "Soviet Trackmen Win, US Loses Dual Meet," *New York Times*, 3 Mar. 1974.
222. "US Track Team Accent on Youth," *New York Times*, 28 Feb. 1974, 9.
223. "Records by Outlin, Hill Can't Salvage US," *Track and Field News*, Apr. (I) 1974, 14.
224. The moratorium applied to men only, who were much more likely to opt out of the national teams than women because they had much more earning potential. Coach Ed Temple complained that in the mid-1970s only three American female athletes, Francie Larrieu Smith, Jodi Huntley, and Martha Watson, were even having their expense payments met. Ed Temple Interview Notes, 27-28 Feb. 1976, New York, NY, Sport-by-Sport, T and F—Interview Notes Folder, Box 71, PCOS Records.
225. LeRoy Walker, "Five Day Rule: An Open Letter," *Track and Field News*, May (II) 1974, 27.
226. "Last Lap: No AAU for Prefontaine," *Track and Field News*, Jun. (II) 1974, 29.
227. "Last Lap: ...Or Pacific Coast Club?" *Track and Field News*, Jun. (II) 1974, 29.
228. "NCAA Good, But AAU Better," *Track and Field News*, Jul. (II) 1974, 8; "US Coach Predicts Track

- Victory Over USSR," *New York Times*, 2 Jul. 1974.
229. "Pre Not Winning, But Running Like Hell," *Track and Field News*, Aug. (I) 1974, 8; Jon Hendershort, "The Summer Odyssey of Steve Prefontaine," *Track and Field News*, Oct. 1974, 4; "AAU Threatens to Penalize Leading Athletes," *Track and Field News*, Nov. 1974, 22; "Travel Permit Violations Could Result in Suspension," *Amateur Athlete*, Nov. 1974, 6; "Soviet Men, Women Lead US in Track," *New York Times*, 6 Jul. 1974.
230. "Last Lap: AAU Moratorium Reaffirmed," *Track and Field News*, Jun. 1975, 60.
231. Neil Amdur, "AAU Sets New Rules on Travel," *New York Times* 18 Oct. 1974, 51,
232. Neil Amdur, "Miss Larrieu, Wohlhuter, Bayi Capture AAU Track Titles," *New York Times*, 1 Mar. 1975.
233. The tragic car accident death of the 23-year-old Prefontaine had, and continues to have, a tremendous impact on track and the athletes. For example, see "Pre's People Remember," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1975, 25; Kenny Moore, "Final Drive to the Finish: Steve Prefontaine," in *Best Efforts*, 73-77.
234. Neil Amdur, "AAU Stars May Not Try," *New York Times* 28 May 1975; Garry Hill, AAU Preview (maybe)," *Track and Field News*, Jul. 1975, 34.
235. Minutes of the United States Track and Field Federation Governing Council Meeting, Wichita, Kansas, Jun. 1, 1975, [item #9] 4, USTFF Folder, Box 5, Donald Canham Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan,
236. Sam Goldaper, "AAU lifts Restrictions on 4 Meets," *New York Times*, 12 Jun. 1975, 47.
237. On the television rights controversy, see "US-USSR: On Again," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1975, 40; "Last Lap: US-USSR Meet Canceled," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1975, 61; Roy Conrad, "Stomped by Soviets, US Rallies in Prague," *Track and Field News*, Sep. 1975,445; "Last Lap: AAU Moratorium Repealed," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1975, 61; "AAU Cancels Meet," *New York Times*, 17 Jun. 1975; "US and Soviet Sports Strain," *New York Times* 18 Jun. 1975; "US Soviet Track Meet Will Be Held After All," *New York Times*, 28 Jun. 1975.
238. "Last Lap: President's Panel Formed," *Track and Field News*, Jun. 1975, 60.
239. "Statement by the President," Jun. 19, 1975, PCOS—Hearing and Meetings, 1st Commission Hearings Folder, Box 83, PCOS Collection, Ford Presidential Library. Ford established an investigatory commission because endless congressional attempts to pass legislation had failed. For example, between January and May 1973, five different senators introduced four different bills that sought to settle the amateur sport conflicts. There were also many attempts in the House in the first half of the 1970s. Copies of many of these bills can be found in Box 39, PCOS Records. See also Jane Lipton, "Legislative History of Amateur Sports Legislation, 1972-1976," PCOS: Alexandria, VA, Hearings, Sep. 1976 Folder, Box 16, PCOS Records; Pat O'Donnell, to Mike Harrigan, 13 Sep. 1974, Olympic Sports Committee (1) Folder, Box 7, Patrick E. O'Donnell and Joseph S. Jencks Files, White House Congressional Delegation Office Records, Ford Presidential Library.
240. Bob Hersh, "Many Stars Avoid AAU Meet Friday," *New York Times*, 22 Feb. 1976; Tony Kornheiser, "Bayi Takes AAU Mile in 3:56.1," *New York Times*, 28 Feb. 1976.
241. Tony Kornheiser, "Many AAU Stars Skip Soviet Meet," *New York Times*, 29 Feb. 1976.
242. Bob Hersh, "Keeping Track," *Track and Field News*, Feb. 1978, 45.
243. The AAU suspended Stones for receiving money for competing on the Superstars television shows. A number of track athletes had similar conflicts with the AAU concerning their Superstars winnings in the 1970s. Joe Marshall, "He Sure Goes Like Sixty in the 60," *Sports Illustrated*, 6 Mar. 1978.
244. Wilkins took the AAU up on its offer and competed and won the discus throw at the 1978 USA-USSR meet. Joe Marshall, "Dual Duels in the Sun," *Sports Illustrated*, 19 Jun. 1978, 67, 69; Cava and Bareman, *1985 United States Track and Field Team*, 57.
245. Joe Marshall, "Dual Duels in the Sun," *Sports Illustrated*, 19 Jun. 1978, 67, 69.

246. Joe Hendershott, "The Home Front," *Track and Field News*, Sep. 1978, 30; Joe Marshall, "Not Quite As High But a Bit Mightier," *Sports Illustrated*, 27 Jul. 1978, 20-26.
247. Amateur Sports Act of 1978, Pub. L. 95-606, 92 Stat. 3045, *codified as amended at* 36 U.S.C. § 371 *et seq.* The Amateur Sports Act is an understudied and very important piece of sport legislation. For an introduction, see James A.R. Nafziger, "The Amateur Sports Act of 1978," in *Law and Amateur Sports*, ed. Ronald J. Waicukauski (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982), 114-60.
248. International Amateur Athletic Federation, *International Amateur Athletic Federation Handbook, 1996-1997* (Monaco: IAAF, 1996), 8-9.
249. Pamela Lynne Cooper, "26.2 Miles In America: The History of the Marathon Footrace in the United States" (Ph.D. diss., University of Maine, 1995), 226-227.
250. On the growth of professional road running, see Pamela Lynne Cooper, "The 'Visible Hand on the Footrace: Fred Lebow and the Marketing of the Marathon," *Journal of Sport History* 13: 244-56 (1992).
251. James Dunaway, "Nabers Wins \$15,000 for Marathon Victory," *New York Times*, 22 Sep. 1980; Phil Stewart, "The First Pro Road Race: 2:31:06 Wins \$15,000!" *Running Times*, Dec. 1980, 28-29.
252. "Runners Each Earn \$12,500 in Marathon," *New York Times*, 24 Nov. 1980.
253. Tom Derderian, *Boston Marathon: The First Century of the World's Premier Running Event* (Champaign: Human Kinetics, 1996), 353, 363, 404.
254. "Money; When, Where, How Much," *Track and Field News*, Feb. 1982, 58.
255. "Olson & Tabb Grand Prix Winners," *Track and Field News*, Mar. 1982, 45.
256. "Last Lap: Mobil Grand Prix Winners," *Track and Field News*, Jul. 1982, 69.
257. Seventeen-year-old Michelle Glover, who had just finished high school, finished ninth in the 100-meter race at the TAC championship meet and still qualified for the USSR meet team. She surprised most when she won the 100-meter race at the USSR meet. "TAG/Mobil Championships: Lewis Gets Even Better Yet," *Track and Field News*, Aug. 1981, 31; "Demyanyuk New High Jump Star," *Track and Field News*, Sep. 1981, 26; John F. Burns, "Soviet Union Tops U.S. Track Team," *New York Times*, 12 Jul. 1981.
258. Neil Amdur, "Ovett's 3:49.25 Wins Oslo Mile As Seven Runners Better Than 3:51," *New York Times*, 12 Jul. 1981; John F. Burns, "Soviet Union Tops U.S. Track Tea," *New York Times*, 12 Jul. 1981.
259. "Absent Track Stars Are Missed by US in Loses to Russians," *New York Times*, 5 Jul. 1982.
260. John MacAloon, "Are Olympic Athletes Professionals?: Cultural Categories and Social Control in US Sport," in *The Business of Professional Sports*, ed. Paul Staudohar and James A. Mangan (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991). 268-69, 272.