Paralympics: past, present and future

Tony Sainsbury

Series **University Lectures | 15**

Centre d'Estudis Olímpics
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

This work has been published as part of the educational project promoted by the Olympic Studies Centre (CEO-UAB), *University Lectures on the Olympics*, within the framework of the International Chair in Olympism (IOC-UAB). The project aims to provide online access to texts covering the main subjects related to the written by international experts and aimed at university students and lecturers.

To cite this work, you can use the reference:

Sainsbury, Tony (2010): *Paralympics: past, present and future: university lecture on the Olympics* [online article]. Barcelona : Centre d'Estudis Olímpics (UAB). International Chair in Olympism (IOC-UAB). [Date of consulted: dd/mm/yy]
<http://ceo.uab.cat/pdf/sainsbury_eng.pdf>

ISBN: 978-84-693-6233-4

Summary

1. Early days

On the same day as opening ceremony of the Olympic Games London 1948 a sports event was being held north of the English capital in a village near the town of Aylesbury called Stoke Mandeville. As a sports event it was nothing special. There were two 'teams' comprising 14 men and 2 women, all former military personnel. In their own way they were competing in 'parallel' to that larger event even though in only one sport, archery. However there was a marked difference between the two sets of competitors. The Stoke Mandeville athletes were competing in the cumbersome wheelchairs of the day as they had all suffered some form of traumatic spinal injury.

The following year 1949 six 'teams' made the journey to Stoke Mandeville to compete in three sports including net-ball, which caused some consternation years later from visiting international teams who came expecting basketball and backboards and found only a pole and net. In his closing speech the founder of this embryo movement, in front of a significant group of VIPS declared that the event would grow in 'world fame as the disabled men and women's equivalent of the Olympic Games'.

The name of this founder is as synonymous with the Paralympic Games as De Coubertin's name is with the Olympic Games - his name, Ludwig Guttmann, later knighted by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

Ludwig had come with his family to England as an early refugee from Hitler's Nazi policies as a neurosurgeon with a reputation, an 'attitude' and some very revolutionary ideas in the management of spinal cord injured people. His approach involved individual personal care and clinical evaluation in the early days of an injury. He coupled this methodology with a determination to re-light the touch-paper of the devastated inner spirit of those so traumatised individuals. He chose sport as the means to that end. Ludwig reversed a harrowing statistic from a 1:10 survival rate in 1940 to 9:10 by 1950.

Today sport is still a tool in many forms of rehabilitation for the same valid reason. But for thousands of men and women across the world, who live each day with their disability, sport has become just another part of their regular daily activities. Their performances and

achievements mirror those of their able-bodied peers and find their zenith, their show-case at the equivalent of the Olympic Games, the Paralympic Games just as 'Poppa' as he was familiarly known predicted.

2. Paralympic development

Competition development

In the short space of just one Olympiad those National Stoke Mandeville Games attracted hundreds of spinal cord injured athletes and in the year of the Helsinki Olympics 1952 they took on an international flavour when 4 athletes and 2 staff from the Netherlands came to what became known world-wide as the 'Home of disabled sport'. Stoke Mandeville took on a mantra similar to that of Olympia in Greece. And perhaps even more so because it was a real place offering real opportunities to test out the "the triumph of the human spirit" as the future motto of the 1996 Atlanta Paralympics would proclaim. For 50 years disabled athletes of the world wore their presence at an International Stoke Mandeville Games like a badge of honour.

Over the next eight years the national and international events grew rapidly both in terms of teams/countries present, athlete numbers and sports offered. The clinical messages of Guttmann carried to the far corners of the earth including the importance of sport. So successful was that message that in some regions sport for disabled people was better organised and structured than that for the community at large because of the health authorities and hospital infrastructure that often supported such medically-justified beneficial activities.

The founder's own words of 1949 never left him and in 1960 he persuaded a friend and colleague in Italy to hold the first International Games outside of Stoke Mandeville in Rome to coincide with the Olympic Games of that year. These Games became known as the 1st Paralympic Games and attracted twenty-one countries and four hundred athletes in thirteen sports.

It is interesting to note that at this stage there were no track events, probably because tracks were predominantly of soft material and nobody wanted to race in the 'rickety' chairs they

used for daily living. The organiser of these first Paralympics was the Spinal Unit at Ostia supported by INAIL (the Italian National Insurance Institute against accidents at work) and CONI the Italian National Olympic Committee.

The table below lays out the growth of the Paralympic Games. For a variety of reasons the precedents of Olympic locations created by Rome 1960 and Tokyo 1964 failed to prevail. Yet the continuity of the Games did not fail and in 1988 to the enormous credit of the Korean people, the VIIIth Paralympics were held in a truly Olympic environment and that pattern has been maintained to this day. The new agreement with the International Olympic Committee (IOC) guarantees that continuity for the future.

Summer Paralympic Games				
Year	**Venue**	**Nations**	**Athletes**	**Olympic Venue**
1960	Rome	23	400	Rome
1964	Tokyo	22	390	Tokyo
1968	Tel Aviv	29	750	Mexico
1972	Heidelberg	42	1004	Munich
1976	Toronto	40	1560	Montreal
1980	Arnhem	42	2000	Moscow
1984	Stoke Mandeville &	41	1100	Los Angeles
	New York	45	1750	
1988	Seoul	61	3500	Seoul
1992	Barcelona	82	3500	Barcelona
1996	Atlanta	83	4000	Atlanta
2000	Sydney	123	4000	Sydney

It was to be some time before the first Winter Paralympics took place but they too have now found their place in the calendar of high performance sport.

Winter Paralympic Games				
Year	**Venue**	**Nations**	**Athletes**	**Olympic Venue**
1976	Ornskoldsvik	17	250	Innsbruck
1980	Geilo	18	350	Lake Placid
1984	Innsbruck	22	401	Sarajevo
1988	Innsbruck	22	398	Calgary
1992	Tignes	24	475	Albertville
1994	Lillehammer	31	512	Lillehammer
1998	Nagano	32	571	Nagano
2002	Salt Lake City	36	416	Salt Lake City

Institutional framework development

As this movement for athletes with spinal cord injury developed so the demand for competitions at national and international level grew among people with other disabilities. At the instigation of the World Veterans Federation based in Paris an inaugural meeting was convened in 1961 of leaders in the area of sports for disabled people. This meeting led to the formation of the International Sports Organisation for the Disabled (ISOD). The result was that there were now two International Federations, ISMGF (International Stoke Mandeville Games Federation) and ISOD both formed to look after the interests of spinal cord injured athletes and other physically disabled athletes respectively.

However it was not until fifteen years later in Toronto 1976 that the first non-spinal cord injured athletes took part in the Paralympics with the presence of events for blind and amputee athletes as full medal events. In the 80s two new federations were created, CP-ISRA for athletes with cerebral palsy and IBSA for athletes with visual disabilities. As already stated blind athletes had first appeared in 1976 and cerebral palsy athletes had their first outing albeit in small numbers at the Arnhem 1980 Paralympics. In the early 1990s INAS-MFH was created to look after the needs of elite athletes with a mental handicap. INAS-FMH is a different organisation than the Special Olympics organisation that caters for the whole group and whose basic philosophy is participation and fun rather than high level performance. This

new federation sought entry to the Barcelona Paralympics 1992 but it proved too late so they themselves organised a successful event in Madrid in the same summer. These athletes finally made their debut at the 1996 Atlanta Paralympic Games.

However as early as the immediate post-Arnhem '80 period the distinctions between these disability sports federations were already being eroded in terms of the prevailing disability-specific sport model with a movement towards one more conformist with regular sport, i.e. a sport by sport structure. The genesis of this evolution (some still say revolution) was the desire of one of the blue ribbon sports, wheelchair basketball to allow all basketball players regardless of their physical disability to represent their country internationally. The 1980 Paralympics was the last when the wheelchair basketball event was limited to spinal cord injured athletes.

Up to that date other (non-spinal injured) players had been restricted to domestic competition alone, i.e. other disabled athletes could only play for their local teams at home and could not represent their country. The catalyst for this change was 'functional classification' which instead of evaluating each athlete according to their disability evaluated her/him according to their residual potential ability. Care was taken not to penalise athletes for the consequences of their training but were judged on what motor/movement potential they had as a consequence of their disability and NOT by what they could not do.

At the core of this system was/is the observation of the athlete active in their actual sport in order to make these crucial assessments. Prior to this time, i.e. under the old system and for many years athletes received one classification for ALL sports without any consideration of the mechanics of each sport. A sense of unfairness developed among the athletes and mistakes and cheating were regular occurrences – the 'disability assessment system' lost all credibility. The new approach removed once and for all the lines of athletes queuing at major events waiting to be prodded and poked by someone from the medical profession: this was clearly as invasive a procedure as the discredited gender testing at former Olympic Games.

A number of other factors accelerated this process. First was the growing desire by the athletes to specialise in a single sport and not feel compelled to participate in 4 or 5 sports at

international level. However the reality is that the early events would not have had a viable sports programme if this multiplicity of participation had not occurred.

The second factor was the demands being made on the Paralympic sports programme, the credibility of the Paralympic Games and the value of a Paralympic medal. In the Seoul Paralympics 1988 there were nearly 800 gold medals awarded: only about 30% of the same number were contested in the Olympic Games.

An outcome of this new approach to classification was the ability to merge disability groups in this functional way and consequently begin the process of reducing the number of events, increasing the value of the medals and thus the standard of competition. A third important factor was the creation of the International Paralympic Committee (IPC) in 1989 which added a further impetus to this process as many newly created National Paralympic Committees created alliances with their National Olympic Committees (NOCs) and national governing bodies of sport. This move led to a new appraisal of their relationship with their national organisations of disability sport and/or the equivalent disability sport international federations.

The model increasingly adopted today is the assimilation of high level athletes with a disability into the national sport specific programmes of their countries: leaders in this field are Canada, Great Britain, Australia, Sweden, and The Netherlands. However the NDSOs (national disability sports organisations)/IOSDs (international disability sports organisations) remain the best recruitment agencies and development organisations for new athletes: there is no such equivalent in regular sport.

As part of this evolution one should not ignore another emerging trend where the athlete him/herself has fought their way into their national able-bodied squads by their own efforts and ability. A few examples include Ajibola Adeoye (Nigeria – athlete with an arm amputation) track, Trisha Zorn (USA – visually impaired athlete) swimming and Paola Fantato (Italy) archery who not only gained a place in her national squad but competed in the Atlanta Olympics and then a few weeks later in the Paralympics and uses a wheelchair for daily living.

3. Paralympic sports

The Paralympic Games programme has evolved over many years and like the Olympic Games has its own historical oddities. While some modern Olympic events still attract a smile from the uninformed it is nothing compared to the look of disbelief when people learn that Olympic gold medals were once awarded for events such as 'synchronised rope-climbing' and tug-o'-war. Early Paralympics Games awarded medals for *dartchery*, an event like darts but using bows and arrows, *precision javelin and precision club,* events involving a target similar to a dart board marked on the grass. And the one whose passing many still regret *wheelchair slalom*, an event where wheelchair users travelled down a course with coloured bollards indicating the requirement for forward/reverse movements, up and over ramps, etc – the winner as in the alpine slalom was the one with the fastest time. By way of interest in some early USA domestic track & field programmes, *wheelchair hurdles* was offered.

The Summer Paralympic programme is best described by the following table:

Olympic programme sports	Adapted sports	Disability specific
Track & Field athletics	Wheelchair tennis	Boccia *(CP-ISRA)*
Swimming	Wheelchair basketball	Wheelchair rugby
Sailing	Soccer *(CP-ISRA & IBSA)*	Goalball *(IBSA)*
Equestrian	Sitting Volleyball	
Cycling		
Powerlifting (Weightlifting)		
Basketball *(INAS-MFH)*		
Judo *(IBSA)*		
Shooting		
Archery		
Table-tennis		

The Winter Paralympic programme involves the following:

Alpine events: downhill and the various slalom disciples for all the different disabilities, some examples:

- Skiers with arm or hand disabilities use a single or no ski sticks
- Skiers with a single leg use ski sticks with small skis on the bottom

- Sit skiers use a bucket seat with shock absorbers on a single ski and the same kind of ski sticks as above but shorter.
- Skiers with visual impairments who need to be guided down the courses by a personal sighted skier.
- All other ambulant skiers who have no easily visible disability but may have co-ordination disabilities because of cerebral palsy for example.

Nordic events: 'cross-country' with the different distances and for all the disability groups using similar but modified equipment as described for Alpine, so for example:

- For the sit-skier, the seat is now on two skis as an additional aid to balance
- For the visually impaired biathlete part from the guide, the shooting discipline is performed with a modified rifle (not carried) which is based on acoustic principles rather than line of sight.

Sledge Ice Hockey:

This dynamic sport has all the 'push and smash' of the standing game. The players sit on modified sledges with two skates attached underneath, so they are centimetres off the ice. Their hockey sticks double as the means to propel the puck and themselves as the handles have a point which they 'pick' in the ice to move: the action is not dissimilar to that of an alpine skier coming out of the start gate using their ski sticks to gain momentum

Curling for athletes using wheelchairs.

These Paralympic sports list are under constant review and sports need to maintain a global following. *Lawn bowling* the Commonwealth sport and *standing volleyball for amputees* are two recent examples of exclusion from the summer programme with *ice sledge racing* similarly withdrawn from the winter programme following the Nagano 1998 event because its following was limited to a few countries. New sports do enter the programmes with *women's powerlifting* (summer) and *wheelchair curling* (winter).

The IPC is particularly sensitive to the need to protect and increase events for women and athletes with a severe disability and has established Commissions whose influence on the

Paralympic Games programme is significant and growing in a not dissimilar way to that of the events programme for women in the Olympic Games.

Unless otherwise stipulated most of the sports listed have events for those with physical and visual disabilities. Some have been designed with one disability in mind, for example boccia which is a sport similar to boules and when played by athletes with cerebral palsy requires skill and concentration of the highest order. The blue ribbon events of the summer are track & field, swimming and wheelchair basketball.

Part of the current programme debate in the Paralympic Movement revolves around the issue of total inclusion. Basically if sportsmen and women with disabilities can compete at Olympic level in certain sports why preserve a programme on the Paralympic programme? Shooting and archery are two of the examples often sited.

A sports programme is nothing unless it has spectators hence the need for Paralympic Organising Committees to pay particular attention to this area. In all the Games since 1988 using Olympic venues swimming has always been over-subscribed; wheelchair basketball attracted 15,000 people a day for ten days in Sydney; the ice sledge hockey matches in Salt Lake City were a sell out with tickets for the last day rarer than gold dust once the USA battled their way to the final. Part of the reason for this growing public awareness, interest and advocacy for more access to Paralympic events is the increased media coverage with more and more domestic companies demanding the presence of a host broadcaster. By way of example, for the last two summer Paralympic Games the BBC in Great Britain has shown a day's highlights programme every night of the Games at peak times and attracted significant audiences.

The most immediate Games in Athens and Turin will enjoy the same professional presentation as the Olympic Games, another important factor in guaranteeing the future of this important festival of high performance sport, the Paralympic Games.

4. Paralympic Games infrastructure

The word 'infrastructure' here refers to all those physical and planning developments requiring special attention by a Paralympic Games Organising Committee (OCOG) other than competition venues. As Olympic and Paralympic OCOGs become more and more one and the same the particular characteristics of the latter need early consideration if significant modification and expense is not to be incurred during the transition between the two events. Not included in this description here is the preparation of the sports venues which in general terms are capable of easier modification. The extra sports that are Paralympic specific tend to require hall and spectator space of which there is abundance in Olympic venue mode which can be quickly converted.

This infrastructure aspect can be summarised as follows:

- functional activity such as the Village and transport services
- support services such as marketing, ticketing, education programmes and staff and volunteer training
- planning processes such as arrivals and departures and the main ceremonies.

Transport services are particularly critical regardless of the size or prestige of the event. For Paralympic Games recent organising committees have managed to enter into collaborative agreements with government agencies and public transport providers to ensure the best possible accessible vehicle solutions which then became a legacy for their communities post-Games.

Not surprisingly tail-lift buses do not figure much in this regard as they provide only limited opportunities for the wider communities they are to serve which is why OCOGs now work hard with their partners to acquire 'kneel down' or low axle buses. The benefits of this approach are that Paralympians enjoy this level of provision during the Games and subsequently parents with children in push chairs, heavily laden shoppers, the disabled community generally, older citizens or those permanently or temporarily experiencing ambulatory problems are the long term beneficiaries. Olympic/Paralympic cities have been able to justify the acceleration forward of years of planned investment in accessible transport into a short period because of the imperative of these Paralympic needs.

The preparation (conversion) of the Olympic Village for (to) the **Paralympic Village** remains the greatest challenge. Ideally there is an overwhelming logic to include Paralympic experts and/or access professionals and/or special needs architects in the concept and other planning from the outset. However such specialists need to be 'applied realists': it is unfair to an OCOG to expect them on top of everything else to rectify all the access omissions of previous years. But where 'new build' is concerned they have no excuse and should provide the examples of best practice.

Unlike transport this 'fixed' development once under construction can prove highly complex and expensive to modify. The reluctance of planners historically to involve such specialists early in the process is the belief that the consequences of incorporating Paralympic needs will simply add to what is already a huge investment cost.

What they often fail to realise is that many of the practical requirements are user-friendly to Olympians, Paralympians and the post-Games users. One simple example is the use of ramps instead of stairs: user-friendly for all and cheaper construction costs.

Experience has shown that Paralympians can use (survive) an unmodified Olympic Village. An early example is Rome 1960 and the first Paralympics. A few days before the first arrivals, the organisers were informed that they could not use the Olympic Village accommodation equipped with lifts must use the part with stairs. Instead of cancelling the whole event Italian soldiers were drafted in to carry the athletes in their wheelchairs to their rooms. (It is unlikely that the health and safety regulations of countries would permit this solution nowadays.)

95% of the Olympic Village does not require modification but unfortunately for those who feel that this is an argument for doing nothing, the remaining 5% is the 'nuclear core'; if those elements are badly planned then a Paralympic Village is provided that is decidedly unfriendly. There are some other significant examples of such failures in the recent past but propriety suggests that none should be sited here.

Post-Games research has shown that one can identify at least 10 key factors critical to the design and management of the Paralympic Village. Although in some cases these factors appear general for everyone they have particular relevance when applied to Paralympic athletes.

Factors for a user-friendly Paralympic village[1]

1. personal privacy
2. good topography/access
3. close to external amenities
4. good internal amenities
5. tight security and health/safety consideration
6. freedom from congestion
7. variety/availability of food services
8. bathroom hygiene/general cleaning
9. individual information services
10. flexible/sensitive management

It would be possible to dedicate the whole of this paper to a discussion about Village infrastructure but in the interests of brevity two excellent examples of Olympic/Paralympic Villages will be used to compare and contrast two of the aspects above.

Barcelona 1992

When these criteria were tested with athletes, post-Games, Barcelona scored very high achieving 44 from a possible 50. Before conducting the test the subjective view was of a much higher score. However although Barcelona scored very high on factor 2 (good topography/access) because the beachside location was very flat, it scored less well on factor 10 (flexible and sensitive management).

[1] Each of the ten elements is given a weighting ranging from 1 to 5, with 1 satisfying the criteria least and 5 being a near perfect score. Thus 44 in the two examples show a high degree of athlete satisfaction with the Village – when this model was applied to another Paralympic Village the score was just 28.

The Barcelona staff was very friendly and anxious to help but many of them including some of the senior Village managers did not speak English very well. Where athletes interacted with staff at the 'sharp end', 'the delivery end' there were occasions when they were unable to provide the simplest of services easily – examples, servers in the dining hall, cleaners, resident centre volunteers.

Sydney 2000

The Sydney Olympic Village also scored 44 out of a possible 50 but for different reasons. Sydney scored very high on factor 10 because the staff could speak good English and had been trained to operate in a 'customer-orientated' environment. The key to their approach was that decisions wherever possible should be made at the lowest level of the organisational structure. But and there is always a but, this Village did not score as high as Barcelona on factor 2.

The Village was built on a slope leading down from Silverwater Road to the Homebush site where all the major sports venues were located including the main Stadium. In spite of locating as many Paralympians in the flat part of the Village along Spine Road and providing a good IVTS (in-Village transport system) the gradients inhibited those who used wheelchairs for daily living or had ambulant difficulties from enjoying the same degree of independence to that provided in Barcelona.

5. Issues and challenges

Every single sports organisation in the world faces new challenges every day. The world is changing so rapidly and with those changes comes uncertainties. When this phenomenon combines with the very high expectations and ambitions of elite, ego-centric athletes, the sports' organisational environment becomes very volatile.

The Paralympic Movement is not shielded in this regard. Indeed its growing notoriety and media attention means that while its athletes at last begin to enjoy the recognition for their sports performances, the organisation which supports them becomes more susceptible to criticism and negative analysis. The dangers are there for all to see.

Probably one of the most significant issues is the protection of the Movement from those who wish to pretend to be a 'disabled athlete' – whether a journalist as was the case in Sydney or other person who is not physically disabled but sees entry into the Paralympic Games and subsequent revelation as an able-bodied person as their only vehicle to an otherwise unremarkable life. Clearly the IPC has a responsibility to do all it can to ensure this abuse does not happen but as with all systems no matter how secure, it is very difficult to defend against a determined individual.

Linked to the last issue is that of athlete classification and here there are both internal and external issues. Paralympic sport will never enjoy the same clarity in every individual discipline that comes from having one gold medal and thus one Paralympic champion. One of the underlying principles of sport is that competition should be fair. Sports go to significant lengths to ensure they maintain this principle – judo/boxing use weight classifications, orienteering use age classifications. Thus it is generally believed that in Paralympic sport the development of the functional classification system has provided an opportunity to merge classes from different disability groups thus increasing the value of the medal and level of world competition.

This does not mean that a blind athlete might compete against an athlete who uses a wheelchair for daily living. But it does mean that a paraplegic athlete could/does compete against a cerebral palsy athlete with similar physical potential using wheelchairs. In this latter case it could even mean that an athlete with a leg amputation who normally walks and has a prosthetic aid could decide to use the wheelchair to race because he has the same physical potential as the paraplegic and cerebral palsy athletes after assessment. Why might he do this? It may be that he finds it easier to compete in this way rather than running on a prosthesis and/or he simply sees the racing wheelchair as a piece of sports equipment. As the stigma of the wheelchair diminishes in society this approach could grow. Even now in wheelchair basketball because of the popularity of the game and in some regions of the world because of a lack of players, able-bodied people play the sport at a domestic level on a regular basis.

Internally this move to merge meets with two kinds of opposition. Those who genuinely worry about the fairness of the system because it is under development and mistakes can still occur in those crucial assessments.

Then there remain a few who oppose because they do not want to see any diminution in classes because they know they will face tougher opposition and less chance to win medals. There is no doubt which view will ultimately prevail.

Of course doping and unethical performance enhancing techniques are significant issues within Paralympic sport. IPC has signed up to the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) agreements and there is more and more competition and out-of-competition testing. However we cannot be complacent as WADA can only control those elements that it knows about. WADA therefore needs to incorporate Paralympic experts to educate and instruct its officers and regulation makers in any potential unethical practices that are specific to high performance athletes with a disability and are made possible because of the specific nature of the individual's disability.

Probably the greatest threat being experienced similarly in the Olympic movement and other major sports federations is the huge difference between those who 'have' and those who 'have not'. In Paralympic sport the major inhibitor to participation equity is the attitude towards people with a disability in some societies and the explosion in sophisticated equipment with all the expense involved in areas such as designer wheelchairs and prosthetics. There is no doubt that sport has driven innovation in these critical areas and the benefits to society as a whole are enormous. Lighter, more manoeuvrable wheelchairs, prosthetics that are designed for the efficiency of the mechanics rather than cosmetically have all changed the way people can live their lives. But to the child in some very poor country recently maimed by a land-mine any kind of independent means of moving is a luxury and a far cry from the made-to-measure mobility we see on our 'sophisticated' streets every day. IPC now knows that it has a leading role to play in bridging this gap.

The most important factor at this time is the continued development of a positive and mutually supporting role between the IOC and the IPC – so in effect this lesson has come full

circle. Can the IPC ever see the day when it can stand alone without the IOC? The answer is maybe but unlikely. The supplementary question has to be, why should it? The best way for IPC to meet the ever increasing demands of its athletes and match their standards in terms of the organisation of the Paralympic Games is by this amazing, fortuitous link. The Olympic Games guarantee that approximately two weeks after that major event there is a reprise on a smaller scale but with all the venues and infrastructure in place for a parallel event for elite athletes with a disability, Paralympians.

6. Conclusions

This paper would not be improved by concluding with a series of soon-to-be forgotten statistics. Rather the aim should be to stimulate further thought and research. A useful methodology is often to leave the final words to others.

Seoul, South Korea 1988

> *"Even now there are many Koreans feeling shameful to have physically or other disabled members in their family. They hide them and this is why the ministry has only been informed of 900,000 disabled persons when there are over four million disabled Koreans in our estimate. The Paralympics have awoken many Koreans who have been asleep by uprooting prejudice against the handicapped. Koreans saw the athletes running and laughing with their friends and realized that the blind sympathy or over-sensitivity for the disabled is not appreciated. Gradually they started to accept the athletes as they are and very slowly they became aware of the indifference of their friends and family members hidden behind the wall of excessive protection or shame. No single event in Korean history has so radically changed our society in such a short space of time."*
>
> *Kow-Kwi-Nam*
> *President*
> *Seoul Paralympic Organising Committee*

Barcelona, Spain 1992

> *"If Olympism is* 'a philosophy of life, exalting and combining in a balanced whole the qualities of body, will and mind (Olympic Charter. Fundamental Principle 2)' *then there*

is little basis or need to use a different expression, Paralympism to allude to an ideology which in every way also speaks of the same principle."

Fernand Landry

Landry (1995)

These quotations are worthy of a debate, but that's for another lesson on another day.

Bibliography

Landry, Fernand (1995): "Paralympic Games and social integration", in Moragas, Miquel de and Miquel Botella (eds.): *The Keys to success: the social, sporting, economic and communication impact of Barcelona'92.* Bellaterra : Servei de Publicacions de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, p. 124-138. Available online at: http://olympicstudies.uab.es/pdf/wp041_eng.pdf

Further readings

Beasley, Kim Allen (1996): "The Paralympic village: a barrier-free city", in Miquel de Moragas, Montserrat Llinés and Bruce Kidd (eds.): Olympic Villages: a hundred years of urban planning and shared experiences. International Symposium on Olympic Villages, Lausanne, 1996. Lausanne : International Olympic Committee, p. 105-119.
Available on-line at: *http://blues.uab.es/olympic.studies/pdf/OD003_eng.pdf*

Guttmann, L. (1976): *Textbook of sport for the disabled*. Oxford : Aylesbury Bucks.

Medawar, J. and D. Pyke (1999): *Hitler's gift: scientists who fled Nazi Germany*. London : R. Cohen : In association with the European Jewish Publishing Society.

Sainsbury, T. (1996): "Athletes at the Paralympic Village", in Miquel de Moragas, Montserrat Llinés and Bruce Kidd (eds.): *Olympic Villages: a hundred years of urban planning and shared experiences. International Symposium on Olympic Villages, Lausanne, 1996.* Lausanne : International Olympic Committee, p. 173-179.

Scruton, J. (1998): *Stoke Mandeville road to the Paralympics: fifty years of history*. Brill Aylesbury : Peterhouse Press.

Strohkendl, H. (1996): *The 50th anniversary of wheelchair basketball: a history.* New York : Waxmann.

Svardal, G. (1994): *Paralympics '94: no limits.* Oslo : Typografisk a.s.

Tiessen, J. A. (1997): *The Triumph of the human spirit: the Atlanta Paralympic experience.* Ontario : Disability Today Publishing Group.

Related web sites

Cerebral Palsy International Sports and Recreation Association
http://www.cpisra.org/

International Blind Sports Federation
http://www.ibsa.es/

International Olympic Committee
http://www.olympic.org/

International Paralympic Committee
http://www.paralympic.org/

International Stoke Mandeville Wheelchair Sports Federation
http://www.wsw.org.uk/

International Sports Federation for Persons with Intellectual Disability
http://www.inas-fid.org/

Paralympics Fact sheet: Australian Sport Commission
http://www.ausport.gov.au/info/Factsheets/para.html

Sydney 2000: Accessibility information
http://www.gamesinfo.com.au/ac/index.html

Series **University Lectures | 15**

Paralympics: past, present and future

This lecture provides an analysis of the emergence of the Paralympic Movement, from its origins at the Stoke Mandeville Games to the agreement between the International Paralympic Committee (IPC) and the International Olympic Committee (IOC) that has shaped the organisation of the Paralympic Games. Insight is provided into the nature of Paralympic sports, their organisation and infrastructural requirements. Consideration is also given to the key issues and challenges facing the Paralympic Movement including its classification system for athletes, doping and the IPC-IOC agreement.

Tony Sainsbury

ceo UAB

Centre d'Estudis Olímpics
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Edifici N. 1a. planta
08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona)
Spain

Phone +34 93 581 1992
Fax +34 93 581 2139

http://ceo.uab.cat
ceoie@uab.cat