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In October of 2000, the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and the International Paralympic Committee (IPC) signed an official agreement that brought them into a close working relationship with each other. In June 2001, their relationship further solidified with an agreement that integrated the organizing committees for the respective Games through 2010. These unprecedented co-operative agreements benefit the promotion of the official ideologies and public image of both organizations. Prior to the signing of them, however, little official relationship existed between the IOC and international organizations of disability sport like the IPC, largely due to the slow development and fractured nature of the disability sport movement. The International Paralympic Committee only came into existence in 1989, but “Paralympic Games” have been held quadrennially since 1960 in some form, and various disability sports federations have operated since the 1920s. The IOC never got directly involved with the Paralympics until the mid 1990s, and its support of disability sport and the Paralympics had never extended much beyond recognition or official endorsement. This raises questions of why and how this new, close working relationship developed.

The IOC’s response to developments in international disability sport progressed through four stages. In the earliest and longest stage, from the 1950s to the early 1980s, the IOC quietly monitored and reported on developments as they occurred and offered some tokens of recognition and support. The second stage, loosely from the early 1980s to early 1990s, saw personal and public support for disability sport from the new IOC President Juan Antonio Samaranch, and attempts at integration into the Olympic Games. During this time, the “Olympic Family” was drawn into contact with the Paralympics largely on the initiative of the Organizing Committees of the Olympic Games (OCOGs) of Seoul in 1988 and Barcelona in 1992. In the third stage, roughly the decade of the 1990s, direct relationships between the Paralympic and Olympic movements began, both in terms of support and struggle. With the signing of the Co-Operative Agreements of 2000 and 2001, the IOC and IPC moved into a fourth stage, of close co-operation and relations. Brought about mainly by the growth of the Paralympics in terms of public popularity and commercial viability, the current relationship mutually benefits both organizations, in terms of the creation and management of image and control over world sport.

Monitoring of Events

The IOC’s earliest response to developing disability sports was practically a non-response, quietly monitoring developments as they occurred, and reporting them to their members through official publications. The tokens of recognition and support offered by the IOC remained few and far between until the early 1980s. International disability sports slowly developed from the 1950s on, mainly through separate disability groups and organizations promoting sport for themselves.

Major developments in disability sport leading to the Paralympics occurred after the Second World War, when rehabilitation programs for veterans with disabilities began to use physical activity, and sport in particular, as therapy. Among many Post-War rehabilitative programs, the most significant in the history of the Paralympics was Dr. Ludwig Guttmann’s work at the Stoke Mandeville Hospital in Aylesbury, England, during the late 1940s and 1950s. Sports competitions for people using wheelchairs grew out of his rehabilitative work, with the organization of the first Stoke Mandeville Games in 1948. These games became annual, and added more sports and competitors over time, becoming international in 1952. By 1960 the International Stoke Mandeville Games had grown into a multi-sport event of 350 athletes from 22 countries. The 1960 games, held in Rome in the former Olympic facilities and called “the Olympiad for the Disabled,” are considered to be the first “Paralympics.”
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and public popularity of these games convinced the organizers, the International Stoke Mandeville Games Federation (ISMGF), to attempt to conduct their Games held during Olympic years, in the country that had hosted the Summer Olympics. The quadrennial “Paralympics” grew in number of athletes and countries competing, so that by 1972 in Heidelberg, 1000 wheelchair athletes from 44 countries competed.8

As the ISMGF ran the early Paralympic Games, only athletes with spinal cord injuries competed in them until 1976. Sport for people with other disabilities developed independently of the ISMGF. The World Federation for Ex-servicemen created the International Sport Organization for the Disabled (ISOD) in Paris in 1964. ISOD historically served as the international governing body for sport programs for amputees, dwarf athletes, and the group known as “Les Autres” (individuals with other physical and locomotor disabilities who did not fit into regular classification schemes).9 Athletes with cerebral palsy (CP) received attention in 1968 when the International Cerebral Palsy Society formed a sub-committee on sport and leisure. Over time, the committee’s activities expanded, and it became a separate entity in 1978, the Cerebral Palsy-International Sport and Recreation Association (CP-ISRA).10 Athletes from the ISOD groups first competed at the 1976 Paralympic Games, and athletes with CP in 1980.

International disability sport experienced much fragmentation in its early years, as it developed on the basis of disability, not on a sport-by-sport basis like “mainstream” international sporting federations. Each group watched over its own concerns, and competing visions of the purpose of disability sport existed. Sir Ludwig Guttmann’s vision of disability sport as primarily for medical rehabilitation, for example, clashed with the views of others advocating sport for sport’s sake, or those with vision of elite-level sport.11 Despite such problems, the Paralympics grew into a large, multi-sport, multi-disability event. Winter Paralympics started in 1976 at Ornsköldsvik, Sweden, and the 1980 Summer Games, held in Geilo, Norway, hosted 2500 athletes from 42 countries, including athletes with amputations, visual impairments, spinal cord injuries, and cerebral palsy.12

The first forms of IOC response to developments in disability sport occurred in the 1950s and 1960s. In 1955, the IOC officially recognized the world organization for deaf sport, the Comité International des Sports des Sourds (CISS), which had been founded in 1924.13 Recognition by the IOC carried prestige and obligation. As noted in the CISS official history, “Following this recognition, the CISS agreed at the 14th Congress in Milan in 1957 to amend its statutes in accordance with the Olympic spirit. This meant that the word “Olympic” and five ring emblems shall not be used by the CISS.”14 Recognition by the IOC thus meant the exertion of control.

In 1956, the IOC awarded the Fearnley Cup, one of its annual awards, to the Stoke Mandeville Institute, in recognition of its work in sport and disability,15 and awarded its Olympic Cup to CISS for 1966.16 Other than these recognitions and awards, the IOC seemed content to quietly monitor early developments in disability sport, much as it did for world sport in general. Several brief mentions to events or occurrences in disability sport appeared in the IOC Newsletter and Olympic Review between 1963 and 1970, but otherwise, little notice was paid.17

During the 1970s, the IOC began to take more of an interest in physical activity and sport for the physically disabled— a brief series of articles written by administrators within disability sport appeared in Olympic Review, two of which Sir Ludwig Guttmann authored.18 These articles had heavy medical and rehabilitative tones, and read largely as informational pieces for people who followed trends within sport in general. Until the 1980s, the IOC made no real moves towards support or integration of disability sport, limiting itself to such informational pieces.

**Coming Closer: Samaranch and the OCOGs**

At the beginning of the 1980s, the IOC moved into a second stage of relations to international disability sport through the efforts of its new president Juan Antonio Samaranch, and initiatives undertaken by the OCOGs for the 1988 Seoul and 1992 Barcelona Summer Games. In this period, two new disability sports organizations came into existence, the International Blind Sports Federation (IBSA) in 1981, and the International Association of Sport for Persons with Mental Handicaps (INAS-FID) in 1986. This stage saw the rise of what might be identified as a true “Paralympic Movement,” and a period of both unification and fragmentation of disability sports organizations.

The first umbrella organization of international disability sport governing bodies was formed in 1983, the International Coordinating Committee of World Sports Organizations for the Disabled, known as the ICC for short. It led a short and contentious existence. Negotiation with the IOC was one of the major reasons behind the creation of the ICC, as the IOC had expressed a desire to deal with a single governing body in its negotiations with the disability sport community.19 The first meeting of the organizations in 1985 resulted in two things: official recognition of the ICC by the IOC, and official adoption of the term “Paralympics” as the name for the quadrennial disability sports festival, as the IOC characteristically demanded that any use of the word “Olympic” or variants on it be ceased.20

Member organizations disliked the structure of the ICC, and the depth of in-fighting led to the 1984 Summer Paralympics being split into two.21 Due to the many problems, the member federations of the ICC voted to change its format and create a new organization, the International Paralympic Committee (IPC), in 1989. The sports federations that made up the founding members...
of the IPC included CP-ISRA, IBSA, INAS-FID, ISMWSF, ISOD, and CISS.

The recognition of the ICC and IOC patronage of various Paralympic Games from 1984 to 1992, demonstrated a more active promotion of disability sport by the IOC in the 1980s and early 1990s. Much of the beginnings of this relationship can be traced back to the new IOC President at the time, Juan Antonio Samaranch.

Many examples of Samaranch promoting or supporting disability sports organization can be found in Olympic Movement publications throughout this second stage of involvement. For example, Samaranch gave a speech at the 1981 World Games for the Deaf, and said, "I am very interested to see the number of clubs, committees, or federations which deal with sport for the handicapped of all kinds. We [the IOC] are well aware of the difficulties they [disability sports groups] face in their work and take this opportunity to remind them of the special interest we take in them." Other brief examples of Samaranch being a booster of disability sport include his raising of the topic in an interview about himself in 1985, an appeal he made to the International Sports Federations in a 1986 meeting to follow "the IOC’s lead" and integrate more athletes with disabilities, and his personal patronage of the Paralympic Games in 1992. While reports of the Presidents activities in Olympic Review would of course only be glowingly complimentary, Samaranch appeared sincere in his support for disability sport.

During the Olympic Games of 1984, the IOC made moves towards integrating athletes with disabilities. In Sarajevo, amputee athletes competed in nordic and alpine demonstration events, and in Los Angeles, wheelchair athletes competed in track events. Similar exhibition events happened in the Olympic Games of 1988 and 1992. One possible reason for the IOC moving towards integration was that it tied into the new concept of “Sport for All” in the 1980s. However, the IOC Committee on Mass Sport (later the Sport for All Committee), only came into being in 1985, the year after athletes with disabilities first competed at the Olympics. The most plausible reason for the IOC’s attempt at integration is that the President desired them. An article in Olympic Review prior to the Sarajevo Games noted that “following the IOC President’s wishes, a disabled men’s skiing competition will be held in Sarajevo as a demonstration event...” Samaranch appears to be the major impetus behind the early attempts at integration, and his support of disability sports would continue throughout his time in office.

While personal support came from the President’s office throughout the 1980s, the IOC had no direct involvement with disability sports organization until the mid 1990s. The “Olympic Family” only came into direct working relationships with disability sport through the initiatives of the organizing committees for the 1988 Seoul Games and the 1992 Barcelona Games.

The Seoul Olympic Organizing Committee offered its facilities and administrative assistance for the organization of the 1988 Paralympics. Seh Jik Park, President of the committee, wrote that, “It is the first time that the Olympic and Paralympic Organizing Committees are making an integrated and co-ordinated effort in order for human resources and sports installations to be fully utilized.” The Olympic and Paralympic organizing committees worked closely together for the first time, and the Seoul event set the precedent for the Paralympics to closely follow the Olympic games, in Olympic facilities. Seoul’s hosting of the Paralympics fit into the OCOG’s stated notions of the “Olympic Spirit,” which included ‘compassion’ and ‘unity through sport.’ It also provided the city with another sporting festival through which it could promote itself on the world stage, further demonstrating Korea’s ‘new era.’

Despite being the largest until then (3053 competitors, 61 nations), the Games were incredibly successful, and marked the completion of the transition to elite sport for the Paralympics, with 971 world records. The improved competition, organization, and stature of the Seoul Games later prompted former IPC president Robert Steadward to look back and call them “the first Modern Paralympics.”

The Barcelona Olympic Organizing Committee followed Seoul’s example, organizing the 1992 Paralympics two weeks after the Olympic Games. Like Seoul, the Barcelona Organizing Committee also acted independently of the IOC on the Paralympic issue, although the IOC President probably had some influence over the events in his home country. By all accounts, the Barcelona Paralympics were excellent in organization, more elite than ever, and popular among television audiences, with an estimated seven million viewers for the first-time broadcast.

**Beginnings of Direct Relationship**

The 1992 Games represented a transition into the third stage of IOC involvement with disability sport, where it began to become directly involved in the Paralympics and the activities of the IPC. In 1993, the IPC took over the IOC’s recognition as the main governing body for international disability sport. Despite the increasing status of the Paralympic Games and unification under the IPC banner, disability sport still experienced fragmentation in the 1990s. CISS broke away from the IPC in 1994 and opened up its own negotiations with the IOC. In 1997, the IBSA threatened to do the same. In the latter case, the IOC brokered the resolution of conflict, and President Samaranch hosted the signing of a cooperation agreement between the IPC and IBSA in Lausanne. This event indicated the IOC’s developing role in disability sport, and the IPC’s increasing ties to the IOC. The developing relationship, at times rocky, met some resistance within the IOC.

Receiving official recognition from the IOC requires that an organization agrees to abide by the “IOC spirit” and IOC rules.
As part of receiving the IOC recognition in 1993, the IPC had to change its official logo. The IPC logo had first appeared at the Seoul Games in 1988, a five “tear-drop” design based on the concept of Yin and Yang. At the 1992 Executive Board meeting, Vice President Richard Pound reported that he “had met with IPC about the disabled sports logo. Nothing had happened so far and he had ‘threatened’ not to give any more support until they were prepared to design a new logo.” Former IPC President Bob Steadward later related the story of the conflict,

the IOC felt that it was too similar to the five rings [Olympic Logo], making it very difficult to market the two organizations if they co-existed with a similarly designed yet entirely different logo. As a result, the IPC modified their logo in order to preserve the excellent relationship that had developed with the IOC...It was, however, a very sensitive issue with many members of our movement.

In this instance, the IOC supported the Paralympic movement with recognition, but drew the line when it influenced commercial decisions.

The IOC began to give the IPC some funding in the mid-1990s, although when this began is not specifically mentioned in the minutes of IOC meetings. In 1989, the IOC denied an IPC request for funding but, by 1994, the Executive board held discussions on the IPC’s distribution of IOC funding to its member organizations. In 1997, the Executive Board decided to increase its annual subsidy to “Disabled Sport” by 20%, but again listed no specific amounts. The IOC gave some funding to the IPC throughout the 1990s, but guaranteed amounts only came through the 2000 Cooperative Agreement.

The IOC began to back away from integration of athletes with disabilities into the Olympic Games in this third period, instead concentrating on support of the Paralympic Games. Samaranch still advocated for some forms of integration, even though he made it “quite clear that disabled sport would never be integrated in the Games.” Resistance arose in other parts of the Olympic Family. In a 1995 IOC Executive Committee meeting, Richard Pound, with the support of colleagues, “opposed to include events for the disabled on the Olympic Programme.” No decision was made on that motion but, in 1998, the Committee denied the request to make wheelchair events in Sydney 2000 full medal status. Towards the end of the 1990s, the IPC itself began to look for greater support of the Paralympics instead of integration.

All Paralympic Summer and Winter Games from 1994 to 2000 followed closely after the respective Olympic Games in the same facilities. The success of these Games required cooperation between the IOC, the IPC, and the OCOGs, which did not readily transpire in some cases. Despite initial resistance from the OCOG, in Lillehammer the largest-ever Winter Paralympic Games progressed quite smoothly, mostly because the Lillehammer Olympic Organizing Committee President became the Paralympic Committee President. The 1996 Atlanta Games, on the other hand, experienced many problems. ACOG largely resisted involvement with the Paralympics. Little co-operation occurred between the Atlanta Olympic and Paralympic Organizing Committees, leading to problems with organization, facilities, communications, and transportation. In Nagano and Sydney, close cooperation between the organizing committees led to very successful Games.

Throughout this third stage, the IOC debated whether or not cities bidding for the Olympic Games should be forced to conduct the Paralympic Games as well (a clause entrenched in the new cooperative agreements). The issue first arose in an Executive Board meeting in September of 1991, and went into further review by the Sports Director. In 1992, the decision was made that “Costs of staging Paralympics would only increase and IOC could not recommend OCOGs to host Paralympics as well.” Samaranch accepted the majority opinion, but “wished it recorded that he urged and recommended the 2000 bid cities to organize Paralympics as well.” Two years later, Pound insisted that the IOC had to take a neutral or opposed position on host-cities organizing the Paralympics, but Samaranch continued to insist that ACOG had responsibilities for them. The issue faded off somewhat towards the end of the decade, as the OCOGs for Nagano, Sydney, and Salt Lake City came to hosting agreements for the Paralympics fairly amicably.

Part of the increasing relationship during the third stage came from constant pressure from the IPC. The IPC pressed for more integration in the Olympic Games in the early 1990s, and constantly kept pressure on for inclusion by host cities. For example, the IPC requested that the IOC not consider 6 of the 9 candidates for 2000 as they were not prepared to host the Paralympics, and in 1997, sent out its requirements to candidate cities without consulting the IOC. The IPC sought a close relationship with the IOC for administrative reasons, and to improve its public image and standing in world sport.

Creating Image and Gaining Control: The Co-operative Agreements

The Co-Operative Agreements signed by the IPC and IOC in 2000 and 2001 brought them into a fourth stage of relationship, working directly with each other. The agreements were designed to foster a closer working relationship between the two organizations, streamline marketing and sponsorship, and force the integration of Olympic organizing committees and Paralympic organizing committees. Moreover, they allowed each organization to improve its public image, and gain more control over world sport.

Samaranch and Steadward signed the “Co-Operation Agreement Between the International Olympic Committee and the Inter-
national Paralympic Committee” on October 20, 2000, in Sydney, Australia. The agreement held the following terms: The IPC President was co-opted as a member of the IOC; the IPC gained representation on ten IOC Commissions, including Coordination for the Olympic Games, Athletes, and Sport for All; the IPC will receive an annual financial contribution from the IOC of US$ 300,000 from 2001 to 2004, with the possibility of a new assessment in 2002, and an annual subsidy from the IOC of US$ 100,000 for IPC development projects. As well, the IOC pledged financial contributions to assist athletes from developing countries in the Paralympic Games.49

On June 19, 2001, the “Agreement on the Organisation of the Paralympic Games” was signed in Lausanne. This agreement “aimed at securing and protecting the organisation of the Paralympic Games, and shall be in effect from [until] the 2008 Paralympic Games and the 2010 Paralympic Winter Games. It addresses the general scope and organisation of the Paralympic Games, with the aim of creating similar principles for the organisation of the Olympic and Paralympic Games.”50 The Agreement reaffirmed that the Paralympic Games would always take place shortly after the Olympic Games, using the same sporting venues and facilities.

These agreements enabled both associations to boost their public images. Over the last decade or so, the IOC has been a beleaguered association, suffering from doping and corruption scandals, to name but two. Much as with the IOC’s new “Third Pillar of Environmentalism,” associating with a disability sport group supposedly purer and more inclusive, helped prop up the IOC’s image. Interestingly, the more the IPC moves towards an elite sport model, the more it encounters its own problems of doping, mis-classification of athletes and inequality, so this image may yet wear thin.

For its part, the IPC improves its image of being elite sport. The Paralympic Games still struggles with public misconceptions about the purpose of disability sport and its elite nature.51 Associating with the IOC, seen as the pinnacle of “amateur” sport, might help associate the Paralympics more with elite sport in the public eye.

The International Olympic Committee is probably the most powerful association in sport in the world today. Throughout its history, the IOC has made moves to consolidate its power and get the rest of the world’s sports organizations to operate by Olympic guidelines. For example, the IOC co-opted the Women’s Olympic movement in the 1930s just as it gained momentum.52 The move towards co-operating with the IPC might be seen as a similar means of gaining more control over a burgeoning sports movement. The summer Paralympics have gained to be the second-largest multi-sport event in the world, eclipsing other events such as the Commonwealth or the World University Games. The 2000 Games in Sydney hosted 3824 athletes from 122 countries, and had a budget of 136 million USD.53 The Co-Operative Agreements gave the IOC some control over the growth of the Paralympics. As part of the second Agreement, the size of the Paralympics was limited to no more than 22 sports/disciplines for the Summer Games, and eight sports/disciplines for the Winter Games.54 This restriction on the Paralympics, while fitting into the IOC’s own attempts to cut back on the size of its Games, may also be construed as a move to make sure that the Paralympics, already second in size only to the Olympics, do not reach “Olympian” proportions.

While the agreements meant that the IPC lost some of its autonomy to the IOC, they also meant that the IPC gained some control over world sport, and over its own future. The close association with the IOC affirms the power of the IPC over international disability sport, which remains somewhat fragmented, and thus represents a consolidation of power for the IPC.

The agreements also guaranteed the survival of the Paralympic Games, through the integration of future Paralympic and Olympic organizing committees. To maintain its current state, the IPC is largely dependent on the beneficence of the IOC for its survival, because it needs the use of Olympic facilities. The Paralympic movement has become too large to be able to conduct its Summer Games in anything short of Olympic-type facilities. Building their own Olympic-style facilities would be entirely too cost prohibitive; even more established multi-sport competitions like the Commonwealth or Pan-American Games rely heavily on existing facilities. To maintain its present state, the IPC needs the close association with the IOC, and the Co-Operative Agreements give it some control over its immediate future.

Conclusion

The International Olympic Committee has moved through four stages of involvement with disability sport on the international level, from greatly distanced monitoring of events, to the current close working relationship with the IPC inaugurated by the Co-Operative Agreements of 2000 and 2001. The relationship arose through the IOC’s response to historical developments in disability sport, guided by its ideological missions and its vision of itself.

The first period saw the founding of international sports competitions for people with disabilities, and a period of slow growth with much in-fighting. The IOC, from its position as the major organization in amateur sport, reported back to its members on developments and offered minor tokens of support. At a time when the Paralympics began to grow in size and include more disability groups, the IOC elected a President sympathetic to disability sport, and Olympic host cities began to look at the Paralympic Games as another sports festival worthy of attention. The IOC made some attempts at integration in the Olympic games in the 1980s, but otherwise remained very much at arms length from disability sport. In the third stage, the Paralympic Movement
became large and vocal enough that the IOC had to become more involved with it. Throughout the 1990s, the IOC provided some funding and support for the IPC, and all the Paralympics from 1994 to 2000 used the Olympic facilities. The decade witnessed pressure from the IPC for further relations, and the exercising of control by the IOC in the Paralympic logo issue.

With the signing of Co-Operative Agreements at the turn of the 21st century, the IOC and IPC entered into an unprecedented working partnership, through which both organizations gained more control over world sport, and boosted their public images. The IPC lost some of its autonomy in signing these agreements, but guaranteed its survival as a major multi-sport event. The current agreements last until 2010. The future will tell whether the close ties that exist now will be strengthened or severed upon further review.
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