

Legacy Challenges and Opportunities: Comparing the Rio 2016 and Tokyo 2020 Paralympics

Lyusyena Kirakosyan

(Virginia Tech Institute for Policy and Governance, USA)

Introduction

The literature on sporting mega-events suggested that hosting the Olympics and Paralympics may yield long-term benefits, including economic, social, sporting, environmental, and political legacies within a host city and nation. However, a positive legacy is not a given and requires planning and integration strategies with the long-term development vision of the host city.

Turning Paralympic Games' success and plans into legacy outcomes has been accompanied by challenges and opportunities unique to each event. The article will examine such circumstances for the Rio 2016 and Tokyo 2020 Paralympic Games from a comparative perspective. The study is motivated by the need to explore legacy across multiple contexts to consider how contextual features enable and constrain the process of legacy production. In the view of Bocarro, Byers and Carter (2017), such analysis may lead to a more robust understanding of the legacy process and its contextual factors.

This article is organized into five parts. First, I outline critical debates around sporting mega-event legacies, with an emphasis on the Paralympic legacy. Second, I summarize the key circumstances of the Rio 2016 Games and highlight its unique Paralympic legacy-related opportunities and challenges that have since evolved. Third, I highlight the relevant details of the Tokyo 2020 Games with a focus on its Paralympic legacy's distinct challenges and opportunities. Fourth, a comparative analysis of both cases reveals insights that I hope are helpful to better grasp the meaning of each Paralympics and their respective legacies. I conclude by attempting to discern lessons with broad relevance for practitioners and scholars interested in

participatory and transparent policy development in all aspects of the mega-event and its legacy production.

Legacy, Leveraging and Paralympics

According to Girginov and Hills (2008), the notion of a sporting mega-event legacy grew out of the Olympic Movement's pursuit of increased global recognition, self-promotion, and power projection. Legacy planning has become essential in any bid process and aims to leave lasting impacts on the hosting city, region or nation (Harris and Dowling, 2022). While analysts debate about the legacy definitions, categories and frameworks and which impacts to prioritize, there is mounting evidence that many of these legacies haven't materialized to date and the costly sporting mega-event cycle continues with little policy learning (Grix et al., 2017; Harris and Dowling, 2022). In turn, Chalip (2017) suggested that perhaps the problem with legacy is in our lack of complete comprehension of how to pursue legacy and build such plans into event organizing. Possibly focusing on fewer legacies with a more sustained effort and investment would produce better outcomes.

However, as Brittain, Bocarro and Byers (2018) argued, legacy is not only an outcome of good planning and adequate financing. Winning the bid seven years before the Olympics and Paralympics makes it unfeasible to foresee and plan for global, regional and local political, social and economic changes in the future. This, in turn, makes it challenging to guarantee any legacy. The Rio 2016 and Tokyo 2020 examples discussed in more detail below illustrate this complex interplay of factors and the importance of context. Nevertheless, legacy rhetoric remains a vital public relations tool as it promotes a vision for a better future enabled by an event.

Instead of debating legacy definitions, categories, and frameworks, some scholars suggested focusing on strategic processes to leverage the events' opportunities for legacy potentials and improvements in the host community (Chalip, 2017; Knott and Swart, 2017; Misener, 2017). Leverage places responsibility on those who manage development in the host community rather than event organizers responsible for staging the sporting (Chalip, 2017). However, critics contended that although the inclusion of leveraging has contributed to understanding legacy, by focusing on rational planning and tangible mechanisms as determinants of legacy, it remains

limited: leveraging prevents more profound knowledge of why we need to produce legacy, why specific legacies may occur, and how different types of legacy are related to one another (Bocarro, Byers and Carter, 2017). Besides, mega-event organizers often face conflicting legacy-related priorities during the planning stages (for instance, economic vs. environmental legacies), dealing with pressure from sports governing bodies, local governments, sponsors, the media, activists, and residents to reprioritize projects (Kellison and Casper, 2017). Finally, the demands of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) or other awarding organizations can also conflict with the practical needs of the host city, as the case of Rio will well illustrate below.

Legacy categories

Scholars and practitioners suggested many typologies for the thematical organization of legacies into categories. A recent IOC legacy strategy analyzed by Harris and Dowling (2022) outlined seven legacy types: organized sport development; social development through sport; human skills, networks and innovation; culture and creative development; urban development; environment enhancement and economic value. The available academic literature has outlined mega-event legacy categories along similar lines adding national pride and international prestige/soft power (e.g., Grix et al., 2017; Gratton and Ramchandani, 2017).

In turn, the International Paralympic Committee (IPC) outlined four broad legacy categories in its Handbook (2013, p.37):

- Accessible infrastructure in sport facilities and in the overall urban development;
- Development of sport structures/organizations for people with an impairment, from grassroots to elite level;
- Attitudinal changes in the perception of the position and the capabilities of persons with an impairment as well as in the self-esteem of the people with a disability;
- Opportunities for people with an impairment to become fully integrated into social living and to reach their full potential in aspects of life beyond sports.

However, as Misener (2017) observed, a single organizing committee responsible for both Olympic and Paralympic Games has often sidelined the Paralympics and its

legacy developments. Therefore, she advocated for making the Paralympic legacy central in the hosting agenda of any candidate by ensuring proper representation of the Paralympic Movement in all aspects of planning and developing the Games.

Challenges and opportunities in creating a Paralympic legacy

While systematic research on the Paralympic Games and their impact has been limited (Adair, Darcy and Frawley, 2017; Brown and Pappous, 2018; Darcy, 2016; Misener et al., 2013), scholars discussed opportunities for positive social change that Paralympic Games bring and challenges associated with creating and researching a lasting impact.

On the opportunity side, researchers (Brittain and Beacom, 2016; Goh, 2020; Misener, 2017) argued that the Paralympic Games, as part of a broader Paralympic Movement for inclusion and equality in sporting opportunities for disabled persons, offers legacy potential concerning fundamental human rights and thus open up the space for social change. Barriers to full participation in community life, among them inaccessible infrastructures, poor attitudes towards disability, social stigmas, lack of necessary equipment and inadequate transport, could be highlighted on a platform such as the Paralympic Games. However, these opportunities have remained underexploited, underrated and often under-resourced when many host cities continue to assume that the event by itself will deliver the desired outcomes. For instance, when it comes to increased mass participation rates, such attitudes shift organizers' priorities and available resources away from grassroots and toward elite sports (Brown and Pappous, 2018; Grix et al., 2017). For a mega-event to inspire mass sport participation and health legacies, it needs coordinated leveraging, experience and knowledge of providing sport participation opportunities for people with disabilities, as well as acknowledging the societal, structural, and impairment constraints that limit disability sport participation (Adair, Darcy and Frawley, 2017; Brown and Pappous, 2018). Ultimately, as Weed (2021) argued, the failure of the Olympic and Paralympic Games to deliver health-related legacies through physical activity and sport is a policy failure to provide evidence-based strategies, leaving the potential of these legacies open for further exploration.

In terms of challenges, the Paralympic legacy is difficult to measure for a series of factors, among them: the reasons for hosting the Paralympic Games will be very

different from that of the Olympic Games; the dependency of the IPC on the IOC, resulting in a limited power of the IPC over legacy development; lack of robust legacy evidence-based measurements; lack of monitoring of the impacts from previous Games; and the problem of determining legacies specific to the Paralympic Games (Misener et al., 2013; Ogura, 2018; Pappous and Brown, 2018). Moreover, the lack of proper integration of the sporting mega-event into existing development strategies of the hosting city and nation poses additional challenges in producing meaningful and sustainable benefits (Chalip, 2017).

The following two sections examine factors that enabled and/or constrained Paralympic legacy production in Rio 2016 and Tokyo 2020. Research indicates that legacy, especially Paralympic legacy, is context-specific (Brittain, 2016; Misener, 2017), and understanding it in specific contexts would inform comparative analysis and draw out common themes.

Rio 2016

The Bid in context

When Rio de Janeiro won the right to host the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games in October 2009, Brazil was prospering. These economic circumstances gave the Brazilian government and the Rio 2016 Organizing Committee the confidence that they could put on highly successful Games creating numerous positive legacies for Rio and the rest of the nation (Brittain and Mataruna, 2018). By winning the bid, Rio regained the condition of a nation's capital lost to Brasilia in 1960 and sought to reimagine the coexistence of informal growth with planning and reconciling nature with urban development for a socially homogeneous city (Canales, 2011).

Nationally, the Brazilian government has used international sporting events of various scales as part of its economic development strategy to promote tourism, urban renewal and economic investment. Among those events were the 2007 Pan and Parapan American Games, the 2011 Military World Games, the 2013 FIFA Confederations and the 2014 FIFA World Cup, and the 2016 Rio Olympic and Paralympic Games (Almeida, 2016; Brittain and Mataruna, 2018; Millington and Darnell, 2014).

In 2009, Rio's bid for the 2016 Games was the most costly of the four candidates,

with an initial budget of US\$11.1 billion for capital investments into the highest number of new venues and urban interventions, including wide-ranging and costly transportation arteries. The bid committee spent a reported BRL\$100 million on the candidacy alone (Barbassa, 2017a). The bid documents proposed to focus on four key strategies for successful Rio 2016 Games: engaging young people; social transformation through sport; regional outreach; and global promotion (Rio 2016 Bid Committee, 2009). One of the primary motivations for the country to want to host the 2016 Games was the hope that it would provide a long-term boost to Brazil's growing reputation as "an exciting and rewarding place to live, do business and visit." (Ibid, p. 19)

Challenges and opportunities ahead of Rio 2016

On the eve of the 2016 Games, Brazil dealt with several challenges that adversely impacted the event and its planned legacies. First, the country no longer enjoyed the economic boom it did in 2009. Instead, it faced one of its worst political and economic crises ever. Amid the political crisis following the impeachment of President Dilma Rousseff, the interim government of Michel Temer threatened to reduce investments; additional issues such as environmental and health concerns over pollution and the Zika virus kept emerging in the press, criticizing Brazil for ineffective handling (Azzi, 2017). The alarming Zika news led an international group of prominent doctors and scientists to sign a petition calling for the Games to be moved or postponed, and many star athletes chose to avoid the Olympics competitions (Zimbalist, 2017a). However, no accounts mentioned Paralympic athletes withdrawing from Rio due to fears of the Zika virus (Brittain and Mataruna, 2018).

Second, during Brazil's preparation for and hosting of the 2014 World Cup and 2016 Olympics, the world followed the unprecedented corruption scandal (*Lava Jato*, or Car Wash), along with the graft of World Cup and Olympics construction contracting, campaign financing, and more (Zimbalist, 2017a). As a result of the hosting of the World Cup, media reports and experts expressed criticism that instead of showcasing the nation's capacity and ambitions for political and economic prominence, the mega-events became a catalyst for and ultimately a symbol of the corruption plaguing Brazil (Barbassa, 2017a; Koenigstorfer and Kulczycki, 2017).

Third, just seven months before the start of the Olympics, the state of Rio de

Janeiro faced one of its worst financial crises that affected public health and the public sector at large, resulting in a state of emergency before Christmas 2015 (Puff, 2016). The Rio state government's financial misdeeds and the changes in the federative distribution of the oil revenues, its primary revenue source, created enormous economic challenges (Neri, Hecksher and Osorio, 2020). Neri and Osorio (2020) argued that the Games were not responsible for the state of Rio's financial collapse, announced just before the opening ceremony. Ultimately, while Rio's economic conditions didn't result from the burden of hosting, they were undoubtedly exacerbated by it (Neri and Osorio, 2020; Zimbalist, 2017b).

Fourth, Brazil and the city of Rio de Janeiro also faced domestic security challenges, portraying to the world Rio as a safe city through an increased militarization, particularly before the 2016 Olympics (Azzi, 2017). In 2008, shortly after FIFA announced Brazil's hosting of the 2014 World Cup, both the federal and Rio state governments announced implementing a new public security program in Rio: the Police Pacifying Units (known as the UPPs). The UPPs allocated a specially trained police force in selected favelas to prepare Brazil for the World Cup and, later, for the Olympics and Paralympics. Moreover, Rio 2016 had 85,000 civil and military police patrol the city, more than doubling the force present at London 2012 (Boykoff, 2017).

Fifth, spiraling Rio 2016 costs were another big reason for concern: estimates suggested over US\$20 billion spent by 2016 vs. the initial budget of US\$14 billion. Zimbalist (2017b) cited a University of Oxford study that put the cost overrun for the Rio Olympics (not counting urban infrastructure) at 51%, or US\$21.8 billion (in 2008 dollars). The Oxford study may have been too conservative in its estimate of overruns: after the \$14.4 billion bid budget was accepted, the IOC added two sports to the Olympics competition — golf and rugby — which required additional facilities and personnel costs not considered in the original budget (Zimbalist, 2017b). Another study claimed that the costs of the Rio Games were not only the lowest compared to previous editions but also the only case of the final budget being under the initial proposal in the candidacy file (Ainbinder, 2020).

Sixth, with ballooning costs, the organizers announced 30% budget cuts and diverted all available funds towards saving the Olympic Games, at the potential expense of canceling the Paralympic Games (Brittain and Mataruna, 2018). The organizing committee failed to pay travel grants on time to the National Paralympic

Committees (NPCs), many of whom relied on these grants to send their teams to the Games. Consequently, of the 176 teams expected in Rio, only 157 teams and the team of Independent Paralympic Athletes attended (Ibid). And although the release of the federal funds on the eve of the Paralympics ensured that the event went ahead, deep cuts to services caused the downsizing of the overall event, including the volunteer force (Ibid).

Finally, the differences in how the organizers approached the Olympic and Paralympic Games and the apparent priority placed upon the Olympic Games could be seen in promoting the ticket sales. Before the Olympic Opening Ceremony, only 12% of the Paralympic Games tickets had been sold (Duarte, 2016). Ultimately, the Rio Paralympics sold more than 2 million tickets (out of 2.5 million), making them the second most successful Paralympic Games after London 2012, which sold 2.7 million tickets (IPC, 2016a).

Rio 2016 Legacies

The severe economic and political crisis in Brazil negatively impacted the ability of the organizing committee to carry out its legacy plans for the Olympic and Paralympic Games (Mataruna et al., 2015). Moreover, previous research showed that achieving sustainable legacies is more challenging in societies with high inequality, poverty, crime rate and corruption (Grix et al., 2015).

Urban development. Rio endured a long period of economic and cultural stagnation following the federal capital's move to Brasília in the 1960s, and the city's difficulties were aggravated by decades of political misalignment between federal, state and municipal governments (Nobre, 2016). Hosting several mega-events has mobilized resources from the public and private sectors and created a series of new opportunities for the city.

The first South American nation to host the Olympics and Paralympics spent over US\$20 billion in preparation for the event, with the city of Rio alone shouldering at least US\$13 billion (CFR, 2018). The city built four clusters of sporting and other facilities, connected by new highways and transportation lines, most going over the budget. For instance, a state auditor found that the city's US\$3 billion subway extension was overbilled by at least 25% (Ibid).

Rio Mayor Eduardo Paes's ambitious *Morar Carioca* (Carioca Living) project to

provide urban infrastructure to 260 favelas by 2020 made little progress, as did the city's proposed planting of 34 million trees to compensate for environmental damage associated with the Olympic construction (Nobre, 2016). Moreover, Rio witnessed significant gentrification and widespread eviction of around 77,000 residents by 2016 (Boykoff, 2017). Having set the agenda to integrate favelas in the 1990s, Rio has effectively moved away from that policy, allowing the World Cup and the Olympics to derail the process of addressing urban inequality (McGuirk, 2016). Concerning crime and security challenges, the UPPs were not a means to integrate their community into the city and connect it to resources and services, but primarily a police occupation intended to serve someone else's needs (Barbassa, 2017b). Overall, in a city where 30% of the population lives in precarious conditions, the public policies focused on favela urbanization have been oppressive and far from inclusive (Nobre, 2016).

Disability awareness-raising and accessibility. Eighteen months before the Games, a senior member of the Brazilian Paralympic Committee admitted that they had already given up on plans to change attitudes towards disability and were instead focusing on a sporting legacy for the Paralympic Games, which demonstrates the fragility of sporting mega-events legacy claims (Brittain and Mataruna, 2018).

Most disability awareness-raising actions focused on 50,000 students from Rio state public schools whom organizers took to watch Paralympic competitions, providing 33,000 tickets, transportation, snacks, t-shirts and an opportunity to meet Paralympians from around the world (IPC, 2016b). Another remarkable initiative was the #FillTheSeats international crowdfunding campaign supported by Rio 2016, the IPC and British Royal Prince Harry. The campaign raised US\$450,000 and allowed 15,000 children from low-income families to attend the Paralympic competitions (IPC, 2016a).

Actions enhancing accessibility in Rio were also limited. Rio City Hall installed over 8,000 ramps around the city as part of the program *Bairro Maravilha* (Marvel Neighborhood), which by December 2016 was projected to surpass 10,500 ramps (Rezende, 2016). Moreover, the 2011 plan to make Rio's 102 SuperVia train stations accessible only reached 22; and of 1500 municipal public schools, only 584 were accessible to students with a disability (O Globo, 2016b).

Sports infrastructure. Although not included in the candidacy file, the greatest

Paralympic sports legacy of Rio 2016 has been the Brazilian Paralympic Training Center, inaugurated in 2016 (Dilascio, 2017a). The Center received funding and support from the federal and Sao Paulo State governments and has been administered by the Brazilian Paralympic Committee. The Center has provided training facilities for Brazilian and international athletes in 15 Paralympic modalities and hosted numerous local, national, and international youth and adult competitions (Dilascio, 2017a; Dilascio, 2017b).

Sport participation. Hosting Rio 2016 worked as a catalyst to support the creation of formal policies for sports development, although predominantly focused on elite sports (Rocha and Mazzei, 2021).

For sport participation legacy, Tahir (2016) reported, the city government established several programs specifically for low-income youth, the most high-profile of which are the *Vilas Olimpicas* of Rio de Janeiro. It created public spaces for sport and physical activity in 22 low-income areas across Rio, and for 18 of those targeting 140,000 individuals, the authorities entered into a funding partnership with the Inter-American Development Bank, the F.C. Barcelona Foundation and the National Basketball Association to promote social inclusion through sport. On balance, the *Vilas* project underscored the heavy bias in the government's sport participation policy towards investment in sports infrastructure at the cost of long-term planning and sustainable funding for the maintenance and continued operation of this infrastructure. It also ignored the need for a long-term vision to promote sport and an active lifestyle for health and social benefits.

As Rocha and Mazzei (2021) concluded, the lack of public policies and funding to promote grassroots sport participation would hardly translate into longer-term benefits. Without a large base of participants (mainly children and young people), it is improbable that the country can sustain success at the international level.

Tokyo 2020

The Bid in context

Tokyo has won three out of five bids for the Olympic Games to be hosted in 1940 (canceled due to World War II), 1964 and 2020 (Liu, 2017). The city spent US\$150 million on its failed 2016 bid and about half as much on the successful 2020 bid (CFR,

2018). Although the bid for the 2016 Games failed, the Japanese government approached Tokyo's bid for the 2020 Olympic and Paralympic Games as a national project that could have created a momentum similar to the 1964 Games (Yuan, 2013). One of the primary purposes of hosting in 2020 was to recover from the economic blow of the Great East Japan Earthquake and tsunami in 2011 (Kaneko, 2021). The bid totaled US\$7.1 billion, but the 2020 edition was expected to be the most expensive in history, reaching, by some estimates, US\$15.4 billion, including an unprecedented deferral cost of US\$2.8 billion (Kato, 2021). Other estimates put the projected costs at US\$30 billion (Zirin and Boykoff, 2019).

In its candidacy file, the 2020 Bid Committee underscored the historical importance of the Tokyo 1964 Games and the London 2012 Games as a model to be followed:

The Tokyo 1964 Games was a landmark for Japan and the world, instrumental in economic development and social reconstruction. It proved a turning point in terms of national spirit, unity, and confidence. Last summer, London 2012 proved that a major, developed city can still have an enormous positive and global impact. Tokyo 2020 will demonstrate again all the benefits that come from established infrastructure, passionate yet respectful spectators, and a stable society united behind a shared vision for the Games. (Tokyo 2020, 2013, p. 4)

In the bid to become the first in the world to host the Summer Paralympics twice, its candidacy file declared that Tokyo 2020 intends to “deliver a Paralympic Games which will show how inclusion and non-discrimination, and full consideration of the needs and interests of people with a disability, can create a better world and provide a brighter future for the entire community.” (Tokyo2020, 2013, p.66) As preparations for the Games proceeded, stakeholders in Japan expected that the Paralympics would raise awareness and improve the lives of those with disabilities (Frost, 2021).

Challenges and opportunities ahead of Tokyo 2020

While the resources allocated to sports had risen dramatically since 2013 when Tokyo was chosen as a host, most of the budget has been assigned to developing competitive sports; only 10% of the budget went to promoting community sports (Kaneko, 2021). Although disability sports were relatively unknown in Japan, the Tokyo 2020 Paralympics provided an excellent opportunity for the Japanese public to

view disability sports at the highest level. Before the event postponement due to the COVID-19 pandemic, around 2.8 million tickets to the Tokyo Paralympics had already been sold, and media exposure had grown exponentially (van der Veere, 2020).

The Tokyo Games catalyzed technological innovation in Japan: the Olympic torch and the flame platform were fueled by hydrogen; the Olympic Village was powered by hydrogen energy; and transportation between the competition venues used hydrogen-fuel-cell buses. Moreover, technological achievements and affiliated policy innovations, such as robotics, 5G technology, and automated driving technology, offered solutions to current and future social challenges in Japanese society, such as traffic congestion, time, and the declining workforce due to aging (Wang and Jiang, 2021).

Due to the pandemic, the postponement of Tokyo 2020 until 2021 posed unprecedented challenges, causing disappointment, frustration, confusion, and relief among athletes and their coaches (Taku and Arai, 2020). Furthermore, because the fiscal year in Japan starts on April 1 and ends on March 31, there were two Olympic and Paralympic Games within the same fiscal year—the Tokyo Games in August-September 2021 and the Beijing Winter Games in February-March 2022—adding to the financial burden for Japanese people (Ibid). This could have affected the budgets allocated to each athlete, team, sport, and game, posing additional concerns to the athletes and coaches (Ibid).

Tokyo 2020 Legacies

The organizing committee underlined the importance of physical (e.g., newly constructed venues, refurbishing 1964 Games venues and the construction of the new Athletes' Village), social and environmental sustainability legacies (e.g., new standards of social, ecological and economic sustainability practices) (Tokyo 2020, 2013). Tokyo 2020 was heralded as an opportunity for three-pronged socio-economic regeneration: raising the international appeal of Japan as a destination for tourism and business; advancing a recovery from the Great East Japan Earthquake; and developing new far-reaching sport policies to enhance the promotion of sport nationwide (Kaneko, 2021).

Because it is challenging to determine to what extent the legacy of the Tokyo Paralympics is independent of the Olympic legacy, Ogura (2018) suggested placing

them in the broader context of social inclusion in an “aging” society and considering the active social participation of the senior citizens and persons with disability. Thus, its significance lies not so much in possibly enhancing Japanese competitiveness in adaptive sports but rather in the potential impact on the welfare and social environment of disabled persons: improved accessibility and communication and a more inclusive socio-psychological environment (Ibid).

Disability awareness-raising and accessibility. As Frost (2021) explained, the Tokyo Games offered a model for the awareness-raising potential of the Paralympics. First, Japanese media outlets regularly complemented their growing coverage of disability sports with stories about the experiences of average Japanese living with disabilities. Second, disability policies, language usage, discrimination and accessibility were discussed in newspaper editorials, online chats, television programming, and school classrooms, reflecting responses to disability-related issues associated with the Paralympics. While banning domestic spectators, the organizers allowed schoolchildren to attend some Paralympic events, hoping that seeing the sports live would sow the seeds of a more inclusive society (Rich and Hida, 2021).

Tokyo’s commitment to improving accessibility served as an exemplary case of the positive impact that the Paralympics have on host countries. Ogura (2018) cited a study by the Mizuho Research Center that evaluated the economic impact of the Paralympics separately from the Olympics. The report estimated that by 2020, the economic effect of better accessibility in transport facilities would amount to approximately 80 billion yen.

The organizing committee and the Tokyo metropolitan and national governments worked together to institute “barrier-free” action plans to eliminate social, physical and communication barriers in Japan. More specifically, governmental changes like new barrier-free building bylaws and revised national lodging standards have been accompanied by non-governmental initiatives. These efforts included accessibility upgrades to Japan’s famous train network and Toyota’s development of “universal design” JPN Taxis that could accommodate wheelchairs (Frost, 2021). However, Tokyo wheelchair users complained that taxi drivers often didn’t stop when hailed or asked for extra fees since rolling out ramps to help them board was cumbersome (Rich and Hida, 2021).

Japan’s progress in accessibility and social inclusion before the 2020 Paralympics

had gradually evolved over decades of disability activism. These actions would benefit 9.6 million Japanese categorized as disabled by the Health Ministry, or more than 7% of the population, and an increasing number of elderly residents benefitting from the same accommodations (Rich and Hida, 2021; Sneep, 2020).

Finally, the Tokyo 2020 Paralympics had significant international impacts. The campaign WeThe15— a movement to advance the human rights of 15% of the global population with disabilities — used the Paralympics as a springboard for its launch (Carty et al., 2021). For the first time, it brought together the IPC, Special Olympics, Invictus Games Foundation, International Committee of Sports for the Deaf (Deaflympics), Virtus, UNESCO, and The Valuable 500, to raise awareness, change attitudes and create more opportunities for disabled people.

Urban regeneration. In the city of Tokyo, no large-scale new venues for the Paralympic Games were planned because most of the sports could take place in the same venues as the Olympic Games, with modifications needed for some Paralympic sports (Ogura, 2018). However, the venue construction, especially the new national stadium, prompted evictions: homeless people were removed from their shelters and Tokyo Metropolitan Kasumigaoka apartments had to be demolished and the residents relocated (Ichii, 2019). Many elderly residents of this apartment complex had been previously forced to relocate due to the urban redevelopment for the Tokyo Summer Olympic Games in 1964 (Ibid).

Sporting infrastructure. Unlike in Brazil, constructing a national training center in Japan exclusively used by athletes with disabilities wasn't particularly popular among athletes. Instead, the Tokyo Municipal government planned to reform and enlarge the existing national training center to accommodate athletes with disabilities (Ogura, 2018). The Tokyo Metropolitan Government's Facility Management plan suggested post-Games legacy use of the sports venues for large-scale national and international sports competitions (aiming for ten annually) and for Tokyo residents to engage in sports (Bureau, 2017).

Sport participation. As van der Veere (2020) argued, creating Paralympic legacies in the context of Tokyo 2020 required an understanding of disability, disability sports, and local communities in Japan. Therefore, winning the bid to host the 2020 Games has forced Japanese stakeholders to assess their disability services, especially in disability sports. There is a significant gap between how society perceives disability

and factors it into national and local policies in Japan and the IPC's Paralympic values (van der Veere, 2020). For instance, Kaneko (2021) pointed out an imbalance in policy focus and funding for community sports compared to elite sports. Although the legacy discourse emphasized promoting and developing community sport as an integral part of Tokyo 2020, policy statements and funding indicated a bias toward elite sports. At the same time, both the number of community sporting facilities and mass sport participation have decreased significantly in recent years (Kaneko, 2021).

Ogura (2018) considered collaboration or integration of the disability sports associations with mainstream sports as one possible legacy of the 2020 Paralympics. Recent data indicates that only three sports associations in Japan have integrated (at least in a legal form) sports associations for disabled and non-disabled athletes: triathlon, taekwondo and rowing (Ogura, 2018; Japan Rowing Association, 2016). This integration is slowed by the underlying differences in views on disability sports: while the national policy-making regards Paralympic sports as sport activities, many provincial governments see disability sports in the context of general welfare policies. The Japan Sports Agency's 2020 Survey revealed that 17 out of 47 prefectural governments have moved disability sports from the welfare departments and integrated them into sports policy departments (Japan Sports Agency, 2020, p.74).

Soft power and knowledge exchange. According to Ogura (2018), Tokyo 2020 organizers used the Games to promote international exchange in sport management and help resource-poor nations consolidate their sports activities. This intent was behind forming the "Sport for Tomorrow Consortium," which supported around 35 disability sports projects from 2013 to 2016 in 25 countries. These projects ranged from an international seminar on classification in wheelchair basketball held in Germany and the provision of soccer balls for disabled children in Cambodia to a lecture series for those who want to become instructors for disability sports organized in Laos.

Comparative Analysis: Legacy Challenges and Opportunities

The comparative analysis of both Tokyo 2020 and Rio 2016 cases in this section reveals several helpful insights into how both hosts handled challenges and opportunities in realizing the Paralympic legacies and how contextual factors shaped

those actions.

First, from bidding to hosting the Games, both hosts emphasized the continuity between past and current sporting mega-events, framing it as a unique opportunity to create legacies leading to further progress for the host city and nation. For instance, in Rio, while the organizers attempted to leverage the legacies of the 2007 Pan American Games and the 2014 FIFA World Cup to argue continuity, in practice, there was no positive outcome. For the World Cup, Brazil spent a total of US\$3.6 billion on building five new stadiums and renovating seven existing ones, of which several have ended up as “white elephants” (Solberg, 2017). Moreover, many facilities built for the 2007 Pan-American Games have been either abandoned or privatized and have not served the local population to any great extent (Sousa-Mast et al., 2013). Therefore, the rhetoric of building on the legacies of the previous mega-events has not materialized, resulting in a missed opportunity for Rio 2016.

In the case of Tokyo, while the 1964 Games showed Japan’s post-war recovery and helped lead the country into a period of rapid economic growth, the 2020 Games showcased a mature metropolis, Japanese culture and technologies to boost the economy and recovery from the Great East Japan Earthquake, and promote sport in Japan as the previous Tokyo Games did (Kaneko, 2021; Sneep, 2020). Moreover, the importance of the Paralympic Games was highlighted as a means to move toward an inclusive society, integrate people with disabilities into the workforce and promote international exchange and cooperation through sport (Kaneko, 2021; Takeo, Hagiwara and Mori, 2021).

Second, scholars and practitioners expect the media to play a crucial role in publicizing Paralympic sport and Games and changing society’s perceptions of its disabled population (Santos et al., 2018). However, the media at Rio 2016 and Tokyo 2020 missed opportunities to provide qualitatively balanced and unbiased coverage of the Paralympics, Paralympians, and the broader disability issues in their respective nations and globally. For instance, the analysis of the dominant media frames in the coverage of the Rio Paralympics revealed the Brazilian media’s patronizing attitudes concerning parathletes, victim or superhero stereotypes, and the accompanying narrative of overcoming their impairments that often undermined their athletic accomplishments (Kirakosyan, 2021a). Similarly, in Japan, the media portrayed Paralympians as overcoming their impairments through superhuman hard work,

which undermined the efforts and experiences of other individuals living with a disability in Japan (van der Veer, 2020). Moreover, the short timeframe of the Japanese media's coverage of disability sports in the run-up to the event has potentially served as a limiting factor, as assuming that increased media exposure would by itself lead to long-term benefits may be flawed (Ibid). Ultimately, the 2020 medal table exemplified the perception gap between Olympic and Paralympic athletes and a hierarchy of sports: placed third in the Olympics, Japan was in 15th place in the Paralympics (Takeo, Hagiwara and Mori, 2021). These considerations align with Shiota's (2018) earlier conclusion that receiving the right to host may not have produced a measurable effect on the interaction between disabled and non-disabled people in Japan.

Third, while the "barrier-free" design was strongly emphasized as part of the 2020 Paralympic legacy, the organizers could not ensure widespread urban accessibility. Strategically implementing barrier-free facilities close to the most popular tourist attractions showed lesser concern for the mobility needs of the locals with disabilities (Sneep, 2020). Also, a lack of tourists and spectators with disabilities during the Paralympics prevented their feedback after testing the venue and urban accessibility and suggesting possible improvements (Rich and Hida, 2021). While the Paralympics were considered an opportunity to improve accessibility in Rio, both the city and the Paralympics received criticism from wheelchair users for poor accessibility (Kirakosyan 2021b; O Globo, 2016a).

Fourth, boosting sport participation was a significant challenge faced by the Rio 2016 and Tokyo 2020 organizers. Based on anecdotal evidence, Dilascio (2017a) claimed that Paralympic sport participation was growing after Rio 2016. However, in terms of promoting sport participation as a legacy of Rio 2016, Rocha and Mazzei (2021) found that Brazil committed several mistakes. First, the organizers assumed that legacies would happen naturally and did not devise specific leveraging strategies. Second, they did not develop long-term and effective policies for sport participation, probably because mass sport participation never was a priority legacy of Rio 2016. Finally, as mentioned above, Brazil's sport development policies have been predominantly focused on elite sports. Similarly, according to Kaneko (2021), in Japan, sport policy and funding have prioritized elite sports at the expense of promoting community sports. But the Tokyo 2020 organizers used the Paralympics in

strategic leveraging to spread disability sports in Japan and attempt to sustain the event benefits (van der Veere, 2020).

Fifth, both Rio 2016 and Tokyo 2020 organizers faced the challenge of Games cancellation or postponement. The reasons behind calls for Rio 2016 cancellation, as mentioned above, were the Zika virus and the financial crisis. After deep budget cuts and a federal government bailout, the Rio Paralympics went ahead, significantly limiting the intended Paralympic legacies. Tokyo 2020 organizers turned a pandemic-related postponement of the Games for a year into a learning opportunity and showed the world how its comprehensive pandemic prevention and control, and high-tech measures, left unique lessons to the world (Taku and Arai, 2020). In particular, the Beijing 2022 Winter Games organizers borrowed from Tokyo's pandemic prevention and control experience, based on timely data acquisition and analysis techniques, to carry on the epidemic prevention process (Wang and Jiang, 2021).

Finally, from the urban development point of view, both host cities missed the opportunity to address the existing social inequality and gentrification issues exacerbated by the preparation for the sporting mega-events. As Barbassa (2017b) argued, when the long-term needs of the communities and their residents clashed with the short-term needs linked to the hosting of mega-events, the latter was prioritized, bringing thousands of evictions and gentrification at the cost of the community's engagement and allegiance. Although to a much lesser extent, Tokyo residents also dealt with gentrification, especially in the Kasumi neighborhood (Zirin and Boykoff, 2019).

This discussion drew parallels between the challenges and opportunities that the organizers dealt with in each Paralympic Games. It was evident that, unlike in Tokyo, there was limited leverage planning and delivery by the organizers before, during and after the 2016 Paralympics, which, together with contextual features, constrained the process of legacy production.

Conclusions

From the bid and through the planning and delivery of the Paralympics, legacies have been part of the discourse, particularly concerning social change and improving the lives of local residents with disabilities. However, this paper suggests that there is

often a “legacy gap” between the rhetoric and the reality in achieving the Paralympic legacy, pointing to place-specific and mega-event-induced parallels. These observations help discern lessons to provide an evidence base for policy development and learning through community participation, transparency and accountability in all aspects of the event and its legacy production.

Lesson one: A mega-event and its legacy planning and delivery need to consider the needs of the local communities. Zimbalist (2017) explained that the less developed a country is, the more it has to invest in transportation, telecommunications, hospitality, security, and sports infrastructure to satisfy the requirements of the IOC, which often do not correspond to the development needs of a city. For instance, as McGuirk (2016) explained, Rio spent US\$70 million on the extensive cable-car system in the Complexo do Alemão as a slum upgrading program, but only 17% of the population uses it regularly. When consulted, local residents had expressed a preference for the money to be spent on sewage systems. However, due to the poor state of participative processes, their needs were ignored. Rocinha residents also wanted basic sanitation, not an expensive, high-profile and tourist-friendly cable car to the top, and mobilized to prevent it (Barbassa, 2017a; McGuirk, 2016). Although the Rio Games are long gone, a legacy remains of incomplete and overbilled infrastructure, the aftermath of displacement and poor accessibility.

Meanwhile, Japan used the Games as an opportunity to showcase its barrier-free designs in pursuit of making Tokyo a “barrier-free,” age-friendly city. Although barrier-free implementation attracted criticism for its limited scope, the strategy was developed considering the community’s needs and integrated into the Tokyo 2020 Paralympic legacy (Sneep, 2020).

Lesson two: A mega-event and its legacy planning and delivery need a supportive context and leveraging investments for a sport participation legacy. As the above discussion showed, hosting a mega-sport event has no inherent effects. On the one hand, while the Games played a significant role in enhancing formal sport development policies in both cases, most policies and funding focused on elite sport and investment in infrastructure. However, the lack of public policies and funding to promote mass sport participation will likely hinder the development of a large base of participants. This, in turn, would affect the country’s ability to sustain international sporting success. So Olympics and Paralympics legacy development needs

accompanying effective policies with a long-term vision and funding to encourage and sustain mass sport participation and an active lifestyle for health and social benefits.

Lesson three: Long-term benefits of the Games need to be evaluated with transparency, accountability and representation. This lesson relates to two broad challenges: lack of Paralympic legacy research and evaluation, and transparency and accountability. Although since Sydney 2000 bid cities are required to host both Games, few studies have focused on evaluating the Paralympic outcomes, legacies, and event leverage generated by these Games (Darcy, 2016). Moreover, the examination of the Olympic and Paralympic legacy typically takes place before the Games, with detailed legacy plans, and studies of any impact of the mega-event usually lose momentum after the Games. Therefore, it is vital to further develop the Paralympics research and evaluation agenda to address this gap.

On the other hand, as Misener (2017) pointed out, the top-down legacy planning approach lacks institutionalized mechanisms to provide transparency and accountability, from creating the bid to the final evaluation built into the bid agenda for many years. The organizing committees need to specifically set aside the necessary resources to develop and evaluate the legacies of the Paralympic Games. Moreover, the host communities need to be able to monitor and ensure that legacies are indeed realized effectively. For this, the Paralympic Movement and the disability rights movement need adequate representation in all aspects of the event and its legacy production.

References

- Adair, D., Darcy, S., and Frawley, S., 2017, "Paralympic Paradigm: A Research Agenda." In Darcy, S., Frawley, S., and Adair, D. (Eds.), Managing the Paralympics, Palgrave Macmillan, pp.289-293.
- Ainbinder, R., 2020, "An Urbanistic View of Rio2016: Aspiration, Planning and Legacy." In Neri, M. (Ed.), Evaluating the Local Impacts of the Rio Olympics, Routledge, pp. 25-63.
- Almeida, B.S., 2016, "Megaeventos Esportivos, Política a Legado: O Brasil como Sede da Copa do Mundo FIFA 2014 e os Jogos Olímpicos e Paralímpicos Rio 2016." [Sports Mega-events, Politics and Legacy: Brazil as a Host of the 2014 FIFA World Cup and the Olympic and Paralympic Games Rio 2016], Espacio Abierto: Cuaderno Venezolano de Sociología, 25(2): 68-81. <https://ludopedio.org.br/biblioteca/megaeventos-esportivos-politica-e-legado-o-brasil-como-sede-da-copa-do-mundo-fifa-2014-e-os-jogos-olimpicos-e-paralimpicos-rio-2016/>
- Azzi, V.F., 2017, "Security for Show? The Militarisation of Public Space in Light of the 2016 Rio Olympic Games," Contexto Internacional, 39(3) 589-607. DOI: 10.1590/S0102-8529.2017390300007
- Barbassa, J. 2017a, "Brazil's Olympic Rollercoaster," In A. Zimbalist (Ed.), Rio 2016: Olympic

- Myths, Hard Realities. Brookings Institution Press, pp. 35–56.
- Barbassa, J. 2017b, “Safety for Whom?: Securing Rio for the Olympics.” In A. Zimbalist (Ed.), Rio 2016: Olympic Myths, Hard Realities. Brookings Institution Press, pp. 153–178.
- Bocarro, J., Byers, T., and Carter, L., 2017, “Legacy of sporting and non-sporting mega event research: What next?” In I. Brittain, J. Bocarro, T. Byers and K. Swart, (Eds.), Legacies and Mega Events: Fact or Fairy Tales. Routledge, pp.7-24.
- Boykoff, J., 2017, “The Olympics in the Twenty-First Century: Where Does Rio 2016 Fit In?” In A. Zimbalist (Ed.), Rio 2016: Olympic Myths, Hard Realities. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, pp. 13–34.
- Brittain, I., 2016, “A Critical Perspective on the Legacy of the London 2012 Paralympic Games,” Journal of Paralympic Research Group, 5, 23–42.
- Brittain I., Beacom A., 2016, Leveraging the London 2012 Paralympic Games: What Legacy for Disabled People? Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 40(6):499-521. DOI:10.1177/0193723516655580
- Brittain, I. and Mataruna dos Santos, L.J., 2018, “The Rio 2016 Paralympic Games,” In I. Brittain, A. Beacom (Eds.), The Palgrave Handbook of Paralympic Studies, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 531-553.
- Brittain, I., Bocarro, J. and Byers, T., 2018, “Conclusion.” In I. Brittain, J. Bocarro, T. Byers and K. Swart, (Eds.), Legacies and Mega Events: Fact or Fairy Tales. Routledge, pp.259-262.
- Brown, C. and Pappous, A. S., 2018, “‘The Legacy Element… It Just Felt More Woolly’: Exploring the Reasons for the Decline in People with Disabilities’ Sport Participation in England 5 Years after the London 2012 Paralympic Games,” Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 42(5), 343–368. DOI: 10.1177/0193723518781237.
- Bureau of Tokyo 2020 Preparation, 2017, “Facility Management Plan for New Permanent Venues,” https://www.2020games.metro.tokyo.lg.jp/631b5dbe0479cbb9c65933750ca29a99_1.pdf
- Canales, F., 2011, “The Olympic Games And The Production Of The Public Realm: Mexico City 1968 and Rio De Janeiro 2016,” Architectural Design, 81(3), 52–57. DOI:10.1002/ad.1238
- Carty, C., Mont, D., Restrepo, D. S., and Salazar, J. P., 2021, “Wethe15, Leveraging Sport to Advance Disability Rights and Sustainable Development,” Sustainability, 13(21), 11738–11738. DOI:10.3390/su132111738
- Council on Foreign Relations – CFR, 2018, “The Economics of Hosting the Olympic Games,” <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/economics-hosting-olympic-games>
- Chalip, L., 2017, “Trading legacy for leverage.” In I. Brittain, J. Bocarro, T. Byers and K. Swart, (Eds.), Legacies and Mega Events: Fact or Fairy Tales. Routledge, pp. 25–42.
- Craven, P., 2016, “The Paralympic Games and the promotion of the rights of persons with disabilities,” UN Chronicle, 2, 10-13.
- Darcy, S., 2016, “Paralympic Legacy - Learning from Sydney 2000 to Prepare for Tokyo 2020,” Journal of the Nippon Foundation Paralympic Research, 4(1), 43-61. <http://para.tokyo/english/Simon%20Darcy.pdf>
- Dilascio, F. “Legado Paralímpico: CT Brasileiro Reaproveita Material Utilizado na Rio 2016,” [Paralympic Legacy: Brazilian Training Center Reutilizes the Rio 2016 Materials], Globoesporte, March 21, 2017a. <https://globoesporte.globo.com/paralimpiadas/noticia/legado-paralimpico-ct-brasileiro-reaproveita-material-utilizado-na-rio-2016.ghtml>
- Dilascio, F. “Um Ano Depois: Esporte Paralímpico Cresce no País Embalado pelo Sucesso da Rio

- 2016.” [A Year Later: Paralympic Sport Grows in the Country Thanks to Rio 2016 Success], *Globoesporte*, September 9, 2017b. <https://globoesporte.globo.com/paralimpiadas/noticia/umano-depois-esporte-paralimpico-cresce-no-pais-embalado-pelo-sucesso-da-rio-2016.ghtml>
- Duarte, F. “Rio 2016 Corre Contra o Tempo por ‘Paralimpiada Da Superação’” [Rio 2016 Races Against Time for the ‘Paralympics of Overcoming’], *BBC Brasil*, August 22, 2016. <https://www.bbc.com/portuguese/brasil-37146489>
- Frost, D.J., 2021, “Lessons from Tokyo: The Impact of the Paralympics in Japan,” In D. Jackson D. et al., (Eds), “Olympic and Paralympic Analysis 2020: Mega Events, Media, and the Politics of Sport.” Centre for Comparative Politics and Media Research, Bournemouth University, p.17.
- Girginov, V., and Hills, L., 2008, “A Sustainable Sports Legacy: Creating a Link Between the London Olympics and Sports Participation,” *The International Journal of History of Sport*, 25, 2091-2116.
- Goh, C. L., 2020, “To What Extent Does the Paralympic Games Promote the Integration of Disabled Persons into Society?” *The International Sports Law Journal*, 20, 36-54, DOI:10.1007/s40318-020-00164-w
- Gratton, C., and Ramchandani, G., 2017, “Economic Legacy to Cities of Hosting Major Sports Events: A Case Study of London 2012.” In I. Brittain, J. Bocarro, T. Byers and K. Swart, (Eds.), *Legacies and Mega Events: Fact or Fairy Tales*. Routledge, pp. 117-133.
- Grix, J. Brannagan, P.M., Wood, H. and Wynne, C., 2017, “State Strategies for Leveraging Sports Mega-Events: Unpacking the Concept of ‘Legacy.’” *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 9(2), 203-218, DOI: 10.1080/19406940.2017.1316761
- Harris, S., and Dowling, M., 2022, “Conclusion.” In S. Harris and M. Dowling, (Eds.), *Sport Participation and Olympic Legacies: A Comparative Study*, Routledge, pp.182-201.
- Ichii, Y., 2019, “‘Creative Reconstruction’ and the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games: How Does the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games Influence Japan’s Neoliberal Social Reform?” *International Journal of Japanese Sociology*, 28, 96-109. DOI: 10.1111/ijjs.12102
- International Paralympic Committee – IPC, 2013, “Handbook Paralympic Games chapter,” https://www.paralympic.org/sites/default/files/document/141113151011315_2014_10_07+Sec+i+Chapter+3+Paralympic+Games+Principles.pdf
- IPC, 2016a, “#FilltheSeats Campaign Closes - 15,000 Brazilian Youngsters to Attend Rio 2016.” <https://www.paralympic.org/news/filltheseats-campaign-closes-15000-brazilian-youngsters-attend-rio-2016>.
- IPC, 2016b, “Paralympics Ticket Sales Exceed Two Million.” <https://www.paralympic.org/news/paralympics-ticket-sales-exceed-two-million>.
- Japan Rowing Association, 2016, “Pararowing. History of Pararowing.” <https://www.jara.or.jp/para/about.html>
- Japan Sports Agency, 2020, “Department in charge of para-sports in local governments.” A Survey by the Office for Promote of Para-Sports, Sports for Health Division, Japan Sports Agency. https://www.mext.go.jp/sports/content/20210426-spt_sseisaku01-000014466_16.pdf
- Kaneko, F., 2021, “Tokyo 2020 (+1): United by Emotion.” In S. Harris and M. Dowling, (Eds.), *Sport Participation and Olympic Legacies: A Comparative Study*, Routledge, pp.153 -181.
- Kellison, T.B., and Casper, J. M., 2017, Environmental Legacy Of Mega Sport Events. In I. Brittain, J. Bocarro, T. Byers and K. Swart, (Eds.), *Legacies and Mega Events: Fact or Fairy Tales*. Routledge, pp.135-156.

- Kirakosyan, L., 2021a, "Media Portrayal of the Rio 2016 Paralympics: Narrative Patterns in the Brazilian Online News Outlets," The International Journal of Sport and Society 12(1). DOI: 10.18848/2152-7857/CGP/v12i01/71-90
- Kirakosyan, L. 2021b, "Journalistic Narratives about the Rio 2016 Paralympics: (Re) producing Cultural Values and Social Identities," The Journal of Communication and Media Studies 6 (3). DOI: 10.18848/2470-9247/CGP/v06i03/29-43
- Knott, B., and Swart, K., 2017, "Mega-events and Place Branding Legacy for Emerging Economies." In I. Brittain, J. Bocarro, T. Byers and K. Swart, (Eds.), Legacies and Mega Events: Fact or Fairy Tales. Routledge, pp.159-170.
- Koenigstorfer, J. and Kulczycki, W., 2017, "The Legacy of Corruption in the Context of the 2014 FIFA World Cup: Short-Term and Long-Term Consequences for Sponsorship Perception." In I. Brittain, J. Bocarro, T. Byers and K. Swart, (Eds.), Legacies and Mega Events: Fact or Fairy Tales. Routledge, pp.171-187.
- Liu, E., 2017, "Branding Ideas for the Tokyo Olympics 2020." In I. Management Association (Eds.), Advertising and Branding: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications, IGI Global, pp. 326-345.
- Mataruna, L., Range, D., Guimaraes, A., and Melo, T., 2015, "Rio 2016 and Disability - An Analysis of the Sport-For-Development Discourse and the Legacies for Disabled People," Journal of Sport for Development, 3(5). <https://jsfd.org/2015/12/04/rio-2016-and-disability-an-analysis-on-the-sport-for-development-discourse-and-the-legacies-for-disabled-people/>
- McGuirk, J., 2016, "Failing the Informal City: How Rio de Janeiro's Mega Sporting Events Derailed the Legacy of Favela-Bairro," Architectural Design, 86(3), 40-47. DOI:10.1002/ad.2044
- Millington, R., and Darnell, S. C., 2014, "Constructing and Contesting the Olympics Online: The Internet, Rio 2016 and the Politics of Brazilian Development," International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 49(2), 190-210.
- Misener, L., Darcy, S., Legg, D., and Gilbert, K., 2013, "Beyond Olympic Legacy: Understanding Paralympic Legacy Through a Research Synthesis," Journal of Sport Management, 27, 329-341.
- Misener, L., 2017, "Managing the Paralympics." In Darcy, S., Frawley, S., and Adair, D. (Eds.), Managing Legacy and the Paralympic Games, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 93-111.
- Neri, M., Hecksher, M. and Osorio, M.C., 2020, "Past and Future of Rio City and Main Conclusions on the Games' Impact." In Neri, M. (Ed.), Evaluating the Local Impacts of the Rio Olympics, Routledge, pp.279-293.
- Neri, M. and Osorio, M.C., 2020, "Fiscal Impact of the Rio Olympics." In M. Neri (Ed.). Evaluating the Local Impacts of the Rio Olympics, Routledge, pp.99-106.
- Nobre, A. L., 2016, "A City at Play: Rio de Janeiro on the Eve of the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games," Architectural Design, 86(3), 28-39. DOI:10.1002/ad.2043
- O Globo. "Apesar de Avanços no VLT, no BRT e no Metrô, Acessibilidade ainda é Falha nos Transportes Coletivos no Rio" [Despite the Advances in VLT, BRT e subway, Accessibility is Still Lacking on Rio's Public Transportation], O Globo, September 4, 2016a. <https://extra.globo.com/noticias/rio/apesar-de-avancos-no-vlt-no-brt-no-metro-acessibilidade-ainda-falhanos-transportes-coletivos-no-rio-20047895.html>
- O Globo. "Acessibilidade precisa passar da retórica à prática." [Accessibility Needs to Move from a Rhetoric to Practice], O Globo, September 11, 2016b. <https://oglobo.globo.com/opiniao/>

- acessibilidade-precisa-passar-da-retorica-pratica-20081764
- Ogura, K., 2018, "Visions on the Legacy of the Tokyo 2020 Paralympic Games." In I. Brittain, and A. Beacom (Eds.), The Palgrave Handbook of Paralympic Studies, Palgrave Macmillan, pp.579-601.
- Pappous, A. S., and Brown, C., 2018, "Paralympic Legacies: A Critical Perspective." In I. Brittain and A. Beacom, (Eds.), The Palgrave Handbook Of Paralympic Studies, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 647-664.
- Puff, J. "Saúde Pública: Como o RJ Chegou a Uma de Suas Piores Crises no Ano Dos Jogos" [Public Health: How Rio de Janeiro Reached One of Its Worst Crises a Year Ahead of the Games]. BBC Brasil, January 11, 2016. http://www.bbc.com/portuguese/noticias/2016/01/160106_crise_economica_rio_jp
- Rezende, C. "Sede da Paralimpíada é Inacessível a Pessoas com Deficiência," [The Paralympic Headquarters are Inaccessible for Persons with Disabilities], EXAME, September 5, 2016. <http://exame.abril.com.br/brasil/sede-da-paralimpíada-e-inacessivel-a-pessoas-com-deficiencia/>
- Rich, M., and Hida, H. "Disabled Japanese are Often Invisible. Will Paralympics Bring Lasting Light?" The New York Times, September 3, 2021, <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/09/03/world/asia/japan-paralympics-disabled.html>
- Rio 2016 Bid Committee, 2009, "Rio 2016 Candidate City: Candidature File for Rio De Janeiro to Host the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games," <https://library.olympics.com/>
- Rocha, C.M. and Mazzei, L.C., 2021, "Rio 2016: A New World." In S. Harris and M. Dowling, (Eds.), Sport Participation and Olympic Legacies: A Comparative Study, Routledge, pp.132-152.
- Santos, S.M., Furtado, S., Poffo, B.N., Velasco, A.P., and Souza, D.L., 2018, "Mídia e Jogos Paralímpicos no Brasil: A Cobertura da Folha de S.Paulo entre 1992 e 2016," [The Media and the Paralympic Games in Brazil: The Coverage of Folha de S.Paulo between 1992 and 2016] Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte, 41 (2), DOI: 10.1016/j.rbce.2018.03.012
- Shiota, K., 2018, "Survey Report on Awareness and Participation Behavior in Disabled Sports and Disability Understanding after Tokyo's Bid for the 2020 Olympics and Paralympics," The Journal of Physical Therapy Science, 30(1), 5-10, https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/jpts/30/1/30_jpts-2017-373/_pdf.
- Sneep, D.A.L., 2020, "Discover Tomorrow: Tokyo's 'Barrier-free' Olympic Legacy and the Urban Ageing Population." In A. Ogawa and P. Seaton, (Eds.), New Frontiers in Japanese Studies, Routledge, pp.91-103.
- Sousa-Mast, F.R., Reis, A.C., Gurgel, L.A. and Duarte, A.F., 2013, "Are Cariocas Getting Ready for the Games? Sport Participation and the Rio de Janeiro 2016 Olympic Games," Managing Leisure, 18(4), 331-335, DOI: 10.1080/13606719.2013.809187
- Spence, C., "The Paralympic Games legacy: Changing societies forever," IPC blog, July 17, 2015, <https://www.paralympic.org/blog/paralympic-games-legacy-changing-societies-forever>
- Solberg, H.A., 2017, "Mega Events: Why Cities are Willing to Host Them, despite the Lack of Economic Benefits. In I. Brittain, J. Bocarro, T. Byers and K. Swart, (Eds.), Legacies and Mega Events: Fact or Fairy Tales, Routledge, pp.43-59.
- Tahir, I., 2016, Rio 2016's Unending Legacy. *Politheor*, <http://politheor.net/rio-2016s-unending-legacy/>
- Takeo, Y., Hagiwara, Y., and Mori, K., "Japan Offers Disabled a Stage for Paralympic Glory But Few Jobs," Bloomberg, September 3, 2021. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/>

- articles/2021-09-03/japan-offers-disabled-a-stage-for-paralympic-glory-but-few-jobs
- Taku, K., and Arai, H., 2020, "Impact of COVID-19 on Athletes and Coaches, and Their Values in Japan: Repercussions of Postponing the Tokyo 2020 Olympic and Paralympic Games," Journal of Loss and Trauma, 25(8), 623-630, DOI: 10.1080/15325024.2020.1777762
- Tokyo 2020 Bid Committee, 2013, "Tokyo 2020: Discover Tomorrow." <https://library.olympics.com/Default/doc/SYRACUSE/70447/tokyo-2020-discover-tomorrow-tokyo-2020-olympic-games-bid-committee>
- van der Veere, A.P., 2020, "A Study of the Tokyo 2020 'Game Changer Project' between the Netherlands and Japan: Leveraging Disability Sports in Local Communities in Japan," Working research paper, <https://leidenasiacentre.nl/a-study-of-the-tokyo-2020-game-changer-project-between-the-netherlands-and-japan-leveraging-disability-sports-in-local-communities-in-japan/>
- Wang N. and Jiang Y., 2021, "Legacy of the Tokyo 2020 Summer Olympic Games," The Innovation, 2(4), 100178.
- Weed, M., 2021, "Can Health-Related Legacies through Physical Activity and Sport be Delivered By the Olympic and Paralympic Games? In D. Chatziefstathiou, B. García, B. and B. Séguin, B. (Eds.), Routledge Handbook of the Olympic and Paralympic Games, Routledge, pp.375-384.
- Yuan, S., 2013, "A Miraculous Revitalization of Japan? A Comparative Analysis of the 1964 Tokyo Olympic Games, the Failed 2016 Host City Bid and the Successful 2020 Bid," Asia Pacific Journal of Sport and Social Science, 2(3), 198-213. DOI:10.1080/21640599.2013.861665
- Zimbalist, A., 2017a, "Introduction: "Welcome to Hell." In A. Zimbalist (Ed.), Rio 2016: Olympic Myths, Hard Realities, Brookings Institution Press, pp. 1-12.
- Zimbalist, A., 2017b, "The Economic Legacy of Rio 2016." In A. Zimbalist (Ed.), Rio 2016: Olympic Myths, Hard Realities, Brookings Institution Press, pp. 207-238.
- Zirin, D., and Boykoff, J. "These Women Have Lost Their Homes to the Olympics in Tokyo— Twice," The Nation, July 23, 2019. <https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/tokyo-olympics-displacement/>

レガシーの課題と機会： リオ2016パラリンピック大会と東京2020パラリン ピック大会を比較して

リュシエナ・キラコシアン

(米国・バージニア工科大学政策研究所)

パラリンピック競技大会の成功とレガシープランを持続可能な成果とレバレッジ戦略に転換するには、これまでの大会それぞれに固有の課題と機会が数多くあった。本稿では、リオ2016パラリンピック競技大会と東京2020パラリンピック競技大会の主催者がそうした課題や機会にどのように対処したかを比較検討する。リオ2016大会のプランニングは、政治経済危機、リオ2016大会の予算削減、環境や衛生の問題、ジカウイルス感染症、汚職スキャンダル、リオの財政破綻、国内の治安問題、リオ2016大会費用の肥大化、オリンピック大会とパラリンピック大会の不平等な扱いなど、ブラジルがとりわけ混乱期にある中で進められた。その結果、公文書に明記されたインクルージョンとダイバーシティの理念が、大会開催における実践レベルで効果的に実現されることはなかった。一方、東京2020オリンピック・パラリンピック大会は、世界規模のパンデミックの最中に開催された。それでも1年の延期を経て、8億ドル近くのにぼるチケット収入の損失や一般市民の大会開催反対、さらにはコストの急増、ほぼ無観客のスタジアム、歓声もない屋外会場など、COVID-19に関連した困難な問題に対処しての開催であった。とはいえ、東京大会は、マスコミを取り込み、障がい政策や「バリアフリー」アクションプランに影響を及ぼし、意識啓発・変革そして障がい者のための機会拡大に向けた国際的な動きを引き起こすなど、パラリンピック大会が果たし得る意識向上の可能性を示すモデルを提示した。リオと東京のパラリンピックがそれぞれにもたらした課題と機会に各開催都市がどのように対処したかを比較分析したところ、背景要因と開催意欲の重要性が浮き彫りになった。さらに、リオ2016パラリンピックの場合、東京大会とは異なり、開催前、開催中及び開催後において主催者側によるレバレッジ計画やその実践がほとんどなかった。リオでは、そのことが、背景特性と相まって、レガシー創生のプロセスを抑制した。結局のところ、一連の課題に主催者が十分に対処しなかったことで、リオにおいても東京においてもパラリンピックの持続的なレガシーを構築する機会を失うこととなった。分析に基づき、本稿では最後に、透明性の高い参加型の政策策定に向けてエ

レガシーの課題と機会：
リオ2016パラリンピック大会と東京2020パラリンピック大会を比較して

ビデンス基盤を構築するための教訓を見極め、パラリンピック大会及びそのレガシー創生のあらゆる側面から学ぶ。

キーワード：パラリンピック・レガシー， リオ2016大会， 東京2020大会， 課題， 機会