

er, Wassong highlights what amounted to a biased vision from the Baron. Forever focused on the supportive evidence of his view, he neglected to document the negative aspects of the U.S. schools, such as the professionalism that detracted from the broader aims of education. Wassong explains that the Baron's perfumed view of the high schools was derived from his experiences at the Ivy League colleges, which, Yale apart, "strived to keep student sport untainted with professionalism." Wassong claims that in his efforts to convince the French authorities to change, it inspired in him a certain flexibility with the truth.

For Wassong, the experience and pleasure that Coubertin derived from his trips to the U.S. became manifest in his efforts to narrow the widening gulf in attitude between the "old" and "new world." Wassong argues that Coubertin foresaw the burgeoning power of the U.S. as a political monolith. As a result, he aimed to promote mutual understanding between France and the United States by writing on the subject and, with the help of his Ivy League contacts, encouraging students to do the same by creating essay competitions. It is this involvement in smoothing international relations, contends Wassong, that must be considered when looking for reasons as to the Baron's determined call for the rebirth of the Olympics.

Very convincing it all is too. Without having consulted the new material that Wassong draws on it is hard to be critical of his study, taken at face value it is compact and executed efficiently. As MacAloon demonstrated in his consummate study of Coubertin, the Baron's life makes for a rich source of research, a life thoroughly well lived aside from his often tragic private life. Wassong's work adds more depth to prior knowledge of the motivating factors behind Coubertin's visits to the U.S., and therein lies its obvious value.



*Andrew Novak, "Rhodesia's 'Rebel and Racist' Olympic Team: Athletic Glory, National Legitimacy and the Clash of Politics and Sport," International Journal of the History of Sport 23, no. 8 (2006), 1369–1388. Reviewed by Stephen Swain.*

In this article, Novak examines the history of Rhodesia's involvement in the Olympic Games, and traces the debates and controversies surrounding the country's participation, or lack thereof. Applying Weber's "threefold typology of pure forms of legitimate authority," Novak categorizes De Coubertin, and later Brundage, as "a charismatic leader" and the International Olympic Committee as a "charismatic organization, outside the mere moral world of the ordinary." As such, both the IOC and its leader seek to maintain the concept of Olympism in the face of external forces attempting to bring change to the world.

As a history and narrative, Novak's article is noteworthy, providing a well researched and documented account of the different factors involved in the controversies surrounding Rhodesia's participation in, and exclusion from, the

Olympic Games. In addition, Novak also provides excellent discussion of the importance of sport in Rhodesian society, both before and after the country's acrimonious split from Great Britain. Of particular interest is Novak's discussion of how sports were not segregated in Rhodesia as they were in South Africa the "neighbor country" also under sanction and scrutiny over segregationist racial politics at the time.

Novak discusses several important historical moments in his article, among them, the pressure to exclude Rhodesia from the 1968 Mexico City Games. These Games will be forever remembered both for the protests of John Carlos and Tommie Smith, immortalized on posters on dorm room walls of young progressive sports fans, and the Tlatelolco massacre that took place less than two weeks before the Games opened. Novak discusses the political manoeuvrings that led to Rhodesia's exclusion and the differences of opinion and approach between the Mexican NOC and the IOC.

Following the 1968 Games, Novak also addresses the 1972 Munich Games, again immortalized in history for massacre and controversy, rather than sporting achievement. In addition to discussing the politics involved in excluding Rhodesia, Novak also discusses how these events led to the end of Brundage's control over the IOC. Again, Novak renders a viable understanding of the controversies and debates over Rhodesia's participation.

In addition to discussing the political manipulation surrounding Rhodesia, Novak also brings the issue down to the level of the individual, discussing the athletes themselves, and the effects that Rhodesia's exclusion had on them. This strengthens an already strong article. It seems as if a nation's shortcomings must be attached to a real individual, the Olympic athlete, in order to accelerate concerns over social justice.

Perhaps my strongest criticism of Novak's article concerns his discussion of how Olympism, and the Olympic Games, were envisioned as being free from politics. It is unclear whether Novak is being ironic in discussing this, or if he is merely reiterating what others believed. While men like De Coubertin and Brundage may have chosen to delude themselves into believing the Olympics were apolitical, it does not make it so. The Olympics have always been political. Their very origin lies in the highly politicized notion of the modern nation-state. Beyond that, issues of the participation of women are examples of gender politics. Even the selection of an Olympic Games host city is an example of politics in action. To claim that the Olympics are free from politics is naïve at best and foolish at worst. Novak doesn't address this point, and while this may be a strategic decision on Novak's part, I feel that ignoring the political nature of the Olympics detracts from the paper.

Beyond that however, Novak has written a very strong paper. And perhaps most importantly, he has addressed how, while the decision to exclude Rhode-

sia certainly had a negative impact on the Rhodesian athletes at the time, it has now come to be seen as a positive benefit for athletes around the world. Novak also avoids grandiose proclamations that the Olympic Games ended apartheid, but he does acknowledge the importance of the Olympics in helping to affect change, if only in the Olympic Movement itself.



*Brian Bridges, "Reluctant Mediator: Hong Kong, the two Koreas and the Tokyo Olympics," International Journal of the History of Sport 24, no. 3 (2007), 375-391. Reviewed by Terry Gitersos.*

Brian Bridges recounts the fascinating story of the diplomatic efforts undertaken to present a united Korean team at the Tokyo Olympics of 1964. South Korea had participated in the Olympic Games since 1948 under the name "Korea;" North Korea's attempts to compete in the Games were continually rebuffed on the grounds that "there could not be more than one recognized NOC in any one country." Faced with a powerful eastern bloc agitating for North Korea's inclusion, IOC President Avery Brundage proposed sending a unified Korean team to Tokyo. In that regard, negotiations occurred in Hong Kong, a city that proved to be an extremely reluctant host. Hong Kong saw the presence of both North and South Korean delegations as an impingement on its security and neutrality. Bridges adroitly describes the diplomatic mine fields navigated by the main actors. After covert attempts by American diplomats to influence the proceedings, the talks broke down in the face of ideological and political squabbling. The IOC, in the end, recognized North Korea as a separate NOC, a decision which paved the way for a politically-tinged row in Tokyo between the IOC and North Korea over athletes who had participated in the "anti-imperialist" GANEFO games.

Despite its narrative strength, Bridges' article suffers from a damaging lack of focus and an underdevelopment of some crucial topics. The title makes direct reference to Hong Kong as a "reluctant mediator; the introduction promises to "examine the nature of Hong Kong's involvement in this complex and ultimately frustrating effort," but this is a work more concerned with the two Koreas and the intrigues surrounding the effort to produce a unified Korean Olympic team. Hong Kong remains a secondary actor. Hong Kong's geopolitical status during that era is not discussed other than to say that it was still a British colony, nor is it made clear why Hong Kong became the "agreed-on" meeting place for the Korean delegations. Bridges writes that Hong Kong was "wary of the role that had been thrust upon it." We learn that American diplomats attempted to intervene in the second meeting, but it is never made apparent what Hong Kong stood to gain or lose from these diplomatic machinations. Bridges only begins to delve into these topics during the conclusion, where we are finally introduced to Hong Kong as a neutral "Switzerland of Asia... steadily acquiring more au-