

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-

tonomy from London in their decision-making.” Hong Kong’s differences with London relating to the presence of North Korea in the territory are highlighted as “a small step forward in Hong Kong’s emerging national identity.” These are precisely the topics that should have been introduced in the introduction and examined throughout, but they unfortunately are barely mentioned until the very end when it is too late to properly expand upon them. While the article succeeds as a riveting account of cold war feuds and behind-the-scenes Olympic diplomacy, it largely fails as a narrative about Hong Kong, which is the expressed purpose of the article.



*Andreas Niehaus, “‘If You Want to Cry, Cry on the Green Mats of Kodokan.’ Expressions of Japanese Cultural and National Identity in the Movement to Include Judo into the Olympic Programme,” International Journal of the History of Sport 23, no. 7 (2006), 1173-1192. Reviewed by Anne Warner.*

In this article, Andreas Niehaus examines how the inclusion of judo into the Olympic Games helped to rehabilitate post-war perceptions of Japan and restore Japanese national identity after its defeat in the Second World War. He focuses on Japan’s quest to include judo as an Olympic event, which eventually came to fruition at the 1964 Tokyo Olympic Games, marking the first time a non-European sport was included on the Olympic programme. In addition, Niehaus recounts the history and significance of judo in Japan including its subsequent internationalization and the Western construction of the sport.

The greatest strength of this article is its subject matter. It is refreshing to read an article about a lesser-known sport, such as judo, instead of typical Western sports that tend to be the focus of much research. While Niehaus proposes a potentially captivating premise for the paper, that is, that sport can be a mechanism for rehabilitating a nation, the article lacks organization and critical analysis in some key areas, leaving the reader confused and with several unanswered questions.

The primary confusion stems from a lack of connection between the main ideas of the paper. The paper begins with the assertion that the 1964 Olympics was a key date for the bolstering of Japanese national identity, as Japan was the host of the Games and dominated judo. However, Niehaus does not carry through with this idea in the paper. In fact, there is little discussion of the actual ’64 Games, how judo was received at these Games, or whether Japanese national identity was bolstered. Rather, the paper turns into a discussion about Western exoticization of judo and the eventual loss of Japanese control of the International Judo Federation. Niehaus’s intention is to show that the West recognized a spiritual or religious aspect to judo that was not part of traditional Japanese judo, creating conflict between world judo bodies. But, Niehaus fails to suffi-