

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-

ciently show the connection between this idea, and the initial discussion of the '64 Games, creating a disjointed paper that would be better off as two separate pieces.

In addition, Niehaus's work would have benefited from more critical analysis and the fleshing out of ideas that he touches on only briefly. For example, the paper begins with an historical account of judo's acceptance as a sport at the 1964 Olympics, but fails to answer why it took twelve years to get Judo admitted to the list of Olympic sports. It would seem that identifying these obstacles and how they were overcome are crucial to our understanding of attitudes toward Japan at that time. The reader is left wondering whether it was post-war antagonism, the newness of the Japanese Olympic Committee, or disinterest.

There certainly is a need to explore sports that are less "mainstream" in academic literature and thus Niehaus's research is significant. However, his failure to pursue his initially-stated premise means that his potentially thought-provoking points are lost in superficial and disconnected arguments.



*Ann E. Cudd, "Sporting Metaphors: Competition and the Ethos of Capitalism," Journal of the Philosophy of Sport, 2007, 52-67. Reviewed by Natalie Szudy.*

In this article, Ann E. Cudd explores the use of common sporting metaphors as general descriptors to illustrate different attitudes towards capitalism. Specifically, she examines the relationship between competitive structures underpinning sport and capitalism. In this comparative analysis, Cudd focuses on the following sporting metaphors: i) competition; ii) level playing field; iii) playing by the rules; iv) teamwork; and v) stepping up/slam dunk. Fundamentally, Cudd argues that the nature of capitalism can be viewed as strictly competitive; however, through the exploration of sporting metaphors, capitalism could also be viewed as having a combination of cooperative and competitive themes.

To establish the connection between sporting metaphors and capitalism, Cudd begins by exploring the relationship between metaphors and cultural representations. She argues that metaphors provide another way of expanding how we analyze rule-governed practices in society. Cudd notes that metaphors are commonly used to draw parallels and comparisons from familiar behaviours and actions to help understand less familiar experiences. This claim is dependent on the argument that the cultural structures that underpin society are prevalent in sport and business practices. Cudd locates the connection between sport and capitalism by establishing that both practices are essentially rule-governed and competitive. The operational definitions of sport and capitalism included in the article support the comparison.