

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.

In the discussion of the sporting metaphors, Cudd includes an assessment of the meanings that these metaphors have in society. She notes that there is a large amount of ambiguity associated with these metaphors, but the underlying theme of competition and cooperation provide substantial support in guiding behaviour. Cudd ultimately argues that the discussion of these metaphors is another way of challenging the underlying rules governing cultural structures. An interesting parallel explored in this article is sporting metaphors that seem to illustrate competitive ventures but also demonstrate cooperative themes. An example of this is the metaphor of the level playing field. Although competition is considered in creating a level playing field, there is also cooperative involvement to contribute to a level of fairness. Cudd argues that by adhering to the goal of equality in competition, the pursuit of individual or team excellence involves the consideration of all those participating in the game. This relationship highlights the potential for positive interactions between individuals competing against one another.

A problem with the argument offered by Cudd is the loose distinction made between competition and cooperation. This parallel plays a large role in Cudd's argument that capitalism is not strictly competitive, but also has cooperative values. Although the sporting metaphors that Cudd examines fit with the discussion of capitalism, there are some questions as to whether drawing on these metaphors assists in demonstrating the ethos of capitalism. It may be possible that these sporting metaphors illustrate themes of cooperative behaviour that are based on the telos and underlying cultural structures of capitalism. The analysis of how the telos or, goals of capitalism compare with the goals of sport contests would have provided further depth to the connection between sporting metaphors and capitalism.

Overall, the exploration of sporting metaphors in connection to capitalism raises the question of how these metaphors can provide explanations of other social structures. The development of the connection between metaphors and culture provides an additional avenue of analysis that addresses the connection between sport and society.

