

emphasis on Formula One), the management and sponsorship side of racing, media coverage, oversight organizations, and the technological and economic infrastructures. The work is especially useful for the recent statistical data and the thumbnail sketches of many of the companies and organizations discussed. There is an excellent bibliography, though it is often difficult to find the correlative entry from the text citation; the bibliography is arranged by chapter and apparent footnote numbers, but there are no footnote numbers in the text, and not every study mentioned in the text appears in the bibliography for the corresponding chapter. An appendix of motorsport companies in the UK is also a plus.

The writing style, however, is a drawback. The text sometimes reads as if it has been translated from another language by someone who possesses only a technical knowledge of English. Awkward wording is exacerbated by serendipitous use of commas. Further, there is unnecessary repetition, as if chapters had been written independently of each other. These stylistic matters should have been dealt with during editing.

The last three chapters of the book provide a good summary of the work. This reviewer suggests reading these first and then dipping into the detailed descriptions and analyses of specific companies, teams, organizations, and relationships so well covered in the first eleven chapters, which can nearly serve as a ready reference handbook to the major forces in British motorsport. Scholars interested in the economics of motorsport will want to read *Britain's Winning Formula*.

—SUZANNE WISE  
*Appalachian State University*

ROSS, DONALD J. *Golf Has Never Failed Me: The Lost Commentaries of Legendary Golf Architect Donald Ross*. Chelsea, MI: Sleeping Bear Press, 1996. Pp. xi + 258. Illustrated. \$29.95 cb.

THOMAS, GEORGE C., JR. *Golf Architecture in America: Its Strategy and Construction*. Chelsea, MI: Sleeping Bear Press, 1997. Pp. xxv + 342. Illustrated. \$85.00 cb.

Most of us who play golf as a hobby probably never think of the architecture of a golf course, except when we hurl imprecations at an ill-placed bunker or more contemplatively marvel at the scenic beauties of a well-designed hole. But as these two accounts reveal, the design of a golf course involves a complex, sometimes maddening series of rational decisions, often as hidden from the weekend golfer's view as the subterranean drainage systems without which golf would be mere hacking for us all.

Both Ross and Thomas were prolific and influential golf course architects, doing the bulk of their work in the first three decades of the twentieth century. Born in Scotland in 1872, Ross moved to the United States in 1899 to build and operate a golf club near Boston. Over the next half-century, he designed over 400 courses, including such famed ones as Pinehurst in North Carolina and Oakland Hills near Detroit. Thomas was less well-known and prolific than Ross. Born into a wealthy Philadelphia family in 1873, Thomas took up golf architecture as a hobby. His first love was gardening, a passion which

we can see in his concern with enhancing natural beauty in his courses. He worked largely in California—without fees—designing several of that state’s most spectacular courses, including Rivera.

Ross’s *Golf Has Never Failed Me* is not a coherent exposition of his philosophy of golf architecture. Instead, it is a hodge-podge of bits and pieces, most of them dealing in some way with course design, some providing little bits of homely advice to golfers. There is little sense of connection or transition between pieces. The heart of the book is a “lost” manuscript that Ross intended to publish in 1914 but “for reasons we will never know” failed to do so. The manuscript has been edited and “supplemented with other commentaries made by Ross during his career” (5). Unfortunately, these components are never differentiated in the text.

If *Golf Has Never Failed Me* has a central theme, it is that golf course design is an enormously complex enterprise that has to please both the scratch golfer and the weekend amateur. Thus, holes should be built so they can be played in a number of ways. His own Pinehurst Number Two Course is his ideal, “the fairest yet most exacting test of [golf], and yet a test from which [golfers] will always derive the maximum amount of pleasure” (18 1). Much of that joy comes from the fact that the best golf courses are those that blend with the natural environment. Golf should be both challenging and visually pleasing. Ross adds bits of golf wisdom to his design advice. He tells us to avoid gambling on the game, never to carry more than 14 clubs, that lots of young golfers are spoiled, and that large balls are good for golf,

If Ross tends to wander, in *Golf Architecture in America*, a sumptuous reprint of the 1927 edition, Thomas is relentlessly on task as he takes us through golf course design in painstaking detail. We learn about site selection, dealing with club secretaries, blasting techniques, soil composition, hazard placement, and, above all drainage. Much like Ross, Thomas is a great believer in combining beauty and utility and in respecting the natural environment of the site: “On the artistic side there is a theory of construction with a main fundamental that we copy nature; in this all seem to agree” (139). He also tries to make his courses to be both challenging and fair so that each hole can be played in a variety of ways. Like Ross, he believes courses should be designed to minimize congestion. Finally, with a degree of sympathy for duffers like me, he seeks to avoid constructing holes on which too many balls would be lost. Interestingly, Thomas does stray once from his analysis of course design and construction. He notes that “half the shots of par golf are putts,” then argues that that is “undoubtedly too great a proportion” (3 16). His solution: counting each putt half a stroke and then making par for most 18-hole courses. (As an inveterate yipper, I deeply regret the United States Golf Association’s failure to adopt this eminently sensible course of action!)

Avid golf fans will find these two works fascinating. They are beautifully put together, with original photographs and diagrams, sewn bindings, and premium paper—surefire gifts for the golf *aficionado*. They are of considerably less value for the serious sports historian, largely because much of the detail will seem relatively trivial. As documents, however, they do confirm that golf in the early twentieth century was largely a white, male, upper-class sport. Women, African Americans, and middle-class Sunday hackers are absent from these accounts. Those people who appear are club members, gentlemen, and, of course,

golf architects. Ross's class assumptions are particularly evident: he praises the Royal Dornoch course near where he was born in Scotland, claiming that "no American golfer should omit to go there," partly because "he will find... no rabble" (183). The heir to a Victorian moral code, Ross eschews gambling and says up front that "Golf is the one gentleman's game" (203). Indeed, he concludes, "A country which gets golf-minded need not worry about the honor, the integrity, and the honesty of its people" (203). I can't help but wonder what Mr. Ross and Mr. Thomas would have said had they been with me on an unusually warm day this past November. Seated in the middle of a fairway, waiting for an illegal fivesome to clear the green, dodging balls hit by the foursome behind me, I watched my opponent nudge his ball from behind a tree. Golf-mindedness does not guarantee honor!

—ANTHONY O. EDMONDS  
Ball State University

---

MARTHA MCCAUGHEY, *Real Knockouts: The Physical Feminism of Women's Self-Defense*. New York: New York University Press, 1997. Pp. xvi + 270. \$18.99 pb

Although I have never had a personal interest in self-defense, I have always been fascinated by people who take courses to take their aggression out on others. As a scholar, I am interested in the gendered dimensions of sport, and thus was pleased to come across *Real Knockouts*, a book that effectively examines the link between feminism, women's bodies, and self-defense.

Although not technically a book that will appeal to sport historians, this volume provides an entree into the world of self-defense and an examination of the women who participate in such activities. The real strength of this ethnographical study is the dismantling of a number of myths that surround women, rape, fighting back, and hegemonic masculinity and femininity. Aggression, as McCaughey points out, is a "primary marker of sexual difference" (2), and thus expressing aggressive behavior challenges a "naturalized heterosexual femininity" (3). The assumption that women are "naturally" passive, while men are "naturally" aggressive, "fuels the frequency and ease with which men assault women" (3). McCaughey initially questions the strategies that have largely been put in place for women, but generally not by women, to protect them from assault. So-called "risk-reducing" strategies tend to restrict women to indoors or otherwise challenge women's freedom of movement. McCaughey argues that women's use of weapons or willingness to resort to self-defense is publicly scrutinized in a way that more accepted protective measures (husband, alarm system) are not. Thus this book is concerned with the process by which women reject these traditional protective measures and seize back control of, not just the night, but of their own bodies.

It is widely asserted that women are more likely to survive a rape with fewer injuries if they simply "lie back and take it." Women who fight back, so many women believe, are in increased danger of being severely injured, or worse, killed. McCaughey, however, points out that few rape statistics take into consideration the numbers of rapes that have been averted as a result of women taking control and aggressively fighting back. Indeed, she sees