

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

self-defense as a key mechanism in the prevention of rape and other physical assaults, for it shatters the stereotype of “male invulnerability and female helplessness” (177). McCaughey also convincingly dispels the myths that self-defense classes lead to a false sense of security among graduates. It is from here that McCaughey takes the reader through a number of self-defense classes from full-on body contact and martial arts to weapons such as guns.

While this book may not be worthwhile for most sport historians, it is certainly a valuable insight into the physical control and regulation of women’s bodies. Certainly, it is a useful text for those in feminist or women’s studies and for those interested in issues surrounding the body and self-defense.

—TARA MAGDALINSKI
Sunshine Coast University

GEMS, GERALD R. *For Pride, Profit, and Patriarchy: Football and the Incorporation of American Cultural Values*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2000. Pp. ii + 224. Notes, bibliography, index. \$35.00 cb.

During the last half century, football has emerged as America’s most popular team sport. The National Football League has established a professional league in Europe, and its Super Bowl broadcasts are seen by hundreds of millions of fans worldwide. Select college teams play games periodically in Mexico, Japan, and the British Isles. Despite its growing popularity, relatively little attention has been focused on the cultural and ideological impact of American football. Many scholars have carefully examined the cultural significance of baseball, but football remains largely overlooked. Gerald R. Gems provides a service to sport historians and those interested in popular culture by filling this void.

In his first chapter, “For Victory and Profit,” Gems gives an overview of the development of American football up to 1900. Building on the work of scholars such as Ronald A. Smith, Michael Oriard, Robin Lester and others, Gems incorporates important new research, mainly from university archives, to provide a succinct and riveting introduction to American football. As is the case throughout the book, Gems uses his extensive research most impressively and skillfully. He links early football with manliness, *laissez-faire* capitalism, and nationalism as well as militarism. Gems pulls no punches in describing the brutality of the early game, the rampant commercialism which enveloped it, and the dishonesty and hypocrisy of coaches and benefactors at the increasing number of colleges which fielded teams. Throughout the book Gems tends to be nonjudgmental in his analysis. He might have pointed out more forcefully the contradiction of many coaches and football promoters preaching amateurism and manly Christian values while on the other hand subsidizing players and conducting illegal recruitment.

In dealing with gender, Gems makes it clear that football was and largely remains a man’s game. Many late nineteenth century American males feared effeminate trends in society and found football to be a powerful antidote. “Football more so than any other game,” Gems maintains, “marginalized women, restricting them to spectatorial roles in the symbolic maintenance of gender relations” (51). While football turned its back on