

it turned out, when the panelists, even the PGA members, came to filling out the ballot for the PGA National, they decided it wasn't good enough. I think when you have to put numbers down in seven criteria you sort of lose sight of the politics.

A criticism we are vulnerable to is that we give too much attention to Dye and Nicklaus. Part of that is because they have the big budgets and the big facilities behind them, the ones that would most likely make the 100 Greatest list. So we have created two other categories of recognition for architects — the Best New Courses of the Year and the Best Public Course. The Best Public is an every-other-year ranking and Best New is obviously every year. We have been able to recognize new architects like Dennis Griffith and Brian Silva. Brian designed, with Geoffrey Cornish, the Captains Golf Course, on Cape Cod, which is our Best Public Course of 1985. Dennis Griffith worked with Ron Kirby in doing Pole Creek, which was our Best Public Course of 1984.

We like to think the 100 Greatest and the other awards that *Golf Digest* bestows on architects and courses promote better design the way the Academy Awards promotes better picture making or the Pulitzer Prizes promote better reporting. Awards drive people to excel. I was talking with Bill Davis, the founder of *Golf Digest*, the other day on the phone, and he quoted Napoleon as saying, "If you give me enough medals I will win any war." And that is what we are trying to do with our course ranking. We are giving medals to architects and owners, trying to get them to excel and to solve the problems facing golf course architecture today.

#### Closing Remarks by FRANK HANNIGAN:

To put our discussions of Contemporary Golf Course Architecture in perspective, I would make one point to you. Name a handful of great golf courses that have one thing or a couple of things in common and the list will surely include Oakmont, Merion, Pebble Beach, the National Golf Links of America, and Pine Valley. What those golf courses have in common is that every one was designed by an amateur. In all but one case it was the amateur's first attempt at designing a golf course and, finally, he didn't take any money for doing the work.

Maybe golf course architects ought to think about that!

# Reflections on Golf's Future

by C. GRANT SPAETH

Vice President, USGA, Menlo Park, California

*(Editor's Note: Frank D. Tatum, Jr., was unable to attend the Conference because he was playing in a tournament at Pebble Beach, California. C. Grant Spaeth agreed to present Tatum's paper in full while condensing his own scheduled remarks to a few brief comments.)*

**T**HE TOPIC "Reflections on Golf's Future" is, I find, not an easy one. In my research for it, I came across a quote from Sam Goldwyn; "Never make forecasts — especially about the future." So I am simply going to capsulize the material I do have while eliminating statistics on numbers of golf courses, numbers of golfers, etc.

If the past is any key to the future, we can look for the game to be relatively mature, relatively unchanging. In large measure, this will be true if the golfer — the amateur golfer that is — retains his

control over the destiny of his game. It seems to me that, regardless of what occurs during the course of the next 50 years, if the organizations of amateur golfers, i.e., city, regional, state, or national, continue to have no commercial objectives and are simply and solely concerned about preserving the game, then, whatever happens in those 50 years can be dealt with effectively.

In the field of turfgrass management, we can safely forecast the absolute certainty that less water will be available for our golf courses, particularly within metropolitan areas. With this forecast in mind, it is the amateur golfer who is investing heavily in research to develop grasses which, in fact, will not require high maintenance and particularly the high watering requirements that now seem necessary.

High technology clearly is going to try to change the game. Thus it is that amateurs, and in recent years the USGA, have spent enormous sums resisting changes, whether it is government or innovators or new patents, in order to protect the challenge and to preserve the game. And there is no one else around but the amateur golfer to resist these inroads. I personally see the inroads continuing and the litigation continuing. The amateur golfer is simply having to stand up and resist those challenges.

I could go through other aspects of the game, but you can do it just as well. I hope you will take with you the notion that ultimately the strength of the game depends upon amateur players spending some time and money to protect the game.

Sandy Tatum, as you all know, certainly exemplifies the sort of amateur golfer who spends a large chunk of his life on the mission I have just tried to describe. His paper conveys his depth of feelings about these issues.



C. Grant Spaeth