

Sand; for traps, 200 cubic yards.....	200.00
Labor, after July 15, in preparing seed beds, seeding, mowing, etc.....	1,835.00
Miscellaneous expenses	256.00
Building shed	400.00
	<hr/>
	\$21,435.00
Uncompleted work, about	2,000.00
	<hr/>
Total	\$23,435.00
	<hr/>
Total cost of labor	\$11,500.00

The Need of Criticism in Golf Architecture

There is a positive if indefinable relation between the character of a golf course and the pleasure derived by the golfer. The character or degree of excellence of a course depends on three things: First, its architecture; second, its standard of maintenance; and third, its landscape beauty. In the betterment of any golf course, all three of these elements are essential, and the excellence of golf courses will improve in proportion as golfers realize their importance. It is true that golfers get a lot of fun out of a simple course laid out in an old pasture; but it does not follow that such a course is to be considered a model.

In promoting the movement for better golf courses, the Green Section is concerned not only with turf, but also with landscape beautification and with quality of architecture.

There was a time when the professional golfer was supposed to be a Pooh Bah who knew all about playing the game, everything about green-keeping, and the whole subject of golf architecture. Today nearly everyone recognizes these three things as distinct though interrelated subjects, and justly distrusts the man who claims to be proficient in all three or even in two of them. In other words, specialization has entered golf as in other fields where progress is usually in proportion to intensive studies of limited scope. The day of the man who assumed expertness in all phases of golf has gone the way of the Ichthyosaurus.

In the evolution of any particular subject, frank discussion of principles and methods helps to promote advancement. There certainly has been and still is abundant discussion as to playing the game of golf, and usually with the assumption that the form of the latest champion is the best. Every one has perfect freedom to present his experience and theories on how to grow grass. When it comes to golf architecture, however, there is practically nothing in print, but by word of mouth one often hears violent expressions of opinion in which the word "rotten" is frequently used. The relative immunity of golf architecture to critical discussion is partly due to the fact that it involves the architect himself, or in other words is likely to be taken as personal criticism. There is likewise a vague sort of unwritten law akin to lese majesty which to a great extent absolves artists (including architects) from criticism. Finally the architects themselves maintain a sort of guild—they do not publicly discuss or criticize each other's ideas, nor do they write books or articles for the education of the golfing world. This condition of affairs is not a healthful one for the progress of golf architecture.

In spite of these strictures there has been progress in golf architecture, mostly by a very few men. It is depressing to see many new courses built in which the construction features deserve only censure. In the effort to construct something novel, the result is often one that excites only ridicule. Incidentally such caricatures reveal that the architect is only human—not, as we were fain to believe, one of Nietzsche's supermen. And so the architect must submit to criticism like any other mortal.

One of the notable advances in golf architecture in America was made when the National Links were built by Mr. Charles B. Macdonald, each hole being a more or less exact replica of one in Europe which had become well known. Valuable as this plan may be, there are two obvious limitations. First of all, if used generally there could be no progress but merely constant replications of the holes chosen as best. Second, there is wide divergence of opinion in regard to certain well-known holes, some architects insisting they are in reality not *famous* for their good qualities but *infamous* for their bad traits. Clearly a discussion by the different architects over the merits or demerits of a particular hole could not help but be educational. But the architects remain silent, and it is becoming increasingly apparent that the discussions will have to be by the growing number of amateurs who are making a study of golf architecture. Such amateurs are not content either with the explanation that a hole is a replica of one that is noted, or with the architect's *ex cathedra* pronouncement that the hole is superb. The amateur student of architecture asks himself such questions as these: Is the green properly placed? Is it of the best size and shape and properly undulated? Are the bunkers correctly placed and of the right size to be fair? etc. In the answer to such questions neither authority nor tradition should have influence. The attitude must be that of the scientist, who remains skeptical until the proof is sufficient.

As an outcome of this growing amateur interest in golf architecture, it is not surprising to find work of very superior character being done by non-professional architects. Indeed, it is not too much to say that such amateurs are outstripping the professional architects in the excellence of their work. This is doubtless due in part to the fact that such amateurs devote far more time and study to the building of a particular hole than does the professional architect. If this be the true explanation, then many architects are endangering their reputations by undertaking too much work—which naturally leads to a sort of made-in-the-factory type of architecture.

The golf clubs are vitally interested in this matter, because golf courses are expensive and the members like to have a course that excites admiration, not one that calls for adverse criticism. The architects owe it to the clubs, from which they derive their support, and also to themselves, to aid in getting better architecture and in suppressing freak construction. It is earnestly urged that they abandon the policy of secretiveness and silence and discuss frankly the good and bad architectural features of golf courses -- to the end that golf progress be furthered.

Professional golfers' register.—A register of professional golfers is maintained by the Professional Golfers' Association. Clubs desiring the services of a competent professional are invited to make their wants known to the Secretary, Professional Golfers' Association, 366 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.