

Some U. S. Golf Association Decisions on the Rules of Golf

A player tees the ball for a drive, swings, and misses it entirely. He then addresses the ball, playing two, and accidentally knocks it off the tee. Has he the right to re-tee without penalty?

(Decision.) As the player had made his first stroke when he missed the ball, it was in play, and therefore there is a penalty of one stroke for knocking it off the tee when he subsequently addressed the ball. Rule 12.

Both players have reached the green. One player putts his opponent's ball toward the cup and his opponent then putts the other ball left on the green, which he thought was his, and after making the putt discovers that both players played each other's ball. This was in match play.

(Decision.) Rule 20 covers this point. The hole stands as played out.

A player driving off of the tee drives a ball straight down the fairway and gets an unlucky hop to the left into a ditch under a bridge. This bridge is just laid across the ditch and can be moved very easily. Is the player allowed to move the bridge so that he can make his shot? This ditch is dry about nine months out of the year. The way the ball was lying, it was impossible for him to make the shot without moving the bridge. An opponent objected to his moving the bridge, upon which he took the attitude that if he could not move the bridge he could drop the ball a club's length from the bridge in the ditch without penalty.

(Decision.) The player should not have moved the bridge, as it was part of the water hazard. Unless there were a local rule covering, the player had no right to drop a club's length from the bridge.

Competition in Golf Architecture

It has long been the practice in the construction of buildings to invite the submission of plans and estimates of cost by different architects—the builder reserving the right to select the one he deems most satisfactory. Is this idea applicable to golf architecture? Certainly any golf club in building its course desires the best possible layout and the highest type of holes, both as to playing quality and to landscape beauty. Such a plan, if golf architects can be induced to compete, should make for more rapid progress in their art. Certainly it would go far to discourage the tiresome repetition on one course after another of identical holes.

It is true that every painter, every sculptor, perhaps every artist, has idiosyncrasies, so that an expert can almost at once recognize the creator of a piece of art. This is notoriously true of golf architects. For them it would seem there is far less excuse than in the case of painters, builders, or other artists. The golf architect has Nature as his setting, and no two pieces of terrain are quite identical. In other words, Nature never repeats. To make more or less exact replicas of holes whether meritorious ones or otherwise—regardless of the topography and landscape—is not a high type of art.

It certainly would be both interesting and instructive to compare the plans of several different architects for the same piece of land. It would necessitate careful work of competent judges to determine the most meritorious.

Any club contemplating the building of a first-class course could very wisely offer a fee of, say, \$10,000 for the most meritorious plans—a sum which some architects are already asking. If the club furnished an accurate topographical map of the land, the fee might be considerably reduced.

At the present time the selection of a golf architect is more or less an emotional matter. Some one urges that John Smith is best, because he has built many courses; others lean to James Jones, because he is a convincing talker; while some would get George Robinson, because he has a wonderful set of models. Personal likes and dislikes enter the equation also. Few if any of the men who select the architect have the necessary temperament and technical knowledge to decide on an architect in an unbiased way based on the actual merit of his work.

It is hoped that some of the new clubs will adopt this suggestion of inviting competitive plans and estimates.

Strange Archaeological Discovery

(From *The Scientific World*, January, 1916.)

In an excavation being made for the new sunken garden at Frogaria, not far from Niock, which the ancients, at the time this rock was formed, called *New York*, a layer of shale-like rock of recent geological formation was encountered, evidently an old lake bottom. This layer of rock contained a stratum of globose objects about as large as a hen's egg, but perfectly spherical. These objects were stratified, as many as twenty layers in some places, elsewhere fewer. The surface markings show a curious series of symmetrical designs, some of them tessellated, others dimpled, some muricate with little excrescences. Over one hundred different designs have already been found, and but a small portion of the rock has been broken so that the objects can be released.

At the meeting of the National Academy of Science last evening there was tremendous interest shown. The more conservative members refrained from making comments, but among the younger men were enthusiastic advocates of at least four different theories. Dr. Bougee argues that the objects were seeds of some unknown group of plants. Prof. O. Y. Dumbkopf ridiculed Bougee's idea and insisted that the peculiar fossils were the eggs of some large lizard. Other guesses were by Dr. Razz, who thought they must be puff-balls, and by Dr. Koth, who opined they were coprolites.

Cross sections of the objects have not as yet been accomplished, but Director Glum, of the Biological Laboratory, called attention to the fact that many of the objects were scarred, some indeed with deep gashes, which disclosed that the outer layer is different from the interior. He estimates that the area of rock containing the objects is about 100 yards long and 200 feet wide. In this rock are embedded at least 13,650,000 of the curious spheres.

The meeting adjourned without shedding much light on the mysterious things, but interest among the savants is intense. It is hoped that with very hard steel saws it will be possible to section the objects, whatever they may be, and thus perhaps solve the mystery. A very mystifying feature of these strange objects, utterly new to science, is that they should occur in such immense numbers in the spot where found.