

The shade of the great Sir Isaac is, doubtless, very sensible of the compliment thus conveyed. *Ego et meus Rex!*

Nor does our author's modesty fail to inform us of his own prowess as a golfer. At page 75 we have an account of how he taught Mr. Jerome Travers a new stroke in golf—the very old one of negotiating a styne by allowing the loft of a masbie to do the work. Mr. Vaile also, it appears, taught the same "new" trick to no less a personage than George Duncan!

Another fine bit of self-revelation is to be found on page 26.

"I can remember playing a very good drive across a small river and about two hundred yards up a hill on the other side. The tee was within a few yards of the river. The force of my drive smashed my club off at the splice and carried it away over the river, but I had never played a better shot at this hole, nor did I ever do so afterwards."

This was certainly a very good drive. It is not everybody who can drive a ball across a river and about 200 yards up a hill on the other side. Besides we must remember that the tee was within a few yards of the river. In fairness to Mr. Vaile, these few yards should be added to the distance. Some drive, as the street poets say! Of course there are rivers and rivers; but this book has been written for American readers and they know what a river is. Mr. Vaile is perfectly right. He never played a better shot at that hole, wherever it is, and he never will.

The *A. B. C. of Golf*, by John Duncan Dunn, the well-known teacher of golf, scion of a family of Scotsmen famous in golf, is another book which has come to hand. It is published by Harper and Brothers—the first of an *A. B. C.* series on divers interesting themes—housekeeping, electricity, architecture, etc., which will only indirectly interest golfers. There is, however, one on *Correct Speech* and another on *Good Form*, which golfers should, perhaps, add to their libraries. But, as I have not been favored with a sight of these, I cannot speak with authority.

The essential of golf according to Dunn is "balance." He will allow you to stand or swing pretty much as you please; he will allow you to use either the Vardon or the two-V grip; he thinks (*pace* Mr. Vaile) that most wise golfers bear their main weight on the right leg at the top of the swing, but admits that many divide their weight about equally as to their legs—but the great thing is balance.

Allied to this doctrine of balance is the teaching that "the real energy of the big strokes in golf comes from the big, strong leg and back muscles. The hands and arms are the only members that enter consciously into the stroke and yet they contribute but a small percentage of the total power." It is true that Mr. Marshall Whitlatch has advocated a similar doctrine which has a striking analogy to the elder Sothorn's joke about the doggy wagging its tail because the tail cannot wag the dog. But I cannot but think these doctrines should be received with caution.

The body-movement is contributory, but it is relatively slow; the hands and arms are swift, and swiftness in the proper direction with proper impact is what counts in the drive. Mr. Dunn is absolutely right when he says (page 32) that "The large heavy muscles of the back and hips cannot move so rapidly as the lighter ones of the wrists and arms." True, but this is rather inconsistent with his doctrine that energy comes from the big muscles. He makes this a reason for advising that the body-muscles start the down-swing first; but even here I cannot but think he is wrong. The body-muscles are contributory; to a certain extent directory too; but the swiftness comes from the hands—the true leaders.

Mr. Dunn is quite right in asserting the importance of balance, but many will wish it were perfectly in accord with experience to say: "If you are in perfect balance at the top of the swing the rest is easy." After all the golfer's task is to hit the ball and there is a way of hitting it which is quite independent

of balance; this way depends upon grip and chiefly, perhaps, upon our mental conception of it.

The *A. B. C. of Golf* is replete with useful hints and tips and is eminently quotable. For example:

"Early golfing authors seemed to look upon golf as a literary rather than an athletic exercise; to Mr. Arnold Haultain, delightful essayist, golf is merely a state of mind."

"The good player hits underhand; the bad player hits overhand."

"Bad golf is often an error of mind."

Let us add that the book is written in excellent temper and contains the results of well-won experience. Every golfer should buy it.

Golf Insurance—By Robert Stanley Weir

IT might be interesting to learn by means of bona fide confessions the extent of domestic club-swinging that goes on in the privacy of golfers' homes. How many new theories have been there evolved; how often the secret of the game has been there discovered! For some reason or other, however, golfers are usually silent with regard to these private and solitary rehearsals. They prefer to affect the nonchalance of unpremeditation, stepping up to the tee as though they had not handled a club since last they were seen on the links; whereas, if the truth were known, there has been at those hours of morning and evening that used to be devoted by our ancestors to meditation, such a swishing of drivers and cleeks at imaginary balls within the precincts of the home, far, too far from the beloved links, as assuredly would convince the non-golfer, were he permitted to know what was going on, that much golfing like much learning in the case of St. Paul doth make us mad.

A little light upon this habit of club-swinging at home has just been revealed in the course of a suit at law just terminated before the Superior Court of the Province of Quebec. A certain insurance company was condemned by Mr. Justice Greenshields to fulfil their liability towards Mr. A. G. Brooke Claxton, barrister-at-law, under two policies obtained from the company to insure him against bodily injuries caused by accident. The question that came up for consideration, and about which a spirited legal fight was engaged in, was whether a slight hernia in the left side was the result of accident or of predisposition.

The judgment of the Court is not without interest to golfers, establishing as it does an important point of jurisprudence.

"The plaintiff," said His Lordship, "has from his boyhood taken an active part in outdoor sports. Later, and for a number of years he followed with keenness the royal game of golf as a matter of amusement and exercise. In winter, when he was unable to follow the game out of doors, he continued his exercise by swinging his clubs in his house. On March 12, 1914, while at this exercise he felt what he describes as a 'tearing pain' in his left side. Subsequently medical aid was called, and the doctor pronounced that Mr. Claxton was suffering from double hernia, caused by the violent exercise the patient had indulged in on March 12. An operation was performed; the company defendant was notified of the injury and of the intended claim under the two policies, but they refused to pay; hence this action.

"Defendant's plea was that the assured did not suffer bodily injuries which were caused through external violent and accidental means, but that the hernia existed previous to March 12, 1914, if not actually apparent at that time, and the plaintiff was always predisposed to hernia.

"No matter how predisposed plaintiff may have been to develop hernia the actual condition never developed until March 13. It is a fact well known to medical science that a person may become im-

moderately afflicted with hernia as a result of a sudden strain or wrench no matter from what cause that strain may arise. I have no doubt that whatever the predisposition of the plaintiff may have been to hernia, the actual condition developed on March 13 was due to the violent exercise of swinging his golf club on the morning of the 12th. That the policy contemplates hernia being caused by an accident is beyond any question, and the liability existed from the moment the policy was issued. 'But,' says defendant, 'that was not an accident as contemplated by my policy, even if the hernia resulted as a consequence of what the plaintiff was doing.' I cannot follow the defendant in this pretension. The word 'accident' or 'accidental,' where used in this policy, has, in my opinion, no technically restricted—or what I might call 'insurance'—meaning. The policy is a contract the wording of which was chosen by the defendant, and I should interpret the word 'accident' or 'accidental' when and where used in the policy in the ordinary and popular significance of the words. The plaintiff intended to swing his club for healthful exercise. He did not intend to cause himself injury, and if while practising this exercise, and as a consequence of doing it, injury resulted, that was an injury caused by the accident.

"I find that the resulting disability to the plaintiff in the present case was immediately due to the accident which happened while he was swinging his club on March 12, 1914, and the company defendant is condemned to pay to plaintiff the sum of \$100 on the policies."

If one may comment upon the facts as thus disclosed one would be disposed to conclude that the learned counsel had either put too much body into the stroke or had resisted, with his body, the impetus of the arms. In either event it might have been argued that the plaintiff was guilty of contributory negligence and ought to be non-suited. The defendant's argument would thus be: Granted that the plaintiff is entitled to swing his golf clubs in the privacy of his own chamber as well as on the links; it is to be conceded that he must do so in a golfing manner. No stroke in golf, properly executed, can result in a hernia for the force of the golf stroke must be smoothly applied.

This point was not raised and judgment went for plaintiff. In another case known to the writer an enthusiastic golfer found himself *hors de combat* by reason of a lumbago-like stitch in his back. He traced the matter to having missed his ball in an attempt to send it far and sure. Relating the circumstances to the insurance accident company he omitted the details of his bad performance, reporting merely a golfing accident. In this he was supported by his medical adviser and obtained an adequate solatium in the form of the company's cheque.

The jurisprudence of golf is not, so far as I am aware, very extensive for golfers are a peaceful folk. Perhaps the most celebrated litigation was over the Haskell patents. Certain celebrated amateurs have been tempted by the rulings of the U. S. G. A. to apply for an order of Court compelling that august body to permit them to compete as amateurs in the amateurship championship, but so far this temptation has been resisted; and for this we are all grateful. R. STANLEY WEIR.

The Case of Ouimet

THE United States Golfing Association has followed its resolution regarding professionalism to its practical conclusion, and has sent an official notice to Francis Ouimet and his partner John L. Sullivan that they are not eligible to compete in amateur events. Of course, this is a pity; and the golfers of both hemispheres will sympathize with the winner of the famous contest with Vardon and Ray, in being the first victim of the stricter attitude now taken up by the ruling body in the States on the question of profes-

sionalism. With this feeling we are in the most cordial agreement, but at the same time we cannot quite go so far as some of the American papers which are arguing, with more good heart than logic, that because the new ruling touches Ouimet it must necessarily be bad. It is not permissible, it seems to us, to argue from the particular to the general even in such a problem as this. The U. S. G. A.'s decision to rank as professionals all those who exploited their success at golf for commercial purposes had to be considered on its merits and without reference to its effect upon any individual. And the decision having once been come to, rightly or wrongly, we certainly consider that the Association are to be commended for having had the courage of their convictions and carrying their views to the practical outcome. We have seen enough in this country of the folly of admirable theoretical legislation unattended by any practical application on the part of the executive. Such hidings of the ostrich head in the sand do no good to anybody, and even the opponents of the U. S. G. A. who think that the reforming zeal has carried them too far, will not dispute that they are making an honest fight for what they consider the purity of the game. We must add that of course not the slightest stigma attaches to Mr. Ouimet, whose actions throughout have been as open as the day. An alteration of the rule has placed him technically outside of the amateur class, and that is all.

An interesting point that does not seem yet to have been raised by any one, is whether the American Association's decision will prevent Mr. Ouimet from competing in the Amateur Championship here. According to the regulations governing the conduct of that championship—and those regulations supply the only definition of a professional on this side of the Atlantic—Mr. Ouimet in this country would still be regarded as an amateur. Is it material that he has ceased to be regarded as an amateur in his own country? We think not. To be sure if the boot were on the other leg, if a player were regarded as an amateur in the States, he would be accepted as an amateur here without question, nor would the authorities here go behind the American Association's recognition of the player as an amateur to examine evidence brought forward to show that that recognition had been granted in error. That, we believe, has already been decided. But while such evidence would not be accepted against the player, it does not follow that in the contrary case similar evidence would not be admitted in the player's favor. The principle, we think, is that in either case the player must get the benefit of the doubt; and as the United States Association has clearly indicated that their reason for classing Mr. Ouimet as a professional is one which would not make him a professional in this country, it appears he would still be acceptable as an entrant for the British Amateur Championship when the war permits it to resume, unless by that time we ourselves have altered our amateur definition so as to bring ourselves more or less into line with the American one.

As we have already suggested, this problem of commercialism is one that ought to receive the earnest consideration of our governing authorities when the game returns to its normal again. We do not think that there is any need to copy the Americans by adopting a stricter definition of the amateur. What we want is a little of the American thoroughness in enforcing the one we have already. It is a matter of common report that at least one famous amateur has given as the explanation of the infrequency of his appearances in that event during the last ten years, that he is not satisfied with the way in which the amateur restrictions are enforced. It is a pity that there should ever be any murmurings of this kind; the status of all the entrants for our Amateur Championship ought to be above suspicion. It may be that there has never been any foundation for the rumors that have from time to time been circulated. But we should feel more confident of it if we could believe that should the necessity arise, our own championship authorities would display as much firmness in dealing with the matter as the American authorities have done.—(From *Golfing*.)