

and fame into money. Such an act is contrary to the spirit of amateurism and to prevent it how are we going to proceed to legislate so as to be fair to one and condemn the other. It seems impossible, for even today the amateur ruling is most unfair where it declares the workers in golf ball factories are professionals. Many of them have perhaps never seen a golf course in their life, and yet according to the modern conception they are professionals in every line of sport. That is, of course, absurd. What, it seems to us, we must be careful of in our desire to protect the amateur body is not to overstep the bounds of reason and create a dividing line so hard and fast that it can not be maintained. Of this danger the U. S. G. A. is fully aware and is consequently bringing every influence in its power to awaken public opinion in order that the weak and guilty-minded will not dare overstep the mark.

The U. S. G. A. Nominations

A more efficient (pardon the word) committee than that which has held office during the last year the Association could not ask for. Never perhaps have we had a President with a broader conception of his duties and a zeal and ability to carry them to a successful conclusion. Routine duties have occupied but a small part of his time when compared with burdens he has shouldered by initiating things which in a way were outside his province but for the good of the game in this country. His has been a live interest whose influence has been felt where least suspected. So has that of Mr. Howard Whitney, who as secretary has had a great deal of detail work to care for. A position of this kind requires tact and firmness, both of which qualities Mr. Whitney has. The other members of the committee have all taken a most sincere interest in their duties. It is with regret therefore that Mr. Percy R. Pyne, 2nd, finds that business duties will prevent him from accepting the nomination as treasurer for the coming year. In Mr. Frederick S. Wheeler, a former President of the Metropolitan Golf Association, the Nominating Committee has found a most excellent man to fill his place.

The nominations are as follows: President, Frank L. Woodward, Denver Country Club; vice-presidents, Howard W. Perrin, Merion Cricket Club, and John Reid, Jr., St. Andrews Golf Club; secretary, Howard F. Whitney, Nassau Country Club; treasurer Frederick S. Wheeler; executive committee, M. Lewis Crosby, Brae-Burn Country Club; Walter B. Smith, Onwentsia Club; Dr. Walter S. Harban, Columbia Country Club, and John S. Sweeney, Country Club of Detroit.

Mr. Weir Disagreed With

To the Editor of Golf Illustrated,

Sir,—As one of that great majority of golfers who does not possess mechanical perfection, and who endeavors to obtain a

basis for improvement from every source possible, I wish to protest against the injustice of Mr. R. S. Weir in his caustic criticism of the articles by Mr. J. Albert Scott which appeared in GOLF ILLUSTRATED during the spring months of this year. I am sure that through their clear style and simple English these articles have been helpful to so many that they should be defended from malevolent attack. And in passing, let me say that I do not think the duffer has had the only profit from them; for, during the summer, I overheard one of our best amateurs freely proclaim that he was indebted to Mr. Scott for a great improvement in his game.

I am willing to concede that Mr. Weir is sincere in offering his review as a criticism of the logic of Mr. Scott's analysis, but what he really does is to scold the author for not using the words which he would have used under similar circumstances. A limited amount of such criticism might be permissible as suggestions, but the dogmatic manner used is that of the old-fashioned pedagogue. I have understood that Mr. Weir belongs to the legal profession, however, and this may account for his inability to understand the ordinary English of our Anglo-Saxon forefathers. I venture to say that in the three articles reviewed no expression used was misunderstood by a single reader (members of the bar excepted), but I should like to know the percentage of subscribers who are familiar with the terms "*quoad*," "*pronator*" and "*logomachic*." Is it better to say "*position quoad the ball*," or, position with reference to the ball?

Certain criticisms of another type were also unworthy of a man of Mr. Weir's reputation. An entirely gratuitous assumption is made that the author considers the drive the whole game of golf. Is it possible that such a keen analyst as Mr. Scott finds no difference between iron play and wood play? Is it not more likely that he expects to analyze iron play later? The subject of the articles under consideration, *The Triumvirate Analyzed*, receives admonishment. Surely it must have occurred to the reviewer in his capacity as author, that in nine cases out of ten the editor is the author of the title. Was it so in this case, Mr. Behr?

I do not believe it desirable to reply in detail to the reviewer's other criticisms. The readers will judge for themselves whether the author's case is not better than that of the reviewer. I must, however, point out two facts. The author distinctly states that this analysis of the driving stroke must be judged as a whole. If this is done, I believe the golfing public will give it approbation. One word more. Criticisms of Mr. Scott's articles and pictures should be made with the assistance of pictures of the same type. His pictures, if I am not mistaken, are action photographs, photographs of parts of strokes actually played. The pictures in the books of Vardon and Braid are posed.

Professor E. M. EAST,
Harvard University

Mr. Weir's Rejoinder

To the Editor of Golf Illustrated,

Sir,—It is quite clear that "Prof. E. M. East, Harvard University," has lost his temper; something no golfer should do, whether pen or niblick be in his hand; least of all one who is also a university professor. And his defense of Mr. Scott illustrates once more the persistent, but pernicious old practice: "No case. Abuse the plaintiff's attorney." I am not going over the whole ground again, but would ask: where are the flaws in my argument? I am charged with "injustice." Where, and how committed? A "malevolent attack." This is serious. My criticism was "caustic" and I "scolded" Mr. Scott! Awful. Well, it shall be Prof. East's turn now.

I am afraid the professor must be somewhat old-fashioned in his methods—sometimes, but not always, a merit. He abuses me, not my argument; which is very old style indeed. He then indulges in a fling or sneer at my profession; which is also a

very ancient, but now discredited, custom. He will surely regret this when he sees how bad it looks in print; and Harvard will be disappointed at the lack of originality.

Prof. East thinks he recognizes "the dogmatic manner of the old-fashioned pedagogue." There, naturally, being himself of the profession, he should have the advantage of me; in both theory and practice. Still, I fail to see what old or new style pedagogics have to do with the merits of Mr. Scott's articles and my review.

The professor complains of me that "an entirely gratuitous assumption is made that the author (Mr. Scott) considers the drive the whole game of golf." But I certainly made no such assumption, gratuitous or otherwise. I merely remarked that Mr. Scott, in writing articles entitled *The Triumvirate Analyzed*, had analyzed nothing but the drive; as though that were all! I criticized an assumption. I made none. In any event the little "admonishment" (the learned professor who is fond of "ordinary English" should have remembered that persons, not things, are "admonished") was couched in the mildest terms.

Next. Does not Prof. E. M. East, Harvard University, pay poor compliments to the readers of this excellent magazine by questioning whether many of them understand the meaning of "*quoad*," "*pronator*" and "*logomachic*"; as though they were all undergraduates still? "*Quoad*" in particular, troubles him; and he translates it, taking several words to do it. Personally, I don't mind being driven to the dictionary now and again. I am sure our readers found those three nice-looking words quite harmless and, in their way, pleasing and fitting. Certainly, there is no suggestion of vindictiveness or bad temper about them, excepting perhaps "*logomachic*"; but I said I wanted to avoid "a *logomachic* dispute," or war about words. Certainly, too, they are not nearly half so bad as "*caustic*" or "*malevolent*" or "old-fashioned pedagogue."

Again. The worthy professor, obliged to admit that the title was too broad for the text, is quite sure, anyway, that "in nine cases out of ten the editor is the author of the title," and hints that I must admit this. I am certainly not going to blame Mr. Behr for the title Mr. Scott chose; and am of opinion that in "nine cases out of ten" authors choose their own titles. Prof. East should, on this point, consult his colleague in the Chair of Literature, who will put him right.

Prof. East "does not believe it desirable to reply, etc." He meant to say "advisable," not "desirable," but was probably in a hurry as well as in a heat. Still, he should not charge one with "injustice," and leave it at that. The main point is, was my criticism, whether "caustic" or not, sound? At least one proof of its soundness is that Prof. East attempts no refutation.

I quite agree with the Harvard professor that "readers will judge for themselves," and I also agree with another point: "Criticisms of Mr. Scott's articles and pictures should be made with the assistance of pictures of the same type, etc." Very good. The professor may be surprised to learn then, that my pictures were taken from Mr. Scott's own admirable photographs and from no other source! The editor was kind enough to allow me to make a selection from a hundred or more in Mr. Scott's collection. They showed convincingly that the Triumvirate do not play in one stereotyped style. The professor, in his eagerness to score a point, has tripped.

To conclude. I really thought I had written a fair, candid and quite good-humored review. I am sure, too, the editor would not have printed it, had it not been such. To prove I have nothing but good will in this little controversy, however, let me say that I shall be delighted, at any convenient time, to make up a foursome with Prof. East, Mr. Scott and, if he will favor us, the accomplished editor of GOLF ILLUSTRATED. After the match, if not before, Prof. East will, perhaps, withdraw those unpleasant words "malevolent attack." There, certainly, has been "injustice."

R. STANLEY WEIR.

To All Clubs, Members of the United States Golf Association

For several years there has been more or less objection, from men prominent in the game of golf in this country, to the form of organization that prevails in the United States Golf Association. This objection is based upon the fact that the Allied Clubs, which form the large majority in its membership, have no voice whatever in its management and cannot vote at its meetings.

The existing plan of government was devised at a time when golf was practically unknown in the United States and it was then considered necessary that its control should be confined to a few of the more important and influential clubs. Over twenty years have passed since that time and a thorough knowledge of the game, together with an understanding of its spirit and precedents, has kept pace with its phenomenal growth and widespread popularity so that the same necessity for the old form of government no longer exists.

In recognition of the right of every club that is a member of the Association to have a vote at its meetings, and in order to make the United States Golf Association a truly representative organization and to widen its influence and usefulness, the enclosed amendments to the constitution are presented for consideration at the annual meeting, to be held in Chicago, Friday evening, January 14, 1916.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES GOLF ASSOCIATION

Amend Article III, Sec. 1, paragraph "a," so that said paragraph shall read as follows:

(a) Active Members:—Any regularly organized Club in the United States, supporting and maintaining a golf course of at least eighteen holes, and whose reputation and general policy are in accord with the best traditions and high ideals of the game, shall be eligible to election as an Active Member.

Provided, however, that all Clubs enrolled as Active Members of this Association on the 14th day of January, 1916, may continue as such notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph.

Amend Article IV, Sec. 4, so that the same shall read as follows:

Sec. 4. Voting Privileges:—At all meetings of the Association each Active Club shall be entitled to be represented by two delegates, each of whom shall have one vote; each Allied Club may be represented by one delegate who shall have one vote. All members of both Active and Allied Clubs shall have the right to attend all meetings of the Association and to participate in the discussion of any question.

Amend Article IV, Section 5, so that the same shall read as follows:

Sec. 5. Quorum:—Forty-five Clubs represented by delegates in person or by proxy shall constitute a quorum at any meeting of the Association.

Amend Article VII by substituting the words "twenty-five" in lieu of the word "thirty" in the first line of said Article.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE