

OUR LETTER BOX

A Department Devoted Exclusively to the Fans and Their Ideas and Suggestions on the National Game

The following department is set apart solely for the discussion by our readers of any baseball topic which appeals to them. While we cannot find space for all the letters which come to us in the course of the day's mail, we shall be glad to print a few representative letters each month. It is our earnest wish that the friends of baseball may take advantage of this opportunity to express their views on their favorite game.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., 1912.

BASEBALL MAGAZINE CO.,
65 5th Avenue,
New York.

DEAR SIR:

J. H. C., Sacramento, Calif., denies that "Mathewson, after ten years of major league service," is a greater pitcher than "Kid" Nichols was in his prime (see Oct. magazine, page 88). Taking Nichols' five best years in percentage of wins would equal .721. Mathewson's five best years would equal .767, or a gain .045 in Mathewson favor.

I believe the inclosed records cover J. H. C.'s request. He claims Mathewson had nothing on "Kid" when in his prime. Taking pitchers as to general worth, figures show Mathewson is Nichols' superior in every department of play, except batting.

If these records are of any value to the magazine, use them as you see fit. With success to your magazine,

Yours truly,
JNO. J. LAWRES,
230 Brady Street.

P. S.—No record of B. B. and S. O. for Matty in 1901.

NICHOLS, CHARLES A.

Born Madison, Wis., Sept. 14, 1869.

R. P.—6-1. .175

Base on

Season.	Club.	Games.	B.A.	S.B.	F.A.	Balls Given	S.O.	Won.	Lost.	Per.
1887	Kansas City.....	18	203	2	900					
	Kansas City.....	26	207	2	897					
1888	Memphis.....	7								
1889	Omaha.....	29	302	3	912					
1890	Boston, (N. L.).....	47	247	2	717	117	222	27	19	587
1891	Boston.....	47	201	1	879	96	213	30	19	638
1892	Boston.....	54	207	5	736	87	229	35	16	686
1893	Boston.....	49	239	4	960	110	92	35	12	717
1894	Boston.....	45	282	1	856	100	98	33	12	733
1895	Boston.....	43	231	1	884	82	146	27	16	628
1896	Boston.....	45	189	2	972	93	95	30	15	666
1897	Boston.....	42	264	4	872	72	136	31	12	738
1898	Boston.....	46	252	0	852	84	132	33	12	733
1899	Boston.....	41	181	1	884	86	109	22	16	553

1900 Boston	28	207	2	904	73	54	13	14	464
1901 Boston(N.L.)	46	299	0	863	78	92	20	14	588
1904 St. Louis (N. L.)	36	156	0	950	87	87	21	12	625
1905 St. Lo. & Pa. (N. L.)	25	200	0	881	45	67	11	11	500
14 Years M. L. work	594	239	23	873	1210	1772	368	200	632.6
1902 Kansas City (W. L.)	37	194	16	961	90	168	30	7	794
1903 Kansas City (W. L.)	35	270	1	954	81	156	22	14	636

SUMMARY.

Nichols.	Games.	Base on Balls.	S.O.	Won.	Lost.	Per.
14 years Major League	594	1210	1772	368	200	.6326
11 years for Mathewson	468	606	1791	291	132	.6807
Nichols' average, per year	42 3/7	86 3/7	126 4/7	26 2/7	14 2/7	.6326
Mathewson's average, per year	42 6/11	55 1/11	162 9/11	26 5/11	12	.6807
Per club in Mathewson's favor	.022	.285	.140	.016	.171	.0481
Adding 1902-3 Western League	71	171	324	52	21	.715
Total that J. H. C. requests	656	1381	2096	420	221	.673

With all of Nichols' success in the Western League, Mathewson still holds fourth, .6807 to .673 for Nichols, or .077 points over all. Nichols was in Wichita in 1907, Oshkosh manager 1908 and played in the Kansas City city league in 1909-10.

Newport, Ky.
 The Baseball Magazine,
 New York, N. Y.
 Dear Sirs: What do you think of the following team:
 Myers, c.; Daubert, 1b.; Lajoie, 2b.; Wagner, ss.; Zimmerman, 3b.; Cobb, rf.; Jackson, lf.; Speaker, cf.; Wood, Marquard, Matty, Johnson, Rucker, Walsh, p.

Can it be beat?
 Why don't you say something about the Reds in your magazine? When they get the right kind of a leader they will "breeze in."
 Yours truly,

PAUL PLANK.

ALL AMERICAN TEAM.

Now that the world's series is over, every baseball fan likes to name an all American team. Not unlike the rest, I have my choice, and think I have named below a team that, if played together, would trim any team in the country. I have selected its members for present worth, present and past experience and future playing ability for their respective teams.

This team is supposed to be fully equipped and ready to travel on either the American or National League circuits:

Pitchers—Wood, Marquard, Johnson, Walsh, Rucker. Catchers—Myers, Carrigan, Archer. First base—McInnis, Daubert. Second base—Collins, Doyle. Third base—Baker, Byrne. Short stop—Wagner, Boston. Right field—Cobb. Center field—Speaker. Left field—Jackson. Utility outfielders—Murry, Hooper. Managers—John J. McGraw, Connie McGillicuddy.
 J. P. JOHNSON.

6 Adelaide St., Boston, Mass.

Editor Baseball Magazine,
 New York City.

Dear Sir: I have been a reader of your magazine ever since the first issue and have the numbers all bound in volumes. The last issue of Baseball is a corker. Wish you would have an article in future numbers as to who is the father of the curve ball, as there is some doubt in the case. An article in Sunday Her-

ald states that Rusie, an old-time pitcher in 1867 or '68, was the original one to fathom that ball. But I saw in a Portland, Me., paper a few years ago an article that went on to say that Geo. Anderson, an old-time ball player of 1859 or '60, in that city, pitched the first curve ball in existence, long before others who now claim the honor. I cut out the article to save, but lost it somewhere. The Portland Evening Express, I think, was the paper that published the article that I mention. Only wish I had saved it.

In those early days the ball pitched was a straight ball, or an underhand one, delivered by the pitcher, and used by old-time Bowdin College pitchers as well as others in the game. The score in those days used to run up to 40 to 100 runs in a game, as I have an old-time list of games played in 1860. Hope you find space for this.
 W M. L. LOWELL.

Editor Baseball Magazine,
 Boston, Mass.

Dear Sir: Now that the world's series have been played and the Red Sox are declared to be the winners, and I have now a very substantial bet on the result, perhaps it may surprise you that, while I was a most rabid rooter for the Red Sox (as most Brooklynites were), I am ready to admit, after witnessing a game that was played at the Polo Grounds on Friday, October 11th, between these teams, that the Red Sox are the worst lot of world's champions that I ever saw in the very many years that I have followed the "grand old game." How any such slobs could "put it over" McGraw's bunch is more than I can figure out, and I do not believe that there is any unbiased "fan" who knows the game but what will say the same.

Being a Brooklynite, naturally I am a Brooklyn rooter, and that means that we do not stand for the McGraw article of baseball in our village, and for that reason we were all rooting for the Red Sox; not that we loved them, but hated the Giants, and it is but fair to state that though we wanted to see the "New Yorks" lose, and were told by a lot of Boston

"experts" what wonders Jake Stahl's men were, the Polo Ground artists were superior in every department, and are certainly a much better team than the Boston American Leaguers ever were or ever will be. Yours truly,

WILLIAM H. PARRY,
664 E. 31st St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn.
The Baseball Magazine Co.,
65 Fifth Ave., New York City.

Dear Sirs: I have now been a much interested reader of your magazine for two years, and have been particularly interested in your articles about "Who's the greatest ballplayer in the world?" I have always considered Napoleon Lajoie to be that and also, without question, to be the greatest of second basemen. I think your article in your November number is excellent about "Napoleon the Unlucky," and it certainly does him justice.

I will be looking forward with great interest to the article on "The greatest of second basemen."

In your article about "Ty Cobb," which was certainly an excellent one, I wish to say that, although I know I will be met with a great deal of opposition, I consider "Larry" Lajoie to be the "king of ballplayers."

If you could possibly post his averages for all time, including this year's ones, I would be ever so thankful to you. Please put them in your next issue. Sincerely your,

Box 79. H. D. ANDREWS.

Rome, N. Y.

F. C. LANE, Editor,
New York City.

Dear Sir: I am a reader of your Baseball Magazine every month. I receive it from my newsdealers. Now I would like to ask you to give me a little information on how I can get a try-out with some minor league team this spring. I am a pitcher and first-class fielder. I have been playing semi-professional ball all summer. Would like a try-out with some Central League team, South Bend or Terra Haute. Please advise me how to apply for a try-out.

I remain, hoping to hear from you by return mail, yours very truly,

MR. GEO. J. SCHMITT, JR.,
4185 James St., Rome, N. Y.

Mt. Vernon, N. Y.

F. C. LANE, ESQ.,
Editor Baseball Magazine.

Dear Sir: It is with pleasure that I subscribe to that increasing number of fans in proclaiming our appreciation of such a magazine as yours. It covers a field no other publication has attempted. Its pages are filled with topics most interesting, and particularly the news that pleases me greatly is that which from time to time relates to the ballplayer off the diamond—in other words, his home life after the season closes.

I am very much interested, as a follower of the game, in your article touching on the Players' Fraternity and may have something to say on the matter later on.

Personally, I believe the absolute control of the owners over the players as now exercised is wrong, and some of the principles of the leader of the "Bull Moose" should be injected in the management of organized baseball, and are needed as much as those principles are needed in the affairs of government.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES L. DOWNES.

Lampoc, Calif.

Editor Baseball Magazine,
New York.

Dear Sir: In looking over the pitching records of the 1912 world's series, I am more convinced than ever that both the players and the "fans" would welcome a better system for judging the pitcher's ability.

Here the great Mathewson ranks near the bottom, while nearly all the writers agreed that Mathewson pitched about the test ball in the series.

I thank you for the publicity you gave my last letter, and please pardon me for coming again.

I have made some changes in the system I presented for figuring pitchers' averages, consisting in deducting one point from the P.L. column for every stolen base that figures in the scoring. Also I charge the pitcher with four points for every run he allows, exempt deducting for errors and stolen bases, as noted.

If the batter should "single" and steal second, third and home in succession, one point would be charged against the pitcher.

Of course, the pitcher can, to a certain extent, prevent stolen bases, but, as a rule, the catcher is held responsible; then again it's a hard matter to stop men like Cobb and Bescher.

Below I give the pitchers' records of the 1912 world's series, according to my way of figuring pitching averages:

	P.W	P.L.	Pct.
Crandall	6	0	1.000
Bedient	51	7	.879
Marquard	54	9	.857
Mathewson	89	36	.712
Collins	43	17	.702
Tesreau	69	35	.663
Wood	66	38	.635
Ames	6	4	.600
Hall	32	25	.561
O'Brien	27	25	.519

These figures need some explanation, but my letter is already too long, and by referring to my letter in the November number the system is easily understood.

It will be noted that Wood ranks low; that awful first inning of the seventh game explains it.

How about the batting averages? Is it fair to the batsman that a "home run" should count no more than a "single"?

No doubt something could be done to improve this department as well as the pitchers' records.

Yours very truly,

JOHN O. LINDEN.

F. C. LANE,

Editor of Baseball Magazine,
65 Fifth Ave. New York City.

Dear Sir: In a recent issue of your magazine there was an article about Ed. Ruelbach and his pitching, entitled "The Shut-out King."

There is absolutely no doubt whatever but that Ruelbach, in his palmy days, was one of the best pitchers that ever heaved a ball across a plate. But in justice to Ruelbach and his wonderful shut-out games, what about Ed. Walsh? Walsh, according to the records of the American League, has pitched more shut-out games than any pitcher in either League.

Walsh, without a doubt, is justly entitled to be called the king of spitball pitchers, and when you take into consideration that Walsh has always had, since he has been with the Sox, either a weak hitting or else a poor fielding team behind him, and his record shows him to be in the lead with shut-out games, it makes his record all the more wonderful. Walsh, in my estimation, ranks along with Wood and Johnson as three of the best pitchers in the business to-day, barring none. In the recent city series here between the Cubs and Sox the question was asked the Cubs: If you were playing a world series game, whom would you prefer to have pitch for you? Fifteen of the Cub players without a moment's hesitation said, "Ed. Walsh," which simply speaks volumes for itself.

Being a reader of your valuable magazine, I would some time like to see an article in your future issues about Walsh and his great shut-out victories. Thanking you in advance, I am,

Yours truly,

R. F. SHANK,
1640 Monroe St., Chicago, Ill.

Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR:

In the December number THE BASEBALL MAGAZINE printed an article on "The Greatest Ball Team in the World." I don't see how the writer of this article can place Magee over Murray, the Giant outfielder. Murray out-classes him in everything but batting. Murray is one of the most wonderful outfielders in the game to-day, while I don't think Magee has ever been noted for being a great fielder. There is no comparison in baserunning. For batting honors Magee may lead, but I don't think it makes up for the difference in other parts of the game.

I don't see why the writer gives Rucker the preference over Tesreau. Rucker might win in a game between the two, but does he compare with Tesreau in strength and ability to pitch often?

Hoping you will print this, I remain,

A faithful reader,

JAMES E. TAYLOR.

542 PENN ST., CAMDEN, N. J.

The Editor of THE BASEBALL MAGAZINE.

DEAR SIR:—As a subscriber to your excellent publication, I wish to congratulate you upon the fair and liberal spirit which you have shown towards the ball players' fraternity. This eminently sportsmanlike attitude is a pleasing contrast to the malicious vituperation of the organization which has appeared in only too many sporting papers and magazines.

Yours truly,

W. H. CHAMBERLIN.

LA84
Foundation

