



THE AMERICAN INVASION OF GREAT BRITAIN

THE American invasion of Great Britain to capture the British Amateur Championship promises to make it the most spectacular in history. Besides our Amateur and Open Champions, Messrs. Travers and Ouimet, the third member of our amateur triumvirate, Mr. Evans, will in every likelihood be present. With a vanguard including such names as Frederick Herreshoff, Arthur G. Lockwood, P. W. Whittemore, Frazer Hale, C. W. Inslee and Harold Weber, the golfers of Great Britain will have a problem set them the difficulty of which, from report, they seem fully conscious of.

If I had to make a wager on the British Amateur Championship I should be inclined to take the American entry against the field on even terms. This may sound like a rash proposal. There is not a shadow of doubt that Great Britain possesses a greater number of first-class players than we do. There will be at least forty or fifty competitors at Sandwich, any one of whom might defeat Hilton or Travers in an eighteen-hole match without causing any great surprise. How, then, it may be argued, can it be reasonable to take nine Americans against forty or fifty Britons and make an even bet on it? The answer is that when it comes to championships blood always tells. There are forty or fifty-British golfers who are capable of beating Hilton or Ball, but how often do they do it in a real test? There are dozens of professionals who might beat Vardon and Braid and Taylor and Ray, but what do the records of championships show? There are many American golfers who can boast that they have actually beaten Jerome Travers in a friendly game. But where are their names on the roll of championship fame? The fact is that between ordinary first-class golf and championship golf there is a distinct gulf fixed. The ordinary first-class golfer may oc-

asionally have a spasm of real championship form and upset all calculations. But in at least five cases out of seven, it is the championship player that wins. The championship player or the super-golfer possesses not only the ability to play every stroke in golf to perfection, but also the ability to pull off the best stroke just when it is most needed. His class depends on a combination of skill, determination and imagination. He possesses nerve of the highest quality. This does not mean that he is not nervous. I should imagine that Hilton and Walter Travis have always been rather nervous men. Yet they possess the power of controlling their nerves at the crucial moment. A certain amount of nervousness is even a good thing in golf, just as it is in singing or public speaking or acting; it stimulates the player to extra brilliancy. But a control of the nerves and the temper at the critical moments is absolutely essential. And this control is the mark of the great players.

Now on public form in England there are at present only two great tournament players left among the amateurs, and there are none visible as yet on the horizon to take their places. Harold Hilton and John Ball are the only consistent winners who remain in the field. And they have been consistent winners for more than twenty years. Against them we have to put Travers and Ouimet. About Travers there is no possible doubt whatever. A man of twenty-six who has been four times Amateur Champion of the United States is surely one of the elect. Ouimet's claims are possibly less substantial. He accomplished what seemed impossible in beating Vardon and Ray at Brookline. But that might be just a winning streak for the moment. But taken in conjunction with his performance at Garden City in the Amateur Championship last September when he led the field in the qualify-

GOLF ILLUSTRATED

ing rounds, Ouimet's great victory at Brookline may be regarded with comparative safety as placing him definitely in the championship class. Therefore, at Sandwich next May there will be exactly four entries from the super-golfer class provided Ball and Hilton both compete. And if I had to make a choice between Ball and Hilton and Ouimet and Travers I should most emphatically choose the latter pair; and I should choose them over any course in the world, including Hoylake. They may not have the experience of Ball or all the finesse of Hilton, but they have an advantage of more than twenty years on their side. In actual competition Hilton defeated Travers at Apawamis three years ago; but he only did it by a narrow margin when Travers was transparently off his game and was driving wretchedly. And I doubt whether Hilton is quite as good to-day as he was three years ago. Certainly his performance last year, when he won the British Championship, showed more the good luck of great generalship than perfection of golfing form. Consequently, so far as the real winners are concerned, the odds are distinctly in favor of the American contingent; for it is a case of Travers and Ouimet against Ball and Hilton. And it is so much in their favor, to my mind, that the possibility of an upset of form and the victory of an ordinary first-class player is only sufficient to make the balance even. H. J. WHIGHAM.

GOLF GALLERIES

Perhaps one of the earliest statements of what constitutes the etiquette of a golf gallery is that which occurs as a foot-note to the "Rules of The Thistle Golf Club" published at Edinburgh in 1824, an original copy of which is before us. The note is as follows:

It may not be improper here to mention certain points of etiquette, which it is of importance should be observed by all who are in the habit of attending matches at golf. It is understood that no looker-on is entitled to

make any observation whatsoever respecting the play—to walk before the players—to remove impediments out of their way—or, in short, to interfere in the most distant manner with the game while playing. The player is at liberty, at all times, to ask advice from his partner or caddy, but from no other person.

So far as we have been able to discover this is the first occurrence of golf etiquette in printed form; and



TOM KERRIGAN

A young American professional whose scores in the professional tournaments last winter never went above 150 for 36 holes

that it should have to do with spectators of golf matches shows that even in early days the golfer in very self-protection had to establish some form of conduct for those who were watching his play. Does it not seem peculiar that golf should be distinctive from other games in this possession of an etiquette? What other game has any special code of conduct which is not supposed to govern the actual play of it? True, the supposition is that gentlemanly conduct must always be a part of all games in which gentlemen take part. But this is not altogether sufficient in golf: it is necessary that this conduct should be directed. And the reason lies in the fact that golf is the only game that has something in common with sports, such as hunting, shooting, fishing, etc. All major games but golf are played within certain specified areas, the surface of which is uniform, making possible rules

to govern all action within it, whereas, the unconfined area and inequality of the surface over which golf is played makes impossible a code of law which would be all-inclusive. In other words golf is a game with a background of sport: and to sport etiquette is its only law. Hence it must be evident that etiquette is vitally important and deserves as much attention as the rules themselves.

A recent editorial in the *New York Times* made the statement that the manners of golf galleries are becoming bad. This is so in one respect only, and holds true in the immediate past, of such galleries which were largely made up of those non-golfers curious to see Vardon and Ray, as any golfer would be curious to see the pinnacle of perfection in any other game

GOLF ILLUSTRATED

exhibiting his skill. It was not true of the play-off of last year's Open Championship because of the atrocious weather conditions and the extreme precautions taken. But when Ouimet as Open Champion was as well known to the baseball fan as any of his own heroes, an element appeared in the gallery that watched his match against Mr. Travers in the Lesley Cup Competition last fall, that in its conduct was exceedingly humiliating to Massachusetts golfers. We feel sure that if Mr. Ouimet had been a resident of any other city the conditions would have been the same. It was no one's fault, and certainly no reflection upon Boston golfers, for how could any one expect to control local patriotism accompanied by the unsportsmanlike attitude which we have come to think is a necessary part of our baseball galleries. Undoubtedly the conduct of a western gallery which Vardon complained of was due entirely to the few who were witnessing golf for the first time.

However that may be, if this non-golfing element is to be a part of our galleries in the future, something must be done to educate them. If a club expects that a match to be held over their course will attract this outside element, we suggest that either they be disbarred altogether, unless accompanied by a golfer who will stand responsible for their conduct, or arrangements be made with the newspapers to publish prominently on their sporting pages what the etiquette of a gallery is, together with printed forms of it to be distributed to the gallery before the match starts.

In the April number of the St. Nicholas magazine appears an article by Francis Ouimet entitled "The Game I Love." There are passages in it that deserve wider attention than the young audience to which it is addressed, revealing Mr. Ouimet in a way both creditable to himself and the high position he occupies in American golf. The first passage worthy of remark is as follows:

"It always has struck me that for any one who

truly loves the game of golf, there is even a pleasure in being defeated when you have played first-class golf yourself, and have been beaten only because your opponent has played even better."

It is rare, we believe, that one comes across a golfer who holds his pleasure subordinate to the game itself and who can look upon defeat, at the hands of an opponent whose play merited victory, in such a light

as this. It is an attitude typical of the true sportsman and one which is not sufficiently prevalent in any game. Mr. Ouimet by no means belittles success. In his short career he has experienced an amount of it that few may ever hope to attain to. One would think that in his present position the thought of defeat would be very uncomfortable. His very ability to contemplate it in the manner his words show, is indicative of a sanity under conditions that would be most trying to anyone, and of a modesty of thought that will always keep him master of himself.

In regard to the common feeling of exasperation which the finding of one's ball in a bunker is only too apt to throw one into, his naive opinion of how such a disaster should be looked upon, shows a philosophical temperament that has been one of the greatest contributing factors to his success.

"If the player gets into a bunker, it is not the bunker's fault, but his own. If he could only teach himself to take that point of view, he might almost bring himself around to the point where, instead of uttering some angry word over the situation, he would beg the bunker's pardon for having disturbed it."

How seldom do we meet with a golfer who exhibits under such trying conditions a temperament so equable as these words imply. How much would not the pleasure of our rounds be enhanced if every reverse of fortune was met in this way.

We believe these quotations reveal Mr. Ouimet's ability as a golfer to be founded upon a character that will bring him a higher and more permanent reputation as time goes on.



R. S. WORTHINGTON

Who won the United North and South Championship at Pinehurst by defeating Paul E. Gardner