Architects must cater to ‘real golfers’

To the editor:

The commentary and Point/Counterpoint items in your last issue ([GCN June 2002 “Drawing a line in the sand” and “How has the golf ball harmed golf?”] are worth comment.

The first thing that we must be realistic about is that there are two entirely distinct golf worlds: professional golf and real golf. The former is played by less than one percent of active golfers, and the 25 million strong latter is what makes the golf industry’s wheels go round. Conceivably, real golf could exist by itself, and it is only logical that we golf course designers should concern ourselves with that sector.

Mr. Pascuzzo dubs us “problem solvers,” a sterile designation, as that is only part of our responsibilities. The major thrust of our job should be “entertainment creators” and as such we must cater to the vast majority. If our work is to be ruled by the facts of the tiny minority, and the occasional horror story, then the sad scenario that he paints may well happen.

The date traveled by golf balls has increased very slowly over the years and let real golfers enjoy seeing the 340-yard drives and 180-yard nine irons on the telly. They know that such feats have little to do with the “championship courses” go to 8,000 yards and far beyond, and let real golfers enjoy seeing the 340-yard drives and the 180-yard nine irons on the telly. They know that such feats have little to do with
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