

## Push for hurry-up golf on par-3 courses could lead to hazards, suits

To the editor:

As a preface to my criticism of your "Publisher's Note" in the July issue, let me state that you have a top-notch publication which has long been needed in the golf industry.

Your suggestion that all par-3s have signs to alert players on the tee to hit before the players on the green putt out attempts to cure one problem (slow play on the green) by creating another one (potential liability for course operators).

In the era of "cart-ball," it does seem logical that a group would drive up to the back of the green, signal the next group to hit, go to their balls and wedge and/or putt out while that group is driving up (hopefully in electric rather than gasoline carts) and proceed to the next tee. But logic does not always address complexity in the real world as we find it.

Par-3s come in a variety of lengths, greenside bunkering, solar orientation and wind conditions. Not everyone standing in back of a 200-yard par-3 waiting for the following group is going to see a high shot on a cloudy day or if that shot is coming from the

same direction as the sun.

When a player is hit by a ball and is injured, the golf course operator becomes potentially liable for having encouraged, by the sign, the shot to take place, grossly and negligently disregarding the contra-indicative conditions.

The sign you recommend is the evidence of the course operator's wanton disregard for the safety of the guests he or she has invited onto the course (at a fee, of course).

Obviously, attorneys will differ on this subject (and many of them are golfers, and no two golfers ever agree on anything...), but it seems that prudence would dictate that no course operator expose his or her players to the hazard of being shot at by a golf ball while standing in back of a par-3 hole. There are enough crazy things that happen on a golf course without encouraging an additional risk of this sort.

I don't have a solution, except to tag on to your general plea for education on etiquette of the game and the need to fight slow play. The "allow faster players to play through" concept is at least as widely disregarded as

the U.S.G.A. Rule to play the ball as it lies. I would even guess that playing through is much more likely to occur on a par-4 or par-5 (when someone is in the woods looking for a lost ball) than on a par-3.

With that in mind, one can only question what is to be gained by interrupting the front group's play of a par-3 hole (i.e. directing a slow group to wait for the group behind so they can get closer but not through).

It is difficult to attack slow play, and your implicit premise that most delay occurs on the greens is valid. It is also unlikely that golf in the United States (even with a pre-qualification that all golfers must be Type A personalities) would ever get to the "fast play" standard in countries like Ireland and Scotland, where three-hour rounds are the rule, and playing through is automatic if you hit one in the high grass.

Again, I enjoy your publication very much, but thought that it would be useful for you to have this minor but important criticism.

Sincerely,  
David L. Collins  
San Mateo, Calif.

## Equal treatment in design coverage

To the editor:

I wanted to thank you for your article, in the June issue of *Golf Course News*, about our project in Mexico.

We appreciate the fact that you gave us equal space with the articles about the Nicklaus and Dye projects. You have been equally fair with your coverage in past issues.

After working seven years for Tom Fazio, I feel we can design excellent courses. But many other (not all) magazines will give us little or no mention, whereas they give the big names, who don't need the publicity, large articles about projects that may be two years in the future.

Your magazine is different, and we definitely appreciate that fact. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,  
Stephen R. Burns  
Fernandina Beach, Fla.

Please address letters to: Letters to the editor, *Golf Course News*, P.O. Box 997, Yarmouth, ME 04096.

## Facts, notes and quotes that shed light on the battle over the environment

The following are taken from the files of Tim Hiers, who wrote our guest commentary on the opposite page.

### The fear factor

"How extraordinary: The richest, longest lived, best protected, most resourceful civilization, with the highest degree of insight into its own technology, is on the way to becoming the most frightened."

— Aaron Wildavsky,  
University of California at Berkeley

Neil Orloff, director of Cornell University environmental research, has proposed three psychological reasons why Americans fear pesticides. First, there is the emotional need to find a scapegoat for dreaded diseases, like cancer. Secondly, there is the ingrained belief that nature and its products must be essentially pure and welcome. Thirdly, there is a pent-up need to lash out at big business to release our frustration and resentment.

### Truth bears witness

"It now takes only 11 percent of the average citizen's disposable income for food compared to up to 50 percent of such income in much of the rest of the world."

— American Agri-Food producers

"Pesticides have been used in substantial amounts for nearly 50 years, and there is no evidence from analysis of cancer patterns that pesticide residues are responsible for any cancers in adults or children."

— Dr. Elizabeth Whelan

"Alar, a manmade plant growth regulator, causes cancer in mice; but only at levels 4 million times greater than any human exposure."

— Dr. Elizabeth Whelan

"If you do nothing with rats or mice, 10 percent will get cancer. Now consider the massive dosages they're given."

— Tim Hiers

"What is there that is not a poison? Only the dose makes a substance a poison."

— Paracelsus (Swiss-born alchemist and physician)

### Torturing numbers

#### Ave. annual incidence of lethal poisonings in the United States

For the Year	From Agri Chemicals	From Other Substances
1970	44	5299
1971	43	5313
1972	38	5380
1973	32	5302]
1974	35	5499
1975	30	6241
1976	31	5699
1977	34	4936
1978	31	4741
1979	29	4608
1980	24	4331

— Agri-Chemical Magazine

"Torture numbers, and they'll confess to anything."

— Gregg Fasterbrook

#### How much is that, anyhow?

##### One part per million equals:

- one inch in 16 miles;
- one minute in two years;
- one cent in \$10,000.

##### One part per billion equals:

- one inch to a 16,000-mile trip;
- one bogey to 3.5 million golf tournaments;
- one second in 32 years;
- one cent in \$10,000,000.

##### One part per trillion equals:

- one flea to 360 million elephants;
- one second to 320 centuries;
- one penny in \$10,000,000,000.

### Will the real motive please step forward?

"The history of DDT and particularly the events leading to its banning make fascinating reading. One is left with a number of unanswered questions about why the environmentalists were so enthusiastically anti-DDT. Dr. J. Gordon Edwards makes an impressive case to the effect that some of those pushing for the DDT ban had some rather questionable motives, specifically, the banning of a lifesaving chemical as a means of

human population decimation.

"Edwards quotes environmentalist LaMont Cole: 'To feed a starving child is to exacerbate the world overpopulation problem.'

"He writes that during a debate in San Francisco, Dr. Van den Bosch, from the University of California, chided him about his concern for 'all those little brown people in poor countries.' Dr. Charles Wurster, chief scientist for the Environmental Defense Fund, responded to a reporter's question by stating that there are too many people and 'this is as good a way to get rid of them as any,' referring to the banning of DDT. His comments caused attorney Victor Yannacone, an early opponent of DDT, to resign from the Environmental Defense Fund in disgust."

— Dr. Elizabeth Whelan in "Toxic Terror"

"Actually, the problem in the world is that there are too many rich people. The birth of a baby in the United States is something on the order of 20 to 100 times more disastrous for the life support systems of the planet as the birth of a baby in poor countries like Bangladesh or Venezuela."

— Paul Ehrlich, Stanford University

"It may be time to view the faults of the United States capitalist economic system from the vantage point of a socialist alternative."

— Barry Commoner, biologist,  
University of St. Louis

### Media & fabrication

"Speaking on the environment, Charles Alexander said, 'As science editor at Time, I would freely admit that on this issue we have crossed the boundary from news to advocacy.'"

"Boston Globe environmental reporter Dianne Dumanoski is often quoted as saying, 'There is no such thing as objective reporting... I've become even more crafty about finding voices to say the things I think are true. That's my subversive mission.'"

"Barbara Pule, environmental editor for Cable News Network, said, 'I do have an ax to grind. I want to be the little subversive person in television.'"

— Insight magazine

"I was particularly interested in understanding the role of the press in disseminating a group of major myths in which environmental cancer is now embedded. The manipulation of the press by scientists, above all by some government scientists, has been so severe that the issue that should concern us is the manipulation, not the press."

— Edith Efron

### Science or politics?

"George Wald, professor of biology at Harvard University, in addressing the environment, explained that the solution was not scientific but political and it would be necessary to reorganize society."

— The Apocalypitics

Internal memo from the EPA:

"Our priorities (in regulating carcinogens) appear (to be) more closely aligned with public opinion that with our estimated risks — and with scientific evidence."

— Imprimis (Hilsdale College magazine)

"Jimmy Carter had professed himself an admirer of Ralph Nader and had hired a group of Nader's lieutenants for top regulatory positions."

— The Apocalypitics

"What one learns above all, is that the government has systematically fed the public the views of one faction in the academic world, while the views of others have been largely withheld."

— Edith Efron

"A small but vociferous minority in North America is effectively stopping the use of vital agri-chemicals, not always on the basis of scientifically sound health and safety concerns, but often to forward the lifestyle, world view and political goals of anti-pesticide activists, thereby diverting precious time, money and the public interest from legitimate questions of safe and beneficial pesticide use."

— Ron Arnold (in "Politics of Environment")

"Any movement or cause that requires a deception, coercion or other devices as fuel for propulsion is a movement that is inherently wrong and historically doomed to fail."

— Tim Hiers