FEBRUARY, 1930

## Need of Understanding work

## THE SECTION'S VIEWPOINT

W1TH the earnest desire to help in removing the misunderstanding that continues to exist between some of the greenkeepers and the Green section, GOLFDOM has been able to get comment from the other side of the case on the greenkeeper's presentation of the section's meeting and operating policy.

The statement is unofficial, although it was made to GOLFDOM by a man well acquainted with the Green section's policies and operations so any prevailing misunderstanding could be cleared up. Lack of time prevented an effort to get an official statement. GOLFDOM asks Riggs-Miller to cover the annual meeting from the greenkeepers' viewpoint, and takes this opportunity to thank him for bringing out into the open some criticism that hitherto has been sort of a complaining back-stage murmur.

To our way of thinking it is high time that there be a firm basis of clear understanding and hearty co-operation between all the greenkeepers and the Green section. Beyond any doubt both factors have the same aim and hope of maintenance improvement, so why not every outward, as well as every inward, evidence of teamwork?

Pretty little tombstones mark a lot of spots where rest the remains of young mortals who kissed themselves into family misunderstandings in the hope that the world would be sweeter with all living in harmony, but nevertheless—well, maybe Barnum had us in mind.

Now, for the Green section side:

The Green section meetings this year were attended to a far greater extent than the combined attendance of the three previous years and invitations extended to members of the section's staff for addresses before greenkeepers' meetings have been more numerous this year than ever before. This initial evidence does not indicate that greenkeepers hold any appreciable amount of antagonism against the section. What Riggs-Miller says about the extent of the section staff's traveling may have some merit but the greater part of the travel is in response to greenkeeper's request. Mr. Dahl and Mr. Harrison, representing half of the section's staff, are not available for such out-of-town calls for service.

About the statement on research policy. Good research workers in any line take nothing for granted. One does not learn anything new if he starts with the hypothesis that everything is known on the subject. It seems that this criticism is self-contradictory for if, as Riggs-Miller says, "fundamentals were established two decades ago," why the urge for more experimental work?

The financial aid of the government, without which the Green section could not function, was a major factor in locating the station at Arlington. Mr. Leach, at the Greenkeepers' convention in Buffalo, told something of the financial restrictions on Green section operations and gave the greenkeepers a fair idea of the cost of turf research work, which is far beyond the average estimate.

If one is to study flood control he goes to a region where flood problems are acute, not to a desert. Likewise, turf problems must be studied where they are most acute. And they are acute in the Washington zone.

With respect to the criticism of red fescue for putting greens it should be remembered that the Green section never claimed red fescue could not produce the good turf under certain special localized conditions. The Green section never has sponsored a law forbidding its use and as free-born American citizens the greenkeepers certainly are entitled to use that grass, if they so desire.

Green section demonstration plots are in charge of good greenkeepers for whose experience, performance and professional integrity the section has the highest respect. The organization is not political, and for that reason is intent upon finding out what turf wants rather than what individuals want. That is a fact

(Continued on Page 105)



problem in their respective lines will vary very little over the length and breadth of the land.

There is no reason why greenkeeping practice cannot be made uniform in the different localities. There must be a best possible method. Therefore, if the Green Section is to remain and extend as a factor in the life of American golf it will have to co-ordinate all these agencies.

## Green Section Tells His Policy and Performance

## (Continued from Page 43)

that may supply a solid foundation of a clear understanding.

As one indication of the Green section's trail-blazing for the aid of greenkeepers it might be stated that the present budget of the section is the sixth on which has been carried an item for New Jersey work. This work was started by Prof. Musgrave, following the advice of Doctors Piper and Oakley in 1921. In 1925 the work was enlarged and Green section funds appropriated with the hope that state aid would be forthcoming. At





that time, it is doubted that most greenkeepers were aware of the existence of an agricultural experiment station at New Brunswick. The valuable aid of the New Jersey Greenkeepers' association in securing the state legislature's appropriation was forthcoming after the turf work had been under way for some time and it was plainly evident that more money was needed.

Regarding the comment on the soil employed for the section's experiment, it must be admitted that criticism is not sound when one understands that research has repeatedly demonstrated that treatments which remedy disorders in the poorest soil will work on the best soils where such problems are minor in comparison.

In substance, the above represents a Green section advocate's answer to the Riggs-Miller statement, and in it there are several illuminating paragraphs that may help a lot to get the Green section and greenkeepers working as a happy and effective tandem. By all concerned, it is a consummation devoutly to be wished.

