

# Sporting Goods Buyers

*know they can get what they want in the*

## **LYTTON BUILDING**

Because they know where it is—know that it's the heart of the mid-west's sporting goods market—and that here they get what they want, golf professionals and other sporting goods buyers long ago formed the habit of coming to the Lytton Building for their supplies. This buying habit means more business for Lytton Building tenants . . . ask them:

Chicago District Golf Association, Burke Golf Company, Kroydon Company, Golfing Magazine, Golfdom Magazine, Midwest Golfer Magazine, Sporting Goods Journal, Chicago Daily Fee Golf Association, and other active factors in the golf business.

If you are planning to open a Chicago branch, or if you are not satisfied with your present metropolitan location, let us show you in detail just what the Lytton Building has to offer.

*Rents are reasonable*

*Suites conveniently arranged*

*Ceilings high, plenty of windows*

*Building immaculately maintained*

*Excellent elevator service*

*One block from Post Office*

## **LYTTON BUILDING**

L. E. EATON, Manager

14 EAST JACKSON BOULEVARD (AT STATE STREET)

**CHICAGO, ILL.**



## "CANADIAN CLUB"



ETHER conviviality begins before the first tee . . . or after the eighteenth hole . . . "Canadian Club" adds to the pleasure. It is so rich and mellow—so distinctive in flavor . . . so thoroughly a quality product, that it is everywhere preferred by those who appreciate the really fine things in life.

Back of it is the 75 years' experience of one of the world's leading distillers. Attesting its age is the Canadian government's official stamp which seals each bottle. You will like Hiram Walker's London Dry Gin, too, as well as other Hiram Walker products, including several fine brands of moderate-priced blended whiskies.

*Be sure to visit the Hiram Walker Exhibit  
in the "Canadian Club" Cafe at the Century of Progress in Chicago*

*Hiram Walker & Sons*

WALKERVILLE, ONTARIO • PEORIA, ILLINOIS



# Golfdom

The Business Journal of Golf  
REG. U. S. PATENT OFFICE

Vol. 8

JUNE, 1934

No. 6

## Business Better? Then Make Good on Your Word

By HARRY RADIX

**A**MONG THE many problems to which the golf club official falls heir when he takes office is that of coordinating sportsmanship and the brutally firm business factor of finance. I have heard it said that private golf clubs do not often live up to the fraternal spirit responsible for their being when a dollar is involved. Regretfully enough we have seen ample basis for this charge during the harsh years of the depression. Members who were good fellows when they had it were summarily ejected from membership when their money got low. It couldn't be helped. Probably the absence of courtesy in handling the regulation formalities of these forfeitures has left some sore spots from which the clubs' reputations may not recover as quickly as may the finances of the former members.

In the meanwhile the officials who were in office during the acute days of the depression and who were burdened with the unhappy responsibility of forfeiting memberships in accordance with the by-laws have finished their terms of office. After having had due time and a detached perspective for reflection many of them have told me that they would have taken a different and more considerate course had they the job to do again. But new officials, unacquainted with such matters, now rule at the clubs, and the mistakes continue to be made. Therein lies one of the sorriest

flaws in the golf clubs' method of management.

Golf clubs are witnessing such definite evidence of general business recovery that attention might well be given by club boards of governors to a review of their

This is a personal, and entirely unofficial expression from Mr. Radix, who is president of the Chicago District Golf Assn. He is a former president of the Ridgemoor CC and a member of Ridgemoor and Oak Park CC.

He is one of the leading business men and prominent sportsmen in the Chicago District.

Radix comments rather than criticizes on a vital point of golf club official policy. The subject is especially timely at many clubs and certainly is not restricted in interest to the Chicago District, although managers in the Chicago area are complaining about losing valued veteran employees because these club workers can get more money washing dishes at A Century of Progress concessions than they can earn at golf clubs after 10 years of service.

former membership lists, bearing in mind that men, rather than money, should be the first consideration of any organization entitled to take pride in its position in the field of sport.

### How Good Is Clubs' Word?

When the depression set in many clubs were prompt to make drastic cuts in the salaries of their department heads. Loyal and competent men and women stuck to the ship. Through their thought and labor the clubs managed to weather the storm. My horizon in the golf field is limited to the Chicago district, with the exception of the cases of some distant clubs with whose members and officials I happen to be acquainted. Speaking of the Chicago district, which I believe is fairly typical of the general metropolitan situation, I am of the opinion that financial operation of private golf clubs in 1933 was on a more substantial, sane and profitable basis than for a number of the pre-depression years.

It would be vain to the point of idiocy for the officials to claim entire credit for this achievement, and I know of no officials who have taken unto themselves sole glory for the salvation. The department heads and other employees have done work at a critical time that I think we would find on close examination approaches the proportions of one of the outstanding feats of the depression. After all, golf clubs are not essential and to keep them operating during times when businesses concerned with the necessities have just managed to drag through, reflects more credit on club operating officials and their staffs than has been given these people by the elective officials or members of golf clubs. But, as I see it, a golf club is not usually the place for credit to be given spontaneously. You who have been through the mill—or are going through—as club officials realize that you consider yourselves lucky if you get only an indifference that permits you to carry out policies and operations for the good of the cause. You are reconciled so you do not protest at the blunt ingratitude which may often be your lot.

### Living on Credit

Our club operating men and women get even less credit than the officials. That makes their credit, net, practically nothing. This might be fair enough were they paid in a manner commensurate with their abilities and efforts but that

they are in most cases, is something that I question.

Those of us who have had what we thought were investments in the hotel field have had opportunities to compare club and hotel salaries. Such comparisons often are shocking in the salaries revealed as being paid to hotel men operating hotels that are in receivership and losing money, and in the bare living wages paid to some club managers whose organizations are "organized not for profit" but still have registered in the black for the last two terrible business years despite unduly large plant investment.

Understand, please, that I do not take the position that these hotel men are over-paid. The conditions require able men and able men demand money for working out a problem. But I do maintain that where the club manager has taken severe cuts and has been promised a readjustment upward when business conditions improved at the club, he should have that promise kept. Of course the same thing goes for the greenkeeper, professional and other employees. The great trouble is that the officials who made the promises have been out of office a year or more and the present officials are in the dark.

Unless the officials of clubs that have regained some of their lost financial ground look into this situation and correct it, I am of the opinion that golf club operation will suffer a severe set-back. We will not be able to attract the type of men we need to operate the departments of our clubs.

Certainly it is true that some clubs still are in bad financial shape and probably are paying in salaries and wages every cent that they can afford. Against them no criticism can apply, but it must be admitted by members and officials of clubs that can pay encouraging and merited money to their help, the figures now do not often show the employees are getting a good sportsmanlike "break."

Discussions about a code for golf clubs I hope reminded club officials of one thing; the unusually long hours their responsible employees had to spend on the job. The work is difficult, too. I am unable to call to mind any of the fine gentlemen with whom I have been associated as a fellow member or official of clubs who would enjoy the routine of being on the job an hour or so after every club party

## FINE EXAMPLE OF LARGE GREEN



Green surface should be ample and the surrounding traps well separated when the player's approach demands a long carry. This green, the second at San Francisco GC, illustrates these desirable characteristics

has finished and then get up after a few hours' sleep to see that everything was ship-shape for the early birds at the club. I know of none of them who would welcome getting up at four a. m. to tour the course looking for signs of turf disease and go to bed at 11 p. m. after supervising the operation of the watering system. None of them would want to work in compost under the blazing sun, and none of them would want to spend hour after hour out on the lesson tee. Working for some one else's pleasure is hard work.

I have heard lately of significant cases that warn us we will have to be considering our deserving employees. In one instance I was informed every one of the course employees of one of our very good clubs in the Chicago district was compelled to live on relief last winter. These men have families. They have small homes in the neighborhood of the clubs. They do skilled work in the application of the various remedies required by fine turf maintenance, and in greens cutting. It would cost a lot of money in labor and in lowering of maintenance standards to train men to replace them each spring; still, the men of the club mentioned to me had to live on charity because they were not paid enough to get by on the most frugal basis during the off season. How many men there were in the district in this plight during the winter I would not attempt to estimate, but the number must

be dismaying. Naturally that is one of the problems of a seasonal business, but the rate of pay these men get during the active season is seldom enough to enable them to provide for their families.

### What's the Answer?

What the answer must be to this problem is beyond me, but I am confident that the official minds of golf clubs can and will get a fairly satisfactory solution when they begin to give it earnest thought.

As a private in the ranks of a golf club's membership, and not speaking as an organization official, I will say that while the problem exists it is with poor sportsmanship and dangerously bad social and business judgment that a golf club official calls attention to his private club showing a good, strong operating profit. A good operating profit with our help well paid is fine. We are entitled to boast of that, but an operating profit at the expense of people who work for true sportsmen is highly improper.

Look over your own situation. If more members, repeal profits, and the general improvement in business conditions warrant it, make good the promise given your employees when their income was reduced. Your club told them that brains, work and fidelity would be rewarded when the storm had passed. As sportsmen and as business men your word must be made good.

# Green Section to Submit Data on Demonstration Garden Results

By JOHN MONTEITH, JR., and KENNETH WELTON

**I**N 1928 THE United States Golf Association Green Section started a series of turf gardens on golf courses. This series was extended with the establishment of other gardens in following years. The chief purpose of these gardens was to test various grasses and fertilizers under a large number of soil and climatic conditions.

It is well known that soil and climatic conditions exert important influences on plant growth and, as a result, recommendations which are based on tests in one locality may need modification under somewhat different local conditions.

The Green Section experimental work previous to 1928 was confined chiefly to the Arlington turf garden. There has always been some question as to how generally applicable some of the observations at the Arlington turf garden might be. It has been well recognized for years that the general principles of turf culture as observed at Arlington have applied in a practical way on golf courses throughout the country. In spite of this general proving of the Arlington observations in practice on golf courses there still remained the important question as to how important the minor deviations in the observations might be under different golf course conditions. The series of gardens planted on golf courses were designed not to test out new materials and new methods but to serve as gardens for demonstrating certain fundamental principles and local variations. The gardens were therefore designated as demonstration turf gardens.

The demonstration turf garden series provided an opportunity to compare various grasses and fertilizers, both for putting green and fairway purposes, in a systematic manner under a greater variety of conditions than had ever been attempted before. Standardized blank forms were provided and records thereon were kept during the growing season. These reports were then tabulated and they have provided a composite summary which has served to provide some much needed in-

formation and also to break down several erroneous impressions of both grasses and fertilizers.

Anyone acquainted with golf course maintenance work during the past years has recognized that in altogether too many cases ideas and prejudices on turf culture are based chiefly on personal opinions hastily drawn without any background of fundamental fact. Thus it has not been uncommon to find an individual who is interested in turf culture, or even a fairly large group who have endowed a certain grass or fertilizer with qualities which it cannot live up to. In the demonstration gardens grasses and fertilizers are tested under similar conditions and fair comparisons can be made.

In the case of the demonstration turf gardens the seed and fertilizers used were all carefully tested to make sure that they were true to name. All lots were carefully analyzed and weighed and all gardens received the same amounts. Thus in the case of grass seed for a certain plot, the seed was analyzed and the same quantity of this seed was taken out of the same bag for all of the gardens. Therefore if there was any variation in the behavior of this particular grass in the Detroit garden compared with a garden in New York, for instance, that variation could be attributed to soil and climatic adaptability rather than to any variation in the source of seed.

During the season of 1928 15 of these demonstration turf gardens were planted. In 1929 and 1930 several more gardens were planted. Unfortunately, due to economic conditions and other factors, some of these gardens had to be abandoned after they had been in operation for only a year or two. Reports from the gardens have been consolidated each year for the past five years. These consolidated reports will be discussed in later issues of GOLFDOM. Because of the changes made necessary by dropping some of the first gardens and the establishment of new ones the figures in the yearly summaries

PLAN OF DEMONSTRATION TURF GARDENS

	A	B	C	D	E		
1						Optional	
2	Red fescue Chewings fescue	Washington	Metro-politan	Colonial, western Colonial, N. Zealand	Colonial bent, R. I.	Velvet bent seed	Trial plots of putting green grasses.
3	Annual blue-grass	Virginia	Columbia	Seaside bent	German mixed bent	Highland velvet No. 14276 velvet	
4	Activated sludge	Poultry manure tankage	Check	Sulphate of ammonia	Compost and sulphate of ammonia		Fertilizer experiments on putting green grass (seeded German mixed bent).
5	Check	Nitrate of soda	Urea	Ammonium phosphate	Check		
6	Complete fertilizer 6-12-4	Complete fertilizer 12-6-4	Check	Lime and sulphate of ammonia	Bone meal		
7	*German mixed bent	German mixed bent	German mixed bent	Metro. bent stolons	Chewings fescue		Putting green length.
8	*Ky. blue and redtop	Ky. blue and redtop	Ky. blue redtop and Ger. mixed bent	Ky. blue and redtop	Chewings fescue and Ger. mixed bent		Fairway length.
9	Ky. blue redtop and Chewings fescue	Ky. blue and redtop	Ky. blue redtop and Ger. mixed bent	Colonial bent	Chewings fescue and Ger. mixed bent		Trial plots of fairway grasses.
10	Bone meal	Lime	Check	Sulphate of ammonia	Activated sludge		Fertilizer experiments on fairway grasses (Kentucky bluegrass and redtop mixture).
11	Check	Manure	Complete fertilizer 6-12-4	Complete fertilizer 12-6-4	Check		
12	Lime and mixed fertilizer 6-0-4	Lime and mixed fertilizer 6-12-0	Check	Mixed fertilizer 6-0-4	Mixed fertilizer 6-12-0		

\*Soil in plots 7A and 8A poisoned with arsenate of lead.

do not in all cases represent the same group of gardens. In some instances a garden was maintained properly throughout a season but the reports were not complete and it was therefore not included in the summary for that year. The summary of the 1929 season included the reports from 12 gardens; for the 1930 and 1931 seasons, 14 gardens; for the 1932 season, 17 gardens, and for the 1933 season, 12 gardens.

The demonstration gardens were divided into series of plots 10 feet square and the plots were arranged in groups for making certain tests. Thus one group, containing 10 plots, provided a test for different kinds of grasses maintained as putting green turf, while another group of 15 plots was set aside for testing different fertilizers for putting green turf. Another group, of five plots, was used for comparing different combinations of grasses for

fairway turf. Another set, of 10 plots, which was later extended to 15 plots, was used as a comparison of different types of fertilizers for fairway improvement. Other plots included tests on height of cut, use of arsenate of lead, and miscellaneous tests.

All seed, stolons and fertilizers for the gardens were supplied by the Green Section. Certain standard directions for the general care of the gardens were given those who were charged with their maintenance. The details of maintenance were left to the individual greenkeepers. In general the instructions were to maintain the turf in the sections where different grasses were tested as turf for a similar purpose would be maintained on the golf courses where the gardens are located. The plots in the fertilizer series did not receive the dressings of compost that are commonly used on golf courses, because compost contains elements of plant food, and applications of compost would complicate the results to be obtained from the fertilizer tests. Fertilizers were applied at regular intervals according to directions. In addition to the differences due to soil and climate there were differences in the care of the several gardens due to variations in the individual maintenance methods practiced on the courses where they are located. As a result of this variation the highest ratings indicate the ability of the particular grass or treatment to produce good turf under a great variety of soil, climatic and cultural conditions.

### Reports Made Monthly

Monthly reports on the condition of turf on the various plots were made out in duplicate, one copy being sent to the Green Section office in Washington and the other retained for home reference. These reports were made out from May to October. In most cases the notes were made by two persons in order to give the results the advantage of combined opinions, thereby reducing the likelihood of overlooking some points of interest. Occasionally the report was omitted for one month due to some unusual rush of work which prevented its preparation or due to the fact that no change had occurred in the previous ratings of the plots. In order that the summary might not lack the benefit of these otherwise complete and well-prepared reports they have been included.

Where, however, reports from a garden



Above, one of the demonstration gardens during construction, and below, how it looks after turf is installed and growing

were missing for two consecutive months the reports in their entirety have been disregarded in the preparation of the summaries. Anyone who has taken careful notes regularly on a series of tests such as these will appreciate the fact that it is a tedious and somewhat monotonous task. The names of those who have cooperated to the extent of performing this task conscientiously during the past five years are given in the following list of the demonstration turf gardens cooperating with the Green Section. Readers should bear in mind that without the help of these cooperators no such interesting summary as will be given in future issue of GOLFDOM could be possible: Allegheny Country Club, Pittsburgh, John Pressler, Paul F. Leix and Lois Miller; Century Country Club, Metropolitan District, Henry Shakeshaft, G. W. Milnes and T. T. Taylor; Charles River Country Club, Boston, F. H. Wilson, Jr., and G. J. Rommell, Jr.; Country Club of Virginia, Richmond, Douglas Call and Dominic Larusso; Detroit Golf Club, Detroit, Alex McPherson, M. Milenow and Ernest Way; Hyde Park



Golf and Country Club, Cincinnati, William Harig and William Fruechtemeyer; Indian Trails Golf Course, Grand Rapids, Floyd Metcalf, H. Pas, Carl Fiedler and Robert Cullin, Sr.; Interlachen Country Club, Minneapolis, E. W. Pahl and Harold Stodola; Keller Golf Course, St. Paul, P. N. Coates and Harold Stodola; Lochmoor Club, Detroit, W. F. Beaupre, F. H. Beaupre, Andrew Wedyke and Charles Hilgendorf.

Massachusetts Agricultural College, Amherst, Wm. E. Robison, Jr., and L. S. Dickinson; Meadowbrook Country Club, Detroit, Thomas Slessor and Wm. Slack; Morris County Golf Club, Metropolitan District, G. Donofio and G. W. Milnes; Niagara Falls Municipal Golf Course, Niagara Falls, Frank Bulges and Albert Bulges; Oakmont Country Club, Pittsburgh, Emil Loeffler and Lois Miller; Philadelphia Country Club, Philadelphia, M. E. Farnham, Herbert Murphy and Benjamin Webber; Pine Valley Golf Club, Clementon, G. T. Cunningham and E. R. Steinger; Royal York Golf Club, Toronto, Canada, Frank A. Hamm; Upper Montclair Country Club, Metropolitan District, George Robertson, G. W. Milnes, Stanley Davis and T. T. Taylor; Westwood Country Club, St. Louis, A. J. Goetz and Al Linkogel; Wheatley Hills Golf Club, Metropolitan District, Frank Kraus, G. W. Milnes and T. T. Taylor.

### How Reports Were Made

In order to simplify the taking of notes details were standardized as much as was practical. Blank forms were provided to be filled in with a few simple markings. The turf on each plot was rated as excellent, good, fair, or poor. In determining this rating of the turf it was specified that consideration be given its density, vigor, color, fineness, freedom from nap, and any other factor that would affect its quality for golf turf purposes. For several reasons it seemed desirable in 1931 to change to a numerical system which, when reduced to percentages, could be more readily summarized and thus represent more accurately the ratings as given. It was therefore decided to give a rating of excellent the value of 4, good the value of 3, fair the value of 2, and poor the value of 1. A plot which during six months received six ratings of excellent would receive a rating of 24 and a plot which was classed as good for six months would receive a rating of 18.

An actual comparison of the ratings

with the two methods has shown that the relative positions of the different plots are the same except in occasional places where the differences between plots were extremely small by either method of rating. Therefore the tables prepared by this new method of rating can be compared directly with the previously established summaries for 1929 and 1930. The change of system was made primarily as a means for simplifying the consolidation of reports and preparation of tables.

No effort was made to establish any one standard of excellence by devising a score card. The ratings are therefore to be regarded as merely relative. In the series of plots of different grasses for putting greens, for instance, a report from one club might indicate that a certain grass was good whereas the report from another club might rate the same grass as fair. As an actual fact the turf in the latter case might be fully the equal of the former, but the person or persons making the report in the latter case were probably more critical and exacting than those making the report from the club where the grass was given a rating of good. However, the person who was more exacting and held higher standards would naturally scale down all the ratings in the same degree.

Since the purpose of the reports was to compare the grasses side by side rather than to compare the ratings of different sections, all reports that were made with care and fairness were equally valuable. It will be noted in the foregoing list that in the majority of cases the notes were made by two persons, which, of course, helped to avoid oversights.

Many who are interested in these gardens have wondered just how these records could be of value without a definite standard to guide in making the ratings. To make this clear we use a single example. Reports were received from three gardens, which for convenience will be referred to as reports No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3. In report No. 1, Metropolitan bent is rated as excellent and Virginia bent as good; in report No. 2, Metropolitan is rated as good and Virginia as fair; in report No. 3, Metropolitan is rated as fair and Virginia as poor. This might be interpreted as meaning that in garden No. 1 the Metropolitan was much superior to the Metropolitan in either of the two other gardens, and that the Virginia in garden No. 1 was superior to the Metropolitan in

garden No. 3. Such a conclusion is unwarranted, for these differences may merely mean that those who made out report No. 3 used a much higher standard of excellence than those who made out No. 1.

Such comparisons between different course reports may or may not have some significance other than the personal factor. The important point in the three reports is that the Metropolitan proved superior to the Virginia in each instance regardless of differences in soil and climate.

From some of the gardens the reports for the entire year did not include a single rating of excellent even though the turf was well cared for and many of the plots in these particular gardens had turf which would have been a credit to most courses of that neighborhood. This merely indicates that those who prepared the notes in many instances were extremely critical and were inclined to underrate the turf rather than to assign any flattering ratings. This tendency makes the prepared tables more interesting than would have been the case had the tendency been the other way, with ratings universally higher.

The reports on fertilizers and grasses are condensed to tables, while the points of greatest interest are emphasized in the text. The reports cover a period of six months, May to October, inclusive.

The gardens in many sections proved of much interest and were carefully watched by greenkeepers and green-committee members in their neighborhoods. Meetings of greenkeepers and green-committee members were held during the summer on many of the gardens. Some of these meetings were attended by visitors from courses over 100 miles away. In addition to the visitors at the time of these regular meetings, a large number of persons, singly or in small groups, have gone over the gardens with the greenkeepers or others familiar with the plans. The clubs on whose grounds the gardens are located have willingly made the gardens accessible to visitors at all times.

Summaries of the reports of these gardens covering a period of five years will be given in later issues of GOLFDOM.

### Alfred Sargent Heads Toledo PGA

**T**OLEDO, O.—Alfred Sargent, professional at Inverness GC, was elected president of the Toledo District PGA at the annual meeting. He succeeds Marty Cromb, pro-

fessional at Country Club.

Clarence Bender, professional at Normandy Hills, was elected secretary-treasurer to succeed Harry Moffitt, pro at Otaka Park. Plummer Whipple was re-elected to the post of recording secretary.

The Toledo professionals last season staged a series of golf lectures and exhibitions sponsored by the Toledo *Blade*, daily newspaper. Each session of the "course" attracted hundreds of spectators. The pros hope to provide something similar in 1934 in an effort to help increase interest in the game.

Sargent, the new president, is the son of George Sargent, long an active figure in affairs of the National PGA. He has been professional at Inverness for three years.

The professionals also elected S. P. Jermain, president of the Toledo District Golf Association, honorary president of the Toledo District PGA, in honor of his years of devotion to the game and to his tireless efforts in behalf of the professional golfer.

## RUNS A SHOW

### Brookside Club Starts Season With a Golf Exhibit

**A** SUCCESSFUL IDEA for beginning the golf season was used this year at the Brookside CC, Canton, O. George Howard, Brookside professional, was ringmaster of a golf show which resulted in stirring up golf interest and producing business for him.

Movies were shown to the club members guests, about 250 of whom attended. The PGA films of Jones, Wethered and Vardon, the US Rubber movies on golf ball making, and some films shot at the club were the picture features. A buffet dinner at the club started the whole affair.

Displays of the complete lines of several of the leading companies were put on. Salesmen of the companies were in charge at the exhibits. Companies and their representatives were: Jack Keefe, Wilson-Western; Arnold Minkley, L. A. Young Golf Co.; Bill Roney, Burke Golf; Al McCann, Bristol; Hawkins, United States Rubber, and C. Studer with a tennis line.

Howard and his chairman, Dale Holwick, consider the show one of the most interesting club entertainment events Brookside has presented. It produced business for Howard.