

LETTERS FROM MEMBERS

Dear ISOH,

My country's name is officially Koninkrijk der Nederlanden, thus Netherlands in English and the people they call Nederlanders, in English Dutchmen. However, Holland is shorter and more common for many people. In fact, Holland is the name under which my country is promoted, thus two names are used, one official, the other a nickname. In fact Holland is a part indeed, viz., the West part, divided into Noord-Holland and Zuid-Holland, both provinces now. I live in Noord-Holland, thus NH behind my town (village) Laren NH.

Pim Huurman
Laren NH, Holland

Dear ISOH,

With regard to the Holland/The Netherlands issue, I am certainly not in agreement with Pim Huurman about this. The name of our country (in Dutch) is Nederland, as you can see on all our stamps. The only correct translation is The Netherlands in English, Pays-Bas in French and Niederlande in German, but certainly not Holland. There are two provinces in my country: Noord-(North-) and Zuid-(South-) Holland and these form the most populated area of The Netherlands! But The Netherlands has no less than 12 provinces in all (among which the province of Friesland is a very special one with a language of its own) and so "Holland" is only a part of The Netherlands!

The term "Holland" was used for many years as a general indication for my country; like in a yell or so. We had for many years a famous yell: "H.O.L.L.A.N.D.: Holland spreekt een woordje mee." (translated: "Holland does also play along.")

Do not forget that when an American would write a letter to "Holland" the letter would most likely be transported to "Holland, Michigan." But OFFICIALLY "Nederland" is the only correct and acceptable name for my country, so in your case it should be "The Netherlands."

Tony Bijkerk
HH Fochteloo
The Netherlands

Dear Members,

Well, those two letters didn't clear up too much, but they were interesting. Also, I think it is interesting to note that the IOC three-letter abbreviation for this country was HOL until early 1992, and it is now recognized as NED. This change is reflected by the difference in the *Olympic Movement Directory '92* (NED) and the *Olympic Movement Directory '91* (HOL).

Other countries have had changes in their IOC three-letter abbreviation. Notably, in the last few years, Iran changed from IRN to IRI (Islamic Republic of Iran), and Saudia Arabia changed from SAU to KSA (Kingdom of Saudi Arabia). Also, South Africa was once SAF and is now RSA - Republic of South Africa.

Dear ISOH,

The latest edition of *Citius, Altius, Fortius* arrived here this week and I enjoyed reading the articles. I'm grateful to colleagues Anthony Bijkerk and Heiner Gillmeister for correcting the definition of **kaatsen** that appeared in my article, "Baseball in the Olympics." Trying to find information on Olympic baseball in this country was difficult; getting details on **kaatsen** was impossible. The explanation I used was the only one available to me.

Mr. Bijkerk's description of **kaatsen's** playing rules makes me wonder: How could this sport be confused with baseball? The two games seem as far apart as javelin throwing and shooting. If anyone has a more plausible explanation as to why some reports from the 1928 Games include baseball as a demonstration sport, please contact me.

I'd also like to respond to Don Sayenga's comments regarding baseball and the 1904 Games. The Spalding Almanac for 1905 explains that many athletic events in St. Louis throughout 1904 were designated as "Olympic" events. These contests, however, were less Olympic than some of the all-comer meets that take place on the eve of Olympic track competition. Since the "Olympic" baseball tournament of 1904 (a) didn't take place during the actual dates of the Games, and (b) since there is no record of international participation, it's safe to say that the title "Olympic" was strictly honorific. I appreciate Mr. Sayenga's sentiment: our intent as researchers should never be to denigrate any Olympic athlete's participation. As for baseball players of 1904, I'm not sure that even they considered themselves Olympians.

Bill Mallon's article ("Qualification for Olympic Games of the 21st Century") raises important questions about the Olympics' future. It seems we are at a crossroads: are the Olympic Games a sports festival or a world championships? Those who favor the Olympic precepts of de Coubertin would opt for the former; those who support the "swifter, higher, stronger" concept, the latter. Recent history may give weight to the Olympics-as-Championship argument. This streamlining of the Olympics, however, reminds of when a dirt road is paved over. Sure, the new path is more efficient and makes much more sense. But part of the charm is lost, and often, that's the price of progress.

Pete Cava
Indianapolis, IN, USA

Dear ISOH,

Super great issue of *Citius, Altius, Fortius*. Comments on 1904 baseball - The AAU Committee "invested with full power to arrange" according to *The New York Times* 23 August 1903, p. 14, column 1, had a committee which scheduled "June 20-23 college baseball." Has anyone ever zero'd in on the best college baseball teams of the era/vicinity as a way to pin this down? I have found most college archives have very good records of their sport teams, but not their players. Remember Kamper's words - All forgotten Olympic competitors will be honored??

Don Sayenga
Bethlehem, PA, USA

Dear Don,

Again I never found any results of 1904 baseball that were considered "Olympic" in nature by the St. Louis newspapers. See Pete Cava's comments above.

Further investigation, however, turned up some new information. *Spalding's Official Athletic Almanac for 1904* listed all the Olympic committees involved with the 1904 St. Louis Olympics. They listed committees for both Baseball and College Baseball. The Baseball committee consisted of the President of the American League, National League, and National Association. The College Baseball committee was the same as the College Athletics committee and consisted of about 40 college professors.

Once again, however, *Spalding's Official Athletic Almanac for 1905*, which came out after the Olympics and included the "full" results, did not list any baseball results. I really don't know what ever happened to the Olympic baseball idea which may have been scheduled, but does not appear to have been held.