

LETTERS

From the *Slavic Review* Editorial Board:

Slavic Review publishes signed letters to the editor by individuals with educational or research merit. Where the letter concerns a publication in *Slavic Review*, the author of the publication will be offered an opportunity to respond. Space limitations dictate that comment regarding a book review should be restricted to one paragraph of no more than 250 words; comment on an article or forum should not exceed 750 to 1,000 words. When we receive many letters on a topic, some letters will be published on the *Slavic Review* Web site with opportunities for further discussion. Letters may be submitted by e-mail, but a signed copy on official letterhead or with a complete return address must follow. The editor reserves the right to refuse to print, or to publish with cuts, letters that contain personal abuse or otherwise fail to meet the standards of debate expected in a scholarly journal.

To the Editor:

I would like to take issue with three points from Jelena Milojković-Djurić's review of my book *Slavic Thinkers* (vol. 67, no. 3).

First, the reviewer claims that a chronological order of the six intellectuals and my analysis of their political thought, respectively, would have "helped to elucidate the evolving intellectual discourse" (739). Second, she notes that I "fail[s] to consider these selected thinkers' participation in the Pan Slav and, subsequently, the Neo Slav discourse" (739).

My intention was to focus precisely on how political thought *internally* influenced the national groups in the central European and Balkan states. The intellectuals whose ideas I explore were seeking political arguments legitimating their nations' wishes for autonomy or sovereignty. With respect to the first point, the geographical order I used is directly connected to my interdisciplinary hypothesis. It takes into account the established historical fact that the geographical proximity to the western hub decisively influenced the economies, politics, and post-1989 democratization, as I discuss in my introduction, where I also describe my research outline and method. With respect to the second point, the intellectuals' exchange with fellow Slavs in similar conditions—the Pan-Slav and Neo-Slav discourses mentioned—was not within the scope of my work, a fact I stated clearly in the introduction and the method. In the bibliography, though, the standard works by authors such as Isaiah Berlin, Wilhelm Goerd, Hans Kohn, Leon Poliakov, and Peter F. Sugar are listed.

Finally, Milojković-Djurić states that my hypothesis, critical of Samuel Huntington's theory of *the clash of civilizations*, is to be questioned owing to the "Islamic revival that has reverberated around the world" (740). But my hypothesis questions Huntington's less well-known views on Orthodoxy; his generally known views about Islam were not relevant for my analysis.

JOSETTE BAER
University of Zurich

Dr. Milojković-Djurić chooses not to respond.