

Seemingly, entries for CMR are implicitly expected to meet certain ideological (beside philological) requirements. Ideally, contributions to CMR should include virtue signalling, even if dealing with centuries-old subjects, and dragged in by the head and shoulders, with superficial expressions like “this travelogue’s remarks about Muslims and Islam are generally open-minded and respectful”.

And so, one member of the ‘vetting committee’ for an entry on Pieter van Woensel’s *Remarks*, already forewarned board members: ‘I could not see much of what other people praise in Pieter van Woensel: [namely] his liberal view on Ottoman history and Muslim practices in Turkey of his time.’ Therefore, a possible contribution can only be accepted ‘under the strict condition that the entry must be succinct and in conformity with the aims [!!] of CMR.’

(end of quote)

Eventually, an unsuspecting Pieter van Woensel proved unable to meet the intriguing “aims of CMR”, and he, and his *Remarks* were rejected by the Editorial Board:

‘(...) “wonder[ing] of the value of the inclusion of this entry: written by an avowed atheist, can this work really be said to shed light on, or contribute anything substantial to, the history of Christian-Muslim relations? It reflects something of the history of modern Western secular society’s relation to Islam, perhaps. But does that qualify it for CMR?” (...) there would be a lot of work involved in trying to make the entry relevant to CMR, if indeed it could be made relevant. So (...) the entry will not be published in CMR.’

(end of quote)