

EDITORIAL NOTE

Observers of the nationalities scene in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union find themselves once again swept up by the dramatic accretion of events. This tends to sharpen the traditional dilemmas of author and editor: articles should be current, yet deadlines must be kept. During periods of relative calm, articles are not imminently jeopardized by the constant threat of obsolescence; in more turbulent times, the faster flow of incidents (new data) causes considerable stress between the conflicting needs to “up-date” and to meet regular publication deadlines as one moves from the somewhat flexible moment of submission and acceptance to the post-typeset writ-in-stone status.

Unrestrained submission to the tyranny of constant revision can bring on both indefinite suspension of judgement on the part of a conscientious scholar and a paralyzing delay of going to print by the editor. The present issue amply embodies these tensions.

A case in point is the article by Birch. Had one given in to the temptation of up-dating, it would not have been included in this issue. It appears, however, in recognition of another dictum: that the sheer rapidity of current events does not automatically invalidate prior conclusions. Sara Ginaite’s extensive article illustrates this caveat: surveying the national minorities’ access to higher education since 1959, she suggests that the present stormy times are not likely to drive a three-decade process significantly off-course. Nor for that matter, judging from Holowinsky’s article, will the party’s policy to subject Ukrainian youth to assimilatory experiences abate in the near future.

Less clear is the relationship of Bruchis’ topic to the contemporary scene: can one expect a shift away from the half-century, Moscow-dictated, official history of the origins of the Moldavian SSR? Will a less polemical approach leading to a more accurate assessment emerge from the Gorbachev exhortations for a more “open” confrontation with the past? And will the Estonian “fever” — the quest for a less biased version of the painful past — spread to Moldavia? The questions are validly raised in the light of present developments, but the answers are not yet forthcoming. Even more precarious is Knight’s article on Romanian policy towards the Hungarian minority: it certainly deserved a last-minute revision in the face of a seeming radicalization of events. However, our subscribers rightfully demand a new number of the journal on time, and Knight deserves to be read sooner than later.

A final note: beginning with this issue, *Nationalities Papers* will inaugurate an additional service to its subscribers. Under the rubric “Publications of Interest” appears a list of publications neither reviewed

nor yet received, a kind of bibliographic aid of items associated with the themes covered by the journal. Readers are encouraged to contribute regularly to this segment of the journal and, thereby, share information scattered throughout catalogues here and abroad as the number of publications involved with nationalities questions rises in response to heightened activities on the part of ever bolder and daring steps taken by minority peoples in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.