

becoming more commercial than philanthropic, and conditioned on arts organizations becoming leaner, more business-oriented, and able to meet the corporation's own marketing objectives."

To survive and thrive, Scheff and Kotler say, arts organizations need to build audiences by mounting "full-fledged campaigns that include direct mail, telemarketing, well-designed, high-quality brochures, advertising, and special offers designed to attract and retain patrons." Surveys indicate "that many more people are interested in attending the

performing arts than currently do so." It will take creative marketing to get them into the theater or concert hall. That may mean, for example, selling tickets in grocery stores or workplaces. The Columbus (Georgia) Symphony enjoyed a 35 percent increase in ticket sales after putting a humorous ad on local television showing that it was okay for concert-goers to dress down.

Many people in the arts have traditionally looked on marketing with disdain, but that attitude, the authors say, is a luxury that arts organizations can no longer afford.

The T. S. Eliot Debate

"A Flapping of Scolds" by Vince Passaro, in *Harper's Magazine* (Jan. 1997), 666 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10012.

In *T.S. Eliot, Anti-Semitism, and Literary Form* (1995), Anthony Julius stirred controversy on both sides of the Atlantic by arguing that Eliot's well-known anti-Semitism blighted the poet's literary achievement. Nonsense! says Passaro, a contributing editor of *Harper's Magazine*.

Eliot (1888–1965) "unquestionably" was an anti-Semite, Passaro says, but Julius renders the great poet "utterly vile" on the basis of just "one full poem, five passages in Eliot's poetry (some of which were not published in his lifetime), and a few scattered prose remarks." It is not mere political correctness that leads Julius to jump from these transgressions to an indictment of Eliot's entire corpus, Passaro says. It is literature itself, with its insistence on "making something significant and even beautiful out of ugliness, dissonance, fever, hatred, anger, failure, and pain" that today's undereducated literary intellectuals find unacceptable. They nod perfunctorily toward Eliot's greatness but do not grasp the meaning of the word.

Eliot's accusers fail to see, Passaro writes, that his "constant effort [was] to take the stuff of the neurotic, damaged, modern personality, and the stuff of everyday irritation, anger,

fear, loathing, and contempt—the self, in all its horrors—and try to move it toward some divine plateau . . . where the burdens of personality fall away and the truth, painful and retributive though it may be, makes itself known." This "narrative movement toward God" can be traced back even to Eliot's early poetry, predating his 1927 conversion to Anglo-Catholicism.

Thus, in the case of "Gerontion" (1920), which contains some notoriously anti-Semitic lines ("And the jew squats on the window sill, the owner,/ Spawned in some estaminet of Antwerp."), Julius misses their secondary meanings and the very meaning of the poem itself, Passaro contends. "Gerontion" is about an old man waiting to die, and the house in which he lives "serves as the central metaphor of the poem: the house is his life and contains history itself. . . . The image of the Jew is un-

pleasant and disturbing, but that he is the owner of the metaphorical house containing history itself suggests something else about him. That he is squatting on the windowsill is scatological, but it also suggests an animal about to leap—Christ the tiger, who, later in the poem, 'devours' us." Though the common meaning of *estaminet* is "cafe" or



The transgressive poet.

“bistro,” another meaning—one that would have been well known in Antwerp, since it comes from the Walloon dialect spoken in Belgium—is “manger.” In a later line (“The word within a word, unable to speak a word”) in the poem, Eliot borrows the language of the Elizabethan bishop Lancelot Andrewes and “doubles the image of Christ in the manger.”

Julius saw none of that, Passaro says. “A universe in which a horrifying, hostile, contemptuous image of a ‘jew’ can also be made to suggest God, in his most tender moment of Incarnation as well as in his terrifying justice, is a universe in which Anthony Julius and many other critics steeped in comfortable assumptions would prefer not to live. Literature is not the game for them.”

OTHER NATIONS

Russia: Transition to Nowhere?

A Survey of Recent Articles

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, Westerners writing about Russia have probably used no word more often than transition—as in, “transition from totalitarianism to democracy and a free-market economy.” Scholarly appraisals of how much progress Russia has made in this endeavor have varied widely—ranging, on the economic front alone, as Duke University economist Jim Leitzel points out in *Problems of Post-Communism* (Jan.–Feb. 1997), from Anders Åslund’s *How Russia Became a Market Economy* (1994) to Marshall Goldman’s *Lost Opportunity: Why Economic Reforms in Russia Have Not Worked* (1995). Now, some commentators are suggesting that the transition hobbyhorse be set aside in order to get a better grasp of Russia’s situation.

All the *transition* talk in Washington and academia—where “transitionology” represents “a new paradigm . . . for securing funds, jobs, and tenure”—obscures the full extent of “Russia’s unprecedented, cruel, and perilous collapse,” contends Stephen F. Cohen, a professor of politics and Russian studies at Princeton University. The truth is, he says in the *Nation* (Dec. 30, 1996), “that Russia’s new private sector is dominated by former but still intact Soviet monopolies seized by ex-Communist officials who have become the core of a semi-criminalized business class; that inflation is being held down by holding back salaries owed to tens of millions of needy workers and other employees; that a boom has been promised for years while the economy continues to plunge into a depression greater than America’s in the 1930s; that President [Boris] Yeltsin’s re-election cam-

paign was one of the most corrupt in recent European history; that the Parliament has no real powers and the appellate court little independence from the presidency; and that neither Russia’s market nor its national television is truly competitive or free but is substantially controlled by the same financial oligarchy whose representatives now sit in the Kremlin as chieftains of the Yeltsin regime.”

The oft-repeated transition phrase “is profoundly misleading and betrays Western arrogance and ideological blindness,” asserts Anatol Lieven, a Senior Fellow at the United States Institute of Peace in Washington, D.C. in the *Washington Quarterly* (Winter 1997). He is a former Moscow correspondent for the *Times* of London. Russia, like many countries in Latin America, he says, is today a “weak, quasi-liberal” state, and may well remain so indefinitely.

Since the Soviet Union expired, Stephen Cohen maintains, “the great majority” of Russian families have experienced “an endless collapse of everything essential to a decent existence—from real wages, welfare provisions and health care to birth rates and life expectancy; . . . from safety in the streets to prosecution of organized crime and thieving bureaucrats.” The murder rate is twice that in the United States, and, at last official count, some 8,000 criminal gangs were operating in the country.

Economist Leitzel paints a less stark picture. One reason for the wide disagreement about the economic reforms’