

International Politics of Western Literary Theory: Literary Theory as Doctrine and as Discipline

LIN Jinghua

Capital Normal University, Beijing, China

European literary criticism was rapidly transformed into literary theory through the United States after Rene Wellek and Austin Warren's textbook *Theory of Literary Theory* by Harcourt, Brace and Co. (1949). Within a short period of time, American new criticism, European psychoanalysis, semiotics, structuralism, hermeneutics, deconstructivism, and so on, as well as the western Marxism, feminism, new historicism, post-colonial criticism, and cultural studies, all the critical methods little referenced to postwar Western ideology and Soviet Ideology, and are even known for their profound criticism of some problems in capitalist society. These intuitively scientific or neutral literary theories flourished during the Cold War years that contained the Soviet Union. During this period, "political correctness" not only influenced the direction of social development in the West, but also directly influenced the academic pattern and the development trend of universities at that time, so that "literary criticism", which was originally only based on personal experience, benefited and became "literary theory" in the discipline and curriculum system. As a result, the discipline of literary theory, which benefited from the Cold War pattern, is often in conflict with the specific literary theory that transcends ideology. However, the Cold War ended with the failure of the Soviet Union and its socialist realism theory system, and the western literary theory unexpectedly gained full legitimacy like Fukuyama's "the end of history". In the post-Cold War era, Western literary critics reasonably expanded the controversial theories and this has become the most concerned topic for 30 years. Thus, the international politics of the disguised Western literary theory was highlighted. Such Western literary theory has been generalized in China in the last 40 years, because Chinese academic yet has not understood the difference between theory as discipline and theory as doctrine, even anti-western in recent years.

Keywords: Cold war, literary theory, international politics, literary theory as discipline

Introduction

As soon as Rene Wellek's *Literary Theory* (1949) was translated into Chinese (1984), it spread like fire, destroying not only the Soviet literary theory which dominated in China for nearly 50 years, even though it was often titled "Marxist-Leninist Literary Theory"; Similarly, after the collapse of the Soviet union, Russian popular literary theory, for example, the Moscow State university professor L. V. Chrenev's textbook *The Literary Theory: An Introduction* (1997), or his colleague professor V. Halize (B. Хализе, 1930-2016)'s textbook *The Literary Theory* (1999), or the Saratof state University professor Prozorov and Elina's textbook *The Literary Theory: An Introduction* (2014), etc., all became very different from the literary theory during Soviet-era—from concept to structure, all traces of Western literary theory to varying degrees.

LIN Jinghua, Ph D., Yenching Professor of Comparative Literature and Russian Studies, Department of Comparative Literature in the School of Librery Arts, Capital Normal University, Beijing, China.

However, the Western literary theory, which changed the literary theories of China and Soviet Russia, developed from theories into textbooks and courses, expanded into disciplines. It started shortly after the end of World War II and prospered rapidly along with the process of the Cold War. Its momentum continued until the early 1990s, truly achieving the so-called “20th century is the era of literary criticism”. In fact, even in its flourishing process, it continues to accompany the debate on the crisis of literary theory: in the Cold War era, many critics in their masterpieces criticized “literary theory” from different aspects as deviating from the aesthetic nature of literature and the purpose of literary education, for example, Irving Babbitt Professor of Comparative Literature at Harvard Harry Levin’s work *Criticism in Crisis* (1955), the English department of Columbia University’s first tenured Jewish professor Lionel Trilling’s work *The Opposing Self: Nine Essays in Criticism* (1955) and work *Freud and the Crisis of Our Culture* (1959), famous American writer and critic Susan Sontag’s work *Against Interpretation* (1966), Sterling Professor of Yale University Henri Maurice Peyre’s work *The Failures of Criticism* (1967), prominent Sorbonne professor Raymond Picard (1917-1975)’s work *Nouvelle Critique ou Nouvelle imposture?* (1969), Edytha Macy Gross Professor of Humanities at Brandeis University Eugene Goodheart (1931-2020)’s work *The Failure of Criticism* (1978), and so on, as well as many works further explore the crisis of literary criticism during the later period of Cold War, such as Professor University of California at Berkeley Steven Knapp (1951-) and Walter Benn Michaels (1948-)’s work *Against Theory* (1982), professor at the University of Oslo Stein Haugom Olsen (1946-)’s work *The End of Literary Theory* (1986), the Avalon Foundation Professor of the Humanities at Princeton University Alvin Kernan (1923-2018)’s *The Death of Literature* (1990), Professor of Wellesley College William E. Cain (1952-)’s work *The Crisis in Criticism: Theory, Literature and Reform in English Studies* (1990), and so on. Oddly enough, the end of the Cold War made these literary theories, like other western theories, gain global legitimacy, but it did not stop the debate on literary crisis theory in the Western literary circle, on the contrary, Professor Nicolas Tredell’s work *Critical Decade* (1993), Eugene Goodheart’s work *Does Literary Studies Have a Future?* (1999), Professor Terry Eagleton’s work *After Theory* (2003), and so on, they generally believed that the era of “literary theory” has come to an end and entered a “post-theoretical” era, because the literary theory conceived in the Cold War era has become a self-sufficient body independent of literature, and infinitely expanded, squeezed the literature education in universities, and excluded the public’s opinion on literature. It is confusing to colleagues of literary studies, and no one outside of the academic circle can know what the theory is. Paradoxically, for almost half a century, the debate of literary theory itself has formed part of Western literary theory, and this is its vitality, which is different from that of Soviet literary theory. However, we are used to observing the specific problems of various theories with the general framework constructed by Western literary theory, and we never consider the Cold War context, atmosphere, and discourse in which this general “literary theory” is produced. As a result, we mistakenly believe that it is only in the post-Cold War era that the West has put forward the crisis of literary theory, and always meditated in the context of discipline. It naturally does not help to understand the truth about the development of literary theory in the West and its crisis.

In fact, the idea that the emergence, prosperity, and crisis of literary theory as a discipline in Europe and America is the product of the Cold War, and is far from inconceivable. Valentine Cunningham (1944-), former professor at Oxford University, has argued in his book *Reading after Theory* (2000) that “literary theory intensifies regression and indeed strengthens the value of literary criticism. There is no doubt in my mind that literary theory did revitalize literary studies after World War II,” along with the sharp decline in the influence of

new criticism and the linguistic turn in the 1960s, literary theory flourished rapidly, which lasted until the late 1980s (Cunningham, 2002, p. 38). Then, a famous British novelist Martin Amis (1949-) also claimed in *The War Against Cliches* (2001) that the 20th century was known as the “Age of criticism”, but the exact beginning date of this era is 1948, with T. S. Eliot (1888-1965)’s *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* and F. R. Leavis (1895-1978)’s *The Great Tradition*, while the decline of the era began with the socio-economic chaos of the 1970s (Amis, 2001): its beginning period coincided with the onset of cold, and the 1970s was a time when the crisis of literary theory was rampant, and the strange situation of the Cold War and socio-economic problems were frequent. Indeed, since signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, European and American intellectuals have been arguing fiercely about the Soviet Union and its communist system, juxtaposing it with fascism. After the end of World War II, the Soviet Union re-intensified suddenly its confrontation with the capitalist world, the Western intelligentsia more concerned about the threat of the Soviet value system including the theory of socialist realism.

This situation extended from the late 1940s to the 1980s. As Professor Noam Chomsky described in his work *Towards a New Cold War: Essays on the Current Crisis and How We Got There* (1982), the emergence of complex situation of the Cold War, for example, the Third world prose in revolt against European colonialism and American imperialism, and hostility between capital and labor kept cropping in the USA, UK, and European states, made the western intellectuals rethink about Western lifestyle and values, even reconstruct concepts or theory about the complex situation (Chomsky, 1982).

The Crisis of Literary Theory and the Doctrines of Literary Theories

The grand values and modes of expression which were been formatted and developed in Europe since the Enlightenment, through modern academic and university institutions, suggest that the Western humanities and social sciences of the Cold War era didn’t design to address but beyond Soviet ideology to construct grand narratives that seemed more neutral than the Soviet discourse system, such works as Professor at Harvard University Daniel Bell’s *The End of Ideology* (1960), *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society* (1964), and *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism* (1976), and Alvin Toffler’s work *The Third Wave* (1980), are masterpieces in this field. Accordingly, literary theorists constructed the universal paradigm of literary criticism, as professor of English language and literature at the University of Michigan Tobin Siebers in his work *Cold War Criticism and the Politics of Skepticism* (1993) described, “Modern criticism is a product of the cold war, and the repeated emphasis by the New Critics on objectivity, ambiguity, paradox, the impossibility of paraphrase, and double meaning are part of the cold war climate” (p. 30). For example, “The Intentional Fallacy” and “The Affective Fallacy” by Wimsatt and Beardsley were published in 1946 and 1949, English Professor at Yale University Cleanth Brooks’s *The Well Wrought Urn* (includes both “The Language of Paradox” and “The Heresy of Paraphrase”) came out in 1947, and two years later Brooks published *Irony as a Principle of Structure*,

Cold war critics use literature and other aesthetic forms to symbolize the harmony and order that they believe have become impossible to find in the postwar world. We are attracted to formalism because we see the mirror image of our own distraught and disordered condition in the perfections of pure form. Certainly, the cold war era is not the first period in history when literature has been used to represent a better ethical and political world. The aesthetic symbolism of Kant, Schiller, Wordsworth, and Shelley comes easily to mind as historical precedents. But the cold war period has produced some of history’s most political and ethical critics, perhaps for the reason that criticism has itself reached a critical mass in this age of the Bomb. (Siebers, 1993, p. 30, 35)

Literary theory suddenly emerged and flourished after the war, not only does the physical timing match with the cold war, but more importantly the theory itself is closely related to the Cold War, Tobin Siebers already said,

we are afraid that the cold war will never end, and so the history of the cold war is the story of our skepticism about endings, intentions, interpretations, and calculations concerning numbers, troop movements, weapons, negotiations, and claims to truth and falsehood. We are forever watchful and on our guard. Our fear contributes an essential part to the cold war mentality. It determines the distrust, suspicion, paranoia, and skepticism that have always characterized the cold war era, that cold war criticism has introduced a model of the self-conscious critic whose greatest desire is to deny his or her own agency in the world shows that modern criticism is tied to our vision of what the World Wars and the postwar era have taught us about the darker nature of human beings. (Siebers, 1993, pp. 29-30)

The discourse defined the relationship between the Cold War and literary theory.

This means that if it is not clear that literary theory as doctrine, curriculum, teaching material, and discipline is unique to the after end of World War II era and related to the course of the Cold War and its history of transition from Cold War to post-Cold War, no matter how we unearth the sublime words with deep meaning of these serial works, such as Rene Wellek's eight volumes *History of Modern Literary Criticism*, Professor Harlod Bloom edited 11 volumes *The Art of Criticism: Literary Theory and Criticism from Ancient Greece to the Present* (1985-1990), Brooks et al. edited nine volumes *Cambridge Literary Criticism* (1989-2013), and so on, then we couldn't understand why works about crisis of theories of literary research often have been published in the process of such vital literary criticism methods, because these works of literary criticism discussed theory classics, and these works are methods of literary criticism and its practices existing in the form of text. In other words, relying on existing literary theories, rather than independently exploring how the classics of literary criticism methods were formed, or the complex historical situations generated by the texts of important literary criticism theories, may be one of the sources of problems, because we do not know how the systematic knowledge of literary criticism methods is established. As a result, it is impossible to insight into the complex historical situations produced by those texts of literary theory within the existing literary theoretical canon—It is the source of the problem. For example, Russian formalism, which was discovered and “resurrected” in the United States in the 1950s and traced back to be an important school of western criticism, was rejected by the reflection theory of the Soviet Union's ideology. In order to counter the Soviet Union, Western critics just incorporated this scientific criticism method into their literary theory system and believed that it started Western literary theory (Stamiris, 1986, pp. 133-150). Furthermore, we cannot face up to the controversial literary theory, which is still an important course in the English and comparative literature departments of British and American universities, as well as in the mother tongue literature departments of major universities in Europe. Therefore, it is necessary to go back to history in order to clarify the confusion of Western literary theory: its way of discourse or the concepts used are generally obscure, almost couldn't read for non-professionals, and it is not without difficulty to use freely such complex theories for professionals, however, they were widely popular in the Cold War era when political correctness was highly emphasized, and began to spread around the world in the late Cold War era. What was this literary theory that has great influence in the world for?

It is well known, Rene Wellek and Warren's work *Literary Theory*, as well as its teaching materials and courses, supported by the departments of English literature and comparative literature in Yale University and other first-class universities, began to develop the literary theory as a theory proposed by Jonathan Culler in his work *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism* (1982)—

It does seem true that recent European philosophy—Heidegger, the Frankfurt School, Sartre, Foucault, Derrida, Liotta, Deleuze—has been imported to England and America by literary theorists rather than philosophers. In this sense, it is the literary theorist who have done most to contribute the genre of “theory”. (Culler, 1982, p. 10)

Moreover, this kind of “literary theory” is the result of historical processes: the Enlightenment and Romanticism movements promoted the nation-state and the public’s identification with it as a trend, European universities, which were born out of theological education, successively reduced theology, linguistics, and rhetoric, and increased the proportion of native language and literature education, and Literary history and literary criticism which enhanced the feelings of the country’s citizens, have become the core courses of humanities in universities, along with linguistics, philosophy, and history since the end of the 19th century. Accordingly, the university education system has established academic freedom, the high education system made personnel training objectives of specific departments, curriculum content, and other aspects to avoid the interference of church and government. Even in Britain and many countries in continental Europe, there are still King’s or Queen’s colleges, Catholic universities or Christian colleges, which are not controlled by theocracy/state politics ideology. As a country of immigrants, the United States is more fully secularized than Europe, and the neutrality of literary education is widely popularized. Professor of French at Yale University Albert Feuillerat (1874-1953) in his article “Scholarship and Literary Criticism” (1925) highly valued this mechanism of literary criticism for maintaining political neutrality (Feuillerat, 1925). In 1940, Arthur Ransome (1884-1967) and other five critics, Cleanth Brooks (1906-1994), and the other professors, respectively published their essays on “Literature and Professors” in *The Southern Review* and *the Kenyon Review*, all emphasized the aesthetic education function of literary criticism, similar to the opinions of the British literary critics Matthew Arnold and Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881) and the French literary historian Gustave Lanson (1857-1934). However, the Cold War changed the university education and its academic system. Under the politically correct premise of “freedom”, “democracy”, “human rights”, and “market economy”, the natural science, engineering technology, social science, and humanities all obtained great opportunities for survival and expansion with the large financial investment allocated by the strategy of containing the Soviet Union. And the humanities, like aerospace, computers, law, and so on, have become another area of manifesting freedom and creative (Bell, 1982; Lewontin, Katznelson, Nader, & Ohmann, 1997; Christopher, 1998). The great development of literary theory was more due to the overall atmosphere of the Cold War era: the government and foundations increased financial support for academic research. For example, the National Humanities Foundation was established by the US government in 1965, which made the production and research of literature and art a part of the Cold War. This happened to be the most prosperous period of literary criticism; The university literature education system and the academic community established by the discipline have been injected with vitality. Of course, institutional strength is not limited to the official system itself, but also includes the various academic communities supported by funding from governments and foundations and relying on the existence of universities and their disciplines, as Associate Professor of Comparative Literature at the University of Tartu Marina Grishakova et al. said in their work *Theoretical Schools and Circles in the Twentieth-Century Humanities: Literary Theory, History, Philosophy* (2015),

Hence, schools and circles, as more tight-knit associations, appear within broader intellectual movements without being separated from the disruptive events of their age: wars, political fights and repressions, migrations, and catastrophes. They function as fragile heterogeneities that are permanently on the verge of falling apart, calling for extra effort for survival. (Grishakova & Salupere 2015, p. 9)

This is not only narrow opinion of Eastern European scholars who joined the Western camp after the war (Estonia is a member of NATO and the European Union), but a theory based on history: in the development and expansion of literary theory in Europe and the United States after the war, the academic community itself belonged to the part of the academic career. Derrida's post-structuralist theory of linguistic philosophy, which deviates from the French linguistic tradition, was generally rejected by the French philosophical circle, but it was accepted by the American literary criticism community since the late 1960s, then it has been brewing into a global trend of deconstructive literary criticism. It can be seen that the academy system has contributed to the construction and practice of literary theory in the West during the Cold War era. Even though Derrida has always understood deconstruction as a radicalized Marxism, Eagleton argues that, whether Derrida is right or wrong, Deconstruction is one of the most important elements in some intellectual circles of Eastern Europe, in other words, the Deconstruction was once used as a symbol of anti-communist dissent. The problem is that the Russian formalism was invented and revived in the West, and the academic status of Paul de Man and his Rhetorical criticism undisturbed by his pro-Nazi early years, are far from unique in the Cold War: the transition of new criticism in the United States, the rise of structuralism and semiotics in France and the popularity in the United Kingdom and the United States, the emergence of reader response theory in Germany and its popularity in Europe and the United States, and the emergence of cultural studies from the United Kingdom and Europe and the development of a global important academic field in the United States, etc., also benefited from the modern academic system and university literature education promoted by the Cold War era, and was closely related to the literary criticism tradition developed in the era of European colonialism. For example, the German philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834) became interested in hermeneutics when he was asked to translate Lieutenant-colonel of the British Royal Marine Corps David Collins (1756-1810)'s illustrated book *An Account of the English Colony in New South Wales: With Remarks on the Dispositions, Customs, Manners, &c. of the Native Inhabitants of That Country* (1801), chronicling narrating the author's encounters with Australian Aborigines. Schleiermacher's obsession with understanding this national belief is that "the art of hermeneutics was born out of a colonial encounter" (Eagleton, 2000, p. 23): In the Cold War era, the European tradition of interpreting the Bible evolved into a non-historical contextualized interpretation theory due to the hermeneutics which is intuitively scientific and in essence originates from need of European colonialism. Through the academic system, literary study becomes the confirmation of Western cultural heritage and value system. For example, in the centennial commemoration of William Wordsworth (1770-1850)'s death organized by the English Department of Princeton University, the Professor Lionel Trilling's book *The Opposing Self: Nine Essays in Criticism* (1955): "If Wordsworth cannot be remembered by us through the university, he cannot be remembered by others" (Trilling, 1955, p. 118), declared the Essay Criticism. In other words, the construction and practice of literary theories in the West during the Cold War era benefited to a large extent from the academic system. For example, the evolution of post-structuralism theories from France into deconstructionism in the United States was realized through the introduction the department of English and comparative literature and its classes in Yale University, which effectively domesticated students' professional abilities and moved to the field of national basic education along with the trend (Cusset, 2008, p. 76). This means that the ever-changing Western literary theory did not come out of nowhere, but was the result of the exploration of literary criticism methods by scholars from the English departments of universities such as Oxford, Cambridge, London, and Edinburgh, and from the departments of languages and literature such as the Ecole Normale Supérieure Paris France, La Sorbonne and the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in France, as well as the universities of Berlin, Turin, and Utrecht,

their academic achievements about the critical methods have been converted into courses (and content) through the departments of English and comparative literature departments at Harvard, Columbia, Yale, Princeton, Berkeley, and the University of California, Irvine, and scholars from these departments deepened doctrines of feminism, black studies, postcolonial criticism, and cultural studies in response to issues arising from the rapid development of postwar America as a nation of immigrants. According to Reader Helen Gardner (1908-1986) at Oxford University in her book *Professional Literary Criticism* (1953), the critical significance of writers, poets, and critics as literary experts was quickly replaced by the works of professional literary researchers, who occupied important positions in literary research. For example, Professor Cleanth Brooks who held the position of Gray Professor of Rhetoric at Yale University held close linguistic reading of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* in his course Understanding Poetry and Understanding Drama, or teaching material *The Well Wrought Urn: Studies in the Structure of Poetry* (1947), his criticism has had the greatest influence beyond the academy (Gardner, 1959, pp. 3-75). Professor Henri Peyre described about flourishes of academic criticism in his work *The Failures of Criticism*,

in the United States today, we do live in the age of literary criticism, at least in the circle of academic criticism. Numerous papers, pamphlets, and monographs on Hemingway, Faulkner, Joyce, Yeats, Eliot, and even Proust, Rilke, Thomas Mann, and Beckett were published, interleaved and widely read by other professors and awed students. (Peyre, 1967, p. 320)

With the progress of the Cold War, this situation became more and more prevalent, so much so that according to famous book *Criticism in the University* (1985), postwar literary criticism refers to the professional literary study under the academic system (Graff & Gibbons, 1985). Importantly, the academic institutions that directly stimulated the boom of literary theory in postwar were themselves a product of the Cold War. The Cold War prompted the "free world" to form a common "West" in order to contain the communist ideology and resist the national liberation movements of post-war, such as France's brutal suppression of the Algerian independence movement and Britain's reorganization of former colonial countries into the Commonwealth. European and American countries were keen to construct various theories to reinterpret the history of colonialism. Furthermore, the great wave of actively exploring the so-called universal theory was born in European and American academic circles, and the literary criticism methods developed in Europe, Britain, and America were brought to the United States and forged into operable literary theory. Moreover, the French academic community was keen to explore the methodology of literary research, and the CIA also turned from covert surveillance to vigorous support and promotion (Rockhill, 2017, <http://ift.tt/2m6tfnN>). In 1965, "The continuing development of literary studies will be driven in part by European criticism of all kinds", Professor Joseph Hillis Miller Jr. said at a seminar on literary criticism organized by Yale University's Comparative Literature Organization, "By absorbing and assimilating the essence of European criticism, American scholars are likely to develop new criticism from the combination of American culture and European thought" (Hoffman, 1979, p. 71). Then, "French theory" became no longer just the theory in French but a universal method of criticism. That is to say, in the face of common communist pressure, the "West" was able to ignore internal contradictions by constructing so-called universal "theories". This is what Derrida emphasized at the conference *The Present State of Theory* held at the University of California, Irvine, in the spring of 1987, regarding literary theory concepts and terms as North American products. It was only given connotations from the specific position of the United States, although it had a general impact. Thus, we could see why French theory was so easy to catch on in the United States, and why French Enlightenment

ideas were no longer met with European or American resistance. Of course, this rejection of the historical context behind literary narration leads to the covert resistance of Western scholars from the Third world, such as Edward Said's postcolonial criticism. The academic pattern formed after the war coincided with the educational revolution of the Cold War era. For example, after the war, the United States found that its students were not trained enough to recruit soldiers, and Education and technology seemed to take precedence in the Soviet Union over USA (Soviet Union was the first to succeed in landing on the moon). These forced the United States to revitalize basic education and strengthen the training of English and history to ensure the future development of the country (Stosky, 2012, pp. 13-14). This reform of basic education impacted on the reform of university education, increased investment in the humanities, made the status of English departments and comparative literature departments in universities continue to rise, and a large number of outstanding literary theory teachers emerged,

Literary criticism has also been heavily impacted by the orientation of the department and institute, it was the unique contribution of the American higher education system. In this situation, the university clearly encourages departments to join forces to win students and funding, and to innovate. (Stosky, 2012, p. 15)

For white Anglo-Saxon men who obtained certain standards and economic status, literary study was an upper-class profession in the early days of our time. New criticism challenging traditional scholars still mostly came from men of this class, but the composition of critics after them was divided with the change of the Cold War pattern. For example, in 1969, Jews accounted for 7%-13% of the scholars in the English department of famous American universities. The proportion of female scholars and black scholars has also increased with the democratization process in the University campus (Culler, 1988, pp. 26-32). Such structural changes of teaching staffs were consistent with social changes, which stimulated the growing rise of gender studies, feminism, minority studies, and cultural studies, and contribute to the first flourishing of new historicism, deconstruction, and postcolonial criticism in the departments of English, French, and comparative literature in the universities. This situation was closely related to the transformation of these studies into courses.

However, this situation directly affects the reconstruction of literary classics. The Cold War spurred the literary research community to engage more ethnically diverse scholars, many of them women, and unexpectedly inspired them to unearth another set of classics that changed the Canon sequence and the way of understanding Canon. At the same time, political correctness prevents Americans from easily denying this trend of change. They must face up to the fact that

Western culture originates from multiculturalism. Western culture originated in the field of Mediterranean, which gathered the Middle East and Europe, Hebrews and Ancient Greeks, Semitic and Asian ethnic group together. The Semitic elements are shown right from the start. Not only did ancient Greece learn a lot from ancient Egypt, but the writers we think of as primarily Ancient Greek and Roman—Aesop (c.620-c.564), Lucius Apuleius (124-170), Terentius, St. Augustine—all belonged to de facto Africans, in other words, they were actually born in Africa or have lived in Africa. Moreover, even French Dumas and Russian Pushkin, the classical writers found in nationalist Europe, were of African descent. It is certain that they became classics in the same way as the Europeanized Jews, from Spinoza and Heine to Proust and Kafka, not because of their birth and ignorance of the fact that they were outsiders, (Fiedler, 1993, p. 35)

but because the institution of the classics had changed. In fact, there is a historical basis for this proposition in American critic Leslie Fiedler "The Canon and the Classroom", for example, Leavis' work *Great Tradition* excluded *Jane Eyre*, *Wuthering Heights*, *Tristan Shandy* and other canon. The New criticism curriculum has shaped a number of high Modernism literary classics, British novelist D. H. Lawrence's work *Studies the Classics*

of *American Literature* (1923), and a professor at Harvard University Matheson's work *The American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman* (1941), etc., developed the sequence of American modernist literary classics, and became an important content in literature classes since the 1950s and 1960s. At the same time, Professor at John Hopkins University John Guillory (1952-)’s work *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (1993) asserts that the distinction between classics and non-classics was increasingly determined by academic institutions and has a direct impact on literary education in every era, where classics identified by this tradition are misinterpreted as “great traditions” (Guillory, 1993, p. 3). More recently, Berg Professor of English at New York University Harold Bloom (1930-2019)’s work *The Western Canon* (1994) argued that:

The Canon, a word religious in its origins, has become a choice among texts struggling with one another for survival, whether you interpret the choice as being made by dominant social groups, institutions of education, traditions of criticism, or, as I do, by late-coming authors who feel themselves chosen by particular ancestral figures. Some recent partisans of what regards itself as academic radicalism go so far as to suggest that works join the Canon because of successful advertising and propaganda campaigns. The compeers of these skeptics sometimes go farther and question even Shakespeare, whose eminence seems to them something of an imposition. If you worship the composite god of historical process, you are fated to deny Shakespeare his palpable aesthetic supremacy, the really scandalous originality of his plays. Originality becomes a literary equivalent of such terms as individual enterprise, self-reliance, and competition, which do not gladden the hearts of Feminists, Afrocentrists, Marxists, Foucault inspired New Historicists, or Deconstructors—of all those whom I have described as members of the School of Resentment. (Bloom, 1994, p. 20)

Therefore, we can understand that the literary education under the leadership of new criticism is keen to promote modernist works as canon, because the creation and understanding of literature with complex narrative shows the literary cultivation of upper society and middle class; The changes in literary theory that have entered the curriculum system of universities since the 1960s are the emergence of women’s literature and black literary classics along with the feminist and black civil rights movements, which impacted on the language and literature courses of basic education.

It can be said that the post-war literary theories of the West are not directly concerned with specific political issues, relying on the academic system reconstructed by the Cold War situation, the higher education and its expansion stimulated by the Cold War, so the humanities cannot become the academic self-entertainment independent of social practical issues, as Associate professor at English Indiana University Harold Formm (1933-) in his work *Academic Capitalism and Literary Value* (1991) described, even in the magazine *Critical Exploration* which claimed to be dedicated to the pure exploration of literary critical methods, published many articles in the 1980s that were devoted to the issue of ethnic appeal and acknowledged the political appeal of literary critical methods (Formm, 1991, pp. 166-182). Furthermore, Professor of English at Brown University Marc Redfield (1958-) in his work *Theory at Yale: the Strange Case of Deconstruction in America* (2016) concluded that “literary theory” could not take place outside the institutional and specialized context of the American university in the late 20th century, and literary theory is part of the business of an academic institution, a professional teaching (Redfield, 2016, pp. 13-14). The theory has changed the traditional literary criticism existing in the form of personal experience, and grown up in the form of discipline. Any school, writings, and concepts can only have vitality with the help of the academy system, which not only makes them a self-circulation of knowledge within the academy, but also contributes to the expansion of the knowledge of literary theory in the West, becoming a super discipline.

The Crisis of Literary Theory and the Discipline of Literary Theories

Western literary theory swelled up suddenly after the war, Professor Jonathan Culler in his work *Literary Theory* (1972) believed that:

Literary theory is not a disembodied set of ideas but a force in institutions. Theory exists in communities of readers and writers, as a discursive practice, inextricably entangled with educational and cultural institutions. Three theoretical modes whose impact, since the 1960s, has been greatest are the wide-ranging reflection on language, representation, and the categories of critical thought undertaken by deconstruction and psychoanalysis (sometimes in concert, sometimes in opposition); the analyses of the role of gender and sexuality in every aspect of literature and criticism by feminism and then gender studies and Queer theory; and the development of historically oriented cultural criticisms (new historicism, post-colonial theory) studying a wide range of discursive practices, involving many objects (the body, the family, race) not previously thought of as having a history.

The role of criticism in this attempt is decisive: professors speak of teaching and administrative tasks preventing them from 'getting on with their work', identifying the production of criticism as their essential role. Ironically, it was precisely the expansion of universities in the 1960s and the market demand for more teachers of literature that permitted teachers to define themselves as writers of criticism. ...Criticism has been affected by the role of departments—that distinctively American contribution to the system of higher education. The structure which makes the university a consortium of departments competing for students and money may encourage visible, innovative enterprises. ...Criticism has also been affected by changes in the membership of university faculties. Commentators suggest that in the early part of our period literary scholarship was a marginally-acceptable genteel vocation for white Anglo-Saxon protestant males of a certain social standing and economic status. The New Critics who challenged the Old Scholars were of the same sex and class, but they were followed, Leslie Fiedler writes, by a second generation of modernist critics, of literature in the generation that followed Trilling, after making their reputations by writing on canonical literary works (Harold Bloom on romanticism, Geoffrey Hartman on Wordsworth, and Robert Alter on Stendhal), have frequently begun explicitly to take up elements of the Jewish tradition in their contributions to literary studies (Bloom on Kabbalah, Hartman on sacred interpretation, Alter on the Hebrew Bible). (Culler, 1988, pp. 28, 30, 31-32)

Thus, just as the humanities as a whole enjoyed extraordinary development during the Cold War era, the rapidly expanding literary theory became a part of the theoretical construction of the Cold War era, as Professor Vincent B. Leitch in his work *Live With Theory* (2008) claimed, it was necessary to consider situations in which economic, political, and social phenomena are controlled by the dominant theories of past eras if we wanted to understand literary criticism and theory today (Leitch, 2008, p. 2). The concept of "literature" and its relationship to politics was unexpectedly restructured during the Cold War, Professor of Humanities and Comparative Literature Jean-Pierre Barricelli (1924-1997) and Professor Joseph Gibaldi (1942-) in their work *Interrelations of Literature* (1982) told us that since the beginning of Romanticism, the relationship between literature and politics has become the most sensitive and contradictory problem that modern aesthetics must face, it was clear that students who interact between literature and politics are engaged in intellectually dangerous ventures at a difficult time, because the cultural landscape they set out to explore is so complex and uncertain, full of contradictions, paradoxes, and clichés. For almost two centuries, the battle over literature and politics was far from settled. Many critics today assert that literary interpretation should not avoid political questions. Even if some of these critics see the ultimate goal of criticism as the rediscovery of the inherent meaning of literary works, they recognize the limited usefulness of some auxiliary external method (history, sociology, political science, etc.), even if many critics still dislike the notion that literature can or should be directly related to politics (Barricelli & Gibaldi, 1982, p. 123). This statement profoundly points out the complicated relationship between literary criticism and politics.

Literary criticism became politically relevant again, and this seeming regression occurred because the Cold War changed what concept "politics" means. In order to counter the Soviet Union, the postwar West consciously

established a free capitalist consumer society and promoted the scientific and technological revolution, which unexpectedly prompted the advent of the post-industrial era and led to the widespread popularity of postmodernism in the field of literature, art, and aesthetic practice. This consequence of modernity, which was originally associated with the Cold War, is not necessarily undamaging to the political correctness that threatens Western orthodoxy, but Alvin Toffler (1928-2016)'s work *The Future Shock* (1970) and *The Third Wave* (1980), Professor at Harvard University Daniel Bell (1919-2011)'s *The End of Ideology* (1960), *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society* (1973), *Capitalist Cultural Contradictions* (1976), and other works as the general development direction of human civilization greatly highlighted. The American intellectual left fierce backlashed the discourse, and they saw the rise of left-wing thinking in the 1960s as a testament to the lie that the West had no ideology and that technology had saved the country. Accordingly, this postmodernism, which is used to show the "developed" and "free" of the West, has become another background for the exploration of literary criticism methods. "Concepts such as truth, history and value may well be absolutely indispensable, but French theory tries to operate without them as much as possible" (Lotringer & Cohen 2001, p. 5). Thus, deconstruction, Western Marxism, feminism, and other literary criticism methods used to disintegrate the "grand narrative" of the imaginary enemy were given legitimacy. Therefore, we understood that during the Cold War, the West consciously established a different discourse from the Soviet camp, and political correctness became more secretive through the academic system. Just as Fredric Jameson (1934-)'s *The Political Unconscious* (1981) said, Russian-Soviet folklorist Vladimir Propp (Владимир Пропп, 1895-1970)'s *Morphology of the Tale* (1928) divided folk stories into different narrative types. Lithuanian literary scientist and French semioticians Algirdas Greimas (1917-1992)'s structuralism took literary texts as symbols, but the object of this kind of "scientific" analysis is the narration about heroine actions, and it is against common sense to eliminate human beings for the purpose of analysis. Furthermore, he attached importance to Marxist criticism, was enthusiastic about exploring the works of realistic novelists such as Balzac's novels, and believed that it is impossible to discuss Nietzsche's philosophical issues about transcending good and evil without leaving the specific ideology, because "political unconsciousness" exists everywhere in the exploration and practice of literary criticism (Jameson, 1981). Equally significant, Joseph Hillis Miller Jr. in his famous article "The Function of Literary Theory at the Present Time" (1989) said,

In fact there has been a massive shift of focus in literary study since 1979 away from the "intrinsic", rhetorical study of literature toward study of the "extrinsic" relations of literature, its placement within psychological, historical, or sociological contexts.

My contention is that the study of literature has a great deal to do with history, society, the self, but that this relation is not a matter of thematic reflection within literature of them extra linguists forces and facts, but rather a matter of the way the study of literature offers perhaps the best opportunities to identify the nature of language as it may have effects on what de Man calls "the materiality of history".

The distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic, like most such binary oppositions, turns out to be false and misleading. Those apparently "extrinsic" relations themselves require a rhetorical analysis, for example a clear understanding of the various figures of speech always necessary in one form or another to talk about the relation of a work of literature to its "context": "reflection," which is metaphor; "context," which is metonymy; "ideology," which is an morphosis, and so on. (Wolfreys 2005, pp. 262-264)

Importantly, Miller deeply and perceptively pointed out the political appeal of traditional literary criticism,

The consensus on the function of the humanities in American life lasted until about the time I went to college in 1944. That consensus was largely the product of the humanism of Matthew Arnold as it was embodied in the curriculum of

American colleges and Universities. That curriculum was oriented primarily toward preparing what Anglo-Saxon middle-class males for professions: law, medicine, teacher, public service, business, the protestant ministry and toward preparing white Anglo-Saxon middle-class women to be better wives, mothers, hostesses, and community servants. The idea was that you went off for four years to a protected and sequestered place, often protected and sequestered from the "opposite sex," and there assimilated the humanistic values by reading Plato, Shakespeare, Robert Browning, and so on, in preparation for entering society. The consensus about humanistic study saw it as primarily thematic and stylistic. Courses in the humanities were in aid of the assimilation of the best that has been thought and said in our Western tradition from the Bible and the Greeks on down. Such courses also provided models of style mostly taken from Victorian prose. (Wolfreys, 2005, pp. 265-266)

In fact, associate professor Michael Clark in his article "Political Nominalism and Critical Performance" claimed that the connection between literary studies and political action has been problematic since Matthew Arnold declared that literary criticism must remain "impartial" and detached from the common concerns of livelihood and government, and after the publication of his article "Function of Literary Criticism at Present" literary criticism moved towards the aspect he condemned, advocating a return to the new humanism combining ethics and aesthetics, in order to redeem the theme that had emerged in the Romantic era and then disappeared, and in the 1930s, two M movements emerged, namely Marxism in politics and Modernism in art (Clark, 1989, p. 230). The vision of modern literary criticism reflected the white male politics in the traditional literary criticism, furthermore, just as Western politics in the Cold War era was international politics, as a product of the Cold War era, the politics of literary theory was naturally not limited to a certain country, under the background of recognizing the political correctness confirmed by the Cold War, to explore the academic issues of literary theory and carry out literary theory education. The Frontiers of Literary Criticism Seminar, held on April 24-25, 1969, discussed literary criticism methods in Britain, France, West Germany, Russia, the United States, and other major countries of the Cold War era, as well as in Europe, for example, Wellek's article "The Atlas of Contemporary European Literary Criticism", Edward Brown's article "Some New Trends in Soviet Literary Criticism". Specific literary theorists also benefited from the Cold War international political situation, Professor of German Studies at Cornell University Peter Uwe Hohendahl (1936-) in his work *The Institution of Criticism* (1982) said, most of his articles have benefited from German society and literature, and although some aspects of his findings may not be immediately generalised into theory,

But it was clear that West Germany was a developed industrialized society, part of the Western world, politically and culturally closely related to other industrialized societies in Europe and the United States. I do not wish to diminish the national tradition, for it undoubtedly plays an important role in the practice of literary criticism; It is also noted, however, that this essential problem is a common topic in all developed industrial societies, albeit in various forms. (Hohendahl, 1982, p. 13)

The history of war and trade had made the conflict between the United States and Europe difficult to resolve. As a result, the gap between British, American, and continental literary criticism and philosophy has long been addressed through translation, not only the litter matters of converting from one language to another, or the more important issue of cultural migration. There seems to have been disturbing or even disturbing about the relationship between American culture and European culture for a long time. However, the establishment of a common ideology contained soviet communism could form a unified "West", which unexpectedly broke the boundary of knowledge and thought. For example, *The Partisan Review*, founded in New York in 1934, changed from the ideological platform of American left-wing intellectuals to the position of cultural Cold War, and linked the United States and Europe after the war. European intellectuals such as Jean-Paul Sartre, Albert Camus, Simon

de Beauvoir, and so on were happy to publish works or discuss topics in the magazine. In response, the establishment of a common “literary theory” became another way to promote effective convergence between the United States and Europe,

We continue to observe that the greatest context for the gap between Anglo-American and continental literary criticism is rooted in different social experiences. This gap allows for a meaningful dialogue between the two, a dialogue in which the Yale critics have an important voice, and it allows them to see a truth that is difficult for American readers to understand. (Arac 1983, p. 6)

Thus, Professor of American literature at Soka University Jim Merod (1936) in his work *The Political Responsibility of the Critic* (1987) said, in the period of the Cold War “North American culture enjoys the context of international influence” (Merod, 1987, p. 38).

Of course, as doctrine of literary theory, its political charm is realized through the academic system and the university education system. It is on this basis that a series of works on the discussion of the general problems of literary politics appeared in Europe and the United States. For example, Raymond Williams in his work *Marxism and Literature* (1977) firmly believed in the significance of Marxism for literary studies, Jamaican-born British Marxist sociologist and cultural theorist Stuart Hall (1932-2014)’s work *Politics and Letters* (1979) and Philip Goldstein’s work *The Politics of Literary Theory: An Introduction to Marxist Criticism* (1990) advocated linking the development and prosperity of literary theory in the period of Postwar with contemporary politics; English academic Marxist Terry Eagleton full discussed the relationship between literary research and ideology in his many works, such as *Exiles and Émigrés: Studies in Modern Literature* (1970), *The Body as Language: Outline of a New Left Theology* (1970), *Myths of Power: A Marxist Study of the Brontës* (1975), *Criticism & Ideology* (1976), *Marxism and Literary Criticism* (1976), *The Function of Criticism* (1984), *The Ideology of the Aesthetic* (1990), *Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature* (1990), and so on. Evelyn Barish in his work *The Double Life of Paul de Man* (2014) creatively proposed and discussed the concept “politics of comparative literature” (Barish, 2014, p. 10). Furthermore, M. Keith Booker edited *Encyclopedia of Literature and Politics: Censorship, Revolution and Writing* (2014), and he asserted in the work, “in the past few decades, highlighting the social, historical and political significance of literary works has been the dominant method of literary research. This situation reconnects literature and politics in Western history in the post-Cold War era” (Booker, 2014, p. 9), and discussed political significance of Marxist criticism, women’s criticism, post-colonial studies, African American literature, Asian American literature, and other literary studies. Philip Goldstein in his work *The Politics of Literary Theory: An Introduction to Marxist Criticism* (1990) discussed Marxist criticism played an important role in the contemporary literary theory. Professor of Modern English Literature at the University College London John Sutherland (1938-) in his article “The Politics of English Studies in the British University, 1960-1984” discussed the politics of English teaching in the Cold War era, and said that in *Literary Criticism and Ideology* which is the most influential literary theory work of 1970 years, “Terry Eagleton filled the ideological and political vacuum at the core of the English department with Marxist aesthetics, so the practice of literary criticism may be revitalized again” (Sutherland, 1985, p. 140).

At the same time, literary and theoretical discussions of many important social phenomena from the perspective of political science became a common phenomenon during the Cold War. Even feminist criticism and homosexual studies, which began to boom in the 1960s and 1970s, and focused on personal physiological phenomena such as body, sexual orientation and sexual psychology, were also included in the framework of

political correctness, and such discussion accompanied the process of the Cold War. There were great works of feminist literary criticism during the period of the Cold War, such as De Beauvoir's work *The Second Sex* (1949), Ellman's work *Think of the Women* (1968), Katherine Murray Millett (1934-2017)'s work *The Politics of Sexuality* (1970), Toril Moi's work *Sexual/Textual Politics* (1985), Elaine Showalter's many works, such as *Towards a Feminist Poetics* (1979), *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830-1980* (1985), *Sexual Anarchy: Gender and Culture at the Fin de Siecle* (1990), and Sandra Gilbert & Susan Gubar's work *The Madwoman in the Woman Writer: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination* (1979), former Professor of Contemporary Women's Writing at Leeds Beckett University Mary Eagleton's work *Feminist Literary Theory: A Reader* (1996) and so on and so forth. Ellen Rooney in his article "The Literary Politics of feminist Theory" said that "Common sense has convinced us that feminist politics and feminist theory are directly related" (Rooney, 2006, p. 73). Therefore, these works about the Feminism became the canon of feminist literary criticism.

Similarly, the issue of ethnicity and identity has become an important part of literary theory, which is related to the international significance of the black civil rights movement in the United States in the Cold War era to highlight the equality between colored and white people. Therefore, Longtime University of Virginia English professor Ralph Cohen wrote "Introduction" for the collected papers *The Future of Literary Theory* (ed. by himself, 1989) that the feminism and black theories were part of a larger political and cultural movement that demanded gender equality and ethnic equality in the marketplace, the social space, the political arena, and the educational institutions, and the two kinds of theorists associate literary "theory" with new goals and redefine the theory.

This trend continued as an important legacy of the post-Cold War era. For example, the Feminist criticism and the Ethnic studies, as literary criticism methods, were originally in line with the realpolitik of the United States and Britain, but with the post-Cold war process, they were legitimized to the whole world and became universal theories. According to professor Stanley Fish's opinion which he discussed in his book *Professional Correctness: Literary Studies and Political Change* (1995),

Specifically, I shall be questioning the possibility of transforming literary study so that it is more immediately engaged with the political issues that are today so urgent: issues of oppression, racism, terrorism, violence against women and homosexuals, cultural imperialism, and so on. It is not so much that literary critics have nothing to say about these issues, but that so long as they say it as literary critics no one but a few of their friends will be listening, and, conversely, if they say it in ways unrelated to the practices of literary criticism, and thereby manage to give it a political effectiveness, they will no longer be literary critics, although they will still be something and we may regard the something they will then be as more valuable. (Fish, 1995, pp. 1-2)

Paradoxically, stimulating the development of high technology and encouraging university education to face the market, which are supposed to highlight the superiority of western capitalist system, have led to the discussion of literary criticism methods becoming a new way of literary education. After the end of World War II, higher education has largely been transformed into vocational education by accident, and tests of students' learning ability or technical proficiency have become more important than demonstrating humanistic qualities. The academic exploration of literary theorists has been regarded as a new social form of intellectual work, and literary theory has changed from highlighting humanistic quality in the general sense to a special specialty showing professional ability. In this academic system and university reform, serious consequences have been produced for the theory of literature as a theory, and the situation has appeared in Professor of English at New York

University John Guillory (1952-)’s work “Cultural Capital: The Formation of Literary Classics” directly criticized, “Literary theory that emerged in the 1960s destroyed disciplinary boundaries between literary texts and texts which derived from other discourses such as linguistics, psychoanalysis, philosophy, and so on. These texts are now fully recognized as part of ‘classical theory’” (Guillory, p. 3), the practice of literary criticism was proclaimed as a new state of literary education, according to the tendency to regard the intellectual work mode of literary theorists as a new social form of intellectual work, the technocratic labor of a new professional bureaucratic class. The consequences of such a trend are even more serious in the view of Professor of general and comparative literature at the University of California in Santa Cruz Wlad Godzich (1945-)’s work *The Culture of Literacy* (1994), that is literary theory is a speculative, declining profession, while literature has become rude, utilitarian, and there is no intersection between literary theory and literature, but in retrospect they have always worked well together (Godzich, 1994, pp. 2-3).

All in all, European critics and scholars promoted important literary works of European countries as “classics” to developing countries by constructing universal literary criticism methods, which became a widespread phenomenon in the world since the end of the 19th century. At that time, intellectuals in those countries with deep cultural traditions fiercely resisted, but in the Cold War era, the West established literary theories trying to counteract this resistance. The emergence and development of literary theory in Europe and America after end of the World War II, involved not only the method of literary criticism as a specific theory, but also evolved into a specialized course and expanded into a discipline, eventually became the institutional complex topics. That’s what Professor of Yale University Henri Peyre (1901-1908) ascribed in his work *The Failures of Criticism* (1967),

involved in literary theory, some of the most prominent critics usually argued about aesthetic standards and systems, tried to relate particular works to broad genres, or to national traditions or philosophical approaches. They are less likely to critique specific works than those who offer literary criticism practices. Specific novels do not seem worthy of the theorist’s discussion, and they rarely offer evaluations of new works, and when they do so with humility, it is hard to match the deep philosophical insights which Heidegger, Fry, and Wiemsatt discussed works when they commented humbly on new works. Their influence was limited to universities. (Peyre, 1967, p. 322)

This happened under the international political process of the Cold War. However, this process in the field of literary studies was not the direct replacement of literary criticism by Cold War ideology, but promoted and completed through rigorous academic system and perfect university education system. The process was extremely tortuous. More importantly, the literary theories of Europe and the United States first exerted influence on the western world in the European continent, North America, and the Commonwealth with the academic charm itself. With the process of the Cold War, the production process of these theories and the institutional power of the university education and academic system behind them were cleverly shielded, and then spread to the whole world in the form of theories.

Conclusions

In this way, we understand that the literary theory was production of the Cold War era, and there are some complicated political implications behind it, we are only dealing with literary theory as a doctrine—the literary theory of depoliticized scientism, or feminism, Western Marxism, post-colonialism, cultural studies, and so on which often criticized Western social and political issues. In fact, Western political correctness in the Cold War era has become the part of life and common sense in the Europe-America. The western political correctness

included that feared Soviet ideology to endanger “democracy”, “freedom”, “human rights”, etc. They wisely approached the tense situation of Cold War in a way that was different from the Soviet Union’s, by depoliticizing the concept of a universal theory, and they constructed universal theory with the concept of depoliticization, as described by Daniel Bell in his work *The End of Ideology* (1988). The question before us in America and the world is to resolutely reject the age-old idea of an ideological debate between “left” and “right”, a term that is, at present, hopelessly derogatory, if it even has a reason to exist at all (Bell, 1988, p. 406). This situation inspired academic circle to choose a different approach from the Soviet Union, which restricted the development of literary theory by allowing ideology directly into the humanities and social sciences, according to Rene Wellek’s opinion in his work *Theory of Literature* (1949) that literature is no substitute for sociology or political science. Literature has its own reason and purpose. Such literary theories could help to ease tensions between nations, and it the irreplaceable function of political diplomacy. Soviet Russia which took the lead in establishing literary theories, and China which had transplanted Soviet literary theory, naturally regarded Western literary theory as a cutting-edge and developed literary theory in the late Cold War and post-Cold War. When applying some critical methods, the Chinese academic circle was constantly troubled by the western literary theories as theories, and tried to criticize it on the theoretical level, but the results were often inadequate, and even missed the point; More importantly, it reminds us that Soviet literary theory and Western literary theory respectively constructed in the period of confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union, western literary theory finally gained wider recognition. The official literary theories of the Soviet Union which were directly an extension of ideology, failed in the end. In addition to the advantages and disadvantages of their theories as doctrines, they also had the effects of their literary theories in international politics.

References

- Amis, M. (2001). *The war against cliché: Essays and review 1971-2000*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Arac, J. (Ed.). (1983). *The Yale critics: Deconstruction in America*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Barish, E. (2014). *The double life of Paul de man*. New York & London: Liveright Publishing Corp.
- Barricelli, J.-P. & Gibaldi, J. (1982). *Interrelations of literature*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.
- Bell, D. (1982). *The social sciences since the Second World War*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Bell, D. (1988). *The end of ideology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bloom, H. (1994). *The western canon: The books and school of the ages*. New York, San Diego & London: Harcourt Brace & Com.
- Booker, M. K. (Ed.). (2014). *Encyclopedia of literature and politics: Censorship, revolution and writing*. Westport, Connecticut & London: Greenwood Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1982). *Towards a new cold war: Essays on the current crisis and how we got there*. New York: Pantheon.
- Christopher, S. (Ed.). (1998). *Universities and empire: Money and politics in the social sciences during the Cold War (Cold War and the university)*. New York: The New Press.
- Clark, M. (1989). Political nominalism and critical performance. In J. Natoli (Ed.), *Literary theory’s future(s)*. Urban & Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Culler, J. (1982). *On deconstruction: Theory and criticism after structuralism*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University.
- Culler, J. (1988). *Framing the sign: Criticism and its institutions*. Norman & London: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Culler, J. (1997). *Literary theory: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cunningham, V. (2002). *Reading after theory*. Oxford, & Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Cusset, F. (2008). *French theory: How Foucault, Derrida, Deleuze, & Co. transformed the intellectual life of the United States*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Eagleton, T. (2000). *The idea of culture*. Boston: Blackwell Publishing.
- Feuillerat, A. (1925). Scholarship and literary criticism. *Yale Review*, 14, 309-324.
- Fiedler, L. (1993). The canon and the classroom: A Caveat. In S. Gubar & J. Kamholtz (Eds.), *English inside and out—The places of literary criticism*. New York: Routledge.

- Fish, S. (1995). *Professional correctness: Literary studies and political change*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Formm, H. (1991). *Academic capitalism and literary value*. Athens & London: The University of Georgia Press.
- Gardner, H. (1959). *The business of criticism*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Godzich, W. (1994). *The culture of literacy*. Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press.
- Graff, G., & Gibbons, R. (Eds.). (1985). *Criticism in the university*. Evanston: Northwestern University.
- Grishakova, M., & Salupere, S. (Eds.). (2015). *Theoretical schools and circles in the twentieth-century humanities: Literary theory, history, philosophy*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Guillory, J. (1993). *Cultural capital: The problem of literary canon formation*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hoffman, D. (1979). *The Harvard contemporary history of American literature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hohendahl, P. U. (1982). *The institution of criticism*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.
- Jameson, F. (1981). *The political unconscious: Narrative as a socially symbolic act*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Leitch, V. B. (2008). *Living with theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Lewontin, R. C., Katznelson, I., Nader, L., & Ohmann, R. (1997). *The Cold War & the university: Toward an intellectual history of the postwar years*. New York: The New Press.
- Lotringer, S., & Cohen, S. (Eds.). (2001). *French theory in America*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Merod, J. (1987). *The political responsibility of the critic*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.
- Peyre, H. (1967). *The failures of criticism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Redfield, M. (2016). *Theory at Yale: The strange case of deconstruction in America*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Rockhill, G. (2017). CIA reads French theory: On the intellectual labor of dismantling the cultural left. Retrieved February 28, 2017 from <http://ift.tt/2m6tfnN>
- Rooney, E. (2006). The literary politics of feminist theory. In E. Rooney (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to feminist literary theory*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Siebers, T. (1993). *Cold war criticism and the politics of skepticism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stamiris, Y. (1986). *Main currents in twentieth-century literary criticism: A critical study*. Troy & New York: The Whitston Publishing Company.
- Stosky, S. (2012). *The death and resurrection of a coherent literature curriculum: What secondary English teachers can do*. Lanham, etc.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Sutherland, J. (1985). The politics of English studies in the British University, 1960-1984. In J. J. McGann (Ed.), *Historical studies and literary criticism*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Trilling, L. (1955). *The opposing self: Nine essays in criticism*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- Wolfreys, J. (Ed.). (2005). *The J. Hillis miller reader*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.