

Conflict between Internationalist Cultural Exchange and Market Realism in World Literature

Mazhar Hayat

Teaching at Columbia University over the past quarter-century has not only given me the opportunity to refine ideas on reading world literature; it has brought the world into my classrooms. (David Damrosch)

From New York to Beijing, via Moscow and Vladivostok, you can eat the same junk food, watch the same junk on television, and, increasingly, read the same junk novels . . . instead of 'socialist realism' we have 'market realism.'
(Tariq Ali)

Abstract

Works of world literature have immense potential to outlive historical and cultural boundaries of their local frames of reference to pave way for international literary culture. They also offer the readers a vast set of literary and aesthetic pleasures and cultural experiences. A survey of the historical trajectory of the academic discipline of world literature and its major tributaries – comparative literature and translation studies – informs that world literature which commenced as a way of looking at literatures of various regions and cultures from global perspective has been virtually identified with European literature and has been used to project Europe as cultural capital. For a work of literature to gain entry into the society of world literature, it has to adopt Europe-oriented international writing style and patronage of key publication centers. Resultantly, trendy approaches in writing gain international fame even if they are of little cultural significance. So world literature is a matter of reading and circulation. In reality, market realism is more pervasive than socialist realism. With the rise in multiculturalism and glocalised perspective in literary relations, it seems understood that the sources of literary horizon have expanded beyond European frontiers and cannot be measured through the yardsticks of binaric approach. This research article investigates how Europe-oriented circulation of literary works has affected the growth of a genuine internationalist cultural exchange in world literature. It also intends to explore the ways in which the works of world literature can best be read and circulated, particularly the works of marginalized cultures.

Keywords: cultural exchange, market realism, glocalization

Introduction

Internationalist cultural exchange in world literature refers to the task of preserving world literary system extending over five millennia

which overrides and yet does not obliterate the specificities of various cultural and literary traditions. In recent years in the wake of globalization, the idea of world literature has gained much attention in the two fields of critical enquiry – comparative literature and postcolonial studies. Comparative literature which has virtually taken over the domain of world literature visualizes the possibility of an integrated world through literary globalization with its emphasis on Europe-centered “difference obliterating standardization” (Prendergast, 2004, p. ix). Postcolonial studies considers literary globalization as a Eurocentric enterprise and international literature as a modest intellectual activity confined to Western Europe and in the words of Moretti, “mostly revolving around the river Rhine” (2000, p. 148). This West-based literary enterprise does not incorporate into the domain of its study the folk literature of the world which remains even today the most fundamental source of human self-expression.

Market realism refers to the literary culture of consumerism and market oriented circulation of literary works. Eurocentric literary Globalization and publishing trade has greatly complicated the idea of world literature and the plurality of human cultures. To gain entry into the realm of world literature, literary works require to be circulated beyond their cultural location, either in their original language or in the form of translation. Metropolitan literary works gain easy access as their culture and languages find familiar readers across the globe whereas the literary works of marginalized cultures and languages depend on translations for their circulation beyond their native culture. To add to it, world literature is not simply a library, it is intimately linked with the intellectual and historical processes. So, the task of world literature is to preserve world literary system with its convergences and divergences resulting from the occurrences of historical and cultural transformations. Under literary globalization and its poetics of genre, Oriental oral literary tradition is not read as literature. Furthermore, for writers from peripheral cultures to gain circulation, they are to be embraced by the Western key centers of publications whose publishing patronage is determined by the phenomenon of the best sellers and the trendy approaches popularized by global literary agents and opinion makers. This hegemony of European publishing market affects the outlook of the writers compelling them to write in conformity with West-sponsored international standards. “Writers themselves may find it hard to resist going with the global flow, producing work that fits foreign stereotypes of what an ‘authentic’ Indian or Czech novel should be” (Damrosch, 2009, p. 107). Alternately, diluted forms of trendy approaches continue to gain circulation even though devoid of any vital cultural value.

Glocalization in literature refers to the literary practice of respecting and accommodating the local and the global perspective to achieve internationalist cultural exchange. Under this literary strategy, writers treat indigenous matters for global readership or they present global material for a local audience, setting their locality as a microcosm of universal value. Glocalization is taken as a resistance strategy to a globalized planetary unification. For the critics of globalization, Glocalization is a highly viable literary trend for writers of less known cultural regions because for them representation at international forum is a matter of survival. Furthermore, glocalization in World Literature and comparative discourse offers an opportunity to represent our own voice in accordance with indigenous tradition and allows us to identify our own place in humanities and social sciences. "Comparative studies could and should be a critical meta-theory for all the humanities, for not only globalized but rather glocalized times" (Kola, 2013, p. 39).

Nexus between Literary Globalization and Market

Under capitalism, culture and commerce are intertwined. Globalization is at once a cultural and materialistic enterprise as is evident from its history. "Culture operates as a sub-set of capitalism in general, in that it 'feeds on itself and is limitless,' is inevitably impelled toward global circulation and is the mechanism for its own subsequent growth" (Simpson, 2007, p. 157). West-based literary globalization is a business which is flourishing by the profitable reproduction of Eurocentric genres and motifs. It is a unidirectional enterprise which promotes cultural transfer from Europe to the peripheral world. "That there are satellite dishes in Nepalese villages, the opposite is never true. The everyday cultural detail, condition and effect of sedimented cultural idiom, does not come up into satellite country" (Spivak, 2003, p. 16).

Agents of literary globalization maintain satellite-culture through publishing market. Western major publishing centers i.e. London, Paris and New York acquire cooperation of electronic and print media and film to popularize and determine best-sellers of the year. The role of "The New York Times" and "The Guardian" is a case in point to promote the culture of best-seller and that of consumerism. To contextualize the discussion on nexus between globalization and market in the meteoric rise of the writers following trendy approaches and international writing styles, I have selected a number of writers from non-Western societies whose works have gained international fame in recent times. Khalid Hussein's *The Kite Runner*, a debut of an American Afghan author, is an instance of market realism. The novel was published by Riverhead Books – a publisher of bestselling works, with over almost seven million copies sold only in U.S.A. The reason of work's exceptional popularity in West is nothing other than

the author's pro-Western perspective on Soviet invasion and the rise of Taliban regime in Pakistan.

The exceptional popularity of Milorad Pavic's *Dictionary of the Khazars* in West, Eastern Europe and Asian markets in 1990s is a classic example of market dominance in world literature. Before the publication of this debut novel of Pavic in 1984 in Serbian language, the author was a poet of little fame. Since the fall of Berlin wall, Western publishers and translators are vying to capture Central and Eastern European market. Furthermore, there is a growing interest among European readers to read East European literature. A study of the art type of magical realism is in vogue. Capitalizing on these trendy approaches, *Dictionary of the Khazars* which equates Khazars with Serbs in magical realistic vein was translated into English in 1988.

Milorad Pavic's sudden success was remarkable, but it wasn't exactly random. His dictionary of the Khazars was aided by a confluence of two market forces: a vogue in the 1980s for Eastern European writings, plus the broad popularity of the "magical realism" associated with writers like Gabriel Garcia Marquez. (Damrosch, 2009, p. 106)

This meteoric rise of Pavic in European market and consumers was followed by its translations in Eastern European and Asian languages. "In the newly marketized countries of Eastern and Central Europe a book can be consumed just like a McDonald's hamburger" (Ali, 1993, p. 140). To add to it, international literary standing of 19th century Brazilian writer Machado is exceptionally high today. This meteoric rise of Machado which took place in 1950s in the form of unprecedented scale of translations was not incidental. It was mainly due to the interest of American scholars in Brazilian author from the perspective of Cultural Studies and New-criticism. "Machado's work, created in another time and another country, not only offers no resistance to such literary theories but almost seems specifically designed to illustrate them" (Schwarz, 2007, p. 86). Furthermore, Machado was admired for his discrete irony and distance from Brazilian provincialism and from the tensions of young Brazilian nation due to its colonial legacy. Malala Yousafzai's *I am Malala* and Sharmeen Obaid's *Face Saving* are the most recent examples of exceptional popularity of non-European works in Western market due to the aforesaid reasons.

World literature circulates through translations. Even hegemonic languages of West are spoken by a minority of readers. So, literary works in global languages as well as in less known languages are passed on through translation. "Without translation, the novelist Orhan Pamuk would

be unknown outside his native Turkey” (Damrosch, 2009, p. 65). The Turkish novelist also owes it to translations to have won Nobel Prize in literature in 2006. Translation studies is a relatively new phenomenon as an academic discipline yet the practice of translation dates back to the antiquity and is widely acknowledged as a Roman invention. Cicero and Horace – the Roman pioneers of translations envisioned the practice of translations of other nations as a source of enrichment of Roman language, culture and literature and emphasized upon “sense for sense approach.” It was in the nineteenth century that translations became Euro-centric. European translators did not consider translations of non-European texts as a source of cultural enrichment. Rather they translated Oriental texts to construct Euro-centric vision of Oriental cultures and histories. So, translation was viewed as a tool for imperial domination because the subaltern societies had no voice of their own. In the words of Anuradha Dingwaney, “the processes of translation involved in making another culture comprehensible entail varying degrees of violence especially when the culture being translated is constituted as that of the ‘other’” (1995, p. 4). In postwar era, translation studies, which is elevated to the level of an autonomous discipline, remains ethnocentric.

Non-European works of literature are selected for circulation on the basis of their market value, not on the basis of their cultural value. While American and Western academicians are busy in anthologizing world translations in lieu of large advances, great classics of non-Western society which are widely acclaimed as true representatives of their culture are non-existent in these anthologies. “Typically, the entire literature of China, say, is represented by a couple of chapters of *The Dream of the Red Chamber* and a few pages of poetry” (Spivak, 2003, p. xii). This marginalized representation of Chinese classic is notwithstanding the fact that *The Dream of the Red Chamber* is recognized as the pinnacle of Chinese fiction and is valued very high for its graphic representation of social structures of 18th century Chinese aristocracy. Such instances of under-representation of non-Western literary works establish that North is promoting unidirectional cultural transfer through Machine Translation (MT) and Language Service Providers (LSPs). In the words of Tony Hartley, “it is not uncommon for a large multinational to be processing 1.5 billion words per annum for up to 500 products in over 30 languages, with the requirement that the different language versions be released simultaneously in their respective markets” (2009, p. 106). As a result of unidirectional policy of Western translators, European readers and intellectuals remain ignorant of the cultural capital of Asian-African and Latin-American societies.

This discussion on the nexus between literary globalization, publishing market and translation studies establishes that the relationship between West and non-Western cultural zones is lopsided. It is structured with Europe as cultural icon and the Oriental world as periphery. “With regard to cultural exchange in world literature, the periphery, out there in a distant territory, is more than taker than the giver of meaning and meaningful form” (Hannerz, 1997, p. 107). This asymmetrical relationship between West and the rest of the literary traditions is antithetical to the vision of plurality of world cultural system through world literature.

To further proceed on the topic and to historicize the “conflict between internationalist cultural exchange and market realism,” we need to trace historical growth of the idea of world literature. In the ongoing discussion and analysis, world literature and comparative literature are used as mutually alternative terms because comparative literature provides a practical model of study in comparative mode for looking at national literatures from international point of view.

World Literature –Idealistic Perspective

Since antiquity, works of literature have been in circulation across the cultures. Apuleius –a writer of North African language, Punic – was read across distant regions of Roman Empire. “He wrote his *Metamorphosis* or *Golden Ass* in Latin, so as to entertain Roman readers with his asinine hero’s adventures in Thessaly and Egypt” (Damrosch, 2009, p. 105). Furthermore, Abu Nuwas – Arab writer – was readily circulated and read around Islamic world. “The classical Arabic poet Abu Nuwas was read across a wide swath of Islamic cultures from Morocco and Egypt to Persia and North India” (p. 105). So, literary interactions have long been global. However, European intellectuals and comparatists locate the origin of world literature in the literary works of the intellectuals of pre-imperial Germany. The term “The Republic of Letters” was a commonplace use in the writings of Voltaire, J. G. Harman and Herder. In the words of Abbe Prevost, the aim of the Republic of Letters was “to bring together into one confederation all the individual republics into which the Republic of Letters can be divided up to the present time” (as cited in Guillen, 1993, p. 37). To add to it, Goethe had, by coining the term “weltliteratur” (world literature) acknowledged international dimensions of modernity which was living through its phase of nationalism. Goethe’s idea of world literature was rooted in the existence of national literatures – hence establishing the possibility of a dialogue between the local and the universal, a dialogue that has gained momentum as a multiple perspective approach in comparative literature today. For German intellectuals, comparative literature was a historical process that would facilitate the historical movement towards more enlightened, more tolerant, self-conscious

human society. In France, the emergence of comparative studies was mainly indebted to the appearance of the works of Alphonse de Lamartine and Victor Hugo – the pioneers of French Romantic literary tradition. French Romantics at once glorified the simultaneity of the indigenous and the cosmopolitan element in literature and an awakening of national consciousness and a lowering of territorial boundaries between neighboring societies. In the words of Edward Said, “the idea of comparative literature not only expressed universality and the kind of understanding gained by philologists about language family, but also symbolized the crisis-free serenity of an almost ideal realm” (1993, p. 45). So, the discipline commenced as a framework of looking at literatures from international point of view to emphasize supranational harmonies among cultures and societies. “Reading world literature gives us an opportunity to expand our literary and cultural horizons far beyond territorial boundaries of our own culture” (Damrosch, 2009, p. 46).

Shift from Internationalism to Eurocentric Cultural Homogenization in World Literature

Parallel to the idealistic perspective of cooperation between cultures, existed a completely different notion of cultural exchange. According to the literary accounts of Lord Byron (1817), “national identity and cultural inheritance” are closely linked. Pointing to the national turmoils of Italy and Germany in 19th century, Byron argued that nations and societies struggling for independence and national identity jealously protected their cultures against cultural influx. Imperialistic perspective of the cultures also runs counter to the idealistic perspective of cultural relativism. In the nineteenth century, under the influence of imperial mindset, comparative discipline became Eurocentric. Invoking Pierre Bourdieu’s literary account of cultural capital in *La Distinction* (1984), comparative studies promoted European cultural pride in the wake of nationalistic uprisings in the colonies. The discipline indulged in the practice of epistemic violence of colonial discourse to affirm European cultural competence and cultural absolutism. This narrative of ethnocentricity which finds its philistine manifestation in the infamous comments of Lord Macaulay lives up to the recent times. In the words of Macaulay, “I have never found one among them (Orientalists) who could deny that a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia” (as cited in Bassnett, 1998, p. 17). Similar cultural pride is reflected in Eric Auerbach’s *Mimesis* (2013) in which the author glorifies European politics of cultural competence and hostility. The author glorifies Greco-Roman Western literary tradition from Plato to Virginia Woolf for its true representation of reality. He invokes analogies between Homer’s *Odyssey* and Bible on representation

of the world – popularizing the myth of universality of Western literary canon. He does not mention a single instance of literary contribution outside Europe. Even W.B. Yeats, a cultural bard of Ireland against British imperialism, reflects same European cultural pride against the Orient when in *Sailing to Byzantium* (1995) he calls Istanbul an exotic place.

To proceed further on the topic, it is appropriate to analyze the strategies which the European intellectuals and comparatists used to promote Eurocentric cultural homogenization and the politics of hostility towards subaltern linguistic and cultural heritages. Western literary scholars and comparatists played the politics of genre. They classified literary texts into three genres i.e. epic, drama and prose fiction and proclaimed the author as the center of the meanings. Non-Western texts which were predominantly in the form of oral narrative were declared as non-generic and were excluded from the domain of comparative mode. “Comparative literature during the nineteenth century was author-centered, therefore, oral literature, anonymous literature, folk literature were outlawed” (Bassnett, 1998, p. 28). British comparative model was dominated by the “touchstone method” of Matthew Arnold which used Greek and Latin literary classics and their English counterparts that is, the works of Shakespeare, Spenser and Milton as models for evaluation and dismissed Asian and African texts as non-canonical and inferior. In the words of Said, “to speak of comparative literature, therefore, was to speak of interaction of world literatures with one another but the field was epistemologically organized as a sort of hierarchy, with Europe and its Latin Christian literatures as its center and top” (as cited in Behdad & Thomas, 2011, p. 7).

American comparative model which was mainly inspired by Hugo Meltzl de Lomnitz’s vision of world literature was an improvement upon its European counterparts. De Lomnitz, a Hungarian comparatist, is acknowledged as the pioneer of comparative literature as an academic discipline. In the inaugural essay of the first journal of comparative literature, De Lomnitz (1877) criticized chauvinistic approach of European intellectuals. He sets out three tasks for the comparatists:

1. a revaluation of literary history as an autonomous discipline
2. a revaluation of translation in the development of comparative literature
3. a revaluation of multilingualism in comparative mode

Extending non-generic approach of De Lomnitz, American comparatists particularly Henry Remak (1961) who is considered as the pioneer of American comparative school proposed:

1. descriptive and synchronic approach in comparative study, and

2. interdisciplinarity (comparison of literature with other spheres of human intellectual enquiry)

Later on, Remak's view of ahistorical approach in American model provoked criticism among New Historicists who questioned the validity of synchronic study while comparing texts across cultures. "It was this deliberate avoidance of socio-economic or political issues that was eventually to produce a reaction and lead to the birth of New Historicism in North American criticism in the 1970s and 1980s" (Bassnett, 1998, p. 36). Rene Wellek (1970) who criticized French factual positivism of Paul Van Tieghem, advocated open-ended approach and tried to resolve the controversy on synchronic approach by affirming that history was central to comparative studies but it was cultural history and not any other kind.

However, in post-war era, comparative literature receded into the background due to growing interest in literary and critical theory.

The great wave of critical thought that swept through one after the other from structuralism through to post-structuralism, from feminism to deconstruction, from semiology to psychoanalysis – shifted attention away from the activity of comparing texts and tracking patterns of influence between writers towards the role of the reader. (Bassnett, 1998, p. 5)

So, American comparative model with its fervor for open-ended approach and interdisciplinarity could not practically move beyond Western frontiers. Charles Bernhemier (2004) in his report on comparative discipline says that the "impulse to extend the horizon of the literary studies that had motivated post-war comparativism did not often reach beyond Europe and Europe's high cultural lineage going back to the civilizations of classical antiquity" (p. 40).

This overview of the historical ambit of comparative discipline and translation studies establishes that ethnocentricity in world literature runs counter to the pluralistic vision of Goethe, Herder and Hugo who emphasized on

1. comparative study of literary history of world literatures
2. promotion of translations as core areas of comparative mode, and
3. comparative study between oral, folk literatures and generic poetry

This asymmetrical relationship between topical and historical trajectories of the discipline has provoked criticism about the prospect of glocalised approach among writers particularly of less developed societies.

Beyond Global Babble and White Noise – A Case for Glocalization

Glocalization in world literature is a vital prospect for our age in the wake of the rise of multiple perspective approach in Cultural Studies. We need to move “beyond Global babble” (Abu-Lughod, 1997, p. 131) because under Euro-centrism, world literature will wear out its utility without being refreshed by the contribution of non-Western tradition. Even Western literary and critical discourse is not lacking in those who think that due to the occurrences of certain historical and intellectual processes in 20th century, world cannot be demarcated into the “cultural capital” and the “cultural void.” Ours is the age of demographic shifts and hybridization. Eurocentric view of history, identity, class and nation is historically and culturally bound and that universality is a myth. “Demographic shifts, diasporas, labor migrations, the movements of global capital and media, and processes of cultural circulation and hybridization have encouraged a more subtle and sensitive reading of areas’ identity and composition” (Volkman, 1999, p. ix).

To initiate discussion on the need for glocalized perspective in world literature, it is appropriate to briefly highlight historical and intellectual processes of the 20th century i.e. global citizenship, democratization, decolonization and deconstruction etc. which have brought to focus multiculturalism. The historical process of global citizenship refers to an increased interaction between people belonging to diverse cultural, linguistic and religious backgrounds due to advancement in science and technology, electronic and social media. This historical process has brought to light the issues of cultural pluralism and relativism. It means we need to deal various cultures relationally. The historical process of democratization refers to the availability of enormous opportunities like education to those sections of society particularly women and colored-people in West who were hitherto excluded from the body politic of Western world. This process has not only posed challenges to the traditional perspectives on gender and race but also has brought forth cultural variants of critical theories on gender and race. For instance, West-based feminism has its cultural variants like postcolonial feminism, black feminism and Islamic feminism. While Western feminists consider Islamic veil as a symbol of male authority as well as a symbol of monolithic entity of Muslim women who are forced by their male tormentors to wear *hijab*, Islamic feminist writers like Mohja Kahf present women protagonists who relish *hijab* which provides them safety against incursions of the outside world. The historical process of decolonization refers to the liberation of colonized societies from the colonial rule in post-war era. Decolonization has generated post-colonial critical discourse which

challenges imperial representation of history and culture of the colonized world. It has initiated a dialogue between West and postcolonial societies to accommodate latter's perspective on history, culture and nation. The critical theory of deconstruction which has challenged centuries-held assumptions, transcendental signifiers and centers of truth on which entire Western intellectual and philosophical tradition is based, has brought to fore new vistas of meanings about language and text.

Furthermore, there is a renewed interest in Marxism in the aftermath of neo-liberalist drive for unchecked consumption of nature and environment for its capital value and its preoccupation with the idea of same currency system in the whole world. Marxism disapproves of consumption of resources for the sake of profit and approves all those economic and cultural patterns of behavior and thought of various cultural zones which ensure the principle of self-sufficiency of the individual. "There should exist several different Marxisms in the world of today, each answering the specific needs and problems of its own socio-economic system" (Jameson, 1974, p. xviii). Moreover, there is growing interest in eco-critical theory and environmental literature in the aftermath of the dangers of ecological imbalance. Eco-criticism and environmental literature promote bioregionalism and advocate return to eco-systems, strict use of regenerative agriculture, renewable energy resources and ecologically-based policies, paving way, on the one hand, for a cultural and social organization that inhibits power and property-seeking and, on the other hand, a society of planetary subjects rather than global agents. "Bioregionalism offers the best hope we have for creating an interdependent web of self-reliant sustainable cultures" (Aberley, 1993, p. 4).

This growing consciousness in favor of cultural pluralism and multiple perspective thinking in literary and critical discourse invites a dialogue between the universal and the local, the modern and the medieval and the metropolitan and the native. Glocalization with its respect for the local and the global is better poised to promote plurality of cultural tradition as there is no fetishization in it either for the local or for the universal. To achieve glocalization and cultural plurality, we need to cross borders. Spivak argues that it is easier for metropolitan countries and writers to cross borders because peripheral countries and writers have to encounter highly structured bureaucratic frontiers to gain entry into the metropolitan centers. We need to decolonize and depoliticize the processes of translation, production and marketing of works of literature. We need to give voice to the subaltern cultures through translations in the wake of Western canon of Dead White European Males (DWEMs). Ethnocentricity in world literature is illogical because it promotes

bureaucratic view of humanity and nature and opposes life-producing role of native cultural systems. European comparatists and translators should abandon monolingualism and undue care for language and idiom. They ought to benefit from global citizenship by accommodating people having multicultural and multilingual backgrounds into its domain. "I am advocating a depoliticisation of the politics of hostility towards a politics of friendship to come and think of the role of comparative literature in such a responsible effort" (Spivak, 2003, p. 13). Up till now Europe has been perceived in terms of bigoted nationalism. Due to her Euro-centrism, West has been taken for a society claiming cultural, lingual and intellectual snobbery resulting in ethnic prejudice and divide. Metropolitan writers need to expunge the notion of foreignness and exoticism in their works while referring to native cultures. Instead of presenting foreign culture as mysterious and awesome, European writers should depict it as an exciting world of new possibilities.

As far as postcolonial world is concerned, one of the major obstacles in the way of glocalization is lack of communication across subaltern cultures of the world. This lack of communication within subaltern cultures can be streamlined through structured coordination in the discipline of translation studies by acquiring translators having proficiency in more than one regional language. Furthermore, efforts are required for a reorientation of publishing market in postcolonial countries. Many postcolonial writers abandon their commitment with indigenous cultures to win favor of the metropolitan publishing centers and Western media. They are induced to write for Western readers rather than their national and native readership which perverts their experience as well as expression. "There are enough nations in Asia and Africa to make any writer international without any Western certification, if he is recognized in one or both continents" (Faiz, 2008, p. 52). This requires rectification not only in the attitude of postcolonial writers but also in the attitude of indigenous readers. This reorientation in the outlook of non-Western writers and readers will not only help recuperate subaltern cultures but will also help revisit asymmetrical relationship between Western and non-Western cultural and literary traditions.

Conclusion

World literature along with its tributaries – comparative literature and translation studies – is still largely influenced by Western literary Globalization. Production and circulation of literary works are dominated by European publishing houses. However, multiculturalism and multiple perspective approach in literary and critical studies are on the rise. Glocalized perspective in World Literature is widely acknowledged as the most suitable reading and writing strategy to conceptualize internationalist

cultural exchange through literatures of the world. So, Western poetics of exclusion and hostility towards non-Western literary traditions and its strategy of market manipulation can no longer continue to contain and marginalize pluralism. The way out for Western intellectuals and comparatists seems to be to value the participation of all nations and societies in further unfolding cultural and intellectual processes of the entire world. By accumulating the vast set of cultural experiences, we can visualize an international cultural and literary system envisioned by the most mature thinkers since antiquity. So, properly read and circulated, world literature is not at all doomed to relapse into the antagonistic multiplicity of national literatures nor be overwhelmed by the white noise.

References

- Abu-Lughod, J. (1997). Going beyond global babble. In A. D. King (Ed.), *Culture, globalization and the world-system: Contemporary conditions for the representation of identity* (pp. 131-137). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ali, T. (1993). Literature and market realism. *New Left Review*, (199), 140–145.
- Auerbach, E., & Said, E. (2013). *Mimesis: The representation of reality in western literature* (W. R. Trask, Trans.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bassnett, S. (1998). *Comparative literature*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Behdad, A., & Thomas, D. (2011). *A companion to comparative literature*. Oxford: Wiley – Blackwell Publication.
- Bernheimer, C. (Ed.) (2004). *Comparative literature in the age of multiculturalism*. London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Damrosch, D. (2009). *How to read world literature*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.
- Dingwaney, A. (1995). *Introduction: Translating third world cultures*. London: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Faiz, F. A. (n.d). Decolonising literature. In S. Majeed (Ed.), *Coming back home* (pp.49-52). Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Guillen, C. (1993). *The challenge of comparative literature*. England: Harvard University Press.
- Hannerz, U. (2007). Scenarios for peripheral cultures. In A. D. King (Ed.), *Culture, globalization and the world-system: Contemporary conditions for the representation of identity* (pp. 107-128). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hartley, T. (2009). Technology and translation. In J. Munday (Ed.), *Routledge companion to translation studies*. London: Routledge.
- Jameson, F. (1974). *Marxism and form: Twentieth-century dialectical theories of literature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kola, A. F. (2013). Beyond ‘global babble’: Comparative literature as a critical metatheory of glocalizing humanities. *World Literature Studies*, 5(2), 39-51. Retrieved from

https://www.academia.edu/3878521/Beyond_Global_Babble_C Comparative_Literature_as_a_Critical_Metatheory_for_Globalizing_Humanities

- Lomnitz, H. M. D. (1877). Present tasks of comparative literature. In H. J. Schulz & P. H. Rhein (Eds.), *Comparative literature: The early years* (pp. 56-62). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina.
- Moretti, F. (2000). Conjectures on world literature. In C. Prendergast (Ed.), *Debating world literature* (pp. 148-162). London: Verso.
- Prendergast, C. (2004). *Debating world literature*. London: Verso.
- Remak, H. (1961). Comparative Literature, its definition and function. In N. P. Stallknecht & H. Frenz (Eds.), *Comparative literature: Method and perspective*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Press.
- Said, E. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Schwarz, R. (2007). Competing readings in world literature. *New Left Review*, 48, 153-160.
- Simpson, D. (2007). Selling Europe culture. *New Left Review*, 47, 85-107.
- Spivak, G.C. (2003). *Death of a discipline*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Volkman, T. A. (1999). *Crossing borders: Revitalizing area studies*. New York, NY: Ford Foundation.
- Wellek, R. (1970). *The name and nature of comparative literature, discriminations*. London: Yale University Press.