Chapter 6

The Seeds of Revolt: George Lamming and The Tempest

Peter Hulme

The title of this chapter draws on a metaphor used in the opening words of the sixth part of *The Pleasures of Exile*, the book of essays George Lamming published in 1960, after ten years of ‘exile’ from the West Indies: ‘The Tempest is a drama which grows and matures from the seeds of exile and paradox’. Lamming often uses that metaphor of the seeds: it informs his typically precise and grounded recognition of the origins of the language of culture in the practises of growing food, a recognition he shared with his near-contemporary, Raymond Williams. In his Tribe Boys legend, towards the beginning of *The Pleasures of Exile*, Lamming emphasizes the agricultural practices of the indigenous inhabitants of the Caribbean: ‘an’ the land begin to take a human shape, turnin’ soft, an’ sheddin’ new food wherever the Boys put down their fingers, tendin’ seed an’ tiny plant for what we call harvest’ (p. 19). Such labour, Lamming elsewhere writes, is always the basis of culture, first literally and then metaphorically.

Broadly speaking, the chapter discusses the seeds of *The Pleasures of Exile* itself, and in particular of its reading of *The Tempest*, thereby raising questions concerning the genealogy of Lamming’s work and the contexts in which it might best be read and understood. One of the literary-critical reasons for being interested in genealogical questions is that Caribbean writing is usually discussed with reference to the European generic norms – lyric, novel, essay – from which it supposedly develops. Rarely, if ever, have Caribbean writers been paid proper attention for the generic novelty of their work. The conventional terminology seems particularly inadequate to describe Lamming’s writing. His prose fiction is often shoe-horned into a category called ‘novel’, where it doesn’t easily fit. And ‘essay’ is a peculiarly vapid term for Lamming’s non-fictional prose, a kind of writing which in any case has never been given much critical attention. ‘The essay’ is essentially a short reflective piece originally associated with the engaging scepticism of Montaigne and which then took various forms, and was written in various tones, by eighteenth- and nineteenth-century writers (having a strong association in Britain with periodical writing). But the term ‘essay’ has tended to dominate discussion of Caribbean non-fiction with little reflection on the variety of actual writing involved, the different models drawn upon, and the formal novelty of that non-European work.
In a welcome break from this tradition, Nadi Edwards has noted that Lamming’s critical discourse in *The Pleasures of Exile* is marked by fragmentation and digression, and by an investment in creative opacity and in the logic of metaphor rather than proposition, which – she argues – relates Lamming’s work to that of Wilson Harris, Kamau Brathwaite, Edouard Glissant, and Antonio Benítez-Rojo in a singularly Caribbean tradition. I want to extend that suggested network, partly by looking for Lamming’s significant precursors as well as at his contemporaries, partly by considering *The Pleasures of Exile* within the context of travel writing.

The Caribbean tradition Edwards outlines is distinctly international, drawing together writers working in English, French, and Spanish, and Lamming’s precursors were indeed not necessarily writing in English. The focus here is on the French and, to a lesser extent, the Spanish contexts. The international dimension of a writer’s work is almost always strengthened by travel. The final two sections of *The Pleasures of Exile* deal most openly with the theme: the penultimate, ‘The African Presence’, tells of Lamming’s journeys through Africa and the USA in the late 1950s, the last, ‘Journey to an Expectation’, goes back to Lamming’s arrival in England in 1950. But the whole book is arguably dependant on a vantage point gained only through travel, indeed through the triple crossing of the Atlantic that allowed a full measure of reflection and comparison before the hurricane of the book’s composition in 56 days spanning the end of 1959 and the beginning of 1960.

***

The passing of more than forty years hasn’t dulled the sheer brazen confidence and freshness of *The Pleasure of Exile* as a whole and in particular of the reading it offered of *The Tempest* in 1960. It is worth recalling the originality of the tone of the book:

This book is based upon the facts of experience, and it is intended as an introduction to a dialogue between you and me. I am the whole world of my accumulated emotional experience, vast areas of which probably remain unexplored. You are the other, according to your way of seeing me in relation to yourself. There will be no chairman.

(p. 12)

English readers in 1960 were not used to being addressed like this. The first-person singular was impolite, the second-person singular was decidedly rude, and not having a chairman was plain incitement to anarchy. But this tone was wholly indicative of what was to follow in the course of the book.

The Britain of the 1950s was deeply marked by the European history of the first half of the twentieth century, and particularly by the recent war against Germany (1939-1945). If the empire was an issue, then it was because of the pressure of events in Kenya or in Malaya. England was home to ‘this island race’ – a phrase initially used by Sir Henry Newbolt, but
which later became a favourite of Winston Churchill’s – and that ‘fortressed rock’ (as Claude McKay put it, in a poem I’ll discuss later) was not likely at that time to be remembering much of its earlier, mostly Atlantic, imperial history. When the major West Indian influx of the early 1950s began, it was therefore the West Indians (previously unknown ‘immigrants’ to the British) who brought with them the knowledge, in Lamming’s famous phrase, that ‘We have met before’ (p. 12). The Pleasures of Exile was therefore reminding its British readers of a history that was unlikely to be in the forefront of their minds.

‘Our’ first meeting – in this sense the first meeting between Prospero and Caliban – occurred when Sir John Hawkins took his slave ship from the African coast of Guinea to the West Indian island of Dominica, which he referred as an ‘Island of the Canybals’ – ‘that tremendous Voyage which swept Caliban from his soil and introduced him to Heaven through the long wet hell of the Middle Passage’ (pp. 12-13). The African slave and the Carib Indian thereby become identical, ‘both seen as the wild fruits of Nature, [they] share equally that spirit of revolt which Prospero by sword or Language is determined to conquer’ (p. 13), and they can be identified together by Lamming in the figure of Caliban. ‘I cannot read The Tempest without recalling the adventure of those voyages reported by Hakluyt’, writes Lamming, ‘and when I remember the voyages and the particular period of African history, I see The Tempest against the background of England’s experiment in colonisation’ (p. 13). Lamming recognizes the beginnings of his own history in this first crossing of the oceans, a middle passage which he sees reflected in the great Shakespearean play about sea-changes.

The Pleasures of Exile was published at a time when the hegemonic readings of English literature, and of Shakespeare in particular, came, ideologically and usually physically, from the metropolitan centre. The Pleasures of Exile – ideologically situated in the Caribbean – deliberately offered a reading that was coming ‘home’, to the place from which Shakespeare had been made such a meaningful authority; and it was addressing the play which more than any other of Shakespeare’s had been read since the mid nineteenth century as a meditation about the responsibilities of empire: Prospero as the white man, Caliban as his burden. In writing about The Tempest in the way he did, drawing out its connections to imperial beginnings and associating the hallowed figure of Shakespeare with slavery and colonialism, Lamming had a very clear sense that he was blaspheming, and blasphemy works best in front of the tabernacle itself.

The Tempest plays at least three different rôles in The Pleasures of Exile. The whole book – and one might even suggest the whole of Lamming’s work – operates through the interplay of three carefully-chosen dramatic scenarios: the Haitian vodou ceremony of the souls; The Tempest; and the procedures of a legal trial. All three are introduced at the beginning of The Pleasures of Exile, and all three structure Water with Berries, published in 1971, which is the fictional piece that resonates most closely with The Pleasures of Exile. These three scenarios seep into each other from the very beginning so that the other two
already serve to illuminate *The Tempest*, which can itself be seen as both a trial and as a ceremony of souls.

The second rôle *The Tempest* plays in the book is perhaps the most familiar: it provides the terms for an allegory in which the Caribbean plays the part of Caliban in revolt against Prospero, with figures such as Toussaint Louverture, C. L. R. James, and George Padmore taking up the Calibanic baton. In this rôle Lamming himself would also be, as it were, the Caliban to Shakespeare’s Prospero, offering a writing back to that original imperial vision, appropriating and distorting the terms of the play to his own ends. *The Tempest*’s third rôle, however, is simply as the play that Shakespeare wrote and that Lamming reads; and this third rôle complicates the second because it’s not possible to read the play adequately as Caliban: to read the play involves a more complicated set of identifications and disidentifications.

At the heart of Lamming’s originality as a reader of *The Tempest* in 1960 was his willingness to ask unfashionable questions: his concern for both the politics of the island situation and for the human relationships on the island blithely ignored the contemporary formalism of much English criticism, expressed so damningly in L. C. Knights’s then much-quoted and sarcastically entitled essay, ‘How Many Children Had Lady Macbeth?’, exactly the kind of question that a formalist would never dream of asking – and one which I certainly, as a student in the 1960s, was taught to regard as the ultimate sign of critical naivety. However, it’s precisely family questions of that kind that provide Lamming with an entry point into the racial and sexual politics of the play. He initiates speculation about Prospero’s wife: ‘Is she alive? Or did she die in the treacherous *coup d’état* which led to Prospero’s exile?’ (p. 104). And in particular he asks about the relationship between Miranda and Caliban, focusing on Prospero’s accusation of rape and Caliban’s reply: ‘Would’t had been done! ... I had peopled else / This isle with Calibans’ (1.2.348-50). Lamming responds with a further series of questions: Is there a political intention at work? Does Caliban mean that he would have numbers on his side. But why does Caliban think that the population would be Calibans? Why would they not be Mirandas (p. 102)?

Within the allegory, Lamming’s speculations are now fully legible. But Lamming’s probing questions can also be read as directed towards the play itself, offering explanations for aspects of the plotting, for the relationships between the characters, for the parallels between sets of characters, and in particular for the disturbances that punctuate the play’s surface. Lamming is not just elaborating an allegory on the basis of the characters from *The Tempest*, as many writers have done, from Ernest Renan to Philip Osment, he is reading the text of the play with an insight which was beyond most other readers in 1960.

If the relationship between allegory and reading is a relationship between future and past, between what something can be made to become as opposed to what it originally was, then Lamming might initially seem to look determinedly forward. He writes that he wants to ‘remind ... the descendants of both sides that what’s done is done, and can only be seen as a
soil from which other gifts ... may grow’ (p. 15). But that formulation actually looks in both
directions: growth can only ever come from the seeds that the past provides. The Tempest
itself constantly introduces the idea of new futures, new rôles: ‘we were all sea-swallowed,
though some cast again’ (2.1.247), says Antonio, using a word which applies equally to seeds
as to actors. And if Prospero needs recasting in the future, then the nature of the original
needs to be properly understood: as Lamming writes, ‘There is no escape from the prison of
Prospero’s gift’ (p. 109). The teaching of language to Caliban may not have had the effect
Prospero desired but, ‘It has a certain finality. Caliban will never be the same again. Nor, for
that matter, will Prospero’ (p. 109). The future always depends on reading better the scripts
that the past provides – if only the better to avoid repeating them.

The implications of Lamming’s meditations on these matters, if I read them correctly, are
that the postcolonial response must involve at least a partial disidentification with Caliban on
the grounds that Caliban is Prospero’s creature, and that postcolonial intellectuals, whilst
having to recognize themselves partially in Caliban, should at the same time refuse any full
identification, and must therefore find other grounds on which to stand. One of those other
grounds might simply be as readers and interpreters of The Tempest, ground which
‘Prospero’ had long thought of as rightfully his. Prospero expects a nail in the head from
Caliban and takes precautions, as the play shows; but he doesn’t expect to be displaced as a
literary commentator. In the war of position, always take the enemy by surprise is good
tactics, and they’ve worked in this case, if slowly, since the enemy’s entrenchments are deep
and muddy. This particular essay of Lamming’s has had a very long fuse, which burned very
slowly. But its impact has ultimately been explosive. The reading of The Tempest first
adumbrated by Lamming has changed the way in which the The Tempest is now approached,
in scholarship and in teaching, as is now apparent in recent editions of the play. That is an
extraordinary achievement, one which would have been quite inconceivable in 1960 when the
essay was first published.

***

Where does this originality come from? How might it be understood? What sort of historical
contextualization might make sense of it? From recent interviews and studies, the genealogy
of Lamming’s thought has begun to emerge more clearly. By genealogy I don’t just mean
intellectual networks and influences, however important those are, but also horizontal
affiliations, and indeed the connections with those precursors which, according to Borges,
every writer always creates anew. In these senses there are genealogies yet to be
understood: the surface of the soil that nourished the seeds that grew into The Pleasures of
Exile has only just been scraped.

Recent studies have begun to give us a better sense of the wide variety of writing
produced by West Indians in Britain over the course of the twentieth century. Conventionally, Lamming belongs to a second generation. The first – C.L.R. James, George
Padmore, Una Marson – had arrived in the early 1930s. Along with Sam Selvon, Stuart Hall, and many others, Lamming arrived in the early 1950s. This generational positioning is helpful in locating Lamming’s novels, along with Selvon’s, at the forefront of a new West Indian narrative tradition – as Stuart Hall was the first to point out; and it can help highlight the significance of the civil disturbances in the West Indies in the late 1930s, which did so much to radicalize that second generation. Less well captured, however, are the links that might be made between Lamming and even earlier West Indian writers, and the international dimension of his literary relationships. These can be taken in turn.

The volume *West Indian Intellectuals in Britain* based itself on the hypothesis that generations of West Indian migrants coming to Britain in the twentieth century brought with them the gift of a particular vantage from which to comprehend the civilisation of the mother country. The classic narratives of that second generation, such as Selvon’s *The Lonely Londoners* and Lamming’s *The Emigrants*, trace in fictional form the experiences of West Indians in Britain and therefore inevitably have something to say about British society and its response to that West Indian presence. Non-fictional writing is less frequent, although one fascinating early example is C. L. R. James’s almost ethnographic pieces written for the *Port of Spain Gazette* in the 1930s but published in book form only in 2003 as *Letters from London*. Written for Trinidadian readers who had never been to Britain, James’s letters offer to a contemporary British reader that outsider’s perspective on what is too commonplace to be noticed – for example just what a row of terraced houses looks like, a perspective more often associated with the eighteenth-century tradition of Montesquieu’s *Persian Letters* and Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels*. There are elements of this ethnographic perspective in *The Pleasures of Exile* – an account of an evening at the ICA (the Institute for Contemporary Arts), for example – and Lamming’s relationship with James is obviously a defining feature of his whole intellectual and political trajectory, James’s *The Black Jacobins* featuring as the subject of one of the key chapters in *The Pleasures of Exile*. However, for the purposes of specifying the particular originality of Lamming’s approach to *The Tempest in The Pleasures of Exile*, it’s rather his distance from James that is striking. For James, English literature (and the civilization that produced it) remained a non-negotiable ‘good’, so valuable to him that he wrote surprisingly little about it at all, even though he could quote endlessly from it and often claimed to re-read his favourite novel, *Vanity Fair*, every year. Shakespeare, almost synonymous with English literature, could therefore be invoked, but never probed. Lamming’s approach was markedly different, and in *The Pleasures of Exile* he actually poses the question: ‘What is the real connection between James who knows Thackeray by heart and James who wrote the history of Caliban’s resurrection from the natural prison of Prospero’s regard?’ (p. 151), noting – in this context – that he and James belong to different generations (p. 152). Lamming recognized that culture, and especially literature, and therefore especially Shakespeare, was the keystone to colonial ideology, marking for the colonizers the achievement that signalled their superiority over those they colonized.
But the differing approaches of Lamming and James can’t just have been generational. In
1924, after a year spent in Britain, the Jamaican Claude McKay wrote a savage poem, simply
called ‘England’, which perhaps provides the most striking anticipation of Lamming’s more
extended analysis. McKay’s imagery seems deliberately Shakespearean, but with a very
different inflection:

How like a fixed and fortified rock she stands,
Cliff-featured arrogance against the world
Of change the striving human spirit demands.  

The initial reference point is clearly John of Gaunt’s speech in Richard II, where England is a
‘sceptered isle’, ‘a fortress built by nature for herself’ (2.1.40-9), but as the poem develops the
characters of The Tempest seem to be invoked: the ‘castled lord’ sounds like Prospero, failing
to still the ‘low murmurings’ of the revolting slaves. However, whereas in Shakespeare’s play
the tempest is the instrument of Prospero’s revenge, controlled by his magic, here ‘the angry
tempest’ is the storm of history itself which ‘will not lash in vain’ against England’s granite, but
will see the ‘plundered native multitude’ dash England down ‘with strong hands and rude’ –
very much Caliban’s vision in Act 4 of The Tempest.

The relationship between McKay and Lamming goes beyond this poem (which, as it was
never published, Lamming may not have read), since McKay’s A Long Way from Home
(1937), with its nicely ambiguous title and its original mixture of autobiographical memoir and
travel writing, perhaps offers the one significant model from the anglophone Caribbean that
Lamming could draw on for the composition of The Pleasures of Exile.

What Lamming perceived in The Tempest was not something simply alien to Caribbean
experience, however beautiful or moving it might be, a rôle now traditionally played by
Wordsworth’s poem to daffodils, and therefore something to be replaced by an equivalent but
more appropriate Caribbean phenomenon. Rather he saw a canonical work which spoke in
distorted or symptomatic fashion of a Caribbean world which, though now occluded from view,
had gone into the making of what was subsequently exported as the essence of Englishness.
Both his interest in revealing that process, and the tools for its revelation, may come directly or
indirectly from Lamming’s familiarity with French and Spanish intellectual traditions so
important both inside and outside the Caribbean.

Pre-eminently among his contemporaries, Lamming can’t be understood simply in an
anglophone context. He himself has spoken of his reading in the early 1950s in London as
comprising Camus, Sartre, de Beauvoir, Malraux, Freud, Jung, Reich, and Heidegger.
There were personal connections too, via C. L. R. James to Richard Wright, then to de
Beauvoir and Sartre; and to the Congress of Black Writers and Artists in Paris, convened by
the journal *Présence Africaine* in 1956, where Lamming spoke in the context of a more violent anti-colonial struggle than anything experienced in the English-speaking Caribbean.

This French context has several strands. The first and perhaps most obvious is the link to Aimé Césaire, the Martinican poet, whose tribute to ‘those who never conquered anything’ from his *Notebook of a Return to the Native Land* (1939) provides the epigraph to the *Tempest* chapter in *The Pleasures of Exile*. In some sense Césaire was outlining in that early poem the vision of his Caliban as developed in his later play, *Une tempête* (1969), which can also be read as responding to Lamming’s essay in *The Pleasures of Exile*.26 The complexities of this Caribbean dialogue across thirty years have never been fully explored.

Almost equally obvious are the links to Frantz Fanon, which have, on the contrary, been well explored.27 It’s always worth remembering – when we draw up that list of the great books that early deaths have deprived us of – that Fanon was just two years older than Lamming and came to Europe just four years before him. The parallels are by no means exact, though there are worse ways of reading *In the Castle of My Skin* than through *Black Skin White Masks*, both written in the years immediately following their authors’ arrival in Europe, and the differences between *The Pleasures of Exile* and *The Wretched of the Earth*, published a few months apart, say a great deal about the differences between the processes of decolonization in the British and French empires.28 At the beginning of the chapter ‘Concerning Violence’, in *The Wretched of the Earth*, Fanon refers to the changes threatened by decolonization as being experienced in the consciousness of the colonizers ‘in the form of a terrifying future’.29 The colonizers’ use of violence makes them terrified of the violence which might be used to repay them once power changes hands. That thought encourages the colonizers to even further violence. Madagascar in 1947 was the French example Fanon would have had in mind, a scenario to be repeated in Algeria. In the form of the phrase ‘terrified consciousness’, Fanon’s words were then lodged into the history of West Indian literary criticism by Kenneth Ramchand’s use of them in his 1970 book on the West Indian novel, though his reference there is exclusively to novels by white West Indians writing in contexts rather different from those described by Fanon.30 It’s perhaps surprising that Ramchand didn’t choose Lamming’s use of that same adjective at the end of one of the early chapters of *The Pleasures of Exile* where he’s discussing the recent riots in Notting Hill:

[Prospero] must act; and he must act with Caliban; or he must die, not so much from spears, as from the slow and painful diminution of an energy he used to call human dignity ... Colonised by his own ambition, Prospero’s role is now completely reversed. Prospero is once again face to face with what is urgent and near-impossible. And he is terrified. (p. 85)

Lamming here shows a startling insight into Prospero’s psychology. Just as startling, perhaps, is that he should be interested enough to generate such insight. Presumably he was galvanized by the sense that Prospero’s terror springs less from the threat of violence
than from the thought that he must now act with Caliban – in other words that any productive activity has to be co-operative. Here, as elsewhere in his analysis of the play and its consequences, Lamming emphasizes that it’s the mutual experience of separation from their original ground which makes both slave and master ‘colonial’ and which links their futures in ways which neither of them is very happy about.

That gloss on the colonist’s ‘terror’ probes more deeply than Fanon was ever interested in doing into the mind of the oppressor. In the genealogical context, that emphasis on ‘mutual experience’ and the interest in analysing Prospero with the forensic tools offered by psychoanalysis relates Lamming more closely to metropolitan French analysts such as Georges Balandier, Jean-Paul Sartre, Michel Leiris, and – in particular – Octave Mannoni, who were interested in trying to understand the specificities of what they called ‘the colonial situation’, in which the identity of both colonizer and colonized has been altered. Indeed, the French tradition of literary ethnography, which would place Mannoni’s *Prospero and Caliban* alongside Leiris’s *L’Afrique fantôme* (1934) and Claude Lévi-Strauss’s *Tristes Tropiques* (1955), as well as Fanon’s *Black Skin White Masks* (1952) and even Sartre’s *Anti-Semite and Jew* (1946), provides a better set of correlates for *The Pleasures of Exile* than any anglophone equivalent. This is not necessarily a question of influence, even though Lamming may have come across Mannoni’s work either directly, or via Fanon, or in some of the French journals with which he was probably familiar.

Mannoni, a French colonial official and amateur ethnographer working in Madagascar, published his *Psychologie de la colonisation* in 1950, the year that George Lamming arrived in Europe. On his own account Mannoni was an obsessional neurotic who had begun analysis with Jacques Lacan during a brief return to Paris in 1947, having come to psychoanalysis through ethnography. Subsequently he became a prominent French Freudian and author, in 1968, of one of the standard short introductions to Freud’s work. His eventual position could perhaps be described as something like a ‘critical Lacanian’. But when he wrote *Psychologie de la colonisation* he was – again on his own account – only an enthusiastic beginner in psychoanalysis. As a result there is no single psychoanalytic framework for the argument he puts forward. There are brief mentions of Abraham, Jung, Klein, and Adler, but the analysis is carried by a broad and for the most part untheorized distinction between, on the one hand, cultures characterized by a ‘dependency complex’ which tend, in the right circumstances, to become colonies (such as Madagascar), and, on the other, those characterized by an ‘inferiority complex’ which tend, again in the right circumstances, to dominate other cultures by colonizing them (France and Britain providing the two main examples). The two ‘personality types’ corresponding to each complex are foreshadowed in the characters, respectively, of Caliban and Prospero – used in the title of the English translation, even though they feature quite briefly in the book.
Mannoni was writing at a time when the beginnings of a Madagascan independence movement provoked a backlash in which more than 60,000 Madagascans had been killed by French troops. And in Prospero, Mannoni saw the manifest psychology of that brutal response: an impatient and neurotic character whose behaviour towards the other inhabitants of the island demonstrates a kind of paranoia common – according to Mannoni – in those people whose unresolved infantile complexes led them to entrench themselves in isolated outposts where they could live out their fantasies of omnipotence. This was a long way indeed from the traditional image of Prospero as the benevolent magician.

One of Mannoni’s innovations was his recognition that a study of the psychology of colonization needed to pay as much attention to the colonizers as the colonized. According to Mannoni, ethnographers had ignored the colonial situation because they’d regarded a colonized society as ‘bastardised’ and therefore unworthy of attention: ‘their attitude of scientific objectivity, which forced them to keep their own personality outside the field of observation, disconcertingly began to appear as White Privilege and seemed to be a source of difficulties – almost a symptom of their refusal to understand certain aspects of the situation’. So Mannoni realized that the Prosperos were as much in need of analysis as the Calibans, indeed that their symptoms needed reading together. This emphasis on the colonial situation sharply distinguished Mannoni from previous anthropological writers on ‘native cultures’ and ‘primitive psychology’. He took the naturalized relationship of colonial domination and through identifying it by means of its literary analogues, constituted it as visible, as a scandal.

Particularly controversial was Mannoni’s assertion that the colonizers felt inferior to the colonized. This is what Mannoni has to say about the character of Prospero:

Whenever his absolute authority is threatened, and however slight the threat, Prospero ... always becomes impatient and almost neurotically touchy ... Caliban has fallen prey to the resentment which succeeds the breakdown of dependence. Prospero seeks to justify himself: did Caliban not attempt to violate the honour of his child? After such an offence, what hope is there? There is no logic in this argument. Prospero could have removed Caliban to a safe distance or he could have continued to civilize and correct him. But the argument: you tried to violate Miranda, therefore you shall chop wood, belongs to a non-rational mode of thinking. In spite of the various forms this attitude may take ... it is primarily a justification of hatred on the grounds of sexual guilt, and it is at the root of colonial racialism.

One of the most striking aspects of this paragraph is its lack of deference. Mannoni analyses the character’s behaviour with the cold eye of an outsider, introducing the theme of sexual guilt, which will become one of the staples of contemporary analysis of Prospero. The kind of clinical distance Mannoni brings to Prospero’s neurotic and non-rational behaviour isolates a
symptom to which literary criticism had previously been blind, and one which Lamming would develop in his essay on *The Tempest*.

To recognize the European as the *subject* of analysis: this is at heart of what Lamming shares with Mannoni, and what leads him to his analysis of Prospero and all his works. To relate Lamming too closely to Mannoni might seem problematic. In the heroic tradition of Calibanic rewritings of *The Tempest*, Mannoni is the disavowed precursor, the discredited white grandfather, whose rôle is to have written about Prospero and Caliban in a manner which provoked Fanon into his rejection of Mannoni’s theory of the dependency complex. One of the problems with this often repeated view is that it doesn’t begin to attempt to understand the complexity of the relationship between Mannoni and Fanon. Fanon clearly accepted much of Mannoni’s analysis, especially the parts relating to Prospero’s inferiority complex, which are the ones that Lamming’s reading of the play is closest to, even as he develops that reading in more detailed and sophisticated ways than Mannoni.

Mannoni read the colonial situation in terms of the Freudian ‘other scene’. Just as for Freud, the ‘other scene’ was the spatially distinct realm where dreams did their work of condensation and displacement (a kind of theatre of dreams), so Mannoni saw literary texts as offering privileged access to that ‘other scene’ of the ‘colonial situation’. This is how he approached *The Tempest*. Similarly, though in his case through a reading of Lacan, Althusser later came to that same sense of the literary as a special space outside ideology, and he also gave particular weight to the stage, where the *work* of the literary is most obviously a process.

In teasing out the inconsistencies in Prospero’s story, and his angry responses to any counter-narrative, Lamming makes use of at least the general vocabulary of psychoanalysis, which he may have inherited from Mannoni as well as from his own reading of Freud: Caliban ‘haunts’ Prospero ‘in a way that is almost too deep and intimate to communicate’ (p. 99); Prospero is ‘a sadist by disease’ (p. 112), ‘[h]is imperialism is like an illness’ (p. 113), ‘[s]adism is characteristic of this type’ (p. 113). He moves close to analysing Prospero, intrigued by the ‘almost insane’ rage he shows towards Sycorax (p. 115): ‘We ask ourselves why a Duke should debase himself to speak in such a way. The tone suggests an intimacy of involvement and concern which encourages speculation’ (p. 116). And his insistence on the play’s family romance suggests Lamming’s interest in what lies behind the dramatic presentation, what might only be implicit, even repressed, in Prospero’s long accounts of what happened before his arrival on the island.

Although his own literary analysis was rather crude, Mannoni pioneered the deployment of psychoanalytic categories to understand how literary texts figured colonial matters in displaced forms. Lamming’s literary-critical approach, exploring the hinterland of the text through attention to its obscured family romance, refined Mannoni’s use of psychoanalysis in ways not dissimilar to Althusser’s and Macherey’s parallel, but slightly later, refinement, which
grew from the same soil of postwar French culture, with its invigorating mix of surrealism, psychoanalysis, existentialism, and anti-colonial politics.

Aimé Césaire and Frantz Fanon had written about colonial trauma as suffered by colonized peoples, especially by blacks. Mannoni had focused on the white colonizer. All three had analysed their ‘own’ experience. However, in his discussion of *The Tempest* Mannoni had written of the colonial European, introducing a third term which began to undermine the Manichaeisms of white: black and European versus native. Extraordinarily, Lamming was able to transcend his own experience, combining some of the insights of Césaire/Fanon and Mannoni to offer a fuller analysis of the underlying colonial situation, in which he offers a sense of the future as *mestizo*. *The Tempest* has often been read as providing those Manichaean terms. But read through Lamming’s eyes Prospero and Caliban might be better seen as given their identities only through the colonial situation that brings them together, and to which they are deeply accustomed by the time the play opens. The work’s properly Manichaean characters, uncompromised by that colonial situation, would be Alonso and Sycorax, both peripheral to the main action.

Unable to acknowledge the implications of that colonial situation, Prospero’s real terror, Lamming suggests, lies in the potential relationship between Caliban and Miranda, a relationship whose possibility the play acknowledges, but which Shakespearean criticism still often tries to categorize as unnatural by refusing Caliban’s humanity. This is another of the familial questions Lamming insists on: could Prospero really have endured the presence and meaning of a brown-skin grandchild? And it’s the only question to which he offers an unequivocal answer, in these words: ‘It would be Miranda’s and Caliban’s child ... : the result and expression of some fusion both physical and other than physical: a fusion which, within himself, Prospero needs and dreads!’ (p. 102). Both Raquel Carrión’s play *Otra Tempestad* and Marina Warner’s *Tempest* -based novel, *Indigo*, develop a love relationship between their Caliban and Miranda figures.

In a speech given as the keynote address at the University of the West Indies first Humanities Festival in Barbados in 1994, Lamming makes a point of distinguishing between two 1970 books with the identical title, *From Columbus to Castro*, on the basis of the greater attention given by the Spanish-speaking author, Juan Bosch, from the Dominican Republic, to the indigenous population of the Caribbean, a crucial element in what Lamming calls the ‘cross-fertilization’ that ‘was the seed of our journey’, indeed ‘the seed of all the journeys’. Associating himself firmly with the language of creolization and transculturation, Lamming insists on the particular and paradoxical Caribbean relation to place: ‘where each island signals the origin of a disaster and is also a seed which fertilizes an extraordinary faith in the possibility of recovering worlds of the spirit which yet remain obscured and entombed’. As the historical depth of *The Pleasures of Exile* attests, Lamming’s notion of the Caribbean
takes him back to its modern origins in the encounter between Spanish and Carib at the end of the fifteenth century, a subject he has again been working on in recent years.\textsuperscript{49}

Lamming’s affiliations with the Hispanic Caribbean are less direct than those with the French and so the nub of the matter here is not influence, although Lamming certainly had his contacts with the Spanish-speaking Caribbean from the time he taught at a Venezuelan college in Trinidad in the late 1940s.\textsuperscript{50} There would, too, be intriguing parallels to be drawn with figures such as the Puerto Rican Jesús Colón.\textsuperscript{51} However, the real Hispanic reference point for \textit{The Pleasures of Exile} is with Cuba.

The actual writing of \textit{The Pleasures of Exile} was completed over 56 days spanning the end of 1959 and the beginning of 1960, exactly one year after Fidel Castro and his guerrilla army overthrew the corrupt regime of Fulgencio Batista, so changing the course of Caribbean history. The Cuban Revolution isn’t mentioned in the pages of \textit{The Pleasures of Exile}, though it’s tempting to wonder whether it didn’t leave its mark.\textsuperscript{52} However, as an early and long-time supporter of the Cuban Revolution, and frequent visitor to the island, Lamming could hardly not have come quickly into contact with the work of José Martí, perhaps the greatest of the Caribbean exile writers.\textsuperscript{53}

The affiliation here would be rooted in similarities of ‘ways of seeing’, to use one of Lamming’s own chapter titles from \textit{The Pleasures of Exile}. In fact, the genealogical link might be found in the very recourse by both authors to genealogical thinking of a metaphorical kind. So, just as Lamming situates his own identity with respect to an ancestry which includes both Prospero and Caliban, and as he speculates implicitly on a Caribbean future that might have Caliban and Miranda as its parents, so Martí had written passionately about how the blood of Carib warriors could flow through the veins of a Cuban born, as he was, to parents from Valencia and the Canary Islands, and about how all Americans, whatever their biological parentage, would only have a future if they paid respect to their Indian mother.\textsuperscript{54}

***

It’s often said that West Indians only became West Indians, only became conscious of their common identity, in Britain in the 1950s. When Lamming makes this point, in an 1989 interview, talking of getting to know Jamaica and Guiana in London, he refers to that moment as an \textit{extension} of that ‘learning to be a \textit{Caribbean} person’ which had begun by Eric Williams telling him that if he was going to be a writer of and for the region he should read Aimé Césaire and Nicolás Guillén. ‘So that’, Lamming says, ‘by the time I got to England, this seed was very firmly planted’.\textsuperscript{55} The soil which nurtured the seeds of \textit{The Pleasures of Exile} won’t be properly understand until we can give the book its full intellectual and literary genealogy within the whole Caribbean region.
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