

Anthurium: A Caribbean Studies Journal

Volume 10

Issue 2 *Intellectual Formations: Locating a Caribbean
Critical Tradition*

Article 8

November 2013

English Studies in The University of The West Indies: Retrospect and Prospect

Edward Baugh

University of the West Indies, ebaugh@cwjamaica.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/anthurium>

Recommended Citation

Baugh, Edward (2013) "English Studies in The University of The West Indies: Retrospect and Prospect," *Anthurium: A Caribbean Studies Journal*: Vol. 10 : Iss. 2 , Article 8.

Available at: <http://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/anthurium/vol10/iss2/8>

This Part II: "The Generation of 1968" is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarly Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Anthurium: A Caribbean Studies Journal* by an authorized editor of Scholarly Repository. For more information, please contact repository.library@miami.edu.

(A shortened version of a lecture read to the P.E.N. Club, Jamaica, Tuesday 21st April 1970.)¹

The opinions which I shall express are my own opinions and do not necessarily represent the views of the University or the Department of English.

In the Preface to *Saint Joan*, Bernard Shaw tells us that “the law of change is the law of God” and he adds that “there is nothing for us but to make it a point of honour to privilege heresy to the last bearable degree on the simple ground that all evolution in thought and conduct must at first appear as heresy and misconduct” (Shaw xli-xlii).

In my experience, academics as a group are not famous for farsightedness or as architects of change. Perhaps this is an inevitable corollary of that occupational caution which comes of having been schooled in rigorous examination of all aspects of any problem. But it would seem as if there are times when academics, for their own survival, have to forego some of the satisfaction of that carefulness in order to keep pace with and make the best of, and make their own contribution to, the inevitable process of change.

For the better part of twenty-odd years, the University College and, subsequently, University of the West Indies slumbered along, taking itself pretty well for granted and becoming more and more set in its ways. Now, quite recently and suddenly, it finds itself shaken by change as a result of pressures from within and without. This development was bound to follow the political independence of the region and the University’s own independence from its parent institution of London. But these changes and demands for change are coming so rapidly that some people are no doubt ready to cry “Hold, enough!” and to ask for a moratorium on change. If we had some means of measuring the quantity of change and demand for change during the past year, we might well find that it is greater than all the change or demand for change which had taken place in the preceding two decades. Indeed, if all the proposed changes were to be put into effect as immediately as the proponents of those changes desire, the whole machinery of the University would, ironically, simply cease to function, stalled in bewilderment and confusion. The question, as I see it, is not so much whether the changes are good or bad (after all, the morality of great and popular movements of change is never quite the same as the morality which governs the day-to-day business of living); the question, then, is not so much whether the changes are good or bad as whether or not we are prepared for them and in a position to make the best of them. One of the things which we have inadvertently consolidated over the years is a significant lack of any philosophy or strategy of

¹ Originally published in *Caribbean Quarterly* 16. 4 (December 1970): 48-60.

change; and in proportion as we have consolidated this deficiency, so much more traumatic must change prove when it is effected. We need to create a system which allows for change, a system built on the principle of the inevitability of change, a system which can accommodate itself to change with the least possible strain and waste.

The general unpreparedness, the upsurge of questioning and self-examination, and the suspicion of unreality about many of the things which had been taken for granted, manifest themselves in all areas of the University's life—from the paved pathways which bear little relation to where people actually walk, to the growing traffic problem of a campus which was not really designed as a motor-car campus, to the relatively superficial question of ceremonial (some of us finding ourselves with splendid, expensive robes and, suddenly, the prospect of nowhere to wear them), to the questioning of the structure and authority of the administration, and, ultimately, to the overriding and most basic question of what the University is for anyway, the question of its very reason for existence. It is clear that many of the questions which are now being asked should have been asked before now. And while some of those who are clamouring for change are no doubt being merely fashionable or merely anarchic, or are only seeking in dissent and activism a therapy for their private ailments, we cannot afford to let slip the opportunity for self-questioning and stock-taking to which the clamour exhorts us. The more conservative among us, and those who were accustomed to taking things for granted, cannot afford to be merely petulant in reaction to the new, challenges. It will not do simply to parade the old clichés and assumptions, the old “what-is-the-world-coming-to” and “we used to get along well enough thank you without any of this new palaver.” To react in this way is to ensure our doom.

So I am happy to address myself to the question of what I am doing in the Department of English in the University of the West Indies. Let us remember from the outset that English studies, more than most other university disciplines, has always been the subject of a seemingly endless debate as to its nature and purpose. There has always been a steady stream of theorising on the subject, coming, as we would expect, mainly from those actively involved in English studies. The approaches and emphases vary from university to university, and even within the same Department we sometimes find quite a sharp difference of opinion as to what a course in English should be and how it should be taught.

While the very lack of agreement about what the subject should be accounts for some of the excitement and challenge which people find in it, that indefiniteness and elusiveness have been used against the subject by those, and we have never been without them, who would question the very idea of literature as a university discipline. To quote D.J. Palmer: “...in certain quarters it is still suspiciously regarded as an occupation not altogether respectable, good neither

for education nor literature” (Palmer 1). It is regarded with suspicion because it proves so intractable to efforts to reduce or elevate it (depending on your point of view) to the status of a science, because it depends so little on fact and so much on sensibility, feeling and the pleasure principle.

I have no intention of joining that old battle now. But at least we should note that the question of the value and necessity of the study of literature at our university takes on a new urgency in the present West Indian context. Attending the currently popular question of whether or not the University is meeting the needs of the society (which needs, incidentally, seem to be as diverse as the people who champion them) is a suggestion that the University is wasting its resources in turning out so many Arts graduates when there are more useful priorities to be met. It is suggested that except for teachers, an Arts degree is at best a mere luxury which the society can ill afford and at worst a training-ground for misfits and trouble-makers. In this latter regard Arts students are identified with their much maligned brothers the social scientists. The argument for the usefulness of literature has been made many times and by many famous men. I do not think that I need to repeat it now. Nor do I doubt that the society has need of more technologists and artisans and tractor-drivers and people trained in management skills and commerce. And perhaps many of the Arts graduates of the University of the West Indies would have been of more use to themselves and to the society if they had devoted their three years to subjects rather less genteel or subjects which are, in the popular sense of the word, useful. But it would still remain true that as many people as possible should be allowed to study it as fully as they desire. And we should remind those politicians who profess to care about culture and the fostering of a genuine culture that careful study and training in the Arts, properly conceived, is essential to any healthy society. The needs of a society are not only those which are obvious to hungry voters and to politicians bent on impressing the world.

In the next few paragraphs I shall outline certain principles which I think we ought to bear in mind in considering what English studies in the University of the West Indies should be. I shall also say, briefly, what has been done over the years in the Department of English, and what is being done now; so that we may judge those activities against the principles which I shall have outlined. I believe, too, that this latter information will be valuable simply as information. One of the minor contributing factors to the present crisis of change in the University is the fact that most people in the community simply do not know what goes on at the University in the normal course of its existence. The Community is usually ill-informed, or not informed at all, as to what has been done at and by the University. I have heard it said that a University should not bother itself about explaining or promoting itself; that it should get on with its teaching and research and that teaching and research will make their influence felt among those

members of the public who are worthy or desirous of benefiting from that influence. This view may be all right for some universities and some societies, but I cannot believe that it is right for our society, a society which still needs to be educated in the very idea of a university. We cannot afford such olympian attitudes.

At this stage I should perhaps make it clear that the English studies of which I speak comprise both language and literature. At times I shall find it convenient to speak of both fields together under the one term, "English", while at other times I shall find it convenient to speak of them separately; and since it is literature that is the more ticklish question, it should be understandable if I devote more attention to that.

But I must return to the matter of principles for determining a satisfactory course of English studies in the University of the West Indies. In trying to arrive at such principles, we should do well to have a look at the history of English studies in England itself. There are a few useful lessons to be learnt from such a look; and here I must express my indebtedness to two books in particular, one of which I have already quoted from—D.J. Palmer's *The rise of English Studies* (London, 1969) subtitled "An account of the Study of English Language and Literature from its Origins to the Making of the Oxford English School." The other is E.M.W. Tillyard's *The Muse Unchained* (London, 1958) subtitled "An Intimate Account of the Revolution in English Studies at Cambridge." It is significant for our purposes that Tillyard saw the founding of the English School at Cambridge as nothing less than a revolution.

From the story of English studies in England, there are four points I particular which I should like to commend to your attention as being especially relevant to our present purposes:

1. that English studies as we know it today is a comparatively recent innovation;
2. that the pressures which made for the development of English studies in the universities came to a large extent from outside the universities;
3. that those pressures involved a clear spirit of nationalism;
4. that the advocates of English studies saw themselves as working to make higher education more meaningful and closely related than it was to the life and needs of the society in general.

I stress the recentness and slow evolution of English studies because by the very nature of its unquestioned introduction into our university, it may well have seemed to us to be a phenomenon which had appeared long ago and full grown from heaven like the Adam of Genesis, carrying with it a sanctity which placed it

beyond question. And even if the slightest reflection had told us that this could not have been so, there would still have been an unconscious tendency to act as if it were so. English studies was introduced into the University College of the West Indies as an appendage of English studies in the University of London. I have no doubt that the chief consideration of the introducers was that West Indian students should obtain, as far as circumstances would allow, the best that was available to English students. And since what was best for English students must have been arrived at after years of deliberation and practice, the only thing for us to do would be to seize our opportunity of partaking of that excellence. But the more serious implications of all this are better left for when I come to talk about nationalism and relevance.

According to Palmer, “The study of English in England began in quite a humble and informal way, as a kind of poor man’s Classics, and more than a hundred years passed before it won recognition as a branch of scholarship in the highest state of learning” (vii). The academic study of English literature, as we know it in schools and universities, has developed within the last hundred and fifty years. During that time, it has emerged from humble and informal origins to become a subject of central importance in orthodox English education” (Palmer 1). During the nineteenth century, the study of the Classics remained the central discipline in what is called humane education. The struggle to get English studies recognised was ultimately, in effect, a struggle to remove the Classics from the central position, though this was not necessarily the intention of the early champions of English studies.

One such champion of English studies, who, nevertheless, saw it as taking a place secondary to that of the Classics, was John Churton Collins. He brings me to my next point, the one about pressures from outside the universities playing a great part in the development of English studies. Palmer devotes an entire chapter to an account of Collins’ attack on Oxford for that university’s tardiness in giving the study of English literature a central place in its curriculum. While Collins was engaged in the attack, he was not a lecturer at Oxford or any other university; he was a free-lance teacher and journalist and an editor of the works of earlier English writers. His campaign against Oxford, of which he himself was a graduate, was one of the greatest influences in bringing about the revolution in English studies there. But Collins is only one example of the kind of outside pressure of which I speak. Tillyard has an interesting comment in this connection. He says, “The old universities are proud and would like to think that they are self-sufficient, and they resent pressure from without. But this they have to endure and finally yield to” (19). It seems to me that the truth of Tillyard’s observation applies not only to old universities, but to all universities, not least our own.

In England the pattern of influence was one of popular demand throwing up institutions of higher education to fill the needs which the existing universities were not filling; these institutions in turn promoted English studies, which proved increasingly successful, and so popular demand eventually made Oxford and Cambridge see good sense. I can cite here, as examples, the Mechanics Institutes, beginning with the London Mechanics Institute in 1823, which later became Birkbeck College and was incorporated into the University of London in the 1870's. Then there were adult education colleges like The People's College, Sheffield, founded in 1842, and The Working Man's College, officially opened in 1854, which grew out of evening classes given by a few far-sighted professors from King's College in 1852.

There was also pressure on the older universities from the newer universities, a pattern which is still very much in evidence. Let me round off this section of our survey by quoting briefly from Henry Morley, who has the distinction of being one of the first two men "to devote an academic career in England solely to English studies" (Palmer 50). In a lecture on "The Study of Literature," given to the London Extension Society in February 1887, he said:

...I watch with the greatest sympathy and admiration the efforts of those who are striving so hard, and I hope, so successfully, to bring the systematic and methodical study of our own literature, in connection with other literatures, among the subjects for teaching and examination in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge." (Palmer 94)

I have gone into this business of outside influence in the development of English studies in England in order that we may remind ourselves, lest we forget, that much good can come out of such influence. Lest we become too hardened in our self-satisfaction, and think ourselves above popular interests, and have here a clear lesson that the people within universities do not always necessarily know best what is best for universities or for the people whom universities exist to serve. And this lesson, exemplified in this instance in the very field of English studies, is especially relevant to our own deliberations as to what English studies ought to be in our own University.

I have already anticipated the other two points that I wish to stress in our brief survey of the development of English studies in England—I refer to the points about nationalism and general relevance to the development of the society, which two points are, of course, intimately inter-related. I say that I have already anticipated these points because obviously the growing popular demand for English studies in the nineteenth century was inherently an expression of what the society regarded as real needs and also, ipso facto, an expression of the national spirit. In the quotation which I read just now from Henry Morley, you will

remember that he spoke for “the systematic and methodical study of *our own* literature.” That *our own* is what I wish to focus on now.

Perhaps at this point I ought to establish my position with regard to the question of nationalism. I hold no brief for nationalism, at least not as it is popularly presented, as a kind of ultimate virtue, the chief reason and glory of a man’s existence; and I am enamoured of a rather wistful statement from Rose Macaulay’s *The Towers of Trebizond*:

We mused for a while over parents. Then I went on musing about why it was thought better and higher to love one’s country than one’s county, or town, or village, or house. Perhaps because it was larger. But then it would be still better to love one’s continent and best of all to love one’s planet. (106)

Nationalism is too often nothing but chauvinism, a grand accumulation of selfishness and egotism of individuals; it is too often nothing but the rationalization of the murderous greed of nations. Nevertheless, it is an incontrovertible fact that mankind is deployed across the earth in what are, by one set of criteria or another, national groupings. The best of us, I suppose, in our best moments, think of ourselves as citizens of the world; but the only true citizens of the world are displaced persons. We are creatures of time and place. Only God can see everything completely under the aspect of eternity, and such glimpses of eternity as we are fortunate to catch are determined by our particular position in time and space. The question is not whether or not nationalism is desirable, but how to achieve and maintain the best kind of nationalism, while guarding against the evils of the worst kind.

I have noticed that the nationalism of small and new and poor nations is often regarded disparagingly as “mere nationalism”, the pathetic gestures of little men trying to make themselves feel big; while the nationalism of large and old and powerful nations is seen to be so natural and rarefied a phenomenon that it is hardly recognised as nationalism at all. And the distressing fact is that this view of things is quite common among the people of “little” nations. The literature of great nations, it would seem, is literature; the literature of little nations is mere parochialism.

So I wish to stress the nationalistic aspect of the development of English studies in England. Some Englishmen of the last century felt that the study of literature in England should be centred in the study of English literature precisely because it was the literature of England, a feeling which seems to me to be entirely laudable and proper. It is significant that when Palmer looks for a point at which to begin his account of what we might call the pre-history of English studies, he should say that “There is a neutral point of departure in the last quarter

of the sixteenth century, when Englishmen first became conscious of their own national literature...These critics voiced the general feeling in their awareness of the new vernacular literature as a national possession" (1). But let us pass quickly to more recent times and listen to one of the most formidable of the Victorians, the scientist T.H. Huxley. In 1886 he writes: "That a young Englishman may be turned out of our universities 'epopt and perfect,' so far as their system takes him, and yet ignorant of the noble literature which has grown up in these islands during the last three centuries, is a fact in the history of the nineteenth century which the twentieth will find hard to believe" (91). Later, in 1909, when new proposals for English studies were put before the Senate of Cambridge, A.W. Ward "pleaded for English as a proper object of a man's main studies at a university," arguing that "it was unworthy of the spirit of the Renaissance not to admit the study of the national literatures to the position given to that of the Classics" (Tillyard 36).

Implicit in statements like these is the idea that to any people the study of their own literature has a particular relevance which is not provided for by any other literature. The idea becomes explicit on other statements, such as that by Charles Kingsley, in his inaugural lecture at Queen's College, that literature is "the autobiography of a nation," or of F.D. Maurice, the first Principal of the Working Men's College, that "we cannot safely separate our literary pursuits, even our literary recreations, from the history and life of our nation" (Palmer 39). An even more pointed, substantial and disinterested statement comes from A.J. Scott in 1848: "...a vernacular literature," he says, "is that of a speech and nation yet both living, and in whose life he partakes who is to study them; ...it is the utterance of the free action of mind in its wholeness or concrete existence, under the conditions of the character and circumstances of our own people" (Palmer 26).

There is another aspect of the idea of the importance of English literature to Englishmen in the nineteenth century which we should note. As Palmer says,

...there was a widespread feeling (in the Victorian age) that the spiritual and physical conditions of the industrial revolution impoverished the cultural lives of a large class of people, that they had been cut off from their traditional past, and that therefore they needed to be given new means of establishing connections with a national cultural heritage. (39)

I need not elaborate on that observation. If ever there was a statement relevant to the West Indies now, that is it.

We should also note that the question of English studies as being relevant to the lives of Englishmen was not just a matter of introducing English studies where there were none. The campaign of the progressives all during the period under review was also one of making such study of literature as did take place more and more up-to-date and realistic in content and approach, less and less

pedantic, remote and purely philological. This important feature of the development is excellently summarised by Tillyard.

I should like to round off this survey of the rise of English studies in England by referring to an article on “Nationalism in Canadian Poetry,” written by Louis Dudek, himself one of the better known contemporary Canadian poets and a member of the English Department of McGill University. The Canadian situation, in respect of the development of a national literature and the study of literature in general presents many interesting parallels to our own situation. Dudek points out that “the study of literature is always to some extent a political fact, as well as a purely aesthetic or literary one, though teachers and students are often unaware of that dimension” (*Queen’s Quarterly* 557). “Each of the great nations,” he says, “believes its own literature to be the best...Only nations still under tutelage, subordinate to others, live a life of virginal modesty: to them ‘great art’ is always what other people have done, especially those others to whom they are culturally and politically bound” (*Queen’s Quarterly* 558-559). He says that “this is not a matter (simply) of qualitative superiority. If it were, we (Canadians) might study Dostoevski instead of George Eliot, Goethe rather than Wordsworth” (*Queen’s Quarterly* 558).

Each nation is interested first and foremost in its own literature because that is in fact the best for them...English literature is about English life and about the permanent issues of English society; therefore it moves English readers like no other...There may be a Homer on some neighbouring Greek island, but our own Mimnermus has more to say. We have our George Eliot and William Makepeace Thackeray; what matter that others have a Tolstoi or a Dostoevski? (*Queen’s Quarterly* 560-561)

On that note, and in the light of all the foregoing considerations, we can now look at English studies in the University College and University of the West Indies. The story is not eventful. It might be argued that this is because everything has been as it should be.

From its inception in 1950 until now, what the Department of English has offered is the history of the literature of England, with the inclusion, in recent years, of a few fringe benefits. In the beginning, the final examination for the General degree comprised four papers, as follows:

1. Middle English and Early Tudor Literature, 1300-1550, with prescribed texts.
2. English Literature, 1550-1700.
3. English Literature, 1800 to the present day.
4. Exercises in critical appreciation.

I don't know for certain, but I suspect that the excellent leaven of the paper in critical appreciation was there partly because the first Professor was a Cambridge man, and it was Cambridge which practical criticism famous. This syllabus remained unchanged for more than ten years, except for the fact that Paper 3, English Literature 1800 to the present day, was narrowed down to English Literature 1798-1830, a sensible change, even if a very minor one, since it at least allowed students to study one homogeneous period in some depth. Incidentally, the term "present day" in the original paper was something of an overstatement, since there was little or nothing after 1900. The twelve years during which this syllabus was in effect may be called a period of stability, depending on how one looks at it. We must remember, however, that during all this time the Department was teaching for degrees of the University of London.

The changeover from the University College of the West Indies to the University of the West Indies (1962) coincided with the departure of the first Professor. The syllabus for the final examination as published in 1963 shows a slight change from the previous syllabus. Now there are five Papers instead of four:

1. English Literature, Chaucer to Wyatt.
2. Shakespeare.
3. English Literature, Donne to Pope.
4. English Literature, Johnson to Byron.
5. English Literature, Victorian Period.

Except for a very slight change in the first Paper, which became "English Literature, Chaucer to Spenser," instead of "English Literature, Chaucer to Wyatt," that syllabus as remained in effect up to this year. The changes over the previous syllabus are little more than refinements. Indeed, with the dropping of the practical criticism paper, it became completely a course in the history of the literature of England; the titles of the papers may be new, but the basic conception of the course remains the same; and a paper is introduced to fill the historical gap between 1700 and 1800 which had existed in the former syllabus. Besides, the study of literature still stopped short at 1900.

When we look at the syllabus for what was originally the Honours degree, and latterly the Special degree in English, we find basically the same pattern and emphasis, though with a few more adventurous offerings in recent years. Here is the original list of papers for the final examination:

1. Old English Texts and Literature.
2. Middle English and early Tudor Texts and Literature, 1300-1550.

3. Outlines of the history of the English language, with a study of linguistic change from Old English to the present day.
4. History of English Literature, 1550-1700.
5. History of English Literature, 1700-1800.
6. History of English Literature, 1800 to the present day.
7. Shakespeare.
8. Exercises in critical appreciation.

A few noteworthy changes were made in 1963. Old English literature became optional, at least in theory; the alternative was a course in “The Classical Background to English Literature”, but this never got off the ground. Practical criticism was removed, and a paper entitled simply “The Novel” introduced. “The present day” took on definite shape, as a half-course entitled “English literature, Yeats to Auden,” the other half being “American Literature,” a long overdue introduction. But the changes were in effect merely small additions to the old comprehensive foundation of the history of the literature of England. Other slight changes were subsequently rung, one of the most important being the introduction of a paper entitled “Selected West Indian and Commonwealth Literature;” but this was introduced at the expense of American literature. Other interesting recent introductions in the final examination were “Modern Drama” and “20th Century Prose Fiction”, but these were optional extras which the Department managed to squeeze in, largely by swelling the syllabus. We still live under a compulsion, it would seem, to make sure that the students get a comprehensive course in the literature of England, as if we must first seek the heaven of that kingdom and one or two things else will be added on to it. And such daring additions as were effected, were effected, it would seem, not so much as a result of Departmental policy as of the particular interests of individual teachers.

This year, for the first time, we are teaching a full course in West Indian Literature, to all students reading for the final examination of the special degree in English. A similar course will be introduced next year for students doing what was hitherto called a general degree. This year we are teaching, for the first time, a full course in American literature as an option for the special degree. Also for this degree, we shall introduce next year a Commonwealth literature option which will be based largely on West African literature. And on the language side, we shall be introducing what should be an exciting new option, a “Socio-linguistic Survey of West Indian Dialects.”

I believe that for us to continue to approach English studies in the way which we have inherited, to take over wholesale a programme and approach developed, quite rightly, for the well-being and betterment of a people not our own, and to think that we are thereby allowing ourselves the full benefit that a

society can derive from the study of literature, is simply to perpetuate our cultural blight.

I believe that we will have to change the orientation and scope of English studies. I believe that what it should be for us here in the West Indies now is not the study of the history of the literature of England, but the study of literature in English. By this I mean literature produced by anybody anywhere who writes in English. We have a world to choose from—Canada, the U.S.A., Africa, Asia, Australia, the West Indies, and, of course, Great Britain. There is our source, wide open and waiting. We shall go to it freely and openly, with no bias except that which, as we have seen, is natural and necessary to any people in this kind of situation. We shall select from it what seems to us to be most beneficial to us, whether in regard to our specific problems at this particular moment, or in regard to matters of universal interest which appeal to us inasmuch as we are part of mankind. We shall allow for courses designed in all sorts of ways, flexibly, to give us the benefit of all the possible approaches to literature—there may be courses on particular historical periods, or on particular genres, or on particular authors, or on particular regions, or on particular themes and preoccupations of different writers, and so on.

And in this programme, the study of West Indian literature (at least as long as the University of the West Indies exists as such) should naturally have a central and increasingly important place. In terms of sheer volume, that place, though essential, will be relatively small for the time being, since West Indian literature is in an infant, if not embryonic state. Almost all the books prescribed for the current West Indian literature paper were published after the inception of the Department.

This new orientation will not mean the rejection of English literature (i.e. the literature of England). The value and relevance to all men of the great works of English literature are indisputable, and so are their particular value and relevance to all whose language is English. In the present mood of angry reaction against the wrongs of our past, some voices would seem to cry for such a rejection. I can do no better than quote from one of our own West Indian authors, Derek Walcott:

Nowadays (in the West Indies), any foreign or even white is considered alien or useless. This is a totally new kind of intellectual fascism that is really an embarrassing form of revenge. What we will produce if we keep this up is a society of intellectually stunted people with no other values than “buy local.” (27)

But Derek Walcott himself might not go down too well with the more “advanced” thinkers. So let me quote from yet another outstanding West Indian, this time one

of the spiritual fathers of our young West Indian radicals, a man who has recently been teaching in a Black Studies programme in the United States. I mean C.L.R. James. He writes:

The atmosphere in which I came to maturity, and which has developed me along the lines that I have gone, is the atmosphere of the literature of Western Europe...We live in obe world, and we have to find out what is taking place in the world. And I, a man of the Caribbean, have found that it is in the study of Western literature, Western philosophy and Western history that I have found out the things I have found out, even about the underdeveloped countries. (73-74)

What the new orientation will mean is that we will go to English literature with free minds, concentrating on what in it seems most meaningful to us, freely recognizing its foreign-ness and not fooling ourselves into reading it as if it had been written primarily for us. And this is not to say that we will go to English literature or to the literature of any other region, only for that in it which flatters our own immediate moods or prejudices or national desires. There is a value in studying experiences and ideas different from our own precisely because they are different. As one of the most eminent of Englishmen, Francis Bacon, said: "I have taken all knowledge to be my province."

Works Cited

- Bacon, Francis. "Letter to Lord Burleigh." 1592.
James, C.L.R. "The Nineteen-Thirties." *Journal of Commonwealth Literature* (July 1969).
Macaulay, Rose. *The Towers of Trebizond*. London: Collins, 1956.
Palmer, D.J.. *The Rise of English Studies*. London: O.U.P., 1965.
Queen's Quarterly LXXV (Winter 1968): 557-561.
Shaw, George Bernard. *Saint Joan*. London: Constable, 1924.
Tillyard, E.M.W. *The Muse Unchained*. London: Bowes & Bowes, 1958.
Walcott, Derek. "Interview with Benedict Wight." *Express Independence Magazine* (Trinidad, 31 August 1969): 27.