

THE WORLD'S CLASSICS

# JOSEPH CONRAD

## UNDER WESTERN EYES



THE WORLD'S CLASSICS

---

JOSEPH CONRAD

*Under Western Eyes*

---

*Edited with an Introduction by*  
JEREMY HAWTHORN

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1983

*Oxford University Press, Walton Street, Oxford OX2 6DP*

*London Glasgow New York Toronto*

*Delhi Bombay Calcutta Madras Karachi*

*Kuala Lumpur Singapore Hong Kong Tokyo*

*Nairobi Dar es Salaam Cape Town*

*Melbourne Auckland*

*and associates in*

*Beirut Berlin Ibadan Mexico City Nicosia*

*Introduction and Notes © Jeremy Hawthorn 1983*

*Bibliography and Chronology © John Batchelor 1983*

*This edition first published 1983 as a World's*

*Classics paperback*

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of Oxford University Press*

*This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser*

*British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data*

*Conrad, Joseph*

*Under western eyes.—(The world's classics)*

*I. Title II. Hawthorn, Jeremy*

*823'.912[F] PR6005.04*

*ISBN 0-19-281619-5*

*Printed in Great Britain by*

*Hazell Watson & Viney Limited*

*Aylesbury, Bucks*

## INTRODUCTION

IN THE middle of writing *Under Western Eyes*, in 1909, Joseph Conrad composed his short story, *The Secret Sharer*. Although this latter work is undeniably minor in comparison with the achievement of *Under Western Eyes*, the similarity of its central situation to that which initiates the action of *Under Western Eyes* is very striking, and this similarity helps to illuminate the larger work. In *The Secret Sharer* the young, inexperienced captain of a ship, waiting to sail on what is, for him, a first voyage of command, is confronted by the first mate of another ship who has just killed a fellow sailor, and to whom the captain grants refuge. The captain is thus faced with a situation not dissimilar to that which Razumov is placed in in *Under Western Eyes* when he returns home to find Haldin—a self-confessed political assassin—asking for his assistance. That Conrad was working away at related issues in both works can be argued more convincingly when other parallels between them are noted; early on in *Under Western Eyes* Razumov is described as a man who ‘was as lonely in the world as a man swimming in the deep sea’—which is, literally, how the young captain in *The Secret Sharer* first sees the fugitive murderer, Leggatt. Much later in *Under Western Eyes*, after having visited the revolutionaries at the Château Borel in Geneva, Razumov feels, ‘bizarre as it may seem, as though another self, an independent sharer of his mind, had been able to view his whole person very distinctly indeed’. The comment calls to mind both the title of the shorter work, and also the recurrent feeling experienced by the captain that Leggatt is in some way his double or second self.

The questions which both works raise for their readers are very similar. What are the respective claims of self-interest, social duty and common humanity? To whom, or to what, do we owe the first allegiance: to ourselves, to our social group or nation, or to the particular claim of another individual who, in extreme circumstances, asks for help?

If these sound rather abstract questions, it needs to be stressed that their consideration in *Under Western Eyes* is a very concrete one, with the specific social, historical and political context of Razumov's situation made very explicit. Whereas the Brussels of *Heart of Darkness* and the Russia of *The Secret Agent* had been implied but not named, and Conrad had actually objected to Richard Curle's naming the implied setting of *Youth*,<sup>1</sup> the political and historical setting of *Under Western Eyes* is given to the reader directly and without equivocation. This is not to say, however, that we should treat the novel as a *roman à clef* which can be understood only when we have worked out the 'real identity' of the characters and their deeds. It is certainly true that Conrad used actual people and events as source material for the novel,<sup>2</sup> but the same generalizing aim that he spoke of with regard to *Youth* is apparent in *Under Western Eyes*; his use of his source material is designed to enable real issues rather than actual people to be examined.

I have said that *Under Western Eyes* asks us to consider the respective claims of self-interest, social duty and common humanity. The novel presents us with a paradox: on the one hand, it is impossible for the individual to separate him or herself from society, from other people, but on the other hand society is composed of innumerable privacies, secrecies and concealments—and so too is the individual.

We learn very early on that

There was nothing strange in the student Razumov's wish for distinction. A man's real life is that accorded to him in the thoughts of other men by reason of respect or natural love.

It is on this basis that we can understand why it is that later on, acting a lie among those who believe him to be a fellow-revolutionary, Razumov begins to feel that he has no

<sup>1</sup> In a letter to Curle written 24 April 1922, and published in *Conrad to a Friend: 150 Selected Letters from Joseph Conrad to Richard Curle*, edited and with an introduction and notes by Richard Curle, Sampson Low, Marston and Company Ltd, 1928, pp. 142, 143.

<sup>2</sup> See the Explanatory Notes for further details.

such 'real life'. And eventually, of course, he is led to recognize that in giving Haldin up to the police, 'it was myself, after all, whom I have betrayed most basely'. Moreover, this view of the interpenetration of the social and the personal means, necessarily, that 'the moral corruptions of an oppressed society', as the Teacher of Languages puts it, enter in to the individual in innumerable ways.

Whenever two Russians come together, the shadow of autocracy is with them, tinging their thoughts, their views, their most intimate feelings, their private life, their public utterances—haunting the secret of their silences.

But this is where the paradox becomes clear: if it is the case that the individual is, willy nilly, saturated with the social, constituted by as well as existing in a particular society, then what happens when that society is full of secrecies: corrupt, deceitful, and vilely oppressive to such an extent that open and honest intercourse is impossible amongst its members? The answer would seem to be that the individual cannot but be affected by this corruption. At the start of the novel we learn of Razumov that he 'was always accessible, and there was nothing secret or reserved in his life'. But as a result of the external pressures exerted upon him, rather than because of any significant inner flaw, Razumov finds that he is forced into abandoning this openness. His speeches to Haldin become opaque, ambiguous:

"Can you conceive secret places in Eternity? Impossible. Whereas life is full of them. There are secrets of birth, for instance. One carries them on to the grave. There is something comical . . . but never mind. And there are secret motives of conduct. A man's most open actions have a secret side to them."

Conrad had already indicated his concern with the tension between the collective nature of our life on the one hand, and the existence of privacies and secrecies on the other, in his previous major novel *The Secret Agent*. His scorn for what he considered to be oversimplified views of our social being is apparent in *Under Western Eyes* in the ironical juxtaposition of Razumov, writing his secret report to Mikulin, and the statue

of Rousseau, author of *The Social Contract*, which is placed conveniently on what seems to Razumov to be the most suitably private place in Geneva.

This tension between self-interest and collectivity is very reminiscent of the work of Dostoevsky, and it is hard to write of *Under Western Eyes* without mentioning the Russian author. Conrad frequently expressed extreme distaste for Dostoevsky and his work, but as M. D. Zabel has written in connection with *Under Western Eyes*, the Dostoevskian tradition 'though he persistently repudiated it and professed himself baffled and repelled by it, opens a radical question of temperamental affinity and influence in his work'.<sup>3</sup> It seems hard to imagine that *Under Western Eyes* could exist—at least in the form we have it—had *Crime and Punishment* never been written. Conrad had, of course, written about betrayal and expiation in *Lord Jim*, and there are clearly parallels between Jim's jump and its aftermath, and Razumov's betrayal of Haldin. A phrase much used in *Lord Jim* to describe its hero—'one of us'—is used twice in *Under Western Eyes* of Razumov by the Genevan revolutionaries, and with a similar irony: Razumov both is, and is not, of their ranks, much as Jim has a problematic relationship with his fellow men and seamen. But the treatment of such themes in *Under Western Eyes* has an undeniably Dostoevskian element in it; at times the novel seems to have more in common with *Crime and Punishment* or *The Devils* than with *Lord Jim*.

Two of the particular focuses of Conrad's attention in the novel are not, however, especially Dostoevskian. It is with regard to *language* and to *vision* that Conrad explores most insistently the paradoxical oppositions which self-interest, social duty and humanity present to the individual. From the first page of the novel the duplicities made possible by—or explored through—language are highlighted for the reader. Language of course unites the personal and the social: it is given to us socially, passed on as a legacy of the group to which we

<sup>3</sup> Morton Dauwen Zabel, introduction to the Doubleday Anchor edition of *Under Western Eyes*, revised 1963, p. xvii.

belong, but it also forms the substance and structuring impulse of our most private thoughts and self discoveries. And language is both the means whereby we know others as well as that which we use, on occasions, to deceive them. Thus Razumov, talking to Sophia Antonovna, is struck by the 'epigrammatic saying that speech has been given to us for the purpose of concealing our thoughts', but at the same time it is when speaking to others that he feels most insistently the power of the truth. It is worth quoting a comment of Conrad's reported by his son John, in the latter's *Times Remembered*:

My father did not approve of words being 'made a mess of' and would stop me [when reading] until I had sorted the words out, explaining that they were to be treated with care, like friends. Treated properly they were good friends but if one abused them they could become enemies.<sup>4</sup>

We see them becoming enemies for Razumov when he lapses into the crudest clichés in justification of his betrayal of Haldin.

"The fellow's mad," he thought firmly, but this opinion did not mollify him towards Haldin. It was a particularly impudent form of lunacy—and when it got loose in the sphere of public life of a country, it was obviously the duty of every good citizen . . .

Conrad's movement from direct to indirect speech, and his pointed use of ellipsis at the end of this paragraph both seemed designed to draw the attention of the reader towards the artificiality of Razumov's language; it is almost as if the Czarist state is talking through him in the form of pompous, banal and stereotyped utterances.

Razumov deceives himself by means of clichés, but he is also deceived by them—to make a rather fine but important distinction. And crucial to his failure here, as it was crucial to that of Jim and of many other Conradian heroes, is his isolation.

Razumov longed desperately for a word of advice, for moral support. Who knows what true loneliness is—not the conventional

<sup>4</sup> John Conrad, *Times Remembered*, Cambridge University Press, 1981, p. 101.



word, but the naked terror? To the lonely themselves it wears a mask. The most miserable outcast hugs some memory or some illusion. Now and then a fatal conjunction of events may lift the veil for an instant. For an instant only. No human being could bear a steady view of moral solitude without going mad.

In *Nostromo*, we may recall, Decoud bore such a steady view—and killed himself. Razumov's isolation is one of the things which injects a modern, or more precisely a modernist element into this novel which is both more contemporary and more old-fashioned than that of Conrad's modern peers. As Ian Watt puts it, '[Conrad's] imagination was impelled . . . to confront a . . . contemporary question, and one which was not to be of any great concern to the other great figures of modern literature: "Alienation, of course; but how do we get out of it?"'<sup>5</sup> Razumov's alienation is intimately involved in his self-deception, as if isolation rendered words untrustworthy and unreliable, and Conrad's answer to the question—how do we get out of alienation?—seems to involve a purification of language through social use along with other rejections of deceit and secrecy. Razumov confesses his betrayal and faces the revolutionaries much as Jim refuses to try to escape his fate. Both characters escape isolation by putting the interests of openness and honesty higher than those of personal safety.

Of all forms of language *writing* is seen to be the most problematic in *Under Western Eyes*. Almost all the texts mentioned in the novel are misread: Haldin's letter to his mother and sister, Peter Ivanovitch's books, the newspaper report of Haldin's death. And even Razumov himself is treated as a text at one point in the novel: he accuses Peter Ivanovitch: "All these days you have been trying to read me, Peter Ivanovitch". The reading is no more able to detect the real man behind the surface appearance of this human text than Peter Ivanovitch's readers are able to see his reality (as told to Nathalie by Tekla) behind the words of his books. The Teacher of Languages at the start of the novel compares the illogicality

<sup>5</sup> Ian Watt, *Conrad in the Nineteenth Century*, Chatto and Windus, 1981, p. 33.

and arbitrariness of Russians to that of grammars, and after meeting the drunken Ziemianitch, Razumov sees the snow-covered Russia as a 'monstrous blank page awaiting the record of an inconceivable history'. This is very reminiscent of Conrad's statement in his earlier essay 'Autocracy and War', that Russia will find herself on awakening (we assume from Czarist oppression), 'possessed of no language, a monstrous full-grown child having first to learn the ways of living thought and articulate speech'.

But it is through a written report—Razumov's diary—and another one—the account of the Teacher of Languages which the novel purports to be—that we learn the truth. Writing can *do other than mislead*, but the reader must be eternally vigilant to make sure that his or her interpretation is correct.

One of the things which writing allows us to do is to observe ourselves, to split ourselves into subject and object. The theme of 'doubles' emerges at a number of points in the novel; the Teacher of Languages describes Razumov's keeping of a diary as a form of self-observation in a mirror. As I have mentioned, after meeting with the revolutionaries we learn of Razumov that he

felt, bizarre as it may seem, as though another self, an independent sharer of his mind, had been able to view his whole person very distinctly indeed.

The echo of *The Secret Sharer* is strong here, and it seems that as in the case of the young captain, Razumov's isolation and 'playing a part' in Geneva has almost created a double for him—divided him in two. Conrad mentions the tales of E. T. A. Hoffmann in the course of *Under Western Eyes* (when describing Madame de S——), and Hoffmann was best known for his stories involving doubles.<sup>6</sup> I might also add that

<sup>6</sup> Ralph Tymms, in his *Doubles in Literary Psychology* (Bowes and Bowes, Cambridge, 1949), points out that although the theme of the double is very old and is associated with magic and religious speculations, it became particularly fashionable during the nineteenth century—partly as a result of the influence of Hoffmann. Many of the German Romantics wrote works concerned with the 'doppelgänger', and Dostoevsky's early work *The Double* is a classic instance. But nineteenth-century writers as dissimilar as Charles Dickens, Edgar Allen

Razumov's vision of Haldin lying in the snow, which he has after he has decided to betray him, is to me very reminiscent of Golyadkin's sight of his own double in the snow-covered streets of St. Petersburg towards the beginning of Dostoevsky's *The Double*. It is as if the rival claims of self-interest, social duty and common humanity can split a person into two, especially when that person is lonely, isolated, and a member of a society in which honesty is impossible and cruelty is unpredictable and extreme. This fragmentation of identity is a very characteristic element in the modernist novel.

I mentioned language and vision as two focuses of Conrad's attention in the novel. It is hard to find a page of the novel in which a character's eyes, a glance, or 'seeing things' are not mentioned. And as the title of the novel reminds us, what we see is to a certain extent dependent upon who and what we are. Western eyes see different realities from Russian eyes. Moreover, the person who is absolutely isolated: Razumov, Mrs Haldin, can end up 'seeing things' in the idiomatic sense of that phrase: experiencing hallucinations and illusions. I have explored this theme elsewhere and do not wish to repeat myself here, but I would draw the reader's attention to the ways in which Conrad uses references to eyesight to suggest both self-interested blindness and also a disinterested perception of the truth and a recognition of one's human duty. The final scene involving the Teacher of Languages, Nathalie and Razumov is worth analysing in terms of the repeated references to eyes and sight it contains.

I have mentioned the Teacher of Languages on a number of occasions already, and it is perhaps indicative of his function in the novel that we tend rather to look with him than to look at him. Tony Tanner has suggested that by the end of *Under Western Eyes* it is Razumov's experience 'which seems

Poe and Robert Louis Stevenson wrote novels and tales in which doubles appeared with more or less prominence. Many writers link this development with the rise of modern psychology, a concern with cases of 'multiple personality' in real life, and the familiar fragmentation of the ego experienced by modern man. The theme offered an obvious way to objectify warring, internal impulses in the human individual.

authentic and real, while the impercipient, incredulous narrator dwindles and draws away from us into unreality'.<sup>7</sup> This seems to turn the unnamed narrator into a figure comparable to that of Captain Mitchell, in *Nostromo*, and it is certainly true that the Teacher of Languages has something in common with Mitchell: both are very 'English', suspicious if not dismissive of foreigners, and generally matter-of-fact and pragmatic in their approach to problems. But the Teacher of Languages, unlike Mitchell, is aware of many of his limitations; he knows how different things are in Russia from what might be familiar to 'western' readers. His function is, in part, I think, to draw attention to the crucial importance of the social and historical context in which the moral decisions facing Razumov are made.

Like another, better-known Conradian narrator—Marlow—his 'Englishness' seems to have been important to Conrad for a number of reasons. One simple function that his nationality perhaps performs is that of a shield for Conrad's 'foreignness'; the reader reading a story narrated by someone who keeps calling attention to his English nationality—especially the British reader, for whom Conrad was, we assume, primarily writing—is less liable to remain conscious that he is reading a work by a Pole. Conrad had of course had British nationality for many years by the time *Under Western Eyes* was published, but he had been made aware on a number of occasions that many British people still considered him to be a foreigner.

Perhaps more importantly, the Teacher of Languages is—again like Marlow in, for instance, *Heart of Darkness*—a sort of surrogate British reader. He can draw the attention of British readers to the limitations and inadequacies of their vision, and they are perhaps more likely to accept such comments from an ostensibly English source than from a 'foreign' one. The British reader can thus respond with the Teacher of Languages whilst also observing the limitations of his understanding of events.

<sup>7</sup> Tony Tanner, 'Nightmare and Complacency: Razumov and the Western Eye', reprinted in C. B. Cox (ed), *Heart of Darkness, Nostromo and Under Western Eyes: a Casebook*, Macmillan, 1981, p. 166.

All this raises an obvious question: 'Why does Conrad not have Marlow narrate *Under Western Eyes*?'. Apart from the difficulties involved in getting such a dyed-in-the-wool sailor into a country with no coastline, one feels that the primary answer to this question is that Conrad wants to have a narrator who can make the reader think more directly about language. It is true that at one time in the creation of the novel (at the manuscript stage—see the Note on the Text) Conrad had Razumov as the pupil of the Teacher of Languages, and it is hard to think of Marlow undertaking to teach Razumov anything. But Conrad's chosen narrator in *Under Western Eyes* is able to direct the reader's attention towards the problematic nature of words and of language from the very first page of the novel. This 'problematizing' of communication, to use a rather ugly phrase, along with the exploration of the hero's isolation and alienation, contributes much to the modernism which mingles with more traditional elements in Conrad's work.

The actual narrative technique of the novel is extremely complex in a number of different ways, although the reader is not necessarily made conscious of this complexity on first acquaintance with the novel. While the reader's sense of continuity is preserved by having the familiar figure of the Teacher of Languages as the immediate source of our information, we are also given information coming from a number of other sources—such as Razumov's diary—and this additional information includes, on occasions, comment on the Teacher of Languages. He is also personally involved in parts of the action, and this allows Conrad to inject a more dramatic element into some of the scenes than would have been possible with a detached third-person narrator. It is also fair to say, however, that on occasions Conrad's emphasis is very much away from that of reminding us that we are actually listening to (or reading) the opinions of the Teacher of Languages; on these occasions Conrad can reap all the benefits that a more conventional detached narrative might have offered. Thus although the reader may feel, after finishing the novel and looking back on its progress, that some of the narrative

conventions have been a little artificial, he or she is unlikely to experience this sort of twinge of disbelief while actually reading the work. It is unlikely, for instance, that a real person telling such a story as is told by the Teacher of Languages would feel so confident—even with the aid of Razumov's diary—to discourse upon the inner thoughts and emotions of Razumov. Moreover the presentation of realistic detail in the narrative surely goes beyond what the Teacher of Languages could have learned from Razumov's written account. Take the opening of the fourth section of part four:

Razumov walked straight home on the wet glistening pavement. A heavy shower passed over him; distant lightning played faintly against the fronts of the dumb houses with the shuttered shops all along the Rue de Carouge; and now and then, after the faint flash, there was a faint, sleepy rumble; but the main forces of the thunderstorm remained massed down the Rhone valley as if loath to attack the respectable and passionless abode of democratic liberty, the serious-minded town of dreary hotels, tendering the same indifferent hospitality to tourists of all nations and to international conspirators of every shade.

The owner of the shop was making ready to close when Razumov entered and without a word extended his hand for the key of his room. On reaching it for him, from a shelf, the man was about to pass a small joke as to taking the air in a thunderstorm, but, after looking at the face of his lodger, he only observed . . .

It seems clear that Razumov would hardly have included all this sort of detail in his written account. It also seems clear, I think, that were the Teacher of Languages a real person writing a factual account his story would be considerably less 'literary' than this. Conrad is able, at times like this, to push the Teacher of Languages into the background and to continue in a conventional third-person narrative style with an implied narrator who is, if not omniscient, then certainly better-informed than we can imagine the Teacher of Languages being.

My impression is, too, that when we get a narrative opinion expressed in passages such as this—the one on Switzerland in the first paragraph quoted above, for example—we tend to

attribute it more directly to Conrad than to the Teacher of Languages. But a couple of paragraphs further on we are back with comments which are clearly meant to bring the narrative presence of the Teacher of Languages once more into the forefront of the reader's consciousness, as a bridge into direct quotation from Razumov's diary. We thus get the benefit of subtle shifts of narrative perspective as the novel unfolds.

Comparing the published text of the novel with Conrad's manuscript version, from which many sections were deleted (see the Note on the Text), we can follow how Conrad made the Teacher of Languages less a participant in, more an observer of the events described. He ends up almost as a pair of eyes: the 'Western eyes' of the title. One aspect of this is probably particularly beneficial to the final text: the romantic interest in Miss Haldin on the part of the Teacher of Languages, of which the merest hints remain in the published novel, is rather more apparent in Conrad's manuscript. Conrad was not good at the depiction of sexual love or passion, and this shift in emphasis along with a comparable shift from his early intention to have Razumov marry Miss Haldin and to reveal his complicity in her brother's death only when their child's resemblance to Haldin so prompted him,<sup>8</sup> was probably to the benefit of the final text. Clearly Razumov and Miss Haldin are attracted to each other, but the relatively low-key depiction of this attraction allows Conrad to suggest that Razumov's final confession represents something more profound than might have been implied by a confession inspired purely by his love for Nathalie.

Some readers may feel that a novel so inescapably political as *Under Western Eyes* should perhaps be discussed and introduced in a more committed political fashion than I have so far attempted. Conrad's apparent equivocation concerning political action has led some readers to find *Under Western Eyes* a rather unsatisfying novel, a novel in which Conrad clearly demonstrates the evils of Czarist Russian autocracy, but

<sup>8</sup> An intention revealed by Conrad in a letter to John Galsworthy written 6 January 1908, and published in G. Jean-Aubry, *Joseph Conrad: Life and Letters*, volume two, New York, Doubleday Page, 1927, p. 65.

is unwilling to see anything much better in those working to overthrow it. This view of the novel is perhaps understandable, but to be fair to Conrad and to his creation it should be pointed out that not only is the portrait of Sophia Antonovna a fair and balanced one, but Conrad also allows Nathalie Haldin to indicate the shortcomings of a view such as Conrad's in her discussion with the Teacher of Languages concerning Russian realities. Conrad is prepared to allow the revolutionaries to have at least a few of the good tunes in *Under Western Eyes*, even if they have one very bad one in the shape of Peter Ivanovitch.<sup>9</sup> Of course it cannot be denied that there is a strongly fatalistic streak in Conrad, an element revealed in a representative manner in the final paragraph of his Author's Note to the novel. Conrad was no lover of revolutionaries or of Russians, and there are ample comments in letters and essays, not to mention novels, which demonstrate this. Moreover the impasse into which this led him was clear: if, as he says in his Author's Note of Russia, the leopard cannot change his spots, then all political action in Russia or by Russians is vain and pointless, reproducing as if in a mirror the evils that it is ostensibly fighting against.

But at the heart of Conrad's political attitudes there is a contradiction, one which is apparent in *Under Western Eyes*. For Conrad, it would appear, human beings are simultaneously subject to the operations of a fatality which they cannot control or change, but are also possessed of an independent will which they have a moral duty to exercise. This is reminiscent of the commitment of the Christian religion to free-will and determinism, and, as has been shown in an interesting article on *Under Western Eyes*,<sup>10</sup> this novel is saturated with biblical

<sup>9</sup> Very bad for the most part that is; but Sophia Antonovna's final comment that he is 'an inspired man' needs to be remembered. Perhaps this mocks 'inspiration' along with other possible criticisms of religious belief in the novel; certainly his pursuit of Madame de S——'s money and his treatment of Tekla hardly seem to merit the term 'inspired'—except in an ironical sense. His 'uniting himself' with a peasant girl could be a direct hit at Tolstoy's attitude to the peasantry, which was probably considered sentimental by Conrad.

<sup>10</sup> Dwight H. Purdy, "Peace that Passeth Understanding": The Professor's English Bible in *Under Western Eyes*, *Conradiana* 13 (2), 1981, p. 83.



references. Religious belief is an important element in the novel, but it is not associated with one 'side' in any mechanical way; Razumov and Mrs Haldin are non-believers whilst Haldin and General T—— are both believers. Conrad expressed himself in a typically contradictory fashion concerning his personal attitude towards religion in letters and comments to friends and relations; he told Edward Garnett that from the age of fourteen he had always disliked the Christian religion, and that the most galling feature was that 'not a single Bishop of them' believed in it; but his son John reports his assurance that he *did* believe, along with 'all true seamen'.<sup>11</sup>

What is clear is that in his oscillation between a view of a heartless, Godless universe of which man was a disregarded part, and a belief in some sort of divine power, Conrad consistently rejected all the different varieties of individualism available to him. It has been argued that the 'moral crises of Conrad's heroes are object lessons in the failure of individualism', and that Razumov should be seen less as the victim of the stifling effect of revolutionary politics on the free development of the individual, and more as an individual who seeks to balance the conflicting demands of various allegiances but fails because 'he has been reluctant to realize and act on the fundamental fact that human life is social, that there is nowhere for the individual to retire in isolation'.<sup>12</sup> This is well said, and points to a tension within the novel between, on the one hand, a fatalism that argues the impossibility of escaping a corrupt regime that infects even attempts to destroy it, and, on the other hand, a continuing belief in the responsibility of individuals to act in a socially responsible rather than a selfish manner. Razumov pursues his illusory dream of individual

<sup>11</sup> The comment to Garnett is made in a letter written 22 December 1902, and published in *Letters from Conrad 1895-1924*, edited and with an introduction and notes by Edward Garnett, Nonesuch Press, no date [?1928], p. 188. The report from John Conrad is to be found in John Conrad, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

<sup>12</sup> Avrom Fleishman, *Conrad's Politics*, Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1967, p. 72.