

**EXISTENTIALISM IN LORD JIM AND UNDER WESTERN EYES
BY JOSEPH CONRAD**

**Pamukkale University
Graduate School of Social Sciences
Master Thesis
Department of English Language and Literature**

Gülsiye BIÇAK

Supervisor: Associate Prof. Dr. Cumhuri Yılmaz MADRAN

**January 2021
DENİZLİ**

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that as required by these rules and conduct I have fully cited and referenced all materials and results that are not original to this work.

Signature:
Gülsiye BIÇAK

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all I would like to thank my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cumhur Yılmaz MADRAN for his endless patience, support and guidance throughout my study. I am very grateful to my family for their support while writing this dissertation. Lastly, I would like to thank my mother and father for their never-ending support and love. This dissertation would not have been possible without the support of all these lovely people.

Lastly, I want to express my gratitude to all my teachers from the English Language and Literature Department at Pamukkale University.

ABSTRACT**EXISTENTIALISM IN LORD JIM AND UNDER WESTERN EYES BY
JOSEPH CONRAD**

Bıçak, Gülsiye

Master Thesis

Western Language and Literature Department

English Language and Literature Programme

Adviser of Thesis: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cumhuri Yılmaz MADRAN

January 2021, IV+103 pages

This study aims to focus on "Lord Jim" and "Under Western Eyes" by Joseph Conrad by analyzing the protagonists in the light of Sartrean Existential motives such as freedom, responsibility, anguish, bad faith, and relation to the other. Conradian usage of existential motives will be analyzed in the main characters of the novels during their journey to find their essence, while suffering from the oppressions of political and social institutions in an absurd world.

The first chapter focuses on Existentialism and its background in detail. The second chapter analyses Existential motives in Lord Jim. The third chapter deals with Existential motives in Under Western Eyes. The conclusion part sums up the outcomes that both novels bear existential motives embodied in the protagonists of the novels during the struggles on their quest for authenticity. Conrad, as a Modernist writer, has created non-traditional anti-hero characters in his novels, who differed from traditional hero types. Conrad shows all facades of the characters openly to the reader, but their understanding of themselves will only be possible at the end of the novels.

Key Words: Sartre, Conrad, Existentialism, freedom, anguish, bad faith, self, identity.

ÖZET**JOSEPH CONRAD'IN LORD JİM VE BATILI GÖZLER ALTINDA ADLI
ESERLERİNDE VAROLUŞÇULUK**

Bıçak, Gülsiye
Yüksek Lisans Tezi
Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları ABD
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Programı
Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Cumhuriyet Yılmaz MADRAN

Ocak 2021, IV+103 sayfa

Bu çalışma, özgürlük, sorumluluk, ıstırap, kendini aldatma ve başkası ile somut ilişkiler gibi Sartrean Varoluşsal motifler ışığında, Joseph Conrad'ın "Lord Jim" ve "Batılı Gözler Altında" adlı eserlerindeki baş karakterleri analiz etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Varoluşsal motiflerin Conradian kullanımı, absürt bir dünyada siyasi ve sosyal kurumların baskılarından muzdarip, özlerini bulma yolculukları esnasında romanların baş karakterleri analiz edilecektir.

Bu bağlamda, ilk bölüm Varoluşçuluk ve geçmişine ayrıntılı olarak odaklanacaktır. İkinci bölüm, Lord Jim'deki Varoluşsal motifleri tespit edecektir. Üçüncü bölüm Batılı Gözler Altında'ki Varoluşsal motifleri araştıracaktır. Sonuç kısmı, her iki romanın da özgünlük arayışları sırasında romanların ana karakterlerinin somutlaşan varoluşsal güdüler taşıdıkları sonuçlarını özetleyecektir. Modernist bir yazar olan Conrad, romanlarında geleneksel kahraman tiplerinden farklı, anti-kahraman karakterler yaratmıştır. Conrad, okuyucuya karakterlerinin tüm yönlerini açıkça göstermektedir, lakin baş karakterlerin kendilerini anlamaları ancak romanların sonunda mümkün olacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sartre, Conrad, Varoluşçuluk, Özgürlük, İstırap, kendini aldatma, Öz, Kimlik.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ÖZET	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
INTRODUCTION	1

SECTION ONE

EXISTENTIALISM FROM KIERKEGAARD TO SARTRE

1.1 History, Emergence, Kierkegaard	7
1.2 Jean Paul Sartre's <u>Existentialism is a Humanism</u>	13
1.3 Jean Paul Sartre's <u>Being and Nothingness</u>	26

SECTION TWO

EXISTENTIALISM IN JOSEPH CONRAD'S LORD JIM

SECTION THREE

EXISTENTIALISM IN JOSEPH CONRAD'S UNDER WESTERN EYES

CONCLUSION	96
BIBLIOGRAPHY	101
CV	103

INTRODUCTION

After two world wars, man's belief in institutions and social norms was shattered, his belief in social and traditional values was destroyed. Existentialist movement arose during the times of wars in the 20th century as a result of the disappointment created by the wars and institutions. It was not the first time that wars created chaos among men, but this time it was different from the other wars as the destruction was immense. Man's disappointment in social values led to his rebellion against the ready-made human identity imposed on him by institutions, and man's alienation and loneliness is depicted in many works of this era. This movement is an answer to the demands of man who has been in search of his own identity throughout the centuries.

From the beginning, man's role in the social mechanism has been defined by religious, social, and political institutions. In the past, man was denied to have an individuality. It was believed that humans have a common human nature. For centuries, man's existence has been questioned by many philosophers throughout the ages. Their concern has not been man as an individual, but as a member of society.

Existentialism as a movement focused on the man as an individual. For the first time, it was himself who was responsible for his own life. After so many oppressions, people found liberation in Existentialism. Then the generation after the World War and the young generation turned away from absolutization and saw existentialism as the liberation of man. Man was not supposed to fulfill a pre-defined meaning of his existence, for him existence itself was the meaning of life.

Jean-Paul Sartre, one of the most influential philosophers of the 20th century, is the founder of Atheist Existentialism. He is the first philosopher who gave man the freedom to decide his own life. Sartrean Existentialism rejects God as the creator of man. It is not God anymore who decides the destiny of man; man's fate is in his own hands. To understand this movement and to understand why Sartre felt the need to write this philosophy, the political and the social background of Sartre's life has to be evaluated. Sartre was raised by his mother as he lost his father in infancy. His interest in philosophy started at an early age. He was influenced by philosophers like Kierkegaard,

Kant, Hegel, Husserl, and Heidegger, among others. Sartre served in the French army in 1939, after being captured by German troops in 1940, and he spent 9 months in a German prison. He participated in an active resistant group after being released from prison, but decided afterwards to leave the group and express his dissenting thoughts by writing. Sartre himself suffered from the circumstances of the era he lived in as he witnessed the dilemma of humanity in his age. Even his own life was shaped by Existentialism. He had an open relationship with Simone de Beauvoir; it was a scandal in his times. He had very few possessions, and he remained a devoted advocate of humanitarian and political causes till his death. Sartre himself claimed about Existentialism:

In any case, let us begin by saying that what we mean by "existentialism" is a doctrine that makes human life possible and every action imply an environment and a human subjectivity. It is public knowledge that the fundamental reproach brought against us is that we stress the dark side of human life (Sartre, 1946: 18).

Sartre was of course aware of the negative opinions of the opponents of Existentialism, and with Existentialism is a Humanism, he tried to defend his ideas against them by mentioning all concerns uttered by them.

According to philosophical existentialism, life is a task that we must overcome. One focus of this task is to become yourself, to achieve your own authentic being. This search for identity, which is particularly evident in both novels of Joseph Conrad, is based on the conditions of being thrown into the world. It will be analyzed in the theoretical part of this dissertation. Man's rebel against oppressions and restrictions started when he began to taste the forbidden fruit from the tree of wisdom. This act resulted in the punishment of man who is forced to live in the world. Man as an individual has always struggled to define the meaning of his existence in this world. Philosophers for centuries have been more concerned with universal values and universal human values, instead of man's individuality and identity. However, man had never been the deciding factor of his own life till the 20th century. The socio-political and religious institutions shaped man according to social and religious norms. Their aim was not to allow man to find himself, as this would create problems while keeping the social norms, but to create obedient members of the society. Time has changed, concepts have changed, even ideologies have changed, but man's struggle has always been the same in almost all societies for centuries.

Man was shaped by religions, institutions, and by societies in earlier centuries; according to them, man was sent to the world with a special aim, and with predetermined human values and morality, and he had an essence already. This was the religious belief, which claims that man has a predefined human nature and an essence given by God. Man has his duties as a good Christian, and his deeds in this world. However, changes came as man were witnessing traumatizing things during their existence in the world. After witnessing the traumatic World Wars, man lost his belief in all the artificial constructions imposed upon him, and he felt the need to understand the meaning of his life. All his beliefs in humanity were shattered, and he began to question the reasons for his existence in this world. Before Existentialism, man had been defined by society and religion as seen in many philosophers' theories before the existential movement. Man was born with an essence already, and this essence gave him meaning of his existence in this world. There was a universal value, which was valid for all men.

Within the scope of this dissertation, the first chapter will be a general explanation of Existentialism's historical background and the pioneers of this movement starting with Kierkegaard's Existentialism and going on with Sartrean Existentialism. Furthermore, main ideas of Sartrean Existentialism will be analyzed by using his two important writings, Being and Nothingness and Existentialism is a Humanism, published between 1946 and 1947. The most striking and important characteristics of Existentialism such as freedom, responsibility, anguish, bad faith and relation with the other will be discussed in a detailed way. Further, freedom, responsibility, anguish, bad faith and relation with the other will be used to prove Existential traces in Conrad's works.

Conrad is regarded as one of the greatest novelists in English language of the modernist era. The second chapter of this study will be devoted to the analysis of Conrad's novel Lord Jim within the scope of Sartre's existential theory.

Conrad wrote his novels in very turbulent times. The unrest in his times and his own experiences were also a great inspiration for his Works as Jeremy Jericho explains in his writing:

During the 1880s, Conrad made voyages to such Asian ports as Singapore, Bangkok, and Samarang (on Java). All three have their place in *Lord Jim*: Singapore as the unnamed city where the *Patna* inquiry is held; Bangkok as one of the ports where Jim works as a water-clerk (and gets into a fight); and Samarang

as another of these ports, and the home of Marlow's friend Stein. On one of his voyages, Conrad was injured during a storm, much as Jim is in Chapter Two, and was laid up in the same Singapore hospital where Jim recuperates. After his recovery, he signed up as mate on the steamship Vidar, which traveled around the islands of the Malay Archipelago. It was in these exotic islands that Conrad found the raw material for his first two novels, *Almayer's Folly* and *An Outcast of the Islands*. He transformed one Borneo locale into the fictional Patusan, where the last half of *Lord Jim* is set (Jericho, 1985: 3).

He lived in the colonial era, and he himself also witnessed the inhumane conditions of natives in Congo and many other places around the world, which can be seen in many novels such as *Heart of Darkness* and *Lord Jim*. In his writing about Conrad in *Cambridge Introduction*, John G. Peters remarked about the times in which Conrad lived:

Wars, political uprisings, colonial rule and unrest, and the ebb and flow economic fortunes all play a part in the literature of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Important cultural issues, such as woman's rights, increased industrialism and mechanization, scientific and technological advances, and the changing political climate were equally influential. Furthermore, the literary, philosophical, and artistic movements of this period directly relate to the literature that appeared (Peters, 2006: 19).

Peters goes on to prove how Conrad's works were affected by the time and the circumstances he lived in:

Even more than most British novelists, Conrad was affected not only by important historical events in England but also by those on the continent. Given his years in Poland, France, Russia and the Orient, Conrad's experience was far more cosmopolitan than that of most of his fellow novelists in England. In particular, Conrad was significantly influenced by events affecting France, Poland, and Russia during the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth centuries. These events would form the context for Conrad's life and also for much of his fiction (Peters, 2006: 19).

In his novel *Lord Jim*, Conrad tells the story of Jim from Marlow's mouth. Jim is the protagonist of this novel. During his journey, Marlow meets the water-clerk Jim who was a seaman before, and Jim struggles to come to terms with his past, as a crew of *Patna*, who is on his way to Mecca with more than 800 pilgrims. After a collision, the crew leaves the *Patna* and their passengers as they assume that it will sink. Although he tries to help the pilgrims, Jim also leaves the boat. The passengers are later rescued, and the crew are vilified by the public, and they all lose their certificates as sailors. Jim's struggles to come to terms with his action, are told by Marlow who is also a character in many of his books, and Daniel R. Schwartz explains the existence of the character of Marlow:

Because he wanted to dramatize how a writer comes to terms with words and meaning, he focused on the teller as much as the tale. Focusing on the problems of how we understand, communicate, and signify experience, he anticipated essential themes in the philosophy, linguistics, criticism, and literature of our

era. He understood the potential of the novel for political and historical insights and thus enlarged the subject matter of the English novel. When he dramatized the dilemma of seeking meaning in an amoral universe, he addressed the central epistemological problem of the twentieth century. To achieve a more intense presentation of theme and a more thorough analysis of characters' moral behavior, he adopted innovative techniques, including nonlinear chronology and the meditative self-dramatizing narrator he called Marlow (Schwartz, 2001:16).

Marlow is a subjective character as he tells the story of Jim from his point of view. It becomes even more subjective when Jim's story is also told from the perspective of the other characters. There is no chronological order as the story shifts from one time to another. Lord Jim is about the protagonist Jim's dilemma to find his identity as a member of the society and as an individual. There are many elements of Existentialism in Joseph Conrad's character, Jim. Jim suffers from existential problems to find his meaning of existence, questioning moral values, responsibility, alienation, isolation, loss of identity. Jim's sufferings include freedom, responsibility, anguish with choice or action, aloneness, lack of interpersonal relationships, search for meaning, and absurdity of existence. So written in the modernist age, the novel Lord Jim can be divided into two parts: the first part is a psychological writing about the moral failures of Jim on the ship Patna, the second part is about his success and downfall in Patusan. Jim's failure is told from many perspectives and by different characters, but the main storyteller here is Marlow. Although Jim is explained from many different points of view, Jim's real character is not clearly visible since there is always the unknown part in him.

The third part of this study will be an Existential analysis of Under Western Eyes, a historical novel written by Joseph Conrad, published in 1911. Under Western Eyes is about a student called Razumow, who is the protagonist of the novel. Conrad uses a narrator, who is a Professor of Languages. We hear Razumow's story from the perspective of Professor of Languages.

Razumov is an ordinary young man who is interested in studying and pursuing his career, and his life is turned upside down when a student called Haldin, who is involved in the assassination of an official, seeks shelter in his room. Razumov suddenly finds himself in a dilemma, as his betrayal of Haldin leads to Haldin's death. Throughout the novel, Razumov deals with many conflicts as a result of his betrayal, but till the very end of the novel, he tries to defend himself, in order to silence his guilty

unconsciousness. We witness Razumov's existential anguish throughout the novel, like Jim in Lord Jim. Razumov also shows all signs of an existential character during his struggle to exist in the world and to find himself and his identity. Razumov is a character who mainly denies his freedom and lives in bad faith, which is an existential concept which will be evaluated in the following parts of this dissertation. He blames everyone except himself for his failures. He has a split identity, and it seems as if he is imprisoned in his own shell since his soul and his mind are in a fight. The reader follows him on his journey to find a meaning of his existence in the world and to find peace between his mind and soul. As existentialists comment upon him, he tries to understand the reasons for his existence in order to find his essence. The existential struggle of being thrown into the world is the main reason of his pains. Every downfall during his journey will strengthen him as the reader will see. Razumov has to endure many obstacles, and his only aim is to be a successful student. Yet, he finds himself in a political whirlwind, where he is used as a toy from many sides and in this tumultuous atmosphere, there is no way than to collapse between them.

To sum up, Existentialism is one of the most striking literary philosophies, and it is perfectly adaptable to so many character types, like heroes or anti heroes. These characters are either in an oppressive environment, or as Existentialists believe, they believe that they are oppressed, and they can't act, but actually it is themselves who accept this oppression as each of them has freedom and can decide anytime to stop being oppressed. Existentialism is the perfect theory to be used for Conrad's two characters Jim and Razumov in Lord Jim and Under Western Eyes as they are both lost, thrown into the world, without any aim and without any meaning. Their wrong decisions turn their lives upside down and their journeys in search for identity will have painful outcomes.

Considering all these issues, this study aims to analyse Joseph Conrad's novels Lord Jim and Under Western Eyes with reference to social and individual existence, freedom of the self, search for authenticity and understanding the reasons of one's existence and the search for identity. Accordingly existential motives such as freedom, responsibility, anguish, bad faith and relations with the other will be explored and further applied to Conrad's novels.

SECTION ONE

EXISTENTIALISM FROM KIERKEGAARD TO SARTRE

1.1 History, Emergence, Kierkegaard

Existentialism as a philosophy explores man's existence in the world, and it is mainly linked to European philosophers of the 19th and 20th centuries. The philosophies before the Existential philosophy, were mainly about man's universal condition instead of concentrating on the individual. Accordingly these philosophies were not concentrating on man's experience, emotions, actions as an individual. Existentialism is concerned with man's individuality and his existence in an absurd world. Moreover, Existentialism emphasizes the authenticity of man. Existentialism's forerunners were the Christian Existentialists, who took an existential approach to Christianity and man's existence. According to Christian Existentialists, it was believed that God is the reason of man's being in the world. God gives the essence to man, and his duty is to exist. So for the Christian Existentialists, man's essence comes before his existence. For Christian Existentialists the essence of man is before his existence. The difficulty for Christian existentialists is mainly to combine Christian belief and philosophy, whereas it can be logical as a theory from the philosophical point, since it may contradict with Christian belief, and the difficulty was to combine both.

The first Christian Existential ideas were associated with Soeren Aabye Kierkegaard, born in 1813. Kierkegaard is one of the most important representatives of Denmark's Golden Age of philosophy. He is regarded as the father of Existentialism. He was a theologian and philosopher and the pioneer of Christian Existentialism. In his writings, mostly published under pseudonyms, he showed himself to be a committed advocate of the idea of Christianity against the reality of Christianity. About a third of his printed work also consists of sermons and religious speeches published under his own name. Kierkegaard is considered as the leading Danish philosopher and also an important prose writer. He is often seen as a pioneer of existential philosophy or even as its first representative. Elizabeth Li's interpretation of Kierkegaard's ability to combine theology and philosophy is as follows:

In order to see how Kierkegaard seeks to redefine this debate, it becomes necessary to establish how the terms philosophy, theology, and Christianity are defined. First of all, it is important to point out that

Kierkegaard in the 1835 journal entry is considering the relationship between philosophy and Christianity and not theology. Instead, Kierkegaard distinguishes between a) objective forms of philosophy and theology, i.e., sciences or academic disciplines in pursuit of objective knowledge; b) subjective forms of philosophy and theology, and finally c) Christianity as an existence-communication. In contrast to the academic nature of this debate and its pursuit of objective knowledge through the unification of philosophy and theology, Kierkegaard's early engagement with this question emphasises his concern with the question of how to existentially appropriate Christian faith, which in turn cannot be encompassed or explained by objective inquiry, but must become a matter of subjective-existential import for the individual person (Li, 2019: 137-138).

Kierkegaard regarded himself as a philosophical and theological philosopher, further he was also a brilliant psychologist who sees philosophy as an instrument to rethink about Christian belief. Kierkegaard himself was aware of the difficulty to put both his Christian belief and philosophy together, as for him Christian belief can't be inquired objectively. And further, it has to be adapted together in harmony with the subjective Existential individual. Kierkegaard was concerned with reason and faith.

He was concerned not so much to determine whether Christianity was true and thereby clarify the relationship between faith and reason (Vardy, 2008: 8).

In The stages on life's way, Kierkegaard evaluates the different stages of a person. He divides them between aesthetic, ethical and religious stage. It is not meant to be that man has to stay in a specific stage. These stages represent "different ways in which an individual may centre their life" (Vardy, 2008: 35). The person, who is in the aesthetic stage is mainly concerned to build his own identity by rejecting ethical standards, and the person in this stage is selfish, and concentrated on enjoying life according to his interest, disregarding society and God. The ethical person is more concerned to live according to ethical rules, for Kierkegaard these persons are "Tragic heroes" (Vardy, 2008: 50).

In An Introduction to Kierkegaard, Vardy comments Kierkegaard's view of these two stages as:

Kierkegaard sees both the aesthetic and the ethical stages ending in despair. The person in the ethical stage has chosen to centre his or her life around an ethical code, in relation to a particular group of other people. This will end in despair- just as concentration on self ends in despair for the person in the aesthetic stage. The ethical good will come to be seen as a construct, which only appears to confer meaning and purpose, and will eventually be seen empty (Vardy, 2008: 56).

Neither the aesthetic nor the ethical stage support the person to create authenticity for his existence, and Kierkegaard does not approve of them, as the quotation above states.

The last state is the religious stage. These stages are about the interaction between individual and God, for Kierkegaard the ethical stage is tempting, as it stands for modern society. By being a part of the “crowd,” it is not possible to connect with God (Vardy, 2008: 58). And Kierkegaard believes that it is only possible for man to achieve an “an individual’s real identity, and eternal destiny can be found” (Vardy, 2008: 65).

In his Concept of Anxiety, published in 1844, Kierkegaard evaluates the first anxiety of mankind. It is the anxiety of Adam, who is in anxiety about whether to eat or not to eat from the tree of knowledge. Kierkegaard saw Adam’s sin as the source of human beings’ pains. When God bans Adam to eat the apple, Kierkegaard sees it as the first free act of human being, namely for Adam. So Adam and the whole humanity after him are free, and he is the one who can decide whether to eat or not to eat from the apple; nevertheless, he is restricted by God’s ban in his freedom. However, it is Adam who has to make a decision. He is responsible for his actions or his for his non-acting. Further, he is also responsible for the others and Eve. His choice will affect not just him, but also Eve and the humanity after him. Acting or not acting is a choice. In both cases, it is an action. In the first he eats the apple, and in the second case, it will be not eating the apple, but it will still be choosing something. Adam decides to eat the apple. According to Kierkegaard, in this conflict while deciding, uncertainty plays an important role, which turns to fear. Man desires the object, but his fear prevents him from doing so as the freedom of man creates angst (anxiety). His fear in this very moment while deciding can be attributed to the fact that he fears the result, and the effect of this result will be on him and others. Here it can be added that man also fears the outcomes of his decisions in terms of God. Therefore, it can also be uttered that Kierkegaardian Existentialism, despite claiming that it is unlimited freedom, has its limits in religious beliefs. David J. Humbert argues that Kierkegaard’s interpretation of freedom of the self is not absolute as it has limits. He states that:

Kierkegaard's view of freedom and the self is closer to that of Augustine's, according to which the self becomes free by being bound to God. Freedom is therefore not an immediate possession of the self but something which must be acquired by virtue of the supernatural action of grace, the origin of which is God (Humbert, 1983: iii).

Here there is a contradiction as it claims that man is free when he is bound to God, but when someone is bound to God, because of his religious belief, then it cannot be claimed that he is free, as his actions are predefined by his bound to God. He can’t take

a decision by disregarding God, and therefore, his decisions are taken only in consideration of God. As it has just been discussed, it is difficult to combine both Christian faith and philosophy, and this quotation is somehow the proof as it is stated clearly that bound to God is the basis for freedom.

Kierkegaard goes on claiming that animals have their born instincts, and this corresponds to human's essence. Animals have their instinct, and men have their essence. Animals use this instinct while acting towards a specific situation, but Kierkegaard compared instincts of animals to the essence of man, but here it can be added that man differs from animals as they have also intelligence and emotions. However, Julia Watkin in A to Z of Kierkegaard's philosophy mentioned that Kierkegaard claimed that animals have no consciousness nor spiritual reason for their existence, and therefore, they cannot feel any anxiety, which is an indication for self consciousness (Watkin, 2010: 9). He also criticizes man who lives in a "crowd" and humiliates them by them as animals as they have failed to achieve spiritual growth as an individual. The label crowd is chosen intentionally as it is used for man who remains in groups and only resembles each other with no personal individuality, and he names them also as animals (Watkin, 2010: 16). So here Kierkegaard also criticizes the society he lives in as the society in his age did not differ much from the society in our age. Man in society adapts himself to social rules, and he is then regarded as part of society; otherwise, he is regarded as outlandish.

God plays an important role for Christian Existentialists as they assume that real freedom is only possible by a strong bond to God. So they believe that this freedom is not a matter of course, and it is something that has to be obtained by faith, in the religious stage. Christian Existentialists first claim that man is free, but later they also contradict themselves, by stating that freedom is only possible with a strong bond to God. A man can't act freely when he has to take actions to satisfy his religious believes. At the same time, he has to have faith, and he has to obey God. This pre-determined situation is the reason why it can't be stated that man is free.

Atheist Existentialism started from this contradiction of the Catholic Existentialism. God's existence cannot allow man to be free and independent. Therefore Atheist Existentialists eliminated God from their approach. Nevertheless, there are also similarities between Christian and Atheistic Existentialism as Christian Existentialism

functioned as a starting point for Atheist Existentialists, and we can claim that Sartre was influenced by Kierkegaard's philosophical approach. Further, it can be assumed that Atheist Existentialism does not contradict with Kierkegaard's theological and philosophical approach. The main difference between Christian Existentialists and Atheistic Existentialists is the absence of God for Atheist Existentialists. Precisely Atheist Existentialists eliminated the interference of God in the existence of man. For Kierkegaard, the existence of God cannot be denied, and he is the creator of man; this is also the answer for the meaning of human life as God gave man the essence, namely the meaning to him before his existence. He further states that God also gave the free will to man, and with it, the freedom to decide. Man is free, and his freedom is before his essence. The term freedom was well-known after Sartre mentioned it, but it had already been used before him. Here it has to be clarified what the Existential philosophers mean by freedom since there are diverse forms of freedom as it is known: there is political freedom or economic freedom, the freedom from social responsibilities or the freedom from psychological oppressions. However, the freedom Existentialists describe is the freedom of will. The choice between many options is freedom. Sartre here mentions also the ontological freedom as the basis of all these freedoms. For Sartre, there is no difference between a man who is in prison and a man who is free, since both of them have choices to make. Prison is not an obstacle for making a free choice, so for Sartre, they are both free. Conrad's Jim in Lord Jim and Razumov in Under Western Eyes have also many difficulties to accept their failure as they assure themselves that they are forced to make the decision they have made, but according to Existentialists, it is the opposite, and it will be proved according to their comments, actually they both deny their freedom. As mentioned before, Atheist Existentialists took the Christian approach as a starting point. Many terms such as 'anguish' and 'freedom' were used by them, but actually it was coined by Kierkegaard as the concept of Anxiety (Angst), and further evaluated or taken as a basis by philosophers such as Heidegger, Nietzsche and Sartre. All of them took the concept of Kierkegaard as a starting point in their theories and reinterpreted it further. So Kierkegaard can be regarded as the father of Existentialism. In Being and Nothingness, Sartre describes the Kierkegaardian approach of anguish is:

Kierkegaard describing anguish in the face of what one lacks characterizes it as anguish in the face of freedom (Sartre, 1966: 29).

This description of anxiety does not oppose to Sartre's description of anguish. On the contrary, he agrees with Kierkegaard's definition of anxiety. So, man's anguish is an outcome of the immense freedom he has, but his theory of anguish mentioned in his Being and Nothingness will be analyzed in detail in the following parts of this dissertation.

Nonetheless, going on with Kierkegaard first, it has to be understood what Kierkegaard means in his "concept of anxiety", for Kierkegaard anguish is a condition. Anguish has to be felt to stimulate human to take action, so there is no action without the feeling of anguish. It is also the emotion that has to be felt to realize that we have our freedom. So anguish is felt before making any choice of what we are going to do. The anguish that man feels is the reason why man fears his limitless freedom, and in anguish, he is aware of his freedom. Kierkegaard believes that man feels the responsibility of his freedom as his choice will affect men. It is not only a decision he takes with his limitless freedom that affects him, it is also humanity that is affected by his choice. Therefore, there is of course a sort of panic when confronted with this freedom, that is connected with responsibility towards humanity.

Kierkegaard's main difference to atheist Existentialists is that he connects this feeling of 'anxiety' with religious beliefs. This belief of Christian Existentialists changed later as the God figure disappeared for the Atheist Existentialists such as Sartre. The term anguish or anxiety was reinterpreted by them, and they believed that a human is the only responsible one for his own life and what he makes of it.

So Atheist Existentialists focus on man and his struggle to handle his life and his quest on his way to selfhood, and they aim to find their essence in their life, so this is not an easy task. In Conrad's both novels, the feeling of anguish of the protagonists Razumov and Jim will be elaborated in detail in the following parts of this study as Conrad vividly shows the emotions of both characters, and the readers can see the existential traces of the characters' emotions. When Christian Existentialists and Atheist Existentialists are further compared, there are similarities between the theories of Christian Existentialists and Atheist Existentialists such as man's freedom and Kierkegaard's concept of anxiety, but as mentioned before, the main difference is God. Christian Existentialists like Kierkegaard believe that man has God-given essence

before his existence. The existence of God is definite for Kierkegaard, and he claims that man cannot escape this responsibility as we will see in the following parts of this thesis. Kierkegaard paved the way for the Existentialists who came after him. In his times maybe the society was not ready to eliminate God out of the process of the existence of man, and perhaps Kierkegaard himself was not ready as he saw himself as a theologian and a philosopher. However, as time passed and as men became more and more disappointed of the world, their faith began to shake. Therefore, the existentialists after him started to eliminate God out of the position of the creator. There had to be groundbreaking events to take such an important and bold decision. However, if we go back to Kierkegaard, he believed that man has already an essence when he is in the world as other Christian Existentialists like him did, but he further believed that they have also their freedom. Many of his theories were used as a starting point for Existentialist philosophers after him and have opened new doors in regards of new types of Existentialism; therefore, it is believed that he is one of the first Existentialists, even he did not like to be labelled as Existentialist. However, even he is seen as one of the first Existentialists, his Existentialism can't be regarded as modern Existentialism as Atheist Existentialism is. For Kierkegaard, man is a creation of God, and he has pre-given reason for his existence; therefore, it cannot be spoken about absolute freedom as it is in the Atheist Existentialism, but he is one of the first philosophers who gave rise to the Atheist Existentialism with his theories.

1.2 Jean Paul Sartre's Existentialism is a Humanism

After Christian Existentialists, as a reaction to world war II in the 1940's, a new type of Existentialism started, and as mentioned already, they were called the Atheistic Existentialists. We have already compared the differences between them and the Christian Existentialists. The most famous Atheist Existentialists are Sartre together with Albert Camus and Simone de Bouvoir. As their name already indicates, they believed in the absence of God. It is not only the absence of God that distinguishes them from the previous Existentialists, they also claimed that the existence of man is first, and after he starts to exist, he begins to shape his essence. However, before discussing Sartre, it is significant to understand the main influencers of Sartre's ideas.

Sartre was influenced by many philosophers, as he formed his theory from many little parts of other philosophers' theories. Sartre took all theories before him as a basis either to take them further by reshaping them with his own ideas or rejecting them after proving that the theory cannot exist with examples. So all Existentialists believed in some theories, and Sartre choose the most appealing ones to him. To understand Sartre, Husserl's Phenomenology has to be known. Husserl believes that there has to be an object to focus the consciousness on, and Sartre refers to Husserl's view of consciousness, but it is also his point of view of consciousness. There must be something that we are conscious of (Sartre, 1966: li). Further, Hegel's Dialectic plays an important effect on Sartre's ideas, too. Heidegger's "question of being", Shoppenhauer's "freedom", Kierkegaard's concept of "angst" and also Descartes 'cogito are quite functional. Just to be able to penetrate Sartre, it is essential to know their ideas. As an atheist Existentialist, Sartre stated that man is not defined by God. He goes a step further, and for him, there is no God. Man comes to the world without any essence, and he has to exist first, and at the same time, he has his freedom, so he has to define his essence by himself. Gehring re-interprets Sartre in Philipine studies:

When we think of a creator God, says Sartre, most of the time this God is conceived by us after the fashion of a superior craftsman who knows exactly the sort of thing he wants to make, and whose knowledge completely determines its nature and its purpose - in other words, defines its essence, before it exists. Hence the individual man is conceived after the fashion of the artisan's product. He is supposed to realise a certain concept in the mind of the creator God. He is a particular example of a universal human nature, the same for the man of the woods and a man of the bourgeoisie. His essence precedes his historic existence (Gehring, 1960: 87).

So here it is obvious why Sartre rejects the existence of God, as God is assumed to be the father of mankind, and his creation of mankind is for a special purpose. So he has a pattern of man. They all have to have a universal human nature, and they already have a purpose of existence, which means their essence comes before their existence. So these assumptions altogether show why Sartre takes God out of his theory. So if God does not exist, then there is one being that has to exist before creating his essence.

The existentialist is convinced of the solitude of man. Man is thrown into the world without any meaning, and fear of death leads to nothingness. Sartre's Existentialism is based on the idea of different conditions of being as it is in Heidegger and also Hegel. It is differentiated between being in itself and being for itself. Being in itself defines concrete, not changing things namely the identity such as a material object. Being in itself is what it is and differs from being for itself in the point "that it

has to be what it is, that it is what it is not and that it is not what it is” (Walter, 2009: 2). Being for itself urges for the future, to what it will be, it is constantly in doubt as it does not know his future or present. The being for itself characteristic is that all the time it strives for the being in itself, but this is a hopeless strife as man can reach being in itself only by dead.

Existentialism is a Humanism despite being short is one of Sartre's most-read writing; therefore, it is very important to comprehend Sartre's Existentialist approach, and further it is also an introduction to his most important work Being and Nothingness. In his writing, Sartre defends existentialism against accusations made by opponents of existentialism. He further explains the structure and aim of this philosophy. His famous terms such as “anguish”, “bad faith”, “abandonment” are mentioned in this writing, and these terms are also explained in detail in his most important writing Being and Nothingness. Sartre states that existence comes before the essence of man: “Existence precedes essence” (Sartre, 1947: 28). It is Sartre’s most important statement in his existential approach; further, it is the most significant difference compared to the Existentialists before him. Sartre declares:

Atheistic Existentialism, which I represent, is more consistent. It states that if God does not exist, there is at least one being in whom existence precedes essence -a being -whose existence comes before its essence, a being who exists before he can be defined by any concept of it (Sartre, 1947: 28).

What Sartre wants to emphasize in this quotation is to show the main difference between Atheist Existentialists and Christian Existentialists by describing his own Atheist Existentialism, which claims that man comes to the world without any essence; first he exists, then he has freedom, and through this sense of freedom, he is free to act according his decisions. Thus, he defines his essence. Man cannot say that it is his human nature that is the reason for his wrong choice. There are no excuses such as “this is how we are or this is our human nature. In Existentialism is a Humanism, Sartre further states that Existentialism is not so much concerned about God’s existence, but even God would exist, the freedom of man would be the same. It is not about God, it is about man, as he needs to define himself by comprehending that all his actions are his own responsibility, even God cannot save him from his responsibility (Sartre, 1947: 53-54).

To sum up, Sartre does not care if God exists or not; he is more concerned about the freedom of man as God is mainly used as a protection for his failures, so man should stop using God for his wrong decisions, as it is not God who limits him while choosing; on the contrary, it is himself. God can exist, and God's existence cannot take the responsibility that man has for his decisions in life with his absolute and unlimited freedom. He can't escape this responsibility. Gehring's interpretation of Sartre's comment above is as follows:

For one who takes the point of view that God's existence would make no difference, Sartre shows a surprising amount of interest in God. If God indeed is "dead" and his very notion "obsolete," why worry so much about Him? Is it solicitude for the rest of humanity that animates the Sartrean pursuit of a non-existent Being? No, there seems to be something other than pure charity here, and other than a pure love of truth. In Sartre's rejection of God there is a personal quality, a relentlessness, an obstinacy; one might almost say a vindictiveness. One wonders whether he did not, at some time in his life, think himself personally hampered or deluded by the idea of God. And one also wonders whether Sartre, even now, is entirely easy without God (Gehring, 1960: 95).

Sartre's fundamental difference from previous philosophies is here: when it is assumed that God had created man, then God had done it for a specific idea. Further he added a universal human nature to all men. Sartre rejects the existence of a creator-God; further, he rejects the idea of a universal human nature, for him man is undefinable. Man is something that is developing and creating his essence, and therefore there is not anything like human nature; human nature is only used as an excuse for failures in man's life. In the following parts of this study, the characters Jim and Razumov of Conrad's two novels will be analyzed according to this development of their essence, and it will be seen that these characters are the only ones who are responsible for their failures as they make their own choices freely. Sartre states that philosophers, such as Christian Existentialists are objectifying man, as they claim that essence of man precedes his existence. He gives the example of the paper knife. A paper knife is created with a specific aim. It has a function, and the one who produces a paper knife knows how to use it. For Sartre, Christian Existentialists turned man into an object as they believed that God created man with the example of the paperknife and man. However, a man differs from a paperknife as it has emotions and a consciousness. Sartre states that Christian Existentialists see no difference between man and a paper knife. So, for Sartre, man is not an object, and he chooses his own essence after existing. At the beginning, he is nothing, and he is defined according to his decisions. So man is not a thing, and it has not a special purpose; therefore, man has to be disconnected from God, and man has to be disconnected from the idea that he is in the world for a special

purpose. Man has a consciousness; therefore, he differs from a paperknife, and so man cannot be like an object.

Before Sartre, there were the Atheist Existentialists in the 18th century such as Diderot, Voltaire, and even Kant, who also rejected God as the creator of man. However, only rejecting God is not enough to give freedom to man. These Atheist Existentialists from the 18th century still believed that there is a universal human nature. They excluded God from the concept of creator. This was one of the points they had something common with Sartre: They differed from the 20th century Atheist Existentialists as they still believed that the essence of man comes before his existence. So rejecting God does not give freedom to man. Man has to exist first and has to define his essence on his own. Otherwise, his essence would not be his own choice, as he would be pre-determined. Sartre clearly rejects both Existentialists' insistence that essence precedes existence. There is nothingness at the beginning of man's journey on earth, and man has to choose everything. In his Existentialism is a Humanism, he declares:

Man is not only that which he conceives himself to be, but that which he wills himself to be, and since he conceives of himself only after he exists, just as he wills himself to be after being thrown into existence, man is nothing other than what he makes of himself. This is the first principle of existentialism (Sartre, 1947: 28).

Man's action after his existence will define him, so it is man who is responsible for his future self and his present self also. Sartre claims that existence of man preceding his essence is about freedom and responsibility of man. Man is responsible for himself, and he is born without any essence or a priori knowledge. His reality is not defined by society's moral concepts. There are no predetermined universal human values. Sartre wants to show how man escapes from taking responsibility for his actions. Sartre rejects excuses by eliminating God. Man does not want to take responsibility for his actions because there is a God who decides that he has to be sent to the world with an essence, and in case anything goes wrong, man blames human nature or his creator. This is of course something that serves the purpose of man. Sartre thinks that all this spiritual belief is an escape from responsibility. There is no God figure or human nature to be blamed for failures, wrong decisions we take, lack of bravery, lack of sense of justice, etc. If man is the only responsible for his life; then it can't be known what he will put first: will he put his ambitions and goals in the first place and what will be the outcomes for the others? This is a dilemma that man has to

face while taking this great responsibility. Joseph Conrad makes use of this struggle in his characters on their journey to find their essence, and clashes between the individual and society while making choices is inevitable.

Sartre argues about three concepts which are strongly connected to man's existence in the world and his dilemma. These concepts are "*anguish*", "*abandonment*" and "*despair*". Anguish has already been mentioned by Kierkegaard, but now it is Sartre who explains his sense of anguish which is derived from Kierkegaard's concept of anxiety and Heidegger's concept of *Angst*. Heidegger is another important Atheist Existentialist and one of the main influencers of Sartre. There is an undeniable influence of German existentialist philosophy on Sartre and other French philosophers. For Heidegger anguish is the outcome of an emotion, when man feels the nothingness in himself (Sartre, 1966: 29).

According to Heidegger, this anguish occurs because man is thrown into the world totally by himself, and this is the reality. Man feels this anguish, and it is the fear of death. Sartre takes both philosophers' concepts, and explains his approach as:

Existentialists like to say that man is in anguish. This is what they mean: man who commits himself, and who realizes that he is not only the individual that he chooses to be, but also a legislator choosing at the same time what humanity as a whole should be, cannot help but be aware of his own full and profound responsibility (Sartre, 1947: 25).

The feeling of anguish is the outcome of responsibility that man has at the moment he exists in the world. Existentialism does not show the perfect man. It just shows the absurdity of man's existence. The basic experience of man according to the Existentialist view is anguish and fear. Sartre claims that this anguish is the result of man's loneliness. It can be concluded from Sartre's definition of anguish that man feels fear (anguish) as he is left alone. Bohlmann interprets anguish as feeling that occurs because man is not responsible for his existence, and he has this absolute freedom, and further he has to choose (Bohlmann, 1991: 35). So man is in the world without his wish and without any idea why he is in the world, or why the world exists, and suddenly he is confronted with the fact that he has to choose in order to create a meaning of his existence. He has further to choose for all men, but in this part, he has to think twice about the outcomes of his actions for himself and for the others, so absolute freedom can't be this way here since it contradicts in itself. In order to unearth the struggles of

man in Conrad's novels, the key concepts such as responsibility, anguish and freedom will be elaborated. This unlimited freedom and the actions he has to take creates panic, or anguish as the philosophers name it. He is his own God, like a sculptor who shapes his essence, and every single sculpt is added as another part to the essence. Man is alone as he has no meaning for his existence. Since God is rejected as a creator and essence giver of man, now man is in the world without any meaning. He has to act, and he feels anxiety about this enormous task, so he has to find the meaning of his existence. "Nothingness" is directly connected with our freedom. For Sartre, our freedom is absolute, and there is also nothingness. There is nothing in us that tells us what to do and how to act. Sartre explains it as follows:

We mean that man first exists: he materializes in the world, encounters himself, and only afterward defines himself. If man as existentialists conceive of him cannot be defined, it is because to begin with he is nothing. He will not be anything until later, and then he will be what he makes of himself (Sartre, 1947: 25).

On the one side, we are absolutely free; on the other side, we are absolutely free because there is nothing in us that limits our freedom since there is also nothing in us that tells us that we have to live. Even the decision to go on living has to be decided again and again. This is because we have nothingness in our essential core. So man does not decide once that he wants to live. He has to redecide it again and again because it is an ongoing battle as it will be proved in the following parts of the study. Sartre further states:

If nothing compels me to save my life, nothing prevents me from precipitating myself into the abyss (Sartre, 1966: 37).

If we look at this quote from the perspective of a Christian Existentialist, a Christian Existentialist would say here that there is an inner voice that urges man to live; furthermore, they would say it is a sin to kill yourself. So their definition would be this, but for Sartre, no one makes the decision for us to live, no inner voice, and no God. And further the decision to live is not a decision that is made once. We have to decide to live many times throughout our lives, and we have to redefine the meaning of our life. In Conrad's two novels that will be analyzed in the second and third chapter, the protagonists Jim and Razumov struggle to find the meaning of their existence. We will see how they urge themselves to go on living and to take action. Nothingness for Sartre is something that we feel and perceive, so Sartre does not mean that the opposite of the

thing is nothingness. This nothingness can be felt when we feel anguish, and by feeling anguish, we can feel the nothingness (Sartre, 1966: 35). To comprehend this relation, one has to be capable of differentiating fear and anguish. The feeling of fear is clear, so someone can be afraid of a dog that can bite him, or he can be frightened of a thunderstorm. So fear has a concrete reason, and there is something that we are afraid of. However, the feeling of anguish does not have a specific reason. We can't define exactly what the basic reason for our anguish is. In Being and Nothingness, Sartre explains the difference between fear and anguish:

In this sense, fear and anguish are exclusive of one another since fear is unreflective apprehension of the transcendent and anguish is reflective apprehension of the self; the one is born in the destruction of the other. The normal process in the case which I have just cited is a constant transition from one to the other. But there exist also situations where anguish appears pure; that is, without ever being preceded or followed by fear. If, for example, I have been raised to a new dignity and charged with a delicate and flattering mission, I can feel anguish at the thought that I will not be capable, perhaps of fulfilling it, and yet I will not have the least fear in the world of the consequences of my possible failure (Sartre, 1966: 30).

Here, the difference of fear and anguish is explained as many assume that they are nearly the same, but for Sartre, they differ from each other: first it is claimed that they are a part of each other as one occurs after the other is felt. Nevertheless, there are also some situations in which anguish is all by itself. For example someone can feel anguish after getting a promotion, and his feeling of anguish arises when he believes that he is not sufficient for this job, but he feels no fear to face the outcomes of his failure. In the character of Jim in Lord Jim, we will differentiate these two emotions by the character's actions since his actions differ when he feels fear or anguish, as fear prevents him to act whereas anguish is necessary to make him act.

There are phases in our lives in which we lose the closeness or familiarity, and in the modus of anguish, we face our inner nothingness. We have to make decisions every single day, and we have to take on the task of life. This task of life is sometimes not easy, and it creates anguish. The feeling that you can fail creates this anguish.

The feeling of anguish is not making the person incapable of taking decisions as it is mainly believed that anguish could stop someone from acting, which is quite the reverse; he feels the anguish, but he also takes action. So anguish in a way urges him to act. Man needs this anguish to act, and anguish is needed to force man to take action; so, it is an essential part of man. To sum up there is no action without anguish.

It is this kind of anguish that existentialists describe, and as we shall see it can be made explicit through a sense of direct responsibility toward the other men who will be affected by it. It is not a screen that separates us from the action, but a condition of the action itself. (Sartre, 1966: 27).

Sartre goes on to explain the term abandonment, as the terms anguish, abandonment and despair are related to each other, and they are the outcomes of our recognition of the immense freedom with all responsibility. The term “Abandonment” is coined by Heidegger:

“What is this abandonment? “It is itself arisen from what is precisely not own most to be-ing, out of machination.” (Heidegger, 2000: 75).

The term refers to man’s loneliness, left alone in the world. There is no creator, and man is on his own, so there is no excuse of human nature for our wrong decisions.

I am condemned to be free. This means that no limits to my freedom' can be found except freedom itself or, if you prefer, that we are not free to cease being free (Sartre, 1966: 439).

There is only man existing in the world with his freedom and responsibility; for Sartre, this freedom of man is condemnation because man has not created himself, but after his existence, he is free to create his future according to his decisions he takes, without any a priori knowledge. So man has to decide how to think and how to act. He has to take responsibility of his acts. With his absolute freedom, he can create his own individual world. Each individual can create his own life as he wants. Man feels abandoned, so the feeling of “*abandonment*” arises, when we are aware that the responsibility of our decisions belongs to us. Because of this, we have to take the consequences of our actions. Man has no escape, and there are no pre-given values. Man chooses his own values. Man creates himself as he visions him to be. He is able to do so because of the freedom he has. Nevertheless, it is not all the time possible to create himself according his visions as it is not easy to make the right choice at the right time.

To sum up Sartre gives the example of his student to make us understand this feeling of abandonment: This student is stuck in between two sides, and he has to choose either fighting for his country or staying with his mother since both sides are important: one side staying with the mother who is left by her husband and whose other son was killed in the war; on the other side, fighting for his country to revenge the death of the brother (Sartre, 1947: 30). However, before deciding, nobody can say which side is more important. After deciding for one side, we can know which side is more important for him. Here Sartre interprets it as follows:

In other words, feelings are developed through the actions we take; therefore I cannot use them as guidelines for action. This means that I shouldn't seek within myself some authentic state that will compel me to act, any more than I can expect any morality to provide the concepts that will enable me to act (Sartre, 1947: 32).

So without acting, we can't say which side is more important for us, and we can see it only after acting. We can't expect anything that is not related to us. So, we are the one who has to act without any prior knowledge of the outcomes of our action. After the student makes his decision, it will be seen what is more important for him. Although there are signs of course around us according to Sartre, but we are the one who will interpret these signs. If we blame circumstances for our failures, then it means we have chosen the easy way. The student seeks for advices from others, and he also asks Sartre, but here Sartre also believes that the selection of the person whom we want to ask is chosen intentionally as he can already guess what the one who is consulted will answer; so, when we ask a clerk about an issue, we already know that his perspective is mainly religiously oriented. Therefore the student in Sartre's writing the Existentialism is a Humanism is an enlightening example to understand what Sartre means by abandonment. The student decided to consult his teacher, but he could decide to consult a priest, who is in favour with the Resistance. Then it would be obvious what advice he would make to the student. By preferring his teacher Sartre, he knew already what advice he would receive. He is free, and he should make his choice on his own without considering any ethical rules. There are no universal values or any human nature that can say to him to choose this or the other option. He has to find his own way by saying "invent": It is actually the invention of the student as an individual, by choosing his way. The student also chooses himself, his morality and his values. He creates his essence, which is his individual character (Sartre, 1966: 35).

Sartre goes on explaining "*abandonment*" by giving further examples. This time it is the Jesuit whom he met in a prison. He has many failures in his life, but instead of letting these failures affect him negatively, he interprets these failures as a sign that he is not born for a secular life; therefore, he chooses to join the order. However, in the same situation, many others would fall into despair when confronted with so many failures. This is so common in our society; on the one side, there are people who fell into despair only because of one failure in life, and there are others who get stronger by their failures. So here Sartre states that we see him taking responsibility for the interpretation of the sign, and this is the "*abandonment*" about which existentialists

speak. The sign is interpreted differently by the characters of Conrad's novels, and we will discuss their despair and their actions they take to go on finding their essence.

The third term in this sequence is "despair" which is explained as "It means that we must limit ourselves to reckoning only with those things that depend on our will, or on the set of probabilities that enable action. Whenever we desire something, there are always elements of probability" (Sartre, 1966: 34). We have to act, but we can't expect that the outcomes of our action will be positive, as we have no common human nature, which will guarantee that he or she will act in a specific way, nor can we expect anything by divine interference as there is no God. The expectation of the support of others is also not realistic as every individual is free, and we can't know if they will support us to realize our aim; therefore, it is impossible to know what will happen. Sartre remarks that we have to act without expecting anything, as the result of our action is not in our hands. On the other hand, this should not lead us to pessimism. To sum up, man has no excuse for his failure, but at the same time, he can't know the outcomes of his actions, which is frightening.

Sartre goes on defending Existentialism against the opponents who claim that Existentialism is pessimistic. He disagrees with them. Sartre states if someone is a coward, and he is one not because of his psychology, his surroundings, and the social influence, and he is not coward because he is born this way, but because of the actions he takes or choices he makes in his own life. For Existentialists, if a man is weak, he is the one who is solely in charge of this weakness (Sartre, 1947: 39). This weakness can change at the time when he decides not to be weak anymore; therefore, it gives man the chance throughout his life to change himself by his actions:

What the existentialist says is that the coward makes himself cowardly and the hero makes himself heroic; there is always the possibility that one day the coward may no longer be cowardly and the hero may cease to be a hero. What matters is the total commitment, but there is no one particular situation or action that fully commits you, one way or the other (Sartre, 1947: 39).

Everything is in man's hands as he is the one who decides what he wants to be, either a coward or a hero. The decisions he takes define him. So if he decides to stop being a coward and start being a hero, he can do so as it is in his own will. These characteristics of the Existential man will be seen in both novels' characters of Conrad. Jim will start his journey as a coward and end it as a hero, so Sartre's definition will be

proved by Jim's actions. The opponents of Existentialism also claim that existentialism leads to quietism, which is defined as a behavior in which man believes, "everyone can do it, but I am incapable of doing it", but Sartre means the opposite:

Man is nothing other than his own project. He exists only to the extent that he realizes himself, therefore he is nothing more than the sum of his actions, nothing more than his life (Sartre, 1947: 37).

As man is "*defined by his actions*", Existentialism neither leads to "*quietism*" nor is pessimistic, as Existentialism claims that man himself has his destiny in his hands (Sartre, 194: 727).

So all the accusations that opponents make against Existentialism are defended by Sartre. It has already been uttered that Existentialism rejects that there is a core human nature; instead, there is a human condition which differs from human nature as it describes the circumstances in which someone is born. If someone is born a slave according to Sartre, there are limitations that he has to overcome compared to someone who is born as a member of an aristocrat family.

Historical situations vary: a man may be born a slave in a pagan society or a feudal lord or a member of the proletariat. What never varies is the necessity for him to be in the world, to work in it, to live out his life in it among others, and, eventually, to die in it (Sartre, 1947: 42).

Man has the necessity to live in this world to survive in this world, and then there is no escape from death which is independent from who you are, so even there is a difference in the society someone lives; for example, one lives in a European society and the other in an Asian society. There is no difference in the restrictions they have to overcome as there are restrictions in all societies. In some societies, these restrictions could be cultural or religious, and in the other political, but man has to face them. So man has to choose everything related with him; at birth he has nothing, so he has to choose a morality. It is not an option he must choose, which is inevitable.

We can define man only in relation to his commitments. It is therefore ludicrous to blame us for the gratuitousness of our choices. In the second place, people tell us: "You cannot judge others." In one sense this is me, in another not. It is true in the sense that whenever man chooses his commitment and his project in a totally sincere and lucid way, it is impossible for him to prefer another (Sartre, 1947: 46-47).

As mentioned above, freedom here is the freedom of choice, which means our life is not readily given, so we create our life by making our choices, by choosing our morality. Every man is free to choose whatever he wants; he can't choose not to choose. Then, it is not right to say that he is free to choose anything he wants, and actually he has to choose; not choosing is not a possibility. Even when he does not choose, it is a

choice through which man also encounters the world. So not choosing means to stay at the same point, so it is a choice not to move on to another point. Here we can say that this is a choice of the person not to make a choice. The accusation made by the opponents who claim that the fact that man is free to choose whatever he wants will result in anarchy is not correct. The dilemma of choice will be seen in both of the novels of Conrad, in which Jim and Razumov are in between choosing and not choosing; therefore, even they do not choose they have taken a decision. By choosing for ourselves, we are choosing for all men, which defines the attitude of man towards others, to his surroundings, and himself, when it is said that man has to choose, it is not only a choice that affects him, it affects all men. When man is creating his authentic identity, he is at the same time choosing for mankind. By “choosing to be this or that is to affirm at the same time the value of what we choose because we can never choose evil. We always choose the good, and nothing can be good for any of us unless it is good for all” (Sartre, 1947: 24).

For Sartre, if we say that man has free sense of choice, and if he has no excuse for his choice as it is his own will, then no man can excuse for false decisions by his passion. This type of reaction is called “bad faith” by Sartre (Sartre, 1947: 47). For Sartre, “bad faith” is a lie to one self as it disguises the truth of man's freedom, but here we can claim that this lie is not the same lie as it is known to us (Sartre, 1966: 48). He further argues, when someone claims, that he has to act according to some values and then say that these values are shaking his freedom, he also acts in “bad faith”.

If we define man's situation as one of free choice, in which he has no recourse to excuses or outside aid, then any man who talies refuge behind his passions, any man who fabricates some deterministic theory, is operating in bad faith (Sartre, 1947: 47).

Sartre criticizes people who know that they have absolute freedom, but despite knowing that they hide themselves from this responsibility, which is bad faith (Sartre, 1947: 47). Here there is also a contradiction; first, he believes that man has absolute freedom, then there is nothing wrong in choosing bad faith. As man is free, we can argue that he is free to choose, which is also bad faith, but Sartre explains that he does not criticize this decision to choose bad faith, but bad faith is for him a lie. He further states that: “Bad faith is obviously a lie because it is a dissimulation of man's full freedom of commitment. On the same grounds, I would say that I am also acting in bad faith if I declare that I am bound to uphold certain values, because it is a contradiction

to embrace these values while at the same time affirming that I am bound by them” (Sartre, 1947: 47-48). Here Sartre clearly states his rejection of bad faith, but he also mentions that man is free to choose it. When someone declares, he has to act according to some rules, then he also admits that his decisions are affected by this commitment to the rules, and he has to choose by regarding these rules in order not to violate them. This is a contradiction and also hypocrisy; on the one side, he utters that he is bound by them; on the other side, he goes on acting according to these values. This explanation clearly shows why acting in bad faith is criticized by Sartre.

The existence of the other is also very important as man needs the other to prove his own existence; furthermore, the contact with the other is important as it is through the existence of the other that we not only feel responsibility for ourselves but also for the others. The emotion of responsibility is thematized in Conrad’s works. Both characters, Jim and Razumov feel the responsibility towards mankind, but first they find security in bad faith as it will be seen in the analysis part of this study.

The other is essential to my existence, as well as to the knowledge I have of myself. Under these conditions, my intimate discovery of myself is at the same time a revelation of the other as a freedom that confronts my own and that cannot think or will without doing so for or against me. We are thus immediately thrust into a world that we may call "intersubjectivity." It is in this world that man decides what he is and what others are (Sartre, 1947: 39).

Sartre insists that man has to respect the freedom of the others as he respects his own freedom. When our target is our own freedom, the other’s freedom is as important as one’s own freedom, so the we have to respect the freedom as we respect our own freedom: “I cannot set my own freedom as a goal without also setting the freedom of others as a goal” (Sartre, 1947: 49). Sartre claims that man’s biggest challenge is himself. Man’s life is not about God’s existence or absence; it is about man and his struggle with himself.

1.3 Jean Paul Sartre’s Being and Nothingness

Another important work of Sartre is his writing “Being and Nothingness”. Being and Nothingness is regarded as one of the most important writing of the Atheist Existentialist, as it was written for philosophers and specialists. Joseph S. Catalano wrote in his A Commentary on Jean-Paul Sartre’s Being and Nothingness:

Anyone who attempts to read *Being and Nothingness* is aware of its difficulty. Unlike Sartre's literary works and popular expositions of existentialism, *Being and Nothingness* is addressed to a specific philosophic community, and consequently, with no knowledge of phenomenology, even the student of philosophy finds this work somehow mystifying (Catalano, 1980: xv).

Sartre wanted to define the meaning of freedom: What is freedom for Existentialists? Man first comprehends that he is free by "reflection" (Sartre, 1966: 155), and man understands his freedom, but it is only after he intuitively understands that he is free. This freedom is felt by anguish and fear. First, after being thrown into the world, man feels his freedom through fear and realizes that his life is in his own control, and he has the responsibility for every act he takes as he has freedom. Only later by the "reflection", which is the act in which the for-itself finds its own nothingness, is man able to show different behaviours towards his freedom. Sartre differentiates two reflections and explains it as follows:

We must distinguish two kinds of reflection if we wish to grasp the reflective phenomenon in its relations with temporality: reflection can be either pure or impure. Pure reflection, the simple presence of the reflective-for-itself to the for-itself reflected-on, is at once the original form of reflection and its ideal form; it is that on whose foundation impure reflection appears, it is that also which is never first given; and it is that which must be won by a sort of catharsis (Sartre, 1966: 155).

So the freedom cannot be defined as a conscious decision, and it is the being of man, in fact, "*the non-being*" as Sartre names it. So man at the beginning of his existence is thrown into the world. The original term for "*being thrown into the World*" was first uttered by Heidegger in his book Being and Time. It was "*geworfen sein*" (Heidegger, 1927: 461) that is the German meaning of being thrown. As man's existence is without his wish and without his knowledge, therefore it is not his own decision. He is in the world, and he has no other choice, and therefore, his existence in this world is seen as condemnation:

...man being condemned to be free carries the weight of the whole world on his shoulders; he is responsible for the world and for himself as a way of being (Sartre, 1966: 707).

The responsibility of man is because of his absolute freedom. And Sartre insists that the responsibility of man is the result of his freedom. This entire responsibility creates sometimes anxiety in man, and he turns to bad faith as mentioned already.

So man is "*being thrown*" into the World, but men can differ from each other in points such as social status, place, gender, religion etc. These differences can also be cultural, material, or political circumstances. So men can be born as slaves or masters. These circumstances in which men are born are named "*facticity*" by Existentialists. Sartre states that facticity is the "...the fact that I am condemned to be wholly responsible for myself. I am the being which is in such a way that in its being its being is in question (Sartre, 1966: 556).

It would be more suitable to give an example from Sartre's age: "*Facticity*" of a man can differ if he is born as a Jew in Nazi Germany or if he is born as a German at the same place. However, for both of them, there is a freedom that is limitless. This can be extended to many other examples such as social status and many other differences. So we can say that "*facticity*", "*others*", the world itself are borders of our freedom. If we consider the explanation of facticity, then it can be assumed that it differs if we are born a slave or a master. However, Sartre disagrees as mentioned before as he assumes that men have the same aim in life, which is living and working for his basic needs, and lastly everyone will face death. By these analysis, Sartre defines the meaning of freedom for himself.

Man for Sartre has a tragic existence. Man is "condemned to be free" (Sartre, 1966: 439), and he is not complete; so he has the responsibility to carry the burden of finding the meaning of his life. Man is aware of himself, but this is only possible by being separated from himself. He has to understand his nothingness. This means that for itself is nothingness. Man can separate himself through nothingness from his being. This ability is called freedom by Sartre. The being for itself can separate itself from itself, so freedom is not a will as man is freedom himself, and will is only a way to be free. Sartre makes a distinction between free will and freedom.

Thus since freedom is identical with my existence, it is the foundation, of ends which I shall attempt to attain either by the will or by passionate efforts. Therefore it cannot be limited to voluntary acts. Volitions, on the contrary, like passions are certain subjective attitudes by which we attempt to attain the ends posited by original freedom (Sartre, 1966: 444).

Now man is in the world without his wish, without any idea, and he realizes he is free. Now the term "act" is explained by Sartre, for his act is intentional. He separates the real action from an accident such as burning the house down while falling asleep with a cigarette. Here nobody can speak about acting, and he has not acted. On the other hand, when you burn a house down by setting it on fire, it can be spoken about acting or doing as he has accomplished his plan, and it is a realization of a "conscious project". It does not mean that man knows all the consequences of his acts. To speak about doing, it is enough to have a correspondence between results and intention. Sartre explains it as follows:

The concept of an act contains, in fact, numerous subordinate notions which we shall have to organize and arrange in a hierarchy: to act is to modify the shape of the world; it is to arrange means in view of an end; it is to produce an organized instrumental complex such that by a series of concatenations and

connections the modification effected on one of the links causes modifications throughout the whole series and finally produces an anticipated result (Sartre, 1966: 559).

Here we can say that acting must be deliberate, and man also has to realize the lack of something in order to act. Here he gives the example of the worker, and the worker is not aware of the low standards of his life, but at the moment, he is aware of the possibilities life can offer him.

He is triggered to act, and his current life is now unbearable for him. Man only acts when he realizes that there is something missing. As man is free according to Sartre, he has to act, and he has to create his essence by this acting. So here it can be claimed that there is no escape from acting. Thus, we can do something or we can reject acting, and we do nothing. Even if we do nothing, both decisions are ways of acting for Sartre, so there is no escape for man from his responsibility as this freedom brings along responsibilities logically. After existing, the next step one has to take is to shape his essence. First, he is responsible for his individuality as this individuality shapes his appearance; furthermore, he is responsible for his acts. The situation that man has to define himself is the same even when the circumstances are different.

Sartre goes on explaining the main categories of human reality as he names them which are “having”, “being”, and “doing”. Sartre thinks that all human acts can be subsumed under these acts. They are the total of human behaviors. In this part, he wants to clarify the question of whether the highest value of the human activity is doing or being! Here he seeks help from ontology (Catalano, 1980: 197). This part deals with the themes doing, freedom, ethic, and possession. The theory of freedom that is explained here presupposes the existence of freedom of choice, an assumption that can be true when evaluated independently from Sartre's ontology. There is a hidden truth in the following passages about freedom, and its aspects of the situation exist in the dispute with many possible or true arguments that exist or are claimed by philosophers against the existence of total freedom. The freedom of man is “*complete and infinite*” (Sartre, 1966: 532). The only limits that exist are the limits that man makes himself. For example, a rock that falls down the mountain blocks our way; then, it is our natural border, but it is a border for the one who is convinced that there is a rock, and he has to turn back. However, for the one who tries to find a new way around the rock or climb over the rock, who sees the rock as a barrier that needs a detour, for him this rock does

not stand as a border. The obstacles that we encounter in our lives are then defined as borders of our freedom when we accept them as such. Sartre insists that man is free, and that he is what he makes of himself:

It is a relation, illuminated by freedom, between the datum which is the cliff and the datum which my freedom has to be; that is, between the contingent which it is not and its pure facticity. If the desire to scale it is equal, the rock will be easy for one athletic climber but difficult for another, a novice, who is not well trained and who has a weak body. But the body in turn is revealed as well or poorly trained only in relation to a free choice. It is because I am there and because I have made of myself what I am that the rock develops in relation to my body a coefficient of adversity (Sartre, 1966: 489).

As Sartre mentioned before, man is a project. We project ourselves to the future, and that is what distinguishes us from others. As Sartre is very convinced of man's freedom, Freud's theory of psychoanalysis, which claims that we are shaped from an early age, and that we have drives, and traumas, etc. is irrelevant for him:

Other, who directly attacks our being by the very fact that he has existed, would be originally a substratum unqualified by these desires; that is, a sort of indeterminate clay which would have to receive them passively or he would be reduced to the simple bundle of these irreducible drives or tendencies (Sartre, 1966: 561).

Once thrown into the world, we must choose as we have our freedom, and we have to make our decisions. These decisions are not all the time important decisions; for example, we have to decide what to study. Each decision we make is a burden, and at the moment man is thrown into the world, he is also guilty, guilty of himself. He is guilty in the existential sense because at the moment he decides for something, he withholds him from something else as he has already decided for another thing. When a person chooses to marry, he decides to give up his single life; he makes himself guilty as he deprives him of this freedom. He has to choose all the time.

Every choice, as we shall see, supposes elimination and selection; every choice is a choice of finitude (Sartre, 1966: 495).

With each decision, we eliminate other options, and we have no alternative, but we have to choose. Someone can say that he does not want to be guilty towards himself; therefore, he does not want to decide, but even not deciding is a decision; therefore, there is no way out. Can we escape from this vicious circle?

We can choose ourselves as fleeing, as inapprehensible, as indecisive, etc. We can even choose not to choose ourselves (Sartre, 1966: 472).

We have the responsibility for all our choices, and we can't escape from it. We are free, and there is a positive side of making choices. The moment becomes important and precious. So to decide to go to a specific place for a specific aim is, for example, a chain of many choices, and therefore, the moment is very valuable. Time plays an

important role for Sartre, and we are free in comparison to future, past, and present. We are free in comparison with our future as we can do something else in the future. We project ourselves to our future if we decide to change our work. We make a plan according to it and change our work. We are also free at present, and we can also affect our present by our spontaneity. However, why are we free concerning our past? Normally there is nothing to do now as it is in the past. One possibility could be that we can decide how to handle our past experience. Sartre also knows that we can't change the actions and events in the past, but we are free to choose how we handle it, by our decisions, how we act in future, and how we handle events that occurred in our past.

I alone, in fact, can decide at each moment the bearing of the past. I do not decide it by debating it, by deliberating over it, and in each instance evaluating the importance of this or that prior event; but by projecting myself toward my ends, I preserve the past with me, and by action, I decide its meaning (Sartre, 1966: 498).

Shortly here Sartre means that through his actions that he will make, his past also changes. We know from our own experience that some events who seemed to be the worst thing that can happen to us are now not so bad for us, so our emotions towards some events can change. For example, the history books written in the past are still rewritten; normally the past is over, but it is still rewritten. This is because we have different evaluations and values in our future and in the present time compared to our past. Even though the past is over, we still have the power to change it. However, this does not mean that we can change the events that happened in the past, but we can change their effect on us. We can change our attitude towards them. An event in the past discourages us, and we have decided not to do something that we would love to do, but now at the present time we have rethought about it and decided to try it again. This is the way how we can change our past.

The past is originally a project, as the actual upsurge of my being. And to the same extent that it is a project, it is anticipation; its meaning comes to it from the future which it sketches in outline (Sartre, 1966: 499).

The meaning of the past comes from the future, and man is free in comparison to his past, present and future. So as we are free, we can't blame our bad childhood for the wrong decisions we make, or our background. Man has absolute freedom to his past, present and future. His writing about Baudelaire from 1947 is a good example for living in bad faith by blaming our childhood. According to Sartre, Charles Baudelaire, a famous French poet (1821-1867), had a very bad life, and he blamed it to his problematic childhood. His mother was his hero, but after her marriage, she put him into

an orphanage. He blames his horrific childhood for his failures in life. In Sartre's writing Baudelaire, Baudelaire comments the marriage of his mother as follows: "When one has a son like me"—'like me 'was understood—'one doesn't remarry.' (Sartre, 1947: 17). Here, his bond to his mother is seen. And it also explains, why his childhood was the reason for his failures in his later life. The bond to his mother was so intense that Baudelaire regarded himself and his mother as one person. However, Sartre declares that he chose to be the victim, and it was his own choice. He proves his accusation by giving examples from Baudelaire's life. Baudelaire intentionally chose a woman as a partner although he was sure it would be a failure again. He could see his separation from his mother as escaping from his past and liberating himself from a very dominant mother, but he preferred to blame his childhood. According to Sartre, his action is bad faith as he denies his freedom. Sartre states that he chooses intentionally evil for himself (Sartre, 1947: 81). It is his own decision to go on suffering in the memories of his childhood.

Going on with bad faith, bad faith has already been mentioned at the beginning of this thesis, but it is further analyzed in Being and Nothingness by Sartre who explains bad faith by making an introduction leading to this term.

The human being is not only the being by whom negatives are disclosed in the world; he is also the one who can take negative attitudes with respect to himself (Sartre, 1966: 86).

How can a man take negative attitudes towards himself? First of all, it has to be known that our consciousness is aware of its nothingness in him (Sartre, 1966: 86). So we are aware of our nothingness. This nothingness in us is the reason, according to Sartre, that we lie to ourselves. The attitude in which the "negation" is turned to oneself instead of the outside is called "bad faith". This negation does not include the consciousness but the transcendence. It differs from the lie as a lie is an act to the other, not to oneself, since in a lie we know the truth. Heidegger also defines the lie as a definite sign of man's existence, not only the existence of man but also the existence of others. Man lies because he wants to create a specific appearance towards others either as a protection or a mask. Man witnesses this attitude in everyday life. Bad faith is an act, by which man lies to himself, and the reason is the nothingness in him, and it is an act chosen to avoid the anguish.

The lie is a behaviour of transcendence. The lie is also a normal phenomenon of what Heidegger calls the "mit-sein." It presupposes my existence, the existence of the Other, my existence for the Other, and the existence of the Other for me (Sartre, 1966: 88).

The person who lies is aware of the truth. He makes the plan for the lie, and he is aware of what the lie is and what the truth is. The person who is confronted with that lie has to believe him. Lying is transcendent. An ordinary lie can have a similar structure to bad faith, but bad faith differs from a lie as it is lying to oneself. I am altogether, the deceiver and the deceived in one person, and there is no other person that I deceive. It is me who lies; it is me who is deceived, and both acts are done without knowing each other. So I am the liar and the betrayed, and both do not know it. So in bad faith, man is the deceived and the deceiver in the same consciousness, and he is acting in bad faith as he lies to himself. However, actions are coming from the same consciousness. The deceiving act is made by the same consciousness, and the deceived is also from the same consciousness. The person in bad faith is aware of his act, but even being all in the same consciousness, the deceived does not know that he is deceived. Sartre supposes that the truth must be known by the person, and this knowledge makes him more careful to disguise the reality from outside. Man who is in bad faith has a side of himself in good faith. This part is aware of the bad faith. When being aware of the bad faith, the person is embarrassed as he is not ready to reject it, and he is at the same time not able to comprehend it.

A person can live in bad faith, which does not mean that he does not have abrupt awakenings to cynicism or to, good faith, but which implies a constant and particular style of life. Our embarrassment then appears extreme since we can neither reject nor comprehend bad faith (Sartre, 1966: 50).

Sartre here mentions Freud's psychoanalysis, and at this point in order to escape from the feeling of guilt, we seek to find a shelter in our unconscious, as it is easy to escape from the responsibility, but Sartre insists that all acts of the person are real and in the conscious part, his behavior, his words, and his manners are all real, and there is no escape to the unconscious, so a person who is in bad faith can't blame unconscious when he suddenly realizes what he is doing. As we already know from Sartre, even he does not believe in Freud's unconscious; Yet, he proves that even if it existed, it would be unable to explain this contradiction. The contradiction is that the same consciousness knows and does not know the truth. Sartre goes on to explain Freud's psychoanalytic

theory to prove that it does not work. For Freud, we have the id which is composed of drives and instincts, and all these instincts and drives need satisfaction according to the pleasure principle. When we grow, the id grows too, and Ego which is ruled by the Reality principle is the part of the Ego that controls these instincts. The reality principle controls the Id and also the pleasure principle, and advises Id to wait. However, some drives are restricted. Therefore, the superego which is a part of the ego is the control mechanism of both id and ego. Ego and the superego are the conscious parts, even ego and superego know what is going on in the Id, and Id is not in the conscious part. Dangerous urges are never brought to consciousness by repression, but as these drives nevertheless need to be satisfied, there are different outcomes of these drives, which are not dangerous but satisfy the need of the id. The connection to bad faith is as follows: Id knows everything and sends it to the Ego (superego). It can be claimed that the ego is unaware of the truth as the id keeps some drives repressed. So for clarification, Ego is deceived, id is the deceiver, then the ego is separated from the truth. According to Sartre, this is not the case, and all repressions on the Id come from Ego, and Id wants no restriction. It is the ego that does this, so now we have the ego that is aware of the truth and at the same time unaware. So Freud's theory does not work.

As Sartre's work is descriptive (phenomenological), he starts to give examples. It is a descriptive approach to being (Catalano, 1980: 81). The examples of the woman and also the waiter are given to prove the patterns of bad faith. The woman who dates a man is, of course, aware of the intention of him, but she ignores his sexual aim and instead concentrates on his compliments and regards them as only compliments without any sexual purpose; otherwise, she would admit that she has also sexual desire towards him, and she would be humiliated by these primitive desires. Instead of showing her passion, she turns him into a nice man who makes compliments like a thing (Sartre, 1966: 56). She is in bad faith, and she uses several methods to stay in bad faith. She is totally aware of her date's intention, and she also has the same desire as him, as she does not want to show it, and she tries to ignore it. The desire felt by them is not things, but she convinces herself that they are things, and this is bad faith. For Bohlmann "Sartre would deem this mere bad faith, a flight from reality. 'The sincere man constitutes himself as a thing in order to escape the condition of a thing The man who confesses that he is evil has exchanged his disturbing "freedom-for-evil" for an inanimate character of evil; he is evil, he clings to himself, he is what he is' (Bohlmann, 1991: 89).

Further, the example of the waiter is also important in short. The waiter plays a role, acting in bad faith. The waiter in Sartre's Being and Nothingness is a good example to understand bad faith. The waiter plays a role which society imposes upon him. His movements are too exaggerated, and there is too much effort in the movements. He acts as if he is playing to be a waiter (Sartre, 1966: 59). Being in bad faith does not allow man to find his own identity. The waiter is not just a waiter, and he has free choice, but it is his decision to be a waiter. He wakes up, prepares himself and goes to the restaurant with his own free choice. In the restaurant, he starts to play his part; in this case, it is the waiter; in other cases, it could be another job or another role. It can be the teacher, the hairdresser or the role of a mother. These roles are not limiting our freedom as long as we don't see them as limits, but when acting in bad faith, we restrict us within the walls of these roles, and this is bad faith. There are also circumstances that enable us to keep in bad faith; here Sartre speaks about "*facticity*" and the "*transcendence*" that enable us to stay in bad faith. To clarify the meaning of "*Facticity*", facticity is how we are, our appearance, the circumstances in which we are born and our past, and it is also facticity what is happening to us at the moment, the emotions we feel etc.

Facticity also means that humans have free choice, but they have not the choice not to choose. He is thrown into the world, even if he does not make a decision or a choice: it is a selection. As we do not only exist as our facticity, namely our body, our environment and our current emotions, our consciousness does not identify itself with it, and we know that we can turn facticity to an object by overthinking them. Man can stay in bad faith because he can be in the state of facticity and transcendence. According to Sartre, we are shifting from facticity to transcendence and from transcendence back to facticity.

Bad faith seeks to affirm their identity while preserving their differences. It must affirm facticity as being transcendence and transcendence as being facticity, in such a way that at the instant when a person apprehends the one, he can find himself abruptly faced with the other (Sartre, 1966: 56).

So referring to the quotation above, the waiter is playing his role as a waiter perfectly, but there is a specific aim for doing this. He wants to stay in the safe walls of facticity, namely in the context of being a waiter. By doing this, he wants to escape from freedom as it terrifies him. He, by turning himself into a perfect waiter figure and by this into a being in itself, is in bad faith. Sartre states that consciousness arises from in itself, but

there is a need that is compelled on consciousness from outside. It is also the society that wants to see him in these limits, and he has his role as a tradesman, and he has to play this role. Going out of this role would annoy the society as they expect from him to fulfill his role. The waiter turns himself to an in-itself but different to an in-itself. He is aware that he is doing so.

According to Sartre, it is a representation, a representation for himself and for the others. Despite all the efforts to be a waiter, it is not possible to be a waiter as it is only a role play. The public expects from a waiter to be a waiter, from a taxi driver to be a taxi driver. Sartre is of the opinion that the public wants them to stay in the limitations of what he functions in this society. The person who plays this role is, of course, aware of it as he is the one who fulfills the duties to be what he is, but he is as Sartre states only a representation for himself and the public. He is not a waiter, but he acts as the waiter.

What I attempt to realize is a being-in-itself of the cafe waiter, as if it were not just in my power to confer their value and their urgency upon my duties and the rights of my position as if it were not my free choice to get up each morning at five o'clock or to remain in bed, even though it meant getting fired. As if from the very fact that I sustain this role in existence I did not transcend it on every side, as if I did not constitute myself as one beyond my condition (Sartre, 1966: 103).

Since being-in-itself is unconscious, the waiter wants to be conscious as he feels the security, and he tries to be being-in-itself namely the perfect waiter, and being-for-itself namely his person knows that being a waiter gives him security. To sum up Sartre believes that every conscious behavior of us is because of free choice. As this behavior is happening in the conscious part we are aware of it, we can't escape from it, by deceiving us, as we know it already. As already mentioned, we turn facticity into transcendence and vice versa to convince ourselves. Taking the example of the woman, she is aware that there is a sexual interest, but by turning the facticity into transcendence, she believes that they are having an intellectual talk. She is assuming that the hand in his hand is not her hand but a hand, in this case, a thing. Sartre agrees that man has to combine both facticity and transcendence, but acting in bad faith he separates them. There is shifting between the two but not a combination. She assumes that she is having this intellectual talk with him, and she disregards her body's signals for desire. Her hand rests in his hands as she knows what it means, and it gives him hope about his aim. She enjoys the moment, and although she knows that she has to

take her hand from his hands, she forgets her hand, and as if she has no power to take it from him, there is a split of *"the body from the soul"* as Sartre states (Sartre, 1966: 56). She acts in bad faith.

But then suppose he takes her hand. This act of her companion risks changing the situation by calling for an immediate decision. To leave the hand there is to consent in herself to flirt, to engage herself. To withdraw it is to break the troubled and unstable harmony which gives the hour its charm. The aim is to postpone the moment of decision as long as possible. We know what happens next; the young woman leaves her hand there, but she does not notice that she is leaving it. She does not notice because it happens by chance that she is at this moment all intellect. She draws her companion up to the, most lofty regions of sentimental speculation; she speaks of Life, of her life, she shows herself in her essential aspect-a personality, a consciousness. And during this time the divorce of the body from the soul is accomplished; the hand rests inert between the warm hands of her companion-neither consenting nor resisting-a thing (Sartre, 1966: 55-56).

The reason for the dilemma of this situation is transcendence, and humans are free while facticity says they are free, but they have to choose. Normally these two aspects can coordinate with each other, but bad faith has not the aim to coordinate them.

The basic concept which is thus engendered, utilizes the double property of the human being, who is at once a facticity and a transcendence, These two aspects of human reality are and ought to be capable of valid coordination. But bad faith does not wish either to coordinate them nor to surmount them in a synthesis. Bad faith seeks to affirm their identity while preserving their differences. It must affirm facticity as being transcendence and transcendence as being facticity, in such a way that at the instant when a person apprehends the one, he can find himself abruptly faced with the other (Sartre, 1966: 56).

Sartre claims that bad faith is possible because sincerity *"is conscious of missing its goal inevitably, due to its very nature"* (Sartre, 1966: 66). By acting in bad faith, we try to hide our real aim, our real personality. Through transcendence, it is possible for us to escape criticism from outside, and Sartre claims if we were only who we are, we could consider an allegation someone makes against us as serious and would ask ourselves for its reality and finally maybe would be forced to accept that it is real, so to avoid this reality, we escape in bad faith.

And what is the goal of bad faith? To cause me to be what I am, in the mode of "not being what one is," or not to be what I am in the mode of "being what one is." We find here the same game of mirrors. For me to have an intention of sincerity, I must at the outset simultaneously be and not be what I am (Sartre, 1966: 66).

So bad faith helps us to hide from our responsibility, but it does not show what we are in reality, so bad faith allows you to stay in the role you wish, but on the other hand, it is something that you are not, then we can say that you are and you are not at the same time.

We have to deal with human reality as a being which is what it is not and which is not what it is (Sartre, 1966: 58).

After analyzing bad faith in detail, there is also the antithesis of it. Sartre calls the antithesis sincerity, how the conditions should be to be in insincerity. First, he starts by explaining the idea of sincerity and categorizes it as a demand, not a state. Man has to be as he is, and it is at the same time the definition for in itself. So when man is what he is, there is not the possibility to be in bad faith. Sartre compares bad faith with sincerity. So being as one is, is sincerity, but as man differs from things, it is not possible to be sincere all the time. During his evaluation, he sums up that it is impossible to be sincere all the time, so the time when it is not possible to be sincere, it is possible to be in bad faith.

Thus the essential structure of sincerity does not differ from that of bad faith since the sincere man constitutes himself as what he is in order not to be it. This explains the truth recognized by all that one can fall into bad faith through being sincere (Sartre, 1966: 65).

Sartre further assumes that being in sincerity consequently is also bad faith as it would mean to be in a fixed position, so as man has to choose himself every time; then, it would mean to be in bad faith to be sincere all the time.

The basic concept which is thus engendered, utilizes the double property of the human being, who is at once a facticity and a transcendence, These two aspects of human reality are and ought to be capable of a valid coordination. But bad faith does not wish either to coordinate them nor to surmount them in a synthesis. Bad faith seeks to affirm their identity while preserving their differences. It must affirm facticity as being transcendence and transcendence as being facticity, in such a way that at the instant when a person apprehends the one, he can find himself abruptly faced with the other (Sartre, 1966: 56).

While recognizing that sincerity is impossible, man peddles in between facticity and transcendence on one side, facts on the other side wish: What is happening right now and what we would prefer to happen. Bad faith makes us believe in our lies. When someone is in bad faith and believes in his lies then, according to Sartre, this man has faith in his bad faith, which sounds paradox.

In bad faith, there is no cynical lie nor knowing preparation for deceitful concepts. But the first act of bad faith is to flee what it cannot flee, to flee what it is. The very project of flight reveals to bad faith an inner disintegration in the heart of being, and it is this disintegration which bad faith wishes to be. In truth, the two immediate attitudes which we can take in the face of our being are conditioned by the very nature of this being and its immediate relation with the in-itself (Sartre, 1966: 71).

The difference between bad faith and good faith has to be evaluated to prove this. Good faith means that we first look for proof in a situation, and according to this proof, we decide to believe. When we are in bad faith, we first believe and then do not worry much about proof. There is no clear and absolute evidence of the other's love, so love is

bad faith when we fall in love and do not look for evidence. It is good faith when we would look first at his attitude and behavior and then fall in love according to it. Bad faith is possible as there is never good faith all the time.

Good faith wishes to flee the "not-believing-what-one-believes" by finding refuge in being. Bad faith flees being by taking refuge in "not-believing-what-one-believes." It has disarmed all beliefs in advance—those which it would like to take hold of and, by the same stroke, the others, those which it wishes to flee. In willing this self-destruction of belief, from which science escapes by searching for evidence, it ruins the beliefs which are opposed to it, which reveal themselves as being only belief. Thus we can better understand the original phenomenon of bad faith (Sartre, 1966: 70).

To be in bad faith means that one should not be what one is. In this case, if we are a coward through bad faith, we hide this cowardliness. So good faith is not to be what one is not. So if I am not a coward, I have to say that I am not this coward, or otherwise if I am this coward, I have to say that I am a coward. Good faith is aware of its freedom, and man does not try to ignore this freedom. For Sartre, there is a similarity in good faith and bad faith. Good faith and bad faith can merge into others (Sartre, 1966: 70). Sartre sums up by saying that bad faith is an attitude to disregard our freedom whereas good faith is an act of facing the reality of our freedom.

There is no certainty for the existence of the other, and Sartre opens the door for the possibility of "solipsism". There is no definite proof of the existence of the other as I confirm my existence in cogito, then the existence of the other is also in cogito. Sartre remarks that there should not be the aim to prove the existence of the other as it is a being like me.

The Other does not appear to me as a being who is constituted first to encounter me later; he appears as a being who arises in an original relation of being with me and whose indubitability and factual necessity are those of my own consciousness (Sartre, 1966: 275).

Sartre divides our relation with the other in two: either we communicate with the other in good faith or in bad faith, but there are also other subcategories. Yet, the type of relationship can change anytime as our relationship with the other is based on conflict. With our freedom, the for itself goes from one side to the other. Sartre explains the reason of this conflict as the clash of freedoms for both sides. Both sides have their freedom and can decide as they wish. Therefore, conflict is the outcome of these two freedoms confronting each other. When a man is in the world besides existing in this world, he is together with the other. We are all, as Sartre's phrase, "contingent existence in the midst of the world" (Sartre, 1966:359).

I am responsible for my being-for the Other in so far as I realize him freely in authenticity or in unauthenticity. It is in complete freedom and by an original choice that, for example, I realize my being-

with in the anonymous form of "they." And if I am asked how my "being-with" can exist for-myself, I must reply that through the world I make known to myself what I am (Sartre, 1966: 246).

Our interaction with the other, or as Sartre names it, the interaction of the being-for-itself with the other is also essential and has to happen as it is necessary for the confirmation of one's existence. The other is important as we see ourselves in him, and he is also free like us. And from the other, we learn a lot about ourselves, and we reflect on ourselves in his freedom. As there are no pre-given morality, we create our own morality. The morality is like an art that we create without predetermined rules.

The "transcendence" for Sartre is very important. Of course, he does not mean the transcendence leading to God, but the transcendence to outside, to the other, the transcendence of himself. The search for an aim out of the self is the way to realize himself. Man realizes himself through this. By knowing that "existence precedes essence", man should not turn back to himself all his life. He has to go beyond himself; he has to be transcendent, transcendent to the other, and to the world, and this is very important to be a human being. Sartre does not mean egoism by creating yourself. He means that we should step out of ourselves to the world and to the other. So there is no escape from the other since we are in the world, and we are together with the others. As mentioned before the existence with the other is also the reason for the feeling of responsibility. While we decide with our free choice, we feel the responsibility for the others as we are not deciding only for us but also for the others. Yet, deciding with responsibility does not mean to become one of a whole, and each individual can be unique in his way and authentic. According to Sartre, Existentialists insist that man has to be authentic, deciding with the freedom he has and creating his unique essence. Sartre declares that individuality comes before society. Nevertheless, as there is responsibility in a man, he has to engage himself with the others, and this engagement is compulsory, and of course it slows down the process of creating the self. Sartre further announces that contact with the other requires knowledge (Sartre, 1966:429).

It appears therefore that the experience of the "We" and the "Us" although real, is not of a nature to modify the results of our prior investigations. As for the Us-object, this is directly dependent on the Third-i.e., on my being-for-others-and, it is constituted on the foundation of my being-outside-for-others. And as for the We-subject, this is a psychological experience which supposes one way or another that the Other's existence as such has been already revealed to us. It is therefore useless for human reality to seek to get out of this dilemma: one must either transcend the Other or allow oneself to be transcended by him. The essence of the relations between consciousnesses is not the *Mitsein*; it is conflict (Sartre, 1966: 429).

Sartre criticizes the belief of idealists and realists who claim that the relation with the other is an external one (Sartre, 1966: 171). If it is an external relation, the

existence of God is required for it. As we can only know the other by representation, and we can't be sure if this representation does correspond to the other. Sartre is sure that this relationship with the other is an internal one.

God is neither necessary nor sufficient as a guarantee of the Other's existence. Furthermore, God's existence as the intermediary between me and the Other already presupposes the presence of the Other to me in an internal connection; for God, being endowed with the essential qualities of a Mind, appears as the quintessence of the Other, and he must be able to maintain an internal connection with myself for a real foundation of the Other's existence to be valid for me (Sartre, 1966: 233).

There is a claim by Sartre that most of the philosophers such as Heidegger, Husserl, and Hegel say that the relation to the other is internal:

For Heidegger, to be is to be one's possibilities; that is, to make oneself be. It is then a mode of being which I make myself be. And I am indeed responsible for my being-for the Other in so far as I realize him freely in the authenticity or unauthenticity. It is incomplete freedom and by an original choice that, for example, I realize my being-with in the anonymous form of "they." And if I am asked how my "being-with" can exist for-myself, I must reply that through the world I make known to myself what I am (Sartre, 1966: 246).

After mentioning their ideas about the existence of the other, Sartre criticizes them by proving that their ideas are not possible. There is a difference in how we see a man as an object and a tree as an object (Sartre, 1966: 233). Despite seeing the other as an object, we know at the same time that this object differs from other objects such as trees, since this object is a subject for them, and furthermore even seeing him as an object for us, we are aware that we are the object for him. The awareness of being seen and also the awareness of having a body that is seen from exterior persons come when we feel that we are being watched. This is not about the eye as an organ. It is more the emotion of being seen by others and realizing that we have a body.

The Other's look hides his eyes; he seems to go in front of them. This illusion stems from the fact that eye as objects of my perception remain at a precise distance which unfolds from me to them (in a word, I am present to the eyes without distance, but they are distant from the place where I "find myself") whereas the look is upon me without distance while at the same time it holds me at a distance that is, its immediate presence to me unfolds a distance which removes me from it (Sartre, 1966: 258).

So here he explains the difference between the eyes and the look. The eyes look but do not see the person. They only see the appearance, but the look has no distance at all. Eyes see man from outside, but the look goes deep. For Gavin Rae "the look describes the process whereby consciousness is seen by the Other" (Rae, 2009: 56). Actually the person does not need the look to react. It can be footsteps or a rustling of branches, which remind us that someone is coming (Sartre, 1966: 257). Therefore, the look

reminds us of that the Other is present. So the presence of the other makes us worry as we realize that we are visible for the other and vulnerable:

What I apprehend immediately when I hear the branches crackling behind me is not that there is someone there; it is that I am vulnerable, that I have a body which can be hurt, that I occupy a place and that I cannot in any case escape from the space in which I am without defense-in short, that I am seen (Sartre, 1966: 259).

So the look cannot be possible from both sides at the same time. This means that both cannot look at each other at the same time. Either consciousness is looked at, or we are the one looking at the other, Sartre explains the way we look to the other as:

I am fixing the people whom I see into objects; I am in relation to them as the Other is in relation to me. In looking at them I measure my power. But if the Other sees them and sees me, then my look loses its power; it cannot transform those people into objects for the Other since they are already the objects of his look (Sartre, 1966: 266).

We see the other as object, and the other sees us as an object, too. Yet, both parts are aware that this object which they perceive differs from other objects such as a tree. So being seen by the other turns us to an object. Therefore, the person who is seen as an object has to prove to the other that he is more than just an object that the other sees in him. Thus, human relationships are always characterized by a struggle for self-insurance. On the other hand, man has also the opportunity to become aware of himself, his freedom and the possibilities he has.

The awareness that the other is also a free subject like us is possible due to the characteristics of how we perceive the other as an object. This enables us to acknowledge him as a subject like we are. While describing the feeling of shame, the example with the keyhole is again important in describing the effects of the look of the other on us. While looking through the keyhole totally with our freedom and facticity, the other with his look turns our freedom into shame since with his freedom that is as free as our freedom, he decides the situation, in which we are. This look that comes from the other at this moment turns us into an object. Now we feel the threat of losing our freedom because of his freedom. The freedom of the other is known by us as he can make a judgment upon us by looking at us in a specific moment, so as we are judged by his look and as we feel shame, we become aware of his freedom. If it were our freedom, we would not allow him to judge us or we would not feel shame. The look of the other is important since the look the other relates itself to our consciousness. So the effect of the look of the other on us is described by Sartre as follows:

Therefore he appears as the one who in his full freedom and in his free projection toward his possibles puts me out of play and strips me of my transcendences by refusing to "join in" (in the sense of the German *mit-machen*) (Sartre, 1966: 287).

Sartre also defines the structure between man and the others. As Sartre is a phenomenologist, he begins with the phenomenon meaning concrete human relationships. He starts with the feeling of shame:

Let us imagine that moved by jealousy, curiosity, or vice I have just glued my ear to the door and looked through a keyhole. I am alone and on the level of a non-thetic self-consciousness. This means first of all that there is no self to inhabit my consciousness, nothing, therefore, to which I can refer my acts to qualify them (Sartre, 1966: 259).

Here he describes phenomenologically the feeling of shame. At the moment when he is caught red-handed, he feels shame. It is not a problem for him beforehand, but when caught, he is ashamed of the situation in which he is. Ashamed of the image he has in the eyes of the other, this has to be taken seriously as it creates a problem for the freedom. For Sartre, the other with his freedom defines us as a pitiful person. The freedom even if it is free is forced to take this seriously, because at the moment of being caught, he feels also like a pitiful peeper. We are forced at this specific moment to recognize us in the picture that the other has designed from us:

Pure shame is not a feeling of being this or that guilty object but in general of being an object; that is, of recognizing myself in this degraded, fixed, and dependent being which I am for the Other. Shame is the feeling of an original fall, not because I may have committed this or that particular fault but simply that I have "fallen" into the world amid things and that I need the mediation of the Other to be what I am (Sartre, 1966: 288).

Shame is a feeling that needs the existence of the other. Shame is felt when a man feels shame for an act he does when he suddenly recognizes that he is watched by someone. The feeling of shame is also because he is aware of his responsibility, but he disregards it and nevertheless does something that wouldn't be approved, and when he does this, it is more secretly, but we suddenly realize that we are caught red-handed, and we feel shame. Shame reminds us of the existence of the other and also the relation with others. Sartre mentions, that shame is felt at this moment because man is aware that he is as the other has caught and observed us at this very moment. We are aware that we can't escape this look, or we can't stop him to look at us as he does it with its freedom that has nothing to do with our freedom. The idealists and realists' efforts to prove the existence of the other lead to solipsism as they only focus on the existence of the self. It is for sure that the feeling of shame is felt only with the connection of the other. The other sees me, and I see him, so there is of course the possibility to be affected by him or also affect him. We as the subject see the other as the object, but at the same time, the

other regards himself as the subject and turns us into an object. Shame is by nature recognition. I recognize that I am as the Other sees me (Sartre, 1966: 222). We depend on the others, and we feel according to how the others objectify us. We realize ourselves as the picture of how the other objectifies us. On the one side, we can get a knowledge of ourselves through the other; on the other side, only through the feedback of the other, we can know who we are, because we realize ourselves through him. By the management of our attitude towards the other, we influence him in the way we want him to see us. We are exposed to the look of the other. At the same time, we can't know if the look of the other is positive or negative.

By virtue of consciousness, the Other is for me simultaneously the one who has stolen my being from me and the one who causes "there to be" a being which is my being (Sartre, 1966: 364).

The other is the one who has stolen my being because I can't say out of my freedom, I am as this or as that. At the moment the other sees me different, he urges me to see my being also as the way he sees me. By this act, he steals my freedom of creating my own being. On the other side, I need him, because I can know who I am through their feedback.

Thus being-seen constitutes me as a defenseless being for a freedom which is not my freedom. It is, in this sense that we can consider ourselves as "slaves" in, so far as we appear to the Other (Sartre, 1966: 267).

There is always the danger that we can be negatively anticipated, as the others are also totally free like us. The ego goes a step further, and man knows that they can be judged by others. Now he tries to manipulate the other. We need others to show ourselves. This freedom of the other is the basis of our being. Yet, as I exist due to the freedom of the other, but this freedom of the other brings me in danger as it forms my being, and it steals my values or gives values. My aim to get my being back can only be realized when I possess this freedom, and when I reduce this freedom of the other as a freedom that is the only subject of my freedom. Love is an example of this attitude when someone falls in love with me. He praises me, and he supports me even when making some critics he is very sensible, we are mutually in security. As love is such a positive thing, everybody wants it.

Seduction aims at producing in the Other the consciousness of his state of nothingness as he confronts the seductive object (Sartre, 1966: 372).

We are now not in nothingness anymore as there is the other who wants me, who wants me to exist. Our being is in a different dimension now. We are desired, and this is the reason why everybody searches for love. Now the one who searches for love wants the other to fall in love with him, but how is it possible to achieve this goal? According to Catalano's interpretation of Sartre, we have to make us the precious object in the eyes of the other as it is a way to prove our existence:

The relation with the other is unavoidable, we need the other to prove our own existence, but our relationship with the other has some difficulties, when we are aware of the freedom of the other first attitude we do is to try to preserve the others freedom, this leads to objectifying the other. When we make the other an object, "we recognize in this objectified freedom of a subject (Catalano, 1980: 180).

When the other is so charmed by us, we mean the world to him. When we reach this level, it means that we have captivated the other's freedom, but at the same time we have also a freedom that accepts me with the eyes of a lover. Then there is no danger that someone would anticipate me negatively. This also applies to the other as I also show him my love and accept his freedom.

Thus the lover does not desire to possess the beloved as one possesses a thing; he demands a special type of appropriation. He wants to possess his freedom as freedom (Sartre, 1966: 367).

In the ongoing pages in Being and Nothingness, Sartre explains why this is doomed to fail. Sartre explains why it fails since we want to secure ourselves with the way of love. When we enslave the loved one to secure that he stays with me and that, he gives up his freedom for our sake to be sure that he does not have another preferred one, as he is enslaved by me. We are sure of his love, but now it is not the recognition of the other but the fear he feels towards us. The recognition does not come from the freedom of the other but the fear. Therefore, there should be no enslavement of the other. There is always the fear that the other can find another object of his desire, Sartre assumes:

...the Other's awakening is always possible; at any moment he can make me appear as an object-hence the lover's perpetual insecurity (Sartre, 1966: 377).

As the other is absolutely free, he can make himself independent any moment. Therefore love is also doomed to fail. We live in a society and not on a remote island. We can't enslave the other as we lose the recognition of the other. If we do not enslave the other, he stays free, and his love can change any moment.

To conclude, Atheist Existentialism is a great contribution to literature, and especially Sartre's approach is focused on man as an individual, not as a part of a

society, like an object. Man does not exist to serve for a specific aim as it was believed till then. He is unpredictable, which differs him from a thing. It is a revolutionary step forward regarding man versus society, and man versus individuality, man is free and totally responsible for his acts. Until then, man was not regarded as an individual, since he was only a member of the crowd. For the first time man as an individual with his own identity has stepped forward with this movement. Now man is a revolutionary individual rebelling against all institutions, aware of his freedom and individuality, mature enough to understand that he is responsible for his acts. Of course together with Existentialism, he has to face the dark sides of his character. He is alone, thrown into the world, in despair, and with an immense freedom that makes him feel anguish. With all these characteristics, the existential man will be a good example to analyse the characters in the novels Lord Jim and Under Western Eyes by Joseph Conrad within this dissertation.

SECTION TWO

EXISTENTIALISM IN JOSEPH CONRAD'S LORD JIM

This chapter is concerned with the analysis of Joseph Conrad's novel Lord Jim as an existential novel. Moreover, it evaluates to what extent the motives of philosophical existentialism such as freedom, responsibility, anguish, abandonment, and bad faith affect Lord Jim's protagonist's Jim's search for self-identity. According to Existentialism life is a task that man has to cope with. The most crucial part of man's life as a task is to achieve authenticity. This search for authenticity is seen in the novel Lord Jim by Joseph Conrad.

Conrad was the forerunner of the modernist writers as mentioned previously. The most important question that one can ask himself is the question of the self. Literature is full of protagonists who are in search for their self. Joseph Conrad's novel Lord Jim is about the quest of the protagonist Jim to achieve an authentic selfhood by cutting his bonds with the social institutions. Jim fails to establish any social relation with others. The world is absurd, and he is alone, There is an ongoing struggle for man, so man is in the world without any intention. Nevertheless, Jim tries to understand the reasons for his existence. He does not only exist, but he also has this terrifying freedom that puts all the responsibility on his shoulders. To understand this dilemma, it has to be understood that man has not preferred to be in this world. Nobody has asked him, but he exists; further, he has this freedom, and he has to decide. He is also aware that he has the responsibility for his actions, as his actions do not only affect him but all mankind. These features of the Existential man are seen in Lord Jim's protagonist Jim, who also struggles to survive within the social structures as it will be seen in the ongoing pages of this chapter.

The novel's setting is the 19th century, and the events take place in different settings around the world such as Europe and Asia. All events happen all around the world, most probably because the search for an identity is a universal human condition. Despite belonging to different cultures or religions, man's struggle is the same everywhere according to the Sartrean universal human condition. At the beginning of the novel, Conrad already gives the impression of greater events that will come. There is no chronological order, and the places change as the events change without any

specific order. Joseph Conrad's famous novel Lord Jim shows us man as tragic victim of his fate. With its complex structure and sophisticated narrative technique, the work sets the trend for the novel of the 20th century as previously mentioned. The narration of the novel is from many perspectives. Marlow is the narrator of Jim's story. "The only universe that exists is the human one- the universe of human subjectivity" (Sartre, 1947:52), and the reader listens to the story of Jim from Marlow's point of view. Jim's inner world is a mystery for the others. Conrad depicts the modern character with the struggle of his age. There is also criticism by Conrad towards society. The main focus will be on the character Jim as he is the protagonist of this novel and all events are happening around him. Conrad's novel focuses on the destroying effects of industrialism on modern man. Jim represents the man of Conrad's age, in which man lost his soul. It is a tragic existence of man in this world. Conrad shows man's sufferings in this atmosphere, with the fictional character Jim. Jim, as a resemblance of the modern man, is in a battle against social oppression. His ultimate aim is to find his essence, and Conrad blames the modern world for the downfall of Jim. Jim is alienated, isolated, and lonely without any sense of belonging. All his previous beliefs in traditions, culture, religion, and institutions, as a son of a parson, collapse. He is forced to rebuild himself as an individual. In this chapter of the dissertation, the main focus will be on the effects of existential philosophy on Jim and on his way for self identity. For Existentialists life is a task that the individual has to fulfill. Further the alienating effects of societies oppression on Jim will be discussed in detail.

Lord Jim is about a young man called Jim who is in flight from his past. Jim's struggle is the struggle of men "he was one of us" (Conrad, 2005: 40). Jim is an officer at a vessel called Patna. One night when the Patna has a leak due to a collision with an object under the water, Jim is confronted with a crucial decision. He decides to leave the vessel together with the rest of the crew. This act leads to the loss of his certification as a seaman. Moreover, it is the beginning of his alienation and isolation from the society. Jim loses his profession and his honor. Further this act of betrayal to more than 800 pilgrims, who trusted him and his crew, imposes an inevitable guilt on him. His past haunts him incessantly, never letting him rest. It thwarts all attempts of Jim to lead a happy life. At least it seems so to Jim.

The narration of Jim's story is made by Marlow. He can only tell the story he hears from Jim and from others. Further, he is free to add his emotions to Jim's story. Lastly, he can only tell what Jim reveals to him. It is a subjective narration of Jim's life, and the reader cannot hear the whole truth. The reader has to read the whole novel to understand Jim's suffering and fight for identity. Jim's consciousness is a secret, that nobody knows yet. The true story of Jim is within himself, and the others only tell what they see or what they hear. The setting of the novel are places where Conrad has been as a seaman like Jim. Similarities to Conrad's own life are seen in many occasions within the novel.

During the 1880s, Conrad made voyages to such Asian ports as Singapore, Bangkok, and Samarang (on Java). All three have their place in *Lord Jim*: Singapore as the unnamed city where the Patna inquiry is held; Bangkok as one of the ports where Jim works as a water-clerk (and gets into a fight); and Samarang as another of these ports, and the home of Marlow's friend Stein. On one of his voyages, Conrad was injured during a storm, much as Jim is in Chapter Two, and was laid up in the same Singapore hospital where Jim recuperates. After his recovery, he signed up as mate on the steamship Vidar, which traveled around the islands of the Malay Archipelago. It was in these exotic islands that Conrad found the raw material for his first two novels, *Almayer's Folly* and *An Outcast of the Islands*. He transformed one Borneo locale into the fictional Patusan, where the last half of *Lord Jim* is set (Jericho, 1985: 9).

As mentioned in this quotation, Conrad himself made voyages to the places where Jim has also gone. Even his injury is adapted to his character Jim, as Jim also suffers from an injury and has to stay at a port to recover from it. Even the last place, the island Patusan is from Conrad's own experience, as Patusan is a fictional place derived from Borneo.

In this chapter, while analyzing Jim, it will be seen how Jim turns from a coward to an Existential hero. Jim resembles James Joyce's protagonist Stephen in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Like *Lord Jim* and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, all Bildungsromans focus on the same topic. In each of them the protagonist is on a quest. The question of identity is the main theme of these novels.

The story begins with the introduction of the protagonist Jim. He has already experienced the worst tragedy in his life. Jim, as the reader gets to know him, is a water clerk serving for the captains while the ship is docked at the port. Directly at the beginning, the reader is aware of the mystery around Jim since he leaves the port as soon as he is recognized by anyone.

Nevertheless, with black ingratitude he would throw up the job suddenly and depart. To his employers the reasons he gave were obviously inadequate. They said 'Confounded fool!' as soon as his back was turned. This was their criticism on his exquisite sensibility (Conrad, 2005: 8).

Jim is running away from something, as it is seen in this quotation. This run from everyone who knows him will also be evaluated in this chapter. Jim's appearance is also significant. He is all in white:

He was spotlessly neat, appareled in immaculate white from shoes to hat, and in the various Eastern ports where he got his living as ship-chandler's water-clerk he was very popular (Conrad, 2005: 7).

Jim wears all white, and his appearance seems as if he is hiding something. His dark past is covered with his appearance all in white, but it is also a message that he has no essence. Jim does not make any attempt to define the meaning of his existence; therefore, he is all in white. It seems as if his dark side is hid behind an angelic appearance. Yet, actually Jim is like anyone else. His struggle is the struggle of man. In other words, Jim is a representation of the modern man, whose fate is the fate of all men. According to existentialists, man is thrown into the world without any idea why he exists. All men have the same destiny, as they are thrown into the world without any meaning. However, they have to live in this meaningless world. Sartre names it as the universal human condition. Jim is thrown into the world. He is also aware of the fact all men are in the same position even when they are living in totally different circumstances "The majority were men who, like himself, thrown there by some accident....." (Conrad, 2005: 15). From this quotation it can be assumed that Jim comprehends that his struggle is the struggle of all men, which is a universal human condition. Jim understands that he is not alone with his alienation in this world. He is one of many men who search for the meaning of their existence.

Jim's story is revealed to the reader chapter by chapter. The whole events around Jim can be divided into three parts: before Patna, after Patna, and in Patusan. The Patna accident is the key to the whole story of Jim, as Jim before Patna and after Patna is no longer the same person. After Patna, we see a Jim who is on the run from the inauthentic character he has created till then, and he is also on run from his past.

Only later in the book does Jim start to understand his existence and starts to act. Jim has to understand that he needs the world as proof of his existence. Without the world, he is not able to define himself. Jim feels "abandoned in the midst of

indifference” (Sartre,1966: 508). His situation is the state of abandonment. According to Sartre:

'There is no sense in life a priori ... it is yours to make sense of, and the value of it is nothing else but the sense that you choose' (Sarre, 1947:54).

The value of Jim’s life has to be defined by himself. Jim is the only person who can decide how his life will be, as it is seen in the novel. At the beginning of the novel he feels lost without meaning in his life. However, the Patna accident opens his eyes.

Due to the difficult existential position of Heideggerian being thrown into the world, Jim’s search for self-identity is one example of this complexity of man’s alienation in the world. He is thrown into the world and into a society. He has to deal with the question of identity. Connected with Existential theory, there are many parallels between Jim and existential man. They both encounter the same existential difficulties. To achieve authenticity is a sheer endless story, a lifelong struggle. Marlow’s first encounter with Jim at the court is as follows:

The occasion was obscure, insignificant--what you will: a lost youngster, one in a million--but then he was one of us; an incident as completely devoid of importance as the flooding of an ant-heap, and yet the mystery of his attitude got hold of me as though he had been an individual in the forefront of his kind as if the obscure truth involved were momentous enough to affect mankind's conception of itself. . . . (Conrad, 2005 :80).

He is an ordinary man existing in the world. Like all men, he has to endure the restrictions by the society, as all societies impose restrictions upon men. Here it does not differ where you are born. Jim also believes that everyman has somehow the same fate.

Jim’s journey starts with his decision to go to sea, but at the beginning, he is living in a dream world. He has many dreams of heroic acts. This leads to his disconnection from reality. The incidents he encounters throughout his journey are mainly because of his inexperience as an individual. Like the existential man, Jim feels as if he is “thrown there”, and he is unable to act. Jim sees that this is not only his fight, and all men have similar struggles. It is not man’s wish to be in this world. Man is in the world without any idea why he exists. Stein’s comment to Marlow clarifies the situation of Jim.

Yes! Very funny this terrible thing is. A man that is born falls into a dream like a man who falls into the sea. If he tries to climb out into the air as inexperienced people endeavour to do, he drowns--nicht wahr? .

. . . No! I tell you! The way is to the destructive element submit yourself, and with the exertions of your hands and feet in the water make the deep, deep sea keep you up (Conrad, 2005: 173).

The destructive element that Stein mentions is life itself. Jim has no idea why he is in the world. However, he has to struggle to exist in the society he is living. There is no other choice. Jim is thrown into the world, and from this moment on, he is responsible for his life. All his acts will define his essence, as existentialists believe that “existence precedes essence”.

The dream metaphor is also an important implication of Jim’s detachment from the real world. As long as he dreams he has not the intent to act, as he believes that he has already achieved his deeds. These dreams prevent Jim from acting to situations. The dream metaphor is also a good resemblance to explain that Jim’s existence in the world is not his choice, and he is confused by his existence. Moreover, it is not he, who has wished to be in this world. His existence in the world is totally by chance. Therefore, he finds comfort in his dreams. There, he can be as he dreams himself to be in reality. However, in reality he is a disappointment for himself. Why are we born? Where are we born? In which society are we born or in which historical time? It is a total coincidence. Jim, born as the son of a parson, wants to be a seaman. Yet, he is not ready to take responsibility. He feels the nothingness in him, and therefore, he can’t act. There is nothing in him that urges him to act. And as a result, he feels as if he is drowning. The “destructive element” Stein mentions is of course the world and Jim has to act to gain a foothold in this world. So without acting there is not the possibility to find authenticity. He has to leave his footprints. As his all white appearance already indicates, he is more in disguise.

Jim is in search for a meaning and for his inner-self. Yet, his existence has no meaning for him. Jim is an individual with freedom, and with his freedom, he has to find the meaning of his existence. Jim’s task is to define his essence. Finding the essence after existing in the world is also the first principle of Existentialism. Man existing in this world is responsible to define his essence. Jim is responsible for his essence.

To sum up, Jim is thrown into the world, like all the other men around him. He has to exist in it. Further, he becomes aware of his nothingness and his freedom.

Jim exists in the world. He is there but without any action. As man is defined by his actions, he has to act. He is the symbol of the modern man with his existence without any identity. Jim is the symbol of man in his age. He is alienated, isolated without any relationship to anyone, functioning within the rules of social oppression. However, Jim is a human, and humans have their own individuality and their goal is to achieve an authentic being. Sartre states:

Man is nothing other than his Project. He exists only to the extent that he realizes himself, therefore he is nothing more than the sum of his actions, nothing more than his life (Sartre, 1947: 37).

As it is understood from this quotation Jim has to act, and he has to realize himself. Jim is a dreamer who has heroic acts in his head, but as long as he does not act, he can't be seen as a hero, so his heroic deeds remain in his head. Without acting, these deeds remain only as deceptive dreams according to Sartre. Daniel R. Schwarz comments Jim's inability to act as follows:

Lost in his fantasies of heroism, Jim fails to respond to an emergency on the training ship. Because Jim has not internalized the proper responses, when he is faced with an actual chance to take part in a rescue he becomes physically and morally paralyzed: "He stood still. It seemed to him he was whirled around" (Schwarz, 2001: 81).

Jim cannot act when he is supposed to act. He does not comprehend the importance of his action. He is responsible for so many lives, but he is far away from reality. As Schwarz shows in his quotation, Jim is overwhelmed. He has the opportunity to be a hero, but his fear prevents him from acting. His dreams are only his flight from reality, and his responsibility as an existing individual in the world.

He saw himself saving people from sinking ships, cutting away masts in a hurricane, swimming through a surf with a line; or as a lonely castaway, barefooted and half-naked, walking on uncovered reefs in search of shellfish to stave off starvation. He confronted savages on tropical shores, quelled mutinies on the high seas, and in a small boat upon the ocean kept up the hearts of despairing men--always an example of devotion to duty, and as unflinching as a hero in a book (Conrad, 2005: 9-10)

Jim dreams of becoming a hero, and his dreams are full of heroic deeds. However, in reality, there is nothing, no heroism, no action.

In other words, feelings are developed through the actions we take; therefore I cannot use them as guidelines for action. This means that I shouldn't seek within myself some authentic state that will compel me to act, any more than I can expect any morality to provide the concepts that will enable me to act" (Sartre, 1947: 32).

Jim has to act, without expecting an emotion in him that urges him to act. He has no emotions. Only his action will help him to get his emotions. Jim tries to live his life as a part of a society, but Jim does not function as society expects from him. His confusion after being confronted with action is so great that he fails. This failure leads to rejection by society. Yet, actually, it is also Jim who rejects to function in this artificial world. After his exclusion from society, he loses belief in institution. Jim's jump from Patna is a symbolic act, and his jump enables him to see the real world for the first time. He wakes up from his daydreams and shows signs of existence in him. Action is important, and this jump is an action in Jim's case. It can be regarded as a failure, but it is nevertheless an action. Jim was stuck within the mechanism of the society, and suddenly, he feels alienated towards all the system that he embraced before and towards the society he lives in. However, the most important issue is that he feels alienated from himself. His departure from society has an important reason, but he is not aware of it yet. He has to distance himself from society to find himself. His quest to selfhood needs his alienation and isolation, as his journey has to be on his own.

The Patna is described as "The Patna was a local steamer as old as the hills, lean like a greyhound, and eaten up with rust worse than a condemned water-tank" (Conrad, 2005: 16). The Patna might be the symbol of the society, as it is rotten and "eaten up with rust". Conrad also utters the word condemnation, since Patna is condemned to function despite its defects in many parts. So the society has to function too. Many of the parts of society fail to exist, and society destroys Jim. Jim is not a part of the society's machinery like the parts of Patna. He has emotions, and he is an individual; therefore, he rejects this existence as a soulless creature. Jim's jump is a rejection, an outcry, a rebel. Jim is ready for his quest for selfhood. Existence in the world is an immense hurdle that he has to overcome as the Existential man.

As it is understood, Jim is like all the other men around him. He is "condemned to be free", and further, he and all the others are condemned to exist in this world. Nonetheless, now, after his jump from the Patna, Jim has the possibility to create his own future as he wants.

Jim has the possibility of showing an action at three incidents. The accident at the Merchant ship is one of them. One day during his training in the Merchant Academy, a collision happens, and the survivors are rescued by Jim's classmates.

Unfortunately, Jim is not one of the rescuers, which is very disappointing for him. The captain tries to comfort him and says that he can be quicker the next time: "Better luck next time. This will teach you to be smart" (Conrad, 2005: 11). Jim's response is:

He could detect no trace of emotion in himself, and the final effect of a staggering event was that, unnoticed and apart from the noisy crowd of boys, he exulted with fresh certitude in his avidity for adventure, and in a sense of many-sided courage (Conrad, 2005: 12).

From this description of Jim, it can be interpreted that he feels nothingness in him as he shows no emotions. Existentialists believe that man is defined with nothingness at the beginning of his existence; therefore, there are no emotions or any knowledge a priori. Jim does not comprehend the situation he is in. He is disconnected from reality. Jim shows signs of arrogance without achieving any deeds. As Daniel R. Schwarz mentions in his writing Rereading Conrad:

Conrad thus gives the nuance of narcissism to Jim's self-indulgent fantasies. Living in the world of his fictions rather than in the world of actual duties and responsibilities, Jim is a hopelessly divided self unfit for his tasks (Schwarz, 2001: 84).

Jim remains inactive, as he is not ready to fulfill the duties of his responsibility. Yet, he still believes to be a hero, as he speaks about "many-sided courage", but this courage is not visible at all. This is also the clear evidence for his arrogance as Schwarz also mentions in this quotation. All heroic deeds are only in Jim's head. Jim has to understand that all events in his life have a meaning. It is a warning, or a foreshadowing of greater events ahead. This event warns Jim to act, or as Sartre says in Existentialism is a Humanism, these events are a sign. Jim has to interpret these signs, and understand the message.

Jim runs away from society and the world, but Jim is nothing without the world. The relation between Jim and the world is interdependent. The existence of the world is important to identify man as a part of it. The existence of man is also essential as the world will not exist without man's conception of it. "Without the world, there is no selfness, no person; without selfless, without the person, there is no world" (Sartre, 1966: 104). As stated by Sartre, there is no world without Jim, and there is no Jim without the world. He can't run away. The feeling that a place would not exist without his existence comes to Jim in Patusan. It is the first place where he is accepted, and where he has achieved to find his authenticity.

This was, indeed, one of the lost, forgotten, unknown places of the earth; I had looked under its obscure surface; and I felt that when to-morrow I had left it forever, it would slip out of existence, to live only in my memory till I myself passed into oblivion (Conrad, 2005: 271).

In this quotation, Jim clearly explains that his existence is connected with the existence of Patusan. Bohlmann states that “this implies that there is no world (as humanity understands it) without man, but not of course in the sense of *esse est percipi*: the absolute existence of material objects is not dependent on the mind that perceives them, and the sheer corporeal world would continue without the presence of men” (Bohlmann, 1991: 4). Jim is again disconnected from reality. His existence has nothing to do with Patusan. Patusan will go on existing.

After Patna, Jim searches for reason to go on living, but life is an ongoing battle man has to decide to live every day again and again: “If nothing compels me to save my life, nothing prevents me from precipitating myself into the abyss” (Sartre, 1966: 37). Jim could easily commit suicide in his confusion as he is a free individual. Yet, he confronts his weakness. Further, he fears death and he wants to live. He believes that all the accidents around him happen, because they aim to kill him. When he lays disabled, after an accident he thinks:

.....that this complication of accidents or these elemental furies are coming at him with a purpose of malice, with a strength beyond control, with an unbridled indefinite, undefined, nondescript, cruelty that means to tear out of him his hope and his fear, the pain of his fatigue and his longing for rest: which means to smash, to destroy, to annihilate all he has seen, known, loved, enjoyed, or hated; all that is priceless and necessary—the sunshine, the memories, the future; which means to sweep the whole precious world utterly away from his sight by the simple and appalling act of taking his life (Conrad, 2005:13).

As stated in this quotation, Jim is not only dreaming, he sees hallucinations around him. He feels alienation, therefore he interprets everything wrong. Jim feels the whole world is against him. But on the contrary, he has to see the complications around him as a sign. In Existentialism is a Humanism, Sartre gives the example of the Jesuit, who has many dilemmas, but he does not stop fighting, and he succeeds in the end. For Jim, it can be said that he fails to interpret the signs. Jim has no morality nor any values, and he has to invent his morality.

In this sense, Jim does not do anything to interpret the signs that his environment gives him. On the contrary, he goes on lamenting himself, as he believes that the whole world is against him. The state of existential abandonment is seen in Jim’s attitude. After finishing his training, he becomes a mate on a Merchant ship, while lying disabled for days, and he is left behind trying to recover, immobilized and helpless.

Jim saw nothing but the disorder of his tossed cabin. He lay there batted down amid small devastation and felt secretly glad he had not to go on deck. But now and again an uncontrollable rush of anguish would grip him bodily, make him gasp and writhe under the blankets, and then the unintelligent brutality of an existence liable to the agony of such sensations filled him with a despairing desire to escape at any cost (Conrad,2005: 14).

As seen in this quotation, Jim has to decide between laying disabled or standing up and starting to act. His disability shows metaphorically his inaction. As mentioned in the theoretical part of this dissertation, Jim is in the state of Sartrean abandonment and on his own. He is not able to move, laying amid a “small devastation” (Conrad, 2005: 14). Jim regards his situation as hopeless, as he is not able to move. Jim is not able to move psychologically, but this time he is not able to move physically. Here it has to be reminded that Sartrean abandonment cannot be the reason for quietism. Sartre explains this abandonment by giving the example of the student, who is stuck in between two possibilities. As long as Jim does not decide, nobody can know what he will choose. It is not possible to make any predictions about Jim’s decision. Jim has to act, as his emotions will be developed by his actions. By laying disabled or by not making any attempt for action, Jim will never achieve moral values or his essence. He dreams about heroic deeds, but only his actions count. Jim is the total of his actions. Jim resembles the existential man with his confusion in the world. So, in the first encounter, Jim is not able to act. However, he will have the possibility to act in the coming parts of the novel. He will also see that there is no way out, and action is a must.

Jim’s situation is exactly as Sartre states “alone and without excuse” (Sartre,1947: 34). Jim is alone, and there is no other who is responsible for his decisions, and he is the only responsible one even though his captain at the training ship consolidates him for being late. He is the only responsible person for his failure. Man’s freedom is a condemnation. Jim is free, and he is “condemned to be free”; here it is obvious why Sartre calls it condemnation. Due to this condemnation, Jim has the responsibility for the others with his immense freedom. This freedom is nothing that is seen, and it can only be understood by taking action. Jim will comprehend his freedom after acting. Sartrean freedom is limitless as he takes God out of the concept of creation. Jim is free, but he does not understand his freedom. His freedom is only in his dreams in himself. However, it is important to comprehend this freedom and use it by action; otherwise, it is only existing but not used. He has to act to give meaning to his existence. He does not choose only for himself, as it is a choice or action for all men.

Jim is responsible for himself and for the others. On the Patna, before jumping from the board, he has to consider the defenseless people on board. They have trusted Jim and the crew, but Jim and the crew are incapable of fulfilling their duties. By denying his responsibility for himself and for the others, Jim imposes an image of a certain man to the others. This image of man is cowardliness. "I am therefore responsible for myself and everyone else, so I am fashioning a certain image of man as I choose him to be. In choosing myself, I choose man" (Sarte, 1947: 24-25). By jumping from the Patna and denying his freedom and responsibility, Jim imposes cowardice on men. It is the image of a coward. Nonetheless, he has excuses for himself. He claims that the reason for his jump is that he is shocked, and he is unable to act.

There is only chaos and tumult around him. Jim is surrounded by chaos as it is visible in this quote:

The gale had freshened since noon, stopping the traffic on the river, and now blew with the strength of a hurricane in fitful bursts that boomed like salvos of great guns firing over the ocean. The rain slanted in sheets that flicked and subsided, and between whiles Jim had threatening glimpses of the tumbling tide, the small craft jumbled and tossing along the shore, the motionless buildings in the driving mist, the broad ferryboats pitching ponderously at anchor, the vast landing-stages heaving up and down and smothered in sprays. The next gust seemed to blow all this away. The air was full of flying water. There was a fierce purpose in the gale, a furious earnestness in the screech of the wind, in the brutal tumult of earth and sky, that seemed directed at him, and made him hold his breath in awe. He stood still. It seemed to him he has whirled around (Conrad, 2005:10).

Nature is warning Jim about an upcoming event, but Jim is not able to see it. Nature shows all her power to signal Jim his existence in the world, and his freedom. However, as long as Jim does not wake up from his dream, he will not be able to realize his actions. It is Jim's consciousness that prevents him from acting. The disorder is all around Jim reminding him of the absurdity of his existence and the world. Here, there is again a resemblance of Jim to the existential man. The absurdity around him prevents Jim from acting. He stands there without any movement. Nature's mood is also a reflection of Jim's confused mind, alienation, despair, and suffering

The term anguish has been mentioned many times. Anguish is the state of emotion that man experiences when he comprehends the nothingness in himself. When man feels this anguish, he understands that he has to change his existential mode, and he has to move. As understood, anguish is the stimulating factor to urge Jim to act, and to give a meaning for his life. Without feeling this anguish, Jim won't be able to achieve authentic selfhood. Jim wants to be a hero and to fulfill this dream. He has to make

decisions for his selfhood. Meanwhile he has an inauthentic existence within the society. The first principle of existentialism is that man is the deciding factor of his existence. And anguish is the necessary emotion to make Jim act. However, it is still Jim, who has to act. Anguish provides the necessary ground. Bohlmann interprets Sartre's anguish as follows:

Sartre sees the origin of anguish in the feeling of a being which is not responsible for its origin or the origin of the world but which, because of its dreadful freedom to choose one form of action over another, is responsible for what it makes of its existence and for the structuring of what Heidegger terms its 'field of concern' (Bohlmann, 1991: 35).

For Jim it is only possible to be aware of his responsibility accompanied with anguish, after his failure at the Patna. He is reminded by Marlow about it:

There would be no regrets; but if there were, it would be altogether my own affair: on the other hand, I wished him to understand clearly that this arrangement, this-- this--experiment, was his own doing; he was responsible for it and no one else (Conrad, 2005: 191).

Jim has the responsibility according to Marlow. Yet, he fails, and he pays a high price to understand that he has the responsibility not only for himself but also for the others. He fails twice to take responsibility. The first event is a warning for him, but he can't understand it. The second event is harsh reality. Jim fails a second time and he leaves 800 pilgrims to die.

Jim comprehends that the responsibility of his actions is his own. He is responsible since he is a free individual. While opening up about the Patna incident, he insists that he has nothing to do with the others who are eager to get off the boat. He is confused. He is petrified, and he only watches everything happening around him without any action. He feels "severely left alone" (Conrad, 2005: 87). He does not act to save the others. Conrad calls his action a "passive heroism", but actually without any deed, there is no heroism at all (Conrad, 2005: 89). A man is defined by his actions, Jim fails to achieve an authentic being. He stays in inauthenticity. His leap from the Patna, is a jump toward his quest to find an identity.

As seen in Jim's reactions, he is not ready to act in the first encounter. The second and the most important action at the Patna is also disregarded by him. He feels the anguish, but at the end, he fails to act.

It is this kind of anguish that existentialists describe, and as we shall see it can be made explicit through a sense of direct responsibility toward the other men who will be affected by it. It is not a screen that separates us from the action, but a condition of the action itself (Sartre, 1966: 27).

Jim's inaction has consequences for him and for the others. Jim is responsible for the other, and when he decides not to act, the others are affected by it. Let's assume there is no one except Jim who can rescue the survivors of the collision during his training at the Merchant ship. By not acting, they would have been left to die, as it is the case in Patna. Jim does not take responsibility for others. He has denied responsibility at this time. His confession to Marlow is as follows: "I was so lost, you know. It was the sort of thing one does not expect to happen to one. It was not like a fight, for instance" (Conrad, 2005: 106). At this point Jim has to understand that it is his decision to jump from the Patna. He can't blame anyone except himself. Jim has to transit his fear to anguish "normal process in the case which I have just cited is a constant transition from one to the other" (Sartre, 1966: 30). Jim feels the fear, but it is not accompanied by anguish as one is born by the destruction of the other. At the Patna, he is again reminded about his responsibility for him and for the others. He realizes that the decision to jump off the Patna is his responsibility, and this realization leads to abandonment.

When your ship fails you, your whole world seems to fail you; the world that made you, It is as if the souls of men floating on an abyss and in touch with immensity had been set free for any excess of heroism, absurdity, or abomination (Conrad, 2006: 104).

Jim is in the mood of abandonment. The chaos that surrounds Jim after his jump, makes him feel helpless (Sadoff, 1970: 519).

Jim, as the representative of Existential man, has to face the consequences. His failure leads to alienation and isolation. Jim is condemned to exist as a solitary being without any identity, just the water clerk Jim. He has no place where he belongs, as he leaves every place after being recognized. The Patna accident is an end and a beginning at the same time.

Marlow's remark about Jim is an important clue to see the difference between Jim before the Patna accident, and Jim after the Patna accident. Jim utters this comment in Patusan:

On her remonstrating against this on the score of his fatigue, he said that something might happen for which he would never forgive himself. "I am responsible for every life in the land, he said (Conrad, 2005: 336).

This quotation is crucial to understand Jim's development. Jim tells Marlow that he feels responsible for every man at Patusan. Jim has shown no responsibility for anyone before. He is the man who has left all 800 pilgrims on the board. In Patusan, he

understands the meaning of his existence. For the first time, he takes the responsibility for the men in Patusan. The quest of Jim from Patna to Patusan is a long way to go.

As evaluated in the theoretical part of this dissertation, bad faith is the inauthentic existence of man by rejecting freedom and obeying society. For Sartre, bad faith is when the consciousness directs the negation instead of outwards toward itself. Negation or the nothingness in us creates anguish, and this anguish should make us act normally, but people in bad faith ignore their freedom. Further, they also ignore this anguish, and by doing so, they act in bad faith. We have already mentioned that “bad faith is an act, by which man lies to himself, and the reason of which is the nothingness in him, and it is an act to avoid the anguish”. Jim is in many situations in bad faith. First of all, he denies responsibility for the Patna accident. In his first accident, where he fails to help to rescue the shipwrecked, there is panic in the air, and this panic and chaos makes him inactive. Yet, in the second disaster on the Patna, there is the silence and Jim again fails to act as he feels not ready to disturb the silence. He interprets it as follows:

He was not afraid of death perhaps, but I'll tell you what, he was afraid of the emergency. His confounded imagination had evoked for him all the horrors of panic, the trampling rush, the pitiful screams, boats swamped--all the appalling incidents of a disaster at sea he had ever heard of. He might have been resigned to die but I suspect he wanted to die without added terrors, quietly, in a sort of peaceful trance. A certain readiness to perish is not so very rare, but it is seldom that you meet men whose souls, steeled in the impenetrable armour of resolution, are ready to fight a losing battle to the last; the desire of peace waxes stronger as hope declines, till at last it conquers the very desire of life (Conrad, 2005: 75).

As is obvious from this quotation, Jim is again stressed by the chaos that would happen around him. He is not ready to disturb the silence around him. This is an indication for Jim's unwillingness to act. For the sake of quietness, Jim decides to jump. Further, he believes that a peaceful death is much better for the pilgrims than the chaos created before dying. He is sure they all would die “They were dead! Nothing could save them!” (Conrad, 2005: 74). Jim fears the chaos that would occur when all the 800 pilgrims would try to rescue themselves. His jump is a jump away from the self he has created. It is a jump away from the society he is oppressed by. Moreover, it is a jump away from the freedom he has. It is also a jump away from the responsibility he has. All in all, it is an act of bad faith. Further, after his failure at the Patna, he does not stay at the same port. As soon as someone recognizes him, he runs away. He is in flight from his past and himself. He will not find peace before he cannot accept his failure and before he cannot take the responsibility for his actions. Jim is in the Sartrean sense of the

existential man, who is responsible for his actions as a free being. His detachment from society turns him into a solitary being.

Jim is on his own, lonely, solitary, and confused. Marlow defines Jim's despair as "He was severely left alone..."(Conrad,2005: 87). These words are uttered when he is on board the Patna. However, as stated, there are different ways to deny freedom. Bad faith is one of them. Jim is in a quest for his authentic selfhood just like the Existential man, and during his struggle, he shows attitudes such as bad faith.

As a son of a parson, he decides to be a seaman, only by reading some stories about the sea. The sea that Jim dreams of and the real sea are not the same. He only dreams to be a hero, but he shows no action. His awakening is after the leap from the Patna. He understands that the sea is not only about heroic deeds in his dreams. The reality is different as his leap proves. To act in bad faith requires the existence of the other: "It presupposes my existence, the existence of the Other, my existence for the Other, and the existence of the Other for me" (Sartre, 1966: 88). Jim wants to hide his failures from the others. He is aware of the others' critical attitude toward him. He is the seaman who has denied to act. This is the most disgraceful attitude he can show as a seaman.

Jim acts in bad faith as he feels not belonging to the world, and he does not want to act. His aim is to be hero. On the contrary, he is a coward, and he does not want to accept this reality. All this confusion around him turns him into a character that does not resemble his dreams. Therefore, he turns to bad faith, and it is a run from himself. Source Nobody is born a coward says Sartre, it is man himself who decides to act cowardly (Sartre, 1966: 39). Therefore Jim is not born a coward, too. He can decide that he does not want to be a coward anymore, and he can do anything to be a hero. Therefore, Jim has to choose all the time. At the Patna and at the training ship, he chooses cowardice. Nevertheless, he can change his choice and accomplish his dream. Yet, this requires Jim's action. Meanwhile, he acts as the water-clerk:

To the white men in the waterside business and to the captains of ships he was just Jim--nothing more. He had, of course, another name, but he was anxious that it should not be pronounced. His incognito, which had as many holes as a sieve, was not meant to hide a personality but a fact. When the fact broke through the incognito he would leave suddenly the seaport where he happened to be at the time and go to another--generally farther east. Amid such snares, Jim failed to sunder himself from the 'gossiping crowd' who seemed 'more unsubstantial than so many shadow (Conrad, 2005: 7).

From this quotation, it is clearly seen that Jim is far away from an authentic existence. He is a man with no identity and unable to decide. He is Jim, a man among million others with no characteristics. According to Marlow, Jim does not hide his personality. He hides a 'fact' (Conrad, 2005: 7). As soon as someone from his past recognizes him, he leaves, as he has no courage to face the reality. He runs away from himself. Jim is an in-itself as Sartre says, an object. He is only Jim, without an identity. He is a Jim among millions of Jim's, as he hides his last name: "He had, of course, another name, but he was anxious that it should not be pronounced" (Conrad, 2005: 8). Like the waiter in Sartre's example of bad faith, Jim is a perfect water clerk. He plays a perfect water clerk. Conrad's description is as follows: "Thus in the course of years he was known successively in Bombay, in Calcutta, in Rangoon, in Penang, in Batavia--and in each of these halting-places was just Jim the water-clerk" (Conrad, 2005:8). Jim is not just a water-clerk. He has an identity, he has a personality, but as he is on the run from all of it, he is just a water-clerk Jim. Like Sartre's waiter, Jim plays the role of the water-clerk:

Let us consider this waiter in the cafe. His movement is quick and forward, a little too precise, a little too rapid. He comes toward the patrons with a step a little too quick. He bends forward a little too eagerly; his voice his eyes express an interest a little too solicitous for the order of the customer. Finally there he returns, trying to imitate in his walk the inflexible stiffness of some kind of automaton while carrying his tray with the recklessness of a tight-rope-walker by putting it in a perpetually unstable, perpetually broken equilibrium which he perpetually reestablishes by a light movement of the arm and hand. All his behavior seems to us a game. He applies himself to chaining his movements as if they were mechanisms, the one regulating the other; his gestures and even his voice seem to be mechanisms; he gives himself the quickness and pitiless rapidity of things. He is playing, he is amusing himself. But what is he playing? We need not watch long before we can explain it: he is playing at being a waiter in a cafe (Sartre, 1966: 59).

From this quotation, it is obvious that Jim also plays like the waiter. Sartre says that society expects the tradesman to act within the limits of a tradesman and nothing else. So Jim acts in his limits as water-clerk. Yet, he can't stay in the modus of being in-itself as he is by no means an in-itself. He is different from a stone or a tree. Jim hides behind his being a water-clerk. The water clerk is only a "representation" for the others, and Jim acts as a water clerk, but he is not the water-clerk. He is Jim, the son of a parson and the seaman. Jim's jump from the Patna is an outcome of the truth that Jim failed to define the meaning of his existence. His jump is the outcome of his failure to define himself. Jim jumps away from the individual he has created. However, it is himself who has created this self. As man is an ongoing project, Jim will have the possibility to change himself according to his wish. "Man is nothing else but that which he makes of

himself' (Sartre, 1947, 28). His daydreams are a lie to himself, and it is also bad faith. He is dreaming, but this prevents him from acting. Sartre explains it as follows:

In bad faith there is no cynical lie nor knowing preparation for deceitful concepts. But the first act of bad faith is to flee what it cannot flee, to flee what it is. The very project of flight reveals to bad faith an inner disintegration in the heart of being, and it is this disintegration which bad faith wishes to be (Sartre, 1966: 70).

Jim imagines himself as a hero. He believes in it, and it is seen during his first incident. Despite feeling very disappointed, he goes on dreaming of being a hero in the future. In Jim's case, we can't speak about any deceitful concepts as Jim himself believes in it. According to Jim, he is a hero in his fantasy. His ideal self is accomplishing heroic deeds. Jim acts like the woman in Sartre's Being and Nothingness. The woman has an intellectual talk to the man when she is in transcendence, but in facticity, it will end in sexual intercourse. For Jim, it is the same as he is the one who jumps from the Patna. However, he is not able to comprehend that his jump is his decision. He only says that he has jumped as if it is only his body that has jumped. This jump has so many outcomes for him. It has to be in bad faith to say only "I jumped", as Jim names it. Further, he adds "I may have jumped, but I don't run away" (Conrad, 2005: 129).

She seemed higher than a wall; she loomed like a cliff over the boat . . . I wished I could die," he cried. "There was no going back. It was as if I had jumped into a well--into an everlasting deep hole (Conrad, 2005: 95).

He regrets his jump ironically after jumping. Jim does not rescue himself by his jump. He dives into a hole as he explains in this quotation. He feels that greater problems wait for him. As he describes it as "everlasting deep hole" (Conrad, 2005: 95).

Jim is confronted with his most disgraceful act by enduring the trial on his own. After the Patna jump, Jim feels the alienation in himself. He cannot identify himself with the being he has created till then. This self of Jim is so far away from his imaginary self. The trial after the Patna incident opens Jim's eyes. As he has created an individual, that is by no means near to his wishes. This disappointment makes him run away from himself, and makes him act in bad faith. Nevertheless Jim isolates himself from the society as his inauthentic existence irritates him. In Julia Watkin "the A to Z of Kierkegaard's philosophy", it is mentioned that Kierkegaard says that men who remain in the safe borders of a crowd have no difference from animals, like men who are in the safe walls

of society, they deny their freedom (Watkin, 2010: 9). Jim has broken the walls of this society and declared himself free. There is no place in the world where Jim is safe. The first place where he finds peace is Patusan. Jim is on run as Marlow says "He was running. Absolutely running, with nowhere to go to" (Conrad, 2005: 130). The journey of Jim is a long and exhausting one. The chronological order of his quest for authenticity starts with his jump from the Patna. Further, it is followed by the trial he endured. The last event is when he pours out his heart to Marlow, as he is ready to speak about all the events. It is the first time that the reader has listened to Jim's story from Jim's perspective. Jim says to Marlow: "I don't think I've spoken three words to a living soul in all that time" (Conrad, 2005: 75). He starts to speak about the incident like a sinful Christian to a priest. There are religious metaphors in Jim's actions. The jump of the Patna is a symbol of baptism or purification. Stein defines the importance of the jump as: ". . . No! I tell you! The way is to the destructive element submit yourself, and with the exertions of your hands and feet in the water make the deep, deep sea keep you up" (Conrad, 2005: 177). Stein's advice is to take the responsibility for your own life. However, when you feel drowning, the water will take you to the surface. It is again an Existential element, as the existentialist also claims that man's life is in his own hands. Jim regrets his failure, but now he has a second chance in Patusan. He has given up before as Bohlmann states:

But the existentialist demands that dreams be turned into commitments, into conscious projects that should be actively undertaken by engaging the world, not evading it (Bohlmann, 1991 :66).

Jim has to show what he expects from his life. He needs new projects and ambitions. He has to engage himself in the world. However, it is only possible in Patusan as it is the only place where he can erase his past and have a new start. Jim's soul is injured, and he is devastated. He is the only one from the whole crew who has sacrificed himself, and who has showed the courage to face all this humiliation and insult during the court trial. It is not the trial that makes Jim suffer. The disappointment he creates in himself with his own hands is much greater. Marlow states that Jim's spirit is a "wounded spirit" (Conrad: 2005:153).

The relation with the other is crucial for Jim. His relation with the other has to be handled from three perspectives. Jim's relation with the other before Patna differs

from Jim's relation with the other after Patna. And finally, Jim's relation with the other in Patusan differs from the first two. Jim is aware of the presence of the other, but he is not ready to interact with them. This presence of the other irritates him. However, there is no alternative as Jim exists in the world together with the others. Further, his existence is either inauthentic or authentic. Jim's first interaction with the other is inauthentic as he is not willing to determine his identity. Nevertheless, it has to be mentioned that Sartre states that the individuality of the person is before the society. Jim has no other choice to engage himself with the others, but he has to define himself also. Without individuality, there is no essence. Moreover, after Patna he decides to run away from the others, and also from his freedom. Yet, the collapse of his attempts at the Patna does not mean that he has to run away. Jim has to let go, and he has to stop his past to dominate his present existence. Bohlmann describes Jim's relation with the other as follows:

During the trial Jim looked on other people primarily as threats, which is Sartre's view of how we regard other contingent beings when we lack firm interpersonal bonds (Bohlmann, 1991: 165).

Jim is afraid of the others presence, as he feels that they turn him into an object. He feels the shame of his failure at Patna, and he is not ready to face it. He can't handle the judging look of the others. He runs away: "The presence of the other is obvious as we are a consciousness before the others" (Jericho, 1985:152). Jim's escape from society is the result of his shame. He feels the shame when he is stared by the other. Sartre explains it as:

Shame is by nature recognition. I recognize that I am as the Other sees me. There is however no question of a comparison between what I am for myself and what I am for the Other as if I found in myself, in the mode of being of the For-itself, an equivalent of what I am for the Other (Sartre, 1947: 222).

For himself, Jim is a hero, but for the others, he is a coward. He is ashamed because the others have seen the reality about him. And he is not able to hide the reality from the others. He understands that he can't change the situation, and he is "as the other sees" him. Jim is aware of the presence of the others, in the courtroom as seen from this quotation:

Outside the court the sun blazed within was the wind of great punkahs that made you shiver, the shame that made you burn, the attentive eyes whose glance stabbed (Conrad, 2005: 27).

He feels ashamed as the example of the keyhole by Sartre in his Being and Nothingness shows. Patna is the obstacle that “has to be handled with care” (Sartre, 1966: 259). At this moment only his action is important: Neither his failure as a seaman, nor his refusal to take the responsibility for the others. At this moment, Jim feels “..a pure mode of losing myself in the world, of causing myself to be drunk in by things as ink is by a blotter in order that an instrumental-complex oriented toward an end may be synthetically detached on the ground of the world” (Sartre, 1966: 259). He is hypnotized and only concentrated with his own act. Jim is free to jump, but he denies the responsibility for the others. For Jim it is not possible to see his guilt when he is alone. However, Jim has left all the 800 pilgrims to die. He has to understand, that he has the responsibility for them. Jim is looked at by the others, as they are a free consciousness in front of him. They all are free beings like Jim, and therefore, it is not possible to turn them into objects, as Sartre states. Jim is gazed by the look of the other at the court, and he feels the shame in his core:

He had a thin horseshoe beard, salient cheek-bones, and with both elbows on the desk clasped his rugged hands before his face, looking at Jim with thoughtful blue eyes..(Conrad, 2005: 28).

Jim’s awaking is traumatizing. The thoughtful blue eyes look at him, but it is more about the look than the eyes. We feel the presence of the other, and Jim knows that all people around him know his failure, and he can’t escape from it:“ What I apprehend immediately when I hear the branches crackling behind me is not that there is someone there; it is that I am vulnerable, that I have a body which can be hurt, that I occupy a place and that I cannot in any case escape from the space in which I am without defense-in short, that I am seen” (Sartre, 1966: 259). Jim is visible for the others with all his deficiencies. He is vulnerable, and he is visible with all his failures. Jim is the object for the others. He hears the gossiping and their looks at him and at each other. We are how the other sees us, the audience in the court does not only look at Jim with their eyes, there is a much deeper look, even the consciousness of the other is seen for us (Rae, 2009: 56). Now Jim feels the threat to lose his freedom because of the freedom of the other. The other is free, and he can make judgments about Jim. The “thoughtful blue eyes” in the court are staring at him. He is turned to an in-itself at the moment of the look. Jim has many problems in his relations with the other. First, he is rejected by society for failing to function in it. He has no one around him who can approve of his existence. Jim understands that his quest has to be in isolation, as he feels alienated and isolated in society. Jim is on run all the time as soon as someone recognizes him.”

Nevertheless, with black ingratitude he would throw up the job suddenly and depart” (Conrad. 2005:8), and he is in a flight from his past. Yet, it is a sheer impossible flight, as he has to face it, sooner or later. For Sartre, time is important, and man is free, and it is again the man who can control his past, his present, and his future as he is free. So Jim has to decide how he wants to handle his past, instead of running away. The events in our past do not change says Sartre, but we can stop its effects on our present life, and Jim could start to live with it without being on the run. Jim decides to jump, but his act lets him to despair, as he could not accept the coward image he has created for himself. There are no pre-defined values or morality, and man is not able to know the outcomes of his action. Jim can only know the outcomes of his actions after acting. Therefore, Jim shows a pessimistic attitude after all the events. Jim has not felt the lack of something, as Sartre states that man has to feel the lack of something as a trigger to act. Jim is a dreamer who thinks that he is a hero, Therefore, he does not feel the need to act. Why should he act? He is already a hero in his dreams. However, he wakes up from his dream and sees the catastrophe he has created with his own hands. Jim cannot find peace in his world.

His spirit is wounded, and his new destination with his “wounded spirit” is Patusan. Stein appoints Jim as a manager for his company in Patusan, a “remote district of a native- ruled state” (Conrad, 2005: 83). Nobody in Patusan has heard of the "Patna", and Jim can go into hiding in Patusan for the rest of his life. He recognizes his chance, gratefully accepts the offer and immediately travels to Patusan. First, the natives are suspicious. Also the criminal Cornelius, his predecessor is hostile to him. However, he finds an ally in Cornelius' stepdaughter, whom he calls Jewel. He meets the influential old Doramin, an acquaintance of Stein. He is welcomed by his family and becomes friends with Dain Waris, Doramin's only son. At Patusan, Jim cannot avoid the relation with the other. He has found a friend in Dain Waris and a love in Jewel.

The meaning of Patusan indicates the importance of this place in the existential sense. According to Kramesberger “the word Patusan originates from the Malay word 'put up', which means 'disconnected' or 'cut off'. Nevertheless, in the Javanese language 'Patusan' means also 'drainage' (Kramesberger, 2017: 1). Jim is of course disconnected from his original society, and this disconnection enables him to start his existence from the beginning. Sartre comments it as:

Rather it appears that the world has a kind of drain hole in the middle of its being and that it is perpetually flowing off through this hole. The universe, the flow, and the drain hole are all once again recovered, apprehended, and fixed as an object (Sartre, 1966: 256).

Jim is in Patusan (Drainage), and this is an indication that Jim's last chance is Patusan. He is near the drain hole. He can anytime flow of, and it is also Jim's last chance in the world. In the eyes of society, he fails as a seaman. For the first time, Jim understands that there is nothing that can limit his freedom. Further, he can change his mode and he can redefine himself with his absolute freedom. With this absolute freedom, Jim can create his essence according to his visions. In Patusan, he will have to possibility to accomplish his aim. Yet, at the beginning, he decides to go to Patusan to hide himself. Now at Patusan he has no other choice than having a relation with the other. Patusan is so far away from the society he knows. Here he has the opportunity to create himself.

Another form of the interaction with the others is love. Jim proves his existence by his relationship with Jewel. Here the features of the theory of love stated by Sartre, can be seen in both Jim and Jewel. First Sartre comments it as:

It is in this sense that love is a conflict. We have observed that the Other's freedom is the foundation of my being. But precisely because I exist by means of the Other's freedom, I have no security; I am in danger in this freedom. It moulds my being and makes me be, it confers values upon me and removes them from me; and my being receives from it a perpetual passive escape from self. Irresponsible and beyond reach, this protean freedom in which I have engaged myself can in tum engage me in a thousand different ways of being. My project of recovering my being can be realized only if I get hold of this freedom and reduce it to being a freedom subject to my freedom (Sartre,1966: 366).

Jim needs the existence of the other to get out of the state of nothingness. Catalano comments the relation with the other as crucial, because the other is necessary to prove one's existence (Catalano, 1980: 180). It is possible through the feeling of love. According to Sartre, it is important to become the precious object in the eyes of the other, or in this case from the beloved. Jim's relationship with Jewel is dominated by conflict. Jim is the precious object for Jewel. Moreover, Jim names her Jewel. Jewel is a name given to valuable gems. Therefore, Jewel is also the precious object for Jim. However, Jim does not try to capture Jewel's freedom, as she does. The difficulty of the relation to the other is for Catalano the selfish attitude of the lover to disregard the freedom of the other by objectifying him. After turning him into an object "we recognize in this objectified freedom of a subject" (Catalano, 1980: 180). So Jewel

loves Jim, but she does not trust him, and she tries to seduce him, as she wants to have him for her own.

Her vigilant affection had an intensity that made it almost perceptible to the senses; it seemed actually to exist in the ambient matter of space, to envelop him like a peculiar fragrance, to dwell in the sunshine like a tremulous, subdued, and impassioned note other as a bodily presence that is not just an external object (Conrad, 2005: 236).

Jewel has no trust in men because of her mother. She is left by a man, and she teaches her never to trust a white man. Marlow narrates it as follows:

What notions she may have formed of the outside world is to me inconceivable: all that she knew of its inhabitants were a betrayed woman and a sinister pantaloon. Her lover also came to her from there, gifted with irresistible seductions; but what would become of her if he should return to these inconceivable regions that seemed always to claim back their own? Her mother had warned her of this with tears, before she died . . . (Conrad, 2005: 259).

Jewel loves Jim. She wants to hinder him to leave her, therefore she “envelopes” him. Sartre explains it as “if the Other tries to seduce me by means of his object state, then seduction can bestow upon the Other only the character of a precious object to be possessed” (Sartre, 1966: 431). So in this term, the precious object for Jewel is Jim. Jim loves Jewel as he tells Marlow “I--I love her dearly. More than I can tell” (Conrad, 2005: 256). He does not understand her fears, but Jim has once denied his freedom during the Patna accident, but this time, even for love, he will by no means deny his freedom. He will take the responsibility for himself and for the others. As it has been already mentioned in the theoretical part, man is aware that he can be judged by others as they are free beings like us. For Jim, it is a long way and a problematic relation with the other. It is based on hate and shame due to the Patna accident; therefore, he is cautious. He loves Jewel. Nevertheless, he is afraid of being judged.

He was jealously loved, but why she should be jealous, and of what, I could not tell. The land, the people, the forests were her accomplices, guarding him with vigilant accord, with an air of seclusion, of mystery, of invincible possession. There was no appeal, as it were; he was imprisoned within the very freedom of his power, and she, though ready to make a footstool of her head for his feet, guarded her conquest inflexibly—as though he were hard to keep (Conrad, 2005: 236).

Jim knows that he is guarded by Jewel as she is his accomplice. Yet, he is also treated by her like an “ invincible possession”. Jim can see the danger of being objectified by Jewel. However, by trying to objectify Jim, Jewel turns herself into an object. She has so many self-doubts. She can't understand why Jim is in Patusan, and it is a mystery. She believes that he will go away one day, go back as everybody goes back. She does not know the reason why Jim is in this island, far away from his civilization. Thus, it is not possible for her to trust Jim. Yet, she is so in love with Jim that he means the world

to her, and this level of love for Sartre is the level where the other, in this case, it is Jim, controls the freedom of the beloved one (Jewel). Nevertheless, on the other hand, Jewel aims to control Jim's freedom by trying to seduce him. It is not possible to see the future of this love yet, but Jim has already given up his responsibility and freedom twice. Further, he knows that Patusan is his last chance to achieve authentic selfhood.

Jim did not tell Jewel his past, but Jewel feels the mystery around Jim. Marlow, as the confidant of Jim, tries to convince her that he will never leave her, but Jewel asks:

Why?" she murmured. I felt that sort of rage one feels during a hard tussle. The spectre was trying to slip out of my grasp. "Why?" she repeated louder; "tell me!" And as I remained confounded, she stamped with her foot like a spoilt child. "Why? Speak." "You want to know?" I asked in a fury. "Yes!" she cried. "Because he is not good enough," I said brutally (Conrad, 2005: 268).

The despair of Jewel is seen in this quotation, and she fears to lose Jim. He is a free individual, and she can't control him. Marlow's remark about Jim is also an indication that it is not possible to control the freedom of the other. He tells Jewel that Jim is not good enough for the world outside Patusan. Jim is again exposed to the subjective view of Marlow. Jewel is free to distrust Jim.

Jewel is in anguish, and she is aware of the freedom of Jim. He can decide to go, and nobody could be able to stop him as he has his free choice, Catalano interprets Sartre's theory of love as "the ideal love carries within it the seeds of failure of its own failure", as both have the intention to capture the freedom of the other, and this is only possible as the other does not know that the lover has the same plans, therefore it is doomed to fail, as soon as one of them decides to go (Catalano, 1980: 182).

"I--I love her dearly. More than I can tell. Of course one cannot tell. You take a different view of your actions when you come to understand, when you are *_made_* to understand every day that your existence is necessary--you see, absolutely necessary--to another person. I am made to feel that. Wonderful! But only try to think what her life has been. It is too extravagantly awful! Isn't it? And me finding her here like this--as you may go out for a stroll and come suddenly upon somebody drowning in a lonely dark place. Jove! No time to lose. Well, it is a trust too . . . I believe I am equal to it . . ." (Conrad, 2005 :256).

Jim understands that his existence is approved by the love of Jewel for him. He also loves her dearly. Jewel goes through similar existential struggles like Jim. Her existence is also approved for the first time, with the love of Jim. Like Jim, Jewel is also in the state of nothingness, and by falling in love with each other, for both of them, there is another person who wants the existence of the other. Jim believes that he has somehow rescued Jewel as he states "as you may go out for a stroll and come suddenly upon somebody drowning in a lonely dark place" (Conrad,2005: 256). Bohlmann explains it:

“Yet again Conrad shows love giving a Sartrean sense of justification to a formerly pointless existence” (Bohlmann, 1991: 162). Jim believes that he has given a meaning to Jewel’s existence. However, Jim’s existence without any meaning also finds justification by the love of Jewel in Patusan. Jim turns into an authentic being, and it is not possible for anyone to turn him into an object or take his freedom anymore. Jewel’s last scene with Jim is:

Suddenly Tamb' Itam saw Jim catch her arms, trying to unclasp her hands. She hung on them with her head fallen back; her hair touched the ground. "Come here!" his master called, and Tamb' Itam helped to ease her down. It was difficult to separate her fingers. Jim, bending over her, looked earnestly upon her face, and all at once ran to the landing-stage. Tamb' Itam followed him, but turning his head, he saw that she had struggled up to her feet. She ran after them a few steps, then fell down heavily on her knees. "Tuan! Tuan!" called Tamb' Itam, "look back;" but Jim was already in a canoe, standing up paddle in hand. He did not look back. Tamb' Itam had just time to scramble in after him when the canoe floated clear. The girl was then on her knees, with clasped hands, at the watergate. She remained thus for a time in a supplicating attitude before she sprang up. "You are false!" she screamed out after Jim. "Forgive me," he cried. "Never! Never!" she called back (Conrad, 2005: 352).

Jewel has failed to keep Jim by her side. This last scene also shows Jim’s sacrifice. He loves Jewel, as he has told Marlow many times, but he has decided to realize his dream to be a hero, Jewel is precious to him, but Jim has the responsibility for the people in Patusan. The attempt to try to turn the other into an object, in order to capture his freedom, is “doomed to failure” (Sartre, 1966: 380), as it is seen in this quotation. Earlier at the Patna, Jim denies his responsibility and acts in bad faith. Yet, now he has achieved his authentic existence, and he has found his essence. Jim is aware of his responsibility for the people in Patusan, and he is ready to do everything to protect them. He has achieved his dream to be a hero. However, it is not only an adventure to be a hero and a leader of a place. It brings along responsibilities and sacrifices. Jim is aware of it as he tells Marlow about “an awful responsibility”. This responsibility is his success. He is the hero and protector of the Patusan people, and he has the power. Jim is again carrying a much heavier burden than ever before. Marlow comments it as:

Immense! No doubt it was immense; the seal of success upon his words, the conquered ground for the soles of his feet, the blind trust of men, the belief in himself snatched from the fire, the solitude of his achievement (Conrad, 2005: 225).

This feeling of “immense” responsibility is of course an outcome of his failure at Patna. Sartre states that man has “...always the possibility that one day the coward may no longer be cowardly and the hero may cease to be a hero (Sartre, 1947: 39). Jim believes

that he will have the chance to make up for a wrong. Finally at Patusan the time for redemption has arrived for Jim. He tells Marlow:

Some day one's bound to come upon some sort of chance to get it all back again. Must!" he whispered distinctly, glaring at my boots (Conrad, 2005: 148).

Jim hopes for a new chance, he longs for it. As he has missed his chance twice, he hopes for the opportunity to make amends. The first incident at the training ship is a foreshadowing for greater events. Then afterwards, the Patna accident happens.

He endures the trial and all the humiliation, even he knows that he can run away. He does not want to run away this time since he believes that he has to "...face it out--alone for myself--wait for another chance--find out . . ." (Conrad, 2005: 112). His suffering has an aim, to get a third chance. His last chance is Patusan.

Jim goes to Patusan as a brute existence with no essence at all, and he feels thankful to Marlow who, together with Stein, gives him this opportunity. Jim says to Marlow: "You have given me a clean slate" (Conrad, 2005: 153). It is the first time that Jim is no longer affected by his past. As Sartre says "I preserve the past with me, and by action, I decide its meaning" (Sartre, 1966: 498). He keeps the past in himself, but he does not allow his past to lead him to pessimism.

Oh yes, I know very well--I jumped. Certainly. I jumped! I told you I jumped; but I tell you they were too much for any man. It was their doing as plainly as if they had reached up with a boat-hook and pulled me over. Can't you see it? You must see it. Come. Speak--straight out.the thickness of a sheet of paper between the right and wrong of this affair (Conrad,2005: 105-106).

Jim wakes up from his dream, and after his awakening, he has accomplished his dream to be a hero in Patusan. Jim follows his dream. His fight for his aims starts after the Patna incident. He endures all struggles, his "destructive element" in which he is "immersed" is his self. He dives into himself. This jump is a symbol of courage as he jumps into an unknown future. However, after the jump, Jim starts to define himself, but first, he has to confront himself. Jim is aware that Patusan is his last chance to realize his dream. He does not miss it, and he can dive into the sea, but he can come again to the surface, as Stein has remarked; therefore, he takes all the responsibility in Patusan, till the end.

The death of Doramin's son Dain Waris is again an end to Jim's success and achievements. His Patusan project fails. Now Jim is again confronted with inauthenticity. Jim's situation is according to Bohlmann's interpretation of Sartre:

We recall Sartre insisting that an individual constantly needs to formulate a fresh project for attaining a fuller sense of self as soon as each current project stops imparting authenticity; the 'new project' then 'rises' on the 'ruins' of the 'prior project' that has decayed into inauthenticity (Bohlmann, 1991: 193).

Jim has understood that there is not the possibility of being authentic with the others, but we need the others as we 'feel our existence is justified' (Sartre: 1966: 371). Jim is ready to take full responsibility for the death of Doramin's son. Jewel is not ready to let him go. She wants him to defend himself. The world is absurd, and it is without any meaning. Sartre says that our birth is absurd, and our death is also absurd (Sartre, 1966: 547). Jim is ready to face the consequences for the death of Doramin's son, as he has explained that he has the responsibility for the people in Patusan. Jim does not defend himself, and he even ignores Jewel's plea to fight "Will you fight?" (Conrad, 2005: 351). Their dialog is as follows:

There is nothing to fight for," he said; "nothing is lost." Saying this he made a step towards her. "Will you fly?" she cried again. "There is no escape," he said, stopping short, and she stood still also, silent, devouring him with her eyes. "And you shall go?" she said slowly. He bent his head. "Ah!" she exclaimed, peering at him as it were, "you are mad or false. Do you remember the night I prayed you to leave me, and you said that you could not? That it was impossible! Impossible! Do you remember you said you would never leave me? Why? I asked you for no promise. You promised unasked--remember." "Enough, poor girl," he said. "I should not be worth having (Conrad, 2005: 351).

Jim is a being with his freedom, and it is not possible for Jewel to convince him. She is not able to seduce him. All actions to convince him are doomed to fail as "the essence of the relations between consciousnesses is not the Mitsein; it is conflict" (Sartre, 1966, 429). All of Jewel's efforts fail, and her relation ends with a "conflict" as Sartre stated:

Thus the lover does not desire to possess the beloved as one possesses a thing; he demands a special type of appropriation. He wants to possess his freedom as freedom (Sartre, 1966: 367).

As it is stated in this quotation, Jewel wants to possess the freedom of Jim. However, Jim does not allow it. even He loves Jewel. He has achieved his authentic self, and he is aware of his freedom and responsibility. Jim also stresses the absurdity of his existence.

He mentions that there is no escape. Before his past haunts him, and he is sure that there is also no escape from this event. It will follow him. The scene when he goes to Doramin is the same scene when he is in the court. Now his punishment is his death before it is his isolation alienation. Catalano's explanation of Sartre's view of death is:

While we are alive, we are masters of our intentions; we can even appropriate the subjectivity of the other. But when we have died, we are perfectly exteriorized and in the hands of the other. Conversely, the other as alive is characterized by its attitude toward the death. Finally death, is the end of our possibilities, and as such, it cannot be truly conceived. For whatever attitude is toward death, the fact remains, that it puts an end to our attitudes (Catalano, 1991: 211).

In this commentary of Sartre by Catalano, it is obvious that death is "an end to our attitudes". Jim decides to confront Doramin since he knows that he has to face the consequences of his actions, as man is responsible for his actions, Sartre states that the actions of a man are his own choices, and therefore, he has full responsibility for them. So the death of Doramin's son can be regarded as the result of Jim's action. Jewel wants Jim to fight, but Jim decides to be passive and leaves his destiny in Doramin's hands.

Jewel is desperate:

She cried "Fight!" into his ear. She could not understand. There was nothing to fight for. He was going to prove his power in another way and conquer the fatal destiny itself. He came out into the courtyard, and behind him, with streaming hair, wild of face, breathless, she staggered out and leaned on the side of the doorway "Open the gates," he ordered. Afterwards, turning to those of his men who were inside, he gave them leave to depart to their homes. "For how long, Tuan?" asked one of them timidly. "For all life," he said, in a sombre tone (Conrad, 2005: 335).

Jim orders to leave the gate open forever, and men should freely decide to leave or to enter. Jim has to consider all men while deciding for action as Sartrean responsibility expects it (Sartre, 1966: 79). Jim cannot only think about Jewel, but he also has to consider all mankind, and he has to choose the best for all. And Jewel cannot control Jim as his freedom is under his control and cannot be controlled by anyone else. All acts to get the freedom of the other ends in frustration. She uses everything. She even cries, but all plans are "doomed to fail". After Jim's death, she tells Stein and Marlow about the last minutes of Jim:

She went on whispering to herself: "And yet he was looking at me! He could see my face, hear my voice, hear my grief! When I used to sit at his feet, with my cheek against his knee and his hand on my head, the curse of cruelty and madness was already within him, waiting for the day. The day came! . . . and before the sun had set he could not see me any more--he was made blind and deaf and without pity, as you all are. He shall have no tears from me. Never, never. Not one tear. I will not! He went away from me as if I had been worse than death. He fled as if driven by some accursed thing he had heard or seen in his sleep (Conrad, 2005: 284)

As is seen in this quotation, Jewel knows that Jim is a free being, and she feels already that one day he will leave her, as she mentions “the day came”, she is desperate. Jim plays a passive role at the end of his existence in this world, Jim stays inactive, but even not acting is an action. Sartre states:

And when we say that man is responsible for himself, we do not mean that he is responsible only for his own individuality, but that he is responsible for all men (Sartre, 1947: 23).

Jim takes actions by considering all the people in Patusan, and he never fears death as he says to Marlow:

Do you think I was afraid of death?" he asked in a voice very fierce and low. He brought down his open hand with a bang that made the coffee-cups dance. "I am ready to swear. I was not-was not. . . . By God—no (Conrad, 2005: 76)!

Jim is not afraid of death as his life after Patna is a deathlike life, without any identity. He is isolated and alienated. And he is turned into an in itself, always on the run from his past. Bohlman explains it as:

So, although Jim (for example) is in the end destroyed as a result of his own actions, Conrad does not denigrate his accomplishments. Indeed, he has Marlow extol Jim's 'extraordinary success' and emphasize his 'proud and unflinching' moment of death (45:313). The novel does not controvert Marlow's assertion that in Patusan Jim, 'in complete accord with his surroundings' (16:135), approaches 'greatness as genuine as any man ever achieved' (24:186) by having 'regulated so many things ... that would have appeared as much beyond his control as the motions of the moon and stars (Bohlmann, 1991: 194).

Jim dies in the hands of Doramin, but he achieves his dreams as Conrad says “greatness as genuine as any man ever achieved' (Conrad, 2005: 203). There is a great difference between the Jim who jumped from the Patna and the Jim who died as a hero and brave man in Patusan. Jim runs to his death as if he wants to find his eternal peace. He achieved so many things, but he is not able to get rid of the feeling of guilt for Patna. And the people of Patusan also believe that he has failed to protect them. Jim passes away leaving everything behind as brave as possible. Jim is one of us like all men. “It is absurd that we are born; it is absurd that we die” (Sartre, 1966: 547).

And that's the end. He passes away under a cloud, inscrutable at heart, forgotten, unforgiven, and excessively romantic. Not in the wildest days of his boyish visions could he have seen the alluring shape of such an extraordinary success! For it may very well be that in the short moment of his last proud and unflinching glance, he had beheld the face of that opportunity which, like an Eastern bride, had come veiled to his side. 'But we can see him, an obscure conqueror of fame, tearing himself out of the arms of a jealous love at the sign, at the call of his exalted egoism. He goes away from a living woman to celebrate his pitiless wedding with a shadowy ideal of conduct. Is he satisfied-- quite, now, I wonder? We ought to know. He is one of us (Conrad, 2005: 354).

To sum up, Conrad embodies many existential features in his fictional character Jim, and the suffering of Modern man is depicted perfectly. Modernism begins with the promise to bring development, but man loses his identity and finds

himself in mere chaos. Man has many existential features embodied in his character. The development has come with technology, but it has turned man of the 20th century away from society, and he feels alienated. The system has failed to integrate man in it. Man has lost his belief in social values and traditions. The protagonist Jim in Joseph Conrad's Lord Jim is a perfect example of the struggles of Existential man. Jim lives in a chaotic world without any meaning of his existence. While trying to exist, he fails to define his authenticity. His bad faith leads him to total alienation and isolation from society. After many struggles, he starts to understand the meaning of his existence. However, in the end, despite finding his authentic selfhood, he has to take responsibility for his actions. Jim is condemned to be free like all men. In the end, his death is his absolute freedom as he is rescued from the burden of defining his essence and having the whole responsibility for mankind.

SECTION THREE

EXISTENTIALISM IN JOSEPH CONRAD'S UNDER WESTERN EYES

This chapter focuses on the analysis of Joseph Conrad's literary-historical novel Under Western Eyes as an Existential novel. It aims to prove the existence of Existential motives such as freedom, responsibility, anguish, bad faith, and relations with the other in the fictional characters of Under Western Eyes.

Conrad depicts modern man's alienation and struggles for identity in a chaotic world. Conrad's inspiration to write this novel was Crime and Punishment of Fyodor Dostoevsky, but he again refers to his own life as a source of his inspiration as his father was a revolutionary, and was even arrested:

In the Preface to *A Personal Record*, Conrad proudly defends his father against the charge of being a mere revolutionary and says he was a better thing, a patriot (Goonetilleke, 1990: 157).

The novel's time is the 19th century, and the setting of the novel is Tsarist Russia, then the events shift to Switzerland. The depiction of these two places is also crucial as one represents the repressive regime and the other the modern western society. The struggles of the character in the novel are due to the lack of meaning in life. Conrad questions the irrationality of life by depicting the alienated man, who is left alone in a chaotic world. Under Western Eyes shows the sufferings of modern man by the protagonist Razumov, stuck between institutions and human emotions, on his way to identity. Razumov's complex character is also reflecting the complexity of the age he lived in, and it is not possible for a man to preserve one's own identity, by obeying the institutional mechanisms. Man is doomed to fail, as it is seen in the protagonist Razumov.

Razumov represents the Russian middle class in the struggle for success which is aggravated, in his case, by a personal problem of being born a bastard. He tries to draw an identity from Russia herself, but it is vague and unsatisfying. He is a nobody who wants to be somebody (Goonetilleke, 1990: 161).

As pointed out in this quotation, Razumov has neither a social identity nor an individual identity. As a bastard of an Aristocrat, he is in search for social acceptance. Rachel Hollander describes Razumov as follows:

Before Haldin appears in his room, Razumov lacks a clear sense of identity or direction. The circumstance that ostensibly accounts for this open and ill-defined character is his orphanhood:

“Officially and in fact without a family [. . .] no home influences had shaped his opinions or his feelings. He was as lonely in the world as a man swimming in the deep sea (Hollander, 2015: 6).

He is an orphan, further he has no family bounds. However, this cannot be a reason to stay inactive or act in bad faith. In Existentialism is a Humanism Sartre states:

“Historical situations vary: a man may be born a slave in a pagan society or a feudal lord or a member of the proletariat. What never varies is the necessity for him to be in the world, to work in it, to live out his life in it along others, and, eventually, to die in it. These limitations are neither subjective nor objective... (Sartre, 1947:42).

He is torn in between institutions and his identity as his name also indicates he stands for reason. After betraying Haldin, he struggles to accept to be only an institutional identity. The reader hears the story of a man’s quest on his way to authenticity after many downfalls. From the outside, the reader sees a deceptive Razumov, but in his consciousness, he is in a battle for his authentic identity.

Obsessed first with personal success and later with self-preservation, Razumov is without fundamental moral identity. Simultaneously Everyman (chameleonicly taking on every role required of him) and No Man (lacking an authentic self), he is Conrad's vision of moral damnation (Schwarz, 1976:102).

As Schwarz states in this quotation, Razumov lacks an identity. He is only concerned with his ambitions and his success as a student. Before his downfall, Razumov is a man of reason, who is only focused on academic success. He regards this success as the only possibility for social acceptance. It cannot be claimed that Razumov has the feeling of belonging to anywhere. He only exists. He is a representative of the modern man as he goes through the same feelings of isolation, alienation, and loneliness leading to despair, like the modern man in Modernist times.

The novel starts with the assassination of an important political figure in Tsarist Russia. The most important incident of the novel occurs right at the beginning of the novel, all events revolve around this assassination. Razumov, who is a university student, finds his fellow student Haldin in his room. Haldin confesses that he is the accomplice of the assassination, of Mr. de P——. Haldin states that he has chosen Razumov to help him as he is aware of the fact that Razumov has “no ties, no one to suffer for it if this came out” and as he feels “confidence” in him. Razumov is flattered by the compliments, but he fears for his existence. Razumov is a lonely man with no family and no social value. He is sponsored by Prince K. Further, he is an ambitious

student, whose only aim is to be a professor and a member of society as this is his only possibility to win recognition in the eyes of society. All his life is turned upside down after Haldin seeks shelter in his home. Haldin wants his support, but Razumov aims to get rid of him; therefore, he agrees to help. However, unfortunately, the only accomplice of Haldin, the sled driver Ziemianitch, who has agreed to get Haldin out of Russia, is drunken. Razumov is not able to wake him up, so he beats him in his despair as he is the only person who could take Haldin out of his life.

Razumov goes to the authorities and turns Haldin in. Haldin is sent to his death by Razumov, not knowing that he is betrayed by him. Haldin dies, and Razumov is used as a spy by the Russian government. The novel depicts the psychological sufferings of Razumov after he has betrayed Haldin. Razumov's experience is told by the Professor of languages from the diary of Razumov. As the diary is in Russian, it is translated by the Professor of languages. The title already suggests, and as the Professor of Languages is an Englishman, the story of Razumov is told by a Westerner. It is the story of a Russian from the subjective eyes of an Englishman. Although he can speak Russian, he can't say of himself that he can understand the emotions of a Russian man born and grown in the Russian culture.

"The westerner in me was discomposed. There was something shocking in the expression of that face"
(Conrad, 2010: 279)

As seen in the quotation, the Professor of languages adds his critical European opinion to his narrative. At the beginning of the novel, the Professor of languages explains to the reader that his narrative bases on the personal diary of Razumov. By saying that he has only added his "knowledge of the Russian language, which is sufficient for what is attempted here" (Conrad, 2010: 49). He goes on explaining that words are "the great foes of reality" (Conrad, 2010:49), so this means that words can change the reality of Razumov as it is also the case in Lord Jim. The reader again hears the story of Razumov from the subjective narration of the Professor of languages. And again it is not possible for a man to avoid "human subjectivity" as Sartre states "the only universe that exists is the human one - the universe of human subjectivity" (Sartre, 1947:52).

Razumov cannot defend himself and cannot speak for himself, and a diary is by no means an objective source. The Professor of languages can only tell the story with the help of the translated diary and by also adding his Western mind: “Vague they were to my Western mind and to my Western sentiment, but I could not forget that, standing by Miss Haldin’s side, I was like a traveller in a strange country” (Conrad, 2010:171). To understand a language is not enough to give the emotions as it is meant to be, and there are moral codes and cultural codes that have to be known to understand Razumov’s mind; otherwise, it is only the story of Razumov from the perspective of the narrator. Without understanding the cultural background and the circumstances, it is not possible to give an objective narrative of Razumov as a Westener. The Professor of languages goes on explaining the reader: “Yet I confess that I have no comprehension of the Russian character” (Conrad, 2010: 24).

Razumov is a solitary man only existing to fulfill his duty to be a part of society, only functioning as apart of a mechanism. He feels alienated and isolated from the world he is a part of. Even the place he has lived is strange for him. His alienation goes on also in Geneva, as the reason for his alienation is the whole world, not peculiar places: “In his incertitude of the ground on which he stood Razumov felt perturbed” (Conrad, 2010: 240). He is on his own, a “young man of no parentage” (Conrad, 2010: 55). Even his name is an indication of his loneliness: “the word Razumov was the mere label of a solitary individuality” (Conrad, 2010: 55). Before meeting Haldin, he has had an inauthentic existence as a student only aiming to win a silver medal in an essay competition.

Razumov was one of those men who, living in a period of mental and political unrest, keep an instinctive hold on normal, practical, everyday life. He was aware of the emotional tension of his time; he even responded to it in an indefinite way. But his main concern was with his work, his studies, and with his own future (Conrad, 2010: 54).

Razumov shows attitudes of Sartrean bad faith as it is stated here. Razumov does not act as it is expected from man existing in this world since action defines his essence. He is only stuck to his daily routines despite being aware of the tumult around him. He chooses an inauthentic existence; he is responsible for his identity, and he has to realize himself. Sartre says “I must reply that through the world I make known to myself what I am” (Sartre, 1966: 246), but he decides to act in bad faith as he cannot handle the anguish because of the immense freedom and responsibility for himself and the others.

He rejects his freedom and obeys to rules of society. Bad faith is a lie to himself, but it differs from the normal lie as the liar and the deceived are the same person. Razumov betrays himself, not Haldin. Haldin dies, but Razumov's struggle and pain are much greater. His sufferings go on as he hands out his freedom to the others and turns himself into an object. However, his inner self goes on improving day by day, and as soon as he has the strength, he will get his freedom back. Razumov only functions as a part of society. He feels as if he is a machine:

He got on his feet, and divesting himself of his cloak hung it on the peg, going through all the motions mechanically. An incredible dullness, a ditch-water stagnation was sensible to his perceptions as though life had withdrawn itself from all things and even from his own thoughts (Conrad, 2010: 97).

In this quotation there is a description of a machine. There is no sign of a living person as it is said that life has withdrawn itself. Razumov does not feel as if he were living like the waiter in Being and Nothingness:

All his behavior seems to us a game. He applies himself to chaining his movements as if they were mechanisms, the one regulating the other; his gestures and even his voice seem to be mechanisms; he gives himself the quickness and pitiless rapidity of things. He is playing, he is amusing himself (Sartre, 1966: 59).

The movements of the waiter are resembled to "mechanisms" like Razumov whose movements seem to be mechanical. He shows no signs of an individual. He goes on playing to act, but actually, he does not move. Like the waiter, Razumov also acts in bad faith as he could decide to run away any time with his freedom, but he is afraid of the anguish. By acting in bad faith, Razumov aims to hide his real personality, and transcendence supports him to avoid critic from the others.

And what is the goal of bad faith? To cause me to be what I am, in the mode of "not being what one is," or not to be what I am in the mode of "being what one is." We find here the same game of mirrors. For me to have an intention of sincerity, I must at the outset simultaneously be and not be what I am (Sartre, 1966: 66).

Razumov uses bad faith to be what he is not. He is by no means a rational loyal person, but he acts like one. His encounter with Haldin's sister Natalia and his mother makes him more disgusted as he confesses in his letter to Natalia. He is in bad faith: "Natalia Victorovna, I embraced the might of falsehood, I exulted in it—I gave myself up to it for a time. Who could have resisted" (Conrad, 2010: 309). He "asked who could have resisted" (Conrad, 2010: 309). The existentialists say that bad faith is a lie to oneself. The reason is the nothingness in man.

Bad faith seeks to affirm their identity while preserving their differences. It must affirm facticity as being transcendence and transcendence as being facticity, in such a way that at the instant when a person apprehends the one, he can find himself abruptly faced with the other (Sartre, 1966: 56).

It is not possible for Razumov to stay sincere. He is in a state of a representation. Acting in bad faith requires the existence of the other. The person who acts in bad faith is aware of the existence of the Other. He cannot endure to be judged, and he uses disguise as a method to hide his real character. However, it is not in his consciousness; he is the liar and the deceived in one person.

Razumov is responsible for the interactions with the others, but he prefers only an inauthentic existence within the crowd. And as he sees Haldin in his room, he only thinks about his silver medal “There goes my silver medal!” (Conrad, 2010:59) as this silver medal stands for his ambitions to become a perfect member of society despite being solitary.

Razumov stamped his foot—and under the soft carpet of snow felt the hard ground of Russia, inanimate, cold, inert, like a sullen and tragic mother hiding her face under a winding-sheet— his native soil!—his very own—without a fireside, without a heart (Conrad, 2010: 70).

Before betraying Haldin, he walks on the snow and has this feeling of alienation at that time. He feels lonely, alienated isolated. Sartrean nothingness is felt by Razumov at the moment he walks on the snow. Razumov has no self as Sartre states: “Without the world, there is no self, no person; without self, without the person, there is no World” (Sartre, 1966: 104). He has to define his existence as the relation with the world is interdependent with the existence of man since they both need each other.

Razumov walks on the snow. He feels strange to a place where he was born. We recall the Sartrean term “condemned to be free” (Sartre, 1966: 439). Razumov feels this condemnation in his core. As he says “I am being crushed—and I can’t even run away” (Conrad,2010:71). Razumov’s psychology starts to break down as it is seen in the scene when he beats Ziemianitch. He feels the Sartrean abandonment, left alone without any support and on his own. As he walks on the snow, he feels this abandonment in him: “And again there was a dead silence in Razumov’s breast. He walked with lowered head, making room for no one. He walked slowly and his thoughts returning spoke within him with solemn slowness” (Conrad,2010: 73). Man “abandoned amid indifference” (Sartre,1966: 508).

Razumov has freedom, and he has to interpret the signs existing around him. He can choose between falling into despair, or acting. Therefore, as the Jesuit example of Sartre, he can decide to send Haldin away, without betraying him, and this would be a fair interpretation of the sign. However, Razumov has decided to act in bad faith, by ignoring his freedom and blaming the others.

There goes Razumov, thrown into the world, feeling the freedom and responsibility in him, and doesn't know how to act. And the word he utters is: "I shall give him up", so he feels the anguish that will lead him to act, but he decides not to act for the sake of inauthentic existence. He searches for the reason for his existence, and he can't run away and directly goes to his fate. The question "Where to" (Conrad, 2010:30) by Mikulin is tragic as it summarizes the meaningless effort to run away since Razumov can't run away from himself as you take yourself with you wherever you go. Evelyn T. Y. Chan explains the question of Mikulin as follows:

The question which Councillor Mikulin poses right before Razumov agrees to his request to leave for Geneva to become a police spy- "where to?" (63)- also refers to where Razumov can turn himself so that he is not caught in the endless process of hermeneutics which seeks to impose personality traits and identities onto him that conflict with his own sense of self (Chan, 2015: 83).

Razumov starts interior monologues to silence his conscience. He convinces himself: "I am not a coward" (Conrad, 2010:73). Yet, he acts in Sartrean bad faith. Man is not born a coward, but he makes himself a coward. However, Razumov can change his mind with his absolute freedom and decide to be a hero. It is about commitment as Sartre states, and many events make a man a coward or a hero as nobody is born a coward, and he makes himself a coward. Razumov believes that he is not a coward, but these are only words as man is defined by his actions, only his actions count.

What the existentialist says is that the coward makes himself cowardly and the hero makes himself heroic; there is always the possibility that one day the coward may no longer be cowardly and the hero may cease to be a hero. What matters is the total commitment, but there is no one particular situation or action that fully commits you, one way or the other (Sartre, 1947: 39).

Razumov tries to convince himself that his act is not a betrayal as he has not invited Haldin, but he is a free individual, and his actions are defined by him. It is not Haldin who pushes him to act. It is his consciousness, and therefore there is no one to blame except himself. There is no excuse for him as he is free, and he takes his action as a free being. Sartre eliminated God for this purpose, as men have used to blame human

nature for their failures, but actually, it is the lack of morality, and man has nothing in him at the beginning of his existence, so he has to choose his morality. In the end, he also accepts that he has betrayed himself: "it's myself whom I have given up to destruction" (Conrad, 2010: 296). He has failed to take Sartrean responsibility for his existence, and his actions. Man does not know what to choose as he can't know the outcomes of his actions without acting. Man has to create his essence after existing, by choosing his moral values. It is Razumov who has betrayed Haldin, and he cannot blame anyone else for it. He could have sent Haldin away by saying that he cannot help him, but he hasn't. There is no other option despite the choice itself. In the feeling of guilt, Razumov goes on blaming Haldin,

Again he began to think. It was twenty-four hours since that man left his room. Razumov had a distinct feeling that Haldin in the fortress was sleeping that night. It was a certitude which made him angry because he did not want to think of Haldin, but he justified it to himself by physiological and psychological reasons (Conrad, 2010: 98).

On the one side, he has seen Haldin as the reason for all his problems, but on the other hand he thinks that Haldin sleeps in peace. There is a truth in it as Haldin died, and indeed he was in peace. Razumov again denies the responsibility for his acts. Sartre explains this situation as:

Thus, we have neither behind us, nor before us, in the luminous realm of values, any means of justification or excuse. We are left alone and without excuse. That is what I mean when I say that man is condemned to be free: condemned, because he did not create himself, yet nonetheless free, because once cast into the world, he is responsible for everything he does (Sartre, 1947:29).

Razumov tries to find a responsible for his act of betrayal, but according to Sartre, he fails. It is clearly stated by him that man himself is responsible for his actions after his existence in the world. This is also the condemnation of man. It is not Razumov's choice to be in this world. He was thrown there like all the other men around him, and he has to find the meaning of his existence.

"Betray. A great word. What is betrayal? They talk of a man betraying his country, his friends, his sweetheart. There must be a moral bond first. All a man can betray is his conscience. And how is my conscience engaged here; by what bond of common faith, of common conviction, am I obliged to let that fanatical idiot drag me down with him? On the contrary— every obligation of true courage is the other way" (Conrad, 2010: 74).

Razumov is aware of the fact that his betrayal of Haldin is a betrayal of himself: "in giving Victor Haldin up, it was myself, after all, whom I have betrayed most basely" (Conrad, 2010: 31). However, this understanding has come to Razumov after finding

his authentic existence. He is in the Sartrean sense of anguish. The feeling anguish of Razumov is as Bohlmann states:

The “the origin of anguish in the feeling of a being which is not responsible for its origin or the origin of the world but which, because of its dreadful freedom to choose one form of action over another, is responsible for what it makes of its existence and for the structuring of what Heidegger terms its field of concern (Bohlmann, 1991: 35).

There is nothing to console him. He has nothingness in himself. Razumov as an existential man feels the weight of the responsibility of his actions on his shoulders. Like Jim’s jump from the Patna, Razumov’s betrayal of Haldin leads him to alienation, isolation, and the search for the meaning of his existence, intending to achieve authentic selfhood. He questions his existence, and he goes through a quest of suffering in search of his authentic identity.

Razumov prefers to have an inauthentic existence within the others, but he couldn't stay in this modus, as Haldin’s appearance has forced him to make a choice. He has to understand that it is impossible to stay inactive. As action defines his existence and gives meaning to his otherwise meaningless existence. He gave up Haldin for the sake of his social ambitions. But at the end, he is forced to work as spy for the Russian government. His efforts to become a respected member of society were in vain. Actually, Razumov betrays himself by betraying Haldin.

The beating of Ziemianitch is an indication of Razumov’s psychological chaos, and it is not possible to foresee what he will do. Razumov’s suffering is different from Lord Jim’s Jim. Thus, Razumov is forced to face his dilemma as a spy whereas Jim could escape to Patusan. After betraying Haldin, he feels anguish as he fears to be stamped as a traitor. He is in Sartrean anguish:

What does he want with me? “he thought with a strange dread of the unexpected which he tried to shake off lest it should fasten itself upon his life for good and all” (Conrad, 2009: 100).

“I don’t say you have done wrong. Indeed, from a certain point of view you could not have done better. You might have gone to a man with affections and family ties. You have such ties Yourself (Conrad, 2010: 91).

Razumov exists in this world, and he has immense freedom. This comprehension leads to anguish and fear. Razumov is unable to understand that his life is under his control because he has this immense freedom. He has betrayed Haldin. He

has betrayed himself as he has an inauthentic existence in the world. It is Razumov's decision to stay in inauthenticity. Razumov has no essence, and he is only existing as an inauthentic being in the world. The metaphor of the white snow is a resemblance to his existence without any authenticity. Sartrean existence in the world is described as:

We mean that man first exists: he materializes in the world, encounters himself, and only afterward defines himself. If man, as existentialists conceive of him, cannot be defined, it is because, to begin with, he is nothing. He will not be anything until later, and then he will be what he makes of himself (Sartre, 1947: 25).

Razumov's life is put into danger by Haldin, involuntarily involved in the assassination of Mr. de P——. He laments: "His solitary and laborious existence had been destroyed—the only thing he could call his own on this earth" (Conrad, 2010: 107). He acts in bad faith and falls into despair, but the right way is to turn outward as Sartre comments:

...also because we show that it is not by turning inward, but by constantly seeking a goal outside of himself in the form of liberation, or of some special achievement, that man will realize himself as truly human (Sartre, 1947: 53).

Razumov fails to turn outward to realize himself, he blames Haldin for his problems as he believes that his life is destroyed by him. At the same time, it is a confession of his loneliness. He is in the Sartrean condition of:

'We have neither behind us, nor before us in a luminous realm of values, any means of justification or excuse. We are left alone (Sartre, 1947: 29).

There is no God, so there are no pre-given values, and there is no excuse for human nature. Man is on his own, like Razumov with his possibilities. He has to find his morality, and he has to define his actions. He can't excuse his non-action by blaming Haldin.

Man is condemned to be free, and it is a great burden to handle. Therefore, the only responsible person for his actions is Razumov himself, and he can't blame anyone except himself as he is free. Man has to create his values, so he has to choose what is right for all mankind, not only regarding his decisions as he has responsibility for himself and the others.

The absurdity of Razumov's existence in a meaningless world goes on as man is in the world alone without any morality or values, and he is aware that he has

nothingness in him. He is also aware of the freedom that is connected with responsibility toward men. When he chooses one action for another, he has to consider all man as his choice affects mankind. With this in his mind, Razumov feels the anguish in him, and he is aware of the responsibility for Haldin and for Prince K. who is his protector.

It is this kind of anguish that existentialists describe, and as we shall see it can be made explicit through a sense of direct responsibility toward the other men who will be affected by it. It is not a screen that separates us from the action, but a condition of the action itself (Sartre, 1966: 27).

Yet, there is no other way as man has no emotions in him, and when Razumov takes action, he will develop his essence, and with it, his emotions and his morality:

“In other words, feelings are developed through the actions we take; therefore I cannot use them as guidelines for action. This means that I shouldn't seek within myself some authentic state that will compel me to act, any more than I can expect any morality to provide the concepts that will enable me to act” (Sartre, 1947: 32).

Razumov has no morality or ethic codes that would tell him to act this way or that way. He is responsible to find moral values by acting, and before acting, it is not possible to see what he will choose:

“We can define man only in relation to his commitments. It is therefore ludicrous to blame us for the gratuitousness of our choices. In the second place, people tell us: "You cannot judge others." In one sense this is me, in another not. It is true in the sense that whenever man chooses his commitment and his project in a totally sincere and lucid way, it is impossible for him to prefer another” (Sartre, 1947: 46-47).

Before the choice it is not possible to know what man will choose as Razumov, at the beginning, it seems as if he would help Haldin, but at the end, he has betrayed him. He does not show any emotions or any sign that he does not want to help him; on the contrary, he assures him of his support: “Yes, of course, I will go. ‘You must give me precise directions, and for the rest—depend on me” (Conrad, 2010: 63). When he says “depend on me”, he acts in bad faith. Nicole Rizutto in her writing Ethical Limits and Confession in Conrad's "Under Western Eyes" and "Poland Revisited interprets this scene as:

Thus, when immediately after this interior monologue Razumov assures Haldin, "Yes, of course I will go. You must give me precise directions, and for the rest—depend on me," the text refuses to verify that this is a promise. Indeed, the passages preceding this imply that this utterance seems motivated mainly by Razumov's desire to keep Haldin in his rooms in case he decides to hand him over to the authorities. Leaving the status of the promise unresolved, the novel apparently allows for Razumov's model of responsibility grounded in reason (Rizutto, 2013: 94).

Haldin has no reason to distrust Razumov since Razumov assures him of his support. He hides his real intention from Haldin, and Razumov could tell Haldin that he will not help him, and Haldin would go to search someone else for support, but Razumov does not have the courage to tell him the truth:

He saw his youth pass away from him in misery and half starvation—his strength give way, his mind become an abject thing. He saw himself creeping, broken down and shabby, about the streets—dying unattended in some filthy hole of a room, or on the sordid bed of a Government hospital (Conrad, 2010: 62).

He feels his existence in danger, and he decides to get rid of Haldin. He fears losing his identity, which is ironic, as he has no identity at all. An inauthentic being is no existence at all. He feels desperate and abandoned and totally on his own.

With something resembling anguish he said to himself—

“I want to be understood.” The universal aspiration with all its profound and melancholy meaning assailed heavily Razumov, who, amongst eighty millions of his kith and kin, had no heart to which he could open himself (Conrad, 2010: 75).

Here, the loneliness of Razumov is emphasized as he has no one to open his heart. It is also the dilemma of Modern man as mentioned in the theoretical part since man is in a universe on his own. Sartre divides our relation with the other into two: either we communicate with the other in good faith or bad faith. The relation with the other is problematic, and nevertheless, a must as the other is the proof of our existence. Conflict is not avoidable as the freedoms of both sides clash. They both want to control the freedom of the other as they fear the other would leave him, with his freedom.

Razumov has to decide one action over another, with his freedom but without knowing the outcomes for him and the others. He suffers, and he only wants to be understood, but as he has not acted yet, he can't define his existence. The other is important to prove one's own existence,

The other is essential to my existence, as well as to the knowledge I have of myself. Under these conditions, my intimate discovery of myself is at the same time a revelation of the other as a freedom that confronts my own and that cannot think or will without doing so for or against me. We are thus immediately thrust into a world that we may call "intersubjectivity." It is in this world that man decides what he is and what others are (Sartre, 1947: 39).

Razumov feels the existence of the other as he feels being watched all the time. This is the Sartrean look that affects Razumov, who is a solitary man without any bounds to anyone. The existence of the other is also a risk as being visible which makes him defenseless:

...it is that I am vulnerable, that I have a body which can be hurt, that I occupy a place and that I cannot in any case escape from the space in which I am without defense—in short, that I am seen (Sartre, 1966: 259).

Razumov is a traitor, a spy, and he is the person who has caused Haldin's death. The look of the other threatens to unmask him. Like Jim, he is on the run from his past. The look of the other does not have any distance as it directly sees the consciousness of man, and Razumov tries to escape from becoming an object for the other. The look differs from the eyes as the look directly sees the consciousness of a man:

I did not care if all the house had been there to look at me. But I don't suppose there was anyone. It's best not to be seen or heard. Aha! The people that are neither seen nor heard are the lucky ones (Conrad, 2010: 234).

Razumov wishes to be invisible as he is aware that the look of the other is judgmental: Sartrean explanation is as follows: "look is upon me without distance while at the same time it holds me at a distance that is, its immediate presence to me unfolds a distance which removes me from it" (Sartre, 1966: 258). The look of the other turns Razumov into an object, and he is judged with this specific look. Like Jim in the courtroom, Razumov's courtroom is the whole world. Everywhere he is, there are eyes on him. Yet, it is sheer impossible to avoid the relation with others: "To cut oneself entirely from one's kind is impossible. To live in a desert one must be a Saint." (Conrad, 2010: 117)

Razumov runs away from the look, and he feels the look of autocracy on him. During his investigation by Mikulin, he feels the look of him on his consciousness:

He followed Razumov with his eyes while that last crossed the room and sat down. The mild gaze rested on him, not curious, not inquisitive—certainly not suspicious—almost without expression" (Conrad, 2010: 109).

The look is the reminder of the presence of the other. Razumov feels Mikulin's look, and he does not have to see him. Sartre gives the example of cracking wood that is a sign of the presence of the other, or the noise of footsteps f.e. At the moment, Razumov is looked at since it is not possible for him to look back. He has to wait for his turn. Razumov is turned into an object under the look of Mikulin, who is the representation of institutions:

I am fixing the people whom I see into objects; I am in relation to them as the Other is in relation to me. In looking at them I measure my power. But if the Other sees them and sees me, then my look loses its power; it cannot transform those people into objects for the Other since they are already the objects of his look (Sartre, 1966: 266).

The look goes on irritating Razumov as he is scared to lose his facade. He feels the look of Sophia Antonovna on himself, and he can't hide himself:

He noticed the vacillation of surprise passing over the steady curiosity of the black eyes fastened on his face as if the woman revolutionist received the sound of his voice into her pupils instead of her ears. He checked himself, passed his hand over his forehead, confused, like a man who has been dreaming aloud (Conrad, 2010: 234).

Razumov feels the need to act calm as he is nervous, and he “felt something stir in his breast, a sort of feeble and unpleasant tremor” (Conrad, 2010: 236). Razumov tries to hide himself from the Sartrean look: “he had even lost the sense of being watched in a sort of heavy tranquillity” (Conrad, 2010:232). Yet, ironically it is again a look that makes him confess his betrayal of Haldin and find peace. This time the look comes from the “most trustful eyes in the world”, and this look convinces Razumov to give up his inauthentic existence and start to exist in the world.

The confession of Razumov is again a crucial part of the novel as it is his first serious step toward authentic existence. His relationship with the other makes this confession possible. It is his own choice, for the first time he takes the responsibility for the chaos he has created because of his actions. His first confession is to Natalia. Natalia asks Razumov:

The story, Kirylo Sidorovitch, the story!”

“There is no more to tell!” He made a movement forward, and she actually put her hand on his shoulder to push him away; but her strength failed her, and he kept his ground, though trembling in every limb. “It ends here—on this very spot.” He pressed a denunciatory finger to his breast with force, and became perfectly still (Conrad,2010:305).

It is not the type of confession where someone accepts that he has killed someone. Here gestures are important since there is a word play, an indirect implication, and he does not say that he has betrayed her brother, but “he pressed a denunciatory finger to his breast with force, and became perfectly still” (Conrad, 2010: 305). There is no need for words, as this betrayal is such a heavy burden on Razumov's soul. He does not explain it with words, and he uses his gesture. It is also a gesture of respect for Natalie, the

sensitive soul. Before leaving, he takes the veil of Natalia with him. The scene is described by the Professor of Languages as follows:

At his feet the veil dropped by Miss Haldin looked intensely black in the white crudity of the light. He was gazing at it spell-bound. Next moment, stooping with an incredible, savage swiftness, he snatched it up and pressed it to his face with both hands. Something, extreme astonishment perhaps, dimmed my eyes, so that he seemed to vanish before he moved. The slamming of the outer door restored my sight, and I went on contemplating the empty chair in the empty ante-room. The meaning of what I had seen reached my mind with a staggering shock. I seized Natalia Haldin by the shoulder. "That miserable wretch has carried off your veil!" I cried, in the scared, deadened voice of an awful discovery. "He. . . . (Conrad,2010:306)

The Westerner interprets this scene as stealing of a veil, but it has more to say. It is Razumov's expression of love, for Natalia. She is the person who makes Razumov confess, and find his inner peace. Afterwards, again as a sign of trust, he envelopes his diary together with the veil. His writings are his most secret emotions that come from his heart; therefore, it can be interpreted that Razumov leaves his soul (heart) in Natalia's hands. To interpret it from the Sartrean love perspective, through love the lover tries to possess the other's freedom and consciousness. This scene indicates that Razumov also gives up his existence for the sake of Natalia. He loves her, but he also knows that he has to sacrifice himself for his sin.

After leaving Natalia, Razumov finds his inner peace. There is the scene of cleansing by the heavy rain, and Razumov lets the rain do his work,

"You've got very wet."

"Yes, I am washed clean," muttered Razumov, who was dripping from head to foot, and passed through the inner door towards the staircase leading to his room." (Conrad, 2010:307)

He is clean, and his mind is cleared from the unknown. He has found his identity, and his essence. He has turned himself from an object into a subject. Indeed, he is wet, but he is finally the authentic being he has longed for. Joanna Skolik comments Razumov's confession as:

His confession not only brings him inner peace and relief, but also restores his personal identity. He is free from falsehood and suspicion. He can feel his moral rebirth(Skolik, 2011: 21).

Razumov's confession to the revolutionaries is different from Natalia's. It is like Jim's from Lord Jim, who has walked to Doramin to face his destiny. Razumov has walked into the lion's den to face his fate without showing any fear for the first time.

What are you clamouring for?" said Razumov disdainfully, in the profound silence which fell on the raising of his hand. "Haven't you all understood that I am that man (Conrad,2010: 314).

This is the confession that leads to Razumov's authentic existence, crippled by the revolutionaries, but with an inner peace that is invaluable. Sophia Antonova's comment of Razumov sums up everything, and also indicates that this is the situation for all men. As Sartre states, it is a universal human condition.

There are evil moments in every life ... How many of them would deliver themselves up deliberately to perdition ... rather than go on living, secretly debased in their own eyes? ... And please mark this - he was safe when he did it. It was just when he believed himself safe and more - infinitely more - when the possibility of being loved by that admirable girl first dawned upon him, that he discovered that his bitterest railings, the worst wickedness, the devil work of his hate and pride, could never cover up the ignominy of the existence before him. There's character in such a discovery (Conrad,2010:323).

Evil is in all men, but it needs the courage to admit that one is evil. Razumov is a respected figure, and there is no danger to be identified. Despite all this, he confesses and gives up his social inauthentic identity. It is even possible for him to be loved by Natalia. His existence can be justified by the love he has felt for Natalia as his life is defined by a meaningless existence, in bad faith. Yet, he chooses to be authentic, and he has found his essence in a chaotic world. However, ironically he is only able to find peace as a cripple and deaf man, depending on the other.

His letter to Natalia is also striking to understand Razumov's inner world. Razumov admits his inauthentic existence in the world "I, too, had my guiding idea; and remember that, amongst us, it is more difficult to lead a life of toil and self-denial than to go out in the street and kill from conviction" (Conrad, 2010: 308). Living an inauthentic existence, acting in bad faith, is much more difficult than being Haldin. In his letter, Razumov further explains his inner pain while being with her as it is impossible for him to find peace because of his guilty conscience. The letter has so many messages. There is the implication of the existence of the other. Razumov says that Natalia has turned him back to the truth with the same method as her brother.

Suddenly you stood before me! You alone in all the world to whom I must confess. You fascinated me—you have freed me from the blindness of anger and hate—the truth shining in you drew the truth out of me. Now I have done it; and as I write here, I am in the depths depths of anguish, but there is air to breathe at last—air! And, by the by, that old man sprang up from somewhere as I was speaking to you, and raged at me like a disappointed devil. I suffer horribly, but I am not in despair. There is only one more thing to do for me. After that—if they let me—I shall go away and bury myself in obscure misery. In giving Victor Haldin up, it was myself, after all, whom I have betrayed most basely. You must believe what I say now, you can't refuse to believe this. Most basely. It is through you that I came to feel this so deeply. After all, it is they and not I who have the right on their side?—theirs is the strength of invisible

powers. So be it. Only don't be deceived, Natalia Victorovna, I am not converted. Have I then the soul of a slave? No! I am independent—and therefore perdition is my lot (Conrad, 2010: 310).

The last paragraph of Razumov's confession letter is touching and at the same time honest. Razumov's letter is his first free action, with responsibility as an authentic being with freedom. In this paragraph, Razumov admits his love for Natalia. He is not in nothingness anymore as there is another who approves his existence. He feels the pain of anguish as he says that he has been "in the depths of anguish" (Conrad, 2010: 310) but at the end "there is air to breathe at last-air!" (Conrad, 2010:310). It is the freedom that Razumov breaths, freed from his shackles called institutions and society. There are similarities between Jim and Razumov. Jim gives up his love for his freedom and authenticity, so it is the same for Razumov. He can go on pretending to be an honest man, but he decides to get his authentic existence. Yet, it is Natalia who opens his eyes: "freed me from blindness" (Conrad, 2010: 310). He does not fall in despair, and he interprets the signs: "I suffer horribly, but I am not in despair". Through Sartrean love, Razumov can define his existence. "Yet again Conrad shows love giving a Sartrean sense of justification to a formerly pointless existence "(Bohlmann, 1991: 162). Razumov has achieved his essence at the end.

All in all, Sartre's Existential man is alive in Conrad's protagonist Razumov. He declares his freedom from all institutions by claiming that he is "independent" at the end. He gets rid of his shackles, and he can breathe for the first time. Suffering can be regarded as the way to an authentic existence in Razumov's case. Razumov understands that inner peace is more important than any titles in society. By confessing the truth, he is freed from a very heavy load. Despite the tragic end, Razumov finds his inner peace as an individual. He is deaf and crippled, but he finds his authenticity. His body is deaf and crippled, but his consciousness is alive.

Conrad narrates a perfect existential man in his literary-historical novel Under Western Eyes with the protagonist Razumov, who goes through all the existential dilemmas to find his identity in suffocating circumstances. He is torn between institutions and social oppression but succeeds to find his essence.

Conrad narrates the protagonist Razumov's psychological and ethical maturity process. The reader can witness the psychological sufferings of Razumov from a limited

point of view and fractured narrative by Professor of Languages. Conrad presents Razumov's psychological maturity process and ends with his catharsis. It is a confession as he can no longer bear his inauthentic existence. Razumov, a young man without any family ties, feels the oppression of institutions, so he prefers an inauthentic existence within this system. However, when he is unwillingly confronted to support Haldin, he is forced to decide between mind and heart. This decision brings along a betrayal. The reader is sometimes shocked by the cruel spirit of Razumov. Razumov, who is exploited by the authorities, collapses at the end. His collapse leads to his psychological and individual freedom.

Razumov creates his values and morality, to achieve an authentic identity. Razumov's journey is painful, full of inner dilemmas, and challenging. Razumov shows the features of Existentialist man such as isolation, alienation, and anguish. It is not possible for him to have interpersonal relations. His spiritual growth enables him to define the meaning of his existence. Razumov, a complex, problematic lonely, and alienated man finds himself, during his quest with many hardships to overcome. Razumov is deaf and crippled at the end, but his spirit is free. The reader is torn between disappointment, disgust, sympathy, and admiration for Razumov.

CONCLUSION

Existentialism is regarded as one of the most important movements, which has elaborated human condition in the world, by putting the man into the center of existence. Jean-Paul Sartre, as one of the most significant representatives of this movement, gave man's existence a new meaning by claiming that existence is before the essence of man. Absolute freedom has been given back to the individual. Nothing forces man to act according to any morals as the man himself is responsible to define his morality, for he has nothingness in him at the beginning of his existence. All actions and all decisions he makes are his responsibility, and in anguish he takes action. When a man denies his freedom, he is in bad faith. Man who acts in bad faith lies to himself, a liar and a deceiver in the same consciousness, but without knowing. Man needs the existence of the other to prove his existence. The relation with the other is essential to find authenticity. Man needs the approval of the other for his existence.

In the light of the above-mentioned details, this dissertation has aimed to analyze existential motives in Joseph Conrad's two novels Lord Jim and Under Western Eyes. Moreover, the effects of philosophical Existentialism on the protagonist's search for self-identity have been elucidated. For Existentialism, life is a task that man has to handle. Man is on an ongoing project, and the meaning of life has to be redefined every day. The most important part of this task is to find one's authenticity. The condition of man, as being thrown into the world, is the reason for his search for identity. It is seen as a Leitmotif throughout both novels of Joseph Conrad. Joseph Conrad narrates the quest for authenticity in both of his novels Lord Jim and Under Western Eyes. The protagonists Jim and Razumov both feel the need to find the meaning of their existence. They are isolated, alienated and without an identity merely existing in this absurd world. In this sense, the common ground of both protagonists is their lack of authenticity and interpersonal bonds. They both have to depart from themselves and from everyone to find themselves. Jim and Razumov go through similar sufferings and feelings of guilt. They both show features of Existential concepts in their attitudes toward themselves and the world. Both protagonists fight for their freedom and rebel against all kinds of oppression, which is remarkable. Despite being fictional characters, they show the struggle of Modern man of the 20th century and his place in modern society. Conrad

narrates existential motives in his protagonists' attitudes toward life, which are shared by Existentialists such as Sartre.

Joseph Conrad, as one of the most influential authors of his age, gave the classical hero types a new face by showing their pain, weakness, suffering, and failures through the existential perspective. Nevertheless, their fight for an authentic existence despite all the obstacles around them is remarkable. Both protagonists give clues about modern man's struggles in his age. Conrad's criticism of man's alienation in his age due to chaotic circumstances, loss of belief in social, political, and religious institutions is shown in his two novels' thematic vividly.

As mentioned previously, many themes of the novel are mainly from Conrad's own life, and his own opinion is also emphasized within the scope. Both protagonists' difficulties in embracing life and finding a meaning for their existence are nearly similar despite happening in totally different settings and times. As pointed out, the classical hero type changes, and also the narrative changes. Conrad paved the way for the modernist narration techniques by using fractured narrative, time shifts, and limited point of view techniques. His fictional characters show humanitarian pains, as an ordinary man. Their existential sufferings are the sufferings of all men to find an identity in an artificial and alienated world in modernist times. Both protagonists of Lord Jim and Under Western Eyes show man's condition within the framework of Existential motives. They are thrown into the world, and they find themselves in a world that they cannot either escape from or identify themselves with it. Razumov and Jim are strong characters in search of identity, so the reader witnesses their psychological and physical sufferings. The Existential characteristics of Sartre are seen in Conrad's novel's protagonists. Conrad himself was also influenced by the Existentialist movement as he used many elements of Existentialism in his protagonists' attitudes towards the meaning of their existence in the world.

There are many mutual features that Conrad's Razumov and Jim show while defining the meaning of their existence. Both protagonists struggle in their relations with society, and their relationship with themselves and with the other. Parallel to being thrown into the world, they are also thrown into the society, and they cannot get out of this society. Razumov and Jim try to find their selfhood within this society. Society

gives roles to the individuals. Razumov is a student, and Jim is a seaman, but they are not authentic existences: Razumov, a student and a spy and Jim, a seaman and a hero. Yet, within these roles, they can't define their authenticity, for it is sheer impossible to find identity stuck in these social roles. The only way for Jim to find authenticity is his escape from society. However, both protagonists understand that the existence out of society is impossible. They have to find their authenticity in this universe.

Conrad shows very realistically how the freedom of an individual can be easily limited by institutions and society by imposing restrictions on him. After experiencing this oppression, man understands that he can't find his authentic existence. They are confronted with the fact that it is impossible to be a part of society by also being authentic. Man has to decide between either living in inauthenticity as a member of the society or resisting and being disregarded from it. They either decide to obey, or they start to resist. Rejecting means life in alienation and isolation without any interpersonal bonds. Taking this as the basis, Razumov and Jim both suffer from the oppression of society. Razumov obeys the social oppression and turns into an object, and Jim is on the run as he is not able to face his failure to create his individuality. Conrad shows the immense psychological pain of Razumov. He is stuck between society and autocracy. Razumov struggles to have an inauthentic existence, to be a member of society, but he fails as he is forced to make a choice: A choice between life and death. Razumov's actions differ from his inner emotions. His actions are mechanical like the society he lives in. It is expected from him to function. By the protagonist Razumov, the reader witnesses the loneliness of the Modern man, suffering in an inhuman surrounding. There is no place for identity. Man has to function within this corrupt and rotten mechanism called civilization. Razumov only wants to be an accepted member of society as he has no family ties at all. He shows disgust towards any type of radicalism. He acts mainly by reason. And everything on his way for a perfect member of society is regarded as an obstacle to be removed. He even shows no signs of opinion in any discussions with his fellow students as he fears to fail to achieve his goal as a member.

Jim has many similarities to Razumov, so he also fails to take action and to take responsibility, and he is rejected by a restrictive and oppressive society. Throughout the novel, Jim struggles to accept his failure at the Patna accident. He chooses to escape from society by going on a quest far from society and civilization to find his authenticity. Nonetheless, he also understands that it is impossible to run away, as his

struggles are in himself. And without confronting them, it is not possible for him to overcome them. Jim dreams of a world where he can be a hero and live according to his wishes. His dreams are shaped by heroic deeds, but the reality is different. The social norms restrict him. However, failure to act at the Patna becomes his curse, as a result, his inauthentic social existence as a seaman is taken away from himself. So Jim, who has regarded his inauthenticity as the only possible existence, feels alienated, isolated, and is surrounded by absurdity. Unfortunately, Man has no place in the social order as an individual, as society rejects man's freedom and expects obedience. Concerning this, Jim feels estranged, and on his way to selfhood, he regains his identity, and he also achieves his goal to create a heroic identity, but when it comes to taking responsibility, he does not hesitate to take the responsibility for himself and the others, even if it means death. His disappointment in society leads him to isolation, but he succeeds in creating his ideal self.

Both, Razumov and Jim go through different struggles with the same aim. The reader witnesses their psychological, emotional, and physical sufferings. They differ from the crowd as they gain awareness about the absurdity of their existence. Furthermore, Razumov differs from Jim as he is forced to confront his heaviest burden, confronting Haldin's sister. He feels the guilt in him, and he is disgusted by his duplicity. Yet, in the end, it is this pure and innocent human that opens his eyes and makes him rebel against his oppressors. Razumov solves his problem of existence by unwilling confrontation. He is forced to confront his biggest crime. The sufferings they endure differentiate them from their fellow men. Jim runs away from his first responsibility, but after achieving his goal, he comprehends that there is no way out. The only way to solve conflicts is by facing them. Razumov's and Jim's destinies are nearly the same. Razumov confesses his guilt without any hesitation, and with his request, the outcomes are heartbreaking. At the end, he is deaf and crippled, but he is rescued from all the heavy burden of his inauthentic existence. Clearly, the turn of Razumov from an essence precedes existence state at the beginning of the novel, to the essence precedes existence stage at the final of the novel, indicates a deep ambivalence of Razumov's identity.

Similarly, Jim also confronts Doramin, and he is for the first time ready to take the responsibility for his failure. Like Razumov, Jim pays for his failure with his death.

Both characters' ends are tragic, but they both succeed to find their authentic existence in the sheer meaningless world. They both show so many similarities to Existential man.

To conclude, Conrad's exceptional works Lord Jim and Under Western Eyes are some of the most remarkable novels depicting Existential features within the narrative. Jim and Razumov are perfect representatives of modern men of the 20th century, with all their pains and sufferings, Jim and Razumov are both heroes in terms of their sufferings and their rebel against oppressions. Both achieve selfhood by sacrifice and in terms of Jim by death.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bohlmann, O. (1991). *Conrad's Existentialism*, Macmillan Academic and Professional Ltd., Hong Kong.
- Catalano, J.S. (1980). *A Commentary on Jean Paul Sartre's Being and Nothingness*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Chan E.T.Y. (2015). "Kierkegaard and Conrad's Razumov", *Texas Tech University Press*, 79-93.
- Conrad, J. (2010). *Under Western Eyes*, Broadview Press, Peterborough, Ont.
- Conrad, J. (2005). *Lord Jim*, Icon Classics, San Diego.
- Friedmann S. S. (2009). "Definitional Excursions: The Meanings of Modern/Modernity/Modernism", *Palgrave Macmillan*, 11-32.
- Gehring R.B. (1960). "Jean Paul Sartre", *Ateneo de Manila University*, 82-98.
- Goonetilleke, R. A. (1990). *Beyond Culture and Background*, Macmillan Press Ltd., London.
- Jericho, J. (1985). *Joseph Conrad's Lord Jim*, Barron's Educational Series, Inc., New York.
- Heidegger, M. (2000). *Contributions to Philosophy (From Enowing)*, Trans. By Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly, Indiana University of Press, Indiana.
- Hollander R. (2015). "Ethics and Politics in Joseph Conrad's Under Western Eyes", *Indiana University Press*, 1-19.
- Humbert, D.J. (1983). "Freedom and Time in Kierkegaard's the Concept of Anxiety", *MacSphere*, iii.
- Kramesberger, M. (2017). The remote village "Patusan" in Joseph Conrad's "Lord Jim". Where is Patusan?, <https://www.grin.com/document/385138>.
- Li E. (2019). "Kierkegaard's Existential Conception of the Relationship Between Philosophy and Christianity", *De Gruyter*, 136-146.

- Rae G. (2009). "Sartre & the Other: Conflict, Conversion, Language & the We", *Berghahn Books*, 55-74.
- Rizutto N. (2013). "Ethical Limits and Confession in Conrad's "Under Western Eyes" and "Poland Revisited", *Duke University Press*, 79-103.
- Peters, J. G. (2006). *The Cambridge Introduction to Conrad*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Sadoff I. (1970). "Lord Jim as Existential hero", *dalspace.library.dal.ca*, 518-525.
- Sartre, J.P. (1966). *Being and Nothingness*, Trans. Hazel E. Barnes, Washington Square Press Edition, New York.
- Sartre, J.P. (2007). *Existentialism Is A Humanism*, Trans. Carol Macomber, New Heaven & London: Yale University Press, London.
- Sartre, J.P. (1967). *Baudelaire*, Trans. Martin Turnell, New Directions Publishing Corporation, New York.
- Schwarz,D.R. (1976). "The Significance of the Language Teacher in Conrad's "Under Western Eyes", *Journal of Narrative Theory*.
- Schwarz,D.R. (2001). *Rereading Conrad*, University of Missouri Press, Columbia and London.
- Skolik J. (2011). "Lord Jim and Razumov – Interpretations Lost and Found Under Western Eyes", *Jagiellonian University Press*, 7-22.
- Vardy,P. (2008). *An Introduction to Kierkegaard*, Hendrickson Publishers, New York.
- Watkin, J. (2010). *The A to Z of Kierkegaard's Philosophy*, Scarecrow Press, Inc., Maryland.

C.V.**IDENTITY INFORMATION**

Name and Surname : Gülsiye BIÇAK
Place of Birth : Denizli
Date of Birth : 05. 11. 1972
E-mail :gulsiyebicak@gmail.com

EDUCATION INFORMATION

High School : Açık Öğretim Lisesi
B. A. : Pamukkale University
Faculty of Science and Letters
Department of English Language and Literature
M.A. : Pamukkale University Social Sciences Institution
Western Languages and Literatures
Department of English Language and Literature

Foreign Language and Level : English, Advanced,
German, Advanced,
French, Intermediate

WORK EXPERIENCE :International Relations Office staff, Pamukkale University (2017-present)