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Abstract- This paper attempts to analyse the term ‘one of us’ in Joseph Conrad’s Lord Jim from a range of viewpoints. Marlow consistently regards Jim as ‘one of us’ and many hidden meanings tag along. We have to ponder over the fact that what Marlow’s actual intention is especially when he utters those three words. Consequently, the phrase, ‘one of us’ has turned into a tricky puzzle before us. Let us find out what is concealed behind these words. However, it goes without saying that this paper will concentrate especially on racism, behaviour, optimism, honour, sympathy, shameful secrets, homosexuality, trustworthiness, manliness and courage and universality in order to detect the factual meanings of the term in question.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In Joseph Conrad’s Lord Jim, “Marlow is unequivocal in affirming his own status as “one of us”” (Teng, 2000, p. 198) and he also aptly refers to Jim as “one of us” (Conrad, 1986, p. 74). Marlow thinks about the young man in such a way even before he hardly knows him. Marlow likes Jim a lot because of his appearance, manner etc. As Marlow utters, “I liked his appearance; I know his appearance; he came from the right place; he was one of us” (Conrad, 1986, p. 74). Obviously, “one social and also emotional bonding is drawn between them” (Moosavinia & Alami, n.d., p. 98). After Marlow has begun to know Jim more, his belief that Jim is ‘one of us’ becomes firmer. However, the very term deserves critical analysis from the perspectives of racism, behaviour, optimism, honour, sympathy, shameful secrets, homosexuality and trust worthiness, courage and optimism and universality. At the same time, it must be said that “in Marlow’s unrelenting attempt to see Jim whole, to account for both his fine aspirations and his cowardice, to judge him fairly, readers recognize their own difficulty in assessing characters in the twentieth century” (Al-Haj, 2014, p. 214). Hence, nothing can be as proper as summing up this paper’s focal point with Conrad’s effective words in “Author’s Note” to Lord Jim about the portrayal of Jim concerning human commonality i.e. ‘one of us’:

My Jim is not a type of wide commonness. But I can safely assure my readers that he is not the product of coldly perverted thinking. He is not a figure of Northern Mists either. One sunny morning in the commonplace surroundings of an Eastern roadstead, I saw his form pass by – appealing – significant – under a cloud – perfectly silent. Which is as it should be. It was for me, with all the sympathy of which I was capable, to seek fit words for his meaning. He was “one of us”. (Conrad, 1986, p. 44)

2. THE SCRUTINY OF “ONE OF US” IN JOSEPH CONRAD’S LORD JIM

2.1 Jim is a White Man

Marlow is a racist and it becomes transparent when we concentrate on his relationship with Jim. Marlow first sees Jim at the inquiry held because of the fact that the officers of the Patna have deserted the ship. Marlow himself is a white man and an Englishman; he mentions that Jim is “one of us” (Conrad, 1986, p. 74) because he is also a white man and an Englishman. Thus, Marlow uses the phrase ‘one of us’ “to refer to national or racial identity or perhaps even to membership in the merchant service” (Moosavinia & Alami, n.d., p. 97). Whereas, J. Batchelor (2007) in “Lord Jim at the Frontier” “considers “one of us” as the reminder of one frontier Jim is unable to cross: the racial frontier” (as cited in Moosavinia & Alami, n.d., p. 97)

The crisis underlies Marlow’s brooding over a question, which seems to him to affect humankind’s conception of itself. His interest in Jim extends to the larger problem of the application of a fixed standard of conduct to the individual in every circumstance; for the fact that the standard does not hold for Jim in his supreme test on the Patna casts doubt upon its validity.

In other words, as Jim is from a white race like Marlow, therefore the latter feels interested in Jim. In fact, Marlow’s interest in the trial is due to the fact that a white man is being tried especially at a place where Marlow and Jim are both foreigners:

In Lord Jim the principal male bond evoked is explicitly a professional code in an idealized
2.3 Jim is Optimistic

Jim’s optimism becomes obvious as he does not commit suicide like Brierly rather he wants to start life in a new way to prove himself. “Indeed, the event of Patna haunts Jim not because he was forced to confront his inferior qualities as a seaman, but because he had been waiting for the opportunity to prove his superiority” (Yang, Hsieh and Tien, 2013, p. 106). He waits for a second chance to accomplish his aims. Fortunately, he finds it soon in Marlow’s job-offer. “For Marlow, the global domination of Euro-imperialism transforms “this sky and this sea” into the arena where each “one of us” is able to pursue immense “opportunities”” (Teng, 2000, p. 193). In fact, Marlow talks to Stein and manages a job for Jim in Patusen since he can clearly differentiate between right and wrong now. It reminds us of Genesis 3:22:

And the LORD God said, “The man has now become like one of us, knowing good and evil.”

(Bible, 2014)

2.4 Jim is a Man of Honour

The term ‘one of us’ can be interpreted from the point of view of ‘honour’ also. According to Marlow, Jim is a man of honour. He likens himself with Jim in this regard. Obviously, men of honour are few in number on earth. It deserves to be mentioned that all the members of the white races are not to be called the ‘men of honour’. For example, the German captain of the Patna and the two engineers are not honourable persons in any sense.

Certainly, Jim has escaped from the ship but he feels a sense of guilt and hesitation right before he jumps into the life-boat. Furthermore, when the boat moves on, Jim still thinks about the sad fate of the eight hundred passengers on the ship. His conscience keeps on poking his brain like a pin. As a result, Jim feels extremely sorrowful and ashamed since his father’s inspiring words roam around inside his brain- “resolve fixedly never, through any possible motives, do anything which you believe to be wrong” (Conrad, 1986, p. 295)-cultivating “in Jim an inflexible mindset of moralism” (Yang, Hsieh and Tien, 2013, p. 106).

While answering the charges against Jim in the court, he mentions about the fact that he has felt sorry for the sleeping passengers at the time of leaving the ship. However, the other white men have thought only about themselves and their own safety. For instance, the German captain has made a quick decision to abandon the ship so that he can save his own life; the two engineers’ decisions also echo this. Nobody has ever thought about the possible destruction of many lives except Jim. The worst kind of behaviour is witnessed by the readers when the captain and the two engineers reach the shore in safety and erase the act of cowardliness from their brains! They behaved as if their misconduct were not that serious! Their cunning...
attitude becomes more evident especially when they do not appear at the court. Obviously, Jim has been suffering mentally after the desertion of the ship. His agony is doubled when he listens to the verdict of the court. In a word, his life becomes equal to despair. Jim’s happiness seems to return when he reaches the distant island called Patusan. His honour is restored since the islanders love and respect him to the fullest; he is even given the title of honour ‘Tuan’ or ‘Lord’ by the inhabitants. Now, a shift from ‘one of us’ to ‘one of them’ takes place. It proves that Jim has utilised the second chance since he is “loved, trusted, admired, with a legend of strength and prowess forming round his name as though he had been the stuff of a hero” (Conrad, 1986, p. 171)[5]. After years of restless wandering in search of atonement and self-fulfilment, in the remote settlement of Patusan, it seems that Jim finally redeems himself, realising his idealism and becoming, “in his own eyes the equal of the impeccable men who never fall out of ranks” (Conrad, 1986, p. 334)[5]. Hence, Jim, who was once a moral cripple, triumphantly transforms himself into a saviour figure, a lawgiver, a standard bearer, and more ironically, a moral cornerstone. He starts to forget the shameful act gradually:

Jim’s life, however, achieves significance only in the moment that it is forgotten, because the very act of forgetting it—and the experience that it contains—is what binds a community together. Perhaps then, Marlow is not altogether incorrect. Jim is indeed “one of us”—but only to the extent that he is not. (Boes, 2007, p. 131)[4]

However, when Dain Waris, the son of Doramin [the chief of the Bugis community], is murdered, his father considers that Jim’s irresponsible behaviour is the chief reason for the son’s death. Actually, it is because of Brown’s betrayal that the innocent Dain Waris dies. Now, Jim has two alternatives before him- either to face everything boldly with honour or to escape from the island as soon as possible. But, he rightly sticks to the first option. Here, a wonderful contrast is at work between two white men. On the one hand, Brown is dishonourable and on the other hand, Jim is exceedingly honoured. Even after Jim is murdered by the angry Doramin, our sympathy is ever with Jim since he has not been a coward.

2.5 Jim Deserves Sympathy

Perhaps, Marlow thinks that as a human being, Jim deserves our sympathy. Even if he has made a huge mistake, yet we must not hate him rather we should be supportive. Most importantly, Jim is repentant after his mistake and this is the reason why we have to be sympathetic with him. Therefore, Marlow thinks that “the inquiry was a severe punishment to Jim, and that his facing it – practically of his own free will – was a redeeming feature in his abominable case” (Conrad, 1986, p. 93)[5]. In other words, according to Christopher GoGwilt (1995) in “Lord Jim and the Invention of the West”, “the whole of the Patna inquiry might be read as the progressive revelation of the underlying material interests of an international capitalist imperialist” (as cited in Al-Khaidat, 2010, p. 50)[2]. Other coward officers should be treated harshly but Jim needs our compassion to survive. This is the reason why Marlow cannot agree with the verdict of the court according to which all the guilty persons are penalised equally:

By carrying with him the scar of moral disgrace, ironically, Jim appears to reclaim the idealistic ground in that he exceeds the society’s expectation of the outcast. He has certainly earned Marlow’s sympathy, through whose progressive narration, readers probe into the Jim’s innermost thoughts, seeking an understanding of the fundamental “why” of Jim’s shattered heroism… Marlow’s leniency towards Jim is obvious; perhaps, to Marlow’s mind, the desertion of duty for a seaman is all too human. (Yang, Hsieh and Tien, 2013, p. 107)[14]

2.6 Jim has Shameful Secrets

Perhaps, by referring to Jim as ‘one of us’, Marlow may have indicated that we all have one shameful secret in our pasts. Jim’s sense of shame arises because he has jumped from what he believes is a sinking ship:

Jim’s singe-minded illusion is shattered by his leap from the Patna; such a disgraceful action not only sheds his self-aggrandising image to pieces, more importantly, it impels Jim to face up to his own fallibility. Although Jim tries to excuse his behaviour by blaming it on fellow officers calling to him from the lifeboat – “it was their doing as plainly as if they had reached up with a boat-hook and pulled me over” (Conrad, 1986, p. 134)[5], as he explains to Marlow – he cannot escape from the fact and the consequence of the jump. Leaping onto the lifeboat, Jim breaks the ethical code and, crucially, as an individual whose existence rests utterly upon a heroic self-image, such an action smashes his thinly protected self-regard. Unable to rationalise his betrayal at the Patna, the jump becomes the catalyst for the collapse of Jim’s world, a prelude to its disintegration. (Yang, Hsieh and Tien, 2013, p. 106)[14]

Jim’s “age of innocence is over. In the face of such a catastrophe, it is comprehensible that Jim, tormented by his wounded ego, interprets his physical descent from the Patna as a free fall from heaven to hell” (Yang, Hsieh and Tien, 2013, p. 106)[14]. “There was no going back. It was as if I had jumped into a well – into an everlasting deep hole” (Conrad, 1986, p. 125)[5]. In other words, Jim’s disgrace is similar to the Biblical Fall. Right after the jump, Jim turns into Adam; his sense of shame never leaves him and rather acts, from then on, as a constant shadow over his happiness.
However, Marlow feels the mental agony that Jim is constantly suffering from. Therefore, Marlow’s court of conscience does not label Jim as guilty although the court of the law does. This pervasive emotion is constantly returned by Marlow in his narrative as he points out several times that others do not think badly of him; it is only Jim who is unable to forgive himself. Yet, through the romantic escapades, Jim endeavours to erase his shame. He decides to live in Patusan since no one knows his shameful past there. In addition, since he has broken the codes of sacrifice and honour, he makes a decision to chastise himself for the rest of his life.

2.7 Jim is Homosexual!

Perhaps, Marlow appears to be homosexual and he thinks that Jim is homosexual too. For example, Jim is surprised to know that Marlow has stared at him for a long time—“What did you mean by staring at me all the morning?” (Conrad, 1986, p. 95)[5]. Once, Jim’s presence even distracts Marlow aboard his ship. Marlow picks Jim up after his trial:

> I took him away from Bangkok in my ship, and we had a longish passage... In every sense of the expression [a passenger who is a seaman] is ‘on deck’; but my Jim, for the most part, skulked down below as though he had been a stowaway. He infected me so that I avoided speaking on professional matters... I felt extremely unwilling to give orders to my officers in his presence. (Conrad, 1986, p. 189-190)[5]

Now, we can find in the aforementioned lines that Marlow’s attachment to Jim is very intense. Obviously, such feeling has an effect on his professional opinion. It seems to us that Marlow is trying to conceal something concerning that bond from his crew. However, there are myriad details in Lord Jim that indicate at the homoerotic element in the rapport between Marlow and Jim. For example, Marlow takes Jim to dinner—“I had been staying at the Malabar House for a few days, and on my pressing invitation he dined with me there” (Conrad, 1986, p. 99)[5]. Again, Marlow escorts Jim to his hotel room after the trial. As Marlow utters:

> He followed me as manageable as a little child, with an obedient air, with no sort of manifestation, rather as though he had been waiting for me there to come along and carry him off. (Conrad, 1986, p. 168)[5]

Normally, a man is supposed to escort a woman. But, in Lord Jim, Marlow is leading Jim to the hotel, which is something weird and homoerotic! Even in most of the romantic novels, men accompany the stunning young damsels in difficulty, not good-looking youthful men. Perhaps, “on a deeper level, on which the relation between Jim and Marlow is the true subject, it is the moral ambivalence of a disavowed homosexual attraction that drives the narrative on” (Harpham, 1996, p. 120)[6]. Later on, Marlow recommends Jim to a variety of proprietors of shops, plantations, and business parties in the East. Denver, “more than middle-aged bachelor, with a reputation for eccentricity” (Conrad, 1986, p. 179)[5], is one of the tradesmen and the owner of a rice mill; he almost adopts Jim. Jim is merely an employee but Denver provides him with a room in his house; according to Marlow, the relationship between Jim and Denver looks like this:

> It seemed to me on reading [Denver’s] letter that my friend had found more than tolerance for Jim—that there were the beginnings of active liking [...] For one thing, Jim kept his freshness in the climate. Had he been a girl--my friend wrote—one could have said he was blooming--blooming modestly--like a violet, not like some of these blatant tropical flowers. (Conrad, 1986, p. 180)[5]

The references to the words like ‘freshness’, ‘blooming’, and ‘violets’ are used by the older males in homoerotic literature especially when a young man’s appearance is described. When Jim departs, Denver seemed very sad as if he were a jilted lover:

> There are no spoons missing, as far as I know... I haven’t been interested enough to enquire. He is gone, leaving on the breakfast-table a formal little note of apology, which is either silly or heartless. Probably both--and it’s all one to me. Allow me to say, lest you should have some more mysterious young men in reserve, that I have shut up shop, definitely and for ever. This is the last eccentricity I shall be guilty of. Do not imagine for a moment that I care a hang. (Conrad, 1986, p.181)[5]

Jim appears rather passively to us. He is more an object rather than a subject since we hardly know about his inner mind. He is a person for whom others feel pity and become emotional. Consequently, Mr. Denver adores him and feels deceived when Jim departs. Noticeably, Jim is devoid of any homosexual orientation; it would be better to say that he just rouses a homoerotic reaction. At the same time, we can rightly say that Jim is not particularly heterosexual either as he leaves Jewel the way he left the mill owner earlier. Certainly, Jewel feels that she has also been deceived by Jim. It goes without saying that Marlow loves Jim too like the way Jewel and Denver do, and feels likewise deceived by his narcissistic suicide.

Marlow last sees Jim when the latter turns into a notable person in Patusan. The inhabitants fear that Marlow will take Jim away from them; they do not want to lose their hero. Jewel is more doubtful about Marlow than others. “While Jim and I were talking,” Marlow tells the reader, “she would come and go with rapid glances at us, leaving on her passage an impression of grace and charm and a distinct suggestion of watchfulness” (Conrad, 1986, p. 251)[5]. Nonetheless, Marlow assures Jewel that he has no intention to take Jim away from her: “‘Why did you come to us from out there?’ she asks Marlow. ‘‘He speaks of you too often. You make me afraid. Do you—do you want him?’ A sort of stealthy fierceness had crept into our
hurried mutters. ‘I shall never come again,’ I said bitterly. ‘And I don’t want him. No one wants him!’ (Conrad, 1986, p. 277)[5].

Marlow’s sourness deceives him; it seems that he does yearn for Jim. But, he has to fight with himself to give up Jim to Jewel. Marlow feels that he has lost something very precious and this feeling becomes crystal clear when he sees Jim for the last time. He says that his shape “seemed to catch all the light left in a darkened world... And, suddenly, I lost him” (Conrad, 1986, p. 291)[5].

Undoubtedly, we recognise and value the tragedy in Lord Jim if we comprehend the infatuated concern of Marlow for Jim and the mental agony of loss that Marlow suffers from. Marlow’s profound feelings for Jim become clear once again when he mourns Jim’s death in his letter to the fortunate reader near the conclusion of the novel. With the portrayal of Jim’s beauty, Marlow’s grief as a depressed lover is exposed. As Marlow says:

> It’s difficult to believe he will never come again. I shall never hear his voice again, nor shall I see his smooth tan-and-pink face with a white line on the forehead, and the youthful eyes darkened by excitement to a profound, unfathomable blue. (Conrad, 1986, p. 296)[5]

### 2.8 Jim is Trustworthy

This trust in another is seen in Marlow’s companionship with Jim and in Stein’s yearning to support a romantic person. Their trust for Jim is vital for his well being. “Conrad believes in faithfulness or fidelity as a prime human virtue...” (Al-Haj, 2014, p. 212) and uses “…a number of characters and incidents as moral touchstones for Jim’s situations” (Karl, 1992, p.45)[7]. “Marlow reiterates that Jim “was one of us”, which signifies beyond the responsible mariners to whom Marlow ostensibly refers, to include all of us who are redeemable (Marlow clearly thinks that characters like Brown, Cornelius and the crew of the Patna are irredeemable). The phrase “one of us” may also gesture towards the Incarnation; given lapidary expression by Blake [in “There is no natural Religion”]: “Therefore God becomes as we are, that we may be as he is” (Vernon, 2013, p. 8)[13]. “When Marlow refers to Jim repeatedly as “one of us”, he recognises in Jim the fellowship of a society that is governed by the concepts of honour and fidelity, yet making allowance for the intrinsic flaws of humanity” (Yang, Hsieh and Tien, 2013, p. 109)[14]. However, C. I. Baxter (2009) interprets ‘one of us’ rather peculiarly in “Lord Jim: A Character in Search of a Plot”:

> She contends that Marlow, in the initial stages of the first part of the novel, spends his energy on avoiding the “depths of horror” in Jim’s apparent trustworthiness through romance techniques of digression which serve to emphasize his similarity to “us”. (as cited in Moosavinia & Alami, n.d., p. 97)[8]

### 2.9 Jim is Manly and Courageous

Maybe Marlow considers Jim as someone manly since he “is powerfully built” (Conrad, 1986, p. 45)[5] and “has an excellent physique” (Conrad, 1986, p. 47)[5]. Besides, Jim is courageous; even when Brierly, one of the judges who sit on Jim’s trial, offers Jim a chance to “clear out” before the official inquiry takes place. “If he went away, all this would stop at once” (Conrad, 1986, p. 92)[5]. It requires immense courage to appear at the court and hear the verdict. We must not forget that “a man is not so courageous by nature although the code of a seaman requires him to be so” (Iwashimizu, n.d. p. 62). Even in Patusan, Jim displays his courage by standing before Doramin:

> Jim’s confrontation with Doramin is Christ-like in his recognition of human fallibility, it must also be remembered that it might also be an action derived from the flamboyant heroism of the light literature that he is described as reading at the outset. Nevertheless, by offering himself up, Jim is to become a martyr to his own cult of heroism. (Yang, Hsieh and Tien, 2013, p. 110)

### 2.10 Jim is Universal

Perhaps, Marlow thinks that since Jim belongs to the human race, all the members of the race are guilty in one way or another. No one is perfect; everyone is guilty of breaking the moral code even at least one in life. “Our common fate is to “hang together” for, in a post-lapsarian world, we are all of us guilty and “under a cloud”’ (Vernon, 2013, p. 7)[13]. However, every guilty person is not caught. J. Hawthorn (2005) indicates at Aristotle’s attitude towards tragedy in “Artful Dodges in Mental Territory: Self-deception in Conrad’s Fiction” while discussing the notion of self-knowledge and self in Lord Jim:

> All of us have our hidden flaw or flaws, and as we know from Marlow’s repeated reminders, Jim is certainly “one of us”; finding out[,] what these flaws are[,] is a never-ending process... One must be tested, and one must learn from the results of the test. Jim fails... (as cited in Moosavinia & Alami, n.d., p. 97)[8]

Marlow feels sad for Jim because he feels Jim’s misery from the heart. In a word, according to Marlow, Jim is universal. This observation becomes solid when we see that Jim has no family name in the novel, which indicates his universality as a person. We come across a universal message when Jim achieves moral victory in Patusan, “…which contributes to the reinstatement of his romantic self-image, it seems that chasm between Jim’s illusions and realities finally ceases to exist, and his inner and outer worlds at last come to a unity” (Yang, Hsieh and Tien, 2013, p. 109)[14]. Therefore, it can rightly be said that Jim is... “one of us,” and in him we meet and see ourselves on moral grounds, so to speak. (Panichas, 2000, p. 19)[9]
3. CONCLUSION

In the end, even though Marlow has not revealed his true intention while calling Jim as ‘one of us’, we have to agree with all the points put forward earlier. All the senses seem to be applicable to Jim- it is Marlow who may have intrinsic racism since he possibly starts helping Jim because he is a white man; besides, Jim has a shameful past like most others; furthermore, he deserves our sympathy and respect because he is trustworthy and a man of honour; perhaps, Jim is not homosexual but perhaps Marlow is and the latter has mistakenly [or correctly] thought that the former is homosexual; he is a man of courage and faces the hurdles of life with positivity; Jim is universal in the sense that he represents ‘everyman’; anyone regardless of the geographical frontiers can relate to his emotions and mental sufferings; his sense of guilt can arouse the similar feeling in every reader’s mind since all of us have done mistakes in certain stages of life. Perhaps, Conrad wants to preach that

the highest human dignity may be to accept the facts of human behavior regardless of their momentary implications. (Skinner, 2005, p. 449[11])

In fact, we can only guess about the possible interpretation of the term ‘one of us’ uttered by Marlow about Jim in the novel. The readers are to judge regarding this. As Tobias Boes (2007)[4] states in “Beyond the Bildungsroman: Character Development and Communal Legitimation in the Early Fiction of Joseph Conrad”, “Marlow never definitively proves that Jim was “one of us,” and in the process leaves us with an analysis of a human subjectivity that in its complexity transcends the simple binarism of communal inclusion and exclusion” (p. 114). Hence it can rightly be said that

Jim is ‘one of us’, says Marlow,
About the man who is exceptional so,
The very phrase is alive with myriad meanings,
That Marlow’s judicious heart ecstatically sings.
Jim is ‘one of us’ regardless of race or religion,
He is ‘universal’ like the ray of the dawn,
An emblem of conscience,
An emblem of goodness in every sense.
Until death, Jim stands for honour,
A hero who compared to death seems stronger. 
(Ziaul Haque, 2015)[16]
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