

I. Introduction to Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go* and the concept of Bio-power

The research critically examines the role of Bio- power in Ishiguro's literary texts *Never Let Me Go*. This research aims at unraveling the subjugation in modern society by exploring the complex identity of narrator and other characters where wireless internet and new technologies especially in medical sector have taken the possibility to new level of power politics, redefining security and reality through universalized medical gaze. To support the claim the researcher draws some of the theoretical insight from Bio-Power mainly forwarded by Michel Foucault, Agamben and Rabinow.

Never Let Me Go (2005) takes place in 1990s which is presented as future. It depicts the imaginary society that normalizes the creation of human clones for the service of human being proper through the therapeutic medical technology. The story projects a society that produces genetic copy of embryos which are grown to certain time period and forced to sacrifice for the sake of medical science. This world blurs the boundary between remedial cloning and reproductive cloning as the clones are reproduced in mass scale.

The narrative questions the project of cloning and appeals the readers to think about human beings and their life which are affected by science of genes. It looks for the answer within the internal development of the individual, thus separating human life from cloned life from the start. But Ishiguro's reworking of the form of life asks a different question: how might human life and cloned persons share a space and context; how might they respond to one another? In other words, rather than talking about clones, it foregrounds an ethical question

regarding cloning and its relationship with human beings. It starts with a different point of reference of the human locating it on the ethical bonds between people when they do have unequal associations with each other or to the world. Through emphasizing narrative modes of relationality by which one's existence begins to "count" in the minds of others within and against normative ways of giving form to life (continuity, teleology, immanent development), the author starts to enlarge the narrative limitations of the human beings. This narrative takes us far away from a well realized human life to more 'fully realized' life to more improbable spaces to dig out the pride and form of human life.

Never Let Me Go is particularly useful in this context because it is a work that calls into question its own generic expectations and thus some of our expectations of the human. The genre confuses with which reviewers greeted Ishiguro's novel is a symptom of this problem of giving form to life. Many "reviewers took pains to distinguish between the heavy-handed, over-determined conventions of a popular genre like science fiction, its mechanistic and thus non-human quality and Ishiguro's interest in the complex, non-conventional world of the human, in "profound emotions" and "individuality" (James 22). For example, in a review subtitled "Ishiguro's Quasi-Science-Fiction Novel" Louis Menand notes that the novel takes up science fiction but that "this is not, at heart, where it seems to want to be" (12). Caryn James argues: "Far from creating genre fiction, these artists use cloning as a way to get at profound emotions of love and loss, and to address a mechanized culture in which individuality itself sometimes seems threatened" (22). These reviewers

preserve a notion of the human individual as non-mechanized, unique, and spontaneous by imagining humanity as only emerging against generic conventions. But this constructed opposition misses Ishiguro's highlighting of the ways in which our notions of the human rely on generic and narrative expectations that give form to life.

Ishiguro upsets the opposition between science fiction as "genre fiction" and the non-mechanistic value of the human by creating science fiction without the technological. Indeed, the novel seems almost to be technology-phobic in its lack of reference to technology, especially bio-technology. Despite the fact that the students' lives are lived in and through medical and bio-medical technologies, these technologies only hover in the background even as they structure their life possibilities. Regarding the originality of the story of this fiction, Keith McDonald argues:

Never Let Me Go is reminiscent of two canonical Science Fiction texts, Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale* (1985), the former of which deals with the issue of cloning and the social implications of a eugenics program, and the latter of which focuses on the plight of a woman in a world where biological reproduction has been hijacked by a totalitarian state. (71)

In other words, by not foregrounding a "mechanized culture," Ishiguro brings together instrumentalization and life, reduction to body parts and the 'wholeness' of life, thus disrupting the assumption that a life must never be

thought of as a means to something else. But still the characters in the text live their life and come into being through the same instrumentalized bodies.

If Ishiguro resists the conception of the human that undergirds the opposition of “banal” science fiction and the “profound emotions” seen to be the province of “high” literature, he further troubles the anticipations of the readers by providing a story of clones in which these clones neither struggle nor fight for their identity as human being proper. Indeed, an online discussion of the text centers on the problem of why these clones do not simply run away, resist, or protest. One comment, posted by “Sandy J,” reads:

Throughout the novel, I kept wondering why somebody doesn't . . . just run away. Or challenge the authorities. . . . Rebellion and questioning authority are a part of the human experience. By not . . . giving anybody in the novel (cloned or otherwise) a counterpoint opinion, it rings false as a human, contentious, viable alternative future. (5)

He draws multiple examples in order to highlights the passion to define humanness in terms of agency and separation, and thus judge the clone students to be inhuman as they fail to resist.

Kazuo Ishiguro's novel *Never Let Me Go* told from the viewpoint of Kathy portrays a dark world with no free will. It is all about three clone-friends who grew up together in the late twentieth century imaginary society. These three students including the narrator study in a boarding school called Hailsham, in which the actual clones are raised to make organ donation in later part of their life. These friends are sent to a communal housing after completing their

schooling. Along with these three friends, other clones finally start donating their organs and complete their cycle.

The subject of cloning has let the author to dig up the ideas about memory and human self and friendship. Karl Shaddox in his writing *Generic Considerations in Ishiguro's Never Let Me Go* states:

In *NLMG*, the ambassadorial perspective is similarly used to create an intimate, emotional connection between Kathy and the reader by humanizing her and by extension the other clones in the novel. To flesh out her voice, Kathy appeals to the reader through narrative episodes that render her and the other clones de facto humans. (454)

Shaddox is mainly concerned about the relationship established by Kathy with the readers which is a kind of emotional bond. In another words, Kathy is able to move her readers with her story. Besides, the novel comes up with the ways her liabilities and innocence are shown and also as an interpreter of what she views her pain and the need for the warmth. The children reared in Hailsham are detached from the outside world. Their self made rules and their chaotic existence.

As Kathy, Ruth and Tommy enter a haunted adulthood, their friendship results in a shifting love triangle with the images of odd beauty and an existential distress. Kathy and Tommy seek out to raise few questions about their identity. She struggles to obtain clarity and satisfaction in an uncooperative world. They were been raised human beings for harvest and are helpless as Marvin Mirsky indicates:

The success of “Dolly,” coupled with the growing practice of familial decisions to have an “extra child” for use as a source of organ transplants when needed for earlier or favored children, has encouraged Ishiguro to imagine a time very near the present when society (Britain in Ishiguro’s case) will have a regular program for producing clones for the specific purpose of providing a ready supply of organs for transplant. (630)

The clones are raised and educated in a special boarding school in which they stay in remote residences where they are instructed and indoctrinated as they are special and are destined for specific purpose which is never explained properly to them.

The novel has been entitled to signify the most pressing imitation of the story. When the narrator listens to a song “Never Let Me Go” in a cassette, she acts as if the singer is rejoicing the birth of a baby whom Kathy would never have. The narrator has worked for more than eleven years as a carer along with Tammy and Ruth, her close friend. Hailsham was considered the best school where Kathy and her friends were taught of being lucky to be a part of. It articulates the symbolic, unheard cry of the subject on the operating table who faces the donation. This statement is the real resistance we can find in the text. Shameem Black in his text, Ishiguro’s *Inhuman Aesthetics* writes:

When the novel invites us to extend sympathies beyond the category of human, it recognizes this category as exclusionary and troubling in itself. The implicit analogies between deracinated, genetically-engineered students and exploited

workers in a multicultural Britain and a globalizing economy ask us to recognize how many people in our own world are not considered fully human. (863)

Individual lives seem to be confined as they are produced only for a special purpose, i.e. for organ donation, and this shows that their life is also out of their own control. They can only imagine horrific death they will experience as donors.

Though cloning is claimed to preserve the biological continuity and be used to save one's own children. Mark Jerng departs with the opinion as:

For critics, cloning violates precisely this same sanctified space of the family because it represents the use of children for "convenience," for "spare body parts," which is inimical to the construction of the person as a whole as codified within traditional family forms of "cultivation." (7)

The parent and child relation is as one that of cultivation where they design and program their children according to their wish. No parent can treat the clone child as with the child given birth out of natural biological process.

In this context, Critic Gabriele Griffin in his article "Science and the Cultural Imaginary: The Case of Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*" states:

At the heart of *Never Let Me Go* is the question of the relative status of the clones and of what it means to be human. *Never Let Me Go* raises the question of how we are meant to think of the clones – are they like us or unlike us? The impulse to see them as

‘like us’ is realized through the experiment that is Hailsham, the boarding school where the clones are brought up. (653)

The text combines different types of biotechnical developments such as cloning, organ harvesting, designer babies into one set of fictional obsessions concurrently compressing into a particular perspective. But still the readers, of course, different from the characters especially the clones, try to analyze the life of the clones. Harrison believes that the novel move readers and argues:

The story is presented through the eyes of a young woman, Kathy H., who is among the human clones created to serve as organ "donors" and "carers." Carers are clones who, before they become donors themselves, are assigned to care for those in the donor phase of their lives as they are gradually killed by repeated organ retrievals. In this regard Bruce Jennings in his article “Biopower and the Liberationist Romance” writes:

Ishiguro's narrative device allows him to insinuate this future system of biopower in faint outline, instead of describing it directly and in narrative detail as a typical work of science fiction would do. By adopting the perspective of one of the new class of human beings created by this system, and by tracing her gradually dawning awareness of her status and function in the world, Ishiguro explores ambivalence, defensive denial, and the complex process of identity formation. (18)

It is obvious that the maximum use of power for maximizing life holds a darker side. Anything can be justified when the state is engaged in protecting life of the citizen and when the stakes are life within itself. If certain groups are

categorized as the potential threat to the nation or the humanity then such groups are eradicated with impunity. In recent time, genocide can be seen but it is not out of the return of ancient right to kill other rather it is exercised because power is implemented at the level of organism, race, species and the large-scale population as the subject of the state.

The novel restructures our common definitions of the human and has considered human as not a whole person as Mark Jerng states; “Ishiguro explores the theme of partial personhood by showing the struggle of the narrator, Kathy, to stage her life in terms of the usual parameters of an innocent childhood and a mature adulthood” (382). The characters body has been reduced to the parts that can be reused in other bodies. Jerng further writes:

Ishiguro brings together instrumentalization and life, reduction to body parts and the ‘wholeness’ of life, thus disrupting the assumption that a life must never be thought of as a means to something else. Indeed, the characters in this novel struggle to live through their instrumentalized bodies. (383)

Clone is the product of another’s will and further assumes oneself as an instrumentalized body. The clone fails to construct himself as a developmental unity. They are not fully realized people. Despite these they learn to live as a human and make a sense of their lives as clones.

Using the body as the spare parts is almost the improper use of the innocent child. Cloning has destroyed the autonomy and agency and the very idea of giftedness. It is not about rearing or raising but cultivating. They do behave as human but are not human in real.

In the “Notes on Reading Kazuo Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go*” Marvin Mirsky commented on the purpose of creativity, art, and exposing outsiders to the art, was to make the clones real to their counterparts:

One learns that at the “residence” of Hailsham, special courses involving creative activities like painting, sculpture, poetry, and the arts in general have been introduced in order to answer a crucial question: do clones have souls? One may quarrel with the method or the premise underlying the method, but the seriousness and the implications of the question and its answer are beyond evasion. (629)

Creativity is honestly related to being perceived as human. As clones, Hailsham students are encouraged, or likely to produce artwork that displays both heart and soul for those who judge their status.

From the short analysis of the selected novel we can suppose that, Power is now exercised through machines and the structured sites of social institutions that directly organize the brains and bodies toward a state of autonomous alienation from the sense of life. To support these assumptions, we can take the theoretical bases of several theorists and their theories regarding Biopower.

It discusses how Biopower was exercised in terms of transplanting human organs in the novel. Kathy, the central character, in one context comments on those cloned peoples’ future; “No, I don’t think she meant that. What she was talking about was, you know, about *us*. What’s going to happen to us one day? Donations and all that” (87). She gives a speech to the students around her, explaining to them that they will never grow old or have careers

because they will be compelled to make organ donations. The students are talking about the careers they want when they grow up, and Kathy becomes very upset.

Bio-power is all about having power over bodies to manage them as a group. Michael Foucault argues that bio-power is modern appearance of power and is supposed to bring positive impact on life, optimize and multiply life by bringing under certain regulations. While defining the bio-power, Foucault opposes the conventional sovereign power that was exercised to seize things, time bodies and seizing of life.

Foucault's work allows us to recognize Biopower as a form of power that regulates social life from its interior and even throughout the brains and bodies of the citizens residing in the society. It can be argued that within modern state there is a reconciliation of bio-power and sovereign power that legitimizes the misdeeds of the government in power.

Agamben deploys the history of the bio-power in talking about new form of power that takes the bare lives, bodies of the people to political calculations and that marks the modern state. This ultimately proves that the bio-power existed since the beginning of the concept of sovereign in the West. There is nexus between sovereign power and bio-power, and so the bond between sovereignty and bare life. Citizen whose life is reduced into a bare life exists as determined by the sovereign.

In contrast to Foucault, Agamben is of the opinion that, bio-power differs from body power over bare life rather it is power over all life for the sake

of the living. Bio-power is not power in conventional sense but it is the living condition of all collective life and also the measure of the success of bio-power.

In simple term, bioethics is an activity associated with the reflective concern of ethics in different medical domains such as healthcare, health policy, health science and genetic engineering. Outwardly, it sounds like bioethics is only related with hospitals and doctors but in fact it is also related with labs, patients, scientists, politicians and general public as well. Despite massive interference of medical science in human life the issue is bioethics hardly gets attention as the medical field is highly trusted in comparison to other profession.

Probably this is why it is called that bioethics is under the shadow of other great structure and its contribution is not regarded properly in understanding power. One of the problems in the narrative of bioethics is to present it in the fashion of liberationist romance. Autonomy seeking individual, fighting against limitations, and inhibitions inflicted from outer forces like customs, traditions, rules, regulations and institutions. But the scenario is different now; the old liberationist romance is challenged and corrected. There are at least two perspectives to counter the old notion. First, “deontological humanism” i.e. redefines our understanding of dignity and individual sovereignty beyond minimalist notions of freedom from other’s intrusion. Second, ‘critical deconstruction of “biopolitics” and “biopower”’ that gives systematic and political narrative of ethics in relation to power.

When we analyze these criticisms, we come to realize that the intervention of biotechnology into the human life threatens our dignity, sovereignty and rights. This also destroys the basic foundation of personhood,

individual identity upon which these ideals have been erected. It is because, though biotechnology is often designed to promote human subjects, it is reductionist form of power that destroys human self which is regarded as a unique subject. Individuated selves become fungible parts such as 'healthy people' or 'people with genetic defects.' Both bio-power and biotechnology subvert the individualist notion of moral and political community. Rather than taking state as a social contract for mutual self-interest, it is taken as a structure of protection designed to preserve the life of productive, functional and efficient bodies, and exclude dangerous, defective, or deviant life.

Criticism on bio-power has a long history. Foucault inspired through his work "Labeling Theory" in sociology, psychiatry and related institutions. In recent years, genetic engineering and bio-technology have been developed because the bio-power has also been broadened.

Never Let Me Go possesses uniqueness in rhetoric and tone in its narrative. The imaginary world is looked from the perspective of Kathy H., an ordinary woman but a human clone produced to serve human being proper as organ 'donor' and 'carer.' Donors are the clones who donate their vital organs to the original human beings. Similarly, carers are those who before being donors look after donors as they are gradually die or 'killed' completely by donating organs multiple times.

Ishiguro employs the narrative that instead of describing it directly and in detail as traditional sci-fi does, allows him to use a new potential system of creating clones. The author exposes the contemporary issues like defensive denial, ambivalence and the complex nature of identity formation. The narrator,

Kathy, gradually gets knowledge that she along with her clone fellows are created and educated to be passive and accept their role as carer and donor obviously. They are stigmatized and out casted in modern sense as they are not equal to proper human beings. *Never Let Me Go* falls under genre called 'coming-of-age' and is mainly concerned with the practice of bio-power in the aging bodies and failing organs. The setting of the story is an imagined community of organ transplantation and procurement which is made effective through human cloning.

Clones are the group of organisms created from one forebear asexually to which they are genetically identical. In the past, Aldous Huxley talked about a society of "standard men and women . . . millions of identical twins. The principle of mass production at last applied to biology" (7). Proving this possibility, the world has seen the success of the Human Genome Project, highlighting a day when cloning of human beings is technically feasible. But still the clones are presented as a faceless and nameless being and enemy of human beings.

No doubt this fiction is a story related to clones, but it subverts the traditional image of clone as zombies rather the clones here are very rational civilized, and creative. If we follow some clone fellows like Kathy and Tommy from their days at Hailsham to the finishing point of their lives, it is sorrowful that the clones hold unique faces, names and personalities. The story unveils the darker side of technological development and its intervention in human body as the clones are harvested to the maturity to donate the originals. But the difficulty comes in the story when these clones develop normal human

behaviors. They cry, laugh, write and fall in love before the ‘completion’ of their cycle from carer to donor.

The society that created and raised the clones know and accept that the clones are normal in all sense. Miss Emily, the headmistress at Hailsham, reveals Kathy and Tommy that they do possess soul as their creation are collected and displayed in The Gallery:

Why did we take your artwork? Why did we do that? You said an interesting thing earlier, Tommy. . . .You said it was because your art would reveal what you were like. What you were like inside. . . .Well you weren’t far wrong about that. We took away your art because we thought it would reveal your souls. Or to put it more finely, we did it to *prove you had souls at all*. (120)

The headmistress discloses the rationale of The Gallery. This rejects the conventional thought clones as soulless beings. In fact, the discourse about clones as soulless beings is to rationalize the practice of out casting clones.

The clones are compassionate and intelligent human beings. They differ only because the society they are surrounded from is unable to take them as human beings. They take the clones only as their ‘shadowy objects in test tubes.’ Despite this, even those that know them best remain afraid as Kathy explains,

. . . in the same way, someone might be afraid of spiders. . . .

[And] the moment when you realize that you really are different to them; that there are people out there, like [that], who don’t hate you or wish you any harm, but who nevertheless shudder at

the very thought of you – of how you were brought into this world and why – and who dread the idea of your hand brushing against theirs. The first time you glimpse yourself through the eyes of a person like that, it's a cold moment. (17)

Kathy's narration expresses the fear she senses in human beings. Actually this fear is the result of the consequences of human's intervention in the lives of the clones. Defamiliarizing the clones is some dehumanizing the clones but the fact is that the inhumanity human sees in clones do not belong to clones inherently to the clones themselves.

In 2002, there was raising concern about cloning. The president's council on Bioethics concluded that reproductive cloning "would affect not only the direct participants but also the entire society that allows of supports this activity . . . cloning is morally unacceptable, and ought not to be attempted" (xxix). Similarly, in 2006 US president, George Bush, formally urged Congress to "pass legislation to prohibit the most egregious abuses of medical research: human cloning in all its forms . . ." (2). Today, the dominant view is that human cloning should not be allowed unless and until it is demonstrably safe and effective, until it is safe and technically feasible. Along with this there is ethical concern as well.

Ishiguro attempts to show that the normals are frightened out of nothing. The fear is in the mind of the normals and there is no concrete reason to be afraid of clones. One thing is for sure that the existence of the clones creates a kind of threat to the normals and they tend to dehumanize the clones. In this

sense, the author is talking not about soulless clones but soulless society who denies accepting the existence of clones as normals.

Critical View on Cloning

Finn Bowring has analyzed a distinction between reproductive cloning and therapeutic cloning while analyzing the contemporary technologies of cloning and ethical consequences. He writes:

It is because treatments derived from embryonic stem cells are likely to require the production of human embryos by cloning, that scientists and politicians have popularized the distinction between ‘therapeutic’ and ‘reproductive’ cloning, and made strong moral and legal cases for prohibiting the latter (defined as implanting a cloned embryo in a woman’s womb). (403)

This distinction between the reproductive and therapeutic cloning holds the interest on the use of embryos in medical research and the truth that reproduction is vital to all forms of cloning. Reproductive cloning is a kind of assisted reproduction that is outlawed but is naturalized as ‘the right to a child’ whereas therapeutic cloning is justified medical means. This debate shows that the technology is accepted by human society but the issue is the goal of the technology. Here the question of ethics holds all the importance.

Critical View on Bio-power

The term bio-power is coined by French philosopher Michel Foucault which is related to the exercise of modern nation states and their regulation of their citizen via “an explosion of numerous and diverse techniques for achieving the subjugations of bodies and the control of populations” (34). Similarly,

Rabinow reads Foucault and writes: “As the fostering of life and the growth and care of population becomes a central concern of the state, articulated in the art of government, a new regime of power takes hold. Foucault calls this regime “bio-power” (17).

One of the prominent critics on Foucault, Paul Rabinow, puts forward some ideas upon the new thought on power. He writes:

The old power of death that symbolized sovereign power was now carefully supplanted by the administration of bodies and the calculated management of life. During the classical period, there was a rapid development of various disciplines – universities, secondary schools, barracks, workshops; there was also the emergence, in the field of the political practices and economic observation, of the problems of birth rate, longevity, public health, housing, and migration. Hence there was an explosion of numerous and diverse techniques for achieving the subjugation of bodies and the control of populations, marking the beginning of an era of “bio-power.” (26)

Foucault identified the rise of a new technology of modern power in the second half of the eighteenth century. This new technology could be distinguished from its original power by the way it directs individuals. Sovereign power takes individual as part of social body comprised in contractual term whereas disciplinary power influences only as a body; as a machine that holds specific capabilities and uses: “This new power, on the other hand, reformulates the existing disciplinary concept of the individual body as a species-body, a

multiple body with so many heads that, while they might not be infinite in number, cannot necessarily be counted” (245).

This process of managing people works on a more totalizing context rather than at the level of individuals. For the functioning of this mechanism, it is necessary to downsize human beings as a population. So, bio-power functions both scientifically and politically in order to minimize a population’s vulnerability to such liabilities such as health, birthrate, longevity and race.

Bio-politics’ “purpose is not to modify any given phenomenon as such, [nor] to modify a given individual insofar as he is an individual” (247). It aims to advance human life via managing, isolating, and regulating the elements that intimidate human existence. Essentially, bio-politics enforces to bring what out to be; it decreases the mortality rate, boosts up life expectancy, and manipulate birth rate. So, bio-politics creates a controlling mechanism in order to achieve a kind of balance between different biological processes. Supporting this, Mitchell Dean elaborates:

It is concerned with matters of life and death, with birth and propagation, with health and illness, both physical and mental, and with the processes that sustain or retard the optimization of the life of the population. Bio-politics must then also concern the social, cultural, environmental, economic and geographical conditions, under which humans live, procreate, become ill, maintain health or become healthy, and die. From this perspective bio-politics is concerned with the family, living conditions, with what we call ‘lifestyle’, with public health

issues, patterns of migration, levels of economic growth and the standards of living. It is concerned with the biosphere in which human's dwell. (99)

These statements focus at the concepts different activities of population and state related to health. It clarifies that biology of the population is taken a legitimate matter for government intervention. It legitimizes state's political action and its consequences on the issue of health of the population.

Bio-power is now associated with the new vision of development. It is the result of new form of knowledge about the regimes that demands new standard of life of the population as a collective rather than individual. The consent to this new knowledge creates fundamental experience of life and death, suffering and health and collective and individual identity that are linked to the practice of power by the state.

However, bio-political interventions are not exercise at the state level. They function in a collaborative manner with other specialize agencies and via different modes of subjectification. But it will be mistaken to take population as territorially bound members to give consent to be ruled by the sovereign power rather they are essential beings with their own every day practices, habits, norms and personalities. This asserts that population are not mere subject of the state, they can work on themselves to optimize and improve their living standards and enable and permit various authorities to function bio-political interferences.

Foucault introduces bio-politics as the phenomenon that took place in early modern era through which politics came into existence as a power over

life. In this sense, bio-politics is a transformation in the idea of politics as it achieves domination over life through legal control. He asserts that “. . . until the baroque age, the preservation of biological life, much like the capacity to speak, had been considered merely the preconditions, not the ends, of a political way of life” (143). He further clarifies the discourse of early Roman on body in his book *The Care of the Self*. He argues:

. . . medicine was not conceived simply as a technique of intervention, relying, in cases of illness, on remedies and operations. It was also supposed to define, in the form of a corpus of knowledge and rules, a way of living, a reflective mode of relation to oneself, to one’s body, to food, to wakefulness and sleep, to the various activities, and to the environment. Medicine was expected to propose, in the form of regimen, a voluntary and rational structure of conduct. (99–100)

Foucauldian concept of bio-politics is modern phenomenon and it had different dimension during Roman era. At that time, medical interferences used to be taken not as interferences but as voluntary and rational way of conduct. There was less role and control of state over the health of the population. Similarly, in the classical period, it was not only a “virtual explosion of disciplinary institutions - schools, workshops, hospitals; but also an upsurge in political interest for the specific problems that populations face” (141).

Foucault is, especially, concerned about Eighteenth century as it was the period when human civilizations started to evaluate, measure and manage the problems related to human life and health. Some totalizing and individuating

mechanisms of discipline were created during that period and that is why, that marked the new beginning of the era of 'bio-power.' For him, bio-power was a absolute break from the conventional thought of power practically as well as conceptually. No doubt, sovereign power still exists in the society but it is no longer in the same form. That is why, Foucault asserts that the radical shift in the exercise of power in pre-modern and modern era is that the power cannot be centralized or localized in a single entity or individual. Traditional sovereign power is fragmented in modern era. It "is everywhere, not because it embraces everything but because it comes from everywhere" (93). For him, Sovereign power is power over death of the population whereas bio-power is similar power but over life. This clarifies the shifting nature of power from pre-modern to modern era and also the claims of the state and other authorizes over the death and life of the population.

This research mainly concerns about the application of Foucauldian concept of bio-power in Ishiguro's fiction *Never Let Me Go* in which the researcher dwells upon how life has become the site of power play of the state. To support the hypothesis, the researcher has divided the dissertation into three parts. The first chapter introduces the primary text of the research, different perspectives of critics on the text and the concept of Foucauldian bio-power. The same chapter reviews the previous researchers claim and forwards the departure from them. The second chapter is textual analysis in which the researcher studies the primary text from the perspective of bio-power. This chapter draws and cites different textual evidences and the statement of different theorists on bio-power to prove the research claim. And finally, the last

chapter concludes the finding of the research and also forwards the possible area for further search.

II. Giving Form to Life in Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*

The major argument of this research is the increasing technological scrutiny of the state over its citizens and how that give new form to their life. Drawing the ideas from Foucauldian concept of Bio-power, the researcher studies its implication in the modern life. In general, the technological invasion within the territory of human subjectivity is regulatory means of the state.

In the *History of Sexuality*, Michael Foucault forwards the idea of bio-power in modern context. In simple words, power is the ability to change the behaviors and decisions of others. But Foucault defines in different terms and tries to distinguish this new form of power by contrasting with the conventional form of sovereign power: “the ancient right to take life or let live was replaced by a power to foster life or disallow it to the point of death” (138). Thus, It relates to the practice of modern nation states and their regulation of their subjects through diverse techniques for achieving the control over their subjects. Foucault further elaborates it as:

This power over life evolved in two basic forms; these forms were not antithetical, however; they constituted rather two poles of development linked together by a whole intermediary cluster of relations. One of these poles—the first to be formed, it seems—centred on the body as machine: its disciplining, the optimization of its capabilities, the extortion of its forces, the parallel increase of its usefulness and its docility, its integration into systems of efficient and economic controls, all this was ensured by the procedures of power that characterised the

disciplines: an anatomo-politics of the human body. The second, formed somewhat later, focused on the species body, the body imbued with the mechanics of life and serving as the basis of the biological processes: propagation, births and mortality, the level of health, life expectancy and longevity [. . .] Their supervision was effected through an entire series of interventions and regulatory controls: a bio-politics of the population. (139)

Biopolitics, therefore, is related with the second types of exercise of power that acts as a strategy to govern over citizens as a whole. It minutely examines the mechanism of life and studies the interventions injected at different level of life. Biopolitics is not only concerned about health, it also takes different dimensions of human life such as life expectancy and longevity and control over them into account.

He describes Bio politics as a new technology of power that exists at a different level, on a different scale. Supporting this, Katia Genel in “The Question of Biopower: Foucault and Agamben” writes:

The hypothesis of biopower, which Foucault formulated at a turning point in his investigations, brings to light a specific mode of exercising power: beginning with the eighteenth century, life is the privileged stakes of power. It is the life of individual bodies, objects of an anatomo-politics that are concerned and, in this respect, Foucault is engaged in a continuation of his analysis of disciplines. More precisely, however, beginning with the second half of the eighteenth century, the stakes of political

strategies become the life of the human species, thereby marking
 “a society’s ‘threshold of biological modernity.’” (43)

Conventional sovereign power imposes what individuals cannot do but Foucault’s bio-politics is mainly concerned about positive aspects of human activities, that means unlike sovereign power, it emphasizes what individuals can do. So power mechanisms are positive means in bio-politics. Foucault believes that these mechanisms are able to function in modernity because they ultimately “exist on different levels . . . operate on different scales and thus make use of very different instruments” (242). Essentially, Foucault noted, “they exist as two sides of the same coin, or rather, as two opposite poles” (139). Bio-politics, even in its first formations, did not attempt to exclude or reject the established techniques of disciplinary power. In fact, Foucault contended, it was able to effectively embrace them, to “dovetail into [disciplinary power], integrate it, modify it to some extent, and above all, use it by sort of infiltrating it, [and] embedding itself in existing disciplinary techniques” (242).

According to Foucault, the powers are “situated and exercised at the level of life” (137). They are the steady force that persistently manage, administer and manipulate the life, its process and circumstances. Foucauldian concept of power contrasts with sovereign power in the sense that it mainly concerned with specific tasks like taxes, property and life of the subject itself.

Kathy, the narrator and the protagonist while introducing in the opening lines of the novel, tells us her own story. She looks back over her life from the perspective of her thirty-one-year-old self, and tries to remember all her most

important experiences. Kathy is already a carer while narrating the past. She states that she feels lonely at work as she is forced to move frequently from one place to another and from one clinic to another. At the same time, she also becomes hopeful that she will get company after being donator. This is how her career forwards; carer to donator. She begins her story as:

My name is Kathy H. I'm thirty-one years old, and I've been a carer now for over eleven years. That sounds long enough, I know, but actually they want me to go on for another eight months, until the end of this year. That'll make it almost exactly twelve years. Now I know my being a carer so long isn't necessarily because they think I'm fantastic at what I do. There are some really good carers who've been told to stop after just two or three years. And I can think of one carer at least who went on for all of fourteen years despite being a complete waste of space. So I'm not trying to boast. But then I do know for a fact they've been pleased with my work, and by and large, I have too. My donors have always tended to do much better than expected. Their recovery times have been impressive, and hardly any of them have been classified as "agitated," even before fourth donation. Okay, maybe I am boasting now. But it means a lot to me, being able to do my work well, especially that bit about my donors staying "calm." I've developed a kind of instinct around donors. I know when to hang around and comfort them, when to

leave them to themselves; when to listen to everything they have to say, and when just to shrug and tell them to snap out of it. (1)

Ishiguro reveals the theme of partial personhood by showing the struggle of Kathy to stage her life in terms of the usual limitations of an innocent childhood and a mature adulthood. This introductory section clarifies that the clones such as Kathy are treated as subject to medical gaze through which their activities are scrutinized and prescribed to them. Foucault stresses that sovereign power can be exercised periodically and it claims power over the life and death of the people.

Foucault defines it as the “right to *take* life or *let* live, a power that was definitively improved upon by bio-power, the power to foster life or disallow it to the point of death” (138). He further argues, “the old power of death that symbolized sovereign power [was] carefully supplanted by the administration of bodies and the calculated management of life” (139-140). Power, in traditional sense, is practiced for enhancing life rather than seizing life or defers death. In the text also, the young clones are doomed to face premature death as they are created for organ donations. They try to search truth and reality of their life through

For Foucault, Death is not a visible demonstration of power in modernity: “it is the end of life, the term, the limit, or the end of power too. Death is outside the power relationship . . . [it] is beyond the reach of power, [for] power has a grip on it only in general, overall, or statistical terms” (247-8). But the relation of death to a sovereign power was public, obvious, and the most

extravagant materialization of sovereign authority. Beyond execution, “death still had everything to do with power,” as one sovereign (the king) was comforted by another (god) (138). Opposite to this conventional idea, Foucault sustained that death in modern time is “the moment when the individual escapes power” (248). It has become survival strategy of the modern man.

Kathy puts forward it with an clarification about ho:

[w]e still didn't discuss the donations and all that went with them . . . it became something we made jokes about . . . now it was okay, almost required, every now and then, to make some jokey allusion to these things that lay in front of us. A good example is what happened the time Tommy got the gash on his elbow. (84)

By averting the episode of Tommy's gash before telling it, Kathy distracts the horror of the organ donations by explaining it away prior to an illustrative plot. On surface level, Kathy's narration sounds unreliable as she does not remember things in detail and she can't possibly be everywhere at the same time. It is no secret that Kathy does not have perfect recall. She often admits that she might not remember everything accurately and another character remembers the same event differently. She often states that she may be misremembering certain details.

Kathy gets confused about her past as her present understandings about life have already been troubled any capacity to learn what she experienced in the past. Talking about the secrecy of why the clones' art-work was unruffled into a “Gallery,” She queries her earlier assumption: “But did we really believe in the Gallery? Today, I'm not sure” (32). Kathy tries to reassemble what she

might have experienced in the past which was blurred, foggy, and she is not been able to reconnect with her past. Her narration is only from her own point of view, hence, a subjective one. She does not recall events in strict chronological order, frequently interrupting one memory to share a related memory from another period in her life.

The discontinuity in narration is usual in autobiographical narration. It is also vital because Kathy takes her life lived as an incomplete one. She cannot take her life as a complete whole as she needs to find justification for being, existing and experiencing elsewhere through different narrative modes.

Robinow argues as:

An essential component of technologies of normalization is the key role they play in the systematic creation, classification, and control of “anomalies” in the social body. Their *raison d’etre* comes from two claims of their promoters: first, that certain technologies serve to isolate anomalies; and second, that one can then normalize anomalies through corrective or therapeutic procedures, determined by other related technologies. (21)

This definition of human is significant as the clones also need to fall under the culturally specific category to be called human. The mere existence is not sufficient someone to be called human. There are certain expectations from the society and the clones are refused to be categorized as authentic human being. The social discourse draws the distinction between human and formless clones.

The fiction raises the question that challenges our discourse on humanness: a not ‘born’ life in the common sense awarded form and dignity.

By disrupting the account of individuation, the author gives us the imaginative space for changing our prospect of the form of humanity.

One cannot deny that the author has portrayed the clones as proper human beings. He presents a story that subverts the narrative of individuation. This is a greatly upsetting story because it holds back our desire for liberation: clones become human because they do not rebel. Instead, they realize their status as clones.

In this way, *Never Let Me Go* disrupts the discourse of humanness and the values given to birth, life and wholeness of life. Foucault believes that bio-power has carried mechanisms of life into the domain of politics. Politics is more about power and less about law. He further argues: "Such a power has to qualify, measure, appraise, and hierarchize, rather than display itself in its murderous splendor; it does not have to draw the line that separates the enemies of the sovereign from his obedient subjects; it [instead] effects distributions around the norm" (144). Foucault takes the norm as the one component capable of regularly circulating between the disciplinary and the regulatory mechanism. He further goes, "the norm is something that can be applied to both a body one wishes to discipline and a population one wishes to regularize," for just as individuals have certain behaviors and regularities, so too does the population (252).

For the management of the population, Foucault believes, an institution with the power and ability is required to make certain rules and regulations about how citizens should live. This is not just for individuals but individuals as members of the family and citizens of a state. Thus, according to Foucault,

medical discipline was developed because it takes “public hygiene, with institutions to coordinate medical care, centralize information, and normalize knowledge,” as its main function (243). Medical discipline deals different problems related to populations. It directly intervenes the private life of the public through different means such as public health campaigns.

Recent political objective has been the raising of the health level of the people. For this Foucault concludes, “The imperative of health was at once the duty of each and the objective of all” (341).

Similarly, Kathy’s narration indicates that these clones were always scrutinized by certain medical team. They were always under medical gaze. She remembers what the regular schedule for health checkup at Haisham was as:

I don’t know how it was where you were, but at Hailsham we had to have some form of medical almost every week—usually up in Room 18 at the very top of the house—with stern Nurse Trisha, or Crow Face, as we called her. That sunny morning a crowd of us was going up the central staircase to be examined by her, while another lot she’d just finished with was on its way down. (7)

A central narrative tactic that Ishiguro uses is to emphasize narrative from the perspective not of the ‘whole’ individual but of the partial individual. He begins to regenerate our definitions of the human by stressing the tensions between the narrative prospects of humanness when “taken as a whole” and narrative as a relational, communicative exercise between persons.

The paradox of being whole is that one is never complete unless there is someone else to tell the story. One's unique story and one's childhood is always partial. This view of partiality forwards an aspect of humanness that is always dependent on and attached to others. Thus, questioning the hypothesis and the idea of 'fully realized' individual count as human.

The story in the fiction carries a life from early childhood to the age of thirty-one more or less chronologically. But this story does not move from inexperience to experience or from childishness to adulthood or from dependence to independence; a narrative arc inherent in the construction of the enlightenment individual. Kathy narrates her life as: "Certainly, it feels like I always knew about donations in some vague way, even as early as *six* or *seven*. And it's curious, when we were older and the guardians were giving us those talks, nothing came as a complete surprise. It was like we'd heard everything somewhere before" (83). We learn very early on that the students were "told and not told." Kathy attempts to negotiate the gap between what she knew and understood in the past and in the present, but cannot possess one from the other.

We hardly find the difference in the manner of conversation between Kathy and Tommy when they were at Hailsham and when they are older. This can be observed in her narration towards the end of the story. Their interactions are not particularly "adult": "Maybe Tommy and I were making a special effort to be nice to each other, but the time seemed to slip by in an almost carefree way . . . Once or twice, Tommy even brought out his notebook and doodled away for new animal ideas while I read from the bed" (283). Though Kathy suggests a division between innocence and experience, she actually blurs the

two. As Kathy looks back at the halcyon days of Hailsham from her present knowledge of her fate as a clone, the distinction between innocence and experience does not hold.

This kind of plot development rejects the conventional form of linearity from innocence to experience. Rather, life of a clone moves from childhood to career to donor and finally to completion. The clones are known through their functionality rather than internal development. Kathy shows with the narration about the donation Ruth made and aftermath:

We were having this conversation on a fine summer evening, sitting out on the little balcony of her recovery room. It was a few months after her first donation, and now she was over the worst of it, I'd always time my evening visits so that we'd be able to spend a half hour or so out there, watching the sun go down over the rooftops. (9)

Ishiguro is more interested to show the conflict between the one's desire to take life as a whole and other narrative modalities by which a life can be calculated. The principle of individuation uniquely identifies one individual in relation to others. It gives form to life in ways that ensure structures of personhood such as uniqueness and singularity. This is because it traces the grounds for a full realization of the human as a state property. The formation of new agency of individual identity or personhood is marked with separation from school, parents and immaturity. This helps clones to realize their personhood as authentic which is further realized through the relational aspect of their belief system.

The paradox of identity can be found in clones as well. It is natural phenomena to associate ourselves with our parents or our origin. But the clones association with their origin differs from normal parents-child relationship. The clones can find their origins whom they call “possible” but unlike parents-child emotional bond, clones’ relation with their possible is only biological one.

Kathy observes that their relationship with the “possible” and notes: “Some students thought you should be looking for a person twenty to thirty years older than yourself - the sort of age a normal parent would be. But others claimed this was sentimental. Why would there be a ‘natural’ generation between us and our models” (139). Kathy stresses not that the possible is like a parent or a point of genealogical origin by looking for the possible they are not searching for their origins, i.e. where they came from or their background. Rather, it is a working out of who they are through the credence that there is someone else who they are like.

On the one hand, the narrative of a relational practice changes the clones’ perspective from life “taken as a whole” toward personhood as the ability to relate with the other, on the other hand, Madame and Miss Emily enforce on the clones a narrative of individuation and the need to show their unique inner selves. Kathy records the need to relate to others as a way to confirm her own experience. She comments on her visit to Ruth as: “But Ruth didn’t get my point — or maybe she was deliberately avoiding it. Maybe she was determined to remember us all as more sophisticated than we were. Or maybe she could sense where my talk was leading, and didn’t want us to go that way” (18). The dialogue between Ruth and Kathy exposes the crisis resulted by

being unable to hold on to the versions of the past that mark their lives shareable and coterminous. Kathy gets so irritated with Ruth, and later Tommy with Kathy. This misremembering claims the very reality of their existence into question.

Memories are never complete without out others as we start remembering through others. That means other's memory undermines our memory as well. The difficult relationship of the clones as 'carer' and 'donor' joins on this inability to find a stable life, a kind of the past uninterrupted by another. This reality questions their understanding and the extension as personhood in this world. The author intends to draw our attention to the fluctuating nature of our personhood as human because our memory itself is shared and overlaps with each other. So a complete "oneself" never exists in absence with others.

This is shown in the meeting of Kathy, Tommy, Madame and Miss Emily near the end of the novel. Madame and Miss Emily offer the narrative of the individual as a whole with all of its tropes of growth and individual uniqueness. Miss Emily tells Kathy and Tommy:

We sheltered you during those years, and we gave you your childhoods . . . I'm so proud to see you both. You built your lives on what we gave you. You wouldn't be who you are today if we'd not protected you. You wouldn't have become absorbed in your lessons; you wouldn't have lost yourselves in your art and your writing." (268)

Miss Emily behaves like a true parent. She feels proud of her children that they are now grown up and ready to perform their act as donors.

This shows that their lives get meaning on the basis of their functionality which is countered by different theories by Tommy and Kathy about the Gallery, their own stories of self-realization. They are designed to prolong the life of original human beings for many more years. This way of making a life count leaves Tommy with the despairing retort, “There was nothing more to it than that?” (266). It leaves the young people with the feeling that they do not count as human after all – and ultimately, in the eyes of Miss Emily and Madame, they do not treat as human: “We’re all afraid of you. I myself had to fight back my dread of you all almost every day I was at Hailsham” (269). The conversation and the alternative version of the clones signify the limited existence of the clones defined by the state through administration or through medical team.

Ishiguro’s novel ultimately disrupts the binary between clone and human on which narratives of clones’ individuation rely. This can be seen at the level of narrative address. For Kathy’s narrative starts as an apology for her conduct and position, as if her life were to be judged in terms of some normative horizon represented by the reader: “Okay, maybe I am boasting now. But it means a lot to me, being able to do my work well” (3). It suggests that the narrator is experiencing things that anyone could know. It brings the reader into alignment and identification with the narrator: “If you think about it, being dependent on each other to produce the stuff that might become your private treasures — that’s bound to do things to your relationships” (16). But the “you” addressed is

also other clones: “I don’t know if you had ‘collections’ where you were” (38). This kind of double mode of addressee challenges the easy divide between the implicit reader as human and the “you” as clone. The assumption behind this statement is that “you” were in some other place – not Hailsham- that also raised clones. Indeed, the form of addressee places being a human and being a clone side-by-side, as “you” are made in-between the condition of being human and the condition of being a clone.

Very soon, Kathy outlines that the account of her past specially during her school years turns out to be a complex and half reality. Kathy realizes that Tommy has fierce temper that leads to pitiless maltreatment by schoolmates. Tommy is often known for his temper tantrums, his lack of creative skills and his dullness. These clones produce creative writings like poems, paint, and artifacts for exchange in Hailsham and uncreative clones are bullied.

The argument regarding creativity in Hailsham was however serious and endangered Tommy’s future. Surprisingly, Tommy has changed over the years and he can hold his temper too. His irritability shortly disappears without much convincing. Miss Lucy, a guardian, thinks that it’s ok if Tommy is not creative. However, she suggests that he should not pay much attention to the circulating gossip. The conversation between Miss Lucy and Tommy might sound almost frivolous, but as Tommy recollects it, he emphasizes that “when she said all this, she was shaking” (28). She was trembling out of hidden fury, yet the cause for the anger remains, at the time, unnoticed for.

Similarly, the event of the “Sales”, when the clone students can buy products, gets a new section of information: “students seem never to go out of

the school area” (41). When Kathy relates the past in understanding Ruth, she goes back to the time when they were juniors and used to play in a sandbox. This incident suggests that Hailsham is functioning as a laboratory for manufacturing donors to human being proper. Readers are hardly informed about the relatives and home of the clones as no clones has ever left Hailsham.

Moreover, these clones have a real distress related to the forest that lies above the school. This distress is so real that they themselves can punish dissenters by forcing them to gaze at the forest. Actually, the source of all these fears is a story, often told, but never validated by the guardians of the school.

Kathy narrates:

There were all kinds of horrible stories about the woods. Once, not so long before we all got to Hailsham, a boy had had a big row with his friends and run off beyond the Hailsham boundaries. His body had been found two days later, up in those woods, tied to a tree with the hands and feet chopped off.

Another rumour had it that a girl’s ghost wandered through those trees. She’d been a Hailsham student until one day she’d climbed over a fence just to see what it was like outside. This was a long time before us, when the guardians were much stricter, cruel even, and when she tried to get back in, she wasn’t allowed. She kept hanging around outside the fences, pleading to be let back in, but no one let her. Eventually, she’d gone off somewhere out there, something had happened and she’d died. But her ghost was

always wandering about the woods, gazing over Hailsham,
pining to be let back in. (50)

It sounds like the purpose of the tale is just to scare the clones, to make them more disciplined and obedient. The fact is that these clones are reared solely for organ donations. This tale has no authenticity and no validation but still it seems that the tale is used to discourage clone to run away from the school.

Kathy tells her occurrence to Tommy only after some years with her now broadened knowledge about the condition. By this time they were aware about their position in the world where they are discriminated and used as only clones:

By then, of course, we all knew something I hadn't known back then, which was that none of us could have babies. It's just possible I'd somehow picked up the idea when I was younger without fully registering it, and that's why I heard what I did when I listened to that song. But there was no way I'd known properly back then. As I say, by the time Tommy and I were discussing it, we'd all been told clearly enough. None of us, incidentally, was particularly bothered about it; in fact, I remember some people being pleased we could have sex without worrying about all of that—though proper sex was still some way off for most of us at that stage. (72)

But the noticeable thing is that these clones never effort to rebel about their limitations rather they mock the condition imposed upon them by the authority. Kathy does the same. She comes to know that she along with all the clones

cannot give birth to babies but she is not worried about that and says that they can have sex without any tension related to unwanted conceptions.

Similarly, in another instances, we come to learn that it's not only present but the future of the children is all planned and arranged. They are expected to sacrifice their lives by donating their organs.

When a group of clone children gather and share their future desires in the pavilion. Some of them desire to go to America, some desire to become actors and so on. But at the same time, Miss Lucy eavesdrops the conversation of the clones and gathers them to advise for not dreaming. She frequently repeats and shuts all the possibility of the kids going to America or becoming a superstar or working in a supermarket. Miss Lucy tells:

The problem, as I see it, is that you've been told and not told. You've been told, but none of you really understand, and I dare say, some people are quite happy to leave it that way. But I'm not. If you're going to have decent lives, then you've got to know and know properly. None of you will go to America, none of you will be film stars. And none of you will be working in supermarkets as I heard some of you planning the other day. Your lives are set out for you. You'll become adults, then before you're old, before you're even middle-aged, you'll start to donate your vital organs. (80)

In a sense, their fate is already written through humans. They are doomed to be organ donors for their 'possible.' They were created for this reason, and Miss Lucy wants these clones be aware of this reality. This incident has a particular

role in the story. Some students soften the significance of Lucy's talk, simply saying that this is something they are always aware of. Tommy has different understanding on this as he thinks that throughout these years the guardians in Hailsham have been manipulating the children so "that we were always just too young to understand properly the latest piece of information" (81). Though Kathy finds some validity in Tommy's argument but she is not entirely convinced. This results reverse, elusive and indirect for the children.

However, Lucy in her speech elucidates the condition. Both Lucy and Kathy are open regarding the question of the future of the clones. It takes a long time even for Kathy to mention the facts related to 'possible.' She narrates as:

The basic idea behind the possible theory was simple, and didn't provoke much dispute. It went something like this. Since each of us was copied at some point from a normal person, there must be, for each of us, somewhere out there, a model getting on with his or her life. (137)

The story explicitly reveals after a long time that the "students" of Hailsham and institutions alike are clones. They are bred only for the purpose of organ harvesting. But the interesting thing is that unlike any other slave narrative or captivity narrative, these clones never develop the consciousness to resist against the administration. Even after the clarification of the fact of cloning, many past realities remain unclear, and the story moves ahead by discharging the remaining suspicion, innocence and other irrational theories. Before any revelation and any resolution, the story manages the audience to identify with the clones and co-experience the vitality, fear and ignorance. This co-experience

is important because individual experience is ignored by state as Rabinow argues: “. . . the state is envisioned as a kind of political power which ignores individuals, looking only at the interest of the totality . . . of a class or a group among the citizens” (*Foucault Reader* 14).

Kathy hardly tells about her reaction on the revelation. Over this, even Lucy clearly states that: “You don’t go to America, you don’t become an actor, you start donating your organs as your career” (80). Now the clones are also aware about their destiny and do not fight for their identity or for their identity.

But these clones are not revolting for their human life. They don’t fight for their identity. Furthermore, there is no distress, fury or sadness in the clones. There comes a moment in the narration when it turns out to be very awkward. But it is more about misreporting, misconception and under-reporting or rather under-reporting. Lack of hatred, rage and distress is the common characteristics of all clones. Opposite to this, Kathy is able to shift the point of view frequently to tell the story so that she can present different emotions of different clones. This shift in perspective enhances the readers to identify with the emotions of the clones.

Ruth tries to search the ‘possible’ but fails. In a scene, the clones arrive at the art gallery but they come to learn that the ‘possibles’ have already left the gallery and they come to talk with the owner. The clones are frustrated and this gets reflected on Ruth’s observation:

That other woman in there, her friend, the old one in the gallery. Art students, that’s what she thought we were. Do you think she’d have talked to us like that if she’d known what we really

were? What do you think she'd have said if we'd really asked her? 'Excuse me, but do you think your friend was ever a clone model?' She'd have thrown us out. (164)

In this statement, Ruth unveils the racism against clones which is absent in the narration of Kathy. Ruth's fury exposes human-clone relationship. Humans refuse to give clones human status. To be more precise, it is a matter of disgrace to be a clone as the so-called 'normals' refuse to socialize the clones. And more interesting thing is that such kind of racism is absent in the narration of Kathy. Ruth envisions a fragile future as the absolute difference between normal human being and the clones threatens the clones' identity and existence. It is noteworthy that the clones had kept on fantasizing about normal life but this fantasy is just to become nothing more spectacular.

When story begins, we come to know that Kathy addresses a donor who is very eager to know everything about Hailsham. Kathy tells: "What he wanted was not just to hear about Hailsham, but to remember Hailsham, just like it had been his own childhood" (5). The donor is from another institution and wants to learn about Hailsham in deeper sense rather than mere a donor's representation. Both Kathy and the addressee can identify each other and the donor wants to explore Hailsham in terms of identity through Kathy.

The issue of 'soul' is at the center of any traditional discourse of discrimination. The 'Othered' group is always asked whether they have soul or not. Groups like Africans, slaves, women or heathens are supposed to lack soul in them. But in the case of clones, the mission to learn the existence of the souls

is interesting one. Generally, the ‘othered’ are refused to have creativity but it is different is the case of clones:

Before that, all clones – or *students*, as we preferred to call you – existed only to supply medical science [...]. We selected the best of [the art] and put on special exhibitions. In the late seventies, at the height of our influence, we were organizing large events all around the country. There’d be cabinet ministers, bishops, all sorts of famous people coming to attend. (256)

Ministers, bishops and other famous people are visiting Hailsham to observe different activities of the clones. But this exhibition cannot be taken as pure creative activities of the clones because it has something to do with “Morningdale scandal.” It is like genetic engineering through which the clones are pushed to the extreme by the scientists in seeking maximum characteristics in the clones. The whole process is viewed as strengthening the genetic feature of the ‘possibles’ not the clones. The clones are not regarded as human proper. So there is no question of appreciating their creative acts.

Genetic engineering is going natural law and this scientific nightmare has become the remarkable issue of sci-fi. This fiction also critiques nurturing certain characteristics of human race through genetic engineering. The Morningdale scandal is one example how modern people are trying to control human life directly through modern science. We can learn this austerity of this genetic manipulation in Miss Emily’s statement: “It’s one thing to create students such as you, for the donation programme. But a generation of created children who’d take their place in society? Children demonstrably *superior* to

the rest of us? Oh no. That frightens people” (259). Miss Emily actually expresses the dominant political thought of the 1970s through her words. The ambivalent nature of Miss Emily shares the reservation towards the scientific development. This ambivalent is manifested as a moment earlier she had boasted that Hailsham “has never lost touch with reality” (257).

Miss Emily is ironical in her appreciation of the clones. When Miss Emily tries to impose a preconceived model of slave narrative over Tommy and Kathy, her irony comes on surface. Similarly, it is also incomprehensible to Kathy why she shouted on Miss Emily on her awkward commentary at the end of the episode: “*Madame never liked us. She’s always been afraid of us. In the way people are afraid of spiders and things*” (263). Kathy brings different metaphors of animals to denote clones as they are not given status more than animals and insects. These metaphors are appropriate since clone are not given human status. At this stage, Miss Emily faces difficulties to veil her anger:

‘Marie-Claude has given *everything* for you. She has worked and worked and worked. Make no mistake about it, my child. Marie-Claude is on your side and will always be on your side. Is she afraid of you? We’re all afraid of you. I myself had to fight back my dread of you all almost every day I was at Hailsham. There were times I’d look down at you from my study window and I’d feel such revulsion’ (263–64)

Miss Emily shows her hesitation in accepting that she is afraid of the clones but at the same time she wants to take back her positions as a principal, guardian and benefactor. The “pride”, generously pronounced just a moment earlier,

finds its proper place when Miss Emily airs her normal and self-evident dread for clones.

Eventually, Madame defends the cabinet and shouts at the workers with rage. Kathy as a narrator does not remark on this situation with a word but anyhow the readers are informed of Miss Emily's and Madame's ethical quality, marking them as authoritarian characters in a class society. Still we the readers do not find words of protest in Kathy's account. The cruelty of the episode is dramatized when these self-appointed reformers start taking pity on themselves. It is all about the ungratefulness of the youths, who do not consent to understand their humane labor:

‘Don't try and ask them to thank you,’ Madam's voice said behind us. ‘Why should they be grateful? They came here looking for something much more. What we gave them, all the years, all the fighting we did on their behalf, what do they know of that? They think it is God-given. Until they came here, they knew nothing of it.’ (260)

These youths had been given an inestimable present, because within their own horizon Kathy and Tommy had received a great life as a clone. Madame and Miss Emily have existed calmly into their retirement years but they do not see any problem with the fact that the clones like Tommy did not have more time. Behind all of the reformist pathos, Madame and Miss Emily express the common shared belief that the clones are not counted as humans, and humans do not even effort to acknowledge clone's life and sacrifices the made for humans. Therefore, it is good and reasonable to lie to clones, in order to protect

them. Hypocritically enough, Miss Emily raises the youths as her own products, “Look at you both now! I’m so proud to see you both. You built your lives on what we gave to you. You wouldn’t be who you are today if we hadn’t protected you” (263).

The predicament of the clones raised in the talk shows being unable to hold on to the past that make their lives shareable. The specific example of the pond at Hailsham suggests a mysterious referent throughout the novel. It does not only question the perceptions, memories, and realities of each of the characters, but also that of the reader.

Similarly, after Kathy and Ruth move to the Cottages, Kathy is struck by how Ruth “pretends” not to remember things about Hailsham:

I’d referred, just in passing, to the fact that at Hailsham, the short-cut down to the pond through the rhubarb patch was out of bounds. When she put on her puzzled look, I abandoned whatever point I’d been trying to make and said: ‘Ruth, there’s no way you’ve forgotten. So don’t give me that.’ (190)

Kathy reads Ruth’s reaction as an endorsement for the veterans, but her own experience is not reflected in someone else and so her sense of reality gains no support.

Ironically, the issue of pond is repeated again in the novel but Kathy does not remember. Kathy and Tommy look at a watercolor painting in Miss Emily’s house, and while Tommy thinks it is a picture of Hailsham whereas Kathy is not sure about that.

“It’s the bit round the back of the duck pond,” Tommy said.

“What do you mean?” I whispered back. “There’s no pond. It’s just a bit of countryside.”

“No, the pond’s behind you.” Tommy seemed surprisingly irritated.

“You must be able to remember. If you’re round the back with the pond behind you, and you’re looking over towards the North Playing Field.” (250)

The conversation has no logic. The reason behind their miscommunication may be Kathy is referring to the watercolor painting and Tommy is referring to his memory, or it is because Kathy does not remember the pond at Hailsham. The pond in question is referred to earlier in the novel as a place where Kathy and Tommy have one of their conversations about the guardians (25). But its focus of the pond as a constant misremembering questions not only the memories and experience of the characters but also the reader’s experience of the novel.

Memories are not simply one’s own; they are filtered through others, so we begin to remember through others. The most critical point in these episodes is how they need to have someone else authenticate one’s memory of a place begins to destabilize one’s own memory of it. This means, the incorporation of the memories does not lie only in the physical body of one’s one rather the other community and socio-cultural context also form the memories. And that is why Kathy often expresses her anger with Ruth, and later Tommy with Kathy. Ishiguro projects the narrative instabilities within a conception of personhood in

which we are human to the extent that our memories overlap and are shared with others, in which oneself is never complete without another. This misremembering about the pond calls the very reality of their existence into question.

Katia Genel in “The Question of Biopower: Foucault and Agamben” reads the concept of sovereign body as:

What is called into question, therefore, is the formulation of the limits and the original structure of the state sphere. His thesis is then the following: sovereignty functions according to the logic of the exception, the privileged object of which is life, and constructs itself by producing a biopolitical body, which is to say by including bare life through its exclusion. (51)

Agamben is concerned to the holiness of human life by relating it with its ancestry. Power exists with the exercise of its force and sheer life is a fabrication of power.

It is also significant to refer to the existing discussion on the concept of reproductive process of cloning that reveals that the clones are the copies of human beings in relation to genealogy, authenticity and individuality. Judith Butler, in this context, in her book *Undoing Gender* argues as:

It is the inhuman, the beyond human, the less than human, the border that secures the human in its ostensible reality. To be called a copy, to be called unreal, is one way in which one can be oppressed, but consider that it is more fundamental than that. To be oppressed means that you already exist as a subject of some

kind, you are there as the visible and oppressed other for the master subject, as a possible or potential subject, but to be unreal is something else again. To be oppressed you must first become intelligible. To find that you are fundamentally unintelligible is to find that you have not yet achieved access to the human, to find yourself speaking only and always as if you were human (30)

Butler exposes the heteronormative refusal of the reality of homosexual existence and identity: the way in which this denial to grant legitimacy or allow intelligibility reduces a category of beings to less than human status. In fact, Butler is examining the implications of the discourse of heterosexual normativity regarding the existence of homosexual beings. This passage reveals implications of plausible heterosexual normativity in definitions of the human and in the discourses of rights to which humans have a claim. The cloned protagonists, in this novel, are unintelligible both to themselves and to others. The affective power of this novel resides in its unsettling of the familiar intelligibility of heterosexual normative identities. The debates provoked by reproductive human cloning can be credited in part to the ways in which it challenges the heterosexual privilege to human reproduction.

Significantly, the clones are regarded as ‘students’ even after their completion of the school. These students used to assume that they will relay what they had studied at Hailsham: “We gathered round to listen, the way we might have done at Hailsham when a guardian started to speak” (161). They are never treated as matures. Moreover, the students are made to internalize that

they are the inferiors at Hailsham. They are instructed to stay away from physical relationship as it can result in conception and child birth. And this human phenomenon is something the clones will never experience. Their desires, sexuality and existence are taken as poor imitations of those of the normal humans:

Then suddenly . . . [Miss Emily] began telling us how we had to be careful about who we had sex with. Not just because of the diseases but because, she said, ‘sex affects emotions in ways you’d never expect’. We had to be extremely careful about having sex in the outside world, especially with people who weren’t students, because out there sex meant all sorts of things. Out there people were even fighting and killing each other over who had sex with whom. And the reason it meant so much – so much more than say, dancing or table tennis – was because the people out there were different from us students; they could have babies from sex. (82)

Physical relation is mainly conducted for reproduction but, for the clones, it is not meant for conceiving babies. They cannot conceive babies and strictly suggested not to be in relationship with other people outside Hailsham. The narrative suggests that sexual relationship makes clones emotional which the guardians don’t want the clones to be. Despite the comprehensive sex education at Hailsham, Kathy has a conflicted relationship with sex. Hence, she is not so much expressive regarding adolescent curiosity about sexuality. Her anxiety comes from the concern about whether her emerging sexual urges are normal.

The fiction ignores the historical feature of racial or ethnic differences existing in our society. Rather it fantasizes new category of human discrimination and this time on the basis of gene. Theorizing this issue, Baudrillard puts:

It is no longer possible to fabricate the unreal from the real, the imaginary from the givens of the real. The process will, rather, be the opposite: it will be to put decentered situations, models of simulation in place and to contrive to give them the feeling of the real, of the banal, of lived experience, to reinvent the real as fiction, precisely because it has disappeared from our lives. (124)

Baudrillard's concept of 'model of simulation' is borrowed by Ishiguro in his prose. This kind of micro and macro repetitions can be read as failings of aesthetics and presenting the narrative speculation in genetic engineering, the fiction calls to dismantle the conventional hierarchy that favors original over repetition. This is what Baudrillard advocates "the simulation is now the ultimate reality" (126).

Similarly, realizing the status of being copy of normal human, Kathy narrates:

The basic idea behind the possibles theory was simple, and didn't provoke much dispute. It went something like this. Since each of us was copied at some point from a normal person, there must be, for each of us, somewhere out there, a model getting on with his or her life. (137)

Kathy is aware about the position of the clones which reflects the interest of the Hailsham in developing the clones. This reveals the reality that the human society does not acknowledge the clones as human proper.

This intension is further justified in the novel as Miss Emily states:

Before that, all clones – or *students*, as we preferred to call you – existed only to supply medical science . . . We selected the best of [the art] and put on special exhibitions. In the late seventies, at the height of our influence, we were organizing large events all around the country. There'd be cabinet ministers, bishops, all sorts of famous people coming to attend. (256)

The confession of Miss Emily and the presence of the Ministers, bishops and other famous people demonstrate the direct involvement of the state in the production of the clones. The statement denies the existence of the clones as mature being rather they are always remained as 'students' even after their graduation. They are not allowed to provide sufficient information on their position of future. The humanist education and the arts should confirm that clones had a soul, but even the propagandists of the soul didn't think that the clones possess a soul and they should have rights to proper knowledge, not to mention the right to have some bodily autonomy.

It is disturbing to learn that Hailsham, a school, plays and exploitative role, but it is more distressing to learn the way this fiction rejects to present Hailsham as an institution that perpetrates oppression on the students. When Kathy and Tommy encounter Miss Emily, she projects the school as a necessary shelter for the clones against the horrors that exist outside the school. She

exclaims: “Whatever else, we at least saw to it that all of you in our care, you grew up in wonderful surroundings. And we saw to it too, after you left us, you were kept away from the worst of those horrors. We were able to do that much for you at least” (261). Miss Emily advocates that Hailsham is functioning as a positive force which is able to give good lives to the clones and protect them. At the same time, she gives another reality of Hailsham as:

You see, we were able to give you something, something which even now no one will ever take from you, and we were able to do that principally by *sheltering* you. Hailsham would not have been Hailsham if we hadn’t. Very well, sometimes that meant we kept things from you, lied to you. In many ways, we *fooled* you. But we sheltered you during those years and gave you your childhoods. . . . You built your lives on what we gave you. You wouldn’t be who you are today if we’d not protected you. (268)

What is interesting is that Miss Emily sounds sympathetic towards the students but she also shows that she has internalized the binary opposition between normals and clones: normal as guardians and clones as their protected subjects. She argues that Hailsham inherits deceitfulness but still she regards it high for providing shelter to the students which is immutable gift to the students. It provides full opportunity for the development of the clones’ personality through law, human rights and literature.

Miss Emily also unintentionally tries to expose Hailsham’s flaws, and the difficulty faced by any governing body that seeks to implement human rights through incorporation into a larger community. Hailsham has its

boundaries in which the clones are not given freedom. They are confined to protect from the outside world. The freedoms that they wished to offer their students is restricted because they were freedoms tendered within the constricting boundaries of an institution demanding the eventual conformity and submission of the individual to the perverse responsibilities demanded by a corrupt social order.

In another instance, Madame tells Kathy that clones are different from 'non clone humans' In a sense, she sympathizes Kathy but no need to say that she is the principal of the Hailsham and is working as per the interest of the state:

You really are different to them; that there are people out there, like Madame, who don't hate you or wish you any harm but who nevertheless shudder at the very thought of you . . . and who dread the idea of our hand brushing against theirs. The first time you glimpse yourself through the eyes of a person like that, it's a cold moment. It's like walking past a mirror you've walked past every day of your life, and suddenly it shows you something else, something troubling and strange. (36)

The clones are made to realize that they are not the real beings; they are created from the genetic materials of unknown humans and raised for the express purpose of providing organs for transplant to non clone humans. This politics of differentiation is nothing but deducing them into mere organ farm rather than human being proper.

At the end of the story, Miss Emily tells Kathy and Tommy the reasons for society's insensitive dismissal of clone rights. Despite people are aware of the existence of the clones, they remain silent for the underlying reason of the donation system:

However uncomfortable people were about your existence, their overwhelming concern was that their own children, their spouses, their parents, their friends, did not die from cancer, motor neuron disease, heart disease. So, for a long time you were kept in the shadows and people did their best not to think about you. And if they did, they tried to convince themselves you weren't really like us. That you were less than human, so it didn't matter. (263)

Miss Emily confesses that people outside Hailsham are also aware about the existence of the clones but still they remain silent about the rights of the clones. What Emily insists is that their silent doesn't mean that people are evil. It is simply that they chose their people over clones. Clones are helpful to cure their loved ones. That is why; people remain silent about the rights of the clones. In this fiction, the humans refuse to identify with the clones on the basis of the discourse of genes. The "less than human" status of the clones allow the normals to put clones beyond moral empathy. By not indentifying, people can give less than human status to the clones and this lack of apathy helps them use clones as organ donors.

When a clone dies, it is not regarded as a failure or loss; rather it is taken as the accomplishment of the teleological task. The death of a clone is not a

failure or loss; it means the accomplishment of the teleological assignment.

Clones are waiting for their death. Talking about the dehumanization of body, after analyzing Foucauldian bio-power and Agambenian Sovereign body, Genel further writes:

. . . both below and above the processes of normalization and control which manage the individual and collective bodies, a separation is operative at the level of bare life, which is the very survival of individuals. It takes the form of an exclusion, discriminating between the living subjects and others who are considered destined to die with utter impunity, the life of which has not been made an object of protection. (60)

Agamben who was a Holocaust survivor is more concerned about the seizure of sovereign power of a body in totalitarian nation. His concept is significant in modern world as well. Genel by lending the concept of Foucault and Agamben, argues that individual and the community are rejected their sovereignty and deduced to mere body who are waiting for their death.

What is important in the narrative is that Kathy share her knowledge with her addressee but does not vigorously concern her meeting with Madame and Miss Emily. Opposite to that, her thoughts and emotions encounter with other clones. Her narrations are not politically changed. Kathy concludes her narration as:

I half-closed my eyes and imagined that this was the spot where everything I'd lost since my childhood had washed up, and I was

now standing in front of it, and if I waited long enough, a tiny figure on the horizon would appear across the field, and gradually get larger until I could see Tommy, and he'd wave, maybe even call. The fantasy never got beyond that—I didn't let it—and though the tears rolled down my cheeks, I wasn't sobbing or out of control. I just waited for a bit, then turned back to the car, to drive off wherever I was supposed to be. (288)

Kathy's narration ends here that tells the life story of several young students for the sole purpose of harvesting their vital organs to people. She cries for the friends she lost and they used to live the life: a life that exists only in her memory. She even goes to the extent to refuse herself to be a living organ farm but ultimately resign to becoming a donor herself. Her memories are the only things she has hold on and she refuse to let them go.

The result of Hailsham, i.e. farming of human is always upsetting and intimidating. As a narrator, Kathy visualizes the abuse, discrimination and ruthlessness of human beings over clones. On the surface level, Kathy's narration is apolitical but in deep it is political and it belongs to those who dare to remain alive.

The message is clear; the possible mishaps in upcoming days when we challenge the natural law through technological advancement. The modern people are more obsessed to find solution for everything but forget the natural process. The clones are the results of scientific development and through the technologies we try to scrutinize every aspect of their life. Modern society has

also become like Hailsham and humans as clones. The ways the clones are observed and controlled in Hailsham, people are also controlled in the society.

III. Conclusion: Instrumentalization of Human Body

Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go* dramatizes the relation between human beings and their clones produced by new science and technology. The prejudice and offense in opposition to the clones are steadily exposed through the activities that take place at Hailsham. The life of clones including the narrator, Kathy, is under the observation as they are product of new technology which ultimately seizes their status of being a human being proper.

We hardly find any 'normal' to relate with the clones; clear discriminations can be seen against the clones but the clones stay passive and do not protest. What remains is only their angst of the clones for total control over their life.

The body of the clones is totally instrumentalized as they are supposed to transfer their organ to normal being. With this concept of clones as donors, the sovereignty of their body is rejected. The state takes the ownership of their body and soul through Hailsham School. The clones are not regarded as human being proper that is why they are not taken as developmental unit. They are not supposed to be taken as subjects who remain 'students' throughout their life as their life is predestined to be donor, a subordinate to human life.

The narrative takes place at the time when Kathy works as a career and Tommy and Ruth as donor. Kathy and Tommy's relation turns into love affairs as it is filled by a sense of loss. But this love relation is not the major concern of the novel rather it is their life itself. That is why love, art and creativity have no space in the life of the clones. Kathy's narration sounds apolitical but the

underlying meaning is crucial. The narrative exposes the modern life in modern society which is represented through Hailsham.

Following the WWII, science has sophisticated itself enough to make the production of clones enough. Due to the advancement of medical science, it was decided to manufacture clones as living organ-storage units than as a fully realized human being. Human organ trade has big share in illegal market and this is legalized in this fiction through the production of clones and refusing their status as human beings. People are practicing organ implantation from the clones grown in Hailsham but without learning the reality.

As Miss Emily and Madame discuss, we learn that the early institutions before Hailsham were violent, rough and totalitarian. Through their discussion we come to learn that Hailsham is different from previous institutions as it gives shelter and better life to the clones. On the other hand, it also provides opportunities to the clones to enhance their arts and creativity.

No doubt, the objective of Hailsham project is to manufacture human clones along with upbringing clones with humanist as well as creative talent; obliged to donate their vital organs for the sake of humans. But Hailsham is conscious to the risk of blurring the demarcation between humans and clones. That is why, different discourses are created to project clones as less than humans so that people cannot identify with the clones.

The arts and humanist education should also claim that clones had a soul whereas propagandists of the soul refuse that clones should have knowledge about what is right and wrong. The clones are also not expected to be guided by bodily desire. They are brain washed to be career and donor. Different methods

are used such as fear; discourse and propaganda are used to manipulate the clones so that they remain aloof from reality.

This project foregrounds the inhumanity of humans by bringing the story of industrial clones. In a sense, there is a moral flaw in the clones in being detestable towards reality. Kathy indeed does something unusual as she challenges the so-called 'normals' by critiquing human being to whom she must have been grateful. Her narration is not as simple as it sounds on surface level. Her narration is innocence but she is not.

Probably this is why, the clones are not looking for revolt or revenge or any kind of freedom. Characters like Kathy, Ruth and Tommy are not expected to be better humans rather they give up many qualities during the course. The society also doesn't expect any human quality from the clones.

The story is much more about the general horror related to the differences; i.e., skeptical human beings create clones to sort out their own health problems but later on they fall in the moral crisis of their own creation. The story of a teen age clone boy bound to a tree and murdered brutally can be a myth; a fictitious story to intimidate the clones and prevent them to run away from Hailsham. This symbolically suggests that human lives are under continuous observation and it can be under many forms like CCTV or medical observation.

No doubt, there is the thread of hidden totalitarianism in the modern world as well but this function with different means of science and technology. We learn that Hailsham is a reformed breeding institution for clones with much added concern on creativity of the clones but still one cannot justify for creating

the clones and differentiating them with humans. Death is most epic fear of human beings. So that people created clones lengthen their life expectancy. This fear of death can also be found in clones and this is justified from their myth of the jungle horror and their incapacity to escape from Hailsham. That is why Hailsham students have no contact with outside world. But they do have the realization that they are not the 'normals.' They also sense the disgust and sense of discrimination in the eyes of the 'normals.'

Hailsham has reformed its education but still the clones are put in the condition in which everything is scrutinized by the administration, be it their life style or the information they get. It has created a complicated web of misinformation and lies. Theoretically speaking, the organs of the clones do not belong to the clones themselves but to the society. In projecting Hailsham as an institution of paradox: a place of individual growth and restriction. *Never Let Me Go* establishes conflict between personal development and compliance to the society in relation to the existence of the clones. This human rights paradox offers a new avenue to look into the life of modern people under multidimensional scrutiny. Though the clones idealize Hailsham and follow the rules and regulations honestly, Kathy's narrative works as a revolt against the exploitative demands of society over individual freedom. There is always inherent contradiction between democracy and the need of security. Absolute individual freedom is always threatened by the urge for security in the society. Thus, Hailsham functions as a microcosm of the new developed country where individual sovereignty of any citizen is snatched through the use of science and technology over personal autonomy and freedom.

Works Cited

- Bernick, Philip. "Rev. of *Never Let Me Go*". *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 53.5 (2010): 289-302.
- Black, Shameem. "Ishiguro's Inhuman Aesthetics." *MFS Modern Fiction Studies*. 55.4 (2009): 785-807.
- Butler, Judith. "Melancholy Gender/Refused Identification." *The Judith Butler Reader*. Ed. Sara Salih. London: Blackwell, 2004. 243-58.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality* 3 vols. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage, 1988.
- - -. "*Society Must Be Defended*": *Lectures at the College de France, 1975-6*. Trans. David Macey. New York: Picador, 2003.
- - -. *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*. Trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Vintage, 1994.
- Genel, Katia. "The Qestion of Biopower: Foucault and Agamben." *Rethinking Marxism*. London: Routledge, 2006, 43-62.
- Griffin, Gabriele. "science and cultural imaginary: the case of Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *Textual Practice* 23.4 (2009): 645-663.
- Ishiguro, Kazuo. *Never Let Me Go*. New York: Vintage, 2005.
- James, Caryn. "Duplicates That Can Beat the Real Things." *The New Yorks Times*. 2005.
- Jenning, Bruce. "Biopower and the Liberationist RomanceAuthor(s)." *The Hastings Center Report* 40.4 (2010): 16-20.

Jerng, Mark. "Giving Form to Life: Cloning and Narrative Expectations of the Human." *Partial Answers: Journal of Literature and History of Ideas* 6.2 (2008): 369-93.

Karl, Shaddox. "Generic Considerstions in Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *Human Rights Quarterly* 35.2 (2013): 448-69.

McDonald, Keith. "Days of Past Futures: Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go* As "Speculative Memoir.'" *Biography* 30.1 (2007):

Menand, Louis. "Something about Kathy: Ishiguro's Quasi-science – Fiction Novel." *The New Yorker*. 2005.

Mirsky, Marvin. "Notes on Reading Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 49.4 (2006): 628-630.

Robbins, Paul. "Cruelty Is Bad: Banality and Proximity in *Never Let Me Go*." (2007): 289-302.