



## **Clones and Commodification: An Ethical Issue in Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go***

**Kamal Sharma, PhD**

**Amrit Prasad Joshi**

*Ratna Rajyalaxmi Campus*

### **Abstract**

The paper explores an ethical concern of clones' commodification in the novel *Never Let Me Go*, set during the late 1990s in England. It revolves dominantly around three clone characters; Kathy H, Tommy D and Ruth. Their initial position as happy students at a seemingly idyllic Hailsham school is erased when they are identified as clones. They are ostracized and excluded from society as the society does not acknowledge them as humans. Their unnatural birth creates more complexity of moral questions while fulfilling the selfish purpose of normal people. The mention of words/phrases like "guardians", "carers", "donors", "completions", "practice" and "the Gallery" is a tactful strategy of the dominant humans, the creators, to put the clones in the position of painful servitude. Do clones exist to serve the humanity? Are they different to humans? Who owns these bodies? are pertinent questions to discuss about the ethics of cloning and subsequent impacts on clones. Since clones are the victims, the ethical issues fall on the part of humans – the guardians. Clones' meaningless life, in Agamben's term, the bare life and their constant supervision in Hailsham similar to the concept of panopticon in Foucault term, raises the ethical issue of what it means to be human. The research follows textual analysis as research method within qualitative research design. It concludes that the clones' state of servitude and their position of donors showcase commodification of clones and the inhumanity of humanity. It raises ethical and moral questions regarding advancements of medical science in which Kathy, Ruth and Tommy live.

**Keywords:** *clone, commodification, ethics, humanity*

### **Introduction**

The novel *Never Let Me Go* is set at the backdrop of high technological advancement in the field of cloning. Technological advancement in genetic transformation marks a significant shift in creation of cloned humans. In the novel under scrutiny, the clones are presented as different creatures in comparison to normal humans. Thus, "ormals" are the non-cloned humans. Initially, the clones are students at the Hailsham School, then they are the carers, and finally they become donors who donate their vital parts of body to needy people. They are destined to donate their vital organs to the prospective patients. The clones are hegemonized and agree to donate without any resistance. Meanwhile, the novel uses euphemism in the language use. It plays with the language using the words in indirect way to mean

“harsh.” The words; donation, guardians, possible, deferral are tricky ones. The operation of the body for organ extraction is called donation. The original human from whom the clone is produced, is called possible. The medical surveillance of the clones ensures their healthy condition. However, the question comes what the healthy condition has to do with clones if they are to be completed after four donations. They are repaired like machines for the usefulness of humans. They are owned by others at the school.

Cloning is an artificial way to create new life form. A clone is genetically identical copy of a biological entity. It has marked a great turning point in scientific and medical contexts. It was first implemented when the first clone Dolly sheep was produced through cloning. John Harries argues about the ethical side of cloning in reference to Dolly, “There are two rather different techniques available for cloning individuals. One is by nuclear substitution, the technique used to create Dolly. . .” (353). Dolly is first cloned creature. After that, it has been used as instrumental tools to create identical bodies that are supplied in the market. In this regards, Dickenson argues that the trade of human organ is increasing: “The use of condemned prisoners as cadaver ‘donors’ for the international organ trade was openly acknowledged by the Chinese deputy health minister, Huang Jiefu, in November 2006” (155). In the trade, the prisoners are used as donors giving certain amount of money which is never worth-noticing in comparison to the priceless value of body itself. He brings reference from Amnesty International, “Amnesty International had been reporting large-scale ‘harvesting’ of vital organs from prisoners since 1993. In 1998, the European Parliament passed a resolution condemning the sale of organs from executed prisoners” (Dickenson 155). The large-scale “harvesting” of vital organs from prisoners since 1993 has been reported.

The Hailsham School where the clones spend their childhood period is understood as one of the privileged institution. The narrator remarks, “People from Hailsham, or one of the other privileged estates” (4). The children in Hailsham are easily convinced that they are in best school and they are hegemonized for the organ donations, “Hailsham. I bet that was a beautiful place” (5). In this supposedly beautiful place, the guardians work in such a way that they foreshadow the sale of the body of the clones. It is done through the art exhibitions. They draw what is appealing to them and it is put in exhibition, “That was why we collected your art. We selected the best of it and put on special exhibitions” (256). Actually, it is not art that is on sale rather it is their body that is on sale. So, their existence in Hailsham is questionable from ethical point of view.

## Literature review

After its publication in 2005, the novel has got good reviews. It has raised the debate on cloning and its ethical consideration. It also opens a discussion for how and where the world is heading in collaboration with science and technology. The novel has also been interpreted as a typical dystopian text. Arnab Chatterjee, for example, brings utopian setting of the novel to the fore to talk about dystopian features of the text. Chatterjee asserts, “The first part of the narrative shows the predominantly pastoral setting of Hailsham, only to deflate it with the description of the Cottages that carry with them the dark purpose of the growing up of these clones and coming to maturity and the ultimate knowledge, something that they come to know as the narrative progresses” (112). The clones’ experience with the ideal landscape in the Hailsham school prepares ground for the dystopian settings in which the vital organs of

clones are taken. They were designed for the dark purpose of death.

The clones are watched and monitored as a representative figures of surveillance. In this regard, Chatterjee mentions, "This theme of surveillance is a central feature of regulatory control in NLMG. For example, the school begins with an assembly: children are not allowed to smoke and the guardians are strict. There are routine examinations of the clones and a considerable amount of time is spent on this business" (115). This issue related to surveillance to have regulatory control of the clones deprived them of doing their own activities. The school prohibits children to smoke and they have routine examinations in the name of medical examination.

Chatterjee further explores the issues of William Blake's two worlds; the world of innocence and the world of experience. The children are deprived of the world of experience because they cannot go to the woods due to the fear of ghost story associated with them. He argues, "The image of the woods beyond the confines of Hailsham indicates the world of experience, to take it in Blakean terms" (117). The quote means to say that Hailsham students were controlled going to the woods.

In the same way, the critic, John Marks mentions about the status of clone as less than humans, "In the popular imagination the clone is less than human but has the appearance of the human" (331). The clones in the novel are the objects in the form and structures of humans. The purpose behind clones is morally questionable. Marks asserts, "Cloning may fascinate, and maverick organizations and individuals may express the desire to clone individuals, but mainstream discourse on cloning invariably attributes the desire to clone to a morally misguided" (332). The process of cloning is wrong if seen from moral judgement. The clones are told to art their emotions in painting in the school, "Art plays a key role in the life of the students at Hailsham: their art work is collected as evidence of the fact that, contrary to received wisdom, they have 'souls'" (349). The clones as understood in the society are not devoid of souls; emotions and feelings. It is also a part of experimentation done from the side of controlling mechanism.

Josie Gill also raises this issue, "The Guardians' reduction of the students' art and creativity to functioning as evidence of their humanity echoes the artificial relationship between art and humanity that historically characterized Europeans' judgment of the nonwhite subject" (851). The projection of humanitarian implication through the art work of the clones in fact projects the superiority of humans over other creatures. Kathy draws a picture where humans' facial expressions are described rather than facial features, "Rather than describing physical features, Kathy instead describes facial expressions. Her narrative abounds with descriptions of people's countenances and her interpretation of the thoughts and feelings that these looks express" (854). Kathy's highlight on expression rather than on facial features marks common features of humans across the world. Gill mentions, "Specifically, her description of faces challenges the emphasis in much Victorian literature" (853). It is expression that matters rather than physicality in term of height and color. Thus, "Kathy's emphasis on a universal, biological means of expressing emotion has, however, implications beyond repudiating the primacy of racial forms of identification" (857). The racial issue as stated above is less significant and it is projected through Kathy's emphasis on a universal, biological means of expressing emotion.

Josie Gill, similarly, brings the issue of clones' role to the fore as carer of organ donor and donor themselves. The clones are happy to be carer and donor as they were grown up with the same ideology. They were brainwashed in the Hailsham. Gill remarks, "Ishiguro's tale of human clones brought up at a

kind of boarding school, Hailsham, before preparing for their future roles as carers and organ donors is not a novel that engages with science, race, and the relationship between the two in any overt way” (845). Though the racial issue is not covertly mentioned in the text, the clones are the colonized creatures. They were hegemonized to play a role as carer and donor.

The novel has also been interpreted as speculative fiction. Rachel Carrol elucidates, “Never Let Me Go – published in 2005 but located in ‘the late 1990s’ imagines the near past as speculative future. It depicts a recognizable and far from futuristic British cultural landscape but one in which the mass production of human clones in the service of therapeutic medical technology has become normalized” (133). It is a debate if therapeutic medical technology is acceptable or not. The clones are dehumanized. What goes to them in the process of organ extraction is beyond imagination. The various spaces and activities designed to monitor them are the sports pavilion, the pond, the lunch queue and all the ‘hiding places, indoors and out: cupboards, nooks, bushes, hedges, “The struggle over prescribed and sequestered spaces – the sports pavilion, the pond, the lunch queue and all the ‘hiding places, indoors and out: cupboards, nooks, bushes, hedges’ recalls the ways in which child and teen identities are mapped out through peripheral social territories” (136). The clones are mapped out, measured, and marked out in the school periphery. In fact they are the docile characters, “The trusting docility of Hailsham’s pupils is suggestive of the successful internalization of its regime; both within and beyond the school their lives are policed by ‘unspoken’ and ‘unwritten’ rules and agreements, many concerning what cannot be openly acknowledged” (140). The quote explains that the boundary of school and beyond the unspoken and unwritten rules and agreements restrict the clones.

The clones are hegemonized with ghost stories, “The ghost stories provide an oblique literary model for how the clones of Hailsham can simultaneously know and not know of their deplorable circumstances” (431). The miserable situation of clones is depicted through the depiction of ghost stories. Tiffany Tsao also highlights on the limited space of freedom of clones. Tsao mentions about the narrative background and subsequent deplorable situation of clones, “The office scene from Never Let Me Go takes place after Ruth, Kathy, and Tommy have left Hailsham boarding school to enter their new phase of life during which clones are relocated to small, isolated communities in various parts of rural England. There is no more adult supervision, and they are given relative freedom to do what they wish” (216). The clones live in the communities of their own which has been isolated with the rest of the world. The lack of religion also marks the issue to freedom:

At first glance, religion has no place in Ishiguro’s version of late 1990s, England, and in this respect, would appear to mirror its real life counterpart which has been experiencing a decline in religious practice among its citizens over the past few decades. In the novel, Christianity appears to remain only in the form of relics: during their adolescent years the three main clone characters—Ruth, Kathy, and Tommy—take to hanging out in the yards of an ‘old church’. . . (219)

The influence of religion is not seen in the novel. Only in the distant past where clones play in pastoral settings, Christianity is found in the form of relics. The clones like Kathy, Ruth, and Tommy play near the old church. From religious point of view, producing clones is debatable issue. The production of clones reminds humans of their similar situation. Tiffany Tsao again mentions, “Hitherto,

scholarship on *Never Let Me Go* has tended to emphasize the parallels between the clones and ourselves rather than the human characters and ourselves. . . has observed that the clones' devotion to a certain Order is no different from our own loyalties to our school, our profession, our country" (220). The modern people are also clones as their life is determined, monitored and calculated.

Arnab Chatterjee's take on dystopian elements, John Marks's idea of clones' artworks, Josie Gill's focus on clones as colonized people, Rachel Carrol's idea on speculative fiction, John David Schwetman's comparison of clones with the victims of the concentration camp show that the clones are in the state of servitude. Along with these readings, it is remarkable to delve into the narration of Kathy, the thirty-one years old middle aged clone, to expose the inhuman practice in the name of cloning with due emphasis on Foucault's idea of supervision of political bodies, and Agamben's idea of homo sacer.

### **Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical approach underpinning the paper comes from the ideas shared by Michael Foucault, Giorgio Agamben, and Donna Dickenson. Human body, according to Foucault, is owned, controlled and constantly observed through political mechanisms and falls into the category of object to be watched. Its agency is restricted due to the direct interference of power. Foucault asserts that, "the body becomes a useful force only if it is both a productive body and a subjected body" (Foucault 26). The body is valued when it serves the purpose of dominant group and it becomes a subjected body. Foucault contends that the subjection is achieved through violence and ideology:

This subjection is not only obtained by the instruments of violence or ideology; it can also be direct, physical, pitting force against force, bearing on material elements, and yet without involving violence; it may be calculated, organized, technically thought out; it may be subtle, make use neither of weapons nor of terror and yet remain of a physical order. (26)

The body is subjected to act as desired by power. The subjection takes place in two-fold ways; violence and ideology. First, the body is exercised through the consent and if it does not work, power is exercised which is violent form of manipulation. The subjection is done through constant watching. Foucault calls it surveillance. The cloned characters of *Never Let Me Go* undergo through the surveillance of guardians. They have strict rules and regulations to follow. They are motivated for their organ operation which they understand as donation. Their life as students ends when they become carers, and finally when they become donors, their life completes or ends after four or five donations. They are objectified and their body is on sale.

The disciplinary mechanism is made in such a way that the subject is watched from anywhere "The perfect disciplinary apparatus would make it possible for a single gaze to see everything constantly. A central point would be both the source of light illuminating everything, and a locus of convergence for everything that must be known: a perfect eye that nothing would escape and a center towards which all gazes would be turned" (173). The single gaze from the certain point can observe the subjects. No one can escape the monitoring mechanism. Foucault asserts, "This enclosed, segmented space, observed at every point, in which the individuals are inserted in a fixed place, in which the slightest movements are supervised" (197). The lives are monitored and examined. They exist to serve dominant ideology. This is represented in the novel through the projection of clones created to serve mankind in need. The clones living in Hailsham as students resemble a group of penned animals or scapegoats waiting to be

slaughtered. They are happy to serve their vital organs to other people. They are, in Foucault's terms, "docile and disciplined" body. Undisciplined and unexamined bodies are threat to ruling class people. This involves politicization of bodies. This is what Foucault means by a new micro-physics of power, "a certain mode of detailed political investment of the body" (139). The body in the context of political dimension is subjected to be controlled. The docility of the body is political and constructed through power.

In this regard, Foucault gives political contour to body. The bodies are political tools, "A body is docile that may be subjected, used, transformed and improved. The celebrated automata, on the other hand, were not only a way of illustrating an organism, they were also political puppets, small-scale models of power" (136). The bodies are manifestations of power projection. They are fragile bodies, "Thus discipline produces subjected and practiced bodies, 'docile' bodies" (138). They are controlled through the monitoring and suggestions, "Inspection functions ceaselessly. The gaze is alert everywhere" (195). Since monitoring is a never stopping task, the subjects are watched and observed in regular basis. They are warned and given guidelines. The gaze surrounds both bodies and surrounding. Foucault argues:

This enclosed, segmented space, observed at every point, in which the individuals are inserted in a fixed place, in which the slightest movements are supervised, in which all events are recorded, in which power is exercised without division, according to a continuous hierarchical figure, in which each individual is constantly located, examined and distributed among the living beings, the sick and the dead – all this constitutes a compact model of the disciplinary mechanism. (197)

The space which is used to monitor the subjects is tactfully designed. The individuals are inserted in a fixed place with disciplinary strategies. Power is exercised continuously in dualistic trend. The subjects are constantly observed, examined and located in the fixed territory. It constitutes a panopticon which for Foucault, ". . . is a privileged place for experiments on men, and for practice with complete certainty the transformations that may be obtained from them. The Panopticon may even provide an apparatus for supervising its own mechanisms" (204). The panopticon with disciplinary mechanism is a space where power is used for the experimentations. This is applied to the structural set up of Hailsham School in the novel. The narrator mentions, "Hailsham stood in a smooth hollow with fields rising on all sides. That meant that from almost any of the classroom windows in the main house—and even from the pavilion—you had a good view of the long narrow road that came down across the fields and arrived at the main gate" (34). The classrooms are designed in such a way that they are constantly watched and supervised. The supervision is seen when the narrator mentions, "Hailsham was full of hiding places, indoors and out: cupboards, nooks, bushes, hedges. But if you saw Miss Emily coming, your heart sank because she'd always know you were there hiding. It was like she had some extra sense" (43). Miss Emily easily finds the whereabouts of the clones due to the monitoring.

Similarly, Agamben's concept of controlled and inspected life brings the issue of cloned life to the fore. This life is devoid of value reminding the bare life of homo sacer, "The new juridical category of "life devoid of value" (or "life unworthy of being lived") corresponds exactly—even if in an apparently different direction—to the bare life of homo sacer and can easily be extended beyond the limit imagined by Binding" (139). Such life in Agamben's terms becomes worthless. It is the politicization on life where basic rights are snatched. He asserts, "It is as if every valorization and every politicization of life (which,

after all, is implicit in the sovereignty of the individual over his own existence) necessarily implies a new decision concerning the threshold beyond which life ceases to be politically relevant, becomes only “sacred life,” and can as such be eliminated without punishment” (139). When the life ceases to work on one’s own impulses, it is a political exercise on body which is significant. In fact, it becomes a bare life, “Bare life is no longer confined to a particular place or a definite category” (140). Humans, according to quote, are in the zones of exception. The life becomes meaningless and bare one without having a definite category.

### **Commodification and Subjection on Cloned Bodies**

The controlling mechanism for the clones is strategically designed in the Hailsham school. The clones cannot escape the supervision. They are not aware of this in their initial stage. The clones are the students under medical surveillance in Hailsham. The constant watching on clones is practiced by guardians including Miss Lucy. The narrator mentions, “But Miss Lucy was now moving her gaze over the lot of us” (79). The clones like Kathy, Ruth and many others are watched and observed by Lucy. She represents power of Hailsham. The narrator further observes that the clones do not have a decent life. Lucy highlights about the purpose of cloned people set by normal people in power:

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. That’s what each of you was created to do. (79-80)

The guardian Lucy mentions about the purpose of clones. Their lives are already set for organ donation. Though Kathy mentions they are happy as students in the Hailsham school in the first few pages of the novel, the readers were never told who/what they are, it’s not until Miss Lucy’s revelation that the readers understand who the clones are. The ethical question behind such practice of cloning is self-centered notion of humanity. The guardian tells the clones about their position in the society. They are not working in the significant space. Their lives are determined. They are destined to donate their vital organs. Then, they will complete (die). Even if they do not die, they will be switched off. They don’t have basic human rights. They are controlled with consent by guardians. Since the name of owners of the fictional boarding school, Hailsham is not mentioned in the novel, the guardians are ones who own the clones. The implication behind presenting clones under fate having no choice in the matter is to raise question related to unethical and immoral practice. Their body is on sale along with their arts.

Donna Dickenson in the book *Body Shopping* argues that in consumer society the body is often on sale. She asserts, “What do you expect? We live in a consumer society, where money is the measure of all things. Bodies and parts of bodies are no different. Yes, of course, it’s dreadful, but only the terminally naïve are shocked by it. You’ll never be able to regulate it, either. There’s too much at stake for the big biotechnology firms, and they can make life very uncomfortable for any government stupid enough to try” (7). To claim to own one’s body is a illusionary realm because what counts in consumer society is money not the soul. The trade on blood, cells, tissues, sperms and eggs marks the objectification of human lives, “Trade in human tissue, like any other consumer commodity, now stretches from the time before birth to the treatment of the body after death” (1). This has made the human body a mere

object. It is reflected in the novel when the guardian asserts that they have put their arts on sale. It is not the art but the body which is on sale. It raises ethical issues in commodification.

The ethical concern for the reproduction through cloning comes as Bernard E. Rollin argues: “The moral concern here, of course, is the effect on the creature created or manipulated by the technology” (56). The moral concern is on the creatures affected by the use of technology. In the modern era, people are not influenced by the moral concern and religion. Bernard E. Rollin, in this regard, asserts, “. . . we do not validate our ethics by appeal to religion in a secular society. On the other hand, religious traditions have indeed given much thought to how humans ought morally to live, and much of that thinking may be viable even outside of the theological tradition in which it is embedded” (57). The devoid of theological tradition enable humans to challenge the mysterious creations. Thus, the guardians give minimum knowledge and skills to clones.

The guardians expose piecemeal information about clones’ status in the society. The narrator in this regard, observes, “Tommy thought it possible the guardians had, throughout all our years at Hailsham, timed very carefully and deliberately everything they told us, so that we were always just too young to understand properly the latest piece of information” (81). The clones were told that they were too young to understand about their lives and purposes. The limited information which the narrator ponders, “I suppose that was all part of how we came to be told and not told” (82). The guardians employ the principle of telling and not telling the things at once to the clones. The clones know that they will not reproduce the babies. They are deprived of having babies. The narrator asserts, “Then there was the whole business about our not being able to have babies” (82). The clones are sad to know the lack of reproduction quality.

Kathy narrates about the guardian Miss Lucy. She perceives the ghostly expression of Miss Lucy, “I went on watching Miss Lucy through all this and I could see, just for a second, a ghostly expression come over her face as she watched the class in front of her” (77). When she watches the students, Kathy finds apparition of ghost in Miss Lucy. Kathy realizes that they are in danger condition of being exposed to guardians, “It’s just as well the fences at Hailsham aren’t electrified. You get terrible accidents sometimes” (77). The walls are visible to guardians even though they were not electrified. The guardians could watch them from the top of the hill, “The woods were at the top of the hill that rose behind Hailsham House” (50). False stories about woods were created to create fear in cloned students, “There were all kinds of horrible stories about the woods” (50). The horrible stories about woods were shared to the clones to control them. The narrator further intensifies his description of woods, “The woods played on our imaginations the most after dark, in our dorms as we were trying to fall asleep. You almost thought then you could hear the wind rustling the branches, and talking about it seemed to only make things worse” (50). Students were afraid of the woods due to the constructed truth about woods. The idyllic perception of ‘school’ turns out to be more sadistic and immoral institution with a strategy of telling and not telling. The students are told horror stories about the woods to hegemonize them. On the contrary, they are never taught about the world outside the Hailsham, their entrance to the other world is a mark of mockery and insult because they even do not have surviving knowledge in the unknown world outside. Going there with minimal knowledge is ironic as school teaches nothing about this. So, they trapped in prison-like school.

In the "knowing and not knowing" speech that Miss Lucy makes, the theme of morality resonates the cruelty and inhuman practice. Lucy’s take on ‘you’ve been told and not told’ is a hegemonic



tool to induce the sense of being lesser in values in comparison to guardians themselves. This shows dark futures implying a level of immorality in Hailsham. Thus, clones become dissatisfied after knowing the truths, “We all know it. We’re modelled from *trash*. Junkies, prostitutes, winos, tramps. Convicts, maybe, just so long as they aren’t psychos. That’s what we come from. We all know it, so why don’t we say it” (164). The quote shares the sad truths about the origin of the clones.

The clones were similar to normal humans as they share emotions and feelings. Thus, the clones were told to paint art to reveal their soul. This proves that they have emotions and feelings like normal people. The narrator listens what the guardian tells, “You said it was because your art would reveal what you were like. What you were like inside. That’s what you said, wasn’t it? 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” (255). The art production is not a sense of autonomy as perceived by clones, it is a proof for the guardians that these clones have human sensitivities and rationality, known with the metaphysical concept of souls. The guardians want to prove that the clones are intelligent and emotional, “Most importantly, we demonstrated to the world that if students were reared in humane, cultivated environments, it was possible for them to grow to be as sensitive and intelligent as any ordinary human being. Before that, all clones—or *students*, as we preferred to call you—existed only to supply medical science” (256). With this, the guardians are expanding the monetary value of the clones. Thus, Madame, another guardian calls them “Poor creatures” (267). This is similar to Agamben’s concept of bare life having no worth. The unethical side is exposed when the body organs of the clones are extracted, and they are commodified, in Dickenson’s words, “Body has become an object—a thing—and why some commentators actually think there’s nothing wrong with that”(1). The trade of body encompasses the trade of all the precious body organs, “Nor is this trade confined to kidneys, of which we’re all born with a ‘spare’. The ‘capital’ in prisoners’ bodies extends to their hearts, lungs and livers. The only snag is that you can’t live without those organs” (154). Hearts, lungs, livers are extracted from the clones indicating the unethical side of medical advancement. Humans are less sensitive to ethical sides as they are secular and devoid of religious back-grounding. In this regard, Bernard E. Rollin further argues that it is not job of humans to interfere the God’s role. Rollin, thus, argues that humans should not seek to unravel the hidden mysteries in the creation. “Human beings should not probe the fundamental secrets or mysteries of life, which belong to God” (60). Rollin assures that it is God’s job to create creatures which may need further evidences. Yet, his adherence to ethical side is good.

The clones in the novel could talk privately when they queue for lunch, “I suppose this might sound odd, but at Hailsham, the lunch queue was one of the better places to have a private talk. . . Quiet places were often the worst, because there was always someone likely to be passing within earshot. And as soon as you looked like you were trying to sneak off for a secret talk, the whole place seemed to sense it within minutes, and you’d have no chance” (22). However, they immediately sense that their private talk even in lunch queue is watched. They have no chance to share the private talks. They are denied of human agency and their existence is marked by their success to complete (die) after donations of their vital organs.

Regarding their existence and origin, Ruth, friend of Kathy shares that they are the outcome of trash; junkies, prostitutes, winos, tramps, and convicts. She comments, “We all know it. We’re modeled from trash. Junkies, prostitutes, winos, tramps. Convicts, maybe, just so long as they aren’t psychos.

That's what we come from. We all know it, so why don't we say it? A woman like that? Come on. Yeah, right Tommy. A bit of fun. . . . Look down the toilet, that's where you'll find where we all came from" (164). This bitter remark on the existence of clones like her, Ruth shows her anger and frustration. They do not own their body; neither have they realized they are good people. The clones are designed in a way that they cannot reproduce.

The production of clones is designed in such a way that they cannot reproduce. Kathy narrates, "Then there was the whole business about our not being able to have babies" (82). This asserts that they are denied of their agency to own their body. They acknowledge their status, "We have to respect rules" (82). They follow the rules and regulations. These cloned characters move from Hailsham School to Cottages and to donation centers. In donation centers, they are operated to extract their body parts which they understand as donations. They feel comparatively free in Cottages. Kathy mentions, "We arrived at the cottages expecting a version of Hailsham for the older students, and I suppose that was the way we continued to see them for some times" (114). They enjoy their life in the Cottages with Keffer, the guardians. They wait for the time to donate passionately. The narrator mentions, "It happened about a week after the notice came for his fourth donation" (273). The fourth donation is important to them because some of them die or complete before the fourth donation. Thus, they often worry about the fourth donation, "You know why it is, Kath, why everyone worries so much about the fourth? It's because they are not sure they will really complete" (272). The clones want to donate in maximum level before they complete or die. The fourth donation is a mark of good news for them, "And then there is this odd tendency among donors to treat a fourth donation as something worthy of congratulations" (273). They celebrate the fourth donation. It is because they are heavily influenced by the Hailsham rules despite the fact that some of the clones already know that they are designed for donating purpose. When Miss Lucy tells about it, they know it, "Your lives are set out for you. You will become adults, then before you are old, before you are middle-aged, you will start to donate your vital organs" (80). They are to donate their vital organs. Though the sense of protest can be seen in their attempt to apply for deferrals, they acknowledge their fate, and happily accept the operation for the vital organs donation.

## Conclusion

The paper concludes that cloned characters' devoid of human rights is the exposition of human cruelty. The cloned body's agency lies in the owners of Hailsham boarding school. The body serves the transplantation needs of humans. They are living a bare life in Agamben's terms and subjugated life in Foucault's terms. Moreover, their bodies are on sale in Donna Dickenson's terms. The clones are created to serve the humanity. The creation of clones, a new form of clone creatures, is antithetical to nature because the clones are manufactured for organ donation purpose. These bodies are owned, watched and controlled by people at power at Hailsham School. People's desire to live long is fulfilled through clones who donate their organs to needy people. These clones possess the essence of human qualities. Their stimuli, emotions, creation of artworks, tantrums, resistance seen in deferral, and their search for possible show they are similar to humans, but they are operated in the name of donations. Though their pain, anguish, suffering, and trauma are less mentioned in the novel, they are the victims at the hand of humanity. They live a bare or empty life. They are subjected bodies with constant supervision. Their body is valued when it serves the purpose of dominant group. It is not a free body but a political body owned by others. This body is docile body that is subjected, used, transformed and improved to meet

the goal of transplantation purpose. They are political puppets at power. Their minimum freedom is seen in Cottages. They are in the enclosed, segmented space, and they are observed at every point. They are deprived of their agency because they are inserted in a fixed space making the slightest movements of supervision possible.

Thus, the paper's concluding remarks raise the ethical concern of clones' commodification in the novel. It is a lack of humanity's sympathy and empathy towards clones revolving dominantly around Kathy H, Tommy D and Ruth. They are in Hell-shame, rather than Hailsham in their initial position. They look outwardly happy due to their ignorance, and their position as satisfied students at a seemingly idyllic Hailsham school is the indication of bare life. Their happiness is gone when they are identified as clones. Their wish for extending romance through deferral shows that they have similar to humans. Their resistance to cloning is foregrounded highlighting the ethical side of humanity which is significantly lacking as the clones are ostracized and viewed as abnormal humans. Clones' meaningless life, in Agamben's term, is the bare life. Similarly, their supervision by guardians in Hailsham similar to the concept of panopticon in Foucault terms. It is observed that the clones' state of servitude and their position of donors expose the commodification of clones and the harsh inhumanity of humanity.

### Works Cited

- Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford UP, 1995.
- Booker, M. Keith. *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature: Fiction as Social Criticism*. Greenwood Press, 1994.
- Carroll, Rachel. "Imitations of Life: Cloning, Heterosexuality and the Human in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *Rereading Heterosexuality: Feminism, Queer Theory and Contemporary Fiction*, Edinburgh University Press, 2012, pp. 131–48. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt3fgtnm.10>.
- Chatterjee, Arnab. "Exploring an Anti-Utopian Subtext in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2019, pp. 109–24. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/10.5325/intelitestud.21.2.0109>.
- Dickenson, Donna. *Body Shopping: The Economy Fuelled by Flesh and Blood*. One world Publications, 2008.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. Vintage Books, 1977.
- Gill, Josie. "WRITTEN ON THE FACE: RACE AND EXPRESSION IN KAZUO ISHIGURO'S *NEVER LET ME GO*." *Modern Fiction Studies*, vol. 60, no. 4, 2014, pp. 844–62. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26421759>.
- Gottlieb, Erika. *Dystopian Fiction, East and West: Universe of Terror and Trial*. McGill-Queen's UP, 2001.
- Harris, John. "'Goodbye Dolly?' The Ethics of Human Cloning." *Journal of Medical Ethics*, vol. 23, no. 6, 1997, pp. 353–60. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27718019>.

Marks, John. "Clone Stories: 'Shallow Are the Souls That Have Forgotten How to Shudder.'" *Paragraph*, vol. 33, no. 3, 2010, pp. 331–53. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43151855>.

Rollin, Bernard E. "Keeping up with the Cloneses: Issues in Human Cloning." *The Journal of Ethics*, vol. 3, no. 1, 1999, pp. 51–71. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25115600>. Accessed 1 Nov. 2024.

Schwetman, John David. "'Shadowy Objects in Test Tubes': The Ethics of Grievance in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies*, vol. 19, no. 4, 2017, pp. 421–40. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/10.5325/intelitestud.19.4.0421>. Accessed 7 Jan. 2024.

Tsao, Tiffany. "The Tyranny of Purpose: Religion and Biotechnology in Ishiguro's 'Never Let Me Go.'" *Literature and Theology*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2012, pp. 214–32. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23927483>. Accessed 7 Nov. 2024.