

# The Representation of Fukuyama's Pathways to a Posthuman Future in *Brave New World* and *Never Let Me Go*

**Sharareh Kashi and Zahra Jannessari Ladani**

## Summary

Dealing with the in-vitro creation of human beings, Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go* (2005) share the dystopian tradition, holding a catastrophic view of a technocratic society in a future in which humanity is depicted to be in a state of crisis. This article aims to examine the above-mentioned novels in terms of posthumanism, focusing on one of the well-known theorists of this field, Francis Fukuyama, who in *Our Posthuman Future* treats posthumanism as a threat to humanistic values. Fukuyama warns against a posthuman future in which technology will give us the capacity to modify the essence of human nature gradually, over time. The focus of this article will be on "Factor X", a concept introduced by Fukuyama, and the ways in which the characters of the novels possess it, or come into its possession. The ways in which Fukuyama's pathways to a posthuman world are realised in the dystopian worlds that Huxley and Ishiguro create, are also discussed.

## Opsomming

Aldous Huxley se *Brave New World* (1932) en Kazuo Ishiguro se *Never Let me Go* (2005) handel oor die in vitro-skepping van menslike wesens en deel die distopiese tradisie, met 'n katastrofiese beskouing van 'n tegnokratiese gemeenskap in 'n toekoms waarin die mensdom in 'n krisistoestand uitgebeeld word. Hierdie artikel het dit ten doel om bogenoemde romans aan die hand van posthumanisme te ondersoek, met die fokus op een van die welbekende teoretici op hierdie gebied, Francis Fukuyama, wat posthumanisme in *Our Posthuman Future* as 'n bedreiging vir humanistiese waardes sien. Fukuyama waarsku teen 'n posthumane toekoms waarin tegnologie ons die vermoë sal gee om die kern van die menslike aard geleidelik, met verloop van tyd, te wysig. Die fokus van hierdie artikel is op "Faktor X", 'n konsep wat Fukuyama bekendgemaak het, en die maniere waarop die karakters in die romans daarvoor beskik, of hoe hulle dit verkry. Die maniere waarop Fukuyama se roetes na 'n posthumane wêreld verwerklik word in die distopiese wêreld wat Huxley en Ishiguro skep, word ook bespreek.

The twentieth century saw a dramatically rapid succession of technological and scientific innovations in every aspect of human life. These developments were usually accompanied by intense public debate, combining anxieties about change and upheaval with excitement at the new possibilities of human beings' potentials. The remarkable increase in the bulk of science fiction in recent years clearly reveals the public interest in the future possibilities of science and technology. In addition to its visionary quality, one of the significant contributions of science fiction is "its ability to arouse critical thinking about our own nature and the way we relate to the issues that most dramatically shape human experience, which often include scientific discourses and practice" (Perez 2014: 1). Therefore, by recourse to dystopian vision as a tool to explore the possibilities for humanity's future, science fiction authors attempt to reflect their anxieties about future technologies, ethical issues in their developments and the status of men in general in future societies.

The recent advances such as animal cloning in biomedical science and genetic engineering have raised controversial ethical debates about the future of this science and the possibility of human cloning. Michael Levy and Joan Slonczewski acknowledge genetic engineering and human cloning as "the most enduring themes" in science fiction studies in the twentieth century (2003: 176). Clone fiction is mostly concerned with the question of what it means to be a human and who can be categorised as such, usually conveying the hidden message that cloning and genetic engineering can lead to unpredictable catastrophic consequences. Clone narratives usually demonstrate a world where a humanistic picture of the subject is in a state of crisis that is tenser than ever or even the end of humanity is prognosticated by some of them. The reason why contemporary thinkers and science fiction writers are interested in clone narratives is that human nature strikes the core of human identity with regard to the individual as well as to the species. Consequently, any modification in human nature through genetic manipulation could result in a disastrous identity crisis. Hence, clone narratives mostly create dystopian societies to shed light on the potential risks of uncontrolled science and warn the readers against inhumane consequences of its developments. This is the point where posthumanism as a contemporary philosophical and cultural discourse comes to significance, since it deals with the question of what it used to mean to be a human and what it means to be a human in a high-tech world where advances in the realm of science and technology offer new possibilities such as extending human subjectivity or intelligence. Moreover, posthumanism poses fundamental questions of human identity and explores the boundary between the self and the other, mostly artificial life forms such as clones. The present study, thus, strives to examine two dystopian clone narratives – *Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley and *Never Let Me Go* by Kazuo Ishiguro – to explore the concept of posthumanism as a radical decentring of the human, humanism and the humanities in the wake of the complexification of technology.

Posthumanism is now a well-established critical discourse within the humanities and social sciences. The term “posthuman”, popularised in the 1980s, refers to “various conditions in which humans might have modified themselves so extensively by cyborgization and genetic engineering as to liberate themselves from the traditionally recognized ‘human condition’”, and “Posthumanism”, a derivation of posthuman, is a term used with regard “to schools of philosophy subsequent to humanism” (Stableford 2006: 401). However, there is no convenient consensus when it comes to the questions of posthumanism. For instance, according to Ivan Callus and Stefan Herbrechter, posthumanism reflects on how “the effects on and of contemporary technoculture and biotechnology force through a rethinking of the integrities and identities of the human” as well as non-human others (2012: 241). John Lechte regards posthumanism as “a category which derives from developments in cybernetics and information technology that have fueled the quest to reproduce and reconstruct the human being” (2001: 332). Paul Giles traces back the provenance of posthumanism to “specific concerns around the mid-1980s about the extent to which a politics of human identity might ontologically be differentiated from other categories of scientific and biological existence” (2007: 329). In his discussion on posthumanism, Bart Simon makes a distinction between what he considers as “popular posthumanism” and “critical posthumanism”. On the one hand, he refers to Francis Fukuyama’s *Our Posthuman Future: Consequences of the Biotechnology* as a good example of popular posthumanism, since it presents the posthuman as a condition which threatens the integrity of human nature by the emergence of new technologies. On the other hand, Simon sees critical post-humanism “as a way of thinking the human”, or as “implicated in the ongoing critique of what it means to be human” (2003: 8). Posthumanism is defined here “as a critique, both of an essentializing conception of human nature, and of human exceptionalism,” and is characterised by “discourses of dissolution or blurring of the boundaries of human” (Wallace 2010: 692-693). Thus discussed, posthumanism is an umbrella term that refers to a wide range of discourses. However, this study is devoted to investigate the ideas of Francis Fukuyama, who is considered as “one of the major figures who has shaped the rhetoric of posthumanism” (Miah 2010: 3).

Francis Fukuyama has shaped the concept of the posthuman’s recent historical development and might even be attributed “the burden of having embedded the concept into common parlance” (2002: 4). His analysis of a posthuman future where biotechnological advancement is widespread invokes the rhetoric of posthumanism to frame and define this future. Fukuyama’s understanding of posthumanism is advanced as a negative case. In other words, Fukuyama’s apocalyptic tone in *Our Posthuman Future* warns the readers against any future advances in biotechnology and genetic engineering that allow the self-modification of “our complex evolved nature”

and “lead us down a very perilous path” where humanity loses its essence (160).

In *Brave New World*, Huxley contrives to express his anxieties about human genetic engineering by depicting a futuristic totalitarian society, in which people are genetically engineered and socially conditioned from conception. In similar vein, in *Never Let Me Go*, Ishiguro depicts a society where human beings are cloned and bred for the purpose of harvesting their organs once they reach adulthood. Therefore, both novels can be taken as good examples of dystopian fiction reflecting Fukuyama's worries about the possibilities of a posthuman future when human biotechnological enhancement is feasible.

In *Our Posthuman Future*, Fukuyama focuses his discussion on three main areas of debate: “Pathways to the Future”, “Being Human”, and “What to Do”. In the first part, Fukuyama lays out four plausible pathways to the future and draws their consequences. The four stages that Fukuyama outlines include increasing knowledge about the biological sources of human behaviour, neuropharmacology and the manipulation of human behaviour and emotions, prolongation of life, and finally genetic engineering. In the second part, Fukuyama discusses the philosophical issues raised by an ability to manipulate human nature through advances in genetic engineering. Fukuyama argues for the centrality of human nature to our understanding of human rights, which he refers to as the essence of liberal democracies, and develops a concept of human dignity which rests on what he calls “Factor X”: “some essential human quality underneath [...] that is worthy of a certain minimal level of respect” (149). In the third part, Fukuyama calls for national and international regulatory institutions to set restrictive rules for greater political control over the uses of science and technology, in particular progress in human biotechnological enhancement.

In describing the ways in which Huxley's *Brave New World* and Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go* can be interpreted in terms of Fukuyama's ideas, the two novels will be discussed in two main parts, namely “The Pathways to the Future” and “Factor X”. The first part examines the novels in order to see how Huxley's and Ishiguro's representations of the posthuman correspond with Fukuyama's four stages, and to what extent the consequences are comparable to what Fukuyama assumes. The main focus of this part is on Soma<sup>1</sup> as a product of neuropharmacological advances in *Brave New World*, and cloning as one of the possible results of genetic engineering advances in *Never Let Me Go*. The second part sheds light on how Huxley and Ishiguro respectively represent human dignity in their novel, and to what extent the characters of both novels possess Factor X. Moreover, it analyses how human nature is represented and how human rights are observed by the rulers of the societies

---

1. In *Brave New World*, Soma is the imaginary ideal pleasure drug that resembles a hangoverless tranquilliser or an opiate.

Huxley and Ishiguro depict. By doing so, this study seeks to show how applicable Fukuyama's ideas are to *Brave New World* and *Never Let Me Go*.

## The Pathways to the Future

In *Our Posthuman Future*, Fukuyama refers to the threat of a big biotechnological revolution which would alter “human nature and thereby move us into a posthuman age” (7). The pathways predicted by Fukuyama can be traced to a similar world that Huxley and Ishiguro create in *Brave New World* and *Never Let Me Go*. Among the instances that are analogous to what Fukuyama regards as the big biotechnological threat, we can refer to Bokanovskification,<sup>2</sup> the drug soma, the Feelies,<sup>3</sup> the modification of behaviour through constant subliminal repetition and administration of various artificial hormones in *Brave New World*, and human cloning in both *Brave New World* and *Never Let Me Go*.

The accumulative knowledge about the human brain and the biological sources of human behaviour – particularly in the case of three types of higher-level behaviour with genetic roots, namely intelligence, crime, and sexuality – is among the possible pathways that pave the road to a post-human future. Huxley cleverly represents the negative political implication of this kind of knowledge through the way the powerful Fordian rulers of his World State use it in order to maintain their power over the new “worlders” and control the masses by turning them into mindless automatons. In the foreword to *Brave New World*, Huxley points out that “the theme of *Brave New World* is not the advancement of science as such; it is the advancement of science as it affects human individuals” (1932: iv). Huxley elaborates on this idea by stating that he is concerned with “the sciences of life” – biology, physiology, and psychology – because they can eventuate in a “really revolutionary revolution” that takes place in “the souls and flesh of human beings” (*BNW* x). What Huxley considers as “the sciences of life” and their application by “the all-powerful executive of political bosses and their army of managers [to] control a population of slaves who do not have to be coerced, because they love their servitude” (*BNW* x-xi) resembles, in many ways, Fukuyama's pathways to a posthuman future.

In the first part of *Brave New World*, Huxley details how the World State's Controllers have learned to use science and technology to produce “a race which loves its servitude, a race of standardized machine-minders for

- 
2. In *Brave New World*, Bokanovskification is a cloning process which is applied to fertilized human eggs in vitro, and causes them to split into identical genetic copies of the original.
  3. In *Brave New World*, a feely is a kind of movie which allows the audience to experience the same physical sensations as its characters.

standardized machines who will never challenge their authority” (Reiff 2010: 66). As Huxley puts it in the foreword of the book, one method that governments would invent to make the masses love servitude is “a fully developed science of human differences, enabling government managers to assign any given individual to his or her proper place in the social and economic hierarchy” (*BNW* xii). Huxley’s World State accomplishes this in two ways: first, by controlling the citizens’ genetic makeup before birth, which Huxley refers to as “a fool proof system of eugenics designed to standardize the human product” (*BNW* xii), and second by conditioning them through different psychological and biological methods. In *Brave New World*, embryos are hatched in five groups, forming a caste system of superiors – The Alphas and Betas – and inferiors – the Gammas, Deltas, and Epsilons. In the first three chapters of the book, the Director of London Central Hatchery and Conditioning Center explains how the superior castes are created through a selection of biologically superior sperm to fertilise biologically superior ova. Whereas the lower castes come from inferior eggs and sperm that are made into a legion number of identical twins by the Bokanovsky Process. Moreover, to further ensure their inferiority, the lower castes are injected prenatally with alcohol and other types of poison and deprived of proper amounts of oxygen during the Bokanovsky Process, which directly affects their intelligence and mental ability. Hence, through genetic engineering, Huxley’s World State is able to produce standardised humans including a minor group of thinkers and a major group of inferior creatures. The second science that helps the World State Controllers manipulate the citizens, “a great improved technique of suggestion – through infant conditioning” is, indeed, a psychological one. Following eugenically the creation of infants, the World State Controllers brainwash the infants and children with Pavlovian and hypnopaedia, or sleep-learning, techniques. In chapter two, the Director takes the students into Neo-Pavlovian Conditioning rooms to show how Bokanovsky babies “grow with what the psychologists used to call ‘an instinctive’ hatred of books and flowers. Reflexes [are] unalterably conditioned. They’ll be safe from books and botany all their lives” (*BNW* 14). The nurses present the babies with books and flowers, and while the babies crawl toward the books and flowers, an alarm rings shrilly to expose the babies to a mild electric shock. Afterwards, when the nurses offer the flowers and books to the babies, they recoil in fear and walk away. As “a love of nature keeps no factories busy”, the Controllers decide to “abolish the love of nature” among the lower classes, “but not the tendency to consume transport. For of course it was essential that they should keep on going to the country, even though they hated it” (*BNW* 15). The Director concludes by stating that:

We condition the masses to hate the country [...] But simultaneously we condition them to love all country sports. At the same time, we see to it that all country sports shall entail the use of elaborate apparatus. So that they

consume manufactured articles as well as transport. Hence those electric shocks.

(BNW 16)

Neuropharmacology and the way it can be used to manipulate human behaviour relates to Fukuyama's other pathway to a posthuman future. Indeed, Fukuyama warns against the future generation of psychotropic drugs accomplished through neuropharmacology. The Soma of Huxley's *Brave New World* closely resembles what Fukuyama refers to as "mind-altering drugs" used by governments to "maintain social control and produce compliant subjects" (2002: 53). In *Brave New World* the Soma is the latest psychotropic drug delivered by third-millennium neuropharmacology that brings instant gratification without any harmful side effects to the body. The Soma is a one-dimensional tranquilliser. It can only effect a shallow feeling of oblivion to get rid of the brutal reality of the new world. In other words, the Soma never brings about a sublime or enriching feelings. Instead, it makes a "mindless, inauthentic, imbecile happiness" to make the new "worlders" feel comfortable with their lack of freedom. The Controller describes the Soma as what "gives you a holiday from the facts. And there's always Soma to calm your anger, to reconcile you to your enemies, to make you patient and long-suffering" (BNW 162). Put it differently, the Soma is one of the Controllers' strongest methods to control the masses and preserve social stability. Therefore, it is free and readily available everywhere for the use of citizens. As Huxley maintains in *Brave New World Revisited*,

systematic drugging of individuals for the benefit of the State (and incidentally, of course, for their own delight) was a main plank in the policy of the World Controllers. The daily soma ration was an insurance against personal maladjustment, social unrest and the spread of subversive ideas [...] The drug had power to console and compensate, it called up visions of another, better world, it offered hope, strengthened faith and promoted charity.

(1958: 55)

In contrast to Huxley's many descriptions and references to new discoveries in the field of what he calls the "sciences of life" – biology, psychology, and physiology – genetic engineering, and neuropharmacology, Kazuo Ishiguro's scientific references in *Never Let Me Go* are very rare, even non-existent. The science of genetic engineering and cloning, indeed, is not Ishiguro's primary concern. Thus, the scientific base of *Never Let Me Go* is very vague. Instead, Ishiguro aims to raise ethical questions regarding human cloning by portraying how humans are cloned and what they experience as clones. Nevertheless, because the novel exemplifies Fukuyama's most important possible pathway to a posthuman future, human cloning with the aid of genetic engineering, we can conclude that *Never Let Me Go* manifests Fukuyama's dystopian posthuman future, as does Huxley's *Brave New World*.

## Factor X

As discussed earlier, Huxley and Ishiguro both create worlds that have already entered a posthuman stage through biotechnological advances. By portraying a dystopian vision of the posthuman world, both Huxley and Ishiguro present us with a special moral dilemma about progress in the field of biotechnology. This moral dilemma about the promises of future biotechnological advances makes sense when it is analysed in terms of Fukuyama's "Factor X" in *Our Posthuman Future*. In his words, Factor X is a fixed conceptualisation of the human and a universal "human essence that unites all human beings" (2002: 156). Fukuyama regards Factor X as the possession of qualities such as moral choice, reason, language, sociability, sentience, emotions, consciousness, free will, and so forth that have been put forth as grounds for humanness. He believes that "every member of the human species possesses a genetic endowment that allows him or her to become a whole human being, an endowment that distinguishes a human in essence from other types of creatures" (*Our Posthuman Future* 171). Consequently, all human beings are supposed to be equally respected on the basis of their possession of Factor X. The aim of this section is to analyse to what extent Huxley's and Ishiguro's characters possess Factor X.

Fukuyama refers to "a broad emotional gamut" as the most significant, and uniquely human, characteristic which is related to man's complex interactions:

For it is the distinctive human gamut of emotions that produces human purposes, goals, objectives, wants, needs [...] and hence is the source of human values. While many would list human reason and human moral choice as the most important unique human characteristics that give our species dignity, I would argue that possession of the full human emotional gamut is at least as important, if not more so.

*(Our Posthuman Future* 160)

Emotional stability is one of the cornerstones of society in *Brave New World*. Therefore, the rulers of the World State keep the citizens away from having any deep feelings or emotional conflicts. In fact, emotional stability is achieved by teaching slogans that make people feel satisfied with their lives and abolish individualism because "when the individual feels, the community reels" (*BNW* 62). The Fordian rulers encourage the citizens to take the soma drug to get rid of hostile feelings, while slogans such as "One cubic centimeter cures ten gloomy sentiments" (*BNW* 60) and "A gramme in time saves nine" (*BNW* 59) promote the use of soma to eliminate sadness. "Everyone feels happy now" and there is no place for pain, sorrow and misery: "Fortunate boys!" said the Controller. "No pains have been spared to make your lives emotionally easy-to-preserve you, so far as that is possible, from having



emotions at all’,” since “Ford’s in his flivver” and “all’s well with the world” (BNW 29).

Among the conformist citizens of the new world, Bernard Marx and Helmholtz Watson appear as two discontented intellectuals who are eventually exiled to an island owing to their wider gamut of emotions. The excerpt below clearly shows Helmholtz’s yearning for experiencing a deeper emotion, the origin of which he does not know:

“Did you feel”, he asked, as though you had something inside you that was only waiting for you to give it a chance to come out? Some sort of extra power that you aren’t using- you know, like all the water that goes down that falls instead of through the turbines? He looked at Bernard questioningly.

“You mean all the emotions one might be feeling if things were different?” Bernard asked.

(BNW 46)

Such discontent is also evident in Bernard’s reluctance to take Soma, and in his conversations with Lenina:

And in spite of his misery absolutely refused to take the half-gramme raspberry sundae which she pressed upon him. “I’d rather be myself”, he said. “Myself and nasty. Not somebody else, however jolly”. (BNW 59)

[...]

Bernard began to talk a lot of incomprehensible dangerous nonsense.

Lenina did her best to stop the ears of her mind; but every now and then a phrase would insist on becoming audible. “...to try the effect of arresting my impulses”, she heard him say. [...] The mad bad talk rambled on. “I want to know what passion is”, she heard him saying. “I want to feel something strongly”.

“When the individual feels, the community reels,” Lenina pronounced.

“Well, why shouldn’t it reel a bit?”

(BNW 62)

Throughout the novel, Bernard frequently looks back nostalgically at the old world, when people were still capable of experiencing a variety of emotions:

Often in the past he had wondered what it would be like to be subjected (somaless and with nothing but his own inward resources to rely on) to some great trial, some pain, some persecution; he had even longed for affliction [...] He had imagined himself courageously resisting, stoically accepting suffering without a word.

(BNW 69)

In a world devoid of any emotions other than shallow fake happiness, where everyone thinks, feels, and acts alike, Huxley shows that there is no room for people like Bernard and Helmholtz, who want to practice their individuality

and go beyond the very restrictive gamut of emotions as a consequence of which they are sent into exile.

Fukuyama believes that “the distinctive human gamut of emotions [...] is the source of human values” (*Our Posthuman Future* 169). As Peter Bowering puts it, in Huxley's world, “the imprisonment of the human spirit by science is almost complete; human values have totally disappeared, natural impulses allowed to atrophy until inhabitants react like automata” (Reiff 2010: 71). In other words, Huxley creates a World State where human values such as family, marriage, parenthood, spirituality, and art are lost owing to the lack of “the distinctive human gamut of emotions”. In *Brave New World*, family and marriage are abolished; parenthood sounds like a banality to the new worlders; religion as the most important source of spirituality is eliminated because “God isn't compatible with machinery and scientific medicine” (*BNW* 159); and high art is sacrificed because it is beautiful and “beauty's attractive”, thus, the Fordian rulers do not have people to be attracted to old things. As Mustapha Mond, the Controller puts it:

The world's stable now. People are happy; they get what they want, and they never want what they can't get. They're well off; they're safe, they're never ill; they're not afraid of death; they're blissfully ignorant of passion and old age; they're plagued with no mothers or fathers, they've got no wives, or children, or lovers to feel strongly about.

(*BNW* 149)

In addition to a full emotional human gamut, Fukuyama refers to human moral choice and free will as two other important uniquely human characteristics. Fukuyama cites Kant who made “the most famous effort to create a philosophical basis” for what Fukuyama calls Factor X. According to Fukuyama,

[f]actor X was based on the human capacity for moral choice. That is, human beings could differ in intelligence, wealth, race, and gender, but all were equally able to act according to moral law or not. Human beings had dignity because they alone had free will. [...] It is the existence of free will that leads Kant's well-known conclusion that human beings are always to be treated as ends and not as means.

(*Our Posthuman Future* 151)

In Huxley's new world, free will is lost and the citizens are thus robbed of the power to make moral choices. The Director of the London Hatchery and Conditioning Center states that “moral education [...] ought never, in any circumstances, to be rational” (*BNW* 17) and regards hypnopaedia, one of the conditioning methods, “the greatest moralizing force of all time” (*BNW* 18). Therefore, in the new world, moral education is just indoctrination through hypnopaedia. This means that the members of the world are conditioned and programmed to act according to the moral laws that are determined by the

state beforehand. Indeed, the new worlders are “so conditioned that they practically can’t help behaving as they ought to behave” (BNW 149). Mustapha Mond deems liberty “to be inefficient and miserable [...] a round peg in a square hole” (BNW 31).

Throughout the novel, Bernard often shows his reluctance toward being subjugated by the absolute power of the Controllers. In a conversation with Lenina, Bernard insists on enjoying nature in solitude, because nature

“makes me feel as though ...” he hesitated, searching for words with which to express himself, “as though I were more me, if you see what I mean. More on my own, not so completely a part of something else. Not just a cell in the social body [...]”.

But Lenina was crying. “It’s horrible [...] how can you talk like that about not wanting to be a part of the social body? After all, everyone belongs to everyone else”.

“[...] What would be like if I could, if I were free- not enslaved by my conditioning. Don’t you wish you were free, Lenina?”

“I don’t know what you mean. I am free. Free to have the most wonderful time. Everybody’s happy nowadays”.

He laughed, “Yes, [...] But wouldn’t you like to be free to be happy in some other way, Lenina? In your own way, for example; not in everybody else’s way”.

(BNW 60)

The above excerpt clearly shows the new worlders’ lack of freedom. In fact, they are only free to be happy in the way which is already determined for them by the Fordian rulers. John the Savage, an outsider to the new world, is shocked to see how the new worlders are imprisoned: “Linda had been a slave, Linda had died; others should live in freedom and the world be made beautiful. A reparation, a duty. And suddenly it was luminously clear to the Savage what he must do; it was as though a shutter had been opened, a curtain drawn back” (BNW 143). John’s mother’s death acts like an epiphany, opening his eyes to the truth of the *Brave New World*. And that is why the Savage decides to rebel;

“Don’t you want to be free? Don’t you understand what manhood and freedom are?” Rage was making him fluent [...] “Don’t you?” he repeated, but got no answer to his question. “Very well then”, he went on grimly. “I’ll teach you; I’ll make you free whether you want or not”. [...] and he began to throw the little boxes of soma tablets in handfuls out into the area.

(BNW 144-145)

Rendered incapable to make moral choices, and deprived of a full gamut of emotions as well as free will, Huxley’s new worlders do not possess what Fukuyama calls Factor X, “the essential human qualities” or “human essence, the most basic meaning of what it means to be human” (*Our Post-human*

*Future* 149-150). In other words, Huxley shares Fukuyama's notion of the potential pernicious consequences of biotechnology and genetic engineering advances by showing how these advances can manipulate human nature. This manipulation, thus, would eventuate to a posthuman world where human beings are dehumanised, their dignity being disrespected, and their rights violated. Being aware of the sordid truth behind the brave new world, John the Savage reclaims all his rights:

“But I don't want comfort. I want God, I want poetry, I want real danger, I want freedom, I want goodness. I want sin.”

“In fact”, said Mustapha Mond, “you're claiming the right to be unhappy.”  
“All right then”, said the Savage definitely, “I'm claiming the right to be unhappy. Not to mention the right to grow old and ugly and impotent; [...] the right to have too little to eat, [...] the right to live in constant apprehension of what may happen tomorrow, [...] the right to be tortured by unspeakable pains of every kind [...] I claim the all' said the Savage at last.”

(163)

Contrary to Huxley's depiction of the dehumanised new “worlders”, Ishiguro portrays the clones as being more humanised. One of the novel's main concerns is, indeed, to explore what it means to be a human and to what extent an artificial life form like a clone is capable of possessing essentially unique human characteristics, or Factor X in other words.

The most humanising characteristics of the clones in *Never Let Me Go* relate to their broad gamut of emotions.

They enjoy a much wider and more profound range of human emotions than the citizens of the *Brave New World*. The novel is replete with emotional scenes which invoke the readers' empathy with the clones and raise very important moral questions about the ethics of cloning. Ishiguro explores the depth of the clones' emotions in two ways: the identity crisis experienced by the clones Kathy, Ruth, and Tommy – and their struggle to make sense of the posthuman world in which they live, and the relationship between these three. Throughout the novel, Ishiguro demonstrates the emotional development of the clones as they grow up and struggle to make sense of their minds, bodies, and existence, and their ultimate fate. The novel is characterised by Kathy's narration which reveals her disappointments, anxieties, and joys as she grows up. Moreover, Kathy's numerous flashbacks to the clones' childhood at Hailsham help readers realise the fact that the clones experience the same feelings of sorrow, sadness, regret, frustration, jealousy, pain and empathy as normal human beings might do, even more powerfully, since clones are deprived of parents, and are treated as outsiders to the world of humans. Hoping not to be regarded as the “other” or the outcast, the clones at Hailsham constantly seek attention from their guardians and struggle for recognition: “Didn't we all dream from time to time about one guardian or other bending the rules and doing something special for us? A spontaneous hug, a secret

letter? A gift?" (NLMG 60). The clones' empathy with one another is best demonstrated in the relationship between Kathy as a carer and her donors. Kathy shows great love and patience to the clones during their donations:

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" [...] 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 listen to everything they have to say.  
(NLMG 3)

Whenever Kathy is permitted to choose her donors, she chooses the clones from Hailsham, "the clones of her own kind", and shows a great empathy toward them. As she puts it:

Carers aren't machines. You try and do your best for every donor, but in the end it wears you down. You don't have unlimited patience and energy. So when you get a chance to choose, you choose your own kind. That's natural. There's no way I could have gone on for as long as I have if I've stopped feeling for my donors every step of the way.  
(NLMG 4)

Ishiguro also explores the depths of the clones' emotions through the relationship that develops between Kathy and Tommy, and a love triangle that involves Ruth, a fellow clone. The love affair between Tommy and Kathy develops gradually. As Henriette Ross also puts it, "in *Never Let Me Go* it is the expression of love that is an especially strong indicator of humanity. The love between Kathy and Tommy is not just there to create a touching love story, but also to communicate their humanness in the most recognizable way" (50). Tommy and Kathy start caring for each other from their childhood. Despite the intimacy between Tommy and Kathy, Ruth wins Tommy's love. However, at the end of the novel Ruth apologises for keeping Tommy and Kathy apart and asks them to try their chance to obtain a deferral from Hailsham on the grounds that they are truly in love and, thus, can experience authentic and profound emotions. Kathy's and Tommy's capacities for emotional depth are highlighted in several scenes. In one scene, Tommy blames Kathy for seeking sexual satisfaction in porn magazines. To Tommy, sex is not a casual mechanical act but a meaningful one if love is involved: "I don't think it's necessarily a bad thing. Once you find someone you really want to be with, then it could be really good. Remember what the guardians used to tell us? If it's with the right person, it makes you feel really good" (NLMG 182). In another scene, when Kathy and Tommy find out that there is no such thing as a deferral and their hope for living longer shatters into pieces, they cling to each other in what seems to be an infinite embrace. The intensity

of their passion for each other far surpasses the shallowness and superficiality of the emotions shown by their human counterparts in the novel:

I caught a glimpse of his face in the moonlight, caked in mud and distorted with fury, then I reached for his flailing arms and held on tight. He tried to shake me off, but I kept holding on, until he stopped shouting and I felt the fight out of him. Then I realized he too had his arms around me. And so we stood together like that for what seemed like ages, not saying anything, just holding each other.

(NLMG 274)

By exploring the inner lives of the clones, the moving love affair between Kathy and Tommy and the turbulent friendship between Kathy and Ruth, Ishiguro suggests that the clones are capable of experiencing a full gamut of emotions as deeply and intensely as any human being might do. Besides, Fukuyama refers to human's capacity for free will and, consequently, moral choice as another important ground for Factor X. Ishiguro's characters are remarkably passive regarding the acceptance of their fates, that is, the donation of their vital organs until they complete.<sup>4</sup> Tommy remarks:

You'll have heard the same talk. How maybe, after the fourth donation, even if you're technically complete, you're still conscious in some sort of way, how then you find there some more donations, plenty of them, on the other side of the line; how there are no more recovery centers, no carers, no friends; how there's nothing to do except watch your remaining donations until they switch you off.

(NLMG 279)

This excerpt shows how the clones' lack of free will eventually disempowers them to change their predestined futures. Therefore, the clones in *Never Let Me Go* seem less human-like because of the fact that they show almost no resistance to their predetermined fate. Instead, they accept their unfair fate docilely as it is. Throughout the novel, no character gets involved in any act of rebellion or escape. They even regard completing before the third donation a shame.

Kathy's account of the donors who successfully manage to reach their fourth donation reveals how conformist and passive the clones are to their predestined futures, mere commodities to be exploited for the sake of the society's good:

I've known donors to react in all sorts of ways to their fourth donation. Some want to talk about it all the time, endlessly and pointlessly. Others will only joke about it, while others refuse to discuss it at all. And then there's this odd

---

4. A euphemism that clones use for death. Most clones "complete" after their third or fourth organ donation.

tendency among donors to treat a fourth donation as something worthy of congratulations. A donor “on a fourth” [...] is treated with special respect.  
(NLMG 278)

The clones’ lack of free will is inherent. As Kathy puts it, she does not give up, but rather something inside her makes her give up: “Something in me just gave up. A voice went: ‘All right, let him think the absolute worse. Let him think it, let him think it’” (NLMG 195). As previously mentioned, free will is one of the components of Factor X in Fukuyama’s argument.

Though Ishiguro’s clones possess a wide gamut of deep human emotions, they are unable to change their fates. Ishiguro portrays his characters to be so human-like that they even feel love and empathy as strongly as normal men do, although they are deprived of volition. Furthermore, the love and sympathy of these characters are sufficient for Ishiguro to suggest that they are worth of being respected and fairly treated as any other human being. Hailsham is the only place where clones are treated in a more humane way and that is why the clones recall Hailsham with great fondness. Even clones who are not from Hailsham are fond of hearing Hailsham stories as if they seek solace in them. The conversation between Kathy and one of her donors clearly supports this:

He could hardly breathe, but looked towards me and said: “Hailsham, I bet that was a beautiful place.” [...] and I asked him where he’d grown up, he mentioned some place at Dorset and his face beneath the blotches went into a completely new kind of grimace. And I realized then how desperately he didn’t want reminded. Instead, he wanted to hear about Hailsham [...] What he wanted was not just to hear Hailsham but to remember Hailsham, just like it had been his own childhood. That’s when I first understood, really understood, just how lucky we’d been – Tommy, Ruth, me, all the rest of us.  
(NLMG 5-6)

What makes Hailsham so special to the clones is the way they are treated. It is where the clones could reflect their subjectivity by producing different art works and poetry. As Kathy puts it: “A lot of the time, how you were regarded at Hailsham, how much you were liked and respected, had to do with how good you were at creating [...] ‘It’s all part of what made Hailsham so special,’ Ruth said once. ‘The way we were encouraged to value each other’s work’” (NLMG 16-17). Later Miss Emily explains to the clones that the truth behind Hailsham is a cruel experiment. The purpose of encouraging the clones to produce art works and poetry is to demonstrate that the clones are not able to reach the artistic competence of a normal human being because they do not have souls. In other words, proving soullessness of clones justifies their organ donation for the public opinion: “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 [...] All around the country, at this very moment, there are students

being reared in deplorable conditions, conditions you Hailsham students could hardly imagine" (*NLMG* 260). As Miss Emily puts it, people's reaction to the new possibilities of the cloning project was first to ignore where the organs come from: "And for a long time, people preferred to believe these organs appeared from nowhere, or at most that they grew in a kind of vacuum" (*NLMG* 263). But by the time people became concerned about how the organ donors were reared, it was too late to reverse the cloning project; "there was no going back. However uncomfortable people were about [the clones'] existence". Hence, for a long time the clones were kept in shadows:

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 human, so it didn't matter [...] Here was the world, requiring students to donate. While that remained the case, there would always be a barrier against seeing you as properly human.

(*NLMG* 263)

By depicting a hostile and cruel posthuman world where human exploitation of clones is possible through biotechnological advances, Ishiguro suggests the fact that cold inhumanity – where the dignity of the clones, as well as their most basic rights, is denied – ironically reveals that it is the clones who are capable of emotional depths and compassion as well as love whereas it is the cold selfishly willing humans who abandon their humanity for their own, mostly selfish purposes.

To conclude, Aldous Huxley and Kazuo Ishiguro create worlds that have already entered posthuman stage through advances in biotechnology, neuropharmacology, and genetic engineering. However, Huxley's depiction of the pathways that lead to a posthuman stage is more detailed than Ishiguro's, since Huxley is more concerned with science and technology and their possible effects on human's life whereas Ishiguro is more concerned with the psychological effects of such advances. Huxley dehumanises the citizens of the World State in *Brave New World* by depicting them as passive creatures incapable of making moral choices and experiencing a full gamut of human emotions. This dehumanised picture of Huxley's clones suggests that the clones do not possess Factor X and that is why they are deprived of most basic rights and their dignity is ignored. Ishiguro, on the other hand, gives a more human-like picture of the clones by exploring the depths of the human emotions which the clones can experience. Ishiguro's humanised picture of the clones makes the readers sympathise with them despite their lack of freedom and passivity. Nevertheless, like Huxley's clones, the clones' dignity as well as their rights are ignored and disrespected in *Never Let Me Go* and this is where the cruelty and inhumanity of the posthuman world originate.



## References

- Callus, I. & Herbrechter, Stefan  
 2012 Introduction: Posthumanist Subjectivities, or, Coming after the Subject. *Subjectivity* 5(3): 241-246.
- Fukuyama, Francis  
 2002 *Our Posthuman Future: Consequences of Biotechnology Revolution*. London: Profile Books.
- Giles, P.  
 2007 Sentimental Posthumanism: David Foster Wallace. *Twentieth Century Literature* 53(3): 327-344.
- Huxley, Aldous  
 1932 *Brave New World*. New York: Harper.  
 1958 *Brave New World Revisited*. New York: Rossetta.
- Ishiguro, Kazuo  
 2005 *Never Let Me Go*. New York: Vintage.
- Lechte, John  
 2001 *Fifty Key Contemporary thinkers: From Structuralism to Post-modernity*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Levy, Michael & Slonczewski, Joan  
 2003 Science Fiction and the Life Sciences. In: Edward, James & Mendelsohn, Farah (eds) *The Cambridge Companion to Science Fiction*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, pp. 174-185.
- Miah, Andy  
 2010 Posthumanism: A Critical History. In: Gordijin, Bert & Chadwick, Ruth (eds) *Medical Enhancements & Posthumanity*. London & New York: Routledge, pp. 1-29.
- Perez, J.E.  
 2014 Sympathy for the Clone: (Post) Human Identities Enhanced by the "Evil Science" Construct and its Commodifying Practice in Contemporary Clone Fiction. *Between* 4(8): 1-24.
- Reiff, R.H.  
 2010 *Aldous Huxley: Brave New World*. New York: Marshall Cavendish.
- Ross, Henriette  
 2008 Not Properly Human: Literary and Cinematic Narratives about Human Harvesting." *Journal of Literary Studies* 24(3): 40-53.
- Simon, Bart  
 2003 Introduction: Toward a Critique of Posthuman Futures. *Cultural Critique* 53(1): 1-9.
- Stableford, Brian  
 2006 *Science Fact and Science Fiction: An Encyclopedia*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Wallace, J.  
 2010 Literature and Posthumanism, *Literature Compass* 8(7): 692-701.

**Sharareh Kashi**  
 University of Isfahan, Iran  
 sharareh.kashi@gmail.com

**Zahra Jannessari Ladani**  
 University of Isfahan, Iran  
 z.jannessari@fhn.ac.ir