The Shape of Individuality in the Bioscientific Dystopias of Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World* and Kazuo Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go*
## Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1: From Utopia to Dystopia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2: The Effects of Bioscientific Engineering on Individuality</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3: Creative Expression</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4: The Shape of Individuality in Totalitarian States</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works Cited</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

This dissertation discusses the concept of individuality within the genre of dystopia by analyzing the effects and importance of bioscientific development, creative expression, and surveillance with regard to the construction and/or deconstruction of individuality in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and Kazuo Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go* (2005). Huxley and Ishiguro’s novels both raise questions concerning the importance of bioscientific engineering and both authors explore the construction of individuality within an essentially oppressive regime. Even though Huxley’s novel was written in the early twentieth century, its questions and warnings are still topical due to recent development in the field of bioscience. Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go* is set in the 1990s, when the debate on the ethical side of cloning heated up, making it a contemporary perspective on the complexity of cloning with regard to individuality. By comparing and contrasting the importance of bioscientific advancement as expressed in the process of cloning humans, conditioning methods, creative expression, and setting, this dissertation explores whether even within heavily oppressed and strictly controlled fictional societies it is possible for individuality to develop and flourish.

To efficiently compare and contrast these two novels I have used two theories on surveillance which analyze the structure of society as well as that of totalitarian regimes in the twentieth century. These are Hannah Arendt’s theory on totalitarian states and systematic analysis of totalitarian surveillance camps as presented in *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951) and *Essays in Understanding* (1930-1954) and Michel Foucault’s theory on discipline and surveillance as presented in *Discipline & Punish: the Birth of the Prison* (1975). Arendt and Foucault’s theories analyze and discuss utilitarian regimes that are very similar to the regimes present in *Brave New World* and *Never Let Me Go*.

Before analyzing the concept of individuality in these two novels, it is important to establish how utopia –from the Greek “eutopia,” which means “good place” and “outopia,” which means “no place” (Abrams 337)– as the ideal state with ideal living conditions, has developed as a literary genre through history because this development has been of great importance to the establishment of the counter-utopia. The dystopia, “bad place,” as this counter-utopia is called, emerged at the beginning of the twentieth century as a reaction to industrialization, as well as in response to the theories of Karl Marx concerning the abolishment of private property to create a classless system, and Charles Darwin concerning the evolution of mankind. A good example of this change is H.G. Wells’s *A Modern Utopia* (1905) in which Wells envisioned a World State which was characterized by control over its...
inhabitants and its value of machines. This vision of technology as fully implemented and as an intrusive element in society became a main principle of dystopian literature.

Chapter 1 of this dissertation discusses how the concept of utopia has been subject to change throughout history by a chronological survey of key texts within the utopian genre. This chapter also serves as a theoretical background for the analyses of subsequent chapters and provides an insight into how these theories fit within the context of utopian and dystopian literature. It is important to demonstrate how the concept of utopia has changed over time and developed a counterpart in the dystopia because both *Brave New World* and *Never Let Me Go* are characterized as dystopian fiction and because the foundation for dystopias, which has its roots in utopian structures, is traceable in both these novels.

Chapters 2 to 4 reflect a detailed analysis of the concept of individuality in the dystopian fiction of Huxley and Ishiguro by discussing three important aspects of bioscientifically controlled societies, namely cloning and conditioning, creative expression, and hierarchized surveillance methods. Chapter 2 focuses on the importance of cloning and conditioning techniques in this novel with regard to control of population and power, and, consequently, to the possibility for individuality to bloom within strictly controlled societies. Chapter 3 discusses the significance of creative expression in these controlled environments because both novels use creative expression as an important tool to indicate the possibilities of individuality within an oppressive state. Finally, chapter 4 analyzes the structure of the states depicted in the two novels with the help of Hannah Arendt and Michel Foucault’s analyses of surveillance in power structures such as totalitarian states. This analysis shows what effects strict surveillance methods in hierarchized societies have on the development of individuality and the ability to express strong emotions.
Chapter 1: From Utopia to Dystopia

One of the earliest utopian texts, Plato’s *The Republic* (360 B.C.), served as a plan for an ideal society in which laws were non-existent, and where static perfection and immutability were vital (Manuel 158). The death of Socrates, Plato’s teacher, in 399 B.C. was the main reason why Plato wrote this book. Socrates was a critic of democracy and tried to undermine the government of Athens because he believed that the increasing ideology of “might makes right” in the larger cities was immoral. He died a martyr because, even though the judges did not sentence him, the Athenian population voted for his death, and this example of debased democracy served as a starting point for *The Republic*. In the introduction to *The Republic* Joslyn T. Pine writes that “Plato perceived that the material greed of politicians was one of the worst evils of political life, and so economic power must be divorced from political power” and that he believed that “democracy must be replaced with a government by the wisest and the best” (vi). Plato’s ideal society is based on the result of a corruption of justice in his own contemporary society and his belief that governmental systems needed to restructure according to aristocratic values: the foundation of his ideal society formed a self-contained unit in which there must be enough land to feed its inhabitants and where independence from any other communities is desired (Mumford 5). Plato’s utopian worldview is a static island, much like the World State—a society that has stability as its primary goal—in Huxley’s *Brave New World*.

Inspired by the political utopian views expressed in Plato’s *The Republic*, Thomas More altered and improved Plato’s idea by incorporating Renaissance ideas on social development and enclosure laws in his *Utopia* (1516). The influence of More’s novel on the genre has been immense, not only because it is as the earliest work mentioning the word “utopia,” but also because it presents contemporary issues within the context of an ideal society. Many of the utopian and dystopian novels contain problems existing in the author’s timeframe to which possible solutions are offered. These problems often involve the dawning of mankind’s eradication due to the development of, for instance, economics, politics and religion. *Utopia* establishes a link between reality and the ideal society by addressing contemporary issues such as unemployment due to the trend of converting farmland into pasture because sheep farming was more profitable. However, More’s emphasis is on the concept and importance of art, which echoes the Renaissance Humanist ideology of “art for art’s sake.” This becomes clear because *Utopia* starts off with a poem and, as Marin Leslie states, because in More’s ideal society “poetry is not only tolerated; it is the essential
embodiment, the very voice, of the philosophical city” (63). This is different from Plato’s *The Republic*, for, according to Plato, poetry and art imitate events rather than being exact representations, which causes a breach in the understanding of the truth (Plato 254-258). Furthermore, he states that poets are a danger to the state’s stability, for they allow their deepest and strongest feelings to be expressed (262-265). The influence and importance of art still seems to be significant in utopian literature five centuries later. Huxley’s *Brave New World* clearly shows that (high) art such as literature can be used to reflect occurring events and to give a deeper meaning to life, and it also shows the consequences of the abolition of (high) art to humanity and, most importantly, individuality. Even in the twenty-first century, Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go* poses that art is needed in the development of character and individual: the clones’ creativity is heavily encouraged and art creates a window of hope in a predetermined life.

More’s ideal society influenced numerous authors, and it also found its way into philosophies and ideologies from the sixteenth century onwards, especially during the Enlightenment. According to Michael Winter, the typical Enlightenment utopia can be characterized by “the moment of maximum equivalence,” a situation in which the social order is equal to the natural order (87), and this type of perfect order was one of the main goals in the theories of eighteenth-century thinkers. One of these philosophers was Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who used ideas reminiscent of utopian ideals in several of his texts. He published numerous works during the second half of the eighteenth century, among which his three most famous books, translated as *Discourse on the Origin and Basis of Inequality among Men* (1754), *Émile* (1762), and *The Social Contract* (1762). In *The Social Contract* Rousseau states that “[e]very member of the community gives himself to it at the moment it is brought into being just as he is—he himself, with all his resources, including all his goods” (21). Rousseau believed that humans become community property at birth and that they will therefore never be completely free. This idea is also present in Huxley’s *Brave New World* and Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go*. In Huxley’s new world, the population is controlled to the extent that they are literally produced to serve the State, and in the institutions of Ishiguro’s novels, clones are raised to become organ donors to preserve normal human beings. Furthermore, Rousseau argues that people are still dependent on the state in order to gain a sense of freedom and thus the chains cannot be unlocked completely (Scott 485). This “communal-I” principle is characterized by “commitments which bind us to the social body [and which] are obligatory only because they are mutual; and their nature is such that in fulfilling them a man cannot work for others without at the same time working for himself” (Rousseau 33); the
commitments serve to maintain harmony within the state and for this reason they are vital to society. These commitments, however, can only be fulfilled if the state remains as small as possible, for Rousseau states that “[t]he more the social bond is stretched, the slacker it becomes; and in general a small state is relatively stronger for its size than a large one” (51), which shows that he believed that smaller states are easier to manage and, as a result, easier to please. This idea occurs in *Brave New World* as well because the World State maintains a fixed population number to make sure stability is preserved. According to Rousseau, larger states would require more sub-governments with the central one as main supervisor, a structure far more exhaustive for its inhabitants as all institutions have to be paid for (52). This idea was taken over by Jeremy Bentham, who presented a grimmer image of the perfect state three decades after the publication of *The Social Contract*.

In 1791 Bentham published “Panopticon, Or, The Inspection-House,” which served as a groundbreaking design for prisons as well as other public institutions such as schools, workhouses and hospitals (Winter 81-2). Bentham designed a circular building with a watch tower at the center, much like the centralization of power used to control societies which aim to create utopian living conditions such as in, for instance, Rousseau’s *Social Contract*. The Panopticon is designed in such a way that it is possible to observe the people in it at all times. This is much like the societies depicted in the dystopias presented in Huxley’s *Brave New World* and Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go* because surveillance in a strict setting is a primary tool to control the population in these novels. Even though the Panopticon is an eighteenth-century design, it is still considered influential today. Michel Foucault’s 1970s research on disciplinary methods in prisons resulted in the observation that:

> The practice of placing individuals under “observation” is a natural extension of a justice imbued with disciplinary methods and examination procedures. Is it surprising that the cellular prison, with its regular chronologies, forced labour, its authorities of surveillance and registration, its experts in normality, its experts in normality, who continue and multiply the functions of the judge, should have become the modern instrument of penalty? Is it surprising that prisons resemble factories, schools, barracks, hospitals, which all resemble prisons? (Foucault 227-8)

Additionally, the prison functioned as a laboratory in which experiments focused on behavior were conducted (203). In this way, Bentham’s idea of reshaping society into circular observatories was something waiting to happen. This becomes clear from Foucault’s analysis
in which is stated that all the mechanisms of power using a double mode of control –that of binary division and branding, and that of differential distribution– find their roots in the Panopticon (199-200). According to Foucault, “[t]he Panopticon is a marvelous machine which, whatever use one may wish to put it to, produces homogenous effects of power” (202). The twenty-first-century dystopias show clear signs of the influence of Bentham’s ideal penal system. This becomes clear in Huxley’s *Brave New World* as the State breeds new citizens and conducts DNA and conditioning experiments in monitored buildings, and also in Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go* in which the cloned children are raised in government-controlled schools as organ donors. According to Foucault, anti-utopians choose this type of state control simply because society is carceral in nature (Booker 26). Strikingly, in both Huxley’s and Ishiguro’s novels the measures to create a perfect society are reminiscent of Foucault’s carceral society theory: their perfect societies are characterized by enclosure, strict surveillance, bioscientific engineering, and various conditioning methods involving thought control. Their dystopias have evolved into prison-states in which people are brainwashed and genetically modified to ensure stability and, ultimately, the preservation of mankind.

Additional to the Panopticon, Bentham drew up a plan for harmonized workshops and factories for the poor, which he labeled as “Pauper Management”. Bentham took his Panopticon design as a starting point and, consequently, the poorer layer of society was regarded as inmates subjected to total control: his design turned individuals into utilities to ensure maximum results from the workforce (Winter 80-2). Huxley and Ishiguro both employ this idea in their novel: Huxley’s World State produces and enhances its population to guarantee that State stability will be preserved, and Ishiguro’s clone institutions function as organ farms in which children are raised to become donors to prolong normal humans’ lives. Bentham’s utilitarian design for a perfect, harmonized institution can thus be regarded as an early description of what nowadays is seen as a dystopia. His industrialist utopia focuses on efficiency of production and transforms a natural order into an artificial one (Winter 87), which simultaneously turns people into tools working for the greater good.

The influx of industrialization required practicality because the nineteenth century brought along with it a movement towards mass consumerism and commodification. Utopian ideals were adapted to this trend and contributed to the theories of Karl Marx and Charles Darwin, whose ideas were influential to the dystopian literature of the twentieth century. Charles Darwin’s evolution theory, published in, for instance, *On the Origin of Species* (1859), had a significant impact on dystopian literature and on a new literary genre: science fiction (Manuel 775). Bioscientific theories and evolution theory influenced anti-utopian
literature such as Huxley’s *Brave New World* in which science has evolved in such a way that it is possible for humans to influence their DNA by the use of a large spectrum of intervention methods to create a society based on a bio-engineered class system. Darwin’s findings are also influential in Ishiguro’s utopian novel: the main sociological issue Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go* addresses revolves around the ethical side to human cloning and its benefit to the prolonging of human products for consumption or material “goods” from a production line.

Karl Marx’s influence on dystopias is also significant: his ideas of capitalism and the commodification of human beings are reflected in fiction. Marx believed that commodification as well as turning individuality into communality would be inevitable if civilization proceeded on the course it had been taking since the end of the Enlightenment. For this reason, he believed that shared ownership would erase the inequities among the different layers of society (Booker 32). The primary goal of Marx’s ideologies concerning capitalism was the elimination of injustice, for the Industrial Revolution had significantly widened the gap between the upper and lower classes of society. Marx’s ideas can be found in utopian fiction from the late nineteenth century onwards. Community, equality, and the commodification of the population are important features in novels such as Eugene Zamiatin’s *We*, Huxley’s *Brave New World*, and Orwell’s *1984*. More recent utopias such as Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go* use his theory on community products and commodification to address the effects of consumer society by portraying clones with seemingly human traits as human sacrifices.

The growing discontent of the late nineteenth century, however, did not mean the end of utopia in literary terms. Despite the age of decadence at the beginning of the twentieth century, H.G. Wells presented an idealistic and alternative view on society in his *A Modern Utopia*, a novel regarded as the last great classic utopia (Booker 63-4). However, in this novel Wells attacks the static states presented by Plato and More by stating that conformity and lack of distinction, both features of the classic utopia, “[burden] us with an effect of unreality” (20) and he doubts “if anyone has ever warmed up to desire himself a citizen in the Republic of Plato” and “if anyone could stand a month of the relentless publicity of virtue planned by More” (21). In order to be achievable, a utopia needs to be a flexible and dynamic social structure based on old ideas and also new ones. Wells’s description of his “modern utopia” serves as a manual for dystopian literature. His utopia ascribes positive forces to technology, whereas anti-utopian authors often try to prove that technological advancement can develop into an intrusive and hardly reversible element in society. For example, Aldous Huxley presents a highly developed State that literally produces its inhabitants and turns them into
tools. Kazuo Ishiguro does the same in his novel, taking the 1990s debate on human cloning as his main theme and transferring it to a parallel society in which this debate is non-existent, since in this society cloning is accepted as beneficial to humankind.

The utopian literature of the twentieth century had, under the influences of Marx, Darwin and Wells, taken on a grimmer and prophetical nature, which often shows the downside of living in and maintaining an ideal state. The three most important novels in this new type of scientific and anti-utopian genre are Eugene Zamiatin’s *We* (1921), Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World*, and George Orwell’s *1984* (1948); novels which depict a society which is subjected to intrusive state control with the help of advanced technology. According to Erika Gottlieb, “Zamiatin, Huxley and Orwell present the totalitarian state as a primitive state religion that can exert its power over the true believers because of their initial need to find a framework for human continuity in the face of death” (39-40). Most often people are commodified by the state to make sure human existence on earth will be prolonged, and due to this state-enforced commodification, many of the inhabitants are being de-individualized and reduced to numbers. This is slightly reminiscent of Thomas More’s humanist ideal in *Utopia*, according to which people were supposed to work and do their part for the community. Most anti-utopian literature takes this obligation of labor to extremes by turning people into parts of the state-machine.

An important analysis of state power combined with strict surveillance can be found in Hannah Arendt’s study of totalitarian concentration and observation camps. Her exploration of the organization of totalitarian movements, for instance those present in Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia, is in a way similar to Michel Foucault’s analysis of society as a prison. Just like the prisons, the camps functioned as observatories for totalitarian regimes in order to control the population as well as to sustain the exercise of power. The camps helped in maintaining complete domination by taking away every sense of spontaneity and by conditioning people to the extent of “transforming people into something that is even less than animal, namely, a bundle of reactions that, given the same set of conditions, will always react in the same way” (*Essays in Understanding* 304). Thus, the ideal state and the ultimate goal of these camps was characterized by the deprivation of freedom as well as instincts and drives because, according to Arendt,

> [i]n reality [the concentration camps] are more essential to the preservation of the regime’s power than any of its other institutions. Without concentration camps, without the undefined fear they inspire and the very well-defined
training they offer in totalitarian domination, which can nowhere else be fully tested with all of its most radical possibilities, a totalitarian state can neither inspire its nuclear troops with fanaticism nor maintain a whole people in complete apathy. (The Origins of Totalitarianism 456)

The goal of exercising unlimited power can only be achieved if every aspect of the subordinates’ lives is fully dominated by the governing power.

Additional to this exploration of the importance of concentration camps, Arendt systematically divides these camps into three types, namely Hades, Purgatory, and Hell. The first type, Hades is characterized by the removal of “undesirable elements of all sorts,” ranging from criminals to the unemployed, from society (445). Hades thus more or less resembles a mild type of prison in which the unruly and those people not fitting into the state’s ideal society are controlled and observed. The second type, Purgatory, Arendt links to Soviet labor camps in which a strong sense of neglect was combined with chaotic forced labor (445). This type can thus be regarded as a utilitarian form of prison which is similar to the utilitarian ideal of the Panopticon. Arendt describes Hell, the third type, as a camp in which thorough and systematical organization in combination with extreme torment are key elements (445). This type is represented by extermination camps, such as those present in Nazi Germany, because “[e]xtermination happens to human beings who for all practical purposes are already ‘dead’” (Essays in Understanding 236). This three-way division will also emerge in the analysis of Huxley’s Brave New World and Ishiguro’s Never Let Me Go because the governing powers in these novels use a similar structure of surveillance with a different type of classification.

Despite these grim views on modern society, it cannot be said that the concept of utopia has changed entirely because even though the word “dystopia” indicates the opposite of utopia, this does not mean that a dystopia is essentially negative. The blueprint for a dystopian society is that of a utopia: in both a utopia and dystopia the highest power seeks an effective manner of governing in order to preserve society. Furthermore, actual utopias have still been described in the twentieth century; examples of these are Wells’s A Modern Utopia, Charlotte Perkins Gilman’s Herland (1915), and Huxley’s The Island (1962). The authors of dystopian or anti-utopian fiction often present a future ideal society which seems to be built on utopian principles of harmony, peace and stability. Its inhabitants often regard these societies as states of perfection and it is only due to outsiders visiting this state, such as John the Savage in Brave New World, that a new view on this society is presented which may cause
ambivalent feelings towards it. Therefore, a dystopia –from the outsider’s perspective– is not essentially negative: the people living there experience it as a state of perfection as they are conditioned to do so and might think their society actually is a utopia. For the authors of anti-utopian fiction, this type of utopia often functions as an example of perfection gone too far. This is present in *Brave New World* in which John the Savage addresses the shortcomings of the city, in *1984* in which Winston Smith questions the morality and legitimacy of the Big Brother regime, and, more recently, in *Never Let Me Go* in which Kathy questions whether the cloning of human DNA –an aspect already present in Huxley’s novel– is justified in the process of prolonging human life.

An important theme in *Brave New World* and even more so in *Never Let Me Go* is that of bioscientific development and its effects on society. In these novels, cloning as a means to preserve mankind and secure power has been fully accepted by society. Because of this implementation and acceptance, both authors raise questions as to whether or not cloning should be a logical next step in order to save mankind from extinction. Their dystopian societies are visions of the future –in Ishiguro’s case perhaps the very near future–, which illustrate the effects that cloning can have with regard to the construction of individuality. These visions are important within the context of recent development in the field of bioscience.

The debate on cloning heated up a few years after 1996, when Scottish scientists at the Roslin Institute successfully cloned the sheep Dolly. A worldwide debate followed regarding the political and, most importantly, ethical implications of DNA cloning. No scientist had ever thought it possible to clone animal DNA, and also because the “science dogma held that once a cell had grown up and became specialized (…) its DNA was through” (Caplan 1). This breakthrough caused a debate on whether or not the cloning of human DNA through the manipulation of embryonic stem cells would now be a logical step forward and, if it were, would this step be ethically correct and beneficial to mankind. This debate is also present in Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go* because in this novel people are cloned and raised with the prospect of becoming organ donors. By presenting his novel as a memoir by one of the clones, Ishiguro raises questions concerning the ethical validation of cloning to harvest organs for the “normal” and naturally conceived people in society. Ishiguro’s text is interesting because it tells the story of a clone living in a world parallel to England in the 1990s who questions the workings of the society she lives in. This setting creates a much closer link to our contemporary social issues in raising important questions regarding current bioscientific development. The debate Ishiguro brings up in his novel involves whether or not the cloning
of human DNA is ethically justifiable if clones are born with emotions like normal people. The clones are encouraged to create their own art works; their art serves as proof that clones have souls like any other human being. *Brave New World* also questions the ethics of cloning and Huxley does this, similar to Ishiguro, by presenting his dystopian future as an extreme form of bioscientific surveillance. One of the most important themes of both novels is the construction and deconstruction of individuality in a world dominated by bioscience and technology.
Chapter 2: The Effects of Bioscientific Engineering on Individuality

Aldous Huxley and Kazuo Ishiguro both use the concepts of cloning and conditioning methods in their dystopian description of the future of mankind, yet they apply this in different manners in their novels. Huxley’s World has a particularly interesting cloning method: the so-called Bokanovsky Process, which is described by the Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning as follows:

One egg, one embryo, one adult – normality. But a bokanovskified egg will bud, will proliferate, will divide. From eight to ninety-six buds, and every bud will grow into a perfectly formed embryo, and every embryo into a full-sized adult. (Huxley 3-4)

Human cloning has evolved to a point where the World States can use a minimum input of one egg to produce a maximum of ninety-six humans. William Matter argues that with this new and enhanced cloning technique, “[t]he same techniques Ford used for mass production of automobiles have finally been applied to people” and that, in Huxley’s new world, “[i]ndividuality must be repressed because it invites a malleable social structure” (95). Indeed, mass production in the World States has been improved with the help of bioscientific advancement compared to production methods used during the industrialization of the nineteenth century and has been fully integrated into the human reproduction system, turning humans into products rather than individuals.

Human procreation is no longer necessary in the World State because the Bokanovsky Process can create a multitude of new human beings which are enhanced, manipulated, and formed according to State standards. Furthermore, as Matter argues, even hints of individuality other than that controlled by the State might cause the society to be more flexible and, consequently, less bound to state control and more prone to social unrest. Huxley’s World State has prevented this by heavily conditioning its population and by manipulating embryos in such a way that individuality is repressed. Robert S. Baker claims that in Brave New World “the arbitrary and unpredictable processes of natural selection have been supplanted and rationalized by eugenics” (135-6), which confirms that the methods used in the World States have advanced to a stage in which the human genes can be improved by several intervention techniques. In this way, Huxley presents his World State as an entirely fabricated and manipulated society.
The World State population is divided into several departments which are controlled by the Directors who, in their turn, are supervised by the World Controller. These authorities supervise the State population which consists of five classes - the Alphas, Betas, Gammas, Deltas, and Epsilons-, which are kept under strict surveillance by various control methods. The set-up of this five-class system is related to the mental as well as physical manipulation of embryos. For instance, when the Director of Hatcheries guides a group of students into the Decanting Room an employee there states that, “[w]e also predestine and condition. We decant our babies as socialized human beings (…) The lower the caste, the shorter the oxygen. (...) [I]n Epsilons we don’t need human intelligence” (10-11).

According to Michel Foucault’s theory on carceral societies, “[t]he distribution according to ranks or grade has a double role: it marks the gaps, hierarchizes qualities, skills and aptitudes” (181). This distribution is also traceable in *Brave New World*. In Huxley’s world the population is controlled in such a way that opportunities to move up in class are non-existent: from an early age, the inhabitants are conditioned according to their class and are taught to dislike people belonging to other classes. The special education program for the manipulated inhabitants, Elementary Class Consciousness, is closely connected to one of the most important conditioning techniques of the World State, hypnopaedia. To uphold obedience, the World State authorities condition the population by playing repetitative slogan-tracks during programs such as the Elementary Class Consciousness as well as during regular sleep time. Class conditioning depends on this a great deal as it effectively forces people to dislike other classes to prevent risks of social unrest from an early age onwards:

Alpha children wear grey. They work much harder than we do, because they're so frightfully clever. I'm really awfully glad I'm a Beta, because I don't work so hard. And then we are much better than the Gammas and Deltas. Gammas are stupid. They all wear green, and Delta children wear khaki. Oh no, I don't want to play with Delta children. And Epsilons are still worse. (Huxley 22)

Hypnopaedia thus serves as an educational as well as restrictive device within the World State’s rank-distribution system by imposing class structure and personality onto its listeners. The main function of the bioscientific experiments in *Brave New World* is that of maintaining stability in an attempt to preserve mankind. By controlling the population to the extent of fixed population numbers, Bokanovsky-clones, and conditioning methods such as hypnopaedia, the World Controllers provide the tools to keep their States stable and their
inhabitants content. However, maintaining satisfaction and stability is merely a helpful tool for the World State to achieve its main goal, which is the preservation of their power. As stated by one of these World Controllers, Mustapha Mond:

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 so conditioned that they practically can't help behaving as they ought to behave. And if anything should go wrong, there's soma. (193-194)

The State houses a content, fearless, and well-structured population and its policy of aiming for complete satisfaction amongst its citizens creates another reality to those living within State borders via various means of conditioning. This is done, for instance, by soma, which, provided the correct dose has been taken, can induce so-called “soma holidays” in which all signs of sadness are replaced by blissful happiness, and by mindless entertainment. As the Director claims, “[a]ll conditioning aims at (...) making people like their unescapable social destiny” (12). In the discussion on these shielding techniques, John H. Jermier argues that:

[t]he techniques of social control are finely tuned and soothe the injuries of caste that would otherwise disable. Their effectiveness is amplified because they seem primordial and natural to a citizenry that has been deprived of historical resources and conditioned to be amnesic. They make it possible to live well-adjusted lives in a world that might otherwise seem monstrous. (244)

Indeed, social control relies on a well-structured State-machine to which the citizens are tweaked accordingly. Outsiders, such as John the Savage, may regard the State as a restrictive and, as Jermier correctly calls it, a monstrous society. By contrasting this world view with an outsider’s point of view, Huxley’s novel shows that the State has altered people according to its own values and beliefs by taking away those parts that make them human: strong emotions, understanding, and, ultimately, a unique personality. In this way, the novel reveals a possible result of the quest for maintaining the best possible living conditions in a society in order to ensure mankind’s existence on earth and, ultimately, the State’s power play.

Like Brave New World, Kazuo Ishiguro’s Never Let Me Go describes a negative vision of a possible outcome of bioscientific engineering in which Ishiguro portrays his clones as
human sacrifices. The clones in *Brave New World* also serve this purpose, but they are regarded as important assets within the State-machine. Huxley’s clones appear to be more conditioned due to strict techniques, whereas Ishiguro’s clones do not show signs of physical and mental manipulation. Huxley’s clones or, rather, the manipulated and conditioned classes are hierarchized according to physical and mental abilities, yet these hierarchies cannot be traced in *Never Let Me Go*. Similar to the conditioning methods in Huxley’s novel, Ishiguro’s clones are shaped and educated according to state rules. They have no possibilities to change their fate. The clones’ fate is sealed once they set foot in Hailsham or similar institutions and the euphemisms used to describe this fate are as futile as the clones’ lives. Their existence is only of importance to the benefit of “real” humans because these “normal” people seek the best manner to prolong their own lives. As James Wood points out, “[t]hey possess individuality, and seem to enjoy it (…), but that individuality is a mirage, a parody of liberty” (39): the clones are not accepted into the outside world and they are put away in specialized facilities which prepare them for the donations. This is much different from the manipulated classes in *Brave New World* because, next to their efficiency in maintaining State stability, they make up the larger part of these civilizations and thus also benefit from their own utilitarian role within society.

Another important difference between the two novels can be found in their narrative voice. Huxley presents *Brave New World* as a story told by an omniscient third-person narrator, whereas Ishiguro writes *Never Let Me Go* as a memoir told by one of the clones. These different presentations of a dystopian society, both characterized by bioscience and surveillance, with different perspectives on the importance of bioscientific experiments in the prolonging of mankind’s existence, raise questions about the importance of bioscience. Huxley illustrates the cause-and-effect sides of a bioengineered, technological political structure by presenting a full picture of the new world order, whereas Ishiguro’s book only demonstrates one perspective. This one-side view, however, is important because it describes a possible future experienced by a creation from this possible future, and by doing so, Ishiguro’s dystopia intimately questions the ethical side of bioscientific engineering. Additionally, it describes in great detail how a fabricated human being acts like a real human being, including strong emotions and opinions. *Brave New World* raises similar ethical issues as a description of a possible future in which the decisions facing contemporary society have been made and are fully implemented in society. Furthermore, the various cause-and-effect descriptions add to the novel’s exploration of the possibility for individuality to bloom within the strict World State because it addresses the possible outcomes of bioscientific and
technological advancements and relates these to control, hierarchy, and the preservation of power.

Cloning in *Never Let Me Go* is shrouded with mystery because it is never explicitly stated that the students are clones instead of normal people; they are described as special and gifted and their fate, which is donating their organs to normal humans at the price of their own deaths, is described with the euphemistic term “completion.” By using subtle language to describe a life that has been set out for them by the state and is filled with inhumane practices, Ishiguro’s characters are normalizing a procedure which would cause debates regarding the ethical aspects of organ farming in present-day society (McDonald 78). In particular the character of Kathy H., the novel’s narrator, is interesting in the context of this normalization. From the beginning of the story she appears to be concerned with personal success rather than with her imminent death because, as she tells the readers, “[her] 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 the fourth donation” (Ishiguro 3). This citation is particularly interesting because it is a perfect example of how Kathy has accepted her fate and, during her days as a nurse, tries to stimulate others to do the same. Her pride in her success makes her life meaningful to those who need her care and if other nurses or, as they are called in the novel, carers follow her example, their profession will reap the same rewards. This becomes even more evident in one of the last conversations Kathy has with Tommy when he asks her if she is not tired of being a carer after all those years. She replies that she does not mind because it is important that there are good carers and that “[a] good carer makes a big difference to what a donor’s life’s actually like” (276). This normalization has turned cloning, in the novel, into an essential part of life; because of its efficiency to the prolonging of normal people’s lives, it has been accepted as a necessary evil by outsiders. Yet, due to the normalization and euphemistic terminology, possible consequences to the clones are covered up, even by the clones themselves. This two-sided secrecy or perhaps even denial –of both the staff and the clones themselves– is maintained throughout the clones’ lives and by being frequently addressed as “special” and “gifted” the clones are placed into a special category from the beginning of their lives up till a point where this categorization is fully accepted as a part of their individuality.

It is clear that Hailsham is fundamentally a sham institution: it functions as a humane environment for the children to grow up in (Ishiguro 253) while it actually is a farm breeding new organ donors for the rest of the population. However, the staff insists that Hailsham is “a
shining beacon, an example of how we might move to a more humane and better way of doing things” (253) and, as one of the guardians claims:

Most importantly, we demonstrated to the world that if students were reared in human, cultivated environments, it was possible for them to grow to be as sensitive and intelligent as any ordinary human being. Before that, all clones (...) existed only to supply medical science. (255-6)

By treating the clones as normal human beings, it does seem as if the staff accepts their “students” as individuals. However, because of their special treatment as “gifted” persons, it is not fully possible for the clones to be accepted as individuals: Hailsham’s staff is molding them according to the state’s organ donor plan from the moment the clones enter the institution.

Hailsham’s staff keeps the children in the dark about their actual fate and tends to treat them as normal humans, but their contact with actual normal people is heavily restricted. Several techniques are used to make sure that the children grow up happily with minimized knowledge of their state-controlled and predestined lives in which they are excluded from reality on two major levels: knowledge and actual reality. Hailsham’s staff answers the students’ questions about themselves as vaguely as possible; it is only Miss Lucy who tells the clones what will happen after they leave the institution, the rest of the staff do not discuss this with the clones while they are still in the first stage of the donor program. This secrecy possibly serves as a tool to preserve control over the clones, for, if the clones would know of their destiny, they might try and find a way out of this oppressive system and change their function within the system.

Alternatively, the guardians at Hailsham teach their students how to live healthy lives to ensure healthy donations to be done properly and without any risks. The clones are confronted with this “each time any reference to cigarettes [comes] along” (67) because, as Miss Lucy puts it, they are “special” and need to keep themselves healthy inside (68): the clones are repeatedly reminded of their special position in society even though Hailsham’s staff pretends their institution to be a human and humane environment. This firm emphasis on health is a somewhat restrictive manner in the style of Huxley’s hypnopaedia because, like the slogans repeatedly played during the Elementary Class Consciousness programs, it enforces the clones to conform to the higher power’s plans. As a result, parts of their existence are fixed which makes it impossible to fully explore their individuality.
In their different narrative approaches and settings, both authors use their novels to address the same topic: the future of mankind, its relation to the development of bioscientific technology, and the effects this development has on individuals. *Brave New World* warns against the realization of the concept of utopia and suggests that utopia should remain a concept to avoid the inevitable destruction of individuality as a result of complete social manipulation and mechanization. Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go* also serves as a warning: this novel questions the ethical aspects of DNA duplication by portraying the clones as normal human beings who possess a unique personality, yet are regarded as organ producers only. In Ishiguro’s dystopia this horror is no longer regarded as a horror, even by Kathy H. herself: it is accepted by both outsiders and clones because of the recognition of its benefits to mankind’s future. Despite these strong warnings, both authors explore the possibilities of the novels’ characters to develop and maintain unique individualities in harsh living conditions because individuality is fostered in creative expression and literature. The significance of creativity and the ability to express becomes clear in the contrast of John the Savage with the values of the World State in Huxley’s *Brave New World* and in the analysis of the value of art and creative expression in the bioscientific world of Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go*. 
Chapter 3: Creative Expression

An important element of the conditioning programs present in Brave New World and Never Let Me Go is creative expression. As Thomas More already acknowledged in Utopia, art gives a voice to thoughts, opinions, emotions, and, ultimately, humanity; it is therefore regarded as an essential asset in the shaping of human identity. This idea is also present in Huxley’s and Ishiguro’s novels because both show the importance of creative expression with regard to personal development within an oppressive environment. Huxley uses literature to contrast the civilized world with the uncivilized one and by doing this, he shows the consequences of technology gone too far. Huxley’s society is a soulless world which is conditioned in such a way that it is impossible to have strong feelings such as anger, pain and passion, whereas the Reservation in Brave New World is a lively society outside State borders which is a more emotionally driven one because storytelling is considered an important part of education. Huxley’s World State resembles much of Socrates’s ideology because it exercises a censorship on what can and cannot be authorized in terms of stories, theories and ideologies, much like Socrates advises Plato in The Republic. According to Socrates, stories will never be able to fully represent the objective truth if they are not accompanied by a logical explanation, which is essential because:

> a young person can not judge what is allegorical and what is literal; anything that he receives into his mind at that age is likely to become indelible and unalterable; and therefore it is most important that the tales which the young first hear should be models of virtuous thoughts. (Plato 49-50)

Literature and creativity have important roles in Huxley and Ishiguro’s fictional dystopias because it becomes clear that these two elements function as means of expression in the process of understanding life as well as in the development of individuality. This becomes most obvious in the clash emerging between the uncivilized world of the Reservation and the civilized World State when John the Savage is brought to the city. In Ishiguro’s novel, art is used as a distractive discipline to keep the clones from asking too many questions about their existence and fate. Madame’s Gallery is a key element in this: its status among the children makes it an important element in their lives because their work can become part of Madame’s private collection. For the clones in Never Let Me Go creative expression functions as a means of recognition and it simultaneously provides them with a goal, but it also keeps their
minds off reality: the strong emphasis on the importance of creativity thus serves as an important conditioning method.

In Huxley’s *Brave New World*, the clash between literature and mind-numbing entertainment is important because it clearly shows the effects of the World State’s control policy on its inhabitants. The meaning of creativity in the new world is contrasted with that in the uncivilized one to show how valuable art and literature are to the expression of emotions. High art—a term used by World Controller Mustapha Mond to distinguish between the art forms present in the State and forms that are prohibited—such as literature, is abolished in the new world because, according to Mond, the new world “is not the same as Othello's world” (Huxley 193). It will never be a world which can contribute to tragedy because there is no instability and social unrest to be found in the World State. Additionally, there is no room for high art to flourish because people are emotionally deprived; they would not be able to fully comprehend literature in the way John the Savage does. Happiness is much more important to maintain stability within the State and high art has been abolished because “that’s the price [the State] has to pay for stability” (194). Material belonging to a world that differs from the World State does not help the new world because the future needs to be taken care of and not the past. The World Controllers do not want to sacrifice stability by approving well-written and well-argued literature, which becomes clear when Mond assesses a new scientific paper. Even though the paper’s treatment of the material is “novel and highly ingenious,” it is denied because:

[i]t was the sort of idea that might easily decondition the more unsettled minds among the higher castes—make them lose their faith in happiness as the Sovereign Good and take to believing, instead, that the goal was somewhere beyond, somewhere outside the present human sphere, that the purpose of life was not the maintenance of well-being, but some intensification and refining of consciousness, some enlargement of knowledge. (154-155)

Opinions and new theories are threats to society because they may cause a change in the population’s conditioned minds; creative and argumentative products provide food for thought, stimulating people to find new means of expressing their own emotions. Emotions, key characteristics of individuality, are repressed by various conditioning techniques involving creative expression and entertainment.
One of the most popular forms of entertainment in the new world is the “feely,” an interactive type of movie in which the viewer’s physical sensations rather than emotions are stimulated. The feelies’ simplistic and sexual stories provide no food for thought and numb the viewers’ minds and it is thus another conditioning method applied by the State to control its inhabitants on an emotional level. Another means to numb the inhabitants’ minds is the hallucinogenic called soma. Strong emotions have no room to be expressed in the new world because the World State has its inhabitants conditioned in such a way that it has made them believe that “there is always soma, delicious soma, half a gramme for a half-holiday, a gramme for a week-end, two grammes for a trip to the gorgeous East, three for a dark eternity on the moon” and that “a gramme is better than a damn” (47). Soma appears to be the key to all problems because, according to Mond:

[I]f ever, by some unlucky chance, anything unpleasant should somehow happen (…) there’s always soma to give you a holiday from the facts.(…) In the past you could only accomplish these things by making a great effort and after years of hard moral training. Now, you swallow two or three half-gramme tablets, and there you are. Anybody can be virtuous now. You can carry at least half your morality about in a bottle. Christianity without tears – that’s what soma is. (209-210)

Instead of interpreting and understanding strong and new emotions, soma takes away strong feelings and converts them to a sense of bliss: it transforms emotions so vital to individuality into artificial morality in which these emotions are carefully erased. Because of this repression, inhabitants of the World States have no desire to create or express their individual emotions, to be creative, or to have individual thoughts and opinions. This repression ensures that the inhabitants remain in an altered state of reality (Schmerl 332), which consequently means that they will never be able to develop as fully human beings.

Huxley contrasts the lack of creative expression and its relation to the destruction of individuality with the importance of art outside the new world. The contrast of John the Savage’s life inside the Reservation with life inside the city becomes clearest with this context: John’s outbursts and his disgust aimed at the heavily conditioned happy brave new world are always related to literature. Even though his mother regards Shakespeare’s writing “to be full of nonsense” and “[u]ncivilized” (111), John sees it as an aid to giving voice to his emotions:
The strange words rolled through his mind; rumbled, like talking thunder; like the drums at the summer dances, if the drums could have spoken; like the men singing the Corn Song; beautiful, beautiful, so that you cried; like old Mitsima saying magic over his feathers and his carved sticks and his bits of bone and stone (...) but better than Mitsima’s magic, because it meant more, because it talked to him. (114)

Shakespeare provides the emotional context to which John can relate his own feelings and because of this, it helps him to express these. Literature has formed the basis of John’s education and has in a way infiltrated his consciousness (Grushow 42). His speech consists of large amounts of quotations from Shakespeare and it becomes clear that he identifies himself with the characters in plays such as *Othello* and *The Tempest* at crucial moments in the novel. *Othello* helps him in comparing the brave new world with life in the Reservation, especially concerning emotions. After Mond states that soma is like Christianity without tears, John argues that “the tears are necessary. Don’t you remember what Othello said? ‘If after every tempest come such calms, may the winds blow till they have awakened death.’” (Huxley 210). This quotation helps him in comparing and contrasting the two worlds, and the value of emotion expressed by it has infiltrated John’s own values. *The Tempest* proves to be the most important influence on him because John exclaims his astonishment and irony by quoting from this play on several occasions. He identifies with Miranda who, just like him, has not been prepared for the world outside their own societies. To John, Shakespeare functions as a tool in the understanding of life. Literature such as Shakespeare’s is able to create a full image of life whereas the lack of it, like in Huxley’s World State and the perfect Wellsian society, numbs people’s minds and leaves a wide range of emotions unexplored. For John, and even more so for Huxley,

> [t]he allusive speech (...) produces a continual contrast between a total, imaginative view of life and the one-sided, incomplete, chiefly functional existences led by the inhabitants of a brave new world that Huxley intends as a satire on what he feels is H.G. Wells’s misguided notion of utopia. (Meckier 131)
This contrast becomes clear when John recites a few lines of a play to Bernard and Helmholtz:

Helmholtz listened with a growing excitement. At “sole Arabian tree” he started; at “thou shrieking harbinger” he smiled with sudden pleasure; at “every fowl of tyrant wing” the blood rushed up into his cheeks; but at “defunctive music” he turned pale and trembled with an unprecedented emotion. The Savage read on (...) “Orgy-porgy!” said Bernard, interrupting the reading with a loud, unpleasant laugh. “It's just a Solidarity Service hymn.” (159-160)

Bernard’s reaction clearly indicates how severely the population has been conditioned: he does not know how to react to real poetry other than by laughing it off with a State slogan. Nevertheless, he still responds to this citation, which clearly shows that there is some aspect of individuality left unconditioned within him. The real danger World Controller Mond sees in poetry and literature is characterized by Helmholtz: the words mean something to him and invoke deep emotion, which is exactly what the State is trying to eliminate. The State’s measures to control these emotions are directly linked to the development of individuality because these aim to create individuals according to State rules and giving voice to creative feelings, emotions, and opinions does not fit within the State’s design for mankind. According to Michel Foucault:

[Discipline] is not a triumphant power, which because of its own excess can pride itself on its omnipotence; it is a modest, suspicious power, which functions as a calculated, but permanent economy. These are humble modalities, minor procedures, as compared with the majestic rituals of sovereignty or the great apparatuses of the state. (170)

Like in Foucault’s analysis of power structures, the World State’s exercise of power is subtle and integrated in everyday life, which results in a steady control on its inhabitants without any fear of unrest and rebellion.

Creative expression is also considered important in Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go* because it is regarded as the main tool in proving that the clones possess feelings and emotions. Hailsham is in this way an exception to the rule because none of the other cloning
facilities provide such care for their clones. This exception, however, becomes discontinued once the students leave the facility to enter the second stage of the cloning program at the Cottages. Madame’s collection of the children’s art, the Gallery, has a pivotal role in this exception, but there are also other stimuli related to creative expression which help in the clones’ process of understanding their emotions. Alongside the numerous art classes, the children are encouraged to be as creative as possible because of the Exchanges and the Sales, which are both opportunities to trade art. As the novel’s narrator, Kathy H., describes:

I can see why the Exchanges became so important to us. For a start, they were our only means, aside from the Sales (…) of building up a collection of personal possessions. (…) I can see now, too, how the Exchanges had a more subtle effect on us all. 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)

The children all have personal collections in which they keep art objects ranging from poems and paintings to music tapes, and they consider these as important elements in their lives. The importance of art to Kathy, however, becomes clear when she talks about her Judy Bridgewater tape:

[T]he thing was, I didn’t used to listen properly to the words; I just waited for that bit that went: “Baby, baby, never let me go…” And what I’d imagine was a woman who’d been told she couldn’t have babies, who’d really, really wanted them for all her life. (70)

Her interpretation of the song is, even though it is wrong, driven by emotions and perhaps also a repressed part of her conscience. The particular lines she is fond of make her relate to the woman in such a way that she pretends a pillow to be her imaginary baby. This is significant within the context of the novel because as the children are clones who are raised to be organ donors, having babies is not an option for them. This kind of emotion is not natural for clones to have because their sole purpose is to serve the state; art invokes emotions which belong to their imaginative lives and thus functions as a contributor to their hope for normal lives. Huxley’s Savage also fits in this line of reasoning: John’s life revolves around the power of literature and this has, in a way similar to the power of creative expression in Never
Let Me Go, tainted his perspective on reality. Because literature constituted large parts of his education, this has become an important element of his mindset causing parts of his reasoning to be closely related to morals and standards expressed in this same literature. Thus, the clones, Kathy in particular, and John the Savage seem to have absorbed the power to express their emotions creatively in such a way that it has changed their ability to objectively perceive and understand reality.

In Ishiguro’s novel, the importance of creativity becomes evident from Tommy’s conversation with Miss Lucy regarding the clones’ future. When Tommy describes the conversation to Kathy, he says he does not understand why Miss Lucy links donations to creativity (29-30), which implies that the children’s fate and art are closely linked within Hailsham’s policy. The staff, and Miss Lucy especially, repeatedly remind their students that “art is important. And not just because it’s evidence. But for your own sake. You’ll get a lot from it, just for yourself” (106): art shapes the individual nature of the children by providing the opportunity to express their emotions. Furthermore, it gives the clones a reason to live by functioning as a distraction: the encouragement, development, and exercise of creative expression shields the children from reality and the harsh fate facing them (Seaman 269), which turns it into an observation device as well as a disciplinary one.

The discipline exercised in Hailsham is a controlled and sophisticated one, which is fully integrated in the systematic environment of the clone farms. This is much like the portrayal of power in Brave New World which is also characterized by subtlety, yet it also differs with respect to the value this disciplinary system places on creative expression. Unlike the complete repression of thought-provoking art in the World State, creativity in Never Let Me Go is one of the most important aspects in the clones’ lives. The staff and children think highly of Madame’s Gallery: if the children’s work is good enough, Madame will put it in her personal collection. The collection, then, serves as the ultimate goal in the children’s lives. This idea appears to be important throughout the novel and makes Madame’s Gallery play a crucial role in the clones’ upbringing. According to Tommy:

[t]he thing about being from Hailsham was that you had this special chance. And if you didn’t get stuff into Madame’s gallery, then you were as good as throwing that chance away. (…) [I]t’s probably not just Madame that decides. There’s probably people higher up than her, people who never set foot in Hailsham. (…) It all fits. That’s why the Gallery was so important, and why the guardians wanted us to work so hard on our art and our poetry. (174-175)
Having a piece in Madame’s Gallery gives the children a chance of being recognized, not for their talent—even though the children believe this is the main reason—but for their existence. As Bruce Robbins, Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia University, states, “[t]hey need to believe that the merit of what they are doing will be rewarded, if only by being recognized, and this entails a belief in the fundamental rightness of the authorities doing the recognizing and rewarding” (294). The Gallery thus functions as the ultimate means of recognition. Additionally, it is a place in which the children’s emotive abilities are on display and, because it is possible that someone else will decide on when the children are ready to donate, it is a helpful tool in establishing which clones are suitable and which are not. Kathy and Tommy as well as many other clones believe that the artwork in the Gallery indicates strong feelings such as love and that, as a result, these expressed feelings can prolong their stay within the institutions and thus postpone their inevitable fate. The Gallery is therefore a sham within the sham society of Hailsham: because of its alleged postponing possibilities, the clones work on their creative expression with blind faith without ever questioning the real purpose of the Gallery and their existence.

Both Huxley and Ishiguro show that the value of creative expression is critical in the development of individuality. Huxley does this by comparing and contrasting the World State’s stance regarding art and literature with life in the Reservation, and Ishiguro illustrates how creativity can function as a means of surveillance as well as a conditioning method. The techniques used to acknowledge the importance or unimportance of art are reminiscent of Michel Foucault’s analysis of disciplinary methods, especially that of the subtle and hidden discipline present in societies exercising careful and calculated governing. Despite the use of these subtle controlling techniques, the main question both authors pose in their novels is whether or not creative expression can be fully controlled. *Brave New World* makes clear that, even in a fully controlled society in which creative expression is reduced to mindless interactive movies and the inhabitants are formed according to State rules, there is still a crucial part of individuality left intact which can generate strong feelings and opinions. It thus demonstrates that strong feelings related to the understanding of art and literature can never be entirely controlled. *Never Let Me Go* suggests that art is important in the understanding of emotions and the shaping of a unique personality. The clones are encouraged to work on their art and have complete freedom in expressing their feelings creatively. Madame’s Gallery creates a goal for the children and as a result, creative expression is given room to flourish. However, this single goal simultaneously cloaks reality by being the most important factor in the clones’ lives. Creativity in Ishiguro’s novel therefore has a double meaning: both as a tool
for the clones to express their individual emotions as well as a repressive tool to hide the truth. Both novels thus use creativity in the discussion of the construction of individuality within dystopian environments and suggest that through art and literature there is still hope for individuality to develop in strictly controlled societies.
Chapter 4: The Shape of Individuality in Totalitarian States

Individuality is in both *Brave New World* and *Never Let Me Go* an important aspect within the structure of a dystopian state: in these novels alternate societies are described in which technological advancement and bioscience have evolved and changed the concept of individuality. Utilitarian reasoning and totalitarianist regimes have turned people into a new type of human to ensure the future of mankind and both novels depict societies which are inhabited by post-humans; humans who have transformed mentally to fit the puzzle of human continuation in order to complete it. The inhabitants are thus turned into commodities. This transformation is not displayed only in the dystopias of Huxley and Ishiguro or other dystopias influenced by bioscience; the post-human or, rather, non-human can also be traced in world history. In *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, a 1951 case study on totalitarianism in Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia, political theorist Hannah Arendt suggests that the institutions in these totalitarian states, such as concentration camps, were characterized by isolation and conditioning to dominate the masses. In her view, totalitarianism strives towards “a system in which men are superfluous” (457) by erasing every sign of spontaneity and thus erasing large parts of their individuality. Additionally, Arendt describes a three-way division of types of concentration camps according to Western concepts of death: Hades, Purgatory, and Hell. These three concepts/types have in common that “the human masses sealed off in them are treated as if they no longer existed, as if they were already dead and some evil spirit gone mad were amusing himself by stopping them for a while between life and death before admitting them to eternal peace” (445). As will be explained, Huxley’s *Brave New World* portrays a division similar to that in Arendt’s systematic division of totalitarian camps in which the inhabitants are utilized. The society depicted in Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go* largely resembles Purgatory because of the organ farms’ exclusive nature which functions as a separate world between that of normal human beings and that of the clones functioning as donors, but also because there is a sense of neglect within this society with regard to the clones’ fate.

For these reasons, perhaps the most important aspect in the construction and deconstruction of individuality in both novels is setting. Hannah Arendt’s theory on the exclusive nature of concentration camps sheds light on the intricate power structures present in Huxley and Ishiguro’s novels. According to Arendt, the most powerful aspect of totalitarian camps was “the complete isolation which separated the camps from the surrounding world as if they and their inmates were no longer part of the world of the living” (*Essays in*
Understanding 239), and this is also present in the novels: Huxley does this by describing a world outside the World States in which strong and individual minds can live, and Ishiguro does this by placing his clone farms outside the cities and within the countryside of England. Arendt’s research provides a helpful theoretical background for the analysis of individuality within totalitarian states such as those presented in Brave New World and Never Let Me Go because it shows how individuality becomes subject to strict control and, in the most extreme cases, abolition in societies whose main goal is the preservation of power.

Strikingly, Foucault’s theory on carceral societies presented in Discipline & Punish is also illuminated by both novels not only because his theory on discipline “making” individuals – due to discipline being a “specific technique of a power that regards individuals as both objects and as instruments of its exercise” (170) – is present but also because his distinction between two disciplinary principles can be found in the dystopias of Brave New World and Never Let Me Go. The discipline-blockade, which entails an enclosed institution which is “established on the edges of society” and “turned inwards towards negative functions” (Foucault 209), is very similar to Hannah Arendt’s analysis of concentration camps as well as Ishiguro’s secluded organ farms. The second principle, the discipline-mechanism, is much like the Panopticon and Huxley’s World States in the sense that it is “a functional mechanism that must improve exercise over power by making it lighter, more rapid, more effective, a design of subtle coercion for a society to come” (Foucault 209). These two principles also prove to be important within the context of Huxley and Ishiguro’s dystopias because they provide the environment in which individuality is constrained, maintained, and explored.

In Brave New World, the utilitarianist approach which the World States use to control their citizens and to sustain their power affects the characters’ individuality immensely. Due to the oppressive nature of State governing, the people living inside the States are reduced to tools that give no sign of individual thinking. Robert S. Baker states that in the World States:

historical process has been terminated, the apocalyptic end of history having ushered in a static society where historicist values and modes of perception have been repudiated and where even individual biography has come under the control of social engineering and its trans-historical perspective. (7)

The World States do not value the past as important to the structure of society because they deem it dangerous to its inhabitants. History can alter the State and change the path to
perfection: old values and theories not implemented and controlled by the State may provide food for thought or give the inhabitants a voice to express their opinions, and this is regarded as the ultimate threat to the static societies the World States wish to represent. To maintain stasis, it is required that the sense of the citizen’s individuality is tailored to State policy. According to Edgar H. Schein,

Huxley [feels] that the totalitarian societies like Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union or Communist China were in the past, and continue to be, quite successful in their thought-control programs. [He argues], however, that the more recently available techniques of influence and thought control are more securely based on scientific fact, more potent, and more subtle. Hence the danger to democratic society lies in the implication that even some degree of centralization of the means of influence and coercion can result in widespread thought control. (433)

This danger is also present in the World States because of the various conditioning techniques and the State’s prioritizing of communality over individuality. Thought control is necessary to maintain the State’s future and this is why history cannot be accepted in any form. Because of the omnipresent and omniscient status in this type of control, the World State’s surveillance apparatus is similar to the observatories discussed in Foucault’s *Discipline & Punish*. According to Foucault, observatories are modelled on ideal military camps in which “all power would be exercised solely through exact observation” (171). The success of observatory models such as the Panopticon relies on the fact that they “[lay] down for each individual (…) his well-being by means of an omnipresent and omniscient power that subdivides itself in a regular, uninterrupted way even to the ultimate determination of the individual (…)” (197). *Brave New World* also poses that the World State has complete control over the expression of individuality of its citizens because of its strict policies concerning creativity and entertainment as well as its publicly available literature. The construction and expression of individuality therefore clearly depends on the State-machine’s policies.

However, what is interesting in this novel is that individuality is not regarded as a crime because, even though it is attempted to be repressed and erased via “rehabilitation” programs involving additional conditioning and large doses of soma (Jermier 244), people who show instances of individuality are deported to islands –among which are Iceland and the Falklands– to quietly live their lives as they please outside State boundaries. Despite the
World State’s seemingly totalitarianist approach towards its citizens, the inner workings of the State-machine are therefore much more intricate than they seem on the outside, because there is room for deviation, even within a society which aims for stasis. A clear example of this instability within the stability the State seeks to preserve occurs when Bernard Shaw protests against his exile. This protest leads to World Controller Mond’s analysis of the importance of this opportunity to escape State domination:

[I]f he had the smallest sense, he'd understand that his punishment is really a reward. He's being sent to an island. That's to say, he's being sent to a place where he'll meet the most interesting set of men and women to be found anywhere in the world. All the people who, for one reason or another, have got too self-consciously individual to fit into community-life. All the people who aren't satisfied with orthodoxy, who've got independent ideas of their own. Every one, in a word, who's any one. (199-200)

This analysis presents the effects World State policy has on its people: within the State there is no place to be “self-consciously individual” because the community is top priority. To be a free thinker without State pressure, one has to move to a remote place which much resembles the remote and secluded environments used to contain and control people within totalitarian societies. Yet the isolated status of the islands in *Brave New World* does not involve isolation to gain complete control over the inhabitants. Instead, the exile islands function as an alternative world to the strict regimes of the World States.

The possibility of being an individual, one that has not conformed to the rules of communal individuality within the State, invites a consideration of Arendt’s theory. Even though Arendt believes that totalitarian states cannot function properly without all signs of individuality having been erased, Huxley’s novel depicts a similar division to the one Arendt makes for concentration camps within totalitarian societies. The three stages –Hades, Purgatory, and Hell– can be found in *Brave New World* as well, but not as clearly categorized as in Arendt’s division. The islands can be analyzed as types of seclusion representing Hades because these also correspond to a “relatively mild form [of a concentration camp] (…) for getting undesirable elements of all sorts (…) out of the way” (Arendt 445). Despite their freedoms, the islands which are used to dispose of the unruly State citizens are still camps within State property making them part of the purgatorial and hell-like environment that is the World State. The World State itself is a mixture of Purgatory and Hell because it mixes a
sense of neglect (Purgatory) with a systematical organization of life (Hell). The State is characterized by strict organization and, due to the engineered class system, workforces are created to maintain efficiency and stability in the State’s production. In order to serve the State and its sense of communality effectively, individuality must be repressed, which is also an essential characteristic of Arendt’s concentration camp system. Still, despite the State’s aim of erasing all traces of strong individualism, the opportunity to give voice to opinions remains within Huxley’s State-machine in the shape of exile.

This opportunity is also present in Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go* because the concept of Purgatory, as presented in Arendt’s analysis, can also be found in this novel. The world Ishiguro describes is characterized by isolation and denial, which shows a similarity to Arendt’s description of Purgatory. The programs executed in the clone facilities and their destructive effects on the clones are ignored by people living in the outside world because, according to Miss Emily, asking a world that has found a cure for cancer to dispose of the cure and go back to the “dark days” out of concern for the organ donors would not be an option (Ishiguro 257). Instead, the clones’ existence is denied because “[t]he only way people can accept the program is to believe that these children are not fully human (…) People outside prefer to believe that the transplanted organs come from nowhere, or at least from beings less than human” (Montello B6). This has an immediate effect on the social reflection of the clones’ individuality from an outsider’s perspective because the clones are regarded as less than human. Without this social acceptance, the possibility of becoming fully human and thus also being able to develop a unique individuality has become an impossibility.

Moreover, the three main stages in the clones’ lives resemble the division made by Arendt, and these stages all contribute to the façade the clone institutions try to maintain. Hailsham, stage one, is an enclosed facility placed in a natural environment which functions as a seemingly normal school. Contact with outsiders is rare and the children’s personal development relies on the specialized educational program and the Exchanges. This stage much resembles Arendt’s description of Hades: just like Hades, Hailsham and the other clone facilities function as camps in which those people who do not fit within the structure of society are controlled and observed. Stage two is comprised of the remains of old farms, barns, outhouses, stables, and other buildings almost falling apart (Ishiguro 114). This stage is very symbolic with respect to the clones’ future: the deteriorating buildings symbolize the fate which awaits them while simultaneously representing the last stop on their path to death. Even though Arendt’s description of Purgatory does not entirely fit here –there is hardly any sense of chaotic forced labor–, the essential characteristic of this type of camp does emerge. Stage
two also encompasses a strong sense of neglect: the symbolic environment contributes to this sense as does the even more limited contact with the outside world because there are no guardians present but the caretaker Mr. Keffers. The third stage, taking place both inside and outside advanced clone facilities, consists of two parts: one in which the clones become carers and one where they become donors. The carers are subjected to lives of loneliness and solitude (203) in which they function as angels of death: they move from donor center to donor center to assist donors after the removal of various organs until their deaths. Once a donor, the clones are placed into hospital-like centers which are described as “relaxed” and “idyllic” (233) to donate until they die. The façade is kept very much alive because of this characterization because the centers’ function is anything but idyllic. This third state resembles large parts of Arendt’s description of Hell because, just as the “Hell”-camps, this stage is synonym to extermination as both “carer” and donor are exterminated once all vital organs have been donated. Thus, these three stages function as transitions between life, or the cloning process itself, and death. The transitional state the clones live in becomes even clearer when Madame reminisces about the time she saw Kathy listening to her favorite song:

I saw a new world coming rapidly. More scientific, efficient, yes. More cures for the old sicknesses. Very good. But a harsh, cruel world. And I saw a little girl, her eyes tightly closed, holding to her breast the old kind world, one that she knew in her heart could not remain, and she was holding it and pleading, never to let her go. (266-267)

The new world she speaks of is focused on science and efficiency, which would mean that the clones and the clone farms would be used strictly for harvesting purposes only. In this way, the clones would not be regarded as human beings, but as utilities. This also means that there would be no possibility to explore and develop a unique individuality because of harsher and stricter rules turning the clone farms of the new world into the Hell-like camps of Arendt’s theory.

This process of turning the clones from somewhat human to complete non-humans is already present in the novel because the exploration and development of individuality, which is encouraged by the institution’s staff, is fake. Similar to Madame’s foreseeing a new world when Kathy and Tommy are already in stage three, traces of this future image are already showing when they are in stage one. When the clones are talking about their dream futures in the pavilion at Hailsham, Miss Lucy reveals the truth about their existence: “[y]our 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 clones are already regarded and used as a scientific tool despite Hailsham’s staff encouraging their personal development to make everything seem more humane. However, after Miss Lucy’s revealing speech, the clones remain in denial:

Some students thought she’d lost her marbles for a moment; other that she’d been asked to say what she had by Miss Emily and the other guardians; there were even some who’d actually been there and who thought Miss Lucy had been telling us off for being too rowdy on the veranda. (81)

Co-contributors to the fake reality in which the clones can be whoever they want to be are the clones themselves. They willingly participate in the charade by pretending their fates can be altered and their hopes and dreams can come true (McDonald 78).

However, at the end of the novel, after Tommy and Kathy have visited Madame, they realize their hopes and dreams, and especially their proof of love for one another will not create a different outcome for them. While still in stage two of the clone program, they both hear a rumor that it is possible to defer their donation by proving they are in love. Madame denies this rumor and this denial results in two versions of understanding. Firstly, it is striking that Kathy remains hopeful even after Madame states she does not know about “this deferral” and asks if this is why they have come to visit her (247). Kathy states that, “[i]f she’d asked this in a certain way, like the whole idea was completely crazy, then I’m sure I’d have felt pretty devastated. (…) She’d asked it almost like it was a test question she knew the answer to” (247); due to her strong faith or perhaps due to her own naiveté, she misinterprets Madame’s answer. Even after Miss Emily has explained that there is no truth to the rumor, Kathy persists on being hopeful:

I felt surprisingly calm, and even though Miss Emily’s words should have crushed us, there was an aspect to them that implied something further, something being held back, that suggested we hadn’t yet got to the bottom of things. There was even the possibility she wasn’t telling the truth. (253)

Tommy’s reaction is also striking because, even though it presents itself in a fit of rage, there is also a trace of denial and perhaps even acceptance to be found. As Kathy reminisces the
days at Hailsham when Tommy’s rage fits frequently emerged, she concludes that “maybe the reason [Tommy] used to get like that was because at some level [he] always knew” (270). Tommy denies this and laughs it off as “a funny idea” (270). Tommy’s fits at Hailsham occurred because of his inability to express creatively, and it is very possible that he knew at that time that art would be an important and possibly decisive factor in their lives. The inability and impossibility to change his course of life –even though this would eventually be a futile goal– re-emerges after discovering there is no possibility to postpone the donations and results in a similar reaction. It is therefore striking to see that Tommy regards the fits as nothing more than idiotic at this stage, which makes it seem as if he has given up all his hopes. Both Kathy and Tommy appear to have come to terms with their imminent deaths and the fact that they cannot change this fate. After the denial of the deferral, there is no sense of rebellion or another attempt to postpone their donations. This is mainly due to their growing up in strictly controlled environments in which their paths have been set out for them and in which their individuality is more or less molded according to the rules of this system. According to German philosopher and psychologist Erich Fromm, this is one of the dangers facing modern society because:

modern society undermines inner security, individual reason, and the capacity to form close personal relationships, leading the individual into that most dangerous of all conditions—the illusion of individuality and freedom, while in reality he is becoming more like everybody else. (qtd. in Schein 432)

The clones in *Never Let Me Go* live this illusion to the fullest and due to this denial, they are no different from the people in the outside world who deny the origins of the organs.

Individuality is an important aspect in both *Brave New World* and *Never Let Me Go* because both novels explore how this is still possible to maintain in an oppressively controlled environment. Both authors use a model in which isolation and observation are key elements. These elements can also be found in historic forms of camps, for instance those used in Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany, as well as observatories such as the Panopticon and prisons. In Huxley’s novel, individuality is closely linked to the workings of the State-machine. Communality has a much higher status than individuality because it is easier to control by the World States. This type of control is necessary because the States attempt to maintain a society which they think will only survive if it remains static. In this way, Huxley’s State is very totalitarian because it exercises this control by erasing all traces of individuality through
the manipulation of its citizens’ thoughts and by functioning as an observatory to ensure that this control is maintained. Additionally, thought-provoking material such as art and literature has been abolished. However, the State’s oppression cannot be regarded as completely totalitarian because there is a possibility for strong individuals to flourish.

Dissidents are exiled to islands located far from the States which are under very limited supervision, but these are still considered State property. Strikingly, these dissidents, who originate from the State’s Hatcheries, and their ability to persist their sense of individuality within an oppressive environment is strongly contrasted by John the Savage’s inability to persist. Because World Controller Mond wants to subject John to a variety of experiments, John cannot be exiled alongside Bernard and Helmholtz. Now torn between two worlds in which he does not belong, John moves away from the city to live a life of solitude and “to escape further contamination by the filth of civilized life; (...) to be purified and made good; (...) to make amends” (218) in an abandoned lighthouse. He punishes himself when he forgets the unkind treatment his mother Linda has had in the city by hitting himself with a whip: John regards self-flagellation as the ultimate means to restore his old values by replacing happiness, which he gained from his seclusion, with truth. His inability to reconcile his values eventually leads to his death: when a woman visits the spectacle of his whipping, John’s feelings for Lenina emerge. During his stay in the city, he develops a love for Lenina, but, due to his own morality, does not give in to these feelings. These feelings re-emerge when the woman spectator watches him and John loses himself in the spectators’ insanity by whipping even more severely than usual, a spectacle ending in a soma-induced orgy (228). The realization of his giving in to something that he has always loathed drives him towards suicide. Thus, because of the irreconcilable conflict between his own values and those present in the reality of the civilized world, John is unable to place his own sense of individuality in this new environment and can only find real peace in death. *Brave New World* therefore shows that the development of a unique individuality is possible in an oppressive environment, but not for an outsider entering this oppressive society, due to a difference in values.

In Ishiguro’s novel, the development of a unique individuality is limited within the context of the clone facilities. There is little to no contact with the outside world because “normal” people rather believe the donations to come from non-existent entities or facilities. Even though the clones live in an alternative and transitional reality awaiting their death, they accept this fake world in which they are able to develop themselves as, at least in their eyes, fully individual spirits.
In *Brave New World*, individuality is proven to be only for those who are part of the World State; outsiders, such as John, are denied this opportunity because they are regarded as test subjects by the governing power. The clash between values other than those of the State, as portrayed by John, and the State’s perspective on this values results in an irreconcilable conflict which ultimately leads to John’s suicide. In this way, individuality becomes a questionable concept within the World State: is pure individuality possible to develop in a society that regards morals as old-fashioned? In *Never Let Me Go*, Kathy and Tommy have been raised and conditioned in such a way that acceptance of their deaths has become part of their individualities; their values and sense of individuality are thus already molded according to the facilities’ rules. However, this acceptance does not keep them from searching for manners to prolong their existence because they do hope to get an extension when they visit Madame, which signifies that they have only been conditioned up to a certain point. Both novels explore the possibility of individuality within a totalitarian or apparently totalitarian society. Huxley and Ishiguro both make clear that individuality is at risk in their dystopian societies and that their futuristic views concerning technological development and bioscience hardly offer a possibility for individuality to remain intact or fully develop. Due to the difference in approach, I think that Huxley’s depiction of freedom of individuality in the setting of an isolated camp is more positive than Ishiguro’s. Ishiguro’s clones choose to live in a sham reality with a feigned sense of individuality whereas Huxley’s nonconformists can live relatively free lives outside of State policy.
Conclusion

By describing their dystopias as advanced technological societies in which bioscience is of great use to the survival and well-being of mankind, Aldous Huxley and Kazuo Ishiguro question the importance of cloning with regard to this preservation as well as to the effects it has on the shape of individuality within a dystopian environment. The dystopias in *Brave New World* and *Never Let Me Go* are characterized by extreme surveillance: the inhabitants of both the World State and the clone facilities are subject to manipulation and oppression implemented by the governing power, which have a strong influence on the construction of individuality. Both authors warn against the possibility of bioscientific development to result in extreme utilitarian governing: in *Brave New World*, the World State hierarchy is determined by cloning and conditioning in order to efficiently serve the State’s aim for stability, and in *Never Let Me Go*, humans are cloned to be raised as organ donors to prolong the lives of normal human beings. Bioscience has transformed the future world into a machine which favors efficiency over individuality and via strict surveillance measures, such as extreme conditioning methods, this machine is maintained and operated in the best possible way.

Despite these warnings, Huxley and Ishiguro’s novels prove that a fear individuality turning into communality is ungrounded because both indicate there is a possibility for individuality to develop. However, the extent of this development is questionable as both novels intertwine the concept of individuality with the limitations set by the governing power. Creative expression and the expression of emotions –key elements of individuality– in *Never Let Me Go* are encouraged, but not for the reason the clones believe it to be. Creative expression in this novel functions as a disciplinary and distractive means. It provides the clones with a goal because their artwork may be selected to become part of Madame’s Gallery, which may be seen as an acknowledgement of their individual existence.

In *Brave New World*, creative expression creates an interesting clash between the inhabitants of the civilized World State and the Savage of the Reservation. Because literature and many creative art forms are abolished, the World State leaves little room for its inhabitants to present themselves as unique individuals. According to State beliefs, the expression of strong emotions and opinions may create a threat to stability and the possibility to express must therefore be erased in its entirety. Instead, the State controls its citizens by manipulating their mental capacity at birth and by providing hallucinogenics and “feelies” as forms of entertainment. It becomes clear, however, that individuality cannot be erased
completely because dissidents, as strong individual spirits are called, are exiled to islands outside society.

My analysis and these two novels pose a question that also arises in contemporary debates concerning the rapid development of bioscience and technology: is the cloning of human DNA ethically justifiable if its sole function is to prolong the lives of human beings? Furthermore, questions arise concerning the possibility for individuality to develop under the harsh circumstances of totalitarian governing. A particularly helpful theory in this exploration has been Michel Foucault’s analysis of carceral societies because of his research on the development of observation techniques over time. According to Foucault, these techniques are gradually developing into becoming part of prison-like observatories and this can also be traced in the dystopian societies depicted in *Brave New World* and *Never Let Me Go*. Another helpful theory has been Hannah Arendt’s research on the structural division in totalitarian camps such as those in Stalinist Russia and Nazi Germany, for both Huxley and Ishiguro use a categorization similar to that of Arendt’s. This division is interesting because it explores how individuality is affected by strict control and terror.

However, the concept of individuality within the context of creative expression and surveillance societies is but a small part in the analysis of these novels. It is also striking to see how nature plays an important role in the shape of the future societies presented in *Brave New World* and *Never Let Me Go*. As Jean-Jacques Rousseau pleads in his tracts, nature plays a crucial part in the construction of individuality, and this importance also becomes apparent in Huxley and Ishiguro’s novels. In this way, setting can be regarded as an important contributor to individuality from more than one perspective: additional to the nurturing state, in these novels symbolized by a dystopian power structure, the opposite one, signified by nature, can also be taken into account in this analysis. Another perspective on the construction and importance of individuality in these novels can be researched in the field of Freudian psychology because the issue of parental support in both novels can also be considered crucial to individuality. As both John the Savage and the clones experience a lack of parental control, questions may arise as to how this affects their personal development.
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