

T.C.
UNIVERSITY OF GAZİANTEP
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

**THE POSTHUMAN CONDITION IN KAZUO
ISHIGURO'S DYSTOPIAN NOVELS: *NEVER LET ME
GO* AND *KLARA AND THE SUN***

MASTER OF ARTS THESIS

SULTAN AFŞAR

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Ela İpek GÜNDÜZ

GAZİANTEP
HAZİRAN 2023

ETHICAL DECLARATION

In this thesis I prepared in accordance with Thesis Writing Manual of Gaziantep University Graduate School of Social Sciences, I hereby declare that:

- I have obtained the data, information and documents presented in the thesis within the framework of academic and ethical rules,
- I have presented all information, document, evaluation and results in accordance with the rules of scientific ethics and morals,
- I have cited and referenced all the works I used in the thesis,
- I have not made any changes to the data used,
- The work I presented in this thesis is original,

if not, I also declare that I accept all the loss of rights that may arise against me.

Signature:

Name and Surname: Sultan AFŞAR
Student ID: 190538111002
Date of Viva: 23.06. 2023

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to a spirit invoking immanent faith in me about a transcendent side of life that makes humanity bearable.

ABSTRACT**THE POSTHUMAN CONDITION IN KAZUO ISHIGURO'S DYSTOPIAN NOVELS: *NEVER LET ME GO* AND *KLARA AND THE SUN***

AFŞAR, Sultan

M.A. Thesis, Department of English Language and Literature

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Ela İpek GÜNDÜZ

June 23, 2023 110 Pages

Posthumanism is a new mode of understanding the concept of humans along with the inter-relationality of all species bringing forth equally shared rights among human and nonhuman agencies. Regardless of class division or marginalized others, posthumanism brings together all species at a common point such as the *zoe*-based subjectivity of Rosi Braidotti, the cyborg of Donna Haraway and the intra-action agency of Karen Barad to name the rhizomatic relationality and dual logic between human/nonhuman, nature/artificial, mind/body and organic/inorganic that is grounded on the classical humanism's principles. Regarding this, dystopian fictions present a perfect example of the excluded party of the binaries as in Kazuo Ishiguro's speculative dystopian novels; *Never Let Me Go* (2005) and *Klara and the Sun* (2021) where the narrators are clones and artificial intelligence offering a chance to empathize with nonhuman beings who are discarded from society and dehumanised. The purpose of their creation is to save the ruling class's lives at the cost of their lives as low-class of people are outside of privileged positions. Bearing in mind all of these statements, this thesis will track down the posthuman condition in *Never Let Me Go* and *Klara and the Sun* challenging the inequality between the different species. While doing this, this dissertation discusses the collapsed wall between the human, animals and machines coming up with posthuman subjectivity as a joint stakeholder.

Keywords: Posthumanism, Posthuman Condition, Kazuo Ishiguro, *Never Let Me Go*, *Klara and the Sun*.

ÖZET

KAZUO ISHIGURO’NUN DİSTOPYA ROMANLARINDA POSTHÜMAN DURUM: *BENİ ASLA BIRAKMA* VE *KLARA VE GÜNEŞ*

AFŞAR, Sultan

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı

Danışman: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ela İpek GÜNDÜZ

Haziran 2023, 110 Sayfa

Posthümanizm, insan ve insan olmayan varlıklar arasında eşit paylaşımlı haklar getiren tüm türlerin karşılıklı ilişkileri ile birlikte insan kavramını anlamının yeni bir biçimidir. Sınıf ayrımı ve marjinalliğe bakmaksızın, Posthümanizm insan/insan olmayan, doğal/yapay ve zihin/beden gibi klasik humanizmin prensipleri üzerine kurulan ikili karşıtlıkları ve aralarındaki ilişkileri adlandırmak için Rosi Braidotti’nin *zoe* tabanlı öznellik, Donna Hraway’ın siborg, ve Karen Barad’ın iç-ilişkisel edim diye adlandırdığı ortak bir noktada buluşturur. Buna bağlı olarak, Kazuo Ishiguro’nun *Beni Asla Bırakma* ve *Klara ve Güneş* romanlarında klon ve yapay zeka gibi dışlanan tarafı anlatıcı yapıp bize onlarla empati kurma şansı vererek dışlanan taraf için bir meydan okuma şansı sunar. Alt sınıf insanlar ayrıcalıklı konumda olmasa da, klon insanların ve yapay zekanın yaratılış amacı canları pahasına da olsa üst sınıfın hayatını kurtarmaktır. Tüm bu ifadeleri göz önünde bulundurarak, bu tez farklı türler arasındaki eşitsizliği eleştiren *Beni Asla Bırakma* ve *Klara ve Güneş*’teki insan sonrası durumun izini sürecektir. Bunu yaparken de insan, hayvan ve makine arasındaki yıkılan duvarın insan sonrası öznelliği ortak bir paydaş olarak ortaya koyması bu tezde tartışılmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Posthümanizm, Posthüman Durum, Kazuo Ishiguro, *Beni Asla Bırakma*, *Klara ve Güneş*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My gratitude goes first and foremost to my supervisor Asst. Prof. Dr. Ela İpek GÜNDÜZ who never turned down my calls for help and support. I am indebted to her feedback and motivational directions when I felt lost in the way of my research. I also profited greatly from her knowledge and experience which was a directional treasure in deciding my thesis proposal and everything.

I would like to emphasize my utmost gratitude to Prof. Dr. Zekiye Antakyalıoğlu Er who inspired me from the first day of her classes. I thank her for being a role model and she will become one in my further studies.

I would like to thank my parents and siblings who care about my health in this process by reminding me that health comes first.

Last, but not least, I am appreciated and would love to thank my life companion Mahmut AFŞAR for whom I feel lucky to have and share everything. I also would like to emphasize my love for our little companion (Kuzey the cat) in our house who brings joy and happiness to our life.

Sultan AFŞAR
JUNE, 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No
ABSTRACT.....	i
ÖZET.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
CONTENTS.....	iv
INTRODUCTION	
CHAPTER 1	
THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF POSTHUMANISM	
1.1. The Appearance of “Anthropos” On The Stage	6
1.2. Anthropocentric Ideals of Humanism and Its Evolution	9
1.3. Post-anthropocentric Vision in Posthumanism	17
1. 4. Posthuman in the Pursuit of Perfection and Bioethics	22
1. 5. Posthuman Intersectional Solutions	29
CHAPTER 2	
NOW AND THEN DYSTOPIA	
2.1. Imperfect Future of Dystopia	39
2.2. Contemporary Dystopia and Kazuo Ishiguro	42
CHAPTER 3	
KAZUO ISHIGURO’S NEVER LET ME GO	
3.1. Introduction to <i>Never Let Me Go</i>	
3.2. Posthuman Transaction In <i>Never Let Me Go</i>	48
3.3. Carbon-Based Posthuman Life In <i>Never Let Me Go</i>	56
3.4. Biopolitics in <i>Never Let Me Go</i>	68
3.5. Conclusion	71
CHAPTER 4	
KAZUO ISHIGURO’S KLARA AND THE SUN	
4.1. Introduction to <i>Klara and the Sun</i>	74
4.2. Posthuman Transaction In <i>Klara and the Sun</i>	76
4.3. Silicon-Based Posthuman in <i>Klara and the Sun</i>	82
4.4. Biopolitics in <i>Klara and the Sun</i>	87
4.5. Conclusion	95
CONCLUSION.....	98
REFERENCES.....	102

INTRODUCTION

Dystopia is a prevalent instrument of literature for chiming about complaints caused by the politics of society resulting in a catastrophic disaster for humans and nonhumans living on earth. Dealing with the accelerated decimation of species and habitats due to the ills of modernity, dystopia of the twentieth century discusses the totalitarian and despotic regimes in which Despotism prevails. Twentieth-century dystopia warns us about the possible future where humanity will be under the surveillance of technological artefacts and every feeling of a human will be controlled by an autocratic figure. The best canonical instances of twentieth-century dystopia are exemplified by George Orwell's *1984* and Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*. In both novels, technological progress is in the servitude of controlling individuals and brings along deindividuation which is oppressed by the dictatorship. To rule over society, the oppressor creates individuals who are exact copies of each other and forbids being active in art and sexual performances because they may stir them up to the riot. However, dystopia undergoes some changes in the contemporary age because its focal point varies. While twentieth-century dystopia imagines the representation of a potential future that is worse than the present time, contemporary dystopia depicts the representation of the current condition of society believing it will not get worse than now. Therefore, contemporary dystopia breaks from the previous dystopias by coming up with more positive alternatives for resistance against current problems of society. Unlike twentieth-century dystopia's limited declamation to problems, contemporary dystopia points to a process-oriented form that cares about here and now rather than progress-oriented form. Gregory Clays calls this new concept of dystopia "post-totalitarian dystopia" basing his ideas on "liberal non-totalitarian societies showed serious signs of cultural degeneration into intellectual senility and enslavement to mindless ethos of hedonistic consumption" (2017, p.447). The contemporary dystopia relegates an anthropocentric vision

which causes inequality between species in the new millennium ordained by the present politics of life.

Focusing on the ills of humanity that exposed other species and the world to facing extinction, Posthumanism challenges the inequity between humans and other species falling out of humanism's conceited mind and exhibiting a unifying attitude considering the relationality between human and nonhuman entities. Posthumanism goes hand in hand with contemporary dystopia since both conceptions try to reach dis-anthropocentric ambience to sort out the disasters caused by the anthropocentric domain. While resisting humanism's human-centred idea, Posthumanism does not mean denying humanism but as Braidotti acknowledges: "My view of posthuman thought is instead profoundly anti-individualistic and it consists in working within the belly of the beast, resisting the myth of organicism and holistic harmony, but also capitalist opportunism" (2013, p.101) by attacking classical humanist thinking. Rather than dreaming of uploading mind to the computers or robots (as in transhumanism), Posthumanism "attempts to understand and deconstruct humanism from within, tracing its internal tensions and conceptual discrepancies" (Roden, 2015, p.9). By meaning uploading, transhumanists turn carbon-based humans into silicon-based posthumans grounded on gene technology or cyber technology as eminent forms of post-humanity. Whatever form it is, Posthumanism stands against human centrality over other agents. Erasing the distinction between human, nonhuman animal and machine, the advanced capitalist era creates a posthuman character who is interrelated to all living entities and they are on the same par in global politics and economy. The ethical status is achieved with the interrelational position of posthuman subjects and other kinds. Braidotti would rather *zoe*-philic accounts of life than an anthropocentric view that worked on binary logic by relocating the alleged subjectivity interpenetrating to human and nonhuman species.

Tapping into technical alteration, the posthuman is "wide human descendants of humans who have become technologically inhuman" (Roden, 2020, p.101). Posthuman figure range from cyborgs to clones, gene therapy, and artificial insemination employing cybernetically connected bodies and machine. A considerable number of literary studies exemplify remarkably rich sources of interaction between human and nonhuman kinds juxtaposing on the biological and artificial ground scale. Therefore, Kazuo Ishiguro's two celebrated dystopian fictions, *Never Let Me Go* and *Klara and the Sun* fall into this category. The main

concern of this study will be to analyze how Kazuo Ishiguro creates dystopian atmosphere in his novels by embodying the artificially cloned individuals in *Never Let Me Go*, and lifted children accompanied by artificial friends in *Klara and Sun*. This thesis will attempt to track down the posthuman understanding handled in Ishiguro's fictional works.

This dissertation will be engaged in the theoretical background of Posthumanism in chapter II starting from the anthropocene that was caused by anthropocentric methods tracing back to its root in humanism which emerged in the Enlightenment period before its counterpart, Posthumanism. After scrutinising Posthumanism in detail in line with transhumanism, this study will deal with the classical dystopia of the twentieth-century and contemporary dystopian which is the main concern of this thesis giving examples of the touchstones of classical dystopia to disentangle the difference between Ishiguro's understanding of dystopia compared to his predecessors. In Chapter III, this study will analyze Kazuo Ishiguro's dystopian fiction *Never Let Me Go* (2005) in which he imagines a world where cloned individuals are harvested for their organs. They are reared in a humane environment by educating them and fulfilling their needs. Ishiguro calls our attention to the inhumane procedure clones get through as they are occupied in artwork not to question the pathetic situation in which they are kept busy. As we do not encounter the normal humans in the novel, we are already aware of the distinction between humans and clone humans as they are exposed to dehumanization going through transplanting their vital organs to prolong their life span even if it cost clone's lives. In Chapter IV, Kazuo Ishiguro's latest novel *Klara and the Sun* (2021) will be scrutinised through the lens of posthuman condition by examining the dystopian elements that the author provides. Kazuo Ishiguro envisions a near future of somewhere in America where children are genetically uplifted to become smarter and better, therefore they will pursue better academic life and professional career. In the novel, poor people who cannot afford the lifting process are excluded from a society where they cannot find a position in education, work and other facilities. Furthermore, technology is so advanced that people create artificial friends to satisfy their lifted children's loneliness since they cannot manage to look after their offspring. The last part will be composed of the conclusion part about both novels as it will be analyzed in the previous chapters.

On the ground statements, Posthumanism challenges the anthropocentric agenda endured in contemporary dystopian fiction, targeting the intersections between twentieth-century dystopian fiction and human-centredness. On this basis, this dissertation will elaborate on the posthuman condition in two celebrated novels of Nobel-winning writer Kazuo Ishiguro, *Never Let Me Go* and *Klara and The Sun* about human and nonhuman entanglement. Although the author tries to create an advanced world through biotechnological enhancement for a more humane world, the readers will observe how anthropocentric experiences cost a heavy price coming through the other side of the same coin, that is through nonhuman entities; artificial friends and clone individuals. Within this frame, it is necessary to remark that Posthumanism clashes with the anthropocentric ideals of classical humanism therefore its continuation, Transhumanism. Thus, in the theory section, this study will investigate the term posthuman in terms of both Posthumanism and Transhumanism because both theories are closely related. The forthcoming section will gradually present the development of anthropocentric norms, their effects, and how they collapse and transform into new perspectives. The transition from anthropocentrism to post-anthropocentrism will be demonstrated step by step to prove how Posthumanism tries to present a more egalitarian and interrelational frame to exceed the former boundaries among humans and other species. In *Never Let Me Go* and *Klara and the Sun*, Kazuo Ishiguro illustrates how technological breakthroughs induce anthropocentrism creating disastrous scenarios.

CHAPTER 1

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF POSTHUMANISM

1.1. The Appearance Of “Anthropos” On The Stage

‘We-Are-(All)-In-This-Together-But-We-Are-Not-One-And-The-Same’
(Braidotti *‘Posthuman Knowledge’*, 2019, p.57)

All beings on planet earth share the same conditions, although not all shape the earth equally. ‘Anthropos,’ the Greek term for human beings, breaks into the natural habitat of other living beings and is traded on nature, which abuses the whole ecosystem shared by all biodynamics. These changes in nature are dominated by ‘Anthropos’ appearing on the stage, surrounded by their technical information or scientific studies, which causes the breaking out of a new epoch. This new era is called ‘Anthropocene,’ which stands for the artificial formation of nature through human activities. Anthropocene is called for human impact on the earth’s ecosystem and geological epoch as a geophysical force—the period started around the 1800s at the beginning of industrialization based on using fossil fuels. Through human enterprise into the natural system, carbon emissions, global warming, and climate change came to the fore as a consequence of contemplating the planet’s natural resources. Carbon dioxide and global warming have accelerated since human-driven activities rose compared to the pre-industrial age. The Anthropocene proposes that “the earth has now left its natural geological epoch, the present interglacial state called the holocene,” (Steffen et al., 2007, p. 614) and the anthropocene started as a period through the continuous human interruption of nature. Human embroilment is so profound that planetary systems become unrecognizable. Human beings’ catalytic processes, including the invention of fire to the domestication of animals and plants,

have had a sharp change in the late Holocene, which started almost 12,000 years ago after the glacial age. Therefore, the term ‘Anthropocene’ has been defined as “the central role of humankind in geology and ecology” (Steffen et al. 2007, p.615) through agricultural developments, deforestation, urbanization and the invention of the steam engine, and the dramatic increase in motor vehicle production. Although the beginning of the ‘Anthropocene’ is traced back to the starting of agricultural activities for some people, many scientists put it nearer back to the late eighteenth century at the beginning of industrialization and around World War II with the excessive use of chemicals and releasing two atomic bombs (Grusin, 2017, p.viii). Though ‘Anthropocene’ is based on examining rock stratification or earth geology, it can be called the ‘capitalocene’ due to the recent transformation of advanced capitalism. If the impact of the industrial revolution and human beings selfishly messing with the world carry on, the Earth should be ready to face the new great extinction just as a meteor hit caused the decimation of ninety-five per cent of Earth’s species; unfortunately, they already destroyed some species. According to the human being put the world into an overwhelming position, the human race is not only biological but also a geological agent.

What is certain about this new geological stage is that the earth faces the sixth great mass extinction since some species gradually perish. A great amount of damage is inflicted on extinct animals’ natural habitats and releases plastic waste on a global scale. Whatever looks like a potential future, the drastic climate changes threaten the whole planet where all livings dwell. Environmental studies show that our dedication to material production puts us and the entire earth at risk of extinction. The chemicals contaminated in our water and other nourishment sources causes more severe damage than we think, particularly to pregnant woman, rural dwellers, and children. For example, many farm workers are exposed to pesticides and toxins much more than the average population. According to environmental activism and Greenpeace’s investigation launching a mercury transmission campaign that encourages people to send their hair samples, the significant amount of mercury found in people’s hair results urges everyone to take caution through dietary and political steps (Alaimo, 2010, p.83). Chemical sensitivities leading to rashes, dizziness, nausea, headache, or chronic fatigue afflict us long-term, causing more serious problems related to autoimmune diseases, cancer, or other health conditions. This indicates how someone is enmeshed with the world from top to down.

Furthermore, we should look from the nonhuman species' perspectives that the chemicals intoxicated the seas and contaminated the foods that breed birds, fish, reptiles, and mammals. Meanwhile, plastic trashes such as razors, brushes, and pieces intended for temporary use created a huge permanent garbage patch like an island. Ironically, the plastic that human-made to make life more accessible does not dissipate, but it dissolves into particles surrounding the seawater and contaminates into marine food circle (Alaimo, 2014, pp.19-20). Because advanced technology and modern foundations give the impression of human-constructed nature, scientific developments merely lead to access to nature, turning the wheel against humanity. From the start, moderns who carry out these activities imagine themselves as different from the rest of marginalized human beings and species considering their accultured, technologically enhanced, and noble life. We are not eligible to choose the future from the destruction that we put the earth into, but the future will decide our fate due to the overconsumption of the earth's planet. No matter what happens, it will be a time for nonhuman being that human being no longer forms nature since they spoilt it enough through industrial activities. These anthropocentric ideals of humans are the reason that drives the earth into the Anthropocene era causing uncontrollable and irrevocable outcomes for all species. Shortly, if anthropocentrism is the cause, the Anthropocene period is the effect of those self-centred practices of humans.

Industrialization and capitalization speed up our consumption of natural resources more than the earth can supply. Sooner or later, humanity has to face the high price of butchering the only natural habitat in the universe that we have and destroying ecosystems hosting for all species. It is clear that humans neither intended to create global warming nor foresee the price at the beginning of development. Nevertheless, there is a fact about buying new products and mass consumption leading to deforestation that causes global warming and mass extinction. To put it another way, the more people tend to work on food production or excessive consumption, the more the planet will be in pain of resource depletion and intensive over-use, and the only species leave their imprints on the planet. Whether it is intentional or not, there is a clear fact that the earth's natural biomass is at stake. As Richard Grusin puts it: "given where we are now (with industrialism, technoscience, mass media, globalism, and traditions of liberal justice), there might be a threshold at which we might be prepared to sacrifice the historical 'progress'" (2016, p.11) to live

a better life. Humanity has to accept its lonely role in changing the natural track of the planet's geological occurrence. As Richard Kerridge succinctly continues: "to take greater and more exceptional responsibility, it also admonishes us for past hubris...we understand too little: in other words, natural creatures caught up in forces beyond our understanding" (2017, p. xv). This understanding helps us turn our face to nature.

Regarding the point about human centrality, this self-opinion provokes human beings as privileged among other species, ignoring that human beings are embedded in a shared ecosystem inhabited by nonhuman critters. If we do not take action, other species will suffer from our failure. Addressing these humanoid catastrophes result of the 'Anthropocene' era, "scientists and engineers continue to rely on many of the same masculinist and human-centred solutions that have created the problems in the first place" (Grusin, 2016, p. IX). The Anthropocene era that we live in is "when the earth's ecological balance is directly regulated by humanity" (Braidotti, 2013, p.79); that is, humanity puts the anxiety of its irresponsibility on the other species. The great destruction that Anthropos gave to Earth is a rich amount of resource for literature, particularly dystopias of the contemporary era. The subtle condition of this age makes the writer search for an alternative future. Contemporary writers alarm us about the calamity nonhuman beings go through to display the reason behind all the ills of human centrality brings. To reach a sustainable planet with an egalitarian environment, writers such as Kazuo Ishiguro problematizes the boundaries between human and nonhuman beings and fallacies that humans sank into in his two dystopian novels; *Never Let Me Go* (2005) and *Klara and The Sun* (2021).

1.2. Anthropocentric Ideals Of Humanism And Its Evolution

Explicating about Anthropocene needs an intensive task, notably if one has the privilege "of living through the infancy of this new and extraordinary phase of our planet's history" (Zalasiewicz, 2017, p.129). The idea of humanity's colonizing nature and sovereignty over nonhuman beings through globalized technologies embarked upon the centrality of humanity in humanist discourse where there is confusion about ethnic and sexual orientations putting the whole human being under the term 'mankind.' Anthropocene's heartfelt bond to human nature causes the hegemonic crisis between species and the redefinition of humanity as it used to be. This hegemony is related to Anthropocentrism, human centrality in the universe, that

positions the human race as supreme power over all nonhuman beings. The notion of Anthropocentrism is richly endowed with the idea of “masculinist, racist, and colonial histories and worlds, among various others that are more desirable” (Schneider, 2005, p.29). To understand what Anthropocentrism truly means, we need to elucidate how humanism emerges and evolves through time. From Cary Wolfe’s point of view, humanity is a cluster of ethical concerns about the “dignity and worth of all people, based on the ability to determine right and wrong by appeal to universal human qualities-particularly rationality” (2010, p.xi). Humanism looks after human truth and morality for the sake of human interest through philosophical thoughts. Humanism has a very complex historical background and a couple of possible meanings. Rene Descartes (1596- 1650) defines humans, along with the words mastery, security, and reason, as the exclusive prospect, “inasmuch as it alone makes us men and distinguishes us from the beasts” (1998, p.3) that is the faculty of judgment through the mind. This feature gives humans the power to distinguish right from wrong, which is universal for all human beings. The quality that humans can differentiate the true and false induces Descartes to say his catchphrase: “I think, therefore I am” (1998, p. 32). To the Cartesian mode of thinking, the core of a human being depends on the rational mind that refuses that precede the body, creating a duality between mind and body. With this famous proposition that Descartes puts forward, the body cannot get along with life without the mind, yet the contrary cannot be claimed. Thus, this dualistic view that differentiates mind and body paves the way for a humanistic mindset.

Consequently, this is the main reason that entails a duality between human and nonhuman beings but not only reason for the genesis of humanism. On the other hand, eighteenth-century philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) attributes dignity as a human quality inherited in all humans. That is why one has to respect every individual because everyone has the liberty to follow their own rational goals. The fact that respect is an ethical demand that reason embarks upon persons symbolizes what Kant suggests as “autonomy of the will” (qtd. in Wennemann, 2018, p. 261). What exactly does David Roden explicate about is Kant’s idea of humanity. As he refers to it as ‘transcendental humanity,’ that human beings not only represent the world but also, they are the agents who give meaning and designate. If everything intrinsically hosts evilness, then “only beings that are rational and capable of autonomous agency can be regarded as ‘ends-in-themselves.’ Lacking reason,

animals can only be means to human ends” (Roden, 2015, p.12). Through ‘transcendental humanism,’ Kant gives distinctive values to the human being as a transcendental designer of the human/ nonhuman world. Put another way, we, as human beings, feel that “the earth upon which we stand lay immobile at the centre of the universe and that the sun and moon, planets and stars revolved around us” (Callicott, 2017, p.139). Kant’s idea of human dignity spices up the human dominance over nature that nurtures the essence of humanism as a human being can reach the moral law, therefore Kant’s theory focuses on the value of individuals.

Nonetheless, there is a fact that human is made of the same essences that anything else is, unlike the fallacy that human reason is supreme power over everything else. Since everything inside and outside the brain collaborated with the parity principle, as Roden elaborates, “mental processes need not occur only in biological nervous systems but in the environments and tools of embodied thinkers” (2015, p. 46). Every item around us contributes to our cognitive process since everything is a part of our mental activities and triggers our mental thinking. Accordance with this human aptitude entrenches mistreatment against animate and inanimate beings because of the belief that reduces their values to sub-humanity that they are not one of humankind; it synchronizes with human actions and thoughts. As Descartes and Kant, the ancient philosopher, Aristotle attributed reason to humans rather than animals, which means only human beings can contemplate metaphysical values. Roden expresses it eloquently as “[t]he less rational serve the needs of those further up the hierarchy of hierarchy rationality” (2015, p.12). Even though nonhumans correspond to nature in their way, neither animals nor even God can reach human moral virtue. It can be deduced from this that the notion that the human being is the only source of truth in modern philosophical positions is more aggressive than anthropocentrism because this mindset favours humans the most among living and nonliving beings once and for all. This perilous mindset of human exceptionality might be not only of themselves but the whole living entity's end.

The long-standing approach of Cartesian dualism has been exposed to criticism since it started to commission because this mind/matter dualism leads nature into irreversible damage. However, humanity does not step back from colonizing habitats, plants, and animals; instead, it works on accelerating the damage. Thanks to mind and soul duality, the developing mechanistic world eases the anthropocentric position in Western society up to this day. This paradigm refuses

all the moral concerns attached to nonhuman beings by putting humans at the centre of the universe. By extension, Anthropocentrism entrenches the human's role as an agent in all institutional structures from politics to education, religion, and science enmeshed with human values and necessities par excellence. This is why Anthropocentrism drives the Holocene, the world's natural functioning, to evolve into the Anthropocene, the effect of man on the earth's natural order. According to the Cartesian dualist state of mind, the binary oppositions in humanism view man as a thinking entity from which differentiated animal beings. For this reason, Descartes marks animals as soulless and deprived of human dignity. Thus, they are inferior to human entities since they are mindless automata. In the strictest sense, this dualist philosophy is the core of thinking that puts the mind, science status quo, at the centre of everything. It encapsulates nature as an observable steward of the earth system enslaved by a human being.

Moreover, this Cartesian reconfiguration is the source of anthropocentrism that separates different species. Cartesian dualism is responsible for the formula of the essence of everything. It is started from the distinction of the body from mind, nature from culture, and female from male, which entails one side a superiority to another. From this perspective, it is not hard to predict that this dualist perspective excludes racialized, naturalized and sexualized others from the white, male, heterosexual humankind from the discourse. This categorization of beings traces back to the Enlightenment when the great philosopher and impressive painter Leonardo Da Vinci portrays the ideal human being in the figure of Vitruvian Man (1490). This portrait of the ideal man, in Pramod K. Nayar's words:

... centres the white male as the universal human, and all other genders, differently formed bodies and ethnic types are treated as variants of this 'standard' model, and also forms/models that lack something. Critical humanism treats humanism as a politically significant philosophy because it enabled Europeans, upper classes, and professionals (like medical doctors or psychiatrists) to categorize some individuals as inhuman or sub-human and confine them or deny them rights. Animals and some ethnic groups have been the victims of this form of classificatory paradigm in which the universal Man was defined. (2014, p. 23)

To put it more concisely, one who is out of this classification subsides less moral human quality because this figure of a man symbolizes a rational man with healthy physical qualities who dominates the world and nature through his reason depending on his senses. Rather, this symbol of critical importance for science and Enlightenment comprises a schism between rational, wise, healthy, and liberal individuals and other groups. Although the main debate about the Vitruvian man was

a man at the centre of nature, the excluded groups of society were unfortunately enslaved by humanity either.

The diffraction in the anthropocentric idea of humanism started with man's elaborating on how the universe runs off, particularly after the epochal studies of Charles Darwin about the scientific theory that species evolve throughout natural selection in terms of 'survival of fittest.' In his book *On the Origin of Species*, Darwin is relevant with his theory of evolution about how living beings evolved and revolved around the world for millions of years to understand the anthropocentric rationale. The position of humans divided from animals since ancient Greeks that power and reason are granted to human beings. Whatever the division is, reason, language, and power to control have cast aside man from nonhuman beings. This allegation lasted until Darwin came up with the idea that "man descended from animals and remains still animal" (Grosz, 2011, p.13) as a profound insult to man's understanding of self. Darwin's questioning of the origin of species placed scrutiny on why humankind has two sexes among other species and different races sequenced hierarchically for no concrete reason. The differences among men are not of a kind but a degree that is decided by sovereign power. According to his presumption, if we situate man in a place, he belongs to animals. There will be no point in privileging humans over other species as man has moral, aesthetic, and linguistic values. Supposing a man is taken for granted a reason, religion, art, and morality "not only problematizes all of the humanities that have made the human mark and measure of creativity, it also obscures animal conditions for the emergence of so-called human qualities" (Grosz, 2011, p.21). Imagine language started as a song form or musical echoes that spark a reaction in the who makes it and the one who hears it. Then, there is a close similarity in functioning between humans and animals such as birds, dolphins, whales, and other music-harmony species. Human vocalization is one form of language, bees are different in performing their language, and other species are different. Each species has its communication system, sexual interest, and morphological system and composes of deep and complex that others can resist.

The distinction between human/nonhuman being evolved into a brand new discrepancy in which no longer every human being is supposed to be equal to the same degree. As it is obvious from the abovementioned quotation, the ideal Renaissance figure of man fails in the context of universal humanism. In her related discourse, Rosi Braidotti attempts to clarify as "that iconic image is the emblem of

humanism as a doctrine that combines the biological, discursive and moral expansion of human capabilities into an idea of teleologically ordained, rational progress” (2013, p.13). Vitruvian men’s being male is a serious issue because people devoid of the biologically male gender are inevitably excluded from this model. In this vein, the universal, rational man of Enlightenment is attached to a set of arbitrary mental and bodily qualities of perfection being set up for an ideal man. There are some fundamental characteristics that human normality is based on, such as race, gender, age, class, and able-bodiedness; whoever acquires these standards is considered the ideal human with a combination of intellectual, physical, and mental capabilities that rests upon moral values. This generic model transforms humanism into a standard civilization that situates European nations at the centre of progression. It subjugates fundamental human rights and freedom of disadvantaged groups. It labels them to become racialized, sexualized (and naturalized) others constituting the alleged unity of humanism as it seems clear that the anthropocentric agenda relegates into a disaster of human chauvinism working in favour of European males except for being a geological force that causes depletion and climate changes affecting all other species on earth. Therefore, many theoreticians such as Rosi Braidotti inaugurate a crisis against universal humanism since they believe that “‘Man’ cannot claim to represent all humanity because that ‘Man’ is a culture-specific, gender-specific, race-specific and class-specific entity” (Braidotti & Veronese, 2016, p.339). Since universal humanism deviated from its purpose when first emerged and started to distinguish a group of people from the rest of society as white, male and European men, thinkers needed a reformation in this discriminative formulation. This leads to opposite foundations as post-anthropocentrism and Posthumanism that drag down humanity from the centre since these two notions do not follow the mind and body duality, rather they emphasize biological and bodily existence on earth.

All people different from Eurocentric criteria are different from others incapable of intellectual power since knowledge production is embedded with European norms. This inequity raises a political debate among other disciplines, such as postcolonialism, feminism, and anti-racist thinkers. They criticize this thinking and try to make others heard, denying the humanist centrality of the dominant subjects and taking a step further beyond anti-humanism. They delink the human position from centrality, not in a complete denial status quo but creating an egalitarian environment among all entities. A legitimate reason exists for a European

nation to plunder non-European societies though Posthumanism thinks habitats are for other living beings, including plants, animals, and even microorganisms, whether people live there or not. Braidotti puts forward that Posthumanism not only stems from the crisis of humanism but also finds an opportunity to defend nonhuman others' rights besides marginalized people. Therefore, the post-anthropocentric idea "displaces the notion of species hierarchy of and a single, common standard for 'Man' as the measure of all things" (Braidotti, 2013, p. 67). In other words, the posthuman subject exceeds the universal humanist thought and Anthropocentrism to reach the planetary scale. Posthuman body and subject are needed to preserve the planet and all living beings by transcending the duality between mind and body that builds barriers between species.

Posthumanism became popular "as part of postmodernist critiques of Enlightenment thought, particularly the assumption that all human beings can be described in terms of a cross-cultural and transhistorical essence" (Heise, 2011, p.454) that the concept of Humanism count on. Posthumanism, unlike poststructuralist and postmodernist thinkers, does not only stick to the concept of overthrowing the sovereignty of one group of people, as in Eurocentrism but also compounds all species equally on the whole planet. Feminists, anthropologists, historians, critics, and linguists studied this concept of 'humanism' from different angles to reveal how it affected the direction of power balance between the dominant and dominated groups instead of the neutral points they submit. Classical humanism defines humans by their ability to shape social and moral behaviours according to the ideals of the white male, which is criticized by poststructuralist, postcolonialist and feminist theories that universally defend the rights of marginalized groups. Posthumanism, so far, reconsiders the hegemonic ideologies and epistemologies that Western tradition worked on consolidating the relationship between human and nonhuman beings, unlike Western thinking that defends human uniqueness and exclusiveness compared to animals, machines, slaves etc.

In the wake of the posthumanist turn, the paradigm that favours humans over animals is radically challenged since the answer to what is to be a human was transformed by a poststructuralist and anti-humanist agenda, yet most significantly owing to technology causing changes in the human body. Besides, artificial intelligence and high technology devices such as robots and animal cognition test results challenge the egocentric humanism's acclaim that "we are special" (Rossini,

2017, p.153). Therefore, physical or mental properties and cultural ideologies that distinguish humans from animals and man's sovereignty over nature are transversed and obtained from animals to man to achieve the fundamental continuity between nature and culture. At this point, what strikes us most is the distinction that Descartes made between humans and animals is choice and perfection, which characterizes the human as the reason that can make choices. Since a human being can reason and think compared to other living being, Descartes's famous sentence of truth fits in once again here "truth—/ think, therefore I am" (1998, p.32). Nonetheless, perfection belongs to animals as they are synchronized with all their actions since they depend on their instincts rather than intelligence. Unlike animals, humans are imperfect and can choose the perfect through reason. They do not make mistakes because they act synchronized, unlike humans who made mistakes consequent on their reason. Though these concepts of perfection and choice are posthuman contestation, they are not well defined. As Andy Miah clarifies "it would be mistaken to characterise posthuman thought as the pursuit of human perfection or the limitless valuing of personal freedom" (Miah, 2009, p.15). However, Posthumanism has a point on these terms. It is not surprising to claim that posthumanism recalibrates the anthropocentric idea at the expense of other species. Posthumanism denies Western humanism's labelling non-western and non-white people as less than humankind. At this point, Paul Gilroy criticizes colonialism and fascism as a betrayal of Western Enlightenment which he took responsibility for political and ethical failures in providing egalitarian rights. An ideal human being on a ground scale is considered anti-racist and post-anthropocentric in the age of genetic power and biotechnology (Braidotti, 2006, p.66). Posthumanism questions the human centrality in the universe, such as the "transcendental humanism" of Kant that privileges human centrality and "treats certain abstract features of human life and subjectivity as unsurpassable sources of order in the world" (Roden, 2015, p.10). In this regard, Posthumanism exhibits beyond an anti-humanist attribute because it regards the human mind as a minor part of its system operating its self-cognition but unaware of the main complex systems. Therefore, the duality between mind and body is broken, and biological asset of humankind gained importance rather than reason in the posthuman age. Thus, a human being is equal to other species in bodily forms.

1.3. Post-anthropocentric Vision In Posthumanism

Posthumanism became popular around the 1970s and does not declare the end of humanism, but instead, it is a consideration against favouring wealthy and powerful groups of societies. Due to criticism of Posthumanism of this human chauvinism, the end of anthropolatry comprises “calls for more respect and priority to be given to the interests of other species and life-forms: less ego, both individually and collectively” (Braidotti, 2006, p.106). In such a complex system, the uniqueness of anthropos is replaced by post-anthropocentrism, demolishing human centrality, which means humanity lost control over and jeopardized the sustainability of the natural elements of planet Earth. This change of mind, the conception of Posthumanism, is closely related to the planetary catastrophe, not to mention chemical and military threats, which can harm all humanity with its vulnerability. The striking answer to the problem of the decimation of nonhumans is not only to depend on the humanization of the environment but merely should regard nonhuman agents par excellence. To contemplate nonhuman beings, we as human beings need different concepts to view the relations from different standpoints. Human beings share many different behaviours with animals. For instance, elephants grieve when they lose their loved ones, which is closely connected to human beings mourning the loss of relatives. From this point of view, Francis Fukuyama paradoxically calls “animal protection societies ‘humane’ societies” (2003, p.132) considering their attribution of value to animals. Different sorts of studies, such as animal, ecocritical, or environmental humanism, challenge humanism, privileging human beings compared to nonhuman beings. It reduces the boundaries between humans and the earth, inevitably leading to unexpected results. If the humanist crisis invokes the birth of Posthumanism by invigorating racialized and sexualized groups to free themselves from subjugation, “[a]nthropos relinquishes the demonic forces of the naturalised others” (Braidotti & Veronese, 2016, p.344). However, humanity seems as a part of natural trajectories sharing the planet with plants, animals, insects, microorganisms, and the whole cosmos, in which humanity shoulders more difficult responsibility than ever. As understood from Braidotti’s definition of Posthumanism, Amy Defibaugh also explains Posthumanism as “not only disrupts the perceived boundaries between humans and animals, nature and culture, and organism and

machine but works to check and potentially destroys human exceptionalism” (2018, p.295).

Post-anthropocentric vision in Posthumanism based on Benedict (Baruch) de Spinoza’s ‘monistic universe’ deconstructs humanity by excluding dualistic definitions of humans and the world situated on oppositions. The target of the monistic philosophy of Spinoza is criticising Cartesian dualism and denying all forms of transcendentalism. As Don Garret defines the monistic philosophy of Spinoza, “the human mind and the human body are identical; yet he also insisted that the human mind can achieve a kind of eternality that transcends the death of the body” (1995, p.1). In this respect, “Monism,” as Braidotti authored “results in relocating difference outside the dialectical scheme, as a complex process of differing which is framed by both internal and external forces and is based on the centrality of the relation to multiple others” (2013, p.56). The monistic legacy is necessary for fortifying posthuman theory and dethroning subjectivity based on classical humanism and Anthropocentrism. There is a close link between monism and post-anthropocentrism in shaping the posthuman mindset. Posthumanism has a significant bond to post-anthropocentrism since the latter provides digital studies, technology, media culture, environment studies, robotics, neuroscience, evolutionary theories, earth sciences, and science fiction. This transdisciplinarity of studies piles up more layers on the complexity of the post-anthropocentric subject, therefore, posthuman agency. Monism adds to self-organized (autopoietic) scientific advances in the relational and structurally interlinked varieties of environments. Therefore, the posthuman subject is not comprised of relational capacity to humanity but nonanthropomorphic agents. Braidotti’s vital force of life, *zoe*, emerges as “the core of the post-anthropocentric turn: it is a materialist, secular, grounded and unsentimental response to the opportunistic trans-species commodification of Life that is the logic of advanced capitalism” (p.60). Postanthropocentric, *zoe*-centred egalitarian environment, thus, is enmeshed with the relational self-functioning in a technologically mediate nature-culture continuum. Spinoza’s monistic ideal highlights the importance of unity between mind and body duality. Since there are no boundaries between anything and everything is so interlinked that abusing nature means giving harm to our species. The only boundary is Anthropocentrism and transcendental humanism to be overcome to reach the egalitarian dimension.

Posthumanism does not signify the end or break from humanism because of the prefix ‘post’ in the word included. However, the prefix is more about reinstating humanity in a larger sense and not misunderstanding the enriching idea of Anthropocentrism. It seems to transform itself into a new form of humanity. It, instead, criticizes human centrality and other forms of hegemonic powers, such as humanist chauvinism against minority groups. In a similar vein, Neil Badmington describes Posthumanism thoroughly as it “is not afraid to tackle the traces of humanism that haunt contemporary Western culture” (2004, p.144). In this quotation, we can observe that Posthumanism is not abstracted from the traces of humanism because past continuously affects the present. Posthumanist and post-anthropocentric convergence are connected to create a new field of critical theory that rejects the “humanist ideal of Man as the allegedly universal measure of all things...and the rejection of species hierarchy and human exceptionalism” (Braidotti 2017, p.83) through interdisciplinary character. However, Posthumanism goes beyond humanism, working it through new technological dimensions. Humanism becomes a stranger to its principles by turning into ‘Posthumanism.’ As Rosi Braidotti asserts, Posthumanism is a generative power “to help us re-think the basic unit of reference for the human in the bio-genetic age known as ‘Anthropocene,’ the historical moment when the Human has become a geological force capable of affecting all life on this planet” (2013, p.7). This new agenda is not apathetic to humanity but highlights the importance of compromising new morals to reach the well-being of extended communities grounded on non-individual interests. Becoming ‘posthuman’ requires redefining human connection to the share-based planet. In crude terms, it helps us to negotiate the connection between human and nonhuman entities on a large scale. Posthumanities suggest new sights for humanism’s exclusion of planetary extents, a new perspective on moral values, and concern for the future of all living beings, including the digital humanities with technological enhancements.

Posthumanism is a new mindset “which builds on but is not confined to either humanism or anthropocentrism” however, it is “a genuinely new programme for the Humanities in the twentieth century” (Braidotti, 2013, p.163). Besides, Posthumanism works on the connection between human and nonhuman agents. For example, it argues that biotechnologies, cybernetics and computerized technologies embody human experiences and cognition in a technologically mediated world. Therefore, the posthuman subject is considered super intelligent and equipped with

advanced technology in nanotechnology, biotechnology, genetic engineering, and information technology. Roden explains it as follows “[m]any argue that these enhanced people might live better lives; others fear that tinkering with our nature will undermine our sense of our humanity...our technological successor will be an upgraded or degraded version of us: Human 2.0” (2015, p.2). Posthumanism is driven by digital technologies, however many engines about genetic engineering and biotechnology are considered the fruit of human evolution that it is impossible completely escape from the effects of humans. While Posthumanism complies with modified bodies through technologies and surgeries, on the one hand, it deals with rebuilding the concept of a human being. As Pramod K. Nayar argued, Posthumanism rejects “cultural representations, power relations and discourses that have historically situated the human above other life forms,” and reconsiders “the human in the age of technological modification, hybridized life forms, discoveries of the sociality (of humanity) of animals and a new understanding of ‘life’ itself” (2014, p.12). In this radical outbreak with humanism, Posthumanism overreaches to the classical humanist notions of uniqueness to reveal that the human being is an assemblage incorporated with other life forms embodied with technological, ecological, and evolutionary coordinates. Simply, it does not agree with human exceptionality. Instead, it is enmeshed in other living entities. To put it in different words, Posthumanism finds its essence in those, what Nayar describes as “the constructed and exclusionary nature of the systems of segregation, difference, purity, coherence and separation – of bodies, subjectivities, identities – in biology, literature, philosophy or politics” (2014, p.14) is overthrown for new assemblages. Posthumanism defends the idea that humanism is constructed both historically and culturally, and it has to be replaced with wider concepts related to nature and culture all at once. To achieve a posthumanist idea, one needs to decenter humanistic exceptionalism and involve complex inhuman lives. The term ‘Posthumanism,’ in this sense, invigorates the task of process in “technologization, based on the idea of a radical interdependence or mutual interpenetration between the human, the posthuman and the inhuman” (Herbrechter, 2013, p. 27). Its main task is to build equal, democratic, and transdisciplinary models for the posthuman future by transforming the way human assumes themselves to be and merging human and nature. From this point, the posthuman predicament has a ‘rhizomatic’ structure, an interconnectedness of different points, by reflecting the ideas about different

backgrounds. Each discipline forges a new bond through its principles and enriches the posthuman paradigm diversely.

Nonhuman acknowledgement may not be easy; however, as human beings, we are facing a global crisis threatening the entire habitat. Therefore, for the utmost sake of every agent on the planet, we need to change our mindset from anthropocentrism to an ecosystem-based one, which is a post-anthropocentric view. This post-anthropocentric turn of posthuman agenda requires a consciousness about being a part of other species and, as humanity, taking responsibility for the destructive consequences and brutal conditions that stick to other living species. Posthumanity is, therefore, embedded in the natural environment that creates a sense of shared belonging. Relational communion extends to different ecologies. Such nets of different relations and negotiation create “a sense of familiarity with the world and foreground the simple fact that we are eco-sophical entities, that is to say, ecologically interlinked through the multiple interconnections we share within the nature–culture continuum” (Braidotti, 2019, p.53). Though the posthuman subject has a cleavage inside, it is interlinked to the technologically mediated world globally. Affinity with other species demonstrates our ability to find our connection with the world. It makes us home, raising deeper feelings for the catastrophe we put the planet into. For this particular condition, Braidotti calls: “posthuman convergence,” a new paradigm for situating problems and possibilities of contemporary conditions (2019, p.53). In this respect, Deleuze and Guattari’s coined term ‘rhizome’ provides us with a better understanding of the interrelationship between the assemblages.

‘Rhizome’ is a philosophical word depicting the connection and relation between things with their root-like shape and growing undergrounds without any direction, beginning, or end. The picture of connected life is elaborated in the book, *A Thousand Plateaus*, in which Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari recognize Darwinian sort of life as ‘arborescent’ “because it assumes a branching out from the one to the many, from sameness to difference, from the primitive to the complex. Discarding the image of life as linear transmission or reproduction” (Idema, 2014, p. 258). Deleuze and Guattari replace the ‘arborescent’ model, a tree-like structure and appearance, with a rhizome, and it applies to life since everything has a symbiotic link on a molecular scale. To better understand nature's incredible variety, Darwin’s theory of evolution is inadequate to explain alone with natural selection. Instead, they put forward that one (someone or something) is not singular but plural because

everyone has been reterritorialized and deterritorialized in one another. To illustrate, a book, as an assemblage, “has only itself, in connection with other assemblages and about other bodies without organs” that someone will never ask what a book is or whether it is a signifier or a signified to elaborate anything in it. Rather one will “ask what it functions with, in connection with what other things it does or does not transmit intensities, in which other multiplicities its own are inserted and metamorphosed, and with what bodies without organs it makes its own converge” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p.4). The multiple dimensions of a rhizome have to be made through a connection that any rhizome is connected to any point of another. The same goes for Posthumanism. Human as a term is not singular but plural in its diverse forms since there are different kinds of humans, not only one, such as different ethnicities, sexes, classes, abled/disabled bodied-ness, nationality, or religion. By extension, on the one hand, human has no singular but plural meaning, on the other hand, every individual is not classified as a human being to the same degree as in the case of marginalized groups. That is why the rhizome has a connective function in posthuman convergence based on interrelatedness as a multidisciplinary study.

1. 4. Posthuman In The Pursuit Of Perfection And Bioethics

Thinking about the motto that Braidotti breached for Posthumanism, ‘we are in this together,’ it is surprisingly possible that animals and other beings are still commodified for xenotransplantation, eugenics or technogenic process. The core of Posthumanism, except for interrelated multidisciplinary concerns, first and foremost, is a theory about human enmeshment to technological advancements. For some theoreticians, human beings were always posthuman because of the deep relation to technological changes in every moment of history. Due to increasing tie with technological developments, he became posthuman. In other words, human beings did not exist without technology; thus, it is impossible to call them pure beings. Therefore it is crucial to introduce transhumanism here since posthuman has an equivocal understanding in both theories as it is portrayed negatively in Transhumanism. The reason the term posthuman has a clash of ideas in Posthumanism and Transhumanism is that Transhumanism still privileges humans over other entities as it can be considered an extension of classical humanism. Transhumanism challenges human capacity via engineering to enhance human

limitations. As Callum T. F. McMillan enlightens us about “‘transhuman’ as a way of considering a future based on the idea that humans still have room to evolve, using science and technology as a catalyst” (2021, p.18). As a consequence of this radical change, ‘posthuman’ corresponds to new species, that encompasses an umbrella term for a developed race of humanity in trans and posthumanist theories. The death of a man in antihumanism coincides with the term posthuman since different qualified humans are born to exist as a result of both trends. Based on the exceptional position of humans, Transhumanism focuses on overcoming the limitations in the way of human enhancement as Lars Schmeink clearly expresses that Transhumanism “hinges on individual advancement through technological means and centres on the selfish utopia of extending the humanist subject into new technologically embodied realities” (2016, p.13). Although posthuman coincides with human beings with technologically intelligent machines, it has an uncertain purpose in different contexts when considering what Posthumanism and Transhumanism stand for. Unlikely, posthuman, for Rosi Braidotti, challenges the idea of man at the centre of humanist thinking. Since we elaborate on Posthumanism in previous parts and its fundamental presence, it is better to draw upon posthuman qualities in Transhumanism to differentiate the distinction between both. Whether Transhumanism is a part of Posthumanism or thoroughly a separate study from the latter is at a loose end, but it can be categorized as the process in the way of Posthumanism. However, unlike Posthumanism, Transhumanism privileges the human over other entities and hopes to add more to the traditional humanist mindset and enhance human capacity, arguably called “inheritor of the ‘cyborg’ strand of posthumanism” (Wolfe, 2010, p.xiii). Technological advances make people seek more updates and upgrades in enhancing human physical and intellectual capabilities, resisting suffering and diseases, and increasing a great amount of life span. Because the standards changed in the evolution of humans, this transhuman is no longer called classical human but rather in the process of transforming to posthuman. It can be deduced that “this sense of Posthumanism derives directly from ideals of human perfectibility, rationality, and agency inherited from Renaissance humanism and the Enlightenment” (Wolfe, 2010, p.xiii). Like their humanist forebears, transhumanists embrace human dignity, appreciating human rationality and aesthetic pleasure to be cultivated. However, it exceeds the constraints of the human body and the limitation of the mind through excessive developments in technological artefacts. This proponent of human

enhancement applies the advanced technological outfits to human nexus in hoping that technology will control their nature through NBIC, which stands for “Nanotechnology, Biotechnology, Information Technology, and Cognitive Science” (Braidotti, 2013, p.59). As Transhumanism aims for physical and intellectual perfection through technology, Nayar calls this status of humans as “the machination of humans and the humanization of machines” (2005, p.17). About this posthuman interface of human and machine interconnectedness, N. Katherine Hayles states that “the posthuman implies not only a coupling with intelligent machines but a coupling so intense and multifaceted that it is no longer possible to distinguish meaningfully between the biological organism and the informational circuits in which the organism is enmeshed” (1999, p.35). Therefore, the link between humans and machines of posthumans as in the case of Transhumanism privileges human centrality, unlike Posthumanism. No matter what, everything is fair for the sake of humans transcending their bodily constraints. Despite its stark contrast to Posthumanism’s egalitarian agenda, Transhumanism; “still emerges as the branch of posthumanism that insists on technological progress, with Nick Bostrom as the best-known academic figure, along with a number of more independent writers and activists such as Ray Kurzweil (2005), Max More and Natasha Vita-More (2013)” (Thamsen & Wamberg, 2020, p.21). However, evolution started with the flesh; it continues with technology, at which point “we will gain power over our fates. Our mortality will be in our own hands. We will fully understand human thinking and will vastly extend and expand its reach” (Kurzweil, 2005, p.25). Towards the end of this century, it seems we will improve our nonbiological intelligence trillions more than our biological minds.

Digital technology emancipates the human body from its limitations by combining human consciousness with software machines. This form of evolution, without flesh, creates a kind of challenge against humans because human dominance is dared by technological developments, just as ironically, our ability to reign over technology to have superiority over animal beings. Therefore, the balance between the power relations of humans and machines is broken. Because of this, people are inclined to medical technologies, which offer “a devil’s bargain” in many cases while it offers expanded mental capacity, letting us free from depression or anxiety but intervening with our creativity and spirit (Fukuyama, 2002, p.14). Thus the distinction between at which point our capacity or the effect of chemicals in our

brain drives creativity is vague. Take, for example, medical technology not only offers Prozac for depression or Ritalin for the uncontrollable behaviours of young individuals but a moral dilemma that leads to unfair class war since only wealthy parents can afford the wave of future technology promising increased intelligence of their kids in the social ends.

Advances have an affirmative impact on life expectancy over one hundred years through xenotransplantation, in which human organs are sewn into pigs' or cows' bodies. Some chronic illnesses such as Alzheimer's, stroke, or brain damage can be fixed easily although in some circumstances, advanced technology cannot sort them out. However, Human's tie to death has shifted because death is not an irresistible aspect of life but can be handled as a disease, such as measles or tuberculosis. The other possibility suggests whether human cloning is likely since the cloning of Dolly the sheep in 1997 (Fukuyama, 2002, p.72). Nonetheless, it is legislatively banned by National Bioethics Advisory Commission at the recommendation of President Bill Clinton. Besides these xenotransplantations, studies encapsulate eugenics in certain countries such as China or Japan, and even more crudely, Nazis Germany had some attempts to change the undesirable individuals. Less quantity and more quality, high IQ level, birth control over population or erasing some genetically potentially sick premature born babies and deciding on baby's features before pregnancy as its sex, intelligence, physical qualities, though, seems quite attractive, it has some unfair competition between people. Imposing some burdens on particularly unwealthy or religious individuals who do not approve of the genetic changes displaces and holds back their unaltered genetically children or abstain them from the whole society. More importantly, these technologies lead humans to an inhuman future in which the dream about the "technical conquest of man over his own nature" is finally eventuality (Sharon, 2014, p.22). Although prenatal genetic diagnosis compromises children with a healthy life without disorders and diseases, the technique is used for deciding unimportant issues including the embryo's sex, and selecting physical qualities of this designer baby such as hair or eye colour, height, ability or intelligence due to choosy parents or self-centred scientists.

Many transhumanists dream of human brains being replicated through computerized systems to become faster and more potent by scanning the texture of neural connections. Although there is a bias towards mind uploading, uploaded

humans, as David Roden emphasises “have the same experiences, beliefs and desires as biologically embodied ones, but they would be running on potentially immortal soul engines rather than messy and all-too-temporary associations of biological cells” (2015, p.18). Depending on the individual’s metaphysical states such as beliefs or mental capacity, we cannot know whether mind uploading is convenient, but if the functionalism is right away “a mental state like experiencing the taste of ice cream could be experienced by you, but also by a functional copy of you that replicated your neural organization to a sufficiently fine grain” (Roden, 2015 p.19). The fact that the brain is a recognizable computerized system, the Turing test brings forth that if a machine can function the same cognitive duty as the brain continuing a discussion just as a human being does and cannot be distinguished from individuals from outside, then it is exactly cannot be distinguished from inside either (Fukuyama, 2003, p.151). These machines or AIs bring a question of whether they can build their creative art, yet some computers surprisingly give unexpected results by their running algorithm. There is a question about this uniqueness that cannot be generalized fully to all machines. Whereas some robots can gain human sophistication, their mental ability is considered below human capacity. Machines can’t create nominative works by recognizing cultural norms but likely for idiographic differences “because they can act in the world as agents and create some kind of narrative, albeit truncated because a robot will not experience the process of personal growth as humans do throughout their life, from childhood to adulthood” (Bess & Pasulka, 2018 p.421). The computer performs the machines’ duties and replaces human faculties transforming them into machine-like figures in cognitive and physical relevance. Darwin’s natural selection, thereby reduced to a mechanical change. His survival of the fittest and evolution of species detracted to a tidier form. Therefore, the barrier between humans and inhuman started to collapse as to Darwin’s perspective about the main difference between animals and human is morality, religion, or conscience. As Andy Miah articulates, “the debate about whether humans are comprised mainly by genetic, inherited qualities, or whether humans are more socially determined – the nature versus nurture debate – begins to ensue” (2007, p.13). Computational enhancements should be accepted uncritically because our existence is at stake if they replace us as our evolutionary descendants. As N. Katherine Hayles states, “whether we decide to fight them or join them by

becoming computers ourselves, the days of the human race are numbered” (1999, p.243).

Further consideration of human enhancement is based on belief about the carbon-based continuation of human embodiment that refers to cloning, tissue engineering, genetic interfaces etc. By extension, Transhumanism offers that human nature can be sophisticated bodily and intellectually through technology to make us posthuman. Moreover, posthumans in the case of Transhumanism “will be persons of unprecedented physical, intellectual, and psychological ability, self-programming and self-defining, potentially immortal, unlimited individuals” overcoming all the constraints related to the human body and mind (Sharon, 2014, p.18). One way to continue this carbon-based materialism is through organ transplantation, such as xenotransplantation, raising human organs such as kidneys, hearts, or livers in animal bodies. There have been experiments about organ transplanting from pigs to nonhuman agents because of some bioethical concerns. Research about xenotransplantation is made for the sake of humanity once again to overcome the shortage of organ transplantation. Nevertheless, the fear of human-to-human transplantation comes to the fore. Experimentations look for bioethical explanations for xenotransplantation and entailing our species (Shildrick, 2018, pp.169-170). Experimentations are tried on animals because creating human organs in an artificial environment is extremely hard. Thus, animal experimentation for a donor organ is promising alternative research. These experimentations bring a further bioethical question about our moral relationship with nonhuman animals and our relation to partly human hybrid critters in the future. At this point, we need to remember that some groups defended these innovations and developments for the sake of human beings, so-called ‘bioliberalism.’ On the other hand, ‘bio-conservatives,’ a group of people disdainfully sceptic of this decision. Mainly because bio-conservatives merge “around the need for precautionary measures in assessing the long-term effects of biotechnologies; issues of discrimination arising from the unequal access to new biotechnologies that might turn financial disadvantages into biological ones” (Sharon, 2014, p.2). Particularly animals are living beings for scientific research. They are used, mistreated, manipulated, or genetically modified to provide us with drugs, cosmetic products, the pharmaceutical sector. Among our over-exploitations of living beings, animals are commodified as one of the largest products in the world. Millions of them are kept for experimentation of military services, medical purposes,

or security services. This condition generates an ethical reconciliation between humans and animals and is thwarted in pursuing a nonexploitative attitude to animals beyond the greed and profit-making view. Humanity needs to embrace a point moral and legal rights in favour of nonhuman animals because they share the same anxiety about the earth's fate, and they need to be considered part of humans as recalling Braidotti once again, "'we' are in this together" (2006, p.108). Therefore, considering animals responding to the environment, we should replace the 'can they think?' question with 'can they suffer?' Only this way we can change our sense towards nonhuman animals, and the question leads to another question "can they not be able?" (Derrida & Wills, 2011, p.396). "That means that human beings are not uniquely obligated to and gifted with responsibility; Animals as workers in labs, animals in all their worlds, are response-able in the same sense that people are" (Asberg & Braidotti, 2018, p.124). However, even if we consider them not suffering, they abstain from a range of rights since they are not human or do not have language. The question is not if they are morally the same as human beings; as Peter Singer maintains that the issue "is not saying that all lives are of equal worth or that all interests of humans and other animals are to be given equal weight, no matter what those interests may be" (2006, p.7). Unfortunately, thousands of animals die at research laboratories because of experimentation; though, most people and scientific experts believe that animals experimentations overbear this dead end since they are central function in producing vaccines or other drugs for the well-being of humanity (Bess & Pasulka, 2018, p.295). Animals are commodified for the sake of advanced capital activities as disposable matters considering traffic in animal trading around the world such as "the Mariatee butterfly, the Amazon turtle, the black tamarin (a tiny primate smaller than the palm of a hand), and the pink river dolphin are the most sought-after items" (Braidotti, 2011, p. 86) sold out of thousands of dollars estimates 15 billion dollars' worth to industry. Animals like mice, pigs, oncomouse and even cloning animals are used for scientific purposes, particularly in xenotransplantation. For instance, Dolly the sheep, first cloned animal of biogenetic engineering, ironically died a few months after birth suffering from rheumatism. The sheep agonizes over the last indignity of being embalmed and taxidermied to be exhibited in a science museum and can be considered a member of what Giorgio Agamben calls 'bare life' in which the organism is at the threshold of being an object and subject, who cannot decide on his or her behalf.

1. 5. Posthuman Intersectional Solutions

Being posthuman, we are no longer masters of nature; rather, we partake in the 'nature-culture continuum.' In her influential book *Cyborg Manifesto*, Donna Haraway introduces us to a cyborg figure as a part of social reality and a fictional creature. This new model of creature problematized the boundary between machines and humans coming into existence to "signal the emancipatory and utopian hopes connected with the transcendence of merely 'natural' human form at that moment and was expressed above all in the new science fiction subgenre of cyberpunk" (Heise, 2011, p. 455). The cyborg has nothing to do with gender, race-based, or naturalized world, which has no reference to the world's creation in a western version that does not imagine a wholly organic world. By extension, the figure of the cyborg is beyond all boundaries and distinctions imposed politically and socially alluding to the pre-modern and non-technological world. Dealing with socialist feminism and technology, Haraway's cyborg figure, short for cybernetic organisms, started to appear around 1960 as "the kind of augmented man that would be necessary for extra-terrestrial exploration or space flight" (Schneider, 2005, p.60). This new organism is the half-organic and half-machinic entity that blurs the line between an imagined machine and an organic being. As Rebecca Pohl notes follows:

Cyborgs are not just figures of science fiction, Haraway argues, but representations of social reality. The cyborg, a hybrid of the organism (human) and machine, reflects how developing technologies have pervaded the everyday lives of humans in an advanced industrial society like the United States: biotechnology, medical advances, information and communications technology, mechanization of industry, and arms manufacture were all a prominent part of US-American culture and society in the 1980s. (Pohl, 2018, p.10)

A cybernetic organism is a product of social reality and science-fiction of our times, particularly since the late twentieth century, called a mythic time. By this time, we are all considered cyborg mixture of material and imagined reality which reconstitutes the Western reality depending on the racist male and capitalist form of society. Unlike other mythical words for deliverance as in the case of religion and politics, the cyborg does not promise salvation through "a restoration of the garden," "the fabrication of a heterosexual mate," a dream of a "community on the model of the organic family," noticing "the Garden of Eden" of dreaming returning to the dust, remembering the "cosmos" regardless of "holism" however; it is "illegitimate offspring of militarism and patriarchal capitalism, not to mention state socialism" (Haraway, 2016, p.9). Neither the machine nor the organism is other to another one.

They are both different communication mechanisms joined in the same consortium that alters both. Cyborg is a liminal creature; both human and machine cannot be pinned down by anyone and does not present all kinds of relationships with a human because both have different historical backgrounds. Cyborg appears when boundaries between species are problematic such as between animal and human, between human and machine, and between corporeal and incorporeal realms, to break the duality that humanist thinking created. Neither human nor a machine, cyborg takes place in the history of military forces and studies in psychopharmacological research, psychiatry or information-based theories etc. In Haraway's world, a cyborg dreams a world without gender, it is not Christian or born as a woman, and it does not present salvation by a heterosexual almighty father. It distracts all categorical boundaries, including colonialism, capitalism, and patriarchy, and against the sufferage all these forms of dominant powers enabled. Although it appeared politically feminist initially, it is classified as a precursor of posthuman studies. She diverts the attention from cyborg to animal as the significant model of posthumanism after she publicizes books called *Companion Species* (2003) and *When Species Meet* (2008). Haraway dwells on the relationship between humans and animals are damaged around the late twentieth century in the USA. In her own words: "[t]he last beachheads of uniqueness have been polluted if not turned into amusement parks - language, tool use, social behaviour, mental events, nothing convincingly settles the separation of human and animal" (Haraway, 1991, pp. 151-52).

One of the contributors to the questioning of the relationship between humans and animals to understand the link between living beings, Jacques Derrida, discusses the similarity between us as human beings and other species with his experience with his cat staring at him when he was nude. In his famous text, *The Animal That Therefore I Am*, he reflects on his discomfort with the gaze of a cat without constant steer and utters dearly as "It is as if I were ashamed, therefore, naked in front of this cat, but also ashamed for being ashamed" (Derrida, p.372). The main message here is that a cat is a creature that makes him aware of his nudity, a kind of response that even embarrasses him, which is the striking point for philosophy. The sense of shame is a masculine or a human attribute but is a testament to the connectedness between humans and animals. His curiosity about the cat's response rather than reacting about what the cat care makes him question about human exceptionalism. Perhaps, this reminds him not to be human in an epiphanic

moment he was in the context of the “embodiment of western logos” (Schneider, 2005, p.73). Acknowledging that animals are no less than human agents, both species are so related that one may not have made it without others throughout their shared history. The question arises at the moment whether animals have moral failing even without language, especially considering dogs. However, Haraway exemplifies the natural goodness with the dogs and mentally disabled individuals; lacking language may bring intentional goodness. Although this is nothing beyond hypothesis, it is related to reasoning leading to intentionality. Haraway claims that language does not biologically have to do with intentionality; as she insists on this claim in a long conversation with Joseph W. Schneider as follows:

Aristotle knew that. Not all meaning-making apparatuses are linguistic. We end up describing them overwhelmingly through linguistic means or gauging them through linguistic means, but also visual means and tactile means. We engage in a lot of ways, and we tend to tie language to most of them, but not all the time. So even at the level of intentionality, it is not all linguistic. (Schneider, 2005 p.135)

In light of this quotation, the human-animal bond is founded on the unrealities which have no concern about the relationality between both. Therefore, companion species is an affirmative alternative to resist this dialectical materialism, the foundations of classical humanism. Their relational impact on human beings, for instance, their highly developed olfactory capacity, inspired humans to develop diagnostic tools in recent technological research. Haraway tries to imply the relationality of all earthlings evolutionarily and ecologically that they cannot be separated from each other. As Richard Kerridge pointed out about the inseparability of all bodies from each other, whether it is human or nonhuman or “whether it is a microscopic or a geological body, all bodies are inscribed with the flows and mutual transformations of material and discursive elements” (‘Foreword’ 2017, p.6) without this collaboration we all might die. In this regard, Haraway highlights the importance of domestication as a species affair considering the dogs as protectors for humanity as Jeffrey Jerome Cohen indicates that “canines are companion species and messmates, animals without which we could not have become ourselves” (2017, p.32). The fact that humans benefit from animals in very different fields makes them companion species, as they are not inferior to humans and do not deserve to be plucked down. Once again, the idea that Braidotti comes up with comes to the fore “‘we-are-(all)-in-this-together-but-we-are-not-one-and-the-same’ kind of subject” (2019, p. 59). The whole relationship of these species can be compared to Deleuzian and Guattarian

rhizome, which “connects any point to any other point, and its traits are not necessarily linked to traits of the same nature” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p.21). That is, they reduce all becomings, including human/animal, to the “molecular” level to comprise intersectional relationality of species at the size of the microorganism (1987, p.272). Either digital or corporeal, bodies are increasingly immersed within each other by emitting others’ particles or molecules in one way or another, therefore companion species best exemplify this relational rhizomatic status quo within “connection to other species and elements of the world” (Pisters, 2014, p.68).

The relation between nature and culture ends the distinction of life as *bios* but refers to the move beyond human centrality interdependence on nonhuman species and inorganic dimensions. The main idea that Haraway defends is proposing a new relationship between nature and culture through a deep interconnection among all species. Donna Haraway moves the posthuman concept forward by offering a new kinship system that situates the ‘companion species’ as relatives. The shift from cyborg to companion species is because Haraway thinks species are in question and it is better to have an alliance with Posthumanism. In an interview, Haraway puts into words: “posthuman is way too restrictive. So I go to companion species, although it has been over-coded as meaning dogs and cats. I set myself up by writing about dogs first” (Gane, 2006, p.140). She assumes a cyborg is a little member of much-extended companion species. Companion species and cyborgs strikingly assemble the organic, inorganic, human, inhuman, self and society, nature and culture, history, and myth. Companion species offer a space for all kinds, including cyborgs, organic and inorganic critters, oncomouse, databases etc. ‘we are in this together’ both as living and dying; in other words, what influences human awaits other species or vice versa. In her new agenda, therefore, Haraway focuses on pets, particularly dogs, rather than farm or lab animals because most of the second group’s rights are defended over debates. She exemplifies the relations between man and dog; the dogs should be reviewed in terms of the environment they grow in because they are inseparable from reality in history, and research proves this study. Therefore, she explains that social and human sciences go hand in hand with natural sciences (Ağın, 2020, p. 70). This invites us to Rosi Braidotti’s concept of Posthumanism in terms of *zoe* and *bios*.

Regarding Braidotti’s affirmative potentialities about *zoe-bios*, Giorgio Agamben, on the other hand, offers a negative contestation in return. Agamben starts

his text *Homo Sacer* with variations of 'life' in Ancient Greek. Acknowledging two terms for life, one is *zoe*, used for the common life of all living, and another is *bios*, which covers the certain form of living of individual or group of people, Agamben stands against the centrality of anthropos and reigning the natures' laws for his interests (Agamben, 1995, p.3). He proposes the term 'bare life' to depict the human being with his wasted life under the sovereign power linking it to politics. Unlike Braidotti's egalitarian concept of *zoe* defined as generative power, Agamben attaches *zoe* to the sheer biological conception of life which is given priority over the way it lived. This form of 'bare life' is exemplified through the figure of *homo sacer*, the life of a sacred man "who may be killed and yet not sacrificed, and whose essential function in modern politics we intend to assert" (Agamben, 2013, p.140). While Rosi Braidotti utilizes the concept of *zoe* to equate all living beings to the same degree, Agamben's concept refers to those discarded from sovereign power's privileged life, including sexualized, racialized, naturalized others and those who are excluded because of their belief systems. This view is related to the anthropocentric paradigm of raising all rights favoring Eurocentric masculinism. The position of *homo sacer* is best exemplified by Nazi concentration camps, a figure who is not at the threshold of being human. However, Agamben "resurrects" this figure "as the one who embodies what it means to be human most profoundly" (Lechte & Newman, 2012, p. 525), which indicates that being at the threshold of death does not discard someone's humanity. Because this figure's humanity is distracted, as in the case of the privileged Westerner, he is truly human. At this point, bare life has to be politicized, to be more precise, transformed into the 'good life' that is in Western politics; it is already excluded and founded the 'city of men' who decides what is appropriate for themselves unlike other living beings. The bond between politics and bare life calls for man, a linguistic being that disregards all nonhuman beings. Though the voice is the indicator of pain and happiness applied to all living beings, language as a manifestation of right or wrong belongs to humankind. The disfranchisement drives bare life dweller to interrogate the 'raison d'être' of language corresponds to his form of life. In this politicization of bare life, man's way of dwelling is postulated so that Western metaphysics does nothing rather than dedicate itself to modernist tradition in which "the fundamental categorial pair of Western politics is not that of friend/enemy but that of bare life/political existence, *zoē/bios*, exclusion/inclusion" (Agamben, 1995, p.6). Through this lens, the same politics that its language separates

and objects to man's bare life simultaneously "maintains himself in relation to that bare life in an inclusive exclusion" (6).

The term 'threshold' is repeated in Agamben's texts many times to stand for a state of distinction that can be neither extinguished nor sustained, concluding that bare life is integral to the so-called 'good life' "in that the good life is both what bare life is not and what bare life becomes" (Norris, 2000, p.41). As though politics is a transforming force that life turns into good life that is already made political and doomed to be bare life. Therefore, this state of threshold, as in the case of refugees and people in concentration camps who lack human rights or are sentenced to death though biologically alive, is between death and life, which is nothing rather than bare life. Those whom Agamben called *homo sacer* are detained from political status and devoid of the exceptional authority of humankind and are left to endless misery. On the other hand, the sovereign sphere is always linked to sacred life, which is neither completely political nor biological. To Agamben, as Andrew Norris asserts:

Sacred life is a hybrid of political and biological life: *zoe* politicized but not included in the political community, or rather, included through its exclusion. Hence the real subject of sovereign power is neither the civic life of the citizen nor its opposite, namely, the pre-political, natural life. Instead, the sacred life is neither fully included nor totally excluded, neither inside nor outside politics, but simply suspended, tragically trapped in the realm of indistinction between...the natural and the social, the private and the public. (2005, p.2005)

For Agamben, human is not biologically separated from animals to continue their life rather, he has a poetic life composing new forms of life. As Agamben criticizes the modern foundation of life as carrying on as it used to be, he pays attention to "a supposedly lost higher sense of life as that which creates from itself to be more than itself: divine, poetic life—the life of man" (Colebrook, 2008, p.110). In this regard, Agamben can be read as long as modernity is biopolitical, humankind can no longer seal its fate of humanity as it is already decided by those who determine the political apparatus that biopolitics cost life's distinction between humanity and inhumanity. Considering the position of *homo sacer*, one is not fully devoid of humanity or attains human rights altogether. Agamben's theory of biopolitics is anthropocentric in a certain respect because it discriminates and harasses humanity, while Braidotti's nomadic theory overreaches the boundaries of the Western tradition of humanity. Braidotti puts the following explanation: "'Bare life' is that in you which sovereign power can kill: it is the body as disposable matter in the hands of the despotic force of power (*potestas*)," (2006, p.143) unlike the conception of nomad and cyborg

which are embodied and embedded beings in search of interconnection not only in the nonethnic or nongender-centric world but also a post-anthropocentric paradigm. When the two thinkers' theories are compared, Agamben's concept of bare life bears witness to dystopic-melancholia contrary to Braidotti's affirmative politics of *zoe*, which is politically feminized and deprived of inequality. Braidotti's conception is not realistic but pragmatic, while Agamben draws a pessimistic picture within distinctive nonrelational agenda. Regarding this, Zekiye Antakyalıoğlu resonates here: "Agamben's philosophy of silence is more cautious and realistic, despite its emphasis on impotentiality, than Braidotti's hyperactive, ambitious and clamorous ethics" (2022, p.94). Nevertheless, biopolitical conditions decide who will possess the human rights in which *zoe* is under the control of the nation-state, therefore *homo sacer* is subjected to lawless sovereign severity, that is why man needs to find a way out that is *zoe* in Posthumanism for Rosi Braidotti who offers a silver lining in a romantic world for human and nonhuman entities as an alternative resolution. We need to search for solutions to the *bios/zoe* discrepancy from different angles by comparing either affirmative or negative keys to find out what is the best.

Posthuman subject looks for a more egalitarian atmosphere through entailing no longer *bios* but *zoe* based insight. While *bios* are anthropocentric, *zoe* is post-anthropocentric not even including anthropomorphic conjuncture. Furthermore, *zoe* embarks upon a technologically and geologically mediated egalitarian world through posthuman convergence, embracing the idea that knowledge production is not merely human-made but rather getting awareness that all living matters are involved via technological networks. By this explanation, posthuman convergence takes the exclusion of nonhuman entities for granted to relocate their positions. Posthuman subjects deviated from their old sexualized, racialized, and naturalized stereotypical definitions and situated in new forms such as becoming animals, becoming women, becoming cyborgs, and becoming *zoe*. Rosi Braidotti pays a huge amount of attention to *zoe* (nonhuman) rather than *bios* (human). In *Posthuman Knowledge*, she refers to *bios* as "the life of humans organized in society, while *zoe* refers to the life of all living beings. *Bios* is regulated by sovereign powers and rules, whereas *zoe* is unprotected and vulnerable" (2019, p.20). She attributes a generative power to *zoe* as a resistance against the destructive side of posthuman convergence. Politically speaking, life management in the posthuman world has a fundamental image in the mids of the advanced capitalist system. This notion perpetuates the

practices which exceed human borders both socially and scientifically. In *Transpositions; On Nomadic Ethics*, Braidotti states that “contemporary genetics and bio-technologies are central to this shift towards posthuman ideas of ‘Life’ or ‘Zoe,’ the non-human” (2006, p. 37). The interdependence of all species brings a new perception to other scales highlighting *geo*, *zoe*, *techno*, and *bios* mediated relying on their material relations. Due to these multiple relations of subjectivity, knowledge is freed from virtual man and his culturally constructed other beings. Braidotti puts it as:

Life is half-animal, non-human (*zoe*) and half-political and discursive (*bios*). *Zoe* is the poor half of a couple that foregrounds *bios* as the intelligent half; the relationship between them constitutes one of those qualitative distinctions on which Western culture built its discursive empire. Traditionally, the self-reflexive control over life is reserved for humans, whereas the mere unfolding of biological sequences is for the non-humans. *Zoe* stands for the mindless vitality of Life carrying on independently of and regardless of rational control. This is the dubious privilege attributed to the non-humans and to all the ‘others’ of Man, whereas *bios* refer to the specific social nexus of humans. (2006, p.37)

From this perspective, human beings carry the issue of mind and body distinction to the stage where the mind always has supremacy. Despite all exclusionary actions, *Zoe* embraces the exclusionary subjects such as racialized, genderized and naturalized beings, and stands by the relationality to nonhuman and dehumanized others. It means not only standing against the distinction between the human agents but also embracing other earthly beings such as insects, plants, water, bacteria, lands, technological entities, cells, software programs, codes, plastic etc. Braidotti takes *zoe* as the affirmative force of life, suggesting a new transformed interaction between human and animal relationships as it is allegedly called *bios* for our concern. The interrelation is required as it is evident from the ecological conspiracies and theories along with a deep-seated transformation of society. Therefore, the emergence of *zoe* is necessary as a political agent in the developed capitalist world. In contrast, it has been excluded from the polity since Ancient Greek because *zoe*, nonhuman life, was discarded from the political and discursive polity.

Acknowledging the potential that *zoe* has, it deconstructs the unitary notion of consciousness hegemony of technology and disrupts classical humanism and liberal individualism that give boundless power to humankind. Classical humanism and anthropocentric vitalism are needed to be scrutinized for bearing challenges of difficulties in the present time. By extension, the classical distinction of others is not working anymore for the division between species and human animals. A generative

power, *zoe* emerges in its own path as a “flux of transversal connections to others” (Braidotti, 2006, p. 270). Having a transposition because of advanced technological developments disrupting old values and the relational bond they imposed reminds us that ‘we are in this together.’ Rhizomatic relations of diverse concepts of transdisciplinary studies, *zoe*-based disciplinaries, reveal cultural and social complexities in humanities for critical formula. That is, *zoe*-based disciplinary is a multidisciplinary resolution that sorts out the conflict between other disciplinary studies.

Depending on *bios* and *zoe*, egalitarianism can have tough results on the vision of the human subject. This potency of *bios* and *zoe* egalitarianism means sweeping away human consciousness through technological apparatuses. Consciousness no longer coincides with either subjectivity of humans or technology-based alone in the course of historical incidences. Advanced capitalism takes advantage of displacing Anthropocentrism through technoscientific methodologies such as biotechnology, nanotechnology, and information technology, which puts the classical humanist idea under pressure. The biotechnology of the capitalist system degrades life into a surplus value. Research on humans, animals, plants, and seeds facilitates the economical and scientific ways to work through the commodification of all those entities. To cope with this turmoil that the system causes, the equity of species is a better response to this; as Richard Grusin states, we are “embodied and embedded entities, we are all part of something we used to call ‘nature,’ despite transcendental claims made for human consciousness” (2016, p.32) entrenched with the cross-species agreement. “*Zoe*-based egalitarianism...is the essence of the Posthuman turn; it is a materialist, secular, grounded, and unsentimental response to the opportunistic transspecies commodification of life that is the logic of advanced capitalism” (Grusin, 2016, p.32). This intensive commodification of life “destroys the condition of sustainable interconnection that life both requires and is” (Butler, 2014, p.26). There is no easy response to the post-anthropocentric fight between *zoe* and *bios*; the answer to this ecological and social problem should be integrating the relational and sustainable life to compromise another sense of life. The relationality between humans and animals is not the only factor that constitutes the interconnected bond between *bios* and *zoe*. Additionally, philosophy, art, literature, and music can touch upon the new territories where new relations between human and inhuman agents developed.

All of the aforementioned biotechnological developments, such as vitro-fertilization, organ transplantations, animal cloning, and artificial ventilators, shifted our perspective on the world. These developments changed the relations between humans and humans or humans and animals. Bioethical concern gets involved to this point in the twenty-first century. Using technological advances for good or abusing it calls the attention of not only the scientific or academic communities but also it runs into literate persons through news, TV shows, social media networks or online sessions where the ethical dimensions of the technoscientific research and implementations are discussed. All of these circumstances bore the question of whether these developments result in egalitarian habitat for all living entities, prepare grounds for a dystopian world of exploitation, inequality, and discrimination, or bring the demise of whole living beings. This very condition of dystopic posthuman condition appears in Kazuo Ishiguro's two celebrated dystopian fiction, *Never Let Me Go* (2005) and *Klara and The Sun* (2021), two significant novels of this study will be elaborated in the subsequent pages. The writer pays our attention to the issue of being a posthuman human in an anthropocentric society trying to reach the post-anthropocentric atmosphere by alarming us about the danger of biotechnological developments. The risk is because two opposite theories offer completely different two alternatives. While anthropocentric claim defends the freedom of enhancements for the sake of humanity, post-anthropocentric insight of posthumanism raises a rebellion against human centrality and embraces all nonhuman entities; a marginalized group of people, nonhuman animals, and cyborg characters that all have a relational bond with each other.

CHAPTER 2

NOW AND THEN DYSTOPIA

2.1. Imperfect Future of Dystopia

Dystopian fiction has been affected by the historical or contemporary ills of humanity. From the beginning of the twentieth century to present times, the catastrophes that world goes through became a resource for dystopian fiction. The shock effect of two world wars, the decomposition of two devastating atomic bombs on Japan, the destructive ideologies such as fascism, communism, and nazism, the destruction of the twin towers, the cold war, the falling of the Berlin Wall etc. that resulted merely by humanity's selfish choices entails the world to the dystopic scenarios in fiction. The impact of these disasters preoccupies pre and post-traumatic stress disorders, which is reflected in the increasing great number of dystopian worlds in fiction. These circumstances are interestingly related to the terms utopia and dystopia¹ simultaneously. The definition of both concepts is controversial, which pulls the attention of the philosophers and thinkers to mediate on the framework of the terms making their proclamation contribute to the existing values. Both terms have been exposed to alteration since they emerged, paralleling the social, political, technological, and environmental concerns over many years. Each century has added new points to the understanding of both concepts. Gregory Claeys identifies utopia as "the depiction of any kind of idealised society regarded as superior to the present by its author" comparing to the inverted opposite term dystopia, which "implies its negation, or any kind of society regarded as inferior by its author" (2013, p.1). While

¹ Although etymologically both terms, utopia and dystopia, constitute the same syllable when looking up dystopia in the dictionary, someone will find out that utopia is for the same purpose.

in utopian fiction, authors search for social justice for the whole society, as in Plato's *Republic* and Thomas More's *Utopia*, writers of dystopian fiction transverse the justice of society into injustice against people through top executives maintaining deceptive political decisions in both the purpose is social criticism of the upcoming years. Depending on the present conditions, if the writer depicts a better future, it is a utopia; however, if he relies his fiction on a worse future, then it is classified as a dystopia. To better understand dystopia, which is the focal point of this thesis, we need to elaborate on the salient properties of dystopia as a genre by the dystopic figurations in society. Keeping in mind that "each dystopian society contains within it seeds of a utopian dream," the most known two pineapples of this genre, Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* and George Orwell's *1984* in which two main ideas appear; totalitarianism and technological advancements exposing the public to the dictatorship, come to the fore (Gottlieb, 2001, p.8). Both novels attune to the posthuman condition in their own right considering their biotechnological enhancements and genetically modified individuals.

So far, the most known properties of dystopia are totalitarianism and despotism. George Orwell wrote *1984* out of totalitarian outcomes of brutality which is pitiless and controls every detail in the life of the comrades, even their sexual desire. Orwell resonates with the horrors totalitarian government causes under the commandment of Stalin by reminding Hitler. In the very dialogue with reality, Orwell coins new phrases into a language such as "Thought Police," "Doublethink," and "Big Brother Is Watching You" are among the catchy words (Booker, 1994, p.69). Known that the year 1984 has passed not as Orwell depicted a terrible future; he pictures a more sorrowful future compared to Stalinist Russia in which he predicates the mechanical technologization assisted the political pressure suffocating free thought. The technological tools are in the service of the government to watch the citizen's attitudes 7/24. In Oceania, one of the three superpowers in the novel, citizens are under surveillance through a telescreen in which Big Brother as an authority controls every "individual's private self, family feelings, sexuality, thoughts, and emotions" (Gottlieb, 2001, p. 11). The most private and intimate moments, thus, have been mysteriously controlled by the state of Oceania. The state provides a basis for controlling the public through ignorance and poverty while creating an ongoing war between the rest of the superpowers. Considering states'

penetration into all fields of life of their citizen, it will be essential to say that the states create a bare life ambience in which the citizens represent *homo sacer*.

Casting aside George Orwell's *1984* as a warning, although he denies it as a prophecy, *Brave New World* is a warning against the terrifying consequences of technological advancements. Just as in *1984*, the controller in *Brave New World* provides stability through biotechnological developments which maintain the belief for the benefit of humanity. The controller in the novel represents the role of a grand inquisitor who "carries the burden of freedom in a society of happy slaves conditioned" (Moylan, 2021, p. 68) to be fond of their servitude for their country. The executives immunize the system against change and any chance for an uprising to prevent unpredictable societal complications. The government provides control through satiation instead of pressure. Huxley creates a society in *Brave New World* where even the lives of human beings are commodified and sexuality transforms into exchange value that people maintain their life pragmatically. Scientific progress replaces human labour and offers them whatever the system is designed for. This highly technologically advanced society has its machinery system; as M. Keith Booker puts it, "in this highly stratified and class-oriented society human infants are literally manufactured on assembly lines, designed according to the strict specifications of the class to which they will belong" (1994, P.49). Citizens in *Brave New World* do not have personal identities. However, the system announces everywhere the individualism they are granted for. What Huxley suggests is, in this fiction, humanity uses the expenses of technology and science by enslaving both nature and human beings. He questions the fundamental principles of utopia by creating a dystopic vision; as Gregory Claeys asserts, "clearly just as one person's freedom fighter is another's terrorist, one person's utopia is another's dystopia. Dystopia, in other words, rather than being the negation of utopia, paradoxically may be its essence" (2013, p.1) reversing the essence of both terms. Fear carries on even though pain, murder, and cruelty have been erased or scientifically justified. All bad emotions, such as depression and anxiety, have been treated by psychological medicine 'soma' devoid of side effects except addiction. *Brave New World* is not a classical dystopia that challenges totalitarian societies; instead attacks manipulating technology and modernity to achieve totalitarian efficiency. As in Orwell's fiction, Huxley made a false prediction, but very likely, the oppression of citizens creates

despotic management. There are similarities and differences in Huxley and Orwell's visualizing horrific future, as Gregory Claeys differentiates them:

Huxley's is clean, efficient, complacent, defined by pleasure, Orwell's clumsy, crude, brutal and focused on pain. Huxley penetrated much further into the behavioural psychology of consumer society. Yet Orwell captured the true horrors of the twentieth century far more accurately, and the manipulative nature of popular, mass culture is an essential ingredient in his description of it. (2010, p. 125)

Two works intend to foreshadow some dark prophecies from the future, and both texts highlight the destructive power of language, empowering both mind and material reality. The fear that modern industrialization brings evil through advanced technology and waxing totalitarian regimes is common in modern or traditional dystopias. The dystopian world of *1984* and *Brave New World* shows the fact that humanism gets off track and reinforces the ideas about *bios* and *zoe*. At this point, *bios* get into power deciding over *zoe*'s destiny². However, classical dystopia inclined into new conditions in the contemporary period considering the concepts; of totalitarian societies and banning individualities which track and reinforces the ideas about *bios* and *zoe*.

2.2. Contemporary Dystopia and Kazuo Ishiguro

Catastrophes that humanity causes and the political foundations carried out around the world in the Anthropocene era, take, for example, the coronavirus, ebola, and SARS virus that are highly contagious and fatal, the massive earthquakes in Kahramanmaraş in 2023, which caused thousands of people's death, and foreseeing the credible next natural events and political decisions on the wrong side of the history provides rich resources for literature and art. The effects of these events cause psychological problems that feed contemporary dystopian fiction. Contemporary dystopias differ from modern dystopias regarding their impulse for the plot ending and the society the current circumstances represent to illustrate that it could not be worse than present, unlike earlier dystopian fiction. Unlike the future-oriented previous traditional dystopias, the process-oriented contemporary dystopia stimulates its readers about the present they live in and alert them to take action to change it for the better. To achieve the prosperity of society, contemporary dystopian fiction raises awareness in its reader to see their ability to change a life by signalling the change for new creations of life. Regarding the differences between twentieth-century dystopia and contemporary dystopia, contemporary dystopia is critical of

anthropocentric modes of discourse, unlike the other one. Dystopia matters since it makes us question the current condition. Lucy Sargisson extrapolates the importance of dystopias as “they help us to imagine and envisage how the present can change into something very nasty. Contemporary dystopian fictions tell us what is wrong with the now. They imagine how things could (easily) become much worse” (2013, p.40). In contemporary dystopia, the world is surrounded by capitalist ideals in which nature and nonhuman entities are exploited and commodified. In this world, where “there are no dominant pictures of a Big Brother, there are the now familiar slogans: there is no alternative, history is over” (Moylan, 2013, p.42). Now that technology and science are at the centre of everything, a new concept of dystopia warns against not always being the better since progress transforms into danger that “what benefits the few may harm the many. Machines may devour us” (Claeys, 2017, p.501). The potential conditions in contemporary dystopias are warnings against the dangers that the present humanity can cause in the upcoming years. It deviated from the Morean tradition of dystopia into the pessimistic mood of new humanity depending on different forms of the apocalypse. These include variations of social or political orders, “from the domination of humanity by machines, monsters, or alien species; from the imposition of norms derived from specific scientific and technological developments, such as eugenics or robotics; or from environmental catastrophe” (Claeys, 2013, p.2). Writers of contemporary dystopias try to annihilate the anthropocentric paradigm by drawing new classification that consists of posthuman critical perspectives as is exemplified in contemporary writers such as Kazuo Ishiguro, Ian McEwan, Jeanette Winterson, Margaret Atwood, and Philip K. Dick. They were interrogating the citizenship and privileged individuality in their works. Though all of the dystopian writers have a significant role in dystopian fiction, the primary concern of this study is Kazuo Ishiguro and his vision in the contemporary dystopia that deals with human and inhuman relations as it is represented in real-life conditions.

Kazuo Ishiguro is one of the most celebrated authors of our time. He was born in Japan in 1954, and he moved to England at the age of five. He won many awards worldwide including the Nobel Prize for literature with his novel, *The Remains of the Day*. Ishiguro is obsessed with memory, forgetting and remembering

² Zoe represents the citizens in both novels, although bios reflect the state's power.

as he utters in one of his interviews that he wishes to “write a story about how a nation or a community faced these same questions. Does a nation remember and forget in much the same way as an individual does? Or are there important differences?” (217, p.20). His first two novels, *A Pale View of Hills* (1982) and *An Artist of the Floating World* (1986) are about the recent past of Japanese individuals. His other two novels, *The Remains of the Day* (1989) and *When We Were Orphans* (2000), examine the feelings that can distort the past of English characters’ lives. However, this study will deal with his two dystopian fictions, *Never Let Me Go* (2005) and *Klara and the Sun* (2021), along with his dystopic vision. Ishiguro’s fiction shares the same qualities of contemporary dystopia in which the writer urges the reader to question not far but near future or present conditions and reveals the truths about reality. The author is fascinated by the effects of technology on humanity, such as genetic enhancements and artificial intelligence, which create new opportunities for humanity. The writer of these two dystopian novels questions provocatively the meaning of what it is to be a human being in both novels and offers subtle hints for his reader to figure out answers. He asks what makes us human through clone individuals in *Never Let Me Go* and artificial intelligence in *Klara and the Sun*. Through the gaze of a clone and an AI narrator, he invites us to join the examination of the ethical side of using these entities for the sake of the immortality of posthuman humanity. He offers subtle clues to help readers find out the answers.

In his suggestive dystopian novel, *Never Let Me Go*, Ishiguro does not imagine a post-apocalyptic future as in traditional dystopian fiction; instead, he creates an alternative history in the 1990s of England where biogenetic advances revolutionized health conditions. All sicknesses are recovered by human clones’ organ donations in this world. Author of the novel alerts us about the possible dangers of scientific developments through the ethical concern of what a human is. In the novel, the clone bodies are harvested for organ donation to save ordinary people’s lives, if it is how we name it. Because as Liani Lochner recognizes, “in current scientific discourse, cloning is sometimes considered an ‘enhancement technology.’ ‘Genetic enhancement’ techniques could be used to produce individuals who are resistant to certain types of viruses or to manipulate height and intelligence” (2011, p.230). The novel deals with the ethics of how being human, as in reality, people often do, by ignoring it or offering better conditions to clear their conscience, as in the case of boarding school, provides every opportunity for clone lives while

raising them. Even though the qualifications of humans in the school permeate for clones, the dehumanization process still lasts. Discovering the dramatic outcomes of the dehumanizing process, Ishiguro suggests an experience for clones in their self-discovery journey to perceive their individuality in *Never Let Me Go*. Therefore, it will not be wrong to condemn Ishiguro for expending science fiction in dehumanized clones to question justice and human or nonhuman rights in the contemporary age. The commodification of clone lives, treating them as cattle in organ farms, and devaluing their personhood demonstrate the immunity to the sanctity of life. In the end, they are used as non-human others. Rebecca Walkowitz argues *Never Let Me Go* as the critique of Anthropocentrism, “the idea that it is ethical or acceptable to sacrifice nonhuman animals to the needs and desires of human life. At many points in the text, we are asked to notice that an unquestioned hierarchy in which humans are distinguished from animals makes the donation system possible” (2015, p.103). If it were modern traditional dystopian fiction, the characters would somewhat object to or rebel against the system, but instead, the clone individuals submit their fate without questioning or resisting the donation programme as though they do not have free will to react. The clone individuals are proper models for *homo sacer* since they are situated at the threshold of being human and at the same time nonhuman.

Besides the donation journey, Ishiguro prefers using euphemistic language (such as complete instead of die) to distort reality and maintain control of the system. “The clones’ passive acceptance shows that Ishiguro’s dystopian vision is more subtle and complex than that of most similar texts. It also again draws attention to the ambivalence of Hailsham and its complicity in the system” (Fricke & Maximilians, 2015, p.34). Although the education that clones have in school is qualified, it does not help them to question their state in society. The complexity of Ishiguro’s dystopia comes from the freedom of love and art rather than the process of genetic details; even in the novel, clones are encouraged to create art as they keep the clones quiet and in peace. Since they are considered dangerous in a twentieth-century dystopia as they awake the impulses and consciousness, they are usually forbidden by system-driven politics. In this respect, clone individuals surrender to the world whatever it offers them. The only thing that differentiates them from artificial intelligence and robots is that they are made of human cells. The controlled emotions and thoughts they have and the arranged life for them until their organs are transplanted and completed are significant details to turn them into posthuman lives.

This intersection of being human and clone alludes to the marginalised group as racialized, sexualized, naturalized others, and nonhuman beings. The representation of their marginalization invigorates posthuman ethics by labelling the clones as nonhuman others. They can be called posthuman in terms of artificial creation without sexual reproduction.

Klara and the Sun, on the other hand, is Ishiguro's latest fiction and first novel after winning the Nobel prize in 2017. The book oscillates between dystopia and utopia, humanism and Posthumanism, and science fiction and social norms. Setting somewhere in America, Ishiguro asks about what it means to be human or what love is and what it means to have self through the AI narrator in *Klara and the Sun*. The novel deals with genetic engineering in which high classes of people lift their children's genetic features such as intelligence and high cognitive capacity whereas low-income families cannot afford to lift their children, creating a huge social division in society. Ishiguro speculates as "new genetic technologies -- such as the gene-editing technique CRISPR -- and advances in Artificial Intelligence and robotics will bring us amazing, life-saving benefits, but may also create savage meritocracies that resemble apartheid, and massive unemployment, including to those in the current professional elites" (2017, p.11). Eventually, some problems can break out; some children are born with debilitating disorders like Josie. Since her daughter may die someday due to her condition, Josie's mother buys an AI to accompany and replace her by imitating all her behaviours. In so doing, Ishiguro asks us about the possibility of whether a human can be imitated by artificial intelligence, or can they replace us in every sphere of life, from working to our emotional depths. Alternatively, can an AI imitate love is the main question we need to ask ourselves throughout the novel. After they are done with AI, they throw it into the junkyard. The state of AIs is reduced to disposable matters in the novel. The position of AI is less than humans as it is reproduced and commodified. The ethics of its disposal fate is not questioned in the novel though the writer puts a question mark in the reader's mind.

Nobel laureate writer Kazuo Ishiguro draws attention to the biotechnological developments such as gene editing and artificial intelligence, clone lives and commodification of nonhuman others in his aforementioned novels *Klara and The Sun* and *Never Let Me Go* revolting against the anthropocentric notion raising the bioethical question. In this regard, this dissertation will attempt to trace

the posthuman condition by tracking the bio-enhancement with the anthropocentric foundation and bioethics through the posthuman character that Ishiguro reveals as cyborgian and humanoid in his two novels appeared between trans and posthuman epistemology.

CHAPTER 3

KAZUO ISHIGURO'S *NEVER LET ME GO*

3.1. Introduction to *Never Let Me Go*

*We are all humans, but some of us are just more mortal
than others.*
(Braidotti, 'The Posthuman', p.15)

*The total humanization of the animal coincides with a total
animalization of man.*
(Agamben, 'The Open', 2002, p.77)

Kazuo Ishiguro's speculative novel, *Never Let Me Go*, composes the imaginative alternative history of England in the late 1990s in which it discovers the life of a bunch of clone students. The novel is set in the past to tempt us to discover the contemporary realities of the growing inequalities. In the organized programme for exploiting the clones' lives and their vulnerable existence in the global system, the novel attaches to a humanist form of art through the forced donation system. As art is necessary to reveal whether someone has a soul, Ishiguro's novel will reveal that the soul is open to exploitation due to its use value. The students are reared for their organs to be harvested to save normal people's lives. The novel draws an image of a posthuman world where every sickness can be recovered through biomedical enhancements and used as a tissue source for the cure. The heal is based on clones being exposed to organ transplantation, which Ishiguro portrays as a world of dehumanization. The clones are expected to donate their organs whenever people need them until they die to provide life for the outside world. These clones live a set life, and every detail is sketched for them. In this posthuman world, there is this sole truth that clones serve to provide an alternative life to expand their life span and get

through deadly sicknesses. Clones are manufactured for their organs “to enable humanity to survive” (Nayar, 2020, p.439) through their organ donations. When the normals are in need, clones donate their organs; therefore, they are connected, and some parts of the clones live inside noncloned or ‘original humans’ (Walkowitz, 2007, p.224).

Never Let Me Go revolves around three characters’ love triangles; Tommy, Ruth and Kathy H. The clones are raised in a boarding school called Hailsham, which is isolated from the outside world. The book is narrated in a linear order and consisting three parts: part 1 start with their life at a boarding school from childhood to adolescence, part 2; their leaving the school to live in the cottages, including their late teen, and Part 3; skipping to Norfolk where they become donor and carers in which Kathy became a carer of her both friends. At the start of their life in Hailsham and cottages, clones are unaware of the aim of their creation; ironically, everyone else knows, but they are not given the fact that they are cloned by somebody else. They are not called clones but students and are brought up by guardians who keep an eye on them in this boarding school. When the clones learned that they will donate their organs, they will soon recognize how they are distanced from the facts. Likely to human beings, the clone individuals exhibit the feelings such as love, curiosity, jealousy, nostalgia about the past, hatred, egoism, and cunningness. The novel’s narrator and protagonist, Kathy H., the 31 years old woman, tells her memories about her past and her friends from childhood and adulthood back in Hailsham. As she narrates in her past, she serves as a carer now and will be at the end of her duty towards the end of the year as she initiates at the beginning of the novel: “I’ve been a carer now for over eleven years. That sounds long enough, I know, but actually, they want me to go on for another eight months, until the end of this year. That’ll make it almost exactly twelve years” (Ishiguro, 2006, p.5). Kathy narrates and talks to the donor about her past to remember Hailsham because the narrator and her donor are irreconcilable about the shared memories since the line between them gets blurry. The use of memory is one of the concepts that makes Ishiguro unique among contemporary writers through characters trying to portray their lives by recollecting the moments from the past. Kathy sees it as a way of consolation: “The memories I value most, I don’t see them ever fading. I lost Ruth, then I lost Tommy, but I won’t lose my memories of them” (Ishiguro, 2006, p.269). Narrating through memories this way, Kathy is never quite right about the narration since the accuracy between the

narration and the narrated time of events is never compromised. While the novel can be measured as science fiction since it has scientific details about the fictional world, it turns out to be a dystopian nightmare through details about the cloning of humans for the sake of humans.

3.2. Posthuman Transaction In *Never Let Me Go*

Posthuman is the accumulation of biological and artificial organism. One of the unjust and unbelievable transactions in gene editing is that clone technology is justified in Transhumanism since it consists of all the facets of the incarnation of humans, whatever it takes. The opposite of these challenges, as discussed earlier Posthumanism, are sometimes used interchangeably by thinkers or scholars. Posthuman figures constitute both fantastic and real, “from the mechanical mixture of the cyborg to the abstract apotheosis of ideas like ‘transcendence,’ which consider the furthest reaches of human imagination, as seen in works such as science fiction” (McMillan, 2021, p.1). Regarding this, Haraway is the one who submits the fusion of human and machine to comply a something entirely new. Contemporary literary fiction is full of cyborgs, a creature who is both human and machine “who populate worlds ambiguously natural and crafted” (Haraway, 1991, p.150). Cyborgs are everywhere, particularly in modern medicine in the form of organisms and machines that are each designed as coded devices. Technology is old as human history, from stone-made tools to aerodynamics. Cloning technology also is part of this development. Although it was a myth of cloning, Dolly the sheep was cloned in 1995. Her birth was a success that seemed impossible, a virgin birth was not produced out of sex. As the creator of Dolly Ian Wilmut discusses, “[t]he scientific magic were suitably amazed. Many had felt that cloning from adult cells was impossible, and even the optimists had generally supposed that it would not be achieved for another 100 years” (Wilmut, Campbell & Tudge, 2000, p.210). As we observe the same magic was created by Kazuo Ishiguro, in his novel, *Never Let Me Go* through clone humans. To prepare the further context for human, transhuman and posthuman thinkers to evaluate the intricate concept of humans regarding the idea of Anthropocentrism which is at the heart of Ishiguro’s novel, *Never Let Me Go*.

Never Let Me Go is about the abuse of the body as a scientific matter that touches upon the necessity to examine the body from the point of trans and Posthumanism. The characters seem to fit both categories. Both terms are quite complex, and different theoreticians use them for different purposes. Notably,

Transhumanism seems to continue the humanist ideals in a new perfectionist insight through technological enhancements or eugenics, while Posthumanism strongly denies humanism's anthropocentric values. Taking into consideration Transhumanism's tendency for biological enhancements and upgrading biological human capacity and living conditions through technologies, clone individuals symbolize the technological advancement to serve Transhumanism positively. The normals who use clones' organs to get better health to enhance human weaknesses are concretized missions of "transhumanism." Although clones are the negative examples of humanism because they do not benefit from the position of human exceptionality, it particularly stands for "the attitudes that foster exclusion of 'others'—those who do not conform to the norm either sexually, economically, or from any other point of view" (Matek & Pataki, p.12). Therefore, Ishiguro sheds light on what it is to be a human through clones that negotiates how much it costs to the human pursuit of immortal life. The criticism of the system and the idea of reified bodies is given implicitly, which lay in the idea of the posthuman. Since there is a criticism of traditional humanist vision and centralizing anthropos, clones are also considered posthuman who is embedded in relational conception. Considering their appearance, intelligence and emotions, they are ordinary humans physically; however, as they are artificially created out of genetic alterations, clones are reduced to subhumans isolated from society. They are both human and inhuman and have body functions the same way as ordinary humans; however, they are virgin-born and produced for the truly human enhancement that feeds the "posthuman quality" (p.14). In this context, *Never Let Me Go* provides posthuman bodies to achieve the transhumanist state of ordinary humans. Unfortunately, it is provided only for those who can afford the cost of organ donation to increase longevity. The privilege for others, normal humans, is convincing since it promises a future for individuals. Such a system causes a social legitimacy of inequality, deprivation of some groups who cannot afford to main rights, and the privileged condition of the dominant group. This system depends on biopower that exploits, dominates, or eliminates sometimes unwanted groups of people on whom they exert their power. In this regard, the exploitation of biopower in using clones for the sake of nonclones is extensive. In the novel, everything related to smoking is torn out as Kathy once refers to this: "There was even a rumour that some classic books—like the Sherlock Holmes ones—weren't in our library because the main characters smoked too much" (Ishiguro,

2006, p.65). On this inequality, as Rosi Braidotti asserts in her book, *The Posthuman*, as clones “have been turned into tradable disposable bodies, inscribed in a global market of post-anthropocentric exploitation” (2013, p.70). The bodies of clones are considered important only for their use value. At the end of the transplants, when they are done with the body, the clones turn out to be the body without organs, which Deleuze and Guattari offer an un-organic body that is freed from the traditional humanist identity. Rosi Braidotti puts further about the inorganic body that “without organs is supposed to create creative disjunctions in this system, freeing organs from their indexation to certain prerequisite functions: this is the process of becoming-animal” (*‘Metamorphoses,’* 2002, 124). In *Never Let Me Go*, the donation system is organized to fool and consume the clones’ bodies, who are taken for granted as posthumans. In this sense, *Never Let Me Go* can be categorized as a dystopia through the system constituting cottages, boarding schools, and labour clones as carers, in the meantime “a utopia that functions only for a particular segment of society” (Gordin, 2010, p.1).

Money is important for Hailsham to have even affordable institutions where teachers are provided by sponsor companies to enable their education as students and offer a normal human-like life despite it being for a short time. When Madame explains why they collect all of their artworks, she clearly means they appreciate the arts differently: “That was why we collected your art. We selected the best of it put on special exhibitions” (p.246). After people started to be afraid of the clones thinking of them as a potential danger, they stopped their help and support of sponsoring which derives Hailsham’s failure. Attitudes towards the clones in this inferior way are not ethical, focusing on being posthuman as they are self-aware and yearning for ordinary life, invoking a general sense about how normal people exploit the whole planet. The system that isolates clones from the social world, educates them as cattle and offers them only one option to live through invokes an idea of abjection in the reader, to be between a subject and object. In this way, clones are the representation of the death of humanist ideas in the form of the posthuman, produced as cyborg bodies as in Haraway’s definition, “the cyborg is a liminal creature, between the human and the machine, neither human nor machine, both human and machine” (Nayar, 2014, p.36). In the novel, Ishiguro creates transhumans by creating cyborg bodies. Although the novel faces into transhumanist atmosphere, keeping up with Posthumanism, it is essential to provide a more egalitarian, inclusive and ethical

attitude towards non-human beings in the era where the boundaries between species are blurred.

Ishiguro intentionally chooses his characters as cloned bodies who have the same capabilities, abused by normals to call off already existing humanist norms by blurring the sharp definitions. In line with Posthumanism, he criticizes humans the using technological enhancement to exploit other lives aiming to quit anthropocentric practices together with the patriarchal, heteronormative perspectives of classical humanism. The critique of Ishiguro not only highlights the importance of the ethics of art but also “makes a case for an ethics offering a very different approach to art and empathy that relies on the recognition of the inhuman” (Black, 2009, p.786). As an alternative mode of humanist thinking, Ishiguro’s novel pays attention to what is reproduced, mechanic or manufactured in our nature, our inhuman side, if we abstain from brutality for the sake of protecting humans. In *Never Let Me Go*, Ishiguro makes us set empathy with clones as they are not only human, he uses art as a shield against traditional human figures because the relationship between clones and humans is highly exploitative. Through a narration of a clone as a first-person narrator, the reader has got a chance to know Kathy and her life together with her friends along with sadness, happiness and any concern she had from childhood to adulthood. The details about clones make us believe that they are fully human just like us. The power of autobiographical narration invokes empathy in readers by suggesting means for the oppressed to overcome their traumatic life.

Normals in *Never Let Me Go* have a function of God who empowers everything deciding about his creatures. The clones serve as a field for organ harvesting in the name of human life. As they are expected to donate their organs till they complete, the one who does not donate has an unfulfilled life. The connection between the creator and his servant is tyrannical since it does not permit created ones to live for themselves. Considering humanism, the modern Western is fond of purpose that makes them use all technological advances for the welfare of humans ignoring other forms of living. Therefore, technology always prioritizes human beings while interfering with other living habitats. The most prominent example is animals which are exposed to numerous cruel experiences to increase the standards of human life. Cloning technology serves the dominant power “of using technology as a means to an end” (Nathan, 2015, p.220). In this stance, clones are not ends in themselves but means. To manage this, clones are needed to be regarded as inhuman.

“Clones are machinic animals, created as a technological means for maintaining human lives” (p.220). Unlikely, Posthumanism is not exclusive to the other allegedly discriminated lower groups. It works to blur the boundaries between the empowered and dominated groups by acknowledging the power of *zoe*, non-human life, over *bios*, the discursive side of life, “claiming that *zoe* as the dynamic, self-organizing structure of life itself stands for generative vitality” (Yan, 2019, p.599). *Zoe*, as a vital force, reconnects the segregated categories. Since the twentieth century, with posthumanist thinkers Fukuyama, Foucault etc., the exclusionary function of humanism has been discarded. This traditional humanist thinking weakened through time by scientific discoveries such as robotics, and bioengineering, and human beings find themselves on the brink of the posthuman age with highly developed digital technologies and artificial intelligence. *Never Let Me Go* proves the invisible line between human and inhuman; thus, post-anthropocentrism disregards humanism as the measure for everything. Through advanced technology, a human being is now considered posthuman by organ transplantation and posthuman clones show off human feelings and life experiences as normals. Thus, “the relationship between natural human beings and the clones is not only antithetic, but also interdependent and interchangeable in its complex metaphoricity. In other words, ‘posthuman’ life-writing in Ishiguro’s novel is distinctly metaphorical” (p.599).

Clones in Kazuo Ishiguro’s novel call for Donna Haraway’s figure of the cyborg as it is aforementioned. Haraway argues about the leaky discrimination between humans, non-humans and machines in her well-known book, *A Cyborg Manifesto*. She delivers an idea about “how late twentieth-century machines have made thoroughly ambiguous the difference between natural and artificial, mind and body, self-developing and externally designed, and many other distinctions that used to apply to organisms and machines” (Horton, 2014, p.226). The machines are unnervingly lively compared to inert people. Whereas, in *Never Let Me Go* clones mirror a society dominated by posthuman improvements however society is not kept in touch with these innovations as can be observed in humans’ attitude towards clones as they keep them in the shadow. Through these innovations, Ishiguro invites readers to experience science’s unbelievable potential to heal, on the other hand, horrific violence against the excluded parts of society. With these fictional works, people can have a chance to define their humanness by being enforced to ask what it is to be a person. Here clone’s existence leads the reader to think about to what

extent a person's body is confined to other bodies. In that case, if the body of a clone is not theirs, how come they have a personality or identity? Therefore, clones' bodies refer to disabilities because their organs are harvested to enhance disability in the way of asking a proper question of what is to be a human. Sticking with Posthumanism, Haraway rejects the idea of a sovereign man and prosthetic science. However, instead, she approves of the linkage between humans and non-humans, suggesting a new 'genderless world.' As she offers us that we are machines that constitute our embedded embodiedness. In Ishiguro's novel, because of those who claim to treat clones equally as ordinary human beings, any challenge to rebel against the system will be vain. Similarly, any attempt to sort out the climate crisis that the earth struggles with will fail if we look out only for humanity and do not protect the non-human right.

Posthumanism critically approaches all the disciplinaries that locate humans over all entities, treated as overtly distinct and completely dominating other lives. An ethical vision of Posthumanism reconsiders all systems that put humanity above all by excluding other life forms and exterminating them. As it is post-anthropocentric, it offers a non-anthropocentric vantage "in which human life has always been symbiotically connected to many life forms and technologies" (Nayar, 2014, p.46). Therefore, Posthumanism deconstructs the idea of essential human subjects which are socially constructed. Because these constructed ideals of humanity exclude all non-human life forms left outside of humanity while removing these ideas, Posthumanism offers an interconnectedness with non-human and non-human normals directly or indirectly. Posthumanism involves not only the discriminated groups of people but also considers the plants, animals and machinic assemblages. This new image created by neurocognitive sciences "summarized in the provocative phrase: 'the mind as machine,' which is beginning to change the way humans see themselves, even where this does not automatically entail a sudden change in daily life practices" (Herbrechter, 2013, p.32). This image spread through science magazines about the plasticity of the human brain, therefore, starting a new global capital flow for humanity. In this new state, we expect a posthuman subjectivity in the form of mechanics and nature to be technologized, for instance, cybernetics, human genome project or vitro fertilization claiming human reproduction and the medicalization of giving birth etc. The boundaries of the human body came over through technological apparatuses integrating bionics with technologies such as

implants, digitalization of sensors, and inorganic drugs. Furthermore, new social and personal space exists in social platforms like Youtube, Instagram, Myspace, and virtual realities in game-based circles.

Never Let Me Go offers a chance for different intraspecies involvement in different forms of human groups by facing off reconfiguration of interspecies association. As it is argued above clones can be taken as one of Haraway's suggested assemblages and can be a metaphor for the currently discriminated groups of human and non-human entities who participate in the same ecosystem structure. For this reason, the clones are not the product of biotechnology but interspecies in which human and non-human relations are embodied. The humans' relationship with clones reveals the inherent human behaviours observed in Kathy's experiences. The novel ended in a posthuman future constituting Kathy's liberation and her friend's lost life, and of course, as she tells us like "everything I'd ever lost since my childhood had washed up" (Ishiguro, 2006, p.270). When she was a carer, her life was exactly in pursuit of mastery over others that she is proud which lay at the centre of the anthropocentric agenda. The novel discusses this challenge to fix it through *zoe*-based egalitarianism by taking care of the relations between species as the most major hindrance on the way of gaining a cosmopolitan vision in the post-anthropocene. In *Never Let Me Go*, Ishiguro invites us to review our aptitude towards the relationship that we build as master-slave distinction in a sovereign system. If humans start to regard a *zoe*-based egalitarian atmosphere, then it would be a hope for other non-human species to live a better life regarding these principles.

3.3. Carbon-Based Posthuman Life In *Never Let Me Go*

Kazuo Ishiguro draws an artificial image of carbon-based bodies. Carbon-based organic bodies depend on carbons that exist in all forms of life on Earth which are artificially created clones through scientific methodology in *Never Let Me Go*. The clones are raised as ordinary humans taking education and social facilities as much as the boarding school provided them. The boarding school of Hailsham claims that they raised and educated the clones in a humane environment, unlike other schools. Although the school is founded on the purpose of promising an ordinary human experience for the enforced donors, it turns out that clones are given a little more education than cattle because they never get consciousness about escaping to save their lives. The complexity of ethical side of organ donation systems gets complicated when teachers at the boarding school claim that they provide humane

treatment to the clones, from art classes to geography and history to boost their creativity to prove that clones have souls just as their original and they are killed slowly to prolong nonclones' lives. Clones are encouraged to create artistic pieces of stuff and their creations are submitted to Madame's Gallery without being aware of the fact that they are under an inhumane experiment. One of the guardians, Miss Emily, confesses to Kathy and Tommy that "[a]ll around the country, at this very moment, there are students being reared in deplorable conditions, conditions you Hailsham students could hardly imagine" (Ishiguro, 2006, p.245). By deplorable conditions, she means the clones at Hailsham are reared in the best conditions among the other boarding schools. The guardians believe that if they raise the clones in more humane and cultivated environments, the world could get a chance to see them as ordinary, sensitive and intelligent beings. By ordinary being, she means not clones who are produced in test tubes but real human beings. Therefore, one can deduce that they are not treated as normal human beings although it seems otherwise for Miss Emily. Miss Emily's confessions only deteriorate the clones' conditions because creating a school like Hailsham to provide a better life for clones does not change the donation. Instead, the realities hit rougher into their face, just as they did to Kathy and Tommy. The system provided a happy childhood to the clone individuals but did not serve a different option to them. Kazuo Ishiguro, in one of his interviews in *The Guardian*, called 'Future Imperfect' underlies as:

The boarding school setting, I might add, appealed to me because it struck me as a physical manifestation of the way all children are separated from the adult world, and are drip-fed little pieces of information about the world that awaits them, often with generous doses of deception - kindly meant or otherwise. In other words, it serves as a decent metaphor for childhood in general. (Ishiguro, 2006)

The boarding school that Ishiguro created may have a more sinister purpose than it seems in which the system mechanism functions to control clones by keeping them busy with practices they produce for them. They try to create a sense of privileged condition for clone humans to unveil the purpose of their donation system. Clones in the novel, *Never Let Me Go* are tempered to feel privileged compared to other boarding schools, then they will not suspect the true aim of the guardians of the Hailsham.

The clones are imprisoned although they are requalified as real humans. In one of the classes they take from Miss Lucy, she compares the concentration camps to the Hailsham, which makes explicit the dehumanization. The teacher visualizes

the conditions of soldiers in prison in camps that they died when trying to escape over electrified fences. The teacher tries to give the impression that it is dangerous to try to escape over the fences in the clones' terrified eyes. Although the fences are not electrified in Hailsham, the fact is that fences encapsulate the school. If not in Hailsham but other boarding schools are electrified which presents the cruel facts about them. In creating fences, they do not aim to protect them from the environment but rather keep the students inside. Kathy and her friends do not think about fleeing from school, but they are captivated by the rumours about what happened to the people who try to run away or end their lives. One of those horrible stories was about a boy who escaped not long before they came to Hailsham. The boy ran off the school and "his body had been found two days later, up in those woods, tied to a tree with the hands and feet chopped off" (Ishiguro, 2006, p.49). The other was about a girl whose ghost wandered in the woods since she tried to look over the fences to satisfy her curiosity about beyond the fences. The clones are made to believe that as Kathy tells us, "[t]his was a long time before us when the guardians were much stricter, cruel even, and when she tried to get back in, she wasn't allowed" (p.49). As a girl goes outside, she died, and her ghost wanders around. Through these rumours they are subjected, clones are afraid that everything is a lot worse than they heard or imagined.

The argument about the humane environment they set for clones does not change their submission to death at the end of the novel. Ishiguro portrays through Tommy and Kathy an image of humanized characters since they are more attentive unlike other clones, thus, they acquire human dignity through education. As a matter of regard, this truth does not change the reality that they and other clones are not treated human enough by the outside world, "from the meat-grinder of biocapitalism does not mean they are posthuman or that we, the readers, are now posthuman" (Johnston, 2019, p.59). Instead, the supreme ideology of the human capitalist system does not foreground anyone human enough in this system. Clones, with their posthuman bodies, are produced for organ donation and their life is set for them. Ishiguro does not get enough and keeps up with the idea that clones' organs will exist in new posthuman condition. Nonclone bodies will start to live a new life by being donated organs of clones, instead of desperately dying. Through this, clones and real human identity are connected internally and this interrelatedness blurs the borders between them. Yet, the organ donation may mean not the end of losing

consciousness as Tommy raises questions that doctors even cannot reply to: “[h]ow maybe, after the fourth donation, even if you’re technically completed, you’re still conscious in some sort of way; how you find there are more donations, plenty of them, on the other side of that line” (Ishiguro, 2006, p.262). What he talks about is it a fulfilment of life which is most clones’ and cares’ desire to achieve. Here what Tommy might try to explain is a “separation between his vocational progression as a ‘donor’ and the body’s physical existence, even though his body’s organs provide a concrete measure whereby he can track his progression” (Nayar, 2014, p.89) to survive spiritually. In this vision, this posthuman body does not need organs which organs are necessary and unnecessary in shaping this cyborg body. Since the purpose is to grow and donate interior organs it is necessary, yet unnecessary because organs have to be donated without distracting clones’ self and goals. Ishiguro provides us with the insignificance of the bodies in shaping the self which is an insight into “posthuman bodies” (p.89). However, it is crucial to bring out that organs are taken out from dead bodies, but in the case of Ishiguro’s clones, they are harvested when they are still living which are considered ‘living cadavers’ after they start to donate. What we are left after the first donation of them “are cyborged bodies of clones: bodies kept alive under careful medical supervision for later donations until their fourth transplant” (p.90). What exactly Tommy tried to express in the above quotation, the condition of their existence, half alive or not fully dead, is what we call cyborgs or posthuman. The details about xenotransplantation are not given; all we know is that the organs are harvested from the human body and transferred to other human bodies. The organs are put into real humans; therefore, the bodies of clones and their reals become enmeshed.

Clones take sex education when they are at the age of sixteen through lessons in Hailsham. Miss Emily brings a skeleton to the classes and shows them how to be careful with whom they have sex. It was not because they might get the disease but sex may lead to intense feelings in a way they do not expect. Outside of the world, people give too much value to sex, people out there “were even fighting and killing each other over who had sex with whom” (Ishiguro, 2006, p.80). Sex is different from playing table tennis or dancing outside the world because people outside are different from clones as “they could have babies from sex” (80) which is the reason why it is important who slept with whom. Though clones are infertile, they are educated to treat sex as something special. The skeleton here indicates how

sex is meaningless and mechanical without any product. They are genetically unable to have babies labelling them as unnatural and, therefore, inhuman. The fact they are artificially created bears the question of whether humanity comes somewhat innate or is immanence. As it is not clear if humanity can be achieved through socialization later in life or more humane environment can change well “genetic predispositions” (Nayar, 2014, p.42). Since they are not reproductive, they are virgin born, as the first cloned sheep Dolly. They do not have relatives or parents. This is the reason their monstrosity came from since they have no origin, they are not human as well. They are the product of an asexual process. In the novel, Ruth has a theory that Madame is afraid of them. To prove Ruth’s theory, they pranked her by hiding to see if she would be afraid. The reaction that Madame gave them is “in the same way someone might be afraid of spiders. We hadn’t been ready for that.” Kathy goes on to being astounded as “[it] had never occurred to us to wonder how we would feel, being seen like that, being the spiders” (Ishiguro, 2006, p.35). This moment was when clones realized it was not only the fear guardians felt against them but also disgust and hatred. Kathy and her friends find themselves in exclusionary situations where they are different from others. However, the fear of clones does not stop Madame from feeling sympathy for them. She is the main sponsor for art that promotes a more humane system for them.

Throughout the novel, clones are asked to create art by drawing, poetry and sculpture. Creating a piece of art is a part of the scientific experiment that guardians conduct. The student is encouraged to produce their best artwork to get appreciated. The artworks they created circulate through a programme they called “The Exchanges” where students can find stuff “to decorate the walls around your bed, or wanted something to carry around in your bag and place on your desk from room to room, then you could find it at the Exchange” (Ishiguro, 2006, p.17). As an exception, Madame collects the best outstanding works and exhibits them in the ‘Gallery.’ Even though students do not comprehend why creativity is so important, there is a rumour they hear that it is necessary to reveal whether they have souls inside. The art’s function is not to be beautiful here. It can be deduced in *Never Let Me Go*, for Ishiguro, art is important. As Miss Emily confesses, “[y]ou said it was because your art would reveal what you were like. What you were like inside...Well, you weren’t far wrong about that. We took away your art because we thought it would reveal your soul. Or to put it more finely, we did it to prove you had souls at

all” (Ishiguro, 2006, p.244). Miss Emily not only tries to highlight the importance of art as revealing the student’s soul through some expression, but also, she tries to preserve the students from the decreasing treatment or humiliation from the outside of the school. Through the Hailsham clones, readers witness the effect of rich context imposed on clone students. Sebastian Groes and Sean Matthew emphasize as “[a]rt needs the world to reflect the ‘real’ through which we live, and the world needs art to reflect on and understand, itself” (‘Introduction’, 2009, p.6). Although this artistic experiment shows human exceptionalism in essence, the impoverished guardians of Hailsham sell important pieces of art. They value art’s financial price which completely deviates from their main purpose without regret which refers to the commodification of the life of clones. No matter what the work of art brings, the question is whether art is related to a decline in mortality.

Evaluating the artworks clones made, Madame said, “[l]ook at this art! How dare you claim these children are anything less than fully human?” (Ishiguro, 2006, p.246) to remind us how insignificant the existence of clones lay. Society starts to panic when the clone shows humane behaviours. Thus, the programme functions since people do not seem convinced enough that clones exhibit real love for each other. When compared to average society, clones show the essence of creativity and love, which decline the distinction between human and clone individual. This, let alone saving them from donation, is not enough even for their deferrals. Because they are unlike natural-born humans, artificially created, thus inferior to human beings. Their existence jeopardizes the human exception system, but people still act to work as their own business; as Miss Emily remarks,

How can you ask a world that has come to regard cancer as curable, how can you ask such a world to put away that cure, to go back to the dark days? There was no going back. However uncomfortable people were about your existence, their overwhelming concern was that their own children, their spouses, their parents, their friends, did not die from cancer, motor neurone disease, heart disease. So for a long time you were kept in the shadows, and people did their best not to think about you. And if they did, they tried to convince themselves you weren’t really like us. That you were less than human, so it didn’t matter. (Ishiguro, 2006, p.246)

This is the easy way people manipulate the system to work it for them. Clones are seen as robots and still cannot reach the statue of being human since any art they create or any emotion they feel does not make sense, whilst clones think their art delivered to a collection in Madame’s Gallery is a reward. Art’s creation and appreciation need human emotions, the only essence that can differentiate human beings from other livings. The world tries to believe that clones are ‘genetically

underclasses' to maintain the donation. Miss Emily's confession shows the functioning of scientific norms and objectivation of the human body predetermine the state of clones they are imposed upon and unlikely humans abstain from every kind of violence.

The privileged status of Hailsham students threaded throughout novels that a rumour spread among clones in both recovery centres and cottages that they have a special state. One of the most famous rumours is that the clones at Hailsham can obtain a chance to get a deferral if they are properly in love. Notably, Tommy, Ruth and Kathy figure out some possibilities at length. Tommy convinces himself that it has to do with the art they sent to the gallery where all drawing sculptures and paintings were kept "intended to be used when students applied for this kind of deferral" (Suter, 2020, p.123). If clones are properly in love and could prove it they can get "three years straight, didn't have to go on with their training or anything. Three years just to themselves, because they could prove they were properly in love" (Ishiguro, 2006, p. 143) the rumour is retailed unintentionally by clones to alleviate the inevitability of the situation. The rumour started when they were at the cottages. Ruth told Tommy that his drawings are meaningless and mechanic and Kathy laughed at his work. Tommy felt ashamed about being unskillful. Kathy later tells his paintings are sweet in fact and he has a different individualistic expression of art. He interpersonalizes animals through objects. For Kathy, the pictures Tommy drew seem like technological items that later "resolve into focus as animal-cyborg bodies" (Johnston, 2019, p.63). These images are significant because they designate his design of posthuman life. Though they are not exact posthuman embodiments they are a new mode of kinship consisting of 'screws' and 'wheels.' His requirements of artistic ability unfulfilled the guardians' concept of art as if they expected his body deserved to be sacrificed in this way. From this point, if artistic capability proves humanity, then the lack of artistic pleasure gives a right for exploitation of clones' bodies. Art serves the purpose of keeping clones busy to be unaware of their enforced condition.

Later in the Recovery Centre, Ruth confessed that she was trying to keep apart Tommy and Kathy. In order to make it up, she encourages Kathy and Tommy to apply for a deferral. Tommy and Kathy tried to show that they love themselves and deserve the deferral, unlike other clones, by bringing their artwork as proof. Kathy also reminds Madame about her listening to a song by Judy Bridgewater

called 'Never Let Me Go' that afternoon. While dancing and grasping a pillow to her breast, Madame saw her eyes filled with tears. She told what she was thinking at the time, holding a pillow that she imagined a mother who holds her baby full of happiness and fear of losing her baby. A few years later, when they went for deferral, they discuss the song, the dancing, and Madame's tears. Kathy imagined an infertile mother who had a baby after a long time and was afraid to lose her baby's grasp. She thought that Madame cried because Kathy was sad about her unwillingness to have a baby. However, Madame interprets it as

I was weeping...because when I came in, I heard your music. I thought some foolish student had left the music on. But when I came into your dormitory, I saw you, by yourself, a little girl, dancing. As you say, eyes closed, far away, a look of yearning. You were dancing so very sympathetically. And the music, the song. There was something in the words. It was full of sadness... Never let me go. Oh, baby, baby. Never let me go. (Ishiguro, 2006, p.254)

There are some contradictions found as a means of unwanted freedom in the interpretation of the song. Paradoxically prisoner is portrayed as a prisoner. A mother may be abandoned by a baby in which she is voluntarily captivated or the baby will be cast off by the ancient old world holding a pillow as if it were her baby, interpreted differently by Madame. At the end of the conversation, Kathy and Tommy learn that deferral is just an illusion as it is something beyond guardians to grant. On the way back, Kathy pulls over the car and Tommy is furious at the inevitable fate exposed to them. When Kathy finds him in the darkness in a field shouting, outbursting and crying as "me being an idiot" (Ishiguro, 2006, p.259), something that Kathy cannot make sense of it. Nonetheless, there is a reference here to cow and cow's shit in the dark field they stand. The clones are likened to those cows. They similarly do not seem in the dark like a ghost, cows are slaughtered and reprocessed for eating or sanitation. Through Justin Omar Johnston's lenses, "[t]his fence, therefore, assembles a conjunction between the clones' bodies in the health care system, the cows' bodies in an industrial food system, and the dark, sticky aesthetic of abject materiality that cloaks both systems in darkness" (2019, p.32).

The clones coming from dirt have been approved later when Ruth seeks the possible person she cloned from. One of the veteran couples claimed that they had seen someone look like Ruth at an office. Ruth and her friends were excited to see her possible while driving downtown. When they came there, she did not see her possible and cried with a sudden outburst of anger: "[w]e all know it. We're modelled from trash. Junkies, prostitutes, winos, tramps. Convicts, maybe, just so

long as they aren't psychos. That's what we come from" (Ishiguro, 2006, p.155). She is finally aware that they are modelled from social underclasses. The possibility that she is cloned by socially low-class people bitterly offended her and damaged her self-confidence. There is no difference in their looking because when they went to the art gallery, they started to have a conversation with the owner of the art gallery without noticing they are clones. Ruth recognizes the fact that they discuss with them since they resemble the so-called 'normals.' According to her assumption, they can live among them without being noticed. With this feeling of inferiority, Ruth bursts out, "[d]o you think she'd have talked to us like that if she'd known what we really were? What do you think she'd have said if we'd asked her? 'Excuse me, but do you think your friend was ever a clone model?' She'd have thrown us out" (p.156). Although they are not different looking from normals, deep down, they are sure of the impossibility of sameness with normal people when they cross the boundaries between humans and non-humans.

The privileged conditions of Hailsham that provide better welfare compared to other schools only exacerbate their current situation. Because they can neither take advantage of being privileged nor be too unconscious to be aware. In fact, Hailsham offers a painful experience for them. Hailsham's mission of humanizing experiment, Ishiguro's questioning of the soul and the problem with the soul being socially constructed are at risk. The humanization mission failed to call the public's attention rather they turned to "en-souled non-humans" (Snaza, 2015, p.217) as if they were humans without souls. In *Never Let Me Go*, Ishiguro demonstrates that a human cannot be produced by education but it creates a being who is ensouled by memory constituted by coming death. A world of non-humans controlled by humans represents the distinction between two groups.

Being a model or an expected future, 'Possible' refers to a reification of the impeccable sample, as in the case of Ruth searching for possible. Furthermore, later, Kathy discovers the pornographic magazines possible since she thinks there is something extraordinary with her sexual instincts. Since Ruth finds this feeling rush of Kathy strange, she browses through porn magazines to find any possible details about her. Clones believe "when you saw the person you were copied from, you'd get some insight into who you were deep down, and maybe too, you'd see something of what your life held in store" (Ishiguro, 2006, p.129). The idea of 'possibles' that Kazuo Ishiguro created in *Never Let Me Go* lacks scientific approval or genetic

operations. This way, he left the image of the ‘possibles’ to the imagination of clones. Identifying ‘possibles,’ Kathy makes possible assumptions for ‘possible’ with her friends that are scientifically invalidated.

As they heard from rumours that “[s]ome students thought you should be looking for a person twenty to thirty years older than yourself” (Ishiguro, 2006, p.129). If *Never Let Me Go* was a classic dystopian novel, the main character would protest against the system, but here there is nothing like that. The fatalism that clones struggle with haunts the reader. It could be anything of the sort, but how come the narrator does not even think of a way out of the system? According to John Mullan, her failure “to resent her destiny, was axiomatic” (‘Afterword’, 2009, p.105). The fictional world in *Never Let Me Go*, as a result, is one of its kind as a scientific dystopia through peculiar dispositions. Science clears away the diseases on the way to health; however, it results in disrespect against human existence. To wipe away the disorders and maladies, humanity abused the cloning technology sacrificing the natural part of the order which is *zoe* that is dominated by socially dominated groups, *bios*, who denies the other parts’ right to live. People are really good at fooling themselves about the necessity of what they make; as Miss Emily proves, “[f]or a long time, people preferred to believe these organs appeared from nowhere, or at most that they grew in a kind of vacuum” (Ishiguro, 2006, p.246). Although there were arguments about whether they are truly human or not and “they came to consider just how you were reared, whether you should have been brought into existence at all,” it was too late to reverse the process. Discriminating that clones are exposed seems due to the distinctive expressions in language. The clones are just a matter for medical operations and, as Kai Yan suggests, “whose right of life is deprived under the indifferent ‘planning’ of science” (2019, p.596).

Kathy, looking back on her working eleven years of a carer, is proud of herself for doing good at her job according to her judgement depending on others’ expectations. Her success is connected to her management of recovering times when helping her donors through the ability to lessen their pains. The novel pays our attention to the feeling of competency and displaying professionalism, in Kathy’s sentences;

Now I know my being a carer so long isn’t necessarily because they think I’m fantastic at what I do. There are some really good carers who’ve been told to stop after just two or three years. And I can think of one carer at least who went on for all of fourteen years despite being a complete waste of space. (Ishiguro, 2006, p.5)

Although she claims this is not for boasting herself, it is what it seems. Thanks to being a donor, Kathy had a chance to defer her donation for about twelve years. She was able to spend time with her close friends unlike the rumour of deferral previously. The time of deferral granted her not only a love with Tommy but a good closure with Ruth before they left the world. Unlikely, Tommy and Ruth were proud of themselves for being a donor. As a response to Kathy's stability of being a carer, Ruth replies, "[i] think I was a pretty decent carer. But five years felt about enough for me. I was like you, Tommy. I was pretty much ready when I became a donor. It felt right. After all, it's what we're supposed to be doing, isn't it?" (Ishiguro, 2006, p.212). Even this language is sufficient to normalize the situation they are in which prepares their demise. As the readers, we understand that this delusional end for clones is created by polite language and deferring mentioning them about the system as long as possible. The terms related to the donation system are not only polite, but also; they constitute "positive connotations" (Kowalski, 2014, p.14). Most of the words alluded consciously that the whole donation system is made willingly as if they are going through the surgeries to take their vital organs for the sake of the humans they are cloned from. The most apparent word is 'donor'; it not only neglects the reality that clones organs are taken without their consent but also by focusing on only the privileged humans' interest externalizes clones' existence. 'Guardian' stands for the one who cultivates clones; 'Carers' are for alleviating the clones' passivity; 'Completion' is used when a cloned dies of the donations; and as a final state, 'Students' are preferred instead of calling clones. The language they seem to utilize suggests a positive illusion to hide the reality of abuse. To maintain the illusion, "the donations went back to being a subject to be avoided" (Ishiguro, 2006, p. 84). To stop working as a carer, for Kathy, means in a reduced euphemistic language, "to die a premature death" (Currie, 2009, p.100). When Ruth, Tommy and Kathy talk about Chrissie's completion of her second organ donation, Tommy reproves the news to himself as "[a] shame. Only her second as well. Glad that didn't happen to me" (Ishiguro, 2006, p.211). What is the shame they thought was not to be on the course as if they want to be captivated by their doomed fate? These delusional illusions function as a faculty of relief to endure the horrible "gravity of the situation" (Kowalski, 2014, p.15). Nevertheless, reduces the resistance against the system desperately Kathy reminds us that even thinking about it is impossible where there is nothing about the system, such as recovery centres, donors, or carers. "And this,

precisely, is where critical science fiction is located for the novel is designed to make us consider this very question of what we think is acceptable, ethically, humanly responsible behaviour towards those or that which we deem or designate potentially non-human” (Griffin, 2009 p. 656).

Related to their subtle future, Miss Lucy, in one of their classes, clinches an argument about clones talking about their dream futures;

If you’re going to have decent lives, then you’ve got to know ...Your lives are set out for you. You’ll become adults, then before you’re old, before you’re even middle-aged, you’ll start to donate your vital organs. That’s what each of you was created to do. You’re not like the actors you watch on your videos, you’re not even like me. (Ishiguro, 2006, p.77)

She clarifies the fact that their future is planned for them in which the whole path of life is decided by humans who destined clones to donate their organs till their life ceases. For this very reason, the school cares about clones checking up on their medical condition, doing vaccinations and using advanced machines for surgeries and scanning their health status, and lectures them to avoid bad habits to keep healthy such as forbidding smoking because it is hazardous for organs. Miss Lucy underlies the importance of being well as if not looking after her interest; “[s]o keeping yourselves well, keeping yourselves very healthy inside, that’s much more important for each of you than it is for me” (Ishiguro, 2006, p.66). Ishiguro promotes the novel to a level where we see humans are modelled from humans to prolong the life span of normals who are wealthy enough to supply the organ donation that costs the clone’s life. The patient who goes voluntarily through the transplantation process accepts to take the cloned human naturally reared organs. Thus, the “body of the patient becomes an open canvas for rectification of design. Here the body becomes a tool for regenerative medicine” (Antony, 2017, p.78).

Apart from the clones surrendering to this fatalism, they think the donation is just a usual occurrence. A student called ‘crow face’ at Hailsham teases Tommy for the scar on his elbow; “[d]on’t you know? If it’s right on the elbow like that, it can unzip. All you have to do is bend your arm quickly. Not just that actual bit, the whole elbow, it can all unzip like a bag opening up” (Ishiguro, 2006, p.81). Tommy is the one who does not laugh at such jokes since he is ironically aware of the fact resembling painfully zipping or unzipping a bag. The writer emphasizes the normalization of the scientific process. This indicates “the dehumanized normalization of biological opportunities on relations of power between different

groups in society” (Lochner, 2015, p.104). The novel raises questions about the differences between the group of people that is absolute truth and challenges the ethical necessity which comprises insistently on this absolute diversity. Also, the reader needs to develop a sort of critical eye for ordinariness between everyday life and scientific practices that is a part of the contemporary spirit. While it is essential for the discourse of normalization of scientific operations, this does not count for the literary intervention of *Never Let Me Go*, which deals with the discourse of dehumanization practices leading to the fragility of vulnerable bodies, as in the case of clones.

3.4. Biopolitics In *Never Let Me Go*

Kazuo Ishiguro discusses the pros and cons of technology in his popular dystopian novel, *Never Let Me Go* as we argued above. On the one hand, Posthumanism is the opposite approach to its related branch Transhumanism since Transhumanism defends human perfection through technological enhancements. In other words, present human capacity is upgradable through applied science and can have enormous potential for human beneficiaries. This may lead us to proceed into a new form of ‘posthuman’, “beings who may have indefinite health spans, much greater intellectual faculties than any current human being—and perhaps entirely new sensibilities or modalities—as well as the ability to control their own emotions” (Weinstein & Colebrook, 2017, p.20). Although the body goes through many changes, humans can still be human according to Posthumanism justifying that human values will not remain the same in future because of changes. However, technology is not removed completely from life for all posthumanist theorists. They believe that our body has already been enmeshed with technology; they go against the political handicaps defending our bodies’ highly increased incorporation with technology as “blurs the oppositions between human and nonhuman (machine and animal) as well as gender identities, thus enabling a deconstruction and revision of current ideas of what it means to be human” (Weinstein & Colebrook, 2017, p.22). A way worse than that, in the modern age, the natural side of life as lands in political power, the politics transforms to biopolitics. Likely, modern man’s existence depends on his political side of life that questions his organism while man was an animal for years, except its political side was in progress. From this perspective, it can be argued that the biopolitical body is the outcome of sovereign power.

Therefore, Giorgio Agamben's bare life comes to the fore as an emblem of the life of *homo sacer*, in which as Agamben puts forward, "life as such becomes a principal object of the projections and calculations of State power" ('Homo Sacer', 1995, p.6). To be more precise, the bare life that Agamben imagines has no clear boundaries because its existence is reduced to being between subject and object; its life depends on political power's decision who can let *homo sacer* be killed and ironically not sacrificed. This is the reason why sacred life is a bad thing to consider. In this very case, Agamben discusses the double exclusion from state power as there is no distinction between homicide and sacrifice. The so-called sovereign pitch in which "it is permitted to kill without committing homicide and without celebrating a sacrifice, and sacred life -- that is, life that may be killed but not sacrificed -- is the life that has been captured in this sphere" (Agamben, 1995, p.42).

The sovereign state is related to the sacrifice of Jews through extermination in Nazi camps. Jews are the incarnation of bare life as they lived through life in a giant holocaust. The extermination is not the sanction of religion or law enforcement, but rather biopolitics. Under the umbrella term, politicization of life, every society defines life as a sacred life that is irrelevant politically and can be erased without penalty. Bare life does not belong to any social category of society but can exist in all biological entities. The threshold between humans and non-human labels humans as no longer human however it considered this figure of a man as human except for the limitation of human standardisations. From this perspective, this new figure is called in between human and inhuman who cannot be separated from each category. For Agamben, therefore, to be a human necessitates being inhuman as well. Slaves, refugees and more importantly asylum seekers are an example of the threshold being since they belong to no man's world. A human being who is completely designated as utilitarian instrumentality is "the one whose humanity is completely destroyed, is the one who is truly human" (Van Baarle, 2018, p.128). For this very reason, Kazuo Ishiguro's mentioned novel constitutes this kind of personhood which is regulated through a modern totalitarian regime that calls for Agamben's figure of *homo sacer*. The clones in *Never Let Me Go* are doomed to be killed but not sacrificed. Their death signifies neither for them nor for the community they dwell in. A boarding school they are reared is present in an asylum that denies its dwellers citizenship. They are a true embodiment of a life that does not represent human-like existence just as Jewish people eluded their citizenship in Nazi camps. They live in a house

that cannot be called a real home. Kept away from society, clones are exposed to become distanced from humanness. To keep them sleeping, they are narcotized through euphemistic language as words deviate from their original meaning to hide the harsh reality. Similarly, art is used as a tool to keep clones busy and it “represents a form of sinister ethical failure” (Black, 2009, p. 798), instead of the common idea that it is necessary to reveal someone’s soul. Ishiguro, unlike traditional dystopian fiction which bans the artistic faculties since they might cause enlightenment and rebellion in individuals, uses art as a tool to opiate the clone humans.

Clones are enforced to donate their vital organs even though they are disgusted as spiders. Clones can remain alive till the last transaction biologically thus they need medical care to sustain their life for the next donations. Nevertheless, Tommy was anxious about if he would be left disposed of life support care agony after his organs were taken. The state that clones are in is undoubtedly bare life and they are threshold beings. Their bare life reminds us of non-human species. The relationship between clones and their creators provides a sketch of their image but also, they govern their length’ of life. Through this way, Ishiguro’s novel creates a chance in literary fiction to unveil “the reification and alienation emerging out of neoliberal biocapitalism that converts bodies into purchasable commodities and reduces sections of humans into consumable entities” (Karmakar and Parui, 2020, p.11). The human body in *Never Let Me Go* is examined as a disposable body used for medical care and turned into biomedical trash at the end of the process. The Sovereign is the power who has a decision on the declaration of life or death, for Agamben. In Ishiguro’s novel, this power to take or give life is in the hands of doctors and the guardians whose call is legalized. Clones live nothing but bare life; they cannot resist biopolitical power. As there is no way to reverse this, it is evidently “a violation of human rights” (Antony, 2017, p.80). *Never Let Me Go* exemplifies cloning for the biopolitical force that is based on an alternative history that could be lived. Ishiguro’s clones are the epitome of exclusionary Anthropocentrism without surnames, as Kathy H., characterized as entities with non-reproductive sexual activities, “as performing affective labour as carers or sacrificial reproduction as donors (male/female); as unofficial labourers without recourse to political rights” (Johnston, 2019, p.54). In this posthuman world, clones are commodities with use value; a bag of organs can be unzipped. Therefore, the novel raises a feeling of terror fusing with pity since humans consume humans.

Last but not least, it is essential to adhere to Agamben's speculation about *zoe* and *bios* in which bare life is what remains when there is a split between *zoe* and *bios*. The entrance of biological organisms into the sphere of sovereignty results in biopolitics. While *zoe* encapsulates natural elements of life, *bios* considers humans enterprise to the political relations, thus, *bios* and *zoe* are inextricable concepts in biopolitics. The biopolitical foundations in *Never Let Me Go* go through clones being both *bios* but their vulnerable nature to death bear witness similar effect just as the humane environment in farming clone human. This engagement between the system of donating programme and running animal farm interpellates the "assessment of the discrepancy of the *bios* of life inside Hailsham and *zoe* in the system outside sheds light into the ethical boundaries that we set" (Lee, 2021, p.121). Through this examination, we may deduce the reason why clones accept their fate without questioning though they regard themselves as human being. In the last scene, Kathy drives her car to the place she works as a carer as she thinks about Tommy's dead and imagines her coming finitude in the external world. She thinks she saw a tiny image of Tommy he'd wave, maybe even call. The fantasy never got beyond that—I didn't let it—and though the tears rolled down my face, I wasn't sobbing or out of control" (Ishiguro, 2006, p.270). "The novel thus points to the way in which for clones as for 'ordinary humans', the threshold between the human and the animal is our inmost truth" (Hanson, 2020, p.143).

3.5. Conclusion

Kazuo Ishiguro furnishes a dystopian atmosphere in his novel, *Never Let Me Go*, inquiring into the meaning of what it is to be a human through biologically cloned humans pointing to human characteristics that made us human. He creates a work of art equipped with the potential to stick with ethics objectively establishing an environment for empathy for the realization of what is human or inhuman. *Never Let Me Go* can be taken as an alternative mode of representation of what is to be human in a humanist sense by recognizing the distinction between innate, manufactured or copied forms of humans displaying the barbarities of human beings stands for protection for real human life. Clone protagonists in *Never Let Me Go* prove the fact that the preservation of humans cannot be achieved through empathetic connection to realize clones are human beings, but the novel enlightens

us by emphasizing that the classical concept of humans is outmoded and cannot function well in the contemporary era.

Many aspects of *Never Let Me Go* yearn for a world based on a non-anthropocentric landscape. The world of genetically created clones portrays a mechanic life in which clones live through a scheduled life for every moment of life basically without noticing the terrible truth and suffering behind the reality. Any attempt to be freed from the system has been reciprocated with ridicule by their fellow peer consciously or unconsciously, who take their fate for the gospel that serves for maintaining their machinelike life. This understanding set a challenge for the definition of the twentieth-century human being. Therefore, *Never Let Me Go* calls for works depending on twentieth-century totalitarian political regimes that resonate in Agamben's concept of the 'bare life' of *homo sacer*. Similarly, clones who stripped of every human right in which they are vulnerable to any attempt to be killed without being called 'killed.' This is precisely where Ishiguro's novel is situated to make us conscious about what a human being should pay attention to ethically non-human entities.

Posthumanism has a methodological function in *Never Let Me Go* since the novel invites us to the posthuman world in which science and technology allow humans to prolong their longevity and defeat sicknesses by cloning humans to harvest organs. The clones can be classified as cyborg bodies since they do not have a clear distinction between human and inhuman and blur the threshold between human and machine. They are neither taken for granted as fully human nor their existence completely rejected. Therefore, their creation is not a commodity justified by people. Clones are deprived of free will and most importantly, fertility which is the inciting reason for them not to benefit from human rights. Clones' organs are transferred to normal bodies therefore, they continue to live in new bodies through enmeshment into a new body. Their bodies embodied an entity reflected in Agamben's bare life by the figure of *homo sacer*, the one who can be killed but not sacrificed. A hell of subjection to whatever authority deems us worthy of politically. In this posthuman world, Ishiguro investigates the meaning of being human through posthuman bodies in the era of biotechnological advancements where the distinction between human/inhuman, organic/inorganic and artificial/natural blurred. This way, we get a chance to question our mortality. Clones constitute a new form of cyborg bodies that should be taken for granted as equal to any human being.

There is an anthropocentric realm in the sacrifice of clones' bodies over extending human longevity watch for human perfection as in Transhumanism. Contrary to this, Posthumanism adopts post-anthropocentric insight to disable this non-human perspective. Rosi Braidotti offers a non-human and non-political form of experience, *zoe*, instead of cultivated life through *bios*. She posits a new interrelational embodiment of all entities in the form of posthuman character in the pursuit of an egalitarian mission for all species. She finds out this new posthuman figure is "a hopeful possibility to find a new ethical position, grounded in the interpenetration of the posthuman with non-human others," correlated to Deleuze and Guattarian's sense as an extended and relational entity of 'becoming human, becoming-animal and becoming machine' (Schmeink, 2016, p.44).

After all, in his speculative dystopian novel, Kazuo Ishiguro attempts to concretize the anthropocentric realm through nonhuman agents by victimising clones for the sake of prolonging their life span without considering the clone's right to live. He demonstrates the danger of using technological and medical advances in favour of a single species sacrificing everything and everyone else. To maintain an effective method, we need to pursue egalitarian embeddedness of posthuman layout incorporating equally human/nonhuman, organic/inorganic, nature/culture and artificial/sentient on a planetary scale.

CHAPTER 4

KAZUO ISHIGURO'S *KLARA AND THE SUN*

4.1. Introduction to *Klara and the Sun*

*The animal
has memory, not memories.
(Heyman Steinthal, in 'The
Open', 2002, P. 45)*

*You're not human until you're
posthuman. You were never human.
(Halberstam &
Livingston, 1995, p.8)*

Klara and the Sun (2021) is Kazuo Ishiguro's first novel after winning the Nobel Prize in Literature in 2017. Since the book was released during the pandemic which lasts since 2019, it mirrors the socioeconomic inequality between classes. Ishiguro highlights the current injustice focusing on digital inequality and financial well-being to reach digital opportunities and the health crisis in which covid 19 accelerated. Therefore, Kazuo Ishiguro speculates about human insecurity in the social dimension against advanced technological developments paying attention to creating a master race through eugenics and gene technology which is the main concern of the narrative. Depending on the eugenic attempts in the novel, *Klara and the Sun* addresses the inequality causing marginalization between different layers of society.

The book, so far, is his latest and the eighth novel discusses the recurring themes in *Never Let Me Go*; What is to be human? What is self-sacrifice? What is love? It raises questions about the human being that is decodified with the algorithmic perception of artificial intelligence. *Klara and the Sun* portrays two types

of artificial intelligence. One is the mechanic and silicon-based artificial intelligence and the other one is genetically uplifted children who compromised biologically artificial intelligence. The book sets somewhere in America in the near future in which highly developed AI technology builds companionship in society. Society has been divided by elite people into two distinct classes; high-ranking dominant people and lower-ranking people who are selfish and fail to resilience.

Klara and the Sun is narrated by an artificial intelligence who has an appetite for collecting information from around. Learning all the emotions and reciprocating to people's behaviours, Klara waits at the sale pitch in a store to be bought observing the attitudes of perusing customers. She is designed to be a companion for lonely lifted children. Klara is highly smart as the manager at the store boosts Klara for "her appetite for observing and learning. Her ability to absorb and blend everything she sees around her is quite amazing" (Ishiguro, 2021, p. 41). The novel partly can be classified as bildungsroman since everything revolves around Klara's growing awareness towards everything around and how it functions. The story starts when a young girl named Josie spied on Klara through the window. The artificial friends are made for lifted children whose parents are workaholics to prevent their kids' cold loneliness by cheering them up. Josie is one of those children who are sick because of the lifting process mirroring the ills of pollution and the climate crisis the earth going through.

Klara and the Sun, Kazuo Ishiguro's masterpiece, is interested in the depiction of love in the patterns of the new world order. As the novel is dystopian fiction, it is narrated by a humanoid, Klara who is powered by solar power to present the nonhuman points of view from a different perspective. The novel includes 29 characters who are discussed in the division. Josie is a lifted girl who has ambiguous sickness because of gene editing and her mother Chrissie. The manager is one of the main characters, besides Rick, and Rosa who are artificial friends as well. A few more characters such as the Coffee Cup Lady, the Beggar Man and the Raincoat Man as Klara refers to them through these strange names. The speaker as it is a robot that does not get the education of clones in *Never Let Me Go*, rather she gathers information by observing and narrates through a basis of observations of customers and other people.

Klara and the Sun focuses on a few hierarchical categories such as lifted people having higher status and human superiority over nonhumans. The conception

of division between human and human and human and nonhuman works differently in the posthumanist agenda. Apart from this, Kazuo Ishiguro discusses the incomplete love story between Josie and Rick, and Miss Helen, Rick's mother, and Mr Vance since they are devoid of commitment on the side of the human heart. This romance between people is structured in dystopian posthumanist insight where human emotions and consciousness can be transferred into artificial beings in which human qualities are replaceable and replicable via algorithmic codes. As being a dystopian fiction, *Klara and the Sun* is regarded as a novel for children. Ishiguro discusses with his daughter the novel written for children as “there’s no way you can tell that story to children. You’re just going to traumatize them. I thought, ooh, well maybe I can use it for a novel, and that’s kind of where *Klara and the Sun* came from” (Bavetra & Ravi, 2021, p.300). However, it is necessary to add here that the novel portrays a dystopian world since it portrays an inequality between human and an injustice end for AI who is thrown to the scrapyard when people find them unnecessary.

4.2. Posthuman Transaction In *Klara and the Sun*

Technological advancements are at the centre of Posthumanism because it encapsulates both communications between society and human enhancement. With improved technological artefacts, humanity goes beyond its borders by developing intellectual abilities and conquering consciousness or bodily entrapments. Therefore, the concept of human is ruptured with the emanation of technological progress. As a new foundation, Posthumanism regards human and nonhuman entities at a scale beyond human boundaries. It throws away the dualities between human and nonhuman, human and animal, human and machine invoking the prospect of relocating human position that is considered transcendental power over everything. Posthumanist thinkers ponder our enmeshment with technology, thus, our humane position cannot be obtained apart from machines. The concept of Posthumanism classifies human beings as human animals to equate different animals to the same position. In this way, we, as human beings, reconsider our interrelations with nonhuman animals or entities. Rosi Braidotti suggests a posthuman subjectivity as acknowledged in previous chapters to reach a post-anthropocentric vision. Posthuman subjectivity, as Braidotti remarks, “expresses an embodied and embedded and hence partial form of accountability, based on a strong sense of collectivity,

relationality and hence community building” (2013, p.49). She stresses the rights of animals to be modelled on the rights of human beings which is the extension of life as *zoe*. The effort about the posthuman condition is about the posthuman subjectivity. This new form of subject is a hybrid figure covering an “assemblage of human and nonhuman, planetary and cosmic, given and manufactured, which requires major readjustments in our way of thinking” (2013, p.159). This complex subject of posthuman goes even further with the new definition of Haraway's companion species turning into a symbiosis which is “cybernetic and machine-driven” (Kukkonen, 2020, p.44). A Cyborg figure that Haraway proposes is entwined with both machine and organism that is a biological figure condensed as a fictional character. She discusses in detail in her book, *A Cyborg Manifesto*, as “by the late twentieth century, our time, a mythic time, we are all chimaeras, theorized and fabricated hybrids of machine and organism—in short, cyborgs. The cyborg is our ontology; it gives us our politics” (2016, p.5).

Science fictions are a rich source of cyborg and posthuman subjectivities in which new cultural identities are indicated as in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Klara and the Sun*. Ishiguro forms a new techno reality in a brand-new novel by creating a humanoid companion to a little girl Josie. Klara, an artificial friend, has been chosen by Josie and her mother to accompany Josie because her mother is so busy that her daughter suffers from loneliness. Since Klara is highly observant and successful at pretending to be a human, Ishiguro invites us to question human quality in the machine world and the existence of artificial machines in human worlds. Klara is good at adapting to a new family that she is adopted as a companion friend. Through the narration, we steadily move into a posthuman world where AI can achieve human consciousness sorting out by computer codes. The mother is afraid of losing her only daughter after her first daughter, Sal, passed away because of a mysterious sickness developed after gene editing. Josie has got the same sickness as her sister, Sal. Out of fear, the mother Chrissie planned to replace Josie with an artificial intelligence as she discovered Klara is professional at imitating human behaviours and emotions. She asks Klara at the store before purchasing her: “What did you notice about the way my daughter walks?” (Ishiguro, 2021, p.41). Klara is intended to be not only Josie's companion but also learn every manner of Josie by heart to replace her one day. In this artificial world, human beings prefer machines to normal human beings for socialising. Machine technology blurs the line between machine and human in *Klara*

and the Sun that is hard to differentiate which one is natural or artificial. In this respect, Haraway's sentence is relevant here to address: "Our machines are disturbingly lively, and we ourselves frighteningly inert" (1991, p.152) to stress the engagement of human and machine relation.

Technology is used to enhance our mental and physical capabilities instead of upgrading our lives and curing incurable diseases. The Technological advancement in *Klara and the Sun* offers us a sample of the transhuman world. It consists of posthuman subjectivity whose "identities supersede the human identity in every part of the novel" (Nath, 2023,p.135). The novel lays the bare fact that a humanoid character equipped with consciousness displays a perfect role contrary to a normal human being. A human being is just socially and medically constructed in a posthuman world that is complex to identify the machine and human differences. The limitations of human beings are removed through artificial interference on the body and mind in posthuman platforms. The artificially created Klara and Josie are the exact nuances of Kazuo Ishiguro's pictures as "a machine could easily be a human and it is not a philosophical idea of post-human it is a reality" (p.135). Unlike most of the dystopian mode of future-oriented science fiction that frames a scenario about the stake in how robots attempt to kill humanity, Ishiguro's novel offers us the possibility of robots being empathetic and friendly which can play an important role in the near future. The first-person narrator, Klara, explores and explains the world in a way that we almost forgot that she is a machine. From a machine's vision, however, she seems a humanlike figure, she is not human but a creation of a posthuman world just as lifted children. The main question should be whether an artificial friend can replace a normal human being. Or If lifted children are supposed to be classified as human beings although they are artificially created through genetic interference, Klara as an empathetic creature of artificial production should be categorized in the same way as the post-humanity of lifted people. Josie promises Klara to visit Morgan Falls together but her mother sensed that she's pretending to be good, therefore Josie's mother takes Klara and shows her around although Josie became cold towards Klara. Even though was not given the right word, she got stuck in the middle of the coldness. On the way to Morgan Fall, the mother loves Klara just because her daughter loves her and has a great time. Chrissie wants Klara to behave exactly to imitate her daughter when she and Klara went to Morgan's Fall alone. When She asks her to sit and talk like Josie, Klara hesitates replying as "[i] mean, you haven't

forgotten how to do it. Walk like Josie. I will be able to walk in her manner. In fact, now I know her better, and have seen her in more situations, I'll be able to give a more sophisticated imitation. However...'" (Ishiguro, p.90). She not only asks her to move as Josie but also wants her to give responses like her daughter "'[i] told you I'd be fine,' I said. 'Melania was right. Nothing wrong with me. A little tired, that's all.' 'I'm sorry, Josie,' the mother said. 'I'm sorry I didn't bring you here today.'" (p.91). From this conversation, it is clear that Chrissie treats Klara as her one of daughters she additionally utters her deep feelings and thoughts that cannot share with her daughter. However, Chrissie believes that Josie will die soon one day, Klara has her own plans as she believes Josie can be recovered through the sun's nourishment as she witnesses a beggar man come back from death when the sun rises.

In *Klara and the Sun*, the human being is genetically lifted for constituting enhanced human generation related to radical changes in human biology and capacity as in Transhumanism. The genetic enhancements in *Klara and the Sun* represent this kind of transformation that transhuman thinking pursue. Such transformations result in posthuman conditions. Although there is no common conception of what a posthuman figure means, its "visions range from the posthuman as a new biological species, a cybernetic organism, or even a digital, disembodied entity" (Ranisch & Sorgner, 2014, p.8). The transhuman is the process between humans and posthumans, that comes from transitional humans to indicate the link between them. This is the reason why Posthumanism subtle term to define. However, Transhumanism is the intensification of humanism, Posthumanism denies the humanist principles privileged mankind. The transcendental figure of the human being has been challenged after humans engaged with technological apparatuses that complicate the definition of post and transhumanism. Both trans and Posthumanism identify humans' coevolution with technology and offer us the term 'posthuman' to describe a new motif of the human being. Robert Ranisch & Stefan Lorenz Sorgner clarifies that "[t]he 'transhuman' is an abbreviation for transitional human, the link between the human and posthuman" (2014, p.10). However, Posthumanism encapsulates all the studies of feminism, technological research, poststructural, and cultural studies to sort out the crisis of humankind. Therefore, Posthumanism is an umbrella term surrounding Transhumanism in the category of technological Posthumanism. In this regard, both Klara and Josie can be linked to posthuman

subjectivity. Though Klara is an artificial friend, a humanoid, Josie is artificially created via genetic editing which is rarely fatal.

In *Klara and the Sun*, Ishiguro presents the defamiliarisation of human nature because of lifting from the perspective of an AI. In the world that Ishiguro creates, rich parents apply the genetic modification to their children to enhance their academic and professional life. In this way, this new race that they create is beyond natural selection theory where a superclass of youngsters appears. Artificially created human beings cause unfair competition between lifted and unlifted people who are most alienated from society. Characters as Josie suffers from an unknown disease as she gets tired easily and spends most of her time in bed with Klara and her unlifted friend Rick. Sometimes Josie and Rick play bubble games in which they communicate by writing their ideas on paper. In one of the bubble games, Josie gets on Rick by asking “[w]hy is it your mom won’t drive anymore? You still have that car, right?” ... ‘Is it like she’s afraid of accidents?’” (Ishiguro, 2021, p.110). She asks about his mother’s friends as they are few and she goes further pointing “she doesn’t have society” (p.110). Inevitably, the difference between human nature in this way leads to the marginalisation of one side of society which is already the unlifted ones.

Scientists of robotics believe that it is possible to transfer every human quality into algorithmic data claiming that there is no unique human feature that cannot be translated. Ishiguro dramatizes through his project of artificial which is failed as Klara is thrown to recycle garbage at the end of the novel when they are done with her. However, Ishiguro offers a successful character, Klara, who blurs the human and machine boundary. As artificial intelligence is constructed, human beings are also represented as a construction in the posthuman world. Ishiguro's *Klara and the Sun* has shown a posthuman frame to illustrate the difference between the emotional mind and sentimental computing machine. This is foregrounded as “[t]he uniqueness of what it means to be a human is not confined to the biological frame subjected to study under a microscope to offer a taxonomical explanation of the neurobiological underpinning of the human body that could be copied to manufacture simulated nonanimated artefacts” (Shau & Karmakar, 2022, p.15). Being an embodied motif, humanness appears “as a result of the enmeshment of boundaries between bodies, animals, technologies, spaces, and materialities of different kinds,” (p.15) thus the appearance of emotions and anxieties that questions the sentiments structured to the traditional human subject. In *Klara and the Sun*, Mr Capaldi, a

scientist and a professional at artificial technology makes a portrait of Josie without stealthily becoming aware that he makes her statue because the mother asks him. Mr Capaldi consoles Josie's mother when she starts to lose hope: "what we made with Sal was a doll. A bereavement doll, nothing more. We've come a long, long way since then. What you have to understand is this. The new Josie won't be an imitation. She really will be Josie. A continuation of Josie." (Ishiguro, 2021, p.173). They brought Klara with them when they make portraits of Josie, however, she believes that they test her how much she knows about Josie. Indeed, they do not ask her to train the statue of Josie about the way she acts as Klara assumes but they ask for as Mr. Capaldi says "[y]ou're being asked to continue her for Chrissie. And for everyone who loves Josie." (p.175). They expect her to inhabit Josie.

Kazuo Ishiguro challenges the dichotomies about whether technology will threaten the human generation or the possibility to enslave them by occupying such a naive artificial intelligence that is more human than most humans in most parts of the novel. Klara strikes the necessary balance between natural/cultural, human/nonhuman, and organic/inorganic to equate the condition in naturally perceived and culturally constructed states. Beginning from the title of the novel, *Klara and the Sun*, Kazuo Ishiguro propounds a combination between Klara, an artificial friend, and the sun, the natural entity, rising to cherish and nourish both natural and artificial beings. The posthuman character that Kazuo Ishiguro creates in the novel "belongs to the human species but has at least one capacity which goes far beyond the capacities of currently living human beings" or it can be "the new human or the posthuman is a member of a different species, such that interbreeding between humans and posthumans would be impossible" (Sorgner, 2020, p.60) to emphasize nature-culture dictum. We are becoming postantropocentric having become embodied and embedded in relational actuality since we are immersed in the material form of the world although we are different from each other. Rosi Braidotti puts about this relatedness in the human/nonhuman world as "[w]e are after all variations on a common matter. In other words, we differ from each other all the more as we co-define ourselves within the same living matter – environmentally, socially and relationally" (2019, p.50).

4.3. Silicon-Based Posthuman In *Klara And The Sun*

Silicon is a synthetic type polymer like plastic considered as a part of plastic but has a different chemical composition. In Kazuo Ishiguro's *Klara and the Sun*, there are two transhuman forms: lifted children like Josie and artificial intelligence. Josie can be categorized as a carbon-based posthuman subjectivity however Klara is a product of silicon elements and software programme. Artificial Intelligence is a part of science and software engineering composing humanlike systems that behave, observe, adapt, and analyze the world just as clever people do. Artificial Friend, Klara is the most sophisticated edition of AI system that depend on solar power absorption as she grizzles “we [Klara and Rosa] used to worry that because we often couldn't see the Sun from mid-store, we'd grow weaker and weaker” (Ishiguro, 2021, p. 8). She gets her energy from the sun like all B2s standing and staring through the sun. As she continues, “that's the Sun's pattern right there. If you're worried, you can just touch it and get strong again” (8). Klara looks at everything through a pixel-like vision instead of a wide field of view. As she made guesses about people across the window, she comments; “I still couldn't see the Coffee Cup Lady's face, but the man had his eyes tightly shut, and I wasn't sure if he was very happy or very upset” (23). She is good at sensing what people intend to do unlike her robot friend Rosa. When they watch outside, Klara recognizes a fight between people, however, Rosa does not believe they fight but she thinks they are pretending or maybe playing. Similar things happen when Klara sees Coffee Cup Lady and Raincoat Man meeting. Klara and the Manager of the store talks about them. As Klara surprised “[y]es, they seem so happy,” I said. ‘But it's strange because they also seem upset,’ Then the manager grants Klara's idea; “You never miss a thing, do you?” (Ishiguro, 2021, p.23). As the manager tells Klara that people have complex feelings in this sort of moment, Rosa did not understand what she means. Human emotions and computing emotions are different as the first one is equipped with social construction that is changing all the time. Human emotions are based on an interactional system depending on the changing person, context, personality, culture etc. However, computing emotions are a range of expressions unravelling to realize the complexities of emotions because human emotions temporarily differ in conversations that are conceived and explained over several forms. Klara's observation skills are almost equal to her human partner. Although

she is quite well-comprehending emotions compared to Rosa, she is aware of her limitations about human feelings as she explains; “still, there were other things we saw from the window – other kinds of emotions I didn’t at first understand – of which I did eventually find some versions in myself” (Ishiguro, 2021, p.22).

In *Klara and the Sun*, a humanoid Klara foresees an optimistic future, unlike human beings. Developing empathetic relationships with people around us, Klara invites us to philosophize our emotional obscurities replicated by empathetic intelligence. If emotions are not the criteria that allocate machines from humans then what is left as an answer is biological. What makes human being unique compared to machines is that we are biological while they are mechanical. Their function is still not enough to put a distance between themselves and humans because our biological existence with emotions is considered better. Acknowledging that we are biological being is not enough to separate us from robots because machines are produced out of biological substances and the human body is supported by machinic materials. Scientists already obscure the division between humans and machines as “we are treating our bodies as things—in our investigations of our genetic code, in the way we implant pumps and defibrillators in our flesh, in our digitizing of our bodies for education, research, and therapeutic purposes” (Mabrouk, 2022, p.451). For this very reason, our identical personality is squeezed into many directions that the definition of a human being is not clear. Josie's health is getting worse and Klara is the only one who believes her sickness can be healed contrary to her human friends and her adoptive family. Ironically, a machine clings to hope despite every contingency proving otherwise. As she is afraid of Josie's death, she goes to Rick's home and convinced him to make up with Josie and bring her to Mr. McBain's barn. Arriving at the barn, she alone gets in and starts to pray: “[i] understand how forward and rude I’ve been to come here. The Sun has every right to be angry, and I fully understand your refusal even to consider my request” (Ishiguro, 2021, p.140). She begins bargaining with the sun in a manner of worship she will sacrifice her existence to help Josie. However, she cannot make sense of Josie and her mother's farewell every time they depart since she is not completely filled with a sense of love. Klara is not just a worshipper who makes a sacrifice to pagan gods but also acts as an argus parent who monitors their kids. “Josie remained tired for much of the day. But in the late afternoon, once I raised the bedroom blinds to let the Sun’s pattern fall over her, she became noticeably stronger” (Ishiguro, 2021, p.76). When Klara comes to the

home first days, she joined a host party in which people are getting together for socialising. Rick goes to the party despite his unwillingness. Klara is a loyal friend that she proves it that day. She does not obey anyone's command but Josie's. The children at the party ask her to show her tricks but she does not follow them. The brattish children mock Klara as one of them says: “[y]ou want to see her,” Danny said, ‘get up off that sofa and come over here.’ ‘Just throw her over. Let’s test her coordination’” (Ishiguro, 2021, p.67). It is clear that she does not have legislated autonomy, but at least she has the cognitive power to achieve it. Not responding to the other children disappoints Josie. When Danny, one of the lifted boys, asks her if she could have a chance to get a B3s and why she did not. “Josie laughed and said: ‘Now I’m starting to think I should have.’” (p.69). Klara has a mission to understand the world through human memories and emotions. Regarding all the emotions such as hope, love, faith and whatsoever, Klara as a friend, a parent or as a caretaker does her job magnificently so that one does wonder whether it is possible for such a living robot capable of having thoughts and emotions.

Throughout the text, Klara believes the Cooting Machine is a source of pollution which is the reason withholds the sun from doing its merciful work since the sun does not like pollution. As a machine, puts Josie's goodness before her interest which is to cover what the sun demands to save Josie's life. She knows that Sun care about love therefore she goes for Rick and Josie's love. She makes a deal with Sun and keeps it a secret, not even share with Rick: “‘I’m sorry, I’m not able to discuss this matter with Rick. Tonight I believe an understanding was achieved. A contract if you like. But it might be jeopardized if I speak about it freely.’” (Ishiguro, 2021, p.142). Her loyalty and care do not let her disturb her promise since the sun may get offended. To destroy the machine to prevent her bleached smoke, Klara gets support from Josie's father who is vehemently against his ex-wife's plan. She learns from him how to sabotage the polluting machine by using the vital fluid in her head. By letting Klara give harm the Cooting Machine, Paul plans to sabotage Chrissie’s plan, replacing Josie with Klara. Once as an engineer, Paul formulates her how she should act: “But if anything, let’s say, with a high acrylamide content got inside its system, for example, a P-E-G Nine solution, it wouldn't be able to handle it...The damage is likely to be terminal.” (p.188). After this process, Klara started to have some cognition problems that coordinate her although Paul warns her beforehand. She believed she completed the task but after a while, her mechanism starts to

collapse as she let us know “over the last few days, some of my memories have started to overlap in curious ways” (247).

People around Klara are not stable when they approach her. The mother when they were at Morgan Falls, she claims that she is the envy of her because she has no feelings. However, Klara responds with her kindness: “‘I believe I have many feelings. The more I observe, the more feelings become available to me.’” (p.85). Then the mother is bold as usual and tells her should not be fond of learning. Klara tries to express her feeling as possible as she can. She believes that she felt sad because Josie did not come with them. The mother reacts: “‘You felt sadness. Okay’” (p.86). Nevertheless, when they were leaving from the place where Josie's portrait has been done, the mother hugs her like her other daughter when they got in the car. On top of that; what Klara finds out is the radical marginalisation of self. The self is not placed in humans but in his bonds with other humans that locate one as a unique and irreplaceable individual. Having faith in the recovery of Josie, Klara believes that if she will destroy the machine that causes pollution, she believes Josie will be well in return. From this point, it is clear that “the illogic of faith and friendship – of effect – ruptures the very calibrations that enable it, undermining Klara's belief that she could replicate Josie simply by studying her” (Banerjee, 2022, p.25). When she is thrown to the junkyard Klara shares her ideas with the manager “‘I did all I could to learn Josie and had it become necessary, I would have done my utmost. But I don’t think it would have worked out so well. Not because I wouldn’t have achieved accuracy. But however hard I tried, I believe now there would have remained something beyond my reach.’” (Ishiguro, 2021, p. 251). She is comprehensive to get the reason why she could not continue Josie which is she thinks she cannot reach what father, Rick, mother or Melania Housekeeper feels towards Josie deep inside their hearts. Although Mr Capaldi, the scientist guy as Melania calls him, believes there is no way that Klara cannot replace Josie, Klara believes that he searches not right in the place because the thing that makes Josie special was not inside her but inside those who love her. Mr. Capaldi even asks Klara if she believes in the human heart, not the organ but he means in a poetic sense (Ishiguro, 2021, p.218). Asking her view if she believes there is anything to make humans special or unique although he will be proved wrong about Klara. As Nicola Simonetti adds about Klara “[w]hilst never fully free from her programmed role, Klara’s actions indicate how her deep learning process has contributed to her growth in ways that do not always comply

with the standing social order” (2023, p.9). Although Klara is good at human emotions such as discomfort, anxiety, sadness, love, loyalty and empathy, the instability of human moods makes her believe to the struggle about learning Josie to continue her is impossible. We see the world through the eye of Klara, therefore we admit it as she conceives as if a child comprehends the real world without the backstory. Through this way, Ishiguro shows his interest in building emotion or building characters rather than building a world.

Ishiguro offers us an AI with the feeling of empathy and moral standing which a human being needs to display in such a digital world. The way she shows her concern for Josie makes us question whether she is an autonomous being. She exhibits some qualities that are part of a moral agency where she has a morality that can practice moral reasoning. Without heed of her rationality, can anyone consider her a moral creature who behaves without attaching her free will and her preferences at large? This questioning drives our attention to autonomy as one necessity of moral agency. Some hints prove she is autonomous while there are the opposite views. At the beginning of the narrative, Klara meets Josie who wants to buy her. To claim to take her, Josie dignifies a human attribute due to her possibility to say no, being sure that she is willing to come with her. Josie asks her “[b]ecause I don’t want you coming against your will. That wouldn’t be fair. I really want you to come...But you do want to come, right?” (Ishiguro, 2021, p.26). For sure, Klara wants Josie to choose her but the manager warned her beforehand she cannot make a choice. Even though there is a possibility of being chosen by another child, she was hoping Josie to return after the last time Josie made a promise therefore it indicates her internal moral agency to dominate her feelings. She is worried about if something worse than being picked by other children would happen, which she is not selected at all. Jacob Stenseke argues that “It appears as if the agreement of their companionship is, at some profound human level, reciprocal” (2022, p.5). Although she seems autonomous implicitly, she explicitly lacks the freedom to choose whatever she decides when she keeps her distance from a girl who wanted to pick her. The manager restrains Klara’s freedom by intimidating her, saying “[l]et me tell you something, Klara. Children make promises all the time...It happens all the time. But more often than not, the child never comes back. Or worse, the child comes back and ignores the poor AF who’s waited, and instead chooses another” (P.33). Klara is vulnerable in her feeling towards human beings however she holds all the time hope

of the optimistic side of the coin. She gives much more credibility to human beings than she gets. Although she is restricted by people most of the time, she proves her agency when she alone gets to Rick and offers a vow to Sun. However, although she shows off human emotions, she is somewhat stays robotic as her cognitive abilities depend on intellect rather than emotion.

As a master of euphemistic language, Ishiguro plays with the word just like he did in his other dystopian novel, *Never Let Me Go*. To soften the result of the transplantation process, he uses ‘complete’ instead of die to manipulate the end. This time a robot calls the machine which has three funnels; the Cooting machine, which describes a man and a woman; Coffee Cup Lady and Raincoat Man; drones that Rick invented; machine birds. Klara just like Kathy is self-sacrificial because of her non-egoistic nature. Similarly, although Kathy tries for deferral, she dedicates her life to transplanting her vital organs to rescue other people's lives and waits for her life ends. Klara donates her vital fluid to destroy the polluting machine similar to Kathy. Unlike Kathy, Klara is unable to accept events as unfair because she keeps her preferences as secondary premises due to her self-sacrificial nature. Setting aside her preferences Klara “never demands them to be heard or respected; they only carry moral weight to the extent they are warranted and dignified by Josie” (Stenseke, 2022, p.6) since Josie came first. Although she can decide what is positive or negative, her programming retains her to think about her priorities. Klara can be considered an artificial perfect slave who does not attain any self-worth to herself. She cannot attribute empathy for herself while “others—Josie, or the reader—are able to empathize with Klara and other AFs, even if the AFs are unable to empathize with themselves” (Stenseke, 2022, p.8). Having all essential qualities of human abilities, Klara deserves to have all the rights reserved for human beings since she is equipped with a phenomenal sense of suffering and perceiving empathy, love, care and reasoning. About the sentient robot, Nick Bostrom and Eliezer Yudkowsky put forward that “[a] sentient AI system, even if it lacks language and other higher cognitive faculties, is not like a stuffed toy animal or a wind-up doll; it is more like a living animal” (2014, p.322). The novel, *Klara and the Sun*, questions what is natural and artificial by blurring the boundaries between androids and humans. The ambiguity between two entities shatters the moral understanding we attach to the agent. Ishiguro portrays a dystopian world that is radically changed although he does not give the details about not too far dystopian future but intends.

4.4. Biopolitics In *Klara And The Sun*

The world that we live in going through an uncertain future driven by a complex range of anthropogenic disasters; the favoritism, political extremism, natural disasters and climate crisis changes the meaning of what is to be a human. The problems accelerated after the coronavirus spread around the world in 2019. This major health problem triggers the increase in unequal balance in both individuals and society's well-being in terms of socioeconomic conditions. Through the course of the pandemic, the world come across the fact about injustices between the social classes that blur the future of our world. The virus also can be evaluated as a chance for mediation about our condition and transform it into a piece of art. Kazuo Ishiguro's *Klara and the Sun* is delivered in this period and mirrors the collective problems every individual experience such as non-access to electronic devices, loneliness or depression engendered by lack of accessibility to the digital world. Therefore, Ishiguro's novel can shed light on injustices and inequality causing the global crisis. To illustrate, *Klara and the Sun* presents a lifted child who chooses an artificial friend because she suffers from loneliness. The lifted children have every opportunity to facilitate their life although unlifted children lack of the rights that the former group has.

Ishiguro foresees a future in America where children take their education from home. Unlike privileged children, underprivileged children lack the opportunities such as access to education and a social environment. The parents of lifted children arrange artificial friends for their children since they cannot spend time with them. They even arrange social interaction meetings to make them socialize since children are isolated from the outer world. In contrast to Josie, Rick is an unlifted boy who dropped out the school and has home tutoring just as lifted children do. In one of the interaction meetings, a new neighbour heard he is not lifted and said “such a shame a boy like that should have missed out.” (Ishiguro, 2021, p.61). This sentence indicates that society is aware of the social division because unlifted children will lack all of the rights lifted children can access. Through this way, Ishiguro pays attention to the increasing gap in digital accessibility that causes a disruptive factor on social and individual positions of society. This state creates an issue between the two groups of people indicated in one of Rick and Josie's discussions gives a hint about the future of society. Josie articulates as “[m]y mom

doesn't have so many friends either. But she does have society...It means you walk into a store or get into a taxi and people take you seriously. Treat you well. Having society. Important, right?" (p.110). The text suggests an example of future society as Rick's mother, Miss Helen, reduces her sociality to her house on the contrary Josie's mother is a socio economical elite who experiences depression from a different point. The debate between Rick and Josie demonstrates the fragment between a new social array in which there is individuality covers the lifted and cognitively privileged class who can afford to have pricey androids such as the artificial friend Klara. As Josie tells the lifted groups parents belong to high society whose minds are upgraded to attain and conquer the information. "Being part of the lifted elite offers human superintelligence, yet the repercussion is that the lifting process alters people's character to such a degree that they lose their individual personality" (Groes, 2022, p.1041). Although it already exists some part of the problems *Klara and the Sun* refers to, the main two issues are increasing fragmentation in society and the prospect of loneliness in the near future.

Ishiguro brings forth the social hierarchy which is consolidated by the eugenic research in his novel. As this state creates a vicious circle because if there is a hierarchy people demand more enhancement and more enhancement increases the fragmentation, Francis Fukuyama foregrounds this: "People want smarter kids so that they will get into Harvard, for example, but competition for places at Harvard is zero-sum: if my kid becomes smarter because of gene therapy and gets in, he or she simply displaces your kid" (2002, p.90). In *Klara and the Sun*, Rick tries to get into Atlas Brookings, a college that builds for lifted children to offer opportunities where 2 % of the unlifted child can be received, in that have a place only for really smart kids. Josie blames Rick for not studying hard to try to get into Atlas Brookings because they cannot be together if he is not accepted to that college. Josie and Rick know some complications may prevent them from their plans in future thus they did not share them with anyone. However, people around them remind them of the fact that Rick is not lifted and equal to them: "'It must be weird for him, being here with us.' 'Why'd Josie ask him? He must feel so weird'" (p.63). The worse one is Rick is aware that he is not lifted therefore he thinks he does not have a right to share the same organisation. The lifting process creates a hierarchy between people. Wealthy people will modify their offspring through genetic editing and they will get all the rights reserved. Peter Singer adds that "they will most probably, therefore, continue

to be wealthier, longer-lived and more successful than the children of the poor, and will in turn pass these advantages on to their children, who will take advantage of the ever more sophisticated genetic techniques available to them” (2009, p.283). Rick is a smart boy, his being unlifted does not influence his cognition but leads to an unfair competition for his future. His mother tries to get him into Atlas Brookings by getting the help of her contacts. She asks her ex-lover to help them and Mr. Vance replies “[t]his is a strange tactic you're adopting here. Favoritism, like any other form of corruption, works best when it remains unacknowledged” (p.210). She offers everything for helping his son to get into college. The mother of Rick goes through the emotions machine-like as she demands her son and stays in between acceptance and denial of her offer. Through his characters in the novel, Ishiguro exemplifies how a human being is fragile and vulnerable to the fact of inevitable death as he amplifies the glamour of being alive to seize the moment. The novel creates two sorts of master human races; lifted and unlifted. The outcome of this hierarchical position shapes children's futures. Although the lifted ones have a big chance of getting a bright future, unlifted ones not only miss the chance but are also considered as an inferior race.

Ishiguro categorizes the residents of the novel into three titles; The lifted human, the unlifted human and humanoids. The first and same categories coming from the same origin are not enough to suggest equal conditions as they highlight the anthropocentric view that dominates the novel. Not only is the order between people hierarchized but also between human and machine and even machine to machine have a class division. For instance, the father of Josie, Paul, has been substituted because he is not part of the new society although he was one of the best of his age. He is happy about where he stands because he lives among people who think just like him. He lives in the woods as a commune with people who are adrift just like him. Klara is categorized as inferior to Rick although he does not embrace her when Josie meets her by not looking at her face. With this action, he affirms her status as inferior to his position as a human being despite being unlifted. Klara is continuously othered by the gazes around her. When Klara and Rosa discuss the AF store, she realizes the facts that Rosa does not. When new B3s came, Klara observes their behaviours: “After four days, there could be no more doubt: the three new B3s were deliberately moving away themselves from the older AFs so that when customers came in, the B3s would look like a separate group on their own” (Ishiguro, 2021, p.35). They are

more advance compared to the B2s version of Klara. Nevertheless, as they find the way they behave unnecessarily because AFs would not be a good friend to the children if think to behave this way. While her being conscious of the facts makes her advantageous towards older models of AFs, her awareness towards superior models “goes to add to her feeling of alienation as an older humanoid robot, effectively relegating her to the bottom of the social ladder” (Simonetti, 2023, p.5). Klara starts the narration as “[w]hen we were new” (p.8) to indicate not young but new. Elaborating that they are old now when she narrates the book. The same thing goes for the AFs outside, Klara and Rosa argue that they do not pass by the store. Later, they will understand that it is because they are afraid that their owners will recognize new models at the store, do not need them and throw away them. Towards the end of the novel, they send Klara first to a utility room and later to a scrapyard to be recycled when Josie recovered to go to college. It is essential to remind that despite the whole process, Klara is planning to replace Josie. Mr. Capaldi works on a project technological Josie can be worn by Klara to continue her. As Chrissie explains to Klara what happens when they go to Mr Capaldi's place: “That Josie you saw up there, as you noticed, is empty. If the day comes – I hope it doesn’t, but if it does – we want you to inhabit that Josie up there with everything you’ve learned.” (p.175). The reason why Chrissie hesitate about whether Klara can replace her daughter is that they are authentic thinkers, their generation still believes that human being has something unreachable that cannot be transferred to an AI.

Kazuo Ishiguro’s *Klara and the Sun* seems as a continuation of *Never Let Me Go*. The rich people in *Never Let Me Go* transformed into lifted people in *Klara and the Sun*. Kathy, the clone girl's existence may be continued in Klara as Ishiguro starts the first letters with ‘K’. However, both characters suggest Agamben's threshold of bare life. Both characters are at the threshold of being *homo sacer* and their whole life is confiscated by their masters. Both characters represent human mastery over nonhuman agents. Like Kathy, Klara is complemented less than her human companions even inferior to any unlifted person. Klara's surveillance of Josie is observed throughout the novel. Just as Kathy and her clone friends were satisfied with doing a good job-saving other people's lives, “for all the emotional capacity built into her, Klara never once rues her nonhuman status, let alone fights her inevitable extinction” (Mabrouk, 2022, p.17). Her mere object is to save Josie’s life no matter what happens even if costs her life. The most obvious common thread in

the two novels is Ishiguro's use of euphemism. As we already discussed in *Never Let Me Go* which consists of words such as complete, carer, and donate, In *Klara and the Sun* Ishiguro's most explicit word is 'lifted' as if he means instead gifted and the 'friend' in an artificial friend is an example of euphemism. While AFs are created to be a kind of peer, friend or schoolmate for lifted children, "Klara is not treated as a friend" (Charlwood, 2022, p.1060) but as an artificial servant. Melania Housekeeper commands her to go observe Josie and Rick in the room "[y]ou stay in there. Make sure no hanky-panky" (p.100). Josie as well accepts Klara's housework when she sends her to Rick's house, she says "other people's AFs go on errands all the time, right?" (p.115) as she legitimizes what she demands from her.

In *Klara and the Sun*, robots and unlifted people are others who "the ideal-typical model of an excluded being is offered by the *homo sacer*" (Bauman, 2004, p.32). The life of others is worthless as artificial intelligence is considered unnecessary, they are thrown into the recycling yard and unlifted children are devoid of rights to uphold their life equal to the superior race. Therefore, it will not be wrong to discard them as killing *homo sacer* is neither crime nor a sacrifice. Science has two forms for Deleuze and Guattari. The one is state science in which sovereign power arranges it in the form of hierarchical classification. The significance of state science is to produce knowledge and use it to empower state power. The other form is nomadic science which is free from the restraints of institutional foundations. Although they believe there is no big difference between nomad science and state science, Deleuze and Guattari induce nomad science (Idema, 2014, p.240). For Agamben, the excluded beings are truly human since they do not carry traces of humanist idealization. In *Klara and the Sun*, compared to unlifted people, Melania housekeeper is classified as inferior to them and Klara is also put in the same category 'servant'. As it is articulated in the novel "'Do you ever hear from Melania? Someone said she went to Indiana.' 'We believe she's now in California. When we last heard from her, she was hoping to be accepted by a community there.'" (Ishiguro, 2021, p.240). She is considered a refugee who is searching for a place to be accepted who lives a bare life and who passes the threshold of becoming *zoe*. She is a migrant who exemplifies the international crisis that some specific communities are exposed to. To borrow what Zygmunt Bauman wrote about refugees, they are "human waste, with no useful function to play in the land of their arrival and temporary stay and no intention or realistic prospect of being assimilated and

incorporated into the new social body; from their present place, the dumping site, there is no return and no road forward” (p.77). Melania, unlifted people and artificial intelligence like Klara are perfect sample for human’s body’s “capacity to be reduced to non-human states by the intervention of sovereign power” (Braidotti, 2006, p.39). In the novel, when Klara went to Rick’s house to apologize in place of Josie, Miss Helen welcomes her “[o]ne never knows how to greet a guest like you. After all, are you a guest at all? Or do I treat you like a vacuum cleaner?” (p.123). Klara’s position is reduced to an object although she is super intelligent and a sentient being. At the end of the novel, it is proved that she is thrown into a junkyard as a disposable utility.

Klara and the Sun consists of the same process as *Never Let Me Go* in which characters were completed after donating their vital organs. Mr. Capaldi was keen on artificial intelligence thus he demands analyzing such an intelligent artificial. He believes artificial intelligence is a mystery and we need to figure out what happens inside them to prove they are not dangerous. Yet, Chrissie rejects his suggestion as she thinks “Klara deserves better. She deserves her slow fade.” (p.244) a moment when her battery expires. This is an end that Klara is destined to have though it is softened through euphemism. She is doomed to be disposed of when she is no longer needed. The reason for their inferior position however they seem humanlike is that a humanist defence for a human having an irreducible soul that is transcendental and cannot be created artificially. In this regard, the novel suggests a prospect of equality of human and nonhuman agents being denied. As Klara is easily disposed of, recycled and exploited as a perfect commodification of a slave for techno-capitalism where she is eager to sacrifice her vital fluid let alone serve to save her human friend’s life. In this giant capitalist system with enormous changes in society, “one individual is sacrificed for the sake of someone else’s advancement or betterment” (Charlwood, 2022, p.1053).

Technological breakthroughs may bring life-saving hacks yet they can cause huge unemployment, molestation, apartheid or savage meritocracies in society. There is a social trouble that AI costs unemployment because they replace the position of people. In *Klara and the Sun*, a woman rebukes Klara outside of the theatre because she thinks she will take her seat. She is angry for AIs take their jobs and now intends to take away her seat. As the lady snaps at Josie “First they take the jobs. Then they take the seats at the theater?” (p.201). In this narrative, the author not only emphasize how human treat AIs, but also how human discard each other by creating

tension between lifted and lifted groups. Ishiguro calls our attention to the human rights and opportunities that are not shared equally through a speculative dystopian fiction to manifest there are no universal rights shared by humans and nonhumans. For Rick, being unlifted means he cannot reach academic career opportunities. *Klara and the Sun* serves to answer an ancient question about what it means to be a human. In *Never Let Me Go*, Ishiguro intends to prove whether clones have human souls which “simultaneously indicates the Sisyphean task assigned to all artificial beings, as well as emphasizes the definitive alienness between man and man-made. The same task is given to Klara, as she faces continuous denials of her possession of feelings” (Yiqun, 2021, p.2).

Threaded on the novel, *Klara and the Sun*, robots are our imperfect equal although they are not confined to the same rights. They are somewhat better than us at some point though they are inferior in different fields. As John Danaher points out “it is not simply some technological dream to suggest that robots can (or will soon) satisfy the equality and diversity conditions” (2019, p.9). The whole idea in *Klara and the Sun* is the writer tries to reveal the facts about the near future as anthropocentric ideals dominate the human race and nonhuman others by creating a new genetically enhanced race that subjugated all rights. Doing this, unprivileged human and nonhuman beings are pushed to the threshold of living bare life whom a dominant power can kill. “Agamben’s ‘bare life’ marks the negative limit of modernity and the abyss of totalitarianism that constructs conditions of human passivity” (Braidotti, 2006, p.39). Due to anthropocentric vision, nonhuman beings are exploited to serve the purpose of producing cures through experimentation. The reason behind this instance is the classical humanistic insight to invest transcendental role in humanity. To overcome this, Braidotti suggests a posthuman subject to attain an ethical state between human and nonhuman critters. She replaces the anthropocentric paradigm with the *zoe*-centric location. This posthuman subjectivity is extended to nonhuman kinds and adopts post-anthropocentric vision which displays arguing “becoming-animal, becoming-earth and becoming-machine” (Schmeink, 2016, p.44) considering the enmeshment with nonhuman animals and machines revealing a self who embedded and embodied in consortism.

One of the issues related to enhanced posthuman and unenhanced humans is the increasing injustice between the latter category. Thus posthuman subjectivity confers animating ethics that is “a dissolution of the boundaries through which we

have traditionally separated the human from the nonhuman, the organic from the inorganic, and nature from culture” (Blaagaard & Van der Tuin, 2014, p.48). Haraway suggests a cyborg figure by relating humans to nonhuman entities including technological agents to discard anthropocentric vision which is for a good cause. Post-anthropocentric insight goes further to suggest not only the sweeping away of Anthropocentrism but also deals with the politics of naturalized nonhuman others obliterating the uniqueness of humanity. The task of posthuman thought, for Braidotti, “begins with the realization that the loss of a familiar notion of the ‘human’, which coincides with the awareness of the present posthuman conditions, is not the endpoint, but just one point in the time continuum that sustains the process of becoming posthuman” (2019, p.76). The posthuman body does not belong to a linear history where past, present and future ordained but in the present crisis of past and future. This human body is not only substituted to “‘the family of man’ but of a zoo of post-humanities” (Halberstam & Livingston, 1995, p.3).

4.5. Conclusion

In *Klara and the Sun*, Kazuo Ishiguro portrays a near-future in a dystopian world where technological breakthroughs bring inequality among human and nonhuman beings. While technology creates lifesaving facilities, he warns us about possible conditions such as hierarchical order in defining the human and nonhuman human agents that bore catalyst results. Human in *Klara and the Sun* is divided into two categories lifted and unlifted ones he uses the word play as if referring to gifted to amplify the privileged condition of one side of humanity. On the other hand, there is a hierarchy between humans and nonhumans who are considered inferior compared to even unlifted humans. Ishiguro even goes further by creating a difference between humanoids to reflect the dual relations that classical humanity brings. To provide an objective perspective, Ishiguro creates an android narrator to feel empathy objectively towards the marginalized side of the duality. Klara, an artificial friend, narrates every detail she can comprehend through the lens of an objective eye. Our nonhuman character is even aware of the evilness of favouritism because it excludes the inferior groups where privileged over the allegedly superior ones. Klara narrates this as “‘I know favoritism isn’t desirable. But if the Sun is making exceptions, surely the most deserving are young people who will love one another all their lives” (Ishiguro, 2021, p.228). She believes that her human

companion is truly in love and therefore deserves to be saved by the sun's special treatment. Klara has her conditions when she prays to the sun. Ishiguro makes us meditate upon love, humanity and empathy through Klara. Showing us machines as humanlike and humans as machinelike, Ishiguro questions the position of human and nonhuman entities.

Ishiguro questions the anthropocentric realm that favours human beings over nonhuman beings by picturing technological apparatuses as innocent and natural. They can satisfy human failure through their genuine and affirmative perspectives. He creates such a naive robot as Klara while humans treat her as an object or a scrap wire when they are bored of her. On the flip side, Ishiguro refutes the possibility that artificial intelligence or technological artefacts will enslave or extinguish us however he proves that it is human beings who misuse science and technology to create appalling disparities among human and human, human and nonhuman being serving the benefit of the superior class while excluding the inferior groups from the social order and leave them to live at the threshold of bare life. The lifting process leads to a schism between the young generation. Overcoming that, Braidotti puts forth a Posthumanism egalitarian mode to unite the *zoe* and *bios* on the same scale. We need to wipe away not only the disparity between humans but also between humans and nonhumans. *Zoe* is resistant to the dehumanization of various devalued nonhuman lives. *Zoe* is an affirmative force that exceeds the borders of Anthropocentrism and offers a space beyond the reterritorialization of capitalist power. Braidotti's posthuman world invigorates in Haraway's nature-culture continuum where every agent living or nonliving, human or nonhuman, organic or inorganic and nature or culture share a rhizomatic connection and share friendly and equal ground.

Last but not least, Kazuo Ishiguro's *Klara and the Sun* proves the vacant Western acknowledgement of human being that is attached to reason, morality, and ideal body which discriminate the ones who do not belong to these categories, marginalized and devalues their position in the accultured society which formed through biotechnological advancement by excluding the lower classes. What Kantian self-ethics, Cartesian Duality or ideal and reasonable humans are nothing but discriminative power for humans, nonhuman and living machines. Ishiguro exemplifies inequality via artificial intelligence introducing her to the complete characteristics of an individual. The idea that can they think or can they suffer does

not see off measuring the value that every human and nonhuman being worth. Therefore, Ishiguro's dystopian fiction winked at the wrong assumptions agelong the period when some groups of humans undervalued humans and nonhuman others in his impressive and provocative novel, *Klara and the Sun*.

CONCLUSION

Posthumanism challenges the unprecedented power among humans and various species in which our existence has been triggered by biopolitical and biotechnological developments that increases our relational bounds to other beings. The discussion about posthuman philosophy bears upon the rhizomatic bond between human and nonhuman assemblages rejecting the binary logic between human/nonhuman, nature/culture, male/female and mind/body that characterize the privileged side superior. Our human-centred classical humanistic notion is the main reason for these positions that Posthumanism precisely stands against. This thesis substantiates posthuman's acclaim for the porosity between human and nonhuman relationality as their existence is enmeshed in Kazuo Ishiguro's two speculative dystopian fictions, *Never Let Me Go* and *Klara and the Sun*. This dissertation deals with the interpenetration between *zoe*-oriented discussions to provide an affirmative relation in contemporary dystopias of Ishiguro to suggest an egalitarian environment. The dualist relations that Cartesian rationalism brings have become harder to pursue since the scientific revolutions in technology and medicine have risen. Since human being is ineffective at understanding their nature, "[n]ever mind posthumans—humans are already weird amalgams of machines" (Roden, 2015, p.43) and we do not care about it yet. The machines in late capitalism have made the difference between natural/artificial and mind/body obscure, therefore the division between devices and organisms has blurred. The posthuman figure is the best diagnosis to express this amalgam of machines and organisms. As a posthuman figure embraces the idea of a post-anthropocentric mission, thus it is a mediating consensus to avoid ambiguity in species to equate their positions. To get across the relationship between machine and human well, Donna Haraway proposes a cyborg figure, in Anneke Smelik's words "the cyborg has been hailed as a posthumanist configuration in its hybridity between human flesh and metal or digital material, its wavering between mind and matter, and its shifting boundaries between masculinity and femininity" (2017, p.110). The

cyborg figure aligns with the posthuman character to facilitate the interconnected relations between organic and inorganic assemblages. Within these particular recommendations for the in-betweenness, Kazuo Ishiguro's dystopias exemplify the posthuman status through carbon-based and silicon-based creatures underlying the posthuman biopolitics and posthuman ethics by criticising the anthropocentric dictum. Ishiguro's novels focus on different agents to pay attention to the various tendencies Posthumanism deals with. Keeping in mind Posthumanism adheres to the ethical side of the dystopian circle, this thesis underlies the selected novels' possible analysis which comes up with the new idea of the embodiment of all human and nonhuman species to figure out how they are pronounced in new entanglement. For this reason, both novels pursue posthuman resolution in dealing with the inequality and injustices economically and politically in species hierarchy. The human enmeshment with the world means that they are interactive in the outside world modify the world and they cannot be disassociated. Manuela Rossini notes as "the human body or subject is seen as just another knot in the web of interspecies or intersubjective dependencies. All organic and inorganic creatures are woven together into an instrumental economy in which 'we' live in and through the use of one another's bodies, being reciprocal means and ends to each other" (2017, p.165). From this standpoint, the natural side of matters is no longer passive matter which is shaped and dominated by humankind.

Posthumanism's critical standpoint and a condition of suggesting a new interpenetration of machine and human in the form of posthuman has been exemplified in both novels of Kazuo Ishiguro by leaning on and supported by the philosophy of Rosi Braidotti, Donna Haraway, N. Katherine Hayles, Neil Badmington, Cary Wolfe as the list goes on. Ishiguro's dystopian fictions help us to recognize the essence that being human is not independent of nonhuman counterparts. In this ground scale, while the theoreticians make us aware of posthuman layouts, he proves that posthuman is already enmeshed with the natural world. The posthuman condition that the thinkers suggest is for the betterment of all species in an egalitarian environment where diseases are lessened and more sustainable resources for the sake of the natural world. Posthuman thinkers worry about the vagueness of the future that might be darker than we think. This future world is described in terms of non-egalitarian, apocalyptic and totalitarian contrary to popular belief. Kazuo Ishiguro is one of the distinct writers who offers us a world

with positive and negative posthuman conditions where he invites us to question the pros and cons of posthuman convergence. His imagined world in novels describes the embeddedness of humans with the embodiedness of nonhumans relocating the concept of humans in the context of posthuman ethics and biopolitics as he makes us wonder what is underlined as posthuman condition in both texts.

Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go* implies the possible danger of medical and scientific advances raising ethical questions as Ishiguro warns us about the possible divisions in society that may cause hazardous consequences for society and nonhuman agents. The scientific revolutionary may widen the line between social classes as the select groups can open the doors of wealthy states. The advancements in health may decrease the diseases and death rate, however, rich people can only take advantage of privileged status as it reverses the natural selection of evolutionary theory. On the other hand, his successful dystopian novel, *Klara and the Sun* investigates what is to be human in high genetic editing and technology-driven society. Ishiguro questions the meaning of being human by replacing humans with artificial intelligence and introducing us genetically lifted humans which raises the social division much more than before. *Klara and the Sun* celebrates the entanglement of human and machines in which intelligence, love, and empathy is not only confined to the human species. Although artificial intelligence is a humanlike social robot, we are aware of the fact that the source of genuine intelligence there is a code-driven human being who calculates the mathematical human instincts and behaviours that cannot be wholly predicted.

The most outstanding point that Ishiguro's novels propose is to deconstruct the stereotyped ideas about the purely natural human body. In *Never Let Me Go* and *Klara and the Sun*, Ishiguro urges his readers to rethink the purity of the essence of the body concerning the biotechnological advancements that change the external elements of the body and play with the mind's structure to define the impossibility of defining the true self. It is only understood through the way to understand how the organic and inorganic organisms are associated to create a posthuman subjectivity. Therefore, the best way to describe Ishiguro's characters is to define the posthuman condition where his characters truly fit in.

In both novels of Ishiguro, the posthuman and transhuman are represented through clone bodies, nonclone bodies, lifted children and artificial friends as they are classified as cyborg bodies to find out about the ambiguous line between borders

of so-called natural and artificial bodies with the other organism's bodies in the surrounding. The posthuman clones in *Never Let Me Go*, thus, defies the great divide between self/other and natural/unnatural posthuman bodies of clones which will end at the end of pre life span when they donate their organs. The bodies of nonclones who "were dying have been given a new lease of life through the donations of organs from the clones. In effect, therefore, the identities of clones (derived from humans) and of the humans (whose organs are now from clones) begin to blur internally" (Nayar, 2014, p.89). Similar to this, the lifted human and artificial intelligence in *Klara and the Sun* appear as the posthuman bodies immersed in human DNA and artificial components cut down the threshold between human, animal and mechanical. Just like Haraway's cyborg figure, they problematize the line between preset boundaries between human and nonhuman entities. Breaking up the boundaries between humans and other species, Ishiguro makes us rethink the position that superior groups held in contrast to underprivileged groups of species. Therefore, we need to further search for the biopolitics prepotency power on the setting out the relationship on the division. In both novels, Ishiguro shows how normal people deindividuates others who are not like them as their transformative tool to serve their bodies. The posthuman subjectivity that Ishiguro introduces to us are subjected to many procedures for improving the lives of privileged others. The posthuman bodies are identified not as normal humans but as spiders, thrash and prostitute in *Never Let Me Go* and objects, creatures, and weird in *Klara and the Sun*.

This thesis analysed the posthuman condition through various transhuman bodies in two different dystopian novels of Kazuo Ishiguro who brings together the human and nonhuman in an ethical precept. Acknowledging different forms of transhuman bodies, Ishiguro not only reconfigures the relational bond between all species but also contradicts the Western values that precede the white, male heterosexual human who masters reason, morality and the ideal figure of a man that only he has among his kind and other species. Therefore, Ishiguro's novels are the epitomes to challenge the universally valid but socially constructed being, but also give a chance to immerse in other species from different posthuman perspectives. Posthumanism, thus is a significant resolution to supply an ethical existence and equal relations in connection to others. The posthuman subjectivity, therefore, shifts our perception of fixed bodies and helps us to understand how remarkably our existence is embedded with other embodiments.

REFERENCES

- Agamben, G. (1995). *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life*. Stanford University Press. In *Omnibus homo sacer*. 1-98.
<https://doi.org/10.18574/nyu/9780814753378.003.0009>
- Agamben, A. (2013). Introduction to *homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life*. Campbell, T., & Sitze, A. (Eds.), *Biopolitics. A reader*. Duke University Press.
- Agamben, G. (2004). *The open: Man and animal* (K. Attell, trans.). Stanford University Press.
- Ağın, B. (2020). *Posthümanizm: Kavram, kuram, bilim-kurgu*. Siyasal Kitabevi.
- Alaimo, S. (2010). *Bodily natures: Science, environment, and the material self*. Indiana University Press.
- Alaimo, S. (2014). Thinking as the stuff of the world. *O-Zone: A Journal of Object-Oriented Studies*. 13-21.
https://rc.library.uta.edu/utair/bitstream/handle/10106/26234/02_Alaimo_Thinking+as+Stuff_OZone_Vol1.pdf?sequence=1
- Anderson, N. (2017). Pre- and posthuman animals: The limits and possibilities of animal-human relations. In Weinstein, J., & Colebrook, C. (Eds.), *Posthumous life: Theorizing beyond the posthuman*. Columbia University Press.
- Antakyaioğlu, Z. The Rhizome d'être of posthumanism and the question of ethics. *Post-theories in literary and cultural studies*, 2022, p. 85.
- Antony, L. M. (2017). Body, power and inhumanity: A biopolitical analysis of Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*. *Teresian Journal of English Studies*, 72-82.
<https://teresas.ac.in/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/2017.pdf#page=80>
- Badmington, N. (2004). *Alien chic: Posthumanism and the other within*. Routledge.

- Banerjee, A. (2022). Just fabric: The becoming black of the (Post) human in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Klara and the Sun* (2021). *Sillages Critiques*, (32). <https://doi.org/10.4000/sillagescritiques.13104>
- Bauman, Z. (2004). *Wasted lives: Modernity and its outcasts*. Polity.
- Bavetra, S., & Ravi, R. (2021). Hope, faith, love, human and humanoid: A study of Kazuo Ishiguro's *Klara and the Sun*. *Science, Technology and Development*, 10(5), 295-301.
- Blaagaard, B., & Van der Tuin, I. (Eds.). (2014). *The subject of Rosi Braidotti: Politics and concepts*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Black, S. (2009). Ishiguro's inhuman aesthetics. *MFS Modern Fiction Studies*, 55(4), 785-807. DOI: 10.1353/mfs.0.1637
- Braidotti, R. (2017). Critical posthuman knowledges. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 116(1), 83-96. Duke University Press. doi 10.1215/00382876-3749337
- Braidotti, R. (2016). Four theses on posthuman feminism. In Grusin, R. (Eds.), *Anthropocene feminism*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2002). *Metamorphoses: Towards a materialist theory of becoming*. Polity Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2011). *Nomadic theory: The portable Rosi Braidotti*. Columbia University Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2006). The ethics of becoming-imperceptible. In Boundas C. V. *Deleuze and philosophy*, 133-159. Edinburgh University Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2013). *The posthuman*. Polity Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2006). *Transpositions: On nomadic ethics*. Polity Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2019). *Posthuman knowledge* (Vol. 2). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Braidotti, R. & Veronese, C. (2017). Can the humanities become posthuman? : A conversation. In Oppermann, S. & Iovino, S (Eds.), *Environmental humanities: Voices from the anthropocene*, 339-346. Rowman & Littlefield International Ltd.
- Bostrom, N., Yudkowsky, E. (2014). The ethics of artificial intelligence. In Frankish, K., Ramsey, W.M. (Eds.), *The cambridge handbook of artificial intelligence*, 316-334. Cambridge University Press.
- Booker, M. K. (1994). *The dystopian impulse in modern literature: Fiction as social criticism*. Greenwood Press.

- Butler, J. (2014). Reflections on ethics, destructiveness and life: Rosi Braidotti and the posthuman. In Blaagaard, B., & Van der Tuin, I. (Eds.), *The subject of Rosi Braidotti: Politics and concepts*, 21-28. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Calarco, M. (2006). *In defense of animals: The second wave*. Peter Singer (Eds.). Blackwell Publishing.
- Callicott, J. B. (2017). Worldview remediation in the first century of the new millennium. In Oppermann, S., & Iovino, S. (Eds.), *Environmental humanities: voices from the anthropocene*, 133-53. Rowman and Littlefield.
- Charlwood, C. (2022). Quiet and personal, or resoundingly universal? An Ishiguro crisis. *English Studies*, 103:7, 1045-1064. DOI:10.1080/0013838X.2022.2150940
- Claeys, G. (2017). *Dystopia: A natural history*. Oxford University Press.
- Claeys, G. (2013). Three variants on the concept. *Dystopia (n) matters: On the page, on screen, on stage*, 14. https://www.dystopie-festival.net/2018/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Claeys-THREE-VARIANTS-ON-THE-CONCEPT-OF-DYSTOPIA_shortened.pdf
- Claeys, G. (2010). The origins of dystopia: Wells, Huxley and Orwell. In *The cambridge companion to utopian literature*, 107-131. Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, J. J. (2016). Posthuman environs. In Oppermann, S. & Iovino, S. *Environmental humanities: Voices from the anthropocene*, 25-44. Rowman and Littlefield.
- Colebrook, C. (2008). Agamben: Aesthetics, potentiality, and life. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 107(1), 107-120. DOI 10.1215/00382876-2007-058
- Currie, M. (2009). Controlling time: *Never Let Me Go*. In S. Groes, & S. Matthews (Eds.), *Kazuo Ishiguro: Contemporary critical perspectives*, 91-103. Continuum.
- Danaher, J. (2019). The philosophical case for robot friendship. *Journal of Posthuman Studies*, 3(1), 1-24. <https://philarchive.org/archive/DANTPC-3>
- Defibaugh, A. (2018). Animal bioenhancement. In M., & Pasulka, D. W. (Eds.) *Posthumanism: The future of homo sapiens*, 287-300. Macmillan Reference USA, a part of Gale, a Cengage Company.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Massumi, B. (Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.

- Derrida, J., & Wills, D. (2011). The animal that therefore I am (more to follow). *Critical Inquiry*, 28(2), 369-418. The University of Chicago Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1344276>.
- Descartes, R. (1998). *Discourse on method and meditations on first philosophy* (4th Ed.). Translated by Donald A. Cress. Hackett Publishing Company.
- Fricke, S. (2015). Reworking myths: Stereotypes and genre conventions in Kazuo Ishiguro's work.' In C. Wong, & H. Yıldız (Eds.), *Kazuo Ishiguro in a global context*, 23-38. Routledge.
- Fukuyama, F. (2002). *Our posthuman future: Consequences of the biotechnology revolution*. Picador.
- Gane, N. (2006). When we have never been human, what is to be done? Interview with Donna Haraway. *Theory, culture & society*, 23(7-8), 135-158. DOI: 10.1177/0263276406069228
- Garret, D. (1995). Introduction. In *The cambridge companion to Spinoza's ethics*. Eds by Koistinen, O. Cambridge University Press.
- Gordin, M. D., Tilley, H., & Prakash, G. (Eds.). (2010). *Utopia/Dystopia: Conditions of Historical Possibility*. Princeton University Press.
- Gottlieb, E. (2001). *Dystopian Fiction East and West: Universe of Terror and Trial*. McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP.
- Griffin, G. (2009). Science and the cultural imaginary: The case of Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*. *Textual Practice*, 23(4), 645-663. DOI:10.1080/09502360903000570
- Groes, S. (2022). Health warnings: Reading Kazuo Ishiguro in times of crisis, *English Studies*, 103:7, 1028-1044, DOI: 10.1080/0013838X.2022.2151781
- Grosz, E. (2011). *Becoming undone: Darwinian reflections on life, politics, and art*. Duke University Press.
- Halberstam, J. M., & Livingston, I. (Eds.). (1995). *Posthuman bodies*. Indiana University Press.
- Hanson, C. (2020). *Genetics and the literary imagination*. Oxford University Press.
- Haraway, D. (2016). *A cyborg manifesto: Science, technology, and socialist-feminism in the late 20th century*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Haraway, D. (1991). *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature*. Routledge.

- Hayles, N. K. (1999). *How we became posthuman: Virtual bodies in cybernetics, literature, and informatics*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Heise, U. K. (2011). The posthuman turn: Rewriting species in recent american literature. *A Companion to American Literary Studies*, 454-468. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444343809.ch28>
- Herbrechter, S. (2013). *Posthumanism: A critical analysis*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Horton, E. (2014). Introduction: Contemporary crisis fiction: A new approach to the writing of Graham Swift, Ian McEwan and Kazuo Ishiguro. In *Contemporary crisis fictions: Affect and ethics in the modern British novel*, 1-31. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Idema, T. (2014). Thinking 'a Life': Nomadism as a challenge for (post-) genomics. In Braidotti, R., & Dolphijn, R. (Eds.), *This Deleuzian century: Art, activism, life* (Vol. 400) 239-268. Brill/Rodopi.
- Ishiguro, K. 'Future imperfect'. *Guardian*. March 25, 2006. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2006/mar/25/featuresreviews.guardianreview36>
- Ishiguro, K. (2021). *Klara and the Sun: A novel*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Ishiguro, K. (2017). My twentieth century evening and other small breakthroughs, 8-27. Faber & Faber. <http://im.rediff.com/getahead/2017/dec/11ishiguro.pdf>
- Ishiguro, K. (2006). *Never let me go*. Faber & Faber.
- Johnston, J. O. (2019). *Posthuman capital and biotechnology in contemporary novels*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Karmakar, M., & Parui, A. (2020). Shadowy objects in the test tubes: Biocitizenship, disposable bodies, and wasted lives in Hanif Kureishi's "the body" and Kazuo Ishiguro's *never let me go*. *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 12(6), 2-12. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v12n6.04>
- Kerridge, R. (2017). Foreword. In Oppermann, S. & Iovino, S. (Eds), *Environmental humanities: Voices from the anthropocene*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kowalski, A. (2014). How to create inhumanity: Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*. *Verso: An Undergraduate Journal of Literary Criticism*. <https://ojs.library.dal.ca/verso/article/view/4473>

- Kukkonen, K. (2020). "The self and subjectivity: Why the enlightenment is relevant for posthumanism." In Thomsen, M. R., & Wamberg, J. (Eds.), *The bloomsbury handbook of posthumanism*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Kurzweil, R. (2005). *The singularity is near: When humans transcend biology*. Penguin Group.
- Lechte, J., & Newman, S. (2012). Agamben, Arendt and human rights: Bearing witness to the human. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 15(4), 522-536. DOI: 10.1177/1368431011432376
- Lee, S. K. (2021). Quotidian resistance to affective biopolitics in *Never Let Me Go* by Kazuo Ishiguro. *Studies in English Language & Literature*, 119-137. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21559/aellk.2021.47.4.006>
- Lochner, L. (2015). How dare you claim these children are anything less than fully human?': The shared precariousness of life as a foundation for ethics in *Never Let Me Go*. In Wong, C. & Yıldız, H. (Eds.), *Kazuo Ishiguro in a global context*, 101-110. Routledge.
- Lochner, L. (2011). This is what we're supposed to be doing, isn't it?': Scientific discourse in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*. In Groes, S. & Lewis, B. (Eds.), *Kazuo Ishiguro: New critical visions of the novels*. 225-235. Red Globe Press, London.
- Mabrouk, D. (2022). Is the digital age disrupting our emotional feelings with reference to Kazuo Ishiguro's novel "*Klara and the Sun*"?. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*. <https://dx.doi.org/10.30574/wjarr>
- Matek, L. & Pataki, J. Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go* as a posthumanist dystopia. 1-20. https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=KAZUO+ISHIGURO%E2%80%99S+NEVER+LET+ME+GO+AS+A+POSTHUMANIST+DYSTOPIA+LJUBICA+MATEK+JELENA+PATAKI&btnG
- Matthews, S., & Groes, S. (Eds.). (2009). Introduction. In *Kazuo Ishiguro: Contemporary critical perspectives*, 1-9. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- McMillan, C. T. F. (2021). *Posthumanism in digital culture: Cyborgs, gods and fandom*. Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Miah, A. (2007). Posthumanism: A critical history. *Medical Enhancements and Posthumanity*, 1-28. <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Andy->

- Miah/publication/226430836_A_Critical_History_of_Posthumanism/links/02bfe50f41634817c7000000/A-Critical-History-of-Posthumanism.pdf
- Moylan, T. (2021). *Becoming utopian: The culture and politics of radical transformation*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Moylan, T. (2013). Step into the story. In Vieira F. *Dystopia (n) matters: On the page, on screen, on stage* (42-43), Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Mullan, J. (2009). On first reading *Never Let Me Go*. In Groes, S. & Matthews, S. (Eds.), *Kazuo Ishiguro: Contemporary critical perspectives*, 104-13. Continuum.
- Nath, A. G. (2023). Blurring of human boundaries in the world of technology; A posthuman analysis of Kazuo Ishiguro's *Klara and the Sun*". *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 11 (5). <https://ijcrt.org/papers/IJCRT2305021.pdf>
- Nayar, P. K. (2014). *Posthumanism*. Polity Press.
- Nayar, P. K. (2020). Precarious lives in the age of biocapitalism. *The bloomsbury handbook of posthumanism*, 439-449. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Norris, A. (2000). Giorgio Agamben and the politics of the living dead. in *Diacritics*, 30(4), 38-58. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1566307>.
- Oppermann, S., & Iovino, S. (Eds.). (2017). *Environmental humanities: Voices from the anthropocene*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Pisters, P. (2014). Transplanting life: Bios and zoe in images with imagination. *The subject of Rosi Braidotti: Politics and concepts*, 65-71.
- Pohl, R. (2018). *An analysis of Donna Haraway's a cyborg manifesto: Science, technology, and socialist-feminism in the late twentieth century*. Routledge.
- Ranisch, R., & Sorgner, S. L. (2014). Introducing post-and transhumanism. *Post-and transhumanism: An introduction*, 7-27.
- Roden, D. (2020). Posthumanism: Critical, speculative, biomorphic. *The bloomsbury handbook of posthumanism*, 81-94.
- Roden, D. (2015). *Posthuman life: Philosophy at the edge of the human*. Routledge.
- Rossini, M. (2017). Bodies. In Clarke, B., & Rossini, M. (Eds.), *The cambridge companion to literature and the posthuman*. 153-169. Cambridge University Press.

- Sahu, O. P., & Karmakar, M. (2022). Disposable culture, posthuman affect, and artificial human in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Klara and the Sun* (2021). *AI & society*, 1-9.
- Sargisson, L. (2013). Dystopias do matter. In Vieira, F. *Dystopia (n) matters: On the page, on screen, on stage*, 40-41. Cambridge scholars Publishing.
- Schmeink, L. (2016). *Biopunk dystopias: Genetic engineering, society and science fiction*. Liverpool University Press.
- Schneider, J. (2005). *Donna Haraway: Live theory*. Continuum.
- Sharon, T. (2014). *Human nature in an age of biotechnology: The case for mediated posthumanism* (Vol. 14). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Shildrick, M. (2018). Re/membering the body. In M. Åsberg, C., & Braidotti, R. (Eds.) *A feminist companion to the posthumanities*, 165-174. Springer.
- Simonetti, N. (2023). Mastering otherness with a look: On the politics of the gaze and technological possibility in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Klara and the Sun*. *Critique: Studies in contemporary fiction*, 1-12. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00111619.2023.2186773>
- Singer, P. (2009). Parental choice and human improvement. Savulescu, J., & Bostrom, N. (Eds.). *Human enhancement*, 277-290. Oxford University Press.
- Smelik, A. (2017). Film. In Clarke, B., & Rossini, M. (Eds.), *The cambridge companion to literature and the posthuman*. 109-120. Cambridge University Press.
- Snaza, N. (2015). The failure of humanizing education in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*, *Lit: Literature Interpretation Theory*, 26:3, 215-234, DOI:10.1080/10436928.2015.1062344
- Sorgner, S.L. (2020). Transhumanism. In Thomsen, M. R., & Wamberg, J. (Eds.), *The bloomsbury handbook of posthumanism*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Steffen, W., Crutzen, P. J., & McNeill, J. R. (2007). The anthropocene: Are humans now overwhelming the great forces of nature. *AMBIO: A Journal of the Human Environment*, 36(8), 614-621. Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1579/0044-7447\(2007\)36\[614:TAAHNO\]2.0.CO;2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1579/0044-7447(2007)36[614:TAAHNO]2.0.CO;2)

- Stenseke, J. (2022). The morality of artificial friends in Ishiguro's *Klara and the Sun*. *Journal of Science Fiction and Philosophy*. Vol. 5. <https://philpapers.org/archive/STETMO-63.pdf>
- Suter, R. (2020). *Two-world Literature: Kazuo Ishiguro's early novels*. University of Hawai'i Press.
- Thomsen, M. R., & Wamberg, J. (Eds.). (2020). Introduction. *The bloomsbury handbook of posthumanism*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Wennemann, D. (2018). Commodification of human traits: The body as industrial product. In Bess, M., & Pasulka, D. W. (Eds.) *Posthumanism: The future of homo sapiens*, 259-271. Macmillan Reference USA, a part of Gale, a Cengage Company.
- Veronese, C. (2016). Can the humanities become post-human: Interview with Rosi Braidotti. *Relations.: Beyond Anthropocentrism*, 4(1), 97-101. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7358/rela-2016-001-vero>
- Walkowitz, R. L. (2015). *Born translated: The contemporary novel in an age of world literature*. Columbia University Press.
- Walkowitz, R. L. (2007). Unimaginable largeness: Kazuo Ishiguro, translation, and the new world literature. <http://english.rutgers.edu/images/documents/faculty/walkowitz-ja-2008b.pdf>
- Weinstein, J., & Colebrook, C. (Eds.). (2017). *Posthumous life: Theorizing beyond the posthuman*. Columbia University Press.
- Wilmot, I., Campbell, K., & Tudge, C. (2000). *The second creation: Dolly and the age of biological control*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Wolfe, C. (2010). *What is posthumanism?* (Vol. 8). University of Minnesota Press.
- Xiao, Y. (2021). Dissonances of emotions: Symbols in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Klara and the Sun*. 1-20. https://doi.org/10.14989/LAR_9_1
- Van Baarle, K. (2018). From the cyborg to the apparatus: Figures of posthumanism in the philosophy of Giorgio Agamben and the contemporary performing arts of Kris Verdonck (Doctoral dissertation, Ghent University). [file:///C:/Users/user/Downloads/KristofvanBaarle_tekst_finaal_1106%20\(2\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/user/Downloads/KristofvanBaarle_tekst_finaal_1106%20(2).pdf)

- Yan, K. (2019). Posthuman biopredicament: A study of biodystopia in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(5), 594-602. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0905.15>
- Zalasiewicz, J. (2020). 4. The extraordinary strata of the anthropocene. In Oppermann, S. Iovino, S. *Environmental humanities* (115-132), Rowman and Littlefield.