

Eastern Illinois University The Keep

2017 Awards for Excellence in Student Research
and Creative Activity – Documents

2017 Awards for Excellence in Student Research
and Creative Activity

Spring 2017

“Shadowy objects in test tubes”: Ishiguro’s Never Let Me Go as an Example of Freud’s “Uncanny” and Agamben’s “Bare Life”

Fabian Rempfer
Eastern Illinois University

Follow this and additional works at: http://thekeep.eiu.edu/lib_awards_2017_docs

Part of the [East Asian Languages and Societies Commons](#), and the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rempfer, Fabian, ““Shadowy objects in test tubes”: Ishiguro’s Never Let Me Go as an Example of Freud’s “Uncanny” and Agamben’s “Bare Life”” (2017). *2017 Awards for Excellence in Student Research and Creative Activity – Documents*. 5.
http://thekeep.eiu.edu/lib_awards_2017_docs/5

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the 2017 Awards for Excellence in Student Research and Creative Activity at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2017 Awards for Excellence in Student Research and Creative Activity – Documents by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

“Shadowy objects in test tubes”: Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go* as an Example of Freud’s
“Uncanny” and Agamben’s “Bare Life”

According to Freud, “the idea of being buried alive by mistake is the most uncanny thing of all” (10). He vividly describes a fear many people cannot grasp because it is too abstract to think about even though death is the indisputable consequence of being alive. The difference is, however, that we are consciously living through our own demise, being aware that death is inevitable and at hand, which rightly depicts one of the most frightening situations a human being can experience. Therefore, human beings desperately attempt to prevent death by trying to cheat it and even avoid it all together. People invent various kinds of remedies such as vaccinations or medications that are supposed to prolong life and create a form of security for us by further fueling our desired immortality. At present, many doctors even fashion through stem cell transplantation so-called “savior siblings” whose sole purpose is to save their sibling’s life. Hence, it is only a matter of time until humans can create clones in order to be able to harvest their organs for the benefit and survival of the society.

Kazuo Ishiguro’s book *Never Let Me Go* depicts a scenario in which clones are created to serve as a remedy for the society’s fear of death as they represent the physical manifestation of society’s desire for immortality. This world appears to treat clones as “normal” children raised in what looks like a boarding school. In the end, however, readers discover that Hailsham is far from “normal” in its treatment of students; Hailsham’s clones were specifically raised in a stable and even nurturing environment; yet, the students ultimately learn that they were never considered to be genuine humans with souls. This discovery, I argue, depicts the main binary between life and death in *Never Let Me Go*: As Kathy H., the protagonist, tries to fool the reader into believing that clones are free human beings, their creation to save humans through organ

donation, resulting in their inevitable demise, suggests otherwise. Kathy's narration tries to hide this inhumane notion of organ donation by creating a false reality in which everyone seems to be equal. This forged reality creates uncanniness, as the depicted reality appears to be like the reader's reality; however, it is not.

We can explain the concept behind this ambiguous reality through Freud's elucidation of the ambiguity of the term *uncanny (unheimlich)*. According to Freud, *heimlich* "is a word the meaning of which develops in the direction of ambivalence until it finally coincides with its opposite, *unheimlich*. *Unheimlich* is in some way or other a subspecies of *heimlich*" (2). Freud refers to *heimlich* as a contronym, "a word with two opposite meanings" (*OED*), since it entails not only positive meanings such as homely and comfortable, but also negative meanings such as secretly and scary. Therefore, since *unheimlich* also means scary, it becomes a part of the second meaning of *heimlich*. Thus, the involuntary incorporation of *unheimlich* into *heimlich* results in the uncanniness of the word *heimlich* because of its ambiguity.

The "reality" within the book, I contend, follows the same concept, as it portrays a reality that the reader and the characters refer to and seem to accept as the real reality; however, at the same time, it also displays a surreality hiding the inhumanity toward the clones that are treated as non-authentic humans, created by the system. This juxtaposition of an allegedly happy, carefree and especially free childhood to what seems to be an imposed power structure on the society and the clones creates uncanniness simply because the actuality, deemed true by the reader, that clones pass for authentic human beings is a charade. In fact, clones do not represent an actual reality, and instead subconsciously and metaphorically depict the readers' desperate attempts to find a remedy to treat and even prevent death. That is, a clone is the allegorical incorporation of the binary of life and death because it is breathing and living, but only because its death results in

prolonging another person's life. One might also refer to clones as a placebo since the mere imagination of something that exists in order to be sacrificed so that others can live tricks the readers into believing that they are saved, when in reality their own decay is inevitable. In this sense, one might claim a clone represents the image of the living dead, whose only reason for living is to die for others.

In reference to Agamben, one is in the position to declare this state of being as "bare life" versus "sovereign." According to Ewa Ziarek, "Bare life is always already captured by the political in a double way: first, in the form of the exclusion from the polis—it is included in the political in the form of exclusion—and, second, in the form of the unlimited exposure to violation, which does not count as crime." As for the sovereign, Andrew Robinson argues that "Agamben defines sovereignty mainly in terms of exclusion or exception. Sovereignty is constitutive of the state and of statist politics, because it constitutes the political body by deciding who is to be incorporated into it." Applying this concept to *Never Let Me Go*, one is able to contend that the given hierarchy represents a power structure in that particular image; that is, the clones represent the bare life, created by society for the sole purpose of organ donation, and society represents the sovereign, willing to sacrifice clones for the greater good that is defined by the societies' survival.

Robinson further states that "state sovereignty operates directly on life, reshaping it according to the state's perspective or way of seeing." In other words, the clone characters would not exist if it were not for their desired organs, which provides the sovereign state with the alleged right to treat clones the way they do. Hence, clones are powerless and at the mercy of the sovereign society, particularly the guardians. This attempt to make clones human beings, while at the same time denying them human freedom, creates an uncanny effect as it destroys the

constructed reality that clones and humans are equal. Miss Emily states that “we were able to give you something, something which even now no one will ever take from you, and we were able to do that principally by *sheltering* you ... we gave you your childhood” (268). She fabricates this stable, nurturing, and dominant reality in which Hailsham’s clones grow up normally and happily.

In the very same sentence, though, she ties this environment to the condition that the guardians were forced to keep information from their clones. Miss Emily admits that in order to keep this reality stable and in existence, “we kept things from you, lied to you. Yes, in many ways we fooled you” (268). The “sovereign” did not allow someone such as Miss Lucy to threaten or even destroy this notion, as it would have jeopardized this false reality. Miss Emily mentions that “if she’d had her way, your happiness at Hailsham would have been shattered” (268). Miss Lucy planned to counter this dominant reality by educating Hailsham’s students about what they should expect once they leave school, and even though they have dreams and wishes, none of them will come true because of their predestined fates of donating their organs to secure the society’s survival.

This conflict between two guardians or two “sovereigns” suggests that the state of sovereignty is unstable and modifiable. Freud explains that a situation can be frightening “precisely because it is *not* known and familiar” (Freud 1); that is, the guardians’ positions within the system are arbitrary because their condition of belonging to the sovereignty is not secured, but extremely tenuous. Robinson states that “everyone is vulnerable, at risk of being declared *homo sacer*. In the case of democratic discourse, this does not change; at most, it just means that, while everyone is potentially vulnerable, everyone is also potentially a sovereign, able to declare others *homo sacer*.” Therefore, I argue that by accepting that everyone is able to

become a sovereign, we must at the same time accept the risk of being turned into “bare life.” Miss Lucy threatened the system, and even though as a guardian she belonged to the sovereigns, Miss Emily and the other guardians dismissed her, thus turning her into “bare life” excluded from the sovereignty and its “political body” (Robinson). The uncertainty that anyone can be “degraded” into “bare life” at any given moment coupled with a constant state of fear and doubt creates an uncanny effect. These scenes, again, utterly fool the reader, as they display a reality in which clones grow up in a nurturing environment cared for by the guardians; however, the moment a character, especially a “human” character, tries to alter the system and make it more accessible to clones in order for them to understand the extent of their predestined lives, this threatening character has to disappear. This dystopian conception counters the alleged perfect world portrayed in the book, in which humans and clones live together happily, and reveals the true horrors of the created system to the reader.

Freud contends that the *uncanny* “is undoubtedly related to what is frightening—to what arouses dread and horror; equally certainly, too, the word is not always used in a clearly definable sense, so that it tends to coincide with what excites in general” (1). People often do not know why certain situations or people arouse certain feelings and emotions. These sentiments, which cannot be assigned, generate uncanniness when they are subconsciously connectable to feelings created by past memories or experiences that are forgotten at present. Thus, people are not able to cope with these upcoming emotions, which results in dreading situations or even people because they are familiar, yet at the same time also unfamiliar. *Never Let Me Go* depicts many of these situations. Miss Emily, for example, enlightens the clones by stating that “it might look as though you were simply pawns in a game, it can certainly be looked at like that. But think of it. You were lucky pawns” (266). This allusion to chess reinforces the role clones hold

in the society. Chess is a game in which players have to constantly offer up chessmen, initially sacrificing their pawns, in order to save the king and win the game. In reference to *Never Let Me Go*, I argue that society portrays the king and clones depict the pawns. Just as chess players sacrifice their pawns first to save the king, society sacrifices their clones for the purpose of delaying the inevitable—death itself. Therefore, clones represent the connecting piece between living and dying to the readers, forcing them to be aware of their own mortality; thus, clones arouse “dread and horror” because the readers know that they are alive; but they are constantly reminded that their sole purpose of being alive is to benefit society through warding off or deferring death.

Walter Benjamin refers to this state of being as “*Das Lebendige* (the living)” and “*Die Lebenden* (the living)” (qtd. in Weber 16) and according to Weber, “*die Lebenden* [...] designate *living beings*, whereas [*das Lebendige*] signifies the state of *being-alive*” (16). That is, since clones are alive and breathing, yet without political power and rights, thus considered bare life, they belong to the former category “*die Lebenden*.” The guardians and society, in general, are like the living and breathing clones; however, they, unlike clones, possess political power and rights thus belonging to the sovereigns and to the latter category “*das Lebendige*.” Weber explains that the main difference between these two categories is that “living beings are understood as imperfect instantiations of natural or ‘bare life’ ... life taken in its generative generality. ... living beings are naturally and inevitably mortal” (16). One needs to acknowledge the other and take them seriously; otherwise, they do not really exist; thus, one is alive but not living. These categories—being alive and living-being—create uncanniness, as the book portrays every character (human or clone) to be living beings; yet, the readers come to know the truth as they witness the clones’ treatment throughout the book. For example, Miss Lucy explains that it

is far more important for the clones, rather than all the other human beings, to stay healthy. She states that “it [smoking] wasn’t good for me so I stopped it. But what you must understand is that for you, all of you, it’s much, much worse to smoke than it ever was for me” (68). Not only does she refer to the importance that clones need to stay healthy so that their organs are in perfect condition for their harvest, but she also portrays the structure of the system. By stating that the students have to “understand” that their health is essential, she describes the methods the system uses to control their clones. It seems as if the system brainwashes the students into believing that the guardians care about them, although the only part society cares about is the clones’ organs; thus, the sovereigns guilt-trip the students into making sure that they do not jeopardize their organ donation in any way.

Miss Lucy claims that the students “have been told about it. You’re students. You’re... special. So keeping yourselves well, keeping yourselves very healthy inside, that’s much more important for each of you than it is for me” (68-9). This statement reveals the hypocrisy that is present throughout the book. The only reason why Miss Lucy is in a position to make that kind of assertion is because there are clones, or in other words, there is a remedy justifying her mistreatment of her body. Society blindly accepts sacrificing clones, and it appears as if they take their existence for granted. Robinson states that “they have ‘bare life,’ but they are not recognized as having ethically significant life. They are people who can be tortured and killed without the usual implications—without their deaths being viewed on the same level as murder.” This assessment clearly explains the reason for Miss Lucy’s statement. As “bare life,” clones do not have the luxury of being important enough to be protected by the laws; therefore, the society is allowed to kill them with impunity, and society knowingly buries clones alive just to save themselves. This dichotomy of life and death creates uncanniness, as it portrays clones as

“choiceless” organisms; that is, clones know about their inevitable death and that there is nothing they can do to defer their ultimate sacrifice. On the contrary, the pictorial representation of being buried alive in reference to the clones is explainable since clones knowingly live to die and they actively experience their own death.

Although the readers are led to believe that every entity in the book accepts and approves this reality, intrinsically they know about the inequity that adumbrates the book, namely the depiction of a false reality or a surreality in which clones are perceived as human beings. Hailsham’s guardians attempt to treat clones like human beings and provide them with a nurturing environment in which they are able to grow up, and as Miss Emily exclaims, “most importantly, we demonstrated to the world that if students were reared in humane, cultivated environments, it was possible for them to grow to be as sensitive and intelligent as any ordinary human being” (261). This depiction, as well as the statement, is flawed since it entails an antithesis in itself by separating or othering the clones by creating a comparison with the sentence fragment “as any ordinary human being.” Here, the word “as” implies that clones can merely become *like* humans; however, they are not actual human beings. This part also reflects that even though Miss Emily claims her students to be humans, actually, she herself distinguishes between students and actual human beings, who are similar, yet still different. This distinction can be further highlighted as the guardians tried to persuade society that the clones are humans by collecting their art “because [they] thought it would reveal [their] souls” (260); whereas according to Madame, “we’re *all* afraid of you. I myself had to fight back my dread of you all almost every day” (269).

This fear is not unsubstantiated since clones are not born like normal human beings, but created in a tube with their intended function to serve the society. As Madame explains, “All

clones ... existed only to supply medical science. In the early days, after the war, that's largely all you were to most people. Shadowy objects in test tubes" (261). Clones are mere products constructed in test tubes, which, indeed, raises the question whether clones actually possess the very thing the guardians tried to prove they have—a soul. This juxtaposition generates uncanniness since the guardians themselves are not certain about their beliefs, which destroys the reliability of the created reality, deemed true by the reader, and reveals its deceit. On the one hand, they treat their clones as free human beings, nursing them in a nurturing and safe environment and trying to prove that clones have a soul; on the other hand, they are afraid of them and refer to them as merely human-like beings. They exclaim their fear toward them because it is difficult to refer to someone as a human being when it is not born naturally, and they also deny the clones their natural right to live a proper and full life. For example, they do not allow Kathy H. and Tommy to defer their donations. This contradiction between perceiving someone as being a human and a human-like organism that was created by society to die for the greater good is akin to the notion of slavery, which is a subspecies of "bare life."

According to Ziarek, "The key link between bare life/sovereignty and the master/slave dialectic is the substitutability of slavery for death: either for the death of the external enemy or the death of the internal "fallen" member of the community." *Never Let Me Go* depicts the perfect example for this statement, since the society within the book does not seem to have a problem consciously killing the clones for their organs (external enemy), and the clones themselves just accept this given condition without a real fight (internal "fallen" member). The discovery that clones depict a modern form of slavery generates an uncanny effect within the readers as they learn that the alleged true reality in the novel that clones are equal to human characters is a charade. Ziarek further states that "the expropriation of the slave's life constitutes

him or her as a non-person, or a socially dead person, it produces another instance of bare life, violently stripped of genealogy, cultural memory, social distinction, name and native language.” Clones experience these problems, too, as they do not know where they are from and their only reason for existence is to donate their organs to the sovereigns. Society also does not accept them as human beings but rather controls them, not allowing clones to live free lives and make independent decisions.

Furthermore, Ziarek defines the clones’ death as a “social death,” or a sacrifice for the society and the greater good. She explains that “death does not give pardon but, on the contrary, creates the anomaly of the socially dead but biologically alive and economically exploited being.” Therefore, I contend that the society or system displayed in the book exploits their clones for their organs, trivializing their death to a social death, a murder with impunity that guarantees the survival of the sovereign—one must die so that the other can live (longer). Hence, clones, in many ways, portray an unprecedented form of slavery since they are uncompensated for working as carers, and their whole existence is justified by and connected to the need for their organs in order to prolong the sovereigns’ lives. Ziarek refers to this condition as the “destruction of the socio-symbolic formation of subjectivity”; that is, bare life does not possess any rights or individuality, which leads to the universal legitimacy that society unhesitatingly accepts the clones’ death. Sovereigns control and govern their lives, reducing them to the sole purpose of servitude in their organ donation.

This objectification is comparable to Robinson’s claim that “bare life is also the ‘animality’ of humans, the point at which human and animal life becomes indistinguishable.” This confluence is depicted in the book through the word “creature,” which the clones use to refer to their animal drawings, whereas Madame associates clones with “creatures.” Hence, only

Madame is implying the aforementioned transformation of the clones into this animal-like position. This transformation serves two purposes: first, guardians of the society, in general, degrade clones to bare life or less valued life, which highlights their inferiority (with the exception of their organs); and second, comparing clones to animals and taking away their humanness facilitates the act of sacrificing them for the greater good. *Never Let Me Go*, once again, displays a paradox that creates an uncanny effect since, on the one hand, the human characters degrade clones to animals, yet, on the other hand, they need the clones' organs to prolong their own lives, creating a contradiction. If one is to look at organ transplantation scientifically, the attempt to transplant organs from non-human organisms into human bodies, called xenotransplantations, will be unsuccessful because the human body rejects foreign or non-human organs (Hansman 2015). Therefore, if the clones in *Never Let Me Go* were non-humans, the organ transplantation would fail, which leads to the conclusion that clones have to be human beings for the donation process to be successful.

Ultimately, all the aforementioned juxtapositions, I contend, refer to Freud's description of the "double." This notion, according to Freud, is "the connection which the 'double' has with reflection in mirrors, with shadows, with guardian spirits, with the belief in the soul and with the fear of death; but he also lets in a flood of light on the surprising evolution of the idea. For the 'double' was originally an insurance against the destruction of the ego, an 'energetic denial of the power of death'" (3). It describes the binary of life and death, the unknowing of whether one belongs to the categories "sovereign" or "bare life," or the division of human and human-like characters. These binaries force the reader to realize that the depicted reality is a pretense through the revelation of the created false reality in which everyone seems to be equal, which creates uncanniness. Moreover, Freud further states that the double

appears in every shape and in every degree of development. Thus we have characters who are to be considered identical because they look alike. ... So that the one possesses knowledge, feelings, and experiences in common with the other. Or it is marked by the fact that the subject identifies himself with someone else, so that he is in doubt as to which his self is, or substitutes the extraneous self for his own. (Freud 3)

This “phenomenon,” as Freud puts it, reflects the fear of encountering a counterpart that represents an individual being highly similar to the own self. That is, one appears to be capable of revealing similarities in physiognomy, knowledge, or other features characterizing one as an individual, which creates fear and uncanniness. Ishiguro captures this uncanniness through the constant search for a “possible,” creating doubts within the donors, as a “possible” has never been found before. Yet, after Ruth learned that her “possible” might have been spotted, the clones are dedicated to finding that person, since they might be able to see their future selves. A clone’s parent cannot merely be characterized as a normal parent to a child, but the clone is an exact replica of one person in order to function as a donor for society. For Ruth, facing her “possible” and coming to know the source of her very existence creates uncanniness because she realizes what kind of life she could, but never will, have. However, Ruth is disappointed after realizing that the discovered person is not her “possible,” resulting in her frustrated comment that “we’re modeled from *trash*. Junkies, prostitutes, winos, tramps ... That’s what we come from” (166). It seems as if students go insane to know, on the one hand, that there are models out there who look exactly like them, but, on the other hand, that they will most likely never find them and will always be kept in the dark.

The book creates a counterfeit reality in which clones allegedly live their own lives with their own dreams and thoughts; however, the truth that none of these deep-rooted wishes, such as

Ruth's desire to work in an office, will ever come true generates uncanniness within the readers as they connect to the clones and the human characters within the book. The readers find themselves in a so-called Möbius strip, an object in which a single band inverts on itself; while neither side crosses the other, they are interconnected in an endless loop, maintaining difference and similarity simultaneously. The readers are aware of the unfair and inhumane treatment of the clones and feel a moral urge to do something about it; however, they find themselves, at the same time, in the position that clones subconsciously and metaphorically depict the readers' own desperate attempt to find a remedy to prevent death, forcing them to be aware of their own mortality. *Never Let Me Go* is a fantastic novel that portrays society's fear of dying especially in connection with how research has evolved over the last decades. Our constant search for desired immortality influences people to turn against each other out of fear and despair. Thus, they are trying to dictate other persons' lives, resulting in degrading them into bare life during the process. Ishiguro represents a futuristic book that reveals people's dread for the future and, at the same time, creates the ethical question we will be faced with one day: Are clones human beings with the right to live independent lives?

Works Cited

Freud, Sigmund. "The Uncanny." *Imago*, 1919.

Hansman, Heather. "The Future of Animal-to-Human Organ Transplants." *The Smithsonian.com*, 17 September 2015, www.smithsonianmag.com/innovation/future-animal-to-human-organ-transplants-180956402/.

Ishiguro, Kazuo. *Never Let Me Go*, Vintage, 2005.

Robinson, Andrew. "In Theory Giorgio Agamben: the state and the concentration camp." *Ceasefire*, 7 January 2011, www.ceasefiremagazine.co.uk/in-theory-giorgio-agamben-the-state-and-the-concentration-camp/.

Weber, Samuel. "Bare Life and Life in General." *Grey Room*, no. 46, winter 2012, pp. 7-24, *MIT Press Journal*, doi: 10.1162/GREY_a_00058.

Ziarek, Ewa Plonowska. "Bare Life." *Open Humanities Press*, ed. Henry Sussman, vol. 2, 2012, doi: 10.3998/ohp.10803281.0001.001.

Annotated Bibliography

Freud, Sigmund. "The Uncanny." *Imago*, 1919.

Freud depicts one of my favorite theorists, as he examines not only the human behavior but the human mind, which is full of surprises. This collection of works provides the essay "Uncanny" that discusses both the humans' inherent fear of death (e.g. being buried alive) and the humans' inherent suspicion that is generated by certain situations that create uncanniness. This essay depicts an extremely important approach to understanding the human mind, which is essential to my research as to why clones create such fear and uncanniness within the human characters but also the reader. This essay also supports the emerging question of whether clones ought to be perceived as human beings with the right to live independent lives.

Hansman, Heather. "The Future of Animal-to-Human Organ Transplants." *The Smithsonian.com*, 17 September 2015, www.smithsonianmag.com/innovation/future-animal-to-human-organ-transplants-180956402/.

This article represents the scientific proof that clones have to be human beings, as non-human organs will be rejected by the body. It further examines that there have been multiple experiments on human beings who received non-human organs, which have all been rejected by their bodies, eventually. Therefore, this article endorses the perception of clones being human beings and not human-like organisms.

Ishiguro, Kazuo. *Never Let Me Go*, Vintage, 2005.

This book is responsible for my research, as it discusses the treatment and perception of clones by the human characters within the book. It further tries to create a surreality that attempts to lead the reader astray into believing that it is the actual reality. Ishiguro created a fantastic book that plays with people's perception of seeing themselves as moral human beings. He forces us to question ourselves and to grow as humans. Since science has already started cloning animals (e.g. the sheep Dolly), it is only a matter of time until scientists are able to clone human beings. *Never Let Me Go* examines a world full of clones and interrogates and depicts their treatment. This book supports my final question of this paper: Are clones human beings with the right to live independent lives? This is a question every person has to answer for themselves.

Robinson, Andrew. "In Theory Giorgio Agamben: the state and the concentration camp."

Ceasefire, 7 January 2011, www.ceasefiremagazine.co.uk/in-theory-giorgio-agamben-the-state-and-the-concentration-camp/.

Robinson's essay examines and discusses in detail Agamben's theory of sovereignty and bare life. He explains it vividly and perfectly understandable to a non-expert audience. He provides plenty of examples to support his explanation that fit perfectly in the essay. The mentioned theory from Agamben supports my research immensely as it categorizes people, putting them into two categories—either sovereignty or bare life—both interacting with each other. It further demonstrates this interconnection and shows that people have an innate fear of being degraded into bare life, thus losing their *bios*. This theory supports me in the attempt to classify the human and clone characters of the book

and show the human characters' fear of becoming less important than the clones. They need to stay in control.

Weber, Samuel. "Bare Life and Life in General." *Grey Room*, no. 46, winter 2012, pp. 7-24, *MIT Press Journal*, doi: 10.1162/GREY_a_00058.

Samuel Weber uses Walter Benjamin's approach to explaining the difference between *die Lebenden* and *die Lebendigen*, which is also essential to my research, as it helps to decipher the lives of the clone characters in the book. Weber does a great job in explaining Benjamin's theory and facilitates the reader's understanding of it. This theoretical approach is useful to the analysis of clones and their lives in this paper. It supports my attempt to show that clones and humans are not that different from each other; yet, society created a binary in the perception of their lives. With Benjamin's theory, we are able to explain and analyze this binary, which is of great value to my research.

Ziarek, Ewa Plonowska. "Bare Life." *Open Humanities Press*, ed. Henry Sussman, vol. 2, 2012, doi: 10.3998/ohp.10803281.0001.001.

This essay examines the difference between slaves and human beings in terms of Agamben's theory of sovereignty and bare life. This examination is also of great use to my paper since it is applicable to the perception of clones and humans. It generates an analytical approach that examines how to perceive clones in general, yet specifically in relation to humans. Ziarek explains why slavery and the negative, non-human perception of slaves were possible. She puts the sovereign in the center of her research, claiming that

it is their responsibility that this class system existed. This analysis supports my research, as it supports the notion that clones, even though human organisms, are perceived as non-human beings with the sole purpose of organ donation.