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摘要

石黴一雄 (Kazuo Ishiguro) 的著作《別讓我走》以複製人為小說的主要敘事角度；相同地，鄧肯瓊斯 (Duncan Jones) 的作品《月球》也是以複製人的觀點來呈現整部影片。兩部作品皆透過人類基因複製人來詮釋作為「人」的意義。更具體地來說，複製人和人類間的關係存在著多面相的問題，包括：真實性 (authenticity)、自主性 (autonomy)、以及獨特性 (uniqueness)，這些議題還可延伸出某些特定觀念，如：身分認同 (identity)、商品化 (commodification)、及個人特質 (individuality)。因此，本研究將從人類存有狀態的角度來詮釋複製人在文本中的象徵意義，並借用吉爾德勒茲的理論進行分析。德勒茲的觀點如：「差異性」 (difference)、「真相」 (truth)、「現實」 (the virtual)、「進化」 (evolution) 與「過剩」 (the excess) 可進一步解析作品《別讓我走》與《月球》裡人類基因複製人與「自然」人類間的關連。

關鍵字：《別讓我走》、《月球》、身分認同、商品化、個人特質、差異性、真相、現實、進化、過剩。
Abstract

Never Let Me Go by Kazuo Ishiguro is narrated by a reproductive human clone; similarly, Moon by Duncan Jones is presented from the point of view of reproductive human clones. Both works use the perspectives of reproductive human clones in order to amplify the problem of what it means to be human. Specifically, the interrelation between reproductive human clones and human beings raises questions about issues such as authenticity, autonomy, and uniqueness, and links them to ideas about identity, commodification, and individuality. This thesis therefore interprets the figure of the clones as a metaphor for human existence. In doing so, it draws on several theoretical conceptions proposed by Gilles Deleuze: his notions of “difference”, “truth”, “the virtual”, “evolution”, and “the excess” can throw new light on the relationship between “natural” human beings and human clones in both Never Let Me Go and Moon.

Keywords: Never Let Me Go, Moon, identity, commodification, individuality, Gilles Deleuze, difference, truth, the virtual, evolution, the excess.
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Introduction

1.1 The Selection of Moon and Never Let Me Go analyzed with Concepts by Gilles Deleuze

In order to clarify the rationale of the selection of referential works for analysis in this thesis, elucidation of the choice of Moon and Never Let Me Go is needed as a more thorough background of this thesis. In fact, these two referential works are not identical in terms of the category in medium; Moon by Duncan Jones is categorized as a film and Never Let Me Go by Kazuo Ishiguro is a novel. These two works are not exactly alike regarding creative art forms of media yet there are certain connections that bring Moon and Never Let Me Go together. The connections represented by the theme of love will be bought up again in the later part of this introduction. In addition, Never Let Me Go by Kazuo Ishiguro, as the creative art form of novel published in 2005, is more authentic regarding originality than Mark Romanek’s movie adaptation that appears later in the year of 2010. Analyzing the original work of Never Let Me Go is the primary and only intention in this research other than representing the issues implied in the adapted movie version.

Apart from the selection of the two works as the main focus for analysis, the concepts by Gilles Deleuze borrowed for the purpose of analyzing the issues of humanity in Moon and Never Let Me Go are the crucial point of views that highlight such question of humanity implied in the works. Concepts by Gilles Deleuze such as “difference”, “truth”, “the virtual”, “revolution”, and “the excess” are directly relative to such issues of humanity revealed in both Moon and Never Let Me Go. With the inseparable relation to the concepts by Gilles Deleuze, Moon and Never Let Me Go
are to be analyzed with the embedded issues that ultimately lead to the question of humanity.

In the following paragraph, there will be the interrelation that elucidates the connections between the main works—Moon and Never Let Me Go.

1.2 The Interrelation Between Moon and Never Let Me Go

In both Moon by Duncan Jones and Never Let Me Go by Kazuo Ishiguro, humanity is the big issue that permeates from the beginning through the end. Some conceptions of humanity issues are even more emphasized such as love, identity and individuality. In the following passages, the focus will be on the interrelationship of Moon and Never Let Me Go based on love, identity and individuality in humanity issues.

In Moon, the different generations of the reproductive human clone Sam are connected with the idea of love. From the basis of memory implantation, Sam seems nothing different from a human being, expect some humanity issues that are related to controversial arguments between the reproductive human clones and the human beings. The memory implantation gives Sam a thorough background that makes up his psychological connection to the original astronaut Sam Bell; the reproductive human cloning technology completes the task of physical appearance. Both psychology and physicality build the human clone Sam and make him seem nothing less than the human being Sam Bell. But they are still different subjects; what connects them is the great idea in humanity—love. Love is something that is very abstract yet something feels extremely concrete in one’s mind. There is no evidence to literally prove love, but there are plenty of ways to show the ability to love. What takes the human being Sam Bell and the reproductive human clone Sam to the parallel
position is their love for Tess. The project on the moon separates Sam and his wife, Tess; yet such distance does not diminish love. Love grows even stronger by separation. The astronaut Sam Bell loving his wife Tess and the reproductive human clone Sam loving Tess are exactly the same thing. In the matter of love, it is not possible to tell the difference between Sam Bell and Sam. And the affection Sam has for Tess even brings him to a higher level and proves that reproductive human clones are not inferior to human beings since the great power of love exists in both the human clone Sam and the human being Sam Bell. For the sake of love, what truly distinguishes Sam Bell and Sam is the firm fact that one of them is a product of reproductive human cloning technology. However, the juxtaposition of Sam Bell and Sam according to the ability to love does not tell the difference of a human being from a reproductive human clone since they are the same in the aspect of love.

In *Never Let Me Go*, individuality is repeatedly emphasized throughout the novel. What makes the assumption of rather questioned individuality on these human clone students is the proof to show the existence of their souls through artistic creativity. If soul does exist in reproductive human clones, it is likely possible for them to love. And the ability to love brings the reproductive human clones closer to human beings. Love proves the clone students the ability only thought to be possessed by human beings, and thus it also suggests that the reproductive human clones have souls just like ordinary human beings. Soulless creatures are deemed inferior since there is nothing in them that brings out the integrity, let alone love. The ability to love relates the reproductive human clones to human beings even closer. Such affection reflects the soul within a subject. It is rather impossible for one to show love when there is no soul inside. In view of the fact that reproductive human
clones are able to love through the proof of artistic creativity that represents their soul, they are nothing less than human beings.

Apart from love, individuality and identity in humanity issues are as relevant as love is in the interpretation of Moon and Never Let Me Go. Individuality and identity are all based on the idea of copy, which is strongly related to reproductive human cloning technology. Individuality is in doubt when there is no firm proof of identity; identity is dubitable when individuality is relatively hard to prove in virtue of the existence of reproductive human cloning technology. The intertwined connection between reproductive human clones and individuality and identity is always the arduous and controversial problem.

Again, love connects the reproductive human clones with human beings in both Moon and Never Let Me Go. Individuality and identity in humanity issues are the controversial arguments for the further analysis as the approaches of interpretation of these two references. In the later part of this chapter, individuality and identity, along with other issues in humanity, will be elaborated on with more supporting details from Moon and Never Let Me Go and other related arguments.

### 1.3 Questionable Humanity in Reproductive Human Clones

In this research, the term humanity can be defined by what it means to be human beings. What makes one human being? Collectively, the idea of humanity is generated from the thinking about human beings; humanity is expected to be the norms in the interrelation among human beings. Humanity is everywhere in the world which is constructed by human beings. For example, the legal constraints are intertwined with humanity to define a human being’s wrongdoing. Therefore, everything is practically about humanity in this world since human beings dominate
societies. A human cannot be humane enough if there is a doubt in the subject’s humanity; judgments from the social and the kindred aspects will be all over the place. Yet, is it humane enough if the subject is not totally a human being but some form of living very close to human beings, a reproductive human clone? A reproductive human clone is something of to be expected to act like humans yet it is close to impossible for reproductive human clones to be recognized as real human beings. Such humanity in a reproductive human clone can be very controversial when morality and ethics are involved in the issue.

Morality and ethics are often the predominant ideas when it comes to humanity. Somehow, if it is not completely possible for human beings to embrace and take reproductive human clones as the living existence of human beings, the issues of morality and ethics enforced on them can be really unnecessary and inappropriate while reproductive human beings are often served as replacements in the stereotypical way of thinking. On the other hand, it is strongly comprehensible that reproductive human clones are the alternative others that human beings categorize as so. Human beings often exclude others such as reproductive human beings since it is widely thought that the two parties are extremely different yet so closely-related that human beings are restraining the boundary to keep everything simple just because the sameness is probably too much to handle. But on the other hand, for human clones in the mass existence of the same kind, it is highly possible that the doubt of thinking oneself as reproductive human clone is close to none. When everything is kept as the way it is designed to be intrinsic, doubtful thinking is nowhere to be found. Therefore, morality and ethics issues of humanity are the way as they are thought to be—authenticity, autonomy and uniqueness are as natural as they can be. No doubt will ever rise. But, when the boundary is crossed, it can hardly
remains so. The mind of thinking will not stay peacefully tranquil. There are controversial thoughts to be involved, questions to be asked and truth to be told.

Through *Illegal Beings*, the author Kerry Lynn Macintosh holds the positive argument towards reproductive human cloning. Macintosh elaborates the ideas with various aspects of researches and facts to support her vision of actualizing such reproductive technology. Though it is not widely accepted in the current society in terms of ethics and religion issues that highly deny the practice of such different method of reproduction, Macintosh still assumes the high possibility of human cloning. Currently, reproductive human cloning is not widely practiced in the medical field but once people realize their urgent need for such an advanced technology, it can be a way of alternative method to solve life and death issues. Infertile couples can possibly enjoy quality time with their own offspring, and for those people who desperately miss their lost loved ones can bring them back to life, in a sense, through reproductive human cloning technology.

### 1.4 Reproductive Human Cloning Versus Humanity

It is unquestionable that human beings can take advantage of reproductive human cloning technology, yet it is widely believed that such a technology surely arouses issues in the nowadays society. Humanity is the fundamental element that constructs the whole human society in which every human being takes part in; hence it is the ultimate standard that everything looks up to. Reproductive human cloning is based on two parts of concern to humanity, especially related to life and death issues as follows.

One part of reproductive human cloning technology is to make human beings beneficial out of such a practice. Being the target of this advanced technology,
human beings are possibly the deciders of life creation. However, life creation is superiority that most religious people believe is a power in the hands of God. According to the argument in *Illegal Beings* by Kerry Lynn Macintosh, in the religious aspect of thinking, by having the ability to create life, human beings are thought to act against God, “. . . cloning is an offense against God” (10). Being in the position to create lives is just like taking over God’s power—human beings are playing the role of God, which is very disrespectful and unacceptable for religious followers. Reproductive human cloning technology is thus a very questionable practice in religious field no matter what and how it can help human beings.

The other is to be a breakthrough in the medical development. It is a huge step for medical experts to be able to practice reproductive human cloning, yet the concern is that the capability of such a technology brings worries to human nature. Life and death is no longer a barrier for people due to the possible fact that reproductive human cloning technology can make a breakthrough in human nature—death is no longer death but another door to life. The practice of reproductive human cloning technology is thus to be thought as an act against human nature according to Macintosh, “. . . cloning is an offense against nature” (10). It is possible that people fear death no more, instead, it is an option to bring the dead back to life though we all know that it can never be completely the same due to genes and upbringing experience in relationships.

Reproductive human cloning applies a rather different means of reproducing human lives. It is different due to the fact that it is asexual reproduction; unlike natural reproducing, reproductive human cloning is a method without sexual intercourse. Sex is a part of human nature that every human being is born with. And just as different as it is, reproductive human cloning is against nature because of its
practice of asexual way of reproducing human beings. Reproductive human cloning thus implies unnatural act. Playing the role of God to create lives and bringing the dead back to life via reproductive human cloning technology are means against nature. Human beings should be born naturally through sexual intercourse and it is how human beings are created naturally. Every human being has only one life and that makes people treasure their own lives; having more than one life is unnatural.

To connect the inter-contextual analysis between Never Let Me Go by Kazuo Ishiguro and Moon by Duncan Jones, the author will elaborate on how the ideas of unnatural, commodification, individuality and identity are related to these literary references along with authenticity, autonomy and uniqueness. How these ideas can be relevant to the literary references and how they are applied as an interpretation of the two references will be focused in the following passages.

1.4.1 Unnaturalness

Through reproductive human cloning, no family will ever face infertile problems and family members can rejoin the family even death befalls. Every human being can be replicated through human cloning technology. But once the human being is created via cloning, there are certain issues that will befall in one’s lifespan.

The human being who is cloned will face the lack of human dignity according to Macintosh’s statement:

In its 2002 report on human cloning, the President’s Council on Bioethics emphasized a second objection to human reproductive cloning. This objection holds that children who are “begotten” (i.e., conceived through sexual reproduction) are gifts from God; as such, they stand as the equal of their parents in dignity and humanity. By contrast, cloning is a human project that
treats children as manmade products designed to genetic order. This project violates human dignity. (17)

Every human being is born equally to have rights for voice and to be treated as beloved. This is an unquestionable truth that no one can fight against. But facing the existence of cloned human beings, such a truth may be questioned by people. We love and respect others because they are just like us—we all have authenticity, autonomy and uniqueness. We stand equally and we expect respect from others. So we know everyone is an individual person that we should value as so—no human being is born exactly the same, not even twins. But do clones lack of “human dignity?” We are all aware of the fact that “human dignity” is a very crucial element to human lives and one’s life almost depends on it. “Human dignity” is one virtue that every human being should at least have. Without dignity, one’s life is worthless and even disrespected. Being created as artificial products, the cloned human being is now facing the fact of being born unnaturally and thus all the virtues that come along birth are in doubt. Cloned human being is created through exquisite genetic designs and such a technology costs certain value to achieve, which makes reproductive human cloning unnatural enough. Moreover, a cloned human being is thus created via a sense of trading and that lowers one’s “human dignity” on a large scale. No human being can be traded as products on the market. Somehow, can we treat the cloned human being less humane just because the way of one’s birth? It is an indubitable truth that one cannot choose the way to be born, naturally or unnaturally. We should all treat others with respect and “human dignity” just because they are human beings as well.
1.4.2 Commodification

It is universally true that every child is the treasure to the parents because no child is begotten effortlessly. Yet, in a different aspect, when children are created with an amount of money through reproductive human cloning technology, they are not too difficult to beget since money is the easier method than natural pregnancy. In this way, children are hard not to be seen as commodification. Commodification can only be traded with money on the market; somehow, anything that can be obtained by money is not too valuable a treasure. Such purchased objects are often taken as replaceable and it cannot be a tough thing to do as long as the price is affordable. Hence, when cloned children are the items that everyone can afford to buy, the authenticity, autonomy and uniqueness of such cloned human beings are controversial.

Objects trading cannot be more than normal and natural in our society—money can buy almost everything. But is it normal and natural when it comes to buying human beings? Though slavery used to be a part of our history and the slaves were the items purchased with money, the whole thing has been proved wrong and less humane, which led to the success of abolishing slave trading when The Emancipation Proclamation came to this world. This is a hard and regretful example of treating human beings as commodities. Thus, the authenticity, autonomy and uniqueness in slaves are hard to be identified; rather, slaves are even thought not as the subjects to these features, let alone the human dignity that every human being should basically have. People came to realize the fact that slaves are also human beings in the fundamental aspect. Breaking away from slavery has made the slaves gradually take control over their rights so that the authenticity, autonomy and uniqueness are finally in their own hands.
Likely, reproductive human cloning is yet another example to see human beings as commodification. It is never a natural thing to take other human beings as commodities because it makes the commoditized human beings less humane and lack of human dignity. Cloned human beings, as commoditized human beings, lack of human dignity due to the very fact that they cannot take control of themselves but to be products of reproductive human cloning technology, they cannot choose but follow the market mechanism, which is ultimately decisive to the very existence of cloning technology.

Nevertheless, when these cloned human beings are thought dubious about their authenticity, autonomy and uniqueness in view of the fact that they are brought to this world by unnatural ways that make them different from other human beings, they are still the beloved ones in every family that conquers all the difficulties and struggles to make their existence possible. And it is undeniable that commodification is not the obstructer to the lives of cloned human beings as we all know that experiences and relationships in upbringings are extremely various so that everyone is rather different in terms of mentality, personality, psychology and physicality. It is even emphasized in Macintosh’s statement in Illegal Beings:

. . . genes are not destiny. Even if one selects a particular genome for cloning, the environment (which begins with the womb) will have a powerful effect on the baby and psychology of the resulting baby, child and adult. Human clones simply cannot be duplicates of the persons who donate nuclear DNA for the procedure; any prospective parent who expects to receive a made-to-order product is doomed to disappointment. (19-20)

It is very crucial to know the disputable fact that duplicated human beings are not possible through reproductive human cloning. Such a fact not only clarifies the
stereotypes that appear commonly confusing to people when it comes to reproductive human cloning but also let the families be aware of the truth to learn how to embrace different lives they are expecting. Cloned human beings cannot be the exact duplicates of the donors due to the actuality that the genes are only provided for the physical features of the body while the mentality, psychology, and personality are open to possibilities in a person’s upbringing related to the interactive experiences and relationships of the families. It does not make sense to expect a cloned human being to act the same way as the genes donor just because reproductive human cloning implies commodification of the cloned human beings. Cloned human beings and human beings are different individualities, which is a truth that needs every human being’s comprehension. The need to respect and treat every human being fairly, no matter cloned or not, is the irrefutable recognition to be expected in all human beings. It is clearly stated as what Macintosh has expressed in the article, “the argument that cloning treats children as manufactured products could lead to the mistaken belief that human clones are soulless, inert, unfeeling, and inferior to other humans” (21).

1.4.3 Individuality

Individuality is what has already existed in every human being, so it is impossible to take it away from a person. Somehow, when a human being donates genes for the purpose of reproductive human cloning, the concern of losing one’s individuality rises. Is it true that a person can lose one’s individuality through genes donation and create a copy or duplicate? Such a doubt has already been a controversial issue when it comes to reproductive human cloning. Losing one’s
individuality is losing one’s distinctiveness, which makes the human being
unidentifiable and indistinguishable among others.

Likely, twins are usually extremely identical to the other sibling due to their
genes from the biological parents. Often, there are stories about how they are
misidentified as the other twin, and this exactly explains how well people rely on
individual identities. In the same aspect, do twins think in a way that individuality is
not in their lives? I strongly believe that individuality is something that would be the
emphasis that twins try to put up: since twins resemble each other, it might be a
desperate gesture to show their differences and individualities between them. As
Kerry Lynn Macintosh has mentioned the statement in Illegal Beings:

Dr. Nancy L. Segal, a developmental psychologist and twins researcher, has
noted that identical twins are more alike behaviorally and physically than other
human pairs. Nevertheless, her findings also show that the heritability of such
characteristics as intelligence, cognitive skills, and personality traits range only
around 50 percent. In short, identical twins are far from identical. This is
consistent with personal experience; anyone who has ever known identical
twins realizes that each member of a twin pair is a unique individual. (23)

Twins are more about differences even when they are identical enough, and just
because of their differences, the individualities are evidently brought about.

No one would want the exact sameness of everything, as it is a symbol of lack
of uniqueness, a lack of specialness, and even a lack of individuality. Having a lack
of individuality is very hard to be differentiated from others and it is even harder to
show one’s features. Standing for one’s unique features is the way to be known as a
person who is special enough to be identified; on the contrary, being deficient in
personal uniqueness is just like a person without identity. A person without identity is
basically nonexistent to others because it is hard to be remembered. A subject who is thought nonexistent is not in the domain of human rights, let alone the autonomy, authenticity, uniqueness and human dignity—it would be just like one of the objects waiting on the shelves in the market to be purchased. Such objects are replaceable and sometimes disrespected. A replaceable and disrespected human being is the last thing on earth to be. Somehow, possessing the same genes from the genes donor does not make the cloned human being a replicated object that lacks individuality. The cloned human being may be seen as a replicated human being that shares the exact same genes with the donor but the latter-created cloned human being is still another person who is rather different from the genes donor as the experiences and relationships in upbringing cannot be the same—the cloned human being is an individual with one’s own identity, autonomy, authenticity and uniqueness. Human dignity is to be expected for cloned human beings in this way. Take twins for example again, they are completely different individualities that share the same genes. Such a statement is elaborated in Kerry Lynn Macintosh’s argument from Illegal Beings:

Such differences between identical twins should reassure us. If two people who are conceived at the same moment, gestated in the same womb, and raised together in the same environment can be unique individuals, it stands to reason that human clones can be unique individuals also. (23)

Again, it is not right to see twins as the copies of each other as if they are replaceable and even insignificant in existence. They are truly individual identities. In the same way, cloned human beings are not supposed to be treated like the duplicates of the genes donors as if they are just the copies of them—insignificant and replaceable. Cloned human beings live just like any other human being. The right to be respected
is the basic starting point to all thoughts. Somehow, it is truly uneasy to all human beings not to take cloned human beings as just duplicated copies from the genes donors. According to Macintosh’s research, the doubt is not hard to be testified in nowadays society:

\[
\ldots\text{even if a human clone is not a copy per se, his or her individuality will be significantly diminished because he or she shares a genome with another person. As a result, the clone must suffer from identity issues and psychological damage.}
\]

As it happens, we already have research data proving this argument to be incorrect. Identical twins are born into every human society on the planet. They are naturally occurring human clones. Even though the members of each twin pair share a genome, identical twins are not overrepresented among psychiatric patients. Rather, most twins are happy to be twins. They may share a particularly close social bond, but this does not imply loss of individuality.

(28)

From what has been mentioned above, it cannot be more than comprehensible that every human being, no matter cloned or naturally born, has one’s own individuality. More than solely individuality, one’s autonomy, authenticity, and uniqueness cannot be expected to vanish under such circumstances. It is all about the humanly experiences and relationships that bring one’s life together—each human being possesses different lives from others. Hence, it is not a repeated life to be expected when a cloned human comes to existence, other than that, it will be a thoroughly different life to come, as what has been discussed in Macintosh’s article:

Contrary to *The Sixth Day*, cloning does not produce a life that can be played back again and again with the same results. Rather, every person, from
gestation to death, is the unique product of physical and psychological events and influences that interact with and upon his or her genes to generate a unique individual. (28)

Therefore, it is indubitable that every human being, cloned or not, is individually unique with one’s various experiences and relationships that have been built to bond with others—as identification and features of one’s own. Such identity is to be expected when a human being seeks for connection with others within the family and even in the society. Being able to connect with others socially and biologically gives the human being a sense of approval and belonging as if one’s existence is always unquestionably true. Yet, identity can be a very tricky issue when reproductive human cloning is involved. Can a human being lose one’s identity when giving genes to a cloned human being?

1.4.4 Identity

Unnerving as it is for a human being to be unidentifiable or unrecognizable when losing one’s identity, one can be as invisible and unnoticeable as it is in this vast world, leaving no tracks to retrace like someone who is nonexistent. Identity is all what it takes for others to differentiate a person; unique features, personal traits and characteristics are the basic foundation to form a human being’s identity, together with the biological and social connections with one’s relatives and others. When identity is blank, there are no unique features, personal traits and characteristics that make the human being distinguishable from others: one can be extremely ordinary without personality, yet one can possibly take in whatever shows up and make it idiosyncratic. Being without identity makes a human being very plain, like a blank paper that nothing can be referable to one’s personal and distinguishable features; it
also makes a human being unexceptional enough that every other feature looks special on him/her.

Under the previously mentioned situation, there are both advantages as well as disadvantages. In the former situation—total blank identity, it is highly possible for a human being to be able to behave recklessly. Blank identity ingeniously opens up an opportunity to commit crimes without direct and retraceable marks. Such exclusiveness comes from the exact reason of being identifiable in unique features, personal traits and characteristics. Being without such specialness that referable clues work with, the human being is just like an invisible figure, in a sense. And invisible figures cannot get caught when committing crimes. It is a worrisome concern for most of the people who are involved in reproductive human cloning.

While in the later part of the statement—taking in whatever features come, there are good sides along with bad ones. Taking in any feature or specialness that comes to the human being makes the person special and different enough that the person can be anyone. Being flexible and differentiated in featured identity, the human being can enjoy the uncommon exclusiveness of being whomever at one’s disposal. Such specialness is nowhere to be found unless one’s identity is indiscernible. Somehow, the indiscernible features in one’s own identity let the human being suffer the exclusiveness as well. The cloned human being is seen as the copy of the original genes donor, and thus it is highly possible that the exclusive uniqueness of one’s identity is doubted in the cloned human being. The cloned human being, in a way, is not that special compared to naturally conceived human beings due to the fact that cloned humans are the later created of the same genes. The flexible and differentiated identity comes after the blank identity; thus, being in no possession of one’s own special identity makes the cloned human being
distinguishable yet indistinguishable. Therefore, the unique features, personal traits and characteristics of the cloned human beings are questionable. The idea is precedential in the argument in Macintosh’s article, Illegal Beings:

Copies of patented, trademarked, or copyrighted products (such as artwork, music, clothing, electronics, and jewelry) are often unlicensed, fraudulent, and inferior in quality. This experience has embedded in our culture the idea that “original” products have more authenticity and value than copies. Thus, to the extent the identity fallacy presents human clones as copies, it prejudges them as fraudulent or inferior. (33)

Cloned human beings are often seen and thought as the copies of the original genes donors and to this aspect are they extensively taken as the latter created of the same individuals, which makes the cloned human beings less humanly valued. Being treated less origin-valued, cloned human beings are associated with copies, replacements and even replicas that are possibly the worst case for a human-involved aspect. Being thought of as copied, replaceable and replicated is definitely not the essence of authenticity, autonomy and uniqueness. The true identity is not to be questioned. Identity is such a great issue that everyone has been striving for some goal and something that can represent themselves as identities, no matter socially or biologically based. What contribute to identity are the ultimate yet most fundamental elements that everyone has been making great efforts for: authenticity, autonomy and uniqueness. When the identification of oneself cannot be proved indubitable, it is also close to impossible for one to present and claim what the most important essence of a human being is—to possess authenticity, autonomy and uniqueness. Only by truly possessing of undoubted authenticity, autonomy, and uniqueness can one spare the effort to worry about self-identification. Yet, it is to some degree interesting if cloned
human beings are compared with human organ donors. The former is a completely reproductive human clone while the latter is a human being who is to donate vital organs to others in need. One thing in common is that between the two existences, they are to satisfy a purpose set by other human beings just as how they are deprived of authenticity, autonomy, and uniqueness.

To connect the inter-contextual analysis between Never Let Me Go by Kazuo Ishiguro and Moon by Duncan Jones, the author will elaborate on how the ideas of unnatural, commodification, individuality and identity are related to these literary references along with authenticity, autonomy and uniqueness as they are mentioned previously.
Chapter One

Moon

2.1 Plot Summary of the Film Moon

Lunar Industries hires Sam to work in a project of harvesting helium-3, which is the most important element in providing energy consumption on the earth. Sam is working alone at the mining base called “Sarang” on the moon for a 3-year stint. His days on the moon have been going quite smoothly for the most part; and just before he feels excited about finishing his workload and thus returning to the earth as what he hopes, things start to happen unusually. Sam starts to hallucinate his wife, Tess. He misses Tess so much and the only source related to her for him is the video clip recorded by Tess; other than Tess, Sam’s hallucination of a person standing by a harvester distracts Sam while he needs to be fully focused on driving the rover. A major accident that nearly paralysed Sam is caused by such a hallucination. After Sam wakes up from a coma, he cannot remember anything; thus, Gerty, an artificial intelligent machine that protects Sam and keeps order at the base on the moon, tells Sam that he has been in an accident. His waking up from the injured state serves as a turning point where things start to be very strange to him ever since. Sam overhears a conversation between Gerty and some people on an Internet meeting when Sam insists on walking around while he is told to stay in bed for recovery. Sam feels wrong about something so he purposely damages a pipe and takes the chance to go outside to fix it. He then sees the crashed rover and rescues a man who looks exactly like him in the car.
After the man\(^1\) wakes up, he sees Sam\(^2\) and thinks that he is just a hallucination. When interaction between these two men is inevitable, they feel odd about their appearances and have some quarrels over their identities. They both strive for proving their authentic and unquestionable identities. Afterwards, they become doubtful about themselves. The man\(^3\) then starts to search everything he knows around the station to find clues. Unfortunately, his injury has gotten worse enough to be an obstruction in his way. Coincidently, he finds some video clips recorded by the previous astronauts\(^4\) showing that they share the same symptoms of the illness. He then becomes more doubtful of his true identity yet more confident in a question he has long to solve. After Gerty\(^5\) reveals the truth that they are actually clones of the original human being Sam Bell, Sam 5 then confuses his existence and struggles with the truth of his own identity. These two clones, Sam 5 and Sam 6, decide to go outside to look for more clues; during the search, they see other bases and the crashed rover where Sam 5 had the accident. Suddenly, his wound starts bleeding severely and he returns to the base compulsively. Sam enters a room where there is a cockpit and a television, showing a video of instruction: a man on TV is expressing his gratitude and respect for the astronaut’s grand work on the base, and he is also illustrating the function of the cockpit—a spacecraft used to travel back to the earth. Once entering the cockpit, there will be a flash of light and the astronaut will be sent back to the earth after disappearing in the cockpit. But Sam 5 does not believe in it; he knows something must be distrustful. Thus, he finds out that there is a tunnel and

---

\(^1\) Sam 5: one of the main characters in the movie. The character is purposely arranged for such a slight confusion in a way of presentation.

\(^2\) Sam 6: he is awakened after the car accident happens to Sam No.5. Sam No.6 is to take over Sam No.5’s work.

\(^3\) Sam 5

\(^4\) Sam 1 to 4: Same as Sam 5, they are all clones of the original astronaut Sam Bell.

\(^5\) An intelligent machine whose job is to protect and serve the clones at the base.
stairs to the underneath while the other Sam⁶ is just coming into the room. They go
down and find out some large drawers; hence, they pull one of them and witness a
body. They identify the body as Sam Bell right away—just as what they all look like.
Such a scene strikes both of them and they understand that if they go into the cockpit,
they will be dead instead of being shifted back to Earth as what they are told.

Due to the awareness, they, Sam 5 and Sam 6, are afraid that the intention of
the whole helium-3 harvesting project would seize them as the victims just like those
previous clones. Instead of obeying the whole procedure, they plan to pursue the best
for their own sake and resolve for their own survival. The fact that Sam 5 has had an
accident, he is supposed to be in the crashed rover rather than being brought back to
the base. And they begin to wonder if there must still be someone to be found in the
car after Lunar Industries plan to send a rescue team to the base. Hence, they
purposely make a plan to awake a new clone and kill him afterwards before moving
him into the crashed rover, so he would be found as the injured Sam⁷. If all goes well,
one of them⁸ can travel back to the earth by a real spacecraft. They tell Gerty about
the plan and ask for Gerty’s help so they can awake a new clone. Sam 5 feels eager
for contacting his family on Earth, so he grabs a communication apparatus and drives
alone in a rover outside; he dials the numbers and speaks to Eve⁹, thus he not only
learns the news that Tess has passed away but also the truth of the existence of the
real human being Sam Bell. Sam is in a great sorrow after learning the death of Tess,
he then becomes gloomy and tells Sam 6 that he wants to give up the hope of
returning to the earth. A plan changing is in need of their decision.

---

⁶ Sam 6.
⁷ Sam 5.
⁸ Sam 5 and 6.
⁹ Tess’s daughter.
They, Sam 5 and Sam 6, head out in a rover together and talk pleasantly about the memory they share—Tess. All of a sudden, dramatically enough, Sam 5 stopped breathing; then, he is put back into the crashed rover. Sam 6 goes back to the base right before the rescue team “Eliza” arrives. Afterwards, Sam 6 thrusts himself into a spacecraft, launching into the space on the journey back to the earth.

**2.2 Introduction**

As a way of interpretation of the film *Moon*, certain ideas in the contemporary culture can be drawn into this approach for analysis.

Clones can be seen as the repetition of human beings. Humans will die of various inevitable causes such as cancers and accidents. Through cloning, human beings surmount some disease problems or natural disasters via copying themselves and prolonging their lives as clones—it is a way of passing on lives. However, the generic uniqueness is diminished concerning copying. Once a human being is no longer unique in the aspect of genetic combination, the special distinctiveness is thus doubted. According to an article “Cloning Human Beings” by Dan W. Brock, human cloning not only denies individuality and generic identities but also violates human rights. Individuality is no longer special concerning copying for sameness; the essence of the uniqueness in each generic identity is thus under question once the cloning still exists. Moreover, the combination of individuality and uniqueness make up a human being’s ideology, but such a right to maintain one’s speciality would be lost when human cloning appears. On the other hand, take twins for example as a comparison with clones, then such a violation would be blur according to “Cloning Human Beings: An Assessment of the Ethical Issues Pro and Con” in *Clones and Clones*. 
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Is there a moral or human right to a unique identity, and if so would it be violated by human cloning? For human cloning to violate a right to a unique identity, that is, a right to a unique unrepeated genome. This would be violated by human cloning, but is there any such right? It might be thought that cases of identical twins show there is no such right because no one claims that the moral or human rights of the twins have been violated. (Brock 152)

Twins are seen as two identical individuals sharing the similar generic uniqueness. But the face is, they are not all the same, not completely. Twins are still two different individuals—two independent autonomic human beings with their own thoughts. It is absolutely not acceptable to see the twins as repetition of each other.

The clone is also represented as the difference of human beings. Though cloning is to create the sameness seen as other being, this other as a clone is intrinsically a difference from a human being. In Difference and Repetition, Gilles Deleuze has proposed the idea about difference:

The difference ‘between’ two things is only empirical, and the corresponding determinations are only extrinsic. However, instead of something distinguished from something else, imagine something which distinguishes itself—and yet that from which it distinguishes itself does not distinguish itself from it. (28)

When comparing a clone with a human being, the distinct features may not be the unique genome or the appearances but the characteristics that represent the soul, the background and even the whole history of a person. The essence as the personal traits is the difference that distinguishes a person from another. As what has been stated in “Cloning Human Beings: An Assessment of the Ethical Issues Pro and Con” by Dan W. Brock in Clones and Clones, identities are not determined solely on genes:

Even with the same genes, homozygous twins are numerically distinct and not
identical, so what is intended must be the various properties and characteristics that make each individual qualitatively unique and different from others. Does having the same genome as another person undermine that unique qualitative identity? Only on the crudest genetic determinism, according to which an individual’s genes completely and decisively determine everything else about the individual, all his or her other nongenetic features and properties, together with the entire history or biography that constitutes his or her life. . . . (152)

Even through the sameness that enhances the limitation of developing personal and unique identities, difference is still found in reproductive human cloning. As time passes by, everything can be different from what is originally designed. Nothing can remain exactly the same since the time is always changing. What has been constituted at the moment is what it is expected to be like, and the expectation is at the highest peak at the first sight of the creativity. Nevertheless, through changing times, the expectation is practically hard to remain and is easily worn out along with the background of the time; change is very likely to happen.

Often, change implies something different from what is originally designed; but such an idea can be referred to the different direction out of one’s righteous choice. A reproductive human clone is expected to possess every feature just like the donor does—genes and appearance, for sure. Somehow, it is to our anticipation that the reproductive human being cannot be exactly like the donor. Lifestyle, work, and preferences are just not to be inherited from someone in advance. They are the choices made by years and years of cultivation and education received in person. It is just not perceivable to let someone take whatever one is told to do, and that does consequently lead to inappropriateness. Thus, a reproductive human clone is
expected to be like the donor but not exactly the duplicate of the donor. Each of them is an individual.

2.3 Humanity Issues in Moon

This film Moon is introduced to viewers in a way that is more scientific than humane—the structure of the whole film is presented with the background that makes people think of modern, even advanced, technology of the aerospace industry rather than the detailed everyday life events that people can often relate to humanity more easily. Living a life on duty to a project on Moon while harvesting consumable energy source—helium-3 does not sound exactly exciting as working at an office in a big city. The former image often appears with a dull, dim and even solitary environment that often contributes to gloomy emotion that is rather less vital and exciting when all the surrounding is about the desolate and uninhabited land, and to whom the only partner to talk is an intelligent machine; in other words, such experience of life is less humanity-related. In contrast, the latter gives a more stimulating thought in an image with a possibility to run into different walks of life, which is undoubtedly questionable, and even to interact with them; that is to say, such a life obviously relates to everything that has something to do with humanity. This is how we often think of when two extreme ideas are being compared with each other.

Yet, to our surprise, the crucial idea—humanity is right embedded in the details that we can look into during the whole film. Therefore, to amplify the ideas of humanity out of this film, Gilles Deleuze’s concepts of “difference” and “truth” will be drawn into this thesis to be the main ideas for analysis along with other scientific concepts on human clones.
2.4 The Interrelation Between Implied Issues and Concepts by Gilles Deleuze

The interrelation between the implied issues related to social relations and memory implants in Moon and the theoretical concepts proposed by Gilles Deleuze is to be explicated here. It is owing to the hard fact that the reproductive human clones lack social relations that they are deemed as different from human beings. Likewise, the memory implants highlights the lack of biological as well as social relations that strongly connect one to another for human beings. Reproductive human clones are not connected in terms of relation, which brings out their differences from the human beings. The difference is related to the concepts such as “difference” and “truth” brought by Gilles Deleuze.

2.5 Interpretation of Issues Implied in Moon

2.5.1 Social Relations—A Person In A Society

Regulation is the foundation of a society—a society is based on the laws and rules that restrict people from the things which the leaders do not expect people to be involved in. For example, various crimes take a large part in it. Crimes are committed against laws that define and restrain them; laws are created to protect people and to be the guidance for restriction which lies with rules and regulations. To their interrelation, crimes and laws cannot define themselves without each other. And the common basic ground of laws and crimes is humanity. Humanity is the boundary that marks laws and crimes. Laws are legislated by the hard ground considered with the largest interest of human beings and so humanity is what makes the laws. Crimes are committed often when humanity is lost and so through legislation to reconstruct the sense of humanity for the crime committers.
Through education, laws and rules, people in a society are expected to act with well-behaved manners—learning knowledge dedicatedly, following laws obediently, presenting themselves decently, and doing jobs responsibly. To do all that, people have certain models as the predecessors to look up to. Hence, when growing up in a society, there are cultural paths as guidance to such manners for people: education, work, relationship, regulation and etc. In order to be able to find a place to fit in and function well in a society, a person is raised and told to follow such paths constructed as if it is for our own good to be beneficial and successful out of it. Being functional, as contributory, in a society is the basic way to build reputation on the way to be even more successful. And success definitely needs the approval from the public. To be recognized as successfully achieved, one needs to be identified rightly—an unquestionable identity. Though such an identity is not something to proclaim easily. There are certain costs involved for sure.

2.5.2 Memory Implants—Cultural Patterns

The memory implants from the human being Sam Bell to his clone beings can be regarded as the metaphors of the cultural patterns of the paths as guidance us human beings often have in a society. That is, certain ways of paths are chosen as the hope of beacon to be the shining light towards success: lawful practices or medical practices for students who bear hopes from the parents and the society even. From this point of view, what people do is all about interrelation with one another and the society: people take large part in the society and the society is built under the collaboration of people with one another. Society and people cannot be torn apart to exist alone. In this way, what connects people to the society is essential—what we have proves who we are to identify us in the society.
Human beings have social relations and biological identities with other people, and these interrelationships among others are the partial elements that construct a whole person.

Social relation and biological identity function as the basic elements of the human being in a larger scale of information. Social relation is the proof that a human being serves as a gear in a society that is more like a machine. The machine, which is the society, is put together because of the various gears that work together. A human being, so to speak, has the interrelation with others in a society: a staff in a corporation, a husband to a wife, a classmate at school, or a neighbor in a community. A person is always related to others due to the fact that a person does not work alone. Likewise, biological identity is even more fundamental than what social relation is to a person. A human being incontrovertibly is not able to give birth to oneself without biological parents, thus, biological relations as referrals for a person’s identification must be drawn into manifestation. When it comes to a person’s biological relation with others, gene is the unfluctuating fact which embedded in human beings that we take into consideration, which leads to genealogy; hence, a person’s basic identification is allowed to prove itself through biological identity, and through identifying with such information can people get to know others in a further way. For example, a person’s name, job, nationality, inhabitation and family are more than cardinal to give others a thorough understanding to know who the person is.

In Moon, the original astronaut Sam Bell is indubitably a real human being. The human clones created after Sam Bell share his earthly memories as implanted ones unconsciously. To relate these implanted memories with our phenomenon in terms of the recommended path for people to follow in the contemporary society,
In our lives, the ideas of guidance such as education, work, relationship, and regulation are just like the social relations that people are born to accept, even demiforcedly to develop, to prove one’s ability to be independent enough and more importantly to fit into the standard of the society and to address identification with the relations between oneself and the others. Nevertheless, human beings are born without any rules or expectations but only biological identifies as individuals, only when starting to connect with the outside world other than just ourselves do these social relations start to fall upon us. We develop and even enrich ourselves by connecting with others in the society. In this way of thinking, social relations are just like the memories implanted in the human clones’ minds. If being put on the two extremities: human beings versus social relations and human clones versus implanted memories, it is not hard to know that both groups are two individual existences that are different from each other but can be collaborated. Social relations for human beings are just the instructions that direct to their social identities; similarly, implanted memories for human clones are the directions for them to understand their identities.

If social relations are taken away from human beings, it is rather vague for others to differentiate the identifications of the human beings, but such judgment is still possible through biological identities. For the clones, once the implanted memories are taken away, their social relations also disappear. There is nothing to be looked into since they have not literally experienced life in a human society ever, let alone the biological identity other than themselves—as they, in a sense, they come from themselves. They are the technological repetition of the same human being Sam Bell; there is no way of relating the clones to other biological beings other than the clones.
Consequently, when being incapable of identifying oneself, it is very likely to lose one’s confidence when faith and belief are drawn into the argument of some crisis. Such a statement is not hard to be convincing: when a person does not even know one’s identity, it is rather difficult to clarify what is believed on one’s own grounds, for the person cannot even address one’s fundamental perspective of oneself let alone viewpoints on others, which is exactly cast from within the mind of oneself. The viewpoints generated from the mind of an unknown self are rather less persuading since the identification of oneself is already a problematic—a disturbing truth.

2.6 Concepts by Gilles Deleuze

For the following analysis, main ideas about “difference” and “truth” from articles inspired out of the concepts from Gilles Deleuze along with other scientific concepts on human clones will be drawn into discussion.

2.6.1 Difference

A certain connection between the implied issue in the film Moon and the conception proposed by Gilles Deleuze will be the main point in the following paragraphs—the interrelationship of reproductive human clones and human beings. Making reference to Gilles Deleuze’s notion of “difference” will be the central argument here. In an article “Difference as Production and Limitation” in Isolated Experiences, James Brusseau claims:

Deleuze’s difference makes no claims about ultimate perfections.

Difference’s primary claim involves experience’s fluid, progressive, continuing generation. Originating is no longer one place back there in the hazy
metaphysical past but a grinding process constantly staking out a claim to beginning in the present. With this distinction between origins referencing the past and the working present, the philosophy of being splits. Deleuze’s difference functions only in the limited, situated event it currently produces—it inclines nowhere beyond its particular moment. Difference always works here and now. Space and time are no longer fodder for overcoming as they were for Socrates, Augustine, and Kant; they were no longer vulgar obstacles on the way to universality and eternity. Naive space and everyday time satisfy difference, they give it all the room it needs. Everything localizes. Here and now, difference makes the world without awakening Socratic monsters of generality.

But exceptions cannot impinge on Deleuze. Difference still works inside the particular experiences it generates and defines. (11)

According to what has been brought up by James Brusseau, the idea of ‘originating’ is very crucial to “difference” (11). As it is commonly perceived, origin often implies the process backwards to the past in a common sense, while here in the article, Brusseau has stated that it is not completely so to such an idea. Related to Gille Deleuze’s “difference”, Brusseau has made an interpretation that ‘originating’ is actually working in the progressing present as well (11). By sourcing back and working on the present, “difference” can always function on the instant. It is always working, no matter the limitation of ‘space and time’ (11). Without the constraint, ‘universality and eternity’ works ceaselessly. It is right here and right now working at every moment in consideration of space and time restrictions.

A certain connection between “difference” and Moon is to be elaborated here. “Difference” works surpassingly both in the past and the present with no ultimate
obstacles like space and time. Similarly, the main character, Sam, in *Moon* also comes up against difficulties such as space and time. Sam, designed as a reproductive human clone, lives to one main purpose in the lifespan—finishing projects on the moon and going home to the earth. Sam appears to be the repetition in cycle of every generation of the real human being astronaut, Sam Bell. Sam Bell can definitely not surpass the restriction of mortality as a human being; there is not the possibility of breaking the limitation of space and time to actually relive the life. Yet, through the repeated lives as Sam, its different generations as reproductive human clones, Sam Bell fulfills his job and even his dream.

Sam Bell’s scientific job to collect the energy on Moon is a labor-consuming work; and such an occupation can never conquer the physical limit on human beings—illness and death. While via the repeated lives of the reproductive human clone Sam, the astronaut Sam Bell solves the intricate problem. The reproductive human clones can continue the work incessantly when Sam Bell has finally returned to the earth and enjoy his dream come true—reunion with family. Such a dream is only accessible for Sam Bell since he is the one who really has the existing relationship with his family.

On the contrary, for the reproductive human clone, the dream is to be kept as a hope and a motivation to continue living and working on the moon. The dream to the reproductive human clone can only be extremely lifelike yet inapproachable. Just as what James Brusseau has been explained in “Difference as Production and Limitation”, the authentic human being Sam Bell originates in the past yet ingeniously in the present as well through the human clone, Sam. Such “difference” exists right between the past and the present of the lives of Sam Bell and his human clones. The different generations of the reproductive human clone Sam repeatedly
relive the astronaut Sam Bell’s life, Sam Bell depends on the human clone Sam to continue living and reliving by means of ‘experience’ (11).

Experience takes both Sam Bell and the human clone Sam to a place where mortality is somehow forgotten. Experience is the connection that holds Sam Bell and Sam together. Without experience, the two subjects are actually biologically related at most; but with experience, Sam Bell and Sam are not only biologically connected but also socially bonded. By way of experience implanted into the human clone Sam, the social connections are parts of the identity: family, friends, and social status, etc. Those are not only the actualizations to bring Sam into real life but also the experiences that can make him feel. Feeling what it is like to be a human being is exactly the experience that differentiates a real human being from a reproductive human clone.

“Difference” in Sam Bell is experiencing the past while “difference” in the reproductive human clone Sam is experiencing the present. Accordingly, “difference” is in the past as well as in the present just as how Sam Bell lives in the past and still lives in the present just as well. It is the existence and the domain that make difference possible and comprehensible. The passage that follows contains the idea of difference as well. According to “Difference as Production and Limitation” in Isolated Experiences, James Brusseau has made a further statement:

When Deleuze writes ‘Being is Difference’ he does not mean all being necessarily reduces to the production of difference. ‘Being is Difference’ means that being as difference is that being brought into existence and saturated by difference’s regulations.” (12)

“Difference” embedded in the subjects is the demarcation that marks the existence in experience. Only by existing in the regulations by difference can such an idea work
in being. When being outside of the circle of difference, experience of existence may not be referred to difference necessarily. Let us take the astronaut Sam Bell and the reproductive human clone Sam as completely separated existences as two; Sam Bell and Sam are not related. But, when connecting them to biological and social references, they appear to be different in some ways and “saturated by difference’s regulations”, according to what has been proposed previously by Brusseau (12). Difference thus separates Sam Bell and Sam by regulations such as time and space, yet it connects them together so that the difference is more conspicuous than ever.

2.6.2 Truth

To relate the idea of the clone with the contemporary culture, the cultural paths as guidance for people such as education, work, relationship, regulation and etc. are just like the different versions of implants in the clone Sam Bell’s. For Sam, Tess, Eve and Fairfield are the memory implants of the original human being Sam Bell. The clone Sam relies on the memory so much and keeps his faith of returning back to Earth for reunion with his family; due to many reasons, he misses the opportunity and comes to realize that the whole project, and even his 3-year-life on Moon, is almost based on a scheme. The scheme is a whole structure planned to set the clone within such a framed trap and to weave a story for the clone to believe in.

Taking advantage of the rather unidentifiable truth of a clone to make progress in harvesting consumable energy for human beings, the project holder—Lunar Industries has planned a hope for the clones to believe in, yet to fulfil a scheme to lie to the clones. The planned hope is supposed to make the clones believe in whatever they receive—the mission, the identity, and the memories, since there is no doubt about anything without confrontation whatsoever; accordingly, the clones will stick to
the schedule of the harvesting project heartily and look forward to the day of returning to Earth. The project seems so well planned in this way, but the scheme that lies to the clones is so deceitful that it might appears to be unethical. The clones are expendable to Lunar Industries in the whole project—they work and then they die. In such a short life can these clones only live for a hope, and it is not even achievable.

The ingeniously woven deception almost accomplishes the clone Sam’s dream yet destroys him completely.

Truth is not always welcome, contrarily, truth can be very inconvenient especially when it is undeniable. When Sam finds out about the truth of his unquestionable identity of being a human clone created after a true human being Sam Bell, the doubt in himself on identity becomes so huge that devastates his sureness, his confidence, and even his hope. He sees no point of returning back to Earth since there is already an authentic identity of the real human being Sam Bell. To his worse disappointment, the love of his life, Tess, has already passed away. Sam’s hope is all gone after he has learned about such a shocking news that is like a beacon of hope that he has been looking forward to in the entire life. He then gives up hope and gives up everything, the social relation and biological identity which turned out to be nothing more than a lie, and then he gives up himself and plunges into the embrace of death, the inconvenient truth.

For more specific examples for illustration, the following will elaborate on the details of Moon and Gille Deleuze’s idea of “Truth.”

The movie technically presents two Sams and eventually reveals the truth that these Sams are just clones of the original astronaut Sam Bell. Within the movie, there are many dialogues presented in ways to arouse issues related to human beings and clones. For example, the two clones are arguing about their identities to be real
human beings without any doubt but then come to realize that they are both clones after the same human being. Such truth seizes both of them astonishingly. What’s more, the clones even plan to help each other achieve a tremendous goal—returning to Earth. Through such a plan, they come to realize everything they believe in—the social relation as an extraordinary astronaut and the biological identity as a father to his daughter.

Though during the plan, they are not expecting others to be involved—the rescue team “Eliza.” The team does not really influence these clones on achieving their purpose of returning back to Earth but it in a way intrigues the dark side of these two clones against the latest clone Sam who is just about to be wakened. Since one of the clones is very aware of his death coming but still hoping for returning to Earth, he then makes up his mind to let the other Sam return to Earth, and he decides to end his life in the crashed rover where the other Sam found and rescued him. The truth of himself being a disposable life form with only short-term life of three years can be interpreted as an inconvenient truth revealed and that nothing can be done to alter such a biological identity created by high technology with a scheme of exploitation.

Within such a scene, it is hardly distinguishable to tell the difference between a clone and a human being: they both share the sublime virtue of love, which is presented as sacrifice here. It is hardly to distinguish a clone from a human being because such a virtue is normally expected in real human beings. The clone’s decision is noble due to the fact that even the truth is harsh, there is still humanity in him when he decides to fulfill a hope that is more attainable than his own for other’s own sake.

According to Keith Ansell Pearson’s article “Deleuze Outside/Outside Deleuze: On the Difference Engineer” in Deleuze and Philosophy, the author has
written:

Truth cannot be said to be the product of a prior disposition or schema, but is rather the result of a tremendous violence in thought, an irruption of the larval mind that is populated by a thousand ‘souls’, a thousand plateaus of intensity. One will never find truth, one will never philosophize, if one knows in advance what one is looking for. When we restrict the philosophical task to the merely human, seeking the true only in order to do good, we find nothing.

(3)

Truth is something under search when there is doubt conflicting with what is believed. The clone Sam sets his foot on finding the truth when there is another clone appearing in his sight with identical appearance just like himself—his make-believe authentic identity revealed to be just a pseudo-identity. The identity to be unique is thus under question. The clone Sam confronts the latter clone with their beliefs in everything received—social relation and biological identity, and then come to the result of the truth searching to be nothing more than just make-believe. Through searching, Sam gets closer to the truth step by step. He not only does the good—revealing the ugly truth of pseudo-identity of the every clone, but also sabotages the whole project of exploiting clones with a lie as meticulously woven and not to be disclosed. Sam may not know what truth is ahead of him, but his deciding to reveal it makes everything better. The search of truth not only ends in finding the true identity but also revealing the unsaid of the scientific project and clarifying the credibility of the belief he has believed in.

Truth here may not be the most wanted fact that Sam searches for, but it is definitely the best answer to what has been interwoven in his belief.
Chapter Two

Never Let Me Go

3.1 Plot Summary of Never Let Me Go

Kathy H. who is one of the main characters in the novel narrates the book retrospectively. When she introduces herself by being a “carer” to others who are undergoing donations, she recollects her memory back in the days in Hailsham, a school in which all the characters grow up. The friendships with Ruth and Tommy have been keeping Kathy company in the early days of her life at school. Hailsham is a school with some peculiarities: the students are always at school and they never speak of their families. Though Hailsham seems a different place, there is still some mutual emphasis that rouses resonance—writing and creativity in arts are at a great importance of value at school. The great importance of art is actualized by the continual visits from Madame, a mysterious woman who collects the artworks for her “gallery,” which is known but in a vague existence due to the fact that students cannot talk about it. Although with the emphasis on creativity, Tommy is not doing well at being creative. Then it comes to the day when a teacher, Miss Lucy, tells Tommy that it does not matter if he is creative in art or not. Though being at school at all times, students are introduced to the countries in England in Miss Emily’s class with pictures. But there are no pictures for Norflok, where Miss Emily calls it “a lost corner.” One day, when Kathy is holding a pillow and dancing to her favorite song, Never Let Me Go, Madame accidentally sees such a scene and bursts into tears. Then it comes to the revelation of the whole truth: Miss Lucy tells the students about their lives being already planned in the future for vital organ donations, and consequently
they will all die young. Such a truth discloses the fact that students are all human clones.

In spite of the tragic revelation, the students carry on with theirs lives without much of influence by it till they move to another establishment called “the Cottages” and students there are referred as “veterans.” From then, the students start to have connections to the outside world. From two of the “veterans,” Chrissie and Rodney tell Ruth that they have seen her “possible”—the person one is modeled from. Then one day, Ruth sees a magazine with a spread of beautiful office space, which is what Chrissie and Rodney have told Ruth about the location her “possible” goes to work. Such a matter influences Ruth and her companions and leads to the trip to find her “possible,” which turns out to be a letdown. But the trip to Norfolk is not completely a disaster, something new with hope is informed by Chrissie and Rodney: if two students are truly in love, they can get donations deferred so they might have some years together.

After some time, Kathy starts her journey to be a “carer” to other donors before she will soon become a donor as well. For this reason, Kathy is able to look after Ruth through her donations. Before Ruth’s “completion” after her last donation, she suggests Kathy become Tommy’s “carer” and form a relationship with him so that there is the possibility of a granted “deferral” in their donations. Accordingly, Kathy begins to be Tommy’s “carer” and a relationship develops naturally. By chance, Kathy and Tommy pay Madame a visit in order to ask about the “deferral.” At Madame’s house, Kathy and Tommy find her with the presence of Miss Emily, the headmistress of Hailsham. And Miss Emily lets them know that there is no such thing as “deferral.” She also explains to them that Hailsham is a place where is intended to educate and culturalize clone students. Some effort has been made to
prove that the clone students are humans with exhibitions of creative artworks by students at Hailsham. However, the public still sees clone students as medical resources instead of human beings; the effort is in vain and establishments like Hailsham are shut down. To the pathetic disclosure, Tommy and Kathy return to the recovery center and Tommy informs Kathy that his death is coming soon. Kathy reluctantly bids Tommy farewell before Tommy gets ready for his fourth donation. Afterwards, Kathy drives to Norfolk to recollect reminisce about her past before going to the upcoming stage in her life.

3.2 Humanized Clones

Kazuo Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go* talks about human clones in a way that is very distinct from what we usually think of human clones as such biotechnological reproductions. Distinguished from other science-based novels where all kinds of advanced technology about surpassed improvement of medical development is usually what comes to the readers when thinking of it, humanity is rather discovered everywhere in *Never Let Me Go*—details about schooling, working, love and art in everyday life events that are just like what real human beings actually do in lives. In this way of presenting the novel, it is more accessible for the readers to relate to the characters in *Never Let Me Go* in terms of humanity; even though the whole idea behind this novel is based upon the very technological idea of reproductive human cloning technology.

For the approach to this novel, three main parts of interpretation on the structure are brought up: imitation, creativity, and death. Among these three issues, there is a certain connection to one another. Imitation starts to appear when clone students are staying in “the Cottages,” trying to connect themselves with the world
outside. Creativity is a huge issue concerned in their lives as students; creative art works can prove that novelty does exist in the minds of clones, and even “soul” is related to creative works of art. When humane issues are involved, the nature of death would be a serious and ineluctable topic for human clones as well. And the neutral idea to these three issues is humanity. Issues about humanity includes abundant of divisions in thinking, what is being lightened is in the domains of identity, individuality and commodification in this approach. Identity in reproductive human cloning is always the most relevant issue; no matter human beings or reproductive human clones, identity is what is very decisive and significant that worth striving for. Individuality is supposed to be within every individual; it is something for everyone to born with. Nonetheless, individuality may seem more than a sure thing in human beings; it is an extreme controversy to reproductive human clones. Commodification is also related to the issues of humanity along with identity and individuality here in the interpretation of Never Let Me Go. Since it is a comprehensible fact that reproductive human clones exist not out of wish from the bottom of their hearts, commodification is what can be placed between reproductive human cloning and human beings as an interpretation.

To elaborate on these points and connect the ideas of imitation, creativity and death in Never Let Me Go along with the issues about humanity such as identity, individuality and commodification, the author will mainly take the concepts from Gilles Deleuze about “difference”, “truth”, “the virtual”, “evolution” and “the excess” with other courses and concepts on human clones from the scientific way of thinking.
3.3 Interpretation of Issues in *Never Let Me Go*

The interpretation of the novel will mainly be three parts as the approach of analyzing the focuses in the story: imitation, creativity, and death.

3.3.1 Imitation

Imitation in *Never Let Me Go* is an issue that can be extensively related to ideas such as copy, individuality, identity and difference. When imitating, a human clone tends to be identical to human beings, but imitation can reversely reveal the difference a human clone possesses. The contrary in sameness and difference is the focal point to be addressed here. For example, in *Never Let Me Go*, Kathy tells Ruth about her imitation of slapping on the elbow: “‘It’s not something worthy copying,’ I told her. ‘It’s not what people really do out there, in normal life, if that’s what you were thinking’” (123-24). Ruth imitates a human being’s behavior, while Kathy doesn’t and thinks the behavior is misunderstood. Such a contrast can be explained by what Gilles Deleuze has proposed in *Difference and Repetition*: “Contrariety alone expresses the capacity of a subject to bear opposites while remaining the same [. . .]” (30). Kathy does not tend to imitate; in contrast, Ruth imitates human behaviors. So, Kathy acts the way she does, and she observes the difference between Ruth and her, but, Kathy is still the same as Ruth is, a human clone. Though such a contrast differs Kathy from Ruth in terms of trying to act like a human being by imitation, the sameness of them is highlighted through contrast.

Difference caused from imitation is also relevant to originality and uniqueness. In *Never Let Me Go*, human clones want to know about the models, so they try to grasp ideas of what they would become in the future:

Since each of us was copied at some point from a normal person, there must be,
for each of us, somewhere out there, a model getting on with his or her life.
This meant, at least in theory, you’d be able to find the person you were
modelled from. That’s why, when you were out there yourself—in the towns,
shopping centres, transport cafes—you kept an eye for ‘possibles’—the people
who might have been the models from you and your friends.” (139)
The originality in a human being is the individuality that people are proud of, but
when the copies appear, people will question the uniqueness. In Illegal Beings, Kerry
Lynn Macintosh has argued the idea about uniqueness:

. . . , cloning does not produce a life that can be played back again and again
with the same results. Rather, every person, from gestation to death, is the
unique product of physical and psychological events and influences that interact
with and upon his or her genes to generate a unique individual. There is no
reason why a human clone should have the perception of being cramped or
limited in independence unless society raises him or her with that false
expectation. (28)

Clones can be unique according to the statements brought up by Macintosh. The
influences of the DNA donors are concerned, but the social milieu is more crucial in
shaping personalities. According to “Do Human Clones Lack Individuality” in Illegal
Beings, Macintosh has stated another argument about human being twins who can be
individuals though they are raised under the same roof:

Fourth, because identical twins are born at the same time, they necessarily
grow up in the same era. Unless they are separated at birth, they also
experience the same family environment and national culture. These common
influences and experiences may lead to shared personality traits, habits, tastes,
and values. The same cannot be said for DNA donors and their cloned
offspring. Human clones will be raised in a different era, family, and culture than were their DNA donors. These divergent influences and experiences will contribute to differences in personality traits, habits, tastes, and values. (25)

Human clones are various in every aspect of humanity. Take Hailsham for instance, clone students are raised in the same organization, and they are encouraged and able to reveal their uniqueness. Though human clones can be individualities as human beings are, they are in fact distant from their originals; difference stands between human beings and human clones. Deleuze has mentioned in Difference and Repetition, “Difference is ‘mediated’ to the extent that it is subjected to the fourfold root of identity, opposition, analogy and resemblance” (29). Identity here is an equivocal problem. Clones try to imitate human beings to be identical, but clones are, in a sense, copied from the original, then the true value of clones’ identities can be blurred. Human clones can be identified, but they cannot ultimately have identities.

In relation to this, difference is again addressed by Deleuze’s argument, “It is qualitative, and to the extent that the genus designates the essence, difference is even a very special quality ‘according to the essence’, a quality of the essence itself” (31). Essential difference can be interpreted as the difference between human beings and human clones. There is a fundamental difference in essence between human beings and clones: the way of reproduction. Human beings reproduce offspring containing variety and differences, while clones are reproduced out of the original and thus is lack of variety. The reproduction thus highlights the difference in between, and this argument can be proved by Delueze’s thought, “It is thus in the nature of genera to remain the same in themselves while becoming other in the differences which divide them. Difference carries with itself the genus and all the intermediary differences” (31).
3.3.2 Creativity

In *Never Let Me Go*, creativity is another relevant issue that is related to difference and uniqueness. Through art trainings, creativity is an emphasis for students in Hailsham, and students can be proved that they have souls, so they can be much closer to normal human beings. In *Never Let Me Go*, Tommy is at first thought as a student devoid of creativity, but later he can present his art works with abundant imagination though there is a change occurred with it:

It came to me that Tommy’s drawings weren’t as fresh now. Okay, in many ways these frogs were a lot like what I’d seen back at the Cottages. But something was definitely gone, and they looked laboured, almost like they’d been copied. (241)

Tommy’s imagined animals differed, implying something in him changed, too. It may be the altered drawings that show the change of Tommy from being a student to a donor later in his life. Minds in a student can be purer and more innocent than a donor despite the inevitable destiny of donation that Tommy has to face. That “something” is the distinction which marks a sheltered student from an experienced donor (241). To urge students for presentations with creativity is to progress on a path towards sameness, while creativity emphasizes variety, that is difference. Thus, creativity can be an amphibolic idea. Besides, human clones are expected by the teachers in Hailsham to fulfill their belief:

Most importantly, we demonstrated to the world that if students were reared in humane, cultivated environments, it was possible for them to grow to be as sensitive and intelligent as any ordinary human being. Before that, all clones—or students, as we preferred to call you—existed only to supply medical science. In the early days, after the war, that’s largely all you were to most
people. Shadowy objects in test tubes.’” (Ishiguro 261)

Through teachers’ hard work, human clones exist in the world to prove their values. More than medical uses, clones are believed to be humane enough. And all of the hard work that the founders and guardians have been through testifies the social attitudes towards the clones. Hence, the idea of difference is argued in the relation of human beings and human clones. In *Difference and Repetition*, Deleuze has proposed his ideas about difference:

> The difference ‘between’ two things is only empirical, and the corresponding determinations are only extrinsic. However, instead of something distinguished from something else, imagine something which distinguishes itself—and yet that from which it distinguishes itself does not distinguish itself from it. (28)

Clones can be distinguished from human beings, yet it is this distinguishability that gains the difference in clones from human beings.

Uniqueness is related to creativity as well; creativity needs souls to prove clones have uniqueness other than the stereotypes of non-human beings. Reversely, unique clones are created from DNA donors; hence the uniqueness is questioned here:

> For example, the California Advisory Committee on Human Cloning speculated that a person who donates the nuclear DNA for cloning could experience a loss of individuality and self-worth upon learning that his or her clone has been born and that he or she is no longer unique. (Macintosh 32)

It is a double-edged problem that human beings would lose individuality and uniqueness while human clones tend to attain unique individualities but are questioned to possess due to their way of creation. Accordingly, this lack is connected with identity problem. Without individuality, identity cannot be
confirmed. Therefore, difference takes control of human clones as a distinctive barrier to cross the boundary of humanity.

3.3.3 Death

Death is another issue addressed in Never Let Me Go; it is related to replacement, threat and slavery. Death can be regarded as a fraud in a sense. To reproduce human clones as organ donors for human beings, human clones are taught to be extremely healthy and disciplined. Such an exploitation of the powerless to fulfill the needs of human beings is not well confessed to the clones directly because they are believed by guardians to be humane enough. Though the destiny of being “completed” is revealed to clone students, their existence to be gloriously helpful to human beings is pathetic in a way (Ishiguro 279). To prove this, the following passage can be served as explanation to the argument:

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. You were brought to this world for a purpose, and your futures, all of them, have been decided. (Ishiguro 81)

It is deplorable to be informed by others about existential purpose of one’s living; and it is even more miserable to live upon a mission of organ donors. These guardians teach and raise clone students in every concern of humanity, but they somehow partially reserve some things that would be important to their lives. The donation is, in a way, cruel because it makes a human clone to go on his or her way to death progressively. According to Macintosh, human clones are made to serve human beings:
In this way, human clones are forced to bear an underserved taint of coercion, pain, mutilation, and death.

The argument further associates human clones with genetic superiority. At the very least, this association will inspire envy and resentment. Human clones will be viewed as arrogant or, perhaps, as cheaters who were given an unfair head start in the footrace of life. At worst, “normal” people may view superior “clones” as a threat to their own existence, the vanguard of a new species that must be crushed at its inception. (41)

In the idea of donation, human clones are to be devitalized and depleted, but for their superior condition of health, human clones threaten the subsistence of human beings. As if the originals are to be replaced by the reproductions, the individuality is again staggering on account of its convincingness.

Humanity is the ultimate issue that encapsulates imitation, creativity, and death. It is a center of cerebration not only for human beings but also for human clones. Identity, uniqueness, and difference are subthemes to support the essence of humanity. Macintosh has proposed his thought about humanity concerning human clones in *Illegal Beings*:

> It is very interesting, however, that opponents of cloning associate it with genetic engineering. The association links cloning to yet another doomsday scenario in which humanity is not literally destroyed but is so altered as to be unrecognizable. By this account, human clones are the harbingers of genetic doom, the merciless destroyers of what was their own kind. (43)

Humanity is thus blurred when human clones are involved. However, human beings have been trying hard to remain the bright side of humanity through various ways such as religion and law, while there are still people who purposely commit crimes to
discredit humanity. Humanity has been testified before human clones are taken into consideration for its reliability.

3.4 Interpretational Approach on Humanity Issues

3.4.1 Identity

Identity has always been a crucial issue for everyone; every individual introduces to the world via identity. Identification is a way of mirroring oneself and looking for recognition for self-images. How one looks at oneself influences the presentation of self-image to others. Identity is such a huge part that we can look into in Never Let Me Go. Identity issues in Never Let Me Go seize the readers to reflect self-identification and relate to the reproductive human clones.

Throughout the whole novel, the characters are always aware of their own identities, though in the beginning it is not serving as a critical threat to them. As vague as how it is, the true identity of being reproductive human clones is not bothering the students too much according to Never Let Me Go by Kazuo Ishiguro:

Thinking back now, I can see we were just at that age when we know a few things about ourselves—about who we were, how we were different from our guardians, from the people outside—but hadn’t yet understood what any of it meant. (36)

From here, it is clear that identifying oneself as a reproductive human clone is somehow acceptable since the identification has not caused too much a trouble that threatens everything in the lifespan. Yet, being different from others can be, if just of the slightest effect, somehow unnerving. Identification is very tricky since one needs the confidence to recognize oneself as same enough, if not superior, to others; yet the sameness of self-identification leads one to the objection to be buried in the mass
crowd as if one would be neglected by other even more outstanding figures. Being different both lightens and darkens one’s identification.

For the reproductive human clones, identity is a sensitive issue that brings hope and despair, on the other hand. Identity as hope makes one look to the expectation in all matters, and it is a way to urge oneself on looking up to the goal. For example, a “dream future” gives hope to Ruth in Never Let Me Go: “The other thing that made me doubtful about all this had to do with the actual description given by Chrissie and Rodney: their picture of a woman working in a nice glass-fronted office” (Ishiguro 142). Such a description of her “originial” out there in society makes Ruth unconsciously influenced upon approaching a goal very close to her role model at work. The descriptive statement is so vivid and persuasive that such a goal controls her determination when Ruth sees a magazine according to Never Let Me Go:

It showed this beautifully modern open-plan office with three or four people who worked in it having some kind of joke with each other. The place looked sparkling and so did the people. Ruth was staring at this picture and, when she noticed me beside her, said: “Now that would be a proper place to work.”

(Ishiguro 144)

When a dream is deep in mind, the determination towards hope is very assertive and forceful. Everything would be about the determination that occupies the mind. Such identification is good when it encourages one to approach the goal for the better future. Identity in here provides hope. But identification is not always about the good.

In contrast, identity as despair is an obstruction to the way of the propitious self-recognition; it is even a disillusionment of all the imagination for the better
future. In *Never Let Me Go*, this identity as more of despair can be traced when Ruth actually sees her “original” out there:

So there we were, all coming out with our views, and I was glad I could say honestly, along with the others, that the woman we’d seen was by no means out of the question. The truth was, we were all relieved: without quite realizing it, we’d been bracing ourselves for a let-down. (Ishiguro 160)

Somehow, when one forgets oneself in the beautified dream, whatever potentially related to the goal is lovely. Nevertheless, being too close to the reality is often hurtful since truth is never a lovely dream. Ruth comes to face her “original” in person and suddenly the disillusionment is what she somehow reluctantly attains. What Ruth feels after beholding her “original” is never thrilled but in a sense, turned into a setback. Such a truth mirrors the issue of her own identity. Seeing a person who is thought to be who you would be expected to be in the future is not a thrilling thing. Though all the excitement comes when the dream of a near future is made, facing the actualization of the dream too close is not joyful at all. Ruth’s “original” takes up what Ruth imagines a suitable workplace would be and such a fact exploits Ruth’s expectation for herself to be at the position. Ruth’s confidence of self-identification is endangered. Ruth has projected her identity onto her “possible”, and now she is facing a problem of lacking her own identity since the identity as her “original” is taken. Self-identification is of great importance to every individual; it not only supports one’s confidence as an individual but also proves one’s own identity that makes one not just anybody but somebody.

Again, identity is the ultimate matter that no one would give up. Not only does identity suggest the confidence of actually being someone but also refer to the individuality of being somebody. Such an idea can be explained by the argument that
follows. From “Introduction” in Pure Immanence: Essays on A Life by Gilles Deleuze, John Rajchman has addressed such a point:

We are always quelconque—we are and remain “anybodies” before we become “somebodies.” Underneath the identity of our bodies or organisms, we each have what Deleuze calls a body (a mouth, a stomach, etc). We thus have the singularity of what Spinoza already termed “a singular essence,” and of what possessed of a peculiar “complex” unfolding through the time of our lives. (14)

Identity, therefore, is what constitutes one’s existence of being. Identity is of one’s identification to be oneself. Everything from one’s whole formation put together makes up an identity of every bit of the combination. Thereby, identity can be seen as the universe while every bit that constitutes the identity is the star. Before getting to know the idea of universe, one only sees the stars. The existences of various stars make one contemplate the bigger picture of the purpose of such existence. Every element of the object makes what it is. The features that put up to be what is thought as identity are crucial and indispensable. Universe, as an identity, implies what has been put together in such an assembly. By inference, stars, as the elements, suggest that a more complete formation must be in existence through the shaping of all stars. Putting every requisite element forms the idea of the whole universe that we come to learn about. On that account, identity is what built by everything that is essential to such a great formation. Through representing the features, identity is a combination of every trait that connects with the whole representation, identity.

In consequence, identity is such a unique representation that allows almost no copies. From such a point, the intense controversy brought by the existences of both real human beings and reproductive human clones is proved inextricably cleared up. The representation of features and traits that form identity is something of a
uniqueness that is indubitably distinctive. Thereby, when facing the coexistence of the real human beings and the reproductive human clones, it strikes the public to abandon the outdated thinking of unsurpassable medical technology. Such advanced technology not only suggests a breakthrough in the development of medical science but also implies the apprehension of the concerned public. Identity, on the appearance of reproductive human cloning, seems not to be the exclusiveness to all the human beings but a shared uniqueness to the reproductive human clones as well. All in all, such issue about identity is both in the disputable discussion of social studies and scientific fields; the final answer to the key question is still suspended. It is only via arguments and discussions over this controversial question can people get a better understanding of such crisis in identity issues.

Besides scientific and social studies, discourses from the religious party upon reproductive human cloning are a way for people to comprehend such issue. Identity is what constitutes human beings, or in a way, human beings are the representation of different identities. But, on the religious way of thinking, human beings are created as a representation by the image of God. The identity is ultimately put together for everyone to be distinctive. Yet, what human beings represent is not what being put together as distinguishable identities but the representation of God. To connect to such a point, the statement about identity is drawn here. From “Difference, repetition” in Gilles Deleuze: Key Concepts, Melissa McMahon has made a point about identity:

The ultimate identity of concept and thing, however, is only able to be grasped by the infinite mind of God; we use it in order to assume the rationality of all existence for the purpose of scientific study, but our notions of things are always incomplete. (44)
According to the passage, Melissa McMahon has brought up that only through the mind of God can people understand identity. It is still an undoubtable truth that identity is worth striving for but what comes at the end of the effort is still unknown. Only through the process of proving one’s identity can one feel the existence of distinctive difference.

3.4.2 Individuality

As it is repeatedly and metaphorically emphasized throughout *Never Let Me Go*, individuality is what cannot be underestimated when it comes to humanity. Individuality suggests one’s existence of the discrete difference against others. Just like identity, such distinctiveness in individuality stands for the unique individuals. Individuality is thus the very idea to determine whether or not one is of distinctiveness. Being distinguishable in the mass crowd is consequential, not just on the superficiality of appearance but in the spirit just as well. Nevertheless, if being placed in a crowd of reproductive human clones of the same genes donor, it is dubitable to be discrete on the appearance level. Or it would rouse more resonance from the public to just compare one human being with his or her reproductive human clone. Such individuality between these two subjects is indefinite. To relate this point of view, a passage from *Never Let Me Go* is required to be correlative:

The basic idea behind the possibles theory was simple, and didn’t provoke much dispute. It went something like this. Since each of us was copied at some point from a normal person, there must be, for each of us, somewhere out there, a model getting on with his or her life. This meant, at least in theory, you’d be able to find the person you were modelled from. That’s why, when you were out there yourself—in the towns, shopping centres, transport cafés—
you kept an eye out for “possibles”—the people who might have been the models for you and your friends. (Ishiguro 139)

From the passage mentioned above, the idea of individuality permeates from the beginning to the end. Individuality here in the passage is an unreachable idea of illusion. Since it is clearly informed that the students in *Never Let Me Go* are the reproductive human clones of other human beings, the bubble of individuality for the reproductive human clones is crumbled. Such vanished individuality implies replication, which strongly refers to the unoriginality of reproductive human clones. Sadly enough, reproductive human cloning creates human clones out of the will of the genes donors through such a technology; the created human clones are brought into this world to face the lack of individuality and unoriginality. Being without individuality is being indiscernible. The existence of the subject can be easily neglected and not distinguishable. It is not implying here that the whole existence of the reproductive human clones is inconsequential to other human beings, but the fact of lacking individuality truly suggests the subordination in such existence of the reproductive human clones.

In a consistent point of views, an argument of lacking individuality for the students as reproductive human clones is cited in the following passage. As what Matthew Beedham has mentioned in “Questioning the Possibles: *Never Let Me Go* (2005)” in *The Novels of Kazuo Ishiguro*, individuality permeates the novel:

This distinction of individuality allows the donation system to function because while the humans value individuality above all and are able to distinguish individuality in themselves, they perceive the clones as *lacking* that highly valued individuality. (141)
Valued as being without individuality, reproductive human clones are not as highly esteemed as human beings. Individuality is the essence that distinguishes each individual among human beings; on that account, it is rather impractical for reproductive human clones to be treated as distinctive individuals. Individuality here is the dividing line between human beings and reproductive human clones. Without individuality, reproductive human clones are deemed less equal to human beings; accordingly, such subordination indirectly helps develop the donation system that exploits the existence of reproductive human beings.

For the idea of individuality, Matthew Beedham has made a further explanation in “Questioning the Possibles: Never Let Me Go (2005)” in The Novels of Kazuo Ishiguro:

The clones, moreover, ‘lack interiority which is measured, according to all of the characters, by the capacity for genuine love, authentic expressivity, and artistic originality’. . . . It is this privileging of individuality, a value to which every character in the novel, human or clone, appears to have been indoctrinated, . . . . (141)

Individuality is so decisive that even such inner nature has been taken to be the standard of measurement. Though being different from human beings, reproductive human clones receive education as well, just like what human beings do. Schooling is also a bit part of these human clones in Never Let Me Go. Education suggests the assimilation of reproductive human clones to human beings. By the power of education, it is possible for the reproductive human clones to be able to stand on the same starting point with the human beings. Education brings them closer by equalization. Even so, education is used to be the medium to separate reproductive human clones from human beings. By the evaluation of love and artistic creativity,
reproductive human clones are appraised based on the rate of humanization. Such policy unquestionably denies the possibility of individuality in reproductive human clones and tries to educate them in order to give pseudo-individuality back to them. That being so, individuality is not only of great importance to human beings but also to reproductive human clones just as well.

Individuality, along with uniqueness, is again brought up here to address its consequential importance. One special song that links the whole story in Never Let Me Go is related to the idea of individuality as well. Matthew Beedham has made a further argument about individuality related to the song in “Questioning the Possibles: Never Let Me Go (2005)” in The Novels of Kazuo Ishiguro:

The two copies of this one recording play an important role in the novel, revealing two models for considering uniqueness; one for people and art work, another for objects. In the first, ‘individuals have an ontological existence that defines what they are and what they will be; copies simply inherit that existence. The second model attributes uniqueness not to a prior existence but to social embeddedness and the capacity for new contextualization’. (142)

What the passage suggests is the individuality in the existence of the original and the uniqueness of the social connection. The existence of the copies is in difference from the original. Reproductive human clones, seen as copies, are accordingly lacking the original individuality; the intrinsic nature of the original is lost in the later existence of the copies. The existence of the two marks the difference of individuality. The existence of such object as copies related to the social connections that are interpreted by the interaction between the possessors and the others. Individuality in both cases is still highly concerned.
3.5 The Interrelation Between Humanity Issues and Concepts by Gilles Deleuze

The previously mentioned ideas of identity and individuality are connected to the concepts brought by Gilles Deleuze. A certain relation between such issues of humanity and Deleuze’s concepts is necessarily to be explicated here. Deleuze’s notions of “the virtual”, “evolution”, and “the excess” are to be borrowed here in the research due to the link that connects the issues of humanity and the concepts. For reproductive human clones, it is just because of the lack of social and biological relations that lead to the crisis and question of identity and individuality. Deleuze’s concepts of “the virtual”, “evolution” and “the excess” are associated with the questionable humanity that makes the concepts theoretically relevant to the analytical approach to the issues implied in Moon and Never Let Me Go.

3.6 Concepts by Gilles Deleuze

The interpretation of Never Let Me Go in this approach is related to the ideas brought by Gilles Deleuze mainly in three conceptions: “the virtual”, “evolution” and “the excess”. In the following analysis, these conceptions proposed by Gilles Deleuze will be the main focus to relate the connection between reproductive human clones to human beings as to elaborate on the intricate interrelation between the two in the domain of humanity issues in Never Let Me Go.

3.6.1 The Virtual

In order to elaborate on the interrelation between reproductive human clones and human beings, the conception about “the virtual” brought up by Gilles Deleuze will be the main point for analysis. From “Deleuze Outside/Outside Deleuze” in Deleuze and Philosophy by Keith Ansell Pearson:
The ‘real’ simply exists in the image of the ‘possible’ whose task it is to be realized. There is thus no real ‘difference’ between the two since in the ‘real’ existence simply gets added to it. No invention takes place in this process of ‘evolution’ (no creation, only as instantiation). Whereas the realization of the possible is governed by rules of resemblance and limitation, the rules informing the actualization of the virtual are ones of the difference and divergence. (8)

The interrelation between the virtual and the possible is reciprocal. Only by realizing the possible can one get closer to the idea of the real. It is like the virtual is the true identity embedded within the existence of a variety of possible that represent the realistic faces of the virtual. Such interrelation can also be traced in Never Let Me Go:

It was Miss Emily herself who taught us about the different countries of England. She’d pin up a big map over the blackboard, and next to it, set up an easel. And if she was talking about, say, Oxfordshire, she’d place a collection of these picture calendars, and we got through most of the countries this way. She’d tap a spot on the map with her pointer, turn to the easel and reveal another picture. There’d be little villages with streams going through them, white monuments on hillsides, old churches beside fields; if she was telling us about a coastal place, there’d be beaches crowded with people, cliffs with seagulls. I suppose she wanted us to have a grasp of what was out there surrounding us, and it’s amazing, even now, after all these miles I’ve covered as a carer, the extent to which my idea of the various countries is still set by these pictures Miss Emily put up on her easel. (Ishiguro 64-65)

From the way of teaching, it is an instance closely related to the ideas of the virtual and the possible. The pictures shown in class are the variety of the possible that
represent the true image of the virtual outside. With the help of the pictures, the students connect themselves with the virtual. Through learning about the possible can the students most likely get a better glimpse of what the virtual is like. Through the resemblance, the virtual is not only imagined in various aspects but it is also realized by the attempt to actualize it in realization. In the process, attempt and realization are actually the means as the possible, and only by them can one unveil the mystification of the virtual.

For additional argument about the virtual and the possible, the following citation is referable. Keith Ansell Pearson has made a further statement about the real and the possible in “Deleuze Outside/Outside Deleuze” from Deleuze and Philosophy:

The possible is to be treated as the source of false problems in philosophy and in biology since it presents us with a real that is pre-formed and ready-made, and simply waits to go through a process of realization in order to come into being as what it already is. In effect, it is not at all the ‘real’ that comes to resemble the ‘possible’ in such a sterile process of realization; rather, it is the ‘possible’ that resembles the ‘real’ from which it has been abstracted once made. (9)

By dint of resemblance, all the imagined come to serve as the metamorphosed alternative that later become the possible. Through the phase of the possible, the existence of the virtual is the ultimate comparison that the possible needs to bear resemblance to. Take another example from Never Let Me Go; the intricate idea of the real and the possible is also exemplified here:

It was midway through the morning and we’d been in yet another Culture Briefing. These were classes where we had to role play various people we’d
find out there—waiters in cafés, policemen and so on. The sessions always got us excited and worried all at the same time, so we were pretty keyed up anyway. (Ishiguro 110-11)

From the passage mentioned above, roleplaying suggests the imagination along with understanding of the characters whom these students are trying to relate to in class. Being separated from the real world, these students find all the possibilities in their interpretation to represent what the virtual is. As roleplaying, these reproductive human clones have a taste of the real world out there. In preparation for the virtual to come in the near future, the various kinds of the possible here are the rehearsals preparatory to the real show.

In further elaborating on the interrelation between the virtual and the possible, a reference is needed. Keith Ansell Pearson has proposed an argument about the possible and the real in “Deleuze Outside/Outside Deleuze” from Deleuze and Philosophy:

In the realization of the ‘possible’, time ad space function as transcendent agents of limitation and exclusion; by contrast, in the actualization of the ‘virtual’, time and space operate as immanent productions of the ‘Idea’ (which for Deleuze is no longer, contra Plato, the self-identical or, contra Kant, simply transcendent enjoying only a regulative status), generating rhythms and resonances that signal the various processes of differenciation taking place. (9)

According to what has been written by Pearson, it is possible to infer from the statement above that in the process of forming the virtual, such idea excludes all that is irrelevant or not resemblant to the realization of the real. Differentiation is embedded in such a process to discern the various alternatives of the possible. By virtue of comparison, what resembles the virtual is represented through the possible,
3.6.2 Evolution

To explain the interrelationship of reproductive human clones and human beings, the notion of “evolution” proposed by Gilles Deleuze will be the focal point for analysis. From the argument mentioned in “Deleuze Outside/Outside Deleuze” in Deleuze and Philosophy, Keith Ansell Pearson has proposed the idea of evolution:

Evolution, therefore, is to be thought neither in terms of realization nor in terms of an immediate actualization. Contra the doctrine of pre-formism, evolutionism insists that life is production and the creation of differences. However, evolutionism is also unsatisfactory since it understands that production of differences solely in exogenous terms (the determination of a purely external causality). The result is that differences are reduced to merely ‘passive effects’ which in their relationships are incapable of functioning as an ensemble regulation and utilizing their causes. . . . Variation and difference are not to be regarded as accidental effects of evolution but rather stipulate its virtual dynamic. (9)

From Pearson’s idea about “evolution”, variation and difference are the exclusive factors that accelerate the formation of evolution. Evolution suggests improvement and it is always good to ameliorate the current situation, which is a wonderful intention. Yet, evolution strongly implies change, and change is sometimes what people are afraid of. Change can either bring people's lives better or worse impact. Therefore, what changes out of evolution is not necessarily acceptable for the public. It can probably improve a lot of things from the current situation, but it can also
sabotage what is already considered enough and make it worse. So such change out of the process of evolution brings out variation and difference. As alternative as what variation and difference connote, it is hard for the public to embrace what comes with evolution. Yet, through variation and difference, it is even more possible to make more changes for amelioration. Variation and difference make the chance of learning what is alternative, and learning is the only way to take things to the next level. That is, variation and difference are needed in the process of evolution. They are even the most important parts in the process of improvement. Without learning the variation and difference, there is no possibility of evolution. Reproductive human cloning is related to evolution. It is an evolution in the medical field. From reproductive human cloning, evolution is the process to make human beings improved. What needs improvement is the current situation that people would like to change for a better living in various ways.

In *Never Let Me Go*, evolution is also an idea taken from reproductive human cloning. The idea of human evolution accelerates the actualization of reproductive human cloning. Through such technology, people are expected to experience a better possibility of living. What follows is an example from *Never Let Me Go* about human evolution:

None of you will go to America, none of you will be film stars. And none of you will be working in supermarkets as I heard some of you planning the other day. Your lives are set out for you. You’ll become adults, then before you’re old, before you’re even middle-aged, you’ll start to donate your vital organs. That’s what each of you was created to do. You’re not like the actors you watch on your videos, you’re not even like me. You were brought into this world for a purpose, and your futures, all of them, have been decided. (Ishiguro
Such a truth from Miss Lucy suggests the huge difference between the reproductive human clones and the human beings. The sole purpose of existence of these human clones is to be used for donation. Vital organs are harvested and donated to real human beings. Such a harsh truth implies the evolution on health in the condition of these reproductive human clones. Only through trying to stay in good health can the vital organs of these reproductive human clones be utilized by others. Evolution on the bodies of these reproductive human clones suggests the expectation of human beings to have a better living. What the human beings need to face is the variation and difference from the evolution—reproductive human clones. As alternative as the reproductive human clones are, they are different from human beings yet they are like human beings in almost every way. The variation and difference from the reproductive human beings are the change that human beings need to learn for amelioration. The change can make the current situation better yet it can make it worse.

About evolution, Keith Ansell Pearson has marked an additional statement in “Deleuze Outside/Outside Deleuze” in Deleuze and Philosophy:

Deleuze is happy to accept that there is finality in evolution simply because life does not operate without directions. However, this does not mean that we can infer that life as an ultimate goal or final purpose. A final purpose can only be thought in terms of a transcendent reality, as something extraneous to the immanent, unpredictable and open-ended, movement of life. (10)

The process of evolution comes to a point that all the variation and difference are no longer the change to be learned. If the process of evolution never stops, the reproductive human cloning technology, as evolution, would be a ceaseless denial of
the past. Variation and difference suggest what needs the improvement. But when the process of evolution never stops, the reproductive human cloning would just keep changing human beings. Variation and difference are thought as the subjects of learning—improving what is not good and keeping what is good enough. While reproductive human cloning denies the past due to the endlessness of evolution, variation and difference are not able to keep the good and improve the bad. The evolution in reproductive human cloning will lead to a stage when everything has gone beyond the limit.

Evolution takes the current situation to a better level rather than denying everything in the past. Variation and difference out of evolution are the changes that are helpful for learning and ameliorating. Learning from variation and difference is the essence to make a better possibility of the current situation. Thus, variation and difference are the cores to the process of evolution. The reproductive human clones are the variation and difference. Take an instance in Never Let Me Go that is even more relevant to the idea of evolution:

After the war, in the early fifties, when the great breakthroughs in science followed one after the other so rapidly, there wasn’t time to take stock, to ask the sensible questions. Suddenly there were all these new possibilities laid before us, all these ways to cure so many previously incurable conditions. This was what the world noticed the most, wanted the most. And for a long time, people preferred to believe these organs appeared from nowhere, or at most that they grew in a kind of vacuum. (Ishiguro 262)

The evolution on the medical science comes from the improvement of reproductive human cloning. The coexistence of these two helps ameliorate the world of the human beings. Evolution on the medical science somehow leads to the retrogression
of the morality and ethics in humanity. Such evolution suggests the superiority of the reproductive human clones in terms of health condition to the human beings. Nonetheless, the exploitation of the vital organs in reproductive human clones implies the superiority of human beings to the clones. Thus, reproductive human clones are seen less human. But the reproductive human clones, as variation and difference, are the changes that all people need to face and learn. Only by learning from variation and difference can people make a better possibility of living. Exploiting reproductive human clones may suggest the evolution in medical science but treating reproductive human clones less humanly is not a process of evolution. Rather, it is deterioration in morality and ethics. Such deteriorated morality and ethics can never ameliorate human beings in terms of a better possibility of living.

According to the passages from “Deleuze Outside/Outside Deleuze” and Never Let Me Go, evolution is supposed to meliorate and take things to a better state with the help of variation and difference. When the intentional ignorance of the variation and difference deteriorates the possibility of a better living and makes the morality and ethics worse, reproductive human clones are thrown into the crisis of being treated less humanly. The existence of the reproductive human clones is an aid to the learning of variation and difference. As a change, variation and difference are the subjects that offer a chance to look into the possibility of occurrence so that a better probability of living would be attainable. But now, the variation and difference are ignored, which makes the existence of the reproductive human clones an excess of the world of human beings.

The conception of “the excess” brought up by Gilles Deleuze will be the main discussion to relate Never Let Me Go to such a notion in the following passages.
3.6.3 The Excess

To elucidate the relationship between reproductive human clones and human beings, Gilles Deleuze’s concept about “the excess” will be the central point for interpretation. According to the statement brought up in “Deleuze Outside/Outside Deleuze” in Deleuze and Philosophy, Keith Ansell Pearson has written:

The world is made possible by excess. This excess is another word for ‘difference’. If the world makes itself by calculating, and engineering differences, its calculations are next exact (just). There is order—which makes it possible to speak of a world at all—because things exist in disparity and inequality. . . . All that happens in this world can be correlated with orders of difference. Taken together these various orders (of temperature, pressure, tension, potential, etc.) signal a difference of intensity. (10)

Difference is what constructs this world with variation. Among all the elements that form the existence of this world, variation and difference are the ultimate facts included in the coexistence. It is just because of these differences and variation that the world can possibly exist. Difference and variation make the space of possibility in changing, which is very crucial to the idea of excess. Through difference and variation, changing is generating what is practically searching for the uniformity that meets the goal of evolution. But during such a process, the abundant variety of existences of variation and difference is the excess in this world. Hence, the world is composed of the excess. Such idea of excess is relevant to reproductive human cloning.

Though reproductive human clones are genetically close to human beings, they are thought to be different from human beings. And for the crisis of humanity issues such as authenticity, autonomy and uniqueness altogether, reproductive human
clones are the excess in this world. The excess suggests something more than necessary. The unnecessary excess is never a desirable expectation in the existence of reproductive human clones as if they are irrelevant to everything. Yet, reproductive human clones are the difference and variation apart from human beings in this world. And it is the difference and variation that make the possibility of changing. Such change is what people need to make a better living by evolution. As a result, reproductive human clones, as excess, are in a position that is both strongly relevant and sadly irrelevant to this world.

The intertextuality between such dejection by the idea of excess and the existence of reproductive human clones in *Never Let Me Go* is also emphasized in the following argument. In “*Never Let Me Go* by Kazuo Ishiguro” from *In Other Worlds: SF and the Human Imagination*, Margaret Atwood has made an interpretation of the novel:

In fact, Hailsham exists to raise cloned children who have been brought into the world for the sole purpose of providing organs to other, “normal” people. They don’t have parents. They can’t have children. Once they graduate, they will go through a period of being “carers” to others of their kind who are already being deprived of their organs; then they will undergo up to four “donations” themselves, until they “complete.” (None of these terms has originated with Ishiguro; he just gives them an extra twist.) The whole enterprise, like most human enterprises of dubious morality, is wrapped in euphemism and shadow: the outer world wants these children to exist because it’s greedy for the benefits they can confer, but it doesn’t wish to look head-on at what is happening. (169)
The reproductive human clones are the vital organ providers to human beings just because they are useful to human beings. What is thought to be a merciful sacrifice is harshly and cruelly taken as only living organs to human beings. Such superior attitude suggests the excess in the existence of reproductive human beings. The excess as they are never to be accepted or seen as real human beings but the vital organ donors to the human beings. Human beings treat reproductive human clones merely as the copies from which human beings can benefit in terms of medical science instead of look into the variation and difference that provides the space of change to make a better living by evolution. Human beings are deteriorating in terms of morality and ethics while reproductive human clones are ameliorating in the aspect of humanity since they are more like humans than human beings owing to the merciful sacrifice.

Human beings always try to eliminate what is different from them; but such difference and variation are just needed for improvement. Without difference and variation, the space of change cannot be possible. And without change, amelioration is not practical. Reproductive human clones are the difference and variation that human beings try to ignore but strongly need. Human beings can possibly make a better living only by looking into difference and variation. The coexistence of human beings and reproductive human clones are the possibility of changes that evolution needs for amelioration.
Conclusion

In conclusion, based on the interrelationship of reproductive human clones and human beings, ideas on humanity issues such as identity, individuality and commodification along with the conceptions of “difference”, “truth”, “the virtual”, “evolution” and “the excess” from Gilles Deleuze are connected to conclude the interrelation between the main literary references, Moon by Duncan Jones and Never Let Me Go by Kazuo Ishiguro.

From the leading voices of reproductive human clones in both Moon and Never Let Me Go, issues on humanity are brought to the analysis of the interrelation between reproductive human clones and human beings. Authenticity, autonomy and uniqueness are the features embedded within the focal points mentioned in this research—identity, individuality, and commodification. Such viewpoints on analyzing issues in humanity are the metaphors emphasized for the relation between reproductive human clones and human beings in both Moon and Never Let Me Go.

Such correlated issues in humanity are the metaphors of losing humanity in the perspective of human beings. Through mirroring themselves in reproductive human clones, human beings come to analyze themselves and realize that human beings are just like reproductive human clones in various ways—lacking authenticity in identity, forfeiting autonomy in commodification, and requiring uniqueness in individuality. Via differentiating themselves from reproductive human clones, human beings retake such factors that define humanity. The following passages will be the analysis of the interrelation between reproductive human clones and human beings with the focal points elaborated on humanity issues—identity, individuality, and commodification.
4.1 Humanity Issues

4.1.1 Identity

Identity is always an approach for one of the interpretations of the interrelation between reproductive human clones and human beings. Identity is the representation of a person to be distinguished from others. Hence, the distinguishability comes from every aspect of facts that relate one to others. Biological relation comes from genetic fact to differentiate identities; and social relation provides information that connects one to the whole society. Based on biological and social relation, one is distinguishable enough with all these facts. Somehow, for reproductive human clones, identity is more intricate than this.

Genetically, one’s genes carry the heredity from one’s family; it is supposed to be very unique since they are the combination of genes from different generations in the family. The uniqueness in the combination of genes is not duplicable in the natural way. But reproductive human clones are the copies of the original human beings, thus, the genetic combinations are duplicated. Such duplication confuses the identities based on biological relations. It is rather complex for a reproductive human clone and a human being to fight for the same identity based on the biological relations. When there is the coexistence of both the reproductive human clone and the human being, the solely genetic relations cannot distinguish one from the other since the combination of genes are duplicated. Hence, with the social relation, it can provide some distinguishable facts.

Social relations are based on facts of one’s interaction with others, so it is a reference with historical sources. Such relation connects one to others in terms of space and time; hence, it is more complicated than just genetic relation due to the involvement with others in terms of interaction. The interaction from one’s social
relations infers one’s identity in the society. For both reproductive human clones and human beings, social relations determine their identities based on the facts of the involvement with others.

In *Never Let Me Go*, the identities of students are not distinguishable in terms of biological relations. They are the reproductive human clones of the genes donors out there in the reality. The genes of the students are fundamentally the copies of their models, the human beings. So based on biological relations, it is close to impossible to identify these reproductive human clones from the genes donors. Yet, with the references of social relations, it is more likely to differentiate one from another. The social relations of the genes donor are constructed with different facts in one’s history; hence, there must be enough information that connects one with others in the society. The identity of the human being is rather effortlessly distinguishable. As for the reproductive human clones, social relations are all based on the interaction at school with other students; thus, it is not challenging for the clone students to claim their identities as well. Nevertheless, when these reproductive human clones are in the real world, identity crisis would be more tangled in terms of the interrelation between reproductive human clones and human beings. There is no reference for reproductive human clones to distinguish them from other human beings in society because the intention is to separate the real world from the school. Reproductive human clones are like blank papers in the real world out there, while the only references to their identities are the biological relations. But such biological relations are associated with history in the family, and that association of history is what these reproductive human clones lack. The identity of a reproductive human clone is thus in unquestionable crisis since there is no authenticity in the biological and social relations for distinguishability.
While in *Moon*, the identity of the human being astronaut Sam Bell is biologically and socially confided in since he is born with historical references in the family and he is also connected to others in terms of social relations. Such identity cannot be challengingly doubted. In contrast, the different generations of the reproductive human clone Sam faces the difficulty in identity proving. The human clone Sam is genetically identical to the human being Sam Bell; however, it is extremely hard to distinguish Sam’s identity through social relations. The human clone Sam is implanted with memories from Sam Bell. Such implanted memory not only diminishes the difference between the human being Sam Bell and the human clone Sam but also reinforces the identities crisis of the human clone Sam. The implanted memory makes the human clone Sam unquestionable in the identification; nonetheless, the truth strengthens Sam’s lack of social relations with others and makes his identity more unconvincing.

Identity is still arguable when it comes to the reproductive human clones and human beings. Such a natural idea seems uncomplicated for human beings but it is somewhat so challenging for reproductive human clones to manifest the credibility of identity.

4.1.2 Individuality

Individuality is also an idea often taken as a way of describing the intricate interrelation between reproductive human clones and human beings. The coexistence of one human being to an identical reproductive human clone reduces the credibility of their individuality. The individuality is supposed to be the distinctiveness of each individual, but when there is the copy that duplicates the combination of genetic uniqueness coexisting with the original, individuality is thus not so unique at all.
Individuality is dubious when a human being donates genes for the success of the reproductive human cloning. It is somewhat implausible in the probability of individuality between a human being and a reproductive human clone. Lack of individuality makes both the human being and the reproductive human clone unidentifiable among the mass crowd. Being indistinguishable without individuality is just like being anything else but oneself. Without unique features in individuality, one is close to nonexistence. And nonexistence is easily ignored and forgotten. When one is ignored and forgotten, it is highly possible that one's existence is irrelevant to others. Irrelevance is never the desirable expectation to anyone, no matter a human being or a reproductive human clone.

In *Never Let Me Go*, individuality is strongly emphasized. Yet the fact that all students are the reproductive human clones lowers the possibility of the individuality in their existences. The crisis of individuality suggests that the reproductive human clones are rather low in uniqueness due to the fact that their models are the genetic donors in the real society out there. Being duplicated in authentic identities highlights the lack of individuality. Notwithstanding, individuality is part of the construction of confidence that is needed in the lives of the reproductive human clones, so that they can still dream about goals and achievements in the future. Though individuality is not what is found in the reproductive human clones when comparing with human beings, these students are still individuals with different features among their own crowd. The doubt of individuality is only conspicuous when there appears to be the coexistence of the reproductive human clones and the human beings.

While in *Moon*, the emphasis of individuality is everywhere. In the film, the technique of presenting different generations of the reproductive human clone Sam
reinforces the lack of individuality. For the human clone Sam, individuality does not even exist since there is the coexistence of different generations of human clone Sam. The failing possibility of individuality strengthens the fact that different generations of Sam are all the reproductive human clones of the same genes donor. And for the human being astronaut Sam Bell, his individuality is also an arguable fact when the reproductive human clones appear to be thoroughly identical to him. Nevertheless, the reproductive human clones are all working on the moon apart from Sam Bell; the crisis of individuality for Sam Bell is rather minor. On the contrary, the crisis of individuality is far more serious for the different generations of reproductive human clone Sam. Their coexistence brings down the possibility of unique individuality. What’s more, the individuality is in danger to both the human being astronaut Sam Bell and the human clone Sam when Sam successfully launches a spacecraft from the moon to the way back to the earth. Individuality not only suggests the distinguishable features on one but also reinforces the uniqueness that represents one’s identity. When the distinguishable features and the uniqueness are no longer special, the crisis of individuality is questionable. Such doubt of individuality is only conspicuous when there appears to be the coexistence of the reproductive human clones and the human beings.

4.1.3 Commodification

Commodification is based on the thinking about the interrelation between human beings and reproductive human clones. When a reproductive human clone exists, there is a certain possibility of commodification. What transfers the genes of the human being donor to the reproductive human clone is the highly developed technology in medical science, and it must take a lot for such a technology to be
thriving. In the current society, what helps make the execution of decisions is money. So, when money is involved in the actualization of reproductive human cloning, commodification exists. Commodification in the interrelationship of human beings and reproductive human clones suggests one party that is commodified. Usually, what is commodified is at the inferior position. Existing in virtue of the donation of genetic combination from someone else does not make one superior than others. Accordingly, reproductive human clones are the products of commodification. Commodification implies that money is the ultimate standard to get to everywhere. In this aspect, what can be done and purchased by for the sake of money is not too valuable. Something invaluable suggests that it is less important; and something less important is taken as replaceable. Being commodified is also a sign of lack of autonomy. Commodities have no control over themselves rather than being at someone else’s disposal. The lack of autonomy strongly reinforces the irrelevance.

In Never Let Me Go, the clone students go through their final steps of donating their vital organs to other human beings. The actualization that makes donation possible is based on commodification of the reproductive human clones. Their genes donors and the reproductive human cloning technology commodify reproductive human clones so that the reproductive human clones can be at the genes donors’ disposal some time when they are in need. In contrast, if these reproductive human clones were seen too valuable for donating vital organs, the whole existence of donation organizations would not be possible. The autonomy in these reproductive human clones is far-gone before they come to realize; the lack of autonomy reinforces the fact of commodification of the reproductive human clones.

In Moon, the different generations of reproductive human clone Sam are the products of commodification. They exist owing to the fact that the company needs
labor to execute the harvesting project. So the whole lives of the reproductive human clones are at the company’s disposal. The company consumes the labor from the human clones and replaces them as commodities. Reproductive human clones, as products of commodification, are in no charge of themselves. Reproductive human clones have no autonomy, so to speak.

Commodification consumes the reproductive human clones in both Never Let Me Go and Moon and belittles their importance in the relevance to humanity. Conversely, it is this irrelevance that brings out the impactful importance in the existence of reproductive human clones. Human beings extremely need reproductive human clones for various purposes, such as the medical aid in Never Let Me Go and the crucial labor in Moon. Rather than looking into the importance of the reproductive human clones, human beings emphasize the differences and irrelevance to diminish the possibility of influence in reproductive human clones and enjoy all the benefit from the consumption of reproductive human clones.

4.2 Concepts by Gilles Deleuze

The following analysis focus on the interrelationship of the interpretational approach of Never Let Me Go and Moon with theoretical concepts borrowed from Gilles Deleuze’s arguments on ideas such as “difference”, “truth”, “the virtual”, “evolution” and “the excess”. How these theoretical statements can be interpreted on the basis of the two literary references will be elaborated as a conclusion.

4.2.1 Difference

Difference is the most critical concept that relates to the interrelation between human beings and reproductive human clones. What emerges from the close
interrelationship of the similarity between human beings and reproductive human clones is the feature that differentiates them. The idea of difference is reinforced in the possibility of assimilation. The juxtaposition of human beings and reproductive human clones manifests the highly possible assimilation yet it reveals the cruel difference that separates the two groups of existence. For the idea of difference, Melissa McMahon has brought up an argument from “Difference, repetition” in Gilles Deleuze: Key Concepts:

The function of the concept of identity, as Deleuze presents in Difference and Repetition, is essentially that of “managing” difference. Thus, for example, a concept subordinates differences by picking out qualities or things as “the same” or identical across (and despite) different cases; such are our general concepts of, for example, “redness” or “dogs”. In another way, difference is made relative to the concept of identity as a mode of its “division” or “specification”. (43)

Sameness in difference is picked out and assembled together to form a uniqueness that defines its existence. What defines the existence is the feature in common in the group. People define reproductive human clones as copies or duplications inasmuch as the fact that reproductive human clones are not categorized in the group of human beings; instead, they are the others. Reproductive human clones are the genetically duplicated beings that the reproductive human cloning technology tries so hard to actualize assimilation between human beings and them. Such assimilation accentuates the sameness yet such sameness in the coexistence of human beings and reproductive human clones reveals the inevitable difference between the two.

In Never Let Me Go, the students are the comprehensive variety of the reproductive human clones apart from the group that is composed of human beings.
Difference is already very distinguishable for the reproductive human clones are separated in the special school from the human beings in the real society out there. In addition, the sole purpose of being vital organs donors to the human beings makes the difference of reproductive human clones more obvious. Such purpose not only extinguishes the possibility of sameness between reproductive human clones and human beings but also highlights the unquestionable difference.

In *Moon*, the biological connection between the reproductive human clone Sam and the human being astronaut Sam Bell suggests the sameness in their existences. The memory implantation even strengthens the assimilation between them. Nevertheless, such implanted memory as social relation implies the fact that reproductive human beings are the duplicated existence of the human being Sam Bell. Social relations do not exist to be the references for reproductive human beings; the biological relations that trace back to the history background in the family even excludes the possibility of sameness. Difference is revealed both in the biological and social relations that separate reproductive human clones from human beings.

A further statement has been made by Melissa McMahon from “Difference, repetition” in Gilles Deleuze: Key Concepts:

The explicit or implicit assumption is that whatever differences may exist outside the concept, these cannot be thought without being referred to a concept of identity, and, “ceasing to be thought, difference dissipates into non-being” (DR: 262). The problem here is not only that notion of difference is understood only as a function of a concept of identity, and thus not “in itself”; it is also a certain kind of difference that is excluded on this model. The conceptual method defines an essence or nature, and thus differences that are “accidental” or “contingent”—those belonging to space and time, to what “happens” or the
individual case—fall outside the general purview of the concept or the limits of its division. (43-44)

The substance of identity is the ultimate and decisive factor in the conception of difference. The crux defines everything that represents all the possibilities that form the identity. The interiority is the center of representation that shows the distinctiveness in identity. In both *Never Let Me Go* and *Moon*, the fact of lacking both identity and individuality brings out the difference embedded within the essence of the existence of reproductive human clones. Difference is in the nature of reproductive human clones that distinguishes themselves from human beings.

### 4.2.2 Truth

Truth is never sweet or amicable when it comes to revealing what is kept hidden. The intention to keep the reality in dark suggests the harshness that comes with the unveiling. The veracity that needs to be uncovered implies the impenetrability of the fact. How the fact is kept impenetrably divulges the poor possibility of revealing the unknown truth. Such harshness in the impenetrably kept verity is either the salvation to the hidden truth or the redemption to one who is concealed from the truth. There are always both good and bad sides of truth unveiling in view of the fact that before the truth is made known to others, one might be accustomed to the present situation; but once the truth is disclosed, there is a certain change to a degree and change is often not comfortable for everyone. An argument about revealing truth has been made in “Never Let Me Go: A Profile of Kazuo Ishiguro” by John Freeman in *Conversations with Kazuo Ishiguro*:

> The gap between the enormities of what Ishiguro’s characters have to forfeit as donors and carers and the relative shallowness of the day-to-day concerns
that Kath describes as she looks back at her younger years gives *Never Let Me Go* an eerie poignancy. As Kath remembers it, her friends were hormone-crazy, keen on sex, and hell-bent on being cool. They listened to music on Walkmans and speculated about their teachers. They were typical teenagers. But all the while, their school kept them in the dark about what exactly awaited them in the world outside. Only Kathy, her friend, Tommy, and Tommy’s girlfriend, Ruth, had the intellectual curiosity to figure out the parameters of their future. *Never Let Me Go* recounts the story of how their relationships came apart in the face of that realization. (197)

Realizing the truth that has been kept in the dark makes one’s life either become dimmer or more meaningful. One’s life would become dimmer due to the hidden truth that would destroy the dream in the future; yet the life would be more meaningful inasmuch as the realization of the truth that opens the window of opportunity to seize the moment and make it more meaningful for the rest of the life. The students in *Never Let Me Go* realize the truth of the plan for their lives to be vital organ donors. Such harsh truth not only demolishes their dreams and expectations in their lives ahead of them but also provides a chance of making the miserably mapped-out plan a more meaningful way of living by being a “carer” to other organ donors in their lives. The truth takes away the expectation yet gives hope back.

In *Moon*, the truth is also a convoluted fact that not only destroys expectation but also gives hope back. At the realization of true identity in the whole counterfeit story made to the purpose of labor consumption, the reproductive human clone Sam gives up his expectation to travel back to the earth to unite with the family. He relinquishes the chance to his happiness; instead, he chooses to sacrifice his life in the wrecked vehicle. Such vanished expectation somehow leads to another hope. The
other reproductive human clone Sam is given the opportunity to travel back to the earth just owing to the fact that the sacrifice brings out such hope. Again, truth not only takes the expectation away but also opens a window to hope.

4.2.3 The Virtual

The virtual does not exist unless there is the variety of possible that connects and forms the conception of the virtual. Through the possible, the virtual emerges in different faces. Without the possible, the virtual is never there since nothing tries to pursue what is in resemblance between the possible and the virtual. A connection between the real society and the human clones is elaborated on by Matthew Beedham in “Questioning the Possibles: Never Let Me Go (2005)” in The Novels of Kazuo Ishiguro:

Similarly, the Norfolk version of Kathy’s cassette tape connects her not only to memories of Norfolk, and the afternoon when she and Tommy found it, but also to her childhood memories of Hailsham when she had the first copy of the tape. In both cases, . . . , the tapes take on value through ‘social experience’—we might say the network—forged by the tapes’ circulation’. (142)

The cassette is the possible that forms the various possibilities of the virtual. Through the cassette, Norfolk brings out all the memories back to Kathy. The memories reminds Kathy of the class when photos are displayed to introduce different places in the country. The cassette and the memories of the photos are the possible that connect her to the real memory back in the days in Hailsham. Likewise, Norfolk is also the possible that relates the reproductive human clones to the real society. Through imagining what it is like in Norfolk in the photos, the possibility of finding what is lost connects the human clone students to Norfolk in the real world out there.
In Moon, the possible is in the implanted memory for the reproductive human clone to connect to the virtual. Through the implanted memory, the reproductive human clone Sam anticipates the virtual via trying to actualize what is possible in the memory. The implanted memory, as the possible, gives the reproductive human clone Sam all the resemblance to his family, as the virtual. The connection between the possible and the virtual maps out the whole plan that restricts Sam’s imagination yet amplifies his hope.

4.2.4 Evolution

Evolution improves what is not good enough through amelioration. Likewise, reproductive human cloning technology is an idea of overthrowing the previous restrictions of barrier in medical science. It is a way to break through the present situation and to achieve some ideals that would not have been done. Evolution may ameliorate the lives yet it does not only bring the good effect but also the influential impact. Though evolution is strongly related to the improvement in medical science, it somehow deteriorates the standard of morality and ethics to a certain extent. In “Never Let Me Go by Kazuo Ishiguro” from In Other Worlds: SF and the Human Imagination, Margaret Atwood has made an interpretation:

The children of Hailsham are human sacrifices, offered up on the altar of improved health for the population at large. With babies already being created with a view to their organs—help for an afflicted sibling, for instance—the dilemma of the Hailsham “students” is bound to become more general. (171)

The reproductive human clone students in Never Let Me Go are signs of both the amelioration and the deterioration in the outcome of evolution. The reproductive human clones are the amelioration owing to the fact that the evolution brings out the
high technology in medical science; the medical science not only helps improve the medical care but also actualizes the better health through the reproductive human cloning technology. The improved health condition in reproductive human clones is to be utilized by human beings. Such evolution not only suggests the technology that ameliorates the better living of people but also carries out the cruelty and ignorance of issues on morality and ethics. Depriving the rights of reproductive human clones does not give human beings a decent credibility on how they treat and see others, especially someone who is genetically close to human beings. Evolution in medical science is the other way of deteriorating morality and ethics.

In Moon, the reproductive human cloning is also an evolution that displays how well the technology has developed and helped the better living of human beings. Yet it is still related to planning to utilize these reproductive human clones for the purpose of labor consumption. Evolution in Moon brings out the vitality of such reproductive human cloning and how it helps take the medical science to the next level, yet evolution also reveals the decadent morality and ethics of blindly utilizing reproductive human clones so that they die away and are buried with our degenerated morality and ethics.

4.2.5 The Excess

The world is made possible by the excess that represents all the variation and difference that opens up the possibility and change. Without possibility and change, the world would never evolve but halt or even regress. The excess is composed of a variety of mass and there are always variation and difference in it.

To elaborate on such conception, the previously mentioned passage is to be brought up again. In “Never Let Me Go by Kazuo Ishiguro” from In Other Worlds:
SF and the Human Imagination, Margaret Atwood has made an interpretation of the novel:

The children of Hailsham are human sacrifices, offered up on the altar of improved health for the population at large. With babies already being created with a view to their organs—help for an afflicted sibling, for instance—the dilemma of the Hailsham “students” is bound to become more general. (171)

The reproductive human clones in Never Let Me Go are the sacrifices of vital organ donations; through the donations, this world is able to continue working. With help from these vital organs, human beings enjoy the better living from such donation. The idea of the excess is exactly what these reproductive human clones represent. They are the variation and difference in the idea of excess that keeps the world running. The fact that reproductive human clones are the ones who make the world possible because they are utilized in favor of the better living of human beings. The exploitation of the excess derogates the value of the reproductive human clones yet reveals the dependence that human beings have on them. The reproductive human clone students in Never Let Me Go are the vital organ donors that keep the world of the human beings possible in working; without the help of the donation, human beings would not be able to enjoy the better living made intentionally by the technology of reproductive human cloning. The dependence on reproductive human clones is evident. Yet the dependence does not make the value of the reproductive human clones higher; rather it diminishes the importance of their existence. The reproductive human clones are only to be utilized for vital organ donations. Such plan belittles the importance of reproductive human clones.

Similarly, in Moon, the consumption of the different generations of the reproductive human clone Sam reveals the cruel exploitation of labor and life that
keep the project going. Nevertheless, such exploitation discloses the dependence on labor and lives of the reproductive human clones. The different generations of reproductive human clones are the excess that make the whole plan possible and somewhat the excess are the needed but also unwanted.

4.3 Conclusion

Lastly, what arouses the anxiety about the questionable humanity in the existence of reproductive human clones is the core of argument over the issues generated in the interrelationship of reproductive human clones and human beings. Such existence of reproductive human clones not only causes anxiety for human beings but also conduces to the discourses upon self-mirroring introspection about humanity. The focus on reproductive human clones upon the question of humanity leads to the elements that account for the differentiation between reproductive human clones and human beings. Somehow, on the other hand, human beings are also the subjects in this discourse upon the question of humanity. Looking into the analysis of the humanity in reproductive human clones brings out the factors constituent of forming the authenticity, autonomy, and uniqueness in the ideas of autonomy, commodification and individuality of humanity issues in human beings. Reproductive human clones are not the opposite of natural human beings; rather, they are the introspective subjects on which all the differences that highlight the issues in humanity are amplified. The amplified differences are hardly to be examined among human beings owing to the sameness that human beings share. It is due to the thoughts on the existence of reproductive human clones that such argument about the humanity in reproductive human clones is possibly prevalent. Such amplification of differences is the core that contributes to the discourses on the interrelation between
reproductive human clones and human beings. Social connections and biological
relations are two of the aspects to look into the issues of humanity that reveal the
variation and differences between reproductive human clones and human beings.
With these aspects, it is more evident to clarify the interrelation that manifests the
ultimate differences that separate human beings from reproductive human clones.

In conclusion, the interrelationship of reproductive human clones and human
beings in both *Never Let Me Go* by Kazuo Ishiguro and *Moon* by Duncan Jones are
intertwined with ideas on humanity issues such as authenticity, autonomy, and
uniqueness that are embedded in identity, commodification, and individuality. Such
interrelation is represented within the interpretational approach to the literary
references by the analysis with concepts of “difference”, “truth”, “the virtual”,
“evolution”, and “the excess” brought up by Gilles Deleuze.
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