

Artificial Intelligence, Bioengineering, and the Ethics of Human Replacement in *Never Let Me Go*

Dr Muzifar Yousuf

Assistant Professor

Department of English

GDC Frisal Homeshalibugh Kulgam (J&K)

Muzifaryousuf7004@gmail.com

Abstract

This research paper delves into the ethical, philosophical, and emotional repercussions tied to the scientific manipulation of life and the creation of artificial life in the book *Never Let Me Go*. These implications are considered through the theoretical frameworks of posthumanism, bioethics, and surveillance theory. The article posits that the book depicts a frighteningly dystopian world where cloned humans are generated, controlled, and sacrificed to keep a so-called “medically natural” humanity alive.

By performing a close reading of the text, the research discusses how the technological apparatuses are portrayed as silent executors that mechanize the human life cycle and make the logic of human substitution seem normal. Moreover, it shows how scientific accomplishment takes precedence over moral obligation thereby turning the body into a biomedical industry and wiping out the ethical roots of consent, dignity, and personhood.

The argument also focuses on the posthuman quandary of identity experienced by the clones who have memory, creativity, and emotional depth but are still denied the recognition of being fully human. Through the emphasis on surveillance, psychological conditioning, and institutional control, the research discloses the method by which the oppressors use care instead of force to prevail. In the end, the paper contends that the book is a strong deterrent to an unregulated artificial intelligence and bioengineering. It unravels the disastrous outcomes of such a redefinition of humanity where human beings are viewed as technological means rather than moral ends.

Keywords: Posthumanism, Bioengineering, Artificial Intelligence Ethics, Human Replacement, Surveillance and Biopower, Identity and Personhood

1. Introduction

The twenty-first century is characterized by the digital age of the rapid technological innovations those three fields of artificial intelligence, automation, and bioengineering, are the most important. These technologies can deliver great results, such as medical breakthroughs and longer lives; however, they also raise very significant ethical concerns about the limits of scientific power. According to Yuval Noah Harari, not only does modern science want to heal the human body, but it also wants to "redesign and replace it altogether" (Harari 38). Nowadays, this idea of a technological future, where humankind is not only assisted but redefined by science, has become the main theme of many contemporary writings.

Contemporary fiction, within this framework, exhibits the growth of a fear of human replacement anxiety, i.e., the fear that the natural human life may be replaced by engineered or artificial ones. Posthumanism scholars argue that the bulk of the narratives now portray humans as beings who can be technologically modified, reproduced, and are expendable. According to N. Katherine Hayles, the posthuman state is one in which "the boundaries between human and machine grow disturbingly porous" (Hayles 2). This uneasiness constitutes the psychological and philosophical aspect of most of the dystopian stories that revolve around artificial life and biomedical experimentation.

The moral dilemmas of biologically engineered life are at the heart of these stories. Frequently, scientific progress moves at a faster pace than the development of moral accountability, thus opening a wide range of questions about consent, dignity, exploitation, and personhood. Leon Kass expresses the idea that the laissez-faire attitude towards the use of biotechnology "threatens to convert human life from a 'manufactured product' into a 'moral subject'" (Kass 17). Thus, literature becomes a prominent area for gauging how moral principles are liberated and most often sacrificed in the race towards scientific triumph.

Such concerns are dramatized in a very powerful manner in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go* (2005), a novel whose vision can be defined as both dystopian and posthuman. The story illustrates the world where cloned humans are made only for organ donation, and the clones are raised in a way that they would not question this fate. At first glance, the novel has no visible robots or supercomputers taking over the world, but it depicts a frightful kind of

biotechnological automation in which human bodies are treated as programmed biological resources.

The central research concern of this study bears two aspects: the first one is to see how technology substitutes natural human life with the methodical production of engineered bodies; the second one is to find out how ethical responsibility goes unnoticed as science makes progress. The research question points to the issue of the moral side of exploitation turning into the norm, i.e., the technological efficiency that is counteracting human dignity taking over.

The goals of this research are to investigate the ethical dilemma of the human replacement issue, to delve into the posthuman nature of the cloned subjects, and to inquire into the ways institutional control facilitates the coming of moral violence. The chosen methodology is qualitative textual analysis and it is supplemented by posthumanist and moral theory which together provide insights into the issues of technology, bioengineering, and moral decline in the novel from a critical perspective.

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1 Studies on Posthumanism and Bioengineered Identity

Posthumanism is largely considered to be one of the main theoretical concepts for explaining the impact of technology on human identity in modern culture and literature. The idea goes against the humanist idea of the autonomous, naturally bounded human subject. N. Katherine Hayles sees the posthuman situation as one where "the distinctions between the human and the machine fade in a disturbing manner" (Hayles 2).

Scholars discuss that the posthuman identity concept is not merely about substituting humans with machines but about the modification of humans biologically and genetically through science and biotechnology. The most notable impact of Donna Haraway's "Cyborg Manifesto" in the argument against the existence of pure humanity by showing the hybrid techno-organic identities as the fact of contemporary life (Haraway 150). This has led literary research to open up the critical debate to the topics of the artificial life and the technological body, where the moral and ontological ambiguity of the cloned beings, genetically modified humans, and synthetic organisms is the main theme.

These characters challenge the fixed concepts of personhood and make the readers think about the nature of consciousness, emotion, and ethical worth.

2.2 AI, Bioethics, and Literature

The ethical implications of AI and bioengineering are at the epicenter of the most recent critical discourse. Academics in the literature field overwhelmingly associate these innovations to the ethical issues of bioethics such as consent, exploitation, and moral responsibility. Leon Kass cautions that the reckless application of biotechnology may lead to the situation where human life is transformed into 'a set of manipulable commodities rather than moral subjects' (Kass 19). This fear dominantly features in stories of cloning, artificial reproduction, and organ harvesting.

The question of fabricating artificial human beings ethically has been one of the most discussed topics in philosophy and literature. Francis Fukuyama claims that biotechnological changes put human dignity at risk as they eventually will change the biological basis of equality, which is the basis of human dignity itself (Fukuyama 101). In the literatures, the representation of the genetically modified human is frequently the one that lacks full ethical recognition even though they have the same emotional and cognitive abilities as the unmodified ones.

The topic of organ harvesting and genetically modified life has been explored as a symbol of extreme capitalist exploitation that converts human bodies into mere commodities. Scholars emphasize that these kinds of stories signify the systems which are scientifically efficient and at the same time morally irresponsible. Literature thus becomes a potent venue for unveiling how technological advancement can, under the mask of medical necessity, make the killing of artificially created life forms easier and more acceptable.

2.3 Critical Studies on *Never Let Me Go*

Most of the critical and scholarly works on Kazuo Ishiguro's novel *Never Let Me Go* have been consistent in pointing out that the themes that predominate the work are those of identity loss, surveillance, as well as, the blurring of the boundary between human and machine. In his reading of the novel, Bruce Robbins sees it "a narrative of slow social death," where the characters are gradually "socially dead" due to soft institutional control which makes them accept their fate (Robbins 292). Their identity is formed not through personal choice, but through the quiet submission of the biomedical fate that has been laid out for them.

Surveillance in this story is a very subtle kind. Instead of a clear technological monitoring, control is exercised through instruction, conditioning, and observation that has become the norm. The concept of disciplinary power that Michel Foucault introduces is invoked very often to the novel as the clones internalize the power of the authority and thus they become their own rulers and no outside force is visible (Foucault 201). They are under continuous surveillance from which they never get a chance to rest, yet it is an invisible one.

The most controversial issue of the novel has probably been the question of the human-machine boundary. The clones are biologically human, still, they are considered medical technology that is programmable. As Sherryl Vint puts it, the novel shows how posthuman bodies "collapse the distinction between tool and person" (Vint 98). The clones are the ones who have the memory, love, creativity, and emotional depth, yet they are the ones who are stripped of human rights. These critical insights combined present *Never Let Me Go* as a key posthuman work that deals with questions of bioengineering, ethical erasure, and the human value restructured by technology.

3. Theoretical Framework

3.1 Posthumanist Theory

Posthumanist theory questions the humanist notion of a human being with a stable, independent, and biologically fixed identity. It rather acknowledges the human as a subject that is to a large extent shaped by technology. N. Katherine Hayles characterizes the posthuman as a state where "the boundaries between the human and the machine blur in unsettling ways" (How We Became Posthuman 2). This change of meaning is crucial for the posthuman theory where consciousness, embodiment, and identity are not necessarily of organic origin anymore.

Posthumanism further challenges the difference between human and machine. Donna Haraway claims that the cyborg is "a hybrid of machine and organism" which "has the effect of breaking down the twin myths of the 'clean-cut' distinctions between nature and culture, human and animal, physical and non-physical" (Simians, Cyborgs, and Women 150). In fiction, such generativity manifests in the stories of cloned bodies, artificial intelligence, and bioengineered beings that are emotionally and morally as capable as natural humans. Hence, posthumanist theory provides the means for critical engagement with those characters who

are ideologically and conceptually in the borderlands of the category of the tool and the person.

3.2 Bioethics and Technological Morality

One of the primary activities of bioethics is to analyze the ethical consequences of biotechnological practices, which are very often the cases when scientific progress somehow contradicts human dignity. Leon Kass cautions that biotechnological advances have the potential to make humans "a product of willful engineering rather than a gift of nature" ("The Wisdom of Repugnance" 18). The morality of organs harvesting, cloning, and artificial reproduction in a very direct way, among others, brings up the problem of consent and exploitation in a posthuman world.

In the same vein, Francis Fukuyama also sees biotechnological innovation as a threat to the biological basis of equality, and he goes on to say that it may "change human nature and thus make us enter a 'posthuman' stage of history" (Our Posthuman Future 101). The dispute between scientific advancement and maintaining human dignity thus becomes the central theme of the bioethics discussion. Once life is created for the sake of utility, its moral value gets reduced to an economic one.

3.3 Surveillance and Biopower

The idea of biopower is about the way the different modern institutions control life through their discipline and observation. Michel Foucault sees biopower as a system that "cares for life and lets die" (History of Sexuality, Vol. 1 138). Surveillance is a kind of punishment which is less visible but it operates through normalization and self-control.

In posthuman scenarios, the body is regarded as a kind of technology that is under the control of the institutions and the individual is no longer the owner. The power that was just governing behavior now has the ability to directly control biological existence. This concept is indispensable when dissecting the issue of how the biologically engineered are under the control of the institutions without being able to revolt.

4. Artificial Intelligence and the Logic of Human Replacement

While *Never Let Me Go* does not feature robots or visibly intelligent machines, it reveals a terrifyingly efficient form of algorithmic and biomedical control technology that operates as a silent controller of human life. The children clones are the product of a society system that

had already mapped out all the stages of their life. They are the characters of a technological program that invisibly assigns roles to them, monitors their movements, and decides their demise. As said by Yuval Noah Harari, technology today is not just making tools, but it is rather "life engineering in a very direct way" (Homo Deus 38).

The described process is essentially the mechanization of the human life cycle. The stages of birth, education, work, organ donation, and death are all followed in a strict sequence without variation. The clones have no say in their destiny; they only go through the steps of a previously biological-coded routine. Their lives are more like the functioning of automated industrial systems than those of organic human development. According to Sherryl Vint, one can describe this situation as "the biological bodies becoming the instruments of production" ("Biopolitical Futures" 97).

Perhaps the scariest consequence of this is the eradication of natural human beings and their replacement by genetically engineered bodies. They are made to facilitate a life of non-cloned humans while sick and death are kept at bay. It results in a population where those artificially created are the ones who keep the 'natural' ones alive while at the same time they are forced to die. Science is then no longer equal in serving humanity but rather it makes biological value hierarchical. Biotechnology, according to Fukuyama, may create "different classes of people with different moral status" (Our Posthuman Future 104).

Biologically, the clones are the equivalent of machines. Even if they experience love, nostalgia, jealousy, and fear, society treats them as mere programmable medical devices. The works of the clones, in particular Tommy's painting, are not seen as personal artistic expression but as experimental data on what extent the clones have a soul. This is quite in line with Haraway's argument that the era of technology "blurs the boundary between human and machine consciousness" (Simians, Cyborgs, and Women 152).

Therefore, people are turned into programmed resources. Personal identity is divorced from autonomy and merely substituted for a functional utility. The clones' body is likened to a mere organ repository, not unlike a piece of hardware in a tech system. Foucault's concept of biopolitics, for instance, points out that power is not only capable of disciplining subjects but can also manage life and death directly (History of Sexuality 139).

The saddest of ironies is that the clones come to accept this logic as their own. They do not revolt; rather they submit. In a manner similar to well-programmed algorithms, they acknowledge their role without outright defiance. By this means, the book lays bare the supreme terror of posthuman control - not the shock of mechanical domination, but the victim's psychological normalization. There is no need for technology to forcibly enslave; it trains its victims to willingly partake in their demise. Therefore, the book unveils that the replacement of humans will not come in the form of a war between machines and people, but it will be silently done by people redesigning themselves into machines.

5. Bioengineering and the Ethics of Organ Harvesting

In *Never Let Me Go*, bioengineering is not described in technical detail, yet its ethical consequences are starkly visible. The clones are the outcome of an invisible system of genetic engineering, produced to support a national programme of organ donation. As Ivan Lacko notes, the novel's world is one in which the main characters are "created and raised for the sole purpose of organ donation" (Lacko 3). Their existence is not an accident of birth but the direct result of planned biomedical design.

A key dimension of this system is the denial of parental identity. The clones have no families, no origin stories that affirm them as children of particular parents. Their only background is institutional: Hailsham and later the cottages and recovery centres. J. Alisha Josephine observes that the novel imagines "the mass production of human clones in the service of therapeutic medical technology" where human bonds are replaced by technical classification (Josephine 8536–37). By erasing genealogy, the system removes any framework through which kinship-based obligation or care might challenge the donor programme.

Equally disturbing is the ethical absence of consent. The clones are never genuinely asked whether they wish to donate their organs; the entire educational structure is designed to make donation appear inevitable, even honorable. Sherryl Vint, in her work on biopolitics and speculative fiction, argues that contemporary biomedicine increasingly treats life as a resource under "the commodification of life through biotechnology" with profound implications for "personhood, agency, and value" (Vint, *Biopolitical Futures*). The clones grow up with a narrative that normalizes their sacrifice and makes refusal almost unthinkable. As one ethical reading of the novel points out, the characters face an "ethical identity" crisis because they are positioned as tools of healing rather than moral subjects with rights (Petrillo).([SCIRP](#))

The novel thus presents the body as a spare-part system. In a detailed study of the text as biodystopia, Yan Kai writes that the clones are “nothing but holding units for spare parts, whose existence is maintained solely for the medical need” (Yan 595–96). This language reflects a radical instrumentalization of the human form: bodies are no longer sacred or inviolable, but storage units whose value lies in their harvestable organs. The ethic of “do no harm” is displaced by a utilitarian logic that justifies harm to some in order to extend the lives of others.

This results in a more substantial, although indirect, dehumanization through medical progress. Leon Kass cautions that cloning along with related technologies may lead to the human being ceasing to be “a product of willful engineering rather than a gift of nature” (“Wisdom of Repugnance” 18). In the fabricated world of Ishiguro, this threat is fully actualized: the clones’ moral status is lowered so that the society at large can go on seeing itself as humane while it profits from their organs.

Lacko’s bioethical interpretation emphasizes that the clones unequivocally have consciousness, emotional depth, and the capability to “feel pain and understand such concepts as separation, anxiety, love, or death” (Lacko 4), however, this acknowledgment does not lead to their safeguarding.

Therefore, the novel lays bare the principal conflict in contemporary bioethics that is medical advancement as both a source of cure and violence. To “save” natural humans, the system is killing another silent category of humans, whose engineered status is employed to rationalize their expendability. *Never Let Me Go* turns into an eloquent caution about the ways in which the biotechnological progress can gradually remove the very notion of shared humanity.

6. Surveillance, Control, and Institutional Power

The world of *Never Let Me Go* is not only run by bioengineering but it is also subject to the surveillance and control of the institutions. The story of the clones’ childhood, which was closely monitored at Hailsham, is the base of the system. On the surface, Hailsham looks like a modern boarding school but a recent research paper describes it as “a place of unpredictable sets and mysterious rules” where the students “special” status is constantly reminded to them while at the same time they are being prepared for a life of donation (Sadeq 1114–15). The

combination of care and secrecy in this way makes power present both as a very close and as an unfathomable thing in the children's world.

The kids are not allowed to have any privacy as they live under continuous monitoring which is not done by high-tech cameras but through teachers, guardians, and institutional routines all of which regulate the children's movement, speech, and knowledge. Michel Foucault describes modern disciplinary systems as those in which the power is exercised by making the subjects "seen but unable to see" the source of control (Discipline and Punish 200). Hailsham works as a mild Panopticon: the students are aware that they are being watched and judged, still, they seldom get to see the workings that determine their destiny.

This directly results in the use of psychological conditioning. Khem Sharma points out that the clones "were brainwashed in the Hailsham," were brought up from the very beginning in the idea that caregiving and donation were their "role" in life (Sharma 49–50). Their obedient behavior is not innate; it is brought about through stories, regulations, and half-truths. Rachel Carroll argues that the novel sets the near-past of Britain as a presence "where the mass production of human clones in the service of therapeutic medical technology has become normalized" (Carroll 133). The key mechanism is normalization: once donation is depicted as something normal, then the ethical outrage fades away.

The system also works to give the impression that one has a choice. When they become young adults, the clones think that they have the freedom at the cottages and later as carers. But their movements, jobs, and even the lives they lead in secret are still very much under control. They hold on to the idea of "deferrals" as a way of proving their love but it turns out to be a lie, a device that is used for keeping them in obedience. Lacko states that when they come to the final understanding that "deferral is definitely not possible" and their lives "must now follow the path that has been set," they still exhibit "quiet, peaceful resignation" (Lacko 4). What this resignation shows is the deep institutional conditioning these people have undergone.

The entire system that is being depicted here is basically the state's monopoly on life and death. The state may be unnamed, but one can see its presence through national policies, medical infrastructure, and explanations given by the guardians. Foucault's idea of biopower—the power that "produces life and allows death" (History of Sexuality 138)—is quite an accurate representation of the situation. The clones are the ones who are given the permission to live, but only to the extent that they will be medically useful; their deaths are the parts of

the health system that is being carried out with the approval of the state, along with the other planned surgeries.

As a result, *Never Let Me Go* illustrates the effect of the power of surveillance and institutions in creating a society, which is exploitable and willingly welcomes their exploitation. What is terrifying in the novel is not the direct use of violence, but rather the efficient, bureaucratic way in which the lives that have been considered less than fully human are administered.

7. Emotional Life, Relationships, and the Tragedy of Artificial Humanity

Unlike many other aspects of their engineered status, the clones of *Never Let Me Go* are shown to have a deep and rich emotional life which only serves to highlight how tragic their existence is. The narrative is mainly about the relationships of Kathy, Ruth, and Tommy. Their friendships, jealousies, and reconciliations are portrayed with the depth typical of any human adolescence. Kai Yan, in his article, notes that the change in focus of Ishiguro is “from the bright prospect of medical application for biological sciences to the ‘dim view’ for human beings in a ‘posthuman’ age” (Yan 595). The novel, by making the emotional experience the most important aspect, confirms that these clones are the same as anyone else in terms of love and pain.

The characters are haunted by the fear of abandonment—by guardians, by friends, and ultimately by the system that will “complete” them. Ruth’s manipulative behaviour and Kathy’s careful self-control are two instances of the characters’ emotional insecurity. In his examination of ethics and grievance J. D. Schwetman, points out that the small-scale conflicts at Hailsham serve as a theatrical representation of “a history of birthright and exclusion” in which some lives are more quietly valued than others (Schwetman 422). The clones can feel the disparity even though they might not fully express it.

Besides the fear, the quest for emotional honesty is very strong. A large part of Kathy’s narration is filled with trying to recall events accurately, interpret gestures, and understand what their relationships meant. M. E. Cannella defines the book as “a fragmented example of the unreliable natures of physical place and memory,” in which characters cannot help but struggle to put together a consistent identity (Cannella). The very act of storytelling, for

Kathy, seems like a way to assert the reality of her life and relationships despite the world treating her as something disposable.

This shows the central paradox of the story: human feelings in posthuman bodies. Although the clones are the result of biomedical research, they experience attachment, jealousy, hope, and grief just like any other person. Lacko points out that they are “very much alive, with their individual personality, and the ability to think for themselves” (Lacko 3). Their emotional depth serves among other things to highlight the moral contradiction of a society that denies them full humanity while at the same time depends on their sacrifice.

In the end, technology ends up destroying natural relationships by turning them into instruments. The love between Kathy and Tommy is bound by the donation schedule; their effort to find a way to postpone is driven by the desire to delay medical intervention. On top of that, love becomes intertwined with survival. Discussions of bioethics on the novel have been pointing out that the donor system turns intimate life into just another space of calculation where the time left for love is weighed against the schedule of organ retrieval (Lacko; Petrillo).

The tragedy of *Never Let Me Go* is exactly here: an artificially created humanity is emotionally authentic but is denied at the institutional level. The clones do love, remember, and grieve; however, the world that created them is not willing to acknowledge that these feelings give them an unalienable right to dignity and moral consideration.

8. Identity Crisis and Posthuman Selfhood

Never Let Me Go, in its essence, is about a chilling philosophical inquiry: What defines a human? The clones are human in the eyes of biology, they are emotionally deep, and they are intellectually bright, still, they are denied the recognition that comes with being a moral agent. The exclusion of the clones from this recognition unmasks the fact that humanity is not based solely on biology but on social recognition. Social commentator N. Katherine Hayles points out that in the posthuman scenario “consciousness is no longer the privileged center of human identity” (*How We Became Posthuman* 4). The clones are conscious beings, yet the social milieu is adamant in its refusal to accord them the moral status that usually goes with it.

The related question is: Who is worthy of a soul? The experiment in the novel where the guardians use art to find out if the clones have souls is a clear indication of the underlying

assumption that clones do not have souls. The idea here reveals a very unsettling one in which one's status as a person has to be demonstrated first before it can be granted. As Leon Kass vehemently warns, thinking in terms of biotechnologies takes the risk of depersonalizing life and characterizing it as something whose moral value has to be confirmed from the outside ("Wisdom of Repugnance" 21). The mere fact that the clones' humanity is the subject of debate makes them mere potencies of ethical experiments rather than persons.

The narrative argues for the idea that memory, creativity, and emotion are the things that make us human. Kathy's story is very much dependent on memory—her recollections of Hailsham, Ruth, and Tommy serve as acts of self-assertion. As Maurice Halbwachs explains, memory is not only individual but also the basis of social identity (On Collective Memory 38). The artwork of Tommy, initially taken as evidence for the existence of a soul, eventually becomes the emblem of his emotional frailty rather than proof of a system. Their love, envy, guilt, and grief, among others, are all the more powerful because they originate from these characters' emotional depths, something that no machine could simply reproduce.

But a glaring societal failure to see them as persons continues after this. The language of bureaucracy helps in normalizing the plight of the clones and words like "donations" or "completion" are used for that purpose, thus concealing the killing operation under a euphemism. According to the Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben, present-day political apparatuses are more and more geared towards the production of "bare life" - life that can be terminated without the killing being recognized as murder (Homo Sacer 8). It is this very space of exception where the clones are located - they are in society but at its moral peripheries.

As a result, it is not their internal identity that is a problem but the identity imposed on them. Emotionally, they know who they are but the world will not confirm that knowledge from an ethical point of view. The sad plight of posthuman selfhood in this book is, as the author puts it, the tragic contradiction that the clones are "human in feeling and memory, posthuman in the eyes of the system that created them"—an ironic human paradox of the made-up world.

9. Conclusion

This research has elaborated how the novel, *Never Let Me Go*, uses the tragic lives of clones to impressively criticize artificial intelligence, bioengineering, and the ethical issues of

human substitution. The analysis has elaborated that the novel depicts the use of technology not as a violent force of machine overthrow but as a silent, administrative system which gradually replaces the original human with the genetically engineered one. The study also revealed that through bioengineering, the body is commodified; through surveillance, the individual is subdued; and through institutional language, death is depersonalized.

The second point made through this research work is that science is prioritized at the cost of ethics. The procedure of organ harvesting is presented as a necessity of medicine, while the consent, autonomy, and dignity of the clones are gradually, and in a systematic manner, erased. The novel illustrates that scientific achievement, without moral control, turns curing into a legitimized violent act. The philosopher Francis Fukuyama, among others, cautions that biotechnology might lead humanity into a “posthuman stage of history” where even the concept of equality will be biologically destabilized (*Our Posthuman Future* 101).

The character of the clone finally serves as the metaphor for the posthuman lament of modern society—the scenario in which emotional human traits still exist but are politically and morally unrecognized. The clones love, remember, hope, and suffer, still, they are regarded as things to be disposed of. Their misfortune is not that they revolt and are therefore suppressed by power, but that they are obedient because they are educated and cared for. Thus, the novel’s dystopia is particularly disturbing: terror is absent, instead, oppression operates through normalization.

Furthermore, *Never Let Me Go* is primarily a vehement protest against bioengineering and artificially intelligent machines operated without any kind of control. It tells the readers that the major risk of future technology is not its capacity to annihilate violently but its capacity to justify quietly the exploitation. The line between cruelty and progress becomes blurred when human beings, who are supposed to be the beneficiaries of technological advancement, are turned into mere tools.

This research paper equally paves the way for numerous future research projects. Comparative research with Margaret Atwood’s dystopian writings, especially *Oryx and Crake*, may shed more light on the themes of biotechnology and corporate control. Additional research on AI ethics in dystopian fiction along with expanded posthuman studies in 21st-century literature would also be a considerable contribution to interdisciplinary scholarship on technology and humanity.

Works Cited

- Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Translated by Daniel Heller-Roazen, Stanford UP, 1998.
- Atwood, Margaret. *Oryx and Crake*. Anchor Books, 2004.
- Cannella, Maria Elena. "Unreliable Physical Places and Memories as Narrative Devices in *Never Let Me Go*." *Sanglap: Journal of Literary and Cultural Inquiry*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2017. (sanglap-journal.in)
- Carroll, Rachel. "Never Let Me Go: The Laboratory of the Near Past." *Literature Interpretation Theory*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2010, pp. 133–44. (sanglap-journal.in)
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, Vintage Books, 1995.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. Vol. 1, Translated by Robert Hurley, Vintage Books, 1990.
- Fukuyama, Francis. *Our Posthuman Future: Consequences of the Biotechnology Revolution*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Translated by Lewis A. Coser, University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Harari, Yuval Noah. *Homo Deus: A Brief History of Tomorrow*. Harper, 2017.
- Haraway, Donna. "A Cyborg Manifesto." *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*, Routledge, 1991, pp. 149–181.
- Haraway, Donna. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. Routledge, 1991.
- Hayles, N. Katherine. *How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics*. University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- Ishiguro, Kazuo. *Never Let Me Go*. Faber and Faber, 2005.

- Josephine, J. Alisha. "Humanity on the Brink: Ethical Reflections on Cloning, Organ Donation, and the Quest for Medical Advancement in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, vol. 30, no. 4, 2024, pp. 8534–42. ([Kuey](#))
- Kass, Leon. "The Wisdom of Repugnance." *The New Republic*, 2 June 1997, pp. 17–26.
- Lacko, Ivan. "Bioethical Concerns in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *World Literature Studies*, vol. 16, no. 2, 2024, pp. 19–31. ([SAV](#))
- Petrillo, Sarah. "Moral Theories and Cloning in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." University of California, 2014. ([eScholarship](#))
- Robbins, Bruce. "Cruelty Is Bad: *Never Let Me Go*." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 40, no. 3, 2007, pp. 289–303.
- Sadeq, Zana Rauf. "Biopolitics in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *Asian Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, 2024. ([InLibrary](#))
- Schwetman, Jordan. "The Ethics of Grievance in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies*, vol. 19, no. 4, 2017, pp. 421–40. ([JSTOR](#))
- Sharma, Kishor. "Clones and Commodification: An Ethical Issue in Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *Literary Studies*, vol. 38, 2025, pp. 45–52. ([NepJOL](#))
- Vint, Sherryl. "Biopolitical Futures in *Never Let Me Go*." *Science Fiction Studies*, vol. 34, no. 2, 2007, pp. 133–148.
- Vint, Sherryl. "Biopolitical Futures in *Never Let Me Go*." *Science Fiction Studies*, vol. 34, no. 2, 2007, pp. 133–148.
- Vint, Sherryl. *Biopolitical Futures in Twenty-First-Century Speculative Fiction*. Cambridge UP, 2021. ([PMC](#))
- Yan, Kai. "Posthuman Biopredicament: A Study of Biodystopia in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, vol. 9, no. 5, 2019, pp. 595–602. ([Academy Publication](#))