

AN ANALYSIS OF JULIAN BARNES' *ENGLAND, ENGLAND* & KAZUO
ISHIGURO'S *NEVER LET ME GO* IN THE LIGHT OF JEAN BAUDRILLARD'S
SIMULACRA AND SIMULATION

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

EMRE KARA

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

FEBRUARY 2019

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Çiğdem Sağın Şimşek
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztapak Avcı
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Hülya Yıldız Bağçe (METU, ELIT)

Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztapak Avcı (METU, ELIT)

Assist. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kırca (Çankaya Uni., TINS)

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Emre Kara

Signature :

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF JULIAN BARNES' *ENGLAND, ENGLAND* & KAZUO
ISHIGURO'S *NEVER LET ME GO* IN THE LIGHT OF JEAN BAUDRILLARD'S
SIMULACRA AND SIMULATION

Kara, Emre

M.A., English Literature

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztabak Avcı

February 2019, 128 pages

This thesis examines the novels *England, England* by Julian Barnes and *Never Let Me Go* by Kazuo Ishiguro from a theoretical background informed by the ideas proposed by Jean Baudrillard in *Simulacra and Simulation*. The aim of the study is to compare these two novels thematically and examine the similarities and differences in the ways that they utilize, question and discuss the notion of simulation. Through this comparison, the study aims to contribute to current scholarship by thematically bringing closer to each other these two novels that seemingly deal with different subject matters and that have not been previously studied together. The study suggests that while Barnes deals with the notion of simulation on a larger scale, focusing on a national body, Ishiguro focuses on the human body. Therefore, while Barnes mainly examines the concepts of country, nationality, history and culture in their relation to the concept of simulation, Ishiguro mainly examines humanness and identity. Both novels depict the negative outcomes of simulations but they also question the validity and singularity of the notion of reality.

Keywords: Jean Baudrillard, Julian Barnes, Kazuo Ishiguro, simulacra, simulation

ÖZ

JULIAN BARNES'IN *İNGİLTERE İNGİLTERE'YE KARŞI* & KAZUO
ISHIGURO'NUN *BENİ ASLA BIRAKMA* ROMANLARININ, JEAN
BAUDRILLARD'IN *SİMÜLAKRLAR VE SİMÜLASYON*'U ÇERÇEVESİNDE BİR
İNCELEMESİ

Kara, Emre

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Edebiyatı

Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Elif Öztabak Avcı

Şubat 2019, 128 sayfa

Bu tez, Julian Barnes'ın *İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı* ve Kazuo Ishiguro'nun *Beni Asla Bırakma* romanlarını, Jean Baudrillard'ın *Simülakrlar ve Simülasyon*'da öne sürdüğü fikirlerden beslenen bir teorik altyapı üzerinden incelemektedir. Çalışmanın amacı bu iki romanı tematik açıdan birbirleriyle karşılaştırmak ve simülasyon kavramını kullanma, sorgulama ve tartışma biçimlerindeki benzerlik ve farklılıkları incelemektir. Bu karşılaştırma yoluyla bu çalışma, görünürde farklı konularla ilgilenen ve daha önce birlikte çalışılmamış bu iki romanı tematik açıdan birbirlerine yaklaştırarak literatüre katkıda bulunmayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışmaya göre Barnes simülasyon kavramını daha büyük bir ölçekte ele alarak ulusal bir kitleye odaklanırken, Ishiguro insan bedenine odaklanmaktadır. Bu nedenle, Barnes temel olarak ülke, milliyet, tarih ve kültür kavramlarını simülasyon kavramıyla olan ilişkileri üzerinden incelerken, Ishiguro ise temel olarak insanlık ve kimlik kavramlarını incelemektedir. Her iki roman da simülasyonların olumsuz sonuçlarını gösterirken aynı zamanda gerçeklik kavramının geçerliliğini ve tekliğini de sorgulamaktadırlar.

Anahtar sözcükler: Jean Baudrillard, Julian Barnes, Kazuo Ishiguro, simülakr, simülasyon

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztabak Avcı for her generous support, guidance and encouragement throughout the process of writing this thesis.

I also wish to thank my family and friends who have supported and motivated me all along the way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND.....	9
2.1 The Precession of Simulacra.....	9
2.2 Simulation of History and Memory.....	14
2.3 Simulation of Spaces.....	16
2.4 Simulation of Bodies.....	19
2.5 The Relation of Simulation to Commodification and Marketing.....	22
2.6 Baudrillard's Last Words: What Remains After Simulation Takes Over Reality?.....	25
3. <i>ENGLAND, ENGLAND</i> : SIMULATION OF THE NATION.....	27
4. <i>NEVER LET ME GO</i> : SIMULATION OF THE BODY.....	58
5. CONCLUSION.....	106
REFERENCES.....	111
APPENDICES	
A. TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET.....	116
B. TEZ İZİN FORMU/THESIS PERMISSION FORM.....	128

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Jean Baudrillard (1929-2007) is a French philosopher, sociologist and cultural theorist, often associated with postmodernism and post-structuralism. His most famous and probably most influential work is *Simulacra and Simulation*, a philosophical treatise written in 1981, in which he examines the relationship between reality and its symbolic recreations. Baudrillard's work presents a radical critique of modern day political and ideological movements, and his theory of simulation has had a great effect on the fields of philosophy and sociology. The main argument in Baudrillard's line of thought is that in the postmodern age, we can no longer differentiate between what is "real" and what is "hyperreal", which is an artificial recreated version of the real. In such a world, the act of "simulation" and the resulting "simulacra" will overthrow and replace reality. Therefore, according to Baudrillard, simulacra do not conceal the truth; they "become" the truth. The experiences of people in the postmodern world are mostly through simulations and the world is so saturated with these simulations that all meaning is liable to being meaningless and reality can no longer be verified.

The present study aims to establish thematic and philosophical relationships between two British novels by taking Baudrillard's arguments as a theoretical standpoint. The first one is *England, England* (1998) by Julian Barnes. The novel has been associated with postmodernism, satire, dystopia and even farce. The main story revolves around the idea of replicating the whole England in a theme park on the Isle of Wight. This idea alone tells a lot about how Barnes' novel can easily be associated with Baudrillard's idea of simulation. While talking about the processes preceding and following the creation of the theme park, the novel questions many notions like country, nationality, history, culture, memory, traditions, myths; specifically underlining the fact that most of the time, these notions are artificially created

illusions. The second novel under examination is *Never Let Me Go* (2005) by Kazuo Ishiguro. It is an unconventional science fiction novel, in that it offers a “retro” scenario: The story takes place in late 1990s, so differently from many typical science fiction stories taking place in the future, the novel rewrites recent history with dystopian and science fiction elements. The main story focuses on a trio of clones, who are raised at a boarding school named Hailsham, in order to become organ donors when they grow up. Hailsham is actually not much different from the theme park in *England, England*, in that it is also an artificial world within the larger world, keeping the students away from the outside world and the knowledge that will come along with it. Apart from spatial simulation, *Never Let Me Go* also delves into the deeper topic of simulating human beings, by creating clones.

England, England and *Never Let Me Go* have been the focus of many studies examining them from various philosophical, sociological and psychological viewpoints. In such studies, one can find the traces of Baudrillard’s ideas, either directly referenced or alluded to. Before comparing these two novels with each other from a Baudrillardian perspective, it might be a good idea to overview the studies dealing with the novels individually, in order to have a panorama of themes and topics within the novels that have attracted scholarly attention.

Many studies examining *England, England* focus on national identity, invented traditions, (re)written histories and memories, artificial constructions and deconstructions. As Nünning (2001) points out, *England, England* is one of many contemporary British novels, along with contemporary literary criticism and cultural history, which deal with the notion of Englishness and related myths, traditions and attitudes, and how they are deconstructed and reconstructed. Bentley (2007) also argues that *England, England* exemplifies how Englishness is rewritten and how the nation is imagined in works of fiction. Bulger (2009) suggests that it is an obsession in English literature to search for the English national character, giving examples from writers like Ackroyd, Byatt, Orwell and Eliot. She regards *England, England* as continuing that pursuit; in a hilarious and sharply critical way, making use of parody, witty ridicule and the questioning of cultural and historical myths. Romero (2011) suggests that national identities are artificially and conveniently constructed by the

political elite. She compares New Labour's modernization programme in the 1997 general election to history writing in general and *England, England* specifically, focusing on the novel's satirical portrayal of such artificial constructions. Pristash (2011) focuses on traditional and alternative conceptions of English national identity, examining reality, authenticity, myth, communal and individual identities within the novel. Böhme (2012) looks at how national identity becomes rebranded and rewritten in contemporary English fiction. The points she focuses on while examining *England, England* are realist, postmodern and pastoral configurations of England; remediating Englishness through listing; narration and focalisation; exposing processes of inventing traditions and rebranding a nation; topoi of English cultural memory and the theme park; and *England, England* in the context of contemporary fiction deconstructing images of Englishness.

Some other studies examining *England, England* focus specifically on spatial simulations, especially the notion of the theme park. Theme parks hold an important place in Baudrillard's book; he has many references to Disneyland and other spaces that seem or function like a theme park. Being a very concrete example of an act of simulation, theme parks have garnered interest in both fiction and literary analysis, *England, England* being a peculiar example. Miracky (2004) compares *England, England* with Michael Crichton's science fiction novel *Jurassic Park* (1990), focusing on theme parking, with specific references to Baudrillard. Walonen (2014) looks at the socio-spatial dynamics of theme parks in contemporary transatlantic fiction. Nitsch (2015) refers to Raymond Williams' *The Country and the City* (1973), focusing on the book's examination of how place is created, valued and devalued. Taking this work as the theoretical background, she looks at *England, England*, focusing on place-production, tourism development and touristic profit, marketing of the place, and neoliberal economy.

As we can see, studies on *England, England* generally focus on the (re)created nature of nation(ality) and the simulation of spaces. In that sense, examining the novel from a Baudrillardian perspective might offer a meaningful insight into the mentioned topics. The examination of England and Englishness also brings about questions related to national and individual identity, national and

individual history and memory, creation of national myths and traditions. The examination of simulated spaces and the trend of theme parking also raise questions about the recreation and rebranding of places; the sociological, political, touristic and economic motives behind such enterprises; and the questioning of the authenticity of such artificially created places. All of these topics lead to the broader questioning of authenticity in general, a comparison of the supposed “real” and its variations, its multiple recreated versions, its simulations.

Although between the two novels *England, England* seems to be the one that is more overtly associated with Baudrillard’s philosophy, *Never Let Me Go* also presents rich material to be analyzed from a Baudrillardian perspective. It is a science fiction novel that deals with clones and cloning, which might be regarded as the most radical act of simulation possible; the simulation of the human body. Even though the science fiction aspect is underplayed in the novel and it seems more like a tragic story of love and friendship, the implications of that act of simulation and the resulting simulated lives that the characters are presented with have drastic influences on their identities and existence.

Many studies on *Never Let Me Go* focus mainly on the fact that the main characters of the novel are clones. Clones and cloning are topics that Baudrillard emphasizes in *Simulacra and Simulation*. That is quite understandable because cloning is a significant modern topic that has a lot to do with the concept of simulation. Discussions on cloning also raise many questions about the concepts of human and humanness. Studies on *Never Let Me Go* often address cloning and humanness hand in hand. Roos (2008) examines several literary and cinematic narratives about human harvesting and organ transplant (including *Never Let Me Go*), observing that these works test the border between the human and the inhumane morally, physically and socio-politically. Jerng (2008) states that:

Ishiguro begins to restructure our definitions of the human by emphasizing the tensions between the narrative expectations of humanness when ‘taken as a whole’ and narrative as a relational, communicative practice between persons. (383)

This statement implies that rather than thinking of the human as an abstraction, one needs to focus on the contextualized and inter-relational nature of the concept within

the narrative. Jerng further comments that “narrative as a relational practice shifts our perspective from life ‘taken as a whole’ toward personhood as the capacity to relate” (387). Guo (2015) observes an analogy between the novel’s clone characters and people of marginality in contemporary real world. Therefore, she suggests that the novel deals with the theme of otherness, also touching upon self-pursuit, ethical choices, responsibility, loyalty and destiny.

Some other writers focus specifically on the ethics of cloning in their analysis of *Never Let Me Go*. McWilliam (2009) examines the novel focusing on the ethics of ownership regarding cloned life. He makes use of Francis Fukuyama’s *Our Posthuman Future* (2003) and Jürgen Habermas’ *The Future of Human Nature* (2003) in dealing with the questions of what separates a natural human from a cloned one. McWilliam suggests that it is a dangerous act to speak either against or on behalf of human life that has yet to come into being. Marks (2010) states that the critical theoretical responses to cloning have generally been informed by the Freudian notion of the uncanny, giving examples from Baudrillard and Žižek, and discusses the bioethical implications of cloning in *Never Let Me Go* from such a perspective. He argues that *Never Let Me Go* “maintains the uncanny in-human difference of the clone even as it highlights the dangers of the biopolitical instrumentalization of life itself” (331). Marks emphasizes that fictional works dealing with cloning can be more thought-provoking and fruitful than simplified discussions on the topic in the mass media. De Villiers & Slabbert (2011) examine the novel from a specifically legal perspective. They deal with medico-legal issues regarding cloning and organ transplants and thereby claim to expose the inadequacies of the current legal approach to organ donations. They suggest that by creating a fictional but still possible scenario of organ harvesting, Ishiguro illustrates the need for a comprehensive legal framework regulating organ transplantation in our real world. Marcus (2012) observes that *Never Let Me Go* does not focus on the process or technique of cloning, or does not even mention the word often, but instead, it underlines the separation of the clones from the community, their otherness, the lack of nice treatment and human dignity as problems that they have to face.

Some other authors draw attention to the topic of commodification in the novel, especially of the human body and human organs. Wasson (2015) observes a relationship between organ harvesting or marking/classifying tissues as transferrable and capitalism or commodification. While focusing on organ harvesting, she also touches upon how this practice is state-sanctioned, legitimized and socially-influenced. Rollins (2015) suggests that the gift labour at Hailsham only contributes to the mentality of commodification. He also establishes an analogy between gift exchange and organ transplant.

Some studies point out the fact that Kathy and the other clone characters in the novel yield to their fate as donors who will give their organs and eventually die at an early age. Such studies focus on fatalism, acceptance, (lack of) autonomy, and (lack of) resistance. Bowyer (2014) states that the novel focuses on the human potential for autonomous action. She argues that the abstractionist definitions of autonomy focusing only on the individual and his/her choices are not very realistic when one takes into account the society and the interrelations or interactions within it. Bowyer argues that Kathy moves from heteronomy to autonomy through moving from being controlled by external laws to embodying those laws. Confronting her condition as it is, accepting it and responding to it appropriately, Kathy's acceptance becomes a liberating one, giving her autonomy. Stacy (2015), on the other hand, observes that in the novel, atrocity and oppression remain mostly unchallenged, stating that "protagonists are not only unable or unwilling to oppose these oppressive systems, but are also complicit with them to a degree" (225) and this complicity is because of their failure to bear witness to their own oppression. Even if the novel is like a testimony, it is a failed testimony because atrocity is so much normalized that the protagonists do not or cannot feel the need to oppose the crimes. Teo (2014) also focuses on narration as testimony, stating that the affirmation of past childhood memories is what keeps the main characters together and these memories serve as "testimonies to their plight in servitude to humankind" (127). He claims that the characters in the novel must find ways to hang on to those memories. Query (2015) approaches the novel from a reader's response perspective and finds an analogy between the characters' "abiding and troubling acceptance of their circumstances"

(155) and the acceptance of the reader who yields and assents to the created world of a novel.

Creativity, authenticity, originality are important topics in *Never Let Me Go*. Such topics often go hand in hand with the question of whether clones have souls. Students at Hailsham are constantly encouraged and even somewhat forced to create new things, create art. This, of course, has underlying reasons and motivations on the part of the teachers and the administration, but for the students, it is a personal, artistic and creative challenge and an opportunity to express themselves as authentic beings. Rizq (2014) establishes an analogy between children being clones and how they copy behaviour from other people, in order to look more “normal” or more “human”. She questions whether a clone could have a unique self or soul. Snaza (2015) focuses mainly on the treatment of the students and education at Hailsham, and suggests that Hailsham is an experiment in humane treatment, with humanizing education focused on aesthetic experience. The school tries to “humanize” its students by proving that they have souls, albeit not with much success.

In sum, many studies on *Never Let Me Go* mainly focus on the issues of cloning and its ethical, philosophical and existential implications. They debate on the instrumentalization or commodification of human life, alternative legal approaches towards cloning, the humanness and individuality of clones, whether they can be regarded as autonomous, independent, “real” human beings with souls. They also examine the living and thinking ways of the clones, as being different from “normal” human beings: What is the (or is there a) line between the clone and the real person? Can the clone truly belong in this world? Is the clone capable of creativity and originality? Writers also focus on the implications of the clones leading pre-determined, artificial, simulated lives. Can the clones resist against their fate? When they do not, what is the meaning of their passive attitude and acceptance? What is the purpose of narration from a clone’s perspective if the narrated life is shaped in every way by external forces? What is the role of memory and the past in the lives of the clones? All these discussions seem to have relations to the fact that the characters have simulated beings (being cloned) and a simulated existence (their life paths being pre-determined by other people). This takes us to the questioning of being and

existence in a world of simulations, which lends itself to a reading of the novel in the light of Baudrillard's philosophy.

Although both novels can be thematically associated with Baudrillard's philosophy from a variety of perspectives, there are not many studies that examine these novels (especially the latter one) from a strictly Baudrillardian perspective. In addition, there are not any studies that compare these two novels with each other. The present study aims to contribute to current scholarship by comparing these two novels in terms of Baudrillardian notions of simulation and simulacra. It will be argued that while Barnes' novel focuses more on the simulation of nation(ality), national identity, history and memory, Ishiguro's novel focuses more on the simulation of the human body, and the notions of humanness, soul, existence, autonomy and individuality. Although their subject materials and perspectives differ in many aspects, the novels have a lot of commonalities in their approaches to the notions of simulation and simulacra. Their differences and similarities, and also their associations with and challenges to Baudrillard's philosophy, will be the focus of this study.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

In *Simulacra and Simulation*, Baudrillard observes a tendency in the postmodern age to recreate reality through signs and symbols, which leads to a dominance of the simulation on the reality that it seeks to represent, so much so that reality can only exist through its simulations. From this standpoint, Baudrillard examines how acts of simulation are utilized in political, cultural and social contexts with the aim of reshaping and reconstructing perceived realities. Through this examination, Baudrillard presents a wide-range critique encompassing the concept of the authentic or the original, the act of representation and the role of signs, modern science, mass culture, history, urbanization, simulated spaces, politics (especially politics of fear), power, capitalism, commodification, and the media. Baudrillard's critique of these areas has postmodern, post-structural and neo-Marxist perspectives.

In this chapter, we will examine the fundamental concepts and terminology in *Simulacra and Simulation*, which will be utilized while analyzing the two novels from a Baudrillardian perspective. Baudrillard's most basic and central concept around which his whole philosophy is shaped is the concept of "simulacrum". He starts the first chapter of his book with the following definition: "The simulacrum is never what hides the truth - it is truth that hides the fact that there is none. The simulacrum is true" (3).

2.1 The Precession of Simulacra

Apart from the concept of simulacrum, Baudrillard's fundamental terminology also includes the concepts of "the real", "the hyperreal", "sign", "representation", "simulation", and "the system of deterrence", which will all be useful in our analysis of the novels. In his examination of these concepts and their reflections in the postmodern world, Baudrillard touches upon politics, power,

culture, history, economy, science, religion, media and the military among other fields. These fields, with their relation to the concept of simulation, are also dealt with to varying degrees in the novels that we will analyse.

Baudrillard mentions the relationship between a land and a map as a symbolic example to make his main concepts clearer. He suggests that in the postmodern world of simulations and simulacra, we can first talk about the map and then the land. That means we first talk about the simulacrum, and only after that can we talk about the reality which the simulacrum replaces. “The real is produced from miniaturized cells, matrices, and memory banks, models of control - and it can be reproduced an indefinite number of times from these” (3). We now perceive reality indirectly, through its replicas, reproductions, and reality can be reproduced over and over again. That does not necessarily mean that we can look at a replica and directly see the underlying reality beneath it. When reality is reproduced, this reproduction does not accept the modest role of being a fake, artificial replica. It takes over; it claims a position previously occupied by the reality itself:

It is no longer a question of imitation, nor duplication, nor even parody. It is a question of substituting the signs of the real for the real, that is to say of an operation of deterring every real process via its operational double, a programmatic, metastable, perfectly descriptive machine that offers all the signs of the real and short-circuits all its vicissitudes. (4)

That means we can no longer differentiate between what is real and what is its reproduction. The distinction between the two is totally erased, so much that we can no longer talk about the “two”, because one becomes the other. One possesses the identity of the other. As a result, “never again will the real have the chance to produce itself” (4). The mind has opposite concepts such as “true” and “false”, or “real” and “imaginary”. What simulation does is to erase the difference between these opposite concepts. And in practice, this endeavour is generally successful, because we tend to think “If he is this good at acting crazy, it’s because he is” (5). Baudrillard mentions Iconoclasts as a striking metaphor. He claims that Iconoclasts were afraid of the power of simulacra because they were aware that religious icons could actually erase the concept of God from people’s minds; they could even make people think that God could only exist through these icons, through the simulacra,

through its reproductions. This ultimately makes one arrive at the idea that God is nothing but the sum of its simulations.

Baudrillard claims that “the West” wholeheartedly believes in the potential of representation and the idea that a sign can have a meaning, or that a sign can replace a meaning. However, he also differentiates between the concepts of “representation” and “simulation”. This difference can be briefly summarized through the relationship between a reality and its created sign: If there is equivalence between the real and its sign (even if it is a Utopian equivalence), we are talking about representation. However, if such equivalence does not exist and instead we have “reversion and death sentence of every reference” (6), then we are talking about simulation.

Baudrillard gives a critique of modern science and culture, as well. His critique of these areas seems relevant to the subject matters of the two novels we will analyse, as *England, England* deals with the simulation of national culture and history, and *Never Let Me Go* deals with a scientific simulation. Baudrillard holds that “science never sacrifices itself, it is always murderous” (7). While trying to “freeze” reality and guarantee its endurance, it actually distances itself from its objects and thereby kills the reality it seeks to discover and preserve. In his examination of ethnology, for example, Baudrillard comments:

In order for ethnology to live, its object must die; by dying, the object takes its revenge for being “discovered” and with its death defies the science that wants to grasp it. Doesn't all science live on this paradoxical slope to which it is doomed by the evanescence of its object in its very apprehension, and by the pitiless reversal that the dead object exerts on it? (...) In any case, the logical evolution of a science is to distance itself increasingly from its object, until it dispenses with it entirely: its autonomy is only rendered even more fantastic - it attains its pure form. (7)

Baudrillard also touches upon the obsession of culture with the past, with the stockpiling of the past, with accumulation. Mentioning the attempts to save the mummy of Ramses II, Baudrillard claims that even if Ramses does not signify anything to people, the preservation of the mummy is crucial to them because “it is what guarantees that accumulation has meaning” (8). The obsession of accumulating the past and the idea of assigning meaning to this accumulation reinforce and validate each other. “To this end the pharaohs must be brought out of their tomb and

the mummies out of their silence” (8). What Baudrillard critiques here is the association of culture with the past and the panic that culture will be destroyed unless the past is preserved: “Our entire linear and accumulative culture collapses if we cannot stockpile the past in plain view” (8).

The “hyperreal” is another fundamental concept in Baudrillard’s book. In defining this concept, he makes use of the example of Disneyland, suggesting that it, along with Los Angeles and the whole of America, does not belong to a real universe, but to a universe of the hyperreal and of simulation. “It is no longer a question of a false representation of reality (ideology) but of concealing the fact that the real is no longer real, and thus of saving the reality principle” (10). The underlying aim is to compensate for an eternally lost reality through the hyperreal. In this sense, the simulation also serves the purpose of establishing an imagined real-fake dichotomy and thereby affirming the existence of a supposed reality, as Williamson (2018) explains:

Baudrillard claims, “Disneyland is presented as imaginary in order to make us believe that the rest is real”. In other words, humans create “simulations,” such as amusement parks, androids, and the cinema, to answer the question of what is “real”—i.e., reality is real *because* Disneyland is fake. Baudrillard suggests that the faith we place in this distinction covers over the fact that the distinction is imaginary, that there is no “real” and “simulation” but only the “hyperreal”. (34)

To this end, while on the one hand simulation tries to affirm the existence of a supposed reality precisely because it allegedly represents that reality, it also suppresses the question of whether the represented reality exists in isolation from the simulation in the first place. Along the same line, Kline (2016) states:

The hyperreal Disneyland functions not as an imaginary fantasyland distinct from the ‘real’ America outside the theme park, but rather to conceal that all of America is Disneyland, replete with infantilization and phantasmagoria. (653)

In creating his philosophy and the terminology we have mentioned above, Baudrillard has the aim of giving a critique of current political systems as well. He applies his philosophy to an examination of power, capitalism, morality, transgression and violence, law and order. His political stance brings us to another

fundamental concept that we have mentioned above, “the system of deterrence” (21). Quoting Bourdieu, he states that “The essence of every relation of force is to dissimulate itself as such and to acquire all its force only because it dissimulates itself as such” (12). This makes everything quite paradoxical. An immoral capital hides behind a moral utopia. Moreover, whoever tries to revive morality ends up working for the capital:

It is always a question of proving the real through the imaginary, proving truth through scandal, proving the law through transgression, proving work through striking, proving the system through crisis, and capital through revolution. (14)

Simulation erases the differences between conceptual opposites and the supposed anti-thesis of a concept only serves to reinforce it. Anti-system stances are absorbed and pacified by the system. As Cherrier & Murray (2004) put it:

Here, signs of resistance and revolt are quickly absorbed and commodified by capital. Rather than threatening the market, consumer boycotts, resistance to material acquisition, revolutionary consumers, and use of consumption for political expression rejuvenate the market. What begins as a sign of defiance soon becomes a part of consumer culture rather than a criticism of it. (511)

In such a mechanism, any act can easily be rendered meaningless, pointless. Baudrillard states:

Transgression and violence are less serious because they only contest the distribution of the real. Simulation is infinitely more dangerous because it always leaves open to supposition that, above and beyond its object, law and order themselves might be nothing but simulation. (15)

For every historical threat posed by the real, power applies to “deterrence” and simulation, by creating signs equivalent to the real. This destroys all opposites. Power creates artificial social, political and economic struggles in order to reaffirm itself again and again.

Baudrillard draws attention to the politics of fear as it relates to simulation. He claims that the “system of deterrence” (21) needs to turn its power into a spectacle in order to evoke fear in people. Simulacra render all events meaningless and turn meaning into short-term temporary scenarios, life into survival or challenge. Baudrillard claims that what paralyzes human life is not a real threat of a nuclear

bomb; it is deterrence. And this game of deterrence can continue to exist even when there is no longer a possibility of a nuclear war. The balance that terror creates is nothing but the terror created by this balance. The threat of a war, of an attack is a child's toy in the hands of armies; it is an idea manipulated in service of a politics of fear, which, as a sign, is sufficient by itself and therefore renders an actual war redundant. The idea of something becomes more important and effective than its possibility or potential actuality. What amazes people is not an actual human being setting foot on the Moon or walking in space; it is the level of technical programming and manipulation, of human command over possibilities and a perfect system of norms. Baudrillard claims that bombs within themselves are purely clean objects. What is dirty is the system of security and deterrence which exists even when bombs do not explode. War serves as a device to rationalize the societal system through a terrorist method. Socialization is based on this type of murder whether a society is communist or capitalist. Communism and capitalism are accomplices in creating a form of submission. We can no longer distinguish war and peace. Deterrence has gone beyond these opposites and is equal to both at the same time. As Walsh (2002) explains, "Baudrillard is quite explicit in his belief that modern politics is nothing but a simulation or simulacrum; one political stance, whether it be left or right, is really no different from the other" (58). According to Baudrillard, wars and social crises are like artificial events, historical abstractions, scenarios, works of fiction. All media of communication and news sources wait for instructions that will be given to them in order to serve the system of deterrence.

2.2 Simulation of History and Memory

History and memory stand out as important themes in both *England, England* and *Never Let Me Go*. *England, England's* theme park recreates famous historical people and events within the larger aim of recreating English national identity and the novel's protagonist Martha reflects on her childhood memories and on Old England throughout the novel. *Never Let Me Go's* Kathy holds onto her childhood memories in Hailsham with her friends Ruth and Tommy after a brutal coming-of-age period. Notions of history and memory are also important topics for Baudrillard,

who suggests that they are concepts that can be simulated and recreated. In his examination of history, he specifically touches upon historical films, the Holocaust and the Vietnam War.

In the second chapter of his book, “History: A Retro Scenario”, Baudrillard focuses on our understanding of history filtered through what he calls “retro”. He points out that we no longer live in a fascist era but one that is worse, and now even fascism can be aestheticized and made to look attractive through this retro filter. In the light of this understanding, he focuses on historical films. He suggests that it is only after history died that it entered cinema as a form of spectacle. The same is valid for the term “historical”. We call what is dead and fossilized as historical. Cinema trying to re-inject history is nothing but “nostalgia for a lost referential” (32). Along the same line, in his analysis of Baudrillard’s ideas, Bentley (2007) touches upon the recreation of the past/history through memory as a form of simulation:

Paradoxically, it is these always already copies that appear authentic to our memories of the past. To borrow Baudrillard’s phrase, it is the hyperreal that we recover, because to talk of the reality of a memory becomes non-sensical. If our pasts are a series of memories of constructed images, then recovering those reconstructed images operates as a kind of recovery of what passes for the authentic. (494)

Baudrillard becomes anxious as he watches retro films because these films present perfect historical scenery and they seem more like perfect remakes rather than veritable films. He makes an interesting observation about the whole of cinema history: “The cinema and its trajectory: from the most fantastic or mythical to the realistic and the hyperrealistic” (33). Baudrillard claims that today, day by day, we are losing the fabulous character and mythical energy of events and narratives. In such a world, an art form like cinema can use all its technical possibilities to give life back to history but it can create nothing but ghosts and it can easily get lost among those ghosts that it creates.

In his examination of history, Baudrillard also touches upon some important historical events. He starts the chapter “Holocaust” with a striking sentence: “Forgetting extermination is part of extermination” (35). This process of “forgetting” is facilitated by the media, which turns historical realities into signs and meaningless

abstractions. Baudrillard uses the historical case of the Holocaust as a critique of the media: “One no longer makes the Jews pass through the crematorium or the gas chamber, but through the sound track and image track, through the universal screen and the microprocessor” (35). Filming the massacre only gives it another renewed form and helps continue its existence within this new form. Giving the reality another form through media also turns that reality into hyperreality, as Bertens (2016) explains:

In the mediation between viewer and outside world, the impact of digital devices on our interaction with what is represented should not be underestimated. Not only do media alter our perspective on events in the external world through selective and distorted representation, but they tend to create an illusory distance between the viewer and this reality. A strange shift occurs in assessing what is real, what is virtual and what lies in the complex zone in-between. (90)

The medium is not just the medium for the transfer of information from a sender to a receiver; it is also a reshaping, altering, distorting force. The reality recreated and presented by the media replaces the reality that it seeks to represent. To this end, the media is no longer the means, but the end. As Bertens (2016) concludes, “while we believe ourselves to be looking *through* these media into the reality behind them, we are in fact merely looking *at* the media themselves” (95).

In the chapter “Apocalypse Now”, Baudrillard again compares a historical event, the Vietnam War, with its recreation in cinema. He claims that there is no difference between the way Coppola makes his film and the way the American army fights in the Vietnam War. However, while America lost the real war, *Apocalypse Now* won its own war. It is a worldwide victory. Cinema becomes more powerful than the military, than Pentagon, than governments. The triumph of the simulation compensates for the defeat experienced in real life.

2.3 Simulation of Spaces

England, England deals with the concept of simulation mainly through space: The theme park is mainly a spatial simulation. It is a tourist attraction composed of recreations of famous buildings or other natural places in England, filled with permanent residents and visiting tourists. *Never Let Me Go* also examines spatial

simulation through its boarding school named Hailsham. Even though the school is not a reproduction of another pre-existing school, it is a very carefully designed, controlled and isolated environment presenting students an alternate reality, which makes it an artificial environment. Baudrillard also touches upon space, again in terms of the notion of simulation. The Disneyland example, which we have mentioned above, is probably the pivotal spatial example of simulation in Baudrillard's book. The fact that it is a theme park also links it closely to *England, England. Never Let Me Go's* Hailsham is not much different from a theme park either, in that it presents the illusion of an idyllic boarding school, a safe haven for children while actually serving the benefits of a consumer society.

Apart from Disneyland, Baudrillard also focuses on Beaubourg, traditional museums and metropolitan cities in his examination of spatial simulations. In the chapter "The Beaubourg Effect: Implosion and Deterrence", he examines Centre Georges Pompidou, a complex building in the Beaubourg area of Paris, in the style of high-tech architecture, including a library, an art museum and a centre for music. This is how Baudrillard describes the building:

Monument to the games of mass simulation, the Pompidou Center functions as an incinerator absorbing all the cultural energy and devouring it - a bit like the black monolith in *2001*: insane convection of all the contents that came there to be materialized, to be absorbed, and to be annihilated. (43)

This is a place that kills culture and turns the dead pieces into hyperreal spectacle:

The general impression being that everything here has come out of a coma, that everything wants to be animation and is only reanimation, and that this is good because culture is dead, a condition that Beaubourg admirably retraces, but in a dishonest fashion, whereas one should have triumphantly accepted this death and erected a monument or an anti-monument equivalent to the phallic inanity of the Eiffel Tower in its time. Monument to total disconnection, to hyperreality and to the implosion of culture - achieved today for us in the effect of transistorized circuits always threatened by a gigantic short circuit. (44)

The very fact that Beaubourg tries to absorb and "reanimate" culture is testimony for the underlying conviction that culture is dead. The only way to revitalize culture is to turn it into hyperreality. Baudrillard argues that we should look at Beaubourg as a monument of cultural deterrence. People are invited to mourn for a dead culture and

they gladly accept this invitation. People do not visit this place to be amazed by this culture that has tired them for hundreds of years; but to have the chance of mourning for it as a mass for the first time.

According to Baudrillard, with traditional museums, all cultures have become intertwined, grouped, categorized, aestheticized. Culture has become hyperreal. Baudrillard draws attention to our obsession with stockpiling, with the production of masses. These masses (of objects and of people) bring an end to sociality because the social implodes within the mass and becomes devoured in a process of simulation. Baudrillard finds stocks and masses dangerous:

Every stock is violent, and there is a specific violence in any mass of men also, because of the fact that it implodes – a violence proper to its gravitation, to its densification around its own locus of inertia. The masses are a locus of inertia and through that a locus of a completely new, inexplicable violence different from explosive violence. (48)

Baudrillard then shouts out his manifesto: “Make Beaubourg bend!” (48) This manifesto calls on to people to respond to a sterile culture in a destructive manner. The only way that masses can respond to the mental deterrence presented by Beabourg is to respond back to it with physical deterrence:

Certainly they obey the imperative of deterrence: one gives them an object to consume, a culture to devour, an edifice to manipulate. But at the same time they expressly aim, and without knowing it, at this annihilation. The onslaught is the only act the masses can produce as such - a projectile mass that challenges the edifice of mass culture, that wittily replies with its weight (...) to the challenge of culturality thrown at it by Beaubourg. To the challenge of mass acculturation to a sterilized culture, the masses respond with a destructive irruption, which is prolonged in a brutal manipulation. To mental deterrence the masses respond with a direct physical deterrence. (48)

Baudrillard then differentiates between “explosion” and “implosion”, important terms in his philosophy. He states that the postmodern world, saturated with signs and hyperrealities, is a world of implosion, because explosion can be nothing but a dream now:

Subversion, violent destruction is what corresponds to a mode of production. To a universe of networks, of combinatory theory, and of flow correspond reversal and implosion. The same for institutions, the state, power, etc. The dream of seeing all that explode by dint of contradictions is precisely nothing but a dream. What is produced in reality is that the institutions implode of

themselves, by dint of ramifications, feedback, overdeveloped control circuits. Power implodes, this is its current mode of disappearance. (49)

Baudrillard thinks that metropolitan cities have turned into centres of implosion, centres that absorb and swallow the social. He suggests that the first incident of implosion is May 1968, which was not the product of revolutionary dynamics; even the idea of revolution implodes and the results of this implosion are more important than those of revolution. Since (and thanks to) May 1968, social life has been turning into an ever-growing desert, losing its characteristics. This is a slow earthquake that can be perceived by the historical mind.

2.4 Simulation of Bodies

England, England and *Never Let Me Go* both deal with the simulation of bodies, in different ways. In *England, England*, actors are hired to impersonate real historical figures important for England. This is more of a metaphoric simulation realized through identity swapping, acting and performance. In *Never Let Me Go*, on the other hand, we have a much more literal simulation of the body, realized through the cloning of actual people. Baudrillard examines the body in various parts of his book and focuses on the human and the animal bodies, cloning, reproduction, sexuality, desire, death, and the body's relation to science and technology. These examinations will all be useful in our analysis of the novels, especially *Never Let Me Go*.

Baudrillard devotes a whole chapter in his book to cloning, named "Clone Story". He questions: Now that we are sexual beings and that sexuality is the carrier of life, what can motivate us to think of a reproduction method other than sexual reproduction? The answer can only be a death drive; a drive that wants to deny and annihilate sexuality. Baudrillard underlines that a human being is more than its pieces, its genetic codes. Cloning plays with this idea. If we can see the whole in its every bit and piece, it means the whole is no longer meaningful. Cloning is the final step in a historical process that transforms the body into a model, an abstract genetic formula and makes it an object of mass production. Mass production replaces

reproduction, genetic models replace all possible bodies. “We are in the age of soft technologies – genetic and mental software” (69).

Marks (2010) examines Baudrillard’s ideas on cloning from a psychoanalytical perspective and thereby attempts to account for his distanced attitude towards human cloning:

Baudrillard focuses on the symbolic dimensions that he feels would be lost with asexual reproduction. For Baudrillard, the clone cannot enter into any of the dramas of socialization and identity—essentially Freudian dramas— that have their roots in sexual reproduction. In short, cloning entails a ‘monstrous’ parody of the mirror stage. There is no longer any image into which the subject can project itself, and consequently cloning abolishes the imaginary. He goes further in identifying cloning with a wider, collective death drive. (...) Cloning expresses a ‘primitive fantasy’ of a state of humanity before sex, differentiation and individuation. (...) For Baudrillard, cloning is symptomatic of the contemporary drive to extend the reign of the Same in order to suppress the threat of the Other. The clone in this sense is the ultimate avatar of both the biotechnological focus on the disembodied genetic code and the general allergy to otherness that characterizes the standardization and simulation of contemporary life. (342-343)

Baudrillard’s thoughts on the human body and on sexuality also surface in his examination of the novel *Crash* (1973) by J.G. Ballard, which deals with car-crash sexual fetishism. Baudrillard claims that technology becomes an extension of the body, a functional sophistication of the human organism. According to this rationalist perspective, the body itself becomes nothing but a medium. Using this “medium”, the characters in the novel engage in deliberately staged car crash experiences in order to simulate the experience of death (or its fear) for sexual arousal. By turning the fearful threat of death into a daily experience that can be simulated over and over again, the crash reduces death, a simple and irreversible phenomenon, to an ordinary thing, and one can see *Crash* anywhere; it is not marginal, it is central to the system. It is no longer an exception to a rational universe but a rule, one that defies all rules. Everything is reversed; *Crash*, an absurd thing, turns into something that forms life, the genital organ of life.

This mutating and commutating world of simulation and death, this violently sexed world, but one without desire, full of violated and violent bodies, as if neutralized, this chromatic world and metallic intensity, but one void of sensuality, hypertechnology without finality - is it good or bad? We will

never know. It is simply fascinating, though this fascination does not imply a value judgement. (80)

In addition to the human body, Baudrillard also focuses on the animal body, in the chapter “The Animals: Territory and Metamorphoses”. Though it focuses on animals, this chapter is actually quite relevant to *Never Let Me Go*, with its focus on scientific experimentation and living bodies becoming the test objects of science. Baudrillard suggests that science always tries to affirm a principle of objectivity, of whose existence it can never be sure, and to affirm the belief that everything thought to be irrational or abnormal can be explained with science. In this quest, science uses animals as experimental objects, thereby forcing them to “confess” the existence of that principle of objectivity:

Precisely the admission of a principle of objectivity of which science is never certain, of which it secretly despairs. Animals must be made to say that they are not animals, that bestiality, savagery - with what these terms imply of unintelligibility, radical strangeness to reason - do not exist, but on the contrary the most bestial behaviors, the most singular, the most abnormal are resolved in science, in physiological mechanisms, in cerebral connections, etc. Bestiality, and its principle of uncertainty, must be killed in animals. (85)

To this end, scientific experiment is not the means for a goal but it is a torture of challenge and confession. However, experiment animals react to this system with death: They can challenge a system of industrial death only through suicide.

Animals have been used and abused in service of human interests throughout history: as carriers, as scientific experiment objects, as industrial meat, as models in zoos. After the development of rationalism and humanism, animals have been turned into “humane” beings. This mentality is no different from racism; behind it lies a racist sentimentality. Just like true racism appears after the end of slavery, this racism towards animals only appears after their domestication. What make it the clearest that we humiliate animals are the feelings we have towards them. The more we love them, the more we humiliate them. The more animals are sentenced to an irresponsible and inhumane life, the more they are seen as worthy of human love; just like children sentenced to a position of innocence and childishness in order to be loved. Sentimentality is the basest form of beastliness. This is a racist sentiment and we are trying to endow even animals with it. Baudrillard uses the example of the film

King Kong (1933), suggesting that it reverses the cultural scenario. In the past, the cultural animal destroyed the wild animal in order to affirm culture. Now, the wild animal comes to the industrial metropolitan city to destroy it and to save the cultural animal from its dying culture.

2.5 The Relation of Simulation to Commodification and Marketing

Both novels to be examined in this study present the simulacra as things that are commercialized or materialized: The theme park of *England, England* takes the notions of national identity, history and culture, materializes them on an island and markets them to tourists. Baudrillard also emphasizes the relationship between the theme park and commodification in his examination of Disneyland. Miracky (2004) states: “Writing from a neo-Marxist position, Baudrillard uses his analysis of Disneyland as a way of illustrating the effects of commodification in late capitalist culture” (163). Similarly, Nitsch (2015) claims that according to Baudrillard, hyperreal spaces like Disneyland are “displacing the realities they purport to honor in their quest for the pure commodification of social life” (47). Commodification is also present in *Never Let Me Go*, in that the clones are seen only as collections of organs to be butchered for the sake of “real” people. Quite literally, their very bodies become commodified.

Baudrillard focuses on commodification, marketing, advertising, capitalism and consumerism especially in the chapter “Hypermarket and Hypercommodity”. He claims that modern cities are now satellited by hypermarkets and shopping centres. People go to hypermarkets to see all the answers to all their questions as objectified and to choose among them. To this end, objects are no longer commodities, not even signs carrying a meaning; they are just tests waiting to be answered. Thiry-Cherques (2010) explains this situation as such:

Competition, under the sign of a purported freedom, transited from production to consumption. Being free is now ‘being able to consume whatever one desires.’ Personalization created the illusion of originality, or exercise of a personal preference. (3)

Consumption, therefore, provides people with an illusion of freedom and individuality. This illusion is further reinforced by the sign values of objects: by owning an object, one also owns the sign that it carries, as Thiry-Cherques explains:

In the semiurgic society, the object lost its use value and its exchange value and reappeared as a function or sign value. The interest is not in the objects but in the system of signs which mirrors them. (...) Consumption changes the signs and serves economy. (3)

Consumption no longer stems from primary needs because the definition of “need” is also updated: “In the consumer society, objects become signs and economy defined by needs is left behind. A need is either psychological or cultural. Lifestyle and values, rather than economic needs, are the basis of social life” (6). Along the same line, Mendoza (2010) explains the interrelationships among consumption, objects, signs and personalization as follows:

According to him [Baudrillard], consumption is not merely the passive recipient of production through satiation of needs but rather it is an active endeavor in “the manipulation of signs” towards the creation of the “person” and its integration within the system. The relationship between the subject which consumes and the object being consumed is what he calls “personalization.” It is the objectification of the subject and the subjectification of the object. Consumption acquires for the person Signs in the object being consumed which in turn determines his status in society. (47-48)

In order to build a desired persona for oneself, to feel both individual and relevant to the system, one selects a series of signs and turns them into a collage; a mirror of the created self. To this end, Mendoza concludes:

The consumption of a commodity in general, is not consumption based upon a need, which in Marx is formalized as the Use-value. It is a consumption of what it signifies and how the consumer consuming the sign is integrated within the system. (49)

Similarly, Szto (2013) draws attention to the relationship between objects and signs in Baudrillard’s examination of consumerism: “He [Baudrillard] argued that postmodern societies have become increasingly organized through the production of signs, images and codes; thus, in order for commodities to be consumed they must first become signs” (45). The capitalist system can preserve its vitality through the

sign value, because the sign precedes the object and the consumer demands the sign.

According to Szto (2013),

The “consumer revolution” has transformed items of economic value or use value into, what Baudrillard calls, commodities of sign value. The sign value of a commodity represents the symbolic currency of an item. (...) Baudrillard’s definition of consumption is based on a systematic manipulation of signs (...); for that reason, commodities offer individuals the ability to construct identities of choice. (47)

Individuals attempting to construct identities for themselves through objects and signs, through what they consume, signify a new type of slavery. As Gane (2015) puts it,

Whereas previously the individual knew where and what he was in relation to an employer, master, or lord, now, as a consumer establishes a personality in ‘living up’ to models, the individual, having become someone, must live up to an ever-changing identity. (9)

In the chapter “Absolute Advertising, Ground-Zero Advertising”, Baudrillard suggests that in advertising and propaganda, everything can mean everything, everything can be combined with everything, everything is explained superficially and everything can be advertised. According to Baudrillard, propaganda gained importance with the October Revolution and the market crash of 1929. And today, we live in a world like this:

A sociality everywhere present, an absolute sociality finally realized in absolute advertising - that is to say, also totally dissolved, a vestige of sociality hallucinated on all the walls in the simplified form of a demand of the social that is immediately met by the echo of advertising. The social as a script, whose bewildered audience we are. (61-62)

In today’s world, advertising means designing a social order, glorifying every type of social order, trying persistently and ambitiously to remind a social order whose absence is felt more and more. In its initial stages, advertising used sentences like “I’m buying, I’m consuming, I’m happy.” But today, it uses sentences like “I’m voting, I’m participating, I’m here.” We live in a universe that is totally full but insensitive, apathetic. As we multiply more and more in numbers, we lose our power and we helplessly try to escape apathy and inertia. Advertising, like news or the media, destroys meaning and accelerates the inertia.

Cherrier & Murray (2004) explain the massive influence of capitalist advertising as such:

Baudrillard argues that individuals are born into a world dominated by the multi-billion dollar advertising and fashion industry. Since the consumption code is intertwined with language, as the child develops cognitive skills, they internalize the code as a natural part of their world. Primary socialization within a consumer culture creates a mass of "good" consumers, behaving in consonance with the aims of corporate capitalism. (517)

The interrelationships among capitalism, language and social life are the force shaping the identities of people. From a Baudrillardian perspective, Cherrier & Murray (2004) then go on to question the virtue of marketing as a whole:

Is marketing virtuous? In response, Baudrillard would argue that marketing is a tool used to increase consumption to the benefits of capitalist exploitation. It creates a logic of signs and codes that has no other virtue but to serve a system of competitive power where consumer needs are purely dominated. (...) Here, the consumer is determined, controlled, and even alienated by marketing practices. (520)

2.6 Baudrillard's Last Words: What Remains After Simulation Takes Over Reality?

What might be the philosophical stance of the intellectual in a world where the soundness of reality (or the belief in it) is irreversibly shattered, simulations have taken over and all of our connections with the world are through replicas, artificial reproductions and signs? In the last chapter of his book, Baudrillard talks about nihilism. Compared to old forms of nihilism, he suggests that we are now in a new and confusing state. According to Baudrillard, romanticism was the first important nihilist movement, followed by a second wave composed of movements like surrealism, Dadaism, absurdism and political nihilism. The first wave was of an aesthetic nature, and the second was of a historical, metaphysical and political nature. Today, we have no relation to either of these waves. Now that the apocalypse has taken place, the real has been replaced by neutral things and forms, by indifference and apathy.

All that remains, is the fascination for desertlike and indifferent forms, for the very operation of the system that annihilates us. Now, fascination (...) is a nihilistic passion par excellence, it is the passion proper to the mode of

disappearance. We are fascinated by all forms of disappearance, of our disappearance. Melancholic and fascinated, such is our general situation in an era of involuntary transparency. (104-105)

Meaning implodes in the media and the social implodes in the masses, to the point of apathy. One may assume that only terrorism can disrupt the system, only terrorism can mobilize the imaginary. However, to this type of radical nihilism, the system responds with a nihilism that renders it ineffective. The system itself is nihilist because it can desensitize everyone, even those opposing it. In such a system, terrorism cannot have a truly destructive, disruptive and mobilizing effect, so terrorism is an accomplice with the system despite itself. “We are in the era of events without consequences (and of theories without consequences). There is no more hope for meaning” (107).

CHAPTER 3

ENGLAND, ENGLAND: SIMULATION OF THE NATION

England, England (1998) is a novel in which England is re-built as a grand simulation on the Isle of Wight. The flow of the novel includes the description and the comparison of the processes that the real England and England, England go through, thus presenting a battle of reality versus simulation.

The novel is divided into three chapters. The first chapter, called “England”, takes place in the real England and focuses on the childhood of the protagonist of the novel, Martha Cochrane. This chapter is both nostalgic and traumatic. Martha’s peaceful childhood existence is disrupted when her father leaves the family. What she holds onto after the departure of her father is a jigsaw puzzle of the counties of England.

The second chapter of the novel is called “England, England”. This is where the simulation is brought under the spotlight and we are introduced to another important character, Sir Jack Pitman. He is an entrepreneur who has a very ambitious and fantastic project in mind: recreating England as a theme park on the Isle of Wight. Martha, now in her forties, gets employed by him and thereby becomes involved in the project. Pitman wants to include everything thought of as “English” by the general population and tourists; these include famous British people, landmark buildings and sites, character traits among others. Pitman realizes this project and it becomes immensely successful, so much that it gradually becomes more famous than the real England, surpassing it in terms of popularity, prestige, economy and tourism. Martha finds her way to become the CEO of the project, but because of her ambitions and her blackmail attempts, she eventually gets expelled from the island.

The last chapter of the novel is called “Anglia”. It takes place decades after the second chapter, with Martha now being an old woman. After spending years abroad, she comes back to the real England but it is all changed. After the success of

England, England, the real England has now turned into a primitive, agrarian state without much population or international recognition. It is now time for Martha to hold on to her childhood memories, to nostalgia about the Old England. People in Anglia want to organize a traditional village festival and make use of Martha's memories about the country's past. Martha's final days are days of nostalgic longing and of reflections on the past.

England, England offers rich material for analysis when it is examined from a perspective informed by Baudrillard's philosophy; it centralizes the theme of simulation through its fictional country and thereby examines the influences of this simulation on notions like country, nation, identity, history, memory, myth and tradition. My main argument regarding *England, England* is that Barnes depicts the triumph of simulation over reality through the dynamics between Old England and England, England, but he also challenges the duality of reality versus simulation through the questioning of the authenticity of Anglia in the end and of all sorts of narratives related to nation.

England, England deals with the notion of simulation mainly from the perspective of space, materialized in its theme park. Baudrillard also touches upon spaces of simulation in various parts of his book, so it might be a good idea to start with an examination of the novel's theme park. The novel's spatial simulation is not of a narrow scope. It encompasses a whole country. Therefore, it asks questions not only about space, but also about every notion we associate with a country: Can we talk about a singular, authentic national identity or national history? What makes a country a country? Is a country a sum of all particles we can list as related to it or representing it? By recreating these particles, can we recreate a meaningful whole?

Sir Pitman's project obviously manages to be successful in this seemingly unrealistic and incredible endeavour. This is affirmed by the fact that England, England surpasses Old England in every way possible. Simulation does beat reality. Not only that; it "becomes" the new reality. After a certain point, people no longer regard England, England as a fake recreation, an imitation, a project. They start regarding it as a country on its own.

This surprising importance that England, England manages to attain is not only limited to an outside gaze; England, England is also a self-important country. Apart from being accepted as the new reality by the outsiders, it starts to regard itself as reality soon after starting as a business project. This is evidenced by the inner dynamics we can observe within the project. Many actors are hired to play the important people representing England and English culture. Soon after, the actors playing these roles simply go beyond this representation, this imitation game and they feel overly attached to their roles. The actors therefore literally turn into the characters they play. What more does a simulation need, when it does not make its artificiality obvious but instead chooses to hide it and usurp reality?

We can compare this process to Baudrillard's comparison of a map and a country, or of a religious icon and the actual religious notions and figures. Baudrillard suggests that the map surpasses the actual country and the religious icon surpasses the religious notion. In the novel, England, England is the map or the icon while the real England is the actual country overshadowed by the map or the icon trying to represent it.

Sir Jack Pitman, the owner of the England, England project, addresses this question of the real. He has this very self-confident attitude towards the real, implying that it is a concept he can easily play with and easily manipulate:

‘What is real? This is sometimes how I put the question to myself. Are you real, for instance – you and you?’ Sir Jack gestured with mock courtesy to the room's other occupants, but did not turn his head away from his thought. ‘You are real to yourselves, of course, but that is not how these things are judged at the highest level. My answer would be No. Regrettably. And you will forgive me for my candour, but I could have you replaced with substitutes, with ... simulacra, more quickly than I could sell my beloved Brancusi.’ (29)

This “comfortable” approach towards the replica is further verbalized by another character in the novel, the French intellectual, who, according to Bentley (2007), is “a clear parody of Jean Baudrillard” (491):

‘No, we are talking of something profoundly modern. It is well established – and indeed it has been incontrovertibly proven by many of those I have earlier cited – that nowadays we prefer the replica to the original. We prefer the reproduction of the work of art to the work of art itself, the perfect sound and

solitude of the compact disc to the symphony concert in the company of a thousand victims of throat complaints, the book on tape to the book on the lap.’ (42)

The French intellectual not only observes a tendency and enchantment towards the replica, but he says that we should embrace and appreciate this enchantment; we *should* demand the replica:

‘In conclusion, let me state that the world of the third millennium is inevitably, is ineradicably modern, and that it is our intellectual duty to submit to that modernity, and to dismiss as sentimental and inherently fraudulent all yearnings for what is dubiously termed the “original.” We must demand the replica, since the reality, the truth, the authenticity of the replica is the one we can possess, colonize, reorder, find *jouissance* in, and, finally, if and when we decide, it is the reality which, since it is our destiny, we may meet, confront, and destroy.’ (43)

If this French intellectual represents Baudrillard in some way, then why does he have a glorifying approach towards simulation? Perhaps, Barnes attempts to create a witty irony by emphasizing the triumph of simulation in a postmodern world, with even intellectuals yielding to its power. As Bentley (2007) suggests:

The irony, of course, is that the theories of Baudrillard, the post-68 *enfant terrible* of the left, are here being invoked for the support of Sir Jack Pitman’s paradigm of a capitalist project. Baudrillard’s critique of postmodern culture is recycled as a celebration of the market economy. (492)

To this end, within a culture of simulation and commodification, even intellectuals become accomplices in this corporate “crime”.

The characters in the novel are not always aware of the true nature of simulation and they get swept away by its charming ambition, but the reader can always see through the illusion. This is probably what creates some sort of dramatic irony in the novel. For the reader, England, England is not much different from Disneyland. People go to Disneyland to get swept away into a world of illusions, a world of lights and colours, but a world strictly of simulation. England, England is actually nothing more than a theme park; carefully thought out and planned with selectively included elements, artificially constructed, aimed for tourists and for economic profit. It is a place that aims to attract visitors with its spectacles and to give them their money’s worth in a nutshell.

This is what Baudrillard has to say about Disneyland:

Disneyland is a perfect model of all the entangled orders of simulacra. It is first of all a play of illusions and phantasms: the Pirates, the Frontier, the Future World, etc. This imaginary world is supposed to ensure the success of the operation. But what attracts the crowds the most is without a doubt the social microcosm, the religious, miniaturized pleasure of real America, of its constraints and joys. (10)

What Baudrillard says about Disneyland applies to England, England as well: a place of illusions trying to represent the “real” England, and it does attract crowds:

Thus, everywhere in Disneyland the objective profile of America, down to the morphology of individuals and of the crowd, is drawn. All its values are exalted by the miniature and the comic strip. Embalmed and pacified. (10)

England, England also tries to encompass all particles of England that make it England, but it only embalms and pacifies these particles. “Disneyland exists in order to hide that it is the ‘real’ country, all of ‘real’ America that is Disneyland” (10). Similarly, England, England becomes the “real” country from the point of its creation.

Miracky’s (2004) following remarks in his description of *England, England* are informed by Baudrillard’s ideas about Disneyland:

A literary satire of English cultural and political decline set in the early third millennium, the novel presents a last-gasp effort to revive England’s image through a media tycoon’s project to replicate the ‘quintessences’ of England for popular consumption in a ‘Quality Leisure’ site on the Isle of Wight. (164)

He suggests that the novel operates on the second order of simulation; that of blurring the line between the real and the simulation and this is evidenced by the fact that the actors in England, England turn into the characters they play. However, Miracky observes that the novel also depicts the third order of simulation; that of the simulation preceding and overtaking the real, evidenced by the novel’s examination of the construction of history and reality. Reality is something to be toyed with in the novel, easily and conveniently. While incorporating English elements to his grand project, Pitman modifies and reshapes them in order to make them as palatable and non-threatening as possible. He tries to make everything more convenient and friendlier, which turns his theme park into a huge success.

Before we delve deeper into an examination of England, England as a theme park, it might be a good idea to give a brief history of theme parks and theme-parking. Walonen (2014) looks at the history of theme parks before examining their usage in fiction. He suggests that in the old times, leisure spaces were more carnivalesque, non-hierarchical, grotesque. However, they gradually came under surveillance and control; they were toned down. Now, they are more capitalist, corporate and commodified, with controlled access and admissions exclusivity. They are also more sanitized, ordered and manicured; they are more bourgeois. They are centres of standardized consumption aimed at consumer gratification through an experience of hyperreality. Walonen observes that in the postmodern era, we have become more and more obsessed with “theming” and the whole world is becoming “Disney-fied” (260). Walonen describes England, England from a perspective informed by this tradition of theme-parking: “*England, England* narrates the rise of a theme park of that name situated on the Isle of Wight that offers a convenient distillation of its target consumers’ hyperreal notions of Britishness” (262).

However, Sir Jack rejects the idea that his project is merely a theme park. He aims for something much bigger. As Baudrillard also suggests, the hyperreality aims to overthrow the reality. This is how Sir Jack expresses his true aims:

‘We are not talking theme park,’ he began. ‘We are not talking heritage centre. We are not talking Disneyland, World’s Fair, Festival of Britain, Legoland, or Pare Asterix. (...) We are not seeking two-penny tourists. It is world-boggling time. We shall offer far more than words such as Entertainment can possibly imply; even the phrase Quality Leisure, proud though I am of it, perhaps, in the long run, falls short. We are offering *the thing itself*. *Der Ding an sich*. (46)

Sir Jack justifies his conviction that he can offer “the thing itself” by saying that a simulation does indeed turn into the thing itself eventually and inevitably. He emphasizes that what people regard as the real might actually be a simulation itself that has managed to turn into the real. This notion underlines the fact that simulation has managed to infiltrate all sorts of spaces, even the ones that look the most natural, as Sir Jack explains:

We change it all, (...), the trees, the crops, the animals. And now, follow me further. That lake you discern on the horizon is a reservoir, but when it has

been established a few years, when fish swim in it and migrating birds make it a port of call, when the treeline has adjusted itself and little boats ply their picturesque way up and down it, when these things happen it becomes, triumphantly, a lake, don't you see? It becomes *the thing itself*.' (47)

After looking at the nature of the simulation in the novel, we need to look at the motivation behind it: Why does Sir Pitman feel the need to simulate England? For this question, we can examine two perspectives; one relating to Pitman's personality, and the other relating to practicality.

Firstly, we need to understand the simulator to see the motivation behind the simulation. Therefore, we need to look at the character of Sir Pitman. Such an examination would actually transcend the character and ask broader questions about the human nature, personified and singularized in the Pitman character. Pitman, as the mastermind behind the England, England project, is presented as an arrogant, overly ambitious man. He is a megalomaniacal billionaire, a mogul. Nünning (2001) likens him to real-life moguls like Robert Maxwell or Rupert Murdoch (60). Bentley (2007) calls him "a parody of a Thatcherite entrepreneur" (489). Sabol (2007) calls him "a perverse figure intent on colonizing the cultural heritage of his nation" (165).

Pitman starts a project that many people would find impossible, unimaginable. This is a very arrogant project: trying to encompass and capture the essence of England within a theme park. This level of ambition may seem unrealistic at first but it also happens in real life in one form or another. All of us may actually have this reductionist, superficial ambition regarding the unknown, be it a country, a nation, or a notion. By discovering bits and pieces, by observing a little from the outside, we think we can totally understand, digest and consume wholes. Examples might be the colonizer's gaze upon the colonized, or the western orientalist gaze upon the east, or the male gaze upon the female. This exceeding self-confidence that always tries to define, quantify, limit and absorb things is what is seen in the case of Sir Pitman. He takes his own version of England and Englishness and materializes this vision in England, England. His ambition goes beyond this limit of representation, because his project does not only aim to represent England, it aims to replace it.

A second motivation behind the simulation is a more practical one. This practicality relates both to economic benefit and to fast consumption. Sir Pitman does not create England, England only out of megalomaniac ambition; he also does it for customer gratification and therefore financial gains. England, England is a capitalist tourism project in addition to being a megalomaniac realization of a crazy vision.

When designing the project, Pitman uses a survey asking people what England means to them. Based on answers garnered on these surveys, Pitman chooses the elements to include in his project. Asking people is not an arbitrary decision; England, England will serve these people, so it is a wise idea to take the opinion of the customer because customer satisfaction comes first. As a result, people will definitely come and visit England, England. They will because it will have just what they have always desired to see. It will be a mirror reflecting their vision of England. It will be the materialized version of their notion of England. The real England cannot do that because reality is far too complex, mysterious, and unpredictable to totally understand and dominate. There will always be bits and pieces that cannot be fathomed, explored or consumed. England, England will not have this uncanny mystery. All its parts are known even before it is actually created. Therefore, tourists will find it much more convenient and practical to visit England, England rather than trying to explore the real England. Actually, exploring is not what they want to do from the beginning; they just want to see their version of England affirmed. They want to see what they already know, they want to see what they think England is, not what England actually is, or might be.

This is where the financial success lies. England, England surpasses England's economy and tourism just for this reason. It is the option that actually gives the customers what they want exactly. Sir Pitman probably sees this business potential and masterfully manipulates it. He is the typical cunning, ambitious, capitalist entrepreneur that enters the tourism market by seeing a gap in it, by understanding the true nature of the tourists' demands and their gaze and by offering them what they demand. This can be proved by the words of a visitor:

From now on, only those with an active love of discomfort or necrophiliac taste for the antique need venture there. [Old England] The best of all that

England was, and is, can be safely and conveniently experienced on this spectacular and well-equipped diamond of an Island. (121)

In many ways, we can compare England, England to Baudrillard's assessment of Beaubourg. Baudrillard states: "Monument to the games of mass simulation, the Pompidou Center functions as an incinerator absorbing all the cultural energy and devouring it" (43). This is also what England, England does: it absorbs and devours the English culture. Why does this enterprise bring success?

Within a museal scenario that only serves to keep up the humanist fiction of culture, it is a veritable fashioning of the death of culture that takes place, and it is a veritable cultural mourning for which the masses are joyously gathered. (46)

Similarly, by going to England, England, visitors actually mourn the death of the English culture, which dies the moment it is encapsulated in this massive simulation. For Baudrillard, this situation is quite ironic. What is expected from the visitors is to be amazed by this culture, but the motivation behind their visit is to enjoy the opportunity of mourning for this culture that "they have always detested" because it has always tired them and rendered them helpless (46).

We can look at England, England as some type of open-air museum which, like all museums, tries to store, categorize, classify, aestheticise, functionalise culture and thereby turn it into a hyperreality. "Make Beaubourg bend!" (48) Make England, England bend! This could be the only way out, the only salvation, for the masses faced with the challenge of accepting a sterilized culture.

After talking about the capitalist motives behind the England, England theme park, we need the touch upon the process of commercialization and marketing, and the notion of hyperreal tourism, in relation to Baudrillard. In the chapter "Hypermarket and Hypercommodity", Baudrillard comments on hypermarkets: "People go there to find and to select objects - responses to all the questions they may ask themselves" (52). This is precisely what happens with England, England and its visitors. The objects to be found and selected are everything that one may typically associate with Englishness, thus the fifty quintessences of Englishness. And all the questions that they, the visitors, may ask themselves are questions related to the true nature, the essence of England. However, they are just too lazy or too

consumerist or too impatient to actually go and seek the answers of these questions in a more natural and organic (if slower and more time-consuming) manner in the real England. Thus, they choose the readily made and presented answers that can be easily accessed in England, England. To this end, it would not be very wrong to say that England, England is one big hypermarket, offering its hypercommodities to its customers and demanding their money. It is a basic equation of supply and demand.

Baudrillard suggests that “the new cities are satellited by the hypermarket or the shopping center” (53). This is what brings the doom of Old England. It is now basically a vehicle to feed the hypermarket, which is England, England. “The hypermarket as nucleus. The city, even a modern one, no longer absorbs it. It is the hypermarket that establishes an orbit along which suburbanization moves” (53). Exchange “hypermarket” with “England, England” and “the city” with “England” and it more or less explains the process that happens within the novel. The triumph of the simulation, of the hyperreality, over reality.

The word “market” and its variants (marketing, marketable, free-market, marketplace) are used numerous times within the novel. Some sentences involving such words are quite revealing about the nature of England, England. It is a project that markets history: “Social and cultural history – stacks of it, reams of it – eminently marketable, never more so than in the current climate” (34). It offers its visitors simulated and refined experiences: “Marketing provided the clinching refinement: the Heavens-to-Betsy Bunjee Experience would become the Island Breakfast Experience” (84). It seeks customer gratification by following the logic of the market: “‘Besides,’ adds Ms Cochrane with a wry smile, ‘don’t you think it is empowering and democratic to offer people a wider choice, whether it’s in breakfast food or historic sites? We’re merely following the logic of the market’” (119). More importantly, England, England is defined as “a pure market state” by an analyst in the novel (120). This is how that analyst praises England, England: “What’s happening on the Island is a recognition that man is a market-driven animal, that he swims in the market like a fish in the sea” (120). The same mentality goes for the visitors: “Most people here are first-time visitors making a conscious market choice between Old England and England, England” (121).

Nitsch (2015) examines *England, England* from a perspective of tourism and place commodification:

The new tourist sites offer the familiar icons and insignia of real places, arranged along the contours of focus-group surveys, rather than those of chronology and culture. These are the hyperreal spaces mirroring Baudrillard's Disneyland nightmares, displacing the realities they purport to honor in their quest for the pure commodification of social life. (47)

England, England totally fits this description: It destabilizes and transforms an entire country to serve the purposes of the neo-liberal market and consumer demands. Projects like England, England become successful because in the postmodern era, people willingly prefer the simulacra over the reality, as Baudrillard claims. Nitsch also draws attention to this point: "This shift to more elaborate simulacra assumed a postmodern savvy among its tourists, too, who self-consciously reveled in the tour's constructedness" (49). England, England is the ultimate, the extreme form of heritage tourism, aimed at people who want to digest the whole heritage of a country in one big bite. Therefore, national heritage turns into a type of commodity. Even people hired by Sir Jack as actors turn into commodities at one point because they literally become the characters they play, losing their individualities and real identities and becoming items in this hypermarket. What we have as a result is a fundamental, deep simulation and commodification, encompassing every particle in the larger system. As Nitsch puts it, "cultural capital of place simply becomes a cultural commodity, to be shaped as the marketing research dictates" (60).

After a discussion on why the simulation exists in the novel, we now need to focus on how it operates. What are the items and notions that are drawn into this big machine of simulation and how are they simulated? Now that England, England is a replica of the real England, it simulates grand, fundamental notions like country, nation, nationality, national history and culture. However, England, England will inevitably fail at representing the reality; particularly because the reality it aims to encompass includes the grand notions we have mentioned above. But before we examine the disparity between the simulation and the reality, the first and the more fundamental question we must ask is, "Is there a reality?" When we define a country or a nation, when we write narratives about national culture and history, aren't our

definitions and narratives always bound by human limitation and subjectivity? Perhaps, each definition is a re-definition and each narrative is pure fiction. Here, we may refer to Benedict Anderson (1983), who defines nation as an imagined community:

In an anthropological spirit, then, I propose the following definition of the nation: it is an imagined political community – and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion. (21-22)

If the so-called nation is “imagined” by its members, by subjective individuals, then how can we talk about the “essence” of a nation? What we suppose as the essence will be nothing but the sum of all subjective assumptions of various individuals.

In the same line with Anderson, we can also refer to Bhabha (1994), who examines nation as a subject of narration, thereby exposing its “imagined” nature. Let us first remember Baudrillard’s statements about turning culture into narration; “stockpiling” the past: “Our entire linear and accumulative culture collapses if we cannot stockpile the past in plain view” (8). “Never, as it did here [the traditional museum], has culture lost its memory in the service of stockpiling and functional redistribution” (47). Similarly, Bhabha states:

The scraps, patches and rags of daily life must be repeatedly turned into the signs of a coherent national culture, while the very act of the narrative performance interpellates a growing circle of national subjects. (145)

However, Bhabha also emphasizes the power of what he calls “counter-narratives”: “Counter-narratives of the nation that continually evoke and erase its totalizing boundaries - both actual and conceptual - disturb those ideological manoeuvres through which ‘imagined communities’ are given essentialist identities” (149). However, we still have the question of whether these “counter-narratives” (still being “narratives”) could somehow contribute to a more non-essentialist or “authentic” view of the nation or they would become yet another attempt at simulating the abstract and unattainable reality. This ambivalence might be the reason why Bhabha mentions “forgetting”: “Being obliged to forget becomes the basis for remembering

the nation, peopling it anew, imagining the possibility of other contending and liberating forms of cultural identification” (161).

Anderson’s concept of “imagined” nation, Bhabha’s emphasis on “narrating” culture and nation, along with Baudrillard’s statements on the obsession of “stockpiling” the past and culture, bring us to the conclusion of nation and national culture as “myths”. Myths, particularly national myths, find their place in the collective mind and in this way, they give people a sense of unity and togetherness. They serve a very practical purpose of making people feel belonging, relevant, like a part of a whole. However, they also impose a certain, restricted version of unity on the individual members of a particular community. As a result, we have a certain amount of tension, a discrepancy and a challenge between the collective myth and the individual perception.

If we take the notion of “nation as a myth” and adapt it to the particular case of the novel, we can observe that this process of myth creation is pretty much what happens with the England, England project. The project is informed by myths predating itself, because after all, the “essence” of England and Englishness that the project ambitiously tries to encapsulate does not exist in the first place. As Nünning (2001) observes, “[T]here is no ‘essence’ of Englishness, let alone a ‘quintessence’” (74). “[P]erceptions of national identity are always constructs” (75-76). By representing national myths in a concretized manner, England, England claims to represent the gist, the reality of England. However, it ends up becoming a myth itself. It provides people with a sense of familiarity and wholeness, but it imposes its own version of Englishness on its visitors; it presents its own “myth” of England to spectators. The novel problematizes the restrictive influences of myths but also draws attention to our nevertheless existing obsession with creating myths and imposing them on others. This ironic duality complicates the novel and its examination of simulation and myth-creation. The novel also has a dual questioning of the authenticity of myths: one being related to England, England and the other related to the pre-existing myths that England, England feeds upon and is informed by.

When we are talking about myths, we also need to consider their fixed, stable, crystallized nature. They are memorized by so many people and repeated so often that they turn into concretized and fixed narratives. In this way, they offer an attractive alternative to an ever-changing, confusing, dynamic real world. However, the theme park England, England cannot really attain this fixedness. Even if it is a new myth artificially constructed, it still has real people in it, even if they are acting. Therefore, rather than being purely narrative like a traditional myth, it has an aspect of humanity and dynamism. This is evidenced by the mischievous behaviour of some actors creating chaos on the island and deviating from their assigned roles. This contrast between England, England and more traditional narrative myths further underlines the fact that narrative myths are totally devoid of the human factor, of dynamism: they are basically dead narratives that people stubbornly try to keep alive. On the other hand, if we go back to the actors on the island, their over-identification with their roles shows the power of the myth over the human, creating yet another irony.

When what we call reality is so fragile and so intangible, what a project like England, England does is to remove us one step further from the unfathomable, impalpable reality. The shadow of a shadow, just like Plato's allegory of the cave. After establishing their own definitions and narratives about England and Englishness through surveys and opinion analyses, Sir Pitman and his team deviate even from their own version. When putting theory into practice, when making the project a reality, they alter and modify many aspects.

Recreating and reshaping history, establishing simulated historical narratives are topics that Baudrillard also deals with in his book. The second chapter of the book denotes history as "a retro scenario" (31). England, England is not much different from the extremely realistic and visually elaborate period films mentioned in Baudrillard's book that try to recreate history. One uses a visual narrative, the other the technique of theme-parking. We can compare Baudrillard's examination of the film *Barry Lyndon* (1975) to England, England's position in the novel. However, the danger lies here: After the film ends, the audience will know that it is a film made in the 20th century dealing with the 18th century and will go back to the real world.

However, England, England pierces into the real world and becomes a part of it. It is actually there, physically, at all times. *Barry Lyndon* can only serve as a temporary fake time machine that takes us back in time virtually, but England, England can destroy the real England. It is not the reality, but it is not a meek fake either; it is the hyperreality.

We can also establish an analogy between Baudrillard's comparison of the film *Apocalypse Now* (1979) with the Vietnam War and our comparison of England, England with the real England. Baudrillard suggests that Coppola made his film in such a way that "the war in Vietnam and this film are cut from the same cloth, that nothing separates them, that this film is part of the war - if the Americans (seemingly) lost the other one, they certainly won this one" (41). Maybe, a similar motivation is behind England, England: taking a lost cause (national identity and culture lost, or never once found) and turning it into a victory through simulation, and more importantly, removing the separation between the real England and the theme park.

What Baudrillard says about the Holocaust is also important and applies very much to England, England as well. Baudrillard suggests that after being killed in crematoriums and gas chambers, Jews are now being killed by the sound track and the image track of the media. Similarly, the moment England, England tries to represent England, Englishness and English culture; it only serves to kill these notions, by turning them into limited hyperrealities within the confines of a theme park. However, this is a metaphorical, philosophical death, not a practical or economic death. That is why, practically speaking, England, England becomes successful. The reality is dead, long live the hyperreality!

If we take a closer look at the techniques of simulation in the theme park, we can see more clearly how England, England dissects and dismantles England and Englishness, thereby killing them. These notions appear like patients that die on the operation table during the attempt of reaching their innermost realities. We have mentioned the surveys and opinion analyses carried out before the construction of the theme park. The information accumulated through these studies becomes a "list" that claims to summarize and encompass what England and Englishness mean. The word

“list” alone shows the fragmentary, conceptualized, categorized, classified and narrated nature of the perception of nation. It shows the obsession with analysing, limiting, concretizing (and thereby killing) abstract notions for the sake of a sense of completeness or wholeness. A quote from the novel on this issue is quite revelatory: “Martha did not understand all the words, and very few of the instructions, but something about the lists – their calm organisation and their completeness – satisfied her” (14). This sentence perfectly summarizes humanity’s obsession with listing: Such an obsession has a pragmatist, utilitarian agenda. It gives people the soothing feeling that the universe is organized and complete.

The novel uses the list as an important symbol for humanity’s attempt to assign a meaning, a wholeness to abstract mental concepts. While constructing the hyperreal England, England, Pitman and his team ask people from many countries to list items that they find quintessentially English. The result is a list of “Fifty Quintessences of Englishness”. When we observe the list, we see that it includes people (from royal family to Shakespeare), places (from Big Ben/House of Parliament to pubs), historical events (from Battle of Britain to Magna Carta), food and drinks (from marmalade to warm beer), personality traits (from snobbery to hypocrisy), media (from BBC to Times Newspaper), or abstract notions or concepts (from class system to imperialism). This list makes one ask the question: Can a nation be reduced to, or shattered into a list of items that define it? Can we thoroughly analyse a nation and divide it into meaningful particles? Then comes an even more important question: If we can actually divide a nation into such meaningful particles, then, can they, when brought together once again in a different setting, form a meaningful and a perfectly complete or a completely perfect whole? This is what Sir Pitman tries to do: His list aims to break Englishness into its pieces and his theme park aims to reconstruct Englishness by bringing those pieces together. However, the list is a mental projection of what the majority think of as English, and the theme park is the actual, physical projection of that mental projection. The shadow of a shadow.

It is also important to note that Sir Pitman’s project has an Official Historian called Dr Max. While recreating England in his project, Pitman also feels the need to

do research on national history and incorporate his findings into his project. National history is an important part of national identity but history is something that can always be rewritten, reordered and modified. Like Romero (2011) states:

History rewriting and editing means idealizing some past facts and omitting others that do not correspond with an imagined self. It is the present that designs how we want to live and remember our past. (253)

We like to reshape history by assigning our own subjective meaning to it, by selecting some historical events and eliminating others, but what we produce is fiction. Even Dr Max himself points out this fact:

‘...there *is* no authentic moment of beginning, of purity, however hard their devotees pretend. We may choose to freeze a moment and say that it all “began” then, but as an historian I have to tell you that such labelling is intellectually indefensible. What we are looking at is almost always a replica, if that is the locally fashionable term, of something earlier. There is no prime moment...’ (90) (emphasis in original)

Dr Max is also manipulated by Pitman, who wants a modified version of history, one that is more likeable and marketable: “Right. Well, the point of our history – and I stress the our – will be to make our guests, those buying what is for the moment referred to as Quality Leisure, feel better” (53). To this end, the novel brings into question the authenticity of both national identity and national history. It also questions the validity and reliability of lists and research relating to these notions.

What’s more, in the end, the project is not even a very faithful adaptation of these list-making and historical research processes. It is, eventually, one person’s, Sir Pitman’s individual vision of England. It all washes down to the perspective of one person. When he looks at the list of fifty quintessences, Pitman has a critical approach to it, crosses off some items, thinks of ways to make the creation process more convenient:

Alone, Sir Jack considered the printout again. It frankly deteriorated towards the end. He crossed off items he judged the result of faulty polling technique and pondered the rest. Many had been correctly foreseen: there would be no shortage of shopping and thatched cottages serving Devonshire cream teas on the Island. Gardening, breakfast, taxis, double-deckers: those were all useful endorsements. A Robin in the Snow: where had that come from? All those Christmas cards, perhaps. The Magna Carta was currently being translated into decent English. The Times newspaper was no doubt easily acquired;

Beefeaters would be fattened up, and the White Cliffs of Dover relocated without much linguistic wrenching to what had previously been Whitecliff Bay. Big Ben, the Battle of Britain, Robin Hood, Stonehenge: couldn't be simpler. (62)

While he cannot completely trust the accumulated perceptions of Englishness coming from outsiders in this list, Pitman can firmly and interestingly trust his own vision:

Sir Jack prodded a forefinger down Jeff's list again, and his loyal growl intensified with each item he'd crossed off. This wasn't a poll, it was barefaced character assassination. Who the fuck did they think they were, going around saying things like that about England? His England. What did they know? Bloody tourists, thought Sir Jack. (63)

In the end, the whole process gives birth to England, England; the child of meticulous analysis, research, list-making, selection and elimination, modification and transformation.

The England, England theme park also includes actors simulating famous national and historical figures. It might be a good idea to focus on these characters and see how as real people, as opposed to the abstract notions mentioned above, they become part of the simulation system and how they are influenced by and in turn influence that system. But before we start discussing the actors in England, England, we must first refer to what Baudrillard has to say about the relationship between simulation and human beings and human behaviour:

People no longer look at each other, but there are institutes for that. They no longer touch each other, but there is contactotherapy. They no longer walk, but they go jogging, etc. Everywhere one recycles lost faculties, or lost bodies, or lost sociality, or the lost taste for food. (11)

According to this picture, people have lost touch with the natural human behaviour and human contact. To compensate for this, people invent simulated conditions to enable them and their behaviour to appear human. As a result, their behaviour and actions are no longer motivated by inner, natural, spontaneous instincts or feelings, but rather, these new actions and behaviours seem to be staged acts, performances serving the prescribed purposes of a simulated situation. So how can we talk about

sincerity and naturalness in such a world? Moreover, how can we talk about real identities and real selves?

This process is what happens with the actors hired for the England, England project. Each actor is hired to play a certain role prescribed by the minds behind the project. From now on, their lives will literally become acts, performances, carefully staged to seem believable and convincing. The actors in the theme park are reminiscent of the “performative” mode of narrating the nation, proposed by Bhabha. Bhabha (1994) defines the performative mode as “the loss of identity in the signifying process of cultural identification” (153). Throughout the novel, we observe this process of “loss of identity” in the actors who over-identify with their assigned roles: “They were happy to be who they had become, and didn’t wish to be other” (129). Even though the project managers pay a lot of attention to controlling the behaviour of these actors and keeping them within limits, the actors transcend these limitations in interesting ways. The actor playing Samuel Johnson changes his name:

Martha called up Dr Johnson’s contract of employment. Of course: it should have been an early warning. Whatever the actor’s original name, he had long ago changed it by deed-poll to Samuel Johnson. They had engaged Samuel Johnson to play Samuel Johnson. Perhaps this explained things. (137)

The actor internalizes his role so much that he turns into this melancholy and depressing figure for the visitors. As a result, visitors file complaints about him. They want to see a more idealized and cheerful version of the historical character even if it would go against the true nature of the character. The complaints of the visitors further prove the fact that people prefer the replica to the real because they hope to see their ideals in the replica. Robin Hood and his Merrie Men turn into mischievous characters creating chaos on the island. The King of England sexually harasses the actor playing Nell Gwynn and tries to justify his actions by using his position as the King. The actors playing threshers, shepherds, smugglers, or fighters in the Battle of Britain all over-identify with their assigned jobs. The personal agency of the actors interferes with the limited, controlled nature of the performance and results in a transcendence of the contractual line.

According to some critics, actors' transformation to the characters they play signifies a return to some sort of authenticity. Sabol (2007) suggests that "the actors thus seem committed to returning a sense of *authenticity* to the historical narrative imposed on them by England, England" (182) (emphasis in original). Similarly, Pristash (2011) argues that although the actors are unaware of the constructedness of their new identities, they still modify these roles and bring their own interpretation to them:

[T]hey begin to assimilate the so-called personalities of the characters they are playing, never acknowledging the constructed nature of that personality. At the same time, however, these actors also create new identities for themselves through their reenactment of the myth, refashioning and updating those mythic identities with more contemporary meanings and attitudes. (111)

On the other hand, Nitsch (2015) suggests that the actors (much like the visitors) fall prey to sentimental nostalgia: "Both employees and clients succumb to the dream of national culture returned—the myths of safe, clean cities and quaint pastoral settings that exist only in collective nationalized memory" (55).

Barnes' inclusion of the actors in the theme park, however it may be interpreted, is a very important topic regarding simulation. First of all, it shows that the simulation within the novel is not limited to spaces or abstract concepts; it also includes real, living people. It shows that the lives of the actors turn into performances, spectacles fuelled by identity loss or identity swapping. Their over-identification with and their transcendence of the assigned roles also raises important questions about the reasons or possible motivations behind them. The novel does not give definitive answers to such questions and this is what makes the actions and behaviour of the actors even more perplexing and thought-provoking.

Up until this point, we have mainly focused on the second part of the novel, "England, England", because it is the one that includes the designing and marketing processes of the theme park and what follows, so it is the part that is the most overtly Baudrillardian in the novel. However, Barnes does not limit his examination of the concept of simulation with his theme park. He subtly shows that simulation is ever-present; before the theme park when a supposedly "real", untouched, undamaged England existed, and after the theme park when conscious efforts are made to restore

“reality”. This makes the novel even more interesting because it implies that simulation does not only occur through a conscious effort to create simulacra, but it also occurs without people ever truly realizing it.

Looking at the first part of the novel, “England”, might give us insight on this issue. Martha’s childhood puzzle named Counties of England stands out as an important symbol from a Baudrillardian perspective. The puzzle is Martha’s most vivid childhood memory but it is also a representation of the constructed nature of a country. The idea of a country is constructed like a puzzle. It is thought to be composed of fragments (like puzzle pieces) that can be ordered, dismantled and reordered.

We can say that another important symbolic detail is Martha’s education in history as a child. History teaching or history narratives are again turned into a game, in the form of “history chants”.

55BC (clap clap) Roman Invasion
1066 (clap clap) Battle of Hastings
1215 (clap clap) Magna Carta
1512 (clap clap) Henry the Eighth (clap clap)
Defender of Faith (clap clap)
She’d liked that last one: the rhyme made it easier to remember. Eighteen
fifty fower (clap clap) Crimean Wower (clap clap) – they always said it like
that, no matter how many times Miss Mason corrected them. And so the
chant proceeded, down to
1940 (clap clap) Battle of Britain
1973 (clap clap) Treaty of Rome (16)

This chant wittily demonstrates that history is taught at schools in the form of list-like chants composed of some dates and some names of events that do not signify or mean anything to the learner, but are memorized and stocked anyway. Berberich (2008) finds this historical list highly limited, selective and subjective, questions the decisions made by people about important and unimportant dates and events, and points to the fact that such lists nevertheless become formative about national identity and representative about the nation.

History taught as an institutional narrative also shows its subjectivity through Martha’s encounter with her Spanish friend, who calls Francis Drake a pirate. Martha sees (or has been taught to see) him as a hero and a gentleman and concludes that

“one person’s plundering privateer might be another person’s pirate” (13). This encounter confronts Martha with the relativity of historical narratives but she still remains sure about the heroic qualities of Francis Drake, because she has internalised the institutional narrative.

In addition to such examinations of country, nation and history as simulated notions, through the symbolism of the puzzle and the history lessons, the first part of the novel also examines human memory as a device of simulation. Barnes shows us through the character of Martha that once the past enters the filter of the human memory, it turns into a simulation of itself, because the human memory transforms the past into a subjective, limited, selected, fallible and very personal “reality”, thereby rendering it a simulation. Memory serves the purpose of creating unreliable narratives about the past.

When we look at the character of Martha, the imperfect and fragmentary nature of her memory shows itself even from the very first sentences of the book: “‘WHAT’S YOUR FIRST MEMORY?’ someone would ask. And she would reply, ‘I don’t remember’” (11). Martha has distrust towards memories, just because of their very nature: “Martha Cochrane was to live a long time, and in all her years she was never to come across a first memory which was not in her opinion a lie” (11). The narrative voice supports Martha here, underlining the fact that memory is not attainable: “A memory was by definition not a thing, it was ... a memory. A memory now of a memory a bit earlier of a memory before that of a memory way back when” (11). The narrator further remarks:

If a memory wasn’t a thing but a memory of a memory of a memory, mirrors set in parallel, then what the brain told you now about what it claimed had happened then would be coloured by what had happened in between. It was like a country remembering its history: the past was never just the past, it was what made the present able to live with itself. (13)

Here Barnes establishes an analogy between a person’s memory and a country’s memory; between personal identity and national identity. According to Bentley,

The process of constructing and re-constructing the nation is, of course, central to this image [of the puzzle], but this is overlaid with the development of Martha’s individual identity. (...) The image of the father providing the

final piece is thus presented in terms of both completing the nation, but also of completing and fulfilling Martha's identity. (489)

When we talk about memory, we need to note that accompanying this examination of the personal memory in the first part of the novel, we have the examination of the collective memory in the second part; embodied in the team behind the England, England project. What these people do is to gather collective memories about England from many people, filter them down and turn them into a theme park. However, the collective memory is not more trustworthy or representative of reality than the personal memory, because it is nothing but personal memories brought together and turned into a list. In this sense, national identity is actually a product of collective imagination. In this way, the novel depicts the simulated nature of both personal memory and national or collective memory. Both types are artificially constructed to attain or impose a sense of identity, be it individual or national. Both types of memory interact with and influence each other. Pristash (2011) observes this tension and interplay between what she calls "individual" and "communal" identities:

People are left to negotiate individual and communal notions of national identity. Since the communal is part of the individual identity, the communal sense of identity affects the individual while public identities are equally reliant on individual creation. (81)

Sabol argues that Barnes' "novel does devote itself to the relationship between personal and historical memory, especially the struggle to recover the past and shape it into a coherent story" (9). However, can we suppose that this "struggle" will ever become successful? If we look at it from a Baudrillardian perspective, memory is also some type of simulation. It is the mental abstraction, the recollection of a reality that is so far gone and that cannot be experienced once again. Moreover, it is limited by human subjectivity, forgetfulness and a tendency to modify past realities within the mind. The novel manipulates this weakness of memory in its narrative. Both Martha and the producers of the England, England project ironically get further away from authenticity through the use of memory. According to Sabol, the novel shows "the sense of disillusionment that results after the failures and distortions of linear narrative memories have become more or less evident" (150).

If we move on to the last part of the novel, “Anglia”, we can again see subject matter related to simulation, completing Barnes’ ongoing examination of the concept that starts in the first part through Martha’s memories and reaches its peak in the second part through the theme park. This last part appears at first like a nostalgic elegy to Old England and its rural beauty. However, this deceptive appearance is what creates the irony in the conclusion of the novel, because Barnes shows that even if the characters have the optimistic agenda of restoring the “real” England as a reaction to the simulated England, England, Anglia, precisely because it is a reaction, is not any less simulated than England, England. Once the simulation infects the notion of the country, it is impossible to make a fresh start offering a genuine, authentic experience. The village fete so carefully planned and organized is just an attempt to cover up this bitter truth. Ironically, the fete itself is also an artificial, constructed event. The form and tone of the last part of the book emphasizes some sort of artificiality and constructedness not much different from the second part. As Bentley (2007) points out, “The opening description of the pastoral scene is exaggerated to the point of parody” and “the artificiality that fuels the second section contaminates the third” (494).

Then, what is Martha’s position in Anglia? Having witnessed all the games of simulation in England, England, can she now truly believe that Anglia might be a meaningful and fruitful attempt at restoring the real England? Martha’s ambivalent relationship with Anglia stands out as another important theme in the novel. It shows the tension between longing for a lost reality in the past and the attempt to restore it in the present. It shows the nuanced nature of Anglia, swinging between search for reality and childish nostalgia.

Already a cynic even before entering the England, England project, Martha becomes further disillusioned about notions like reality, truth, identity, memory and history throughout her stay in England, England. In the end, after being expelled from the project, she decides to go back to Anglia, which is actually the real England that has regressed into an agrarian, pre-industrial state without much population, technology or tourism after the triumph of England, England. Why does Martha choose to go to Anglia? It might be interpreted as her escape attempt from

hyperreality. However, can she actually escape it? The impacts of England, England on the real England are both physical and philosophical. The physical impacts are more directly observable, like England losing its previous importance and development, its power and role in the world, its economy and industry; basically being defeated by England, England. However, the philosophical impact is more tragic, even if it is less directly observable: the spirit of simulation created by England, England manages to infect Anglia, as well.

The proof for that can be seen in the conscious and artificial attempts at creating historical narratives, shaping a national identity and reviving the Old England as it was before. These attempts always show their fake, simulated nature lying under the seemingly idyllic nature of Anglia. In this sense, the members of the community in Anglia are not very much different from the actors in England, England paid to play some roles. What is more tragically ironic is that England, England makes its agenda of simulation clearer while in Anglia, it is a bitter truth swept under the carpet. Everyone in Anglia is desperately trying to define the experience there as real and authentic.

The character of Jez Harris in Anglia is quite indicative of the simulated nature of Anglia. He is a farrier who “shoed horses, made barrel hoops, sharpened knives and sickles, cut keys, tended the verges” (157). To start with, his name is fake; his real name used to be Jack Oshinsky. Furthermore, he is an American who had to leave the country. In Anglia, he is literally “performing”, with a learned British accent and a newly shaped identity:

Marriage to Wendy Temple had softened and localized his Milwaukee accent; and his inextinguishable pleasure was to play the yokel whenever some anthropologist, travel writer, or linguistic theoretician would turn up inadequately disguised as a tourist. (157)

Barnes summarizes Jez’s artificial transformation with the phrase succinctly as “Harris the farrier né Oshinsky the legal draughtsman” (157). When the schoolmaster protests against Jez inventing and telling folk stories in an attempt to look more “local”, Jez answers: “They prefer Jez’s stories, that’s the truth” (158).

Another ironic situation is that residents of Anglia see Martha as authentic, because she spent her childhood in Old England. Whatever Martha says about Old

England is accepted as factual and authentic but she herself knows that she is narrating her own version from her subjective perspective and her imperfect memory. She can also observe that however hard they try, the residents will never be able to create a real sense of Old England, because it was then and there and they are here now, having lost connection with a past reality that they desperately try to recreate in the present. “Old England had lost its history, and therefore – since memory is identity – had lost all sense of itself” (162). To this end, Martha has serious doubts and a sense of otherness:

She was bored, of course; but then, she had returned to Anglia as a migrant bird rather than a zealot. She fucked no-one; she grew older; she knew the contours of her solitude. She was not sure if she had done right, if Anglia had done right, if a nation could reverse its course and its habits. (166)

Martha nevertheless becomes a part of this nostalgic play staged in Anglia, because “the past was never just the past, it was what made the present able to live with itself” (13). The past is what enables her, and the others in Anglia, to come to terms with the present and find meaning in it. In this case, this conscious nostalgia is in a way a suspension of disbelief needed for some comfort of mind.

In the end, the novel depicts the dilemma between confronting the true nature of what we call “reality” and still yearning for meaning in a “post-reality” world, in a world of simulations. What Baudrillard says about the university more or less applies to Anglia as well: “[T]he university remains the site of a desperate initiation to the empty form of value” (102). One could define Anglia in similar terms: Anglia tries to inform and equip its residents with the values of Old England, but can those values ever be attained and preserved anymore? If the answer to this question is no, then one has no choice other than being a cynical nihilist. This is what Baudrillard touches upon in the last chapter of his book: “The apocalypse is finished, today it is the precession of the neutral, of forms of the neutral and of indifference” (104). That is why Martha, always cynical at varying degrees throughout the novel, remains so even in Anglia. She can see the truth behind the spectacle, the façade. But what other chance does one have apart from holding onto nostalgia? If one seeks some sort of meaning in such a post-apocalyptic world, one has to apply to pretence and self-

deception. And the village fete so meticulously and enthusiastically prepared is probably the most symbolic example of this self-deception.

Before concluding our analysis of *England, England*, it might be a good idea to lastly look at the historical background and England's political realities during the time the novel was published because what happens in the narrative and the main themes of the novel relate to the real atmosphere of the times. England was in fact in a process of identity crisis, trying to redefine itself, reshape a certain and definite national identity. Even Sir Pitman refers to this phase of identity crisis and decadence in England, in order to validate his aim of reshaping England through his theme park project: "So England comes to me, and what do I say to her? I say, 'Listen, baby, face facts. We're in the third millennium and your tits have dropped. The solution is not a push-up bra'" (32). According to Pitman, in the postmodern age, England is an outdated country and the identity crisis it experiences because of that situation cannot be solved by trying to give it an illusion of modernity. It should be destroyed and replaced by a brand new country, which is England, England.

So how did England experience this process of identity crisis that urged many to think of ways to recreate or revive it? Romero (2011) suggests that England's national identity crisis was because of the loss of Empire, globalization and mass migration. Due to this crisis, it was trying to define itself and its role in the world, and Tony Blair's/New Labour's 1997 modernization programme was serving this purpose. Blair's programme came after Thatcher and just before the new millennium, a critical time period for renewal and re-imagining. However, this programme only shows that national identity and history are artificially constructed by the political elite. Even the name of the party includes the word "New", pointing to a renewal and reconstruction of national identity. The party's slogan of "Cool Britannia" also points to an attempt to find a new and modern image for the country. These conscious efforts were actually found forced, artificial and unnatural by many and they also echoed in the literature of the times. Romero finds links between *England, England* and the times of Blair:

The manmade creation of Englishness in the novel reproduces the systematic construction of "nation-ness" in Britain. (...) Here we can come back to the possible reading of the novel in a Blairian context connecting the Prime

Minister's rebranding of the nation, the encouragement of a new and modern national identity that becomes a marketable product, to Sir Jack Pitman's "England, England". (...) It could be argued there is a direct connection between Barnes's analysis of national identity constructedness and the fabrication of Labour's New Britain, understanding the latter as a bogus invention and a marketable product for consumerism as is Jack Pitman's theme park. (251-252)

Just like Sir Pitman's theme park, a meticulously designed project with an agenda, Blair had his own projects with the agenda of reshaping the English identity: the Millennium Dome, Britpop, Britart, a British national day, an Institute of Britishness and so on. Also, much like Pitman, Blair was actually trying to make the country more touristic and more open to consumerism.

Pristash (2011) makes a similar observation regarding the recent history of England:

A devolved England deals with both its epistemological and ontological status after its loss as an imperial power and after changes along cultural, racial, and social lines. (...) The past forty years in the history of England indicate that the myths of English culture are becoming harder to hold on to. (86)

Böhme (2012) mentions the 2005 project of the British Government to vote for a hundred Icons of England, as an attempt to recreate a sense of national identity through a list. She argues that this project is one last reaction to an accumulative degeneration of culture, one last attempt at rebranding it. She observes that this process of rebranding culture was accelerated in the 1990s as a reaction to the unifying movements of the EU. The definite or definitive British identity needed to be asserted. Then came the rebranding attempts of New Labour politicians and of popular culture. Böhme observes that "*England, England* both fictionalises the projects of an entrepreneurial, hyper-modern reformation of the nation and challenges the whole process of rebranding enterprise on a self-reflexive meta-level" (178). This is especially evident in the second part of the novel, "England, England", which can be said to be the most obviously postmodern section and the one that deals most clearly with the artificiality of nation construction:

It not only questions an old version of Englishness but also self-reflexively exposes – and challenges – the constructedness of contemporary discussions about redefining or rebranding the nation. (179)

According to Böhme, the novel presents a self-conscious, dystopian and satirical approach towards the reinvention and commodification of Englishness.

Bentley (2007) claims that the attempt to address, define, locate or explore Englishness has been present not only in fiction but also in history, cultural commentary and literary criticism. He suggests that works dealing with this topic have both a nostalgic mourning for a lost Englishness and some sort of anxiety about the present and the future of Englishness, underlying a crisis in the idea of nation. Bentley feels that this crisis is partly fuelled by multiculturalism, which has both an opposing and a supportive role towards nationalism. This includes other important topics like colonialism, imperialism, immigration and race, which all relate to England's history very much, and which are topics that many narrative writers (be it history or fiction) consciously or unconsciously choose to ignore or repress. Bentley also feels that this obsession with defining or rather inventing a concept of nation has psychoanalytical roots as well; related to the incomplete subject's yearning for belonging and completeness by identifying oneself with a concept like nation. Also, by trying to define Englishness, the subject might actually be trying to gain self-awareness of his/her personal identity. Then comes the tendency of narrativization and emplotment in order to articulate the imagined nation, be it historical, mythical or fictional.

It seems that *England, England* is informed by this identity crisis that England was experiencing around the time of its publication. However, the novel does not try to solve this identity crisis by offering yet another reshaping or reconstruction of English national identity. It takes a critical approach to this “identity panic” experienced during times of crisis. By showing the constructed, simulated nature of the England, England project and of the mental conceptions regarding notions like country, nation, national culture and history, the novel suggests that the search for identity will be an ever-present, never-ending quest which will never offer a satisfying and complete end result, and that is actually the

right thing. Rather than artificially creating versions of national identity in a prescriptive and imposing manner and trying to turn national identity into a fixed, stable, dead narrative, always searching and always being on the road seems like the more reasonable option. After all, reality is quite elusive and not easily attainable. It is dynamic and changing. As such, artificial constructions and simulations take us further away from the impalpable, volatile reality that we desperately try to capture and conquer.

In *England, England*, Barnes shows us how an artificially constructed replica, a simulacrum, can overpower the real thing. He does this through the examination of the processes that the theme park England, England and the real country England go through. Because it deals with a theme park, the novel's main examination of the concept of simulation is through spaces. However, because the theme park aims to encompass England and the English history and culture, Barnes also shows us how abstract notions like country, nation(ality), national history and culture can also become transformed, reshaped and reconstructed in a simulated environment. Through the owner of the theme park, Pitman, Barnes depicts the human arrogance and the capitalist motivations beneath the ambitious project and also shows how the project becomes a device of commercialization aiming for utmost customer gratification through a hyperreal tourism experience. With the actors in the theme park, we witness how real people also become a part of the simulation through an identity reshaping. However, Barnes' examination of simulation and simulacra is not limited to the theme park. In parts not dealing with the theme park, he suggests that simulation always exists, a notion underlined by the main character Martha's musings on human memory and how it subjectively reshapes the past, and by the nature of Anglia in the end of the novel. Barnes' ambivalent approach to Anglia as a place between search for reality and childish nostalgia, and Martha's own cynicism in the end render the finale of the novel ambivalent, rather than offering the reader a way out of simulation and a simplistic solution of restoring reality. Mirroring the actual identity panic experienced by England and the actual attempts to rebrand and reshape the nation around the time it was written, *England, England* eventually shows us the artificiality of such attempts and the resulting constructions. Therefore,

while he does show the triumph of simulation over reality, Barnes also suggests that the singular reality in which we firmly believe may not exist after all. All attempts to get to the “core” of a nation or country will inevitably fail, not only because all those attempts will result in artificial reconstructions, but also because the objective reality which those reconstructions are supposed to arise from may not even be there in the first place.

CHAPTER 4

NEVER LET ME GO: SIMULATION OF THE BODY

Never Let Me Go (2005) is a novel by Kazuo Ishiguro, having dystopian, science fiction and coming-of-age elements. The novel focuses on a trio of friends who are actually clones of other people, and examines how they deal with their identity, their assigned places and roles in the world. The novel examines the notion of simulation mainly through concepts like body, bodily autonomy, humanness, identity and free will.

The novel's narrator is Kathy, a girl who grows up in one of the "institutions" opened for children like her, namely the clones. This place is a boarding school named Hailsham, under the careful inspection of teachers and principals, called "guardians". Children in this school are carefully educated and nurtured, guaranteed to remain healthy, and kept isolated from the outside world. They are also encouraged a lot to produce art. When they reach the proper age, they are to donate their organs to other people who are not clones, and these donations will continue until they can no longer sustain their lives. Children are also prevented from learning the true nature of their future destinies, apart from an attempt by a teacher working at Hailsham, Miss Lucy.

There is a strong relationship among Kathy and two of her friends, Ruth and Tommy, which later turns into a tragic love triangle. Contrary to Kathy, who is more of a meek figure, Ruth is a more confident and attention-grabbing girl. Tommy experiences a problematic childhood, never quite fitting in or belonging, being bullied by others because of his bad temper. While Kathy is in love with Tommy, Tommy chooses Ruth over her, which is the beginning of a series of disappointments in Kathy's life. When they grow up and leave Hailsham, the friends move to the Cottages and get some sense of the outside world, but they cannot quite fit in this new world that they have been away from since their childhood. They meet other

people like themselves who grew up in other boarding schools, they try to discover people and places and to understand the real world.

Soon after, their donations have to start. One can choose to go along with donations right away or to be a “carer” for the donors for some time before starting their own donations. Kathy chooses to be a carer, and during her career, she has to witness the deaths of other clones. Meanwhile, there are rumours that if a couple can prove that they are truly in love, they might be given a “deferral”. Ruth is the first one to die among the trio, and after her death, Kathy and Tommy try to get a deferral by proving their love. Tragically, they learn that the rumours of deferrals are just rumours.

Soon afterwards, Tommy’s donations start and Kathy cares for him. After surviving Ruth, Kathy has to go through the same process with Tommy, who dies after a few donations. At the end of the novel, we learn that Kathy’s own donations will start soon. Kathy reflects upon her childhood memories, her relationship with Ruth and Tommy, her platonic love and longing for Tommy, her identity and destiny, and her mortality.

Rather than employing the trope of clones as mysterious and uncanny others as in many science fiction novels, Ishiguro centralizes these characters in his novel, even making one the narrator of the novel. Now that cloning denotes an act of simulation (probably the most extreme form of simulation because it is the simulation of the human body), *Never Let Me Go* lends itself well to an analysis from a Baudrillardian perspective. In this chapter, it will be argued that through the trio of friends in the novel, their relations to each other and to the outside world, and the painful coming-of-age process that they go through, Ishiguro shows us the brutal consequences of simulating the human body. However, rather than rendering a simple warning against the dangers of cloning, Ishiguro manages to find the humane in the supposedly inhuman, the reality in the supposedly fake. By questioning the line between the clone and the real person, Ishiguro also questions the line between reality and simulation. To this end, his criticism regarding simulation does not arise from the nature of the simulated, but rather from that of the simulator, and the bitter consequences that the simulator imposes upon the simulated.

We have examined the theme of simulation in *England, England* mainly through its theme park. *Never Let Me Go* also contains spatial simulation with its boarding school, Hailsham. It would not be wrong to compare Hailsham to Baudrillard's Disneyland or to Barnes' theme park England, England. Like those places, Hailsham is also an artificially constructed and modified place, in order to create a different sense of existence and understanding for the students living there. Guo (2015) describes Hailsham as "a dystopian pseudo-paradise" (2). However, while Disneyland and England, England set out to simulate another outside reality to begin with (the fantastical Disney universe of the country of England), and therefore are more self-conscious about their artificial nature, Hailsham's aim is more to conceal than to reveal. Hailsham mainly tries to keep children unaware of the outside reality, the one experienced in the real world, by "real" people. Now that the children living in Hailsham are clones, they need, the masterminds think, a different type of reality in order to continue their lives without feeling awkward, without feeling like others, or even, without revolting against the true nature of their existence.

Every student at Hailsham is a clone and they are similar to each other in many ways. Firstly, their ages are quite close, and the only adult figures in the school are the guardians. Then, no child in the school has a family; therefore, they have no concept of a family consisting of biologically-related children and parental figures. To this end, they turn into a big metaphorical family within themselves, a family only composed of children (and their guardians). They study the same lessons, go through the same daily routines, deal with arts and sports, eat the same food, interact with the same limited number of adult figures. This sameness in their lives creates a sense of community for them. However, this situation is only valid within the confines of Hailsham. If they ever get a real sense of what is going on in the outside world, they will actually start to feel like outcasts, because then they will have a chance to compare themselves, everyone at Hailsham, to a larger group of people, who are actually quite different from themselves in many ways. The guardians at Hailsham know this truth very well, so they try to limit the children's understanding of the world with Hailsham, imposing the idea that there is no alternative outside world, or that the whole universe is like Hailsham, or *is* Hailsham.

Throughout the novel, we see that this concealing process is quite successful. Students at Hailsham do not really question the outside world; they do not express their interest in or curiosity about it. No child ever tries to escape from the school or even go beyond the fences. Since they do not even know what is going on out there, they do not know what they are missing, or what they should be curious about, to begin with. Secondly, because they were born into Hailsham and raised there, it is easier for them to accept this limited reality as the sole reality. They take the reality presented to them for granted and naturally see it as the only reality possible; they simply do not know any better:

This might all sound daft, but you have to remember that to us, at that stage in our lives, any place beyond Hailsham was like a fantasy land; we had only the haziest notions of the world outside and about what was and wasn't possible there. (66)

The students' relationship with the outside world is so carefully controlled and mediated that even the books in their library, books about the outside world, are meticulously chosen:

There was even a rumour that some classic books – like the Sherlock Holmes ones – weren't in our library because the main characters smoked too much, and when you came across a page torn out of an illustrated book or magazine, this was because there'd been a picture on it of someone smoking. (67)

Another important thing to note about life in Hailsham is that it does not provide students with any sort of personal space, which they appear to be in need of. Kathy, for instance, invents a game for herself in order to compensate for this lack of personal space; dreaming of a family life instead of a communal life:

In those days I had this secret game. When I found myself alone, I'd stop and look for a view – out of a window, say, or through a doorway into a room – any view so long as there were no people in it. I did this so that I could, for a few seconds at least, create the illusion the place wasn't crawling with students, but that instead Hailsham was this quiet, tranquil house where I lived with just five or six others. (88)

This can be named as the simulation of personal space within a simulation of a communal life. This seems like Kathy's counter attack to the artificially created life and environment she is presented with.

We can say that however idyllic Hailsham might seem, the sense that something is not quite normal or natural slowly infiltrates the students' minds, perceived by them in bits and pieces. Guo (2015) states:

Hailsham is the only homely and comfortable 'home' for the clones where they study, play, and grow up together. As the plot develops, Hailsham produces uncanny and unhomely feelings as an enforced colonization. (3)

It turns out that the whole carefully cultivated childhood at Hailsham has the sole purpose of raising healthy donors for the bigger system.

Snaza (2015) suggests that through Hailsham, Ishiguro critiques the Western idea and tradition claiming that education is what makes us human; a tradition he calls as "humanizing education" (215). That is why Hailsham focuses so much on children's education, especially aesthetic education. However, this process of humanizing ultimately fails and in Snaza's words, the clones become "en-souled non-humans" (217). The very act of "humanization" entails the idea that the clones were not human to begin with and that they are being guided through this process of becoming human by their guardians. "The tame animal/man/clone is tamed by producing in it a soul—a singularity, yes, but one caught within, and impossible without, a whole machinery of control" (226).

Hailsham, being the centre of the "machinery of control", also uses fear to exert its power on the students. Right here, it might be a good idea to look at Hailsham from Baudrillard's notion of "the system of deterrence". Imposing or fuelling fear in the minds of people to preserve and protect the simulation is a topic that Baudrillard frequently mentions in his book. In the sub-section called "The Orbital and the Nuclear" in the first chapter, Baudrillard suggests that fear is used in service of a system of deterrence. This system of deterrence turns fear into a spectacle in order to be able to influence masses. Wars, social/political crises and the media are all parts of this system of deterrence. The masses are not afraid of a real threat of a nuclear bomb, but of the ever-present system of deterrence that fuels the fear of the nuclear in their minds. In the chapter "The China Syndrome", Baudrillard suggests that the system of deterrence puts us in a mentality that actually longs and hopes for the explosion; let the explosion actually happen so that we can get rid of

this threatening idea of explosion and its power of deterrence, this panic we associate with the threat. The politics of fear, of inducing terror in people, relies on this ever-existent possibility of a nuclear disaster. Atomic bombs and nuclear plants are devices of deterrence. It is wiser to manipulate this idea of deterrence instead of creating a real disaster; in other words, the simulation of disaster rather than the real disaster.

Such a system of deterrence also exists at Hailsham. Part of the reason that children never even think of going beyond the fences of Hailsham, as we have mentioned above, is that they have heard stories of children who tried it before. These stories are horrifying, even gothic and grotesque. They are like narratives of verbal tradition in this micro-folklore, passed on among generations of students:

There were all kinds of horrible stories about the woods. (...) The guardians always insisted these stories were nonsense. But then the older students would tell us that was exactly what the guardians had told them when they were younger, and that we'd be told the ghastly truth soon enough, just as they were. (50)

An important question here is whether these stories are fabricated by the guardians at Hailsham or by the students themselves. If they are fabricated by the guardians, it is easy to see the motive: to scare children in order to keep them within the fences of Hailsham. However, if they are fabricated by the students themselves, the motives look more unsettling: By inventing such horrible stories themselves, the students are probably trying to validate their confinement in Hailsham. Such stories give them a strong reason to remain inside and not to go beyond the limits. They are actually applying the system of deterrence to themselves. Moreover, their fabricating of such stories also shows the surfacing of their subconscious fear about the real world in the form of verbal narratives, and their gaze towards the outside world as the unknown never to be explored.

Within this system of control and of deterrence, Miss Lucy stands out as an important figure because she appears to be a character working against the system within the system. She has a significant influence on the main characters even though she appears only briefly in the novel. She is a new teacher at Hailsham, who eventually becomes emotionally overwhelmed by the condition of the students and

her own position within the system. She then attempts to undermine the system by making the students of Hailsham more conscious about the nature of their existence.

Her first important influence is on Tommy. Hailsham encourages its students to produce artwork and express themselves through art. However, this is not just constructive encouragement; it is more like an imposed, forced idea that suggests that producing good art is somewhat compulsory in this school, to the point that students like Tommy, who do not regard their artwork as competent enough, feel insufficient and incomplete. When Tommy's artwork is seen as childish and mocked by other students, he develops this defence mechanism of suggesting that his artwork is deliberately childish as a stylistic preference. Miss Lucy understands Tommy's insecurity and tries to soothe him. She says that while producing artwork is good, Tommy should not feel like he has to produce artwork and it is completely alright if his artwork is not really good or satisfactory. This point of view surprises Tommy because it is something totally contrasting the mainstream imposition. However, it also relaxes him a lot. He tells Kathy that Miss Lucy's statements have really helped him deal with his teenage angst and his sense of insufficiency:

‘A couple of months back, I had this talk with Miss Lucy. And I felt much better afterwards. It's hard to explain. But she said something, and it all felt much better. (...) Well... The thing is, it might sound strange. It did to me at first. What she said was that if I didn't want to be creative, if I really didn't feel like it, that was perfectly all right. Nothing wrong with it, she said.’ (23)

Miss Lucy's biggest counter-strike against the system comes when she confronts the students of Hailsham with the true nature of their existence one day. She facilitates this confrontation because she knows that the students were not told enough or that they do not fully understand, as evidenced by what Kathy says about their childhood:

Thinking back now, I can see we were just at that age when we knew 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)

We certainly knew – though not in any deep sense – that we were different from our guardians, and also from the normal people outside; we perhaps even knew that a long way down the line there were donations waiting for us. But we didn't really know what that meant. If we were keen to avoid certain

topics, it was probably more because it *embarrassed* us. (69) (emphasis in original)

Students somewhat know about who they are but they are not really able to analyse and fully grasp this information, and they are afraid and intimidated to question any further. The simulated, hyperreal nature of their existence becomes their reality and now that they do not have a thorough sense of another, alternative reality to compare to their own, they cannot truly see the artificiality of their world and are unsettled about the idea of a quest for reality. If they should find out that reality is actually much different from their condition, this revelation will render their whole life a lie. Miss Lucy facilitates this painful confrontation: She tells the students that they *are* actually very different from the people outside, that they will not have lives like them, that their destinies are pre-decided for them by others. The reason she makes these shocking revelations is that she thinks the students can only live in dignity if they actually have a real understanding of their existence.

‘If no one else will talk to you,’ she continued, ‘then I will. The problem, as I see it, is that you’ve been told and not told. You’ve been told, but none of you really understand, and I dare say, some people are quite happy to leave it that way. But I’m not. If you’re going to have decent lives, then you’ve got to know and know properly. (...) 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 were brought into this world for a purpose, and your futures, all of them, have been decided. (...) You need to remember that. If you’re to have decent lives, you have to know who you are and what lies ahead of you, every one of you.’ (79-80)

However, interestingly, Miss Lucy’s revelations do not have this enormous, stormy, transformative effect on the students. They react like they already knew whatever she tells them and are not moved much. This reaction of indifference is quite important. Yes, the students already knew what Miss Lucy tells them but the important thing is not what they know, but how this information was presented to them in the first place and how it was perceived by them. They were probably introduced to the truth like it was the only truth imaginable for them, like it was the most natural thing. If the difference between them and the outside people was strongly underlined, if they were made aware that their lives were written out for

them and that they had no other choice, if their lack of free will and autonomy was emphasized, would the children still be as indifferent and unmoved by Miss Lucy's revelations? The children are carefully and systematically accustomed to the reality of Hailsham since the beginning of their lives, so it is hard for them to even imagine an alternative reality, or to challenge the reality presented to them.

Even though her revelations do not really work on the students, we learn that Miss Lucy is nevertheless fired from her job. Even a mild threat, a mere challenge to the existence of the simulation is rendered ineffective by the system; firstly through the naive indifference of the students, and then through the institutional punishment coming from the administration of the school. This pessimistic and dystopian process signifies that once the system of simulation takes over completely and is thoroughly internalized by all the members of a community, it is actually very hard to work against this system, even though one shows a very deliberate, conscious and overt effort.

The childhood experiences of the students at Hailsham are quite revelatory about the upsetting incidents that will follow. Hailsham is only the beginning because the main problem in their lives is that they are clones, a fact that will always be with them and that is known by everyone in the outside world. The experiences at Hailsham are just the first fragments of the treatment of clones in the larger system. As the difference between the clones and the "real" people becomes more emphasized in the novel, we observe the examination of the notions of cloning and the clone becoming more evident. Cloning is a topic that Baudrillard also focuses on in his book, so we might refer to what he says first before delving deeper into the novel's examination of the topic. Baudrillard states: "There is a precession of reproduction over production, a precession of the genetic model over all possible bodies" (69). Cloning is probably the most extreme form of simulation one may think of, a human being replicating a human being, a simulation directed towards one's own kind, towards the human body, mind and soul. This is probably why Baudrillard devotes a whole chapter of his book to cloning and why human cloning is a big taboo in today's world.

The main characters of *Never Let Me Go*, along with every student of Hailsham, are the products of this “precession” that Baudrillard talks about; they are clones reproduced from genetic models. Hailsham is one of many institutions established to raise these cloned children isolated from the rest of the society. But what is the motivation behind creating clones? Before examining the motivations in the novel, we must first refer to Baudrillard. In the chapter “Holograms”, Baudrillard claims that “seizing reality live” (72) has been an ongoing fantasy throughout history; the fantasy of immobilizing and suspending reality. “We dream of passing through ourselves and of finding ourselves in the beyond” (72). However, in *Never Let Me Go*, cloning is not motivated by such a transcendental aim of going beyond the limits of time and mortal existence. It is not a purely scientific endeavour motivated by curiosity, either. In the novel, cloning has a very down-to-earth, practical, pragmatist motivation: to harvest organs and to utilize them in the treatment of previously incurable diseases. It is the age of manipulation. As Baudrillard states, “People have the desire to take everything, to pillage everything, to swallow everything, to manipulate everything. Seeing, deciphering, learning does not touch them. The only massive affect is that of manipulation” (48). This utilitarian approach which is also presented in the novel disregards all ethical questions regarding the existence of clones and their life conditions. And if such concerns are verbalised, the system counter-attacks them by arguments like “Now, we can cure cancer!” This counter-attack is also a part of the system of deterrence that Baudrillard mentions.

Baudrillard states that:

Nothing resembles itself, and holographic reproduction, like all fantasies of the exact synthesis or resurrection of the real (this also goes for scientific experimentation), is already no longer real, is already hyperreal. It thus never has reproductive (truth) value, but always already simulation value. (73-74)

However, the cloners in the novel do not ponder on the nature of the clones; whether they can be regarded as real human beings. Their possible answer to this question would probably be no, but the question is simply not focused on to begin with. Therefore, even if the answer would be yes, they would probably still go along with

the project. The main focus is not on ethicality or on the philosophy of cloning, but it is on practicality and utility.

This brings us to a more horrifying implication: Cloners can actually claim ownership of the bodies of the clones. They deny the clones' bodily autonomy and see their bodies as artificial creations that can be used and abused. The cloners are basically playing God and they see the clones as their own creations upon whom they have the right of utter control and domination. This has wider connotations regarding fate and determinism, and the effects of these notions on life, free will and autonomy, which we will talk about later.

Another important thing to note about the practical mindset of the cloners is that they could have actually done other things than cloning. They could have conducted medical research in order to find cures for incurable diseases. They could have worked on new types of medicine or treatment procedures. Or at least they could have focused on therapeutic cloning instead of reproductive cloning; cloning whole organisms and bringing them into existence. The reason they chose this right away is probably that it is the most convenient solution. When you move beyond the threshold of ethics and focus solely on convenience, the process works much faster without obstacles.

The whole cloning project starts with the aim of curing previously incurable diseases via organ donations coming from the clones. The idea proves effective and this is the reason why the project becomes successful and remains in use. As time progresses, people start expressing vague concerns about the status of clones but at this point, it is too late. Once people start regarding fatal diseases as curable, it becomes impossible to ask them to stop cloning and go back to the old days. In order to preserve the cloning system, people feel the need to justify it ethically in their minds. This leads to mental suppression and denial. People do not really think about where all these donated organs come from. Even if they do, they regard the clones as less than human; they regard them as different beings from themselves. The system manages to preserve itself thanks to this mechanism of mental manipulation.

While talking about cloning in relation to humanness, we might also refer to what Baudrillard says about the relationship between cloning and human sexuality.

Baudrillard touches upon the implications of replacing sexual reproduction with cloning. He suggests that this attempt denies and annihilates sexuality, denies alteration for the sake of recreation of the same, and is the result of “a death drive” (66). We can observe such implications and their effects on the clones in *Never Let Me Go*. Firstly, because the clones in the novel are not the products of sexual reproduction, they do not have any parents or families. However, interestingly and tragically, they still feel the psychological need for these notions in their childhood. They regard the guardians in the school as parental figures; an example of psychological substitution. Like children do towards their parents, the students of Hailsham have this unconditional, uncritical fondness towards the guardians at the school. They do not even stop to think whether they actually like them or not; it is default: “‘Do you like Miss Geraldine?’ It might have been the first time I’d actually thought about whether I liked a guardian. In the end I said: ‘Of course I like her’” (47).

We see Ruth claiming that she was given a pencil case by Miss Geraldine as a special gift. This claim is much probably a wishful fantasy invented by Ruth, emphasizing her longing for a sense of being special for a parental figure. Kathy implicitly tries to question the reality of Ruth’s claim but regrets it immediately, empathizing with Ruth soon after and understanding her motives for such a fabricated fantasy:

So what if she’d fibbed a little about her pencil case? Didn’t we all dream from time to time about one guardian or other bending the rules and doing something special for us? A spontaneous hug, a secret letter, a gift? All Ruth had done was to take one of these harmless daydreams a step further; she hadn’t even mentioned Miss Geraldine by name. (60)

The students also have a fascinated attitude towards the mysterious figure of Madame, who visits Hailsham from time to time. However, Madame actually has a very cold and distanced attitude towards the students:

She wouldn’t talk to us and kept us at a distance with her chilly look. For years we thought of her as ‘snooty’, but then one night, around when we were eight, Ruth came up with another theory. ‘She’s scared of us,’ she declared. (32-33)

In another section, when Madame visits Hailsham, children gather around her in order to exact an emotional response from her. When she responds with a cold, even frightened attitude towards them, they become heavily traumatized to find that Ruth's theory about her was actually right:

At a signal from Ruth we all sauntered out, moving straight for her, but like we were all in a dream. Only when she came to a stiff halt did we each murmur: 'Excuse me, Miss,' and separate. (...) As she came to a halt, I glanced quickly at her face – as did the others, I'm sure. And I can still see it now, the shudder she seemed to be suppressing, the real dread that one of us would accidentally brush against her. (...) Ruth had been right: Madame *was* afraid of us. But she was afraid of us in the same way someone might be afraid of spiders. We hadn't been ready for that. It had never occurred to us to wonder how *we* would feel, being seen like that, being the spiders. (35) (emphasis in original)

Children at Hailsham never get to own the real notions of family, parents or siblings but they still feel the need for these notions. To compensate for the non-existence of these notions, they produce new signs. In other words, they create simulations of a family in a simulated setting, underlining the fact that natural needs are always there and nature finds a way.

Apart from these familial/parental issues, clones also have a problematic relation to sexuality. They are produced as infertile beings, so in addition to lacking parents, they themselves will never be able to become parents. They were not the result of sexual reproduction and they cannot sexually reproduce. A tragic passage in the novel showing Kathy listening to the song called "Never Let Me Go" illustrates the traumatic effect of this forced infertility on the students:

I just waited for that bit that went: 'Baby, baby, never let me go...' And what I'd imagine was a woman who'd been told she couldn't have babies, who'd really, really wanted them all her life. Then there's a sort of miracle and she has a baby, and she holds this baby very close to her and walks around singing: 'Baby, never let me go...' partly because she's so happy, but also because she's so afraid something will happen, that the baby will get ill or be taken away from her. (70)

One day, while Kathy is listening to this song and holding a pillow like a baby to her breast, Madame sees her and starts crying, without saying anything to her. When

Kathy tells this event to Tommy, he easily figures out that the reason for Madame's crying is that they, the clones, can never really have babies:

Madame's probably not a bad person, even though she's creepy. So when she saw you dancing like that, holding your baby, she thought it was really tragic, how you couldn't have babies. That's why she started crying. (72-73)

For the clones, sexuality can only mean a pleasurable activity and nothing more, not creation of life. After Hailsham, during their young adult ages, we can see couples among clones, like Chrissie and Rodney or Ruth and Tommy. However, they generally have a more trivial attitude towards sex, and if one student wants to sleep with another, he/she just asks the other one in a manner similar to asking them to have dinner together. Sex does not necessarily mean an emotional attachment or a long-term commitment. It does not necessarily have the undertones of becoming a couple or some sort of a family. It is simply an activity, a bodily urge. As Roos (2008) observes, "The narrative is strewn with almost casual references to sexual encounters, and starting at a remarkably young age, between the Hailsham pupils. It is also emphasised how thorough, yet clinical, their sex education had been" (50). Kathy's observations at the Cottages demonstrate the clones' attitude to sex:

When someone wanted sex with you, that too was much more straightforward. A boy would come up and ask if you wanted to spend the night in his room 'for a change', something like that, it was no big deal. Sometimes it was because he was interested in becoming a couple with you; other times it was just for a one-nighter. (125)

On the other hand, sex also means a challenge for the clones. It is like a task of self-affirmation in order to feel more normal, as we observe it in Kathy's thoughts: "...as that summer approached, I began to feel more and more the odd one out. In a way, sex had got like 'being creative' had been a few years earlier. It felt like if you hadn't done it yet, you ought to, and quickly" (95-96).

The analogy Kathy establishes between creativity and sex here is important. Both of these are regarded as normal, natural human urges that one does not have to put a conscious or forced effort into. However, in the world of the clones, they are notions imposed on them from the outside. They feel the obligation to be creative when they are children and to have sex when they are young adults. To this end,

natural human phenomena become simulated, artificially recreated and imposed on them in their world.

Apart from all these problems arising from the fact that the characters are clones, we also need to focus on the commodification of their bodies. We can say that in *Never Let Me Go*, the bodies and the organs of the clones are turned into commodities. We do not know whether patients needing vital organ donations actually have to pay money in order to have those organs but it is not a remote possibility. After all, the organs are taken from living clones and there must be many patients needing organ donations, so the idea of monetary compensation seems probable. Whether money is involved or not, it does not change the fact that the bodies are commodified because the clones are reduced to mere bodies and sets of organs to be used when necessary. As Roos (2008) puts it, “Organ trafficking presents the triumph of a very specific form of capitalism” (52). Marks (2010) also states that “the cloned characters in Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go* stand as a warning against the brutal instrumentalization of human life” (343).

Regarding hypermarket, Baudrillard states: “[P]eople go there to find and to select objects - responses to all the questions they may ask themselves” (52). The situation is more or less the same at a metaphorical level in *Never Let Me Go*. The question is, “How can we cure all these incurable diseases?” And the easiest response to this question is the organs coming from the clones. In that sense, centres for clones are not very much different from Baudrillard’s hypermarket: They produce and raise clones, they commodify their bodies, they serve the customer needs through their organs, and they answer all their questions with a simple solution.

Within this commodifying mindset, the clones are reduced to a collection of organs in order to justify the (forced) process of organ transfer. Wasson (2015) claims that throughout history, there have been mainly four types of metaphors used for transfer tissue:

All the three foregoing metaphors – transfer tissue as machine parts, transfer tissue as waste, and transfer tissue as greenery – dehumanise the tissue to be transferred, but the final metaphor – ‘organ as gift’ – preserves a sense of human identity in the tissue. Instead of seeing human tissue as alienable, the language of ‘gift’ sees tissue as something that retains traces of the giver, both tangible and intangible. The language of ‘gift’ can feel threatening to a

recipient, occasionally triggering significant survivor guilt and, rarely, an element of identity crisis. Transplant professionals try to reduce the demand of the gift by dehumanising the donor through the other metaphors above. (110)

In *Never Let Me Go*, we do not have a single passage showing a relationship between a donor and a recipient. Actually, recipients are never there, never present, because their world is far away from, and above, the world of the donors. Even though we never hear the voice of the recipients in the novel, or perhaps because of this very lack of voice, we can infer that they choose to remain silent and indifferent about the situation of the clones. They do not want to confront their donors, they do not even wish to thank them for their gifts. The mechanism of suppression mentioned by Wasson above occurs in the novel as well. In order to feel good about the forced donations they receive, the recipients choose to ignore the existence of the donors, ignore the fact that the organs are actually coming from complete, living, human bodies. They probably choose to apply to the other metaphors of “machine parts”, “waste” or “greenery”, in the sense that organs are “harvested” from the “artificially created” and “dispensable” donors, because this approach can validate their view that the donors are less human than human.

To suppress the ethical questions and problems that come with the process of commodification, the society in the novel even goes as far as creating euphemisms in relation to matters related to the clones. Instead of “clones” they use “donors”, instead of “organ harvesting” they use “donation”, as if the process was voluntary on the part of the clones. They use “recovery centres” for the hospitals where the donors try to survive after each donation. Lastly, and most strikingly, they use the verb “complete” instead of “die” when a donor cannot survive a donation. Such euphemisms may at first seem like a clumsy attempt at kindness but at closer inspection, one can easily see that they only serve the purpose of clearing conscience. To this end, as Wasson (2015) states, “In Ishiguro’s novel, the gift rhetoric is wholly disingenuous: ‘donors’ have no choice in harvest and no option to refuse, and their bodies are seen as both wholly abject and wholly disposable” (115). What is probably more tragic is that even the clones internalize these metaphors of “machine

parts” or “waste” about their bodies and organs, just like Ruth, who says that they are modelled on “trash” (164).

The mentality of commodification and commercialization appears in the novel in other forms as well, much before the donations. We can examine the Sales and the Exchanges at Hailsham, for example. At regular intervals, Hailsham organizes these events for the students, where they can go and buy new items for themselves with tokens given to them or exchange items with other students. Why do such events exist at all, when all the essential needs of the students are taken care of by the school? They exist to give a sense of individuality to these students. Their life is a totally communal life, so they resemble each other. However, the objects they buy at the Sales or the Exchanges become unique to them, differentiating them from the others. To this end, commercial practices try to compensate for the loss of individuality and self-identity, providing some sense of fulfilment, personal freedom and ownership. That’s probably why children get excited whenever there is a Sale or an Exchange, as Kathy states:

Looking back now, I can see why the Exchanges became so important to us. For a start, they were our only means, aside from the Sales (...) of building up a collection of personal possessions. (...) I can see now, too, how the Exchanges had a more subtle effect on us all. If you think about it, being dependent on each other to produce the stuff that might become your private treasures – that’s bound to do things to your relationships. (16)

They always have this hope of finding something different, something special that will add some uniqueness to their identity. Kathy, for example, finds a tape called “Songs After the Dark” by a fictional singer named Judy Bridgewater and she especially gets emotionally stimulated by the song “Never Let Me Go” in that tape. The tape and the song open up a personal space for Kathy. Whenever she has the opportunity to be alone, with no one around, she listens to the song and dances to it, thinking about her life and imagining a future for herself, even going as far as thinking she will have a baby and she will never let it go. Again, if we go back to Baudrillard, we see the same mechanism of question and response. The question on the part of the clones is, “Who am I? What makes me, me?” The response partly comes from these objects bought at the sales and it somehow compensates for their

lack of individuality. Through the song, Kathy can enjoy solitude and dreaming, even if she will have to go back to the communal life after. She can imagine having a baby, even if she is not biologically able to have one. That is why when she loses the tape, Kathy feels extremely upset. Still, she does not want her friends to know her feelings about this loss. She wants it to remain a personal secret and revealing it would be embarrassing for her.

I suppose it had something to do with it being a secret, just how much it had meant to me. Maybe all of us at Hailsham had little secrets like that – little private nooks created out of thin air where we could go off alone with our fears and longings. But the very fact that we had such needs would have felt wrong to us at the time – like somehow we were letting the side down. (73)

When Ruth tries to compensate for this sense of loss Kathy experiences, she buys her another tape, thinking that the new one can easily make up for the old one. Kathy feels disappointed but is still very much thankful to Ruth, looking at the situation from her perspective. Then, when they grow up and visit Norfolk, Kathy and Tommy go on a search for the same tape there and they actually find it. However, upon the discovery, Kathy sees things under a new light: “And now it was there in front of me, there was something vaguely embarrassing about the tape, like it was something I should have grown out of” (170). Still, she has this nostalgic and warm attitude towards the newly found tape: “Even then, it was mainly a nostalgia thing, and today, if I happen to get the tape out and look at it, it brings back memories of that afternoon in Norfolk every bit as much as it does our Hailsham days” (171).

It is also important to note that several writers have established an analogy between the Sales/the Exchanges and the organ donations, from the perspective of commodification. Most notably, Rollins (2015) states that:

Through his depiction of the clones’ experience, Ishiguro demonstrates how the principles of gift exchange can be perversely appropriated by the practice of commodification. This perversion of gift exchange is one of the primary strategies used to condition the clones to accept their fate. (351)

The clones are accustomed to a culture of gifts since their childhood in order to condition them into accepting the ultimate “gift” expected from them; their organs. The Sales and the Exchanges, and all the artwork produced by the students serve this purpose. Rollins (2015) states: “The system the guardians establish for the

production and consumption of the students' art trains the clones to view gifts as commodities" (352). This gift-commodity equation, in turn, also conditions them to view their own bodies as commodities, because they are supposed to give their organs as gifts to other people. Rollins further states: "This absurd parody of a market economy transforms potential gift exchange into the act of buying and selling" (353). Organs are commodities "produced" by clone donors to be "consumed" by normal people. Even being a carer before donations serves the same purpose of commodification; caring becomes a gift for the donors. This is probably why Kathy feels some sort of self-fulfilment because of being a carer; she thinks that she is giving a valuable gift to her donors. However, all these gifts in the novel cannot be regarded as genuine gifts, because clones never choose to become carers or to donate their organs with their free will. Rollins accepts that these acts of gift exchange might also serve the purpose of giving clones a sense of agency and freedom, but he thinks that this can only be a secondary effect of the system. The main aim is to make clones accept their future by social conditioning: "Through the commodification of their art, the children learn, not only to accept, but to embrace the fact that their most personal possessions can be sold on the market" (353-354). Rizq (2014) also establishes an analogy between these acts of gift exchange and donations:

The 'Exchanges' that take place between students four times a year – mirroring the four 'donations' that they will all be expected to make before 'completing' – involve 'buying' each other's paintings and sculptures made from old bits of trash and garbage such as bottle tops and crushed tin cans: a recycling of personal possessions that foreshadows the future recycling of their own body parts. (520)

After talking about Hailsham as a place of simulations and cloning as an act of simulation, we need to focus more deeply on their effects on the main characters and how the characters experience an identity crisis in the atmosphere they are living in. Before delving into the identity crisis, it might be useful to refer to Baudrillard's statements about cloning again. In the chapter "Clone Story", Baudrillard suggests that a body/whole loses its meaning if it can be identically recreated through a combination of its parts (67). This signifies that what gives meaning to a being is its

uniqueness; the inability to reproduce it. To this end, cloning erases the meaning of the body and this, of course, has consequences. Interestingly, we do not see its effects on the “models”, people whom the clones were modelled on. What would one feel like when he/she sees a completely identical reproduction of himself/herself? Would they feel a sense of loss of identity, individuality and uniqueness? Then, as a reaction to such feelings, would they regard their cloned versions as inferior to themselves or less human than themselves, as a type of defence mechanism? We do not have answers to these questions in the novel because there is never a single confrontation between a model and his/her clone. This is probably because it is the clone’s novel, not the model’s. The narrator is a clone and the narrative is focused on the experience of the clone. Therefore, even if we do not have the perspective of the model, we do have the perspective of the clone.

The clones constantly question their identity and their humanness throughout the novel, implicitly and explicitly. The idea of being someone else pervades the clones’ lives. At an early age, they know the fact that they are clones and that one day they will donate their organs, although they cannot really approach this information from a critical or deconstructive perspective. They accept the reality presented to them as it is, as a given. They also naturally feel different from “normal” people; they feel like “the other”.

The feeling of being the other is most emphasized when the main characters leave Hailsham, move to the Cottages and start interacting with the real world. Even if they are young adults now, it is notable that they still have an ambivalent and hesitant approach towards the condition of their existence. They still feel insecure about having confrontations with the realities of their lives:

By that time in our lives, we no longer shrank from the subject of donations as we’d have done a year or two earlier; but neither did we think about it very seriously, or discuss it. (...) If anything, the donations went back to being a subject to be avoided, but not in the way it had been when we were younger. This time round it wasn’t awkward or embarrassing anymore; just sombre and serious. (86-87)

It is like every person’s approach to their own life and death: We all know very certainly that our existence is limited and that we are going to die some day, but we

do not really give it a serious thought, or we do not face it as a very clear fact, which would make living impossible or at least unbearable.

In addition to this hesitance, there is also fear; fear of exploring the outside world. Up until then, their reality was limited to Hailsham and it now seems naturally scary to get to know a bigger reality. Even if they now have more freedom and a better sense of the real world, they do not quite know how to deal with it:

Of course, in practice, especially during the first months, we rarely stepped beyond the confines of the Cottages. (...) I don't think we were afraid exactly. (...) You have to remember that until that point we'd never been beyond the grounds of Hailsham, and we were just bewildered. (116)

Getting adjusted to the real world, to more freedom (of even movement), takes a lot of time for them. Kathy becomes surprised at herself when she thinks that she has turned into a person who takes long walks and who drives a car when she becomes a carer. Even if Kathy denies that they were afraid, soon after, she confesses the fear factor and the shame it brings along:

But then again, when I think about it, there's a sense in which that picture of us on that first day, huddled together in front of the farmhouse, isn't so incongruous after all. Because maybe, in a way, we didn't leave it behind nearly as much as we might once have thought. Because somewhere underneath, a part of us stayed like that: fearful of the world around us, and – no matter how much we despised ourselves for it – unable quite to let each other go. (118)

Apart from the feelings of hesitance and fear, there is also a lot of anxiety in the characters when they are in the outside world. They desperately try to look normal and relevant to the world. This brings a process of identity (re)construction, which is portrayed as an artificial and traumatic process. They steal sentences and mannerisms from TV shows, because they think real people act like the people on TV. They laugh at jokes they do not really relate to. Such acts bring us to the concept of “life as a performance” and to this end, it would not be wrong to compare the trio of friends in *Never Let Me Go* to the actors working at the theme park in *England, England*. Through their newly-adopted behaviours and manners, through their “performances”, the characters in *Never Let Me Go* also metaphorically turn into actors because they try hard to fit in and not stand out. The whole process can be

regarded as a teenage-angst-fuelled, painful coming-of-age period. Storrow (2009) explains this situation as such:

When they emerge more and more into the outside world, they seem always to be on the periphery. (...) They pass as humans and in the very act of passing are terrified that they will be discovered and rejected as not qualifying as human in some unarticulated but essential way. (269-270)

The angst is about moving from the periphery to the center, and the ticket for this journey is role-play, the invention or fabrication of a new identity. Rizq (2014) suggests that the conditions clones live in somehow “force” them into acts of imitation:

Ishiguro’s interest in simulation reaches an apotheosis in *Never Let Me Go*, where the children are not only copies or clones, their very existence is predicated on imitation. Without parents, they have no alternative but to conform unquestioningly to the rules and mores of Hailsham. Without friends or family in the outside world, they are forced to understand others and make relationships by copying the behaviour, mannerisms and gestures of each other and from those they watch on TV. (524)

Because they do not have any real biological or social connections to the real world, which they can utilize in shaping their identities, they attempt to do that through observation, inference and imitation. However, Rizq also draws attention to the insufficiency of this attempt:

[W]e might say that we all clone ourselves from one another, borrowing or stealing bits and pieces of each other like a jackdaw to build a self, or an ego, within. But, as Kathy comes to realize, (...) copying alone is not enough. We must be more than our identifications; we must create something new around the internal residue, the kernel of the other. (528)

At the Cottages, Kathy gets the chance to observe other clone youngsters. An important observation is about identity theft:

There was, incidentally, something I noticed about these veteran couples at the Cottages – something Ruth, for all her close study of them, failed to spot – and this was how so many of their mannerisms were copied from the television. (118)

While Kathy has this distanced, critical approach towards the behaviour of the other clones, Ruth tries very hard to be like them. She observes them in order to behave like them because she is the one who is most anxious to feel and look normal among

the three main characters of the novel. Ruth develops the gesture of slapping Tommy's arm as a way of saying goodbye, a gesture she copies from the veterans, who have copied it from the TV. The simulation of a simulation. When Tommy fails to go along with this play, Ruth gets anxious and even furious:

Mind you, at first, Tommy didn't have a clue what was going on, and would turn abruptly to Ruth and go: 'What?', so that she'd have to glare furiously at him, like they were in a play and he'd forgotten his lines. I suppose she eventually had a word with him, because after a week or so they were managing to do it right, more or less exactly like the veteran couples. (119)

Kathy actually confronts Ruth about this mannerism, asking her why she does that. Ruth refuses doing it and when Kathy insists that she does, Ruth seems indifferent, saying she was not aware of it. Kathy, however, does not want to let the issue go: "It's not something worth copying,' I told her. 'It's not what people really do out there, in normal life, if that's what you were thinking.' (...) 'So what?' she said. 'It's no big deal. A lot of us do it'" (121). From Ruth's perspective, she is the one that has better adapted to change and Kathy is the one that has got stuck in the past. Getting furious because of the confrontation coming from Kathy, Ruth strikes back, saying that Kathy is jealous because Ruth has moved on, made new friends and adjusted to a new life better than Kathy.

Ruth's desperate attempt to become somebody else, a totally new person, creates two different Ruths in Kathy's mind; one who always tries to impress the veterans by pretending, and the other who becomes sincere again when she is alone with Kathy. Kathy loves the latter Ruth but later on, she comes to an understanding about the former one too:

Sometimes, as I said, she did things to impress the veterans at our expense. But it seems to me Ruth believed, at some level, she was doing all this *on behalf of us all*. (...) She was struggling to become someone else, and maybe felt the pressure more than the rest of us because, as I say, she'd somehow taken on the responsibility for all of us. (127-128) (emphasis in original)

Another thing that disturbs Kathy about Ruth's behaviour is that Ruth deliberately tries to give the impression that she has totally forgotten about their Hailsham days: "And then there was the way Ruth kept pretending to forget things about Hailsham. Okay, these were mostly trivial things, but I got more and more

irritated with her” (186-187). Whenever Kathy mentions a memory from Hailsham, not in order to test Ruth but simply because she remembers it and wants to share it, Ruth looks at her blankly as if she remembers nothing. Kathy lets her get away with it but in one instance, she gets furious and confronts Ruth about it, to no avail. Kathy’s fury results from her disappointment in Ruth but also, as Jerng (2008) suggests, “Kathy interprets Ruth’s reaction as a performance for the veterans, but what causes her anxiety is that her own experience is not mirrored in someone else and so her sense of reality gains no support” (388). So maybe Kathy is expecting some sort of validation from Ruth and when she cannot receive it, she becomes furious. As Jerng puts it, “Memories are not simply one’s own; they are filtered through others, so we begin to remember through others” (388).

Another aspect of life as a performance lies in the fact that every role clones take on during their lives are pre-assigned by the system and they have to abide by these roles and perform accordingly. Firstly, they have the role of the student, then of the carer, and lastly of the donor. Everything is set out beforehand, and they simply go through these familiar stages. To this end, even if the characters do not choose to perform or put acts like in the case of Ruth, they have to perform according to the roles assigned to them by the system.

While discussing the identity crisis that the characters experience, we also need to touch upon the fact that there are actual people out there whom the clones were modelled on. The clones know this and they always have a semi-conscious desire to find their models, or at least the tendency to wonder about them. They seem to think that if they see their models, they might have a better understanding of their own existence and their future. Therefore, there is always this inevitable urge to find out one’s model, as explained by Kathy:

Then there were those questions about why we wanted to track down our models at all. One big idea behind finding your model was that when you did, you’d glimpse your future. (...) We all realised it wasn’t that simple. Nevertheless, we all of us, to varying degrees, believed that when you saw the person you were copied from, you’d get some insight into who you were deep down, and maybe too, you’d see something of what your life held in store. (...) ...whenever we heard reports of a possible – whoever it was for – we couldn’t help getting curious. (137-138)

For the clones, then, the models represent some sort of a mirror, one they could look at in order to see their own reflection and have a better sense of their existence. Jerng (2008) suggests that the clones' urge to look for possibles is

a working out of who they are through the belief that there is someone else who they are like. (...) The possible is not looked at as a point of origin or parent who imposes a prefabricated vision on the clone, but as a point of sameness who helps the clone negotiate who she is. (386-387)

Storrow (2009) has a different explanation: “[I]t is a human right for everyone to have access to information about their genetic origins because this fundamental part of our ongoing quest for identity is something that defines us as human” (269).

Marks (2010) suggests that we all have the same urge as the clones in the novel:

In a neat reversal of the Romantic *doppelgänger* as a sinister and fantastical harbinger of death, the pupils from Hailsham cultivate the hope that they might be able to locate their ‘possibles’, in other words the individuals from whom they were originally cloned. In this way, the novel might be read as an attempt to show that the clones are ‘like us’. We, too, are copiers, and their vain search for ‘possibles’ constitutes an affecting parallel with our own efforts to give narrative coherence to conventional biological kinship relations. (349)

This observation underlines the novel's underlying suggestion that the behaviours of clones which might be interpreted as peculiar or even inhuman at first glance are actually present in the lives of normal people as well. Rizq (2014) makes a similar explanation, creating an analogy between the lack of biological origins and the state of orphanhood:

Kathy's studiously bland voice disguises what is here an acute rendition of the orphan's desperate search for the lost parent. In the absence of a narrative of origins, of belonging, the children try to invent their pasts by speculating about the human model from which they believe they were made; in this way, they also create a narrative of the kind of life they have the potential to lead and the kind of person they would like to become. (521)

Both these arguments demonstrate how the novel blurs the boundary between the human (the original) and the clone (the copy), by showing that both groups have similar needs, urges and tendencies. Rizq (2014) also suggests that the “possibles” seem to be an affirmation for the clones, an affirmation of the importance and dignity of their own existence:

They are faced with the task of living a life in which they feel they have mislaid their origins and, in these circumstances, the ‘fictive pretext’ of the ‘possible’ is retained in order to sustain the notion that there was such an original: to maintain the idea that they are predicated on something – someone – with a more ontologically valuable interior, perhaps, that would render them more ‘real’, more significant in the world’s eyes. (525)

We can say that the novel challenges the notion that we can only verify and affirm our humanness through our biological origins. Should we think in a backward fashion focusing on our origins or in a forward fashion, focusing on experience and continuous identity-formation process? Rizq (2014) resolves this dilemma as such: “It is not the children’s biological relationship to the ‘possible’ that secures their status as human beings, but their capacity to create or invent the ‘possible’ out of need and desire” (530).

The crisis about the models reaches its peak when rumours of a possible for Ruth arise. Ruth and her friends go and inspect the place where this woman works and they find out that the woman is actually not very similar to Ruth. What seems like a pointless adventure taken on for the sake of curiosity for the others is an event that shatters Ruth completely. When Tommy calls the experience “a bit of fun”, Ruth gets furious: “‘A bit of fun for you maybe, Tommy,’ Ruth said coldly, still gazing straight ahead of her. ‘You wouldn’t think so if it was *your* possible we’d been looking for’” (163). (emphasis in original)

Ruth goes through a tantrum and verbally attacks the others. Seeing a possible, not even the actual model, has this huge effect on Ruth, because she confronts a possible “real” and this puts her in the position of the “simulated”. That woman over there, if she is the model, is the real being and to this end, Ruth has to be the fake, the recreation, the reproduction. Ruth ends her fervent speech by commenting on the sort of people she thinks the clones were modelled on:

‘...They don’t ever, *ever*, use people like that woman. (...) We’re not modelled from that sort... (...) We’re modelled from trash. Junkies, prostitutes, winos, tramps. Convicts, maybe, just so long as they aren’t psychos. That’s what we come from. (...) If you want to look for possibles, if you want to do it properly, then you look in the gutter. You look in rubbish bins. Look down the toilet, that’s where you’ll find where we all came from.’ (164) (emphasis in original)

Rizq (2014) explains Ruth's fury as such:

As they all leave the gallery, Ruth's disappointment and disillusion are palpable. The spell has been broken; the illusion fades. It is as if the subjunctive mood intrinsic to the value of the 'possible' has abruptly shifted into the present indicative, where its hypothetical status can be violently disconfirmed. (522)

Kathy also wonders about her model and secretly goes through porn magazines, looking carefully at all the faces of the models in an attempt to find her model in those magazines, and the reason she chooses to inspect those magazines in particular is that she has strong sexual desires that get extremely intense at certain times and from this, she figures that she might have been modelled on an overly sexual woman. After the experience with Ruth and her possible, Tommy figures out Kathy's attempt: "...I realised then, when Ruth came out with all that, I realised why you keep looking through those porn mags" (178). Upon this confrontation, Kathy gets quite emotional and somewhat unnerved, and responds with a collective confession: "Okay, there's no sense in it, (...) but we all do it, don't we? We all wonder about our model" (179). Maybe the models represent a lost reality longed for by the clones; something real and authentic that they feel they can hold onto in their simulated world, something they feel they can belong to in their detached existence. They are never able to experience this sense of belonging through the models, but can they experience it through other things? Characters firstly have a sense of belonging to Hailsham but they need to leave Hailsham when they grow up. After Hailsham, they seek belonging once again by forging sexual and romantic relationships or sibling-like friendships with one another. Then comes Norfolk as some sort of a promised land. However, whenever the characters do find a real sense of belonging for a while, they eventually have to lose it, let it go.

In the final analysis, how can we respond to the identity crisis experienced by these characters? Should we regard them fully human or less than human or somewhat different from human? Or, more importantly, how should they regard themselves? How should they find a place and purpose in this world that they are detached from, marked out from? How should they answer the question: "Who am I?" Storrow (2009) suggests:

Embracing Kathy's story forces us to conclude that human clones are every bit as human as the rest of us if only because their lives are likewise defined by love and loss and hope. If human dignity is indeed that special quality that makes us more than beasts yet less than gods, then Kathy's memoir demonstrates that even those who have a genetic inheritance from a single person possess it in equal degree. (270)

To this end, we might suggest that the novel is also a philosophical reflection on what makes a human "human". This discussion asks important questions about the human soul. And the question of whether clones can truly have souls in turn asks fundamental questions about the ethics of cloning. Before we talk about its ethics, it might be a good idea to examine the history of cloning in the real world.

Research on cloning goes as far back as to the early 20th century. Yang (2006) states: "Some of the earliest research that created clones was carried out by the great developmental biologist, Hans Spemann, in the early 1900s" (64). Spemann was able to produce twins from early amphibian embryos. From that time onwards, research on cloning through the use of early embryo cells continued until the idea of using somatic cells came up. Yang (2006) draws attention to the groundbreaking role of Dolly: "Somatic cell nuclear transplantation (SCNT) (...) became an additional method of cloning once Wilmut and colleagues had shown that it could be done successfully by producing Dolly the sheep" (65). On the attention that Dolly attracted, McKinnell & Di Berardino (1999) comment: "[B]ecause Dolly was the first animal cloned from an *adult* cell, she stimulated scientists, theologians, ethicists, journalists, and politicians to contemplate the application of cloning to humans" (875).

Yang (2006) states that since Dolly, the same methodology of cloning has been successfully used in "at least thirteen mammalian species (...) and in even more species if we include the amphibians" (63). Despite all these experiments on animal cloning, the idea of cloning human beings has always been a taboo subject generating controversy from religious, legal, governmental and scientific perspectives. Many countries have laws prohibiting it, religious scholars condemn it, religious groups oppose it by regarding it as playing God, scientists draw attention to possible negative biological outcomes, and others have concerns about the possible

living conditions of clones; their integration into society and their possible abuse by society. Human cloning is generally opposed by bioethicists as well.

However, the important question here is: Why do people have a more permissive attitude towards cloning other organisms (including animals) than towards cloning human beings? The answer probably lies in the differences between human beings and other animals: consciousness, thinking, self-concept, and the soul. Many argue that cloning a human being would lead to dehumanization and a loss of human dignity. Also, the identical nature of the clone to the model creates an uncanny effect in the human mind, which would affect both the clone and the model. What is the dividing line, the distinction, between the clone and the original? Are the clone's life and character predetermined by its model? Can the clone be regarded as a truly unique being? Storrow (2009) verbalizes these concerns as such:

[T]he most powerful engine driving the disapproval of human reproductive cloning is that it poses too great a threat to human dignity. This concern takes several forms, from the fear that clones would be mere genetic copies lacking in individuality to the fear that rogue physicians will clone individuals without proper permission. In addition, the humanity of clones themselves might be easy to discount, leading to all sorts of harm, including such 'unrealistic' and 'esoteric' applications as the creation of human organ factories. (265)

Never Let Me Go also deals with the question of whether a clone could have a soul at all. There are two opposing voices in the novel regarding this question: the general public's voice supposing that clones are soulless and the alternative, minor voice (like the voice of Hailsham) working against this mentality and trying to prove that clones do have souls. The fact that the latter is the minor voice explains how the system of organ harvesting from clones operates so well within the novel's world because it is much easier for a world believing that clones are soulless to go along with the organ harvesting scheme. Therefore, the notion of the soul is manipulated by the system in order to create a hierarchy between "normal" people and clones, downgrading clones because of their supposed lack of souls and making them look like the other to the general public's eye. This stance is counter-attacked by the people at Hailsham who try to upgrade clones to the same level with normal people by creating a sense of sameness through the notion of the soul again. To this end, the

downgrading or the upgrading of clones within the social hierarchy has to do with the pivotal notion of the soul. In the middle of this argument are the clone characters burdened with the task of proving to the world that they do have souls, in order to change the course of their lives.

This situation is depicted in a series of events triggered by the rumours of deferrals. The rumour says that if a couple want to get a deferral, they need to prove their love for each other. Kathy and Tommy decide to apply for a deferral and they figure that if they want to prove their true love for each other, they have to show their artwork to Madame. They think that all the encouragement to produce art when they were children, all the artwork collected from them and put in the Gallery actually serve the purpose of testing couples for a deferral by revealing their souls and also their love for each other. This idea is further fuelled by Tommy's recollection of the words of Miss Emily: "...things like pictures, poetry, all that kind of stuff, she said they revealed what you were like inside. She said *they revealed your soul*" (173). (emphasis in original) Tommy then puts the pieces together by adding Madame's gallery into the scheme:

Madame's got a gallery somewhere filled with stuff by students from when they were tiny. Suppose two people come up and say they're in love. She can find the art they've done over years and years. She can see if they go. If they match. Don't forget, Kath, what she's got reveals our souls. (173)

Madame's address is given to Kathy and Tommy by Ruth, who tries to redeem herself towards the end of her life, knowing that she put the other two apart for all these years and wanting to do them a final favour before she dies. However, upon a revelatory visit to Madame, Kathy and Tommy learn that the truth is much more different from what they imagined:

'Because of course' – Madame cut in suddenly – 'your art will reveal your inner selves! That's it, isn't it? Because your art will display your *souls!* (...) Poor creatures. What did we do to you? With all our schemes and plans?' (248-249) (emphasis in original)

Then Miss Emily takes over the explanation and says that she was aware of this rumour of deferrals and she always tried to stamp it out whenever it arose. However, the rumour always managed to be reborn and survive. Miss Emily thinks this is

because “It’s something for them to dream about, a little fantasy” (253). However, she sees that Kathy and Tommy have actually taken the rumour very seriously and feels heartbroken for them. Kathy asks what the point of all the artwork and education was if there were no deferrals. Miss Emily says: “We took away your art because we thought it would reveal your souls. Or to put it more finely, we did it to *prove you had souls at all*” (255). (emphasis in original)

Kathy and Tommy learn that Hailsham was one of the more humanitarian institutions for cloned children. Madame and her team were actually trying to prove to the whole world that the clones were not less human than human, and thereby to draw attention to their conditions and to the nature of the whole cloning project. Miss Emily says: “‘There, look!’ we could say. ‘Look at this art! How dare you claim these children are anything less than fully human?’” (256) Even if Kathy and Tommy become disillusioned because there are no deferrals, they now have the affirmation coming from a prestigious figure like Miss Emily that they actually have souls. However, we also need to note that within the larger picture and in practice, this affirmation does not really help them or console them.

Still, we can observe the later effects of Madame’s endeavour on society. We learn that Hailsham is now closed. This, however, does not mean that the cloning project has been terminated altogether. It only means that Hailsham has been closed for a specific purpose. Facing the fact that the clones are not less human than human and that they do have souls has probably disturbed people and their conscience. However, instead of responding to this revelation by ending the cloning project altogether, they choose to suppress the voice disturbing them. The reason Hailsham is closed is that it treats clones as human beings with souls rather than simply seeing them as organ resources. As Roos (2008) states:

What Hailsham as an institution tried to achieve was to prove that the clones could not be ignored as if they were not properly human, and it is because of that uncomfortable truth that the school was destroyed. (50)

Hailsham being closed adds the novel an even more dystopian perspective. From now on, the cloning project will work much more efficiently without distracting voices.

Miss Emily says that it is not surprising that a disturbing voice like Hailsham's is silenced by a society that always tries to justify the creation of clones and feel good about it, which also entails an obligatory negligence of the clones:

Suddenly there were all these new possibilities laid before us, all these ways to cure so many previously incurable conditions. (...) 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. (...) How can you ask a world that has come to regard cancer as curable, how can you ask such a world to put away that cure, to go back to the dark days? (...) So for a long time you were kept in the shadows, and people did their best not to think about you. And if they did, they tried to convince themselves you weren't really like us. That you were less human, so it didn't matter. (257-258)

Miss Emily says that Hailsham's efforts were rendered useless by this unreceptive world and these efforts were counter-attacked with the closing of Hailsham and a few similar institutions. The power-holders took hold of the situation and repressed the disturbing voice. As Guo (2015) puts it, "The claims of the other, especially in a postcolonial context of power, are usually experienced as a threat, and the other is denied the claim on the self" (6). Miss Emily then makes a confession that Hailsham was an "illusion", but for a good reason:

Yes, in many ways we *fooled* you. (...) But we sheltered you during those years, and we gave you your childhoods. (...) You wouldn't be who you are today if we'd not protected you. You wouldn't have become absorbed in your lessons, you wouldn't have lost yourselves in your art and your writing. Why should you have done, knowing what lay in store for each of you? You would have told us it was all pointless, and how could we have argued with you? (263) (emphasis in original)

However, one can approach this self-soothing confession only doubtfully and critically. As Rollins (2015) states, "Madame, Miss Emily, and the guardians work to reform how the donation system is run but not to eliminate it. They work to improve how the clones are treated but not to prevent what becomes of them" (355). Basically, they are not working against the system; they are working within the system to heal its defects and in the final analysis, this makes them work *for* the system. Similarly, Levy (2011) states that:

The freedoms that they [Hailsham guardians] wished to offer their students would always be tainted, compromised, incomplete in some way because they were freedoms tendered within the constricting boundaries of an institution

demanding the eventual conformity and submission of the individual to the perverse responsibilities demanded by a corrupt social order. (6)

Along the same line, Query (2015) states that “Miss Emily and the Hailsham movement are no less culpable for the students’ subjection, (...) her justification for the project reveals the weakness and even danger of liberal humanist empathy” (166). The irony that lies under this “humanist empathy” shows itself the best when a donor is about to complete; the same society that creates the clones to abuse their bodies shows this fake respect to the clones when they are about to die:

A donor ‘on a fourth’, even one who’s been pretty unpopular up till then, is treated with special respect. Even the doctors and nurses play up to this: a donor on a fourth will go in for a check and be greeted by whitecoats smiling and shaking their hand. (273)

When we look at the clones in *Never Let Me Go* through the lens of the concept of “the remainder” in Baudrillard’s theory of the simulacra, their treatment is put under a new light. In the chapter “The Remainder”, Baudrillard mentions the “society” columns in *Le Monde*. He observes that paradoxically, they always talk about immigrants, criminals, women etc. This is precisely because “they are everything that has not been socialized, ‘social’ cases analogous to pathological cases. Pockets to be reabsorbed, segments that the ‘social’ isolates as it grows” (95). To this end, the media tries to draw these residual groups into the social order, asks them to find a place in this large social system. The social machine asserts and renews its existence through these residues. What happens when everything gets absorbed and socialized by this machine? At this point, the social machine stops and the whole social system turns into a residue, precisely because it has got rid of all residues. “In designating residual categories as ‘Society’, the social designates itself as a remainder” (95).

When seen in the light of this, the “real” people in the novel can be regarded as representing “society” or “the social order”, and the clones as representing a “residue” or “the remainder”. Kathy also feels this sense of being the “other”, being the “residue”, as she expresses it towards the end of the novel: “That night, it seemed to me these dark byways of the country existed just for the likes of us, while the big glittering motorways with their huge signs and super cafes were for everyone else”

(267). So we have the two groups of the “likes of us” and “everyone else”, the residue and the society. Now that there is an uncanny distance and a sense of difference between the society and the residue, the society tries to absorb the residue. To this end, apart from the more optimistic aim of trying to prove that the clones have souls and drawing attention to their living conditions, what Hailsham does might actually have another purpose: to erase the difference between the society and the residue, to absorb the residue, to say that the residue is part of the social order. Clones represent this un-socialized, pathological case that needs to be absorbed by the social. But can the clones accept this invitation? Can they truly find a place in the social order when they know that the society regards them as inferior beings created for a practical purpose? Moreover, is the society itself ready to accept the clones as a part of them? Would it not totally erase the distance between the “real” person and the clone? If the clones were given equal rights with “real” people, if they lived among them instead of living in institutions, would the society feel comfortable about it? The distance between the “real” people and the clones is uncanny because it confronts the society with the unknown, mysterious “other”. But the same distance is needed by the society because it draws a definitive line between the two groups and hinders any possible merging, which would feel much more uncanny. This is probably why Hailsham, an institution that treats clones as human beings and tries to prove that they have souls, is closed. The distance, or rather the hierarchy between the clones and the real people will be preserved. The society will absorb the residue not by including it in the social order but by keeping it below that order, with the lower “residue” being used and abused by the upper “society”.

The approach of the residue towards this state of being absorbed, being used and abused by the society constitutes another very interesting aspect of the novel. We have mentioned the deferral as a symbol for a possibility of diversion from the pre-determined fate for the characters. While reading the novel, one may think, up until the characters learn the bitter truth, that the possibility of a deferral is a motivating force distracting them from their impending doom or preventing them from resistance against their fate. However, interestingly, even after learning that the deferrals do not exist, the characters have a troubling acceptance of their fate. Their

feelings do not go beyond disillusionment, surprise, sadness and suppressed fury. Why is it the case? The notion of rebellion is not even imagined by any character in Ishiguro's novel. This is most evident in Kathy's narration. As the narrator, she has a very accepting, matter-of-fact approach to her condition. As Storrow (2009) states, "Kathy never rails against the fact that she was created to fulfil a function that severely limits her circumstances and opportunities. Her memoir is thus a thoughtful and resigned look back upon her life by one who accepts that death is near" (268). According to Marks (2010), "a pervasive sense of the uncanny" (347) is present in *Never Let Me Go*, partly because of Kathy's silence and her seeming unawareness. One can feel repressed traumas and cries beneath the narrator's voice. From her bland and matter-of-fact narration, one can assume that Kathy is not truly aware of the horror of what she is telling the reader. Guo (2015) also observes as uncanny effect in the novel, stemming from the fact that the clones are not truly experiencing the anxiety related to organ loss.

The first revelation and the first attempt to move children up to a new level of understanding come from Miss Lucy. Students respond to this revelation in a "So what?" fashion. One may assume that because they are little children, because they have never been outside Hailsham, because they have only known other clones like themselves, they are just too naive to understand Miss Lucy. However, when the main characters leave Hailsham, go to the Cottages and start getting a sense of the real world, the situation does not change. Again, one may assume that up until that point in their lives, they have totally internalized their role as clones and donors and therefore see no reason to rebel against it. So maybe the clones have adopted and embraced the reality presented to them and with which they have grown up. Or they are simply afraid. They think something bad can happen to them if they attempt to rebel. They might be instantly killed because the government has nothing to lose.

Or can we look at this passive attitude from a larger and more philosophical perspective? Are the clones actually thinking that the lives of "normal" people are not much different from their own and could it be why they do not really see a reason to rebel? The clones are not asked if they wanted to be brought into existence, but neither are normal people. In that sense, everyone is doomed to their involuntary

existence. The clones will give away their organs, but normal people also give away from themselves; their youth to time, their effort to work and survival, their bodies and minds to other people. The clones die at an early age because of donations, but mortality seizes normal people too, in the end. Several writers have focused on such analogies and similarities between the clones and normal people. Roos (2008), for instance, focuses on mortality:

Scientific advances may prolong the physical life but do not cure or invalidate human frailty and sorrow. We keep trying, as Kathy and Tommy did, to evade this truth, be it through love or religion or art or drugs. In the final instance, however, our fate is to 'complete'. (52)

Query (2015) establishes another analogy through art and the deferrals in the novel:

In a manner of speaking, applying for a deferral is what people have always done with art. They beg for more life, not in a literal sense but in the sense of turning bare life into qualified life, of knowing that there must be more to life than a mere span of years suggests and looking to art to provide the access to that elusive supplement. (167)

Many other writers have found this passive, fatalist attitude of the characters in the novel interesting and sought to come up with several different explanations. Jerng (2008) suggests that this attitude of the clones might be regarded by some readers as proof for the non-human quality of the clones, because we generally associate humanness with agency and with rebellion against oppression. However, Jerng warns that this narrative choice does not necessarily mean that Ishiguro failed to present clones as fully human; maybe he was challenging the reader's conventional expectations of the human. Rather than resorting to a simple scheme of emancipation through an act of rebellion, Ishiguro might be delving into humanness from other aspects, like the struggle to make sense of life and to give it form and dignity within the circumstances one lives in. Jerng (2008) states:

Whereas the moment of separation – from parents, from school, from immaturity – is often used to mark the individuality and form-giving agency of the singular life, this novel's resistance to an arc of separation (succinctly captured in the title, *Never Let Me Go*) marks the clone's personhood as real and realized only through the relationships in which it is held. (386)

Marks (2010), on the other hand, goes along with the theory of conditioning and genetic manipulation regarding the clones' passive attitude:

The reader is left to wonder why Kathy H.—an otherwise apparently perceptive, sensitive individual, who clearly has a recognizable interior life (a ‘soul’)—can accept her difference and her fate with such equanimity. It may be that the pupils are simply conditioned into a passive acceptance of their fate. However, there are also suggestions within the narrative that the pupils may have been genetically manipulated in some way. They are told, for example, that they cannot have children, and for this reason the school is relatively tolerant of precocious sexual activity amongst the pupils. (348-349)

Rollins (2015) also suggests social conditioning as the reason for the situation: “Even more shocking than the novel’s premise is its depiction of the coercive power of social conditioning. Remarkably, the clones do almost nothing to resist their fate” (350). There is an important passage in the novel that might support the claim about the role of social conditioning and internalization. When Kathy, Ruth and Tommy meet years later, when Kathy is a carer and the other two are now donors, Ruth says the following about being a donor: “I think I was a pretty decent carer. But five years felt about enough for me. I was like you, Tommy. I was pretty much ready when I became a donor. It felt right. After all, it’s what we’re *supposed* to be doing, isn’t it?” (223) (emphasis in original) Ruth emphasizes the word “supposed” when she utters that sentence. What is the reason behind her emphasis? Is it out of criticism or even cynicism, or is it out of mature acceptance? She not only says she was ready to become a donor, but also it felt right. In whatever attitude her statement is, Ruth nevertheless affirms their pre-assigned roles and says that she is simply, naturally following the path in front of her. As Rollins (2015) puts it:

For Ruth, the interrogative construction of her final sentence functions not as an earnest expression of doubt about an unethical system but merely as a tag question that invites, and assumes, confirmation from her fellow clones. (350)

Stacy (2015) argues that in addition to not challenging the oppression they face, the characters are also complicit in oppression to some degree, and this is because they are unable to bear witness to their own oppression, which in turn results from a process of normalization and internalization. What is more ironic is that all the atrocity is in plain sight but despite this, it is ignored. It is understood but understated. Moreover, although we do not see any coercive disciplinary power in the novel, the clones never even think of rebelling. Just like the system observes

them, the clones observe the system in order to fit in it and seem normal. They take up this attitude not only towards the system, but towards each other too; they basically shy away from talking about dangerous or slippery topics, they do not want to transgress certain boundaries. This is even visible in the euphemisms used by them (and imposed on them by the system). Stacy (2015) claims that the novel

suggests that failures of witnessing may not necessarily result from the active subscription to morally abhorrent programs, but are more likely to occur through a failure to sustain a sufficiently critical gaze, resulting from a natural, empathic focus on our local concerns at the exclusion of that which is not immediately obvious. (247)

According to Levy (2011), if we look at the novel through the lens of the *Bildungsroman* genre, the attitude of the clones will not seem awkward to us, as the *Bildungsroman* typically ends with a compromise, a middle way between the individual and the society: “From this perspective, Kathy and the other clones are simply following a common plot line that anticipates the submission of radical autonomy to the social responsibilities required by the state” (4). Even the fact that Kathy is able to recount her story, to give voice to a marginalized minority, can be seen as a courageous act in this framework.

Bowyer (2014) also focuses on the issues of compromise, acceptance and submission, and looks at the clones’ attitude from a very subversive point of view. She alleges that what we typically define as autonomy is a simplistic abstraction ignoring the “embodied, embedded, and relational nature of autonomy” (139). She emphasizes that autonomy also means “responding appropriately to others” and “an awareness and acceptance of our existential finitude as precarious and fallible creatures” (139). Rather than regarding individuals as socially isolatable beings with self-interested preferences, Bowyer suggests regarding them with their embeddedness and integration in a historical, social and cultural setting. The clones regard the guardians at Hailsham as parental figures rather than enemies because they simply feel the need for parental figures in a communal life. They imitate the veterans at the Cottages because these people represent guiding figures in the process of adaptation to a larger world. Kathy undertakes the role of a carer because she feels the need to take on responsibility in the world she is living in and to feel empowered.

One can regard Bowyer's interpretation of the novel as somewhat too idyllic and optimistic but it is another theory that can account for the passive, accepting attitude of the characters in the novel.

Query (2015) suggests that it is not hard to find such passivity as that of the characters in the novel in real life, too:

It is not difficult to find examples in daily life of great abuses, inequities, and plain limitations that people accept as a matter of course. The chasm readers perceive between how the characters, particularly the clones, act and how we wish they would seems significantly less vast in such a light. Rather than standing above or outside the characters' passivity, the reader sees as all too familiar the questions the students do not ask and the risks they do not take. (156)

If we come to the reader's acceptance of the situation in the novel, for one thing, Kathy the narrator assumes that the reader has some preliminary information about the clones' condition since the beginning of the novel. The reader, who actually lacks this information, eventually yields to Kathy's assumption and her positioning of the reader. To live up to this position, the reader immediately starts trying to solve the mysteries within the novel. However, the reader gradually comes to understand that this novel is not really about solving mysteries but is about accepting the realities that are very much visible. To this end, although the characters' passive acceptance torments the reader, the reader finds himself/herself in the same position of acceptance at the end of the reading process. Query (2015) states:

In the matter of maintaining the coherence of a fictional world, the reader is the novelist's willing conspirator. Assent is what novel readers do, happily. They refuse to pursue the questions that would lead beyond the novel's horizon, and they supply what is necessary to make sense of what they experience within it. (162)

In this sense, the characters in the novel and the reader of the novel become counterparts in a web of suggestion, limitation, and acquiescence. Query argues:

The answer to the question so troubling to readers of *Never Let Me Go*—why don't the students escape?—can be glimpsed in the way the students acquiesce in their fate in order to make sense of their short lives, but also in the way readers themselves take solace within the narrow horizons of the novel. (171)

Although the characters seem to have an accepting approach to their lives, some abrupt and truly revealing confrontations with realities do cause them to be confused and even shattered emotionally. Therefore, while emphasizing the characters' passivity, it would be wrong not to touch upon these moments of crisis, of emotional eruption, triggered by confrontations with realities. The characters do mostly seem passive and accepting, but they are emotionally receptive, and they do have emotional confusions and even outbursts. Confronting reality as it is always leads to significant crises or illuminations for them. When they leave Hailsham and meet the real world, they try desperately to fit in it and to overcome the sense of otherness, the sense of being outcasts and the residue. When Ruth sees her "possible", she is devastated and broken. When Kathy looks for her own possible in magazines and cannot find someone resembling her, she feels a sense of loss. When they truly grasp their own mortality, they have a shift in their personalities. When Ruth is about to die, she apologizes for standing between Kathy and Tommy and tries to reconcile them with the offer of a deferral. When Kathy and Tommy learn that there are no deferrals, Tommy has an emotional breakdown and faces his own mortality because if there are no deferrals, his donations will start soon. When she becomes a carer, Kathy experiences the downs of the job; moving from a communal life to a solitary life, facing mortality and death every time a donor completes (including Ruth and Tommy), questioning her own qualification as a carer whenever a donor completes, and always being reminded that she will soon become a donor, too. After the deaths of Ruth and Tommy, Kathy has to deal with the realities of loneliness, loss and her own approaching death because she will soon stop being a carer and start her donations. As we can clearly see, every serious encounter with the realities that they try to escape from has a devastating effect on the characters.

At the end of the novel, Kathy is the remaining one among the trio, the one who has experienced every loss and every possible confrontation. On the one hand, she knows that her whole life has been a simulated life pre-determined by other people. Her birth is the result of a scientific endeavour and her following roles have been pre-assigned; being a student at Hailsham and at the Cottages, being a carer for donors in her young adulthood, and being a donor herself towards the end of her life.

On the other hand, despite seeing all these realities, she has to find something in her life to hold onto, in order to assign a sense of reality, authenticity and meaning to her life.

At this point, the past and the memory come into play. We see that at the start of her narration, Kathy is already about to end her career as a carer and start her donations. So she has already confronted all the realities we have mentioned above at the beginning of the narration. She is literally someone approaching death and looking back at her past memories, like an old person examining her life on her deathbed. The past and the memories do help Kathy in a therapeutic manner to assign meaning to her life, because even if all her life has taken place in artificial and simulated situations, her emotions and feelings, her friendships and love, her memories, were all real. This could be considered the counter-attack of the reality to the simulation. Simulation manages to infiltrate the reality, but reality responds with infiltrating the simulation through humanness and humane feelings. To this end, should we regard Kathy as just a sentimentally nostalgic person trying to construct her identity through her past or should we regard her nostalgia as a form of rebellion against a simulated life?

Reflections on past memories surface in many passages of the novel through Kathy's narration. Even at the very beginning of the novel, we read a very interesting incident in which Kathy is the carer of a donor who learns that Kathy is from Hailsham and wants to listen to her memories:

He knew he was close to completing and so that's what he was doing: getting me to describe things to him, so they'd really sink in, so that maybe during those sleepless nights, with the drugs and the pain and the exhaustion, the line would blur between what were my memories and what were his. (5)

This donor actually wants memories from Kathy in order to own them, to regard them as his own. He wants this because he is on the verge of death and he wants to die with the sense of meaning and completeness that memories give, even if those memories do not actually belong to him.

In another passage, Kathy reflects upon her own preoccupation with the past, saying: "But in the end, I suppose I'm not really serious about it. It's just a bit of nostalgia to pass the time" (114). However, we cannot really be sure whether her

attitude is an authentic feeling or a defence mechanism rejecting that she is preoccupied with the past. When she becomes Ruth's carer, Kathy shares her nostalgia with Ruth, partly in order to see if Ruth also has a similar feeling. Kathy tells Ruth that she still keeps her Hailsham collection box and asks her if she has also kept it until this time. Ruth says that her original plan while leaving Hailsham was to keep her box but when they moved to the Cottages, she changed her mind:

'...But when we got there, I could see none of the veterans had collections. It was only us, it wasn't normal. We must all have realized it, I wasn't the only one, but we didn't really talk about it, did we? So I didn't go looking for a new box. My things all stayed in the holdall bag for months, then in the end I threw them away. (...) You were different. I remember. You were never embarrassed about your collection and you kept it. I wish now I'd done that too.' (128-129)

Kathy comes to an understanding that everybody deals with trauma in different ways; some (like herself) cling to the past and others (like Ruth) choose rejection and suppression: "What I'm saying is that we were all of us struggling to adjust to our new life, and I suppose we all did things back then we later regretted" (129).

During her career as a carer, Kathy comes across with Laura, another student from Hailsham. They talk about Hailsham being closed and find it strange and unbelievable. With the closing of Hailsham, it seems like their childhood is also permanently closed, with every trace being wiped out and with Hailsham now only existing in their memories:

It was that exchange, when we finally mentioned the closing of Hailsham, that suddenly brought us close again, and we hugged, quite spontaneously, not so much to comfort one another, but as a way of affirming Hailsham, the fact that it was still there in both our memories. (207)

The mentioning of the closing of Hailsham, despite being a sad event for them, turns into an "affirmation" for Kathy and Laura; what is gone in reality is brought back into existence through memory, and the sense of sharing the same memory serves as a mirror for these two characters, enabling them to see the reflection of their past in another person's mind. Soon after this passage, this is how Kathy reflects upon the closing of Hailsham:

I thought about Hailsham closing. (...) When he was telling me the news about Hailsham, Roger had made a remark, saying he supposed it wouldn't

make so much difference to the likes of us any more. And in certain ways, he might have been right. But it was unnerving, to think things weren't still going on back there, just as always; that people like Miss Geraldine, say, weren't leading groups of Juniors around the North Playing Field. (209)

When Kathy, Ruth and Tommy come together for the first time after the Cottages, they go to see a beached boat which is crumbling. Tommy says that he thinks this is probably how the building of Hailsham looks like now. In Tommy's mind, Hailsham has turned into this empty, crumbling building that has lost its purpose of existence and that stands still, dead, deteriorating. Upon Tommy's comment, Ruth tells them a dream she had, which evokes a similar portrait of a wasteland:

'I was dreaming I was up in Room 14. I knew the whole place had been shut down, but there I was, in Room 14, and I was looking out of the window and everything outside was flooded. Just like a giant lake. And I could see rubbish floating by under my window, empty drinks cartons, everything. But there wasn't any sense of panic or anything like that. It was nice and tranquil, just like it is here. I knew I wasn't in any danger, that it was only like that because it had closed down.' (221)

The striking symbols of a beached boat, flood and rubbish evoke a sense of decay and deterioration regarding Hailsham, but it is still there, in both the conscious and the subconscious mind, in the memories of the characters. Towards the end of the novel, we read Kathy's comments about the ever-presence and vividness of memories:

I was talking to one of my donors a few days ago who was complaining about how memories, even your most precious ones, fade surprisingly quickly. But I don't go along with that. The memories I value most, I don't see them ever fading. I lost Ruth, then I lost Tommy, but I won't lose my memories of them. I suppose I lost Hailsham too. (...) Once I'm able to have a quieter life, in whichever centre they send me to, I'll have Hailsham with me, safely in my head, and that'll be something no one can take away. (280-281)

The last sentence of this passage is quite important because the clones do not have a say over anything throughout their lives; they do not even have bodily autonomy. In such a world, the only possessions they can have, the only things they can keep to themselves, are their memories.

The novel ends with an extremely tragic reflection on and affirmation of past memories. A few weeks after Tommy completes, Kathy pays a visit to Norfolk, the

place they all once visited and where they found the tape from her childhood once again. She finds a great metaphor for her memories (and losses) in the empty field.

All along the fence, especially along the lower line of wire, all sorts of rubbish had caught and tangled. (...) Up in the branches of the trees, too, I could see, flapping about, torn plastic sheeting and bits of old carrier bags. (...) I was thinking about the rubbish, the flapping plastic in the branches, the shore-line of odd stuff caught along the fencing, and I half-closed my eyes and imagined this was the spot where everything I'd ever lost since my childhood had washed up, and I was now standing here in front of it... (282)

Kathy's metaphor of rubbish caught along the fence can be considered together with Tommy's metaphor of a beached boat and Ruth's metaphor of flood with rubbish floating on it. The beached boat is decaying but it stands still, the flood surrounds the building of Hailsham but Hailsham stands still, and however strong the wind might blow, it will not take away the rubbish caught along the fence. The fence is the memory.

Kathy's nostalgia, her passion about past memories and her will to preserve and affirm the past have drawn the attention of many critics. Rizq (2014) comments:

For Kathy, the copy that is her memory is ultimately more important, more durable and more meaningful than the events on which the copy is based. (...) Whilst this could be seen as (...) a 'sentimental' notion of how we console ourselves after someone's death, Ishiguro seems rather to be privileging Kathy's reworking of her experiences, the way she has created a sense of attachment and belonging out of the grim realities of her time at Hailsham. These original experiences have now been supplanted by the copy that is her reworked memory. It is this that she will 'never let go', that she will sustain until she, like Tommy and the donors she continues to care for, 'completes'. (529-530)

Query (2015) states that "the present cannot supply the meaning that retrospection does. Kathy must go over her past to make sense of it. (...) Kathy's record is full of acknowledgments of the power of memory to order and reorder experience" (169). In this sense, the novel's affirmation of memory reminds one of the following statement from *England, England*: "The past was never just the past, it was what made the present able to live with itself" (13).

Teo (2014) observes a tension related to memory in the novel: the tension between the society wanting to forget about the clones and the clones wanting to

cling to their memories. Teo claims that mass amnesia has always been a strategy in the face of big crimes in history; perpetrators want the public to forget about these crimes and the public mostly follows this invitation, but totally forgetting is not possible: “Memory may be challenged, but it cannot be eradicated—such is the nature of testimony that is passed down through the generations and haunts the collective consciousness” (129). In such a context, narrating a story, writing a testimony, bearing witness to a crime, turns into a responsibility, a duty, for a human being. To this end, Kathy’s narrative can be taken as a testimony for herself and for all the other clones. It also helps her understand her past and analyze her own being. As Teo states, “Ishiguro presents us with a novel that focuses on the desire to never forget, a novel about the continual affirmation of the memory of people and places that have made us who we are” (133).

Before we conclude our discussion of *Never Let Me Go*, it might be a good idea to lastly examine the novel in connection to its participation into the sub-genre of the science fiction novel. *Never Let Me Go* is a science fiction novel, albeit an unusual one. It does not have a very scientific language and does not even try to sound scientific. Rather than focusing on technicalities or scientific explanations, it chooses to focus on the humane, the psychological and the emotional. The novel can also be said to have dystopian elements, now that it deals with a very pessimistic portrayal of an alternative world. It is also important to note that *Never Let Me Go* is a retro science fiction novel. It does not take place in the future like many such novels typically do, but it takes place in the late 1990s. Why did Ishiguro make this temporal choice? It might be because the idea of cloning human beings is nothing new and it has existed for a long time in real life. The novel might be suggesting that we could actually be living in such a world. The fact that the novel does not take place in another world or in a fictional country that does not exist, but takes place in England, also adds up to the sense of reality it presents. The spatial and temporal choices of Ishiguro (England, late 1990s) draw attention to the fact that the story of the novel is not so speculative or fantastic after all. If humanity had taken the leap and cloned human beings, we would be living in a world like that of *Never Let Me Go* today. The possibilities that we used to regard as far away and far-fetched can

now easily turn into reality. This reminds us what Baudrillard says about science fiction. He suggests that science fiction used to be more imaginary, transcendental, futuristic and exotic in the past; dealing with alternative universes and spatial or geographic explorations. But in an era when everything is explored, conquered, deciphered and mapped, the imaginary ceases to exist:

It is the end of metaphysics, the end of the phantasm, the end of science fiction - the era of hyper-reality begins. From then onward, something must change: the projection, the extrapolation, the sort of pantographic excess that constituted the charm of science fiction are all impossible. (83)

In this case, what can science fiction produce now, now that it is deprived of its metaphysical, phantasmagoric, romantic and charming elements?

In this way, science fiction would no longer be a romantic expansion with all the freedom and naiveté that the charm of discovery gave it, but, quite the contrary, it would evolve implacably in the very image of our current conception of the universe, attempting to revitalize, reactualize, requotidianize fragments of simulation, fragments of this universal simulation that have become for us the so-called real world. (...) In fact, science fiction in this sense is no longer anywhere, and it is everywhere, in the circulation of models, here and now, in the very principle of the surrounding simulation. (...) And one can see that it is not necessary to invent it: it is there, emerging from a world without secrets, without depth. (83-84)

Baudrillard's observations regarding the nature of science fiction in a postmodern world might offer insights as to why *Never Let Me Go* happens here and now and why its scenario strangely feels so real or at least quite possible.

Several writers have drawn attention to the unusual and subversive science fiction style of *Never Let Me Go*. Jerng (2008), states that: "Ishiguro upsets the opposition between science fiction as 'genre fiction' and the non-mechanistic value of the human by creating science fiction without the technological" (381). He draws attention to the lack of a technical and technological language in the novel. Along the same line, Levy (2011) argues:

While the novel does use aspects of speculative storytelling to engage with human rights issues, Ishiguro's brand of science fiction undermines generic expectations by muting all things fantastical and downplaying anything out of the ordinary. (...) The way Ishiguro twists generic expectations, transforming the fantastic into something verging on mundane, mirrors the disturbing

attitude taken towards atrocity throughout the text, as something ordinary, systemic and utterly unremarkable. (6-7)

This comment proves the novel's subversive and deconstructive approach to the genre of science fiction. Despite being a novel about cloning and clones, the word "clone" is used only twice in the novel. Also, we do not have much information about the larger outside world that encompasses the story of the main characters. By treating the science fiction elements as ordinary givens and adopting a matter-of-fact attitude towards them, the novel chooses to focus more on its main characters, their world, their subjective perceptions and experiences.

Never Let Me Go deals with the issue of simulation mainly through the human body and the concept of the clone. Thereby, it asks significant questions like: What makes a being human? What is the line between a normal person and a clone? How can the identity of a clone be defined, by himself/herself and by outsiders? Can the clone be an independent, autonomous, unique being with a soul? By following a coming-of-age path, starting with the clones' childhood and ending with their young adulthood, the novel depicts the consequences of simulating the human body.

Hailsham is presented as a place between blissful ignorance and footsteps of approaching doom, a place rendering the children in a state of being told and not told. It is an artificially created, a simulated environment that both tries to keep children from truly grasping their fates and at the same time conditions them into accepting that fate. It is a place where what Baudrillard calls the "system of deterrence" rules. It is the place where we first start to see the tragic consequences of the fact that the characters are clones and the perspective of the society towards them. We see the society's aim of instrumentalizing and commodifying the clones' bodies and claiming ownership of those bodies, which asks questions about the ethics of cloning. In Hailsham, Ishiguro also starts to examine the human aspect of the clones; through their relationships with each other and with the guardians. Most importantly, the novel focuses on the identity crisis experienced by the clones, as the others, the marginals in a society that wants to abuse them and that regards them as less than human. After Hailsham, the Cottages seems to be the place where the painful coming-of-age period truly starts, with the characters both being afraid of the

outside world and trying to explore it in order to adjust themselves to it. Here, the novel emphasizes the “performance”, “role-playing” aspect of the characters in an attempt to look like “normal” people. They also start to question their beings and roles as opposed to their original models and within the larger society. The most important question here, of course, is whether clones have souls, whether they are truly human. We learn that Hailsham is an institution trying to prove this but the fact that it is now closed proves society’s indifference towards the clones and how they are disturbed by such fundamental questions. The larger society regards the clones as a “residue” and wants to keep them unvoiced and suppressed. Another truly startling aspect of the novel is the way the clones accept and yield to this fate. With this attitude, the novel asks questions about determinism, fatalism, free will and autonomy, and it also examines how the clones confront and come to terms with the realities of their existence. At the end of the novel, memory and the past stand out as notions that the clones can hold onto, in order to assign meaning and wholeness to their lives. This is especially evident in Kathy’s preoccupation with her past and narrating that past. Her narration also offers a testimony for the atrocity they face as a community, underlining the political and historical role of narratives.

The novel is, above all, a reflection on the human condition, a truly humane story of human existence, love and friendship. To this end, while offering a critique of body simulation and depicting the horrible consequences of such a dangerous act through its clone characters, the novel’s main aim is to find the human in the supposedly inhuman, find human bonds, warmth and meaning in this bleak, dark, dystopian world. Rather than adopting a simplistic, one-sided approach to the notion of simulation, Ishiguro focuses on the reality within the simulated as much as on the simulation of the reality.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Both *England, England* and *Never Let Me Go* offer rich material for an analysis from a Baudrillardian perspective. With its theme park, *England, England* examines the simulation of notions like country, nation(ality), national history and culture, and collective memory, also questioning the supposed “reality” of these notions beyond their simulations. With its clones, *Never Let Me Go* examines the simulation of the human body and questions related to humanness, the notion of the “authentic” and “normal” human being, human soul and human autonomy. Although on the surface they seem to deal with different themes, relating both novels to Baudrillard’s theory of the simulation creates bonds between the two novels, because they have many similarities in their approach to the concepts of simulation and simulacra, along with their differences.

Firstly, both novels include spatial simulations. In *England, England*, this is more obvious because it deals with a theme park that aims to simulate England. However, in *Never Let Me Go*, Hailsham and the Cottages are also spaces of simulation because they aim to present an artificially constructed, carefully shaped and controlled existence and experiences to the clones. In both novels, these places also have the aim of hiding the fact that they are simulations. Even if England, England is a theme park, people behind the project envision it at a higher level than a theme park and regard it as “the thing itself” rather than a mere simulation. The power of the theme park as compared to the real England proves this ambition of transcending the role of a simulation. Hailsham and the Cottages are also places that try to keep the clones from truly learning about the real world, in order to affirm the reality within themselves as the sole imaginable reality.

Both novels depict the sinister aims and agendas behind the simulations. In *England, England*, Sir Pitman is presented as a megalomaniac, arrogant, over-

ambitious man aiming to create a place of “hyperreal” tourism, revealing the capitalist motives behind the theme park and the mentality of commercializing and commodifying country and national culture. The same mentality of commodification exists in *Never Let Me Go* as well, through the depiction of the instrumentalization of the human body and organs in service of curing previously incurable diseases. In both novels, there is a disregard on the part of the simulators for the ethical implications of their enterprises. In *England, England*, fundamental notions like country, nation, national history and culture are butchered, analysed, classified, reshaped and reconstructed for the sole aim of consumer gratification and capitalist gain. In *Never Let Me Go*, the clones are degraded to beings less than human and they are denied autonomy on their own bodies. They are abused by the larger society in a hierarchical world oppressing one supposedly inferior community for the wellbeing of another community thought to be composed of “real”, “normal” people.

In both novels, we see how simulations transform the identities, behaviours, attitudes and existence of human beings. In *England, England*, this is shown most evidently through the actors hired for the theme park, and how they over-attach to their roles and lose their real identities. The novel also depicts how the theme park transforms Martha as the protagonist of the story; depicting her, firstly, as a woman fixated on her past, then as an ambitious entrepreneur wanting power in the project, and, lastly, as a cynic pondering on past, memory and reality. The characters in *Never Let Me Go*, similar to the actors in *England, England* theme park, also try to construct artificial identities for themselves during their young adulthood in order to fit in the outside world. However, while the actors in *England, England* willingly and consciously sign a contract to take over their roles, the process of identity reconstruction is less conscious on the part of the characters in *Never Let Me Go*. They feel forced to perform in a world for the sake of appearing normal. Nevertheless, they are not much different from the actors of the theme park because, after all, all the roles in their lives are pre-determined by a larger system; the roles of students, carers and donors.

Both novels have a strong emphasis on memory, as a force reshaping and preserving the past, and as a subjective, limited simulator of reality. In *England,*

England, we see Martha's obsession with her childhood memories, and we see Pitman's obsession with recreating a perfect sum of national memory in his theme park. To this end, the novel equally emphasizes both personal and national/collective memory. In *Never Let Me Go*, Kathy is the narrator approaching her own donations and the whole novel is in the form of a memoir of a person coming close to her death and reflecting on her past. Kathy's past memories and her act of narrating those memories gives her strength by providing a sense of meaning, wholeness and affirmation to her life. Narrating in this novel also appears to be a silent act of protest, a testimony for the oppression that the clones face, even if Kathy does not really narrate with that specific purpose.

England, England is a novel depicting the triumph of the simulation over reality, with the theme park becoming much more powerful than the real country. The novel thereby testifies the notion that in a postmodern age, people prefer the replica over the original. However, behind this popular attitude of people, through the character of Martha, the novel also depicts the never-ending search for reality and authenticity, even in a setting totally dominated by a powerful simulation. In *Never Let Me Go*, on the other hand, we do not see a triumph of the simulation. The simulated, namely the clones in the novel, are dominated by the simulators who abuse them. To this end, rather than condemning the simulation as a sinister virus infecting, overpowering and destroying reality, Ishiguro focuses on finding the real in the supposedly fake, the authentic in the supposedly artificial and the human in the supposedly inhuman. This approach probably stems from the fact that the novel deals with the simulation of human beings, as opposed to more abstract, more conceptual things simulated in *England, England*.

Lastly, as for the attitudes of the two novels towards the notion of reality, it can be held that in *England, England*, Barnes shows that simulation is not limited to the theme park: Through his strong focus on the imperfections of human memory and its obsessions with reshaping the past, and through his conclusion of the novel with "Anglia" as a place of yet another simulation, a place of make-believe authenticity, Barnes implies that the reality we try to cleanse of all simulations, the reality that we firmly believe in and that we put in front of the simulation in a "reality

versus simulation” duality, might not exist at all. Simulation is always present, be it overt or covert, conscious or unconscious, in an attempt at suppressing the fact that the reality it aims to represent does not exist in the first place or it can only exist through its simulations. In *Never Let Me Go*, on the other hand, Ishiguro paradoxically manages to find reality within the simulation, where one least expects to find it. Writing against the conventional clone archetype as the inhuman, uncanny, mysterious and dangerous other, Ishiguro suggests that there is no difference between the clone and the normal person, that the clone is fully human and does have a soul, through his depiction of the humane relationships, behaviours and feelings, the identity search and existential questionings of his characters. In *England, England*, the simulator and the simulacrum (the theme park) go hand in hand in a battle against reality, but in *Never Let Me Go*, the simulacrum (the clones) appears to go beyond the plans of the simulator and pass on to the side of the reality in a twist of the conventional opposing duality, in that the clones are not different from or less human than normal people and the implications of this merging lead them to become suppressed and silenced by the simulators. To this end, in *Never Let Me Go*, differently from *England, England*, the true danger is the act of simulation itself and not the resulting simulacrum, but we can say that both novels seem to be warnings against dangerous acts of simulation.

One written at the end of the 20th century and the other at the beginning of the 21st century, both of these novels can be regarded as postmodern narratives, in that they both question notions like objective reality and truth, signs, human identity, subjective perception in a deconstructive, post-structural and sceptical manner. This creates bonds between the novels and Baudrillard’s philosophy, which can also be defined as postmodern because of its focus on the real, the virtual, and the sign. Both novels also seem timely for and relevant to the postmodern world we are living in; in that they present scenarios that are either actually happening (nation rebranding and the commodification of the nation) or could very well happen (human cloning) in the real world. Both novels have satirical attitudes towards the dystopian worlds that they depict: While presenting postmodern settings in which the boundaries between the real and the replica are erased, they also present the dystopic consequences of the

act of simulation. They underline the utilitarian motivations behind the simulations; rebranding and commercializing the nation, and instrumentalizing the human body. In the post-industrialist and postmodern world, everything is rebranded with a sign value and serves a utilitarian system of simulation. *England, England* especially has a neo-Marxist attitude towards this process, focusing on place marketing, hyperreal tourism, customer gratification and the commodification of the nation for capitalist gain. While the same anti-commodification mentality is also present in *Never Let Me Go*, thanks to its focus on the instrumentalization of the human body, it can be regarded more as a post-human narrative, questioning the concept of the human through the lens of simulation. Within a narrative world that has strict boundaries between clones and normal people, the narrative voice slowly erases those boundaries and raises the question of whether clones and normal people are really different. While focusing on simulations, both novels also deal with the notions of reality and authenticity, and leave the reader with important questions: Is there a singular definition of the real nation, or of the real human being? Is there a singular reality behind abstraction, conceptualization and simulation?

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Barnes, Julian. *England, England*. Vintage International, 2000. E-book.

Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. University of Michigan Press, 1994. E-book.

Ishiguro, Kazuo. *Never Let Me Go*. Faber and Faber, 2006. Print.

Works Cited

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso, 2006. E-book.

Bentley, Nick. "Re-writing Englishness: imagining the nation in Julian Barnes's *England, England* and Zadie Smith's *White Teeth*." *Textual Practice* 21.3 (2007): 483-504, DOI: 10.1080/09502360701529093

Berberich, Christine. "England? Whose England? (Re)constructing English identities in Julian Barnes and W. G. Sebald." *National Identities* 10.2 (2008): 167-184.

Bertens, Laura M.F. "Playing and Dying Between the Real and the Hyperreal: Processes of Mediation in Mroue's *The Pixelated Revolution* and Cardiff and Bures Miller's *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk*." *Third Text* 30.1-2 (2016): 90-99, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09528822.2016.1266814>

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 1994. E-book.

Böhme, Anna Katharina. "Challenging Englishness: Rebranding and Rewriting National Identity in Contemporary English Fiction." *Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen*, 2012.

Bowyer, Lynne. "Autonomy and Why You Can "Never Let Me Go"." *Bioethical Inquiry* 11 (2014): 139-149, DOI: 10.1007/s11673-014-9533-4

- Bulger, Laura Fernanda. ““We Are No Longer Mega” in *England, England* by Julian Barnes.” *JoLIE* 2.2 (2009): 51-58.
- Cherrier, Helene & Murray, Jeff B. “The Sociology of Consumption: The Hidden Facet of Marketing.” *Journal of Marketing Management* 20 (2004): 509-525.
- De Villiers, J.H. & Slabbert, M. “*Never Let Me Go*: Science Fiction and Legal Reality.” *Literator* 32.3 (2011): 85-103.
- Eatough, Matthew. “The Time That Remains: Organ Donation, Temporal Duration, and *Bildung* in Kazuo Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go*.” *Literature and Medicine* 29.1 (2011): 132-160, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/lm.2011.0312>
- Gane, Mike. “The Cultural Logics of Neoliberalism: Baudrillard’s Account.” *Cultural Politics* 11.1 (2015): 1-17, DOI: 10.1215/17432197-2842373
- Guo, Wen. “Human Cloning as the Other in Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go*.” *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 17.5 (2015), DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2728>
- Jerng, Mark. “Giving Form to Life: Cloning and Narrative Expectations of the Human.” *Partial Answers: Journal of Literature and the History of Ideas* 6.2 (2008): 369-393, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/pan.0.0014>
- Kline, Kip. “Jean Baudrillard and the Limits of Critical Media Literacy.” *Educational Theory* 66.5 (2016): 641-656.
- Levy, Titus. “Human Rights Storytelling and Trauma Narrative in Kazuo Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go*.” *Journal of Human Rights* 10.1 (2011): 1-16.
- Marcus, Amit. “The Ethics of Human Cloning in Narrative Fiction.” *Comparative Literature Studies* 49.3 (2012): 405-433.
- Marks, John. “Clone Stories: ‘Shallow are the souls that have forgotten how to shudder’.” *Paragraph* 33.3 (2010): 331-353, DOI: 10.3366/E0264833410000945

- McKinnell, Robert G. & Di Berardino, Marie A. "The Biology of Cloning: History and Rationale." *BioScience* 49.11 (1999): 875-885.
- McWilliam, David. "The Ethics of Ownership Surrounding the Creation of Cloned Life in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *Kaleidoscope* 3.2 (2009): 57-69.
- Mendoza, Daryl Y. "Commodity, Sign, and Spectacle: Retracing Baudrillard's Hyperreality." *Kritike* 4.2 (2010): 45-59.
- Miracky, James J. "Replicating a Dinosaur: Authenticity Run Amok in the "Theme Parking" of Michael Crichton's *Jurassic Park* and Julian Barnes's *England, England*." *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction* 45.2 (2004): 163-171, DOI: 10.3200/CRIT.45.2.163-171
- Nitsch, Judi. "Like Nowhere Else: Tourism and the Remaking of Place in Julian Barnes's *England, England*." *Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 48.1 (2015): 45-65, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/mml.2015.0012>
- Nünning, Vera. "The Invention of Cultural Traditions: The Construction and Deconstruction of Englishness and Authenticity in Julian Barnes' *England, England*." *Anglia - Zeitschrift Für Englische Philologie* 119.1 (2001): 58-76, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/ANGL.2001.58>
- Pristash, Christine D. "Englishness: Traditional and Alternative Conceptions of English National Identity in Novels by Julian Barnes, Angela Carter, John Fowles, and Jeanette Winterson." *Indiana University of Pennsylvania*, 2011.
- Query, Patrick R. "*Never Let Me Go* and the Horizons of the Novel." *Critique* 56 (2015): 155-172, DOI: 10.1080/00111619.2013.868339
- Rizq, Rosemary. "Copying, Cloning and Creativity: Reading Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *British Journal of Psychotherapy* 30.4 (2014): 517-532, DOI: 10.1111/bjp.12115
- Rollins, Mark. "Caring Is a Gift: Gift Exchange and Commodification in Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *CEA Critic* 77.3 (2015): 350-356, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/cea.2015.0027>

- Romero, Betsabé Navarro. "Playing with Collective Memories: Julian Barnes's *England, England* and New Labour's Rebranding of Britain." *ES* 32 (2011): 241-261.
- Roos, Henriette. "'Not Properly Human': Literary and Cinematic Narratives about Human Harvesting." *Journal of Literary Studies* 24.3 (2008): 40-53, DOI: 10.1080/02564710802024800
- Sabol, Jonathan Daniel. "Memory, History, and Identity: The Trauma Narrative in Contemporary North American and British Fiction." *Fordham University*, 2007.
- Snaza, Nathan. "The Failure of Humanizing Education in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *Lit: Literature Interpretation Theory* 26.3 (2015): 215-234, DOI: 10.1080/10436928.2015.1062344
- Stacy, Ivan. "Complicity in Dystopia: Failures of Witnessing in China Mieville's *The City and the City* and Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *Partial Answers: Journal of Literature and the History of Ideas* 13.2 (2015): 225-250, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/pan.2015.0021>
- Storrow, Richard F. "Therapeutic Reproduction and Human Dignity." *Law and Literature* 21.2 (2009): 257-274.
- Szto, Courtney. "Saving Lives with Soccer and Shoelaces: The Hyperreality of Nike (RED)." *Sociology of Sport Journal* 30 (2013): 41-56.
- Teo, Yugin. "Testimony and the Affirmation of Memory in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *Critique* 55 (2014): 127-137, DOI: 10.1080/00111619.2012.656209
- Thiry-Cherques, Hermano Roberto. "Baudrillard: Work and Hyperreality." *RAE-eletrônica* 9.1 (2010).
- Walonen, Michael K. "The Socio-Spatial Dynamics of Theme Parks in Contemporary Transatlantic Fiction." *Lit: Literature Interpretation Theory* 25.3 (2014): 259-270, DOI: 10.1080/10436928.2014.932244

Walsh, Kevin. *The Representation of the Past: Museums and Heritage in the Post-modern World*. Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2002. E-book.

Wasson, Sara. "Scalpel and Metaphor: The Ceremony of Organ Harvest in Gothic Science Fiction." *Gothic Studies* 17.1 (2015): 104-123, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7227/GS.17.1.8>

Williamson, Colin. "An Escape into Reality: Computers, Special Effects, and the Haunting Optics of *Westworld* (1973)." *Imaginations* 9.1 (2018): 19-39.

Yang, Xiangzhong. "History and Current Status of Nuclear Transfer Cloning." *Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering Reviews* 23.1 (2006): 63-70, DOI: 10.1080/02648725.2006.10648078

APPENDICES

A. TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Bu tez çalışması Julian Barnes'ın *İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı* ve Kazuo Ishiguro'nun *Beni Asla Bırakma* romanlarını, Jean Baudrillard'ın *Simülakrlar ve Simülasyon* adlı kitabında öne sürdüğü fikirlerden beslenen bir teorik altyapı üzerinden incelemektedir. Çalışmanın amacı bu iki romanı tematik açıdan birbirleriyle karşılaştırmak ve simülasyon kavramını kullanma, sorgulama ve tartışma biçimlerindeki benzerlik ve farklılıkları incelemektir. Bu karşılaştırma yoluyla bu çalışma, görünürde farklı konularla ilgilenen ve daha önce birlikte çalışılmamış bu iki romanı tematik açıdan birbirlerine yaklaştırarak literatüre katkıda bulunmayı amaçlamaktadır.

Jean Baudrillard, Fransız bir filozof, sosyolog ve kültür teorisyenidir. Kendisi sıklıkla post-modernizm ve post-yapısalcılıkla ilişkilendirilmektedir. Baudrillard'ın en ünlü ve muhtemelen en etkili eseri *Simülakrlar ve Simülasyon*'dur. 1981'de kaleme aldığı bu felsefi eserde Baudrillard, gerçeklik ile gerçekliğin sembolik yeniden yaratımları arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektedir. Modern dünyanın politik ve ideolojik akımlarının radikal bir eleştirisini sunan bu eser, felsefe ve sosyoloji alanları üzerinde önemli bir etkiye sahip olmuştur. Baudrillard'ın düşünce sistemindeki temel argüman, postmodern dünyada gerçek ile onun yapay bir yeniden üretimi olan hipergerçek arasındaki farkın artık yok olduğu argümanıdır. Böyle bir dünyada simülasyon eylemi ve onun sonucunda ortaya çıkan simülakrlar, gerçeği devirerek onun yerini alacaklardır. Bu nedenle simülakrlar gerçeği saklamaz, gerçek "olurlar". Postmodern dünyada insanlar gerçeklikle yalnızca simülasyonları üzerinden ilişki kurabilirler ve dünya simülasyonlar açısından öyle bir doygunluğa ulaşmıştır ki her türlü anlam, anlamsızlığa meyilli hale gelmiştir; gerçeklik artık doğrulanamaz. Baudrillard politik, kültürel ve sosyal bağlamlar içerisinde gerçekliği yeniden şekillendirme amacıyla simülasyonların nasıl kullanıldığını incelemekte ve

bu yolla sahici/orijinal kavramı, temsil eylemi ve sembollerin rolü, modern bilim, kitle kültürü, kentleşme, simüle edilen mekânlar, politika (özellikle de korku politikası), güç, kapitalizm, metalaştırma ve medya gibi konular üzerine geniş kapsamlı bir eleştiri sunmaktadır.

İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı ve *Beni Asla Bırakma* romanları, kendilerini felsefi, sosyolojik ve psikolojik açılardan ele alan birçok çalışmanın odak noktası olmuşlardır. Bu çalışmalarda Baudrillard'ın felsefesinin izlerini doğrudan atıfta bulunulur ya da ima edilir biçimde görmek mümkündür. İki romanı Baudrillard'ın felsefesi açısından birbirleriyle karşılaştırmadan önce romanları bireysel olarak ele alan çalışmaların genel bir özetini, romanlarda dikkat çekmiş olan temalar ve konuların bir panoramasını çıkarmak gerekir. *İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı*'yı inceleyen birçok çalışma ulusal kimlik, icat edilmiş gelenekler, (yeniden) yazılan tarihler ve anılar, yapay inşalar gibi konulara odaklanmaktadır. Nitekim roman İngilizlik kavramını ve onunla ilgili mitler, gelenekler ve yaklaşımları irdelerken tüm bunların nasıl yeniden inşa edildiklerini göstermektedir. Bazı başka çalışmalar özellikle romandaki mekânsal simülasyonlara, bilhassa tema parkı konseptine odaklanmaktadır. Bu çalışmalar mekânsal simülasyonların yaratılma süreçlerini, sosyolojik dinamiklerini, kapitalizm ve pazarlamayla olan ilişkilerini ele almaktadır. *İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı*'da ön plana çıkan diğer temalar ulusal ve bireysel kimlik, ulusal ve bireysel hafıza ve tarih, ulusal mit ve geleneklerin yaratımı, mekânların yeniden yaratılıp markalaştırılması, mekânsal simülasyonların ardındaki sosyolojik, politik, turistik ve ekonomik motivasyonlar, ve böylesi yapay mekânların sahiciliğinin sorgulanması temalarıdır. Bütün bu konular daha geniş ölçekte sahicilik ve gerçeklik kavramlarının da sorgulanmasını gerektirmektedir.

Beni Asla Bırakma romanının simülasyon kavramıyla en yakın ilişkisi, klonlar ve klonlamayı ele alıyor olmasıdır. İnsan bedeninin simüle edilmesi olarak tanımlanabilecek klonlama, olası en radikal simülasyon eylemi olarak görülebilir. Bu eylemin sonuçları ve karakterlere sunulan simüle edilmiş yaşamlar, onların kimlikleri ve varoluşları üzerinde güçlü bir etkiye sahiptir. Romanı ele alan birçok çalışma, temel olarak ana karakterlerin klon oldukları gerçeği üzerine odaklanmaktadır. Klonlar üzerine tartışmalar aynı zamanda insan ve insanlık kavramları, beden

metalaştırılması, ötekilik, benlik keşfi ve bilhassa klonlamanın etiği üzerine tartışmaları da doğurmaktadır. Klonlamanın etiği tartışması; klon ile normal insan arasındaki çizginin ne olduğu, klon bedeni üzerinde kimin hak sahibi olduğu, tıbbi tedavi amaçlı klonlamanın klon bedenini nasıl araçlaştırdığı, klonlamaya karşı yasal yaklaşımların nasıl olması gerektiği, klonların toplumdaki nasıl ayrıştırılıp ötekileştirilebilecekleri üzerine düşünmeyi de gerektirmektedir. Yine bazı yazarlar insan bedeninin metalaştırılması üzerinden klonlama ile kapitalizm arasında da ilişki kurmuşlardır. Romandaki karakterlerin kaderlerine karşı dirençsiz oluşları da birçok yazarın dikkatini çekmiş ve kadercilik, kabullenme, otonomi ve direniş üzerine tartışmalar doğurmuştur. Bu aşamada bir tür direniş yöntemi olarak anlatının rolü ve yine geçmiş anlatmanın terapötik etkisi üzerinde de durulmuştur. Romanda ön plana çıkan diğer önemli temalar arasında yaratıcılık, sahicilik ve orijinallik yer almaktadır. Romandaki klonların orijinal sanat eserleri yaratmaya teşvik edilmeleri, onların eşsiz ruhlara sahip olduklarını kanıtlamanın bir yolu olarak kullanıldığı için, klonların ruh sahibi olup olamayacakları da önemli bir tartışma konusu olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır. Karakterler otantik sanat eserleri ortaya çıkarma çabasına ek olarak otantik davranışlarda bulunma çabasına da sahiptirler, ancak paradoksal bir biçimde daha normal ve insani görülebilmek adına klon olmayan insanların davranışlarını kopyalamaktadırlar. *Beni Asla Bırakma*'nın genel anlamda, bir simülasyonun sonucu olarak yine bir simülasyonlar dünyasına gelmiş olan varlıkların yaşamları ve varoluşlarını ele aldığı söylenebilir, bu da romanı Baudrillard'ın felsefesi açısından ele almaya uygun kılmaktadır.

Görüldüğü üzere her iki roman da çeşitli açılardan Baudrillard'ın felsefesiyle tematik olarak ilişkilendirilebilecek yapıda olsa da, bu iki romanı (özellikle de *Beni Asla Bırakma*'yı) tam olarak Baudrillard felsefesi açısından ele alan çok fazla çalışma bulunmamaktadır. Buna ek olarak iki romanı birbiriyle karşılaştıran çalışmalar da mevcut değildir. Bu çalışmanın amacı bu iki romanı Baudrillard'ın simülasyon ve simülakr kavramları üzerinden birbirleriyle karşılaştırarak literatüre katkıda bulunmaktır. Ele aldıkları konular ve bakış açıları birçok açıdan farklılık gösterse de, romanlar simülasyon ve simülakr kavramlarına olan yaklaşımları açısından birçok ortaklığa sahiptir. Romanların benzerlik ve farklılıkları,

Baudrillard'ın felsefesiyle olan ilişkileri ve ona yönelttikleri sorgulamalar, bu çalışmanın odak noktasını teşkil etmektedir.

Romanların incelenmesinde Baudrillard'ın bazı temel kavramları kullanılmaktadır. Bunlar arasında simülasyon, simülakr, gerçek, hipergerçek, simge, temsil ve caydırma sistemi kavramları en ön plana çıkanlardır. Baudrillard'a göre postmodern dünyada simülasyonlar, yerini aldıkları gerçekliklerin önüne geçmişlerdir. Bu da gerçekliği yalnızca simülasyonları üzerinden algılayabileceğimiz ve üretebileceğimiz anlamına gelmektedir. Bu durum düşünsel düzlemdeki gerçek-simülasyon ayrımını da silikleştirmektedir. Baudrillard Batı dünyasının temsiline potansiyeline duyduğu sarsılmaz inancın, modern bilimin gerçekliği dondurup hapsetme çabası içinde aslında kendisini gerçeklikten uzaklaştırmasının, tarih ve kültürün geçmişi yığma/stoklama takıntısının bir eleştirisini sunmaktadır. Hipergerçek kavramını ele alırken Disneyland gibi mekânsal simülasyonlar üzerinde duran Baudrillard, böylesi yapay mekânların, kaybedilmiş bir gerçekliğin telafisini sunmaya ve bu gerçekliğin varlığını tasdik etmeye çalıştıklarını belirtmektedir. Baudrillard ayrıca simülasyonların, bir caydırma sistemine hizmet ettiğine de dikkat çekmektedir. Böyle bir sistem içerisinde suçlar hukuka, grevler iş dünyasına, krizler sistemin devamlılığına, devrimler kapitale hizmet etmektedir, çünkü sistem karşıtı gibi görünen tüm eylemler hipergerçekliğe dönüştürülmek suretiyle anlamsız ve zıddına hizmet eder hale getirilmişlerdir. Güç sahipleri yapay sosyal, politik ve ekonomik krizler yoluyla aslında kendi güçlerinin devamlılığını sağlamaktadırlar. Caydırma sistemi insanlara korku aşılacaktır ve bu sayede insanlar için çeşitli kriz tehditleri, krizlerin gerçekliğinin önüne geçmiştir. Savaşlar ve sosyal krizler aslında yapay oluşumlardır ve medya tarafından caydırma sistemine hizmet amacıyla kullanılmaktadırlar. Tarih ve anı kavramları da Baudrillard'a göre birer simülasyon aracıdır. Geçmiş, simüle edildiği anda ölür. Geçmiş tarihe ya da anıya dönüştürmek, yalnızca geçmişin hipergerçek versiyonlarını üretmeye yarar. Tarihin medya tarafından yeniden üretilmesi de bir tür simülasyondur. Müzeler tarihi sömürüp yok eden, onu hipergerçek hale getiren ve öldürdüğü kültürü gösteriye dönüştüren mekânlardır. Baudrillard simülasyonun beden üzerindeki etkilerine de değinmektedir. Ona göre klonlama, cinselliğin reddi anlamına gelen bir tür ölüm

itkisinin, bedeni bir modele ya da genetik formüle indirgeyen, üreme yerine seri üretimi tercih eden, cinselliğin yol açtığı farklılaşma ve bireyselleşmeden korkarak farklı olanın tehdidini aynıyı sürdürmek yoluyla yok etmeye çalışan bir mantığın sonucudur. Nitekim simülasyonlar dünyasında cinsellik arzudan, ölüm tehdit edicilikten yoksundur. İnsan bedeninin yanı sıra hayvan bedenine de odaklanan Baudrillard, irrasyonel ya da anormal olan her şeyi açıklayabileceğini düşünen ve nesnellik ilkesinin varlığını kanıtlamaya çalışan bilimin bu yolda hayvan bedenlerini nasıl kullandığına, rasyonalist ve hümanist yaklaşımların hayvanları “insani” varlıklara dönüştürme misyonunun altında aslında onlara karşı ırkçı bir duygusallık ve küçültücülük yattığına dikkat çekmektedir. Simülasyonların kapitalist sistemler içerisinde metalaştırılma ve pazarlanma süreçlerine de dikkat çeken Baudrillard, pazarlanan nesnelere kullanım ya da değişim değerlerinden çok simgesel değerlerinin önemli olduğunu belirtmektedir. Reklamcılık ve propaganda, her nesneyi her anlamla özgürce ilişkilendirebilmekte ve böylece her şeyi pazarlayabilmektedir. Simülasyonların gerçekliğin yerini aldığı ve gerçekliğin varlığına olan inancın geri dönülemez biçimde sarsıldığı böyle bir dünyada, kayıtsızlık ve duyumsamazlığın getirdiği yeni bir tür nihilizm ortaya çıkmaktadır ve bu yeni dünyada anlam için bir umut yoktur.

İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı romanında Julian Barnes, “İngiltere, İngiltere” adlı tema parkı ile gerçek İngiltere'nin geçtiği süreçleri karşılaştırmalı olarak anlatırken, yapay bir mekânın, bir simülasyonun, gerçekliğin önüne geçerek ondan nasıl daha güçlü hale gelebileceğini göstermektedir. Romanın simülasyon kavramını ele alışı daha çok mekânsal düzlemdedir. Ancak söz konusu mekân (tema parkı) İngiltere'yi, İngiliz tarihi ve kültürünü temsil etmeyi amaçladığı için Barnes aynı zamanda ülke, millet, milliyet, ulusal tarih ve kültür gibi soyut kavramların da bir simülasyon içerisinde yeniden şekillendirilebileceğini, değiştirilip dönüştürülebileceğini göstermektedir. Tema parkının sahibi olan Pitman karakteri yoluyla simülasyonun ardındaki kapitalist motivasyonları ve hipergerçekliğin pazarlama ile olan ilişkisini, tema parkındaki oyuncular yoluyla insanların simülasyon sistemi içerisinde geçirdikleri kimlik dönüşümü süreçlerini gösteren Barnes, romanın ana karakteri olan Martha yoluyla da simülasyonun aslında her

zaman farklı biçimlerde var olduğunu ve insan hafızasının geçmişi öznel biçimde yeniden şekillendirerek her zaman simülasyonlar yaratma eğiliminde olduğunu vurgulamaktadır. Nitekim romanın son bölümünde Anglia'ya karşı gerçeklik arayışı ve çocuksu nostalji arasında bir yerde konumlanmış mesafeli bir yaklaşıma sahip olan yazar, okuyucuya simülasyondan kolay bir kaçış yolu sunmak ve gerçekliği basite indirgenmiş bir biçimde yeniden inşa etmek yerine, gerçeklik kavramının bizzat kendisine sorgulayıcı bir yaklaşımı tercih etmektedir. Dolayısıyla Barnes, simülasyonun gerçeklik üzerindeki zaferini gösterirken, varlığına peşinen inanılan gerçekliğin aslında var olmayabileceği fikrini de vurgulamaktadır. Bir ülke ya da ulusun özüne inme çabası kaçınılmaz biçimde başarısız olacaktır, ama bunun tek sebebi bu çabanın bir simülasyonla sonuçlanacak olması değil, aynı zamanda söz konusu simülasyonun temsil etmeye çalıştığı gerçekliğin en başından beri var olmayabileceği ihtimalidir.

Kazuo Ishiguro'nun *Beni Asla Bırakma* romanı simülasyon kavramını temel olarak insan bedeni ve klonlama üzerinden ele almaktadır. Bu nedenle "insan" kavramının ne anlama geldiği, normal bir insanla bir klon arasındaki çizginin ne olduğu, bir klonun kimliğinin nasıl tanımlanabileceği, klonun bağımsız, otonom, eşsiz ve ruh sahibi bir varlık olarak görülüp görülemeyeceği üzerine önemli sorular sormaktadır. Klonların çocukluk dönemiyle başlayıp genç yetişkinlik dönemiyle bitmesi açısından bir *Bildungsroman* yolunu takip eden roman, insan bedenini simüle etmenin sonuçlarını göstermektedir. Klon çocukların yetiştirildiği okul olan Hailsham, bilgisizliğin masumiyeti ile yaklaşmakta olan tehlikeler arasında bir geçiş sürecini temsil etmektedir. Çocukların kendi kaderlerini bütün gerçekliğiyle anlamalarını engellerken bir yandan da onları bu kaderi kabullenmeye koşullayan bir mekân olarak Hailsham, yapay ve simüle edilmiş bir doğaya sahiptir. Bu açıdan Baudrillard'ın caydırma sistemi olarak tanımladığı sistemin de gözlemlenebileceği bir mekândır. Karakterlerin klon oluşları ve toplumun onlara bakış açısını da ilk kez bu mekânda görmekteyiz. Toplumun klon bedenlerini metalaştırıp pazarlama, bu bedenler üzerinde sahiplik iddia etme amacı, klonlamanın etiği üzerine sorular sormaktadır. Hailsham'da karakterlerin birbirleriyle ve öğretmenleriyle olan ilişkileri üzerinden Ishiguro aynı zamanda klonların insani yönlerini irdelemektedir. Roman

ayrıca klonların yaşadığı kimlik krizine, kendilerini insandan aşağı olarak gören ve istismar etmek isteyen bir toplum içerisinde ötekiler ve marjinaler olarak konumlarına odaklanmaktadır. Hailsham'dan sonra Kulübeler, sancılı büyüme sürecinin gerçek anlamda başladığı, karakterlerin hem gerçek dünyadan korkup hem de onu keşfetmeye ve ona ayak uydurmaya çalıştıkları bir mekân olarak öne çıkmaktadır. Burada roman karakterlerin normal görünmek adına giriştikleri rol yapma süreçlerini vurgulamaktadır. Karakterler aynı zamanda orijinal modelleriyle kendilerini karşılaştırarak toplumdaki konumlarını ve rollerini sorgulamaktadırlar. Bu aşamadaki en önemli soru klonların ruhlarının olup olmadığı, gerçek anlamda insani görülüp görülemeyecekleri sorusudur. Hailsham'ın bu gerçeği kanıtlamaya çalışan bir kurum olduğunu, ancak bu gerçekten rahatsız olan toplumun klonlara kayıtsızlığı nedeniyle Hailsham'ın kapatılmış olduğunu da bu aşamada öğrenmekteyiz. Toplum klonları Baudrillard'ın "kalıntı" olarak adlandırdığı biçimde görmekte ve onların sesini ve varlığını bastırmak istemektedir. Romanın hayli şaşırtıcı bir başka yönü de karakterlerin kaderlerini direnmeksizin kabul ediyor olmalarıdır. Bu yaklaşım üzerinden roman determinizm, kadercilik, özgür irade ve otonomi üzerine sorular sormakta ve karakterlerin, varoluşlarının gerçeklikleriyle yüzleşip onları kabullenme süreçlerini incelemektedir. Romanın sonunda anılar ve geçmiş, klonların yaşamlarına anlam ve bütünlük atfedebilmek adına tutunabilecekleri kavramlar olarak ön plana çıkmaktadır. Bu durum özellikle romanın başkarakteri ve anlatıcısı Kathy'nin geçmişine ve bu geçmişi anlatmaya yönelik ilgisi üzerinden kendini belli etmektedir. Kathy'nin anlatısı aynı zamanda bir topluluk olarak klonların maruz kaldıkları kötü muamelelere karşı bir tanıklık anlatısı olduğu için, anlatıların politik ve tarihsel rolünün de altı çizilmektedir. Roman her şeyin üstünde insanlık hali, insan varoluşu, sevgi ve dostluk üzerine bir eser olduğu için, beden simülasyonunun bir eleştirisini sunarken ve klon karakterler üzerinden böylesi tehlikeli bir eylemin korkunç sonuçlarını tasvir ederken aynı zamanda insandışı görülen içerisinde insani olanı; kasvetli, karanlık ve distopik bir dünya içerisinde insani bağları bulmayı amaçlamaktadır. Simülasyon kavramına basite indirgeyici ve tek yönlü bir biçimde yaklaşmaktansa Ishiguro, gerçekliğin

simülasyonu üzerine olduğu kadar simüle edilenin gerçekliği üzerine de odaklanmaktadır.

Görüldüğü üzere gerek *İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı*, gerekse *Beni Asla Bırakma*, Baudrillard'ın felsefesi açısından ele alınmaya hayli müsait romanlardır. *İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı*, tema parkı yoluyla simülasyon kavramını ülke, millet, milliyet, milli tarih ve kültür, ve kolektif hafıza üzerinden ele alırken aynı zamanda bu kavramların, simülasyonlarından bağımsız olarak kendi içlerindeki varsayılan gerçekliklerini de sorgulamaktadır. *Beni Asla Bırakma* ise klon karakterleri yoluyla beden simülasyonunu ve insanlık, gerçek ve normal insan, insan ruhu ve otonomi kavramlarını ele almaktadır. Görünürde farklı temalarla ilgili olsalar da bu iki roman Baudrillard'ın simülasyon teorisi üzerinden ele alındığında aralarındaki bağlar ortaya çıkmaktadır, çünkü farklılıklarına rağmen simülasyon ve simülakr kavramlarına olan yaklaşımları açısından birçok benzerlikleri de vardır.

Öncelikle her iki roman da mekânsal simülasyonlar içermektedir. Bu durum, İngiltere'yi simüle etmeyi amaçlayan bir tema parkını ele alan *İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı*'da daha belirgin olsa da, *Beni Asla Bırakma*'daki Hailsham ve Kulübeler de simülasyon mekânlarıdır, çünkü klonlara yapay olarak inşa edilmiş, dikkatli bir biçimde şekillendirilen ve kontrol edilen varoluşlar ve deneyimler sunmayı amaçlamaktadırlar. Her iki romanda da söz konusu mekânlar, birer simülasyon oldukları gerçeğini saklama amacını da gütmektedirler. “İngiltere, İngiltere” bir tema parkı olsa bile, projenin arkasındaki kişiler onu bir tema parkından daha üst bir konuma koymakta, onu basit bir simülasyon olarak değil de İngiltere'nin yerini alacak yeni bir ülke olarak görmektedirler. Tema parkının gerçek İngiltere üzerinde sağladığı üstünlük de, simülasyon rolünü aşma hırsını doğrulamaktadır. Hailsham ve Kulübeler de, kendi içlerindeki gerçeklikleri tek hayal edilebilir gerçeklik olarak karakterlere aşılacak amacıyla onları gerçek dünyayı bütünüyle keşfetmekten alıkoyan mekânlar olmaları yönünden birer simülasyon mekânlarıdır.

Her iki roman da simülasyonların arkasındaki kötücül amaçları göstermektedir. *İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı*'da Pitman megaloman, kibirli ve aşırı hırslı bir karakter olarak sunulmakta, bir hipergerçek turizm alanı yaratma planının arkasındaki kapitalist motivasyonlar, ülkeyi ve milli kültürü metalaştırıp pazarlama

anlayışı gösterilmektedir. Metalaştırma anlayışına yönelik benzer bir eleştiri, önceden tedavi edilemez olan hastalıkların tedavisi için klonların bedenlerinin ve organlarının araçlaştırılmasını göstermesi açısından *Beni Asla Bırakma*'da da mevcuttur. Her iki romanda da simülasyonları gerçekleştirenler, simülasyonlarının etik sonuçlarına karşı kayıtsızdırlar. *İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı*'da ülke, millet, ulusal tarih ve kültür gibi temel kavramlar, salt müşteri memnuniyeti ve kapitalist kazanım amacıyla kesilip biçilmekte, analiz edilip sınıflandırılmakta, yeniden şekillendirilip inşa edilmektedir. *Beni Asla Bırakma*'da klonlar insandan aşağı varlıklara indirgenmekte, bedenleri üzerindeki otonomileri reddedilmektedir. Gerçek ve normal insanlardan oluştuğu düşünülen daha geniş bir topluluğun refahı için aşağı ve değersiz olduğu düşünülen daha küçük bir topluluğu baskı altına alan hiyerarşik bir toplumda klonlar istismara uğramaktadırlar.

Her iki romanda da simülasyonların, insanların kimliklerini, davranışlarını, yaklaşımlarını ve varoluşlarını dönüştürme biçimlerini görmekteyiz. *İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı*'da bu durum en belirgin biçimde tema parkı için alınan oyuncuların, oynadıkları rollere aşırı bağlanıp gerçek kimliklerini kaybetmeleri süreciyle gösterilmektedir. Roman aynı zamanda tema parkının başkarakter Martha'yı dönüştürme sürecini de sunmaktadır; kendisi önce geçmişe saplanıp kalmış bir kadın olarak, daha sonra proje içerisinde güç isteyen hırslı bir girişimci olarak, son olarak da geçmiş, hafıza ve gerçeklik üzerine düşünen bir kinik olarak tasvir edilmektedir. *Beni Asla Bırakma*'daki karakterler de, diğer romanın tema parkındaki oyunculara benzer şekilde, genç yetişkinlik dönemlerinde dış dünyaya uyum sağlayabilmek için kendilerine yapay kimlikler inşa etmeye çalışmaktadırlar. Ancak *İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı*'daki oyuncular rollerini almadan önce bilerek ve isteyerek bir anlaşma imzalarken, *Beni Asla Bırakma*'daki karakterler için kimliğin yeniden inşası süreci daha bilinçaltı bir süreçtir. Normal görünebilmek adına rol yapmaya mecbur hissetmektedirler. Yine de tema parkındaki oyunculardan çok farklı değillerdir çünkü sonuçta yaşamlarındaki tüm roller, öğrenci, bakıcı ve donör rolleri, büyük bir sistem tarafından önceden belirlenmiştir.

Her iki roman da, hem geçmişi yeniden şekillendirip koruyan bir güç, hem de gerçekliğin öznel ve sınırlı bir simülatörü olarak hafıza kavramına odaklanmaktadır.

İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı'da Martha'nın çocukluk anılarına olan takıntısını, Pitman'ın da tema parkında kolektif hafızanın kusursuz bir özetini sunma takıntısını görmekteyiz. Bu açıdan roman hem kişisel hem de ulusal/kolektif hafızayı eşit derecede vurgulamaktadır. *Beni Asla Bırakma*'da Kathy, kendi organ bağışları yaklaşmakta olan anlatıcıdır ve tüm roman, ölümüne yaklaşırken geçmişi üzerine düşünen bir insanın anıları bütünü niteliğindedir. Kathy'nin geçmişindeki anıları ve bu anıları anlatıya dönüştürme eylemi, yaşamına bir anlamlılık, bütünlük ve onaylanma hissi vererek onu güçlendirmektedir. Romanda anlatı aynı zamanda, Kathy özellikle bu amaçla anlatıyor olmasa bile, bir tür sessiz protesto, klonların karşı karşıya kaldığı baskılar için bir tanıklık belgesi niteliği de kazanmaktadır.

İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı, tema parkının gerçek İngiltere'den çok daha güçlü hale gelmesini göstererek simülasyonun gerçeklik üzerindeki zaferini sunmaktadır. Bu açıdan roman, postmodern dünyada insanların kopyaları orijinallere tercih ediyor olduğu fikrini onaylamaktadır. Ancak insanların bu popüler yaklaşımının ötesinde, Martha karakteri yoluyla roman, güçlü bir simülasyonun kati bir biçimde hüküm sürdüğü bir dünyada bile gerçek ve sahici olana yönelik asla bitmeyen arayışı da göstermektedir. *Beni Asla Bırakma*'da ise simülasyonun zaferini görmüyoruz. Romanda simüle edilmiş olan, yani klonlar, onları istismar eden simülatörlerin baskısı altındadır. Bu açıdan Ishiguro simülasyonu, gerçekliğe bulaşıp, onu yenen ve yok eden bir virüs olarak sunmak yerine, sahte olduğu düşünülen içerisindeki gerçeği, yapay olduğu düşünülen içerisindeki sahiciyi, insandışı olduğu düşünülen içerisindeki insani elementi bulmaya odaklanmaktadır. Bu farklı yaklaşım muhtemelen romanın, *İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı*'daki daha soyut, daha kavramsal şeylerin simülasyonundan farklı olarak insan bedeninin simülasyonunu ele alıyor olduğu gerçeğinden kaynaklanmaktadır.

Son olarak, bu iki romanın gerçeklik kavramına olan yaklaşımlarına bakmak gerekir. *İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı*'da Barnes, simülasyonun tema parkı ile sınırlı olmadığını göstermektedir: İnsan hafızasının kusurlu doğası ve geçmişi yeniden şekillendirme takıntısına olan vurgusu, ve romanın sonunda Anglia'yı da bir başka simülasyon mekânı, hayal ürünü bir sahicilik mekânı olarak göstermesi yoluyla Barnes, bütün simülasyonlardan arındırmaya çalıştığımız, gerçekliğine sarsılmaz

biçimde inandığımız ve “gerçeklik/simülasyon” dualitesi içerisinde simülasyonun karşısına koyduğumuz o gerçekliğin aslında hiç var olmayabileceğini ima etmektedir. Simülasyon açık ya da gizli, bilinçli ya da bilinçsiz biçimde daima vardır, temsil etmeye çalıştığı gerçekliğin başından beri var olmadığı ya da yalnızca simülasyonları yoluyla var olabileceği gerçeğini bastırmaya çalışmaktadır. Öte yandan *Beni Asla Bırakma*'da Ishiguro paradoksal bir biçimde en umulmadık yerde, simülasyon içerisinde gerçekliği bulmayı başarmaktadır. İnsandışı, tekinsiz, gizemli ve tehlikeli “öteki” şeklindeki geleneksel klon arketipini yıkan Ishiguro, karakterlerinin insani ilişkilerini, davranışlarını ve hislerini, kimlik arayışlarını ve varoluşsal sorgulamalarını göstererek, klon ile normal bir insan arasında fark olmadığını, klonun bütünüyle insani ve ruh sahibi olduğunu belirtmektedir. *İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı*'da simülatör ve simülakr (tema parkı), gerçekliğe karşı savaşta el eledir, ancak *Beni Asla Bırakma*'da simülakr (klonlar), simülatörün planlarının ötesine geçmekte ve geleneksel karşıt dualiteyi yıkarak gerçekliğin tarafına taşınmaktadır, çünkü klonlar normal insanlardan farklı ya da daha az insani değillerdir ve bu birliğin işaret ettiği anlam, klonların simülatörler tarafından baskılanıp sessizleştirilmeleriyle sonuçlanmaktadır. Bu açıdan *Beni Asla Bırakma*'da, *İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı*'dan farklı olarak, gerçek tehlike simülasyonun sonunda ortaya çıkan simülakr değil bizzat simülasyon eyleminin kendisidir. Yine de her iki romanın da tehlikeli simülasyon eylemlerine karşı uyarı niteliğinde olduğu söylenebilir.

Biri 20. yüzyılın sonunda, diğeri de 21. yüzyılın başında yazılmış olan bu iki roman, nesnel gerçeklik, simgeler, insan kimliği, öznel algı gibi kavramları yapı sökümcü, post-yapısalcı ve şüpheli bir biçimde sorgulamaları açısından postmodern anlatılar olarak görülebilirler. Bu da romanlar ile Baudrillard'ın felsefesi arasında bağlar yaratmaktadır, çünkü gerçek, sanal ve simge üzerine odaklanılması açısından Baudrillard'ın felsefesi de postmodern olarak tanımlanabilir. Her iki roman da, gerçek dünyada ya halihazırda oluyor olan (ulusu yeniden tanımlama ve metalaştırma) ya da olması mümkün olan (insan klonlama) senaryolar sunmaları açısından, içinde yaşadığımız postmodern dünyaya uygun ve ilintili görünmektedirler. Her iki roman da, tasvir ettikleri distopik dünyalara karşı eleştirel

yaklaşımlara sahiptir: Gerçek ile taklit arasındaki sınırların silindiği postmodern ortamlar sunarken aynı zamanda simülasyon eyleminin distopik sonuçlarını da sunmaktadırlar. Simülasyonların ardındaki faydacı/çıkarcı motivasyonların (ulusu yeniden tanımlayıp ticarileştirme ve insan bedenini araçlaştırma) altını çizmektedirler. Sanayi sonrası postmodern dünyada her şey simgesel bir değerle yeniden tanımlanmakta ve faydacı bir simülasyon sistemine hizmet etmektedir. Özellikle *İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı*, mekânın pazarlanması, hipergerçek turizm, müşteri memnuniyeti, ve kapitalist kazanım için ulusun metalaştırılması üzerine odaklanmasıyla, bu sürece karşı neo-Marksist bir yaklaşıma sahiptir. Aynı metalaştırma karşıtı mantık, insan bedeninin araçlaştırılmasına odaklanması açısından *Beni Asla Bırakma*'da da var olsa da bu roman, insan kavramını simülasyon bağlamında sorgulaması açısından daha çok "post-insan" bir anlatı olarak görülebilir. Klonlarla normal insanlar arasında katı sınırlara sahip olan bir anlatı dünyası içerisinde anlatıcı ses yavaş yavaş bu sınırları silmekte ve klonlarla normal insanların gerçekten de farklı olup olmadıkları sorusunu sormaktadır. Her iki roman da simülasyonlara odaklanırken aynı zamanda gerçeklik ve sahicilik kavramlarını da ele almakta, ve okuyucuyu önemli sorularla baş başa bırakmaktadır: Gerçek ulusun, ya da gerçek insanın tek bir tanımı var mıdır? Soyutlama, kavramsallaştırma ve simülasyonun ardında tekil bir gerçeklik var mıdır?

TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname :

Adı / Name :

Bölümü / Department:.....

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English) :

.....
.....
.....

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master Doktora / PhD

1. Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.

2. Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years**. *

3. Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for period of **six months**. *

**Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.*

A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature..... Tarih / Date.....